

Citizenship through Community of Enquiry

Transcript: Community of Enquiry

Stimulus Text: Hillary Clinton speech to the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women, in Beijing, China, September 1995 (abridged)

Teacher: You remember the routine – it's two words: Community and Enquiry are the keys to it. Enquiry – we are looking in a deeper way than we normally would at whatever material, in this case this passage; Community – we do it in a supportive way. Now, by supportive I don't mean that we will all agree with each other – if we all agree with each other it would be OK but probably be a better discussion if we have some disagreement. But we'll disagree and we'll agree in a community-type way. We won't be slagging each other; there'll be no bitterness in our disagreement; we won't be laughing unkindly at the points people make. (Of course we'll be laughing at the jokes Stuart makes!)

OK, so remember I'm asking you when you come in with your contribution, will you start it with 'I agree with ...' (in this case Clare) or 'I disagree with Clare because of ...' so your comments keep the argument all tied together.

So we can we start with, which of Clare's points do you want to make? Is it the fact that she is the powerful woman, a woman who is famous as a result of being married to a powerful famous husband? OK, so we are looking at the second part of Clare's last question – 'Does it affect our reading of this passage that it is the speech of a woman who is famous as a result of being married to a powerful, famous husband/man?' OK, Clare, so could you kick us off?

Clare: I feel that it undermines the passage because Hillary Clinton is more of a figurehead than anything. She is meant to be idealistically a submissive wife, the good American wife. She is not really meant to have any power. Also it's highly unlikely that she wrote the speech. I think the speech would have more power if it was by a feminist leader or someone in that field rather than just a figurehead.

Keji: I agree with Clare. I feel it does slightly undermine the passage because you don't take it as serious because you know it's Hillary Clinton and she is married to the President of the United States of America, I feel that it is ... She doesn't make you think, the way it's written, I wouldn't think she actually did write it – I agree with Clare in that kinda way. I don't think she did write it herself. I think if it was stronger ...

Teacher: Just before we move on can you justify why you don't think she has written it herself?

Keji: Well, I don't know ... In my opinion when you look at her sometimes you think she looks like a really strong woman and a determined woman and dominated [sic]. She looks as if she wouldn't really rely on a lot of attention ... attention from her husband, I feel that she would have got someone else to write for her and she would have put her ideas forward, and her opinions forward on it.

Teacher: OK. Right, Nicky?

Nicky A: I disagree. I think that Hillary Clinton did write it herself. Because she is married to Bill Clinton, does that mean she is not allowed to have her own opinions? OK, she maybe might not have wrote it word for word, but she could have put the ideas down and somebody else, like, shaped it out for her, that kind of thing. But I agree it does kind of undermine it because it talks about women dying through diseases and watching their children suffering from malnutrition – she is never ever gonnae suffer from that – so it doesn't really make much difference. I think it would have been a wee bit better if it had been written by somebody who had experience of this, but I don't think that because she's Bill Clinton's wife, I don't think that she is not allowed to have her own opinion.

Teacher: Right, Nicky – then Allan.

Nicky M: I disagree with Nicky saying that she thinks she could have wrote it herself because Hillary Clinton is a senator as well. She is involved in politics as well, like nothing to do with her husband. She is independently involved in it and she also does a lot of work for charities and things like that and when she is talking about women, it disnae matter where they are or what they do for a living. They all have the same common interest so even – I don't think it's that relevant whether she wrote it or no cos it's common for people, important people, to have other people to write their speeches, but just cos they are so busy they don't have enough time to dae it but I don't – she does agree with everything ... but maybe she's just outlined the main points she wants to put in it and somebody's shaped it up for her like Nicky says. But she's a busy woman. She's got a lot of things to dae as well as being, like, a wife and a mother. She's also involved in politics and charity work and things like this she's daeing so, like the people she's talking about in her speeches, she's got a lot to dae. She's an example of it herself, whit she's talking about – she's an example of it. She's so many different things in one person.

Teacher: Now Allan.

Allan: I think she did write it herself because being Bill Clinton's wife when he was the president, he would have a part to play in the problems that women face and her being in politics got to see the problems facing them but in more detail.

Teacher: When you say Bill Clinton would have a part to play in the problems women face – how do you mean?

Allan: Like because he was the president so I think he made it his duty to try and solve some of the problems.

Teacher: Right, OK. Now, Clare. (Could we try and remember the I agree with/I disagree ...?)

