Philosophy for Children and Social Inquiry: An Example of Education for Democratic Citizenship through Political Philosophy

Mehmet Ali DOMBAYCI[1]

Abstract

This study aims to present content and methodology on how to teach citizenship skills by means of philosophical inquiry. In education for democratic citizenship, there are two perspectives. One is rights-based citizenship education and the other is responsibility-based citizenship education. Along with a number of changes, communitariansim, which puts an emphasis on the importance of rights and responsibilities in a community, came to the front as an alternative to the other two. Active citizenship and political participation, concepts that are also important to thinkers like Dewey, Freire, and Crick, aim to develop the autonomous side of the individual which is usually overlooked by education systems and it is in line with this new point of view. However, there is a lack of approach which can reflect this new perspective on education. This study discusses the combination of education for democratic citizenship and philosophy education in terms of providing a solution to this problem. In this scope, the new vision of citizenship is dealt with and ideas on education for citizenship are presented in a comparative manner. Content of political philosophy and education for democratic citizenship are linked in the context of active citizenship and political participation. In the study, it is argued that P4C Programme, developed by Lipman, would be appropriate for education for citizenship as it transforms philosophy, which is usually heavily burdened with academic terminology, into philosophical inquiry. The nature of social inquiry and P4C will serve as a catalyser in establishing the relationship between political philosophy and education for democratic citizenship. In the conclusion part, a perspective is presented on how some relevant terms should be handled in the context of P4C.

Keywords: philosophy for children; social inquiry; community of inquiry; political philosophy; education for democratic citizenship

INTRODUCTION

For centuries philosophy has centred on the human being, problems arising from the structure of his essence and his place in the universe. However, in our age, man has turned more to his own problems and phenomena. Studies on man should not be based on his biological characteristics, his emotional life, the relationship between his soul and body and the area of subject and consciousness but on the tangible whole of his being, and the conditions and phenomena of being, grounded on this whole. These phenomena show that man is a being who knows, acts, hears his own values, adopts a specific attitude, foresees and destines, wants, ideates, commits himself to something, loves, strives, educates and gets educated, founds states, believes, speaks and who is historical, and is the creator of art and technique, with free actions and a bio psychological structure (Mengüşoğlu, 1988). There is a continuous and mutual relationship among these conditions of being. In time, through this relationship man turned into an individual, individual into a society, and society into a "public" even going beyond a community. The organisational image of the public constitutes itself as state. The relationship between the individual and the state/public resulting from this mutual relationship has brought a special term "citizenship" into question.

What is distinctive here is that on one hand the state is dependent on the conditions of being, but on the other hand in order for the state to have a sound basis; it should protect these conditions and help them improve further. State can achieve this through its education system. Through education on one hand individuals reach a stage at which they can serve

---

[1] Yrd. Doç. Dr., Gazi Üniversitesi, Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi

the development of the conditions of being; on the other hand, they acquire the knowledge of absolute value. When an individual faces the risk of being deprived of these, he is in a situation where he can defend these. Demanding human rights or defending freedom are not inherent in human beings. These are attitudes that should be developed through one's own education (Mengüşoğlu, 1988).

As society, in other words public, means dependency and intersubjectivity, autonomy and citizenship are defined as opposites of society. Within this reciprocal positioning, it is crucial to reconsider the relationship between the concept of citizen, arising from the public and becoming public and the concept of autonomy which stresses its individual aspect. It is important that the individual is both autonomous and a citizen and develop skills related to both. Gardner (2000) asks whether there is something basic that we have to teach children and answering this question himself, he maintains that we need to teach them how to take their capacity of autonomy and freedom to the highest level. They should manage to assess relatively contradicting ideas in an honest manner, and more than that, they should be able to handle multiple perspectives concerning an opinion. Since traditional understanding of education focuses more on the public/state in this mutual relationship, the structure of education has also attached more importance to the education of individual as a citizen loyal to his state, leaving his autonomous side incomplete.

From another perspective, this deficiency became more apparent along with a historical transformation. Factors, such as enlightenment, modernity, nation states, globalisation, etc., required the restructuring of the relationship between citizenship and related concepts, and discussion of this relationship (Gündüz & Gündüz , 2002). Since the Enlightenment, citizenship, as a cohesive identity, has lost its position; thus requiring the repositioning of identity in terms of belonging which multiplied in number increasingly, which now faces us as one of the basic discussions in social sciences in general, and especially in the field of philosophy.

Concerning this fundamental discussion, social inquiry and these concepts should be handled through philosophical questioning in the process of raising good citizens, good people. In his famous book, "İyi vatandaş, iyi insan" (Good Citizen, Good Man) (2004), Hasan Ali Yücel presents the points for inquiry through his content which he depicts as four doors and one exit, and he adopts a synthesising approach towards citizenship in terms of rights and duties. Identifying good citizen with good man, Yücel scrutinizes "the right path", "educating one's self" and "becoming a man". Making the same connection in Aristo's Nicomachean Ethics and Politics, Collins (2006), brings forward the relationship between education for democratic citizenship and values. Dewey, on the other hand, argues that democracy is beyond state and government-related processes and procedures, and it comprises a moral component in which individuals' impact on the society and its members should be considered, or "an ethical way of life" (Glina, 2009). The link between a good citizen and a good man is, therefore, striking. When ethics is defined as a discipline searching for "what is good life in general for men" and accordingly trying to determine "how men should live and behave", it will clearly be seen that political philosophy is not something different when examined. However, as the question gets more specialised, it is possible to reformulate it as "what is political good for man and what should he do to realise this political good". A good human life is only possible in a good political-social organisation (Arslan, 2010). Hence, political-social organisation should be considered with all aspects, especially including its problems, it should be discussed and be an object of education so that it could be directed towards the good.

