Critical & Creative Thinking

The Australasian Journal of Philosophy in Education

Vol. 17 No. 1 May 2009

ISSN 1325-7730

Critical & Creative Thinking

The Australasian Journal of Philosophy in Education

Vol. 17 No. 1 May 2009

ISSN 1325-7730

Welcome to *Critical & Creative Thinking*

Welcome to Vol. 17 No. 1 of *Critical & Creative Thinking: The Australasian Journal of Philosophy in Education.*

Critical & Creative Thinking is published in May and November. Subscriptions are due in February (forms are available in this edition). We hope that you will continue your subscription, and if you have any suggestions, please send them to us.

About the Journal

Critical & Creative Thinking is an international journal published under the auspices of the Federation of Australasian Philosophy in Schools Associations (FAPSA). The focus of the journal is philosophical inquiry with school-age students. What was once called Philosophy for Children has now grown into a sub-discipline of philosophy with its own history, traditions and pedagogy, and incorporates what could be called philosophical inquiry in the classroom, reflective education and, generally speaking, philosophy in schools, as well as related methodologies such as Socratic Dialogue. The journal performs two roles. The first is to publish scholarly research concerning the theory and practice of philosophical inquiry at school level. These articles will appear in the 'Research Articles' section. The second is to publish reports of practice, comments on resources, suggestions and ideas about philosophising with school students and so forth, with a view to encouraging professional interchange among those interested in philosophical inquiry with school-age students.

Aim and Scope

To provide a vehicle for the communication of ideas and a forum for discussion and debate of issues concerning the practice of philosophical inquiry with school-age students.

To promote better teaching and curricular design for the development of critical and creative thinking amongst school-age students through increased understanding and use of philosophical inquiry in the classroom.

To enrich the understanding of philosophy and philosophical inquiry as well as its role in the development of good thinking and good judgement.

To increase interaction and collaboration between the academic community of scholars in universities and teachers in schools on matters of logic, epistemology, creativity, metaphysics, aesthetics, ethics, inquiry, philosophy of science, mind, personhood, community, understanding, learning, thinking, dialogue, discussion, and related matters concerning philosophy, inquiry and classroom pedagogy.

To promote discussion of the place of philosophy in the nation and school curriculum and its infusion into the present curriculum, as well as the place of philosophy in the intellectual, creative, moral and social development of individuals.

Notes for Contributors

All contributions will be considered for publication. Articles will be subject to the normal processes of peer-review for scholarly refereed journals, including blind reviewing by at least two referees drawn from the Editorial Committee (or from other international scholars with special expertise as necessary).

Manuscripts should be prepared with a title page. Include all relevant information about the author; institutional affiliation (if applicable), email address and contact details. The title page will be removed prior to review.

Articles should be 1.5 or double spaced in 12 point. Please keep formatting to a minimum. Use footnote citation with a list of references at the end. Tables and text in side-by-side columns should be placed in a table with 1 point border.

Please send articles attached as a Word document to:
sue.knight@unisa.edu.au

Letters to the Editor

It may happen that you read an article and would like to respond, but not in the form of a lengthy article. Such responses, which might simply add to a point made by the author either in agreement or disagreement, or offer an alternative view, could appear as a 'Letter to the Editor.' The idea is to encourage dialogue between readers and authors, in effect using the journal to create a community of inquiry.

Send all contributions to: sue.knight@unisa.edu.au

Critical & Creative Thinking

The Australasian Journal of Philosophy in Education

Vol. 17 No. 1 May 2009

CONTENTS

Editorial

Drawing together and ordering articles for a new issue of the journal is always an interesting process. While we often begin the task with a set of papers that appear quite disparate, the end result is sometimes a collection of works closely related in more than one distinct way. This has certainly been our experience in collating the current issue of *Critical & Creative Thinking*. Four of our six articles, for example, highlight teaching and research efforts from South Australians working in the field, a rewarding outcome for local editors, reflecting perhaps the increased profile of the journal in our state. Thinking ahead, however – as editors tend to do – future issues could, from time to time at least, showcase work from other dedicated Australasian regions. Your comments on this suggestion and on ideas presented in the articles themselves are always welcome; a 'Letters to the Editors' section would surely be an interesting and worthwhile addition to the journal.

The second and more salient theme emerging from papers in this issue is the deep-seated and often steadying influence Matthew Lipman continues to have in philosophy in education. Indeed, Lipman's theories and practical recommendations are drawn upon in various ways within each of these contributions. The first article, from Seyed Mansour Marashi and colleagues from Iran, reports on an intervention study based on Lipman's Community of Inquiry approach and the ethical inquiry curriculum and novel, *Lisa*. The research design and testing methods, too, are based on Lipman's early efforts in empirical research, with pleasing findings for the team of researchers keen to promote philosophy for children in Iranian schools. Clinton Golding's tribute piece to Ross Phillips begins by carefully describing Lipman's approach to teaching logic, an approach that differs from but also complements the 'Logic Game' explained in the article. Golding reminds us of both the roots of philosophy for children and the ways in which it can be enhanced to keep philosophy alive and thriving in our schools. In her contribution, Tania Meyer raises the question of how the limits to tolerance should be drawn in a

democratic society, and explores the role which Lipman's rich notion of Community of Inquiry might play in defining these limits. Martyn Mills-Bayne challenges us not to underestimate the potential of even very young children to discover, understand and apply primary reasoning skills in their daily lives. The author's description of discussions with his own young children, stimulated as so many of us have been by questions raised in *Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery*, is both enjoyable and thought provoking. Angela Pfitzenmeier presents a very different style of writing for the journal in her interview with primary school teacher, Ian Stewart. This feature article is uplifting as it highlights Ian's own love of philosophical thinking and discussion, which is subsequently reflected in his work with students across the year levels. Again, Lipman's influence is clear and his novels and teaching manuals (including *Lisa*, *Harry* and *Pixie*) make possible the task of working with several different age groups on a weekly basis. Chris Meadow's unit of work designed (as part of his recent Masters coursework) for a senior secondary Art class is also clearly grounded in Community of Inquiry methodology and incorporates the use of discussion plans to support the facilitation of ethical inquiry sessions on contemporary and often controversial topics relating to visual arts.

This somewhat unexpected tribute to the work of Matthew Lipman is timely given that we hope to include a book review of Matthew Lipman's autobiography in the second issue of *Critical & Creative Thinking* for 2009. The November issue will also include a review of the recently launched P4C website (http://www.p4c.com/), developed by colleagues from the UK. The website appears to add positively to the selection reviewed in the journal recently and although most benefit is to be gained by becoming a paid member to the site, much is available and worth exploring without taking this step. We are also delighted to announce that the November 2009 issue will be a Special Edition facilitated by Sue Wilks and colleagues from the fields of Education and Architecture on the topic of 'Learning Environments and Pedagogy'. This step in a slightly different direction is, we believe, an exciting venture for *Critical & Creative Thinking* and we look forward with interest to the ideas presented in light of our own work in schools and teacher education settings.

Finally, and as always, we would like to extend our sincere thanks to Justine Gallasch for her editorial and administrative help in bringing the journal to your doorstep. Thanks also to the authors and reviewers for their collaborative efforts in preparing papers for publication in this edition.

Our very best wishes for the second half of 2009.

Carol and Sue

Teaching Philosophy to Children: A New Experience in Iran

A Study of the Effect of the Community of Inquiry in the Philosophy for Children Program on Fostering Reasoning Skills in Eighth Grade Male Students of Nemooneh Dowlati School of Ahvaz

Seyed Mansour Marashi, PhD
Masoud Safaei Moghaddam, PhD
Mohammad Jafar Paksaresht, PhD
(Shahid Chamran University, Ahvaz-Iran)

1. Introduction

The philosophy for children program (P4C) aims to develop children's thinking abilities and reasoning skills, to improve the conditions of teaching children to think, and to help children learn how to think by themselves (Lipman, 1991). It can be done, as Matthew Lipman believes, by integrating children's natural curiosity and their desire for discovering the world, with philosophy. This idea came from an important experience during 1968, a time of student protest and unrest, when Columbia University professor Lipman saw that:

> There was so much rigidity among both students and the university administration, so little communication, so little recourse to reason. I was beginning to have serious doubts about the value of teaching philosophy. It didn't seem to have any impact on what people did. I began to think that the problem I was seeing in the university couldn't be solved there, that thinking was something that had to be taught much earlier, so that by the time a student graduated from high school, skillful, independent thinking would have become a habit. (Lipman cited in Chance, 1986, p. 41)

Since then research has shown that it is too late to develop reasoning skills during adulthood, including university years. The result of these studies, along with the idea that philosophy is not exclusive to philosophers, has persuaded educational scholars to think about teaching philosophy to young children. Thus, the new program entitled *philosophy for children* was proposed as a means by which philosophy could enter schools. This does not mean that children must be taught the philosophy of Plato, Aristotle or Kant directly in class sessions, though these philosophers might have interesting ideas for both children and adults. Concepts such as truth, freedom, beauty, justice, rights and rules may, in both their theoretical and practical ramifications, prove too abstruse for children. Rather, through P4C children are likely, or can be led though group discussions, to ask questions such as these: Should we always follow the majority or the law? How can we demonstrate our friendship? What does a good society look like? What can our body do for us? Do we have to think all the time? How can we understand the way others think?

While this program was under way in many countries by the 1990s, the need for a philosophy for children program in Iran was implicitly referred to by S. M. Khatami, the then president of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Speaking at a primary school in Ardabil (Iran), he asked the students: 'Why should we follow the law?' Holding a masters degree in philosophy of education, Khatami might have been familiar with the program, bringing him to the conclusion that to have a more democratic society it was necessary to have philosophically better-educated students. In fact, this idea transcends Lipman's first and major motivation for proposing his P4C program, in which philosophy is used to cultivate logical thinking among students. Indeed, Khatami's question would, most probably, reflect the new approach to education, which focuses on thinking. This is based on the belief that to have a better life, calls for better thinkers. Before the P4C program was initiated, scholars such as Ennis, Lipman and Paul (cited in Shabani, 2004, p. 1), had argued that cultivating thoughtful people should be the major purpose of education. P4C was thus employed to serve this purpose. Lipman, then, making a historical background for this program, argued that teaching philosophy to children is adopted from Dewey and

Vygotsky's theories that focus on teaching thinking and reject the idea of rote learning. In a similar vein, Fisher (1995) argues that the philosophy for children program is a successful method to teach thinking. Findings in more than fifty countries have indicated that philosophy for children improves thinking skills, including critical thinking (Fisher, 1998).

Since 1998 there has been an increasing demand in Iran for making the educational system more effective in producing thoughtful students. A number of theoretical studies concerning P4C, its content, method, structure, and also its compatibility with the cultural context of Iran, have been initiated to see whether and how this program can be incorporated with the Iranian educational system (Safaei Moghaddam, 1999; Jahani, 2003; Ghaedi, 2005). The current study is the first empirical attempt to see how Iranian students respond to this program.

2. P4C and community of inquiry methodology

One of the main purposes of the P4C program is improving the conditions of teaching thinking in educational systems (Lipman, 1991). Lipman believes that the goal of the program is to help children learn how to think by themselves. He spells out the main focuses of this program as follows: improving reasoning ability, developing creativity, bracing ethical values, enhancing self-awareness and raising critical thinking. In 'Critical Thinking, What Can It Be?', Lipman (1988) proposed a model for critical thinking and claimed that teaching critical thinking aims to cultivate reasonable individuals by using the process of inquiry. Lipman believes that philosophy for children is the only program that uses philosophical discussions to improve ethical thinking in children. Indeed, it comes from engaging children in ethical inquiry. So, 'community of inquiry' is a method, for Lipman, through which the goals of P4C can be achieved. The term 'community of inquiry' was used by Peirce for the first time in *Fixation of Belief* (1955). Unlike the traditional classroom in which information is transmitted from teacher to students, in a community of inquiry students in association with their teachers participate in a joint enterprise. Based on the P4C program, the traditional classroom needs to be changed into the new form of community of inquiry in which the stage is set for

learning through discussion. In this new form of classroom, students are divided into research groups or a community of inquiry where close partnerships and collaboration in an educational setting are encouraged.

As Splitter and Sharp (1995) have pointed out, children enjoy stories and as a result can be motivated to ask questions, participate, and think by being exposed to such texts; especially if the story includes competitive topics and events. For this reason, special storybooks have been developed to implement the philosophy for children program. In the community of inquiry, students read a story and then, under the supervision of the teacher, discuss it collectively as a collaborative work.

3. Hypothesis and purpose of the study

The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of the community of inquiry method in the philosophy for children (P4C) program on fostering reasoning skills in eighth grade guidance school male students of the Nemooneh Dowlaty School of Ahvaz. This school is part of a middle class community located in the city of Ahvaz, the centre of the Khouzestan province in the south-west of Iran. 'Nemooneh Dowlaty' refers to a kind of school in Iran which is attended by high-ability students, who are able to pass an entrance examination as a required condition for admission. This school was selected because of the high educational quality and the rich background of its students. In his interview with the Iranian P4C site, Lipman indicated that students with a good educational background would be most suitable for our research purposes (Naji, 2008). Sixty eighth grade male students, randomly selected from this school, participated in the study.

