

FURTHER STRATEGIES FOR PROMOTING CRITICAL THINKING

PREPARED FOR THE
READING & WRITING FOR CRITICAL THINKING PROJECT

GUIDEBOOK IV

Jeannie L. Steele, Kurtis S. Meredith, and
Charles Temple



The authors gratefully acknowledge the insights, support, and encouragement of Elisabeth Lorant in the design and elaboration of this project.

This manual was prepared for use in conjunction with the Reading & Writing for Critical Thinking (RWCT) project, which is a joint offering of the International Reading Association and the University of Northern Iowa, with sponsorship by George Soros's Open Society Institute and the national Soros Foundations. Co-directors of the RWCT project are Jeannie Steele, University of Northern Iowa; Kurt Meredith, University of Northern Iowa; Charles Temple, Hobart and William Smith Colleges; and Scott Walter, International Reading Association.

This guidebook is intended as supplement to an interactive course. It is not intended for general distribution without an accompanying course presentation. It is intended as a guide for educators participating in the RWCT project who are being prepared to deliver workshops/courses to fellow educators.

© 1998 Steele, J.L., Meredith, K.S., & Temple, C.

Any use of this material for any other purpose without the written permission of the authors is prohibited.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
What Is Critical Thinking?	2
<i>A Definition of Critical Thinking Rooted in Pedagogy</i>	2
Dimensions of Growth in Critical Thinking	2
<i>The Personal-to-Public Dimension</i>	2
<i>The Heteronomous-to-Autonomous Dimension</i>	3
<i>The Intuitive-to-Logical Dimension</i>	3
<i>The Dimension From One Perspective to Many</i>	3
Expected Outcomes	4
Course Logistics	4
<i>Parts of the Course</i>	5
Course Schedule	5
<i>Materials</i>	6
<i>Key Terms for Careful Translation</i>	6
Evaluation of the Workshop	7
<i>Daily Monitoring</i>	7
<i>Final Evaluation</i>	8
Free write	8
Evaluation form	9
Part I Demonstration and Analysis of Sample Lessons	11
First Lesson: "Ivan and the Seal Skin"	12
<i>Workshop Introduction</i>	12
<i>Predicting From Terms</i>	12
<i>The Prediction Chart</i>	13
<i>Free Responses</i>	14
Shared-Inquiry Discussion	14

<i>Predictions From Terms Revisited</i>	15
Discussing the Lesson	16
<i>Recalling the Steps of the Lesson</i>	16
<i>Reviewing Predicting From Terms</i>	16
<i>Reviewing the Directed Reading–Thinking Activity Chart</i>	17
<i>Reviewing the Reader–Response Question</i>	17
<i>Reviewing the Shared–Inquiry Approach</i>	18
Rationale and procedures	18
Points for special attention	19
A modified Shared–Inquiry approach	20
Second Lesson: "How Much Lead Poisoning?"	21
<i>Paired Brainstorming and Know/Want to Know/Learn</i>	21
<i>Using the KWL Chart</i>	21
<i>Discussion Web</i>	22
Discussing the Lesson	23
<i>Recalling the Steps of the Lesson</i>	23
<i>Reviewing the KWL Activity</i>	24
<i>Reviewing the Discussion–Web Activity</i>	24
Rationale and procedures	24
<i>Reviewing the Debate Activity</i>	25
Rationale and procedures	25
Combining Critical–Thinking Methods	27
Part II Guided Practice	29
Part III Planning for Implementation	31
Postworkshop: Planning for Follow Up	32
Sources for Interpretive Questions About Literature	33
<i>Plot–Based Questions</i>	33
<i>Questions About Images and Symbols</i>	34

<i>Questions About Contrasted Elements</i>	35
<i>Reading Against the Grain</i>	36
Paired readings	36
<i>Ethical Questions</i>	37
<i>Metaphysical Questions</i>	37
Unmasking the Implied Reader	37
Comparing Stories: The Story Chart	38
Additional Debate Strategies	39
<i>Academic Controversy</i>	39
<i>Arguments on Cards</i>	40
Framing the other side's arguments	40
<i>Constructive Controversy</i>	41
References	42
Suggested Reading	42
Glossary	44
Appendix A "Ivan and the Seal Skin"	46
Appendix B "The Evildoer"	49
Appendix C "Thank You, Ma'am"	53
Appendix D "The Children's Hour"	57
Appendix E "On Children"	59
Appendix F "Save the Bali Mynah!"	60
Appendix G "How Much Lead Poisoning?"	64
Appendix H From <i>The Log of Christopher Columbus</i>	66
Appendix I From <i>The Diary of Bartolome De Las Casas</i>	70
Appendix J Suggestions for Teaching the Sample Texts	72
Teaching "The Evildoer"	72
Teaching "Thank You, Ma'am"	72
Teaching "The Children's Hour" and "On Children"	73

Teaching "Save the Bali Mynah!"	73
Teaching <i>The Log of Christopher Columbus</i> and <i>The Diary of Bartolome De Las Casas</i>	74

INTRODUCTION

What Is Critical Thinking?

The term critical thinking has been used in educational circles for decades, and has come to hold different promises for different groups. To many mainstream educators, critical thinking means higher order thinking—higher usually referring to elevation up the ladder of Benjamin Bloom’s taxonomy of cognitive abilities. To members of college philosophy departments, critical thinking usually refers to the skills of logic and argumentation that equip students to read carefully, discuss analytically, and write clearly. To literary theorists and their colleagues, critical is shorthand for an approach that deconstructs texts into their constituent parts, and is often viewed with an air of suspicion as to the ways texts achieve effects on readers, and the motives of those who wrote them. And to the followers of Paolo Freire (1970), the critical in education has referred to the imperative for consciousness-raising, that is increasing learners’ sense of agency in shaping their own destinies.

It may not be useful to try harder for a definitive characterization of critical thinking. Indeed, the philosopher Matthew Lipman (1991) recently set out to catalogue the cognitive processes that compete for the label of critical thinking, and then conceded that “the list is endless, because it consists of nothing less than an inventory of the intellectual powers of mankind.” The approach adopted in Reading and Writing for Critical Thinking (RWCT) derives, to a greater or lesser degree, from all of the traditions named above, with the following prejudice: We believe that those mental processes best suited to the RWCT Project are the ones that are most compatible with the challenge of preparing responsible citizens for an open society, the practices of

forming original opinions,
choosing rationally between competing ideas,
solving problems, and
debating ideas responsibly.

We add to this list the social dimension, that is the value of working cooperatively with others to construct meaning while appreciating different

points of view and recognizing the ways people's background can influence their attitudes and perceptions.

Then comes the pragmatic factor. The better approaches are those that involve students in active thinking, without delay, not those that study logical processes in the abstract, postponing indefinitely the opportunity for students actually to think about something important. Moreover, critical thinking is best developed when it flows from the students' own curiosity, with authentic challenges that students care about.

A Definition of Critical Thinking Rooted in Pedagogy

Rather than setting out to develop an inventory of critical thinking skills, for the purposes of RWCT we will focus on transforming classroom practices so that they provide a climate of trust, engage students in interesting ideas, and foster deep inquiry and genuine debate. This approach follows from the belief that a sustained program of inquiry into issues students care about in the presence of a thoughtful teacher with rich discussions and lively debate will help students develop a host of valuable critical thinking skills simultaneously.

Dimensions of Growth in Critical Thinking

As students grow in the ability to think critically, we believe they make progress along the following four dimensions:

1. Personal to Public
2. Heteronomous to Autonomous
3. Intuitive to Logical
4. One perspective to Many perspectives

The Personal-to-Public Dimension

Children's earlier responses to a work tend to be expressed in terms of likes and dislikes, of what appeals to them personally. With experience and maturity, they are better able to express responses in terms that can be understood by others, and that are better suited to comparison and debate with others. The personal response is never abandoned com-

pletely, however. As James Britton (1970) and others have pointed out, having personal commitments to ideas is a source of both vitality and authenticity in thinking. A mark of an educated person is the power to express one's thoughts clearly and persuasively to others, even to strangers.

The Heteronomous-to-Autonomous Dimension

Heteronomous is defined as a younger child's sense that wisdom and authority are possessed by categorically greater others. The text is a work whose authority is beyond question. Autonomy refers to the state of awareness where the child is capable of describing the world and of making judgments about it. There is no reason why we, too, might not be authorities about some things, or why a printed text might have a limited claim to the truth. Students who grow toward autonomy of thought are more confident in venturing their own arguments, and are more willing to debate the claims made by texts.

The Intuitive-to-Logical Dimension

To state things intuitively means to express ideas without much reflection about the connection between the statement and experience or between premises and conclusions. To focus on logic is to become sensitive to ways evidence is marshaled to support truth claims. Logic does not threaten to replace intuition altogether, but to the extent that logic can be a more public form of thought than intuition, democracy is better served when people are able to explain their positions logically.

The Dimension From One Perspective to Many

A less mature (or more dogmatic) thinker may hold firmly to his or her own beliefs, without troubling to investigate alternatives. A more mature critical thinker will take alternative beliefs into account, not only to better understand others, but also to assure himself that his beliefs are the most plausible ones available to him. Thus the more mature thinker may modify his or her own beliefs when another belief becomes more persuasive, but he or she will accommodate other beliefs when arguing for his or her own position. This creates an argument of the form, "I

know there are many who believe x , but let me show you the reasons why y is still sensible.”

Expected Outcomes

The goals of this short course, then, are for the participants to have teaching techniques that will

- encourage their students to form original opinions;
- enable their students to “talk back to” a text that is, to follow extensions of arguments or challenge premises;
- help students reason cooperatively with others to make meaning; and
- empower students to begin to support their own conclusions in debates with others.

Course Logistics

This course is intended to build on the preceding courses and to further develop the participants’ competence in teaching for critical thinking. Experience has shown that when we are dealing with instructional approaches, it is better to do activities first and to talk later. Therefore, the course begins with a minimum of preamble, and takes the participants right into two extended exercises that incorporate a sequence of critical-thinking activities.

Next comes a debriefing time, in which participants explore their reactions to the activities. It is important for the participants to realize that not all lessons will incorporate every activity, and that different subjects and purposes may call for different strategies to be used, some more than others.

A series of activities follows in which the components of the extended lesson are practiced again, one at a time. At this point, we want to be sure that participants have the procedures clearly in mind, in order to reproduce the activity in their own classroom.

Finally, the participants will be given an opportunity to think carefully about ways they could adapt these methods to their own circumstances, and to make specific plans to do so.

Parts of the Course

The course is divided into four parts. Part I includes preliminary activities: Introducing the new presenters and getting-to-know-you activities, and reports and questions from the participants' trials of the strategies introduced in the previous workshop.

Part II includes the presentation of model lessons. It begins with an introduction of the workshop, describing what will happen during the workshop. Presentation of a demonstration lesson followed by discussion and analysis of that lesson come next. This is followed by the presentation of a second demonstration lesson, and discussion and analysis of that lesson. The second part concludes with a review of the lessons presented so far, and where they fit in the teaching-learning framework.

Part III consists of guided practice. Participants are given an opportunity to construct lessons in groups, under the guidance of the presenters, and using texts that are included at the end of this guide.

Part IV is where participants plan for implementation. They discuss where and how these critical-thinking techniques can be employed. Here again, they work in teams, which can be grade or content specific, to identify a content lesson for trial implementation. Participants develop a specific plan for implementation, including setting a date for initial implementation and determining a time for follow-up discussion with the group. After the close of this workshop, participants will use some combination of the critical-thinking techniques, recording student responses and their own questions for discussion at follow-up meetings.

Course Schedule

This short course is scheduled to run 10 to 12 hours or longer. It can be combined with another short course—most logically with the course presented in Guidebook III. The two of them together also might be presented in a session lasting four to five days. The timing of activities may be handled several ways. A model for a four-day workshop in which the two courses are presented follows.

- Day 1 (a.m.)** Warm-up activities and preview of the workshop.
Discussion of participants' implementations of strategies from the previous workshop.
- (a.m.)** First demonstration and debriefing of lesson from Guidebook III.

- (p.m.)** Second demonstration and debriefing of lesson from Guidebook III. Focus on further teaching methods.
- Day 2 (a.m.)** Guided practice of lessons using methods from Guidebook III.
- (p.m.)** First demonstration lesson and debriefing from Guidebook IV.
- Day 3 (a.m.)** Second Demonstration lesson and debriefing from Guidebook IV.
- (p.m.)** Guided practice in using methods chosen from Guidebook IV.
- Day 4** Formulating and sharing plans for implementation (including strategies from Guidebook III and Guidebook IV).
Evaluation of the workshop

Materials

The workshop needs relatively few materials. The most pressing need will be for texts. A small inventory of texts is included in the appendix. If other texts are used, bear in mind that they must be translated; this usually requires considerable lead-time and expense.

When participants give their own workshops, it will be important for them to select local articles and when teachers select content material for their classrooms they should select age-appropriate and content-relevant material. It is helpful, of course, to select material that is interesting to the students and reasonably well constructed.

You will also need copies of a set of readings for each participant; poster paper, tape, and markers, or overheads and markers; and writing paper and pens. If communication is possible with participants ahead of time, they should be asked to bring a relevant content text to use for planning and implementation.

