

Philosophy for Children: A Deliberative Pedagogy for Teaching Social Studies in Japan and the USA

Amber Strong Makaiau
University of Hawaii at Manoa, United States

Noboru Tanaka
Gifu University, Japan

Abstract:

Two international social studies teacher educators and researchers (from Japan and the USA) use qualitative methods to systematically examine the impact of the philosophy for children Hawai'i (p4cHI) approach to deliberative pedagogy on social studies teaching and learning in two countries. The study's participants are two secondary level social studies teachers (from Japan and the USA) and their students. Data comes from class sessions that were video recorded in each country and transcribed. Collaborative analysis of the data produced three major themes: inquiry stance, inquiry topics, and the nature of the inquiry. At the study's conclusion, the researchers share what they learned about implementing the p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy in two countries and how it can be used to prepare Japanese and American students for global citizenship in the 21st century.

Key words: social studies, citizenship education, global citizenship, comparative education, Philosophy for Children, deliberative pedagogy.

Introduction/Purpose

This paper describes how two international social studies teacher educators/researchers use qualitative methods (Creswell, 2007; Patton, 2002) to systematically examine the impact of *philosophy for children Hawai'i* (p4cHI) on social studies teaching and learning in two countries. From the United States and Japan, respectively, Drs. Amber Strong Makaiau and Noboru Tanaka began their collaborative study in the spring of 2017. Tanaka is an Associate Professor at Gifu University who is also helping to re-write the National Curriculum of politics and economics in social studies education for the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology in

Corresponding author: nobol@gifu-u.ac.jp

©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly

<http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

Japan (MEXT). He met Makaiau in 2015 when she traveled to Japan to give a series of public lectures about the relationship between p4cHI and deliberative pedagogy (Carcasson, 2013; Longo, 2013; Manosevitch, 2013; Molnar-Main & Kingseed, 2013). Makaiau is an Associate Specialist at the University of Hawai'i, Manoa (UHM) and also the Director of Curriculum and Research at the UHM Uehiro Academy for Philosophy and Ethics in Education. In each of their home countries, p4cHI is being explored as a viable means for school improvement (Oakes, Quartz, Ryan, & Lipton, 2000), and together they wanted to learn more about the ways in which this particular approach to deliberative pedagogy (Makaiau, 2017) might be used to prepare Japanese and American students for life in a democratic society.

To structure their investigation, the two researchers:

1. Collaborated with teachers who use the p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy to teach secondary level social studies classes in Japan and the USA;
2. Video recorded one social studies teacher in Japan and one in the USA as they used p4cHI to teach the same high school civics lesson with students in two countries;
3. Transcribed and analyzed the video recorded lessons;
4. Drew conclusions about the impact of the p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy on the Japanese and American students in the classrooms that they observed.

In this paper, the authors frame their study by explaining the connection between deliberative pedagogy, p4cHI, and contemporary social studies movements in Japan and the United States. Next, they describe the design and methods of the study, including the two diverse contexts in which the research took place. They explain how they collected and analyzed data from video recorded lessons to learn more about the similarities and differences of p4cHI's impact on the students and teachers observed in Japan and the United States. Then the study's findings are reported. These findings narrow in on the three main themes that emerged from the qualitative analysis of the data that compare and contrast *inquiry stance*, *inquiry topics*, and the *nature of the inquiry* in each country. At the paper's conclusion, the authors explore the potential role that the p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy can play in promoting democratic global citizens in diverse national contexts.

Theoretical Framework

Deliberative pedagogy is an emergent field of research and practice that aims to identify meaningful approaches to democratic education (Carcasson, 2013; Longo, 2013; Manosevitch, 2013; Molnar-Main & Kingseed, 2013). "The primary goal isn't civic education per se, but for students to develop commitment, knowledge, and skills necessary for creating and maintaining

Corresponding author: nobol@gifu-u.ac.jp

©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly

<http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

equitable, diverse and democratic spaces, whether it be in the local community, the workplace, the nation, or world" (Doherty, 2012, p. 25). Deliberative pedagogies work to prepare citizens for life in a democratic society by engaging students and teachers in the practice of "considering perspectives, evaluating views, and treating each other as political equals" as they think collectively about the larger question, "How should we live together?" (Hess & McAvoy, 2015, p. 5).

The worldwide Philosophy for Children (P4C) movement has much to offer this new area of scholarship. Started in 1969 by Matthew Lipman, a Columbia University philosophy professor who observed that children did not think as well as they could or should in a democratic society, P4C aims to provide individuals with the "experience of dialoguing with others as equals, [and] participating in shared public inquiry [so] that they [are] able to eventually take an active role in the shaping of a democratic society" (Sharp, 1993, p. 343). As both an educational theory and a set of classroom practices, P4C is a form of deliberative pedagogy (Makaiau, 2017a) that gives life to Dewey's (1916) assertion that in order for democracy to function as it should, students and teachers must have opportunities to *experience* democracy in schools. Sensitive to context and rarely, if ever, enacted in the exact same way across diverse national, cultural, and institutional settings, the translation of the P4C approach to deliberative pedagogy—from theory to practice—depends on the professionalism and values of practitioners who must adapt it to meet the needs of their particular context.

For the purpose of this study, we are specifically interested in exploring the impact of *philosophy for children Hawai'i* (p4cHI) and the ways in which this unique approach to deliberative pedagogy can be used to create democratic schooling experiences in the context of social studies education. An outgrowth of Lipman's original P4C program, p4cHI is organized around four conceptual pillars (community, inquiry, philosophy, and reflection) and the following key classroom practices (Jackson, 2001):

- Creating **Intellectual Safety** (p. 460) to make sure that *all* participants in the community feel like they can ask any question or state any point of view as long as they are being respectful of everyone in the group.
- Making a **Community Ball** (p. 461) to help mediate turn-taking during democratic classroom dialogue and inquiry.
- Using the language of the **Good Thinker's Tool Kit** (p.463) to stimulate inquiry, articulate questions, claims, and thinking in general.