The general hypothesis maintained in this study was: *Community of inquiry method has a positive effect on fostering reasoning skills in students.*

4. Subjects and methodology

The subjects for this study were 60 eighth grade male students of Ahvaz Nemooneh Dowlaty School, randomly selected from among all 90 students of the same grade (three classes). The participating students were then assigned to either an experimental group or a control group, each consisting of 30 students. This research employed a semi-

experimental design with pre-test, post-test and control group. The experimental group was exposed to the community of inquiry method using the *Lisa* storybook[1] for eleven sessions to examine the effect of this method on the students' reasoning skills. The time allotted to each session was seventy minutes.

The *Lisa* storybook contains a set of philosophical stories written by Lipman (1983) for students in grades seven to nine. The stories focus on issues like goodness, natural, the nature of rules and laws, reasoning, children's rights, animal rights, and thinking. Lisa tries to understand and concentrate on the inter-relationship between ethics and logic. She is concerned with a more specialised portion of philosophy, one which is generally called ethics. The book helps students to think and focus on reasoning skills and their ethical values. It helps them to know explicitly what their real ethical and rational choices are, and how they could be critically evaluated. After that, the students are expected to justify their beliefs and provide good reasons for the different notions and behaviours they may have. Along with *Lisa*, *Ethical Inquiry*, an educational guidance book, was written to assist the teachers in supervising the class or the community of inquiry. In producing this guidance book, Lipman and Sharp (1985) explain that the aim is not to teach students some special and determined values, but open, free and endless thinking.

In this study, philosophy was taught to the experimental group using the community of inquiry method for 11 sessions over 11 weeks. During the first session, the philosophy for children program and community of inquiry method were introduced to the students. For each of the 10 remaining sessions, one topic was allotted; thus, 10 topics were discussed altogether.

The discussion topic of the second session (after the introductory session) was 'appropriateness' (part-whole relationships), which comes from the first episode of the *Lisa* novel. In this episode, Lisa is examining her face in the mirror. She thinks that her features are wrong. This, indeed, is a matter of appropriateness. She thinks that her features are not appropriate to one another and to her face as a whole, and this is, she believes, the reason why someone is not beautiful or aesthetically good. In a similar vein, this is

[1] This storybook is one of the texts that Lipman has provided for P4C.

the reason why something is aesthetically wrong. In this episode of *Lisa*, we have three types of part-whole problems: aesthetic, logical and ethical. Some questions of the discussion plan concerning parts and wholes (which have been discussed by children) are as follows: If a single drop of rain falls, is it raining? If you have just put on your socks, are you dressed? If you have a thought, are you thinking? If you are happy for a moment, does this mean you are a happy person? The relationships of parts to wholes, and wholes to parts, can be much more difficult than it may at first appear. During the discussion, the teacher acts only as a facilitator who helps the students to recognise the serious fallacies that reasoning about part-whole relationships is subject to, and how they can be avoided.

Other sessions focused on discussing the following topics: right and wrong (When should we call things good?); putting oneself in another's place; good reasons (When is a reason a good reason?); what is a right? (Do animals and children have rights?); what is the difference between animals and humans? (differences of degree and differences of kind); universalising vs. considering consequences of individual actions; anticipating the consequences of what we do; adjusting means to ends; and conditional reasoning.

Students in the class were regarded as a 'community of inquiry' so that they all should participate in the discussion under the supervision of the teacher. In any session, students first read some part of the story related to the topic, then the teacher invited students to discuss the story and give their views on the parts that seemed interesting or unusual to them. Writing the proposed opinions of the students on the board, the teacher asked other students to give their own reasons for or against the expressed views. In this manner, the students entered into an active discussion with each other based on the community of inquiry method.

5. Instrument and design

The New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills (NJTRS) was used as an instrument for collecting data. This instrument was developed by Virginia Shipman from 1976 to 1981. The skills that are assessed by this instrument all belong to the category of logic. The language used in this instrument is simple, vivid and non-commanding. The test consists of 50

multiple choice items in the form of syllogisms, representing 22 reasoning skill areas: converting statements, translating into logical forms, inclusion/exclusion, recognising improper questions, avoiding jumping to conclusions, analogical reasoning, detecting underlying assumptions, eliminative alternatives, inductive reasoning, reasoning with relationships, detecting ambiguities, discerning causal relationships, identifying good reasons, recognising symmetrical relationships, syllogistic reasoning (categorical), distinguishing differences of kind and degree, recognising transitive relationships, recognising dubious authority, reasoning with four-possibilities matrix, contradicting statements, whole-part and part-whole statements, and syllogistic reasoning (conditional). Though the test has been designed for large groups of students without time limitation, it takes approximately 35 to 40 minutes to be completed (Shipman & Cohn, 1983). To measure the internal consistency of the test, the coefficient of Cronbach alpha (calculated as 0.70) was used. Coefficient of correlation and criterion tests (calculated as 0.54) were used to test the validity of the instrument.

6. Findings

The descriptive statistical measures including mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum scores in experimental and control groups are presented in Table 1. These indices indicate that the mean of post-test scores of the experimental group, in comparison with its pre-test scores, has increased, while the mean of the control group has diminished on post-test. Moreover, regarding the post-test scores, the mean of the experimental group is higher than that of the control group.

Table 1: Descriptive data of pre-test and post-test scores for the experimental and control groups (NJTRS)

Group	Variable	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	Mean	Standard Deviation
Experimental	Pre-test	21	41	31.40	4.34
	Post-test	27	45	35.36	3.93
Control	Pre-test	22	41	30.76	5.17
	Post-test	20	38	29.83	5.43

The results of ANCOVA and Linear regression analyses are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Results of variance and covariance analyses of pre-test and post-test scores

Variation Source	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean of Squares	F	Significance Level
Covariance (Pre-test)	700.496	1	700.469	65.814	P < 0.0001
Group	425.710	1	425.710	39.998	P < 0.0001
Total	606.533	56	10.831	-	-
Error	66100	60	-	-	-
Group without Covariance	504.6	1	504.6	22.39	P < 0.0001
Error	1307.133	58	22.537	-	-
Total	66100	60	-	-	-

As shown in Table 2, the F ratio calculated for the experimental and control groups is 39.998 which is significant at *P<0.0001* level. Therefore, it can be said that our hypothesis concerning the efficacy of the P4C program in promoting children's reasoning skills is confirmed. In addition, the effect size for the experimental group is *R2=0.412* indicating that about 40% of the reasoning skills variance among students was due to the use of the community of inquiry method. Besides, as Table 2 shows, the difference between the groups in post-test scores is significant without recourse to covariance analysis.

In general, the results have shown that the community of inquiry method has a positive impact on developing the reasoning skills of male students from Ahvaz Nemooneh Dowlaty School. This result agrees with Kane (1985), Simon (1979), Cummings (1981), Iorio *et al.* (1984), Allen (1988), Sprod (1997), Daniel (1998), and Montes and Maria (2001). These researchers have found that the community of inquiry method has a positive effect on the development of reasoning skills. While further replications of this study on a larger scale should be conducted, it can be concluded from the current findings that the P4C program is a useful tool for the cultivation and enhancement of reasoning skills among school-age children in Iran. This fact could be considered as one of the requirements of the Fourth Development Plan of Iran, which calls for essential improvement in the Iranian educational system, particularly the overhauling of its curricula.

References

Allen, T. (1988). 'Doing philosophy with children'. *Journal of Thinking*, 7(3), 35-44.

Chance, P. (1986). *Thinking in the Classroom*, New York: Teachers College Press.

Cummings, N. P. (1981). 'Analytical Thinking for Children: Review of the Research', in *Analytic Teaching*, 2(1), PP, 26- 28.

Daniel, M. F. (1998). 'P4C in pre-service Teacher Education'. *Analytic Teaching*, 19(1), 13-20

Fisher, R. (1995). *Teaching children to learn*. London: Bloch well / Simon and Schuster/ Stanley thornes.

Fisher, R. (1998). *Teaching thinking: Philosophical inquiry in the classroom*. London: continuum.

Ghaedi, Y. (2005). *Philosophy for Children*, Davavin publication, Tehran, Iran.

Iorio, J., Weinstein, M. & Martin, J. (1984). 'Philosophy for children program'. *Journal of Thinking*, 3(2), 28-35.

Jahani, J. (2003). 'On philosophical foundations of Lipman's educational pattern of critical thinking: a critical investigation'. *Journal of Human Science*, Al-zahra University, Tehran, Iran, No.42, pp. 35-55.

Kane, J. (1985). 'Philosophy for children'. *Journal of Critical Thinking across the Disciplines*, 5(2), 67-74.

Lipman, M. (1983). *Lisa* (N.J.: 1976) 2nd edition.

Lipman, M. (1988). 'Critical thinking, what can it be?'. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 40(1).

Lipman,M. (1991). *Thinking in Education*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lipman, M. & Sharp, A. M. (1985). *Ethical Inquiry, Instructional Manual to Accompany Lisa*, Boston. University Press of America.

Montes, M. & Maria, E. (2001). *Juchitande lost ninos*, Abstract in IAPC. Montclair State University.

Naji,S (2008) *Stories For Thinking*, Institute Of Humanities and Cultural Studies,Tehran,Iran.

Peirce, C. S. (1955). *The Fixation of Belief: Philosophical Writings of Peirce*. Selected and edited with introduction by Justus Buchler. New York: Daver publication.

Safaei Moghaddam, M. (1999). 'Philosophy for Children Program'. *Journal of Human Science*, Al-Zahra University, Tehran, Iran, No. 26-27, pp. 26-27.

Shabani, H. (2004). *Methods of Teaching*, Samt, Publisher, Tehran. Iran.

Shipman, V.C. and Kohn, (1983) 'Evaluation replication of the philosophy for children program, final report'. *Journal of Thinking*, 5(1), 45-47.

Simon,C. (1979). 'Philosophy for students'. *Journal of Thinking,* 1(1), 21-34.

Splitter, L. J. & Sharp, A. M. (1995). *Teaching for better thinking: The classroom community of inquiry.* Melbourne, Australia: The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.

Sprod, T. (1997). 'What is community of inquiry?'. *Journal of Critical Thinking Across the Disciplines*, 17(1).

Ross Phillips' Logic Game

Clinton Golding (University of Melbourne)

Ross Phillips spent a great deal of his professional life supporting and promoting the teaching of philosophy, and in particular philosophy in schools. He was one of the key instigators of Philosophy for Children (P4C) in Australia and VCE Philosophy in Victoria. His death in 2008 was a sad loss. In this paper I want to pay tribute to Ross by preserving one jewel from his legacy of philosophical teaching and sharing it with those who would otherwise not have the privilege: the Logic Game.

I first discovered the Logic Game in 1995 when Ross presented it at the International P4C Conference in Melbourne. It is a deceptively simple but highly effective and theoretically sophisticated tool for teaching logic. I particularly want to share this treasure as it was very influential for my teaching and for my understanding of P4C.

In the Logic Game, Ross had developed a method for teaching logic that was consistent with the core principles of learning in P4C and their rejection of standard academic methods of teaching logic. But his method was also different from the way Lipman approached the teaching of logic using *Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery* (1982). To explain Ross' approach I will first describe a standard academic method of teaching logic, and then Lipman's alternative theory of learning and his method of teaching logic. This will allow me to present the theory behind the Logic Game in comparison to the standard academic approach and Lipman's approach. Lastly I will describe how to play the Logic Game.

The theory behind the Logic Game

The standard academic method of teaching logic starts with a description of an argument as a series of statements, where some – the premises or reasons – are meant to give support to a conclusion, to make it at least likely that the conclusion is true. The teaching method would likely

continue with a description of different forms of argument and an explanation of what makes a good argument. Typically the focus is on validity: the lecturer explains to students that some arguments have a valid form – which means that if the premises were true, the conclusion must also be true – and some arguments are invalid – which means the conclusion is not guaranteed by the premises. Additionally it would be explained that if a valid argument also has true premises it would count as a sound argument, but otherwise it would be unsound. The standard academic method of teaching logic might also involve presenting students with a list of fallacies, which are common types of argument that are unsound for one reason or another. Students would learn logic by memorising these descriptions and explanations and then complete exercises where they apply the theory to identify which arguments were valid, which were sound and which were fallacious.

The theory of learning behind the standard academic method of teaching logic is very different from how learning is conceived in P4C:

> To learn something well is to learn it afresh in the same spirit of discovery as that which prevailed when it was discovered or in the same spirit of invention as that which prevailed when it was invented (Lipman, 1988, p. 21).

This theory of learning has Deweyan roots where learning occurs only through a process of inquiry (Dewey, 1938, p. 8). This means that students learn by engaging in inquiry for themselves rather than being presented with 'the refined, finished end-products of inquiry' (Lipman, 2003, p. 20). According to Dewey, inquiry begins with experienced doubt or felt discomfort and moves towards creating a 'unified whole' (1938, p. 108). So under this theory, students learn by starting with a genuine problem and then engaging in inquiry until this problem is resolved. I call this learning by inquiry.

The academic method of learning logic is contrary to the theory of learning underlying P4C because it presents the students with the conclusions of years of inquiry about what makes an argument logical, and does not engage students in inquiry for themselves about these issues. The

only significant learning task for students is to practice applying the conclusions they are presented with.

According to the P4C theory of inquiry learning, to learn logic students should start with an issue about logic that they experience as genuinely problematic, and which puts them in a state of cognitive dissonance (not a 'mock' problem that merely provides intellectual exercise). Then, by engaging in the same sort of inquiry that expert philosophers engage in (but at a more novice level), they resolve their problem, thus developing the same sort of knowledge about logic that philosophical experts have developed.