The relationship between philosophia-paideia (philosophy-education) whose main objective is to instil the "consciousness of recognising problems" should also touch upon how this aim should be structured in the context of citizenship (Çotuksöken, 2012). When areté which includes the concepts of goodness, virtue, and merit are also added to the other

two, a joint process comprising the acquisition of a sense of living and character development comes into being.

The P4C programme, developed by Matthew Lipman, together with the Community of Inquiry (CoI) pedagogy, overcomes the problems mentioned above by using Deweian concepts of self and refusing the dichotomy of community/individual. Like the psychologist Lev Vygotsky, and his followers Charles Sanders and George Herbert Mead, Dewey also acknowledges that thinking is the internalising of social processes. In order for a person to think for oneself, he should be a member of a society. According to Dewey, only an open and pluralistic way of thinking which questions society ensures autonomy or personal development, and such communities are usually democratic societies (Bleazby, 2006).

The main problem of this study can be defined as "How could social inquiry be used in teaching philosophy." In order to solve this main problem, the study aims at delivering education for democratic citizenship through political philosophy. In the frame of the main aim of this study, it is claimed that teaching of philosophy and the method of philosophy constitute a model for education for democratic citizenship. This study argues that teaching and methodology of philosophy constitute a model for democratic citizenship education. Here teaching and methodology of philosophy means P4C. P4C will facilitate the upbringing of reflective, meticulous, reasonable and autonomous individuals and help them intellectualise the relationship between dependency and interdependency; thus contributing to education for democratic citizenship.

METHODOLOGY

In order to solve the basic problem of this study data were acquired from domestic and foreign literature. The main aim of this study is to present a suggestion for delivering education for democratic citizenship through political philosophy. Within the framework of this suggestion, the study also deals with the P4C Programme and social inquiry, which are thought to have given a new direction to philosophical inquiry. Books and articles on education for democratic citizenship and P4C Programme constitute the main sources of data for this study although works that are considered relevant were also taken into consideration. As this study aims at explaining an existing situation, it can be defined as a descriptive survey. (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2006). All the documents were collected for data analysis, and relevant data were firstly noted. The noted data, then, were analyzed carefully and categorized based on their relevance to education for democratic citizenship and the basic concepts and subjects of political philosophy, and philosophy for children and social inquiry. Data which were analyzed and interpreted in accordance with the aim of this study were then synthesized into suggestions that could further be improved.

Conceptual Dimension of Education for Democratic Citizenship

United Nations Children Rights Convention (UNCRC) and the Crick Report (CR) are two crucial and basic texts about education for citizenship, but they point out to different aspects of the issue. While the former focuses on the characteristic features of children rights, the latter attaches equal importance to duties and responsibilities. Lockyer (2008), emphasizes that the UNCRC's definition of child in terms of civil and political rights is incomplete and it should also include participatory rights. When the UNCRC is reconsidered in the frame of the CR, the need to include active citizenship and participatory rights will become apparent once more. Children, as active citizens, should educate themselves as individuals who think for themselves, in a way willing to influence their social lives, who are able and equipped, and who evaluate their personal capacity prior to action and discourse (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 1998). Hence, conceptualisation of active citizenship is the core of the issue in education for democratic citizenship.

Freire, noted for his work "Pedagogy of the Oppressed" advocates political education covering the features of active citizenship. In principle, he shares the same view as Crick concerning the fact that individuals should be free and participatory in the political field. However, they differ in using the term "politics" and explaining the political nature of the society and its ideal political development. While Crick turns to a realistic society which attempts to reconcile groups with different interests, Freire yearns for an idealistic society which is potentially beyond dissociation and injustice. Even though there are a number of different perspectives about the subject, Freire and Crick agree on the importance of all individuals' participation in political processes for the realisation of political education and social justice, as well as for effective functioning of the society (McCowan, 2009). It is important that both underline active citizenship based on the importance of political education.

Freire claims that traditional education fails in facilitating individual autonomy and does not allow students to think for themselves (Bleazby, 2006). Such an education approach which is far from raising autonomous individuals, strengthen their passive attitudes, which are not critical or creative, and makes students subject to the use and control of others. Dewey, who shares similar ideas with Freire, takes these failures as a basis and suggests CoI for citizenship education.

CoI could also be defined as a model for democratic environment or a model of democracy itself. CoI is actually freedom, open debate, pluralism, self-management and a warranty for democracy. Only through this way can students really take part in a common public questioning and experience dialogue with others as equal and autonomous individuals. With such a model of democracy, it would not be a mistake to consider the two characteristics of democracy. These are; the control of citizen over public decisions and equality among citizens in practicing decisions (Burgh & Yorshansky, 2011). CoI is the prototype of these two characteristics in education.

The main aim of democratic citizenship education in the scope of questioning community is to teach children how to be tolerant, sensitive towards the demands other than her own, limit her wishes and objectives as required by being a part of the community, as well as some of the core elements such as solidarity, responsibility within a group, tolerance and respect. Klecker (1982) lists them as the elements of a type of education which he prefers to call "breeding education. Klecker talks about a perception which "places oneself in the centre" and "places some other person in the centre" when such education is conducted. The perception that places oneself in the centre is generally one dimensional and almost entirely subjective. The one that places some other in the centre is more abstract and it provides an understanding which is more detached from objects. The philosophical perspective which has been adopted by social questioning as a method will serve mostly the emotional aspect of the taxonomy developed by Bloom and his friends. There is a correlation between the basic skills of citizenship ad each step of taxonomy. For instance, freedom of expression, as a human right and the way it is handled in the scope of speaking and listening skills in education for democratic citizenship have some specific levels. These could be listed as being open to speak and listen on receptive level, conscious speaking and listening on reaction level, having respect and defending for speaking and listening on evaluation level, conceptualising speaking and listening and linking them to other skills and values on organisation level, and handling speaking and listening in the scope of the value system in a consistent manner on quality acquisition level (Kuzgun, 1982). The basic responsibility of education is to raise reasonable citizens who accept logical controversies in the given framework of these common principles, norms and procedures (Costa, 2011).