Key Terms for Careful Translation

Note that many sessions will be translated from English into the local language and back. If so, it is likely that more than one translator will be employed. Careful translation is important throughout, but accurate translation of key terms is absolutely essential. Often translation of terms

is made difficult when no exact matching terms exist in the two languages. It is essential that you calibrate the translations by showing the translators the list of terms included in the glossary in advance of each workshop, and explain them until the translator is satisfied he or she has a closely matching term for each one. The translator should write down these terms, not only to aid memory, but also so they can be shared with any other translators who may have a role in the project. In time you will come to use these terms yourself, both to save time and to build bridges of understanding with your in-country counterparts.

Evaluation of the Workshop

Evaluation and monitoring of all of our activities helps us keep our work on track, and also gives us the information we need to make the courses better suited to the needs of the participants. You should plan to set aside time at the end of each day to carry out daily monitoring of that day's activities. You should also plan to conduct an evaluation at the end of the session.

Daily Monitoring

Leave five minutes at the end of each day for all participants to answer three questions on index cards, which you will distribute to them. People should sign their names. Explain that these are not test questions: There is no right or wrong answer. They are intended as a way for each participant to communicate with you. It is a good idea to have your translator write these questions on the chalkboard or overhead.

- 1. What, in your opinion, were the most important concepts discussed today?***
- 2. What questions do you have at this point in the workshop?***
- 3. Make any general comment you wish to make.***

You will want to read the answers over before the next gathering. It's a good idea to begin that next session with the comments, and with answers to the questions.

Final Evaluation

At the conclusion of the workshop, you will need to set aside time for two kinds of evaluations. One is a free write. The other is the completion of an evaluation form.

Free write. Distribute paper to the participants. Ask them to write about the workshop for 10 minutes without stopping. It would be a good idea for your translator to write the following question on the chalkboard or transparency:

What is in your mind right now about the workshop you just completed?

Evaluation form. Distribute the evaluation form found on the next page and ask the participants to complete it.

PART I DEMONSTRATION AND ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE LESSONS



First Lesson: "Ivan and the Seal Skin"

Workshop Introduction

It is suggested that the workshop begin with a brief preview of what is to follow: A model lesson in which participants will be asked to take part in a number of different kinds of discussions, to read a short passage, and to write short responses. The lesson is meant to serve as a model of strategies that may be used with some adaptation in their own classrooms. Following the demonstration lesson, there will be ample opportunities to discuss the lesson, and to carefully consider the teaching procedures that were used. The participants should attend on two levels as they participate in this lesson. They should engage in the lesson just as a student would. They also should be mindful of what their teachers are doing, and try to be aware of the instructional outcomes of the teaching methods.

Predicting From Terms

Explain that in a moment the participants will be asked to read a short story. It is a folk story that used to be told among the fisher folk who live and work on the wild sea coast on the far north of Scotland. Present four terms that are a part of the story: *seal skin*, *sea coast*, *locked trunk*, and *marriage*. Each person should imagine as vividly as he or she can how these terms might figure into a story: What scenes and events do they bring to mind? What does he or she think can happen, given these four terms? Give the participants 5 minutes to think on their own. It may help to draw pictures of these four items to aid in comprehension and concentration.

After 4 or 5 minutes, go to the next step. Ask people to turn to the person next to them and share their ideas. They should be reminded to work quickly, as they have only 4 minutes in which to share.

Ask for two or more versions of what people think might happen. Be prepared to explain that it will not be possible to hear each person's ideas, neither in the workshop, nor in the classroom. Assure the participants that everyone will be able to contribute at some point during the lesson.

Tell them that they are about to read the story that contains those four elements. They may pay attention to see how the story they read compares with the one they just thought up.

The Prediction Chart

Now explain that the participants will be reading the story in pairs, and stopping at points in the story to make and confirm predictions.

Ask the participants to prepare a chart that looks like the one in Figure 1.

When they come to the first stopping point in the story, the pairs should stop reading, take a minute to predict what they think will happen next, and take another minute to write that prediction in the space labeled What do you really think will happen? under Part I. They should make notes about the evidence they have found in the first section that leads them to their prediction, and list it in the space provided. Then they should read on to the next stopping point, and when they have reached it, consider the prediction they made before, briefly writing down what actually happened in the space provided under Part I. Then they should predict what they think will happen from this point on, and write the new prediction, with the evidence that led to their making that prediction

Figure 1 Prediction Chart

<p>What do you <i>really</i> think will happen?</p>	<p>PART I What evidence do you have?</p>	<p>What <i>did</i> happen?</p>
<p>What do you <i>really</i> think will happen?</p>	<p>PART II What evidence do you have?</p>	<p>What <i>did</i> happen?</p>
<p>What do you <i>really</i> think will happen?</p>	<p>PART III What evidence do you have?</p>	<p>What <i>did</i> happen?</p>

in the spaces provided under Part II. Then they should read on, check their prediction against what did happen, make a new prediction, write down evidence for that prediction, and read the last section. Finally, they should check their last prediction against what actually happened in the story, and write down what happened in the space on the form.

The story “Ivan and the Seal Skin” is found in Appendix A.

Free Responses

Now that people have had a chance to read the story, it is important to ask for their free responses. What is in their minds right now? What are they feeling? Why? Allow a chance for several people to share.

Be prepared to discuss issues that might arise. For example, one person might express disappointment that Ivan never offered his wife the choice of returning to her seal form. Then you might ask, “Did others of you feel that way?” With the comments that ensue, you might encourage an informal debate between those who saw Ivan’s behavior as unjustly controlling and those who did not see it that way. Although in this lesson we will be prepared to ask some probing questions of our own, it is always more natural and desirable to draw discussion from the participants’ own questions and responses.

Shared-Inquiry Discussion

Now lead the discussion beyond the participants’ personal associations and discuss issues prepared in advance. Explain to the group that there are some other questions about the story and that you would like to hear what they think of them.

Share the following question with the group, and write a shorthand version of it on the chalkboard making sure the translator writes it clearly in the local language.

Would it have been better if Ivan had never taken the seal skin?

Ask the participants to write out their personal answer for the question before discussing it aloud. After 2 minutes, invite them to share their ideas. As each person shares you should perform a variety of tasks.

Keep a seating chart. Write down brief notes on each participant’s answer beneath his or her name on a piece of paper. Use this seating chart

to keep track of the discussion, to note who has and has not participated, and to show respect for the importance of what people have had to say.

Encourage exchanges between the participants. If person A gives one answer, and person B gives another answer, you might ask a third person to say which one he or she agrees with and why. Or you may ask person B to address her answer to person A: Where do they disagree, and why?

Ask for clarification or support for their answers. When a participant says something that is not immediately clear or plausible, ask him or her to clarify. Remind him or her to relate the answer to something specific in the text.

Don't answer the question yourself, and don't favor one answer over another. Resist the urge to give an “authoritative” interpretation. What is desirable is a free and considered offering of the students' ideas.

Review the arguments from time to time. When discussion seems to have run its course, read aloud your notes on people's comments. Ask if anyone has anything else to add.

Follow the participants' own questions, when good ones arise. When you sense that a question raised by a participant will take the discussion in a useful direction, make a note of it, and open that question up for general discussion when the time seems appropriate. You may want to wait until after the people have said what they wanted to say on the question at hand, however.

After discussing the first question, introduce one or more of these questions and discuss them by the same means:

- ***Why did the author have Ivan bear the songs and see the smoke two other times in his life, but only find the cave and the seal woman the third time?***
- ***Why does the storyteller tell us so little about Ivan's parents?***
- ***Did the author mean to suggest that Ivan was punished for withholding the seal skin from his wife?***
- ***Why does the storyteller have Ivan find his wife in June and lose her in December?***

Predictions From Terms Revisited

At the conclusion of the lesson, invite the participants to turn to their original partners, and recall the stories they imagined when they

considered the four terms. What similarities did their stories share with the actual story? After 3 minutes, ask for several volunteers to share their conclusions with the whole class.

Discussing the Lesson

Recalling the Steps of the Lesson

You may want to ask the participants first to free write about the lesson they just experienced. Ask them to write for 5 minutes about whatever is in their minds about the lesson. After timing them, give them one more minute to finish up, then ask for volunteers to share their ideas.

Next, ask the participants to go back through the lesson, recalling step by step everything they did. Give them prompts:

- What was the very first thing I (the teacher) did?
- What was the very first thing you (the participants) did?
- Why do you suppose the lesson began that way?
- What was the effect?
- How did it feel to you?

Reviewing Predicting From Terms

It will be worthwhile to take the participants through the steps of Predicting From Terms. Ask them about the purpose and effects of

giving some background and context of the story before asking for predictions, sharing four terms from the story, having people brainstorm a probable story in pairs, and calling on just a few pairs to share.

The Predicting-From-Terms strategy (learned from Dorsey Hammond of Oakland University, Michigan, USA) is used to arouse curiosity and to encourage active reading for greater comprehension. Like other prediction strategies, it puts the reader in the role of a detective, with a puzzle he or she wants to solve.

The four terms given were important ones from the story, chosen to make a fairly accurate prediction possible, but without giving away the

secret of the story—which is why the term “selchie” (a sealperson) was not given.

Note that in this example we preceded the prediction activity with some background information. The intent was to confine the reader’s predictions within a genre and a setting, because predictions that are wildly off the mark may distract readers, rather than aid their comprehension.

Note that at the end of the lesson, for the sake of completeness, we asked the pairs to review their predictions. This may have seemed anticlimactic, if it followed a lively Shared-Inquiry discussion. Sometimes teachers may use the Predicting-From-Terms strategy by itself, and may ask students to confirm their predictions sooner after reading the story. In this case we wanted to move the participants toward deeper reactions, so we held off this review.

Reviewing the Directed Reading–Thinking Activity Chart

We used the Directed Reading–Thinking Activity (DRTA) Chart to guide the participants’ reading of the text. In Guidebook II participants were introduced to a version of DRTA (Stauffer, 1975). In this activity, readers are exposed to a part of the text, then asked to make predictions about what will come next. Then they read a bit more, and stop and confirm or disprove their predictions. Then the cycle repeats itself three or four more times through the end of the text.

The DRTA is a teacher-directed activity, but the DRTA Chart makes it possible for students to carry out the same prediction and confirmation strategy independently or in pairs. The DRTA Chart asks students to make predictions, indicate the evidence for those predictions, and confirm or disprove those predictions after reading part of the text.

Note that in this case we marked the stopping points in the text. In a classroom situation, the teacher could announce the stopping points, and ask students to mark their own texts.

Reviewing the Reader–Response Question

Immediately after they read the text, participants were asked to say what they were thinking and feeling. This is an important first step to take after a text has been read. It enables readers to get in touch with their own feelings and reactions before the lesson leads them in some

other direction. As a result they may feel that their ideas are respected, and that the discussion is more genuine and less contrived. An alert teacher will often find that the most important issues in a text are touched on in the readers' own unguided responses to it. Such a teacher may draw out these responses into questions for the rest of the class to discuss.

Reviewing the Shared-Inquiry Approach

After inviting participants to make free responses, the lesson moved to the Shared-Inquiry approach. To review this method, ask the participants how the discussion following the story felt to them. Ask them about the effect of each part of the method, or what might have been the thinking behind

- writing out the question,
- the nature of the question,
- writing out answers before sharing comments,
- asking questions that encouraged debate,
- pressing for clarification,
- keeping the seating chart, and
- the teacher not answering the question or rewarding answers.

Rationale and procedures. Sometimes there are interesting and important issues in a text that students may not notice. These issues would not attract discussion if the reader-response approach completely governed the lesson. That is why many teachers use the Shared-Inquiry method, at least occasionally. Indeed, many teachers find that when they guide occasional discussions using this approach, students may become more sophisticated in what they notice in a text and in their comment, when they are left free to guide their own inquiry.

Shared Inquiry (Plecha, 1992) is a method that has been promoted for over thirty years by the Great Books Foundation of Chicago, USA, because it asks students to discuss issues in a text to some depth. The elements of the approach may be used together to lead to a satisfyingly deep and lengthy discussion, or they may be used separately, as part of a teacher's repertoire of sound teaching strategies.

A Shared-Inquiry discussion requires that the students have read the text, and are adequately familiar with it. The teacher will have prepared a set of four to six interpretive questions to use in the discussion.

The session begins with the teacher writing a question on the board for the students to consider. Before answering, each student writes out her or his own response to the question. This has the effect of slowing down the process, inviting the students to think carefully, and also making sure every student has something to say. The teacher calls on a student to answer, then calls on another student. The teacher may ask follow-up questions, in which students are asked to find support for their answers in the text, or follow the implications of their statements. The teacher also encourages discussion and debate between students, asking, for example, of Student Z, “Student X has said this; Student Y has said that. With whom do you agree?” The teacher feels most successful when students are discussing the text in depth, but directing their arguments and comments toward each other, rather than toward the teacher. The teacher, however, does not answer the question, deem a student’s answer correct or incorrect, or venture an opinion about the issue.