Corresponding author: nobol@gifu-u.ac.jp

©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly

<http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

- Participating in **Plain Vanilla** (p. 462) discussion-based inquiries that use the following structure: question, vote, inquiry, and reflect.
- Using **Magic Words** (p. 461) to support student facilitation during the Plain Vanilla inquiries.
- **Reflecting on the Community of Inquiry** (p. 464) with a set of evaluation questions to help measure progress.

Described extensively in a number of other articles and book chapters (Makaiau, 2010, 2013, 2015, 2016, 2017a, 2017b; Makaiau & Miller, 2012), the application of p4cHI to social studies teaching and learning in the United States has been shown to cultivate and nurture: (1) respectful and ethical civic relationships, (2) shifts in the distribution of power and access to multiple perspectives, and (3) dialogue, deliberation, inquiry, and action (Makaiau, 2017a). To build on these findings and contribute to the growing interest in investigating the role of p4cHI in Japanese social studies education, the authors of this paper collaborated on an international comparative study.

Directly related to contemporary social studies reform movements in Japan and the United States, this study narrows in on the ways in which p4cHI could be used to teach Civics in both countries. In Japan, the social studies curriculum guidelines issued by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology will change significantly in 2020. In the new requirements, emphasis will be placed on students: generating questions, exploring and inquiring about important social studies topics, analyzing social problems, and engaging in philosophical and deliberative dialogue. In the United States, a similar transformation is taking place. With the introduction of the College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards (2013), the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) has given new direction to K-12 social studies education in the United States. Among the notable changes is an emphasis on inquiry, taking informed action, and deliberative dialogue and civic discourse. While these advancements in both Japan and the United States are excellent news for advocates of democratic education (Apple & Beane, 1995; Dewey, 1916; Freire, 1970; Gutman, 1987; Hess & McAvoy, 2015; Parker, 2010; Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools, 2011; Vinson, 2006), they present new challenges for social studies educators and researchers, many of whom did not have the opportunity to experience a deliberative pedagogy as part of their own K-12 schooling.

It is for these reasons and more that the authors of this paper set out to investigate, compare, and contrast the impact of the p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy in Japan and the United States. They, like many other social studies educators and researchers, are looking for proven

Corresponding author: nobol@gifu-u.ac.jp

©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly

<http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

strategies for strengthening the role of social studies education in promoting a deliberative democracy both nationally *and* internationally—that is, both within countries and between them. Through the dissemination and mobilization of knowledge relating to the impact of the p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy, they are aiming to reimagine citizenship and citizenship education from a global perspective (Partnership for 21st Century Schools, 2014). Additionally, very little research has been done to both document and examine the ways in which p4cHI can be used to teach social studies in Japan, and there are no previous studies that compare and contrast the implementation of p4cHI in social studies classrooms in Japan and the United States. The study presented in this paper aims to address some of these gaps in the literature and more.

Design/Method

The methods used for this case study (Creswell, 2007; Patton, 2002) were qualitative because of the need to “obtain the intricate details about phenomena such as feelings, thought processes, and emotions” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) of the students and teachers who participated in the classrooms that we were researching. Additional methods and guidelines for “collecting and analyzing visual data materials” (pp. 717-732) were based on the work of Denis Harper (2000).

Research questions. The following research questions were used to guide this study: What is the impact of the p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy on social studies teaching and learning in Japan and the USA? What are the similarities and differences when implementing p4cHI in Japan and the USA? What is the role of p4cHI in promoting a deliberative democracy nationally (within a country), internationally (between countries), and how does it help social studies educators reimagine global citizenship education?

Participants and context. The participants in this study include one middle school social studies teacher and his 40 students from Japan and one high school social studies teacher and her six students from the USA. To follow is a more detailed description of the two groups of participants and their contexts.

Gifu School, Japan. Gifu School is a junior high school affiliated with the faculty of education at Gifu University. It is located in Gifu prefecture, a rural area of the country that has a total population of 2,007,468. Geographically, Gifu’s beautiful forests and hot springs characterize the region. As a result, energy production, manufacturing, and tourism are the prefecture’s top industries. Compared to other parts of the country, the residents of Gifu are considered more

affluent, but as in the rest of Japan, the proportion of people aged 65 and over is increasing while the number of children is decreasing.

In total, there are 499 students who attend Gifu School. These students are in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades. Admissions to the school are selected via a lottery system. The school is well-known for its high academic achievement and club activities, especially its choral program. In general, the curriculum at Gifu School follows the national guidelines. In some cases (like the classroom presented in this study), teachers at the school experiment with innovative practices like p4cHI.

For the study presented in this chapter, the 40 Gifu School student participants are all in the ninth grade. They have one social studies teacher, and with the help of Tanaka, this teacher is voluntarily incorporating p4cHI into his junior high school level Civics lessons. Of these 40 students, half are male and the other half female. They are between 14 and 15 years old.

Kailua High School, USA. Hawai'i is the 50th state to be incorporated into the United States of America. Geographically unique, it is comprised of an island chain located in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. In Hawai'i, public high school students are required to take four credits of social studies. Out of these four credits, the students must select two half-credit social studies elective courses. In 2012, Makaiau worked with the Hawai'i State Department of Education Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support and a small public high school on the Windward side of the Hawaiian Island of Oahu to write standards, benchmarks, and curriculum for a half-credit Philosophical Inquiry social studies elective that is grounded in the p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy. The purpose of this initiative was to use p4cHI to dramatically shift the narrow, Western-oriented, test-driven, and teacher-centered emphasis of traditional social studies coursework to a newer paradigm of social studies education that values global perspectives, multicultural views, "practicing" democratic citizenship, theme/issue-based studies, depth of understanding, experience and interaction, students constructing their own meaning from multiple resources, integration, an emphasis on connecting the past with the present, collaboration, and alternative forms of assessment (HIDOE, 2008). The school that agreed to take part in this innovative initiative is Kailua High School (KHS).

In general, the students who attend KHS come from two main communities: Waimanalo and Kailua. Although these two towns are close in proximity, they do not share a common intermediate or middle school. It is at KHS that students from the more affluent community of Kailua meet students from the more rural community of Waimanalo for the first time. Together,

these students attend the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades, and for the most part their admissions to the school are based on the students' residential zip code.

