The Philosophical Literary Story as a Model of Critical Thinking

Simona Borisova[1], Gabor Pintes[2]

[1] Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Nitra, Slovakia
E-mail: sborisova@ukf.sk
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9502-4659

[2] Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Nitra, Slovakia
E-mail: gpintes@ukf.sk
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5749-6164

Abstract

This article focuses on a detailed review of philosophical literary stories which represent specific area of the Philosophy for children programme primarily aimed at independent thinking development in education process. The benefits of the programme are characterised within the theoretical basis on the level of critical, creative and caring thinking. The philosophical literary story is a part of fiction. It covers philosophical categories, but it is characterised with simplicity in its theme, as well as content and language part. The role of this type of text lies mainly in motivation toward consequent philosophical discussion in a group called community of inquiry. Through the literary text interpretation method, we demonstrate presence and interconnection among critical thinking categories. At the same time, we discuss the subject type of texts as a specific model for critical thinking level development.

Keywords: philosophical literary story, critical thinking, Philosophy for children programme.

Философско-литературный рассказ как модель развития критического мышления

Симона Борисова[1], Габор Пинтес[2]

[1] Университет Константина Философа в Нитре, Нитра, Словакия
E-mail: sborisova@ukf.sk
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9502-4659

[2] Университет Константина Философа в Нитре, Нитра, Словакия
E-mail: gpintes@ukf.sk
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5749-6164

Аннотация

Статья посвящена тому, как философско-литературные истории влияют на развитие самостоятельного мышления обучающихся. Данная методика представляет собой особое направление программы «Философия для детей», воздействие которой на критическое и творческое

мышление охарактеризовано в теоретической части исследования. Философско-литературный рассказ является жанром художественной литературы. Он содержит философские категории, но характеризуется простотой тематики, содержания и языка. Роль подобных текстов заключается в мотивации к последующему философскому обсуждению в группе, называемой исследовательским сообществом. В интерпретации такого текста ученики демонстрируют владение приемами критического мышления. Авторы рассматривают подобную деятельность как специфическую модель развития критического мышления.

Ключевые слова: философско-литературный рассказ, критическое мышление, программа «Философия для детей».

Introduction

Matthew Lipman (1923-2010), an American philosopher and professor, the author of the Philosophy for Children programme, who created the programme in order to develop independent thinking level and personality development of children, pupils and students, is the representative of philosophical literary stories. The Philosophy for Children is aimed to develop critical, creative and caring thinking. Its main pillars cover reading of a literary story, formulation of questions, discussion according to defined rules and education activities. Before we describe critical thinking categories with relation to philosophical literary story, we introduce a role of reading, literature and thinking in the past and nowadays, so as to better understand specific influence of contemporary digital environment on children and adults. The present times are characterised by a statement which says that we live in information times (Pushkarev & Pushkareva, 2018), whereas according to Wolf (2020), a large amount of received information causes problems even when we read. We are able to fight with the bulk of information by simplifying it. We also process information as fast as possible (we read more frequently and in small quantities). Media in their expression in general prefer high speed, immediate reactions, multitasking and flood of information. From the point of the reader's brain, critical thinking is full of scientific procedures. It merges the text content with our basic knowledge, analogies, deduction, induction, derivation, valuation, interpretation and conclusions. According to Wolf (2020), careful formation of critical thinking represents the best way to protect future generations from manipulation and superficial information. In this article we would like to present critical thinking within the context of literature and through empirical research to interpret subject philosophical literary stories with relation to critical thinking.

Critical thinking and literature

The concept of critical thinking is studied as part of philosophy, psychology, pedagogy, theology and other disciplines: it goes through all scientific disciplines including literature (Zbudilova, 2013). We emphasise that the Philosophy for Children programme is focused on the development of thinking as such. However, its theoretical justification involves three dimensions of thinking. Critical thinking does not work as an independent category. It is formed by several categories which are simpler and often may not be clearly divided. There are various definitions of critical thinking due to its relevance and timelessness. This study set out to present critical thinking categories and their position with regard to literature reading. These categories are treated as comparable to the process of community of inquiry, where its members read a story and during discussion they are encouraged to listen actively, so that they are capable to follow-up on the speech of others. Zbudilova (2013) defines two main approaches toward understanding the usefulness of fiction upon the development of critical thinking. First approach suggests that the reading itself requires the capability of critical (as well as creative) thinking – it is a complex process which forces readers to recall and reflect their own experience in a way that the meaning of the text is construed. Furthermore, it is necessary to differentiate facts from opinions

