

Bruno Ćurko\*

## Community of philosophical inquiry as a method in early bioethical education

### SUMMARY

'Community of inquiry' is a concept introduced by Charles Sanders Peirce, and was originally restricted to the practitioners of scientific inquiry. M. Lipman (2003) expanded this concept by moving it into a broader setting – the classroom. He converted the classroom into a community of inquiry, in which "students listen to one another with respect, build on one another's ideas, challenge one another to supply reasons for otherwise unsupported opinions, assist each other in drawing inferences from what has been said, and seek to identify one another's assumptions." David Kennedy (2012) claimed how "Lipman, taking a cue from his friend and mentor Justus Buchler, developed and called 'community of philosophical inquiry' — the most appropriate way to practice with students the philosophical curriculum that he had developed. This idea is also a philosophical one, and it has a far-reaching implication, both practical and theoretical – for learning theory, for theory of teaching, for argumentation theory, for theory of knowledge, for group psychology, for moral education, and perhaps, ultimately of the greatest importance, for grounded political theory and practice." In various and different approaches to philosophy with children, we can find a community of philosophical inquiry as one of the main methods. For instance, a community of philosophical inquiry is one of the methods used in Ethics and Values Education: "The term ethics and values education (EVE) applies to all aspects of education which either explicitly or implicitly relate to ethical dimensions of life and are such that can be structured, regulated and monitored with appropriate educational methods and tools." (Strahovnik, 2015). Leaning on the cited definition of EVE, if we focus specifically on the issues of the contemporary world with its ecological crisis and rapid digitalization, we can set the relation of the ethical dimensions of life as a bioethical question. Using methodology for the community of philosophical inquiry as a basis for bioethical questioning, we can satisfy the need for innovative and effective bioethical education from an early age. In my lecture, I will show how the community of philosophical inquiry can be connected with

---

\* *Correspondence Address:* University of Split, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Teacher Education, Poljička cesta 35, 21000 Split, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5291-4897>. E-mail: [bcurko@ffst.hr](mailto:bcurko@ffst.hr).

bioethical topics such as the relationship between man and wild animals, man and plants, man and nature in global, etc.

**Keywords:** bioethics, community of inquiry, community of philosophical inquiry, ethical education, Matthew Lipman.

## Introduction

Since the 1960s and Lipman's program known as *Philosophy for Children*, many different approaches to philosophical work with children have developed. All these approaches we call by the common name - philosophy *with* children, and, although the methods inside them may vary, they share the same goal - the development of critical thinking in children. Furthermore, Lipman developed the concept of *Community of philosophical inquiry*, which is proved to be very functional in philosophy for children workshops. Today, this concept is used in several different schools of philosophy with children. However, it could be argued that the *Community of inquiry* is the original concept in philosophy for children. Since Lipman's early work, in the 60s of the last century, and the beginnings of the practical use of the method, the concept of *Community of philosophical inquiry*, the method itself has been improved in different schools, but of course, the essence has remained the same. Here, we will present the development of the method and an overview of its use in early bio-ethical education.

## Community of inquiry

The founding father of the concept 'community of inquiry' is Charles Sanders Peirce (1839–1914). Concept 'community of inquiry' was later "refined" in other theories. However, we need to go from the start and find how Peirce himself defined 'community of inquiry':

"Doubt is an uneasy and dissatisfied state from which we struggle to free ourselves and pass into the state of belief; while the latter is a calm and satisfactory state which we do not wish to avoid, or to change to a belief in anything else. On the contrary, we cling tenaciously, not merely to believing, but to believing just what we do believe. Thus, both doubt and belief have positive effects upon us, though very different ones. Belief does not make us act at once but puts us into such a condition that we shall behave in some certain way, when the occasion arises. Doubt has not the least such active effect but stimulates us to inquiry until it is destroyed. The irritation of doubt causes a struggle to attain a state of belief. I shall term this struggle inquiry, though it must be admitted that this is sometimes not a very apt designation."<sup>1</sup>

1 Peirce, Charles Sanders (1877), The Fixation of Belief, *Popular Science Monthly* 12, <http://www.peirce.org/writings/p107.html> (accessed: 29 April 2020).

The concept ‘community of inquiry’ as Patricia M. Shields claims in her article “The Community of Inquiry: Classical Pragmatism and Public Administration” originated in the work of John Dewey and Jane Addams<sup>2</sup>, and, furthermore, Shields recognizes Peirce’s ‘community of inquiry’ in the practical work of Jane Addams.

