Lampert M., Rittenhouse P. and Crumbaugh C. *Agreeing to Disagree*

The writings of Lampert; Scardamalia, Bereiter and their colleagues; and Bielaczyc and Collins talk of "learning communities," "creating communities of scientific practice and discourse," fostering 'a culture of disagreement," and "communities of scholarly pursuits," etc. Why are these models viewed as important?

What is the potential conflict between the kind of discourse that scholars and reformers believe will foster learning in schools, and common beliefs about "disagreeing in public" to which the authors refer? How does this conflict arise in the classrooms in which Lampert teaches? Does Lampert address this conflict in her classroom practices? How?

Researchers spend many hours analysing student discourse such as that given on pages 9-11 of the article --- they try to understand more fully how students approach the learning process, and they look for advances in understanding and for conditions and events that facilitate or block such advances. In other words, they engage in a form of meta-discourse, or discourse about the observed discourse. How useful do you think it would be for teachers to examine such discourse -- as a way to gain deeper insights into student learning? What about its usefulness for students -- as a way to reflect on their own learning?