when reading, as well as to be able to understand literal and implicit meaning and to find casual interaction between acts and events. According to Zbudilova (2013), the reader should be open to new thoughts presented from various points of view, make ethical reasoning and consequently apply new knowledge to other areas of a real life. In practice readers realize procedures of analysis, synthesis, induction, deduction, abstraction, analogy, and application. Categorization, understanding of importance and clarification of the meaning is present when reading a literary work (Kosturkova & Ferencova, 2019). These activities are referred to as interpretation, analysis and conclusions. Creation of analyses (examination of thoughts, identification and analysis of arguments) and findings is an expression of critical thinking.

Critical thinking does not happen by accident. It requires a whole range of procedures for its development to be undergone. Therefore, we briefly describe an activity of the community of inquiry in a real education context. In the discussion we may see the features of Socratic dialogue. After reading a story, an issue is raised (most often through a question and definition of a key notion or notions). Through further questions and logic argumentation an individual gets into the depth of problem solving. The Socratic dialogue represents significant clarification and analysis of words and phrases, it is the capability to clarify meanings of the words within given context, for example, in the Philosophy for Children programme such concepts as love, truth, beauty, goodness are clarified.

Effective execution of the scientific research process in the community of inquiry means that an individual is supported when using a whole range of critical thinking expressions – comparison of findings, assessment of statement reliability, thought hierarchy. In view of our focus on philosophical literary stories as a source and model of excellent thinking we are moving toward selection of individual parts and expressions of critical thinking in the following subchapters. The role of critical thinking development level in educating individuals is mainly transferred into the competence of an educator who faces actual challenge - to teach pupils how to think critically. The categories of critical thinking in terms of the academic literature analysis cover knowledge base, application of logical thinking, including argumentation, criteria and standards, inference, auto-correction and making judgments. The critical thinking categories also cover context sensitivity and non-cognitive factors (curiosity, impartiality, independence of thinking, etc.).

Critical thinking categories

Knowledge base. In order to think critically, we need to have a skill called knowledge base. Without specific reservoir of knowledge, we may progress with difficulties only. The knowledge base represents a prerequisite for good quality and critical thinking operations. With regard to cognitive capabilities the ability to acquire, analyse, sort information, work with it within wider contexts is required (Kosturkova & Ferencova, 2019). Wolf (2020) mentions the opinions of authors who have stated that reading of books has enriched their life for notional "building material". If we want to assess new information from any media, we have to have our own set of facts. Wolf further clarifies that people who read often, get enough resources which they may apply during the reading. On the contrary, those who do not read much, have nothing to put into their new reading. They have less information that could help them deduce or apply analogous thinking. Such people are more vulnerable to become victims of non-verified information.

Logical thinking. Elements of logics may be found in critical thinking. According to Lipman, Sharp and Oscanyan (1980), relation between logics and thinking is similar to relation between grammar and language. There are rules defined in grammar which need to be followed if one wants to speak correctly. Logics defines standards which are

applicable in case we want to think correctly. Formal logics in Philosophy for Children assists children in exploring possibility to think about their thinking in an organized way. Logical thinking covers several categories which are specified below.

Criteria and standards. Lipman (2003) considers criteria to be one of the most valuable tools of a rational process. According to Lipman (2003), it is necessary to guide pupils and students to acquire the ability to identify and use criteria, which is one of the fundamental features of critical thinking. Criteria are created during discussion, when we compare certain phenomenon with a specific standard. We value it according to something or measure it. This is a method of assessment through defined measuring criteria. A criterion is often defined as a rule used when making any judgment or reasoning. The notion of critical thinking itself has the same basis with the word criteria, i.e. critical thinking is based on criteria and it represents thinking which is well established: it is structured, reasonable and convincing. Lipman (2003) explains that anytime we express an opinion, we become vulnerable, unless it is supported somehow. A good reason is based on facts, relevance, it relates to something known which is used for explaining the examined object.

