



OULUN YLIOPISTO  
UNIVERSITY of OULU

Similä, Juho Samuli

DESCHOOLING PHILOSOPHY AND FREEDOM IN EDUCATION

Teachers' views of principles and practices in the Finnish primary school

Master's Thesis in Education

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Intercultural Teacher Education

2015



**Faculty of Education**

**Thesis abstract**

Department of Educational Sciences and Teacher Education Intercultural Teacher Education		Author Similä, Juho Samuli	
Title DESCHOOLING PHILOSOPHY AND FREEDOM IN EDUCATION: Teachers' views of principles and practices in the Finnish Primary school			
Major subject Education	Type of thesis Master's thesis	Year November 2015	Number of pages 96 + appendices
<p>Abstract</p> <p>The goal of this thesis is to study definitions of freedom in education and compare them to find out similarities and differences. The aim is not to come up with practical applications for freedom in education, but to understand what freedom can be and to find out whether there are similarities or differences between the definitions. The theoretical research question of this study is how freedom is defined in the deschooling philosophy, and the empirical research question is how freedom is defined in education according to the collected data.</p> <p>The theoretical framework is based on deschooling philosophy and on texts mainly written by authors from the 1960s and 1970s, but there are also some texts included in the study produced by some more recent authors. The theoretical framework comes from a very different educational context and era which is why it is not directly compared to Finnish primary education. Hence, this thesis does not aim to criticize Finnish primary education.</p> <p>Freedom according to the theoretical framework exists within limits, and does not mean that students can do whatever they want. What matters in freedom according to deschooling authors is the existence of choice and in particular, meaningfulness of the choices. As freedom exists within limits, the limits are seen as providing security for students who can then safely engage in activities that they are interested in.</p> <p>The data comes from five Finnish primary school teachers who answered open questions about freedom in education. The methodological paradigm is closest to constructivism, but borders on pragmatism. Content analysis was chosen for analysis method, since the data was textual and the research was concerned of the latent thematic content. The analysis is qualitative, but quantitative in the sense that code frequencies are given. Code categories were formulated deductively but revised after trial coding. Four actor categories and seven thematic categories were formulated, after which the segments of data were coded accordingly. The analysis was carried out along the order of the thematic categories, and every code combination was analyzed separately. The findings were summarized to answer the empirical research question.</p> <p>The interpretation indicates that freedom in education is always controlled by authority. Freedom is suggested to include practical choices, and possibilities to affect one's own education. Limits are seen as necessary, and responsibility is seen as a necessary competence for using freedom. There are both similarities and differences in definitions of freedom, yet the definitions recognize the importance of limits and the role of authority. Security and providing choices are also seen as important elements of freedom. The data suggests that responsibility is a necessary competence for freedom though it does not appear in the theoretical framework. The findings are based on subjective interpretation and therefore, they cannot be generalized more widely. As the main methodological paradigm is constructivism, the thesis does not claim to provide universal results and thus recognizes the subjective rather than objective quality of the study.</p>			
Keywords	Deschooling philosophy, educational science, educational philosophy, freedom, primary school, content analysis		



Kasvatustieteiden tiedekunta

Tiivistelmä opinnäytetyöstä

Luokanopettajankoulutus		Tekijä <b>Similä, Juho Samuli</b>	
Työn nimi DESCHOOLING PHILOSOPHY AND FREEDOM IN EDUCATION: Teachers' views of principles and practices in the Finnish Primary school			
Pääaine Kasvatustiede	Työn laji Pro gradu-tutkielma	Aika Marraskuu 2015	Sivumäärä 96 + liitteet
<p>Tiivistelmä</p> <p>Tutkimuksen tavoitteena on tarkastella määritelmiä vapaudesta ja vertailla niitä keskenään erojen ja samankaltaisuuksien löytämiseksi. Työllä ei pyritä löytämään vapautteen liittyviä sovelluksia kasvatusta varten, vaan ymmärtää mitä vapaus voi olla ja pohtia määritelmien eroja ja yhteneväisyyksiä. Teoreettinen tutkimuskysymys tutkielmassa on miten kouluttomuusfilosofia määrittelee vapauden kasvatuksessa, ja työn empiirinen tutkimuskysymys on miten tutkimusaineisto määrittelee vapauden kasvatuksessa.</p> <p>Työn teoreettinen viitekehys perustuu kouluttomuusfilosofiaan, ja teoriaa rakennetaan pääasiassa 1960- ja 1970-luvun kirjoittajien näkemysten kautta, mutta mukana on myös muutamia uudempia aihetta käsitteleviä tekstejä. Teoreettinen viitekehys perustuu hyvin erilaiseen kasvatustieteelliseen ja aikakontekstiin, mistä syystä sitä ei suoraan verrata suomalaiseseen peruskouluun. Näin ollen työ ei tähtää suomalaisen peruskoulun kritisoimiseen.</p> <p>Teoreettisen viitekehysten mukaan vapaus on olemassa rajoitusten sisällä, joten vapaus ei tarkoita oppilaiden voivan tehdä ihan mitä haluavat. Vapauden kannalta onkin merkittävää valinnanvapaus sekä erityisesti vaihtoehtojen mielekkyys. Rajojen nähdään myös luovan turvallisuutta, jonka avulla oppilaat voivat rauhassa syventyä itseään kiinnostaviin aktiviteetteihin.</p> <p>Tutkimuksen aineisto on saatu viideltä suomalaiselta peruskoulun opettajalta, jotka vastasivat avoimiin kysymyksiin vapaudesta kasvatuksessa. Tutkimuksen metodologinen paradigma on lähinnä konstruktivistinen, mutta osin myös pragmatistinen. Tekstimuotoisen aineiston analyysimenetelmäksi valittiin sisällön analyysi, jossa keskeisiksi nousivat tutkimuksiin liittyvät teemat. Analyysi on laadullista, mutta koodien lukumäärästä annetaan myös määrällistä tietoa. Koodikategoriat luotiin teoriapohjaisesti, ja kategorioita korjattiin testikoodauksen jälkeen. Lopulta luotiin neljä tekijäkategoriaa sekä seitsemän teemakategoriaa, minkä jälkeen aineiston segmentit koodattiin tämän mukaisesti. Analyysi tehtiin teemakategorioiden järjestyksen mukaisesti, ja kaikki koodiyhdistelmät analysoitiin erikseen. Löydökset on kirjoitettu auki yhteenvedossa, jolla myös vastataan empiiriseen tutkimuskysymykseen.</p> <p>Aineiston voidaan tulkita kuvaavan näkemystä vapaudesta, jonka mukaisesti vapaus kasvatuksessa on aina auktoriteetin kontrolloimaa. Vapauden nähdään sisältävän käytännönvalintoja, sekä mahdollisuuksia vaikuttaa omaan kasvatukseen. Rajat vapaudessa nähdään välttämättöminä, ja vastuu nähdään tärkeänä kompetenssina vapauden käytölle. Vapauden määritelmässä on eroja ja yhtäläisyyksiä, joskin ne tunnustavat rajojen merkityksen sekä auktoriteetin roolin vapautteen liittyen. Turvallisuus sekä valinnanmahdollisuudet nähdään ensiarvoisen tärkeinä. Aineistosta voidaan nostaa vastuun merkitys vapaudelle, mikä ei kuitenkaan nouse esille teoreettisessa viitekehyksessä. Tutkimuksen tulokset ovat subjektiivinen tulkinta, eikä niitä siten voi laajemmin yleistää. Koska tutkimuksen paradigma on suurelta osin konstruktivistinen, ei tutkimuksella yritetäkään todentaa yleispäteviä tuloksia, vaan tunnustetaan niiden olevan enemmän subjektiivisia kuin objektiivisia.</p>			
Asiasanat Kouluttomuusfilosofia, Kasvatustiede, kasvatustieteet, kasvatustieteet, vapaus, peruskoulu, sisällön analyysi			

## Index

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Research objective .....	1
1.2	About the literature .....	2
1.3	Prior understanding.....	3
<b>2</b>	<b>The concept of freedom and the deschooling movement .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Defining deschooling .....	5
2.2	Essentials of freedom.....	7
2.3	Understanding authority.....	10
2.4	Order vs. disorder, structure and discipline in education .....	12
2.5	Freedom of choice and its problemacy in conventional education .....	15
2.6	Freedom to be a child and how we limit this freedom .....	17
2.7	Freedom in the "the new school" .....	20
2.8	Freedom and deschooling – A summary.....	21
<b>3</b>	<b>Methodology.....</b>	<b>24</b>
3.1	Defining qualitative content analysis and the objects of analysis .....	24
3.2	Coding frame, categories and inductive category application .....	27
3.3	Latent content: The themes and meanings .....	29
3.4	Conducting the research.....	29
3.5	Methodological paradigms.....	32
3.6	Language issues .....	33
<b>4</b>	<b>Segmentation and building the code categories .....</b>	<b>35</b>
4.1	Formulating the research categories and trial coding.....	35
4.2	Segmenting the data.....	36
4.3	Trial coding and modifying the code categories .....	36
<b>5</b>	<b>Analyzing the data .....</b>	<b>39</b>
5.1	Code quantities .....	39
5.2	Main analysis – Actor and thematic categories combined .....	41
5.2.1	<i>Limits</i> .....	41
5.2.2	<i>Authority</i> .....	47
5.2.3	<i>Choice</i> .....	52
5.2.4	<i>Rules</i> .....	59
5.2.5	<i>Motivation and self-regulation</i> .....	65
5.2.6	<i>Responsibility</i> .....	71
5.2.7	<i>Nature of freedom</i> .....	74
5.3	Summary of the findings.....	77

<b>6</b>	<b>Reliability and validity .....</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Discussion .....</b>	<b>83</b>
7.1	Empiria and theory.....	83
7.1.1	<i>Rules, limits and the choice within .....</i>	<i>83</i>
7.1.2	<i>Permissive authority.....</i>	<i>85</i>
7.1.3	<i>The freedom contract and conditionality.....</i>	<i>87</i>
7.1.4	<i>An environment of security.....</i>	<i>89</i>
7.1.5	<i>Growing into a more free culture and increasing responsibility.....</i>	<i>90</i>
7.2	Further research .....	91
	<b>References .....</b>	<b>93</b>
	<b>Appendices</b>	

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Research objective

The research objective for this thesis is two-fold, and is split into two research questions between the theoretical and empirical parts of the thesis. As a general objective for this thesis, I have set out to find if there are any similarities between the radical ideas of deschooling philosophy and the ideas of freedom by Finnish primary school teachers. Since these two mindsets at first glance seem to be from opposite ends of the spectrum of educational philosophy, this study can be a very interesting look both theoretically and empirically.

The theoretical research question of this study is *how freedom is defined by deschooling philosophy*. From the literature of a number of authors I aim to unearth a concept of freedom that is as simple as possible but also as comprehensive as possible. With the theoretical framework the aim is to both build up the theoretical basis of the thesis, form the theoretical argument basis for the thesis but also to build and expand my own understanding and conceptions of what freedom can be.

The empirical research question that has been set for this thesis is *how freedom is defined in education according to the collected data*. The empirical part aims to look at the arguments, experiences and definitions of the teachers and to interpret how they understand freedom, what freedom means for the students, what freedom is and how freedom manifests in the primary school environment. The theory and the empirical concept of freedom will then lastly be compared to each other in the discussion part of this thesis.

The objective that I have for this thesis comes from my understanding of deschooling philosophy, and from discussions that I have had with numerous primary school teachers in Finland. The objective is to find out if there are similarities between the radical deschooling philosophy and by Finnish primary school teachers in the way the two sides define freedom in education.

## 1.2 About the literature

The theoretical framework will be constructed by using relevant literature from deschooling authors, as well as articles from periodicals that focus on the aspects of *deschooling*, *unschooling* and *free schooling*. Most of the literature used for this thesis was written rather long time ago, as the height of deschooling related literature was mainly written in the 1970s. Forty years is a long time (in terms of scientific and educational philosophy) but the core ideas of the entire philosophy even with modern discourse are still based on a number of key books and authors that had a profound impact on the formation of deschooling philosophy in general.

The works of John Holt (1970, 1974), Ivan Illich (1970, 1971) and A.S. Neill (1966, 1970) will be looked at with the most depth as these three have produced books and articles that have had quite an impact on the development of freeschooling, unschooling and homeschooling movements in the 1970s. The literature also includes modern authors that deal with the ideas and philosophy of deschooling (e.g. Gatto, 2005; Hern, 2003).

Since the theoretical context of this thesis comes mainly from the 1960s and 1970s, this thesis does not aim to make claims about the nature of modern education and schooling on the basis of the theory. The theory of deschooling was written in regards to a very different era of education, and is therefore not straight away applicable to modern education. In light of the objective, building a definition of deschooling freedom is the goal and not posing critique towards modern Finnish education.

The goal in analyzing the literature for the theory is to see behind the authors' arguments and interpret what the writers are saying, rather than merely listing citations. Dialogue between ideas is what the theory section is aiming for. From the ideas of various authors, a comprehensive idea of freedom will be constructed, along with a comprehensive and a profound argument of what freedom according to deschooling philosophy is.

Relevant literature for the methodological part of the thesis will be used. The method of content analysis will be looked through relevant methodological literature, and discussed in its own section as well as in the empirical section in detail before the data analysis takes place.

### **1.3 Prior understanding**

My prior understanding of the theme of this thesis comes mainly from the area of deschooling, as I did my bachelor's thesis on the same subject. The topic for that thesis was the philosophy in general with only a small part of it dealing with freedom in particular. However, as I am immensely interested in the field of deschooling along with radical alternative education, this may have an effect in terms of bias in the analysis. In 2012 I also did a two month teaching practice period in a democratic free school in Vancouver, Canada and this experience may also affect my understanding, and/or bias of the subject.

While the analysis is being conducted and the findings looked at, the fact that my perception is influenced by my interests and previous experiences need to be kept firmly in mind and striving towards as objective interpretation as possible is a necessity. However, I acknowledge the fact that a completely objective analysis, which is not affected by my prior knowledge, will not be possible.



## **2 The concept of freedom and the deschooling movement**

In this part of my master's thesis I will look into the theoretical side of freedom through deschooling literature. As freedom in this master's thesis is looked through the context of education, the main focus in defining the term is on how deschooling authors understand and discuss freedom in the school and educational environment. John Holt's (1974) book *Freedom and beyond* will be used as the main source, but works of other relevant deschooling authors will also be looked through. Matt Hern's, Everett Reimer's, and A.S. Neill's works and ideas of freedom will be included.

I have written about freedom and its definition in my bachelor's thesis I wrote about freedom and its definition as well as defined the basic concept of deschooling. However, in the bachelor's thesis freedom was only a small part of the finished work. In this study on the other hand, the theoretical concept of freedom will be the main focus. As the deschooling movement has greatly inspired the free schooling movement across the world, the concept of freedom is essential to the very nature of it. Deschooling itself as a movement and educational philosophy will be looked into very briefly in the beginning of the theory part of my thesis, before moving onto the concept of freedom.

The theory part will move onto the actual conceptualization of freedom. This is done by looking at the essentials of freedom: what it universally means for the deschooling authors and what is the essence of it. In this part, the element of education is not as much on the focus as in the latter parts since the objective is to define freedom as a basic idea according to the deschooling authors.

Important things to be kept in mind is the fact that most of the authors come from the educational context of 1960s and 1970s, and therefore the educational discourse comes from a very different point when compared to modern day education. Schools have changed dramatically since then, and the critique that is made against education is not applicable in this exact state.

## 2.1 Defining deschooling

In this chapter the main concept of *deschooling* is given a definition as this is the main theoretical concept in the thesis. A couple of other key terms are used as synonyms for deschooling as they are used from time to time in the literature: *unschooling* and *freeschooling*.

Deschooling is a movement which has criticized coerced education and schooling since the 60's and 70's, and the term was coined in the book *Deschooling society* (1970) by Ivan Illich. Although the term deschooling links itself to schooling from the start, the authors and deschoolers are more concerned about the "schooled" social reality (Illich, 1970, p.10), rather than criticizing schools as institutions. Illich (1970, p.9) argues that we are schooled to confuse product and substance, and pupils are "schooled" to confuse teaching with learning, grade advancement with education, and diploma with competence and fluency with the ability to say something new. Ian Lister (1974b, p. 89) writes that referring to the *schooled society* means talking about the universal and compulsory systems of education which have developed in the last two hundred years, and talking about the kind of formal education offered by institutions such as schools, colleges and universities, as opposed to the informal and incidental education received from life and experience.

Matt Hern (2003) writes how standing against compulsory schooling has to mean standing for social change, and building alternatives to school cannot be just a different lifestyle, but must be an explicit argument for a different world. To advocate a radical transformation of the school system is to advocate radical transformation of the social milieu that both creates and is created by schools. (Hern, 2003, p. 142). Illich (1970) also states that deschooling is not only about schooling, but the whole of society along with our very nature. He mentions that he wants to raise the general question of the mutual definition of human nature and the nature of modern institutions which characterize our world view and language. He continues that in order to do so, he has chosen the school as his main target, and therefore deals only indirectly with other bureaucratic agencies of the corporate state: the consumer-family, the party, the army, the church, and the media. (1970, p.10)

Social change has a major role in deschooling as Illich (1973) writes that all over the world schools are organized enterprises designed to reproduce the established order, whether this order is called revolutionary, conservative, or evolutionary. He continues that everywhere the loss of pedagogical credibility and the resistance to schools provide a fundamental op-

tion: solving the problem by substituting new devices for school and readjusting the existing power structure to fit these devices. (1973, p.2)

Deschooling is a philosophy that puts emphasis on the personal interests of students rather than teaching techniques, Neill (1970) uses the mathematical concept of division as an example: It does not matter whether the school has a special technique for teaching about division, since the concept matters only for the students who *want* to learn it. And a child who *wants* to learn how to divide will learn it, regardless how it is being taught. (1970, p.25). Peter Buckman (1974, p.17) also emphasizes intrinsic motivation as the driving force in learning by writing that time and time again when motivation to learn is a person's own, and not something forced on a person, curiosity, absorption and responsibility for progress is immeasurably greater than when a person is required to learn and proceed at someone else's behest.

Everett Reimer (1971) writes that one of the most important tasks of deschooling movement would be to induce parents and employers to reassume their proper educational responsibilities. Every thinking person knows that real education occurs primarily at home and at work. (1971, p. 110). There would be no separation between learning, life or work as learning would be recognized to be happening all the time, and Buckman (1974, p. 17). comments that the important point is that "work" and "education" are not two separate parts of a process in which you have to finish one before the other.

Kristan Morrison (2007) writes that deschooling is a version of freedom-based education, in which children are free to decide what they study, and how and when they study it. She continues that one antecedent of deschooling is found in most preindustrial societies. In these societies, children are actively engaged in society and learn skills and knowledge by means of imitation, apprenticeship, modeling, and conversation rather than through formal schooling. (2007, p. 43)

Morrison (2007) continues that freedom-based education is also rooted in the Western philosophical traditions of the ancient Greeks, and Romantic thinkers like Rousseau and Froebel; in the Libertarian-Anarchist Tradition; in the Transcendentalist movement of 19th century America; and in the 20th century free school movement, such as A. S. Neill's Summerhill School and the many U.S. free schools that cropped up during the counter-cultural revolution of the 1960s and 1970s. She also mentions that John Holt is widely

credited with being a catalyst for freedom-based schooling known as unschooling. (2007, p. 43)

## 2.2 Essentials of freedom

Freedom as a concept is very broad, and prior to discussing this concept in the context of education, Holt's essential ideas of it must be looked at. If we are to understand what freedom in education means for Holt, we must first understand how freedom as a broader philosophical term is understood in his literature. In this section I will define freedom as a universal concept.

Holt starts define freedom by writing how the word "freedom" is used vaguely and badly, and that we seem to be afraid of it (1974, p. 15). He mentions a letter from the time his book *Freedom and beyond* (1974) was written, and in this letter the writer was defining freedom as means of letting people do everything they want, and if they would be given the chance, people would be doing bad things (Holt, 1974, p.16). Freedom is seen as extreme and opposing to order, and people with freedom are on a slippery slope towards anarchy, chaos and disorder. Therefore freedom as a word is often understood as a state of no constraints. Holt writes how there seems to be great confusion about freedom, and this confusion implies freedom to mean the absence of any limits or constraints, and that such a state is both desirable and possible (Holt, 1974, p.17).

However, there is no life without constraints. We are always bound by great many things, and Holt (1974) starts these limits from the fact that we are mortal. He thus suggests that complete freedom is never possible, and then asks whether life without constraints would even be desirable. Rather than starting from what we can do, Holt starts defining freedom by pointing that we never are truly free as human beings. This takes the idea of freedom to its very basics, and thus Holt suggests that understanding freedom as something absolute is futile. Freedom in our life seems to be an illusion as life on one hand exists through the very fact that we do have constraints. (Holt, 1974, p.17)

Holt explores the problemacy of understanding and the misconception of freedom in his book *the underachieving school* (1970) by writing that so many people do not feel free, never did, do not expect to and hence do not know what freedom is. A person that does not feel free, or has not experienced freedom, cannot therefore understand why freedom should

be made such a big fuss of. Holt suggests that freedom is something that has to be experienced in order to be understood. Freedom is an abstract concept that is given meaning through experience. (1970, s.130)

Everett Reimer (1971) writes about a problem in defining freedom. If we define freedom as freedom *from* rather than freedom *for*, it leads to a definition of basic values and factual propositions in a largely negative way, which then leads to a question of what will we tolerate rather than what shall we do. It is thus important to know and define the angle from where we are looking at freedom. Freedom *from* defines freedom as something that frees us from certain negative aspects of life, and this aspect of freedom according to Reimer includes an intrinsic question of what will we tolerate and what do we free ourselves from, or what do we want to free ourselves from. Defining freedom as freedom *for* includes an element that gives us opportunity to engage in something, or the right and freedom to do something. Freedom *for* therefore on the contrary to freedom *from* is a largely positive definition. (Reimer, 1971, p.90)

Reimer continues that a philosophy based on maximum freedom from human constraint begins by "denying the right of any man to impose either truth or virtue upon another" and thus Reimer would not give permission to any kind of mandatory education (1971, p. 90). Education according to Holt (2008) is defined as something that some people do to others for their own good, molding and shaping them, and trying to make them learn what they think they ought to know. This philosophy of maximum freedom will free students from education imposed on them without permission. Holt's argument can be interpreted as not describing freedom as a form of relativism, in a way that no education is allowed or that no one can influence another person; instead it means freedom from coerced instilment of ideals and values. (2008, p.17)

Reimer (1971) writes how the implications of a philosophy of freedom are very far-reaching. They include, for example, denial of the right to monopolize anything which other people need, since such monopoly is and has been used to violate their freedom. These needs cannot be restrictively defined as those things immediately needed to sustain life as denial of information, for example, leads to denial of fresh air, pure water and nutritious food. Information denial is being used in the modern world – generally, consistently and systematically – to keep people from knowing, and thereby from getting what they need. (Reimer, 1971, p. 90)

Holt (1970) also writes that what makes people feel unfree is being pushed around, and having to submit to someone else who cannot be reached, seen or talked to, and over whom is felt to have no control. Also not knowing what goes on, and feeling that one is not told the truth contribute to feeling unfree. All of these aspects mentioned by Holt come down to the feeling of not having a real say about one's own life, having no real choices to make, and that the decisions determining whether one goes this way or that are made by someone else, behind one's back. (1970, p. 130)

Hern writes how freedom is not simply a liberty, but more so a social freedom: *freedom to something* and not just a *freedom from* (2008, p. 115). Freedom therefore can mean both being free from something, as well as being free to do something. While one is free from doing something, one also has a right and freedom to do something. However, Neill (1966) mentions that to his understanding freedom does not mean that the child can do whatever the child wants or that the child gets everything that the child wants. Therefore, *freedom to something* does not extend in an unlimited fashion. (1966, p. 7)

Hern (2003) argues that freedom is not simply about *choice*. The practice of freedom cannot be disembedded from lived life, nor reduced to the two-dimensionality of *choice*, as freedom is much fuller and has to mean *experience*. It has to be understood as social context, and kids practicing freedom is about learning how to move in shifting and complex circumstances. In this sense being free would mean to be able to act naturally in the surrounding world and being able to engage in it fully, as he claims that the practice of freedom cannot be disembedded from lived life. (Hern, 2003, p. 91)

Reimer (1971) writes about extending the limits of freedom, and points out that we can extend the limits of our own and other people's freedom only if we know what obstacles stand in the way. Therefore the concept of freedom and our understanding of freedom are limited only by our own awareness of the obstacles limiting what we can do. (1971, p. 49)

Reimer also takes the basic definition of freedom back to societal level by linking a number of rights to it: the right to assembly, the right of petition for redress of grievances, the right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures, the right to counsel and the right not to bear witness against themselves (1971, p. 48). As for what rights does freedom consist of, Illich claims that the right to teach any skill should come under the protection of freedom of speech (1970, s. 92).

### 2.3 Understanding authority

The definitions of freedom and authority have an intertwined relation as Holt (1972) writes that authority cannot be understood without understanding freedom. With this argument, Holt points out that freedom and authority are not exclusive to one another. Yet in the educational context it is often seen how authority and freedom have a relationship of hostility and both cannot exist. (1972, p. 4). In this part I will look into the relation of freedom and authority in the educational context to see how deschoolers understand authority and what it means to have both authority and freedom in the same situation. The authors tend to define freedom quite a lot in comparison to society, and therefore at first in this part these examples of society and freedom will be looked at. Then the discourse is taken to the concept of education.

Holt writes about the nature of authority by giving examples. He mentions that a free community differs from an unfree one firstly in that its rules are mostly of Don't Do This rather than the Do This kind, and secondly, that it is clear and specific what you must not do (1972, p. 19). Bluntly put this could also be taken into the educational context by pointing how there exists a rather big difference in rules that either prevent or urge one to do something. Both of these rule types limit our freedom, yet the way they do it is interesting.