Based on this theory of learning, Lipman designed a new way of teaching logic. His approach was to abandon the academic logic text-book based on transmission models of teaching, instead offering a novel as a stimulus for inquiry about logic. His novel, *Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery*, depicts a group of children engaged in an ongoing dialogue which often touches on issues of logic. The novel introduces students to problematic issues about what makes an argument convincing by depicting the children in the novel grappling with their own reasoning and the reasoning of others. Students read the story and choose issues from it that they then address in their own inquiry where they grapple with the problems, raise questions, suggest possible answers and generally inquire about what makes a good argument. In this way, students inquire for themselves and construct their own knowledge about logic.

This process of inquiry learning in Lipman's method of teaching logic can be summarised in the following stages (2003, pp. 100-103):

1. Stimulus: Shared experience of a story that raises philosophical issues.
2. Agenda: Generate philosophical questions about the issues in this story.
3. Dialogue and discussion: Attempt to answer and make sense of each question, facilitated by the teacher who draws on discussion plans and exercises to help deal with the philosophical issues.
4. Review and reflection: Draw final conclusions and decide what to do next.

These stages of inquiry are sometimes taken to be definitional of P4C. However, they are merely a simple, introductory instance of a deeper and more flexible inquiry learning process that starts with a philosophical problem and ends with a philosophical resolution. So, even though Lipman starts with a story as the means to make philosophical problems evident and stimulate inquiry, this is not the only possible method for inquiry learning.

Ross Phillips' Logic Game uses a different method of teaching logic based on the inquiry learning process of P4C. Rather than present students with a story that raises issues that they could choose to inquire into, the game presents students with a collection of arguments that are problematic in various ways, and invites them to rank the arguments from good to poor. The idea is simple but powerful. Rather than start by transmitting principles of logic and then having students apply them, Ross started with the cases that the principles were invented to make sense of. These cases are impossible to categorise using unsophisticated conceptions of logical and illogical, reasonable and unreasonable. In order to make sense of these challenging problematic cases, students must modify, improve and transform their conceptions of logic. The real aim of the Game is not the ranking itself, but the criteria that students devise for distinguishing good arguments from poor arguments. These are the tools that they can use to discern the difference between high quality and poor quality arguments.

The teacher's job in the Logic Game is to help his or her students to participate in inquiry where they can construct (or reconstruct as Dewey might say) the logical principles for themselves, rather than directing them to a particular answer. Through grappling with the cases in the Logic Game, students develop their own principles of logic which make more sense to them than if they were simply imposed ready-made.

I use versions of the Logic Game in my primary, secondary and tertiary teaching as well as in my teacher education work. The result is always a greater depth of understanding of the principles of logic than is possible through a standard academic approach, but because it is a targeted activity, the result is achieved more rapidly than it would be by reading the Lipman novels.

Inspired by Ross' Logic Game, I made use of this same model of teaching and learning in *Connecting Concepts* (Golding, 2002). I present students with a number of philosophically problematic cases about a concept such as 'racism'. It is difficult to say whether each case is an example of something that is racist or not, and in order to categorise them, students have to refine and develop more sophisticated conceptions of racism.

For the rest of this paper I describe the Logic Game itself, and how it is used. The fundamentals of what I describe come directly from Ross, but I have also elaborated and refined the Game over the years, so now (like many teaching materials associated with P4C) it is difficult to say where Ross's contribution ends and mine begins.

Playing the Logic Game

1. Break students into groups and hand out a full set of arguments to each group, one argument to a sheet of paper

   Give the groups the following instructions:
2. 'Arrange the arguments from best argument to worst argument.'
3. 'Come up with reasons for your arrangement.'
4. 'Develop general rules or criteria about what counts as a good or a bad argument, and what makes one argument better than another.'
5. Discuss the different rankings and the criteria for distinguishing a better from a worse argument from those that have been suggested by students. Use the *Teacher Notes* to facilitate a deep, challenging and productive dialogue.

Once some clear rules or criteria for what counts as a good argument have been developed give students the following instructions:

6. 'Write your own good argument that follows the rules you have developed.'
7. 'Write your own bad argument that breaks the rules you have developed.'

Note that the Logic Game is not an exercise where students practise applying the definitions of good and bad arguments which have been given to them by the teacher, nor is it a subtle ploy from the teacher so they can lead students to come up with the categories of valid and sound arguments. The Logic Game gives students a chance to confront problematic arguments and construct ways of thinking about them that help them to make sense of the cases and develop their own meaningful and sophisticated conceptions of logic.

The cases

I will describe a set of cases, based on Ross's original set, that I have been using for many years to stimulate inquiry about the principles of logic. Like Ross, I have put these into syllogistic form to make the structure of the argument clear. The first two lines are intended to give support for the last line. Thus the first lines are the reasons and the final line, indicated by 'therefore', is the conclusion. Some of the cases are culturally specific, so feel free to change them so they refer to your own cultural context.

1. All live chickens squawk when trodden on
   This is a live chicken
   Therefore if I tread on this chicken, it will squawk

2. Listening to modern music makes you very tall
   The Seven Dwarves are really tall
   Therefore the Seven Dwarves listen to modern music

3. All elephants are purple
   This banana is an elephant
   Therefore this banana is purple

4. Auckland is a city in Australia
   Australia is part of New Zealand
   Therefore Auckland is a city in New Zealand

5. Dame Kiri te Kanawa is a New Zealand Cultural icon
   All 'All Blacks' are New Zealand Cultural icons
   Therefore Dame Kiri te Kanawa is a member of the 'All Blacks'

6. If Mangere is in Auckland then Mangere is in New Zealand
Mangere is in Auckland
Therefore Mangere is in New Zealand

7. If Mangere is in Auckland then Mangere is in New Zealand
Mangere is in New Zealand
Therefore Mangere is in Auckland

8. Auckland is a city in Australia
Australia is part of New Zealand
Therefore Auckland is a city in New Zealand

9. If Brisbane is in Auckland, then Brisbane is in New Zealand
Brisbane is not in New Zealand
Therefore Brisbane is not in Auckland

10. The sun rose every day I remember
No-one has ever reported a day in which the sun didn't rise
Therefore the sun will rise tomorrow

11. The first philosophy class I had was brilliant
The second philosophy class I had was brilliant
All philosophy classes will be brilliant

12. Dr McKenzie has a PhD in History
Dr McKenzie said in class that Elisabeth the First died in 1603
Therefore Elisabeth the first died in 1603

13. Dr McKenzie has a PhD in Astrophysics
Dr McKenzie said in class that Elizabeth the First died in 1603
Therefore Elizabeth the First died in 1603

14. Aspirin is better for pain relief than cocoa
Morphine is better for pain relief than aspirin
Therefore Morphine is better for pain relief than cocoa

15. Nothing is better than eternal happiness
    Cold porridge is better than nothing
    Therefore cold porridge is better than eternal happiness

16. If you walk in the rain, you get wet
    I didn't walk in the rain
    Therefore I am not wet

17. If you walk in the rain, you get wet
    I walked in the rain
    Therefore I got wet

18. If you walk in the rain, you get wet
    I didn't get wet
    Therefore I didn't walk in the rain

Teacher notes

In this section I give a brief description of how the teacher can facilitate a productive Logic Game. I provide some guidance for the teacher so she can help her students uncover the issues, discover problems in their current conceptions of logic and in their rankings of the arguments, and then develop new, meaningful principles of logic.

First the teacher can ask questions that will help students think through the general issues:

1. Do the reasons given prove the conclusion true?
2. Do the reasons given provide some support to the conclusion?
3. Do the reasons given provide no support to the conclusion?
4. Are arguments like this one usually good or usually bad arguments?
5. How do you tell the difference between arguments that actually prove their conclusion true and arguments that trick you into thinking they prove their conclusion when they do not?
6. Can an argument convince someone but still be a bad argument?
7. Can we mistakenly think an argument is good?
8. Can an argument be good even if the reasons turn out to be false?

9. Can an argument be bad even if the reasons are true?
10. Can an argument have a true conclusion?
11. Can a good argument have a false conclusion?

Second the teacher can help the students uncover and reflect on the issues that the cases present. The cases, individually and when compared, raise a number of challenges to our conceptions of what makes a good argument. I have not addressed every possible issue here, but only a few of the important ones, which I describe briefly. It is important to note that the students may discover other unanticipated issues with these cases. These are especially important to discuss.

The description of these issues is provided to help you to point out cases that will challenge the students' conceptions and thus help them refine those conceptions. For example: If students decide that argument 1 is good because it has true reasons, ask them to consider an argument such as 7 that has true reasons but which do not lead to the conclusion. If students decide that argument 16 is poor, ask them to consider an argument they think is good which has a similar form, such as 18, and ask what the difference between them is, etc.

- Some cases have true reasons, but the reasons do not lead to the conclusion (2 & 5); while others have false reasons, but the reasons do lead to the conclusion (3).
- A few have (plausibly) true reasons and the reasons do support the conclusion. These seem to be the best examples of good arguments (1, 6 & 9). However, one is bad through and through as it has false reasons, the reasons do not lead to the conclusion and the conclusion is false (2).
- Some have conclusions that are true, which makes it seem like they are good arguments, but the reasons do not support this conclusion (7) or the reasons are false (8). On the other hand, one has a false conclusion, but the argument does support this conclusion (3).
- One has reasons that look false, but they are true and do lead to the conclusion (9).

- In most of the cases, the reasons are given in an attempt to prove the conclusion true, but in some, the reasons are only intended to make it likely that the conclusion is true (10-13). The reasons given in 10 and 12 seem to make it likely that the conclusion is true. They give much stronger support than 11 and 13, but not as strong as 6 which proves its conclusion true.
- Some cases problematise the importance of the meaning of words in the arguments (14 & 15). Although they seem to have the same basic form, 14 is a good argument while 15 seems crazy because the words used in 15 seem to mean different things in the reasons and the conclusion.
- Some have a form that means that if the premises are true the conclusion must be true, but others, although similar, have a form that means the reasons do not lead to the conclusion. The reasons in 6 and 9 lead to the conclusion, but they do not in 7, even though it looks similar. Likewise, 16-18 all share a similar form, but only 17 and 18 prove their conclusion true. Even though 16 looks similar, the conclusion does not follow from the reasons given.

The Logic Game is an enjoyable and useful teaching tool that also advances our understanding of P4C and philosophy teaching. Thank you Ross. Long may students engage with and learn from the Logic Game.

References

Dewey, J. (1938). *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*, in J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *The Later Works 1925-53, John Dewey, Vol. 12* (1986 ed.). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Golding, C. (2002). *Connecting Concepts: Thinking Activities for Students*. Melbourne: ACER Press.

Lipman, M. (1982). *Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery* (second edn.). New Jersey: IAPC.

Lipman, M. (1988). *Philosophy Goes to School*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lipman, M. (2003). *Thinking in Education* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

How to be Tolerant & Yet Not Tolerate Everything: Practicing Reasonable Tolerance

Tania Meyer (University of South Australia)

A well functioning democratic society requires tolerance on the part of its citizens, that is, tolerance towards differences of beliefs, cultural practices and religions. To put it differently, democracy necessarily involves certain freedoms: freedom of religion, freedom of speech and the freedom to choose how to live one's life; freedoms which are enshrined in law. Yet while peaceful coexistence depends on tolerance, it is equally clear that tolerance must have its limits.

Clearly those citizens who believe that it is morally wrong to kill animals for food are required as citizens to show tolerance towards those who eat meat. But should they (or indeed other members of society) tolerate the killing of whales for food? Again our society grants individuals the freedom to hold religious beliefs such as the belief in Intelligent Design and to engage in religious practices such as fasting and the wearing of the Burka, while prohibiting the circumcising of females. This begs the question then: where should the limits of tolerance lie?

- In 2005, following a heated debate between parents, educators, Christians and scientists in the United States[1], the then Australian Federal Education Minister, Dr Brendan Nelson, told the National Press Club that Intelligent Design should be taught in schools alongside Evolution if that was the wish of parents.

[1] Known as the Dover Area School Intelligent Design debate: http://www.nytimes.com/2005/12/21/education/21evolution.html

> As far as I'm concerned, students can be taught and should be taught the basic science in terms of the evolution of man, but if schools also want to present students with intelligent design, I don't have any difficulty with that. It's about choice, reasonable choice. (Wroe, 2005, n.p.)

- Despite progress made in other democratic countries, Australia remains steadfast in its refusal of rights for same sex couples. Although legal in South Africa, Sweden, the Netherlands, Spain and so on, both legalised marriage and registered unions are banned for same sex couples in Australia. Only heterosexual couples have the legal right to marry, to have children, to share tax, Medicare, pension and superannuation benefits, and the list goes on.

- Just this month (June, 2009), in the U.S., Dr George Tiller was shot dead for performing late term abortions (Landers, 2009). Similar attacks have been made on doctors who perform abortions, as well as attacks on their staff and clinics throughout the U.S., Australia, New Zealand and Canada.

These current examples not only demonstrate some of the differences in beliefs, cultural practices and religions which characterise our democratic society, but also show the importance of a range of different views about where the limits of tolerance should lie. This is surely a question which needs urgent and careful consideration.