The KHS students who participated in the study presented in this chapter were selected on the basis of their enrolment in the Philosophical Inquiry Social Studies elective that was offered at the school during the 2014-15 school year. All of the participants were between 14 and 18 years old, five boys and one girl, heterogeneously grouped in regards to their academic ability, the majority qualified for free or reduced lunch; two percent were multilingual learners, and they mainly identified as Hawaiian/Part-Hawaiian (50%), White (12%), Japanese (11%), or Filipino (7%). Their social studies teacher, who also agreed to participate in this study, was selected because of her ongoing commitment to practicing p4cHI and her role in co-creating the brand new Philosophical Inquiry course.

Data sources and collection. The primary sources of data for this study are the two video recorded p4cHI social studies classroom inquiries, one collected in Japan (filmed in Summer 2017 and transcribed in Fall 2017) and the other in the USA (filmed in Spring 2015 and transcribed in Summer 2017). In both countries, the teachers used the same group of readings (translated from English into Japanese) to stimulate student questions. These readings are: *What if There Were No Governments?* (Kaye & Thomson, 2006), *Letter From the Birmingham Jail* (King, 1963), *War, No More Trouble* (Marley, 1986), *Appeal to the League of Nations* (Selassie, 1936), and *Color Blindness: The New Racism?* (Scruggs, 2009). Additionally, the same p4cHI deliberative inquiry procedure—Plain Vanilla (Jackson, 2001)—was used to organize the discussion-based inquiry. The steps of this Plain Vanilla process are: (1) Read, (2) Generate Questions, (3) Vote, (4) Inquiry, (5) Reflect. Each of the two recorded Plain Vanilla sessions are approximately one hour long. The Japanese session totaled seven pages of transcribed dialogue and the American session totaled 11 pages. Secondary sources of data are: classroom curriculum, student work, and the researchers' qualitative memos.

Important note: It is critical to acknowledge that the two teachers who participated in this study have unique perceptions, philosophies of education, cultural and historical backgrounds, and different sets of institutional circumstances that most likely impacted the data collected in this study. In acknowledgement of the influence of these variables on the data sources and collection, the authors of this study collaborated with the teachers in each country to ensure that they did their best to carry out the exact same teaching practice and lesson in both Japan and the USA. While this was not meant to be a perfectly controlled research experiment, our collective attempt to implement the same p4cHI classroom practices and resources should be noted.

Corresponding author: nobol@gifu-u.ac.jp

©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly

<http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

Analysis of the data. To analyze the data, the researchers drew from the methods of constant comparison (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This occurred in three phases. In phase one, we each worked alone and engaged in the analytic process of open coding (Charmaz, 2006). This included placing “names” on the themes that emerged from our back-and-forth comparison of the data (Charmaz, 2006, pp. 47-57). Then, in phase two, we came together (Tanaka flew to Hawai'i to meet in person with Makaiau) and worked as critical friends (Miles & Huberman, 1994). We shared our open codes and collectively refined, collapsed, and organized our individual findings. We used the methods of axial (Charmaz, 2006, pp. 60-63) and theoretical coding (Charmaz, 2006, pp. 63-67) to bring together our initial open codes and created a composite set of analytic themes. For each of these themes we specified their “properties and dimensions,” and related each theme (Charmaz, 2006, p. 60). This culminated in the development of three main themes. In phase three, we wrote our findings and collaborated further to revise and refine our thinking.

Findings

Collaborative analysis of the Japanese and American Plain Vanilla transcripts produced three major themes: *inquiry stance*, *inquiry topics*, and the *nature of the inquiry*. General and overarching, the three themes shed light on the similarities and differences that emerged when implementing the p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy in Japan and the USA. They also help to draw attention to the important role that inquiry plays in the p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy (Makaiau, 2010, 2013, 2015, 2016, 2017a, 2017b; Makaiau & Miller, 2012) and in the overall health of a democracy (Dewey, 1916). In the following sections, each theme is explained further.

Inquiry stance. The first major theme to emerge from the analysis of the data is inquiry stance. Inquiry-based teaching and learning, like the p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy, is rarely framed as a prescribed practice, but rather by the positions that teachers take toward knowledge and its relationship to pedagogy. As a result, teachers who practice inquiry-based teaching and learning can best be described as developing an *inquiry stance* (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999, 2009/2015), or an overall approach to doing inquiry in the classroom. In this study, the data revealed differences in inquiry stance when comparing the implementation of the p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy in the two classrooms observed in this study. These differences are observed in three main areas: how the question for inquiry is selected, the role of the teacher, and the cadence (or pace) of the inquiry.

The first difference in inquiry stance relates to how the main question to focus the inquiry is selected. In Japan, there was much classroom discussion and consensus building that went into the students’ selection of their Plain Vanilla inquiry question. This started with a student saying,

Corresponding author: nobol@gifu-u.ac.jp

©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly

<http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

“Let’s build questions together” and then each student was invited to share their questions. After all the students had been given a turn to say their question out loud, the group began to discuss the similarities and differences between each question. This is seen in the transcript:

Student: Are there similar questions?

Student: All the questions about discrimination are similar.

Student: I think that it could be connected with the question about political systems.

Student: When I divide the questions into issues of discrimination and issues of the government, which theme is best suited for us?

[Break in Transcript—Omitted Dialogue]

Student: I want to argue about the government, too.

Student: I want to argue about discrimination.

Student: The same as above.

Student: Then let's vote.

Student: The results center on governmental issues. So what issues of the government do we discuss...“Does one fundamentally need the government?” or “Should we have the government?”

Student: A problem of the political system may be revealed while I argue whether the government exists. So we should argue whether the government fundamentally exists.

Student: Then let's discuss “Is the government necessary?”

For the students observed in Japan, it is not until page three of the transcript, after much back-and-forth dialogue and consensus building that they co-create the question that will be the focus of their inquiry. This is a very different approach than is taken by the students observed in the USA.