Regarding the free vs. unfree societies example, Holt (1972) writes about imaginary crimes: Imaginary crimes that on the societal level would mean being counterrevolutionary or being unpatriotic, and on the level of education an imaginary crime would simply mean to be uncooperative. The problem with imaginary crimes is that one cannot tell in advance what they mean, and one only finds out about doing wrong after an imaginary crime has been committed. (Holt, 1972, p. 19). The difference thus comes from the idea that in a free society one can find out where the limits are, and in a tyranny you can never be sure. Whether a community or an educational institution has freedom, is not simply a case of having limits or not, but *knowing* the limits and *knowing* what one can or cannot do. Holt (1972) therefore suggests that setting clear limits and making them known provides more freedom as the ones functioning within those limits know exactly what they cannot do. Freedom in this sense refers more to having choices and the right to choose, rather than being free from societal and moral constraints. (1972, p. 19)

Holt writes about *adult authority* (1972, p. 52), which he defines as a general and permanent right and duty to tell children what to do. However, deschooling authors do not see

this as a very fruitful model for education as Kajubi (1974, p. 81) writes that the conventional school of one teacher standing before one class of children behind their desks cannot meet the challenge of taking education to all the children that are demanding, and are entitled to, education throughout the world.

Holt (1972) writes about the authority of greater experience and understanding, and follows this by giving out an example: if we saw someone walking toward an open manhole or some other grave danger, we would shout for them not to, and in this spirit we rightly intervene in the lives of children. He further continues that it would be equally right and natural if a child, in some kind of lab, would see an adult reaching for something acid or hot or otherwise dangerous, should say not to touch it. (Holt, 1972, p. 52). Therefore experience and understanding are what give authority according to Holt. Elana Davidson writes that as adults we might have some insight into the needs of the children with whom we have relationships, but it is important that we do not impose our ideas of what children need (or even an individual child needs) without evaluating the situation, our motivation, and the child involved (2009, p. 23).

Neill claims that children need to obey adults only to fulfill the adult's desire for power (1970, p. 155). There exists a desire, or a need to control the younger generation, hence the right to be obeyed is rarely questioned. He then acknowledges that in every situation involving adults and children there will be some form of authority present, but this authority should not be based on mere need for the child to obey only because he/she is younger, but obeying should be a form of social courtesy. Adults should not have any right to require children to obey them, but the desire to obey should be intrinsic, working both ways and caring. (Neill, 1970, p. 155-156)

Illich (1970) writes about individual freedom and the authoritarian teacher-and-pupil relationship, and argues that the safeguards of individual freedom are all canceled in the dealings of a teacher with his pupil. With this argument Illich takes a rather radical stance against education and claims that the teacher-student-relationship has the students voluntarily submit to giving up on their personal freedom. (Illich, 1970, p.37). John Taylor Gatto (2005) agrees with Illich by writing that children are taught to surrender their will to the pre-destined chain of command. Rights may be granted or withheld by any authority without appeal, because rights do not exist inside a school. (Gatto, 2005, p.6). Illich argues that



school, by its very nature, tends to make a total claim on the time and energies of its participants. (1970, p. 37)

Hern (2008) suggests that authority is not solely about limiting and being in a position where students obey without questioning, or at the very least it should not be. Authority from the deschooling movement's point of view is a voice that has a real basis and natural weight, for the one with authority can see something that the others cannot. (Hern, 2008, p.72). Holt also points out children feel safer, freer to live and to explore, if they feel that people are protecting them from situations in which they might get badly hurt (1972, p. 52).

Authority would therefore seem to have an element of *protecting* rather than restricting, and giving the children freedom to explore and pursue their interests in a safe environment. Hern continues that children need a place in which they can run into ideas and people they will not find in their homes (2003, p. 115). Deschooling authority would therefore give freedom for the children to explore and discover new ideas, people and interests in an environment that is both safe and open.

To conclude, freedom in education is being able to explore something that cannot be explored at home, and feeling safe while doing it. The role of authority therefore would seem to be more of a protector rather than building up unquestionable limitations and restrictions. Limitations on the other are also necessary and setting limits is not opposed to having freedom, but limits have to be clear and known, so that the ones acting within those limits know what they cannot do.

## **2.4 Order vs. disorder, structure and discipline in education**

In the discourse of what freedom is, it is inevitable to discuss order and disorder, as well as discussions about structure and discipline. All of these relate closely to defining freedom as an idea. Conventional schools are based on the idea that order needs to be maintained both in and out of the classroom, and this is maintained through structure and discipline. School days are structured in such a way that everyone knows when what happens, and trying to break free from it might lead into discipline actions. Here the elements of structure in education are looked mostly through criticism of the structure of conventional classroom.

Holt (1972) argues that free situations or “unstructured” situations are not possible. Every human situation, however casual and unforced has a structure, and all of us live within structures. These structures exist in turn within other structures within still larger structures, like Chinese boxes. And this is just as true for children, as they live in the structure of a family, neighborhood, friends and school. Holt (1972) suggests that it is not necessary to put structure into children’s lives as it is already there. If the goal is to control and limit freedom in a conventional school by providing structure, according to Holt it is a useless job since structure is already present in the children’s lives. (Holt, 1972, p. 9-10)

Holt (1972) comments that the structure of the conventional classroom is very simple as there are only two elements in it, or only two moving elements: one is the teacher and other is the students. The children may be all different but in such a class their differences do not make a difference for they all have the same things to do and they are all expected to do them in the same way. The structure in conventional schools is aimed towards handling children as large groups and, based on Holt’s writing, not necessarily as individuals. (Holt, 1972, p. 10)

Holt (1972) writes regarding the structure of a conventional classroom by describing it as inflexible, rigid, and static. The structure does not change from the first day of school to the last, and on the last day as on the first, the teacher is giving out information and orders, and the children are passively receiving and obeying or refusing to obey. (1972, p.11)

Morrison (2007) mentions that when people think about school, they typically envision the conventional model, one with distinct classrooms, regimented schedules, and lessons that are mandated by state or federal authorities. In this conventional model, students have little to no choice in the subjects they take, and what choice they have comes in the area of electives, but even there the choices are limited by the courses offered. Students have limited freedom of movement and they must ask permission from the teacher to leave their assigned classroom, and even within the classroom, students are expected to act and move as the teacher requires. (Morrison, 2007, p.42). Furthermore, Lister (1974a, p. 86) writes that the main message of many schools is passive obedience as students are required and expected to follow and unquestionably do what they are told.

On the topic of order and disorder, Holt (1970) writes how our schools are hung up on a notion that learning in the classroom is a by-product of order. He claims that true learning is not an orderly process to begin with. Conventional classroom setting where a teacher

explains and the students listen creates order, but Holt argues that this does not necessarily lead into learning. (1970, p. 96)

Holt (1970) continues by suggesting that we think, and above all in the classroom, that almost any experience, insight, or understanding can be conveyed from one person to another by means of words. We are constantly talking and explaining, aloud or in print. But as classroom teachers know too well, our explanations confuse more than they explain, and classrooms are full of children who have become so distrustful of words, and their own ability to get meaning from words, that they will not do anything until they are shown something they can imitate. (Holt, 1970, p. 11)

Holt (1970) argues that in the conventional school that testing is done firstly to threaten the students into doing what the educators want done, and the secondly to give the educators and teacher a basis for handing out the rewards and penalties on which the educational system - like all coercive systems - must operate. The threat of a test makes students do their assignment; the outcome of the test enables us to reward those who seem to do it best. The economy of the school, like that of most societies, operates on greed and fear. Tests arouse the fear and satisfy the greed. (Holt, 1970, p. 55)

Students in the conventional school do not have to or cannot make choices about what they would like to be studying, and Gatto (2005) introduces the term *Intellectual dependency* by writing how in the conventional classroom good students wait for a teacher to tell them what to do. This is the most important lesson of them all: we must wait for other people, better trained than ourselves, to make the meanings of our lives. The expert makes all the important choices; only the expert, the teacher, can determine what the kids must study; or rather, only the people who pay the teacher can make those decisions, which the teacher then enforces. (2005, p. 7)

Intellectual dependency thus means that students in the conventional school are dependent on the teacher to make the decisions about what they should be learning every lesson. The students are taught to be dependent on experts, or people more qualified to tell you what you ought to be doing. Gatto writes how the students he teaches are dependent, passive, and timid in the presence of new challenges. (2005, p. 28). Holt also addresses the issue of intellectual dependency and points out that education should be aiming to wean these children from an unthinking dependence on authority, to get them to give up their submissive-

rebellious role, and start to think and act like reasonable and independent human beings (Holt, 1970, p.101).

## **2.5 Freedom of choice and its problemacy in conventional education**

Freedom as a word in itself seems to pose a problem of its own. Freedom has the intrinsic value of being free built into it, thus having freedom means being free from something. However, Holt (1972) and other authors cited in this study argue that being free might not mean free after all; as I discussed in part 4.3 the idea of limits is not itself opposed to the idea of freedom.. Simply, it would seem that Holt and others see freedom as having options and being able to make a choice with the options one has. (Holt, 1972, p. 18)

Illich (1970) writes that the safeguards of individual freedom are all canceled in the dealings of a teacher with their pupils. When the school teacher fuses in the functions of judge, ideologue, and doctor, the fundamental style of society is perverted by the very process which should prepare for life. (1970, p. 37). Morrison (2007) writes that in the conventional form of schooling, students have little to no choice in the subjects they take and the students have limited freedom of movement; they must ask permission from the teacher to leave their assigned classroom, and even within the classroom, students are expected to act and move as the teacher requires. (2007, p. 42)

As for the relationship of freedom and authority (see 4.3) and Illich (1970) points out that the authority of the schools is based on the coercive nature of the educational system. Children do not have a choice whether they attend or not, nor do they have a choice whether they obey the teachers or not. If schools ceased to be compulsory, teachers who find their satisfaction in the exercise of pedagogical authority in the classroom would be left only with pupils who were attracted by their style. In a coercive school environment the students do not have a choice whether to attend class or not, but if this coercive nature would be made to cease, Illich suggests that the students who would enjoy a traditionally authoritarian class environment would choose to remain in the classroom. (Illich, 1970, p. 104)

However, the matter of having a choice is not limited only to the choice of being able to decide whether to attend school or not. Within the school environment, Holt (1970) identifies two dimensions of student freedom that have to do with having a choice: having freedom to decide what to learn and having freedom to decide how they should learn it. The

pace, methods and topic are all options that a student has the freedom to alter in which way one sees fit. (1970, s.129)

Holt (1972) claims however that if the offer of freedom, choice and self-direction is given to students who have spent much time in conventional schools, most of them will not trust or believe what is happening, and given their experience, Holt says they are quite right to do so. Conventional school is teaching the students that there is no choice, and that the teachers choose for them. Students have learned that they do not and cannot choose and ultimately the choices are made by either the teacher or someone else in authority. (1972, p. 78)

Holt (1972) identifies another problem with freedom of choice as choosing is difficult when students do not know where and what there is to choose from and what choices are possible, and even if known, one of those choices may not even appeal to them. All too often teachers say to students how they can now do anything they want, when in reality there is nothing to do. Knowing the limits and functioning within them, knowing your choices and options from which to choose from would seem to give more freedom than all the options in the world. With this argument Holt (1972) again dismisses the option for absolute freedom with *all* the options. He continues by stating that it is frustrating to be told to choose from when there is nothing to choose from. Similarly, it may be frightening, confusing, and paralyzing to have too much to choose from, like a child in a huge toy store. (1972, p. 86)

Common critique towards freedom of choice in schools is that if students have a choice, they will only focus on the fun and educationally meaningless activities. Bennis (2008) approaches this critique by pointing out that it is a serious mistake to assume that when given freedom, young people will only choose to do those things that are immediately interesting to them. He then states that he has seen and observed in discussions with various free-school staff members, that when a young person has the opportunity to be in charge of her life, he or she comes to realize that merely following desires and whims will not lead to achieving his or her goals and living well with others. (Bennis, 2008, p.39)

In relation to common critique towards freedom Holt (1972) writes of a question that he has been asked numerous times: what to do with a student not interested in anything? Holt answers by stating how there exists no such person, and at the very least every living person is interested in something – if only in himself – and usually much more than that. Stu-

dents might not *appear* to be interested in anything or at least any of the things we try to interest them in. Holt therefore claims that educators and teachers introduce things to students, and with mandatory education it is expected of the students to be interested in what the teachers introduce. This shifts the choice of interests away from the students themselves. (Holt, 1972, p. 89)

One of the current educationalists, John Taylor Gatto (2005) comments on the claim of students not being curious by suggesting what the conventional school is doing to the students: "The children I teach have almost no curiosity, and what little they have is transitory. They cannot concentrate for very long, even on things they choose to do. Can you see a connection between the bells ringing again and again to change classes and this phenomenon of evanescent attention?" Gatto thus suggests that the hectic environment and the system where students are being taken to different places for every single lesson shapes the children into persons of short attention span and little to no curiosity. (2005, p. 27). The environment of Finnish primary education does not work in this way however, as the students stay in their own classroom for the most of their school days.

## **2.6 Freedom to be a child and how we limit this freedom**

Reimer (1971) claims that childhood as a concept is a rather new phenomenon, and children, in the modern sense, did not exist three hundred years ago and still do not exist among the rural and urban poor who make up most of the population in the world. By specifying the age of required attendance, schools have institutionalized childhood, and in school societies, childhood is now assumed to be a timeless and universal phenomenon. (Reimer, 1971, p.35)

Illich (1970) writes that childhood as distinct from infancy, adolescence, or youth was unknown to most historical periods, and continues that before our century neither the poor nor the rich knew of children's dress, children's games, or the child's immunity from the law, and childhood belong to the bourgeoisie, and the worker's child, the peasant's child, and the nobleman's child all dressed the same way their fathers dressed, played the way their fathers played, and were hanged by the neck as their fathers. The dramatic example from Illich highlights the point that childhood, as we know it, is a social construct. (Illich, 1970, p. 33). A few hundred years before of our time, children were treated in a way as miniature adults helping and performing adults' tasks to the best of their abilities. Although

all cultures distinguish infants and sexually immature youth from adults, the idea of childhood as a period has existed only a few hundred years (Reimer, 1971, p. 36).

Illich (1970) claims that the concept of childhood as a distinctly different period of life where children need to be in school is mostly created by schools themselves. He comments that only with the advent of industrial society did the mass production of "childhood" become feasible and come within the reach of the masses. The school system is a modern phenomenon, as is the childhood it produces. (Illich, 1970, p. 34). Childhood has become a phenomenon that is associated with school, and the entire school system reproduces the idea over and over again. The intertwined relation of school and childhood thus limits the freedom of children. Consequently defining children as full-time pupils permits the teacher to exercise a kind of power over their persons, which is much less limited by constitutional and consuetudinal restrictions than the power wielded by the guardians of other social enclaves. (Illich, 1970, p. 38)

Neill (1970) defines two kinds of different children: the non-free child and free child. The non-free children are shaped, forcibly adapted, accustomed to discipline and smothered, and live everywhere in the world. He further continues how the non-free child is obedient, eager to follow orders and superiors, fears authorities and has almost a fanatical desire to be normal, conventional and immaculate; almost without questioning he accepts what he has been taught, and he passes on all of his complexes, fears and frustrations to his own children. (1970, p. 103)

The free child on the other hand is a self-regulating and freely growing individual, who are very few in our world. However, Neill admits that no one has yet seen a completely self-regulated child, as all are shaped by their parents, teachers and society. (1970, p. 111). Yet, Neill adds that if children are not given any limits and never told not to do something, they might become unable to understand the realities of life and grow to expect the world to give them everything they desire without effort (Neill, 1966, p. 11).

It would seem that the *free child* is an impossibility, as society, teachers and parents always play a role in shaping a child, even though the very idea of a free and self-regulating child is what freedom to be a child means. This freedom is deeply connected to being able to develop and become who you are without expectations to be forced into the mold of normal, conventional and immaculate. Davidson (2009) writes out that all too often we as adults are more interested in molding them according to *our* whims and fancies than in

*their* freedom. Our focus so often is not about developing a relationship with another interesting and interested human being, but about turning the child into something other than what he or she is. We have come to view childhood as preparation for life, not life itself. (Davidson, 2009, p. 23)

Davidson (2009) writes that all too often we simply accept our social construction of childhood and make claims beginning with "kids are..." and "kids need...", and while there are a few things that apply to all children, this rhetoric lumps a diverse group of individuals into homogenous mass. Children should be seen as individuals with unique abilities, interests, talents and needs. The argument that Davidson makes highlights what it means to have the freedom to be a child, and this means to have your needs and interests recognized as an individual. Often in the mandatory schooling environment, the personal needs of children get pushed aside by guidelines and goals of curricula. (2009, p. 22). Hern (2003) comments this by stating that the discourse about freedom and children has to be about how kids can engage with the world around them. He writes that it can be asserted that all kids have innate curiosity and a desire to learn and investigate the world around them. (2003, p. 93)

Holt writes about children, before they set foot in a school, arguing that almost all children, on the day they set foot in a school building, are smarter, more curious, less afraid of what they do not know, better at finding and figuring things out, more confident, resourceful, persistent and independent than they will ever again be in their schooling, or if very unlucky, for the rest of their life (Holt, 1974, p. 39).

According to Davidson (2009) supporting child autonomy and self-determination is about mutual respect and cooperation. Sharing power with children is not about permissiveness, and just passively accepting everything a child does. It is not about avoiding conflict, but constructive engagement with it. It is about giving and receiving with equal respect, and finding ways in which the needs of everyone can be met. (Davidson, 2009, p.24). Neill (1966) writes that embracing the children's freedom to be genuinely a child is not an attitude where everything goes and the children's power cannot be restricted in any way, but as discussed above (in 4.3), it has everything to do with giving options and space to explore yet at the same time building a safe environment that is based on mutual respect and a genuine interest in every child as a human being. However, no matter how much one believes in freedom, sometimes young children need to be told "no". (Neill, 1966, p.11)



To summarize, deschooling authors make a claim that childhood as part of life is a social creation that is possibly seen as preparation for life instead of life itself. Concept of childhood has allowed children to be submitted to compulsory schooling institution. Childhood is associated with necessary schooling and this view is according to deschooling authors reproduced by the school institution itself. Furthermore, the authors claim that the concept childhood lumps children into a single homogenous mass, which allows for adults to make claims on what the "children need" rather than looking at individual needs. Rather than making claims on what the children need, educators should be striving towards supporting self-regulation and finding ways so that the needs of everyone can be met. However, this does not mean that educators should passively accept everything a child does, but strive towards constructive engagement.

## **2.7 Freedom in the "the new school"**

This section focuses on the ideas of the open classroom, *the new school*. Deschooling authors define much of freedom through criticizing the conventional school system, and next the concept of open classroom will be defined as this is what ultimately their definition freedom and education would lead to. Miller (2008, p.29) writes that the education revolution seeks to return teaching and learning to the sphere of freedom and creativity.

Dana Bennis (2008) writes that "autonomy-supportive" environments, marked by respect and choice, are associated with greater intrinsic motivation, greater self-directed learning, and more extensive conceptual learning and creativity in young people, as compared with controlling environments featuring coercion and external rewards and punishments. He also mentions that freedom-based school is not an environment in which young people only follow their interests and whims. Rather, it is a community based on mutual responsibility in which all school members support one another to achieve their individual goals, respect the needs of others, and develop the ability to self-regulate. (Bennis, 2008, p.39)

In relation to schooling alternatives, Reimer writes how alternatives to school must above all, allow everyone the opportunity to learn what one needs to know in order to act intelligently in one's own interests (1971, p. 89). Morrison (2007) also comments that proponents of freedom-based education argue that children who are given freedom to pursue their own interests will become better democratic citizens because they will know themselves, and will have learned how to negotiate with others and to overcome obstacles.

(2007, p. 43). Sadofsky (2008, p. 160) claims that it is simple to understand but hard to accept that the individual's native curiosity and creativity is best served at every age by allowing that native curiosity and creativity to be undeflected and interrupted.

Morrison (2007) continues that the very premise of all free schooling lies in the way children are perceived: free schooling sees children as naturally curious and having an innate desire to learn and grow. If left unfettered, uncoerced, and unmanipulated, children will vigorously and with gusto pursue their interests, and thus learn and make meaning on their own and in concert with others. (2007, p. 43). Davidson sees children as actors and autonomous beings, not solely to be acted upon by adult ideology (2009, p. 23).

To summarize, the open classroom is based on the ideas of intrinsic motivation, and self-directed learning. Freedom is having a choice in what we ourselves do, and therefore the driving ideas of open classroom are ones that give equal freedom to everyone and that freedom is to be able to listen and choose for yourself. The open classroom as an environment of freedom is about mutual respect between students and staff in which everyone helps and supports the individual learning of every student with the goal of greater self-regulation.

## **2.8 Freedom and deschooling – A summary**

In this final chapter of the theoretical framework, the main points of deschooling and freedom will be brought together and summarized. A complete picture of freedom in the deschooling philosophy is formed by bringing all the different elements together that were discussed in the previous chapters.

Firstly, freedom is something that is grown into and experienced. Freedom as a simple concept or as an idea is ultimately only an abstraction, and thus freedom needs to be experienced to be understood. Freedom cannot be understood and one cannot feel free unless he or she has experienced this first hand, and before understanding therefore comes experience. We grow into freedom, and only by experiencing it can we become accustomed and used to freedom. An unfree environment does not produce people who are free, demand freedom or in the extreme even know how to use their freedom.

Freedom is not absolute, and freedom is not anarchy or an environment merely void of rules and limitations. We are always bound by many things that we either can or cannot

influence. The ultimate limit of our freedom is our own mortality for we are never free to ignore the fact that we are mortal. Other limitations to our freedom are laws that we are bound by, and as freedom does not equal anarchy, laws will always limit our freedom. In this sense, limits are not opposed to the concept of freedom, and the idea of limits is contained within the concept of freedom by default.

It is also important to mention that freedom is simply not about being free from something, but also at the same time freedom about being free to do something. Both sides are implicit in the definition of freedom, as one should be free from tyranny and oppression but also free to speak one's mind, and make choices about one's own life. Freedom is about being in control and having the possibility to make real choices. Freedom is about knowing that one has a say in matters that affect oneself. More than being free from various things, it would seem that the freedom to do something is much more visible and much more important in the deschooling philosophy.

As with the relationship of limits and freedom, authority and freedom also seem to be intertwined. Authority is not opposed to freedom, and the question of authority comes down to the fact that while being subject to authority, we have the most freedom when it is known what can and cannot be done. If we know what we cannot do, then we are free to act within those boundaries and choose from the options that we are given. As freedom is about having a choice and being able to choose, this freedom of choice therefore has an implicit element that we must know what options we have. Having too many choices may result in not knowing what to choose, and not knowing what cannot be chosen distorts our sense of freedom as we may falsely believe that we have more options than we actually have. Interestingly then deschooling philosophy suggests that knowing your limits and knowing what cannot be done provides a more thorough freedom than functioning in an environment of no constraints. Authority and limits are essential and necessary for true freedom.

The element of safety is also closely related to authority, and especially in educational and schooling context. Authors of deschooling suggest that authority has a lot to do with safety, and this relation boils down to creating a safe environment in which the children can safely explore and try out new things. Authority creates a free environment where children know what they cannot do, and can therefore trust that they are alright doing what they are doing

without having to fear that they might hurt themselves or that they might get punished for doing something that they did not know was not allowed to them.

When deschooling philosophers take the concept of freedom to actual schooling context, the most important question comes down to the difference between conventional classroom and so called open classroom. The conventional classroom is seen as one with little to no freedom of students, and the main argument for this is the fact that there are only two moving elements in this classroom: the teacher and the students. In the conventional classroom the teacher makes the choices, conducts the lessons and generally makes judgment calls about what the students need to learn, when they need to learn it and how they need to learn it. Because of this all the students are expected to learn the same way, and behave the same way which makes the school into an environment of coercion, external rewards and no freedom.

Lastly, the concept of freedom according to deschooling philosophy incorporates an element of being a child. Authors suggest that childhood is a rather modern phenomenon as a concept and this concept includes a built in concept of *the age of required attendance*. Childhood as an age of institutionalization and mandatory schooling is widely accepted, and children are both accepted and expected to attend institutional schooling for a certain period. Childhood is seen as a development for life rather than life itself, and deschooling authors argue that freedom to be a child does not necessarily include mandatory institutionalization nor do the children automatically benefit from this involuntary loss of freedom.

Freedom to be a child is about autonomy, self-determination, mutual respect and cooperation. It does not mean that everything that children do should be passively accepted and avoiding conflict, but about constructive engagement and giving and receiving in a way that everyone's needs can be met. Educators tend to all too often make claims about what the children are like while at the same time lumping children into a big mass and this shys us away from looking at children as what they essentially all are: individuals. Freedom to be a child is about having every child's individual needs recognized and given a chance to be the individual who they are and who they are coming to be.

### 3 Methodology

In this chapter, I will introduce the basic methodological definitions of qualitative content analysis which is used to analyze data that aims to answer the empirical research question of *how is freedom defined in education according to the collected data*. The analysis is qualitative, but in addition quantitative in the sense that the code frequencies in the data will be given only in order to give further information of the data.

First the methodology itself will be defined, and then the objective and data of the study will be looked at and identified. After this, the basic research process of qualitative content analysis will be examined and broken down into steps. The steps will be discussed individually, in order to clarify the research process of this thesis. After the analysis has been conducted, the definition of freedom will be compared to the findings of the analysis in order to find out similarities or differences between the two.

#### 3.1 Defining qualitative content analysis and the objects of analysis

Schulz (2008) gives a definition for content analysis by writing that content analysis is a research method for systematically identifying characteristics of communication. Most frequently, content analysis is used as a method for making replicable and valid inferences to unobserved elements of the communication process. The research method of content analysis aims to systematically look at communication and hidden elements of communication. Content analysis as a research method aims to define the characteristics and elements of communication as well as to unearth hidden elements that might be left unnoticed. (Schulz, 2008, p. 349)

Carney writes that in the beginning content analysis was defined as a research technique for the objective, systematic and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication (1972, p. 23). He adds that the research technique has later been defined as any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages (Carney, 1972, p.25).