“The rich ‘community of inquiry’ concept that pertains to public administration grew out of the writing and experiences of Jane Addams and John Dewey. In the late 1890s, they were both in their mid-thirties and worked in Chicago (Dewey - University of Chicago; Addams Hull-House). Although they came from different backgrounds and had different life experiences, they had independently come to recognize many similar philosophic organizing principles.”<sup>3</sup>

It is clear that the concept of ‘community of inquiry’ came from the American Pragmatism tradition. Peirce, Adams and Dewey’s influences on today’s concept of CoI<sup>4</sup> is unquestionable.

“Teachers often intuitively, even unknowingly, assume an inquiry approach to teaching. As both a philosophy and a methodology, much of the basis for inquiry-based learning draws on the work of John Dewey (1938a; 1938b). Dewey believed that improved learning opportunities could be achieved from the integration of the individual learner’s interests with those of society.”<sup>5</sup>

Through his teaching of reflective thinking,<sup>6</sup> Dewey introduces CoI into the educational system. As a forerunner of contemporary critical thinking theories, Dewey’s reflective thinking also contains the notion of ‘reflective inquiry’. The reflective inquiry should be the basis for the development of education systems, the ones whose goal is not short term memorization of facts, but the encouragement of learning to think; as Dewey himself said, teach students how to think, not what to think.

---

2 Jane Addams (1860–1935) was the founder of the first Hull House in Chicago in 1889. It is a house that was open to emigrants who arrived in America without anything. As early as 1920, about 500 such institutions emerged from Hull-House across America. Jane Addams was a philosopher, sociologist, fighter for human rights and world peace. She belongs to the American pragmatist school. In 1931, she received the Nobel Peace Prize for peace.

3 Shields, Patricia M. (2003), The Community of Inquiry: Classical Pragmatism and Public Administration, *Administration & Society*, <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1008.9702&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (accessed: 29 April 2020).

4 CoI – Community of Inquiry.

5 Garrison, R., Kanuka, H., & Hawes, D. (2002), Communities of inquiry, *Learning Commons publication*, [http://reinventnet.org/moodle/pluginfile.php/1195/mod\\_resource/content/3/Comm\\_of\\_Inquiry.pdf](http://reinventnet.org/moodle/pluginfile.php/1195/mod_resource/content/3/Comm_of_Inquiry.pdf) (accessed: 29 April 2020).

6 See more in: Dewey, John (1997), *How We Think*, New York: Courier, Dover Publications; Dewey, John (1926) *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*, Plain Label Books; Dewey, John (1959) *Dictionary of Education*. New York: Philosophical Library.

“Dewey (1933) described the complete cycle of reflective activity in terms of a prereflective state which starts with a problem, followed by five phases of reflective thought (suggestion, intellectualization, guiding idea, reasoning, and testing), and ends with a satisfactory resolution. Dewey believed that reflective inquiry has practical value in providing meaning to experience, and so described a practical method of inquiry, in addition to the full explanation of reflective inquiry, on which he believed an educational experience should be based. It is this concept that was the genesis for the practical inquiry model described below, which operationally defines cognitive presence in the CoI framework.”<sup>7</sup>

Based on this, Dewey’s implementation of CoI in the education system, later, Mathew Lipman developed the concept ‘Community of philosophical inquiry.’<sup>8</sup> CoI became an educational method, a very successful method, based on a formal and informal logic, which aims to develop reflection and reflective thinking – today called critical thinking.

“The method of inquiry contains practical presuppositions which engender a certain community of inquiry. We can discern the character of this community on the basis of those presuppositions. In general, the community of inquiry would, first, encourage self-criticism, that is, encourage reflection on the beliefs presently held (as opposed to a community bent on tenacity), but only if such reflection is warranted by genuine doubt (as opposed to the artificial doubt of Descartes). Second, the community of inquiry would allow and encourage openness toward criticism (as opposed to tenacious and authoritative communities). Participants in the inquiry would be allowed the opportunity to criticize, to refute, as well as present alternative views.”<sup>9</sup>

In contemporary education theories, the ‘community of inquiry’ is a method of educative dialogue. In this method, scientific tools are used to clarify or understand a particular problem or issue. It often happens that there are no final answers or final definition, only the next question that requires new research. Douglas Walton, in his book *Informal Logic - a Pragmatic Approach*, differs six various types of dialogue. One and most useful is ‘inquiry’. From Walton’s description of this version of the dialogue, this is a real ‘community of inquiry’ in practice. The initial situation for this dialogue is the “need to have proof”, the participant’s goal is to “find and verify evidence”, and the goal of the dialogue is to “prove (disprove) hypothesis”.