Clare: It was one of Nicky's points I disagreed with. I think America definitely has this thing where they have to build up a picture of their self. They have to be idealistic, they have the American dream. They have the American image and I think that specially when it comes to the First Lady, they always ... They're overly portrayed in the homely way and in the way that they should be the good wife, they should be obedient to their husband – she always has to play that role and I think it totally undermines the speech completely because she has to play a role. She has to do charity work. She might not particularly want to do the charity work but it's an ideal that she has to follow so by doing this I think she undermines the speech, undermines the whole thing because she has to do ... fulfil an image. She has to fulfil a sort of dominated role and it doesn't give pro women's rights. She has to do this. She doesn't have her own rights at all. She's actually a just sort of 'bolt-on' to the president.

Teacher: So you are saying that the very role of president's spouse is a subordinate role to the president? Would it be the same if the president was a woman?

Clare: It wouldn't be the same if the president was a female. She would have more power because she's not an accessory.

Teacher: And what about the president's husband?

Clare: Well, if he was doing against male rights it would just be another accessory as well ... He doesn't have any real – he's just an accessory – they're not actually – it's not actually a woman in power giving a speech to a world conference. If she had just never married the president she wouldn't have even had had the chance to go up and say that speech instead of someone who is actually fighting for those rights – a real feminist – a real woman fighting for women's rights. She would have been better off saying it rather. She just had got to sit, because she was the president's wife.

Teacher: Right. Nicky, then Ian.

Nicky M: I disagree with Clare because Clare's saying that if it wasn't for her being married to Bill Clinton then she wouldn't be in a position to do that. Fair enough, she wouldn't be in a position, but being married to him doesn't mean that she is an accessory because she is not an accessory. I think she is a really clever woman, but if you take, like, for example what all the scandal with Bill Clinton and Monica Lewinsky, she could have done what most women would have done, but she stood by him – but that wasnae because she was like Clare is trying to say, the little housewife that would stick by her man. I think she was really, really clever about that and she knows that if it wasn't for Bill Clinton she might not be in the position to give speeches like what she done in this conference. But that doesn't mean that it should undermine what she's saying because she wouldn't be there and she wouldn't be saying it if she didn't believe in it a lot. But it just means that she happens to be married to him and this gave her the opportunity. But that's a good thing because people know she's the President of the United States' wife. She's married to one of the most powerful men in the world. People are gonnae listen to what she's gonnae say. She knows she's got the power and she's trying to use it for people that aren't in such a good position as her. It's people that are doing it for, like, starving children in Africa and they wouldn't even be doing anything about it, but I don't think she is an accessory, like I said she's involved in politics individually – it's got nothing to do with Bill Clinton and I think it's just part of being who she's married to and I think that puts her in a position to help people and she should use that position.

Teacher: Ian? Clare?

Clare: I disagree with Nicky. I think to say that just because she's in that position that she has a valid point to say, I don't agree with that. If there's so many people that are accessories to power and they don't have valid things to say but just because they are famous they have a right to say it? But, like, what about Michael Jackson? He's famous and he says you can sleep with children. Is that right just because he has got the opportunity to say it? It doesn't necessarily mean that he is right or it's his opinion. There's so many things through history, like different Greek philosophers saying speeches. They have their public opinion that they have to say to people what they think is a moral right or what they should say – but they have a personal opinion. That might not be her personal opinion. She might never have ... She might not care about poverty. She might just like sitting in the White House playing with her dogs and eating candy and whatever. That might be her. She might just be saying this because she's the president's wife – because she has a moral obligation to say it. That's her public image, her public persona that she views – but not her personal one. We don't know her personal one.

Teacher: I was going to stop that one there but you have raised some instant thoughts there.

Ian: I disagree with Clare because – even going back to Michael Jackson – he's saying his own point of view. She's telling her point of view here. She's trying to get across what she believes in. She doesn't have to do this. She's doing it because she must want to. Because Michael Jackson has embarrassed himself obviously by doing that, so she's doing this because she must want to, not just because she's been forced into it. Nobody has put her in at gunpoint. She's done it because she wants to.

Stuart: I disagree with Clare because I have seen a few movies – it's like about the presidents' wives and the actual background of the family and it's the women and they families, it's like based on actual facts, like the amount of trouble that they go through, like, with cameras all around about the house constantly because they are the president's wife and the trouble they go through, hardship and all that kind of stuff and they have got to put up a good fight just to stay married to them. So that in its own would give Hillary some strong viewpoints on the other things.