As each student makes a comment, the teacher makes a shorthand entry on a seating chart, a page with all of the students’ names written in with spaces underneath. The purpose of the seating chart is to keep track of what has been said and who has participated, so that the teacher can still invite comments from those who have been quiet, and also summarize what has been said about a question and invite further comment and debate or closure before moving on to another question. Keeping a seating chart also adds a slower, more deliberate pace to the discussion, and indicates to the students that the teacher believes their comments are important.

The key to a successful Shared-Inquiry discussion is the interpretive question. An interpretive question is a real question: it probes an issue that people might really wonder about from the text. It is also a real question in the sense that it is open ended: it may be reasonably answered in at least two different ways. Finally, it invites students to think more deeply about the text, rather than to talk about their own experiences. (Please see Sources for Interpretive Questions About Literature on page 33 for suggested methods of deriving interpretive questions.)

Points for special attention. Shared-Inquiry discussions can be valuable invitations to critical thinking. The discussions will be interesting if the teacher approaches them in an open-minded spirit of inquiry. The discussions get even better as the students grow used to the procedure, and trust the invitation to think deeply about a topic. Some suggestions for encouraging this kind of thinking follow.

Choose a text that invites real questions. There are many well-written texts that do not lend themselves to an engaging Shared-Inquiry session because they leave us with no unresolved mysteries at the end. The best texts are those that make us ponder meanings and authors' intentions, and of which several interpretations are possible. Folk tales rate very well, because we may argue fruitfully about what they are telling us and what their images mean.

Resist the urge to reach predetermined conclusions. It is better not to approach a discussion hoping that students will arrive at certain insights about it; but rather to come with issues about which you would like to hear your students' ideas—as if you expected them to say wise things you hadn't anticipated. This may well happen.

Resist the urge to share your own wisdom. Teachers have many opportunities to say what we think. If we venture our ideas in the Shared-Inquiry discussion, we are likely to come across as “right,” making everyone else “wrong.” The spirit of free inquiry thus is lost.

Keep the discussion focused on the text. Students will quickly follow trains of associations away from the text, if the question does not solidly anchor the discussion in the text, and if the teacher does not occasionally remind them to focus, with questions such as, “How does what you just said relate to the text?”

Don't try to follow the Shared-Inquiry model exactly if the group is larger than twenty. If the group is larger, other means must be used to ensure that everyone gets to participate. One recommended approach is the Discussion Web, described on page 22.

A modified Shared-Inquiry approach. Shared Inquiry is normally a teacher-led strategy in which a set of open-ended interpretive questions are put to a group of students for discussion and debate. After a couple of demonstrations by the session leader, the role of preparing the questions and leading the discussion can be passed on to different small groups of students, who read the story in advance and prepare a set of three or four questions to put to the group.

Second Lesson: "How Much Lead Poisoning?"

Paired Brainstorming and Know/Want to Know/Learn

Begin by asking the students in four minutes to pair up and list everything they know or think they know about the problem of lead poisoning in the environment. In the meantime, construct on the board a Know/Want to Know/Learn (KWL) chart (Ogle, 1986) such as that in Figure 2.

Ask pairs of the participants to share their ideas with you. As they do, write the points about which there is general agreement in the left-hand column under What do we think we know? It helps if you group ideas into categories, such as sources of lead poisoning, dangers to humans, or costs of clean-up.

Help participants frame questions as to the points they are unsure about. Questions may arise from details over which there is disagreement, or from categories of knowledge about which the participants are curious. List those questions in the Want-to-know column.

Now ask the participants to keep those questions firmly in mind as they read the article, "How Much Lead Poisoning?" found in Appendix G.

Figure 2 KWL Chart

	Lead Poisoning	
What do we think we know?	What do we want to know?	What did we learn?

Using the KWL Chart

Once the participants have had time to read the article, call their attention back to the questions they raised before reading, questions that are listed in the Want-to-know column. Find out which answers to the questions have been found in the reading, and note these answers in the What-did-we-learn column. Next, ask participants what other information they encountered about which they had not raised prior questions. Note this information in the What-did-we-learn column as well.

Take stock of the questions still left unanswered. Discuss where the participants might go for answers to those questions.

Figure 3 Discussion Web

YES		NO
_____	Should the government	_____
_____	take extraordinary measures	_____
	to protect children	
	from lead poisoning?	
_____		_____
_____		_____

Discussion Web

Now you can explore the issues in the article, using the device of the Discussion Web to organize the next part of the lesson. For the Discussion Web, prepare a grid like the one in Figure 3.

Ask each pair of participants to make a Discussion Web like the one pictured. During the next six or seven minutes, the pairs are asked to consider the question in the center:

Should the government take extraordinary measures to protect children from lead poisoning?

Rather than resolving the issue, participants are asked to list several reasons why the government should take extraordinary measures. These reasons should be listed on the form, under Yes. Then they should list all the reasons why the government should not take extraordinary measures to protect children from lead poisoning, which should be listed on the form under No.

After the pairs have listed reasons on both sides, each pair should join another pair, and share the reasons they listed under Yes and those they listed under No. As the pairs discuss the reasons they listed on both sides of the argument, the pairs should add reasons to their own lists.

When all of the quartets have finished, invite individuals to take a minute to decide how they really feel about this issue. Then invite all of those who personally believe the government should take extraordinary measures to move to the left-hand side of the class. All of those who

thought the government should not take extraordinary measures are asked to move to the right-hand side of the class. Any who are undecided should sit along the back wall.

Because individual participants may have joined each group for different reasons, they should begin by discussing the reasons they feel as they do, and then compile their strongest arguments in defense of their position. You should allow 7 or 8 minutes for each group to decide what its best arguments are.

Then have the two sides debate each other. Ask a volunteer from each side to state that side's position (in under 3 minutes). Once statements from both sides have been shared (or all three sides, if there is a group of undecided participants), members of any group may join in, to rebut what has been said and to offer further defenses of their position.

Set a time limit of one minute per statement. Take steps to make sure everyone gets a chance to participate. Introduce and enforce these two ground rules:

1. You must allow a person to finish his or her statement before answering.
2. You must be polite.

Encourage any participant who is persuaded by an argument from the other side to get up and sit with the group whose argument he or she now finds more persuasive. In order to stimulate people to do this, you may need to move to different sides of the room yourself, as you hear particularly strong arguments given.

After 10 or 12 minutes of debate, ask each group to nominate someone to make a final statement from that group.

Discussing the Lesson

Recalling the Steps of the Lesson

As with the first lesson, you may want to ask the participants first to free write about the lesson they just experienced. Ask them to write for 5 minutes about whatever is in their minds about the lesson. After timing them for 5 minutes, give them a minute to finish up, then ask for volunteers to share their ideas.

Next ask the participants to go back through the lesson, recalling everything they did step by step. Give them prompts:

- What was the very first thing I (the teacher) did?
- What was the very first thing you (the participants) did?
- Why do you suppose the lesson began that way?
- What was the effect?
- How did it feel to you?

Reviewing the KWL Activity

By now the dynamics of the KWL strategy should be familiar to the participants. Still it may be worthwhile to ask for their comments on the purposes and effects of

the Know/Want to Know/Learn chart,
 the paired brainstorming,
 listing ideas from the group under the What-do-we-think-we-know column,
 categorizing these ideas,
 eliciting questions for the Want-to-know column,
 reading with questions in mind, and
 following the reading by entering main ideas under the What-did-we-learn column.

Reviewing the Discussion-Web Activity

Remind the participants of the Discussion-Web activity. Have them recall the steps. Ask the participants how the method felt to them. Ask them what the effect was of each of the elements of the method, or what might have been the thinking behind it. Remind them that

- In pairs, they listed reasons for and against an issue on a graphic organizer.
- Those pairs shared and discussed their reasons on both sides with another pair, and each pair added to both its lists of reasons.
- A debate then ensued between the two positions.

Rationale and procedures. The Discussion Web (Alvermann, 1991) is one of a class of strategies that use a graphic organizer to orchestrate a complex lesson, the result of which is to guarantee that everyone gets to participate in the discussion. It is recommended for group sizes in excess of fifteen students.

The Discussion Web requires that you design one binary question (one that can be answered positively or negatively) that goes to the heart of the issue raised by the text. You ask pairs of students to draw a grid with the question in the center. On the left-hand side of the grid, they should designate space to list the reasons that support an affirmative answer to the question, and on the right-hand side they should set aside space to list the reasons that would support a negative answer.

The activity begins with the pairs discussing the question, and then listing four or five arguments that support an affirmative answer to it, followed by four or five arguments that tend toward a negative answer.

Once they have made their two lists, that pair of students then joins another pair of students, and the two dyads compare lists. Then they consider all of their arguments pro and con. Note that at this point, the foursome may discuss the issue until they reach a conclusion. Then they may write up their conclusion and share it with the class, either orally, or by posting their written conclusion for others to read.

In the lesson included here, however, we stopped short of having the foursomes reach a conclusion, and set up a debate instead.

Reviewing the Debate Activity

Begin the review by having the participants recall the steps of the debate activity. What was the effect of each of the elements of the method? What might have been the thinking behind each element? Remind them of the activity's steps:

- They filled in arguments on the Discussion Web prior to the debate.
- They stood with those who took the same position, and argued with those who were opposed.
- They were given time to review their arguments.
- They were invited to change positions physically if they happened to change positions in the arguments.
- Each side was asked to make a concluding statement.

Rationale and procedures. The Discussion-Web procedure has the advantage of having people work from pairs to quartets to halves of the class. The debate that followed has people arguing ideas with each other. All of these steps invite maximum participation and thought from

the participants; they also have them arguing positions out loud, trying to persuade opponents they can see, and whom they can literally “move” with their arguments.

The debate proceeded with argument and counterargument, using the following guidelines:

- Groups should be encouraged to let everyone within a group have a turn at speaking.
- Individuals should be challenged to listen carefully to what the opponent said before making their statements. If necessary, you may institute the rule that they must restate what the opponent said before making their own statement.
- Anyone who is persuaded away from her or his position may change sides during the debate, by physically moving to the other side of the room.
- If the debate continues for more than fifteen minutes, the students can be asked to stop and write down the most persuasive arguments they have heard. This is an especially good strategy if the students are to be asked to write an argumentative essay later (Brophy, 1996).
- At the conclusion, one volunteer from each side is asked to give a summary statement of that position.
- The teacher may follow the debate by summarizing the arguments offered, calling attention to the main points made, and the logic by which they were used to support a conclusion. The rationale for taking this step is to give credit to the participants for their good thinking, to call due attention to the issues raised in the text that the teacher deems important, and to demonstrate something of the logic of argumentation.

In an informal debate, it requires judgment on the part of the teacher to decide how much structure to impose on the debate while it is going on, and how much intervention is necessary to keep the discussion on track. The teacher can and should ask questions to keep the debate moving productively. The questions should be aimed at

clarifying meaning (“In what sense? Could you give an example?”);
offering evidence or support in a noninquisitorial manner (“How come?”
“Why?”);
considering the relevance of points already made (“How does that square with what Alina said?” “So you are agreeing with Alina?”);

leading students to make points that are clearly relevant (“Are you thinking of ...?”); and
trying to engage students in talking to one another, and carefully listening to one another (“Don’t tell me—she is the one you need to convince”); and
trying to encourage an atmosphere of collaborative inquiry instead of outright competition.

Combining Critical-Thinking Methods

After both demonstration lessons have been carried out, it will be helpful make a chart with three columns labeled Evocation, Realization of Meaning, and Reflection. Ask the participants to help you fill in the chart by listing the teaching strategies that have been covered so far in the appropriate columns. Remember to bring in strategies that were shared in the previous workshop, too.

It may help to raise the point that the methods you just used in the demonstration lessons might have been combined differently. That is, it is not necessary that they always teach these lessons using exactly the same methods you did; other variations are possible, and variation is recommended.

The predictive device used at the outset of the first lesson served to draw students actively into the task of comprehending the text. Were this text full of information, perhaps as is often the case in a work of nonfiction, the paired brainstorming method from the first course might have been used as an alternative to the Predicting-From-Terms strategy. On the other hand, where we are not much concerned with the students’ comprehension of the text, but rather with their thinking about the issues it raises, we might have bypassed these comprehension strategies in favor of the reflection strategies.

Reader-Response strategies, such as the questions “What is on your mind about this text?” or “How did it make you feel?” (as well as the Dual Entry Diary used in Guidebook III), are often used alone, with the teacher counting on the students to find and question the interesting and important issues in the text. If they are used alone, it helps if the teacher, too, contributes his or her responses to the text. This will satisfy the teacher that a thorough balance of issues is being discussed and gives him or her the opportunity to model thought processes for the students.

It also helps to mix in occasional focused discussions, using the Shared-Inquiry approach, perhaps because these lead students into patterns of thinking that they can employ when the discussion is more open to choice. Finally, it is important for the teacher to listen carefully to the students' responses, and be open to these opportunities to hear how they are thinking about issues.