Clearly, the very raising of the question implies the rejection of relativism, the view that there is no objective basis on which to make moral or empirical judgements. It seems unnecessary to reproduce the well known logical arguments against relativism here.[2] We take it that the basis for empirical judgement lies in the intersubjectivity of experience; that such judgements are grounded in objective evidence and reasoning, while moral judgement is grounded in the needs of sentient beings and the notion of equal moral

[2] In his paper 'The Challenge of Cultural Relativism' (2000, in Steven M. Cahn, *Exploring Philosophy*, NY: Oxford University Press), Rachels outlines the arguments for and against relativism.

worth.[3] The dangers of relativism are, of course, well known. In denying that there is an objective basis on which to make empirical or moral judgements the relativist is forced to sanction harmful practices, such as racism and damaging beliefs (such as scepticism about global warming).

Many writers have struggled with the concept of toleration: the idea that as citizens of a democracy, we have an obligation to 'put up with' actions or ideas that we have good reason to believe are false or dangerous. For example, I may have grounds for claiming that it is harmful to allow people to preach religious gospel in public places, or to oppose the amount of government money spent on sending athletes to the Olympic Games, or to disapprove of the way that animals are used for human entertainment (e.g. cock fighting, bull fighting), yet believe that such practices and policies must be tolerated within a democratic society. Toleration also involves extending constitutional and democratic rights to those people we have reason to believe are espousing attitudes which are morally misguided (Sullivan, Piereson & Marcus, 1982): for instance, allowing an openly racist political party to run for government (e.g. the One Nation party in Australia).

It is simplistic then to argue that the limits of toleration coincide with the limits of rationality and morality. Moreover although it is the case that the long history of political attempts to deal with the issue of toleration has led to ongoing re-workings of national and international constitutional and democratic rights, we cannot simply take it that the resultant legal human rights or democratic citizenship laws draw the limits of toleration correctly. Logically, appeal to authority can never constitute adequate justification; we must have independent evidence to believe that the authority is right. And the dangers of appeal to authority are well known: for example, many Nazi soldiers who tortured and killed Jews were simply following orders, doing their job. The limits of toleration must instead be drawn on rational and moral grounds.

[3] This argument is taken from Knight and Collins' (2006) paper 'The Australian Values Education Framework: no justification required?' (*Critical & Creative Thinking: The Australasian Journal of Philosophy in Education*, 14(2), 32-49).

Reasonable tolerance

Many have discussed toleration and the rights of individuals but few so famously as J. S. Mill. In *On Liberty*, Mill argues that ideas, opinions and so on should be open to the public whether or not we agree with them. Allowing ideas to be made public, says Mill, will provide an opportunity for ideas which are true to be hailed as such and spread throughout society, while ideas which are false will be hailed as such, argued against and then (ideally) exchanged for the truth.

> If the opinion is right, ... [and not made public, individuals holding an opposing opinion] are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth: if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error. (Mill, 1863, pp. 35-36)[4]

Take the example of Pauline Hanson and her One Nation Party. Under Australian law, Hanson did have the right to publicly voice her opinion and even run for Australian Government, although her party policies were considered by many to be blatantly racist. Rather than stifling her attempt to run for government and running the risk of martyring her cause, the opposite occurred. Racism became open for public debate; opinions of all sorts were aired and argued, denounced and advocated. Just as Mill claimed, Australian citizens were given the opportunity to exchange error for truth.

Mill (1863) staunchly advocates that one must remain open minded about the truth of one's opinions and learn (where possible) from the comments of others; that one must only feel confident in the truth of one's opinion when genuine attempts have been made to prove false the content of the opinion, and that one must know equally well, at the very least, the opposing arguments to one's opinion.

Without publicly stating ideas, it is easy for people to harbour false and even harmful ideas. The Community of Inquiry[5] teaching approach applies the same theory, encouraging students to feel comfortable in voicing their opinions, both racist, anti-racist and so on. Once the opinions

---

[4] Thomas Jefferson also held this view.

[5] As described by Matthew Lipman in *Philosophy and the Cultivation of Reasoning* (1985, Thinking, 4, 33-42).

have been aired students can discuss whether or not the views are justified, adjust their thinking where necessary and ideally come to hold justified true beliefs. What Mill argues for in terms of the open discussion of opinions provides compelling support for the Community of Inquiry approach given the role it can play in developing students' reasoning.

Currently, a number of authors are arguing specifically for religion to be brought into the public domain and open for discussion. Daniel Dennett and Richard Dawkins both, in their own way, argue that it is dangerous to allow religion to go unquestioned by society. As Trigg argued early in 2008 on ABC Radio National's 'The Religion Report':

> I think it's much better if ... all [religions are] out in the open and we have a rational discussion about them, particularly as I believe that not all religion is the same and some religion can be harmful, some religion can be good, and we ought to be able to discuss it as responsible, rational human beings. (Trigg, 2008, n.p.)

Why shouldn't we expect from religion the same standards of truth and evidence that we expect from medicine, physics, mathematics, chemistry, archaeology, biology, engineering and so on? Dawkins claims that religion is "... protected by an abnormally thick wall of respect, in a different class from the respect that any human being should pay to any other' (2006, p. 20). It is this 'wall of respect' says Dawkins that enables religion, quite wrongly, to carry on unquestioned lest believers become upset or are offended.

> There is an asymmetry: atheists in general welcome the most intensive and objective examination of their views, practices, and reasons. ... The religious, in contrast, often bristle at the impertinence, the lack of respect, the sacrilege, implied by anybody who wants to investigate their views. I respectfully demur: there is indeed an ancient tradition to which they are appealing here, but it is mistaken and should not be permitted to continue. This spell must be broken and broken now. Those who are religious and believe religion to be the best hope of humankind

> cannot reasonably expect those of us who are sceptical to refrain from expressing our doubts if they themselves are unwilling to put their convictions under the microscope. If they are right – especially if they are obviously right, on further reflection – we sceptics will not only concede this but enthusiastically join the cause. We want what they (mostly) say they want: a world at peace, with as little suffering as we can manage, with freedom and justice and well-being and meaning for all. If the case for their path cannot be made, this is something that they themselves should want to know. It is as simple as that. (Dennett, 2006, p. 16-17)

What Dennett calls for is a breaking of the 'spell' protecting religion and a '... forthright, scientific, no-holds-barred investigation of religion as one natural phenomenon among many' (2006, p. 17). It is clear from Dennett's work (and the work of others) that Mill's influence is still strong. Both Dennett and Dawkins believe that it is not just a matter of allowing ideas that we disagree with to be made public, it is necessary for false ideas to be exchanged for true and what is more, no ideas should be exempt from this process.

What of groups who call for the death of doctors who perform abortions, the death of all Israelis, the castration and naming of released paedophiles? What of those groups who hold the belief that all those who accept Government hand-outs are dole bludgers, that all criminals deserve jail time, or that girls wearing skimpy clothing are asking for trouble? Should these groups be allowed to voice their ideas in public? On the one hand we agree with Mill that being made public would provide an opportunity for people to argue against such ideas. On the other hand, though, the voicing of such ideas causes great harm to the recipient and may incite followers. To a certain extent, such groups do have the right to speak publicly; many countries do uphold the right to freedom of speech. Yet, perhaps there are some ideas that we feel people should not have a right to make public (such as, the killing of doctors who perform abortions). In cases such as this, is there any standard that could be applied to help us decide which ideas should and should not be made public?

Mill (1863) suggests that ideas or opinions that will obviously cause harm to others should not be made public. Opinions kept to oneself are not the concern of society, says Mill, nor are actions that one engages in alone that cause harm to oneself. What does concern society however, are opinions that affect others. (It is questionable whether any beliefs or actions privately performed by a member of society can not in some way, to some extent, affect others. Mill does address this point but his discussion is beyond the scope of this paper.) On the grounds of the harm caused it would be reasonable then to not tolerate the public voicing of opinions calling for the death or diminished rights of other beings, such as inciting a mob (to racially taunt a rival group for example) or lobbying for a change to a law (that would prevent women owning property for example).

In line with Mill, Law (2006) separates freedom of thought from freedom of action. Law states that in a liberal democratic society it is reasonable to tolerate freedom of thought: an individual can think about how much she hates another human being on the basis of race, personality, affiliations or anything else. But, when it comes to actions, it is reasonable that actions which cause harm or undermine a liberal democratic society should not be tolerated. In fact, such actions should be controlled and even prevented.

Sullivan, Piereson and Marcus (1982) talk about the 'paradox of tolerance'; a liberal democracy is built on the concept that all citizens are encouraged to hold and have the right to their own opinions, as well as to voice those opinions and be heard. Yet, this concept would also include tolerating the public voicing of opinions that if accepted would destroy a democratic society, hence the paradox.[6] Following Mill and Law, the undermining of a democracy would indeed cause harm: the alternative being a dictatorship or some such political system. So what should a democratic society do here?

Quong outlines three 'premises of public justification' that he uses to determine what people should and should not tolerate which can help with the paradox of tolerance: '1) that political society should be a fair system of social

[6] This paradox can be somewhat avoided. Many countries have attempted to avoid the paradox of tolerance with the use of a constitution outlining what parliament can and can not vote on, such as passing the abolishment of government elections.

cooperation for mutual benefit; 2) that citizens are free and equal; 3) the fact of reasonable pluralism' (2004, p. 315). Those people who reject one or more of these premises can then reasonably be excluded from the constituency of public justification. In other words, those people who reject one or more of these democratic principles thereby forfeit their right to each of the principles; therefore, they are no longer entitled to the benefits of democratic citizenship allowing the containment of their actions.

Although Quong does not explicitly separate out freedom of thought and freedom of action in the way that Law does, it seems clear that Quong applies a similar distinction. All citizens, Quong says, are entitled to the full rights of democratic citizenship, but it is when those rights are used to undermine the rights of others that society has reasonable grounds on which to contain people's actions. For example:

> [T]he member of a white supremacist Christian group cannot be denied any of the rights of citizenship just because he denies the freedom and equality of persons, but he can be prevented from exercising those rights when his aims are explicitly unreasonable – indeed they cease to be rights when he attempts to exercise them in this way. (Quong, 2004, p. 332)

Nevertheless, how does Quong's idea of containment fit with Mill's idea of public discussion of opinions as a means of spreading true ideas or transforming false ideas into true? If we prevent the white supremacist Christian group from publicly voicing its opinion, what will happen? No doubt the group will continue to believe in the tenets of their religion and will continue to try and publicly voice or act on these beliefs. What then? As with Pauline Hanson, we do not wish to make a martyr of these groups but we do not wish to allow them to cause harm. It seems that there is a fine line here and we must treat each situation individually.

Underlying Quong's idea of reasonable containment of intolerable actions is clearly a standard of harm: harmful actions ought not to be tolerated and so can be reasonably contained. Quong uses another example to demonstrate his point, this time looking to religious education. Imagine a religious minority group that chooses to privately educate

their children with no expense spared. A high standard of teaching is set and the children perform above the state average on standardised tests. However the children are also taught that their religious faith is superior to all others, that non-believers are of less worth and that any interaction with the outside community is undesirable and will only be tolerated until the political situation changes. Should such education be tolerated or not?

Quong argues that despite the fact that the religious beliefs are not publicly voiced (the likes of which Mill and Dennett talk about), the teaching of beliefs that '... contradict the fundamental political values of a liberal democratic regime' (2004, p. 326) ought to be stopped, even if that means a parent's right to educational choice is denied. Dawkins (2006) takes a similarly strong view to the religious indoctrination of children arguing that parents do not have the right to raise their children to hold religious beliefs. Quong's example demonstrates when one harm must be weighed against another; the harm of losing one's right to educational choice is outweighed by the harm caused by teaching beliefs that undermine democratic society.

It appears then, even from this brief review of relevant literature, that it is rationally possible to *not* tolerate and even to prevent particular actions. It is widely agreed that we ought not to tolerate actions which cause harm, including actions that undermine a democratic society. When it is deemed that an action will cause harm, society, even a liberal democratic society, is justified in containing or preventing that action. For the purposes of this paper then, let us define what we shall call 'reasonable tolerance': one must tolerate and even encourage the public voicing of all opinions, even those with which one disagrees or opposes, so long as those opinions do not lead to actions that cause harm (including the undermining of democracy). In the event that specific actions will (or do) cause harm these actions can be reasonably contained or stopped. Links between reasonable tolerance and evaluativism in particular are clear. It stands to reason then that the ability and willingness to make well reasoned judgements underlies the ability and willingness to practice reasonable tolerance.

It is in a Community of Inquiry, a dialogue-based teaching approach, that reasonable tolerance is fostered. Developed as part of the program known as Philosophy for

Children, the Community of Inquiry approach is designed to develop the justificatory reasoning skills of children (and adults). What is more, research shows that the approach is successful in this task (Lipman, 1985). It is these skills of justification that are held by evaluativists and those practicing reasonable tolerance. It is these skills of justification that are characteristic of the citizens of a well functioning democracy.

References

Dawkins, R. (2006). *The God Delusion.* UK: Bantam Press.

Dennett, D.C. (2006). *Breaking the Spell: religion as a natural phenomenon.* England: Penguin Books.

Landers, K. (2009). *Abortion Doctor Shot Dead at Kansas Church.* ABC news site, posted on the 1st June, 2009. Accessed on the 10th June, 2009, at: http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2009/06/01/2585944.htm

Law, S. (2006). *War for Children's Minds.* London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Lipman, M. (1985). 'Philosophy and the Cultivation of Reasoning'. *Thinking*, 4, 33-42.