7 Swan, K., Garrison, D. R., Richardson, J. C. (2009), A constructivist approach to online learning: The Community of Inquiry framework, in: Payne, C. R. ed., *Information Technology and Constructivism in Higher Education: Progressive Learning Frameworks*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2009, 43-57, 49.

8 More about the *Community of philosophical inquiry* in the next chapter.

9 Liszka, James, J. (1996), *A General Introduction to the Semeiotic of Charles S. Peirce*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1996, 103-104.

“In another type of dialogue, called the inquiry, premises can only be propositions that are known to be true, that have been established as reliable knowledge to the satisfaction of all parties to the inquiry.”<sup>10</sup>

Formal and non-formal logic is one of the basics of this dialogue. This kind of dialogue is very productive and usable for educational work with all generations.

“The basic goal of the inquiry is an increment of knowledge, and therefore the inquiry is an essentially cumulative type of dialogue, meaning that retraction of commitment is not anticipated. The inquiry too is based on an initial position, but the position here is a certain degree of lack of knowledge, which needs to be overcome. Thus, the inquiry seeks out proof, or the establishment of as much certainty as can be obtained by the given evidence. Evidential priority is the key feature of the inquiry, for the inquiry is strongly directed towards deriving conclusions from premises that can be well established on solid evidence.”<sup>11</sup>

This Walton’s description can be adapted for ‘community of inquiry’; it is also very close to Lipman’s concept of ‘Community of philosophical inquiry’.

## Community of philosophical inquiry

Lipman asks, “if good thinking is to become a prime objective of the classroom, is it to be along the lines of scientific inquiry or philosophical inquiry?”, and further claims that “this is a question Dewey never takes up. His love of philosophy is utterly beyond question. However, he seldom addresses himself to the problem of what it is, aside from an occasional essay or the throwaway remark that it is ‘the general theory of education’.”<sup>12</sup>

This dilemma between scientific or philosophical inquiry should not even be a dilemma. It is a matter of philosophical research because the tools used in the approach are philosophical, and the whole movement and discipline for the same reason are called philosophy for children. In practice, the term ‘philosophical inquiry’ has become established, which best corresponds to what is essentially done in philosophy workshops for children. It is philosophical research, but it is also a scientific one. David Kennedy claimed:

“Lipman, taking a cue from his friend and mentor Justus Buchler, developed and called ‘community of philosophical inquiry’ – the most appropriate way to practice with students the philosophical curriculum that he had developed. This idea is also a

---

10 Walton, Douglas (2008), *Informal Logic: A Pragmatic Approach*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008, 8.

11 Ibid., p. 9.

12 Lipman, Matthew (2003), *Thinking in Education*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 36.

philosophical one, and it has a far-reaching implication, both practical and theoretical – for learning theory, for theory of teaching, for argumentation theory, for theory of knowledge, for group psychology, for moral education, and perhaps, ultimately of the greatest importance, for grounded political theory and practice.<sup>13</sup>

In various and different approaches to philosophy with children, we can find a community of philosophical inquiry as one of the main methods. The inquiry is a way of struggle, of intellectual will by which one wants to progress by thinking itself. The community of philosophical inquiry in philosophy with children emerges only when children are encouraged to doubt their beliefs or thoughts. This is the same suspicion, doubt that Socrates sowed among his interlocutors in the squares and streets of Athens. This doubt is the driver that encourages us to think and seek new and better education. In different approaches to philosophy with children, we often find a community of philosophical researchers as one of the basic methods. For example, the community of philosophical researchers is one of the methods in ethical and value education.

## Ethics and values education (EVE)

Today, the ethics and values education is very important and can be understood as a scope through which the community of philosophical inquiry gets its most practical purpose. This concept was developed through different ethical projects.