The difference between rationality and reasonableness cannot be expressed precisely as it is rather fuzzy. However, it is possible to say that reasonableness should bear some characteristics that are missing in rationality. One way of doing this is to argue that

reasonableness is rationality fortified by self-criticism, deliberation and judgement. One of the preconditions of reasonableness can especially be practised, or becomes apparent, in deliberation. As J. Rawls points out, political deliberations are governed by the following premises (Lipman, 1998).

    a. Aiming for a reasonable agreement: accusing other people merely based on prejudice without presenting certain evidence is not reasonable by any means.

    b. Expecting harsh controversies concerning very basic issues is reasonable.

    c. Despite controversies, giving credit to people with good intentions is reasonable.

Besides all these perspectives, the core of the issue lies in one question "What kind of citizenship education are we looking for?" At present there are two competing traditions of citizenship: One of these is the rights based citizenship education which is the embodiment of liberal tradition, and the other is the duty or responsibility based citizenship education reflecting the civil and republican tradition. In an effort to establish a third tradition replacing these two, a communitarian citizenship education that emphasizes the importance of responsibilities in a given society is suggested (Davies, 2011). In fact, this third one points out to the citizen.

Relationship between Education for Democratic Citizenship and Political Philisophy

Objectives and principles of democratic citizenship are related to three dimensions of teaching and learning. Students who come across with these three dimensions are citizens who (Gollob, Huddleston, Krapf, & Rowe, 2008);

    a. must know which human rights are relevant to them and understand to which conditions they are related, through learning *"about"*,

    b. see school as a micro-society experience which respects its students' freedom and equality and are trained in exercising human rights, by learning *"through"*,

    c. are competent in exercising human rights and self-confident with a mature sense of responsibility towards others and towards the community they live in by learning *"for"*.

These three dimensions are linked with the three basic problem areas of political philosophy. Learning "about" mostly relates to conceptual problems, while learning "through" is linked with normative problems, and learning "for" deals with empirical problems. Indeed, this triple relationship demonstrates that political philosophy is not merely an analytical and normative discipline and it requires systemmatic and comprehensive political thinking (Cevizci, 2008). Yet, accomplishing such learning processes by means of mere empirical data, systemmatic observation and existing practical exercises would mean getting out of the realm of philosophy. The relationship here is just the integration of philosophical questioning to learning process at this level.

When the relationship between these three dimensions of education for democratic citizenship and the fundamental problems of philosophy occurs in environments where CoI is adopted as a learning atmosphere, learning behaviours reach the highest level. Therefore, the basic principles defined by education for democratic citizenship should be integrated with the CoI. These basic principles can be listed as follows, education for democratic citizenship is (Gollob, Krapf, & Weidinger, 2010);

    a. active – emphasizes learning by doing;

    b. task-based – structured around the tasks of active democratic citizenship teaching;

    c. cooperative – leaves room for group work and cooperative learning;

    d. interactive – uses discussion and debate as methods;

    e. critical – encourages students to think for themselves, and

    f. participatory – enables students to contribute to the training process.

The ultimate state which will be the result of these three dimensions and basic principles will become visible in some of the intended competencies of students. Education for democratic citizenship should develop the student's competency for political analysis and reasoning, using methods and political decision making and taking action. As all these are closely related to one another, there is no order of precedence or successiveness. Thus, they should not be considered separately (Gollob, Krapf, & Weidinger, 2010). The three problem areas political philosophy and the method of P4C may contribute more to the development of these competencies than own principles of education for democratic citizenship. Hence, it would be the right approach to consider these structures together from a multi-disciplinary perspective.

Competency of political analysis and reasoning is the ability to analyse and discuss political events, problems and controversial issues in the frame of the basic concepts and problems of political philosophy. In this process, students are expected to understand the importance of political decisions in a person's life, and also to understand and judge their consequences. On the other hand, students' competence in using methodology covers their ability and skills to find and acquire knowledge, and participate in public debates and decision making processes. CoI is perfectly suited for this competence. Competency of democratic decision making and taking action is the ability to express one's opinions, values, and interests in public, to negotiate and to compromise. Here, the aim is to acquire the ability to express one's self and have self-confident and sufficient interaction. These three competencies constitute the basis for active citizenship.

It could be argued that the cognitive dimension of education for citizenship is practised through political philosophy and education for democratic citizenship, while its affective dimension is given rather through P4C and social inquiry. Basic concepts of education for democratic citizenship and political philosophy are so similar that it is almost impossible to distinguish them from one another.

Considering democracy, the core concept, in the context of both political philosophy and education for democratic citizenship will ensure that the two dimensions mentioned above are also considered together. On one hand, it is important to question democracy conceptually and on the other hand it is also crucial to acquire knowledge. Rights, responsibility and justice are the other significant concepts that surround democracy and they should also be inquired together. Concepts of power/authority, equality/diversity, laws/rules, individual/community and cooperation/conflict are those deriving from the relationship between justice, rights and responsibilities. All these concepts also come to the fore from a more external and higher perspective when dealing with moral, social, economical, legal, political or environmental problems (Gollob, Huddleston, Krapf, & Rowe, 2008).

Political philosophy assumes a crucial role when discussing, judging, or trying to set a standard of judgement about the content of education for democratic citizenship (Gollob & Krapf, 2008). Here the important point is to ensure that students participate and to eliminate their indifference rather than teaching them a single political truth, in other words teaching any political doctrine.

