

Community of Inquiry (CoI) for Distance Learning in the Philippines: Appraising Lee's CoI through Garrison's CoI

*Lumberto G. Mendoza
Marielle Antoinette H. Zosa
Jairus Diesta Espiritu
Alexander Atrio L. Lopez*

ABSTRACT

This paper is a critical appraisal of Lee's framework (2020) for the Community of Inquiry (CoI) pedagogy in light of Garrison's work (2000, 2001, 2010, 2016, 2017) in the context of synchronous and asynchronous distance learning. Using the latter as springboard, Lee's CoI framework is examined based on Garrison's three presences: cognitive, social, and teaching presence. The paper discusses the similarities between Lee's CoI and Garrison's CoI, and expounds on the differences between the two (i.e. the end goal of a CoI for cognitive presence, the realization of asynchronous social presence, and the role of the facilitator in teaching presence). It also presents practical suggestions to improve Lee's CoI in a distance education setting. Lastly, it concludes with institutional recommendations for applying CoI for distance learning in the Philippine context.

Introduction

Last November 16, 2020, the UPD Department of Philosophy partnered with Mindanao State University-General Santos (MSU-GenSan) in hosting a whole-day webinar entitled “Teaching Ethics in the Time of COVID: Using Community of Inquiry as Framework.” The webinar showcased a 15-minute talk by Zosimo Lee who is considered to be the pioneer of Philosophy for Children (P4C) in the Philippines (*PAP Mid-Year Conference 2012*, 2012). Lee introduced the Community of Inquiry (CoI) pedagogy in the context of his experience with P4C, the in-person thinking skills program associated with Matthew Lipman (2003). With a background on CoI teaching tied to face-to-face settings, Lee admitted his inexperience in the use of CoI for distance education. And so with the unprecedented shift to distance learning that we now have due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the aim of this paper is to conduct a critical appraisal of Lee’s talk in light of how that CoI framework can also be used in online learning.

This appraisal shall be done through the studies on CoI that were first developed by D. Randy Garrison, T. Anderson, and W. Archer (2000, 2001) in the context of distance education. Their studies, along with more recent works by Garrison (2010, 2016, 2017), deserve special attention because they present a pedagogy that has been developed in the context of text-based, asynchronous distance learning. The framework offers cogent insights on ways Philippine educators could overcome the challenges of transitioning to distance education based on a CoI.

Again, the aim of this paper is to conduct a critical appraisal of Lee’s CoI in relation to Garrison’s CoI. It shall be structured as follows:

First, it introduces a background of the CoI frameworks used by Lee and by Garrison. Lee’s discussion of CoI as it is used in face-to-face setting is summarized based on his talk in the webinar. An overview of the three forms of virtual presence in Garrison’s CoI, namely cognitive presence, social presence, and teaching presence, then follows.

Second, the paper discusses Lee’s CoI in relation to the three forms of presences found in Garrison’s CoI. Points of convergence and divergence between Lee’s CoI and Garrison’s CoI are analyzed in each virtual presence.

Points of improvement for Lee's CoI based on Garrison's CoI are also suggested for each presence. Lastly, institutional recommendations for the use of CoI in the Philippine setting are forwarded based on the analysis.

Note the two limitations of the paper. First, Lee's CoI in P4C is drawn mainly from his 15-minute lecture and his responses to a 5-minute open forum during the webinar. The insights from that event, however, encapsulate decades of Lee's study and practice of CoI in the Philippines. On the other hand, discussions on Garrison's CoI draw from the rich literature on the use of CoI in distance education. These foreign works, nevertheless, provide necessary tools in articulating and addressing the gaps of Lee's CoI. As earlier mentioned, Lee's CoI framework has been limited to face-to-face interactions while Philippine education currently employs flexible distance learning. Teaching should respond to students' varying needs by making room for both synchronous and asynchronous forms of educational content delivery (*Guidelines on the Implementation of Flexible Learning*, 2020). This explains why Garrison's CoI remains as an important source. It is used as a framework for generating practical insights on how to improve upon Lee's CoI and the context for its use in distance learning.

The second limitation relates to the paper's institutional recommendations. Empirical research on CoI in distance education in the Philippines is still absent because the pedagogy is still in the process of being introduced. While it is appropriate to base policy recommendations on evidence, the paper draws conclusions with some implications on present educational reform efforts. These implications will not be comprehensively detailed, but may serve as templates or suggestions for subsequent studies and policies on the subject.

Background of Lee's CoI and Garrison's CoI

Lee's CoI framework

The CoI framework of Zosimo Lee comes from a strictly philosophical background. Lee first introduced the practice in the country in the early 1990s. This is the reason why he is considered a pioneer of P4C in the Philippines. He attended the Mendham workshop of the Institute for the

Advancement of Philosophy for Children (IAPC) twice, in 1996 and in 2000. It was from the IAPC that Lee learned what he also calls CPI or “Community of Philosophical Inquiry” (Mancenido-Bolaños, 2018). Hence, his view of CoI is regarded as philosophical.

Lee characterizes CoI as a methodology. This methodology uses a “text” as a stimulus for discussion. This text can be anything that could stimulate questions from the students. It could be “a written text, ...a video, ...a cartoon, ...a poem, ...or even a picture” (Lee, 2020). Lee explains that the only criterion for what counts as a text in this sense is that it can function as a perceptual stimulus that can provoke questioning and inquiry among students. The attempt to clarify and explore answers to these questions later on expands the discussions. It is in this level of student-oriented discussions that the CoI methodology goes against the traditional classroom approach. The traditional approach is called by Mancenido-Bolaños as “normal practice” (Mancenido-Bolaños, 2018, p. 141). In CoI, what is being stimulated is the students’ ability to think, and it is thus labelled by Lipman (2003) as involving a reflective paradigm of education. It is from the students’ interests that the subject matter of the discussion is derived. In this sense, CoI is radically student-centered. Even the teacher joins the student in its procedure of collaborative inquiry. Traditionally, knowledge needs to be imparted to the students. But in CoI, the teacher is no longer the sole source of this knowledge. Instead, the teacher facilitates a dialogue where relevant forms of knowledge are jointly explored and created.

Because CoI is radically student-centered, students become the source of the learning agenda. Once questions have been solicited from the participants, the facilitator begins to categorize them. The learning agenda then follows from the categorization. It is from these questions that succeeding discussions would ensue. Lee notes that these questions are not necessarily of interest to the facilitator. These questions are of interest only to the participants. The facilitator then asks each participant about what they think about the questions. Lee shares that these questions would be about asking for assumptions and implications. They also include proofs for holding their own views. These are the very same questions that amplify the discussions in a CoI.