“The expression ethics and values education (also ethical education) allows for a variety of interpretations. In order to properly appreciate it, one should first contemplate on several more general dimensions of ethics and values themselves. The latter are inherently connected with the conception of a human being, which includes multi-dimensional and deep anthropological aspects of the nature of a human person. Every educational framework, process or method must recognize this. In the formal educational process, the all-encompassing nature of ethical reflection and ethical awareness thus calls for an integrative approach, in which ethical topics are addressed in most if not all the subjects in school, trans-circularly and infusing school life as a whole.”<sup>14</sup>

Ethics and values education is specially focused on so-called early education for children from 6 to 14 years old.

13 Kennedy, D. (2014), The Role of a Facilitator in a Community of Philosophical Inquiry, *Metaphilosophy* Vol. 35, No. 5, 37.

14 Ćurko, B., Schlenk, E., Feiner, F., Pokorný, S., Sola, P. G., Centa, M., Linares, E., Arenas, B., Kragić, M., Strahovnik, V. (2017), *Ethics and values education curriculum proposal and training courses for teachers. Ethics and Values Education – in Schools and kindergartens*, Ljubljana: Project: ETHIKA - Ethics and values education in schools and kindergartens, 7.

“Ethics and values education steers children or students towards the search and commitment to fundamental values, meaning and purpose in their lives. Ethics and values education is also concerned with a respectful attitude towards others (both individuals and communities alike) and putting one’s beliefs, attitudes and values into practice and everyday life.”<sup>15</sup>

The need for early ethical education is not questionable. In *The LITTLE Guide For Teachers of Ethical Education*, we can find very well developed educational goals:

- “ - to promote ethical reflection, attentiveness, autonomy, and responsibility in the educational community that is established in a given educational setting,
- to enable the examination and understanding of important ethical principles, values, virtues, and ideals, and to cultivate the intellectual and moral abilities (critical thinking, reflection, comprehension, appreciation, compassion, valuing, etc.) needed for responsible moral judgment, decision-making, and action,
- to guide individuals to explore different values and different moral viewpoints
- to commit to the recognized basic values and the fundamental human rights, while at the same time enhance self-esteem and the feeling of self-worth
- to help individuals to overcome possible prejudices, biases, and other unethical attitudes and practices, and at the same time help them to create an appropriate, respectful attitude towards themselves, others around them, society, and the environment
- to promote cooperative, collaborative behavior and to deepen the motivation for creating a group, class, or school environment which is a genuine ethical community
- to build character (with intellectual and moral virtues) in a way that will enable a person to achieve a morally acceptable, flourishing and personally satisfying ‘good life’ the ancient ideal of Eudaimonia
- to reflect on how to situate the individual as an active member of local and global communities”<sup>16</sup>

---

15 Ibid., p. 9.

16 Centa, M., Ćurko, B., Dooley, L., Irwin-Gowran, S., Kojčić, Z., Kragić, I., Pokorny, S., Sola, P. G., Strahovnik, V., Ward, F. (2017), *The LITTLE Guide For Teachers of Ethical Education*, Dublin, Project: Little – Learning Together To Live Together: Teachers Leading Ethical Education For An Inclusive Society, 8.

## Bioethical education

We consider bioethical education as a part of ethical education. First, we need to define what bioethical education is.

“Bioethics (ethics of life) arises as an attempt to give an answer to all these issues. Even though the issues concerning nature and non-human living beings were mainly left out from bioethics in the Anglo-American tradition, it should be emphasized that the idea of bioethics presented by its founder (introducer of the term) Van Rensselaer Potter contains all ethical issues related to life. Moreover, in the very title of his book *Bioethics: Bridge to the Future* (1971), it is clearly indicated that bioethics cannot be limited to biomedical issues. According to his idea, the bridge that should enable our future at the same time should also be a bridge between two separated areas of human knowledge that, for the sake of survival, must get into dialogue – humanities and natural sciences. But the area where bioethics particularly spreads horizons of traditional ethics is the inclusion of non-human living beings into moral consideration. Bioethics gained an additional legitimacy for dealing with this issue by the discovery of Fritz Jahr, who, without anyone knowing, had introduced the term “bioethics” (Bio-Ethik) in 1926 and defined it as ethics that deals with human’s moral attitude towards all living beings.”<sup>17</sup>

In short, bioethical education is ethical education about bioethical issues. It is an ethical education about the humans’ relationship toward all others – human and non-human animals and plants, toward all living beings. The useful definition of bioethical education we can find in Mariana Iancu article:

“Through bioethical education, young people understand that throughout their lives, they have to act responsibly towards science and humanity, regardless of their professional goals and career objectives in the future. Wherever they may live and work, they need to act in a bioethical sense without endangering creatures, nature or Terra.”<sup>18</sup>

The ‘Community of philosophical inquiry’ as an educational method can be one of the most effective methods in early bioethical education. It is a method in which children or adults are not explicitly told what is good in their attitude towards people, animals, and plants. On the contrary, in the discussions in the philosophically argued dialogue, the participants themselves will come to a conclusion about what should be right and what is not right to do. We can say that the community of philosophical inquiry, with formal and non-formal logic as a base and argumentative dialogue as a tool and critical thinking as an aim, can be the most effective in early bioethical education.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>18</sup> Iancu, M. (2014), Bioethical education in teaching Biology, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 127, 74.



Instead of a conclusion, we will show two examples of good practice in early bioethical education in two appendixes. Both examples are from project *BEAGLE - Bioethical Education and Attitude Guidance for Living Environment*.<sup>19</sup>

## APPENDIX I

### Workshop: **Bioethical café**<sup>20</sup>

**Note:** This workshop can be done with a wide range of age groups. Make sure that bioethical topic, number of participants, time, and discussion level are adapted to the group age.

**Age range:** 7-99 years old

**Time:** 60-90 minutes

**Group:** 10-15 participants

**Materials and tools:** Black or white board, several sheets of paper, markers.

**Educational methods:** Socratic dialogue, philosophical dialogue, Community of philosophical inquiry

**Key learning points:**

- Encourage participants to:
  - think about their relationship with nature
  - understand nature and processes in nature
  - re-establish their connection with nature
  - think critically

### **Introduction:**

The first Socratic café was organized in Paris in 1992 by Marc Sautet (1947-1998), professor of philosophy at the Paris Institute of Political Science (French Institut d'études politiques de Paris). This workshop is an adapted version of philosophical café for bioethical education.

---

19 More about project BEAGLE - *Bioethical Education and Attitude Guidance for Living Environment* (Erasmus Plus KA<sup>2</sup> - 018-1-HR01-KA201-047484) you can see on: <https://beagleproject.eu/>

20 Ćurko, B., Kragić M. (2019), Bioetički café, *Bioetičko obrazovanje i razvijanje stavova za živi okoliš OBRAZOVNI MATERIJALI*, [https://beagleproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/4.-Bioethical-cafe\\_7-12\\_HRV\\_final.pdf](https://beagleproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/4.-Bioethical-cafe_7-12_HRV_final.pdf) (accessed: 30 April 2020).

## Step by step - how to do it?

- If you work with children, make sure that they are comfortable and relaxed.
- They can sit however they want, but they need to be aware of your (facilitator's) presence in every moment.
- Facilitator starts the workshop by presenting himself and gets to know participants/ children.
- Facilitator presents the rules of participation in the workshop to children:
  - If you want to say something, you need to raise your hand.
  - You need to listen to others very carefully because it is very important to follow the discussion.
  - Think about the topic of the discussion and express your opinion.
- Facilitator explains the agenda of the workshop:
- Participants need to propose five to ten topics for discussion. Every topic related to nature is welcome. If you work with small children (7-12), you propose the first few topics. For example, you can propose:
  - Wolves – good or bad animals?
  - Should animals be in ZOO?
  - Should people have pets?
  - Do we like ugly animals?
- When the facilitator proposes a few topics ask children what topic they want to discuss. Encourage children to propose topics. If they propose a topic that is not related to bioethics, explain to them why that topic is not related to bioethics.
- Every proposed topic needs to be written on the board.
- Every proposed topic needs to be explained with one or two sentences.
- Children vote for one topic.
- Start a discussion about the topic with the most votes.
- Start the discussion with the explanation of the topic by the author of the said topic. Try to find something interesting in the explanation and ask a question about it. For example: Do you think wolves are good or bad animals? Then encourage children to answer. Through children's responses, the facilitator asks the following question. For example: What do you think about the common opinion that wolves are bad animals? Or: Why wolves are bad in every fairy tale or fable?

- Every new question needs to be connected with the answers in the discussion. (Questions can, for example, go in this direction: Are wolves bad for people or are people bad for wolves? Who determines the goodness or badness of the wolf? Who does more damage? People to wolves or wolves to people? Why? etc.)
- Having a final and precise definition is not the main purpose of the workshop! The aim is to encourage participants/children to think about nature and their relationship with it.
- After 45 minutes of discussion, the facilitator is to end the discussion. If you work with adults, the discussion can go on for up to 2 hours.
- Take 5 more minutes for a meta-discussion, ask the children how they feel about the workshop, or if they have learned anything etc.