The Shared-Inquiry approach is often used alone. However, because the questions for discussion are normally determined in advance, and because they are usually more focused on the text than on the students' own experiences and feelings, many teachers precede the use of this method with opportunities for the students to share their own responses. The individual components of Shared-Inquiry—writing out the question in advance, having students write position statements before answering, using follow-up questions to probe and encourage debate, writing down students' responses on a seating chart, and asking open-ended questions specific to the text—are useful (if still rather formal) instructional ideas to use in other combinations as well.

The Discussion Web can be used alone. It might also be used, as we used it here, as a warm-up for a debate (here it makes students aware of many arguments, pro and con, before they stake out their own position). The use of a graphic organizer to keep order in many simultaneous small-group discussions should not be missed; neither should the two-student, four-student, whole-group progression of conversations. Both are devices that can be used in other kinds of discussions.

PART II GUIDED PRACTICE



Participants will need opportunities to practice the methods described in Part I themselves before the workshop is over. Several other texts with suggestions for use have been included as appendixes for this purpose. Alternatively, you may decide to conduct more whole-group practice in the workshop. In that case, you will find, on separate pages, suggestions for ways these texts might be taught.

Assign different texts to small groups of participants, perhaps grouped by level and subject area they teach. The texts in the appendixes vary between those more suitable for older or younger children, or between classes for literature, or those for civics. Ask the participants, first as individuals, and then as a group, to first prepare four good interpretive questions for the text. Next, have them prepare a Discussion Web using it.

Allow time to review the questions with each group, looking for questions that are sufficiently open ended (that is, those with at least two good ways to answer them), yet specific to the text. Then have the groups take turns leading a discussion of their text with the whole group.

If there is time, consider introducing one or more of the other strategies contained in Appendix J such as “coming to terms,” the “story chart,” or the comparison of texts with the Venn diagram.

PART III PLANNING FOR IMPLEMENTATION



The next step in the process is to have the participants plan for implementation at a very practical level. To make the content of the workshop real and transferable to classrooms, specific plans need to be made using actual content materials. Allowing for this step is critical. Participants just starting out with these methods will need encouragement and support. This phase of the workshop can become a very creative and rewarding experience for all, however it is always difficult to start. Some initial questions can serve as prompts for thinking:

- Let's imagine that tomorrow you are going to do what we have just done in your own classroom; what content or topic would you be working with, or what content would you select to work with?
- How would you go about teaching it with these methods? How would you start? What would you do?
- What materials would you need?
- What questions do you have about what we did today? What needs to be clarified before you proceed?
- What would you want students to learn or be able to do? What exactly would you do to help them?
- What impediments would you face? How would you overcome them? and
- How will you make this hypothetical plan a reality? What activity will you actually try out? When? How often?

Plans, once developed, should be shared with the group as a whole. The group should look for good, creative ways of implementing as well as potential pitfalls or gaps in the plans.

Postworkshop: Planning for Follow Up

Included in the design of the RWCT project is the expectation that participants will meet during the intervals between workshops to share their experiences in putting to use the techniques introduced in the workshops in their classrooms. These sessions form an important part of the RWCT project, and they must be approached with a plan. Specific dates for the sessions should be identified, and responsibilities for reporting should be agreed upon (that is, Who should have tried what, by the time the session convenes? Who has responsibility for securing the

space? For chairing the proceedings?) Participants should be planning ahead to be prepared to discuss the following questions:

- In general, how did the implementation go?
- What were the successes or the most successful parts?
- What failures or difficulties were encountered?
- How did students respond?
- How might they do things differently next time?
- How high was their interest level?
- How much did they learn?
- How did the lesson feel to the teacher? Did it feel right, or were there parts that seemed difficult or cumbersome? and
- How many times was the implementation attempted?

Participants should be encouraged to work first in small groups to share their experiences, and then share with the whole group. Discussion should be encouraged regarding successes and failures, and how the procedures might be modified to fit the local culture, circumstances, and teacher preferences.

Sources for Interpretive Questions About Literature

The Shared-Inquiry approach, presented earlier in this guidebook, requires that the teacher think of a set of good interpretive questions for discussion ahead of time. This section is meant to give the teacher guidance in finding those questions.

The body of literature suitable for discussion with young people is abundant and varied, of course; and it thus may seem presumptuous or reductive to suggest a core of strategies for generating questions to discuss it. However, it is possible to point to some fertile places one might look for good questions, across a variety of works of literature. Here is a beginning list of such places.

Plot-Based Questions

The Canadian literary critic Northrop Frye (1957) remarked that most literature is about the heaven we seek, or the hell we wish to avoid.

Plots, then, are often about people who want something (or don't want something) and strive to get it (or strive to get away from it). In all but the simplest stories, however, what characters want or don't want, how they get it or escape it, and who or what helps them, may be implicit. Because these things drive the story, they are often worth asking about. Good plot-based questions therefore may follow these patterns:

- What did this character really want? What did she *not* want?
- What was it that enabled her to get what she wanted?
- In order to gain her goal, what did she give up?
- How was she in the beginning? How was she at the end? What accounted for the change? and
- What did she learn along the way?

Questions About Images and Symbols

Even when they are not notably symbolic, nearly all works of literature point to issues in our lives, and also to issues that are common to all humanity (F. Moser, personal communication, 1989). The French anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss noted that myths are often a society's means for working through problems that are too sensitive to talk about directly. The same can be said of literature. Images and symbols in literature may resonate with readers when they dimly remind them of something just out of reach in their own lives. A simple way of exploring the meaning of an image or an issue in a story is to ask these three questions of it:

1. What does it mean (or how does it function) in the story?
2. What does (the image or issue) represent in your own life?
3. What does (the image or issue) mean in the human condition?

Looking at the stories in the appendixes, for example, "Ivan and the Seal Skin," we might ask about the boundary between land and water. In "The Evildoer" we might ask about being condemned for a crime you did not know you committed. In "Thank You, Ma'am," we might ask about blue suede shoes, a trivial thing a person wants that leaves to life-changing events.

Questions About Contrasted Elements

As we just saw, we often find images and characters in stories that seem to point to meanings beyond themselves. Levi-Strauss argued that images often appear most meaningful when we contrast them with other images or characters in the same work and then look for similar images in other literary works and in life.

Questions for the discussion of traditional literature can include this idea of contrast:

- Who or what is contrasted in this story? How are they contrasted?
- Who or what is similarly contrasted in other literature? In your own experience? In the world?

To give an example, the characters most starkly contrasted in the story “Jack and the Beanstalk” are surely Jack and the Giant, and their attributes contrast something like this:

<i>Jack</i>	<i>Giant</i>
young	old
poor	rich
weak	powerful
on the way up	on the way down
seems weak	seems powerful
relies on wits and pluck	relies on force or privilege

Now, we may ask: What other characters do we know in literature who are similarly contrasted? David and Goliath come to mind and so do Ivan and Baba Yaga. In contemporary life, such contrasts are visible everywhere an underdog struggles for dominance: the Jamaican bobsled team, or even the younger generation versus the older one.

Unlike folktales and legends, where contrasts are at their most extreme, contemporary literature often presents characters whose differences are more nuanced; here a search for similarities as well as differences between characters can be meaningful. In “Thank You, Ma’am,” for example, the contrasts between the boy and the woman are more meaningful if we first look at the implied similarities: She was like him, but she discovered something he hasn’t yet discovered. What? How? The answers seem like keys to the story. In “The Evildoer” both the magistrate and the peasant, as the ambiguous title suggests, have done harm out of limited awareness.

Reading Against the Grain

Most stories take some kind of position about who or what is good or bad, what sorts of people deserve to be rewarded or not, and how people of different sexes, ages, and stations are expected to behave. Stories may actively affirm certain social orders, tacitly support them, or challenge them. Readers don't have to agree with whatever stand a story takes or implies, of course. But it is most difficult to disagree with those positions on social orders that are implicitly drawn.

For example, many traditional stories describe women by their appearance and dispositions, and men by their actions and achievements. Although this is rarely stated, a child might easily get the impression that women are supposed to be comely and agreeable but not get very much done.

In those cases we may need to challenge students to read against the grain; to ask questions that challenge the tacit assumptions about the social order that are embedded in stories, such as:

- Suppose the genders of the characters were reversed? How would the story be different? What is this seeming to tell us about sex roles? Do we agree?"
- What has the hero done in this story to be rewarded? Does the author suggest that we should do likewise? Do you think we should?

Paired readings. Another good way to read against the grain is to pair two readings that take different approaches to a topic. For example, if we read "The Children's Hour" by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow by itself, we might be moved by the loving description of a father pausing from his solitary but presumably important pursuits to entertain the playful intrusion by his children—an intrusion that inspires the poet to identify himself with the heroes of literary romances.

Then we read Kahlil Gibran's treatment of the same topic, and it acts like a dash of cold water in the face. According to Gibran, our children are not ours to mold to fit our own fantasies: they are startlingly original creatures whose destinies are their own. Our greatest privilege is to propel them on their way.

The attitude of Longfellow's narrator seems problematic—and so do our traditional Western views of childhood—when Longfellow's poem is contrasted with Gibran's (Probst, 1986).

Ethical Questions

Questions of right and wrong, and the consequences of good and bad acts permeate literature. Young children expect moral instruction from literature, and may be perplexed if a character is not punished for what they consider a bad act (such as Jack's stealing from the Giant).

It helps, therefore, to step back and ask if a character was right to do what he did. Would it be right to do this if you were not in a story, but living in our town?

Metaphysical Questions

A children's book called *Days With Frog and Toad* (Lobel, 1987) has two friends telling each other ghost stories and then enjoying being brave together. The story reminds us that seemingly simple concepts like bravery can be complex to think about. In the hands of a skilled teacher, children can investigate their understandings of such terms. The teacher might ask

What do we mean when we say that someone is brave?

Is it brave to resist the fear of things that don't exist, as we do when we hear a ghost story?

Is it brave to undergo danger—but unwillingly?

Is it brave to face danger for no practical reason—such as standing near speeding traffic?

The philosopher Gareth Matthews (1988) has conducted thoughtful conversations with children over these and other issues that seem abstract. But the difficulties of entertaining abstractions can fall away when children encounter them in the vivid context of stories.

Unmasking the Implied Reader

For a story to work, the reader must (provisionally) accept a pattern of affective responses and even beliefs that the author has implicitly scripted for him or her—he or she must believe that this is funny, that is heroic, this goal is worthwhile, that action is despicable—all more or less as the author has tacitly intended. In accepting the role of the implied reader that is laid out for us, we are almost invariably pulled out of our usual beliefs and alliances in order to make the story work. Often we

may conclude that the effect of adopting the stance of the implied reader is a positive thing if we are stretched out of our usual way of seeing things. But it can also be negative, if our sensibilities are manipulated to accept violent or mean-spirited acts that we otherwise wouldn't.

Because readers are rarely conscious of the pull of the implied reader's stance, it is worthwhile to discuss it, to make readers aware of the ways that their sensibilities can be influenced or manipulated. We may raise questions about the dynamics of the implied reader in a discussion, asking students about the author's motivations: With whom do you feel the author wanted you to sympathize or not to sympathize? What was it about the story that lined up your loyalties one way or another? Was there any point in the story where you felt it hard to go along with the author? and What made it hard?

Figure 4 Story Chart

Story Title	Who is transformed in the story?	Who benefits from the transformation?	What does the transformation mean?
"Ivan & the Seal Skin"			
"The Swan Wife"			
"The White Fish"			

Comparing Stories: The Story Chart

Stories yield new insights when they are compared to other stories. The story of "Ivan and the Seal Skin," for example, is reminiscent of a French tale, "The Swan Wife," and a Romanian one, "The White Fish." After reading each story, students can be invited to list elements of it on a chart such as that in Figure 4. As stories are added, the possibilities for comparisons multiply.

Additional Debate Strategies

Informal debates are popular in many classrooms as a means of engendering discussions. Here, in addition to the debate strategy that was featured in the demonstration lesson earlier in this guidebook, are presented several other approaches to debate.

Academic Controversy

This strategy also appears in Guidebook V, *Cooperative Learning*. Academic controversy is a cooperative-learning activity that is similar to the Discussion-Web activity seen in this guidebook.

Present a controversial topic to the class. You might present the issue by reading or telling a short story or case study. Pose a binary (yes or no, pro or con) question along with the topic. An example of a binary question is, Should the government make extraordinary efforts to protect citizens from environmental toxins?

Assign students to groups of four. Within each group, one pair should take the pro position and one pair the con position. They should discuss the question in pairs, with the aim of listing reasons that support the pro or the con position, whichever they were assigned.

After 7 or 8 minutes, the members of the pro pair should split up, and each member should pair up with another person who was discussing the same position. They should compare reasons for 4 or 5 minutes.

Now the original pairs should rejoin, compare notes, and by the end of 4 or 5 minutes agree on a longer and more refined list of reasons in favor of their position.

The pairs within the original foursome then debate the issue. It is best if each side begins with a statement of their position; that is, a statement of what they have resolved, and the main reasons they have resolved it. Then they may debate each other's reasons and arguments. You should let the debate run for at least 8 or 10 minutes. Invite each side to make a summary statement of their position at the conclusion of the discussion.

Another option is to invite the students to take a minute to think about what they really believe about the issue, and share their true position with their group members. Or invite them to free write for 10 minutes regarding what is in their mind about the issue.