Apart from the conventional and long established classical political philosophy courses, associating the basic concepts, arguments and problems of political philosophy with education for democratic citizenship is effective in increasing students' competence. When dealing with the concepts and arguments of political philosophy, it is important to realise whether these are in favour of human rights, or to what extent they oppose human rights. What is crucial here is discussing these arguments and concepts rather than reaching a common agreement about them. Another significant question is how the relationship between power, one of the basic concepts of political philosophy, and democracy reflects on human rights and how this reflection affects the individual, whom we call "the citizen".

Students who concentrate on the ideal could consider "utopia"s, which constitute one of the fundamental discussion points of political philosophy, as a foresight and make their judgement accordingly.

Using political philosophy as a means of participation and serving it to the students to improve their active citizenship skills, also contribute to the transfer of skills from schools as micro-societies to the society on a macro-level. Political participation at this level focuses on environmental conditions and models. Questioning these environmental conditions and models is only possible through political philosophy. Harmony with an open society, in other words public good cannot be forced, it should be negotiated and philosophy is the natural way to do so. Moreover, historical development and transformation of the concepts, arguments and problems of this field can be understood solely by examining the features of the transformation periods of political philosophy discussions (Gollob & Krapf, 2008).

In order to discuss democratic citizenship in terms of political philosophy, the perspective of political philosophies on freedom, equality, justice, state, politics, and individual should be considered. All these modern political philosophies discuss these concepts according to certain criteria and provide recommendations. Political philosophies present important and different arguments about issues such as the structure of collective order, human nature, according to which principles a political system should be constructed, and the relationship between the individual and the state. Students should be oriented towards active citizenship through questioning based on these diverse discourses. Not only is it crucial to inquire, but it is also equally important to establish a set of values and behave accordingly. The core principle of active citizenship, which is participation, can only be exercised in this way.

To ensure a political philosophy discussion in favour of active citizenship, it is required to bring the applicable problems of political philosophy into the classroom. However, in practise, the discussion in the classroom should not be confused with the reality. It is appropriate to discuss problems related to political philosophy based on political issues, political decisions, and political institutions. It is necessary to carry out the discussions on the level of political issues and compare opinions. On the level of political decisions, the practical aspect of philosophy, which means taking action following discussions, should be dealt with. Finally, on the level of political institutions, values, attitudes, and ideologies governing political behaviour could be examined (Gollob, Krapf, Ólafsdóttir, & Weidinger, 2010).

Bringing a fundamental problem of political philosophy to the fore will make fundamental concepts readily apparent. Accompanied by the ideas brought up following the problem and discussion, new ideas and reactions, as the products of dialectics which is one of the methods of philosophy, will interact with each other. After this stage, the problem will be further discussed in another form. The classical thesis, anti-thesis, synthesis cycle will turn into a cycle of political discussion. It is then important for students to position themselves and be aware where they stand as citizens and how they can participate in political decisions. As a result, students can take part in the discussion, develop their own ideas, oppose or support other opinions. Political philosophy, here, should be a means of transition from active discussion to active citizenship.

Philosophy for Children

P4C program, developed by Lipman is a philosophy based program aiming ait teaching children how to think for themselves. Topics such as ethics, epistemology, metaphysics, aesthetic, and logic, which are concerned with the main problem areas of philosophy, are dealt with at the level of K11-12. These are Advanced Philosophical Specialization. However, before reaching this level the method of philosophical inquiry is delivered without referring to the general literature, or terminology, of academic philosophy.

The atmosphere which forms the basis of philosophical inquiry is the CoI. The Programme starts with General Foundations which includes the levels K2 – K3, K4, and K5. On K2 level, Language Acquisition; on K3, K4 levels, deeper Language Acquisition, and on K5, K6 levels, Acquisition of Formal and Informal Logic are delivered. Finally, on levels K7-K10, you will find Elementary Philosophical Specialization (Lipman , Sharp, & Oscanyan, 1980).

P4C focuses more on multi-dimensional thinking rather than critical, creative, or caring thinking. The programme, which uses curiosity, wonder, and suspicion as a tool, is composed of manuals that are considered in the scope of specially designed novels. The most important feature of these manuals is that they present philosophical content through daily language. There is almost no sign of a philosopher, a philosophical movement, or term. Still, the language used is provocative enough to trigger philosophical discussion. Students develop their own perspectives with their original way of expression on the ideas and opinions of others within the CoI. CoI, in general, is a learning atmosphere in which uninterrupted inquiry takes place; students respectfully listen to each other; are open to new ways and methods of thinking; and consider the opinions of others when constructing their own, and where each student supports and helps one another in defining presumptions and reaching a conclusion in accordance with his capacity, knowledge and skills; gives meaning to his own statements as well as the statements of others. In this environment, personal independency is not neglected while acting as a group, and similarly impartiality is maintained and sincere relationships are established (Dombaycı, Ulger, Arıboyun, & Gürbüz, 2008). CoI should be considered as the community of joint philosophising. The most important benefit is that it contributes to the development of an idea of one's own effort.

According to Lipman, for an inquiry based society education has two crucial elements; one is social structure and the other is character structure. The social structure of such education aims at realising democracy, while the character structure focuses on improving reasonableness. Both are put into practise through critical, creative and caring thinking (Lipman, 2003).

Philosophy for Children and Social Inquiry

One of the main assumptions of democracy is that such a society does not only consist of knowledgeable but also reflective people. In addition, it is not sufficient to be aware of problems, one should also have a reasonable perspective about these problems. There is a need for education centred on thinking, without underestimating the inquiry capacity of children and taking into consideration their rich capacity of wonder and active curiosity. P4C delivers appropriate answers to the questions on how the criteria are defined and how it should be practised.