Lee then proceeds to a “meta level.” He goes on to ask what goes on in a CoI (Lee, 2020). He says that it is a method where we respond to certain fundamental questions together. He puts much emphasis on the togetherness of the inquiry. Togetherness distinguishes a CoI from other individual forms of thinking. Thinking together happens when we listen to what each one is saying. Even in a synchronous discussion, Lee remarks that we can feel each other’s “energies.” The way we listen in a CoI becomes purposeful. Such remarks highlight the social aspect of thinking in a CoI. Lee then mentions two dimensions of CoI: social presence and cognitive presence. These presences were first forwarded by Garrison et al. Lee then attempts to reinterpret these two presences according to his own understanding of CoI. For him, they are constituted by the act of fully listening to the other. This attentive listening is putting oneself in the place of the other person.

In this regard, Lee points out that in CoI, we are led to ask who we are to each other. When we listen to the other, we are also led to ask who we are to that person. It is at this point that Lee hints at the disappearance of the self in the process of listening in CoI. This implies that the facilitator, in her capacity as listener, needs to disappear. Disappearance can be read negatively and positively. In the negative sense, disappearance intimates the teacher’s lack of influence in the discussion. As facilitator, the teacher solely facilitates the discussion without steering it to any direction that she wants. In the positive sense, disappearance could only mean that the participants have completely imbibed their role as fellow inquirers. This internalization enables participants to discuss among themselves without much instruction from the teacher.

In listening, we are giving value to a person just as she is. Hence, we are led to ask who is a friend. This remark can be read as an endorsement of friendship in a specific way. This way is that of building a community in a CoI. Such remark highlights the ethical aspect of the methodology. In listening, we also think of what we can add to what the other is saying. This state of mind leads to a “widening of horizons.” Lee then references Charles Sanders Peirce in his thought experiment of the blind men describing an elephant. Any one of them only touches a single part of the elephant. With their collective knowledge, their short-sighted views all widen. Lee calls this widening of horizon as “constructivism.” CoI adopts the move that

knowledge creation is constituted by the collective process of dialogue. In this process, people not only learn from each other. In this process, they are also able to construct a bigger picture. Lee remarks that they could not have built such a picture on their own.

Lee ends with the remark that “CoI can become an institution for virtue and justice” (Lee, 2020). In CoI, the values of tolerance and respect are shown among the participants. It is also in CoI that we recognize each one’s individuality. We also recognize the complexity of each and every person. Hence, it is in CoI that social justice is lived in the here and now.

Garrison’s CoI Framework

This CoI framework was first developed by D. Randy Garrison, Terry Anderson, and Walter Archer. It was borne out of a need to provide a theoretical framework on distance learning pedagogy. The three of them met at the University of Alberta in 1996. Garrison was serving as Dean of the Faculty of Extension at that time. Incidentally, it was during this time that the University implemented a partly online program in Communication and Technology. Because of this, they began research on such online programs (Garrison et al, 2010).

Garrison’s CoI, therefore, comes from a very pragmatic point of view (as opposed to the more philosophical and conceptual approach of Lee’s CoI). Garrison comes from the perspective of educational psychology. Developing such a framework therefore allows for more concrete indicators of success. This also produces more quantifiable results. Yet, despite the scientific nature of his CoI, Garrison recognizes its philosophical roots. It comes from the “reflective thinking” of John Dewey. It also comes from the work of Matthew Lipman (Garrison, 2017; Garrison et al 2010; Garrison et al, 2000).

It is worth noting that both Lee and Garrison recognize their roots in Lipman and in American Pragmatism. Both frameworks were also developed in the 1990s. It was at the height of Lipman’s development of CoI in P4C (Mancenido-Bolaños, 2018; Garrison et al 2010). But while they have the same origin, they have developed separately. This separate development will be shown later on in the paper on the topic of constructivism.

Garrison developed the CoI framework in the context of so-called computer-mediated conferencing (CMC). CMC might sound like a synchronous video conference. However, its context in the year 2000 was an asynchronous text-based discussion (Garrison et al, 2000). CoI is characterized as “a generic and coherent structure of a transactional educational experience whose core function is to manage and monitor the dynamic for thinking and learning collaboratively.” (Garrison, 2017, p. 24) Among other things, therefore, CoI for Garrison is merely a means to an end. It is a pedagogical tool for higher order thinking. In a later study, Garrison showed that CoI is effective in fostering metacognition. Metacognition is understood as self-reflexive thinking, i.e., a way of thinking about one’s own thinking (Akyol & Garrison, 2011). Garrison sees that in a CoI, there is a transaction between the educator and the learner (Garrison, 2017). In a CoI, the functions of the educator and the learner are more fluid (Garrison, 2017; Garrison et al, 2010; Garrison et al, 2000).

Garrison enumerates three dimensions of CoI, namely cognitive, social, and teaching presences (Garrison, 2017; Garrison et al, 2010; Garrison et al, 2000). These could easily be read as exclusive from one another. But the relationships between and among the presences must be seen as dynamic. The relationships are also mutually supportive. Cognitive presence is structured by practical inquiry. Such inquiry is composed of a fourfold procedure: the triggering event, exploration, integration, and resolution (Garrison et al, 2001). The triggering event evokes a sense of puzzlement from the learners as an introduction of the problem. It involves the facilitator asking questions. It also entails that the facilitator presents background information. And then, exploration comes in the divergence of views among the participants. Here, different views clash and personal anecdotes are inserted. Biases are also shown at this stage. Thirdly, integration begins with a clear convergence of ideas. Ideas start to build on each other. Lastly, resolution happens when the ideas are already applied to the real world. It is clear in this process that reflection leads to action. Such application is characteristic of metacognition (Akyol & Garrison, 2011). It is therefore in cognitive presence that the metacognitive aspects of education are most highlighted.

Social presence, on the other hand, is the participants' sense of community that in turn allows for a freer discussion. Garrison provides three categories: emotional expression, open communication, and group cohesion. Social presence therefore provides the affective aspect of CoI. With the right bidding, participants begin to express their own emotions. By being open with their feelings, participants become more open in communicating with the group. By building this openness, the facilitator begins to foster a cohesive group dynamic. As Garrison puts it: "In a true community of inquiry, the tone of the messages is questioning but engaging, expressive but responsive, skeptical but respectful, and challenging but supportive" (Garrison et al, 2000, p. 96) Hence, social presence further highlights the importance of the next presence.