Inference. Inference is also considered to be an expression of critical thinking according to Kosturkova and Ferencova (2019). This concerns questioning of evidence followed by looking for an alternative and drawing conclusions. Conclusions are connected with explanation, which is primarily focused on introduction of conclusions and justification of procedures. This, for instance, covers examination of methods how certain sentences may lead to other sentences, like syllogism.

Self-correction. Self-correction is often demonstrated in the process of community of inquiry. Self-correction occurs when a person re-assesses and changes their own opinion following any other opinion. Splitter and Sharp (1995) consider self-correction to be possible only if we are prepared to criticize our own thinking similarly as thinking of others and to respect opinions of others in similar ways as our ones.

Argument. Kosturkova and Ferencova (2019) understand argument from the philosophical point of view as a set of statements formed by presumptions which lead toward drawing conclusions. As defined by Lipman (2003), thinking is one of the ways to expand knowledge. As he states, "through thinking we are able to explore other things we are interested in through the knowledge we have" (ibid, p. 194). The view of Tozzi (2002) that no philosophical reflexion may exist without capability to argue is worth to mention. We use argumentation in philosophy as it means looking for truth, ability to understand one's relation toward the world, the others, as well as to oneself and ability to try to solve a basic issue. Philosophical doubt means to put aside one's opinions, consider them from another point of view as prejudices until we reach more stable core.

Judgment/reasoning. Judgment is a result of critical thinking. Splitter and Sharp (1995) consider the relation between judgment and the criteria themselves as the complex one. While judgment is based on criteria, selection of a certain criterion in a given situation is the question of a judgment. According to Lipman (2003), it is a good judgment which characterises correct interpretation of a written text, clear understanding of what we hear and thanks to judgment may argue convincingly. If critical thinking is capable to provide for improvement of education, it is because it increases the quality and quantity of meanings which the pupils are capable to derive from what they read and perceive. Therefore, in addition to identifying criteria, pupils can also verify and search for hypotheses, evaluate, compare, and form judgments.

Context sensitivity. Critical thinking is also expressed with sensitivity toward the context when facing certain contents (Lipman, 2003). Sensitivity toward context is based on actual circumstances and their meanings. Critical thinking is therefore against any

stereotypes – prejudice of thinking and bias. It implies identifying specific features when making a decision.

Non-cognitive factors. Non-cognitive factors may be potentially observed in various so-far elaborated critical thinking classifications in a literary story. They include curiosity which comes out from a desire to be informed. Such desire is also passive acquisition of new information completed with asking questions. Philosophical discussion supports creation of questions. Non-cognitive factors were characterised by Paul (2012) who called them affective skills in critical thinking. They cover independence in thinking (formulation of one's own opinions), development of understanding social and egocentric determination (respecting of others), bias, neutrality, empathy, intellectual courage development (non-acceptance of ready information, but its critical examination from various points of view).

Materials and methods

The research sample is represented by a group of stories which are used in the practical part of the Philosophy for Children. We have not found any relevant research aimed at critical thinking in philosophical literary stories. We consider the examination of philosophical literary stories as a partial area of Philosophy for Children to be beneficial due to the deepening of the research side of this programme and the improvement of its implementation in educational practice.

The source of knowledge for shaping future research in this field is a meta-analysis of the effectiveness of the Philosophy for Children program (Yan et al., 2018), which provides broad knowledge about the influence of programme methods on pupils' cognitive outcomes. The authors analysed research and studies from the year 2002 to 2016 that examined the connection between the community of inquiry, philosophical thinking, and socio-psychological personality improvement. The variables included the measurement of cognitive outcomes, such as reasoning, comprehension, and general cognitive abilities (Yan et al., 2018). The respondents in the individual surveys were pupils aged from the first year of primary school to the period before entering university. This meta-analysis gives insights into the ways in which cognitive abilities can be measured.