Nicky A: I agree. Hillary Clinton, she's a, Nicky did say she was a strong woman, right, and I think it would have been her strength if somebody had decided to ask her, 'Mrs Clinton would you give a speech on women at United Nations Fourth World Conference?' She is a strong woman. She could have said no. You know what I mean? She's a big girl. She can speak for herself, you know what I mean? She didn't have to do it and as Ian said, she wasn't held at gunpoint.

Teacher: And Nicky.

Nicky M: I agree with Nicky because she is also, as well as being a strong woman, she is a very, very busy woman, and there is probably thousands and thousands of charities that had been approaching her at this time and asking her, 'Would you represent us?' So why is it she feels strongly about it that she has the right to speak about and she obviously does. I think this is a topic quite close to every woman's heart because I think in every woman's heart the feeling is that the things in the speech are true, and Hillary Clinton gets to be the one to represent us and that's what she's talking about in the passage – we has to represent the people that cannae make it there.

Ian: Well, I'm no really disagreeing or agreeing but does it have to be every *woman's* heart, sort of sitting on the fence talking about women, does it need to be *women* – can *men* no have a view on it either? A view on ... Does it need to be '*ours*' all the time just because it's about women?

Teacher: Do you mean, 'can men have a view on this view of women?'

Ian: Aye.

Teacher: What do you think?

Ian: I think they can because a lot of women always seem to say, 'Oh, it's just us, we ...' But men should have a view as well because I would think women should have a view on stuff about men.

Teacher: And would you have a view on this view of women? What's your opinion yourself? Would you agree with Clinton in answer to what's she saying?

Ian: I didn't really take it in when we were reading it.

Teacher: OK. So OK. It's an honest answer. I think we'll have Stuart, then we'll have Clare and then we'll move on to another question.

Stuart: I totally agree with what Ian is saying because if a guy was to go to a feminist meeting or anything like that you can just imagine the reaction he would get. He would basically get laughed out the place and that's totally wrong. If that guy is trying to get the same point across as the women are, they shouldnae be able to laugh because that's what would happen and people would say, 'Aw, that wouldnae happen', but even if they wouldnae get laughed at they would, like, just be totally excluded fae everything that was happening. That's what I reckon would happen.

Teacher: But why would you think that would be?

Stuart: Because women would say something like, 'Aye, you don't know what it's like to have that done to you. You're no a woman.'

Teacher: And would that be right?

Stuart: No – even just everybody will have something in their life happen to them when they're discriminated against and the way women are discriminated against, sometimes guys can relate to that and say, 'Aye, well, such and such happened to me,' and they can say, 'Aye, right. I know what you mean here,' and that's how they agree with their point.

Teacher: So we're able to identify with another person in a different situation?

Stuart: That's like when something happens in a family, we can say, 'Aye, I know how you are feeling,' and that.

Teacher: Quite often people say, 'No, you *don't* know how I am feeling.'

Nicky A: I'm no a feminist but I'm no, like, pure ... I sit on baith sides. What Stuart's saying is true because if something happens to a woman it affects ... It can affect the men around. Obviously it can affect everybody around. Like a death in the family, right? And say it's like the male parent's relatives. Well, obviously it's gonnae affect the male parent as well. If you have got wee brothers or cousins or whatever, it's gonnae affect them as well. It's no gonnae just affect women. Things can happen and can affect the men around you as well. It just disnae have to be the women. And I think if a woman says to a guy, 'You don't know how I am feeling,' well, if the guy is trying to put across the point, 'Why are you doing this?' and the woman says, 'You don't know how I'm feeling,' well, obviously he does because, if he's asking then he obviously must have some idea you're upset, or something's happened, or something's wrong.

Teacher: Yep, so Keji you finish off with this one.

Keji: I agree with Stuart and Nicky totally here. I think it's all about equality. I think sometimes women think it's them against them. It's always someone, male against female. I think it should stop being this male against female and we should join together and be one – I think we should be stronger together. Maybe it is due to things like these charities, meetings and these references in TV and radio, the way women are portrayed, and the way men are portrayed from each other. They are being made to look different from each other but it has quoted and it has said that we are so alike and OK we don't understand each other in some ways but in a lot of ways we do. In a lot of ways we have so many things in common.