Lastly, teaching presence is defined as the "the design, facilitation and direction of cognitive and social processes for the purpose of realizing personally meaningful and educationally worthwhile learning outcomes" (Anderson, Rourke, Garrison & Archer, 2001 as cited in Garrison, 2017, p. 27). They provide three categories as well: instructional management, building understanding, and direct instruction. It should be noted that this presence is not "teacher presence." Instead, Garrison calls it "teaching presence," to allude to the fluidity of roles in a CoI. In a CoI, both the students and the teacher take turns in facilitating discussions. Garrison notes that the shared role lies in the second category. In building understanding, both teacher and students contribute in facilitating discussion. According to them, this is more apt in online discussions. Instructional management, on the other hand, is provided by the teacher. Here, course content is discussed, providing students with a clear view of the course. Lastly, direct instruction is needed to provide guidance to students. Hence, in Garrison's CoI, teaching presence is much more active than in Lee's. This point shall be discussed further in the section dedicated to teaching presence.

Cognitive Presence: Widening of Horizons

Similarities in Cognitive Presence: Triggering Event, Exploration, and Integration

The paper now examines shared similarities between Lee's CoI with respect to Garrison's CoI. Lee's framework has been successfully pioneered in the Philippines while Garrison's has yet to be applied. This examination enumerates the three presences of Garrison's CoI, along with their corresponding categories. After this, common categories found between Lee's CoI and Garrison's CoI are identified.

The first presence is cognitive presence constituted by four procedures or categories: (1) triggering event, (2) exploration, (3) integration, and (4) resolution. Cognitive presence is not relatively controversial as both Lee and Garrison find much commonality here. This can apply to both synchronous and asynchronous settings. First, the triggering event or stimulus is a shared feature in the CoIs of Lee and of Garrison. Lee mentions that the stimulus for discussion can be a written text, video, cartoon, news, picture, poem, among others. According to Lee, this stimulus must be provocative enough to provoke substantial discourse. In terms of Garrison's CoI, this provocation is the sense of puzzlement evoked by any triggering event. Therefore, the triggering event is a shared feature of both CoIs.

Second, the stage of exploration is captured in both CoIs of Lee and of Garrison. Lee explains that the learning agenda must come from the participants and not the facilitator. Hence, student-centricity in CoI is evident in participants asking meaningful questions through the stimulus. These questions critically include the assumptions, implications, and evidence for holding a belief. This process strongly resembles the overall exploratory stage for Garrison. Additionally, Lee mentions that the CoI should bring out the different perspectives of participants. Garrison likewise acknowledges that exploration entails bringing out points of divergences among individuals in the CoI. Hence, exploration is also a commonality between the two frameworks.

Lastly, integration is also evident in Lee's CoI since being a community means being able to think together in a collaborative manner. Participants intently listen and respond to one another for the goal of building

on each other's ideas. Collaborative thinking culminates in the "widening of horizons" of each participant. The CoI is ultimately a collective achievement wherein everyone appends to each other's perspective. This can only be attained through the virtuous listening and respect for differences or various points of view. Lee calls this entire cognitive endeavour a constructivist one. In Garrison's framework, integration is precisely the process of synthesizing earlier points of divergences towards points of convergence. Moreover, Garrison himself recognizes the constructivist roots of his CoI through the philosophers Lipman and Dewey. Therefore, constructive integration is the last overlap between both CoIs in cognitive presence.

This concludes the similarities in the categories of cognitive presence in Lee's CoI and Garrison's CoI. Specifically, the triggering event, exploration, and integration stages are common features of both CoIs. In the succeeding parts of this section, two points are presented. First is the theoretical difference between the two CoIs. Particularly, there is a contrast in the stage of resolution between Lee and Garrison. Second, the other point is based on practical strategies for improving Lee's CoI through Garrison's framework. This is essential because Lee made no reference to developing cognitive presence in synchronous and/or asynchronous distance learning.

Theoretical Point of Disagreement in Lee's CoI: Resolution

The final category in the cognitive presence of Garrison's CoI is resolution. For Garrison, resolution is the final procedure wherein integrated ideas are applied to real-life scenarios. This application of shared perspectives is the aim of Garrison's CoI for attaining cognitive presence. However, it is unclear what resolution in a CoI means for Lee. He does not mention anything on resolution other than the achievement of a "widening of horizons." In other words, the practical result of CoI as a constructive process is seemingly not the primary concern of Lee. Building each other's ideas is the ultimate goal of CoI for Lee. Thus, there appears to be contrasting perspectives between Lee and Garrison on the cognitive goal of a CoI. However, this is understandable due to the differences in conceptions of constructive thinking.

Lee's constructivism is coming from a philosophical perspective wherein CoI may not necessarily have practical application. His CoI is also a

Community of Philosophical Inquiry (CPI). The goal of CoI and/or CPI may be either of the following: attaining the truth, weeding out falsehoods, constructing understanding, or simply improving discursive skills (Golding, 2017).

First, the constructivist nature of CoI may be aimed towards the extraction of a more holistic conception of truth. Lee likens this constructivism to the metaphor of the elephant and the blind men. A more complete and accurate picture of an issue should be the product of the CoI. This would be a closer approximation of the truth. Second, constructivism in CoI may be the overall process of eliminating false views. This is more realistic than arriving at a definite truth. Lee implies this as he acknowledges that the CoI is a trial and error process. Mistaken perspectives are inevitable but necessary in the journey of collective self-reflection. Third, constructivism in CoI may just be an activity of building understanding instead of uncovering the truth or removing falsities. The metaphor of “widening of horizons” by Lee pertains to the activity of adding on to the worldviews of others. Lastly, constructivism in CoI can also just be the discursive process itself. There is no necessary aim in CoI except discussion itself. Lee further mentions that CoI is an effective strategy for honing skills for inquiry.

In all these descriptions, the CoI of Lee is grounded in philosophical notions of constructivism. Lee underscores the deliberative procedure as the end. However, the end result of Garrison's resolution is practical application. For Garrison, deliberation is integration and not resolution. This practical resolution is less clear in Lee's framework. The most that can be gathered towards resolution in Lee's CoI is the “widening of horizons”. The “widening of horizons” can be argued to be the process of integration and also the end resolution itself. Nevertheless, resolution as the goal of CoI may not be directly applicable for Lee.

Garrison's CoI, however, is less philosophical but more “transactional” between individual and society (Garrison, 1995). His constructivism acknowledges its philosophical roots traced back to Lipmann and Dewey. However, Garrison focuses more on the psychology and sociology of the reciprocal exchange among participants. Constructivism is defined here to be “transactional” between the individual and society through the

process of inquiry. This dynamic of transactions is no less cultivated by the facilitator. Even Garrison's constructivist take on the philosopher Dewey is related to a more social scientific view through the psychologist Lev Vygotsky (Garrison, 2017; 2016). Thus, we can say that Garrison is bent on applying a socially scientific constructivism in the context of educational practice. For him, the facilitator must be aware of the individual psychological and collective sociological considerations of the community.