**Tips for facilitator** written by Reich (2003) for the Socratic Method can be well used in this workshop:

- Look for a suitable space and create a welcoming environment.
- Learn participants' names and have the participants learn each other's names.
- Explain the ground rules.
- Ask questions, and be comfortable with silence. Silence is productive. If nobody replies, re-phrase your question after a while.
- Create what Reich calls "productive discomfort". Do not remove discomfort immediately because this is how independent learning feels like. Allow participants to gain comfort with ambiguity.
- Welcome new differences.
- Do not reject "crazy ideas" since they can offer a new perspective but discourage ideas that attempt to escape engagement.
- Above all else, use follow-up questions to clarify points in answer to a previous question.
- As a facilitator, be open to learning something new.

## APPENDIX II

### Workshop: My favorite dog<sup>21</sup>

**Note:** This workshop can be done with children aged from 7 to 12 years. However, with modifications, the workshop can be conducted with younger groups. Be sure that materials, number of participants, time, and discussion level are adapted to the group age.

**Age range:** 7-12 years old

**Time:** 40-60 minutes

**Group:** 10-25 participants

**Materials and tools:** Computer with speakers or CD player, audio material with animal sounds examples, coloring pencils or crayons, sheets of paper.

**Educational methods:** Interactive listening, creative drawing, dialogue.

#### Key learning points:

- Encourage participants to:
  - express their emotions towards animals
  - question and think about empathy towards animals
  - better understand animal emotions and their needs
  - think about their relationship with animals

#### Introduction:

This art workshop combines elements of listening and recognition of animal emotions through the sounds they make, with the artistic expression of children's empathy with the help of drawings and discussion in order to develop children's sensibility towards animals.

**Keynote:** As an example of this workshop, dogs were chosen as the animals to work with. However, this workshop can be conducted with any other animals if sound examples are available.

#### Step by step - how to do it?

- When you work with children, make sure that they are comfortable and relaxed.

21 Kovačević, A. Kragić M. (2019), Moj najdraži pas, *Bioetičko obrazovanje i razvijanje stavova za živi okoliš OBRAZOVNI MATERIJALI*, [https://beagleproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/3.-My-favourite-dog\\_7-12\\_EN\\_final-copy.pdf](https://beagleproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/3.-My-favourite-dog_7-12_EN_final-copy.pdf) (accessed: 30 April 2020).

- They can sit however they want, but they need to have clear drawing surfaces for the tasks ahead.
- Facilitator presents the steps in the workshop to children:
  - If you want to say something, you need to raise your hand.
  - You need to listen to the audio materials very carefully, as well as the other participants if they have something to say.
  - Think about the presented audio material, and do not be afraid to express your opinions or emotions about the topic.
- Facilitator explains the agenda of the workshop:
- Children will listen to the four different examples of sounds that dogs make
- After every sound example, children will have five minutes to draw the dog in a way that they think the animal looked when it made that sound
- Every sound the facilitator plays to the children represents a different state of emotion the dog was in when he made those sounds: angry, sad, scared, or excited
- Facilitator plays the sound one at a time, not explaining right away what that sound represents and leaving to children to try to interpret the emotion behind it
- After every example, the facilitator gives children five minutes to try to draw the dog in a given state
- During the drawing, encourage children to express themselves freely and draw what they feel is a right answer
- After all four sound examples were played and children draw all four dogs, the facilitator explains which state of the emotion those sounds represented
- Together, discuss with children the drawings they made
- Open discussion with checking who recognized the state correctly
- Ask if anyone has a dog or any other pet and if they can recognize how their pets feel
- Lead the questions further towards the examples of the emotions you played
- If children had difficulties recognizing the emotion from the sound example, ask them are there any other visual signs that can help them recognize the state that the animals are in, or compare the sound example to the next one.
- For example, start with the example of sad sound, discussing the children's drawings, and asking them:
  - When do you feel sad?
  - Do you like being sad?
  - What do you do when you are sad?