Stepchenkova (2012) writes that content analysis examines data for patterns and structures, singles out key features, develops categories and aggregates them into perceptible constructs in order to seize meaning in communications. Content analysis is able to capture a

richer sense of concepts within the data due to its qualitative basis, and at the same time, the data can be subjected to quantitative data analysis techniques. (Stepchenkova, 2012, p.443). Mayring also gives out a definition by stating that qualitative content analysis defines itself as an approach of empirical, methodological controlled analysis of texts within their context communication, following content analytical rules and step by step models, without rash quantification (2000, s.2).

Stepchenkova (2012) writes (with reference to Weber, Cartwright and Shapiro & Markoff) on the objects and data of content analysis by defining this methodology as research method that uses a set of procedures to make valid inferences from a text. However, many writers argue that the term "content" can refer to broader of content. It can be defined as the objective, systematic and quantitative description of any symbolic behavior. Stepchenkova suggests a definition for content analysis by stating that content analysis is any methodological measurement applied to text, or other symbolic material, for social science purposes. (2012, p. 443).

In terms of the object of content analysis, Mayring states that object of qualitative content analysis can be all sorts of recorded communication (transcripts of interviews, discourses, protocols of observations, video tapes, communications) (2000, p. 1). Schulz writes about the typical forms of data for content analysis and mentions stories from newspapers or broadcast bulletins, actors and speakers and their utterances ("sound bites"), sentences as well as pictures as the typical units of analysis (2008, p.350). In relation to texts as the material of analysis does Bauer comment that the text is a medium of appeal: an influence on people's prejudices, opinions, attitudes and stereotypes (2000, p. 7)

Case (2007) explains how any artifact of communication might be analyzed to understand themes and orientations, and either the *manifest* content (i.e. surface features such as words) or the *latent* content (underlying themes and meanings) may be recorded and analyzed. Both types of content may be analyzed in the same investigation. (Case, 2007, p. 227) Content analysis thus has two elements of research: 1. the manifest content, which is about the exterior and surface of the text; and 2. the latent content, which is about the underlying themes and meanings of the text. Qualitative content analysis is a form of analysis in which an understanding and interpretation of the text play a far larger role than in classical content analysis, which is more limited to the so-called 'manifest content' (Kuckartz, 2014, p. 33).

Mayring further continues that in addition to analyzing already available messages of mass media and other sources it is also possible to generate messages especially for research purposes and to submit those messages to a content analysis (2000, p.350). In general letters, texts, photographs, adverts, biographies and autobiographies as well as documents containing statistical data are typically regarded as a resource for the social science researcher (Prior, 2008, p.480). Stepchenkova writes that a major research consideration in content analysis is defining a population of textual materials suitable to answer a particular research question, and this population may be a population of people who in the process of the study produce messages that are to be analyzed (2012, p.447). The data for this thesis consists of written answers to four questions dealing with the dimensions of freedom and student freedom in a Finnish primary school context. The data therefore is applicable to the method of content analysis as Mayring (2000, p.2) points out that the object of content analysis needs to be recorded communication.

Prior (2008) writes that as long as social sciences are concerned most of the research, that uses or calls upon documents, focuses mainly on the collection and analysis of document content, and that is where our own starting point is to be found. The researcher therefore has freedom to make a judgement call about how to advance and conduct the research. (2008, p. 479). Neuendorf mentions that although content analysis must conform to the rules of good science, each researcher makes decisions as to the scope and complexity of the content-analytic study (2002, p.2). Payne & Payne (2004) state that at a more sophisticated level, content analysis becomes more challenging, harder to explain, and its results more difficult to justify. This comment also suggests that qualitative content analysis as a research methodology does not have a simple step-by-step model that is applicable to every research and data in the same manner. (2004, p.54)

As for the main characteristics that define qualitative content analysis, Schreirer brings up three features that characterize the method: qualitative content analysis reduces data, it is systematic, and it is flexible (2014, p.170). Brewerton and Millward state that qualitative content analysis tends to be more subjective and less explicit about the processes by which interpretation of the target material occurs (2001, p.151). Lastly Stepchenkova states that the process of content analysis involves systematic reduction of the content flow, whether it is textual or otherwise symbolic (2012, p.443).

### 3.2 Coding frame, categories and inductive category application

Schreier (2012) defines the coding frame as a way of structuring your data, a way of differentiating between different meanings, vis-à-vis research questions. This coding frame consists of main categories and dimensions and a number of subcategories for each dimension which specify the meanings in your data with respect to these main categories. (2012, p.61). Schreier gives out following instructions and steps for it: selecting the data; structuring and generating categories; defining categories; revising and expanding the frame (2014, p. 174).

Hsieh and Shannon (2005) comment that with conventional content analysis researchers avoid using preconceived categories, instead allowing the categories and names for categories to flow from the data. Researchers immerse themselves in the data to allow new insights to emerge, also described as inductive category development. Many qualitative methods share this initial approach to study design and analysis. (2005, p. 1279)

Mayring writes that the categories are in the center of analysis: the aspects of text interpretation, following the research questions, are putted into categories, which were carefully founded and revised within the process of analysis (2000, p. 3). Schreier (2014) agrees and comments that the coding frame is at the heart of the method. It consists of at least one main category and at least two subcategories. Main categories are those aspects of the data about which the researcher would like more information, and subcategories specify what is said with respect to these main categories. (2014, p.174)

Stepchenkova (2012) writes that there are common principles that researchers should follow while developing categories: they should be exhaustive (i.e. there should be a category for every relevant item in the text), mutually exclusive (i.e. no recording unit should be placed in more than a single category), and independent (i.e. assignment of any recording unit does not affect classification of other data units). The number of categories and the complexity of the coding scheme vary significantly among the studies, depending mostly on the level of detail that the analyst aims to provide. (2012, p.448)

Schreier (2014) writes that the categories of qualitative content analysis requires the researcher to focus on selected aspects of meaning, namely those aspects that relate to the overall research question. There can be many such aspects – some coding frames contain well over 100 categories and subcategories – but ultimately the number of aspects is lim-



ited by the number of categories a researcher can handle. Also, when defining the categories, one will usually go beyond the specifics of any particular passage. Instead, the meaning of the passage will be taken to a higher level of abstraction, resulting in categories that apply to a number of concrete, slightly different passages. (2014, p. 170).

Within the framework of qualitative approaches it is of central interest to develop the aspects of interpretation, the categories, as near as possible to the data, and to formulate them in terms of the data. (Mayring, 2000, p. 4). Carney (1972) writes that basically the categories can be formed straightforwardly, by taking the text at its surface meaning, or they can be formed by inference, by "reading between the lines" when the text is disingenuous. However, Carney adds that there are no rules for forming categories and very few standardized categories which may be used in a variety of studies. (1972, p. 40)

Mayring (2000) mentions that qualitative content analysis has two different ways of building categories: inductive and deductive category application. As this thesis is theory-driven it is logical to use a category application method that formulates categories based on theoretical background and the empirical research question. Thus for this thesis I have chosen to use deductive category application as the goal is to formulate a criterion of definition, derived from theoretical background and research question, which determines the aspects of the textual data taken into account. Following this criterion the data is worked through and categories are tentative and step by step deduced. Within a feedback loop those categories are revised, eventually reduced to main categories and checked in respect to their reliability. (Mayring, 2000, p.4)

Mayring (2000) also gives out an example of the coding frame, category definition and coding rules. The categories, definitions, examples and coding rules will also be presented in this thesis in the same format. All the categories must therefore include a detailed definition, an example from the data itself and coding rules that define the basis which determines what an entry must contain in order to belong to a certain category. (Mayring, 2000, p.3)

To conclude, the coding frame is at the center of qualitative content analysis, and is a way to structurize the data. The code categories of the coding frame need to be exhaustive, mutually exclusive and independent. Every code category within the frame needs to include a detailed definition, an example from the data, and coding rule. Very few standardized cate-

gories exist and there exists no rules for formulating the categories. In this study, the coding frame is formulated deductively with the theory as its basis.

### **3.3 Latent content: The themes and meanings**

As the empirical research question of this *is how freedom is defined in education according to the collected data*, the emphasis in analysis will be put on the meaning and themes of data, and this is logical for qualitative content analysis as Brewerton and Millward state that the method of qualitative content analysis puts more emphasis on meaning (2001, s.151). Kracauer (1952) also points out that qualitative studies usually focus not so much on the content of a communication as rather on its underlying intentions or its presumable effects on the audience. The more involved communications however, reverberate with so many latent meanings that to isolate their manifest content and to describe it in a "straight" is not only almost impossible, but can hardly be expected to yield significant results. (1952, p.638)

The distinction between the manifest and latent content of a document refers to the difference between the surface meaning of a text and the underlying meaning of that narrative (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2009, p. 301). Schreier also stresses the importance of context by commenting that qualitative content analysis shares many features with other qualitative research methods, such as the concern with meaning and interpretation of symbolic material, and the importance of context in determining meaning (2014, p.173).

### **3.4 Conducting the research**

This thesis will follow the research steps of qualitative content analysis that Schreier (2014, p. 174) has introduced. She has come up with eight steps that provide the basic but comprehensive process of analysing data with qualitative content analysis:

- 1. Deciding on a research question.
- 2. Selecting data.
- 3. Building a coding frame.
- 4. Segmentation.
- 5. Trial coding.
- 6. Evaluating and modifying the coding frame.

- 7. Main analysis.
- 8. Presenting and interpreting the findings.

Before looking at the definitions of the research steps, it has to be pointed out that the actual research process in steps 3-6 are described in section 4, and the main of analysis of step 7 in section 5. Lastly, step 8 forms section 7 when the findings of the analysis. In this section the steps will be defined in general.

As the first step the research question has been decided, and based on the empirical research question of *how is freedom defined in education according to the collected data*, the data has been selected thus also completing step two. The data was collected from five primary school teachers, who described their ideas and understanding of freedom in the Finnish primary school context. The questions were open-ended to give the participants freedom to answer in any way they saw fit. The questions that the teachers answered can be found at the end of this thesis as Appendix 1.

The third step consists of building the coding frame, and the categories will at first be generated in a concept-driven way, which means basing the categories on previous knowledge: a theory, prior research, everyday knowledge, logic, or an interview guide (Schreier, 2014, p.176). The categories and subcategories will be based on the theoretical framework of the thesis, and these categories will be modified after trial coding in a data-driven way. Once all categories have been generated and defined, it is time to take a step back, look at the structure of the coding frame once again, and ‘tidy up’ any loose ends. If subcategories are very similar, it might be best to collapse them. Some subcategories may be much more comprehensive than others and might be better conceptualized as main categories. These and other considerations may lead to a revision of the structure of the frame. After 50 percent of the data has been coded, the coding frame and categories will be evaluated and categories will be modified and subcategories introduced if need be. (Schreier, 2014, p. 177)

The fourth step involves segmentation of the data into segments or divided units. Segmentation involves dividing the data into units in such a way that each unit fits into exactly one (sub)category of the coding frame. These coding units are those parts of the data that can be interpreted in a meaningful way with respect to the subcategories, and their size can vary from an entire book to a single word. (Schreier, 2014, p. 178). Data can be segmented

in two ways: formal and thematic, and in terms of this research the data will be segmented into units using thematic segmentation. Especially in qualitative research, a thematic criterion will often be more useful. This involves looking for topic changes, and one unit essentially corresponds to a theme. What constitutes a theme will vary with the coding frame and main categories. Thematic criteria are much less clear cut than formal criteria, but they often provide a better fit with the coding frame. (Schreier, 2014, p. 178)

During the fifth step the trial coding takes place, and Schreier suggests that this phase should be done by two different researchers working independently, but in terms of this research this cannot be done (Schreier, 2014, s. 179). The trial coding will be done for only the answers of a single teacher, and based on this shortened and simplified trial coding the coding frame will then be revisited in step six.

Step six will be the final step before the main analysis. This step consists of evaluating and modifying the coding frame. This involves examining the results of the trial coding in terms of consistency and validity. If the definitions of subcategories are clear and straightforward and if the subcategories are mutually exclusive, units of coding will usually be assigned to the same subcategories during both rounds of coding. (Schreier, 2014, p.179). However, in this research the trial coding will not involve two rounds of coding, and the categories and subcategories will be examined with shortened and simplified form of trial coding.

The research will then move onto the main analysis or the seventh step of Schreier (2014). In this part all of the data is coded. It is important to keep in mind that the coding frame can no longer be modified at this stage. Therefore it is crucial that the frame is sufficiently reliable and valid before entering this phase. (Schreier, 2014, p. 179). A first step in the main analysis is to divide the remaining part of the data into coding units. In a next step, the data is coded by assigning these units to the categories in the coding frame. In the step of main analysis a summary matrix of the coded categories and coded data will be made as well. In a final step of the main analysis phase, the results of coding should be prepared so that they are suitable for answering the research question. This is necessary whenever the units of coding are smaller than the cases specified in the research question. In this case, the coding has to be transformed from the level of the unit of coding to the level of the case. (Schreier, 2014, p. 180)

The eighth and final step of Schreier's (2014) model for qualitative content analysis is presenting and interpreting the findings of the research. With qualitative content analysis, the coding frame itself can be the main result. In this case, presenting the findings involves presenting the frame and illustrating it through quotes. This can be done through continuous text or through text matrices, which are tables that contain text instead of, or in addition to numbers. The findings can also serve as a starting point for further data exploration, examining the results of qualitative content analysis for patterns and co-occurrences of selected categories. This involves moving beyond the individual units of coding and categories to the relations between the categories. (Schreier, 2014, p. 180)

At the end of the main analysis, the findings will be summarized and this will answer the empirical research question: *how is freedom defined in education according to the collected data*. Lastly, the definition of freedom based on the theoretical background will be compared to the one found from the data to see if there are similarities or major differences.

### **3.5 Methodological paradigms**

The methodological paradigm for this thesis is mainly constructivist in nature, but also includes elements of pragmatism. As qualitative content analysis relies heavily on the interpretation of the researcher, this grounds this study firmly in the constructivist paradigm. Phillips writes that the common element in all forms of *constructivism* is that knowledge is not discovered but rather constructed by humans (2010, p.7). Similarly, this thesis does not claim to formulate universal conclusions, as the knowledge created is the personal creation of the researcher.

Pitman & Maxwell (1992) write that constructivists also suggest that reality is socially constructed and depend on the observer for their existence. The constructivist paradigm is thus more subjective rather than objective. (Pitman & Maxwell, 1992, p. 738). Although the analysis of this thesis strives to be unbiased, constructivist research paradigm recognizes subjectivity. In this manner, the research of this thesis is not claimed to be objective as well.

Charmaz (2008) writes that constructivists do not regard the data and their meanings as self-evident. Instead, researchers interpret and categorize data but their potential meanings

are multiple as *constructivists* look for multiple meanings and complexity. Therefore *constructivists* limit the simplifying, generating impulse and resist contextualizing the analysis. (Charmaz, 2008, p.469). The data of this thesis is rooted in the educational context of Finnish primary education, and will be looked in that context also.

The research methodology also includes elements of pragmatism and Denzin writes that according to the pragmatic paradigm, truth is defined in terms of its consequences for action (2004, p.84). Garrison & Neiman (2003) write that pragmatism may be understood as emerging out of the theory of meaning. There is no difference of meaning so fine that we cannot detect it in terms of possible consequences. They also mention pragmatism to have social characteristics similar to *constructivism* as they write that minds and selves emerge socially in creative and critical dialogue with the rest of the community. (Garrison & Neiman, 2003, p. 21-22)

The pragmatic paradigm can be found partly in the analysis of data, as the data comes from practical educational context. The answers of the data are based on what the teachers have seen, and therefore the analysis involves a pragmatic element by trying to find out a definition of freedom that works. Simply put, the definition of freedom built from the data will shape my idea of freedom, and then possibly have consequences which shape the way I see education.

### **3.6 Language issues**

The biggest issue with the research is about the language choice of this thesis and the data that will be analyzed. The questions for the teachers were posed in Finnish, as I wanted to give the teachers freedom in answering with the most comfortable way possible. This then brings a couple of issues in terms of building the code categories and also with coding the segmented data. Firstly, the important terms in the categories need to be translated into Finnish accurately enough so that the translation fits and represents the original English term as accurately as possible. The descriptions and coding rules must also be formulated in such a way that they can be clearly applied and used when coding the Finnish data. Especially the category descriptions and coding rules must be looked at carefully.

Secondly, the coding process and interpretation will then become more complicated, and emphasis on interpretation and contextual understanding will be important. As discussed in

the methodological section of this thesis, qualitative content analysis is a rather open research methodology, which lets the researcher decide the way the research is conducted. Therefore, rather than looking for exact phrases, words etc. the coding of the data will be done in a more interpretative fashion. Segments are coded based on what they are interpreted to thematically be about, and what and who the interviewee is discussing of.

After thinking about translating the data to English, I decided to not translate them before coding the data. Translations can lose a lot of the nuances of discourse if translated poorly, and since the data needs to have all the nuances and meanings that the interviewees intended, translating the work poorly would have seriously compromised the reliability of the thesis in terms of coding the data. However, for the sake of understanding the example segments taken from the text will be translated to English.

Although the choice to use two different languages for the thesis work and the actual data collection poses problems, I believe that choosing to do the thesis this way is justified as using English language as well for the data. Considering reliability, segmenting and coding the data in the interviewees first language makes for a more reliable and accurate data.

## **4 Segmentation and building the code categories**

### **4.1 Formulating the research categories and trial coding**

The code categories for the research were somewhat difficult to formulate. From the start the objective was to build the categories based on the theoretical framework and the categories are therefore formulated from the theoretical background and research question. Since the theoretical framework is a rather important part of this thesis, basing the code categories on theory was a self-evident choice.

After writing the theoretical framework for this thesis, I came up with five key aspects that seemed to be in the core of the idea of what freedom is in the context of deschooling philosophy:

1. Limits (of freedom)
2. Authority (in relation to freedom)
3. Choice (and freedom)
4. Rules (in relation to freedom)
5. Motivation / Self-regulation (in relation to freedom)

Before trial coding was done, these five thematic areas formed the core thematic categories. In the first stage the categories were formulated in a way that combined both an actor and a theme, in order to make straightforward and clearly defined. For example, the categories combined a teacher and him/her using authority, which was applied to all the segments discussing teachers using authority.

All together five categories were formulated that combined an actor and a specific theme. However, the accuracy and applicability of the first version of the research categories already started to raise a few doubts, the first round of trial coding was done a bit early as a test to see whether the research categories would work at all.



## **4.2 Segmenting the data**

Before the trial coding could be conducted or any analysis done the entire data needed to be segmented. This segmenting is done in order to provide a suitable ground for the coding of the data. After the segmentation has been done the researcher can proceed to trial coding, evaluation and modifying the coding frame and categories.

The answers of the five classroom teachers were segmented thematically, and the segments range from entire sentences to subordinate clauses. Main objective in segmenting the data was to segment the data into single segments with only one thematical category, so that only one main category and one subcategory would be fitting for any single segment. As mentioned in the methodological section of this thesis, for a theory-based thesis thematic segmentation is a logical choice.

Segmentation was a rather straight-forward process as the interviewees did not stray too much between topics in a single sentence. The trickiest part was to see where the thematical lines between sentences were. Although, the objective was to reduce every segment to be only about one thing and one thing only, a few of the segments deal thematically with a couple or more of things. This brought up interpretative issues in the coding phase but as a single segment can be coded with a single (sub) category, special attention was given to the interpretation of these tricky segments so that the most appropriate code category was applied. The data in this thesis was segmented in a way that the shortest segments are sub clauses. Most of the segments consist of single sentences, but many of sentences are also broken down into separate segments according to the thematical content in them.

## **4.3 Trial coding and modifying the code categories**

After doing a bit of trial coding with the first version of research categories, it became evident that the categories were too narrow in their definitions. The categories were too strictly defined as well as too specific. For this reason, it was evident that the code categories had to be simplified. The categories had to be simple and defined yet still open for some interpretation. After the first trial coding it became certain that the answers and sentences of the participating teachers were not always simply about one theme, and therefore the

research categories had to leave room for interpretation in terms of context and thematical substance.

The second version of reserch categories consisted of three actor categories and five thematic categories. The *three actor categories* were about the three main actors, or subjects of the primary school context: *the teacher*, *the student* and *the school* itself. These three categories and their codes would then represent who the segment was about. Besides the three main categories, *five thematic categories* were also formulated. These five thematic categories were created from the five thematic key aspects of deschooling idea of freedom: *limits*, *authority*, *choice*, *rules* as well as *motivation/self-regulation*. Every segment would then be coded with an actor category code labeled A, B or C; and with a thematic category code based on the thematic content of the segment, and these codes were labeled with a number from 1 to 5.

After the second round of trial coding, there still was a large number of segments that could not fit in any of the existing research categories. The three actor categories in combination with the five thematical categories worked well, and the last modifications that were made to the research categories were to add one additional actor category and two additional thematic categories.

*The new actor category* was a category for segments that discussed *freedom in general* and were about the teacher, student or school. *The two new thematic categories* were *responsibility* and *general comments about freedom*. Responsibility as a thematic category was added since based on the trial coding there seemed to be a lot of discussion about it in the data. The last thematic category was added because in the data there seemed to be quite a lot of general comments about the nature of freedom. Many consisted of general comments about what freedom is and how it manifests in a school environment, and since the second round of trial coding showed that these segments could not fit in any other category, a new thematic category called *nature of freedom* was added among the code categories.

With the research categories now modified based on both rounds of trial coding, the research could move to the actual coding of the data and after that to the main analysis. Every segment of the data was given an actor category code as well as a thematic category code (e.g. B 5, C 4 etc.)

Lastly, the main difference with the code categories of this thesis and code categories of usual qualitative content analysis is that the research categories, or code categories in the analysis in this thesis, are not separated into main categories and sub categories, but instead both category groups are treated as equal. The two category groups are called the *actor categories* (=who is being discussed) and *thematic categories* (=what is being discussed). To conclude, for the purpose of this thesis both category groups are analyzed together and looked at as being equal. Despite the fact that categories were named main and sub categories, after conducting a bit of the actual analysis it became apparent that both category groups need to be analyzed together, thus making them equal.

The final version of the coding frame can be found at the end of this thesis as Appendix 2.

## 5 Analyzing the data

In this section of the thesis I will present the main analysis of the data presenting first the code quantities of the segmented data. After the quantities of the codes have been presented, the analysis will move on to looking at the codes more thoroughly and focusing on the latent content of the segments. This forms the majority of analysis as the *actor categories* and *thematic categories* are looked in depth in terms of their latent content. The analysis will progress systematically by looking at all the thematic categories one at a time together with the actor categories.

### 5.1 Code quantities

In this section the quantities of codes in the data will be gone through briefly. The goal for looking through the quantities is to form and show how the thematic and actor categories were divided according to the codes in the data, so that the teachers' emphasis and thematic focus can be made clear. Possible reasons or conclusions for the quantities are not discussed, since the focus of this research is on the qualitative side of analysis.

Table 1. Code quantities in the data.

Categories		Limits (1)	Authority (2)	Choice (3)	Rules (4)	Motivation (5)	Responsibility (6)	General (7)
		26	27	36	23	24	15	30
Teacher (A)	43	2	20	13	3	3	1	0
Student (B)	69	10	2	14	8	15	14	5
School (C)	57	12	5	9	12	6	0	12
General (D)	16	2	0	0	0	0	0	13

Starting from the thematic category of *Limits* (1) the teachers did mostly discuss limits in relation to the student and the school. Out of the 26 segments that were coded with the

thematic code of 1, ten segments were about the student and limits (B 1) and 12 about school and limits (C 1). The four remaining segments were equally divided between teacher and limits (A 1) and general comments (D 1). Hence the most emphasis was given for discussing limits related to the students and the school as institution.

For the thematic category of *authority* (2) the most found code was clearly that of teacher and authority (A 2) which yielded 20 segments. The total amount of codes in the Authority code category was 24 and second highest code category was school and authority (C 2) with five segments. Student and authority only gave two segments and for the category of Authority no segments were coded as D 2 (=general comments and authority).

The third thematic category was *choice* (3) and this category came to include a total of 36 segments. The category that yielded the most segments was student and choice (B 3) with 14 segments and the second category was teacher and choice (A 3) with 13, so the teachers did discuss this thematic category fairly equally in terms of the students and teachers. School and choice (C 3) produced five segments while the fourth actor category of general comments and choice (D 3) did not end up containing any segments.

The thematic category of *rules* (4) all together came to include 23 segments from the data, and the majority of those segments were coded as C 3 (school and rules) with 12 segments. The second highest code category was student and rules (B 4) with eight segments, and after this category the next was teacher and rules with three segments. The category of general comments and rules did not yield any segments. The differences between code quantities were quite low in this thematic category when compared to the quantities from the few previous thematic categories.

The next thematic category was the category of *motivation and self-regulation* (5), and this category included a total of 24 segments in the data. The highest code quantities for this category came from the code B 5 (student and motivation) and all together 15 segments were given this code. The second highest was school and motivation (C 5) which included six segments, and the third highest came to be segments dealing with teacher and motivation (A 5) with three segments. No segments were coded with D 5 (general comments and motivation).

The sixth thematic category of *responsibility* (6) yielded 15 segments. The highest category with this theme was student and responsibility (B 6) which includes 14 segments, and

the second highest came to teacher and responsibility with only a single segment. This thematic category did not include any more segments, and is therefore the smallest thematic category of all the seven, and also the one with the most differences in code quantities.

The seventh and the last thematic category is about the *nature of freedom* and much to my surprise, this category came to include a total of 30 segments and is the second highest thematic category of all the seven. Segments coded as D 7 (general comments and nature of freedom) formed the majority of segments in the category with 13 segments, but not too far behind were the 12 segments coded as C 7 (school and nature of freedom). The third-most segments were in the code of (B 7) with five segments, and no segment was coded as A 1 (teacher and nature of freedom).

## **5.2 Main analysis – Actor and thematic categories combined**

In this part of the thesis the data will be analyzed in relation to the thematic categories, and the thematical content of the segments. All of the thematic categories will be looked at in relation to the actor categories. Every thematic category has a main category code attached to them in the segments, and the analysis will code category-wise proceed alphanumerically starting from thematic category 1 and actor category A. Within a single thematic category the analysis will go through all the main categories, and after all of the findings have been introduced, the analysis will then move onto the next thematic category.