Garrison's CoI therefore deals less with the epistemic dilemmas of constructivism. Instead, it focuses towards a more scientific view of education in terms of psychology and sociology. This shift from a philosophical to socio-scientific perspective on CoI is nevertheless practical. Perhaps, this is to render the framework more cognitively measurable in both synchronous and asynchronous settings. Hence, Garrison would have to view the end product of CoI as practically applicable through resolution. The goal would be to scientifically test the cognitive effectiveness of CoI in online platforms.

Therefore, the theoretical differences in the category of resolution have been elaborated between Lee's and Garrison's CoIs. Garrison's resolution is pragmatic based on application of the integration stage. However, this resolution is not directly stated by Lee. At best, resolution for Lee need not have practical application of the discussion. In the succeeding part, practical suggestions are presented. These suggestions specify strategies to enhance cognitive presence in Lee's CoI, which are based on the four categories of cognitive presence.

Practical Points for Improvement in Lee's CoI for Cognitive Presence

Lee's discussion focuses on general principles that can guide the nurturing of an online CoI. These principles can be realized more closely with Garrison's categories of cognitive presence. There is a need to fill this gap between theory and application. In this regard, several studies have evaluated specific strategies in putting Garrison's CoI into practice. One of the most recent of these is Fiock's 2020 article. This article reviews existing empirical studies on strategy effectiveness. Fiock extracts specific strategies from these studies. He then groups these strategies according to Garrison's three presences. These strategies are intended to help build and improve these presences. In this section, some of these presence-categorized strategies

are selected. The selection is according to Lee's breakdown of Garrison's CoI. The objective is for these selected strategies to concretize Lee's conception of Garrison's CoI. Strategies are grouped according to Garrison's four categories of cognitive presence.

Garrison's first cognitive presence category is the triggering event. This category has an indicator of a sense of puzzlement. Similarly, Lee mentions the use of a provocative stimulus. This stimulus may be a written text, video, cartoon, news, picture, or poem. In the same vein, games, simulations, or stories can be used (Dunlap et al., 2016). Given this, there can be additional guidelines on the selection and use of these stimuli.

These stimuli should provide specific contexts that can involve students in concrete experiences. This specificity should be applied in instructional design for both synchronous and asynchronous learning. The more specific an experience is described in literature, the more universal and relatable it is (Lee, personal communication, 2014; 2017). This insight has an implication on stimuli choice. The more relatable a story is, the more it can engage a reader. With engagement and foundation in familiarity, provocation can be more easily produced. That is, specificities provided can become starting points to expand one's curiosity. The more specifics there are, the more starting points for puzzlement there can be. These starting points are important for the next cognitive presence category.

This second category is Garrison's exploration with an indicator of information exchange. For this category, Lee mentions how the learning agenda should come from participants. It is in this aspect that a provocative stimulus is essential. A stimulus should be able to compel students to verbalize their puzzlement. This puzzlement on the issues presented or implied in the stimulus is a launching pad. With enough provocation, students ask their own questions. Because the questions are their own, they themselves can plan how to answer these. This independent style of learning can be more specifically encouraged. Students should be allowed to search, create, and post materials and resources (Dunlap & Lowenthal, 2018). These materials can also involve a wide variety of online platforms and applications. This leeway enables students to choose how to answer questions and complete requirements. Students' choices can be according to what is fun for them.

When students have fun, they continue being engaged in exploring questions provoked by a text or educational stimuli.

Lee further characterizes the questions generated from the stimulus. These questions should be critical and should include assumptions, implications, and pieces of evidence. Students can be specifically encouraged to generate these kinds of questions through certain activities. These activities may include journaling or blogging that can foster reflective observation (Dunlap et al., 2016). Such can be assigned to students. Reflective observation occurs when students reflect or pay attention to the different aspects of their experiences. These experiences include how students ask questions. Through the students' reflective observation, the teacher can evaluate the students' questions. These questions can be evaluated according to assumptions, implications, and pieces of evidence used.

In these reflective observation activities, teachers can ask specific questions to probe students' knowledge. An example of a probing question is "why". Another is the question: "How do you know that's true?" (Rovai, 2000, p. 294). These questions can make the students try to surface their own assumptions and implications. These questions can be asked to an individual or a group. Group dynamics are important for the next cognitive presence category.

The third category following the triggering event and exploration is integration. This cognitive presence category has an indicator of connecting ideas. This indicator connects well with Lee's integration as collaborative thinking. This begs the question on the activities that can promote integration in Lee's CoI. This question is crucial for both integration and the next category, resolution. After all, Lee seems to present a close connection between these two. Collaboration in the integration stage or process can lead to a "widening of horizons", which in turn, is the supposed resolution for Lee.

Collaborative thinking wherein students build on each other's ideas can be encouraged through group activities. These activities can include debates and discussion groups (Rovai, 2000). In collaborative activities, it is important for students to listen and respond to each other. In this way, one's views can be put into conversation with others' views (Stewart, 2017).

Activities that can allow this kind of interaction include virtual cafes, wikis, and blogs. Responding to each other is also possible through peer review of each others' discussion posts (Stephens & Roberts, 2017). With these interactions, diverse perspectives can be aired and encouraged (Stephens & Roberts, 2017). The fostering of diversity is helpful for Lee's interpretation of Garrison's last cognitive category: resolution.

In the last category, Lee's resolution is not equivalent to Garrison's. The closest equivalence to resolution is the students' "widening of horizons" for Lee. This "widening of horizons" can be achieved in group discussions and activities which encourage reflection (Dunlap et al., 2016). Reflection from group activities can help students think about their own and others' perspectives (Redmond, 2014). It is hoped that with a peer-supported instructional design, Lee's constructivist goal can still be achieved.

These strategies that promote the four categories do not exist in a vacuum. To establish cognitive presence, another kind of presence, social presence, is necessary. The next section of the paper tackles social presence in Lee and Garrison.

Social Presence: Online Asynchronous Friendship

Similarities in Social Presence: Emotional Expression, Open Communication, and Group Cohesion

The next presence in Garrison's framework is social presence. Social presence has the categories of (1) emotional expression, (2) open communication, and (3) group cohesion. In terms of similarities, Lee's description of CoI generally matches with all of Garrison's categories in this presence. Social presence can be deemed as the least controversial presence between the two CoI paradigms.

First, emotional expression can still be felt in online synchronous interaction according to Lee. One can feel the "energies" of another even just by turning on one's camera in a Zoom meeting. For Garrison, these "energies" can be affective reactions to the process of inquiry required to develop social presence. Second, open communication is also evident in Lee's CoI in the

discussion among participants. As mentioned earlier, each must listen to one another's perspectives without any bias or judgment. This atmosphere of free discussion is exactly what must be cultivated in Garrison's CoI. Finally, group cohesion for Lee culminates in participants putting themselves in the position of the other person. This empathetic practice gives value to every participant as they are in themselves. Moreover, this exercise can only be fostered in an atmosphere of mutual trust, acceptance, and friendship. In a similar vein, the CoI of Garrison is primarily intended for the collaborative experience of participants bound with a sense of community.