We would like to draw attention to the fact that the facilitator has a free choice in the selection of a literary story as a subject of reading and further discussion. He/she considers literacy competence and maturity of pupils. In this paper we include the interpretation of some philosophical literary stories. Interpretation of the literary text represents a main research method through which we deal with the categories resulting from previous chapter. However, we do not refuse presence of any other critical thinking categories. The above-stated elements potentially observable in a philosophical literary story are subject to interpretation of a literary text through which we may reveal deeper meanings and text functions when focusing on the given topic. Simply interpretation represents reduction of an original text (in spoken or written form) to key statements and at the same time creative communication of meanings. Chrz (2013) describes interpretation as extended understanding, "unrolling of the wound-up", "answering the unanswered". Interpretation of a literary text is a method which depends on the perception of an interpreting researcher. Therefore, it is necessary to avoid any possible "underinterpretation" (non-displaying of literary text key elements with regard to the topic) or "overinterpretation" (displaying of text elements not resulting from the text). The following section includes characteristics and interpretation of several texts aimed at pre-school age, younger school age, middle school age and older school age.

Critical thinking in The Doll Hospital philosophical literary story

The Doll Hospital book is primarily aimed for pre-school age children. However, it may be very useful for primary school first level pupils. The book was written by Ann Margaret Sharp, the co-founder of Philosophy for Children. Through its content the book may also attract adult readers. There are concepts of truth, as well as hope, empathy, personality. There are issues of friendship, difference between toys and people, good and bad behavior and acts handled there. The methodological handbook called "Making Sense of my World" is aimed at categories like human, beauty, truth, fact, identity. Tasks and plans of the handbook cover, for instance, an exercise focused on differentiation between two similar phenomena or sensitivity to context. In the introduction Splitter and Sharp (2000), authors of the handbook, approach the reader (teacher, educator, parent) through an idea that philosophy with children should represent a source of fun. After some time, readers philosophizing with children should observe a significant change - the fact that the children grow and move forward with their assistance. Moreover, the readers may find out that by way of creative leading of the community of inquiry they helped children/pupils and also themselves. The readers may also find out how much a person may get through common thinking on apparently simple things of our everyday life.

The main character of the book in the Slovak language is called Sasha (Saša). This name is an abbreviated form for Alexandra or Alexander. Despite the fact that Sasha is more girl's name, in this story it stands for a boy's name. Some readers may be surprised by the author's selection of a name for a boy. However, this issue may be the subject of philosophical discussion which may focus on the reasons or rules of name selection. There is a very unusual beginning of the story: "Every child has a doll. I do. Do you have a doll? Is it a boy or a girl doll?" Sasha, the narrator, suggests in the following sentences to call all toys dolls: "Maybe you have a fluffy toy – a teddy bear, for example. Maybe it is not a doll, but you treat it like a doll anyway. So what if we called all those toys dolls?" The child reader may or may not accept his generalizing approach, but it may be a moment raising further discussion. Expressions of individual dimensions of thinking included in The Doll Hospital book are summarized in the following table which relates to critical thinking.

Categories of critical thinking represented in the Doll Hospital book

Knowledge base	Differentiation of the knowledge base of pre-school age and younger school age children may be observed, for instance, in the part of the book where the main character is concerned about the colour of hazelnuts: "Roller has green and brown eyes. My mother said her eyes were hazel. I don't know the colour hazel." Another example in which the reader's knowledge base may be expanded is covered in the next chapter, in the part which concerns relatives: "Mom," I asked, "how do you know who is and who isn't your relative?" "Relatives are those who belong to our family." "Who is it, for example?" "A grandmother with a grandfather, aunts, uncles, cousins…"
Logical thinking	Logical thinking covers several subcategories which are stated below. Therefore, we primarily focus on asking logical questions stated in individual parts of the philosophical literary stories: "My mother gave me the doll when I was three. I'm four years old now. What do you think – how old is my doll now?" or "Have you ever thought you understood something, but you later think you didn't understand it at all? That's what happened the day my mother talked about my doll was in the mind of the dollmaker."