- What are the reasons that can make dogs sad?
  - What are the things humans do that make animals sad?
  - Is their sadness important to us, and why?
  - What can we do to make dogs feel better when they are sad?
- Ask the children how they felt when they listened to the sound example before moving on to the next sound example with a new set of questions.
- For example, continue with the example of a scared dog, asking questions about emotions and sympathy with subtle bioethical background:
- When do you feel scared?
  - What do you do when you are scared?
  - Can dogs be scared in the same ways as we are?
  - What can make dogs scared?
  - Can humans scare dogs? Can dogs scare humans?
  - How and why do we scare them?
  - Can we help them not to be scared? How?
  - Is it ok to touch a scared dog to make him feel better? Why?
- Again, ask the children how they felt when they listened to the sound example before moving on to the next sound example with a new set of questions.
- For example, continue with the example of angry sound, discussing the children's drawings and asking them:
- What makes you feel angry?
  - What do you do when you are angry?
  - Do you wish other people to hug you when you are angry?
  - How can we know if a person is angry?
  - Can we know if the dog is angry?
  - What can we do to make dogs feel better when they are angry?
  - Is it ok to pet an angry dog to make him feel better? Why?
  - Are you scared of an angry dog? Why?
  - Can we do something else for the dog rather than petting him? What?
- Again, ask the children how they felt when they listened to the sound example before moving on to the next sound example with a new set of questions.

- When the children answer, continue with the final exciting sound, discussing the children's drawings and asking them:
  - When do you feel excited?
  - Do you like being excited?
  - Is there a difference between excitement and happiness?
  - Can we see the difference between an excited and happy dog? How?
  - Can we see the difference between a sad, scared, or angry dog? How?
  - What kind of dog would you like to meet: sad, scared, angry, or excited/happy? Why?
  - Finally, ask the children how they felt when they listened to the sound example. Did they feel any differently than they felt while listening to the previous sound?

### **Tips for facilitator**

- Given questions are examples of how to lead a discussion. You can always adapt the questions according to age group and given children's answers after each question.
- Children's recognizing all the emotions correctly is not the main aim of the workshop! The aim is to encourage children to think and express their own emotions and help them develop empathy for other living beings.
- Encourage children, especially the younger ones, to find ways (other than petting) to help/take care for the animals. Keep in mind that patting an animal is not always safe for children.

### **Literature:**

- Centa, Mateja, Ćurko, Bruno, Dooley, Laura, Irwin-Gowran, Sandra, Kojčić, Zoran, Kragić, Ivana, Pokorny, Svenja, Sola, Pier Giacomo, Strahovnik, Vojko, Ward, Fionnuala (2017), *The LITTLE Guide For Teachers of Ethical Education*, Dublin, Project: Little – Learning Together To Live Together: Teachers Leading Ethical Education For An Inclusive Society, 8.
- Ćurko, Bruno, Kragić, Marija (2019), Bioetički café, *Bioetičko obrazovanje i razvijanje stavova za živi okoliš OBRAZOVNI MATERIJALI*, [https://beagleproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/4.-Bioethical-cafe\\_7-12\\_HRV\\_final.pdf](https://beagleproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/4.-Bioethical-cafe_7-12_HRV_final.pdf) (accessed: 30 April 2020).
- Ćurko, Bruno, Schlenk, Evelyn, Feiner, Franz, Pokorny, Svenja, Sola, Pier Giacomo, Centa, Mateja, Linares, Eduardo, Arenas, Begoña, Kragić, Marija, Strahovnik, Vojko (2017), *Ethics and values education curriculum proposal and training courses for teachers. Ethics and Values Education – in Schools and kindergartens*, Ljubljana: Project: ETHIKA - Ethics and values education in schools and kindergartens, 7.