Emotional expression, open communication, and group cohesion are manifestations of social presence. These are all shared categories between Lee's and Garrison's CoI. However, for Lee, social presence can definitely be experienced in synchronous contexts like in Zoom discussions. This begs the question of how social presence can be attained in asynchronous settings. This will be problematized in the succeeding part of this section.

*Theoretical Point of Disagreement in Lee's CoI:
Asynchronous Social Presence*

It has been established that the categories of social presence in Garrison's CoI are met by Lee's CoI. However, this presence may only be applicable in synchronous and not asynchronous set-ups for Lee. He mentions the possibility of friendship as an indicator of social presence within synchronous settings, i.e., Zoom conferencing. As long as the participant feels the "energies" of the other, social presence can be attained. This may be questionable as the term "energies" itself is possibly vague and undermined in asynchronous contexts. In these situations, face-to-face discussions are absent. It is unclear how social presence and relations can be strengthened in asynchronous distance learning through Lee's discussion. There was no particular mention of how this can be achieved.

Garrison's CoI, on the other hand, was conceptualized in primarily asynchronous text-based discussions at the beginning of the 21st century. This was studied way before the advent of synchronous video-conferencing. Literature based on Garrison's CoI has emerged and developed significantly since then to include even synchronous and blended learning settings (Laforune & Lakhali, 2019; Rockinson-Szapkiw et al., 2016; Szeto, 2015).

Nonetheless, the formulation of the three presences were originally researched in asynchronous classes.

It seems then that Garrison's CoI has an advantage over Lee's CoI in asynchronous settings. Lee does not discuss any implication for friendship in such situations. However, this is understandable as the CoI in P4C has conventionally thrived in face-to-face interactions. Such interactions, however, are rendered gravely limited in the midst of the pandemic. The closest approximation of a physical CoI would be synchronous class settings. Here, the traditional CoI of P4C and online friendship can potentially flourish. However, distance learning also entails asynchronous contexts which have not been directly addressed by Lee. Nevertheless, such limitations in Lee's CoI can be supplemented by recommendations from Garrison's CoI. In the next part of this section, asynchronous social presence or friendship in Lee's CoI is enhanced. The reference will be the three categories of social presence.

Practical Points for Improvement in Lee's CoI for Social Presence

Lee's social presence as "energies" can still be translated to strategies in asynchronous learning. A similar approach in this paper's section on cognitive presence strategies will be used. This section will again use Fiock's literature review. Articles that Fiock endorses regarding the promotion of social presence are examined. Asynchronous learning strategies are extracted from these articles. These strategies will be discussed according to Garrison's three social presence categories.

First, Lee mentions how a person's "energies" can be detected online. This "energy" relates to Garrison's social category of emotional expression with an indicator of emotion. CoI participants can still emotionally express themselves in an asynchronous setting. A recommended strategy is the use of online discussion forums or boards. A section of these forums should be devoted to students introducing themselves. The instructor can design icebreakers for students. These icebreakers should allow students to get to know each other's academic backgrounds and interests (Stephens & Roberts, 2017). Bonus points can be assigned to these activities. These incentives should be instituted early in the course. As such, necessary student-to-student communication can be facilitated early.

The discussion forums can also be used as a venue to discuss class lessons. The teacher can pose questions that students are required to answer in the forums. The teacher can specifically instruct students to share personal examples and experiences (Stewart, 2017). What results is a combination of lessons with something personal. Insights about the lessons become more real because they become connected to specific people behind them. In the sharing of real experiences, students' emotions can be expressed and shared.

Next, open communication is Garrison's second social presence category. Because one's emotional expression is important, listening to this expression should be valued as well. Lee talks about how listening should be without bias or judgment. This kind of listening is important to attain open communication. This category's indicator is risk-free expression. Risk-free expression is especially ideal to encourage people to honestly express their emotions. Given these, there are specific strategies to attain risk-free open communication in asynchronous learning. For example, it is necessary to establish netiquette or network etiquette. Netiquette refers to rules regarding student participation and interaction with each other (Wade & Fauske, 2004). Netiquette can be included as a grading component or criterion in online asynchronous discussions. This strategy can help encourage desired values that promote a safe learning environment. In such an environment, open communication can be safer or more risk-free.

With the right instructional design, activities for open communication can be promoted. The instructional design should have tasks that allow students to listen to other students. The previous category's online discussion boards are useful here as well. Listening in this context is paying attention to what others say in written form. After listening, the teacher can instruct students to react to their classmates' posts in specific ways. Reactions include asking a question to the previous poster or offering a different perspective. Students can make these reactions by being attentive to their classmates' views. Thus, a certain kind of listening is cultivated. There are indicators of this kind of listening in the forums. Forum indicators include "I agree with you on this idea because x " or "I think that this means y " (Stewart, 2017, p. 73).

Another use of the online asynchronous forum is as a virtual social cafe. A virtual social cafe is “a safe place to meet, discuss, and share concerns” (Peacock & Cowan, 2016). This venue can facilitate student and even staff dialogue. The teacher may also opt to not participate in this cafe. This strategy may encourage more students to freely air what they want to say. The virtual cafe can be a venue not just for academic matters. It can be a place where students vent out concerns about personal or work life (Peacock & Hooper, 2007).

The final social presence category is group cohesion. The various forums mentioned together with establishing netiquette are recommended for risk-free open communication. This kind of communication makes sense in light of Garrison's group cohesion. Group cohesion has an indicator of encouraging collaboration. Lee characterizes this collaboration as involving empathy, mutual trust, and acceptance or friendship. Specific activities to promote this kind of collaboration in an asynchronous setting can be provided.

Such activities can be incorporated in a teacher's instructional design (Stephens & Roberts, 2017). This is to strive for an ideal collaborative activity. Here, students should work together on the same questions instead of separately on different questions. Grouping of students should not be assigned by the teacher. Instead, students should pick their own group. The teacher can also make students cover materials on how to work with groupmates. Students can be quizzed on these materials. Furthermore, group assignments can pose questions of a certain kind (Stephens & Roberts, 2017). These questions include issues with no wrong or right answers. This question type allows students to air their multiple perspectives. Examples include exploration of current events, cultural comparisons, or case studies involving different viewpoints. An assignment can also be applicational like creating a product based on existing reviews. This application involves the integration of knowledge of different group members. The use or creation of blogs and wikis can also be incorporated to aid collaboration.