In the classroom observed in the USA, the teacher asks students to develop a question on their own. Next, students read their questions out loud. Then, students have two votes and they are asked to vote on the question that they want to talk about. In the case of the Plain Vanilla inquiry transcribed for this study, the students all vote and select, “Is it harder to have war, or is it much harder to make peace in the world, and what are the reasons?” When compared to the transcript from Japan, it is clear to see that the students observed in the USA do not spend time co-constructing an inquiry question. Instead, they work as individuals to develop a question, and then employ a democratic voting process to select the question for inquiry. This is the first way that inquiry stance is observed to be different in the two classrooms compared for this study.

The second difference in inquiry stance to emerge from the analysis of the data relates to the role of the teacher. The analysis of the transcript from Japan revealed very little teacher participation during the students' inquiry. Out of seven pages of transcript, the teacher observed in Japan only spoke four times. This is very different than the teacher observed in the USA, who spoke 16 times. Additionally, the comparison between transcripts revealed differences in the ways in which the teachers participated.

The teacher observed in Japan did not talk much. Instead, he let the students facilitate the inquiry on their own. When he did enter the dialogue, he mostly gave instructions. Here is an example from the beginning of the inquiry:

Teacher (Japan): So let's start the discussion. When you talk in your groups, please use community-ball... Let's talk while using all the documents at hand. In addition, please continue your discussion using the worksheet if there are a claim and an argument while you talk while putting it down. You have approximately 30 minutes. Then please go back to your groups and begin your discussion.

After this first set of instructions, the teacher observed in Japan did not speak again until the end of the inquiry. At this time he asked the students to share their "impressions of today's lesson." Mostly engaged in giving directions, the teacher from Japan took on a very different role in the inquiry when compared to the teacher observed in the USA.

In the USA transcript, the teacher, in addition to giving instructions like the teacher observed in Japan, also took on the role of a co-inquirer throughout the inquiry. As a co-inquirer, she asked questions, solicited her own original ideas, made connections between student comments, helped to clarify ambiguous statements, and generally worked to co-construct knowledge alongside her students. Here is one example:

Teacher: That makes me wonder. In psychology there is thing called the "availability heuristic"... So I wonder if we are being exposed to more instances of war when there is actually more peace in the world? [I wonder] are we having that much war or does it just seem like we are. I don't really know how to explain it... I don't know what I'm talking about.

This excerpt is the teacher's response to a student that spoke before her. In the short clip it is clear that she is asking questions, offering her knowledge of psychology, and she is allowing herself to be vulnerable in her thinking. Rather than just presenting herself as an authority figure

in the classroom, she is willing to admit that she too may not know the answer to the inquiry question and that she is willing to think through possible answers alongside her students. In these ways, her overall stance and role in the inquiry seems to be different than the teacher observed in Japan.

A third difference in inquiry stance relates to the cadence or rhythm of the inquiry. In the transcript from Japan, the students were observed doing a lot of individual sharing that did not build or connect to what had been previously stated. Here is an example of typical exchange:

Student: I think that I cannot live freely when the government restricts everything. Only certain people can behave freely and they think that other people cannot do so.

Student: I think that the government has to perform only “to a minimum.” The government that cannot perform minimum politics is weak and is in trouble. If the government is weak, it cannot deal with problems.

Student: The worst thing about having a monarchy was that the opinion of the nation was not reflected. When politics is carried out to bind the nation, the politics only of people trained and educated is reflected. Therefore, I think that the power of the government should be kept to a minimum.

Although all of the students are engaged in thinking about the role of government, it is not clear that they are crafting their responses in relationship to what the person before them has said. Instead, the students’ comments all seem to be separate from one another and their dialogue is made up of disparate/unconnected ideas.

In the transcript from the USA, the cadence of the inquiry is different. Instead of offering isolated thoughts, the students and teacher did their best to build on what the person before them had said. This is an example from the transcript:

Student: My initial response is I think that war is easier than peace because I think it is simpler than peace. War does not need compromise with people, but peace does and I think it goes against human nature to compromise with others.

Teacher: I’m speaking after you because you brought up the idea of human nature...it reminds me of the book *Lord of the Flies*. Have you guys read the book *Lord of the Flies*? The question is, are humans inherently good or inherently evil or bad?... I want to think that humans are inherently good but I’m starting to question that.

Student: Personally I think that humans aren’t inherently good. Not to be a downer or anything, but I think it has to do with what we actually are... I think of the quote, “some men just want to see the world burn.” I just think that people are born not nice.

Student: I think we shouldn't look at us not being able to achieve world peace as a bad thing. I don't think that is a healthy idea because even in the animal kingdom they are not peaceful but that is how it works... I think we need to learn to accept that that is the way it is for humans as well.

In this exchange of ideas, it is clear how the inquiry flows from one person to the next. Speakers explicitly reference the person that spoke before them, and they all make sure to focus their comments on the common theme of human nature. This examination of the rhythm or cadence of the two transcripts illustrates the final difference in inquiry stance when comparing observations of the implementation of the p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy in Japan and the USA.

Inquiry topics. The second major theme to emerge from the analysis of the data relates to the topics explored during inquiry. In the Plain Vanilla inquiry process, students are often provided with a stimulus (e.g., a text, video, artifact from the natural world, etc.) and they are asked to use this stimulus as a starting point for generating questions that they want to think about with the community of inquiry. This instructional move aims to alter the “center of gravity” from the texts to the thoughts, ideas, and beliefs of the students in the classroom community. This shift is not simply employed so that students can discuss the feelings and ideas of students, devoid of subject matter. Instead, the texts are still relevant and are used as a catalyst to initiate meaningful philosophical inquiry. The sensitivity of the teacher towards the beliefs of the students provides the incentive to engage in the stimulus and begin a conversation about its meaning.

In both Japan and the USA, the same set of five texts (described in the data sources section above) were provided to the students as a stimulus for their inquiry. In each country, a different inquiry question was chosen.

- Is government necessary? (Japan)
- Is it harder to have war, or is it much harder to make peace in the world, and what are the reasons? (USA)

Although both questions pertain to the readings, it is clear that the students observed in Japan and the USA were interested in exploring unique inquiry topics.