Teacher: So can I just ask you Keji – these problems from line 26–30 – who is it you are saying should join together in order to fight against these?

Keji: Well, OK, we've got, like, to fight against all these signs like diet and diseases and things, OK?

Teacher: Like women being forced into prostitution; barred from holding bank accounts in certain countries; the fact that women suffer more from malnutrition than men in a lot of countries; denied right to go to school – that type of thing.

Keji: OK. You've got doctors, you've got nurses, you've got council social workers who can help. Maybe not in some countries you don't get they kind of people. You don't get as much compared to other countries. But I think if you have these doctors, you have these nurses, you have these social workers there's lots of psychologists, I don't know, but you have lots of people in the NHS. I know only the UK has it, but in other countries there are people who are willing to get out their own lifestyle and get out what they're doing to go and help some other people, because I know I wouldn't mind and I know there are a lot of men, I'm not saying that men wouldn't leave their family or leave their country and go and leave their friends and go to another country, but some men are highly trained and will be willing ... Anybody back me up here, men, would you be willing to go to another country? Aye – there you go! Men would be willing to go to another country and help fight these diseases, malnutrition, poverty, economic deprivation. Men are willing to do this and will do it. If they're given the chance and the choice to do it they will do it. It's as if only women are gonnae to go to another country, OK? I would go to another country, but as you have just heard some men would as well. They should be given the choices just as much as women to do these things.

Teacher: OK, let's keep to it and let Clare get back into this. Clare, would you like to make the last comment?

Clare: I want to disagree with Stuart. I think there's a ... Women are being stereotyped and so are feminists. Most people think feminists are, like, anti-men. I am a practising feminist and what I have learned through reading all the books and going to meetings – the thing is, women want to be treated the same but part of me wants the same as being treated as an individual. The other thing that Stuart said that if a man came up to that conference saying he would be laughed out – that is totally ludicrous. If it wasn't for men, women wouldn't have

these rights that we have the now. If it wasn't for men helping the Suffragettes to get the vote, we wouldn't have the vote. If it wasn't for some Roman emperor allowing women the right to try and get a divorce, we wouldn't have divorce. It would be male only. So men and women are working together to make it equal. So if a man gave that speech it just means he wouldn't be addressing women like himself he would be addressing the women ... like 'Women have these problems ...' and to go for them and I don't think it wouldn't be disrespected any other way. I definitely disagree with you, because if it wasn't for men helping women, they wouldn't have the rights they have the now.

Stuart: I was only saying that from my point of view ... I don't know what goes on in these types of places ... I was just saying that was what I thought would happen – stereotyping – it *is* stereotyping, but everybody does it. I was just thinking that is what would probably happen. I was thinking about it that way. I wasn't saying that's definitely what would happen. I was saying that could possibly happen. That's stereotyping between men and women.

Teacher: Could I ask to move us on to another question? There is one there that we are kind of straying into here. It's Ian's question – 'Is this passage sexist against men?' Do you think people would be happy to look at that question? Maybe take five or ten minutes on that one. So could you start us off? What are your own feelings?

Ian: I think it is a bit sexist against men. The main reason is when it's talking about disease and that. 'Women are also dying from diseases that should have been prevented ...' But they don't say anything about men still dying and it doesn't say women are dying more. It's just women are dying. It's like they are not caring about men are dying. All through it, it's always comes straight back to women. Maybe it's about women. It's always about women's families ... It's like a man's no part of the family – he's just like a bolt-on accessory. He's just there to make babies, aye? I mean it's just 'the women's families'. It even goes into countries, it being the women's country when it should be a joint thing. It shouldn't be either way.

Nicky M: I disagree with Ian because Ian is saying that it's sexist against men. But if you look over the passage although a few things that mentions men is mentioned in a negative way, like when it's talking about the problems women face usually it says there's a man in the way, like they are not allowed to go to school by their own fathers and brothers but at the same time, see when she's talking about families? She's talking about the family as a whole. She's not talking about her and her children. She's talking about her husband as well. He relies on her as much as children will. She's talking about the family as a unit and not as individuals and the father is as much part of the family as the children are, so I don't think it is sexist towards men because it's trying to ... It's not about men. This is about women and what women are feeling and what women had to go through, and if you introduce men to it more than what they are here already then it would be as if ... What they are saying is that women are usually undermined by men and if they were to mention men in this passage as much ... Women are there to talk about women. They are not there to talk about men, they're there to talk about women and their families, and men are part of the families.