Another tool that can be used in collaborative activities is the online asynchronous discussion board (Stewart, 2017). The teacher can require students to reply to their classmates' posts. These replies can actually be

incorporated in, for instance, an individual essay assignment. To illustrate, students can cite the replies of their classmates in their essays. From this method, students gain new knowledge from their classmates' posts and replies. Classmates' replies are particularly interesting when these replies use personal experiences. Students have more trust that the replies are real because of their personal relevance.

Another activity allows student access to classmates' personal insights. This activity is the use of peer review. Students get to be acquainted with how others interpret the assignments and put personal answers (Lowenthal & Dunlap, 2018). Because of this opportunity to understand others' perspectives, connections among students are cultivated. In addition to these activities, the virtual student cafe is helpful for building empathy. This venue lets students encourage each other to complete course requirements (Peacock & Hooper, 2007). It can also be a place where students share similar worries. It can be helpful when students realize how they feel the same at certain times (Peacock & Cowan, 2016).

It is hoped that with these strategies, students can build relationships of a certain quality. Supported by empathy and trust, the students can develop relationships with acceptance. They accept not only each others' different views but also each other as persons. However, aside from student-to-student relations, teacher-student relations also matter. The teacher's role is emphasized in teaching presence in the succeeding section.

Teaching Presence: Role of the Facilitator

Similarities in Teaching Presence: Building Understanding

The final presence in Garrison's CoI is teaching presence with three categories. These are (1) building understanding, (2) instructional management, and (3) direct instruction. It is worth noting that teaching presence is the most contentious presence in Lee's CoI with respect to Garrison's CoI. This is due to the divergent perspectives of the role of the facilitator between Lee's and Garrison's frameworks. In fact, building understanding on the part of the facilitator is the only shared category between the two CoIs.

For Lee, building understanding is a crucial skill for a facilitator so that participants attain a “widening of horizons”. Lee’s CoI as a student-centered learning approach emphasizes the participant’s activity in the discussion. Students’ participation is prioritized over the facilitator’s intervention. In Garrison’s CoI, this is a point of convergence as the facilitator must engage participants in an environment conducive to collaborative thinking. Therefore, the first category is exhibited in both Lee’s and Garrison’s CoI. However, this may be the only explicit point of agreement between the two. For the categories of instructional management and direct instruction, there are differing interpretations. These are owed to the differences in the roles of the facilitator. Such will be argued in the next part of this section.

***Theoretical Points of Disagreement in Lee’s CoI:
Instructional Management and Direct Instruction***

As earlier established, instructional management and direct instruction are two contentious tasks of the facilitator. These tasks are not clearly demonstrated in Lee’s CoI in light of Garrison’s framework. First, the second stage of instructional management in Lee’s CoI is not expounded on. According to Lee, the facilitator must presumably “disappear” or “vanish”. The learning agenda must originate among the participants without the direct interference of the facilitator. This should ensure a genuine community of inquirers engaging in discourse independently among themselves. This may be effective in face-to-face or even synchronous settings. However, asynchronous contexts would require more direct involvement by the facilitator. This may include careful organization, planning, and designing of an asynchronous course. All these require tremendous effort on the part of the teacher in Garrison’s CoI.

Second, even the last category of direct instruction contrasts with the ultimate aim of Lee’s CoI. This aim is the vanishing or disappearance of the teacher. The facilitator’s role in Lee’s framework is secondary to the engagement of the participants. Therefore, traditional teacher-centered pedagogies would not be as important. Any form of didactic approach to teaching such as lecturing does not uphold the student-centric education of CoI in P4C. The “widening of horizons” can only be achieved through the individual and collective endeavours of participants. The facilitator is a mere mediator of discourse. Ideally, this can again apply more appropriately to

face-to-face and synchronous classroom settings. However, Garrison's facilitator in the CoI needs some direct interaction in asynchronous contexts. There is a more active role for facilitators here. They must guide participants in the absence of physical or synchronous discussions. Otherwise, students will be left clueless or demotivated to continue the learning process.

Therefore, comparing Lee's and Garrison's CoIs leads to the unclear extent of the "disappearance" of the facilitator. The question is whether the facilitator should be more or less active in directly instructing or managing discussions. More active efforts of the facilitator are demonstrated in Garrison's CoI. His CoI maintains the crucial role of the teacher in intentionally cultivating social and cognitive presence. The teacher should initiate more active involvement in the course through carefully designing it. Moreover, the teacher should provide more instructional interventions in the distance learning setting. This is the case for both synchronous and, more importantly, asynchronous contexts. This proactive aspect of facilitation is not clearly touched upon by Lee's CoI. More passive intervention by the facilitator is supported by Lee's framework. However, this may again be attributed to the fact that Lee's CoI is more applicable to face-to-face or synchronous interactions.

In light of these, the paper will make final suggestions on how to develop teaching presence in Lee's CoI. It is possible that the vanishing of the facilitator may still synchronously or asynchronously occur. However, this may be better accomplished through strategies from Garrison's CoI. These will be tackled in the last part of this section through the three categories of teaching presence.

Practical Points for Improvement in Lee's CoI for Teaching Presence

This section presents more specific strategies that can promote teaching presence. Using Fiock's article again as a starting point, strategies from this literature review are grouped according to Garrison's categories. These strategies are discussed in ways consistent with Garrison's active teacher. The strategies are related to how Lee's teacher can still disappear to some extent.

First, Garrison's category of instructional management has an indicator of defining and initiating discussion topics. This category involves extensive preparation before the start of the course. It should be noted that it is ideal to have a smaller ratio of students to instructors (Rovai, 2000). This precaution gives the teacher more time for reviewing students' thoughts in discussions and requirements. More time can also be spent in paying attention to students' differing personal needs. Furthermore, individual student needs can be anticipated by including requirements that cater to different learning styles. A related guideline is to accommodate cultural differences in assigning sources and activities (Dunlap & Lowenthal, 2018).

Considering the diversity of learning styles and student interpretations, course organization should be clear. Clarity especially matters in asynchronous learning. In such a setup, there are less face-to-face interactions to clarify issues. A course orientation can help in student guidance (Lowenthal & Dunlap, 2018). The teacher should also mention her availability, so students know the teacher's response time (Watson et al., 2017). What can further help organization is if students can easily navigate the course. It helps that online resources require only one click (Dunlap & Lowenthal, 2018). Clear organization is coupled with clear instructions, especially at the start of the course. Students should be explicitly instructed on how student-to-student interactions are important (Stewart, 2017). This instruction is necessary in a CoI course because the CoI includes collaborative group activities (Dunlap & Lowenthal, 2018).

With all these preparations, instructional management involves a lot of teaching presence. If this category is executed well, Lee's disappearing teacher can still be achieved. With good course organization and clear instructions early on, students can have appropriate course expectations. This set-up leads to students being able to work more independently. However, doing instructional management well is not enough. Ensuring a smooth course requires attention from the teacher for the whole course duration. In this aspect, two other categories are important.