The main analysis of this thesis will be done by looking at every thematic category individually. Every segment from the data has been thematically and contextually grouped together according to their code: e.g. Segments coded A 3 were grouped or paired with other A 3 segments that discuss issues thematically close to each other. The results of the analysis will be introduced in this part of the thesis with example segments from the data.

The segmented and coded data can be found at the end of this thesis as Appendix 3.

### **5.2.1 Limits**

The analysis starts with the thematic category of *limits* (coded 1). In this section the teachers write about the relationship of freedom and limits in the context of education.

*"On koulusta ja opettajasta kiinni kuinka paljon oppilasta rajoitetaan." – "It is up to the school and teacher how much a student is restricted." (Teacher 1) (A 1)*

For the code category of A 1 (*Teacher and limits*), only a single segment is found. Teacher 1 suggests that the amount of restrictions for a student is up to the teacher and school as an institution.. By referring to the school as a whole, the teacher can be interpreted to meaning the rules and the general school environment. Also this comment of teacher 1 can be seen as suggesting that limits exist for students and those limits are always set in a top down fashion, either by the school as an institution and its staff, *"the school"*, and / or the classroom teacher of a particular student, *"the teacher"*.

*"Mielestäni oppilaiden vapaus koulussa on lähtökohtaisesti hyvin rajoitettua." – "In my opinion, the freedom of students in school is very limited to begin with." (Teacher 1) (B 1)*

*"Oman kokemukseni perusteella suomalaisessa peruskoulussa oppilailla on yleensä aika vähän omia tapoja tehdä asioita." – "My experience tells me that in a Finnish primary school, the students have fairly little options to do things as they would like." (Teacher 1) (B 1)*

*"- -mutta saavatko oppilaat todella vaikuttaa heitä koskeviin asioihin?" – "But do they (students) really have a say in matters that affect them?" (Teacher 3) (B 1)*

The next series of segments are from code category B 1 (*Student and limits*). Teacher 1 writes that the freedom of students is very limited to begin with. Teacher 1 writes in the next segment that in a Finnish primary school environment, options for doing thing their way are very few for students. The teacher thus can be interpreted to point out that students do not have a lot of options to choose, and work methods are pre-determined.

Teacher 3 asks whether students really have a say in matters that relate to them. As the teacher is asking a question, the segment can be interpreted as implying uncertainty in the means that the students can affect matters that concern them.

*"Jos mietin, mikä on täysin vapaa hetki oppilaille koulupäivän aikana, sanoisin sen olevan välitunti. Mutta onko se sittenkään?" – "If I try to come up with a moment during the students day in school in which they would be completely free to do what they want, I would say it to be the recess. But are they truly free even then?" (Teacher 3) (B 1)*

Teacher 2 writes about the recess as a rather free moment, but second-guesses the free nature afterwards. The teacher seems to be suggesting that while the students have free time during recess, the freedom during recess still stays within certain boundaries.

*”Kärjistettynä vapaus oppilaiden toiminnassa on epätoivottua käyttäytymistä.” – ”To exaggerate by generalizing, freedom is an undesired form of behavior in the students activities.” (Teacher 2) (B 1)*

*”(oppilaat) - -mutta myös usein testaavat vapauden rajaa jossain vaiheessa.” - ”(the students) - - but also quite often test the limits of freedom at one point or another.” (Teacher 4) (B 1)*

Teacher 2 points out by ”exaggerating” that freedom is a not a desired form of behavior. Although the teacher does not specify why this form of behavior is undesired, the comment can be interpreted as arguing that students are not expected to act freely.

Teacher 4 writes that although the students might follow the limits and know them, they may at some point test the limits of their freedom. When compared to the previous comment of teacher 3 these two segments bring up a contradiction of non-desired form of behavior and inevitable testing of limits and boundaries.

*”Vapaita kansalaisia ei voida kasvattaa rajoittamalla [tai sanelemalla kuinka asiat tulisi tehdä.” – ”Students cannot be educated into free citizens by limiting (or by telling how things should be done.” (Teacher 1) (B 1)*

*”(opetussuunnitelma) - -joka niin ikään rajoittaa ihmisen vapautta opiskella tai jättää opiskelematta tiettyjä oppisisältöjä.” – ”(The curriculum) - - which also limits a person’s freedom to study or not to study certain educational contents.” (Teacher 1) (B 1)*

With these two comments teacher 1 points out a contradiction in the nature of education. The whole educational system is driven by the national curriculum, and following this document should educate capable and free individuals of the society. Teacher 1, however, writes that students cannot be educated to become free citizens with limitations and restrictions. Simply put, the teacher can be interpreted to argue that freedom is not an end product of restrictions.



With the latter segment, teacher 1 points out that the curriculum itself already limits student freedom in terms of what they can and cannot study. Curriculum sets our very clear limitations to what can be studied, or rather what will be studied.

*”(Oppivelvollisuus) - -joka jo itsessään rajoittaa oppilaan vapautta olla osallistumatta opetukseen.” – ”(Compulsory education) - -which in itself limits the students freedom not to take part in education.” (Teacher 1) (C 1)*

*”Jo koulu laitoksena on mielestäni ulkoa tulevien pakotteiden ruumiillistuma:” – ”The school as an institution is in my opinion an embodiment of sanctions coming from the outside.” (Teacher 5) (C 1)*

Next the segments coded as C 1 (School and limits) will be looked at. Teacher 1 writes that the idea of compulsory education limits the freedom of a student to take part or not to take part in education. Teacher 5 writes that the school as an institution is an embodiment of restrictions coming from outside.

*”Totta kai heillä on vapaus omiin ajatuksiin ja mielipiteen ilmaisuun, mutta väittäisin, että monesti niitäkin rajoitetaan.” – ”Of course, they do have freedom of thought and opinion, but I would argue that both are many times restricted as well.” (Teacher 3) (C 1)*

*”Muistelen joskus lukeneeni, että on olemassa kouluun sopivia ja sopimattomia ajatuksia.” – ”I remember reading once, that there exists thoughts both fit and unfit for school.” (Teacher 3) (C 1)*

Teacher 3 points out that the students in a school are naturally entitled to their own thoughts and the freedom to express their opinion. However, the teacher writes that both of these rights might be restricted to a certain level. Teacher 3 can therefore be interpreted to state that the limits a school imposes are not simply about what a student can or cannot do, but also about mental limitations: limits of expressing opinion and limits of what students can think of in school.

In the second segment, teacher 3 further continues the idea of mental limitations by stating that he/she remembers reading about thoughts fit and unfit for school. This backs up the claim that the students can be under mental limitations. At the very least there seems to exist a form of confusion about whether there are thoughts of students not fit for a school environment.

*”- -mutta epäilen kuunnellaanko oppilaita suurella mittakaavalla.” – ” - - but I doubt whether on a grand scale the students are listened to.” (Teacher 3) (C 1)*

In addition to the previous two segments, teacher 3 writes that he/she has doubts whether the students are listened to on a grand scale. If it is assumed that fit and unfit thoughts exist in school, then the teacher can be interpreted to suggest that the unfit thoughts of students are not listened to.

*”Myöskään pukeutumista ja oman identiteetin näyttämistä ei rajoiteta (esim koulupuvut)” – ”Also what the students can wear and how they can represent their own identity are not restricted (for example school uniforms)” (Teacher 1) (C 1)*

As the students have all kinds of limits and restrictions imposed on them, teacher no. 1 writes about examples of what is not limited in Finnish primary schools. According to the teacher, the students are free to dress in a manner of their own choosing and they are free to express their own identity. Teacher 1 mentions school uniforms in the segment and it can be interpreted that teacher claims that school uniforms restrict student personalities.

*”(Oikeutta valita, mitä ainetta oppilaat haluaisivat opiskella) Tämän tyypistä vapautta on varmasti alaluokilla vähemmän.” – ”(The right for students to choose what subject to study) This kind of freedom is bound to exist less during the first grades.” (Teacher 2) (C 1)*

In this segment, teacher 2 states that in the first grades of primary school students do not have quite a lot of freedom to choose what they would like to study. The teacher does not however, mention any reasons why this freedom of choice is low in the first grades, but simply states that there is bound to be less of it.

*”En ole perehtynyt isosti Steinerkoulujen ideologiaan, mutta minulla on käsitys, että he hallitsevat vapauden säännöstelyn ns. perinteisempää koululaitosta paremmin.” – ”I have not looked very much into the ideologies of the Steiner-school movement, but I have an impression, that they handle the regulation of freedom better than the so called traditional schooling system.” (Teacher 2) (C 1)*

*”Oppilaiden vapaus on hyvin riippuvaista koulusta instituutiona, koulusta yksilönä, koulun henkilökunnasta ja erityisesti luokanopettajasta.” – ”The freedom of students is highly*

*dependent on school as an institution, a specific school, the staff of school and especially the specific class room teacher.” (Teacher 5) (C 1)*

*”Mielestäni vapautta rajoittaa tai edistää koulun sisällä oleva koulukulttuuri - -” – ”In my opinion freedom is limited or increased by the school culture inside a particular school - -” (Teacher 4) (C 1)*

Teacher 2 mentions the Steiner-schools by writing that he/she is under the impression that these schools handle the regulation of freedom better than regular primary schools. In this comment, teacher 2 uses the word ”regulation” which suggests that freedom is regulated in schools. It can be interpreted that freedom of students is regulated by somebody and is something that can be regulated.

Teacher 5 suggests that the amount of freedom the students have is limited by the school as an institution, the specific school and it as an environment, the staff of the specific school and lastly the specific classroom teacher of a student. The amount of freedom, the nature of freedom and regulation of freedom might vary in different schools and even in different classrooms of the same school. Teacher 5 is therefore suggesting that quite a number of things affect how much the freedom of students is limited, and any or all of these factors can have an effect.

In the last part of the thematic category coded D 1 (General comments about freedom and limits), the two segments ponder about what the nature of freedom is in terms of limits. Both segments come from a single teacher, as the code D 1 did not provide any more findings. The segments will be looked at together, as they have a specific connection in the data and relate solely to one single argument.

*”Negatiivinen vapaus tarkoittaa sitä, että ihminen on vapaa ulkoa tulevista pakotteista, väkivallasta ja pakkovallasta.” – ”Negative freedom means that a person is free from outside sanctions, violence and coercion.” (Teacher 5) (D 1)*

*”Jos nämä eivät uhkaa yksilöä, katsotaan yksilön olevan vapaa.” – ”If these are not threatening, the individual is seen as free.” (Teacher 5) (D 1)*

Teacher 5 writes about the concept of negative freedom and states that the concept means that an individual is considered to be free from external sanctions, violence and coercion.

The teacher in the second segment then points out that if an individual is not being threatened by any of these three factors, or threats, he/she is considered to be free.

### 5.2.2 Authority

The first set of segments related to the thematic category coded A 2 is about Teacher and authority. These segments describe and explore the many dimensions of teacher authority in a Finnish primary school context. The context of freedom as a concept is present in all of the segments, and as can be seen from the following analysis, teachers identify the freedom of students as a value that the teacher grants for the students.

*”Yleensä opettajalla on mielessä kuinka jokin asia tulisi tehdä tai opetella ja lapset seuraavat sen mukaan.” – “Usually the teacher does have an idea how something should be done or learned, and the students follow that idea.” (Teacher 1) (A 2)*

*”(Vapauden) - - mutta sen tulisi tavallaan tiedostamatta olla opettajan mieleistä oma-aloitteisuutta, ja vastata odotuksiin.” – “(Freedom) - - but it should unconsciously in a way be teacher-approved initiative, and respond to expectations.” (Teacher 2) (A 2)*

Teacher 1 writes that teachers usually have an idea about how a specific thing should be taught and usually the students will follow the idea of the teacher. The segment therefore can be interpreted to suggest that teachers make the educational decisions and students will follow accordingly.

Teacher 2 writes that even if students might have the freedom to do something, in the end the choices should still be choices that the teacher prefers. The freedom of students should follow teacher's expectations. Teacher 2 describes the relationship of teacher authority and student freedom as unequal: the freedom that students have is within the limits that the teacher gives them, and the only choices that the students can choose from are ones approved by the teacher.

Teacher 2 uses the word "unconsciously" which can be interpreted to suggest that students are expected to unconsciously "follow a path" that the teacher has laid before them. Giving choices and freedom might only be an illusion as there really is no actual choices, but only ones that the teacher has already chosen. The students can make a choice, which has already been made for them by the teacher.

*"Olen kuitenkin hyvin skeptinen oppilaiden vapautta kohtaan, koska se on niin riippuvaista opettajista ja muusta koulun henkilökunnasta." – "I am however, very skeptical towards the freedom of students since it is so dependent on the specific teacher and rest of the school staff." (Teacher 5) (A 2)*

The issue and relation of teacher authority and student freedom is also dealt with in this segment by teacher 5. The teacher mentions that he/she is skeptical towards freedom of students, and mentions that this is because the amount and nature of freedom that the students experience is highly dependent on their own teacher and the school staff. This segment also backs up the argument that freedom is something that is given from above, and regulated by the ones above. If the teacher or the staff feel that freedom is not what the students need, then there might not be any.

*"Joskus pyydän oppilaita itse ehdottamaan, mitä tekisimme." – "Sometimes I ask the students to suggest themselves what should we do." (Teacher 3) (A 2)*

*"Opettaja antaa vapauksia oppilaille, kun hän antaa oppilaalle tehtäviä ja luottamustöitä. Esim. järjestäjä luokassa tai paperin kopiointi." – "A teacher gives freedoms to the students, when he/she gives assignments and positions of responsibility. Eq. The class monitor or copying papers." (Teacher 4) (A 2)*

Teacher 3 states that sometimes he/she asks the students to suggest themselves what the whole class should do next. In this way the teacher describes a sort of permissive authority: the teacher is the authority figure, but involves the students in decision making. The students have the freedom to affect what will be done in the lesson, but this freedom is given from above by the teacher. Teacher permits a decision to be made by the students.

The relation of authority and permissiveness is also discussed in this segment by teacher 4. The teacher describes examples of how a teacher can give certain freedoms to the students, by writing that whenever a student is given assignments and/or positions of responsibilities, the students are given freedom. The segment thus suggests that whenever a teacher gives out responsibilities, they are in fact extensions of student freedom. Teacher gives out certain privileges (=freedom) for the students, and in this way teacher 4 also describes a teacher using his/her authority for extending freedom.

*"Vapautta täytyy minun mielestäni myös opettaa." – "In my opinion freedom must also be taught." (Teacher 2) (A 2)*

*”(Vapauden käyttö) Edellämainitsemisissäni tilanteissa sen käyttöä täytyy tietysti opettaa - - ” – ”(Using freedom) How to use freedom must also be taught in the situations that I have mentioned before - -.” (Teacher 2) (A 2)*

*”Meni aikansa, että oppilaani oppivat käyttämään minun heille suomaani vapautta ehdottaa ja ottaa kantaa.” – ”It took some time, before my students learned to use the freedom to suggest and to speak out, that I granted them.” (Teacher 3) (A 2)*

According to teacher 2 and teacher 3 freedom should be taught to students. Teacher 2 suggests that learning to use freedom is something that needs to be taught, and as teaching is usually done by someone in a position of authority, this adds an interesting element to the concept of freedom: can a student be taught to exercise freedom in a situation controlled by an authority? According to this segment, freedom is something that can and should be taught as the students might not know how to use freedom in the first place. A person of authority (=teacher) should teach the students how to be free, and what it means to use freedom.

Teacher 3 then mentions that it took some time for his/her students to learn how to use the freedom that was given to them by the teacher. The segment can be interpreted to suggest that students do not know how to use the freedom that they get given, but rather need to grow into it, or be educated into it as the previous segment by teacher 2 suggested.

*”(Opettajien vapaus) Tämä mahdollistaa siis myös vapauden väärinkäytön.” – ”(Freedom of teachers) This also enables the abuse of freedom.” (Teacher 4) (A 2)*

*”Tunnuksellisuus saattaa edelleen kuitenkin olla läsnä riippuen taas opettajasta.” – ”Confessionality might still be present depending on the teacher.” (Teacher 5) (A 2)*

The Finnish primary school system is rather heavily based on freedom of the teachers as there is no inspection system. Teachers are expected to follow the curriculum and follow all rules and regulations that the Finnish education system requires them to, and teacher 4 writes that this freedom from inspection enables the abuse of freedom. It could be argued that this type of freedom could potentially result in teachers abusing the freedom that has been granted to them.

Teacher 5 mentions an example of abusive authority by writing that although confessionality is not part of the subject of christian / lutheran religion in the finnish na-

tional core curriculum, it is up to the teacher whether the teaching of religion is confessional or not. In this way the teachers can abuse their authority to include prohibited themes in their lessons, thus violating the curriculum and abusing their power and authority.

*”Toisaalta esim. hankalissa tilanteissa joissa esim. oppilas on toiminut välitunnilla huonosti (kiusannut toista tms.) on annettuun vapauteen helppo vedota.” – ”On the other hand, for example in difficult situations where a student has misbehaved during recess (bullied someone e.g.) it is easy to invoke to the freedom that was given.” (Teacher 2) (A 2)*

*” - - ’jos toimintani häiritsee oppitunnin kulkua tai työrauhaa - siirtyy paikanvalitsemisvapaus opettajalle.’” – ”- - ’if my activity distracts the flow or the peace of a lesson - - does the freedom to choose a working place revert back to the teacher.” (Teacher 2) (A 2)*

With these two segments teacher 2 suggests that the freedom given by a teacher works both ways: as the freedom is given by an authority (= the teacher), it can also be taken away by the same authority. In the first segment, an example is given by mentioning that in difficult situations, such as bullying, the authority can easily discuss the situation at hand by invoking the freedom given to the students by the authority itself.

The second segment suggests that while the students may be given freedom from above, it is desirable that the students understand that if they break the rules, freedom and choices can be taken away. Teacher 2 describes a desired thought-process for a student that includes self-reflection and awareness of behavior, along with understanding that the authority will act if rules are broken.

The next set of segments are coded B 2 (student and authority) and deal with the ways the students freedom gets limited by authority, to what extent it gets limited and also by what and whom the freedom is limited.

*”- -tai heidän oppimistapoihin voidaan puuttua.” – ”- -or their learning habits can be intervened with. (Teacher 1) (B 2)*

Teacher 1 writes that the learning habits of the students can be intervened with. By learning habits it can be assumed that the teacher is referring to study habits or study methods; how do the students enjoy learning about something. In regards to the segment, it can ar-

gued that limiting freedom is not only about decreasing choices, but also about affecting how the students learn and work.

*”Sopimattomia ajatuksia ei käsitellä ja oppilaat hiljennetään aiheista.” – ”Unfit thoughts are not addressed and students are silenced from certain topics.” (Teacher 3) (B 2)*

Earlier on in the main analysis section, teacher 3 wrote of fit and unfit thoughts for school and with this segment the teacher further explores the topic. The teacher writes that unfit thoughts are not addressed and students are silenced in regards to certain topics. The segment can be interpreted to state the authority can choose to limit the student right to voice their opinions.

The next couple of segments are coded as C 2 (School and authority), and they mostly explore the authoritative nature of the school and who is in control and holding the authority.

*”Toisin sanoen valta-asetelma on aikuisten ja instituution puolella, ei lasten.” - - ”In other words, the power balance is on the favor of the adults and the institution, not the children. (Teacher 5) (C 2)*

*”Lasten vapaus on annettua vapautta valta-asemassa olevien toimesta.” – ”The freedom of children is a freedom given by the ones in power. (Teacher 5) (C 2)*

*”Oppilaiden vapaus on tarkoin koulun ja opettajan määrittämää.” – ”The freedom of students is strictly defined by the school and the teacher.” (Teacher 3) (C 2)*

Teacher 5 writes about the power balance of the school. The teacher mentions that the power balance is not on the students’ side, but tipped in the favor of the adults and the institution. In other words, students are subjects in school. Authorities hold complete and absolute power in primary schools, and the students can only follow and obey.

Teacher 5 writes that all the freedom of children is given by the ones in power: the adults and the institution. This top-down model of student freedom has been mentioned before and this element of freedom seems fairly apparent.

Teacher 3 also makes the same argument as teacher 5 by writing that the freedom of students is very strictly defined by the school and the teacher. The authority sets out limits and oversees the usage of freedom. Staffs of the school, adults, teacher and the school as



an institution are the ones that create the limits of freedom, and occasionally grant freedoms for the students but even these freedoms are under strict limitations.

*”Suomalainen koululaitos valmentaa kunnioittamaan ja seuraamaan auktoriteettejä- -” – “The Finnish school institution educates to honor and follow authority- -” (Teacher 5) (C 2)*

Teacher 5 continues on the topic of power balance, by writing that Finnish school institution educates the students to honor and follow authority. As the authorities of the school control the freedom of the students, the school system itself reproduces the power balance, which has the adults and institution placed in control.

### 5.2.3 Choice

The next thematic category under analysis is *choice* (coded 3). In this section the teachers write about the teacher giving choices for the students, how much choice do the teachers themselves have, and the relation between the teachers making all the choices versus students having the option to choose various things.

*”Osa opettajista antaa myös vaihtoehtoja eri oppisisältöjen opiskeluun- -” – “Some teachers also give options how to study certain educational topics- -” (Teacher 5) (A 3)*

Teacher 5 mentions that some teachers give alternatives and options on how the students can study certain topics and themes. In this segment the teacher can be seen to point out two different things: 1. Sometimes teachers give options for the students to choose from: 2. these options are given to the students by the teacher.

*”Kuinka matematiikantunti organisoidaan, jos oppilaille olisi vaikka enemmän oikeutta valita, mitä ainetta he juuri tällä hetkellä haluaisivat opiskella?” – “How to organize a lesson in mathematics, if the students would have more of a right to choose what subject they at this very moment would like to study?” (Teacher 2)(A 3)*

*”Opettajalla on vapaus valita opetusmenetelmät ja välineet, tuntien rakenne, päivien rakenne.” – “A teacher has the freedom to choose teaching methods and equipment, structure of lessons and structure of days.” (Teacher 3) (A 3)*

*”Opettajana voin itse valita mihin teemoihin keskitymme enemmän.” – “As a teacher I can choose the themes that we focus on more.” (Teacher 3) (A 3)*

In the first segment of the three, teacher 2 asks how the lessons can be organized, if the students have the freedom to choose what subject they want to study. Teacher 3 writes in the second segment that the teacher has the freedom to choose teaching methods and teaching equipment along with the educational structure of both lessons and school days. According to teacher 2 there seems to be a contradiction between the deciding and planning nature of the teacher and the possible freedom for students to choose what to study.

Teacher 3 seems in both of the previous segments emphasize the fact that the teacher has the choice of what and how much a certain topic gets focused on. The teacher therefore is therefore both responsible for a number of educational decisions everyday and on every lesson, but at the same time also has the freedom to choose and decide on a great number of educational decisions. The second segment is more focused on the subject matter and educational content of lessons as teacher 3 writes that as a teacher he/she is able to choose what topics and themes gets more attention and are focused more.

*"Esim. Sanon usein oppilailleni, että he saavat valita tietyillä tunneilla oman istumapaikkansa." – "Eq. I often tell my students, that they can choose their seating place in certain lessons." (Teacher 2) (A 3)*

*"Annan usein useamman vaihtoehdon, joista oppilas valitsee itse tai äänestämme." – "Quite often I give the students a number of options, which the student chooses or the options are voted on." (Teacher 3) (A 3)*

*"Usein kuulee opettajien antavan kuvistunnin tehtäväksi "saat piirtää mitä haluat"."*  
(Teacher 2) (A 3)

Teacher 2 mentions that he/she often tells the students that they can choose where to sit during certain lessons. Choices of students are not therefore only limited to subjects or educational themes, but can also be practical. However, teacher 2 writes that this choice is limited only to certain lessons.

Teacher 3 writes that often the students are given a couple of options from which they can choose or the class votes which option to choose. The teacher introduces the idea that choices can also be collective. However, the segment can be interpreted to imply that choices and options are still given from above as the teacher writes that he/she "gives the students alternatives".

In the third segment teacher 2 mentions that sometimes certain teachers give out assignments that basically tell the students to do whatever they. In this situation the students are given or provided no limits, and their choices or options are limitless. Teacher 2 describes a completely different situation when compared to the previous segments by teacher 3: a situation where the choices of the student are not previously chosen by the teacher him/herself, but the students are free to choose from every possible option.

*” - - ja heitä rohkaista olemaan vapaita valitsemaan.” - - and they should be encouraged to be free to choose.” (Teacher 2) (A 3)*

*”(Vapaus) Jos se annetaan ‘väärässä’ tilanteessa- -” - - (Freedom) If it is given in a ‘wrong’ situation- -” (Teacher 2) (A 3)*

As the students need to be educated on how to behave and act in a free environment as discussed previously, teacher 2 suggests that the students need to be encouraged to exercise the freedom of choice. Furthermore, the segment can be interpreted to suggest that students need encouragement in choosing.

In the second segment, the teacher suggests that ”wrong” situations for student freedom exist. This segment can be interpreted to claim that students are not perhaps naturally ready or used to choices and freedom. The teacher does not, however specify what these ”wrong” situations are, but can be interpreted to suggest that in some situations the students might not be prepared to exercise the given freedom.

*”Teen päätökset yhdessä muiden opettajien kanssa ja koen myös tekeväni ne yhteistyössä vanhempien kanssa (tai ainakin perustelen vanhemmille valintani).” - - “I make the decisions together with the other teachers, and I feel that I also make the decisions in cooperation with the parents (or at least I explain my choices to the parents).” (Teacher 3) (A 3)*

*”Opettajilla on teoriassa melko vapaat kädet peruskoulussa ja opettaja voi tehdä paljon asioita luokkahuoneessaan muiden tietämättä, hyvässä ja huonossa.” - - “In theory, the teachers have fairly free hands in primary school and the teacher can do a lot of things inside the class room both in good and bad without the others knowing.” (Teacher 4) (A 3)*

The last two segments under analysis that are coded as A 3 explore the nature of the teacher freedom in Finnish primary school context, as teacher 3 points out that he/she makes decisions together with the rest of the school staff, and also partly in cooperation with the

parents of the students as well. The teacher seems to be suggesting that the freedom of a single teacher is also collective and connected to the rest of the school staff and teaching faculty.