Teacher: Right, would you like to try and open it up a bit, Darren? What do you think about that?

Darren: I would say it *was* sexist against men, cos I know it's a conference about women but they should give you the rough idea about what the problems men face as well to give you a rough idea ... to balance them up or whatever, to see how worse women are off than men – if they are.

Teacher: Nicky or Ian.

Nicky A: I totally disagree with the whole thing of sexism against men – it's not. They're talking about how women are. The problems that women face are caused by men. I think that's what Nicky said. It's not like that. All it says is they're being denied the right to go to school by their own fathers and brothers. Well, see in the countries where this happens, I'm thinking the countries where this happened are the countries where men rule, where the men ... These are like the old-fashioned countries where the men say, 'You dae this and you dae

that' to the women. I don't think it's being sexist at all. It is a conference about women, right, but it says it's an abridged version. There could have been a whole half of this speech that has been missed out and that could have been about what men do for women. It doesn't give the whole speech. If it gave the whole speech then maybe we could say, 'Yeah, it's been sexist against men,' if we knew the whole story. But we don't know so we can't say it's being sexist against men because, as far as we know, it's no.

Ian: I agree with them. I'm just wanting to say to Nicky that we're talking about what's wrote down and what's no wrote down, if you know what I mean. We're talking about what's been wrote down. I agree with them because how can you say how bad it is for women if you have no got it to weigh up against how bad it is for men if you're talking about equals. If there is nothing there to judge it against, you cannae say, 'Oh, this is really bad because compared to men ...' When you say, 'Compared to men ...' that's you making a universal comparison.

Teacher: Right, so you can't know how bad it is unless you know both sides?

Clare: I am in two minds. I agree with Ian and I disagree with Ian. It's hard to say because, well, the passage is about women but it doesn't fairly portray men. But the whole point is for being equal and being equals you portray each other equally. It is very pro-women but it does have parts where it's equal for them. It's like in every woman, every man ... This is why every man, woman, every child ... But it is a passage on women, so if you were doing a passage on dogs you wouldn't talk about cats. So that's how I am a bit ... But it does seem to say fathers and brothers are not allowing them to go to school. But if it's true, how can you mask it? That's how I am a bit iffy about it.

Keji: I am agreeing with what both of you are saying. We have found evidence here that it does mention men, and again if you have a dog you couldn't talk about a cat. I feel that what Nicky was saying, that in some countries you do get this high amount of men who do actually tell women what to do and how to do it. Women are not allowed to wear nail polish! I remember getting a story once quoting that a woman in India was caught with nail polish on, where she got her fingers cut off. People I know in some religions have to cover up their faces – I cannot remember what religion it is – they have to cover up their faces. That is, the men think, 'Oh no, oh my god, we see her face!' You know that is portrayed as quite a high thing and quite negative if a woman, a Muslim woman, is seen without covering up her face again. Some women are married off. I know that much myself. Half the time when they don't even want to. In some countries that is showing again the forceful nature of men and what men can do. I think this is the thing where she is trying to portray here. It isn't to undermine. Men are slightly being put down here but it is ... She is trying to show how much women have been put down and have been told to be insignificant compared to men.

Teacher: So are you saying now that if a situation is sexist then if you examine it, you are likely to be accused of being sexist? The other way round – but you're saying it's not sexist – uh, uh, right – is that what you are saying?

Keji: I'm lost!

Teacher: You're saying that the intent of this writing isn't sexist? The intent of it ...but it is examining a situation where it is sexist?

Keji: But the intent of it is not to be sexist. She is just showing that in some cases you do get sexism.

Teacher: OK. Right. Ian.

Ian: I'm back agreeing and disagreeing with them, right? Noo, actually they were talking about dogs? This main point of this passage is human rights. It keeps coming back to the point of human rights. It's man and women. It's not to dae with just women and how fairly women are untreated. Men are treated just as bad sometimes. You don't see it but thingme ... it's just everything seems to be always for women. You never get anything for men. I'm no being trying to be sexist. It's always 'women's rights, women's rights' you have and it always

goes on about the negatives. Over the years everything has got better and it is getting a lot equal – which it should be – but youse always go on about your rights. You never go on about human rights. As it's going it's women's rights should be human rights. They are ... That's what they are trying to make all the time, but youse are always being negative towards the men.