Analysis of the data also revealed how the underlying themes explored in each country were different. In the inquiry observed in Japan, the students mostly talked about imperialism, safety,

freedom, and sovereignty, and they consistently questioned why the question they selected for their inquiry was worth thinking about. In the inquiry observed in the USA, different themes emerged. The students talked about the relationship between war and power and whether or not people truly have free choice (i.e., differences between things that people have to do versus something they choose to do).

Also related to inquiry topics, a closer look at the dialogue revealed that many of the students' comments (in both countries) are connected to the country's history. For example, the topic of imperialism was brought up a number of times in the transcript from Japan. Here is an excerpt from their inquiry:

Student: ...people with the right to vote make up the nation. Further, sovereignty is a right of the people in the nation in spite of imperialism.

Student: The government was chosen by the people. The government shows power for the whole nation uniformly.

Student: When a king has power, power centers on the king. The government is necessary to maintain a state to break up this power.

[Break in Transcript—Omitted Dialogue]

Student: The worst thing about monarchism was that the opinion of the nation was not reflected... I think that the power of the government should be kept to a minimum.

It is evident in this exchange (and others) that the students observed in Japan are not in favor of imperialist forms of government and that they see centralized imperial power as infringing on the rights of citizens. Perhaps this thinking is shaped by Japan's imperialist history that existed from the Meiji Restoration in 1868 to the enactment of the 1947 constitution?

In the inquiry observed in the USA, the students did not discuss the topic of imperialism. Instead, they discussed the inevitability of militarism.

Student: So, my initial response to the question is it not really that I think [peace] is easier, I just think it is more like a way of life if you have war...is making the world peaceful, everyone living in peace, is that even real? Is making peace in the world even possible to even do? And people are asking for that, but would it really change our world for the better or would it change it for the worse?

Student: I think it depends on the situation. There are countries with which peace is no issue for us. And there are countries that give us no choice but war. Say, like, Saddam

Hussein and Osama Bin Laden back in the days, along with the terrorists in the Middle East—we had no choice about whether to have war with them because they attacked us first. So, basically it depends on the situation.

From this excerpt, it is clear that the students observed in the USA believe in the power of military force, including the belief that the American military should be used aggressively to defend or promote national interests. With references to American-led wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, there are clear connections between what the students observed in the USA are thinking about and the history of their country. Much like the students observed in Japan, the students from the USA draw on recent events in their nation's history to make claims and provide examples during their inquiries. This link between student thinking and the history of their country is the final sub-theme related to inquiry topics that emerged from the analysis of the data.

Nature of inquiry. The final theme to emerge from the analysis of the data relates to the nature of the inquiry. In p4cHI, inquiry is often characterized as a shared activity between teacher and student. Based on the theories of social constructivism, this conceptualization of inquiry “rejects the notion of objective knowledge and argues instead that knowledge develops as one engages in dialogue with others” (Palincsar, 1998, p. 347). The dialogue is characterized by mutual thinking and shared communication between teachers and students. Collectively, they work to create what Lipman (1991) calls a classroom community of inquiry where students and teachers “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” (Lipman, 1991, p. 15). In general, the transcribed inquiries from both Japan and the USA took on many of these characteristics. However, there were three differences observed between the nature of the inquiry in Japan and the USA: purpose, complexity, and tendency towards generalization.

In regards to purpose, the analysis of the data revealed how the purpose of the inquiry observed in Japan was framed as a method for thinking through arguments. This is first seen in an exchange between students observed in Japan as they select their inquiry question.

Student: I want to argue against the government, because there was a document showing that the government pressured the people.

[Break in Transcript—Omitted Dialogue]

Student: I want to argue about the government, too.

Student: I want to argue about discrimination.

[Break in Transcript—Omitted Dialogue]

Student: A problem of the political system may be revealed while I argue whether the government exists. So we should argue whether the government fundamentally exists.

The teacher then reinforced this belief in the p4cHI style of deliberative inquiry as a forum for making arguments. He said, "If there [is] a claim and an argument while you talk, put it down" (referring to the worksheet provided). This overall purpose of the inquiry was framed differently in the inquiry observed in the USA.

In the USA transcript, the teacher was observed starting off the Plain Vanilla process with the following statement:

Teacher: So, everyone developed a question for our discussion based on the readings we did in this unit, Race and Politics. And, one student's question was chosen... Now what I would like people to do is to write and initial response to this question on their Inquiry Memos... [address] questions that you have in regards to the question...[this] will give us a starting place for how we are going to tackle and dig deep into the questions.

Although both teachers instructed the students to use writing as a tool for thinking during the inquiry, the nature of what they were being asked to do was very different. In the transcript from Japan, the students were focused on making arguments and supporting their arguments with evidence. In the transcript from the USA, the students were encouraged to ask more questions, use the tools of good thinking to scratch beneath the surface of the topic, and collaborate with their peers to think through possible answers to their questions. This was the first difference in the nature of the inquiry to emerge from the data.

Another difference between the natures of the inquiry observed in each country relates to complexity. Analysis of the two transcripts revealed that the students observed in Japan made many claims throughout their inquiry and they gave reasons to support those claims, but they did not investigate the deeper meanings of the words embedded in their claims. Here is an example from the beginning of their inquiry:

Student: I think that the government is necessary. Because I think that it is necessary for the government to get rid of discrimination and war to change the consciousness of the nation.

Student: I think the government is necessary, too. Discrimination may disappear depending on correspondence from the government, and the existence of the

government limits freedom, however security is guaranteed in it, and I think that security is important for society.

Student: The government is necessary. One role of the government is to provide better conditions for the nation. In addition, the government assists when a disaster happens.

It is clear in this exchange of ideas that the students observed in Japan are focused on answering the inquiry question they selected, but they do not take the time to unpack additional philosophical questions related to their inquiry. In comparison, the transcript of the inquiry from the USA reveals a number of instances in which the students begin to dive deeper into the meaning of the complex topics that they are exploring. One example of this is when one of the students questions what truly constitutes peace.

Teacher: I think that is kind of interesting because when you talk about answers to the past then a lot of people say that war doesn't lead to peace but a counter-example, no an example of war leading to peace would be King Kamehameha. He unified the islands through war and was able to have peace, well until it erupted into war again...