Mill, J. S. (1863). *On Liberty.* Boston: Ticknor & Fields.

Quong, J. (2004). 'The Rights of Unreasonable Citizens'. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 12(3), 314-335.

Rachels, J. (2000). 'The Challenge of Cultural Relativism'. In Steven M Cahn (Ed.), *Exploring Philosophy: An Introductory Anthology*, NY: Oxford University Press.

Sullivan, J.L, Piereson, J. & Marcus, G.E. (1982). *Political Tolerance & American Democracy.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Trigg, R. (Interviewee) & Crittenden, S. (Interviewer). (2008, May 21). *Religion & Public Life: Must Faith Be Privatised?* [Interview transcript]. Retrieved from Radio National Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) Website (audio – 21052008): http://www.oup.com/uk/catalogue/?ci=9780199279807

Wroe, D. (2005). 'Intelligent Design' an option: Nelson. (11th August, 2005). Accessed online, 10th June, 2009, at: http://www.theage.com.au/articles/2005/08/10/1123353386917.html

A Lesson in Underestimating Young Children

Martyn Mills-Bayne (University of South Australia)

Introduction

The basis for this article lies in my own underestimation of the reasoning abilities of the young children I work with in classroom and kindergarten settings. Indeed, my misjudgements in this area have extended even to the capabilities of my own children. In this paper I will give an account of a brief and informal case study that I carried out with my two youngest children aged five and seven which highlights how young children are able to understand and explain the forms of logic contained in chapter one of *Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery* (Lipman, 1984b), a novel designed for use with eleven year old students within the Philosophy for Children (P4C) program.

This brief snapshot of two young children's reasoning about the logic that is demonstrated in this novel is used as a warning about assuming that children in Early Childhood settings are unable to describe and explain sophisticated forms of logic. Furthermore, the case study points towards the need for a focus on incorporating rigorous and systematic philosophical dialogue within Early Childhood Education to help extend and deepen children's developing logical reasoning skills.

Discussion

For the past two years I have been teaching Early Childhood Education undergraduates about the value of philosophical dialogue and the ability of young children to engage with concepts of logic and reasoning. Through this teaching I have engaged with Matthew Lipman's series of philosophical novels designed for use within the Philosophy for Children program, and assumed that the only text in the series that could be accessed by, and used with very young children was

Elfie (Lipman, 1984a), given its focus on foundational philosophical concepts. I was wrong.

It needs to be stated at the outset that previous to this investigation, I had not used any systematic philosophical dialogue with my own children. As a parent and an educator interested in philosophy with children, I had engaged all of my children (and young children in my classroom) with critical and creative thinking and with an exploration of philosophical ideas; but had never exposed my children to the logic within Lipman's novels or to the P4C program. Further to this, neither of my children in this case study have had teachers who use P4C or similar programs based on philosophical dialogue within their classrooms.

I was sitting on the lounge reading *Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery* (Lipman, 1984b) in preparation for my teaching with the novel when my five year old daughter, Lucy, came and sat next to me and asked what I was reading. I explained that I was reading a story about a boy who makes an interesting discovery about things that are true and things that are not. Lucy asked if I could read it to her and sat and listened intently to me as I read her all of the first chapter.

When I had finished, she asked if I could keep reading. Instead, I decided to use the 'Process of Inquiry' discussion plan from the accompanying *Philosophical Inquiry Instructional Manual* (Lipman, Sharp & Oscanyan, 1984) to ascertain whether Lucy was digesting any of these ideas about Harry's reasoning. It must be said that at this point I was not convinced that my daughter would have grasped even the most basic of the notions raised in the chapter, let alone the detailed forms of logic that are presented there.

However, her responses opened my eyes to the possibility that I had been seriously underestimating not only the reasoning abilities of my own daughter, but also the abilities of all five year olds, to be able to work with the notions of inquiry and logic that are presented in Lipman's books for older children.

The following transcript highlights the responses that Lucy provided with minimal prompts and clarifying statements from me to ensure that her understandings came through accurately.

Leading Idea: The Process of Inquiry
Question 1: What is Harry's first idea about reversing sentences?

Lucy: *All planets revolve around the sun.*
Me: *And when he reversed them?*
Lucy: *All suns revolve around planets.*
No. Things that go around the sun are not planets.
It's not true.

Question 2: What is the rule about reversing sentences that Harry and Lisa discover together?

Lucy: *No kangaroos are submarines.*
What is a submarine?
Me: *A ship that can go underwater.*
What is the rule?
Lucy: *Kangaroos are not submarines and no submarines are kangaroos is true too.*
No/no is true.
But all/all is not.
(looking out the window)
No grass is trees and no trees are grass is true.

Question 3: How does Harry get his first idea about reversing sentences?

Lucy: *Dunno.*
The planets?
The things that are not planets that go around the sun.

From Lucy's responses it is easy to see that she has clearly grasped some of the concepts of logic that are presented in *Harry* (Lipman, 1984b). While this article does not explore the minutiae of these responses, it can be seen by comparing Lucy's responses to Question 2 (*No/no is true. But all/all is not*) with the answers suggested by Lipman, Sharp and Oscanyan (see Table 1), that her understanding of this logical reasoning is very accurate.

The responses highlight the notion that five year olds are able to engage with the logic found in *Harry* (Lipman 1984b) and that perhaps it is the expressive language ability of this age group that limits our understanding of their reasoning skills.

Armed with this new insight into the abilities of a five year old to comprehend and explain the logic explored in *Harry*, and the possible applicability of these previously unconsidered books and complex ideas for young children, I decided to repeat this process with my seven year old son, Adam. His responses to the questions following our reading of the chapter underlined for me the vast underestimation I had been operating with.

Leading Idea: The Process of Inquiry
Question 1: What is Harry's first idea about reversing sentences?

> Adam: *When you reverse a true sentence it becomes false.*

Question 2: What is the rule about reversing sentences that Harry and Lisa discover together?

> Adam: *When you reverse a true sentence starting with 'All' its reverse is false.*
> *And when you reverse a true sentence starting with 'No' its reversed sentence is still true.*

Question 3: How does Harry get his first idea about reversing sentences?

> Adam: *He was thinking about planets.*
> *And that question 'had a tail and it rotates around the sun'*
> *If he said it backwards it might be right.*
> *So he tried it.*

I was immediately struck by how closely Adam's responses matched the answers provided by Lipman, Sharp and Ocanyan (1984). When I asked Adam the leading questions, he took some time contemplating the ideas before

responding emphatically and succinctly with his answer. His responses for Questions 1 and 2 clearly showed that he had grasped the logical concepts being explored, while his answer to Question 3 had the basic idea but lacked the depth expected from the eleven year olds the novel was designed for (see Table 1).

While it was clear that there was still some complexity missing in his response to Question 3, Adam's reasoning and comprehension of the logical forms covered showed that a seven year old has the ability to do the kind of thinking required from this text and accompanying discussion plans, and also the language skills to be able to express the ideas distinctly.

Table 1: Answers for Leading Idea 1 – The Process of Inquiry

Question 1	*A sentence can't be reversed; if you put the last part of a sentence first, it will no longer be true. Or: that a true sentence can't be reversed.* (Lipman, Sharp & Oscanyan, 1984, p. 20)
Question 2	*If a true sentence begins with the word 'no', then its reverse is also true. But if it begins with the word 'all', then its reverse is false.* (Lipman, Sharp & Oscanyan, 1984, p. 20)
Question 3	*The Process of Inquiry Outline* 1. *Feeling of difficulty or frustration* 2. *Doubt* 3. *Formulation of the problem* 4. *Hypothesis* 5. *First efforts to test hypothesis* 6. *Discovery of evidence which contradicts hypothesis* 7. *Revising the hypothesis to account for contradictory evidence* 8. *Application of revised hypothesis to life situation* (Lipman, Sharp & Oscanyan, 1984, p. 4)

Conclusion

While this case study is by no means definitive or rigorous, it does help to build a wider picture of the philosophical nature of young children that may be required to inform less philosophically minded adults, parents and teachers (Matthews 1994) who may need to be convinced of not only the reasoning abilities of young children, but also the need for the incorporation of deeper inquiry and philosophical dialogue into Early Education settings.

Children start their schooling experience with a curious mind and a desire to question all aspects of their

worlds. Sadly, by the time they reach Year 3 their passion and desire to question seems dampened and is beginning to disappear (Lipman, Sharp & Oscanyan, 1980). So why are teachers not capitalising on young children's natural disposition for deep thinking by teaching them how to systematically expand their thinking and questioning from the moment they first encounter educational institutions?

If educators can use philosophical dialogue, such as that advocated in P4C, with young children throughout these early school years and encourage and extend their abilities to reason about the world, then we may be able to maintain and develop further this innate hunger for meaning. Research has shown that children aged five to seven years old already have good understanding of some complex cognitive functions associated with reasoning (Amsterlaw, 2006).

This article has shown how it is easy to underestimate the ability of young children to reason about logic and understand complex philosophical concepts. As educators we should be allowing young children the opportunity to engage with these philosophical notions from the time they enter Kindergarten and on into their early primary schooling years. This message is clearly stated by Karin Murris (2000, p. 263):

> Training in philosophical enquiry, rather than age, seems the crucial factor here; and until children have done philosophy throughout their nursery and primary education we should not generalise about children's abilities to do philosophy (Murris 2000, p. 263).

The experiences outlined in this case study have provided me with one of those many moments in life where one is able to see that being human means making mistakes. While I have underestimated the abilities of the very children that I have been advocating philosophical dialogue for, it has been a 'teachable moment' for me to learn from and one that clearly points to the need for further research into the reasoning abilities of young children in Early Childhood settings.

References

Amsterlaw, J (2006), 'Children's beliefs about everyday reasoning', *Child Development*, vol. 77, no. 2, pp. 443-464.

Lipman, M (1984a), *Elfie*, First Foundation, Montclair, NJ.

Lipman, M (1984b), *Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery*, First Foundation, Montclair, NJ.

Lipman, M, Sharp, AM & Oscanyan, FS (1980), *Philosophy in the classroom*, 2nd edn, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.

Lipman, M, Sharp, AM & Oscanyan, FS (1984), *Philosophical inquiry: an instructional manual to accompany Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery*, 2nd edn, University Press, Lanham, MD.

Matthews, G (1994), *The philosophy of childhood*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Murris, K (2000), 'Can children do philosophy?', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 261-279.

Teaching for Dynamic Learning and Engagement within a Community of Inquiry: One Teacher's Approach to Philosophy in the Classroom

Angela Pfitzenmeier (University of South Australia)

A class of upper primary students sits in a circle, inquiring and imagining, discussing and deeply thinking. These students are not simply demonstrating a meeting or a morning talk – they are sharing in a philosophical community of inquiry, facilitated by their teacher, Ian Stewart.

Ian, a South Australian primary teacher with experience in generalist classroom, specialist program and leadership positions in Northern Adelaide schools, is a passionate advocate for philosophy in the primary classroom.

Today, however, this sharing extends beyond the classroom walls. After all, this group is sitting in a lecture theatre at the University of South Australia's Magill campus, with a captive audience of 150 future teachers keenly observing their progress.

"Some of the primary students were able to raise points that were equally as valid as those of the tertiary students," Ian notes of the Community of Inquiry[1] session at the university.

To suggest that some pre and early adolescents can contribute as confidently as students perhaps twice their age or more is significant. It adds weight to the idea that philosophy in the classroom supports students in making valid points and thinking deeply about issues. Thus, taking a closer look at the educational programs Ian has put in place should provide a snapshot of professional practice that supports a philosophy-based approach.

[1] http://cehs.montclair.edu/academic/iapc/whatis.shtml

Ian recalls always having had an inquiring mind and an interest in learning. Subsequently, having an enthusiasm for philosophy at tertiary level – and then in the classroom – has underpinned this methodology.

"If you're already excited about ideas, it makes your work so much more interesting," he says.

Such a constructive outlook has seen Ian facilitate philosophy workshops in various capacities for the past three years. This work has been within the context of Elizabeth South Primary School, a school that has a level of disadvantage. Here, his current role includes teaching students from Reception to Year Seven (primary school years in South Australia,) utilising philosophy in the classroom as a specialist program.

Subsequently, Ian has implemented a Community of Inquiry approach throughout mainstream classes, cultural education, Aboriginal Education and as non-instructional time for colleagues within this setting. Some of these ventures were prompted by the school's involvement in the statewide Learning to Learn[2] project.

"Some teachers became interested in learning about the Community of Inquiry approach as a part of their professional practice," Ian says.

"When I was asked to become involved by facilitating this program, I saw it as an exciting opportunity to further explore the benefits of philosophy in the primary classroom."

By returning to the idea of children sitting in a circle and to inquire about ideas, such a Community of Inquiry[3] is born. From a simple circle, to adding cushions for comfort, and chairs for older children, the formation enables open discussion to begin, Ian explains.

"Philosophy in the classroom creates a dynamic community, where kids engage in discussing fantastic ideas and concepts. Here, the students' ideas can be truly valued and children can discuss things that are important to them."

Such discussions within Ian's upper primary classes have included notions about what is and is not real, as well as what is and is not possible. Further, classes have been exploring ideas about what is logical. Ian has observed

---

[2] http://www.learningtolearn.sa.edu.au/

[3] Lipman, M. (2003) *Thinking in Education* (2nd ed.) Cambridge University Press, U.S.

students' fascination with delving into these concepts, as they may not have previously considered these possibilities.