However, teacher 4 argues that a single teacher in theory has fairly free hands to do whatever he/she wants inside the classroom without the school staff and other teachers knowing. The teachers can exercise complete freedom, as according to this segment by teacher 4, there can be very little or no supervision. There is a contradiction however, as teacher 3 describes that he/she does not exercise the freedom to make decisions completely individually, and teacher 4 mentions that teachers would be able, in good and in bad, to function completely independently in terms of this freedom.

*”Annan usein oppilaiden valita vaihtoehtoisista tavoista opiskella tai viettää viimeiset 15 minuuttia tunnista , jos sillä ei ole minulle juurikaan väliä.” – Quite often I let the students choose between alternate ways of studying or to choose how to spend the last 15 minutes of a lesson, if it does not matter to me that much.” (Teacher 3) (A 3)*

*”Mielestäni oppilaan vapautta (etenkin omaan opiskeluun) liittyvässä päätöksen teossa tulisi myös lisätä.” – ”I believe that we should increase the students power to affect decisions (especially the ones that deal with their studies).” (Teacher 1) (B 3)*

*”Väittäisin, että oppilaat eivät koe olevansa vapaita aamulla valitsemaan tulevatko kouluun vai eivät.” – ”I would argue, that the students do not feel to have the freedom to choose whether to go to school or not.” (Teacher 3) (B 3)*

Teacher 1 and 3 describe student freedom as non-existent and as a value that should be increased. In the first segment teacher 1 writes that the freedom and choice of students, with matters that directly relate to them and their studies, should be increased. In the segment the teacher thus can be interpreted to claim that students have very little choice with matters that affect themselves.

Teacher 3 writes that he/she believes that the students do not feel to be free to choose every morning whether to attend school. As the Finnish school is a mandatory one, in the end the students do not have this freedom anyway, but the teacher is stating that all in all the students do not feel that they have a choice whether to attend school or not.

*”Oppilaat ovat vapaita olemaan tekemättä mitään.” – ”The students have the freedom not to do anything.” (Teacher 3) (B 3)*

*”Eli summa summarum: oppilaalla on vapaus olla tykkäämättä ruoasta.” – ”All in all: the student has a right to not like the food.”(Teacher 2) (B 3)*

*”Suhteellisen usein tulee tilanteita, jolloin saa valita oman parin tai paikan jossa työskennellään.” – ”Fairly often a situation is encountered, where you can choose your partner or a place where you can work.” (Teacher 2) (B 3)*

*”Jos ensimmäiset uupuvat ja jälkimmäisistä ei välitä, on koulussa aika vapaa tekemään haluamallaan tavalla.” – ”If the first ones get tired and the latter ones are not taken care of, one is fairly free to do whatever you want in school.” (Teacher 3) (B 3)*

Teacher 3 writes that students have the freedom to not do anything. Although the students might not feel free to choose whether to come to school, they have a choice of doing nothing. According to teacher 3 the students can make the most fundamental choice of all.

Teacher 2 identifies a practical example of what the students can choose or what they free to do: the students are free during the school lunches to like or dislike any food. The segment can be interpreted to state that students have a right to choose their own opinion on certain matters. The choices that the students are free to make in the school environment might be more of the practical kind: liking or disliking a food, choosing their playmates etc.

The third segment by teacher 2 also emphasizes the argument that the students have choices in terms of practical issues. The students can sometimes choose who of their classmates they work with, or where they choose to work in. Freedom of choice from this perspective seems to be about fundamental and practical decisions.

*”Vapaus tuntuisi kivalta, mutta kun ei keksi mitä tehdä/ei osaa aloittaa/ei tiedä millä tyylillä/ei osaa päättää millä kynällä jne.” – ”Freedom would feel nice, but one cannot come up with what to do, where to start, what style to use, what pen to use etc.”(Teacher 2)(B 3)*

*”Muutama oppilas varmasti innostuu, mutta toisaalta aika moni piirtäjä tuskastuu tehtävästä.” – ”A couple of students is probably thrilled, but on the other hand quite a lot of the drawers grow impatient because of the assignment.” (Teacher 2) (B 3)*

*”Minusta oppilaat käyttävät kaiken vapautensa mikä heille annetaan.” – ”In my opinion student use all the freedom that is given to them.” (Teacher 2) (B 3)*

There is a certain problem with choice which teacher 2 identifies in these two segments. The first one discusses the issue of not being able to choose from all the options. Previously in segments coded A 3, it was identified that some teachers give their students limitless option in a manner of do whatever you wish. Teacher writes that students might enjoy freedom at first, but students might be overwhelmed by the sheer lack of boundaries.

Teacher 2 mentions that with situations where choices are very loosely limited, some students can be able to handle the amount of possibilities but the majority will grow frustrated. This segment backs up the argument of that the students are possibly not used to freedom in education.

However, teacher 2 lastly writes that the students use all the freedom that they are given. When compared to the previous two segments, based on the third segment it can be argued that despite the possibility of overwhelming freedom, students might desire more freedom and if given will take advantage of it all.

*”(Vastuuta ottamalla) Tällöin oppilaan vapaus ja oikeudet koulussa myös kasvavat.” – ”(By taking responsibility) Then do the students freedom and rights in the school increase.”(Teacher 4) (B 3)*

*”(Vaihtoehtoja annettaessa)- -eli oppilaat voivat vaikuttaa siihen, miten haluavat oppia.” – ”(When provided options)- -ergo students can affect, what they want to learn.” (Teacher 5) (B 3)*

Teacher 4 writes that by giving responsibility to the students, the rights and freedom of students can increase. The teacher can be interpreted to suggest that if a student becomes capable of taking responsibility, a teacher can then increase the freedom and rights of the student. This segment can be seen as being in connection to the argument about educating the students for freedom.

Teacher 5 writes that sometimes students can affect the ways of learning. The segment can be interpreted to state that in situations where options are provided, the students become capable of affecting what and how they want to learn. In a way, choices give the students options to take responsibility of their own education.

*"Vapaus esitetään koulussa monta kertaa näissä mainitsemisani yksinkertaisissa tilanteissa (paperi, kynäväri)." – "Freedom is presented in schools quite a lot as I mentioned in simple situations (paper, color of pen)." (Teacher 2) (C 3)*

*"Alakoulussa etenkin vapaus näyttäytyy pienissä asioissa – valinnanvapaus tekemisessä, vastaanottamisessa ja antamisessa." – "In primary school especially freedom can be seen in small things – freedom to choose in doing, receiving and giving." (Teacher 2) (C 3)*

Teacher 2 writes in these two segments of the practicality of choices. In the first segment the teacher writes of being able to choose simple things in simple situations: students can choose what kind of paper, what paper color to use or what kind of pen to use etc. Simple choices might be the starting point towards a broader freedom.

Teacher 2 writes that freedom of choice is also present in doing, receiving and giving. Freedom of choice in doing is possibly related to various ways of doing things and how a student might have the freedom to choose from various ways of doing a certain task or a piece of work. The teacher might be referring to receiving as critical thinking perhaps with writing about freedom in receiving. Freedom to choose how to receive information from lessons: freedom to question and freedom to ponder about the things that the teacher tries to teach to the students. Freedom in giving can possibly be about freedom to choose how much a student gives or takes part in lessons. The students have a choice of how much they interact with the teachers, staff and other students and since no one is forcing them to be active, in a way they have the freedom to choose themselves.

*"(Vapaus valita opiskeltava oppiaine) - -ja sehän lisääntyy yläkoulussa ja esim. toisen asteen koulutuksessa." – "(Freedom to choose what subject to study) - - and this increases in junior high school and eq. Upper secondary school." (Teacher 2) (C 3)*

Freedom in primary schools is a dimension of education that gradually seems to increase through education, responsibility and aging of students. Teacher 2 writes that the school grade and school level also affects how much freedom the students experience. The teacher can be interpreted to argue that upper secondary schools in general provide more freedom than primary schools.

*"Nykyinen suomalainen peruskoulu tajoaa mahdollisuuksia akateemisesti suuntautuneille oppilaille jättäen muunlaiset oppijat syrjään." – "The primary comprehensive school of*

*today's Finland provides possibilities for academically oriented students leaving the different kind of learners aside.” (Teacher 5) (C 3)*

*”Peruskoulu on perustettu osittain juuri tälle päämäärälle: jotta jokaisella olisi mahdollisuus kiivetä yhteiskunnan tikkaita ylös riippumatta omista lähtökohdistaan.” -  
 ”Comprehensive school has been been partly founded on this very objective: so everyone would have a possibility to climb up the ladder of society no matter the starting point.”  
 (Teacher 5) (C 3)*

Teacher 5 writes that the educational possibilities in primary schools are mostly oriented towards academically oriented students. Teacher 5, therefore, can be interpreted to argue that the choices in school are not equal for all students, as the ones who are more capable in academics have more options.

Teacher 5 also writes comprehensive school system was partly founded on the principle that all students would be given equal opportunities in order to advance in the ranks of society. This second segment can be interpreted to be in contradiction with the academically oriented possibilities as all students most likely are not equally oriented towards academic subjects.

#### 5.2.4 Rules

In this section the analysis moves to the thematic category (coded 4) which deals with rules in the context of freedom. The segments deal with teacher freedom and the rules and guidelines of the curriculum, what rules the students are subjected to, and the coercive nature of compulsory education.

*”Opettajilla on pedagoginen vapaus Suomen peruskouluissa, jolloin opettajat voivat opettaa opetussuunnitelmassa mainitut asiat omalla tyylillään.” – ”Teachers have pedagogical freedom in Finnish comprehensive schools, which means that they can teach themes of the curriculum in a manner of their choosing.” (Teacher 4) (A 4)*

*”Yksittäisenä opettajana minulla ei tietenkään ole absoluuttista vapautta näissäkään päätöksissä.” – ”As a single teacher of course I do not have absolute freedom in these decisions either.” (Teacher 3) (A4)*



The thematic category starts with the segments coded A 4 (Teacher and rules) and the first two segments explore the dimensions of teacher freedom vs. school and curriculum rules. Teacher 4 states that teachers in Finnish primary schools have pedagogical freedom in terms of how and what they can teach. This pedagogical freedom, however, is bound by the topics, themes and regulations that are found in the Finnish national core curriculum.

Teacher 3 comments that as a single teacher one does not have absolute freedom. This segment thus suggests that absolute freedom even for teachers do not exist, as freedom seems to be always limited by something or as can be argued based on the previous analysis in this thesis, by someone. Absolute freedom is an abstraction that is impossible, even for the ones in control and the ones wielding the authority.

*"- enää opettajat eivät saa kurittaa oppilaitaan fyysisesti ja yleisesti asiaan puututaan, jos sellaista on havaittu." – "-no more can the teacher discipline their students physically, and should this be noticed, it is intervened in." (Teacher 4) (A 4)*

Teacher 4 comments that the teachers are no longer allowed to use corporal punishment to discipline students, and should this happen it is quickly intervened in. Based on this comment it can be argued that even with the pedagogical freedom that is mentioned in the previous segment by teacher 2, teachers have had more freedom in the past in terms of authority and supervision. The authority of teachers is bound by rules and these rules form the frame in which the teachers are free to make pedagogical decisions.

*"Laki määrittelee, että jokaisen oppilaan on suoritettava 9 vuotinen oppivelvollisuus tavalla tai toisella opetussuunnitelman mukaan." – "Law dictates, that every student must accomplish the nine-year compulsory education one way or another according to the national core curriculum." (Teacher 1) (B 4)*

Teacher 1 writes that the students are first and foremost bound by the law of compulsory education. Every student must pass the nine-year long compulsory education and accomplish the goals set in the national core curriculum. The segment can be interpreted to state that by law students do not have a choice whether to take part in education or not. They have to attend and they have to be able to complete compulsory education in a satisfactory manner in relation to the national core curriculum.

*"Kun olen kertonut tämän "säännön" etukäteen - ja sitten myöhemmin pyytänyt kaverin kanssa höpötelevää oppilasta siirtymään eri istumapaikalle - ovat nämä oppilaat lähes*

*poikkeuksetta mukisematta hyväksyneet tämän toimintamallin.” – ”When I have informed the students of this ”rule” beforehand – and then asked a student’s friend who has disturbed a lesson to move to a different seat – have these students almost everytime accepted this action without any resistance.”(Teacher 2) (B 4)*

Teacher 2 writes that rules that are made known to students are more easily accepted. This segment therefore suggests that when the freedom of students is limited by rules, those rules need to be made known. The teacher can be interpreted to mention that the students accept the actions of the authority when they know what rule the authority is acting upon.

*”(Oppilaat jotka valitsevat olemaan tekemättä mitään) Sellaisia oppilaita kutsutaan ’ongelmallisiksi’.” – ”(Students who choose to do nothing) Those kind of students are called ’problematic’.” (Teacher 3) (B 4)*

*”Voisin kuvitella, että monet oppilaat myös näkevät olevansa luokanopettajiesä ”pakkovallan” alla, - -” – ” I can imagine how many students also see themselves to be under the ’oppression’ of their teachers, - -” (Teacher 4) (B 4)*

Teacher 3 writes that students who choose to do nothing are labelled as ”the problematic ones” in schools. If the students making the choice to not do anything are seen as problematic, the segment can be interpreted to state that in schools exists a rule that a student must take part in the educational work. Students are expected to choose to work, and obey the rules since should they choose to not do so, they are given the label of a ”problem child.”

As the students are under quite a lot of rules and various limitations, teacher 4 writes that many students might see themselves as being under the oppression of the teacher. Possibly some students see this oppression to be caused by the school as an institution, since schools are authoritarian by nature. The feeling of oppression can also be strengthened if disobeying causes one to be seen as problematic.

*”Lasten oikeudet takaavat kuitenkin perusturvan opetuksessa ja oikeuden syrjimättömään opetukseen ja ylipäänsä koulutukseen,- -” – ”Children’s rights guarantee basic security in education and a right to discrimination free education along with education on the whole, - -”(Teacher 5) (B 4)*

Teacher 5 identifies some rules that grant students certain freedoms and rights in schools. The teacher writes that the children’s rights by the UN grant the students basic educational

security along with the right to an education that is free of discrimination. By international law and rules, the education of students should therefore be equal in nature. The rules that students are subject to can be both granting and limiting.

*"Oppilaiden uskonnonvapaus myös on ollut näkyvimpiä muutoksia suomalaisessa koulussa." – "The freedom of religion for students has been one of the most visible changes in Finnish schools." (Teacher 5) (B 4)*

*"Oppilailla on omassa luokassani ilmaisun vapaus, - -" – "Students in my class have freedom of expression, - -"(Teacher 3) (B 4)*

Teachers 5 and 3 give examples of what rules are the students under. In the first segment teacher 5 mentions that the freedom of religion has been one of the most visible changes in the Finnish primary school, although this is not elaborated further. The rules and regulations in the national core curriculum now grant the students the freedom to exercise and belong to any religious group, and they also have the right to participate in religious studies of their own orientation should they be available.

Teacher 3 writes that students in his/her class have freedom of expression, and therefore a rule in the classroom exists that the students are free to express themselves without discrimination, without being silenced or without being ignored. Since the teacher specifically mentions that in the teachers class a rule for freedom of speech exists, the teacher might be suggesting that this kind of rule possibly does not exist generally in schools.

*"Menemme enemmistön mielipiteen mukaan eivätkä siis yksittäiset oppilaat ole aina vapaita tekemään mitä haluavat vaan he ovat 'kollektiivisesti vapaita'." – "We go with the opinion of the majority and therefore individual students are not free to do what they want but are 'collectively free'." (Teacher 3) (B 4)*

*"Koko koulujärjestelmä perustuu oppivelvollisuuteen, - -" – "The entire schooling institution is based on compulsory education, - -"(Teacher 1) (C 4)*

Teacher 1 points out in this segment that the whole schooling institution is based on the idea of compulsory education. The rule in schools above all others for the students is that education is compulsory. Students come to school whether they like it or not.

*”- sekä opettajien että oppilaiden tulee noudattaa opetushallituksen määrittelemiä tavoitteita, koulun opetussuunnitelmaa ja koulun sääntöjä.” – ”Both teachers and students need to follow the goals defined by the national board of education.” (Teacher 5) (C 4)*

*”- mutta koska koulu on tavoitteellinen kasvatusinstituutio- -” – ”- but since school is a goal-oriented educational institution- -” (Teacher 2) (C 4)*

Schools and teachers inside the schools are bound by rules that dictate various things. Teacher 5 mentions that both teachers and students must obey the goals that have been set for them by the national board of education. The teachers must follow the rules and plan the education in a way that aims to fulfill the goals set in the national core curriculum, and the students must obey the school rules that have been set in place by the staff and authorities of the school. However, teacher 5 also mentions that the school rules apply for the teachers as well.

Teacher 2 writes that school is after all a goal-oriented institution. The national board of education provides these goals in the form of the curriculum and the schools follow the goals mentioned in it. In a way the rule above all else for schools is that they are bound by the national core curriculum, since the schools exist to fulfill educational goals.

*”Opetussuunnitelmat määrittelevät, mitä opetetaan ja opetuksen arvopohjan, mutta nekin ovat aika ylimalkaisia.” – ”Curriculas define, what will be taught and the value basis of education, but even those are rather undetailed.” (Teacher 3)(C 4)*

The role of the curricula is discussed further in this segment by teacher 3, and the teacher points out that the curricula define what the teachers will teach and what values they need to base education on, but the goals and values set in the curricula are undetailed. Therefore the teachers and schools are left with interpreting and implementing the goals to the best of their ability. This refers to the theme of rules because the segment is suggesting further that schools and teachers have an obligation to follow the rules set in curricula, both on a national and regional level.

*”Koulussa on paljon pakkoja.” – ”There is a lot of coercion in school.” (Teacher 3) (C 4)*

*”On pakko tulla kouluun, tehdä läksyt, tehdä kokeita, olla hiljaa.” – ”You have to come to school, do your homework, attend tests, be quiet.” (Teacher 3) (C 4)*

Teacher 3 writes that in schools there is a lot of coercion. The teacher therefore can be interpreted to state that schools are coercive environments that state what a student needs to do and how to behave. In the second segment the teacher further elaborates on the kinds of coercion by mentioning that students have to come to the school, have to do their homework, have to attend tests and exams in the school and lastly have to be quiet.

*”Säännöt luovat oppilaille turvaa, joka on peruskouluikäisille tärkeää.” – ”The rules provide security for the students, which is important for primary school aged children.” (Teacher 4)(C 4)*

The rules have a deeper meaning however; as teacher 4 writes that rules in school create security, which is important for young students. Besides providing and enforcing a controllable environment for the school authority, the rules also make sure that the students have a safe environment in which to function and engage in activities both on and off lessons.

*”(Vastuun kasvaminen) Tämä ei kuitenkaan tarkoita sitä, että oppilaat eivät joutuisi noudattamaan sovittuja koulun sääntöjä.” – ”(Increasing responsibility) This however does not mean that, the students should not have to follow the school rules.”(Teacher 4) (C 4)*

Teacher 4 writes that although the students might gain more freedom and more independence, it does not still mean that they do not have to obey the school rules. Rules are always in place, and always need to be obeyed as they provide the boundaries of what can and cannot be done in the school.

*”Esim. kouluruokailussa on sovittu, että täytyy opetella käyttäytymään hyvien ruokailutapojen mukaisesti (syödä haarukalla ja veitsellä jne.), ottaa lautaselle kaikkea mitä linjastolla tarjotaan ja maistella kaikkea lautasella olevaa.” – ”Eg. We have agreed, that in the school lunch you need to learn to behave according to good table manners (eat with a fork and a knife etc.), take on your plate everything there is during the lunch and taste everything you have on your plate.” (Teacher 2) (C 4)*

*”Eli ruokaa täytyy kunnioittaa ja opetella maistamaan, mutta pakko ei ole syödä kaikkea tai tykätä siitä.” – ”Therefore you need to respect the food and learn to taste, but you do not have to eat everything nor like it.” (Teacher 2) (C 4)*

Although the rules of a school build a safe environment, various practical rules also exist. Teacher 2 writes that related to school lunch which obligates the students to try everything the school lunch has to offer, but this rule does not obligate the students to force themselves to like everything. The teacher starts the first segment by writing that "we have agreed" and thus suggests that the rule was made between a number of people. Possibly the teacher is referring to the teacher and students as "we", and this suggests that students can be made part of rule creation.

### 5.2.5 Motivation and self-regulation

This chapter moves onto the next thematic category (5) of motivation and self-regulation. The segments in this category explore the boundaries of teacher and student motivation, self-regulatory skills and starting points of self-regulation in terms of freedom, and the possible outcomes of a motivating environment and freedom.

*"Jos muu henkilökunta kannustaa esimerkillään oman opettajuuden tunnistamiseen ja rohkeisiin opetusmenetelmiin, niin uskoisin varsinkin uusien opettajien olevan rohkeampia opettamaan omaan tyyliinsä." – "If the rest of the staff encourages with their example to find one's own teacher identity and to use also bold teaching methods, then I believe especially the new teachers to be braver teach in their own style." (Teacher 4) (A 5)*

The data brings up the motivation of teachers in terms of how much freedom they feel themselves to be able to take. Earlier in the analysis, school staff was seen as having a large impact on the freedom of the school environment. Teacher 4 writes that if the rest of the staff encourage with their example the younger teachers, this can possibly give the younger teachers courage to try and teach more in their own style, and to educate the students with more freedom in their work.

*(" - - tunteeko opettaja, että vapautta on hyväksyttävää käyttää?" – "- - "does a teacher feel that freedom is acceptable to be used?" (Teacher 4) (A 5)*

Teacher 4 asks if a teacher feels that it is acceptable to use freedom. The segment can be interpreted to state that also the attitude and motivation of a single teacher can limit freedom. A teacher might not be motivated to give students freedom and choices, or a teacher might not see freedom as acceptable behavior primary school environment.

*"Oppilailta odotetaan oma-aloitteisuutta, - -" – "The students are expected initiative, - -"*  
(Teacher 2) (B 5)

*"(vapautuneisuus) - -tavoiteltava tunnetila esim. luokkatyöskentelyssä." – "(Emancipation) - - a desired emotional state eg. in a working situation in a class room." (Teacher 2)*  
(B 5)

For segments coded with B 5, the analysis starts with two segments from teacher 2. These segments explore the dimensions of self-regulation through what is expected and desired from the students. In the first segment the teacher mentions that the students are expected to show initiative. The teachers and staff require and expect the students to have enough self-regulatory skills and motivation to show initiative. The second segment mentions that in a regular classroom work situation, the feeling of emancipation is a desired emotional state for the student. Thus the teacher can be interpreted to suggest that lessons and education should be planned in such a way that would give the students means to feel empowered.

*"Jos vaikka oppilaalla olisikin tarve olla vapaa opetuksesta, ja vaikka leikkiä - ja toisaalta koulun antamassa lukujärjestyksessä lukee klo 10-11 äidinkieltä – tarpeet koulun ja yksilön välillä eivät ikäänkuin kohtaa." – "Say if a students would feel the need to be free from teaching, and would want to play – and on the other hand the school time table would say that the lesson from 10-11 is finnish – the needs of the school and the individual are not meeting in a way." (Teacher 2) (B 5)*

*"Tämän nimenomaisen oppilaan kohdalla liikkuminen tai sormin laskeminen voi kuitenkin edistää oppimista tai helpottaa olemista yleensä." – "With this particular student, movement or counting with fingers can advance learning or ease the students being in general." (Teacher 1) (B5)*

Teacher 1 and teacher 2 discuss the disconnect of student interests and motivation versus the school goals and needs. In the first segment teacher 2 ponders this relation by describing a situation where a student might have the urge to choose to do activities that would have meaning for the student, but at the same time the school as a coercive environment makes the student study a certain subject which might not be what the student himself/herself would choose.

In the latter segment, teacher 1 writes that students might have habits or mannerisms that have an influence on their concentration and/or learning. Schools tend to discourage unwanted and disruptive behaviour, and the teacher argues in the segment that some of this "unwanted behaviour" might have an activating effect on the students concentration and improve their learning.

*"Jokainen yksilö varmasti rakastaa haluamaansa vapautta." – "Every individual surely loves the freedom that they desire." (Teacher 2) (B 5)*

*"(Vapautta) - -tai jos vastaanottaja ei sitä halua, muuttuu tilanne ja vapaus haastavaksi." – "(Freedom) - - or if the recipient does not want it, the situation along with the freedom becomes tricky." (Teacher 2) (B 5)*

In these two segment can be seen an interesting contradiction, as teacher 2 first claims that every individual surely loves the freedom that they desire, and in the second segment the teacher writes that if an authority tries to give freedoms but the recipient does not want to accept the offered freedom, the situation can become challenging. The teacher thus can be interpreted as suggesting that situations exist in school in which the students might not be receptive towards freedom.

*"Esimerkiksi olen havainnut lukuisia kertoja, että vapaus voi alakoululaisen mielestä olla myös hyvin ahdistavaa." – "For example I have noticed numerous times, that freedom can be very distressing for a primary school student." (Teacher 2) (B 5)*

In relation to the previous two segments, teacher 2 writes that through experience has the teacher noticed in numerous occasions that freedom can be very distressing for students. Based on this segment and the previous discussion of growing into freedom, the teacher possibly is suggesting that students can become distressed with too much freedom as they might lack the necessary competences.

*"Huomasin oman luokkani kanssa, että he eivät olleet vuoden alussa tottuneet siihen, että saisivat vaikuttaa omaan koulunkäyntiinsä tai valita, mitä haluaisivat tehdä tai miten." – "I noticed with my own class, that in the beginning of the year the students were not ready to affect their own education, or choose what they would like to do or how." (Teacher 3) (B 5)*



*”Osalla oma itseohjautuvuus on niin harjoittamatonta ja heikkoa, että vapautta ei välttämättä osata edes käyttää.” – ”For some self-regulation is so un-practised and weak, that the students are unable to know how to use freedom.” (Teacher 5) (B 5)*

*”Aina vapauden antaminen ei ole toivottu asia, varsinkin jos ei tiedä mitä sillä pitäisi tehdä.” – ”Giving freedom is not always desired, especially if one does not know what to do with it.” (Teacher 2) (B 5)*

Teacher 3 writes that he/she noticed with her class that in the beginning of the school year the students were not yet used to the fact that they could have a say in the class room. According to the data, the students are not naturally adept at taking part in the decision making regarding their education as this is mentioned in numerous segments and this segment can be seen to emphasize this as well.