Unless the philosophical background of concepts such as freedom, justice, equality, personality, democracy, etc. which are the core themes of democratic citizenship is discussed, it is almost impossible to develop an attitude about these. Hence, it could be said that the responsible citizenship education is reflective. Yet, in that case the relationship between responsibility and reflection should be clearly defined (Lipman & Sharp, 1980);

   a. Students should be familiar with the conceptual basis of the western civilisation and the relationship between the community and the individual, at least to the extent that they show interest.

   b. Students should be encouraged to get familiar with and to understand the social status and social situation they are in, in order to see the general factors that rule the relationship between individuals and the community.

   c. Students' thinking skills should be sharpened by means of continuous practise.

   d. A curriculum equipped with social issues.

When the overall abstract nature of philosophy is considered, concrete discussion of social problems might be seen as a challenge. Dewey's philosophy provides an example for a

philosophical concretisation, for making very abstract philosophical problems concrete and on how to trace back to their social origins. On the other hand, the common view argues that practical aspect of such problems is missing and finding a solution is very difficult because if philosophical problems already lack a proper link to social life, it is quite natural that they transform into mathematical problems. The easiest way to turn philosophical problems into social problems is to establish CoI.

Distinguishing between reliable and unreliable reasoning, benefiting from literary works that cover basic education for democratic citizenship such as justice, rights, and freedom in order to improve children's thinking ability through philosophy, and turning the classroom into a CoI to establish philosophical pedagogy are important solutions.

The method of P4C provide students with tangible experience and contribute to their development. In a way, this method could be defined as an atmosphere for philosophical inquiry and within this environment, students develop their own understanding and gain their own experience; thus contributing to the solution. Students research and examine social-philosophical problems and as a result a prototype of social reconstruction is realised. Emphasising the relationship between students' experiences and philosophical problems concretise philosophy as required by social reconstruction. One important point to consider is that when selecting problems, social ones should be preferred over individual problems; however, in handling these problems individual experiences should be activates. What is meant here is that experiences should be supported by inference, making analogies, making generalisations, constructing abstractions, empathising with others or making concept analysis. Conceptual analysis of philosophical inquiry, its metacognitive aspect and the nature of philosophical problematising enables us to reach the source of problems with a complex nature and to reveal what lies behind the surface of these problems (Bleazby, 2006).

Very few education professionals are concerned about the function of education in preparing students for democratic citizenship. The problem arises when the questions about the necessity of this kind of education and about how its content should be are brought up. Based on his observations, Scheffer underlines that democratic ideals should be dealt with in this kind of education. The most important one is the requirement of adopting a critical and responsible approach towards social events and evaluating them. The education to be delivered should prepare students' minds for inquiry in order to ensure the sustainability of these democratic values. This type of education does not form or bend the students' minds, but rather opens them. Hence, liberal and open democracy requires the demonstration of these inquiry values and its continuous practise. Important merits of this education should be as follows (Lipman, 1998);

    a. liberates the mind;
    b. strengthens the mind's critical powers;
    c. informs the mind with knowledge;
    d. engages the mind's human sympathies; and
    e. illuminates its moral and practical choices

Social inquiry approach of P4C provides details for these merits presented by Scheffler. According to these details, features of social inquiry are as below (Lipman & Sharp, 1980):

    a. Making use of novels which concentrate on the attention, interests and energy of children, use common language of children and are based on social experience with which children can easily identify themselves.
    b. Bringing together the theory and practice of skills such as deducing, inducing, contradicting, comparing, contrasting appraising, assuming, generalizing, abstracting, planning, predicting, describing, interpreting, explaining, wondering and deliberating, which could all be considered as mental actions.

c. Obtaining the students' views at once (at the time of interaction) about fields that provide areas for social inquiry such as social and political philosophy, government, sociology, social psychology, economics, law, political science and anthropology by means of secondary texts.

d. Developing students ability to think by using the basic procedures of dialogue such as presenting good reason for opinions, assessing the consistency and stability of arguments, respecting others, listening carefully, considering all different perspectives. While this is being actualised, triggering the dialectic process by exposing one's own ideas to alternative opinions in the same environment immediately.

These characteristics of social inquiry help education for citizenship activate responsibility and answerability, which are the ethical actions of the individual and law and justice, which are the political actions (Bergo, 2008). One of the important issues here is that being a responsible citizen requires being a reasonable individual. If we want to raise children as reasonable human beings, we need to teach them not only what the society expects from them but also why they do so. Hence the relationship between the individual and the society is deepened through social inquiry. For this reason, participatory environments should be established for participatory citizens.

Handling the Basic Concepts of Education for Democratic Citizenship in Philosophy for Children and Exampeles of Inquiry

Social inquiry which is a part of P4C consists of two parts: the first part is a general introduction to thinking and reasoning, and the second part is mostly concentrated on social concerns and inquiries. Concerning this programme, Lipman presented the first part through Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery and the second part through a novel called Mark and a manual. In the CoI a number of concepts and topics including government, justice, law, freedom, democracy, authority, family, law and crime, friendship, division of labour, tradition, bureaucracy, diversity, community and association, social institutions, human nature, anomie, competition and cooperation, status, etc. are dealt with. These concepts are the common topics of political philosophy and democratic citizenship and are considered in the social inquiry dimension of philosophy.

Basic concepts that are dealt with as the content of P4C program are processed through thinking ability and are questioned. Philosophy teaching, in the classical sense, includes the transfer of opinions and introduction to philosophical movements and philosophers, P4C covers philosophical inquiry. Basic concepts that have been discussed by major philosophers are dealt with from different perspectives. It would be useful to present examples about the basic concepts that are subject to social inquiry and the ways they are handled.