Further, Ian does not see many topics as being 'off-limits', provided these are student generated and arise as a result of their opinions and genuine concerns. Naturally, these discussions should be facilitated by teacher support, he adds.

For example, topics including the nature of God and whether he or she is real, through to discussions about death, have featured within the communities of inquiry that Ian has facilitated.

"The forum allows students to have a say in an environment that is not artificial, but addresses topics of real interest.

"This can be particularly important in areas of disadvantage, where teachers can be advocates for letting students have a voice," he says.

Such an approach is not limited to older students, with Ian acknowledging the value of the program for junior primary students.

Keeping age appropriacy in mind, Ian tends to focus on developing the language skills needed for philosophical discussion with younger children. This has centred on exploring the way language is used in texts. Ian has noted some gradual gains in more complex understandings, such as recognising similies and making comparisons drawn from these texts.

"Activities that normally may not be used for little kids are tackled in a fairly natural way," he says.

Specifically, Ian plans and programs for communities of Inquiry using the Matthew Lipman modules, 'Harry', for older students, and 'Pixie,' for younger students.[4] These sources provide philosophical texts targeted at various primary year levels. Rather than taking a purely thematic or resource-based approach, as can be the case with mainstream programming, Ian suggests working through these modules to extract the emerging themes with the class. Such themes may include 'fairness' or 'friendship,' for example.

"Using the Lipman manuals makes it easier to implement a philosophy program, as although the

[4]https://cehs2.montclair.edu/store/customer/home.php?xid=2210a0830271be7c728cb25a02c0cb92

publications themselves are not relatively recent, they present core issues about philosophy that don't date," says Ian.

"Other benefits of using the Lipman manuals include saving time for teachers in the planning process, and allowing confident implementation of philosophical materials in the classroom."

Having established a physical setup and content conducive to inquiry within his classes, Ian has noticed some gradual and positive changes in the way students contribute. Although he acknowledges that any changes would need to be observed perhaps over several years, he has seen some encouraging indicators that the program is succeeding.

"Students still direct many of their responses to me, as the facilitator, but they are becoming better able to respond directly to other students.

"This will take ongoing practice, but it is improving as their confidence in their own contributions increases," he says.

Ian has noticed additional signs of increased student confidence, most notably evident when they are keen to keep discussing issues – well after the inquiry session has finished. Likewise, when students become interested in questions or issues that have arisen and are new to them, he knows it is a positive indication about their learning.

"It's really about students having a passion for a challenge that you can tell they haven't necessarily had before," he says.

Importantly, Ian notes that students who do not usually have a 'voice' in the classroom, or perhaps have felt discouraged at times, are encouraged to speak out in an environment that facilitates respectful discussion and disagreement. He adds that this process may be aided by increased practice in positive verbal communication and non-verbal cues.

Perhaps an indicator of the program's success spilling out into home life is reflected by parental comments such as, 'My child is coming home asking lots of questions!' Given the questioning nature of the community of inquiry, this could indicate positive reinforcement of the intended outcomes.

As with any learning situation, the philosophy program has presented some challenges, according to Ian. And, as in many programs, these challenges have sometimes involved catering to a diverse range of student interests and abilities, and addressing student behaviour during classes. For students who either generally can't participate – or alternatively, choose not to – Ian has been creative in arriving at alternative learning tasks, such as pictorial responses or written journals. He has also needed to be as flexible as possible to accommodate for student energy levels, reactions and readiness to inquire.

However, as Ian reiterates, these issues are not particular to a community of inquiry session, and could be generalised to the broader curriculum for many practitioners.

"If I wasn't really passionate about philosophy in the classroom, I wouldn't have kept going," he explains.

"It would be easier in some ways just to give out a worksheet, but philosophy just isn't like that."

Thus, it is clear that Ian's passion for philosophy enables him to evaluate that the positive aspects of the program far outweigh the challenges.

In addition, Ian has noticed some colleagues becoming increasingly interested in utilising the community of inquiry approach for themselves. However, he acknowledges that lack of time and awareness about the program, as well as confidence in applying its methodologies, can have an impact on its implementation. In these instances, Ian suggests modifying the program as needed.

"It has been great to see teachers beginning to implement aspects of the community of inquiry in their own classrooms," he affirms.

"My advice to both experienced and beginning teachers is to be ready to adapt the content and approach if needed, have a go and don't give up if you believe in it."

This is encouraging advice, it would seem, for the 150 student teachers who were watching the aforementioned community of inquiry session, where children demonstrated that deep thinking is indeed possible at primary level.

It is this kind of positive attitude that has fostered Ian's success with philosophy in the classroom thus far, and enabled him to plan for future learning pathways. He explains that designing an assessment tool to measure the

outcomes for communities of inquiry is on the agenda, in light of possible research and projected long-term evaluations.

For now, though, Ian Stewart continues to teach philosophy in the primary classroom, encouraging children to question and inquire, while exploring, expressing and justifying their ideas and opinions.

Perhaps such a learning circle will help students' learning come full circle.

Investigating the Issue of Ethics within the Visual Arts

Christopher Meadows (Director of Teaching and Learning in Visual Art, Pulteney Grammar School)

Introduction

Within the curriculum area of the Visual Arts there are numerous occasions when issues of ethics are raised as topics for student analysis and response. As with many ethical questions, opinions can vary and views can be somewhat emotive at times. This was clearly evident in 2008 when the art world was sparked into wide ranging debate regarding the works of the Australian photographer Bill Henson in his depictions of naked children for an upcoming exhibition at the Roslyn Oxley Gallery in Sydney, Australia. Prior to the opening of the exhibition police had raided the gallery and confiscated many of the works to be displayed, while the artist and gallery owner faced a number of serious criminal prosecutions. As a teacher of Year 11 'Photographic Art' at the time, this controversy evoked much discussion amongst my students and eventually became the basis for a unit of work as a component of the Year 11 Art course. The interest and relevance of this topic to my particular teaching area, as well as my own broadening awareness of the theoretical and practical aspects of ethical enquiry, resulted in the development of a unit of work entitled, 'Is it morally wrong to photograph naked children in the name of art?' The paper provides an outline of this unit of work, with the aim of eliciting comment and discussion from others working in the field. Implicit in the planning of the unit is consideration of the requirements of the current South Australian Certificate of Education (SACE) Stage One Visual Art course and of the South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability (SACSA) Framework.

Rationale

It is widely acknowledged that aspects of philosophical enquiry are embedded informally within the Visual Arts curriculum which itself aims to promote a greater understanding of the creative process and the role of art in society. However, much of the emphasis has generally been placed upon individual discovery rather than the benefits of collaborative enquiry in determining opinions regarding ethical views. The primary purpose of this unit of work is to introduce a more formal approach to ethical enquiry presented within a Visual Arts context. Such an approach would aim to promote higher order thinking and reasoning in regard to moral issues that confront artists, their subjects and viewers. In order to develop reasoned judgement, students would be engaged in the process of developing metacognitive skills as they investigate the structure of 'argument' and 'counter-argument' through social interaction and personal reflection. Social dialogue would provide an opportunity for students to externalise internal thinking and in doing so, gain an improved understanding of both their own views and the opinions of others (Kuhn, 1992). Such ethical thinking would enable key principles of 'a community of enquiry' to be established within a classroom environment that supports respectful social interaction and opinion sharing. This vehicle for open discussion would encourage students to actively think through ethical issues for themselves (rather than acting as passive learners) and promote student involvement through discussion aimed at developing reasoned arguments that are valued and respected within a wider group (Splitter & Sharp, 1995). With the ongoing support of the teacher acting as a facilitator, opportunities would be provided to engage in dialogue within small groups, as a whole class and as an extended community beyond the classroom. Such opportunities would not only allow the students to gain greater factual and experiential knowledge, but would help to promote greater depths of logical reasoning aimed at resolving complex ethical issues.

Unit of work

Curriculum Area: Visual Arts
Year Level: Year 11 Photographic Art (South Australian Certificate of Education Visual Art – Stage 1)
Unit Title: Is it morally wrong to photograph naked children in the name of art?

Student background

The unit is aimed at students ranging in age from 15-17 years and would be well suited to a class consisting of students from varied cultural backgrounds. It is also to be expected that communication skills and abilities are likely to vary resulting in students displaying differing degrees of confidence in discussing such a sensitive issue. Students at this level are generally familiar with the traditional process of researching and analysing visual art works and in particular investigating the use of photography as an art form. However they may be less comfortable in considering moral and ethical issues within this area of study. Therefore a greater amount of class time and structural planning will be required in order to achieve positive learning outcomes.

Aims

The overall aim of this unit of work is to provide opportunities for students to respond to two critical strands of the Visual Arts curriculum – 'Arts Analysis & Context' and 'Arts Context' (see Appendix 1) by addressing ethical questions.

- Arts Analysis & Response – To make meaning of art works through research, discussion and critical analysis. To develop and communicate informed opinion regarding a specific topic or issues relevant to the Visual Arts.
- Arts Context – to understand and explain the powerful influences that historic, political, social, moral and ethical factors may have upon the purpose and function of art works.

Unit plan

Lesson One: Defining 'Ethics' and its Implications to Visual Art Works

Aim of activity/process

- Through teacher directed instruction, students are introduced to the general concepts of *ethics* and *values* and implications for the ethical decision making process.
- The aim is for students to gain a basic understanding of relevant terminology and an appreciation of broad ethical issues that are at times evident within the visual arts.
- Initial application of ethical values to specific issues relating to art.
- Some time is spent on establishing some basic procedures process aimed at fostering open discussion in a safe and non-confrontational learning environment.

Teaching strategies

- The teacher introduces a Powerpoint presentation that briefly explores the scope of Ethics by providing basic definitions and examples of ethical questions. This provides a background for more specific discussion regarding the nature of visual art, its role in society and its relationship with sources of authority.
- Students are provided with a series of ethical questions (Appendix 2) regarding 'ethics and art' and by working in small groups of 3 to 4 the students are asked to provide an initial response to present back to the class.
- Students are introduced to guidelines for effective open discussion. The importance of questioning will be emphasised and different forms of questioning discussed (i.e. open, closed, rhetorical, clarification, inquiry etc).
- Collective information is discussed and compared in order to establish whether there are common issues that need to be considered when making an ethical judgement regarding visual art.

- (An optional follow up lesson to a local art gallery would provide an excellent opportunity to analyse art works first hand in regard to ethical dilemmas.)

Lesson Two: Ethical Dilemma in Relation to Photographic Art

Aim of activity/process

- Following from the previous lesson, students are provided with the opportunity for a much more detailed investigation and discussion of specific ethical issues associated through the works of controversial Australian photographer Bill Henson. In a powerpoint presentation students are shown the type of images that characterise controversial aspects of the artists work (e.g, 'Luminous Project', 2005). Often these works depict elements of nudity, as youthful male and female models are photographed in subtle lighting against an engulfing black background.
- Using the topic of 'whether it is morally wrong to photograph naked children', students will have the opportunity to explore issues, considerations and the opinions of others as a means toward establishing their own point of view.
- This activity continues to undertake collaborative enquiry within an environment of open discussion, where key elements of the *ETHIC* decision making model (Empathy, Thinking, Harm, Information, Circumstances) are closely examined (Knight & Collins, 2008).

Teaching strategies

- The issue will be introduced through teacher-initiated discussion supported by stimulus material such as newspaper/Internet articles and video clips of news coverage. Students are provided with some additional time for information gathering via the Internet.
- Students are reminded about procedural guidelines for effective 'community of enquiry dialogue'. Peer Evaluation criteria will be discussed as a means of reinforcing the expectations of the class.

- Introduction of community of enquiry dialogue focusing upon ethical issues posed by the teacher regarding the use of nudity in art, including comparisons between photography and more traditional art forms. Issues are explored following a discussion plan that includes questions such as ... Should nudity be accepted as Art? ... Should there be restrictions to the use of nudity in art? ... Is photography an art form? ... Can some photographic art be considered as pornography? ... Can some art be exploitative? These answers are recorded on the board following the broad headings of 'Yes', 'No' and 'I don't know'.
- After gaining initial reactions, points of view are explored and the *ETHIC* model is introduced. Teacher directions are aimed at facilitating open discussion and students are required to consider the *ETHIC* model in regard to the issue of photographing naked children in the name of art. Following previous procedural processes, reasons are explained and justified.

Lesson Three: Seeking Opinion Regarding 'Freedoms' in Art

Aim of activity/process

- Extending on from the previous lesson, students explore the nature of personal freedom and our capacity to make choices.
- Students exercise their ethical reasoning skills while considering the consequences of freedom and develop empathetic thinking in consideration of differing points of view.
- Students use their ability to consider relative interests and weigh consequences, and in doing so enhance their own ethical reasoning skills. They are also encouraged to seek and consider differing points of view within classroom community, while still gaining an appreciation of the benefits of genuine cooperative enquiry.