Teacher 3 writes that some students can lack so much in self-regulation, that they simply do not know what to do with freedom. This segment by teacher 3 also relates to a previous segment in which it was claimed that unwanted freedom might cause anxiety in students. It can be assumed that a student lacking the self-regulation needed to function efficiently in a free environment can feel very distressed if this freedom is too much to handle. Teacher 2 writes that freedom is not always desirable, and thus the segment can be seen to suggest that giving freedom is not an option if one does not know what to do with it.

*”Tämän kokemuksen perusteella sanoisin, että oppilaiden pitää oppia käyttämään vapauksiaan ja vaatimaan niitä.” – ”Based on this experience I would say, that the students need to learn how to use their freedoms and to demand them.” (Teacher 3) (B 5)*

Teacher 3 states that according to experience, the students need to learn how to use the freedom that they are given and also to demand it. The teacher is therefore implying that it is not enough that one merely knows how to use freedom, but it is also very important to know what freedoms one is entitled to. Understanding the nature and purpose of freedom seems to be therefore equally important to the competences needed for a freedom based environment.

*”Yleensä oppilaita motivoi oma tahto oppia tai kiinnostus ja oppimisen ilo - -” – ”Usually the students are motivated by their own desire to learn or interest and the joy of learning.” (Teacher 3) (B 5)*

*”- -mutta myös ryhmäpaine ja pelko, että vanhemmat saavat tietää, jos pöljäälee.” – ”- - but also peer pressure and fear, that parents will find out if one goofies around. (Teacher 3) (B 5)*

Teacher 3 writes about the motivation of students and where it comes from. The teacher writes that the students are motivated by their innate desire to learn, their own interest and the joy of learning, but also by peer pressure and fear of their parents finding out if they mess around or if they do not do well in school.

*”`Saun huonoja numeroita kokeista, täten olen tyhmä enkä kelpaa’ on hyvin yleinen käsitys itsestään jo nuorten oppilaiden keskuudessa.” – ”`I get bad grades in tests, therefore I am stupid and not good enough’ is a very common perception of identity even among the young students.” (Teacher 5) (B 5)*

*”- - ja jopa edesauttaen syrjäytymistä, sillä alituinen epäonnistuminen akateemisissa aineissa vaikuttaa oppilaiden itsetuntoon ja identiteetin rakentumiseen.” – ”- - and even as much as support alienation, since continuous failure in academic subjects affects the students’ self-esteem and identity building.” (Teacher 5) (B 5)*

Teacher 5 explores the consequences of losing motivation with these two segments. In the first segment the teacher describes a thought-process that the teacher claims to be common among primary school-aged children. Constant underachieving in tests etc. can affect the self-esteem and motivation of students. In the second segment the teacher writes that this constant failure in academic subjects can have an effect on the students’ self-esteem, self-image and can ultimately support alienation.

*”Ns. vääränlainen oma-aloitteisuus ja itsetietoisuus ja samalla vapaus ovat liioitellusti tavallaan koulun vihollisia.” – ”Wrong kind of initiative and self-consciousness, as it were, along with freedom are in a way enemies of the school to put it exaggeratedly.” (Teacher 2)(C 5)*

Although according to the data student are expected to show initiative, teacher 2 writes that wrong kind of initiative and self-consciousness together with freedom can in a way be enemies of the school. In the section 6.2.2 teacher 2 mentioned that the initiative of the students should in a way be teacher-approved. While acting independently, the actions of students should be in line with what the teacher has planned. Deviating from what the teacher sees fit for the students might therefore be this wrong kind of initiative that teacher

2 is describing. Therefore it can be interpreted that student initiative is of the proper kind when it is predictable and controllable.

*”- - ja toimivat koulussa vapautuneesti.” – ”and function in school in an emancipated fashion.” (Teacher 2) (C 5)*

*”Niin henkilökohtaisella vapautuneisuudella kuin sosiaalisellakin vapautuneisuudella on hyvin suuri merkitys olemassaoloon ja motivaatioon niin koulussa kuin muutenkin elämässä.” – ”Both personal and social emancipation play a very important part in being and motivation in school as well as generally in life.” (Teacher 2) (C 5)*

Teacher 2 writes about emancipation in the context of self-regulation and motivation. The teacher claims that emancipation has a large effect on motivation both in and outside of education. The teacher therefore emphasizes the significance of emancipation in developing motivation.

*”Opetus voi olla mielestäni laadukasta vain, jos oppilaat kokevat sen mieluiseksi” – ”In my opinion teaching can have good quality, only when the students experience it as enjoyable.” (Teacher 2) (C 5)*

Emancipation and motivation also link very deeply to the quality of education and teaching. Teacher 2 comments of the nature of teaching by writing that teaching can be qualified as good only when the students experience it as meaningful and enjoyable. Students are motivated towards lessons that they enjoy and see meaning in.

*”Parhaimmillaan, kannustavassa ilmapiirissä, opettajien vapaudella voidaan löytää opettamiseen ja oppimiseen hyvinkin innovatiivisia ratkaisuja.” – ”At its best, in a supportive environment, can very innovative solutions be found to teaching and learning through teacher freedom.” (Teacher 3)(C 5)*

Creating a motivating and supporting environment for the students is not the only concern, as teacher 3 states that at its best can a supportive environment in which teachers have the freedom to explore their own teaching, can the teachers develop very innovative and progressive methods of teaching. The segment can be interpreted to suggest that freedom paired with motivation and support can therefore give space for creation and innovation.

### 5.2.6 Responsibility

The sixth thematic category is about responsibility and in this part of analysis the teachers write about how the freedom of students can increase through responsibility, the conditionality and relation of freedom and responsibility and understanding what responsibility is in terms of freedom.

*”Oppilaan vastuu voi kasvaa, kun opettaja antaa oppilaalle pikku hiljaa pieniä vastuutehtäviä ja luottotoimia.” – ”The responsibility of a student can increase when a teacher gives the student little by little more responsibilities and trusted work.” (Teacher 2) (A 6)*

As discussed in the part 6.2.2 of the analysis, freedom is given by the authority from above. Teacher 2 writes that the teacher can increase the students’ freedom by giving responsibilities little by little. Giving freedom in this way can be interpreted to have two aims: firstly the teacher is broadening the student freedom in general, and secondly the teacher is educating the students to take on more responsibility.

*”Alakouluikäinen ei useinkaan vielä osaa ajatella vapauden mukana tulevaa vastuullisuutta.” – ”A primary school aged child often cannot yet consider the responsibility that comes with freedom.” (Teacher 2) (B 6)*

Teacher 2 writes that a child in the primary school age is not yet capable to think of the responsibility that comes with freedom. In the same manner as with many segments from previous thematic categories, besides lacking the necessary self-regulation and skills to behave properly with given freedom, the children are also seen as not being able to recognize the interwoven relationship of freedom and responsibility. The teacher can be seen to give another strong view on how children need to be educated into freedom, but also into the responsibility that comes with it.

*”Myös oppilailla vapaus ja vastuu kulkevat käsi kädessä.” – ”Also for students do freedom and responsibility walk hand in hand.” (Teacher 4) (B 6)*

*”- ja toisaalta sen, että siitä vastineeksi tulee sitten se vastuukin.” – ”- and on the hand, in return comes the responsibility.” (Teacher 2) (B 6)*

Freedom and responsibility is seen as inseparable in the segments of the teachers, and these two segments can be seen to emphasize this. Teacher 4 writes that freedom and responsi-

bility are inseparable even for students, as freedom seems to not exist without responsibility. This argument relates to the idea that proving to take responsibility can enable the increase of freedom.

*"Tähän liittyy ehto (vastuu),- -" - " This comes with a condition (responsibility,- -" (Teacher 2) (B 6)*

Teacher 2 writes that responsibility is linked to freedom as a condition. Accepting the responsibility in freedom is the condition to accepting freedom, and responsibility needs to be understood and accepted. The condition of responsibility can be interpreted as innate to freedom.

*"Jokainen osaa ottaa vastaan annetun vapauden, mutta vastuukohtaan unohdetaan palata." - "Everyone can accept the freedom given, but the responsibility of it tends to slip from minds." (Teacher 2) (B 6)*

*"Alakoululainenkin ymmärtää aika helposti, että jos on jo saanut vapautta jostakin, kuuluu se yhtäläillä toisillekin- -" - "Even a primary school child can easily understand that if one has received freedom, this same freedom belongs equally to others- -" (Teacher 2)(B 6)*

Teacher 2 writes about freedom and responsibility and whether primary school aged children are able to handle the responsibility that comes along. The teacher mentions in the first segment that students are capable of accepting and possibly handling the freedom that is given to them, but the responsibility coming along tends to be forgotten. Children who do not yet possess the self-regulatory skills for handling the responsibilities coming with freedom might according to teacher 2 not still yet realize that with freedom, and great power, comes great responsibility.

However, teacher 2 claims that even primary school aged children understand how freedom is equal in terms of their peers. If a student is given freedom, then the students understand that the same freedom belongs equally to others. Students therefore can relate to their peers by realizing how the same freedom they have belongs equally to everyone else. Teacher 2 is therefore suggesting that even young students understand how freedom is socially equal.

*"Mielestäni on tärkeää, että oppilaat saavat vapautta kasvaessaan koko ajan lisää, jos he pystyvät myös vastuuta kantamaan." - "I believe it to be important, that the students can*

*receive more freedom when they grow up, if they can also carry the responsibility.”*  
(Teacher 4) (B 6)

Teacher 4 writes that it is important for the students to gain more freedom if they can handle the responsibility. The segment thus can be interpreted to suggest that responsibility is a condition of freedom, as the teacher writes that with *freedom* needs to increase if the student can *handle responsibility*.

*”Kyseessä on etukäteen annettu vapaus ja vastuullisuuden harjoittelu.” – ”In question is beforehand given freedom and practising responsibility.”*(Teacher 2) (B 6)

*”Oppilas voi esimerkiksi ottaa pikku hiljaa enemmän vastuuta läksyjen teostaan.” – ”A student can for example little by little take more responsibility of doing homework.”*(Teacher 4) (B 6)

Teacher 2 suggests that when a teacher gives the students’ freedom, the situation most always includes a dimension of learning about responsibility. When the students are working in an environment that demands self-regulation because they have more freedom, the situation also always exists in order for the students to train and learn about being responsible and taking on more responsibility. Therefore teacher 2 is suggesting that freedom does not possibly exist merely for the sake of it, but it exists so the students can learn how to be more responsible and to gain more freedom through responsibility.

Teacher 4 writes about examples how the students can take more responsibility, and one concrete way is to little by little take more responsibility in doing one’s own homework. In a primary school context possibly the ways to take responsibility are more related to practical ways. However, based on the argument that has risen in analysis that teachers and authorities give freedom for the subjects, does this increase in responsibility need to be accepted by the authority itself. It would seem that the students cannot on their own take more responsibility but the authority needs to notice the capabilities first.

*”Saat valita mitä nyt teet, kunhan hoidat tämän määrätyn tehtävän jossakin kohtaan” – tyylinen ajattelu ei vielä onnistu moneltakaan alakoululaiselta.”* *”Now you may choose what to do given that you finish the other assignment in due time – sort of thinking does not yet go well with a lot of primary school children.”*(Teacher 2) (B 6)

Teacher 2 writes that quite a many students in primary do not yet have the necessary skills to handle the requirements of what a more free school environment poses. In this segment the teacher is describing a contract between the teacher and a student in which the teacher lets the student decide what to do, but gives another assignment for the student that needs to be done in a certain time frame. Teacher 2 can be interpreted to state that not many students in primary yet can handle or realize what this kind of conditional freedom demands.

*”Osa oppilaista on kykeneväisiä käyttämään vapautta.” – ”Some of the students are capable to use freedom.” (Teacher 5) (B 6)*

*”Oppilaat käyttävät vapautta ja pääsääntöisesti oikein ja vastuullisesti,- -” –” The students use freedom and most of the time in a correct and responsible fashion, - -” (Teacher 4) (B 6)*

Teacher 5 and 4 write about students' capability to handle freedom. Teacher 5 mentions that some of the students are capable to use freedom, but the segment can also be interpreted as stating that majority of students are not capable. Teacher 4 writes about the way students use freedom and states that students use freedom reasonably and responsibly.

### 5.2.7 Nature of freedom

In this seventh and last section of analysis the segments that deal with freedom in general or the nature of freedom are looked at. The teachers write about what freedom as a general concept means in schools, what characteristics it has and do the ideals of freedom and equal opportunities live up to what they promise.

*”Koulussa lapsia kohdellaan ihmisinä, joilla on oikeus sanoa oma mielipiteensä.” – ”In the school the children are treated as human beings, who have the right to voice their opinion.” (Teacher 1) (B 7)*

Teacher 1 comments that freedom means that the students are treated as human beings, who have a right to say what they think. Earlier in the analysis teacher 3, however, wrote that the students might not actually have proper ways to have their voice heard, and that there might exist fit and unfit thoughts.

*”Mutta ei niinkään vapaa yksilö, enemmänkin liialliseen vapauteen perustuva työskentelytyyli...vaikeita asioita.” – ”Although not so much a free individual, but a working style that is based on excess freedom...difficult things.” (Teacher 2) (B 7)*

Teacher 2 earlier in the part 5.2.5 claimed that excess freedom is a challenge for the school and can in a way become an enemy of the school. Teacher 2 continues this train of thought by writing that a free individual is not a threat, but a working style that borders on excessive freedom is. The teacher can be interpreted to suggest that freedom is part of the school, when it is kept in manageable and controllable amounts or under the regulation of authority.

*”Minusta harva oppilas käyttää tätä vapauttaan.” – ”Very few students exercise this freedom in my opinion.” (Teacher 3) (B 7)*

Quite a many times before in the analysis, the teachers have mentioned that students might not be capable to handle or use freedom from the start. Teacher 3 writes that very few students exercise their freedom. The teacher can be interpreted to suggest that freedom exists in schools but the students are not actively exercising it.

*”Suomalaisessa koulussa vapaus ei ehkä näy niinkään pedagogisissa asioissa” – ”In the Finnish school freedom might not be seen in pedagogical things.” (Teacher 1) (C 7)*

According to teacher 1, the way freedom manifests itself in Finnish primary schools is not always in the pedagogy. Teacher 1 can be interpreted to suggest that freedom is something else than only education. As freedom is not seen in pedagogy, teacher 2 is thus suggesting that freedom is something beyond pedagogy.

*”Monesti oppilaiden vapaus on luokassani ehdollista ja demokraattista.” – ”Quite a many times the freedom of students in my class is conditional and democratic.” (Teacher 3) (C 7)*

*”Vapaus näyttäytyy demokratian harjoittelulla joissain kouluissa tai luokissa.” – ”Freedom takes the form of practising democratic procedures in some schools and classrooms.” (Teacher 5) (C 7)*

Both teacher 3 and teacher 5 write that freedom takes the form of democratic practices. Teacher 3 mentions that in the classroom freedom a lot of times is both conditional and democratic. The conditionality of freedom was discussed earlier in the part 5.2.6 when



analyzing the segments that dealt with responsibility. The teachers make an argument that freedom in primary schools is both democracy and learning about democratic practices. Teacher 5 however, mentions that freedom takes the form of democracy and learning about it only in some schools and classrooms.

*"Vapautta on minusta äärimmäisen vähän." – "I believe that there is extremely little freedom." (Teacher 2)(C 7)*

*"Vapautta tulisi olla minusta sopivasti." – "I believe there should be a decent amount of freedom." (Teacher 2) (C 7)*

Teacher 2 writes about the amount of freedom in education in two segments. In the first the teacher states that there is extremely little freedom. In the second segment teacher 2 writes that there should be a decent amount of freedom. From these two segments the teacher can be interpreted to arguing that in education there is very little freedom and it should be increased.

*"Sitä voitaisiin monellakin tapaa lisätä yksilötasolla,- -" – "It could be in many ways be increased on individual level, - -" (Teacher 2) (C 7)*

Teacher 2 continues to write about the amount of freedom, and state that on the individual level the amount freedom could be increased in a number of ways. What these ways are do not get elaborated, but this segment seems to suggest that increasing freedom is a process starting from the level of individuals rather than from a collective perspective.

*"Näissä puitteissa vapaus on haaste." – "Within these frames freedom is a challenge." (Teacher 2) (C 7)*

Teacher 2 then mentions that within these frames freedom is a challenge. Freedom does not exist for the students in large amounts, but there should be enough of it. Too much freedom becomes a threat to education and the school, yet it can be argued that freedom is possible to be increased on the individual level. Freedom as a concept or how much freedom is enough seems to be a rather confusing and unclear idea.

*"Mutta jollain tavallahan tuo pakko on illuusio." – "But in some way this coercion is an illusion." (Teacher 3) (C 7)*

Although the schools seem to be environments that are by definition coercive, teacher 3 disagrees and writes that in a way this coercion is an illusion. This segment can be interpreted as stating how there does seem to exist quite a lot of freedom in schools, as the coercion can be an illusion. Even though the students might not have choices in terms of education, the teacher is possibly suggesting illusion of coercion can quite easily be broken by choosing otherwise or by not complying.

*”Esimerkiksi tilanteissa, jolloin yksilön vapaudentarve ei kohtaa koulun tarvetta.” – ”For example in situations, when the individuals need for freedom does not meet with the schools need.” (Teacher 2) (C 7)*

Teacher 2 writes how there are situations where the individuals need for freedom does not meet with the needs of the school. Schools are institutions that are driven by certain educational goals, and these goals might be in contradiction with the need for freedom of students.

*”Vapaus on myös sitä, että voi olla rauhassa oma itsensä, esim. pukeutua haluamallaan tavalla ja ilmaista mielipiteensä.” – ”Freedom is also that you can be yourself, and for example dress the way you like and voice your opinions.” (D 7)*

Lastly freedom in primary schools is identified as freedom of identity. One has the right to e.g. dress the way one likes and also to voice individual opinions, yet in previous thematic categories there has been a number of disagreements on whether the students really have the freedom to voice their opinion. However, this segment strongly identifies freedom in primary schools as essentially freedom of identity.

### **5.3 Summary of the findings**

In this section the main findings of the analysis will be summarized.

From the data it could be derived that school institution in general is seen as an embodiment of limits. There are a great number of limitations and restrictions in place from the first day a student sets foot in school, and the most fundamental limit being the compulsory nature of school. The data could be interpreted to express skepticism towards student freedom along with a belief that student freedom might be almost non-existent. The data identifies the limits and rules in schools mainly as one of two types: 1. what can or cannot be done; 2. how something can or cannot be done.

However, the data also can be interpreted to argue that the limits of primary school are not only about what can and cannot be done, but also stretch to the thoughts and minds of students: what can be thought and what can be voiced. The teachers seem to suggest that fit and unfit thoughts can exist for a school environment. According to the data, the teachers are concerned that students are not being listened to on a grand scale. Freedom is mentioned to contain the right to voice one's own opinions, but based on the data this can be in contradiction with the concern that students might not be listened to.

However, in the data the teachers can be interpreted to suggest that situations, in which the students have a chance to direct their own learning, can contribute to increasing freedom. The data emphasizes the importance of rules in relation to freedom, and can be interpreted to state that increased student freedom does not mean that the school rules need not be obeyed.

The educational goals of Finland have been decided in the national core curriculum, which all schools and teachers must follow and in this sense the authorities of school do not have absolute freedom. Furthermore, the national core curriculum is seen to provide rather clear restrictions for students what can and cannot be studied. The data also suggests that even though the school institution limits and restricts the freedom of students in various ways, there are restrictions coming from outside.

The data describes freedom in education as a top-down process. Freedom can be interpreted as given to the students by an authority, and the same authority monitors how freedom is used. Freedom would seem to not exist without an authority. If an authority grants freedom for students, the same authority can then take the freedom away and in this way freedom in education is suggested to be an element that can and will always be regulated.

Freedom in education according to data is about practical choices. Students sometimes are granted the freedom to choose e.g. where to sit, who to pair up with, what topic they will write about etc. However, the data also seems to suggest that choices should follow an educational plan and expectations of the teacher. The data can be seen to identify a contradiction as the needs of students and school might not meet. In a school environment where students are given freedom of choice, the interests of a student can be in contradiction with the educational goals of the school.

The data also suggests that freedom in a school environment cannot simply be sprung on the students. The students need to be eased into using freedom, allowed to little by little learn how to use freedom. According to the data, students at first can lack the competences needed for freedom based environment but learn through responsibility. While learning responsibility, the students develop self-regulation which helps them reflect on their own behavior and know what actions break the boundaries of freedom.

Freedom according to data is seen as conditional. Freedom given by the authority always holds conditions in form of rules, and the students need to understand these conditions. Freedom is seen an extension of student responsibility that the authority monitors, and when the conditions are breached, the authority acts. The data suggests also that with increased responsibility, freedom needs to increase as well. The students can and need to be gradually given more choices, and therefore more freedom. Freedom therefore also has a condition that when the students are responsible enough, they can gain more freedom.

According to the data, the students can sometimes not be receptive towards freedom. It can be interpreted that students lacking the needed self-regulation can experience situations involving freedom as distressing. Based on the data students might desire freedom but can reject it possibly because freedom is seen as uncomfortable if the students do not yet possess the necessary self-regulation. However, the analysis also suggests that once the students understand the nature and responsibilities of freedom, they usually use it responsibly. Despite this, the data suggests that at some point students will possibly test the boundaries of freedom.

The freedom of choice according to the data is also seen as problematic. Although, the choices for students are usually practical, the data suggests that even simple choices include a number of sub choices. To conclude, too much freedom can become stressful especially for smaller children, as the choices along with sub choices can become overwhelmingly complex.

## 6 Reliability and validity

In this part the concepts of reliability and validity will be briefly defined through methodological literature of qualitative research, and both concepts will be discussed in reference to this thesis.

Reliability is equated with trustworthiness or dependability and predictability, and therefore is related to how trustworthy and predictable the results of the research are (Steinke, 2004, p. 186). Validity according to Hesse-Biber et al. is identified as a process whereby the researcher earns the confidence of the reader that the researcher has "gotten it right", and trustworthiness takes the place of truth (2011, p. 48).

As the research methodology gives a lot of choice for the researcher, and the data coding process involves a lot of interpretation, the reliability of the thesis can be a bit unclear. The study is not claimed to be completely objective and my own subjectivities are accepted to alter the analysis, but if another person would do the same study with the same coding frame, the results possibly would end up at least somewhat different. However, even with acknowledging the subjective interpretation, the results are derived in a logical and systematic fashion. Analysis has been done in the same manner throughout the data, and findings are presented systematically.

In terms of validity the biggest concern is the coding frame, and as valid to the extent that the categories represent the concepts of the research question. However, validity of a coding frame is not either valid or invalid, but it is valid to a certain degree. (Schreier, 2012, p. 175). Schreier writes that instruments in qualitative research are considered valid to the extent that it in fact captures what it sets out to capture (2012, p. 7).

In this study, the coding frame captured results that represented what was set out to be captured. Coded segments represented fairly accurately the thematic categories. However, with a coding system that relies solely on interpretation of the data, the segmentation ends up relying on subjective interpretation and should the data be segmented again by a different person with the same coding frame some differences would definitely arise.

Eisenhart & Howe (1992) write that the data collection methods should be suitable for answering the research question, and thus the research questions should drive data collection techniques and analysis rather than vice versa. In other words, the methodology and data

collection should be defined by the research question. (1992, p.657). Shimahara writes that the collected data must be accurate, authentic and represent reality in terms of reliability and validity (1988, p. 86).

Both the methodology and the data collection methods were both created with the research question as their basis. Textual data as the data format was chosen as this gave the teachers a chance to take time and think their answers through. The methodology of qualitative content analysis was then chosen, since the data was in textual format and the research question demanded the data to be analyzed according to the thematical content. What can however affect the validity in terms of data is the amount of participants in generating the data. Five participants is a rather small amount, and the results of this thesis on that basis cannot be taken as hundred-percent valid. If I would embark on doing a similar study, increasing the amount of individual participants for generating the data would be a certain choice.

Steinke (2004) also describes a number of core criteria for qualitative research and evaluating the quality of qualitative research: documenting the researcher's prior understanding, documentation of the collection method, documentation of the transcript rules, documentation of data, documentation of methods of analysis, and lastly the documentation of information sources. Also, the criteria and checking procedures to be used need to be specified, modified and if necessary, supplemented by other criteria according to the research question, the issue and the method being used. (Steinke, 2004, p. 186)

Eisenhart & Howe write that in addition to deriving coherently from research questions, data collection and analysis techniques must be competently applied, as research studies qua arguments cannot be valid without credible reasons for a specific choice of subjects, data-gathering procedures, and analysis techniques (1992, p. 658). Shimahara writes that measures to enhance reliability involve a complete description of the research process, so that independent researchers may replicate the same procedures in comparable settings. (1988, p.87)

Complete research process of this thesis has been documented in part 4. With the analysis techniques the process of qualitative content analysis is followed as much as was possible, but the methodological process was not used in completely by-the-book manner. The methodology is especially with the coding frame a loose version of qualitative content analysis, but as mentioned earlier in with this particular methodology the researcher has the final call on how research is conducted. The methodology is based on qualitative content

analysis, but with emphasis on modifying a few things for the sake of this thesis. This choice of modifying the qualitative content analysis process can have an effect on the overall validity of this study.

Eisenhart & Howe (1992) mention that perhaps less obvious is the researcher's own prior knowledge and this is the basis for the researcher's distinctive contribution, which comes from joining personal interpretations with the data that has been collected and analyzed. Subjectivities must be made explicit, if they are to advance the validity of research qua argument. (Eisenhart & Howe, 1992, p. 659). Steinke writes that the researcher's implicit expectations need to be documented as these influence perception, and exposing the researcher's prior understanding and knowledge makes possible to decide whether the study lead to any new discovery, or whether the study was only seeking to confirm *ex-ante* hypotheses (2004, p. 187).