Arguments on Cards

Begin by presenting a controversial issue to the class, accompanied by a binary question. Assign half the class to each side of the question. Then assign reading material that provides information relevant to the question. The different sides can read different material; or, if you have material that provides information that can support both sides of an argument, both sides may read the same material.

Students should be alert as they read the material for reasons that support their side of the argument. They should write at least three such reasons on notecards, or on half sheets of paper.

Next, the students should bring their cards to a meeting of their group (their group is the half the class that is arguing the same side of the issue). Each student should offer his or her strongest reason in support of the argument to the group. If, however, another student has already offered that reason, the student must offer another reason. The group now discusses the reasons that have been offered, and chooses the four or five strongest reasons in support of their position. As a next step from this point, a couple of options are available: Each side may agree on an opening statement, and appoint a person to make that statement. After each side has made its opening statement, they may offer reasons in support of their side, and also debate each other's arguments. Alternatively, if more practice in structuring arguments is wanted, students may frame the opposite side's arguments.

Framing the other side's arguments. In this activity, all of the steps in the previous activity, Arguments on Cards, will have been followed, through the step of having each side consider the best reasons in support of their side of the argument, and choosing the strongest reasons.

One side should share its reasons with the other side, but without making an opening statement. The students on the other side take a few minutes to confer among themselves and formulate an opening statement that presents the other side's position (as they infer it to be), and states the reasons that support that position.

Now, the same side states the reasons in support of their position—but does not state their position—to the students on the other side. These students now take a few minutes to formulate an opening statement for what they infer to be the argument, plus supporting reasons, for what they just heard.

Both sides may now debate. Each side leads off with the opening statement that was given to them by the other side. Then they share and debate the reasons supporting each position.

After the debate has run for 10 minutes or more, it stops. Each side is now asked to prepare a closing argument for the other side, and share it with that side. A closing argument is a restatement of the position, with the strongest reasons that support it.

Constructive Controversy

The Constructive Controversy strategy, like the strategy presented in the previous section, is intended to help students both prepare and present their own arguments, and also listen carefully to the other side. It is recommended that the strategy be tried at first with an issue in which the students have little emotional involvement. The issue should still be presented in an interesting way, however; by means of a story or a case study.

Once a topic is presented and the sides are drawn (that is, the students are presented with a binary question), the class is divided into groups, each taking a separate side.

First, pairs within each group read through the material together, and prepare a list of the strongest points in favor of their side. The pairs may then share their list with the others in their half of the class. Next, the members of one side present their arguments to the other side. At this point, the members of the other side may ask clarifying questions only—they do not take issue with the arguments or try to refute them. Both sides should present their arguments to each other.

Now the students return to the groups in which they met previously. They discuss the arguments presented by the other side, and decide on the five strongest points that were made by that side.

The two groups take turns presenting their lists of the other side's strongest points. Again, students may ask for clarification only.

The discussion is opened to the entire class, and the students are asked to come up with the best arguments that were made on either side. The teacher may list these on the board, and, without identifying each argument with the person who made it, the teacher may invite the students to discuss what made each argument strong or weak.

Finally, the students may be invited to decide on a position of their own and write it out, along with the reasons that support it. The composition may take this form:

- Position statement.
- Reasons in support of the position.
- Concluding statement (saying why the position is supported by the reasons).

REFERENCES

- Alvermann, D. (1991). The discussion web: A graphic aid for learning across the curriculum. *The Reading Teacher*, 45, 92–99.
- Bleich, D. (1975). *Subjective criticism*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bloom, B. (Ed.). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Handbook I. The cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay.
- Britton, J. (1970). *Language and learning*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.
- Brophy, S. (1996). *Classroom debate as a method in reading for understanding*. Cluj, Romania.
- Freire, P. (1970). *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.
- Frye, N. (1957). *The anatomy of criticism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Levi-Strauss, C. (1963). *Structural anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lipman, M. (1991). *Thinking in education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lobel, A. (1987). *Days with frog and toad*. New York: Harpercrest.
- Matthews, G. (1988). *Dialogues with children*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ogle, D. (1986). K-W-L: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text. *The Reading Teacher*, 39, 564–570.
- Plecha, J. (1992) Shared inquiry. In C. Temple & P. Collins (Eds.), *Stories and readers*. Norwood, MA: Christopher Gordon.
- Probst, R. (1986). *Response and analysis*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Rosenblatt, L. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.
- Stauffer, R. (1975). *The language experience approach to the teaching of reading*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Temple, C., Meredith, K., & Steele, J. (1998). *How children learn: A statement of first principles*. Geneva, NY: Reading & Writing for Critical Thinking Project.

SUGGESTED READING

- Barone, D. (1992). Dual entry diaries. In C. Temple & P. Collins (Eds.), *Stories and readers*. Norwood, MA: Christopher Gordon.
- Borders, S., & Naylor, A. (1993). *Children talking about books*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

- Brown, A., Palincsar, A., & Armbruster, B. (1984). Instructing comprehension-fostering activities in interactive learning situations. In H. Mandl (Ed.), *Learning and comprehension of text*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Calkins, L. (1986). *The art of teaching writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Dewey, J. (1910). *My pedagogic creed*. Chicago, IL: A. Flanagan.
- Freinet, C. (1960). *Modernizar la escuela*. Barcelona, Spain: BEM.
- Gardner, H. (1991). *To open minds*. New York: Basic Books.
- Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., & Smith, K.A. (1991). *Cooperative learning: Increasing college faculty instructional productivity*. Washington, DC: ERIC.
- Langer, J. (1994). *Teaching literature*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Lipman, M. (1988). *Philosophy goes to school*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Matthews, G. (1985). *Philosophy and the young child*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Paul, R., Elder, L., & Nosich, G. (1995). *Critical thinking: How to prepare students for a rapidly changing world*. Cotati, CA: Foundation for Critical Thinking.
- Piaget, J. (1955). *The language and thought of the child*. New York: Meridian.
- Reimer, J., Paolitto, D., & Hersh, R. (1983). *Promoting moral growth: From Piaget to Kohlberg* (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Roser, N.L., & Martinez, M.C. (Eds.). (1995). *Booktalk and beyond*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Temple, C., & Gillet, J. (1996). *Language and literacy: A lively approach*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Whitehead, A.N. (1957). *The aims of education*. New York: Macmillan.

GLOSSARY

<i>Framework for teaching and learning</i>	A pattern of teaching methods suitable for the beginning, middle, and end of a lesson or learning activity.
<i>Evocation</i>	The beginning phase of the RWCT framework for teaching and learning, in which students' curiosity is aroused and they are encouraged to set purposes for learning.
<i>Realization of meaning</i>	In the RWCT framework for teaching and learning, this is the middle phase, in which students inquire and construct meaning.
<i>Reflection</i>	In the RWCT framework for teaching and learning, this is the end phase, in which students reflect on what they have learned in light of the questions they set out to answer: They apply the learning to new situations, they question or debate the ideas, and they begin to reorder their thinking to accommodate what they have learned.
<i>Shared Inquiry</i>	The Great Books Foundation's technique for managing discussions, in which the teacher poses select interpretive or open-ended questions, and groups of students cooperate to discuss each question in depth.
<i>Discussion Web</i>	A cooperative technique for managing the discussion of a binary question (that is, "right" versus "wrong") using a graphic organizer.
<i>Inference</i>	Using reason to derive a conclusion that is not directly stated.
<i>Interpretive question</i>	In the Shared-Inquiry procedure, this is an important question, specific to a text that must be

answered by a process of interpretation or inference.

Critical thinking

Thinking beyond the information given; thinking that involves creativity, problem-finding and problem-solving, analysis, and interpretation; thinking that is reflective of logic, motivation, and point of view.

Debate

A competitive exchange of ideas, according to formal or informal rules.

Reader Response

A tradition of literary theory associated with Louise Rosenblatt (1978), David Bleich (1975), Wolfgang Iser, and others, in which it is held that the meaning of a text is a joint creation by the author and the reader, involving a transaction between the readers' ideas, images, associations, and emotions, and the suggestions presented by the text.

Prediction

Inferring what may happen on the basis of patterns we have discovered in what has happened.

Confirmation

Determining that a speculation or prediction is true.

APPENDIX A

Ivan and the Seal Skin Retold by Bucksnot Trout

Along the north coast of Scotland, the winter wind howls through dark nights and gray days, and towering waves smash against black rocks. But in summer, the sea calms, and the days lengthen, so that daylight lasts through twenty-four hours. Then the few fishermen who live on that remote coast may dare to throw their nets out into the sea, and try to catch their livelihood. Even in summer, a sudden storm may overtake them; or a silent fog may creep upon them and make them lose their way. Then their loved ones go down to the shore, and gaze for some sign at the mute waves, perhaps to see a seal stare back with big sad eyes. The people see the seals, and they wonder...

On a little cove by the sea lived a fisherman and his wife, and their one son, Ivan Ivanson. It was the longest day of the year: Midsummer's Eve. Close to midnight, with the sky still a radiant orange, young Ivan, barely seven years old, was exploring the rocks by the shore, searching for shells and bits of net and whatever else the waves might have washed up.

Suddenly a strange sound drifted to him on the wind. It was like the singing of unearthly voices, blended in beautiful harmony. He looked up. Away down the shore to his right he could see a tendril of smoke rising from a hole at the base of the rocks, near the point.

First stop

Ivan would have explored, but his short legs wouldn't carry him over the large boulders, so when his mother called, he returned to the family cottage without investigating further.

Seven years went by. Ivan, now fourteen, found himself once again down on the shore, right at midnight, on Midsummer's Eve. Once again he thought he heard strange singing, and again he saw smoke rising from a hole at the base of the rocks, down by the point. I don't know why he didn't go to the source this time. Perhaps some emergency called him back to his parents' cottage. His father's health, like as not. For both his parents were growing old.

Seven more years went by. His father had worn out from fishing the cold brine, so his parents had retired to town, leaving their cottage to

Ivan. Ivan lived all alone, with only the cries of the shore birds for company. He fished long days, and warmed himself at night by the little peat fire. I imagine he was lonely.

When Midsummer's Eve came again, Ivan remembered the singing, and the smoke. At midnight, he walked down to the shore. The same strange singing reached his ears, woven into unearthly and beautiful harmonies.

Second stop

This time, no boulders would stop him, and there was no one to call him back. Ivan made his way down the shore toward the point. As he drew closer, he could hear the crackle of a fire, and could see its reflection against the rocks. Beautiful singing came from inside the cave. And there at the cave's mouth lay a pile of sleek and beautiful gray furs: seal skins.

Ivan chose the one he thought the most comely and slowly, carefully, drew it off the pile. He rolled the seal skin into a ball and made straight off for home with it. Once there, he locked the seal skin in a wooden trunk, slipped the key onto a leather thong tied around his neck, and went to bed.

In the morning he took the blanket from his bed and returned to the cave. There he found a sad and beautiful young woman, huddled and shivering, covering her nakedness with her arms and long hair. Without a word, Ivan wrapped the young woman in his blanket and led her home to his cottage.

Ivan treated the woman kindly, and in time they fell in love. They had one son, then another. Ivan was happy enough, and the woman was a good mother. But often Ivan saw his wife staring off at the sea with big, sad eyes. He never told her what was in the wooden box, and he forbade her to open it.

More years passed. One Christmas Eve Ivan readied his family to go to church. The wife, said she was feeling poorly, though and asked Ivan and the boys to go on alone.

Third stop

Perhaps Ivan was angry at this. In his haste to dress, Ivan left the thong with the key hanging on his bedstead, and went off to church without it.

Ivan and the boys returned from church after midnight. They saw the open door before they reached to the cottage. They found the wooden box lying open, and the key still in the lock. The wife was gone.

They say that sometimes when the boys walked along the shore, a beautiful seal with large sad eyes would follow along close by in the cold water. And they say sometimes when Ivan was fishing, the same sad and beautiful seal seemed to herd the herring fish into his nets. Perhaps the seal was Ivan's wife. No one knows. All we know is that Ivan never saw his wife on this earth again.

APPENDIX B

The Evildoer by Anton Chekhov

Before the investigating magistrate stood an emaciated little peasant in a striped shirt made of ticking and in patched trousers. His hairy face, covered with smallpox scars, and his eyes, scarcely visible under thick overhanging brows, bore an expression of surly coarseness. His head was overgrown with a thicket of long, uncombed hair, giving him the air of a cross spider. He was barefoot.

“Denis Grigoryev,” the investigating magistrate began, “step up and answer my questions: On the seventh day of the present month of July, the railroad watchman Ivan Semyonov Akinfov, checking the rails on the morning, caught you at the one hundred and forty-first milepost unscrewing the nut of one of the bolts that fasten the rails to the ties. Here is the nut. With said nut he detained you. Is that correct?”

“What d’ye say?”

“Did all that take place as described by Akinfov?”

“Yes, it was so.”

“Very well. Tell me, then, why did you unscrew the nut?”

“What d’ye say?”

“Never mind the ‘what-d’ye says’ and answer my question: Why did you unscrew the nut?”