Government; Forms of government vary from primitive societies to dictatorships, from absolute monarchy to decentralised, or centralised structures. When inquiring government concept, a number of different parameters need to be considered. These parameters emphasise the compulsory roles of governments. As the characteristics of a government are different, they strike the attention of students going through social inquiry. However, this is not just a matter of identification, it is also the necessity to define or evaluate the criteria which will ensure that they are differentiated so that certain forms could be analysed. One of the problems encountered during social inquiry is that students may assume that they already know the terms such as government, democracy, society, community, and fail to define them sufficiently. Although explaining democratic process and the main assumptions related to this process is a requirement, presuming that a solution must be found for these is a fundamental mistake. This mistaken assumption also brings about other problems. Hence, the context in which students understand factual events

should be considered and this usually bears the risk of misunderstanding or misinterpreting the information we provide (Lipman, 1988).

The following questions concerning the government could be used to highlight the similarities and differences. In this way, government concept would be examined (Lipman & Sharp, 1980).

- What are the similarities between a state and federal governments?
- What are the differences between a city and a federal government?
- What are the differences between a city and a local government?
- How many political (systems) and economic systems can you list?
- What are the main differences and similarities between capitalism and socialism?
- What are the main differences between democracy and dictatorship?
- Can you name any similarities between democracy and dictatorship?

Law; Each society has some kind of a code of conduct which have an impact more or less on its members. People are forced or directed to be honest. Children also take advice as a kind of moral rule. Yet, when a rule is violated, this fraud is not solely a moral issue anymore, it also becomes a legal issue. This is similar to one's perjury at the court. Based on this, we could say that violation of some social rules require public opinion to create pressure. There are also some legal rules by which the society can compel the government to take specific steps to punish the violators (of the rule). At this point, the main challenge for children is to distinguish between the topics related to law, tradition, social morality, domestic law and the constitution. Students are expected to be sensitive about these distinctions so that they could differentiate much better than they already. In short, students should have a better understanding about the relationship between law and morality than the one they already have. Moreover, they are also expected to have a better understanding about the relationship between the fundamental principles of political philosophy and constitutionality. This understanding will ensure that an enlightened citizen does not show knee-jerk reactions even for a violation to which he could show an emotional reaction. The important thing is believing in the necessity of the legal procedures to operate and students' realisation of the fact that both the defender and the suspect have rights. Indeed, this awareness points out to the balance which distinguish democratic societies from others. The main element that an individual citizen considers when establishing his conscientious reasoning capacity (Lipman, 1988).

When the function of laws and law-like structures, as well as the way they are dealt with and their relationship with other concepts are inquired, the meaning will expand. To ensure such an expansion in meaning, several questions could be referred to (Lipman & Sharp, 1980);

- Is it possible for there to be such a thing as a "perfect law"?
- If there are no laws against a certain form of behaviour, does this mean that such behaviour is (a) permissible; (b) desirable; (c) unimportant; (d) none of the foregoing?
- Would you say that laws are (a) rules; (b) policies; (c) regulations; (d) statutes; (e) none of the foregoing; (f) some of the foregoing; (g) all of the foregoing?
- If laws are not in keeping with the Constitution, does that mean they
- Are just or unjust?
- Can the constitution possibly be unjust? Can the constitution be amended?
- Do good citizens obey the laws because they fear punishment, or because they love the laws, or both?
- Can laws place restrictions on people and still be good?

Social Institutions: Each society establishes social institutions that will follow similar patterns of human behaviour from generation to generation. These social institutions are usually taken for granted and thus the level of awareness about how these institutions shape people's lives is not sufficient. In that respect, there are distinctions between social institutions and traditions. Although traditions are elements that shape human behaviour and pass down from generation to generation, they are only meaningful when they are considered together with the symbolic values of a given society and their meaning. Social institutions, on the other hand, have a rather formal structure and they have the tendency to be taken for granted. For example, it is taken for granted that students attend school, criminals are sent to prison, and practitioners of a religion goes to a church or a mosque. However, the same social institutions may be quite different from or very similar to those in a different society. Therefore, in terms of citizenship skills, when students learn about the government of different societies and the distinction between their social institutions, they should not be misguided about these similarities and differences. What is important here is how these social institutions are governed. Analysing how some of these social institutions function, especially illustrating them by using the family or education as examples of social institutions should contribute greatly to students. In addition, it is also important for education for citizenship to reconsider their own role within such institutions through philosophical inquiry (Lipman & Sharp, 1980).

Comparing concepts such as church, school, family, private enterprise, courts, political parties, which are examples of social institutions, in terms of their relationship with one another or their position against one another will help define the similarities and differences among them. By combining all these concepts with one another, questions like "How is a school like a church? How is a bank like a family?" could be used to spot the similarities, while "How is a school differ from a church? How is a bank differ a family?" could be used to detect differences and facilitate their conceptualisation. Following this questioning for each one of them, it is also possible to make an overall evaluation by asking questions such as "What are the things all these institutions have in common?, Can you generalize about the kinds of ways that institutions differ from another?", etc.

Community: Communities are characterised by face-to-face relationships. Each member of a community has individual knowledge about all the other members of the community and at the same time there is a common acceptance of group traditions and values. In addition, there is a traditional distinction between communities and unions, or associations. Yet, how to explain the inquisitive education community to the classroom is crucial. The traditional perception of community is perceived as a continuous repository of values. Individuals take the core values in their lives from the core values of the communities they live in. This meaning of a community is relevant to its function as a distributor. However, instead of considering community as an institutional structure which distributes values and meaning to individuals, we should see it as a structure that guides and enables them to understand the meaning of their participation. Hence, the meaning of community lies in its operational process (Lipman, 1988).

Concepts like society, community, neighbourhood, institution, and community are very close, yet quite different concepts. They are also distinct from one another in terms of their structure. Focusing on these concepts and their structure could not only be useful in maintaining the unity of meaning, it would also facilitate their understanding in terms of the principles of their structure, establishment and functioning. Following drills can be used to ensure this facilitation (Lipman & Sharp, 1980).