My prior knowledge and experiences are documented and exposed in the beginning of this thesis, and it is mentioned what I have done previously in terms of the topic. Through the analysis, the fact that my perception is altered by previous experiences and by prior knowledge was kept in mind. Complete objectivity in this sense is not possible, and in regards to analysis my subjectivities has been made known. The subjectivities have most likely influenced my analysis quite a bit, but those subjectivities and their possible influences have been exposed.

## 7 Discussion

### 7.1 Empiria and theory

This part of the thesis will discuss the findings of the analysis in regards to the theoretical framework. The results of the analysis will be compared to see whether the theory meets the ideas and definitions found in the data, or whether the two differ fundamentally from each other. Therefore the aim of this part is to look at the objectives set for this thesis and find out similarities and differences between definitions of freedom of the theory and the data. The last part of the thesis aims to put everything together and to reach a final conclusion between the theory and the empiria.

#### 7.1.1 Rules, limits and the choice within

In the theoretical framework it was determined that deschooling philosophy does not see a contradiction between limits and freedom, but instead claim that freedom exists within limits. These limits can be the laws of a nation, rules of school or if taken back to very basics, our own mortality. What matters is how much inside the limits freedom is given. Based on the theoretical framework it can be argued that there exists no freedom without limits, and also that situations without limits do not exist.

The data reflects the importance of rules and limits in relation to education. Limits and rules are seen as necessities for the school institution, but a yearning for more freedom can also be seen. Freedom inside a school takes a form that is made to fit into the limits that already exist. Students are always subjected to the rules that are imposed by the educational system, the particular school they are in, the classroom they belong to and the rules that are either made up by their individual teacher or made in cooperation between the teacher and the students. Therefore no situation within the school institution can exist where absolute freedom would be possible.

The rules also should be made known as this builds into an environment of knowing what can and cannot be done. According to the theoretical framework, there is a clear difference



between a free and an unfree environment, as in a free environment the rules of what cannot be done are clearly known as this creates the boundaries in which one can choose what and how to do something. The data also reflects this transparency of rules in relation to solving problematic situations. When the students are explained what cannot be done, it both increases the understanding of rules but also gives them chances to accept the rules.

Teachers identify school as coercive by default. The nature of the schools is a manifestation of rules and coercion as they are subject to goals of national and local curricula. The most fundamental coercion is the compulsory nature of education, and the fact that students do not have a choice whether to attend school or not. Curricula are also limitative in nature, as they dictate what the students need to learn and at what stage. The starting point for student freedom in primary schools comes from a situation where nearly everything has been already decided. The theoretical framework claims that the nature of the coercive school makes a total claim on the time and energies of the students. In this sense there can be seen a similarity between the theory and the empiria as they have been expressed in this thesis.

What then is freedom if it does not mean to be free? In the theoretical framework it became evident that freedom does not per se mean that one is free, but what it means is how much choice within those limits we have. The nature of freedom in the deschooling philosophy is one of choice, possibilities to be driven by our very own interests and means to have an influence in the things that concern us. Simply put, freedom gives a possibility to follow our interests and whims to a certain pre-determined limit.

This mentality could also be found in the answers of the teachers, as examples of teachers giving students choices and possibilities to influence the structure of lessons were written on numerous occasions. The question that needs to be asked if the core of freedom is looked at is not about how much and what are the students allowed to do, but *how much and what are the students allowed to choose*.

Based on the theoretical framework it can be argued that besides having a choice, the options have to be meaningful. The theoretical framework mentions that quite many teachers provide their students with a choice of "do what you want", when in reality there is nothing to choose from. In this way the choice holds no meaning. Knowing your options and knowing what you can choose from provides a lot more freedom and meaning, than choosing from unknown options.

The problem with unknown options is that a seemingly simple choice becomes complex when one is placed in front of a cornucopia of possibilities. It is easy to see how this situation in the end holds no meaning for the students.

According to data freedom in education is also about practical and simple choices. On some lessons the students can choose where to sit, who to pair up with, what pens to use etc. These practical choices are about meaning and actual choices, although at first glance the options seem simple and limited. But the idea behind practical and simple choices agrees with the idea of meaningful choices that the theoretical framework brought up. *Actual freedom of choice is not how grand the options are or how complicated choices the students can make, but about actuality and genuity.* Even in these situations the limits and rules are still in effect, but within this framework the students know exactly what they can choose from.

As the students are not absolutely free to function in schools because of rules and limitations, the same applies to the teachers as well. The teachers in the data write that although in Finnish primary schools there exists a sort of pedagogical freedom, this freedom is still bound by the limits of the national core curriculum and the regulations of the ministry of education. The teachers have freedom similar to the students since they have the freedom to choose how to conduct and execute education within the boundaries and rules of curricula on a national and local level.

### 7.1.2 Permissive authority

As freedom seems to not exist without rules and constraints, similarly freedom does not exist without authority. In a modern society individuals are always bound by authority of the law, the state, the employer, the teacher and so on. Schools are no different but in relation to freedom, the teachers describe what can be called as "permissive authority". This form of authority has two main forms of action: 1. giving out freedoms and choices, 2. regulating those given freedoms. Permissive authority therefore is not simply about keeping control and managing a group students solely towards a common goal set in the curriculum.

In theoretical framework it is written that in the teacher-pupil-relationship the students voluntarily enter into a situation where one has to completely give up personal freedom. The

data can be interpreted to express skepticism towards the freedom of students, as this freedom is completely controlled by the school faculty, and even going as far as claiming that even some of the thoughts of the students are seen as unfit for school. A situation where you need to pay attention to what you think can be seen as one where personal freedom is completely in control of someone else.

Permissive authority however tries to counter this, as it creates situations in which the students regain some of the personal freedom, even if it comes down to small and practical choices. Instead of choosing for the students, permissive authority can engage in a dialogue with the students in a democratic fashion in order to decide what will be done. Permissive authority can also give options for an individual student to choose from. Although recognizing that education is strictly oriented towards the goals of the curriculum, permissive authority provides options in what and how it can be done.

Permissive authority is therefore about creating situations in which the students can choose from a number of options authorized by the authority. The teachers mention in the data that the students are expected to take initiative. This is what the permissive authority tries to create with situations that give choices. Students are able to take initiative and follow their interests by making certain choices within a pre-approved framework. In the theoretical framework the idea of "sharing power" is discussed and this is about equal respect, supporting child autonomy and finding ways how the needs of everyone can be met. By giving choice and sharing the power, *permissive authority tries to find ways through extended but regulated autonomy of students to meet more of what each individual student strives towards.*

In the data teachers claim that the initiative of students should respond to what the authority has planned. It is mentioned in the data that teachers often have ideas how certain educational tasks should be done, and unconsciously the students should be following this idea with their own initiative. Permissive authority creates situations in which student initiative and exercising freedom is possible, but the students can at the same be steered towards a pre-determined educational goal.

Based on the theoretical framework it can be argued that when limits of a situation are known, this can provide more freedom and not knowing those limits. Permissive authority should try to make the rules known for the students. However, this transparency is mostly because in situations where the rules are breached, the students understand much better

what was done wrong when the rules have been explained to them. In a way this is to prevent the students from unknowingly breaking the rules, and this idea is fairly similar to deschooling philosophy. If permissive authority makes sure that the students know what they can and cannot do, this further increases their understanding of what they actually can do.

The theoretical framework identifies so called *Imaginary crimes*, that are not known before one commits them. By making the rules known, permissive authority rules out the possibility of committing an imaginary crime. Although the teachers in the data do not write about imaginary crimes per se, similarities between the idea of what imaginary crimes according to theory are, and the idea of how the students accept and possibly understand a rule when they are told of it, can be drawn.

Yet there are fundamental differences between how authority in education is viewed in general. In the theoretical framework authority is heavily dismissed as opposing to true freedom along with the negative implications of the teacher-pupil-relationship in terms of personal freedom, but in the data *authority is mostly seen as necessary for keeping the fabric of education intact*. A teacher mentions that a style of working that leans too much on personal freedom is in a way an enemy to modern compulsory education, as excess freedom can become contradictory to the educational goals of the school.

### 7.1.3 The freedom contract and conditionality

The theoretical framework and the data agree that schools are not environments of freedom by nature. In the school environment *freedom is not a value that exists automatically*. In the data there is an idea of freedom as a value that comes into existence only as a social contract with certain conditions, between an authority figure and its subjects. Freedom only exists when it is approved by an authority and accepted by a subject.

*Freedom in schools therefore follows a top-down model*. The ones in power decide when certain freedoms can be given to the ones below. In the data it is mentioned many times how the amount of freedom is completely up to the school staff, faculty and the general attitude culture. In a way the authoritative and coercive nature of education enforces and supports the top-down model of freedom. Since freedom is not an intrinsic value of education, it must be introduced by someone.

The top-down model of freedom is fairly understandable in a way. As education is a goal-oriented process that is dictated by the curriculum, it is rather easy to understand that the strings of education are wanted to be kept in control and freedom of students is regulated as then can be known that students are moving towards the educational goals of the curriculum. In a coercive and goal-oriented educational environment the progress and focus of the students has to be known. The theoretical framework recognizes that regulation is necessary as freedom does not mean that a child can do whatever the child wants or gets whatever the child wants. *The students get the freedom that the authority authorizes for them, if the authority (or the faculty of the schools) chooses to do so.*

In a way, *freedom according to the data is a social contract*, which contains rights and conditions. The authority gives the students the possibility to gain certain freedoms but if the students accept this freedom, they also need to accept certain responsibilities and conditions. Following the responsibilities and conditions is monitored by the authority. Therefore it can be argued that freedom in education does not exist without this contract, and the contract in the end serves the educational plan of the teacher.

The conditionality of freedom goes along very well with the idea of deschooling that freedom does not exist without limits or constraints, but also with the argument that freedom does not mean anarchy or that students can completely follow their whims. The conditionality of freedom gives the students choice that can be based on their interests, but the conditions make sure that in a situation where the conditions are breached, the authority remains in full control. The contract thus gives the students temporary power with the condition that all gained freedom can be taken away if the conditions are broken. *Contractual freedom therefore works as two-way process: freedom can be given and freedom can be taken away.*

The contract is also a way to ensure order. By creating this social contract between the authority and the students, the authority makes sure that the freedom given to the students stays within boundaries that the students can handle. The data suggests students cannot at first handle the freedom or choices they are presented with, as they are not used to an environment that gives them choices. The freedom contract is a way to ensure that the situation does not possibly escalate into an uncontrollable one, by providing framework in which students can exercise their right to choose and follow their interests.

*The whole idea of freedom being a form of social contract between the authority and subjects differs fundamentally with the theoretical framework which describes freedom almost solely as intrinsic.* Freedom is a dimension of education that the students as individuals and human beings should have the right to exercise even without an authority permitting it. As the teachers come from a background of coercive education, the idea of freedom as a social contract can possibly be seen as the reality of compulsory education and this differs mainly from the theoretical framework since it can be interpreted to describe a philosophical idea of education.

#### 7.1.4 An environment of security

In the theoretical framework that freedom is argued to be misunderstood as a right to do whatever one wants, but mention on many occasions this to not be the case. Sometimes children need to be told no because of their own security. Although, freedom and child autonomy are highly desirable in the deschooling philosophy, this should not be done in a way that sacrifices security of the students. As freedom is described in the theoretical framework as being about exploration and experience that the children can do on their own, the role of the authority is therefore about creating an environment in which the children can feel safe and secure. The students cannot truly engage with their environment if they feel afraid or insecure, and creating an environment that extends the borders of student freedom is also about making the children feel secure.

The data agrees with the theoretical framework about creating a safe environment. While striving towards a freer environment, the security of the children cannot be forgotten. The rules of the school along with the freedom contract provide security and make sure that the children know this as well. Children need to be able to trust themselves to be in a safe environment where they can freely engage in whatever activities they are interested in, both on and off lessons. As discussed previously how an environment with rules and limits is not in contradiction with striving towards freedom and child autonomy, it can be argued that *rules exist for the sake of security*. A teacher mentions the declaration for children's rights and how these fundamental rights mention that every child has a right to safe environment.

The creation of a safe environment can also be seen as linked with the idea of permissive authority. As permissive authority creates and plans the situations in which freedom is of-

ferred, in this sense the potential dangers and insecure situations can therefore be considered beforehand. Based on the theoretical framework it can be suggested that one aspect of authority is to attempt to see what others cannot. Authority can see potential risks what the students potentially cannot and plan education in a way that minimizes risks and maximizes the potential to engage safely in the task at hand. According to the theoretical framework, freedom can be described to be about exploration and discovery. A safe environment that is built on minimizing potential dangers gives the students the courage to explore with ease.

This creation of a safe environment is not about adults watching over the kids, but is more to do with equality. The theoretical framework suggests that it is common human practice to warn and watch over others. If a child would see an adult engaging in a possibly dangerous activity, and the child has the experience over the adult regarding the danger, it is only common courtesy to let the adult know of this. A safe environment is not the task of the adult authority but is an equal interaction. Helping each other both ways is equality and lets the students also influence the security of the environment that they themselves are in.

In terms of security and the task of rules in creating a secure place to work in, the data and the theoretical framework agree with most arguments. The teachers recognize the need for rules as they provide security, and the theory agrees that students need to be told no since this enhances security and builds an environment where the students can follow their interests with trust that no harm will come to them both socially and physically.

#### 7.1.5 Growing into a more free culture and increasing responsibility

The teachers make an argument on numerous occasions that the students need to be educated into using freedom. In the data experiences are described in which the student at first have not been used to the choices and freedom that the teacher has provided for them, but little by little the students have grown accustomed to this environment. What the data therefore suggests is that if given possibilities and subjecting the students to situations where they need to show initiative and make individual choices, these situations also make the students learn how to behave in an environment of freedom. Having freedom in schools is not a usual situation, and if the students do not have experience in how to function in such a situation, according to the teachers it cannot automatically be assumed that the students would be competent in using freedom.

The theoretical framework also recognizes this lack of competence by stating that if a person has not experienced freedom, there can be no understanding of what it means. As conventional schools are coercive by nature, they do not provide many opportunities for developing competences for freedom. This can also be seen from the data as teachers describe students as not being able to function in an environment of freedom, without first gaining experiences. Having no experience according to both theory and data means having no competence or understanding.

The students grow more into the environment of freedom by demonstrating responsibility. In the data teachers mention that *there is an intertwined relation between freedom and responsibility*. Students easily accept freedom, but can forget the responsibility which according to the data is what enables the students to gain more freedom. Responsibility is seen as leading to increased self-regulation, which is seen as one of the competences required for functioning properly in a free environment.

Based on the theoretical framework, it can be argued that education for freedom should be striving towards self-regulating students. The "new school" is based on the ideas of freedom, and self-regulation in the sense that the individual interests of students define the focus of education. This kind of environment demands responsibility from the students as they need to be in control of what they want to learn about. The students can therefore take as much responsibility of their own learning as they can handle.

The data and theoretical framework both provide similar ideas about the role of responsibility and self-regulation, yet they differ slightly. *Responsibility in the data is described as necessary for more freedom, but in the theoretical framework responsibility is an element of self-regulation itself*. The data points out that the teacher can increase the freedom of students when students can handle enough responsibility, but the theoretical framework argues that when students get used to freedom, they become self-regulating individuals capable of regulating their own freedom.

## **7.2 Further research**

After completing this study and trying to come up with how this topic could be continued further, the first possibility could be the new national core curriculum for 2016 and how the concept of freedom is portrayed within the document. The new curriculum seems to



emphasize self-regulation and the interests of the student, and it would be interesting to see how freedom is described in this document. As the national core curriculum is the single most fundamental educational document in Finland, it has a tremendous effect on how education is conducted. For this reason, the kind of freedom being portrayed within the curriculum also has a huge effect on how teachers include aspects of freedom to their lessons and education.

As the goal of this thesis was to look at the concepts and definitions, the actuality of freedom would be interesting. After conceptualizing, looking at how freedom actually manifests during lessons and studying the various ways how teachers do try to increase freedom of choice, responsibility and self-regulation could yield a lot of interesting results. On the other hand, in light of the new curriculum the topic of practical freedom in education might possibly be increasing in popularity and many teachers already might be developing a form of education that relies more on freedom and self-regulation. In this sense, the practical side of educational freedom could also be an interesting topic for further research.

## References

- Bauer, M.W. & Gaskell, G. 2000. Classical content analysis: A review. In M.W. Bauer & G. Gaskell (Eds.) *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound*. London: Sage publications Ltd.
- Bennis, D. 2008. Do Freedom-Based Schools Fail to Produce Self-Discipline? *Encounter*, 21(2), pp. 38-40.
- Brewerton, P.M. & Millward, L.J. 2001. Data analysis. In P.M. Brewerton & L.J. Millwards (Eds.) *Organizational Research Methods*. London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Buckman, P.1974. Deschooling. In I. Lister (Ed.), *Deschooling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carney, T. F. 1972. Content analysis: A technique for systematic inference from communications. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba press.
- Case, D. O. 2007. Looking for information: A survey of research in information seeking, needs, and behavior (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). London: Elsevier Ltd.
- Charmaz, K. 2008. Reconstructing grounded theory. In P. Alasuutari et al. (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of social research methods*. London: Sage publications Ltd.
- Davidson, E. 2009. Let Kids Be Free. *Encounter*, 22(2), pp. 22-26.
- Denzin, N. K. 2004. Symbolic interactionism. In U. Flick et al. (Eds.), *A companion to qualitative research*. London: Sage publications Ltd.
- Eisenhart, M.A. & Howe, K.R. 1992. Validity in educational research. In M.D. Lecompte et al. (Eds.) *The handbook in qualitative research in education*. London: Academic press Ltd.
- Garrison, J. & Neiman, A. 2003. Pragmatism and education. In N. Blake et al. (Eds.), *The blackwell guide to philosophy of education*. Malden: Blackwell publishing Ltd.
- Gatto, J.T. 2005. Dumbing us down. The hidden curriculum of compulsory schooling. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishing.

Hern, M. 2003. Field day – Getting society out of schools. Vancouver: New star books Ltd.

Hern, M. 2008. Getting busy. In M. Hern (Ed.), *Everywhere all the time – a new deschooling reader*. Oakland: AK press.

Hesse-Biber, S. N. & Leavy, P. 2011. The practice of qualitative research. Second edition. London: Sage publications Ltd.

Holt, J. 1970. The underachieving school. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation.

Holt, J. 1972. Freedom and beyond. Toronto & Vancouver: Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited.

Holt, J. 1974. Schools are bad places for kids. In I. Lister (Ed.), *Deschooling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holt, J. 2008. Instead of education. In M. Hern (Ed.), *Everywhere all the time: a new deschooling reader*. Oakland: AK press.

Hsieh, H.F. & Shannon, S.E. 2005. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative health research*, 15(9), pp. 27-30.

Illich, I. 1970. Deschooling society. Manchester: The Phillips Parl Press Ltd.

Illich, Ivan. 1973. After deschooling, what? London: The Writers' and Readers' Publishing Cooperative.

Kajubi, W. S. 1974. Is the school an obsolete institution? In I. Lister (Ed.), *Deschooling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kracauer, S. 1952. The Challenge of Qualitative Content Analysis. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 16(4), pp. 631-642.

Kuckartz, U. 2014. Qualitative Text Analysis: A Guide to Methods, Practice & Using Software. London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Lister, I. 1974a. Should schools survive? In I. Lister (Ed.), *Deschooling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lister, I. 1974b. The concept of deschooling and the future of secondary education. In I. Lister (Ed.), *Deschooling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mayring, P. 2000. Qualitative Content Analysis. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 1(2). Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/download/1089/2386>
- Miller, R. 2008. Freedom in the Cultural Sphere. *Encounter*, 21(4), pp. 27-30.
- Morrison, K. A. 2007. Unschooling: Homeschools provide the freedom to learn. *Encounter*, 20(2), pp. 42-49.
- Neill, A.S. 1966. Vapautta – ei mielivaltaa. Tapiola: Oy Weilin + Göös Ab:n kirjapaino.
- Neill, A.S. 1970. Summerhill. Kasvatuksen uusi suunta. Tapiola: Oy Weilin + Göös Ab:n kirjapaino.
- Neuendorf, K. 2002. The content analysis guidebook. London: Sage publications Ltd.
- Payne, G. & Payne, J. 2004. Key Concepts in Social Research. London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Phillips, D.C. 2010. What is philosophy of education? In R. Bailey et al. (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of philosophy of education*. London: Sage publications Ltd.
- Pitman, M. A. & Maxwell, J. A. 1992. Qualitative approaches to evaluation. In M.D. Lecompte et al. (Eds.) *The handbook in qualitative research in education*. London: Academic press Ltd.
- Prior, L. 2008. Documents and action. In P. Alasuutari et al. (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of social research methods*. London: Sage publications Ltd.
- Reimer, E. 1971. School is dead: an essay on alternatives in education. Middlesex: Penquin Books Ltd.
- Sadofsky, M. 2008. A school for today. In M. Hern (Ed.), *Everywhere all the time: a new deschooling reader*. Oakland: AK press.
- Schreier, M. 2012. Qualitative content analysis in practice. London: Sage publications Ltd.
- Schreier, M. 2014. Qualitative content analysis. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The Sage handbook for qualitative data analysis*. London: Sage publications Ltd.

Schulz, W. 2008. Content analyses and public opinion research. In W. Donsbach & M. W. Traugott (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of public opinion research*. London: Sage publications Ltd.

Shimahara, N. 1988. Anthroethnography: A Methodological consideration. In R.R. Sherman & R. B. Webb (Eds.), *Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods*. Basingstoke: Taylor & Francis Ltd.

Steinke, I. 2004. Quality criteria in Qualitative research. In U. Flick et al (Eds.), *A companion to qualitative research*. London: Sage publications Ltd.

Stepchenkova, S. 2012. Content Analysis. In L. Dwyer et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Tourism: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. 2009. Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches to Research. In L. Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*. London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

## **Appendices**

### APPENDIX 1 The interview question in Finnish

Mitä on vapaus peruskoulussa?

Millaista on mielestäsi oppilaiden vapaus peruskoulussa?

Millaisissa tilanteissa vapaus näyttäytyy?

Miten oppilaat käyttävät vapautta? Vai käyttävätkö?

Voit myös antaa käytännön esimerkkejä.

## APPENDIX 2 The code categories for content analysis

Category	Definition	Example	Coding rules
Actor categories: Who is being discussed?			These category codes are applied to segments based on who the segment discusses
A – Teacher (=Opettaja)	Comments about the teachers, the teaching profession, which mean for example (but not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Role of the teacher</li> <li>- Authority of a teacher</li> <li>- Duties of a teacher</li> <li>- General comments or experiences related to the teacher profession</li> </ul>	”Olen nähnyt opettajan puuttuvan esimerkiksi sormien avulla laskemiseen, ääneen lukemiseen tai opettajan mielestä tarpeettomaan tai ylimääräiseen liikehdintään.”	Any segment that includes teacher as either a subject or as another actor.
B – Student (=”Oppilas”)	Comments about school students, which mean for example (but not limited to):: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Role(s) of student(s)</li> <li>- Responsibilities of students</li> <li>- General comments or experiences related to students</li> </ul>	”Oppilaita voidaan rajoittaa fyysisesti olemaan ja opiskelemaan tietyssä tilassa.”	Any segment that features a student or students as subject or as another actor.
C – School (=”Koulu”)	Comments about school or educational system, which means for example (but not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School system</li> <li>- School or national curriculum</li> <li>- Educational system</li> <li>- General comments about school or schooling</li> </ul>	”Oman kokemukseni perusteella suomalaisessa peruskoulussa oppilailla on yleensä aika vähän omia tapoja tehdä asioita.”	Any segment that features school as a subject, as another actor, as a location where something takes place or as a generally important reference.
D – General (=”Yleinen”)	Comments that generally relate to freedom as a concept, which means for example (but not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Definitions of freedom</li> <li>- Dimensions of freedom</li> </ul>	”Vapauteen liittyy läheisesti myös luottamus”	Any segment that does not discuss any of the three other actor categories.
Thematic categories: What is being discussed?			These category codes are applied to segments according to what the segment is thematically about.
I – Limits (=”Rajat” / ”Rajoitukset”)	Comments about limits or setting limits, which mean for example (but not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Limits for students</li> </ul>	”joka jo itsessään rajoittaa oppilaan vapautta olla osallistumatta opetuk-	Any segment that has the word limit in it, or any segment that deals with the

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Setting limits</li> <li>- Limits of freedom</li> <li>- General comments about limits</li> </ul>	seen.”	concept or understanding of limits either in general or in a school context.
2 – Authority (=”Auktoriteetti”)	<p>Comments about authority, which mean for example (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Authority of a teacher</li> <li>- Using authority</li> <li>- Obeying authority</li> <li>- Authority in general</li> </ul>	”Olen nähnyt opettajan puuttuvan esimerkiksi sormien avulla laskemiseen, ääneen lukemiseen tai opettajan mielestä tarpeettomaan tai ylimääräiseen liikehdintään.”	Any segment that has the word authority in it, or any segment clearly contextually dealing with the concept of authority.
3 – Choice (=”Valinta” / ”Valinnanvapaus”)	<p>Comments about choices, which mean for example (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Having a choice,</li> <li>- Giving choices</li> <li>- Restricting choices</li> <li>- General comments about choices or having choices</li> </ul>	”Sanon usein oppilailleni, että he saavat valita tietyillä tunneilla oman istumapaikkansa.”	Any segment that has the word choice in it, or any segment clearly contextually dealing with the concept of choice, options or being able to make choices / choose.
4 – Rules (=”Säännöt”)	<p>Comments about rules, which mean for example (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School rules,</li> <li>- Setting rules,</li> <li>- Obeying rules</li> <li>- General comments about rules</li> </ul>	”Myöskään pukeutumista ja oman identiteettiä näytämistä ei rajoiteta.”	Any segment that features the word rules or any segment clearly dealing with the concept of rules in context.
5 – Motivation, self-regulation (=”Motivaatio”, ”Itseohjautuvuus”)	<p>Comments about motivation or self-regulation, which mean for example (but not limited to)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Intrinsic motivation</li> <li>- Motivating</li> <li>- Lack of motivation</li> <li>- Self-regulation</li> <li>- General comments about motivation</li> </ul>	”Muutama oppilas varmasti innostuu, mutta toisaalta aika moni piirtäjä tuskastuu tehtävästä.”	Any segment that features the word motivation, self-regulation or any segment clearly dealing with the concept of motivation or self-regulation in context.
6 – Responsibility (=”Vastuu”)	<p>Comments about responsibility, which mean for example (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responsibility in school</li> <li>- Responsibilities</li> <li>- Acting responsibly</li> <li>- General comments about responsibility</li> </ul>	”Alakouluikäinen ei useinkaan vielä osaa ajatella vapauden mukana tulevaa vastuullisuutta.”	Any segment that has the word responsibility, and clearly dealing with the concept of responsibility in context.
7 – Nature of freedom (=”Vapauden luonne”)	<p>Description and comments of what freedom is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Description about nature of freedom</li> <li>- Comments about freedom</li> </ul> <p>General comments about freedom</p>	”-vaan enemmänkin vapaus liittyy vahvasti ihmisyyteen.”	Any segment that describes the nature of freedom either in the school context or in general. This code must be applied only when any other code does not fit.