The next teaching presence category is building understanding with an indicator of sharing personal meaning. This category coincides with Lee's conception of the teacher as facilitator. As a facilitator, the goal is to guide

students to widen their horizons. In this facilitation, a teacher should balance how much she interacts with student discussions. A teacher can guide the discussion by explicitly telling students to share their experiences and views (Stewart, 2017). In this way, the sharing of meaning among students is promoted. The goal is for students to build new ways of understanding from their classmates' views. A teacher may also be active in discussion boards. However, posting ideas immediately can stop the flow of student discussion (Watson et al., 2017).

Finally, the last teaching presence category is direct instruction. Sometimes facilitation may not be enough and direct instruction may be needed. This category has an indicator of focusing instruction. Direct instruction strategies include clarity of instructions and the quality of a teacher's feedback. Moreover, direct instruction covers being concrete and explicit in directions for projects, assignments, and activities. Being redundant with instructions helps (Dunlap & Lowenthal, 2018). The goal is for students not to get lost during the course. With clear instructions, students can focus on widening their horizons in their interactions with others.

What can also facilitate this "widening of horizons" is the teacher's feedback. Assignments and requirements should be promptly returned (Watson et al., 2017). Feedback should be included, even just the acknowledgement of receipt of a requirement (Rovai, 2000). This kind of interaction prevents the students from repeatedly sending follow-ups. Feedback should ideally be personalized (Lowenthal & Dunlap, 2018). Personalized feedback makes students feel connected to their teachers. Ideally, feedback should be dialogical (Burns & Foo, 2014). That is, students can pose questions to the teacher's comments, and the teacher should respond. This interaction provides more clarity to feedback.

In providing feedback and instructions, teachers should be careful of how much influence they exert. For Lee's disappearing teacher to be realized, students must be given space. This space or leeway can allow them to nurture their own ideas. Part of this goal is the effective collaboration with others. Ideas can be built by incorporating others' viewpoints or reacting to these. All these endeavors need to be realized with some degree of student

independence. Balance is contextual regarding how much teaching presence should be present.

This paper has provided different strategies for the categories of the three presences. The final section of the paper gives institutional recommendations in light of these strategies. Recommendations are also founded on the appraised CoI of Lee through Garrison's framework.

Implications for Institutional Recommendations for Online CoI in the Philippines

Lee's CoI has been given suggestions for improvement based on Garrison's CoI. This is in light of the similarities and differences between the two frameworks. At this point, an improved CoI of Lee is suggested for implementation in higher education in the Philippines. To achieve this, the paper provides some implications of CoI implementation on the higher educational programs in the country. This means that adjustments in Philippine tertiary education are needed. This section outlines such preliminary policy implications. These are not meant to be comprehensive due to the lack of empirical studies for applying online CoIs in the Philippines. Instead, the paper concludes with broad suggestions for future policy-making in higher education.

General recommendations for higher educational institutions are given with some context of online CoIs. It should be noted that research on applying CoIs online has flourished in more technologically advanced countries. Literature on online CoIs in the Philippines is comparatively limited. This may be attributed to the poor state of technological infrastructure of the country. In particular, the Philippines still grapples with problems in internet connectivity, gadget ownership, and technical knowledge. Thus, internet, gadgets, and training or programs on technical management must be subsidized and provided by relevant educational institutions. These problems and institutional support apply to both students and teachers.

First, access to the internet must be made widely available to all students and teachers. Higher educational institutions should be mindful of this and support internet availability. As mentioned, Garrison's CoI early on

focused on asynchronous modes of learning. However, Lee's and more recent versions of Garrison's CoI recognized the shift to synchronous discussions. Such synchronous discussions entail more stable internet connectivity. This connectivity is both on the part of the teacher and of the students. The case for internet subsidy is apparent.

Aside from connectivity, students and teachers also need the equipment to connect to the Internet. Smartphones alone are not sufficient to carry out the specific strategies for CoI. This applies to synchronous and asynchronous activities. Laptops, desktops, headphones, and earphones are some suitable gadgets for distance learning. These must be afforded to both students and teachers for a meaningful learning experience. The tertiary education sector badly needs to invest in relevant equipment for distance learning.

Lastly, distance learning also entails the technical know-how of teachers. Teachers are left by themselves in troubleshooting and operating different programs. These programs are used in platforms, such as virtual cafes, wikis, and discussion boards. These platforms were discussed previously as specific strategies for improving social presence in Lee's CoI. Teachers, however, may even lack the technical knowledge to navigate around these platforms. Tertiary education institutions should, therefore, provide avenues for educating teachers on technical management. These may come in the form of trainings on navigating virtual platforms and subsidizing program subscriptions.

Other more general recommendations assess the overall educational landscape at the tertiary level. These include discussions of outcome-based education, traditional pedagogy, and curricular adoption of CoI.

First, the implementation of K-12 in the Philippines came with an outcomes-based education (OBE) framework (Commission on Higher Education, 2012). OBE has been widely criticized during its early implementation in the 1990s (Jansen, 1999; Kraak, 1999), especially by liberal arts practitioners (Bolaños, 2019). The Philippines has adopted OBE as its primary educational framework. Furthermore, OBE is notably geared towards measurable outcomes. This approach appears to contradict Lee's CoI

paradigm. The “widening of horizons” in Lee’s CoI can only be achieved within a progressive educational framework. This progressive quality does not necessarily entail measurable outcomes for learning. Hence, OBE disregards the immeasurability of Lee’s CoI’s deliberative practice. Lee’s goal for a CoI is not transactional like Garrison’s framework. His CoI emphasizes less on practical results that can be measured. It focuses more on the discussion itself. Hence, implementing CoI in Philippine classrooms means a critical evaluation of the OBE framework.

Second, traditional ways of teaching are also an obstacle in CoI. CoI is a student-centered pedagogical tool. Therefore, CoI cannot be practiced in normal lecture-based practice. The teacher should not be the sole source of knowledge in CoI. Instead, CoI is based on the collaborative learning of the participants. The tendency of teachers to lecture has been evident since the local introduction of CoI in the 1990s (Mancenido-Bolaños, 2018). Many of the teachers trained by Lee and his team before were unfamiliar with a student-centered pedagogy. However, it was clear that the trainees responded positively to the P4C approach. They were also interested in learning more about its proper conduct. This leads to the last recommendation.