Teaching strategies

- Through the teacher's initiated discussion, the issue of 'freedom' is explored and by asking students to generally explain what it means to be 'free'.
- Given a simple checklist handout (Appendix 3) students are asked to respond to what it means to be 'free' in relation to art. On the board three specific areas are listed and openly discussed: freedom of the artist, freedom of the viewer and freedom of the subject. The discussion is directed towards the issue at hand, namely, the implication of 'freedom' when considering taking nude photographs in the name of art and the questions it raises.
- The works of controversial American photographer Spencer Tunik are discussed and viewed. This artist invites large numbers of the general public to become involved in being photographed nude in public places in the name of art.
- Breaking into pairs, students prepare a 10 point questionnaire in order to gauge wider community opinion regarding this particular issue. Students are reminded to consider questions that seek opinion regarding the 'freedom' and 'rights' of the artist, the viewer and the subject. The questions are checked and if necessary refined with the assistance of the teacher.
- Students are asked to seek the opinion of their two parents or adults beyond the school, two teachers and two other students. This information will be used in the following lesson to form the basis for further discussion.

Lesson Four: Case Study – Presenting a Two-Sided Argument

Aim of activity/process

- Students analyse and categorise their own opinions and the opinions of others, by developing alternative responses to a 'moral dilemma' by demonstrating empathetical and justificatory thinking in relation to the topic.
- Discussion will focus upon reasoned ethical justification. Aspects of functional, non-functional

and non-justificatory arguments will also be explored.
- Students are provided with an opportunity to develop a well-considered argument that is presented in a non-judgemental environment.

Teaching strategies
- The teacher initially introduces the task by discussing the process of establishing reasoned ethical justification used to develop a logical moral argument. Aspects of ethical relativism may also be discussed in this context.
- Pairs of students are required to prepare a short presentation to the class that highlights arguments for and against based upon reasoned ethical justification. One student presents an argument for the freedom to photograph young children in the name of art and the other student presents an opposing argument.
- The major points made are recorded by the teacher as a starting point for a follow up ethical enquiry discussion in the following lesson.

Lesson Five: Ethical Enquiry Discussion

Aim of activity/process
- Students examine the issues raised in response to this moral dilemma and apply collaborative reasoning through thinking and talking.
- Students are introduced to 'procedural' and 'substantive' questioning in relation to the points raised through the arguments for and against.

Teaching strategies
- Following the presentation the teacher summarises the moral dilemma and lists on the board the major arguments raised previously.
- Students are asked to consider procedural and substantive questions that would allow the group to make progress in its ethical enquiry, while the teacher remains an impartial facilitator providing prompting questions and encouraging careful use of the procedures of ethical reasoning.

- Each of the major points are expanded and analysed in detail through open discussion that is directed toward some degree of resolution.

Lesson Six: Developing a Code of Ethics for Photographic Art

Aim of activity/process

- Exploring the role and application to a 'code of ethics' in various aspects of society: 'Why have a code of ethics?'
- Developing a suitable code of ethics that could be applied to art in general with particular relevance to photographic art.

Teaching strategies

- The teacher introduces the concept of a 'code of ethics' by defining its meaning and purpose. The issue of 'ethical relativism' is introduced and questions of whether it is possible to have widespread ethical agreement in regard to art are raised.
- Through questioning and discussion, guidelines are developed regarding how a personal code of ethics might be applied within a visual art context.
- Each student is provided with a written summary of the collaborative results of the ethical enquiry discussion previously undertaken and asked to write their own personal code of ethics that could be applied to art with particular consideration to the use of photography as an art form.
- In providing written explanatory statements, the student should outline how ethical judgements may directly relate to the issue of photographs that depict naked children in the name of art.

Lesson Seven: Applying the 'Code of Ethics' to another Moral Dilemma

Aim of activity/process

- Having established a personal code of ethics in regard to art, students are invited to evaluate its viability by being presented with yet another 'real

life' moral dilemma in regard to the use of children and photography in the process of creating art.

- This lesson provides a summary of the major issues investigated within this unit of work and allows the students to apply what has been learnt to another ethical issue.
- Students are provided with an opportunity to discuss and evaluate the knowledge, skills and values gained by the class group and individually.
- This lesson provides an opportunity to reflect upon the collaborative process undertaken and the student's ability to apply moral judgements to difficult issues.

Teaching strategies

- Through teacher directed discussion, each student shares his/her own 'code of ethics' in regard to the use of photography as art. Discussion is required to be non-judgemental and respectful of the individual in an attempt to determine various moral stances.
- Through a Powerpoint presentation, students are then introduced to the controversy over the works of artist Jill Greenburg who was recently accused of unethical conduct in her photographic images of children (i.e. 'End of Days', 2007). The works are dramatically striking and somewhat upsetting close up portraits of crying toddlers. The artist had offered lollies to toddlers that were then suddenly taken away, resulting in hyper-real close-up images of children clearly in a state of extreme emotional distress.
- Students are asked to provide an opinion on these works and discuss whether such works are within or in breach of their personal 'code of ethics'. Discussion focuses on the advantages and disadvantages of ethical guidelines in providing solutions to other ethical dilemmas.
- The teacher summarises some of the major ethical considerations that have been touched upon in the course of this unit. The *ETHIC* model is again revisited as a pathway toward reasoned moral judgements that confront us both in the art world and at a broader societal level.

- Students complete a peer evaluation sheet and self-evaluation based upon their participation and understanding of the process.

Assessing student development

In assessing the knowledge, skills and values achieved by students undertaking this unit of work there are three modes of evaluation that would be applied: teacher evaluation, class evaluation and self evaluation.

Teacher Evaluation

Various modes of assessment are applied at various stages of the learning process based upon the students' understanding and appreciation of the *ETHIC* model. Initial indicators of the students' understanding of ethical decision-making, their response to ethical dilemmas posed and contribution to the process of developing a community of enquiry are recorded. Furthermore student ability to gather information, think, reflect and respond is determined by the submission of assessable written material (i.e. questionnaire, argument for and against and code of ethics). Observations of student participation through ongoing ethical enquiry discussions form the basis for a teacher assessment rubric (Appendix 4).

Class Evaluation

The student awareness of a class evaluation acts as a mechanism for determining collective performance and also assists in ensuring a respectful and co-operative approach toward the community of enquiry is maintained. It can be used to reinforce the procedural guidelines for the group and allows for feedback regarding the strength and weaknesses in the process of dialogue and community building (Appendix 5).

Self Evaluation

By providing a form of self-evaluation, students are able to effectively monitor their own understanding and development as a result of undertaking this unit of work. They are able to use this form of evaluation as a means of developing their critical skills and reflect upon their personal development and their contribution to the community dialogue (Appendix 6).

Appendix 1: Appropriate Strands of Visual Arts Curriculum – SACE Stage One

Arts Analysis and Response

This strand deals with the development of aesthetic understanding through reflection on, and the evaluation of, visual arts.

Students acquire knowledge about the visual arts and develop their ability to describe and evaluate such knowledge. This knowledge relates to all facets of creating and viewing visual arts forms.

This strand is concerned with:

- responding to a range of visual art works and communicating observations and opinions;
- developing skills in investigation and critical analysis with the use of appropriate language and terminology;
- understanding stylistic, cultural, and formal conventions and methods of expression in visual art works;
- developing students' ability to describe, analyse, interpret, evaluate and respond to their own work and to the work of other people.

Arts in Contexts

This strand deals with the development of understanding of the visual arts in the cultural, social, political and economic life of local and global communities, past and present.

This strand is concerned with:

- recognising the diversity of visual arts experience;
- developing a global understanding of visual arts in the student's own culture and in other cultures;
- learning about the role and influence of visual arts in traditional and contemporary communities;
- critically analysing and challenging dominant points of view and producing alternative interpretations.

Appendix 2: Discussion Plan – Ethics and Art

1. Should there be some restrictions on what is displayed in the name of art?
2. Should some art works be restricted to adult viewing only?
3. Can some art be harmful? In what way?
4. Should some art be banned?
5. Should some art displays come with a warning?
6. Does the 'subject' in art have any rights regarding how their image can be used?
7. Should the artist have the right of free expression?
8. Shouldn't art push the boundaries of convention?
9. Does art reflect societies' morals and ethics?
10. Should art be allowed to challenge cultural, social and political norms?

Appendix 3: Exercise – Freedom in Art

The Artist	Agree	Disagree	?
• The artist should be free to depict any subject matter	☐	☐	☐
• The artist should be free to use any medium to create art (even photography)	☐	☐	☐
• The artist should be free to display their works	☐	☐	☐
• The artist doesn't have to please the viewer	☐	☐	☐
• The artist should be free to create art without restriction	☐	☐	☐
The Subject			
• The subject should be free to choose whether to participate in a work of art	☐	☐	☐
• The subject should be free to decide how their image is depicted	☐	☐	☐
• The subject should be free to decide who views their image and how it is displayed	☐	☐	☐
• The subject should be free to choose whether to be depicted in the nude	☐	☐	☐
• The subject should not be exploited	☐	☐	☐
The Viewer			
• The viewer should be free to choose whether to view a work of art	☐	☐	☐
• The viewer should be free to publicly criticise the work of an artist	☐	☐	☐
• The viewer should be free to legally decide what art is viewed and what is not	☐	☐	☐
• The viewer should be free to protect their children from offensive works of art	☐	☐	☐
• The viewer should be free to make their own judgement on a work of art rather than a source of authority	☐	☐	☐

Appendix 4: Teacher Assessment Rubric

	Low Achievement 1	Marginal Achievement 2	Competent Achievement 3	High Level of Achievement 4	Score
Knowledge and understanding of the ethical issues raised	The student had a poor understanding of the issues involved that resulted in limited participation in the discussion.	While the student appeared to have some understanding of the issues involved they lacked confidence in their ability to share their knowledge with others.	The student demonstrated a sound level of knowledge and understanding of the issues raised but discussion could have been stronger at times.	The student demonstrated a strong understanding of the issues raised and was able to openly and knowledgably discuss fundamental aspects of the ethical dilemma.	
Ability to effectively work within the guidelines of a community of enquiry	The student had difficulty in adhering to the guidelines provided for a community of enquiry. They were often inconsiderate of the thoughts and feelings of others that limited effective open dialogue.	While the students attempted to adhere to the guidelines provided for a community of enquiry, they occasionally had to be reminded of the need to respect the thoughts and feelings of other contributors.	The student generally followed the guidelines of working within a community of enquiry. While there were occasional lapses they were generally respectful of the contribution of others and encouraged open dialogue.	The student always adhered to the guidelines of working within a community of enquiry. They were respectful to the thoughts and feelings of others and contributed to an environment of open dialogue.	
Contribution to open discussion	The student's contribution to the discussion was poor and failed to contribute to the group's understanding of the issues concerned.	The student attempted to contribute to open discussion although some shortcomings in listening, questioning or discussion were evident.	The student contributed well to open discussion and was prepared to listen to others. Possibly more questions could have been asked or occasional lapses in collaboration were evident.	The student was an active contributor to open discussion while also being a good listener to others. They asked thoughtful questions, argued respectfully and sought to enquire in a cooperative and collaborative manner.	

Presentation of argument and counter-argument	The student had difficulties presenting an argument or counter-argument. The presentation lacked preparation and/or was delivered in a confused manner.	The student attempted to present arguments and counter arguments but was limited by their preparation and/or delivery.	The student was able to present an adequate argument and counter argument but it could have been improved by better preparation and/or clearer delivery.	The student presented arguments and counter arguments that were thoughtfully prepared as well as being fluently and confidently delivered.	
Ethical reasoning skills	The student had difficulties in applying reasoning skills to the issues concerned. Their lack of understanding of the *ETHIC* model limited their ability to resolve ethical dilemmas.	The student demonstrated some logical reasoning skills although not all aspects of the *ETHIC* model were understood or applied.	The student generally demonstrated sound ethical reasoning skills although their understanding of the *ETHIC* model could have been improved.	The student was able to apply logical reasoning skills to ethical dilemmas. They showed strong understanding of the *ETHIC* model and was able to apply it to the issues concerned.	

Appendix 5: Class Evaluation

Understanding of the issues

• Did the class understand the issues involved?	0 Not at all	1	2	3	4	5 Almost always
• Did the class obtain an appropriate amount of information?	0 Not at all	1	2	3	4	5 Almost always
• Did the class ask appropriate questions to explore the issues further?	0 Not at all	1	2	3	4	5 Almost always

Building dialogue

• Did the class allow information and opinions to be shared?	0 Not at all	1	2	3	4	5 Almost always
• Did everyone have the opportunity to speak and respond?	0 Not at all	1	2	3	4	5 Almost always
• Was the class respectful of the views of all speakers?	0 Not at all	1	2	3	4	5 Almost always

Collaborative reasoning

• Did the class have the opportunity to explain the reasons for their views?	0 Not at all	1	2	3	4	5 Almost always
• Did the group work collaboratively to resolve the issues?	0 Not at all	1	2	3	4	5 Almost always
• Was the class able to empathise with the views of others?	0 Not at all	1	2	3	4	5 Almost always

Resolving the issue

• Were some aspects of the issue completely resolved?	0 Not at all	1	2	3	4	5 Almost always
• Was the class accepting of issues that could not be agreed upon?	0 Not at all	1	2	3	4	5 Almost always
• Did the issues become clearer as a result of the discussions?	0 Not at all	1	2	3	4	5 Almost always

The process

• Was the class supportive of the community of enquiry process?	0 Not at all	1	2	3	4	5 Almost always

Appendix 6: Self Evaluation

How would you rate the following aspects of your ethical enquiry?