## APPENDIX 3 The segmented and coded data

### Teacher 1

[Mielestäni oppilaiden vapaus koulussa on lähtökohtaisesti hyvin rajoitettua. (B 1)] [Koko koulujärjestelmä perustuu oppivelvollisuuteen, (C 4)] [joka jo itsessään rajoittaa oppilaan vapautta olla osallistumatta opetukseen.(C 1)] [Laki määrittelee, että jokaisen oppilaan on suoritettava 9-vuotinen oppivelvollisuus tavalla tai toisella opetussuunnitelman mukaan (C 4)], [joka niin ikään rajoittaa ihmisen vapautta opiskella tai jättää opiskelematta tiettyjä oppisisältöjä(B 1)]. [Tämä ristiriita taitaakin olla yksi kasvatustieteen suurimmista paradokseista, jota jo Kant aikanaan pohti.]

[Jos kuitenkin mennään tämän paradoksin asettamien raamien sisäpuolelle voi mielestäni oppilailla nähdä olevan jonkinlaista vapautta peruskoulun arjessa. (B 3)] [On koulusta ja opettajasta kiinni kuinka paljon oppilasta rajoitetaan.(A 1)] [Oppilaita voidaan rajoittaa fyysisesti olemaan ja opiskelemaan tietyssä tilassa (B 1)] [tai heidän oppimistapoihin voidaan puuttua.(B 2)] [Olen nähnyt opettajan puuttuvan esimerkiksi sormien avulla laskemiseen, ääneen lukemiseen tai opettajan mielestä tarpeettomaan tai ylimääräiseen liikehdintään.(A 2)] [Tämän nimenomaisen oppilaan kohdalla liikkuminen tai sormin laskeminen voi kuitenkin edistää oppimista tai helpottaa olemista yleensä.(B 5)] [Oman kokemukseni perusteella suomalaisessa peruskoulussa oppilailla on yleensä aika vähän omia tapoja tehdä asioita.(B 1)] [Yleensä opettajalla on mielessä kuinka jokin asia tulisi tehdä tai opetella ja lapset seuraavat sen mukaan.(A 2)]

[Suomalaisessa koulussa vapaus ei ehkä näy niinkään pedagogisissa asioissa(C 7)] [vaan enemmänkin vapaus liittyy vahvasti ihmisyyteen.(D 7)] [Koulussa lapsia kohdellaan ihmisinä, joilla on oikeus sanoa oma mielipiteensä.(B 7)] [Myöskään pukeutumista ja oman identiteetin näyttämistä ei rajoiteta (esim. koulupuvut). (C 1)] [Tämä on hyvä asia mitä tulee tasa-arvoon ja sananvapauteen.(C 7)] [Mielestäni oppilaan vapautta (etenkin omaan opiskeluun) liittyvässä päätöksen teossa tulisi myös lisätä.(B 3)] [Vapaita kansalaisia ei voida kasvattaa rajoittamalla [tai sanelemalla kuinka asiat tulisi tehdä.(B 1)]

### Teacher 2

[Valinnan vapautta – välillä saa valita, minkä värisellä kynällä kirjoittaa, välillä paperin värin.(D 7)] [Suhteellisen usein tulee tilanteita, jolloin saa valita oman parin tai paikan jossa työskennellään.(D 3)]

[Vapautta tulisi olla minusta sopivasti.(C 7)] [Sitä voitaisiin monellakin tapaa lisätä yksilötasolla,(C 7)] [mutta koska koulu on tavoitteellinen kasvatusinstituutio(C 4)], [perustuu sen toimintaedellytykset paljolti samanaikaiselle toiminnalle.(C 2)] [Näissä puitteissa vapaus on haaste.(C 7)] [Kuinka matematiikantunti organisoidaan, jos oppilailta olisi vaikka enemmän oikeutta valita, mitä ainetta he juuri tällä hetkellä haluaisivat opiskella?(A 3)] [Tämän tyyppistä vapautta on varmasti alaluokilla vähemmän(C 1)] [ja sehän lisääntyy yläkoulussa ja esim. toisen asteen koulutuksessa.(C 3)] [En ole perehtynyt isosti Steinerkoulujen ideologiaan, mutta minulla on käsitys, että he hallitsevat vapauden säännöstelyns. perinteisempää koululaitosta paremmin.(C 1)]

[Vapautta on minusta äärimmäisen vähän.(C 7)] [Oppilailta odotetaan omaaloitteisuutta,(B 5)] [mutta sen tulisi tavallaan tiedostamatta olla opettajan mieleistä omaaloitteisuutta, ja vastata odotuksiin.(A 2)] [Ns. vääränlainen oma-aloitteisuus ja itsetietoisuus ja samalla vapaus ovat liioitellusti tavallaan koulun vihollisia.(C 5)] [Kärjistettynä vapaus oppilaiden toiminnassa on epätoivottua käyttäytymistä.(B 1)] [Sanassa vapaus on negatiivinen varaus – se on vaarallista.(D 7)] [Mutta ei niinkään vapaa yksilö, enemmänkin liialliseen vapauteen perustuva työskentelytyyli...vaikeita asioita.(B 7).] [Esimerkiksi tilanteissa, jolloin yksilön vapaudentarve ei kohtaa koulun tarvetta.(C 7)] [Jos vaikka oppilaalla olisikin tarve olla vapaa opetuksesta, ja vaikka leikkiä - ja toisaalta koulun antamassa lukujärjestyksessä lukee klo 10-11 äidinkieltä – tarpeet koulun ja yksilön välillä eivät ikäänkuin kohtaa.(B 5)]

[Toisaalta vapautuneisuus on hyvin toivottavaa(B 7)] ja [tavoiteltava tunnetila esim. luokatyöskentelyssä.(B 5)] [Opetus voi olla mielestäni laadukasta vain, jos oppilaat kokevat sen mieluisaksi(C 5)] [ja toimivat koulussa vapautuneesti.(C 5)] [Niin henkilökohtaisella vapautuneisuudella kuin sosiaalisellakin vapautuneisuudella on hyvin suuri merkitys olemassaoloon ja motivaatioon niin koulussa kuin muutenkin elämässä.(C 5)]

[Vapaus esitetään koulussa monta kertaa näissä mainitsemisissä yksinkertaisissa tilanteissa (paperi, kynänväri).(C 3)] [Alakoulussa eteenkin vapaus näyttäytyy pienissä asioissa – valinnanvapaus tekemisessä, vastaanottamisessa ja antamisessa.(C 3)] [Esim. kouluruokailussa on sovittu, että täytyy opetella käyttäytymään hyvien ruokailutapojen mukaisesti (syödä haarukalla ja veitsellä jne.), ottaa lautaselle kaikkea mitä linjastolla tarjotaan ja maistella kaikkea lautasella olevaa.(C 4)] [Eli ruokaa täytyy kunnioittaa ja opetella mais-

tamaan, mutta pakko ei ole syödä kaikkea tai tykätä siitä.(C 4) [Eli summa summarum: oppilaalla on vapaus olla tykkäämättä ruoasta.(B 3)]

[Vapautta täytyy minun mielestäni myös opettaa.(A 2)] [Esimerkiksi olen havainnut lukuisia kertoja, että vapaus voi alakoululaisen mielestä olla myös hyvin ahdistavaa. (B 5)] [Aina vapauden antaminen ei ole toivottu asia, varsinkin jos ei tiedä mitä sillä pitäisi tehdä.(B 5)] [Alakouluikäinen ei useinkaan vielä osaa ajatella vapauden mukana tulevaa vastuullisuutta.(B 6)] [“Saat valita mitä nyt teet, kunhan hoidat tämän määrätyn tehtävän jossakin kohtaan” – tyylinen ajattelu ei vielä onnistu moneltakaan alakouluaiselta.(B 6)] [Jokainen osaa ottaa vastaan annetun vapauden, mutta vastuukohtaan unohdetaan palata.(B 6)] [Toisaalta esim. hankalissa tilanteissa joissa esim. oppilas on toiminut välitunnilla huonosti (kiusannut toista tms.) on annettuun vapauteen helppo vedota.(A 2)] [Alakoululainenkin ymmärtää aika helposti, että jos on jo saanut vapautta jostakin, kuuluu se yhtäläillä toisillekin(B 6)] [ja toisaalta sen, että siitä vastineeksi tulee sitten se vastuukin.(B 6)] [Esim. Sanon usein oppiälleni, että he saavat valita tietyillä tunteilla oman istumapaikkansa.(A 3)] [Tähän liittyy ehto (vastuu),(B 6x)] [”jos toimintani häiritsee oppitunnin kulkua tai työrauhaa - siirtyy paikanvalitsemisvapaus opettajalle”.(A 2)] [Kun olen kertonut tämän ”säännön” etukäteen - ja sitten myöhemmin pyytänyt kaverin kanssa höpötelevää oppilasta siirtymään eri istumapaikalle - ovat nämä oppilaat lähes poikkeuksetta mukisematta hyväksyneet tämän toimintamallin.(A 4)] [Kysessä on etukäteen annettu vapaus ja vastuullisuuden harjoittelu.(B 6)]

[Toisena esimerkkinä tilanne kuvataiteen tunnilta.] [Usein kuulee opettajien antavan kuvitustunnin tehtäväksi “saat piirtää mitä haluat”.(B 3)] [Muutama oppilas varmasti innostuu, mutta toisaalta aika moni piirtäjä tuskastuu tehtävästä.(B 3)] [Vapaus tuntuisi kivalta, mutta kun ei keksi mitä tehdä/ei osaa aloittaa/ei tiedä millä tyyllillä/ei osaa päättää millä kynällä jne.(B 3)] [Aikaan ja paikkaan sidottu kaksituntinen kuvataidetunti meni sitten siinä – mietiskellessä vapautta ja mitä oppilas oikeastaan tällaisessa tilanteessa oppi? (B 3)]

[Minusta oppilaat käyttävät kaiken vapautensa mikä heille annetaan. (B 3)] [Edellämainitsemisissäni tilanteissa sen käyttöä täytyy tietysti opettaa (A 2)] [ja heitä rohkaista olemaan vapaita valitsemaan. (A 3)] [Jokainen yksilö varmasti rakastaa haluamaansa vapautta. (B 5)] [Jos se annetaan “väärässä” tilanteessa (A 3)] [tai jos vastaanottaja ei sitä halua, muuttuu tilanne ja vapaus haastavaksi.(B 5)]

## Teacher 3

[Vapaus on hankala aihe. Mitä vapaus edes on? (D 7)] [Jos mietin suomalaisia opettajia, on meillä aika paljon vapauksia.(A 3)] [Opettajalla on vapaus valita opetusmetodit ja välineet, tuntien rakenne, päivien rakenne.(A 3)] [Opetussuunnitelmat määrittelevät, mitä opetetaan ja opetuksen arvopohjan, mutta nekin ovat aika ylimalkaisia.(C 4)] [Opettajana voin itse valita mihin teemoihin keskitymme enemmän.(A 3)] [Yksittäisenä opettajana minulla ei tietenkään ole absoluuttista vapautta näissäkään päätöksissä.(A 4)] [Teen päätökset yhdessä muiden opettajien kanssa ja koen myös tekeväni ne yhteistyössä vanhempien kanssa (tai ainakin perustelen vanhemmille valintani.)(A 3)]

[Oppilaiden vapaus on tarkoin koulun ja opettajan määrittämää.(B 4)] [Totta kai heillä on vapaus omiin ajatuksiin ja mielipiteen ilmaisuun, mutta väittäisin, että monesti niitäkin rajoitetaan.(C 1)] [Muistelen joskus lukeneeni, että on olemassa kouluun sopivia ja sopimattomia ajatuksia.(C 1)] [Sopimattomia ajatuksia ei käsitellä ja oppilaat hiljennetään aiheista.(B 2)] [Itse pyrin käsittelemään kaikkia aiheita, jotka oppilaita kiinnostavat ja ottamaan kaikki heidän ajatuksensa yhteiseen käsittelyyn (jos he siis tuovat ne tunnilla esiin.)(A 2)] [Puhuimme vuoden vaiheessa seksuaalivähemmistöistä luokassani hyvin avoimesti.(A 2)] [Myöhemmin aika moni opettaja tuli ihmettelemään kuinka uskallan puhua aiheesta ja kertoi minun olevan rohkea.(A 5)] [Tämä varmaan on sitten sellainen 'sopimaton' aihe.]

[Jos mietin, mikä on täysin vapaa hetki oppilaille koulupäivän aikana, sanoisin sen olevan välitunti. Mutta onko se sittenkään?(B 1)] [Koulussamme puhutaan siitä, miten oppilaat saataisiin irti kännyköistään välitunnilla.(C 1)] [Oppilaiden halutaan liikkuvan enemmän ja toki kannustamme kaikkia leikkimään yhdessä (ja totta kai kiellämme kiusaamisen).(C 5)] [Oppilaat eivät ole sittenkään täysin vapaita käyttämään vapaa-aikansa koulussa.(B 1)]

[Monesti oppilaiden vapaus on luokassani ehdollista ja demokraattista. (C 7)] [Annan usein oppilaiden valita vaihtoehtoisista tavoista opiskella tai viettää viimeiset 15 minuuttia tunnista, jos sillä ei ole minulle juurikaan väliä.(A 3)] [Annan usein useamman vaihtoehdon, josta oppilas valitsee itse tai äänestämme.(A 3)] [Menemme enemmistön mielipiteen mukaan eivätkä siis yksittäiset oppilaat ole aina vapaita tekemään mitä haluavat vaan he ovat 'kollektiivisesti vapaita'.(B 4)] [Joskus pyydän oppilaita itse ehdottamaan, mitä tekisimme(A 2)] [, joskus he ehdottavat itsestään.(B 3)] [Oppilailla on omassa luokassani ilmaisun vapaus,(B 4)] [mutta epäilen kuunnellaanko oppilaita suurella mittakaavalla.(C 1)] [Uskon,

että opettajat todella yrittävät(A 5)] [, mutta saavatko oppilaat todella vaikuttaa heitä koskeviin asioihin?(B 1)]

[Huomasin oman luokkani kanssa, että he eivät olleet vuoden alussa tottuneet siihen, että saisivat vaikuttaa omaan koulunkäyntiinsä tai valita, mitä haluaisivat tehdä tai miten.(B 5)]

[Meni aikansa, että oppilaani oppivat käyttämään minun heille suomaani vapautta ehdottaa ja ottaa kantaa.(A 2)] [Tämän kokemuksen perusteella sanoisin, että oppilaiden pitää oppia käyttämään vapauksiaan ja vaatimaan niitä.(B 5)]

[Koulussa on paljon pakkoja.(C 4)] [On pakko tulla kouluun, tehdä läksyt, tehdä kokeita, olla hiljaa.(C 4)] [Mutta jollain tavallahan tuo pakko on illuusio.(C 7)] [Oppilaat ovat vapaita olemaan tekemättä mitään.(B 3)] [Sellaisia oppilaita kutsutaan 'ongelmallisiksi'.(B 4)] [Yleensä oppilaita motivoi oma tahto oppia tai kiinnostus ja oppimisen ilo (B 5)], [mutta myös ryhmäpaine ja pelko, että vanhemmat saavat tietää, jos pöljäilee. (B 5)] [Jos ensimmäiset uupuvat ja jälkimmäisistä ei välitä, on koulussa aika vapaa tekemään haluamallaan tavalla.(B 3)] [Minusta harva oppilas käyttää tätä vapauttaan.(B 7)] [Väittäisin, että oppilaat eivät koe olevansa vapaita aamulla valitsemaan tulevatko kouluun vai eivät.(B 3)]

Teacher 4

[Vapaus ja vastuu kulkevat käsi kädessä.(D 7)] [Vapauteen liittyy läheisesti myös luottamus.(D 7)] [Opettajilla on pedagoginen vapaus Suomen peruskouluissa, jolloin opettajat voivat opettaa opetussuunnitelmassa mainitut asiat omalla tyylillään. (A 4)] [Tämä kertoo luottamuksesta Suomen opettajiin ja opettajainkoulutukseen.(C 7)] [Opettajilla on teoriassa melko vapaat kädet peruskoulussa ja opettaja voi tehdä paljon asioita luokkahuoneessaan muiden tietämättä, hyvässä ja huonossa.(A 3)] [Tämä mahdollistaa siis myös vapauden väärinkäytön.(A 2)]

[Mielestäni vapautta rajoittaa tai edistää koulun sisällä oleva koulukulttuuri – tuntee ko opettaja, että vapautta on hyväksyttävää käyttää? (A 5)] [Jos muu henkilökunta kannustaa esimerkillään oman opettajuuden tunnistamiseen ja rohkeisiinkin opetusmenetelmiin, niin uskoisin varsinkin uusien opettajien olevan rohkeampia opettamaan omaan tyyliinsä.(A 5)] [Mielestäni vapaus ei ole vapautta, jos se on "hiljaisesti rajoitettua" vapautta.(D 7)] [Parhaimmillaan, kannustavassa ilmapiirissä, opettajien vapaudella voidaan löytää opettamiseen ja oppimiseen hyvinkin innovatiivisia ratkaisuja.(C 5)]

[Myös oppilaille vapaus ja vastuu kulkevat käsi kädessä.(B 6)] [Vapaus tuo oikeuksia.(D 6)] [Oppilaan vastuu voi kasvaa, kun opettaja antaa oppilaalle pikku hiljaa pieniä vastuutehtäviä ja luottotoimia.(A 6x)] [Oppilas voi esimerkiksi ottaa pikku hiljaa enemmän vastuuta läksyjen teostaan.(B 6)] [Tällöin oppilaan vapaus ja oikeudet koulussa myös kasvavat.(B 3)] [Mielestäni on tärkeää, että oppilaat saavat vapautta kasvaessaan koko ajan lisää, jos he pystyvät myös vastuuta kantamaan. (B 6)] [On tärkeää myöhemmänkin elämän kannalta, että oppilas oppii kantamaan vastuuta. (B 6)] [Tämä ei kuitenkaan tarkoita sitä, että oppilaat eivät joutuisi noudattamaan sovittuja koulun sääntöjä.(C 4)] [Säännöt luovat oppilaille turvaa, joka on peruskouluikäisille tärkeää.(C 4)] [Vapaus on myös sitä, että voi olla rauhassa oma itsensä, esim. pukeutua haluamallaan tavalla ja ilmaista mielipiteensä. (D 7x)]

[Opettaja antaa vapauksia oppilaille, kun hän antaa oppilaalle tehtäviä ja luottamustoimia. Esim. järjestäjä luokassa tai paperin kopiointi.(A 2)] [Opettaja voi antaa oppilaalle myös valinnanvaraa koulutehtävissä tai ei tarkista enää läksyjä joka ikinen kerta.(A 2)] [Vapaus näyttäytyy myös esimerkiksi siirtymätilanteissa. Jos opettaja luottaa oppilaisiinsa, hän voi päästää oppilaat esim. ruokalaan omaan tahtiinsa ilman tiukkaa jonoa.(A 2)]

[Oppilaat käyttävät vapautta ja pääsääntöisesti oikein ja vastuullisesti, (B 6x)] [mutta myös usein testaavat vapauden rajaa jossain vaiheessa.(B 1)]

#### Teacher 5

[Vapauden käsite on jo sinällään monimutkainen filosofinen ilmiö, että tähän kysymykseen vastaaminen tuntuu vaikealta myös sidottuna koulun kontekstiin.(D 7)] [Vapaus nähdään klassisen määritelmän mukaan negatiivisena tai positiivisena vapautena.(D 7)] [Negatiivinen vapaus tarkoittaa sitä, että ihminen on vapaa ulkoa tulevista pakotteista, väkivallasta ja pakkovallasta.(D 1)] [Jos nämä eivät uhkaa yksilöä, katsotaan yksilön olevan vapaa.(D 1)]

[Olen ollut nyt melkein vuoden töissä eräässä helsinkiläisessä koulussa ja negatiivinen vapaus ei toteudu ainakaan kaikkien kohdalla.(C 1)] [Jo koulu laitoksena on mielestäni ulkoa tulevien pakotteiden ruumiillistuma:(C 1)] [sekä opettajien että oppilaiden tulee noudattaa opetushallituksen määrittelemiä tavoitteita, koulun opetussuunnitelmaa ja koulun sääntöjä.(C 4)] [Voisin kuvitella, että monet oppilaat myös näkevät olevansa luokanopettajiesä “pakkovallan” alla,(B 4)] [riippuen tietenkin kuinka autoritääriin ja joustamaton opettaja on ja pyrkiikö hänen koko olemuksensa oppilaiden kanssa dialogiin vai ei.(A 2)]

[Valitettavasti myös väkivallattomuus ei toteudu koulussani, sillä monet oppilaat ja opettajat ovat joutuneet kokemaan väkivaltaa koulupäivien aikana muiden oppilaiden toimesta.(C 7)]

[Positiivinen vapaus puolestaan nähdään mahdollisuutena harjoittaa kansalais- ja ihmisoikeuksia ja ylipäättänsä päämääriä elämässään.(D 3)] [Positiivinen vapaus tarkoittaa sitä, että jokaisella yhteiskunnan jäsenelle pyritään takaamaan samat oikeudet heidän lähtötilanteestaan riippumatta.(D 7)] [Peruskoulu on perustettu osittain juuri tälle päämäärälle: jotta jokaisella olisi mahdollisuus kiivetä yhteiskunnan tikkaita ylös riippumatta omista lähtökohdistaan.(C 3)] [Ideaali on minusta kaunis ja toteutuu tiettyjen yksilöiden kohdalla, mutta ei toki kaikkien.(B 7)] [Nykyinen suomalainen peruskoulu tajoaa mahdollisuuksia akateemisesti suuntautuneille oppilaille jättäen muunlaiset oppijat syrjään (C 3)] [ja jopa edesauttaen syrjäytymistä, sillä alituinen epäonnistuminen akateemisissa aineissa vaikuttaa oppilaiden itsetuntoon ja identiteetin rakentumiseen.(B 5)] [“Saan huonoja numeroita kokeista, täten olen tyhmä enkä kelpaa” on hyvin yleinen käsitys itsestään jo nuorten oppilaiden keskuudessa(B 5).] [Koulu ei tarjoa tarpeeksi mahdollisuuksia monipuoliseen itsensä tutkimiseen ja kehittämiseen ja positiivisen itsetunnon ja itsekuvan rakentumiselle.(C 3)]

[Oppilaiden vapaus on hyvin riippuvaista koulusta instituutiona, koulusta yksilönä, koulun henkilökunnasta ja erityisesti luokanopettajasta.(C 1)] [Toisin sanoen valta-asetelma on aikuisten ja instituution puolella, ei lasten. (C 2)] [Lasten vapaus on annettua vapautta valta-asemassa olevien toimesta.(C 2)] [Lasten oikeudet takaavat kuitenkin perusturvan opetuksessa ja oikeuden syrjimättömään opetukseen ja ylipäänsä koulutukseen,(B 4)] [Oikeus koulutukseen toteutuu mielestäni näistä kolmesta parhaiten Suomessa,(C 4)] [kaksi muuta ovat taas riippuvaisia ennen kaikkea aikuisista koulussa,(A 2)] [mutta myös muista oppilaisista.(B 6)]

[Suomalainen koululaitos on kehittynyt esimerkiksi yksilön koskemattomuuden takaamisessa:(C 4)] [enää opettajat eivät saa kurittaa oppilaitaan fyysisesti ja yleisesti asiaan puututaan, jos sellaista on havaittu.(A 4)] [Oppilaiden uskonnonvapaus myös on ollut näkyvimpiä muutoksia suomalaisessa koulussa.(B 4)] [Uskonnonopetus on monipuolistunut paljon ainakin helsinkiläisissä kouluissa.(C 3)] [Tunnuksellisuus saattaa edelleen kuitenkin olla läsnä riippuen taas opettajasta.(A 2)]

[Vapaus näyttäytyy demokratian harjoittelulla joissain kouluissa tai luokissa.(C 7)] [Oppilailla on kouluissa oppilaskunnan hallituksia ja luokkahallituksia, joissa he voivat ajaa it-

selleen tärkeitä asioita, jos sille annetaan mahdollisuus koulussa(C 3)] [ja myös mahdollisesta koulutusta demokraattisiin käytäntöihin ja hoksautusta, että oppilaat voivat vaikuttaa omaan arkeensa ja asioihinsa.(C 3)] [Osa opettajista antaa myös vaihtoehtoja eri oppisisältöjen opiskeluun(A 3)] [eli oppilaat voivat vaikuttaa siihen, miten haluavat oppia.(B 3)] [Olen kuitenkin hyvin skeptinen oppilaiden vapautta kohtaan, koska se on niin riippuvaista opettajista ja muusta koulun henkilökunnasta.(A 2)]

[Osa oppilaista on kykeneväisiä käyttämään vapautta.(B 6)] [Osalla oma itseohjautuvuus on niin harjoittamatonta ja heikkoa, (B 5)][ että vapautta ei välttämättä osata edes käyttää.(B 7)] [Suomalainen koululaitos valmentaa kunnioittamaan ja seuraamaan auktoriteetteja (C 2)] [ja muunlainen oleminen ja opetus on täysin opettajan yksilöstä ja koulun hengestä riippuvaista.(A 2)]