“If I hadn’t needed it, I’d not have unscrewed it,” Denis muttered throatily, with a furtive glance at the ceiling.

“For what purpose did you need it all of a sudden?”

“The nut?... We make sinkers out of the nuts.”

“And who is ‘we’?”

“Us, the common folk—the Klimovo peasants, that is...”

“Listen, don’t you play the fool with me and talk sense. It won’t do you any good to lie to me about sinkers!”

“I’ve never lied in my life, so why would I start lying now?”

Denis grumbled, blinking. “Can it be, Your Honor, that you believe one can fish *without* sinkers? If you cast live bait or worms on a fishhook, would it go down to the bottom without a sinker?... And you say *I’m* lying...” Denis smirked. “What the devil is the use of live bait if it is going to float on the surface! The perch, the pike, and the eel are always on the

bottom, and if the bait floats on the water it will only catch a bullhead and only once in a while at that. Besides, there are no bullheads in our river—this fish likes lots of room...”

“Why are you bothering me about bullheads?”

“What d’ye say? Didn’t you ask me yourself?.. Around here even the gentry catch fish that way. Even the smallest urchin wouldn’t think of fishing without a sinker—rules aren’t made for fools...”

“So, you state that you unscrewed this nut in order to use it as a sinker?”

“What else? Not to play knucklebones with!”

“But you could have used a piece of lead, or a bullet, or some kind of nail...”

“You don’t find lead lying around to be picked up, you have to buy it, and a nail’s no good. There’s nothing better than a nut. It’s heavy and it’s got a hole.”

“He keeps acting the fool! You might think he was born yesterday or dropped out of the sky! Can’t you get it through your thick skull what all this unscrewing can lead to? If not for the watchman, the train might have gone off the rails, people might have been killed! You would have killed these people.”

“God forbid, You Honor! Why would I want to kill people? Am I not a Christian—am I some kind of criminal? Praise be to God, my good sir. I’ve lived all my life not only without killing but without even thinking of such a thing. Save us and have mercy upon us, Queen of Heaven! How can you even say such a thing?”

“And, according to you, what causes train wrecks? Unscrew two or three nuts and you’ll have a train wreck!”

The peasant smirked and screwed up his eyes at the investigating magistrate, expressing disbelief.

“You don’t say! How many years have all of us here in the village been unscrewing those nuts and, the Lord protect us!—there’ve been no wrecks, no people killed. Now, if I’d carried off a rail or, let’s suppose, if I’d put a log in the way—then, maybe, the train might’ve gone off the track...but, pfft! just a nut!”

“Do try to get it through your head that nuts hold the rails to the ties!”

“We understand that. You’d think we go around unscrewing all of them—the way you talk. We leave lots of them. We don’t do it without using common sense... we understand...” And Denis yawned and made the sign of the cross over his mouth.

“Last year a train went off the rails here,” said the magistrate. “Now it’s clear why!”

“Forgive me...I didn’t quite hear what you said...”

“I say, it’s clear now why there was a train wreck here last year...I now understand the cause.”

“That’s why you’ve been a good education—all of you—our benefactors—to understand. The Lord knows to whom to give understanding... You’ve figured it out properly, but the watchman—a mere peasant has the brain of a peasant. Write down also, Your Honor, that he punched me twice in the teeth and once in the chest..”

“When your place was searched they found a second nut. Where and when did you unscrew that one?”

“Are you asking about the nut that was hidden under the little red trunk?”

“I have no idea where you hid it, but it was found! When did you unscrew that one?”

“I didn’t unscrew it: Ignashka, one-eyed Semyon’s son, did it for me. I’m talking now about the one under the little trunk, you know, but the other one, the one in the shed outside, in the yard, that one I unscrewed together with Mitrofan.”

“Which Mitrofan?”

“With Mitrofan Petrov. Haven’t you heard of him? He makes fish-nets—sells them to the gentry. He uses many of these nuts: about ten for each net...”

“Now, listen Article 1081 of the Penal Code stipulates that every deliberate damage done to a railroad endangering the transportation along said railroad, and when the accused knows that said damage would result in a disaster—you understand?...*knows!*...and you couldn’t help knowing what this unscrewing would lead to...the accused is punishable by banishment and convict labor.”

“Of course, you know best! We are ignorant folk—what do we understand?”

“You understand very well what this is all about! You are lying... you are faking!”

“Why should I lie? Ask anyone in the village if you don’t believe me. Only bleak is caught without a sinker, and a minnow is hardly a fish at all, and even that you can’t catch without a sinker.”

“Yes, yes, and what about the bullhead?” prompted the magistrate with a mocking smile.

“We haven’t got bullheads in our parts. If we cast our lines without a sinker on the surface, with a butterfly as bait, all we get is mullet, and even that only once in a while.”

“That’s enough of that! Be quiet!”

There was silence. Denis shifted his weight from one foot to the other, stared at the table covered with a green cloth, and screwed up his eyes as though he was looking not at the cloth but at the sun. The investigating magistrate was writing rapidly.

“Can I go now?” Denis asked after a brief silence.

“No. I must place you in custody and send you to prison.”

Denis opened his eyes wide and, raising his heavy eyebrows, looked inquiringly at the magistrate: “What d’y’e mean—to prison? Your Honor, I haven’t the time for that; I must go to the fair to collect three rubles from Egor—for lard...”

“Be quiet! Don’t interrupt!”

“To prison!... At least if I’d done something...all right...I’d go. But to be sent to prison for nothing...I live a clean life... why send me to prison? I didn’t steal anything, and as far as I know I’ve never started a brawl...but if you have doubts about those tax arrears—don’t believe a word the villager elder says... ask the permanent member of the village commons—he’s no Christian, that elder!...”

“Be quiet!”

“I’ve been quiet enough,” muttered Denis, “But that elder...whatever lies he’s told about the assessment...I’d take an oath...there are three of us brothers: Kuz’ma, Grigoryev, then Egor Grigoryev, and then there’s me, Denis Grigoryev...”

“You’re interfering! Hey, there, Semyon,” cried the magistrate, “take him out!”

“...We’re three brothers...,” grumbled Denis as two husky soldiers seized him and led him out of the room. “One brother is not another’s keeper....Kuz’ma doesn’t pay, then it’s me dead, our late master, the General—may he rest in the Kingdom of Heaven—or he’d show you, judge...you must know what you’re about before you judge and not do it just like that...it’s all right even to flog a man...but for an evil deed...justly...”

APPENDIX C

Thank You, Ma'am by Langston Hughes

She was a large woman with a large purse that had everything in it but a hammer and nails. It had a long strap, and she carried it slung across her shoulder. It was about eleven o'clock at night, dark, and she was walking alone, when a boy ran up behind her and tried to snatch her purse. The strap broke with the sudden single tug the boy gave it from behind. But the boy's weight and the weight of the purse combined caused him to lose his balance. Instead of taking off full blast as he had hoped, the boy fell on his back in the sidewalk and his legs flew up. The large woman simply turned around and kicked him right square in his blue-jeaned sitter. Then she reached down, picked the boy up by his shirt front, and shook him until his teeth rattled.

After that the woman said "Pick up my pocketbook, boy, and give it here."

She still held him tightly. But she bent down enough to permit him to stoop and pick up her purse. Then she said, "Now ain't you ashamed of yourself?"

Firmly gripped by his shirt front, the boy said. "Yes'm."

The woman said, "What did you want to do it for?"

The boy said, "I didn't aim to."

She said, "You a lie!"

By that time two or three people passed, stopped, turned to look, and some stood watching.

"If I turn you loose, will you run?" asked the woman.

"Yes'm," said the boy.

"Then I won't turn you loose," said the woman. She did not release him.

"Lady, I'm sorry," whispered the boy.

"Um-hum! Your face is dirty. I got a great mind to wash your face for you. Ain't you got nobody home to tell you to wash your face?"

"No'm," said the boy.

"Then it will get washed this evening," said the large woman, starting up the street, dragging the frightened boy behind her.

He looked as if he were fourteen or fifteen, frail and willow-wild, in tennis shoes and blue jeans.

The woman said, "You ought to be my son. I would teach you right from wrong. Least I can do right now is to wash your face. Are you hungry?"

No'm," said the being-dragged boy. "I just want you to turn me loose."

Was I bothering *you* when I turned that corner?" asked the woman.

"No'm."

"But you put yourself in contact with *me*," said the woman. "If you think that contact is not going to last awhile, you got another thought coming. When I get through with you, sir, you are going to remember Mrs. Luella Bates Washington Jones."

Sweat popped out on the boy's face and he began to struggle. Mrs. Jones stopped, jerked him around in front of her, put a half nelson about his neck, and continued to drag him up the street. When she got to her door, she dragged the boy inside, down a hall, and into a large kitchenette—furnished room at the rear of the house. Some of their doors were open, too, so he knew he and the woman were not alone. The woman still had him by the neck in the middle of her room.

She said, "What is your name?"

"Roger," answered the boy.

"Then, Roger, you go to that sink and wash your face," said the woman, whereupon she turned him loose—at last. Roger looked at the door—looked at the woman—looked at the door—*and went to the sink.*

"Let the water run until it gets warm," she said. "Here's a clean towel."

"You gonna take me to jail?" asked the boy, bending over the sink.

"Not with that face, I would not take you nowhere," said the woman. "Here I am trying to get home to cook me a bite to eat, and you snatch my pocketbook! Maybe you ain't been to your supper either, late as it be. Have you?"

"There's nobody home at my house." said the boy.

"Then we'll eat," said the woman. "I believe you're hungry—or been hungry—to try to snatch my pocketbook!"

"I want a pair of blue suede shoes," said the boy.

"Well, you didn't have snatch *my* pocketbook to get some suede shoes," said Mrs. Luella Bates Washington Jones. "You could of asked me."

"M'am?"

The water dripping from his face, the boy looked at her. There was a long pause. After he had dried his face and not knowing what else to do, dried it again, the boy turned around, wondering what next. The door was open. He could make a dash for it down the hall. He could run, run, run, *run!*

The woman was sitting on the daybed. After a while she said, "I were young once and I wanted things I could not get."

There was another long pause. The boy's mouth opened. Then he frowned, not knowing he frowned.

The woman said, "Um-hum! You thought I was going to say *but*, didn't you? You thought I was going to say, *but I didn't snatch people's pocketbooks*. Well, I wasn't going to say that." Pause. Silence. "I have done things, too, which I would not tell you, son—neither tell God, if He didn't already know. Everybody's got something in common. So you set down while I fix us something to eat. You might run that comb through your hair so you will look presentable."

In another corner of the room behind a screen was a gas plate and an icebox. Mrs. Jones got up and went behind the screen. The woman did not watch the boy to see if he was going to run now, nor did she watch her purse, which she left behind her on the daybed. But the boy took care to sit on the far side of the room, away from the purse, where he thought she could easily see him out of the corner of her eye if she wanted to. He did not trust the woman *not* to trust him. And he did not want to be mistrusted.

"Do you need somebody to go to the store," asked the boy, "maybe to get some milk or something?"

"Don't believe I do," said the woman, "unless you just want sweet milk yourself. I was going to make cocoa out of this canned milk I got here."

"That will be fine," said the boy.

She heated some lima beans and ham she had in the icebox, made the cocoa, and set the table. The woman did not ask the boy anything about where he lived, or his folks, or anything else that would embarrass him. Instead, as they ate, she told him about her job in a hotel beauty shop that stayed open late, what the work was like, and how all kinds of women came in and out, blondes, redheads, and Spanish. Then she cut him a half of her ten-cent cake.

"Eat some more, son," she said.

When they were finished eating, she got up and said, "Now here, take this ten dollars and buy yourself some blue suede shoes. And next

time, do not make the mistake of latching onto *my* pocketbook *nor nobody else's*—because shoes got by devilish ways will burn your feet. I got to get my rest now. But from here on in, son, I hope you will behave yourself.”

She led him down the hall to the front door and opened it. “Good night! Behave yourself, boy!” she said, looking out into the street as he went down the steps.

The boy wanted to say something other than, “Thank you, ma’am,” to Mrs. Luella Bates Washington Jones, but although his lips moved, he couldn’t even say that as he turned at the foot of the barren stoop and looked up at the large woman in the door. Then she shut the door.

APPENDIX D

The Children's Hour by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow

- 1 Between the dark and the daylight,
When the night is beginning to lower,
Comes a pause in the day's occupations,
That is known as the Children's Hour.
- 2 I hear in the chamber above me
The patter of little feet,
The sound of a door that is opened,
And voices soft and sweet.
- 3 From my study I see in the lamplight,
Descending the broad hall stair,
Grave Alice, and laughing Allegra,
And Edith with golden hair.
- 4 A whisper, and then a silence:
Yet I know by their merry eyes
They are plotting and planning together
To take me by surprise.
- 5 A sudden rush from the stairway,
A sudden raid from the hall!
By three doors left unguarded
They enter my castle wall!
- 6 They climb up into my turret
O'er the arms and back of my chair,
If I try to escape, they surround me;
They seem to be everywhere.
- 7 They almost devour me with kisses,
Their arms about me entwine,
Till I think of the Bishop of Bingen
In his Mouse-Tower on the Rhine!
- 8 Do you think, O blue-eyed banditti,
Because you have scaled the wall,
Such an old mustache as I am
Is not a match for you all!