[Break in Transcript—Omitted Dialogue]

Student: I like the idea of Kamehameha and bringing peace, but I just wanted to ask a question. Is peace through war, is it true peace? What is true peace? If you just conquer everyone around you...is that actually peaceful just because you are on top? How would they feel because they are oppressed? Does that make them just agree with it? Is stepping in line really peaceful? Or is just bad because if enough people are angry enough then they can just revolt and have a revolution. So I was just wondering.

In this exchange, the students observed in the USA are taking the initiative to question the teacher, carefully examine their collective understanding of the concept they are inquiring about, and they exhibit an overall willingness to accept that there may be more than one answer to their question. This openness to see a spectrum of answers contrasts with the transcript from Japan, which illustrates students in search of a definitive answer to their inquiry question.

The final difference between the nature of the inquiries observed in Japan and the USA relates to students' tendency towards using generalizations versus personal examples. Analysis of the data revealed that the students observed in Japan tended not to use personal examples to support their claims. Instead, they used generalizations. Here is one example:

Student: I think that everybody thinks that the government is necessary for reasons of security and peace, which are thought more important than the ideal of freedom. Absolute Imperial rule came out in a discussion some time ago, but what form of government is ideal?

This student response was typical of the dialogue found in the transcript from Japan. The student makes statements like “everybody thinks” and does not use any sort of personal or specific example to support his claim. This is quite different compared to the transcript from the USA.

The students from the USA were found making connections between the larger concepts they were discussing and their personal lives. Here is one example:

Student: My first response is I feel like war isn't the “easier,” depending on the word and how we are going to define it.... An example of this in my life would be last year when I ran for prom queen. The other girl I was running against was my friend, and we were peaceful between each other. I really liked her so I voted for her. So I feel like we don't choose peace and we just choose war...

This sort of response was typical of the students observed in the USA. They would often make a claim and then support the claim with an example from history or from their personal lives. Nowhere in the transcript from Japan did the students provide evidence from their lives outside the classroom.

Discussion

Differences in *inquiry stance*, *inquiry topics*, and the *nature of the inquiry* are three important findings to emerge from this systematic examination of p4cHI's impact on teaching and learning in the classrooms observed in Japan and the USA. Lipman (1993), founder of the worldwide Philosophy for Children (P4C) movement, defined inquiry as learning by “investigation,” where students and teachers are “self-correcting” in their practice (Lipman, 1993, p. 522). When carried out in a social context, Lipman (1991) explained, the classroom can become a “community of inquiry in which students listen to one another with respect, build on one another’s ideas, [and] challenge one another” by using their good thinking (Lipman, 1991, p. 15). Organized around an “openness that lecture cannot have” he characterized inquiry-based teaching and learning as the practice of “discovery” for both the student and teacher (Buchler in Lipman, 1993, p. 522). Jackson (2001), in an effort to expand on Lipman’s original definition, characterized *philosophy for children Hawai'i* (p4cHI) as a form of “gently Socratic inquiry” (Jackson, 2001, p. 459) in which

"members of the classroom community... place much more emphasis on listening, thoughtfulness, silence, and care and respect for the thoughts of others... Above all, the classroom [becomes] an intellectually safe place that is not in a rush to get somewhere." In relationship to social studies education and deliberative pedagogy, inquiry as it is practiced in p4cHI is a form of democratic praxis (Freire, 1970). It provides teachers with both a theoretical framework (the four conceptual pillars) *and* an actual set of flexible classroom strategies that can assist students and teachers in incorporating "deliberative decision making with teaching and learning" (Longo, 2013, p. 49) across the social studies curriculum.

As the results from this study demonstrate, the translation of the P4C/p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy from theory to practice *can* differ depending on the country that P4C/p4cHI is implemented in. Some of these differences might be attributed to culture. For example, in relationship to the nature of the inquiry, findings from this study illustrate how the students in Gifu tended to think in binary fashion—they were less likely than their American counter-parts to be willing to explore "variables, conditions, nuance, and contexts in which there would exist more than just the two possible" answers (Van Der Borne, 2018). Directly in line with the observations of Toyoda (2012), a p4cHI practitioner in both Japan and the USA, this could be a consequence of the cultural context of schooling in Japan.

I witnessed a critical gap between p4c[HI] and Japanese moral education when I observed a first grade classroom lesson at a Japanese elementary school. In the class, students read a story about a girl massaging her grandmother's shoulders that had become stiff from her everyday domestic duties. The grandmother, being happy with this girl's kindness, promises her a small tip. But the girl says that she does not want a tip and keeps massaging her grandmother's shoulders even after her arms start to hurt. Students exchanged ideas about the grandmother's feelings—why she wanted to give a tip to the girl, and the girl's feelings—why she said she wanted no tip and why she did not stop massaging her grandmother's shoulders after her arms started to hurt. Students considered these points from various angles and broadened their interpretations of this story. Since I observed the children actively participating in the exchange of ideas, I was surprised to hear the teacher say, "The class was not successful. It was supposed to be about filial piety. But most children's ideas had different foci such as familial love, kindness, and self-renunciation." From a prevailing view of moral education in Japan, the evaluation of the class often depends upon whether students could obtain a shared understanding about a particular moral value. (Toyoda, 2012, p. 21). While Toyoda's observation of the teacher's aims (even though it is a reference to moral education rather than civics) corroborates much of what was observed in this

study, in addition to cultural differences, careful consideration should also be given to the length of time that p4cHI has been practiced in both of the classrooms we observed.

In Hawai'i, students and teachers have had access to p4cHI since 1984, and experimentation with p4cHI in the context of social studies education has been taking place since 2001 (Makaiau, 2010, 2013, 2015, 2016, 2017). Plus, the Hawai'i-based Kailua High School students who participated in this study are at a p4cHI "model school" (Makaiau & Lukey, 2013, p. 9) in which students are exposed to p4cHI in most of their classes during each of their four years of high school. This is quite a contrast to the students in Gifu, who experimented with p4cHI for the first time during the 2017-18 school year.