	Poor	Below Average	Adequate	Above Average	Strong
My understanding of the ethical issues concerned	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My ability to understand and appreciate alternative points of view	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My ability to work toward reasoned moral judgements	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My ability to listen and respect the views of others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My contribution to discussion within the community of enquiry	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My own presentation of a logical argument	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My ability to challenge with counter argument	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My ability to gather relevant information	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My ability to ask relevant questions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My encouragement and support of other members of the group	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My ability to reflect upon the reasons behind my own thinking	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My ability to change my thinking	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My behaviour was respectful of the feelings and views of others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

References

Edminton, B. (viewed 2008) *Classroom Communities of Inquiry* http://www.mantleoftheexpert.com/studying/articles/BE - Classroom Communities of Enquiry.pdf.

Gardner, S. (1995) 'Inquiry is no mere conversation (or discussion or dialogue): facilitation of enquiry is hard work', *Critical & Creative Thinking: The Australasian Journal of Philosophy for Children,* Vol.3,No.2 pp. 38-49.

Halverson, S. (2004). *Ethical Teaching: The Role of the Classroom Teacher* http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3614/is_200404/ai_n9375867.

Honderich, T. (1993) Extracts from *How Free Are You?,* Oxford University Press Oxford, pp. 1-11.

Knight & Collins (2008) *ETHIC,* unpublished course material, University of South Australia, Magill.

Kuhn, D. (1992) 'Thinking as argument' *Educational Researcher ,* 62,2, pp. 155-178.

Lipman, M. & Sharp, A. (1985) *Extracts from Ethical Inquiry: instructional manualto accompany Lisa,* University Press of America, Upper Montclair, New Jersey, pp. 141-147.

Montague, P. (2005) *Ethics in the Classroom* http://pandora.cii.wwu.edu/showcase2004/ethics2.htm.

Painter, J. (1996) *Why Questioning is Important* http://www.discoverteenergy.com/gifted/Questioning Techniques.html.

Pride,A (1995) Community of Inquiry Evaluation Ideas – adapted from a memorandum.

Splitter, L & Sharp, A. (1995) *Extracts from Teaching for Better Thinking:The Classroom of Inquiry,* ACER, Melbourne,pp.17-31, 34-40 & 54-63.

SSABSA (2008) *Arts Learning Area Stage 1 and Stage 2 Curriculum Statements for 2008* http://www.ssabsa.sa.edu.au/arts/subjects.php.

Woodruff, B. (1992) *Presenting Ethical Dilemmas in the Classroom* http://www.woodrow.org/teachers/bi/1992/dilemmas.html.

Critical & Creative Thinking: Subscription

The Australasian Journal of Philosophy in Education

Renew your subscription for 2009
TAX INVOICE. NO GST APPLIES

Please renew my subscription for 2009 (print neatly):

Name.....

Postal address.....

.....

.....**Postcode**.....

Email.....

Subscription cost AU$35.00

Payment Options:

Online: via the FAPSA website www.fapsa.org.au
Bank deposit: deposit or EFT the amount into the journal's bank account – BankSA account in the name of Critical & Creative Thinking, BSB no. 105-141, account number 038010540. (If you choose to do this, please e-mail the date you made the deposit, and the receipt number, along with a completed subscription form.)
Cheque within Australia: made out to *Critical & Creative Thinking*, and posted to the address below.
International money order or bank cheque (not personal cheque): made out to *Critical & Creative Thinking*, and posted to the address below.

Total: AU$.....

Payment method: Cheque ❑ Bank deposit ❑

Make cheques out to *Critical & Creative Thinking*. Send to (full address):

Carol Collins
Critical & Creative Thinking
School of Education
University of South Australia
St. Bernard's Rd
MAGILL SA 5072
AUSTRALIA
Email: carol.collins@unisa.edu.au

Please Note: Subscription renewals are due in February and will cover the May and November issues. New subscriptions are welcome anytime of the year. Please note that anyone subscribing to the journal after May will receive the May issue with their subscription, and the next issue posted in November. Renewals will then be due the following February. New subscriptions received after November will cover issues for the following year.

Critical & Creative Thinking: Back Issues

The Australasian Journal of Philosophy in Education

Back Issues
TAX INVOICE. NO GST APPLIES

Name.....

Postal address.....

.....

.....**Postcode**.....

Email.....

Please send me the issues below (tick box):

AU$5.00 for each issue

- ❑ Vol. 3 No. 2
- ❑ Vol. 10 No. 2

AU$25.00 for each issue

- ❑ Vol. 12 No. 2
- ❑ Vol. 13 Nos. 1&2 (combined)
- ❑ Vol. 14 No. 1
- ❑ Vol. 14 No. 2
- ❑ Vol. 15 No. 1
- ❑ Vol. 15 No. 2
- ❑ Vol. 16 No. 1*
- ❑ Vol. 16 No. 2

* Limited stocks. Please email carol.collins@unisa.edu.au to check availability prior to sending payment.

Payment Options:

Bank deposit: deposit or EFT the amount into the journal's bank account – BankSA account in the name of Critical & Creative Thinking, BSB no. 105-141, account number 038010540. (If you choose to do this, please e-mail the date you made the deposit, and the receipt number, along with a completed subscription form.)

Cheque within Australia: made out to *Critical & Creative Thinking*, and posted to the address below.

International money order or bank cheque (not personal cheque): made out to *Critical & Creative Thinking*, and posted to the address below.

Total: AU$.....

Payment method: Cheque ❑ Bank deposit ❑

Make cheques out to *Critical & Creative Thinking*. Send to (full address):

Carol Collins
Critical & Creative Thinking
School of Education
University of South Australia
St. Bernard's Rd,
MAGILL SA 5072
AUSTRALIA
Email: carol.collins@unisa.edu.au

Journal Contents

Number 2 October 1994

Ann M. Sharp The religious dimension of Philosophy for Children II
Philip Cam A philosophical approach to moral education
Roger Cresswell & Peter Hobson Contested values and Philosophy for Children in a pluralistic, democratic state
Irene de Puig Beyond knowledge moral and political education
Sue Wilks Encouraging pupil participation practical ways of establishing a community of inquiry
Christine Durham A philosophical fortune hunt
Greg Smith An experience of introducing Lisa to secondary schoolteachers
Tock Keng Lim Evaluation of the Philosophy for Children project in Singapore

Volume 3

Number 1 March 1995

Chris de Haan Deweyan aesthetics in the philosophy classroom
Terri Field Philosophy for Children and the feminist critique of reason
Nina Iulina Philosophy abroad - a Russian perspective
Sandy Yule On trusting teachers with philosophy
Peter Davson-Galle Advocatus Diabli or Advocatus Dei? a reply to Cam, Cresswell & Hobson
Philip Cam Against indoctrination – response to Davson-Galle
Roger Cresswell & Peter Hobson The moral dimension – response to Davson-Galle
Peter Davson-Galle Rejoiners to Cam, Resswell & Hobson
Ann Sharp Habit in the thought of CS Peirce
Yim Pyoungkap A graceful error corrects the cave
Manuel Meglas Rosa Is Philosophy for Children useful for the ESL teacher?
Clive Lindop Philosophy for Children and ESL
Clive Lindop with Liz Delany, Jenny Gee, Wendy Nestor, Ann MacNamara, Mary O'Keefe Philosophy comes to School
Ann M. Sharp Who owns the flowers?
Peter Davson-Galle More doggerel verse

Number 2 October 1995
(ICPIC Conference Issue 1)

Peter Singer Coping with global change
Ann M. Sharp Educating for global ethical consciousness
Susan Gardner Inquiry is no mere conversation
Christina Slade Reflective reasoning and the self
Mike Pritchard On becoming reasonable
Richard Morehouse Research in Philosophy for Children
Vicki Mackrill Philosophy for Children in Kinder and Prep
Kathleen Davson-Galle Bare Brains
James Battye A puzzle for Jessica
Laurance Splitter Philosophy for Children Strategic Plan

Volume 4

Number 1 March 1996
(ICPIC Conference Issue 2)

Robert Fisher Socratic education: a new paradigm for philosophical inquiry
Gilbert Burgh Translating democracy into practice a case for demarchy
Shari Popen Rethinking teaching and teachers within communities of inquiry
Phil Guin Education for global citizenship
Mike Ross A child's belief system and security
Greg Smith Fostering community in the community of inquiry
Lim Tock Keng & Kuna Kallannan Reflections of teachers on the community of inquiry in their classroom
Margarete Wenzel Storytelling as embodied philosophy
Jin Whan Park Democratic citizenship education in a global community the case of Korea
Fr Stan Anih Schooling without thinking the educational curricular crisis in our time
Tim Sprod Bouncing Balls
Roger Cresswell Book Review: *Thinking Stories I & II* by Philip Cam (ed)

Number 2 October 1996

Carol Steiner Learning opportunities, communication and mass education
Christina Slade Conversing across communities
David Kennedy Young children's moves
Ross Phillips Self esteem and ownership of ideas
Dina Mendoca The religious dimension of Philosophy for Children
Steve Williams Learning sequences and inquiry in small groups
Roger Cresswell Demons, devils, dragons and flames harnessing sporting interests in the philosophy classroom
Peter Davson-Galle Matters of degree and kind

Volume 5

Number 1 March 1997

Matthew Lipman Philosophical discussion plans and exercises
Winifred W.H. Lamb A good dinner and a game of backgammon
Clive Lindop Truth, hunches and our form of life
Dina Mendoca Reading Vygotsky
Anthony Imbrosciano Philosophy and student academic performance
Tim Sprod An historical community of inquiry
Kathleen & Peter Davson-Galle Eyes lie

Number 2 October 1999

Gareth Matthews Philosophy as child's play
Tim Sprod Philosophy and Childhood
Stephan Millett The Wesley experience
Winifred W.H. Lamb TOK at Narrabundah
Greg Smith Using non-Lipman materials with Yr 9
Ross Phillips Book Review: *Places for Thinking* by Francesca Partridge & Franck Dubuc, Laurance Splitter & Tim Sprod

Volume 8

Number 1 March 2000

Winifred W.H. Lamb Philosophy for Children and the 'Whole child'
Sue Knight & Carol Collins The curriculum transformed philosophy embedded in the curriculum areas
Felicity Haynes & Bruce Haynes The development of a conceptual framework for critical thinking and problem solving K-12
Joanna Haynes & Karin Murris Listening, juggling and travelling in philosophical space
Mary Barrett American philosophical naturalism in *Lisa*
Laurance Splitter Teacher perspectives on Philosophy for Children – Part I

Number 2 October 2000

Marie-France Daniel From talking to dialogue
Greg Smith Growing into community
Mia O'Brien Developing thinking and knowing
Brenda Cherednichenko Teaching thinking reform for educational equity
Jin-Whan Park Teaching moral wisdom
Laurance Splitter Teacher perspectives on Philosophy for Children – Part II

Volume 9

Number 1 March 2001

Tim Sprod Aristotle, children and morality I
Matthew Lipman with Salvatore Pizzuro The Vygotsky touch
Matthew Del Nevo Philosophy is not a technology
Maureen McDermott & Christine Fox The encouragement of 'reasonableness' through the practice of philosophy with children at risk
Kevin Barry, Leonard King, Carmel Maloney & Maureen Burke Philosophy for Children and the promotion of high level cognitive talk
Clinton Golding Concept games a method of philosophical exploration
Clive Lindop Book Review: *Engaging with Ethics* by Mark Freakley & Gilbert Burgh

Number 2 October 2001

Tim Sprod Aristotle, children and morality II
Matthew Lipman Dramatising philosophy
Jim Burdett Education and aesthetics
Sandra Lynch Encouraging students' voices in school welfare policy
Seon-hee Jo & Jin-whan Park Applying P4C in Korean preschool
Chris Falzon Philosophy goes to the movies
Crystal Baulch The Seven Dwarfs and the Game of Knowledge and Belief
Clive Lindop Book Review: *Philosophical Discussion in Moral Education* by Tim Sprod

Volume 10

Number 1 March 2002

Hannu Juuso Hegel on teaching philosophy
Philip Cam Fact, value and philosophy education
Megan Laverty-Smith Teaching and pedagogy in Australian schools
Gilbert Burgh & Mia O'Brien Philosophy and education: integrating curriculum, teaching and learning

Number 2 October 2002

Marie-France Daniel Pupil thinking: relativistic or inter-subjective?
Hannu Juuso Hegel's influence on P4C
Clive Lindop Plato's legacy: how to do philosophy
GrupIREF Interview with Matt Lipman
Clive Lindop Book Review: *Philosophy goes to the movies* by Chris Falzon

Volume 11

Number 1 March 2003

Val Catchpoole Neither doctrinaire not relativistic: constructing a base for ethical inquiry
David Ward Making the implicit explicit: exploring philosophic method in P4C
Juliana Mercon School and philosophy: the expected and the unexpected
Lynne Hinton Productive pedagogies: the link between New Basics and P4C
Greg Smith Recognising and valuing progress in learning
Stephan Millett Thinking tools for teaching ethics across the curriculum
Cathy Douglas Including the disadvantaged: literacy through philosophy

Number 2 October 2003

Volume 12

Number 1 May 2004

Number 2 November 2004

Volume 13

Numbers 1 & 2 May/November 2005

Critical & Creative Thinking:
The Australasian Journal of Philosophy in Education
Vol. 17 No. 1 May 2009

With support from the School of Education,
University of South Australia

Printed by Hyde Park Press