9 I have you fast in my fortress,
And will not let you depart,
But put you down into the dungeon
In the round-tower of my heart.
10 And there will I keep you forever,
Yes, forever and a day,
Till the walls shall crumble to ruin,
And moulder in dust away!

APPENDIX E

On Children by Kahlil Gibran

And a woman who held a babe against her bosom
said, speak to us of children.

And she said:

Your children are not your children.

They are the sons and daughters of Life's longing for
itself.

They come through you but not from you. And though
they

are with you yet they belong not to you.

You may give them your love but not your thoughts.

You may house their bodies but not their souls.

For their souls dwell in the house of tomorrow, which
you

cannot visit, not even in your dreams.

You may strive to be like them, but seek not to make
them

like you.

For life goes not backward nor tarries with yesterday.

You are the bows from which your children as living
arrows

are sent forth.

The archer sees the mark upon the path of the infinite,
and

He bends you with His might that His arrows may go
swift and

far.

Let your bending in the archer's hand be for gladness;

For even as He loves the arrow that flies, so He loves
also the bow that is stable.

APPENDIX F

Save the Bali Mynah! by Bucksnort Trout

Some animals we see in zoos are almost gone from the wild. These days, zoos have a whole new job to do: keeping species of animals alive, and returning them back into the wild. To do this job, zookeepers have to be ready to solve strange and unexpected problems. Sometimes, they have to make hard choices, too.

On a visit to a zoo, you see a colorful tropical bird, and think of its thousands of cousins flying around sunny forests, somewhere far away. If the bird you're looking at is a Bali Mynah, though, your imagination is fooling you.

The Bali Mynah is a beautiful white bird with a bright blue beak. Its homeland is a forest on the North West tip of Bali, an island in the country of Indonesia. But fewer than fifty Bali Mynahs still live there. All the rest of the Bali Mynahs in the world, several hundred of them, live in zoos or private homes.

Bob Seibels is the bird curator at the Riverbanks Zoo in Columbia, South Carolina, in the United States. He has several Bali Mynahs in his zoo's collection. He has been able to get them to raise their young in captivity. And he knows they are fast disappearing from the wild. Can they be saved?

Some years ago, Seibels decided to try to keep the Bali Mynahs in the wild from becoming extinct. He and other concerned zookeepers and scientists could do this by making zoos go in reverse. That is, they could set some of their captive birds loose to build up the numbers of birds in the wild. The idea was simple. It was just the doing that was hard.

First, they needed some information. Did the birds have a safe place to go back to? It's silly to pour water into a leaky bucket. It's just as pointless to return Bali Mynahs to a place where they'll disappear all over again. Why were the Bali Mynahs disappearing so fast in the wild?

The first reason they learned was embarrassing. Zookeepers had been part of the problem. In the 1960s, word got out that Bali Mynahs were rare birds. Soon private collectors and zoos bought hundreds of birds that were captured in the wild—and further reduced the wild pop-

ulation by half! When they realized what was happening, the zookeepers agreed to stop taking more birds, and to protect those that were left. But by then the wild flocks were down to a couple of hundred.

The second reason was that farmers had been chopping down the forests the birds lived in to make coconut plantations and pasture for livestock, or simply for firewood.

What could they do about that?

The government of Bali had already made a nature park to protect the birds. The Bali Barat Park had forest lands, where it was illegal to disturb the Bali Mynahs. Well and good.

But poachers were sneaking into the park and capturing birds to sell. Sometimes they caught the birds in traps. Sometimes they smeared glue on branches, and caught the birds who stuck to it. Bali Mynahs were an endangered species, but many collectors prized the birds and kept them illegally. For each bird, they were willing to pay a poacher enough money to support his family for a year.

What could be done do about that?

This problem wasn't so easy to solve. Seibels and others asked conservation groups to give money to hire more park police, and provide boats and flashlights and compasses to help them patrol the park and protect the birds. These methods worked some. They haven't put an end to the poaching, but they've slowed it way down. Now the park is safe enough to return birds to.

But surely you can't take Bali Mynah birds from zoos in Columbia, or Chicago, or Washington and return them straight into the wild. Birds raised in zoos are not used to the hot climate of Bali. They don't know how to defend themselves from natural enemies, or even to find food for themselves.

What could they do about that?

Seibels and his team decided to send some of their Bali Mynahs to Bali, but to put them in a special "halfway house" where they could raise another brood of young birds. These young birds would be would be set free in the park forest. After all, they would be used to the hot climate, and they would be raised on native food. They would have a better chance to survive.

But which birds should they take to Bali? Many of the birds that had been raised in zoos were close cousins of each other. In one zoo, 185 birds were descended from two pairs of Bali Mynahs! Zookeepers had not kept track of which birds came from which parents. No one thought

it mattered. But now that they were talking about putting healthy birds back into the wild, it mattered very much.

Here's why. If closely related birds have young, and their young have more young, these birds will grow steadily weaker, and may even forget how to hunt food, or how to care for their own young. The birds Seibels and his team sent out into the wild must not be closely related to each other. If they were, then later generations of birds would be weaker and less fit than the ones before. Even though their numbers might grow for a time, their strength would be reduced, and the Bali Mynah would only be sped on its way to extinction.

What could they do about that?

The first thing they did was to ask all the zookeepers who had Bali Mynahs to write down where the birds came from. For most birds, the zookeepers weren't sure—they were only sure about 100 birds.

The next thing was to pair up the birds that were not related so that they would have healthy young. That meant sending a bird from California to mate with a bird in Washington or even in London, and sending a bird in New York to mate with a bird in Houston, and so on.

Finally the day arrived when Bob Seibels' team loaded twenty crates onto an airplane in Los Angeles. Thirty-one hours later, twenty pairs of Bali Mynahs arrived in Bali, and were sent to a breeding area in a local zoo. The birds got used to their new homes, and eventually eight young Bali Mynahs were seen trying to fly from their nests. At last they were ready to be released into the forest.

Bird handlers set free the first batch of Bali Mynahs in the wild forest in Bali. A few days later, spotters went out to see how they had fared. Disaster! Two had died, and one had disappeared.

Should they give up on the project?

No. People on the scene said they set the birds out during a long dry season, and too far from the nesting grounds in the forest. They could fix that.

The next year, the birds in the breeding ground in Bali had another brood ready. This batch was released in rainy weather, and close to the nesting area. Sure enough, two of them were seen mating with native birds. Soon, these birds had young.

Over the next three years, more batches of birds were brought to Bali from zoos in America and Europe. They bred in the breeding areas at the zoos in Bali, and their young were released into the Bali Barat park.

Birdwatchers in the park counted a steady increase in the wild Bali Mynah flocks—from 18 to 30, from 30 to 48. The project was a success—maybe.

Then came the biggest problem of all. In an American zoo, a young Bali Mynah died of strange causes. The veterinarian found that the bird was infected by a parasite called *Atoxoplasma*. Other Bali Mynahs in American zoos were tested, and many were found to have the parasite, too. Now everyone was worried. If they set out infected Bali Mynahs in the wild, they might infect and kill off the remaining birds. Should the whole project be stopped?

What should they do?

At last report, a new brood of Bali Mynahs huddled in the breeding area, ready to be released. And the native population of birds was shrinking, probably because of poachers and disease. What should the zookeepers do? Release more birds and risk infecting the birds in the wild with infection? Or not take action, and see if the population of wild birds would continue to shrink?

APPENDIX G

How Much Lead Poisoning? by Bucksnot Trout

Environmental scientists and public health officials have long been aware of the threat posed by lead to the human body. We know now that thousands of people in the Middle Ages lost their eyesight and had their reason demented from eating off plates glazed with lead, or drinking water from pitchers or pipes made entirely or partially from lead. In this century, people who drink illegal whiskey have been seen to go blind and worse because the spirits were distilled through automobile radiators, with lead cores.

In the United States, lead was removed from automotive gasoline in the 1970s, and also from housepaints. Rules have even been proposed to ban lead shotgun pellets, because over the years they poison the wildlife who swallow them: an example of hunters hastening the demise of their own favorite pastime.

Lead used by former generations resides other places besides duck ponds. Lead from house paint, either that which peels from walls or the chips scraped off over years of repainting and left around foundations, poisons children. Young people who live six years or more in houses with high lead concentrations can lose up to an estimated fifteen IQ points from this invisible poison.

In the United States, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposes limits that must be approved by Congress for legally tolerable levels of toxins in our environment. Residences with excessively high levels of residual lead poisoning can be condemned by local public health departments using rules developed by the EPA. But how much poison is too much?

Any lead in the environment can cause some brain damage. But getting rid of lead is expensive: causing scraping off all paint down to the base material, for instance, and digging up the soil around foundations of buildings (all of which requires workers to take extreme health precautions themselves)—then disposing of the refuse in expensive, and increasingly scarce hazardous waste dumps. In establishing “tolerable” levels, then, the EPA must rule between what is desirable to do, and what is economically feasible. In an urban apartment building, to remove the

lead that might cause a drop of fifteen IQ points over six years of a child's life might cost \$50,000 per family. In poor neighborhoods, where families struggle to meet even subsidized rent payments and the budgets of social service agencies are already stretched, this \$50,000 is a huge strain. But even if \$50,000 is expended, how much damage-causing lead is left behind?

In the late 1980s scientists at the EPA made some discouraging findings. Even after the lead-infected paint residues inside and out of a set of apartment buildings in New York had been removed, there was still enough lead present in the apartments to cause brain damage calculable to a loss of as many as five IQ points, and many other related problems, to children living in those dwellings for at least a six year period. It turned out that the lead had saturated into the very bricks of the buildings, from more than seventy years of lead-bearing exhaust pollution spewed from truck and automobile traffic.

If the EPA set the level of tolerance below this "five IQ point" minimum, hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of people would have to be evacuated from major sections of the city. To be really safe, the buildings would have to be pulled down, and the waste hauled to environmentally safe burial sites. Massive sites, bigger than many world cities. The residents most drastically affected by this problem are the poorest, because their dwellings are typically closest to the busiest roadways.

Scientists, economists, engineers, and politicians involved with the Environmental Protection Agency must decide where to draw the line. How much lead poison is too much? Where should they draw the line?

APPENDIX H

From The Log of Christopher Columbus Translated into English by Robert H. Fuson

Friday, 12 October 1492

(Log entry for 12 October is combined with that of 11 October.)

At dawn we saw naked people, and I went ashore in the ship's boat, armed, followed by Martin Alonso Pinzon, captain of the *Pinta*, and his brother, Vincente Yanez Pinzon, captain of the *Nina*. I unfurled the royal banner and the captains brought the flags which displayed a large green cross with the letters F and Y at the left and right side of the cross. Over each letter was the appropriate crown of that Sovereign. These flags were carried as a standard on all of the ships. After a prayer of thanksgiving I ordered the captains of the *Pinta* and *Nina*, together with Rodrigo de Escobedo (secretary of the fleet), and Rodrigo Sanchez of Segovia (comptroller of the fleet) to bear faith and witness that I was taking possession of this island for the King and Queen. I made all the necessary declarations and had these testimonies carefully written down by the secretary. In addition to those named above, the entire company of the fleet bore witness to this act. To this island I gave the name *San Salvador*, in honor of our Blessed Lord.

No sooner had we concluded the formalities of taking possession of the island than people began to come to the beach, all as naked as their mothers who bore them, and the women also, although I did not see more than one very young girl. All those that I saw were young people, none of whom was over 30 years old. They are very well-built people, with handsome bodies and very fine faces, though their appearance is marred somewhat by very broad heads and foreheads, more so than I have ever seen in any other race. Their eyes are large and very pretty, and their skin is the color of the Canary Islanders or of sunburned peasants, not at all black, as would be expected because we are on an east-west line with Hierro in the Canaries. These are tall people and their legs, with no exceptions, are quite straight, and none of them has a paunch. They are, in fact, well proportioned. Their hair is not kinky, but straight, and coarse like horsehair. They wear it short over the eye-

brows, but they have a long hank in the back that they never cut. Many of the natives paint their faces; others paint their whole bodies; some, only the eyes or nose. Some are painted black, some white, some red; others are of different colors.

The people here called this island *Guanabani* in their language, and their speech is very fluent, although I do not understand any of it. They are friendly and well-dispositioned people who bare no arms except for small spears, and they have no iron. I showed one my sword, and through ignorance he grabbed the blade and cut himself. Their spears are made of wood, to which they attach a fish tooth at one end, or some other sharp thing.

I want the natives to develop a friendly attitude toward us because I know that they are a people who can be made free and converted to our Holy Faith more by love than by force. I therefore gave red caps to some and glass beads to others. They hung the beads around their necks, along with some other things of slight value that I gave them. And they took great pleasure in this and became so friendly that it was a marvel. They traded and gave everything they had with good will, but it seems to me that they have very little and are poor in everything. I warned my men to take nothing from the people without giving something in exchange.