Jackson (2013) characterizes this difference in exposure to p4cHI by offering the idea of beginning, emerging, and mature p4cHI communities of inquiry:

...as the community matures, the student members will internalize the roles, vocabulary, and protocols (social and cognitive) that are the hallmarks of an intellectually safe philosophical inquiry community...At the outset it is important to be mindful of the nature of your community...Depending on the school experiences to that point, students may resist the idea of sitting in a circle, taking turns, speaking out in front of their peers, or responding to questions to which they may not know the answers. The very idea of an inquiry where no one knows in advance where the discourse may go can be confusing, frustrating, even threatening for some students [and teachers]. (p. 100)

Perhaps, when comparing the students in Gifu to those in Hawai'i, it was not the Japanese culture that made it less likely for them to dive deeper into meanings of the complex topics that they are exploring, but the students' opportunities to practice and mature their p4cHI community of inquiry over time.

This discussion about the reasons for differences in inquiry stance, inquiry topics, and the nature of the inquiry in Japan and the USA is critical to the evolution of P4C as a worldwide movement. It is especially relevant to the growth of p4cHI, which has made efforts to evolve Lipman's original P4C curriculum into a culturally responsive approach to social justice education (Makaiau, 2017c). Positioned as an approach to teaching and learning, rather than a curricular program, p4cHI's culturally responsive conceptual framework and flexible classroom practices "allows students to succeed academically by building on background knowledge and experiences gained in the home and community" (Au, 2009, p. 179). With that said, and in light of the study presented in this chapter, if the aims of p4cHI in the context of social studies education are to build a more

deliberative democracy, both within countries and between them, then the p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy must be more than just responsive to the diversity of cultures found across the globe. Instead, it needs to be what Django Paris (2012) refers to as a culturally sustaining education. It must “support young people in sustaining the cultural and linguistic competence of their communities while simultaneously offering access to dominant cultural competence” (Paris, 2012, p. 95), and in this case, the dominant competencies include those required of global democratic citizenship.

In a recent report, the Partnership for 21st Century Learning (2018) concluded:

An increasingly international, interdependent and diverse world has fundamentally altered our civic, economic and social lives. This environment rewards people with global competencies, such as the ability to make local-to-global connections, recognize divergent perspectives, think critically and creatively to solve global challenges, and collaborate respectfully in different types of social forums. (p. 6)

As the research in this paper shows, inquiry-based approaches to deliberative pedagogy like p4cHI have much to offer social studies educators who are looking to prepare students for the demands of 21st century global citizenship as it is outlined above. Now, the challenge is to ensure that students are able to adopt the global democratic competencies that p4cHI cultivates and at the same time stay true to the cultural assets of their home cultures.

Strengths, limitations, and directions for future research. The strength of the research presented in this paper is that it offers the first comparative case study to examine the impact of the p4cHI approach to deliberative pedagogy on social studies teaching and learning in Japan and the USA. Until now, social studies educators/researchers have not had the opportunity to implement the exact same p4cHI lesson in Japan and the USA, video record student and teacher participation in each country, analyze transcripts, and present findings to an international audience. Therefore, this study should serve as a jumping-off point for similar studies in the future. One limitation of the study is that it offers a single case. The results are not generalizable and the researchers' own subjective feelings may have influenced the findings (Creswell, 2007; Patton, 2002).

Another limitation is the small class size from the USA when compared to the Japanese sample. This could be regarded as more critical feature or variable, which either permits or prohibits the type of inquiry that can occur during a p4cHI session. In an effort to overcome some of these

shortcomings, this study should be replicated in additional contexts (in both Japan and the USA), and quantitative methods could be employed to provide additional empirical data.

Contribution to International Social Studies Education and Professional Collaboration

In conclusion, the research presented in this paper has significance for the authors as well as other social studies educators and researchers. First, as an outgrowth of the scholarship and research being produced by the international P4C community (Gregory, Haynes, & Murris, 2017), this study presents new findings on the ways in which p4cHI can be used to teach social studies in Japan, the USA, and perhaps other countries where colleagues have similar interests. It provides both a conceptual framework and the empirical data to illustrate p4cHI's potential flexibility, transformability, and wider impact on social studies education across the globe. Second, as increasing numbers of social studies educators and researchers make the decision to go beyond their organizations and transcend the geographic boundaries of their national networks, they must have examples of successful international partnerships from the field. This study did just that: It exemplified the type of collaborative inquiry that is needed if we want to work together to "overcome taken-for-granted beliefs and values in our individual institutions" and become more open to new "ways of thinking [that will] help us recognize our own cognitive distortions and reinterpret our beliefs and practices" (Elliott-Johns et al., 2010, p. 81).

As our world becomes more globalized, international approaches to social studies education and research are imperative. If we are going to provide today's students with the knowledge and skills to become the informed and engaged global citizens that our future so desperately needs, then we—social studies educators and researchers—must model what it means to be globalized citizens ourselves. Collaborative research with international partners can help us make these aspirations real.

Corresponding author: nobol@gifu-u.ac.jp

©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly

<http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

References:

- Apple, M. W., & Beane, J. (1995). *Democratic schools*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools. (2011). *Guardian of democracy: The civic mission of schools*. Philadelphia, PA: Johnathan Gould.
- Carcasson, M. (2013). Rethinking civic engagement on campus: The overarching potential of deliberative practice. *Higher Education Exchange*, p. 37-48.
- Castagno, A. E., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (2008). Culturally responsive schooling for indigenous youth: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4), 941-993.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 249-305.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009/2015). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Doherty, J. (2012). Deliberative pedagogy: An education that matters. In Barker, D. W. M. & Gilmore, M. (Eds.), *Connections: Educating for democracy*. Dayton, OH: The Kettering Foundation.
- Elliott-Johns, S., Peterson, S., Allison-Roan, V., & Ramirez, L. (2010). A cross-continent collaboration: Seeking community to support critical inquiry in teacher education. In L. B. Erickson, J. R. Young, & S. Pinnegar (Eds.), *Navigating the public and private: Negotiating the diverse landscape of teacher education* (pp. 81-84). Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Gay, G. (2000). Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Journal of International Social Studies, v. 8, n. 2, 2018, pp. 29-54