- A mob is (a) a society; (b) a rabble; (c) a crowd; (d) a disorderly group of people.
- A society is (a) an institution; (b) a club; (c) an association; (d) an entire population.
- An institution is (a) a pattern of group behaviour; (b) an institute; (c) a social custom or tradition; (d) one of the subsidiary structures of which a society is composed.

- A class is (a) a grouping of persons having the same social status, (b) a group of pupils who are being taught together; (c) a rank which people occupy in a vertical set of social levels; (d) a group of persons in the same economic situation.
- A community is (a) a locality where people reside; (b) a group of people having common interests; (c) a group of people who know each other personally and share the same experiences; (d) a group of people who communicate with one another.

Freedom: For an adult, few other concepts are as crucial as the concept of freedom. During childhood it is usually thought that freedom is more restricted, and there are more obligations. Adulthood, on the other hand, is considered as a process during which people are released from the restrictions around freedom and become aware of their independence. A child's demand for freedom is usually treated as a threat to established values. Indeed, childhood is the laboratory version of the problem of freedom in real life. When dealing with freedom in relation to citizenship, we should start from the child's own freedom. Only in this way could freedom be conceptualised as a rhetoric and ideology within politics. Based on this, a capacity should be developed to analyse the difference between who is free and who is not. In this way, there will be an opportunity to effectively evaluate institutions which are free and which are not and the tendency to consider institutions that are not satisfactory, as uncritical (Lipman, 1988).

The words "free" and "freedom "are used in a similar way from time to time. Distinguishing them from one another is both enjoyable and beneficial in terms of conceptualisation. In this scope, the following phrases could be used to distinguish between free and freedom (Lipman & Sharp, 1980):

- Free public schools
- Freedom under law
- Free enterprise
- Free world
- Free speech
- Free love
- Free air and water
- Free the hostages!
- Freedom from fear
- Free advice

Justice; Besides the importance of making students familiar with the discussions about justice in the society, it is also necessary to get them acquainted with constitutional issues that form the basis of law and the philosophical background of these issues. Such grounding enables the students to see that legitimacy by itself is not equal to social justice. Lack of justice sometimes raises the question whether law should be respected or not, it is important that students do not fall for such a question. Yet, they are quite inclined to do so. When dealing with such concepts, the discussion should take place without developing the risk of losing respect for these institutions due to imperfection. From education for citizenship point of view, the importance of philosophical questioning is basically the requirement to be sensitive about basic concepts such as freedom and justice. However, such discussion does not mean that one could learn how to solve the tension between these concepts. It is, therefore, crucial to get to the heart of social inquiry in encouraging students to discuss these topics (Lipman, 1988).

Concept of justice, in some cases, means respect for rights. When considered from this angle, it is important to bring social inquiry and moral inquiry together. It would be useful to

deal with the concept of justice from this point of view and together with questions given below, and discuss the concept in the CoI (Lipman & Sharp, 1980).

- Could someone violate your rights without being unjust to you?
- Could someone be unjust to you without violating your rights?
- Is it possible that other people respect or violate your rights without knowing that they are doing so?
- If a person has been found guilty of a crime, does the legal system still have to respect his rights?
- If the world were a just world, would everyone's rights be respected?

CONCLUSION

Education for citizenship is not independent from the conditions of human existence. Hence it derives from its concrete whole of being and conditions of existence which are grounded in this whole. However, while doing this, it also considers the relationship between the conditions of existence. Social, political, scientific, etc. developments transform, shape and redesign the structure of societies. The fact that education system aims at raising people who know about physics, chemistry, mathematics, history and geography basically serves for a higher structure, for the education of qualified citizen. At this point, both the individual and the state are in a dependency-based relationship. This mutual positioning is neither individual-centred nor state-centred, it has to be a position in which the individual is both a citizen and autonomous. Constructing the individual in a way where he is subject to the state or as a person who utterly serves the state is the beginning of the end.

The new outlook resulting from the mutual positioning of the individual and the state refers to the importance of individual's rights and responsibilities in the society. Traditional citizenship education values civil and political rights however falls behind in participation. Participation requires active citizenship. Conceptualising active citizenship signifies the solution of education for democratic citizenship at one point. Active citizenship necessitates not only participation but also political participation. Political education is important in the realisation of social justice and effective functioning of the society. Individuals who have been through such an education also discover their autonomy and think for themselves.

In education for democratic citizenship which takes active citizenship as its basic principle, the use of CoI is actually the model of a democratic atmosphere which is intended for in a social sense. When students are educated via this model, they learn how to have control over public decisions and discover equality in putting these decisions into practise. Moreover, it is also important that these students are brought up as reasonable citizens. Reasonableness is a rationality strengthened by self-criticism, debate and judgement.

Students learn about democratic citizenship and they understand what human rights on a cognitive level are; they learn through democratic citizenship and develop themselves in utilising basic citizenship skills; and as they learn for democratic citizenship, they also develop an understanding of responsibility to the society they live in. This is an indicator of the combination of moral and political actions of a citizen. Students, who learn on three different levels, are expected to develop their competence in political analysis and reasoning, use of methods, and political decision making.

Right at this point, there is a need for political philosophy. For political analysis, political events, issues and a variety of topics should be analysed in the scope of the basic concepts and problems of political philosophy. In this kind of education where the use of cognitive and affective structures together is obligatory, political philosophy and education for citizenship may represent the conceptual dimension. Using political philosophy as a means of participation and using it to develop active citizenship skills is a decent way of moving from the school community to a democratic society. Using dialectics as a method,

philosophy will transform into a political discussion cycle in education for democratic citizenship. It is important that students should position themselves in this cycle and realise that they can participate in political decisions.