Criteria and standards	Sasha states the same criteria which prove reality of his doll: "Could I bath Roller if she wasn't real? Could I name her if she wasn't real? Could I talk to her if she wasn't real?" Reality criterion is considered to be sufficient according to the fact that the doll is physically real, so we can touch it for instance. Criterion is not considered as sufficient if the doll is considered to be a living creature – a human. However, the main character states qualitative differences between himself and the doll in the same part of the book: "Roller (his doll) is much more than just cotton fabric and plastic. I'm also much more than just bones and skin." Another criterion may be seen in the next chapter. Stefan says that he does not like a doll which belongs to another boy. Stefan's classmate replies to it: "We can have a lot of dolls that can have different hair and eyes and skin colour, but each of them can still be beautiful in their own way." "Gabriela says: ´Maybe a nice doll is one you like very much.´" Criterion of what we consider as being beautiful means that we like that thing, as the passage states.
Self-correction	The only expression of self-correction is found at the end of the book. Sasha realizes the difference between his doll and a human after Roller breaks down: "What did dad just say a few days ago? Oh, that doll is not a real person. So if my friend Romana was hurt in any way, she would still be human and she would still be my friend. But the doll doesn't get hurt, it just breaks. When I don't want to play with a broken doll anymore, there's nothing wrong with that."
Argument	Main character expresses the reason of his saying in the text: "Jacob and Hubert are not my friends because they are mean to me."
Judgment/reasoning	First chapter of the book covers result of thinking about the fact that someone may be mistaken despite being older than someone else: "My sister thinks she is the wisest in the world because she is twelve years old. But one can have twelve, for example and still be wrong."
Sensitivity to context	Sensitivity to context is expressed in the part when we do not like something, but if we like that thing (or a person) we may perceive it as beautiful: "We can have a lot of dolls that can have different hair and eyes and skin colour, but each of them can still be beautiful in their own way." "Gabriela says: Maybe a nice doll is one you like very much."… "Romana asked: When you think of a person you like very much, don't you think she's beautiful?"
Non-cognitive factors	In this story we may see frequent asking questions, like: "What's the difference between beautiful, pretty and great?" or "Have you ever thought about where your doll comes from?" The questions result from curiosity of the main character.

The interpreted work does not include any evident expression of inference. We observe an assessment category, which does not result from the categories formulated in the theoretical part of this article. Assessment of certain information and consequent opinion may be seen, for instance, in the following part: Mr. Williams (teacher) asked: "What do the rest of you think? Did Francis tell us a good reason why he thinks his toy is nice?" Now Stefan spoke: "What if I thought Francis was wrong? What if I think his doll is ugly? What would I have to say for you all to agree with me?" Mr Williams answered: "I guess we'd have to give reasons why we thought that about his doll." Katrina said: "Not just reasons… Good reasons." Then Stefan said: What if I said I just didn't like doll's face?" Gabriela said: "That wouldn't be a good reason. You would have to say why. I mean you would have to tell us what you think is wrong with the doll's face." Assessment in this sense is considered as an expression of critical thinking.

Critical thinking in Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery philosophical literary work

Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery book is aimed for readers of 11 to 14 years of age. The book is primarily focused on the development of logics. One of the Lipman's objectives when writing the book was to create a space for stimulating philosophical discussion. Harry Stottlemeier, the main character of the book, is a boy who experiences various adventures in reality and also often in his mind. The name of Harry Stottlemeier is a word trick, where connection of the first name and beginning of the surname makes 'Aritsottle'. The book includes elements of Aristotle's logics, primarily his approach to language and speech (Reed & Sharp, 1992). The first chapter takes place in the classroom. Harry's invention is a result of a mistake in front of his classmates. This mistake is formulated as a hypothesis tested and consequently improved after being confronted with Lisa – Harry's friend and classmate solution. All characters represent various paradigms of research: various methods of thinking and perceiving the world. The methodological handbook called Philosophical Inquiry includes several suggestions for work with the first chapter of the book. The handbook includes advice what should be avoided in the process of community of inquiry and recommendations how to proceed with activities, i.e. from the beginning of a session up to the feedback at the end. It also includes possible plan of discussion, additional questions, speech exercises and exercises for writing.