- Dewey, John (1926), *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*, Plain Label Books.
- Dewey, John (1959), *Dictionary of Education*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Dewey, John (1997), *How We Think*, New York: Courier, Dover Publications.
- Garrison, Randy, Kanuka, Heather & Hawes, D. (2002), Communities of inquiry, *Learning Commons publication*, [http://reinventnet.org/moodle/pluginfile.php/1195/mod\\_resource/content/3/Comm\\_of\\_Inquiry.pdf](http://reinventnet.org/moodle/pluginfile.php/1195/mod_resource/content/3/Comm_of_Inquiry.pdf) (accessed: 29 April 2020).
- Iancu, Mariana (2014), Bioethical education in teaching Biology, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 127, 74.
- Kennedy, David (2014), The Role of a Facilitator in a Community of Philosophical Inquiry, *Metaphilosophy* Vol. 35, No. 5, 37.
- Kovačević, Antonio, Kragić, Marija (2019), Moj najdraži pas, *Bioetičko obrazovanje i razvijanje stavova za živi okoliš OBRAZOVNI MATERIJALI*, [https://beagleproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/3.-My-favourite-dog\\_7-12\\_EN\\_final-copy.pdf](https://beagleproject.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/3.-My-favourite-dog_7-12_EN_final-copy.pdf) (accessed: 30 April 2020).
- Lipman, Matthew (2003), *Thinking in Education*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 36.
- Liszka, James, J. (1996), *A General Introduction to the Semeiotic of Charles S. Peirce*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1996, 103-104.
- Peirce, Charles Sanders (1877), The Fixation of Belief, *Popular Science Monthly* 12, <http://www.peirce.org/writings/p107.html> (accessed: 29 April 2020)
- Shields, Patricia M. (2003), The Community of Inquiry: Classical Pragmatism and Public Administration, *Administration & Society*, <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1008.9702&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (accessed: 29 April 2020).
- Swan, Karen, Garrison, D. R., Richardson, Jennifer C. (2009), A constructivist approach to online learning: The Community of Inquiry framework, in: Payne, C. R. ed., *Information Technology and Constructivism in Higher Education: Progressive Learning Frameworks*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2009, 43-57, 49.
- Walton, Douglas (2008), *Informal Logic: A Pragmatic Approach*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008, 8.



# Zajednica filozofskih istraživača kao metoda u ranom bioetičkom obrazovanju

## SAŽETAK

---

‘Zajednica istraživača’ je pojam koji je uveo Charles Sanders Peirce i izvorno je bio ograničen na znanstvenike. M. Lipman (2003) širi ovaj pojam tako što ga smješta u šire okruženje – učionicu. Lipman pretvara učionicu u istraživačku zajednicu, u kojoj se učenici međusobno slušaju s poštovanjem, nadograđuju ideje jedni drugima, izazivaju jedni druge na iznošenje argumenata za drugačija, nepodržana mišljenja, pomažu jedni drugima u dolaženju do zaključaka iz onoga što je rečeno. David Kennedy (2012) tvrdi kako je “Lipman, uzimajući teoriju svog prijatelja i mentora Justusa Buchlera, razvio ‘Zajednicu filozofskih istraživača’ – a to je najprikladniji način prakticiranja filozofskog kurikulumu s učenicima. Ovo je isto tako filozofska ideja koja ima dalekosežne implikacije, i praktične i teorijske – za teoriju učenja, za teoriju poučavanja, za teoriju argumentacije, za teoriju znanja, za grupnu psihologiju, za moralno obrazovanje, a možda i na kraju, što bi se moglo smatrati od najveće važnosti, za utemeljenu političku teoriju i praksu.” U različitim pristupima filozofiji s djecom često nalazimo zajednicu filozofskih istraživača kao jednu od osnovnih metoda. Primjerice, zajednica filozofskih istraživača jedna je od metoda koja se koristi u etičkom i vrijednosnom obrazovanju. “Pojam Etičko i vrijednosno obrazovanje (EVE) primjenjuje se na sve aspekte obrazovanja koji se eksplicitno ili implicitno odnose na etičku dimenziju života i kao takve se mogu strukturirati, regulirati i pratiti odgovarajućim obrazovnim metodama i alatima” (Strahovnik, 2015). Oslanjajući se na citiranu definiciju EVE-a, ako se usredotočimo na pitanja suvremenog svijeta s njegovom ekološkom krizom i rapidnom digitalizacijom, odnos etičkih dimenzija života možemo postaviti kao bioetičko pitanje. Koristeći zajednicu filozofskih istraživača kao osnovu za bioetičko obrazovanje, možemo zadovoljiti potrebu za inovativnim i učinkovitim bioetičkim obrazovanjem od najranije dobi. U predavanju ću pokazati kako se metoda zajednice filozofskih istraživača može povezati s bioetičkim temama kao što su odnos čovjeka i divljih životinja, čovjeka i biljaka, čovjeka i prirode u globalnom svijetu itd.

**Ključne riječi:** bioetika, zajednica istraživača, zajednica filozofskih istraživača, etičko obrazovanje, Matthew Lipman