Teacher: So are you arguing that the cat/dog analogy isn't accurate because man/woman are both human?

Ian: Aye.

Teacher: And can you not differentiate between man/woman when you are talking about politics?

Ian: You shouldnae be different because the both of them have had equal rights, obviously when you are talking about, like, going into families it's different cos the woman has to leave her work to look after the wean, obviously. She cannae have it in the middle of the workplace. But it's women and men should have equal rights. But it's always feminist things. It's always feminist. It's never the other way about. I'm losing the point – she's laughing.

Teacher: Chris hasn't had his hand up much so I'm going to force him to speak just now.

Chris: See in all these third world countries that's mare or less where the, that's what the majority dae – where aw this stuff's happening, like them getting degraded and aw that. I think it's partly down to, like, religion and aw that, just like in different countries ... See the adverts for the banks and aw that, the Lloyds, TSB, they talk about you cannae show your feet in Thailand and aw that, red card and aw that. It just shows cos they have stronger views on religion – they live by that way so.

Teacher: And Nicky, you respond to that.

Nicky M: I disagree ... Well, I agree with Ian because Ian's talking about religion, but who wrote the religions? It was men. I think it's impossible to answer this question. I think it's impossible to answer that question 'Is this sexist against men?' because the minute you stop talking about human rights and start talking about women rights, whether you realise it or not you are being sexist because you are differentiating between men and women. But the very last statement in this whole passage is about the potential of human family to create a peaceful prosperous world will not be realised. It's showing that women can make the world a better place but no by their own. It's part of a family, part of a nation to make the world a better place but they cannae dae it by their self but the men ... I think the minute you start talking about women's rights and empowering women the guys get very sensitive and they are like, 'Aw, aye! They're being sexist against men,' but don't forget that women have been sexually discriminated against for thousands and thousands of years and it will probably take another thousand years or so before everywhere all round the world they'll realise that women have the right to be as powerful as men. There shouldn't be this difference between ... There's enough differences in the world like rich and poor, and other differences to sort out. But in countries like Iraq and countries that we are talking about where there are cultural differences, it's aw to dae with religion. But it's men that are deciding this religion.

Clare: I'm just going to disagree with Ian very angrily.

Teacher: Remember the community aspect of what we are doing.

Clare: You said what we need is human rights? Well, how can women have equal human rights if we don't have rights the same as men? How is that human rights? You deny women the basic things. Like years and years ago when your supposed human rights only involved men, we weren't allowed to vote. Is that a human right to choose who was in control of you? Is that not a basic human right? But yet we were denied it and it's denied in some countries still today. A human right is to wear and dress and have freedom of speech yet women are denied that in some countries and we're denied it in countries and we're still denied it here,

right? So you talk about another human right, right to an education. Yet women in other countries only have permission to have education through their male counterpart. Shall I keep going on? There's more. Do you want me to go on about human rights? Well, how can you turn round and say, 'Well, women's rights are human rights,' when we don't have them? How do we? You can't say that. You can't go on and say, 'Oh, well, it's sexist against women ... It's sexist against men,' when women don't have the same chance as men. It's just recently girls are allowed to take techy, just recently this has happened, and guys are allowed to take home eccies as well, yeah, but the fact is men ... (*interruption*) We are talking about something very trivial but what about the fact that is that you've had the right to vote and we have only had it recently?

Stuart: I totally disagree with you, right? See quite a lot of the points you made like going to school, daeing such and such, a lot of that is like being able to wear certain claes, a lot of that is down to religion, a lot of ... (*interruption*)

Teacher: Order, order! Right, Mr Jeffrey, the floor is yours.

Stuart: That is down to religion, right? We cannae change it, but – well, we could try – but think of the upset that would dae. 'All right we don't like that, so we'll just change religion!' Aye, among men. But we cannae dae that. Well, we *could* dae that but it would cause a helluva lot of upset. But we're gonnæ try and dae it anyway. I don't agree with, like, women being ...things happening to women like that, but I disagree with what you're saying about it's men. That happened thousands of years ago, so don't blame the men in modern days.

Teacher: I'm going to bring Clare back in, but before Clare comes in, Ian, could you say something?

Ian: I was going to say something, but he sort of said it.

Teacher: What was it you were going to say?

Ian: I've forgot now, I swear. I've forgot my point. Everybody's rabbling on.