Classical appearance of philosophy is the transfer on the ideas of many philosophical movements and philosophers. When its specific terminology is also considered it could be argued that philosophy becomes rather difficult to understand. Seeing this risk, M. Lipman developed P4C programme. He suggests a mutli-dimensional thinking model including critical, creative and caring thinking. He wrote novels and manuals to be able to get students discuss philosophical concepts in daily language and as a method he turned the classroom into a CoI. In this way, students find the opportunity or express their points of view in their own words based on the ideas and opinions of others. With the model he presents, Lipman argues that the social structure of inquiry based society may improve democracy, while its character structure dimension may improve reasonableness.

P4C Programme which borrowed content from political philosophy and turned this into social inquiry, is also able to weave this content together with thinking skills and have this philosophical discussion in lower age groups. In fact, the quality of a philosophical inquiry is hidden in the extent to which abstract philosophical problems could become concrete and reach its social origins. Conceptual analysis of philosophical inquiry should ensure the analysis of basic concepts that are subject to education for democratic citizenship. Hence, minds of students will not bent, on the contrary, they will open up and expand.

When children's curiosity, wonder, suspicion and longing for exploration are blended with philosophy, adults can also think in a more flexible and effective way. From the detection of a problem to finding a solution, children develop their own way of thinking in general and their own approach, they construct their own truths and examine their truths in the light of others' opinions, which is a crucial development of thinking skills.

Transferring content, method and point of view from P4C which emphasizes individual's autonomy, takes social inquiry in its content through CoI to education for democratic citizenship will contribute to the active and participatory citizen, who is the ultimate target. Therefore, in the scope of P4C and education for democratic citizenship, they are educated not about what they should think but about how they should think.

REFERENCES

Arslan, A. (2010). *Felsefeye Giriş*. Ankara: Adres Yayınları.

Bergo, B. (2008). Politics, Ethics, Aesthetics. In E. F. Isin, & G. M. Nielsen, *Acts of Citisenship* (pp. 13-73). New York: Zed Books.

Bleazby, J. (2006). Autonomy, Democratic Community, and Citizenship in Philosophy for Children: Dewey and Philosophy for Children's Rejection of the Individual/Community Dualism. *Analytic Teaching, Volume No:26*(No.1), 30-52.

Burgh , G., & Yorshansky, M. (2011). Communities of Inquiry: Politics, power and group dynamics. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 43*(5), 436-452.

Cevizci, A. (2008). *Felsefe.* Bursa: Sentez Yayıncılık.

Collins, S. D. (2006). *Aristotle and the Rediscovery of Citizenship.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Costa, M. V. (2011). *Rawls, Citizenship and Education.* New York: Routledge.

Çotuksöken, B. (2012). *İnsan Hakları ve Felsefe*. İstanbul: Papatya Yayıncılık.

Davies, I. (2011). *100+ Ideas For Teaching Citizenship.* London: Continuum.

Dombaycı, M., Ulger, M., Arıboyun, A., & Gürbüz, H. (2008). *İlköğretim Düşünme Eğitimi Öğretmen Kılavuz Kitabı 6-8.* Ankara: MEB.

Gardner, S. T. (2000). Teaching Fredom. *Analytic Teaching, 21*(1), 24-33.

Glina, M. B. (2009). Democracy as Morality: Using Philosophical Dialogue to Cultivate Safe Learning Communities. *Analytic Teaching and Philosophical Praxis*, 31-38.

Gollob, R., & Krapf, P. (2008). *Teaching democracy - A collection of models for democratic citizenship and human rights education.* Belgium: Council of Europe Publishing.

Gollob, R., Huddleston, T., Krapf, P., & Rowe, D. (2008). *Living in democracy - EDC/HRE lesson plans for lower secondary level.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Gollob, R., Krapf, P., & Weidinger, W. (2010). *Growing up in democracy - Lesson plans for primary level on democratic citizenship and human rights (EDC/HRE).* Belgium: Council of Europe Publishing.

Gollob, R., Krapf, P., Ólafsdóttir, Ó., & Weidinger, W. (2010). *Educating for democracy - Background materials on democratic citizenship and human rights education for teachers.* Belgium: Council of Europe Publishing.

Gündüz , M., & Gündüz , F. (2002). *Yurttaşlık Bilinci.* Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Klecker, N. (1982). Bir İnsan Hakları Eğitimi İçin. *İnsan Haklarının Felsefi Temelleri Uluslararası Semineri* (pp. 151-155). Ankara: Meteksan.

Kuzgun, Y. (1982). İnsan Hakları ve Eğitim. *İnsan Haklarının Felsefi Temelleri Uluslararası Semineri* (pp. 157-161). Ankara: Meteksan.

Lipman , M., Sharp, A., & Oscanyan, F. (1980). *Philosophy in the Classroom.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

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

Lipman, M. (1998). The Contributions of Philosophy to Deliberative Democracy. In I. F. Societies, *Teaching Philosophy On The Eve Of The Twenty-First Century* (pp. 6-30). Ankara, Turkey: Meteksan.

Lipman, M. (2003). *Thinking In Education.* New York: Cambridge Education Press.

Lipman, M., & Sharp, A. (1980). *Social Inquiry: Instructional Manual to Accompany Mark.* New Jersey: Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children.

Lockyer, A. (2008). Education for Citizenship: Children as Citizens and Political Literacy. In A. Invernizzi, & J. Williams, *Children and Citizenship* (pp. 20-31). London: Sage Publications.

McCowan, T. (2009). *Rethinking Citizenship - A Curriculum for Participatory Democracy.* New York: Continiuum.

Mengüşoğlu, T. (1988). *İnsan Felsefesi.* İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. (1998). *The Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship: Citizenship, Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools.* London: QCA.

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2006). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yontemleri.* Ankara: Seçkin Yayınları.

Yücel, H. A. (2004). *İyi Vatandaş İyi İnsan.* Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.