Knowledge base	Knowledge base expansion may be observed, for instance, in the part of the book covering information on the Solar system (comet, Sun, planets, Sirius). Harry works with several notions further in his exploration.
Logical thinking	Logical thinking phenomena are described above – the story includes elements of formal logics, e.g. use of syllogism. There are several questions in the story which may be considered as logic ones: *"And what does that mean?"* or *"What can we find out from what we already know?"*
Criteria and standards	Criteria issue is seen with determination of rules of validity of statements by the story characters. Harry has described Lisa several examples he tried: *"I took sentences like 'all planets revolve about the sun' and 'all models of airplanes are toys' and 'all cucumbers are vegetables,' and I found that when last part was put first, the sentences were no longer true."* Lisa comes up with the solution: *"But the sentence I gave you wasn't like yours. Each of your sentences began with the word 'All'. But my sentence began with the word ´No´.* Harry is happy with what Lisa comes up with but he doubts it now: *"Lisa was right. But could that have made the difference? There was only one thing to do: try some more sentences that begin with the word ´no´."* *"If it is true that 'no submarines are kangaroos', Harry began, 'then what about no kangaroos are submarines'? "Also true," replied Lisa. "And if 'no mosquitos are lollipops', then it's true that 'no lollipops are mosquitos'."*
Inference	Syllogism may be found in the following sentences: *"All mammals are creatures that can experience pain. All dogs are mammals. Therefore, all dogs are creatures that can experience pain".*
Self-correction	The main character is faced with self-correction, when he finds out that the rule he made out does not apply and together with his friend he reaches the correct solution: *"That's it! said Harry excitely, "That's it! If a true sentence begins with the word 'no', then its reverse is also true. But if it begins with the word 'all', then its reverse is false."*
Argument	Argument may be seen in Lisa's sentence: *"But the sentence I gave you wasn't like yours. Every one of your sentences began with the word 'All'. But my sentence began with the word 'No'.*

Judgment/reasoning	Mrs Opatrná states incorrect opinion: *"Imagine… do you know Mrs Bartosová? Every day I see her walking into the store on the corner shop which is selling also alcohol. It is horrible to see those unfortunates who have fallen into drinking. She also goes there every day. So I´m thinking, do you understand… If Mrs Bartosová…."* *"That she would also have problems with drinking?"* Harry corrects the opinion according to the rule he has come up with: *"Mrs. Opatrná,"* he said, *"even if everyone who has a drinking problem goes to the store on the corner, that doesn't mean everyone who goes there has a drinking problem."*
Sensitivity to context	In his incorrect answer to teacher Harry realized that also the answer: *"All planets revolve about sun"* is correct, however, the teacher asked about comets: *"If I had been careful before, I would have known that what my teacher asked me was Halley's Comet. It is true that comets orbit the Sun just like planets, but they are certainly not planets."*
Non-cognitive factors	Characters of Harry and Lisa confirm independence of their thinking by very frequent asking of questions, curiosity and bravery to search for problem solutions.

There are all defined categories of critical thinking in the text. However, in this paper we give only several typical examples of critical thinking expression.

Critical thinking in Lisa – Can We Both Love Animals and Eat Them? philosophical literary story

The book called Lisa is a sequel of the previous literary work. It is aimed for young readers of 12-14 years of age. Character of the book are curious (Harry Stottlemeier), interested in thinking in formal logical formulas (Tony), with intuitive thinking and intuition (Lisa), looking for and enjoying explanations (Fran), sensitive to feelings of others (Anna) with creative thinking (Miki). These characters most often represent models of an adequate behaviour (Lipman et al., 1980). The story called Lisa is focused on moral values reflection. It primarily deals with ethical and social issues like fairness, naturalism, falsehood and truth, basis and rules of standards. Some topics deal with the children's rights, works and discrimination according to sex and rights of animals. The methodological handbook of Lisa called Ethical Inquiry provides further possibilities to practice any possible moral issues which are formulated in various exercises and plans for discussions.

The central topic of the chapter focuses on the relation of people to animals. There are several questions in the story which concern the rights: "Do animals have rights?" "Do children have rights?" "Do you believe that animals have a right to live?" There questions result from curiosity which may be understood as an expression of critical thinking (non-cognitive factors). At the same time, these questions are quite stimulating to be considered as philosophical ones. In their discussions Lisa and her friends deal with the difference between killing animals as a source of food and killing animals for fun or sport. There are arguments among characters (KM – argumentation): some say that hunting of animals is useful as it prevents from their over-reproduction, for instance "There are too many of them," replied Rado, "unless hunters kill of the oversupply, there'll be animals all over the place". This is, however, in conflict with Marek's opinion who objects that there could be a very small step from killing of animals to killing of people in order to prevent our planet from overpopulation. Children do not think about any important nutrients of meat (this argument could be handled in a real discussion).