Many of the men I have seen have scars on their bodies, and when I made signs to them to find out how this happened, they indicated that people from other nearby islands come to San Salvador to capture them; they defend themselves the best they can. I believe that people from the mainland come here to take them as slaves. They ought to make good and skilled servants, for they repeat very quickly whatever we say to them. I think they can easily be made Christians, for they seem to have no religion. If it pleases Our Lord, I will take six of them to Your Highness when I depart, in order that they may learn our language.

Saturday, 13 October 1492

I have been very attentive and have tried very hard to find out if there is any gold here. I have seen a few natives who wear a little piece of gold hanging from a hole made in the nose. By signs, if I interpret them correctly, I have learned that by going to the south, or rounding the island to the south, I can find a king who possesses a lot of gold and has great containers of it. I have tried to find some natives who will take me to this great king, but none seems inclined to make the journey.

Tomorrow afternoon I intend to go to the SW. The natives have indicated to me that not only is there land to the south and SW, but also

to the NW. I shall go to the SW and look for gold and precious stones. Furthermore, if I understand correctly, it is from the NW that strangers come to fight and capture the people here.

The island is fairly large and very flat. It is green, with many trees and several bodies of water. There is a very large lagoon in the middle of the island and there are no mountains. It is a pleasure to gaze upon this place because it is all so green, and the weather is delightful. In fact, since we left the Canaries, God has not failed to provide one perfect day after the other.

Sunday, 14 October 1492

I cannot get over the fact of how docile these people are. They have so little to give but will give it all for whatever we give them, if only broken pieces of glass and crockery. One seaman gave three Portuguese *ceitis* (not even worth a penny!) for about 25 pounds of spun cotton. I probably should have forbidden this exchange, but I wanted to take the cotton to Your Highnesses, and it seems to be in abundance. I think the cotton is grown on San Salvador, but I cannot say for sure because I have not been here that long. Also, the gold they wear hanging from their noses comes from here, but in order not to lose time I want to go to see if I can find the island of Japan.

When night came, all of the people went ashore in their boats.

I kept moving in order to see all of this so that I can give an account of everything to Your Highnesses. Also, I wanted to see if I could find a suitable place to build a fort. I saw a piece of land that looked like an island, even though it is not, with six houses on it. I believe that it could be cut through and made into an island in two days. I do not think this is necessary, however, for these people are very unskilled in arms. Your Highnesses will see this for yourselves when I bring to you the seven that I have taken. After they learn our language I shall return them, unless Your Highnesses order that the entire population be taken to Castile, or held captive here. With 50 men you could subject everyone and make them do what you wished.

Monday, 15 October 1492

I anchored at sunset near the cape in order to find out if there was any gold there. The men from San Salvador told me that people on this island wear big golden bracelets on their arms and legs. I really did not believe them but think they made up the tale in order to get me to put ashore so that they could escape. Nevertheless, I did stop, for I have no desire to sail strange waters at night. It is not my wish to bypass any is-

land without taking possession, although having taken on you can claim them all.

Tuesday, 16 October 1492

At daybreak I went ashore in the small boat. People met us on the beach. There were many people, and they went naked and in the same condition as those of San Salvador. They let us go anywhere we desired and gave us anything we asked.

I decided not to linger very long at Santa Maria de la Concepcion, for I saw that there was no gold there and the wind freshened to a SE cross-wind. I departed the island for the ship after a two hours' stay. Just as I was preparing to board the ship, a big dugout came alongside the *Nina*, and one of the men from San Salvador jumped overboard and escaped in it. This is the second such incident, for in the middle of last night another man leaped into the sea and escaped by dugout. Some of the men went after the boat last night, but there was no way they could catch up to it, even though they were armed. Those boats go very swiftly.

This morning some men of my company tried to catch the second dugout, but again, it outran them. They found it abandoned on the beach, and the men in it fled like chickens. The sailors brought the boat back to the *Nina*, to which had come still another boat with one man in it. He had come from another cape and wanted to trade a ball of cotton. Some sailors jumped into the sea and seized him because he would not come aboard the caravel. Watching all this from the poopdeck, I sent for him. I gave the man a red cap and some little beads of green glass, which I placed on his arm, and two hawks' bells, which I placed on his ears. I also ordered the men of the *Nina* to return his dugout and sent him ashore. I did not take the ball of cotton, even though he wished to give it to me. I could see that he was surrounded by people when he reached shore, and they held it a great marvel and were convinced that we were good people. I wanted them to think that the men who had fled had done us some harm and that was why we were carrying them along with us. Thus I used him for these reasons and gave him all the aforesaid articles in order that the people might hold us in such esteem that on some other occasion when Your Highnesses send men back here they will be well treated. All that I gave him was not worth two cents.

Not only was there a shifting wind and no gold here, I was also afraid that all the men from San Salvador would escape if I did not move on and get farther away. I wanted to go to another large island that I determined lay to the west.

APPENDIX I

From The Diary of Bartolome de las Casas Translated from Bartolome de Las Casas, *Historia de las Indias*

On Wednesday, April 9, 1494, Alonso de Hojeda took some 400 men inland and, after crossing the river that the admiral had called Rio del Oro (it must be the Mao river, for I know the land and the Indian names of rivers very well), Hojeda came upon a town, chained its *cacique* [native chief], his brother and one of his nephews and sent them as prisoners to the admiral. Moreover, he caught a relative of the *cacique* and had his ears cut off in the public square. The reason for this, it seems, is that the *cacique* had given five Indians to three Christians going from the fort to the ship to help them ford the river by carrying bundles of clothes. Supposedly, the Indians left the men stranded in the river and returned to the village, the *cacique* did not punish them but instead kept the clothes for himself. The *cacique* of the nearby town, trusting in the welcome he and his neighbor had given both the admiral and Hojeda on their first visit, decided to accompany the prisoners to plead with the admiral not to harm his friends. When the prisoners arrived and he with them, the admiral ordered a crier to announce their public decapitation. What a pretty way to promote justice, friendship, and make the Faith appealing—to capture a King in his own territory and sentence him, his brother and his nephew to death, for no fault of their own! Even if they were guilty, the crime was so benign it begged for moderation and extenuating circumstances. Besides, how could their innocence or guilt be proven? Hojeda captured them on arrival and nobody knew their language. The same lack of justice may be observed in Hojeda's order to cut off the ears of one of the *cacique's* vassals in his presence. What good tidings all over the land, and such a show of Christian gentility and goodness!

To return to the story, when the other *cacique*, who was perhaps related to the prisoner, heard the sentence, he begged the admiral to save them and with tears promised as best he could by sign language that nothing of the sort would ever happen again, and the admiral granted his plea by revoking the sentence. Whereupon a horseman arrived

from the fort with news of insurrection: the *cacique*'s subjects had surrounded five Christians and meant to kill them, but he and his horse managed to free them and chase some 400 Indians away, wounding some in pursuit and, I have no doubt, killing others as well. What a reputation for Christians who had been held but a short while back to be men come from Heaven! This was the first injustice committed against the Indians under the guise of justice and the beginning of the shedding of blood which was to flow so copiously from then on all over this island, as I will show later.

No man in his right mind would doubt that the *cacique* and his people had a right to declare a just war against the Christians, and that their behavior towards the five Christians was indeed the beginning of their exercise of that right. With their lord taken away as prisoner to the ship, perhaps they meant to ransom him with these Christian lives. What convincing reasons did the admiral have when he came to this town, in the few hours he was there and especially not knowing the language, for the *cacique* not to believe he was acting well by allowing free passage on his land and welcoming him as he did? After all, the admiral had come without permission, and Christians were such a fierce-looking novelty, trespassing with arms and horses that seemed so ferocious that the mere sight of them made the inhabitants tremble and fear they would be swallowed alive! In truth, this was an offense which everyone in the world today would take as such and seek revenge, on the strength of natural law as well as *iure gentium*. Also, would not the *cacique* think himself superior to the admiral and his Christians? And to Hojeda also, who condemned the Indian thief for a dubious theft, acting as supreme judge on foreign soil under foreign jurisdiction.

The worst and gravest crime was to capture a King living peacefully in his own domain, and to chain him was an ugly and atrocious crime. Reason itself says it was not right to trespass, not right to do it in a warlike manner, and not right that the admiral leave the ship without first sending an embassy to notify the Indian kings of his intention to visit them, asking permission to do so and sending gifts, as he had been instructed to do by the King of Castile. The admiral should have taken pains to bring love and peace and to avoid scandalous incidents, for not to perturb the innocent is precept of evangelical law whose messenger he was. Instead, he inspired fear and displayed power, declared war and violated a jurisdiction that was not his but the Indians'; and it seems to me this not using the door but a window to enter a house, as if the land were not inhabited by men but by beasts.

APPENDIX J

Suggestions for Teaching the Sample Texts

Teaching “The Evildoer”

This story lends itself well to reading by the Reader-Response method. It can also be used for Shared-Inquiry discussions, and for discussion and debate using the Discussion Web and the discussion techniques described earlier. Participants might prepare lessons around it for practice on their own. If you wish to use it for discussion, you might begin with these questions:

- Who is the “evildoer”?
- Why did Denis confess to tax irregularities at the end?
- Why does the magistrate mock Denis with his question about bullheads?

The discussion might be polarized into a debate over Denis’ guilt or innocence, with the debate taking the form of arguments by the defense and the prosecution.

Teaching “Thank You, Ma’am”

Although the participants may not be familiar with Langston Hughes and the Harlem Renaissance, most of them should have little trouble identifying with the premise of a poor woman helping to redirect a young boy bent on crime. The strength of the story is that much of the action is implicit: Mrs. Jones hints at her own past, but doesn’t tell us what it is; there is the suggestion of a hope that Roger will be redeemed, but it is by no means certain; and there may be a connection between Mrs. Jones’s past and Roger’s salvation.

We have used the story with the Dual Entry Diary approach, and it also lends itself well to discussion by means of Shared Inquiry. Participants should make up their own questions for it, but in case you want to use it yourself in a discussion, here are some questions you might ask:

- Why did Mrs. Jones take Roger home?

- Why did Roger not run when Mrs. Jones turned him loose?
- Why didn't Mrs. Jones tell Roger about her own past?
- What did Roger mean to say to Mrs. Jones at the end of the story?

If the story were to be used in a Discussion-Web activity, some polarizing questions might be:

- Is Roger likely to go "straight" now?
- Is this the best that Mrs. Jones could have done for Roger? That is, might it not have been better for her to hand him over to the authorities?

Teaching "The Children's Hour" and "On Children"

These two poems take strikingly different approaches to the topic of childhood. More issues seem to come out when the two poems are read together: That is, readers may perceive an odd combination of detachment mixed with a controlling attitude in "The Children's Hour" after reading Gibran's poem. And they may find Gibran's approach strangely refreshing after Longfellow's or not; perhaps Gibran underappreciates the need for adult authority.

Have participants read "The Children's Hour" first, and make several entries about it in a Dual Entry Diary. Then have them share their comments with each other. Have them repeat the process with "On Children." Now have them discuss both poems. It may help their process of comparison and contrast if they construct a Venn diagram, with two overlapping circles. In the separate parts of the circle they would list attributes that are unique to each poem, and in the overlapping part, they should list the attributes the two poems have in common.

Teaching "Save the Bali Mynah!"

This is a true story of the difficulties involved in making right an environmental wrong. It lends itself well to discussion and debate. The issues revolve around the need to be careful when tinkering with endangered members of an ecosystem versus the need for dramatic action to keep a species from dying out entirely.

Participants might approach this passage with Shared-Inquiry questions, followed by a Discussion-Web question around the issue of whether Bob Seibels, the protagonist of this true story, should proceed to release more Bali Mynahs into the wild, or delay their further release, even at the risk of their numbers dwindling beyond the possibility of a comeback.

Teaching The Log of Christopher Columbus and The Diary of Bartolome de las Casas

These two passages are original documents from the “discovery” of the New World by the Europeans. Columbus’s own diary entries chronicles his thoughts and actions during his first days in America. Las Casas’s diary describes the persecution of the indigenous population at the hands of the Europeans, a few short years after Columbus arrived.

Residents of the New World cannot agree on an interpretation of these events. Some claim Columbus was a hero, who brought Christianity and civilization to a land he inadvertently found on his way to the Orient. Others say that Columbus was more of an exploiter, and that his treatment of the native population even in the first days and weeks led directly to their enslavement which was followed rapidly by their extermination, and then replacement by African slaves. This led to a troubled legacy of violence and exploitation in race relations in the New World. The passages lend themselves first to an exercise in reading between the lines, and later to a debate about Columbus’s motives, and his responsibility for the pattern of oppression that began soon after him.

As a preliminary activity, you might ask participants to imagine that they were designing the rules of engagement for a group of explorers who were likely to be the first to encounter an unknown group of people. What rules should govern their behavior? Why? Ask them to read the excerpts from Columbus’s log with these questions in mind: What seem to be Columbus’s own rules of engagement? What makes you think so?

After discussing their findings, have them read the passage from Las Casas. Now that they know what happened to the native peoples, they may debate, by means of a Discussion Web, this question: Was Columbus’s attitude toward the natives, as displayed in his diary, responsible for opening the way for their subsequent mistreatment?