- Gregory, M., Haynes, J., & Murris, K. (2017). *International handbook of Philosophy for Children*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gutman, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Harper, D. (2000). Reimagining Visual Methods; Galileo to Neuromancer. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 717-732). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hess, D., & McAvoy, P. (2015). *The political classroom: Evidence and ethics in democratic education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- HIDOE. (2008). *Curriculum framework for social studies*. Honolulu, HI: US Government Printing Office.
- Jackson, T. (2001). The art and craft of 'gently Socratic' inquiry. In A. L. Costa (Ed.), *Developing minds: A resource book for teaching thinking* (pp. 459-465). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Jackson, T. (2012). Home grown. *Educational Perspectives*, 44(1-2), 3-7.
- Jackson, T. (2013). Philosophical rules of engagement. In S. Goering, N. Shudak, & T. Wartenberg (Eds.), *Philosophy in schools: An introduction for philosophers and teachers* (pp. 99-109). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kaye, S., & Thomson, P. (2007). *Philosophy for teens: Questioning life's big ideas*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press Inc.
- King, M. L. Jr. (1963). Letter from the Birmingham jail. In M. L. King Jr. (Ed.), *Why we can't wait* (pp. 77-100). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Lewis, L., & Sutcliffe, R. (2017). Teaching philosophy and philosophical teaching. In M. Gregory, J. Haynes, & K. Murris (Eds.), *International handbook of Philosophy for Children* (pp. 200-207). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lipman, M. (1991). *Thinking in education*. Victoria, Australia: Cambridge University Press.
- Lipman, M. (1993a). *Thinking children and education*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Longo, N. V. (2013). Deliberative pedagogy in the community: Connecting deliberative dialogue, community engagement, and democratic education. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 9(2), 1-18.

Corresponding author: nobol@gifu-u.ac.jp

©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly

<http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

- Makaiau, A. S. (2010). *Adolescent identity exploration in a multicultural community context; An educator's approach to rethinking identity interventions*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Hawaii, Manoa.
- Makaiau, A. S. (2013). Incorporating the activity of philosophy into social studies: A seven-part philosophical inquiry process. *Questions: Philosophy for Young People*, 13, 15-17.
- Makaiau, A. S. (2015). *Cultivating and Nurturing Collaborative Civic Spaces*. C3 Teachers. <http://c3teachers.org/c3shifts>
- Makaiau, A. S. (2016). The philosophy for children Hawai'i approach to deliberative pedagogy: A promising practice for preparing pre-service social studies teachers in the college of education. *Analytic Teaching and Philosophical Praxis*, 36(2015-16), 1-7.
- Makaiau, A. S. (2017a). A citizen's education: The philosophy for children Hawai'i approach to deliberative pedagogy. In M. Gregory, J. Haynes, & K. Murris (Eds.), *International handbook of Philosophy for Children* (pp. 19-26). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Makaiau, A. S. (2017b). Using a philosopher's pedagogy to teach school subjects: The case of ethnic studies at Kailua High School. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 4(1), 4-26.
- Makaiau, A. S. (2017c). Philosophy for children Hawai'i: A culturally responsive pedagogy for social justice education. In C. C. Lin & L. Sequiera (Eds.), *Inclusion, diversity and intercultural dialogue in young people's inquiry* (pp. 99-110). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense.
- Makaiau, A. S., & Lukey, B. (2013). A philosopher's pedagogy: A three-part model for school betterment. *Journal of Academic Perspectives*, 2013(3), 1-13.
- Makaiau, A. S., & Miller, C. (2012). The philosopher's pedagogy. *Educational Perspectives*, 44, 8-19.
- Manosevitch, E. (2013). The medium is the message: An Israeli experience with deliberative pedagogy. *Higher Education Exchange*, 60-68.
- Marley, R. N. (1986). War, no more trouble. [Recorded by R. N. Marley (Bob Marley and the Wailers)]. On Rebel Music! [Vinyl]. New York, NY: Island Records.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Molnar-Main, S., & Kingseed, L. (2013). Public learning in public schools: How networks of teachers and public partners can support civic learning. *Connections*. Retrieved from <http://kettering.org/periodicals/connections-2013-citizens-in-democratic-politics>

Corresponding author: nobol@gifu-u.ac.jp

©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly

<http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585

- National Council for the Social Studies. (2013). *The college, career, and civic life (C3) framework for social studies state standards*. Silver Spring, MD: The National Council for the Social Studies.
- Oakes, J., & Lipton, M. (1999). *Teaching to change the world*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Palincsar, A. S. (1998). Social constructivist perspectives on teaching and learning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 345-375.
- Parker, W. (2010). Social studies education e21. In W. Parker (Ed.), *Social studies today: Research and practice* (pp. 3-16). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Scruggs, A.-O. E. (2009). *Colorblindness: The new racism?* (2014, September, 5). Retrieved from <http://www.tolerance.org/print/magazine/number-36-fall-2009/feature/colorblindness-new-racism>
- Selassie, H. (2014, September, 17). *Appeal to the League of Nations*. Retrieved from <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/selassie.htm>
- Sharp, A. M., & Reed, R. F. (1992). *Studies in philosophy for children: Harry Stottlemeier's discovery*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Toyoda, M. (2012). Practicing philosophy for children in the search of a better society. *Educational Perspectives*, 44, 20-22.
- Van Der Borne, J. (2008). Shades of gray or black-and-white: Why the color of your thinking matters. *Jake's Health Solutions*. Retrieved from: <http://www.jakeshealthsolutions.com/shades-of-gray-or-black-and-white-why-the-color-of-your-thinking-matters-4518>
- Vinson, K. D. (2006). Oppression, anti-oppression, and citizenship education. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The Social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems and possibilities* (pp. 51-76). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

About the Authors:

Amber Strong Makaiau - Associate Specialist, Secondary Department, Institute for Teacher Education, College of Education University of Hawai'i, Manoa, Director of Curriculum and Research Uehiro Academy for Philosophy & Ethics in Education University of Hawai'i, Manoa.

Noboru Tanaka - Associate Professor, Graduate School of Education, Gifu University, Japan

Corresponding author: nobol@gifu-u.ac.jp

©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly

<http://www.iajiss.org> ISSN: 2327-3585