Knowledge base	The reader's building material from the point of notions could be expanded, for instance, in those parts, where the Charter of fundamental rights and freedoms is mentioned: *"The Constitution doesn't say anything about hunting,"* Mark reported, *"it just says that men have a right to bear arms for the purposes of defense."*
Logical thinking	The title itself *"Can We Both Love Animals and Eat Them?"* deals with an issue which may stimulate thinking over ethical and pragmatic consumption of animal food. Activity to handle the problem may be stimulated by further questions included in the text: *"How come everything looks so simple, and when we start talking about it, all of a sudden everything is so complicated?" "How can I be against killings animals, when I love roast chicken and roast beef so much?"… "Shouldn't our thoughts agree with what we do? Shouldn't our actions agree with what we believe?"*
Criteria and standards	The issue of standards is dealt with in the whole chapter. The characters deal with the standard of killing of animals due to their overpopulation. Killing of people is not considered as a standard. In this case the ethic point of view represents a certain criterion of the killing assessment. Within the text we also deal with criteria of problem solving. This should also include the integrity to look at the problem. It is described in the part of discussion between Harry and his father.
Inference	In *"If I really cared about animals, I wouldn't eat them. But I do eat them. So I don't really care about them."* Lisa used principle of syllogism. First premise was formed as follows: *"If I really cared about animals, I wouldn't eat them."* Additional premise is, however, formulated as follows: *"But I do eat them."* Therefore, the main character is forced to state: *"So I don't really care about them."* Such opinion is not acceptable for Lisa despite the fact that it is valid from the logical point of view. In this case logical point of view surpasses the ethical issue which defines that according to Lisa every living creature has a right to live.
Self-correction	A slight expression of self-correction may be seen in a discussion of Harry and his father. Harry comes up with an idea that it would be better if people stop eating meat. After consideration of the whole context, he finds out that such an idea would hardly work in practice.
Argument	An argument that her family eat meat as a standard is not considered by Lisa as sufficient. She formulates another argument where she says that she herself should not eat animals as she cares about them and does not want them to suffer. Arguments are also present in the part when characters discuss killing of animals due to their overpopulation: *"People got a right to hunt."* Rado said to Mark. *"It's in the Constitution."* Rado argues that hunting of animals results from defined laws.
Judgment/reasoning	Lisa's looking for reasons why she should or should not eat meat cover assessment of several consequences resulting from the acts. Lisa finally comes to a conclusion that she should not eat meat: *"If I really cared about animals, I couldn't bear to eat them."*
Sensitivity to context	Sensitivity to context is identified primarily in the discussion of Harry and his father in passage where the main characters draw attention to the fact of looking at the problem as a whole.
Non-cognitive factors	Independence of thinking, respecting of others, impartiality and fairness are primarily represented in this text by adults. On the contrary child characters take initiative of searching for problem solution, are curious which is expressed by asking questions, like: *"You don't even eat those ducks, so why do you kill them?"… "How can I be against killings animals, when I love roast chicken and roast beef so much?"… "But what about animals?"* insisted Lisa, *"do they have a right not to be killed and eaten?"*

There are all predefined phenomena of critical thinking found in the text. The passage stated above in the Criteria and standards part of the table may be considered as a critical thinking category - assessment.

Discussion

How children, pupils, and students process information, how they know how to behave in difficult situations, their attitude towards helping and caring for others is primarily on the shoulders of teachers and parents. There are many methods concerning the development of critical, creative and caring thinking, and one of them may be Philosophy for Children programme, a significant part of which is a philosophical literary story. Neither the Philosophy for Children nor the philosophical literary stories formulated for this programme tell children what to think: it is up to the children themselves. However, this programe provides the intellectual, social, and emotional tools they need to make their thinking good (Sharp, 2018). The research findings together with theoretical background made it possible to formulate several recommendations for pedagogical practice. The presented paper can contribute to a better orientation in the issue of philosophical literary stories for future and current educators. If they want to include philosophical literary stories for the purpose of implementing the Philosophy for Children, they need to be thoroughly acquainted with the programme and also know the methodology of working with stories.