Teacher: Anybody else want to come in before Clare does?

Keji: I think the big thing is inequality. We are all individuals. We all feel differently. No, we don't all feel differently, but we all have our own *deep* opinions about different kind of things but again going with this ... We shouldn't thrive on the past. We shouldn't dwell on it and think, 'Oh my God, these men done that.' Every man is different and especially with the modern day, men are different today than what they were years ago. You will have some men who are in power, who will want to control that power and use that power the way they want to but we can't thrive on the past and dwell on the past and think, 'Oh my God, Stuart, you are Xxxxxxxxxxxxxx,' when Stuart might not be a xxxxxxxxxxxx.

Teacher: Right, we are heading towards the end of our time, so Ian, then Clare.

Ian: Back to Keji's point. But everything, all this, is in the past. There is still a lot of this, but it's in poorer countries. So in fact these kind of countries are all against it. We're always trying to get it up, the more developed countries, and going back to Clare's point a lot of women are against men and they just hate men for these reasons when a lot of modern men are for getting all these rights, having the same rights as us, which it should be, right? And it should have happened a long time ago and it's only just starting to happen now.

Clare: I disagree with your point. You said that it was religion that did it. What about there's hundreds of people who are atheists the day and they still discriminate against women and then to go wi' your point? The fact is, see, if we are so equal why do we must enforce positive discrimination? Why do we still discriminate people from the workforce? Take the figures. How many secondary school headteachers are female? There's a small percentage of them that are female and they are all males. Yet there's more female teachers and primary teachers and it's the same as well if you go to a primary school. It's mostly female teachers,

yet it's all male heads. And it comes to the same in a secondary school. Why can't ...? There's less female women secondary teachers and there's lots of males and you would never get a ... There's no techy teachers. You go to the big companies. Even when women are meant to be portrayed as equal, there's no women that are heads of the companies. There's hardly any percentages and it keeps going on to this. The fact is we have, see to get an equal, to be equal, we have to be positive discrimination by only allowing women to try and go for the job and it's still discrimination so why can you say, 'Oh, women are equal' and all that when we are clearly still not? And this is in a modern society. How are you saying that?

Teacher: OK, can I ask Nicky to go in there?

Nicky M: See if you take – the world is a big place to talk about inequalities because there's thousands of them – if you take as an example in this school inequalities. For instance there's nae women's football team ... (*interruption*) How come there's nae women techy teachers? There's nae. There isnae. Is there any guy home eccies teachers? No, that's what I'm saying. There's no home eccies, women techy teachers. But when they come to things like Home Economics and other things like French it's maistly female teachers. There's inequalities against men and women. It's just that women have to fight a wee bit mare to have themselves heard because if it was up to men, no aw men, maist men on average, then men would rather *they* were in control.

Teacher: Listen, I realise this is a contentious issue and people here have strong views on it, but we are about to run out of time and I'm going to stop the question there. Clare, just before we start can I ask you to think about what's happened over the last hour, compare that with how we would normally go about these passages and ask just for your thoughts.

Nicky M: People have stronger feelings about this because we are actually involved in it rather than the other stories you have told us about where we've been listening in. This is something that we've been involved, right, because this is being done.

Teacher: Right, so in comparison to the way we have done the Community of Enquiry with stories, this is different in that way and comparing this Community of Enquiry approach to the way we normally would do close reading, for our close reading passage in the exam, would you think about that one as well.

Clare: I definitely, I think ... See if I was coming after this discussion to do a passage like this, no, I wouldn't just look at the English of it. I would look at the background of it as well. Understand it more. I think I would get a better mark doing this after talking about it, cos as well as knowing the English about it, if you have, can think about, have a bit of a background to it, you are going to have better answers, I definitely think.

Teacher: Other folks? Ian.

Ian: It's better as well because you are getting other people's points of view. Like I'm getting my point of view, but everybody else has got their different point of view which has been shown in the last couple of hours. We have all of us got different points of view.

Teacher: OK. Nicky

Nicky A: See before, if I had've done this on my own and wrote an essay on that passage I think I could have probably got a good B for it. But see now I've got different arguments and I've got points and I've got arguments for and against ... Knowing each other's ideas instead of just having your own. It's like ideas uniting and disagreeing or agreeing gies you points for and against. You've got a wider viewpoint on it which would help you getting a better mark.

Teacher: Right, thanks very much.