cover: picasso, las meninas (1957)

developing new methods to assess community transformation through philosophical dialogue

author

kazuki tsuji

toyama university of international studies, japan

e-mail: je.suis.kazuki@gmail.com

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4543-0130

1) suitability of article to childhood & philosophy

The paper is suitable for the standard of the Journal. A new title would be better to clear the contents: The "Visible" in the self-assessment procedure adopted remain not so evident. Probably the term "group" is problematic as a synonym of community…

2) relevance and timeliness of the topic

The topic is relevant and worthwhile to be discussed

3) argument structure and coherency

The structure of the argument needs to be implemented to highlight the main hypothesis which led the inquiry. In particular, more details about the dialogue process and components analyzed in terms of philosophical discourse within community of inquiry need to be detailed (see the NOTES below)

3.1. does the abstract adequately summarize the main issues addressed in the article?

Yes. The use of "exploratory study" instead of "pilot" would be better, considering the challenges listed in the conclusion.

3.2. does the article fairly reflect current literature?

The literature quoted is sufficient, but an enlargement of references to sustain the main arguments and conclusions should be considered.

3.3. are the objectives of the article well-defined?

Yes, but clarification in terms of relationships between the aims and the research general framework on PwC is still useful

3.4. are the ideas clear and well-developed?

The main idea leading the article and the study is clear, but needs some refinement in terms of relevance to the field.

3.5. are the arguments well-founded?

The arguments offered need to be cleared and developed to offer stronger support for the conclusion proposed

3.6. are the conclusions expressed clearly?

See above. The conclusions should be refined. Nevertheless they seem relevant for the discussion on PwC evaluation and educational research implications

other aspects

see the NOTES for Author and Editor

review notes

"Specifically, it seeks to elucidate the progression of dialogue groups as they evolve from an initial, immature state to a more mature and cohesive state through ongoing dialogue sessions"

Please, explain the use of the couple "mature/immature" also in terms of "progression" referring to philosophical dialogue/discussion. Some literature reference to include the hypothesis within a theoretical framework on the issue should be useful for the following coherence of the inquiry arguments offered.

"Of course, several existing methods have been proposed for evaluating the effectiveness of philosophical dialogue.."

Some international reference on the topic is needed. Moreover, a clear position about the attribution of "effectiveness" is still missed and needed

Tsukahara and Eguchi argue that…

Better to include directly the reference (…..) within the text.

"it is undeniable that a community is composed of individuals. Without changes at the individual level, transformations within the community cannot occur. Therefore, it is necessary to assess both individual and communal changes in philosophical dialogue"

This crucial and critical assumption needs to be better explained in particular as regards the concept/idea of community of philosophical inquiry (CoPI) at the core of the exploratory study.

"The Q-U scale is a psychological assessment tool developed by Japanese psychologist Shigeo Kawamura to evaluate classroom group dynamics."

Please, explain the coherence of a psychological approach to the philosophical discourse analysis and the importance of "group dynamics" to understand the "development" of CoPI methodological concept.

"The Q-U consists of two questionnaires: one designed to measure classroom satisfaction and the other to assess students' motivation for school life. This study places particular emphasis on methods for measuring classroom satisfaction."

See the above notes, applying to "measuring satisfaction".

"Affinity Class, indicating a positive and cohesive classroom environment."

A valorization of this idea of "affinity" is suggested as very interesting as regards the co-construction of CoPI

"However, as long as the content discussed during the dialogue remains creative, the act of evaluation does not inherently contradict the fundamental purpose of philosophical dialogues."

It seems that the philosophy in the dialogue is limited to contents… but the self-assessment regards the dynamics… this point needs to be deepened.

"It is important to note that a single dialogue session may not be sufficient to transform an immature dialogue group into a mature one, as the process of change is gradual. Ongoing philosophical dialogue can be instrumental in supporting Class A's transition from an immature dialogue group to a more mature one. Indeed, after the third philosophical dialogue, students in Class A began formulating questions for one another and articulating their personal perspectives."

Please, see above the note on the critical use of the evaluative term of "immature". A clarification on the assumption of "graduality" should be offered too.

"Discussion" part on results is missed… and it is needed! In particular to better understand the (provisional) conclusions, such as the following: "Assessing and understanding classroom dynamics is essential."

Conclusions: the four challenges should be better explained in terms of benefit in the PwC perspective and within the framework of CoPI priorities. A fifth one would be added, regarding the social and distributed aspects of philosophical polyphony/dialogue.