Conclusion

As it results from the analysis of philosophical literary stories elements of critical thinking are present in given stories, however, not all pre-defined categories may always be found in selected stories. Through literary text interpretation method, we identified several categories which do not result from the theoretical part of the article. Selected methods enabled us to examine various phenomena of thinking dimensions in details which could be overlooked under conditions of standard reading of these stories. With regard to critical thinking the theoretical part defines categories which may be observed within the text. Based on literary text interpretation, we may find category of assessment in the stories (e.g. assessment of information, faulty conclusion) which does not result from predefined categories. The characters assess procedures through which they come up to problem solution, they assess correctness or incorrectness of statements. Selected literary stories do not have a character representing an example of an absolute non-critical person. On the contrary, in their dialogues the characters use critical thinking. The problem may be seen in the identification of critical thinking affective level, mainly the one which characterises the independence of thinking. Each story includes identification and description of non-cognitive factors. However, we draw attention to the fact that not all of them are exactly defined. We find identification of openness and perception of problem in philosophical literary stories difficult. Lipman et al. (1980) judge that not all children are always as curious as the philosophical literary stories characters. This, however, is not considered as a negative phenomenon. We would like to emphasise that this specific type of the text provides its reader with model solutions of various everyday life problems as compared to a standard text. In case that teachers or educators wish to use philosophical literary texts in order to assist them in Philosophy for Children implementation they should be well familiar with the given programme, as well as the methodology of work with stories. This article may inspire its readers to look at the programme from other perspective. They may also expand their knowledge with regard to programme methods in any other way.

References

Chrz, V. (2013). Forms of expression. In J. Slavik (Ed.), *Creation as a way of knowing* (pp. 249-317). Univerzita Karlova v Praze.

Kosturkova, M., & Ferencova, J. (2019). *Strategies for developing critical thinking: Critical argumentation, debating, writing and organizing of knowledge*. Wolters Kluver.

Lipman, M. (1982). *Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery*. Montclaire: IAPC.

Lipman, M. (1983). *Lisa* (2nd ed.). Montclaire: IAPC.

Lipman, M. (1984). *Philosophical inquiry: Instructional manual to accompany Harry's Stottlemeier's discovery*. Montclaire: IAPC.

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

Lipman, M., Sharp, A. M., & Oscanyan, F. S. (1980). *Philosophy in the Classroom* (2nd ed.) Temple University Press.

Paul, R. W. (2012). *Critical Thinking – What Every Person Needs to Survive in a Rapidly Changing World*. Foundation for Critical Thinking.

Pushkarev, Y. V., & Pushkareva, E. A. (2018). Philosophical interpretation of knowledge and information: Knowledge value and information diversity in modern communication. *XLinguae, 11*(3), 176-184. https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2018.11.03.17

Reed, R. F., & Sharp, A. M. (1992). *Studies in Philosophy for Children*. Temple University Press.

Sharp, A. M. (2010). *In Community of Inquiry with Ann Margaret Sharp. Childhood, Philosophy and Education*. Routledge.

Sharp, A. M. (2010). *The Doll's Hospital*. Ceské Budejovice: TF JU.

Splitter, L., & Sharp, A. M. (1995). *Teaching for Better Thinking. The Classroom Community of Inquiry*. ACER Press.

Tozzi, M. (2002). *Thinking for Yourself: An Introduction to Philosophy* (5th ed.). Chronique Socia.

Wolf, M. (2020). *Reader, Come Home. The Reading Brain in a Digital World*. Host.

Yan, S., Walters, L. M., Wang, Z., & Wang, C. C. (2018). Meta-Analysis of the Effectiveness of Philosophy for Children Programs on Students' Cognitive Outcomes. *Analytic Teaching and Philosophical Praxis, 39*(1), 13-33.

Zbudilova, H. (2013). Literature as a mind-opening key. In P. Bauman (Ed.), *Critical and creative thinking: isn't there anything more? Development of thinking in philosophical, theological, psychological and pedagogical contexts* (pp. 134-154). Ceske Budejovice: TF JU.

71