Finally, college-level teachers should be educated on CoI. Lipman himself mentioned that CoI be implemented by teachers educated in CoI (Mancenido-Bolanos, 2018). Teachers will continue to teach in the same way as they have been trained. Hence, it is recommended that CoI be incorporated in teachers’ education curriculum. However, no teacher’s education curriculum is mandated to teach CoI as of writing. In the two largest universities in Manila, education majors are not required to take related philosophy courses. These universities are the University of the Philippines and the University of Santo Tomas. This means that teachers lack the proper philosophical background to implement CoI. Therefore, philosophical training of CoI should be given to practicing and future teachers. It could further improve their facilitation skills in distance learning. Ultimately, CoI needs to be institutionalized in the education curriculum.

In this section, the paper concluded with the implications of the appraised CoI of Lee in light of Garrison’s CoI. These implications deal with future policies in Philippine tertiary education. This section also enumerated

general institutional recommendations. These include investing in internet connectivity, equipment, and technical management. This section then moved to discussing more far-reaching recommendations. Such involve evaluation of the OBE framework, focus on student-centered pedagogy, and inclusion of CoI in education curricula.

Conclusion

Lee's contribution to introducing the CoI of P4C in the Philippines has been groundbreaking, but it is limited to face-to-face education. The pandemic has made physical interactions among students and teachers extremely challenging. Fortunately, the CoI of Garrison et al. had already been applied to distance education. It was the goal of the paper to compare and contrast the two CoI frameworks. Lee's CoI is crucially maintained given its acceptance and familiarity in the Philippines. At the same time, insights and strategies from Garrison's CoI would further update Lee's CoI towards online contexts. In the end, the paper attained its objective of appraising the CoI of Lee in light of Garrison's CoI framework.

As a review, the backgrounds of both Lee's and Garrison's frameworks were summarized. Each of the three presences were then highlighted in the main body. Cognitive presence, social presence, and teaching presence were given separate discussions. In each discussion, three points were raised. The first are the points of agreement between Lee's and Garrison's CoIs. Their similarities were extracted in these parts. The second are the points of disagreement between the two frameworks. Explained here were theoretical differences between Lee's and Garrison's approaches on the particular presence discussed. The third are points for improvement in Lee's CoI given Garrison's CoI. Presented here were practical strategies from Garrison's framework through Fiock's literature review. This specific presentation aimed at enhancing Lee's CoI for every presence introduced. At the end of the discussion, Lee's CoI was developed through Garrison's framework to accommodate distance learning settings. Finally, the paper concluded with implications for some institutional recommendations in applying the appraised CoI within the Philippines. These were suggested in the context of higher education institutions.

While the recommendations have been made, the authors of this paper hope this research is only the beginning. This study is an invitation to further explore the use of CoI for distance education in the Philippines. CoI should be taken seriously as a pedagogical tool for higher learning. Such can be achieved through amplifying the already existing CoI by Lee. At the same time, the three presences in the CoI by Garrison can be incorporated for the online setting. Future contributions and institutional reforms regarding this research are highly encouraged. The pandemic has put a temporary halt to face-to-face interactions with one another. However, it will not diminish the sense of community that a CoI brings to the learning experience. The CoI can and will prevail, both physically and virtually. How this may be done is now up to our collaborative efforts as a CoI would want it.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the support of fellow members of the extension project "Teaching Ethics in the Time of COVID: Using Community of Inquiry as Framework." That project allowed for scholarly lectures and discussions that became the starting point of this publication. Special thanks are also due to Mr. Redempto Parafina, Dr. Zosimo Lee, and our anonymous reviewer for their comments on the earlier versions of our manuscript.

WORKS CITED

- Akyol, Z., Garrison, D. R. (2011). Assessing metacognition in an online community of inquiry. *Internet and Higher Education*, 14, 183-190.
- Bolaños, Paolo. (2019). Speed and its impact on education. *Inquirer.net*. Retrieved July 26, 2020, from <https://opinion.inquirer.net/124900/speed-and-its-impact-on-education>
- Burns, C., Foo, M. (2014) What are our international students telling us? Further explorations of a formative feedback intervention, to support academic literacy. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education Journal*, 8(1), 74-88. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1130322.pdf>
- Dunlap, J. C., Verma, G., & Johnson, H. L. (2016). Presence+experience: A framework for the purposeful design of presence in online courses. *TechTrends*, 60, 145-151. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-016-0029-4>
- Dunlap, J. C., & Lowenthal, P. R. (2018). Online educators' recommendations for teaching online: Crowdsourcing in action. *Open Praxis*, 10(1), 79-89. <https://doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.10.1.721>
- Flock, H. S. (2020). Designing a Community of Inquiry in online courses. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 21(1), 135–152. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v20i5.3985>
- Garrison, D. R. (1995). Constructivism and the role of self instructional course materials: A reply. *Distance Education*, 16(1), 136–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0158791950160110>
- Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 2(2-3), 87-105. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516\(00\)00016-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6)
- Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2001). Critical thinking, cognitive presence, and computer conferencing in distance education. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1). Retrieved June 20, 2020, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/222474115_Critical_Inquiry_in_a_Text-Based_Environment_Computer_Conferencing_in_Higher_Education
- Garrison, D. R. (2016). The Community of Inquiry. In *Thinking collaboratively: Learning in a community of inquiry* (pp. 53–66). Routledge.
- Garrison, D. R. (2017). Community of Inquiry. In *E-Learning in the 21st Century: A Community of Inquiry framework for research and practice* (3rd ed., pp. 22–34). Routledge.
- Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2010). The first decade of the community of inquiry framework: A retrospective. *Internet and Higher Education*, 13, 5-9.

- Golding, C. (2017). Getting Better Ideas: A framework for understanding epistemic philosophical progress in Philosophy for Children. In M. R. Gregory, J. Haynes, & K. Murriss (Eds.), *The Routledge International Handbook of Philosophy for Children* (pp. 65–73). Routledge.
- Guidelines on the Implementation of Flexible Learning. (2020)*. Commission on Higher Education. https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DRAFT-Guidelines-Flexible-Learning_for-Public-Consultation.pdf
- Hinteregger, E. (2018, September 16). Community of inquiry framework [Video]. Youtube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YsNeJPBiDeA>
- Jansen, Jonathan D. (1999). Setting the Scene: Historiographies of Curriculum Policy in South Africa. In J. D. Jansen & P. Christie (Eds.), *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-based Education in South Africa*, (pp. 3-20). Kenwyn: Juta & Co.
- Kraak, Andre. (1999). Competing Education & training Policy Discourses: A 'Systemic' versus 'Unit Standards' Framework. In J. D. Jansen & P. Christie (Eds.), *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-based Education in South Africa*, (pp. 31-58). Kenwyn: Juta & Co.
- Laforune, A.-M., & Lakhali, S. (2019). Differences in Students' Perceptions of the Community of Inquiry in a Blended Synchronous Delivery Mode. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*, 45(3). <https://doi.org/10.21432/cjlt27839>
- Lee, Z. (2009). Philosophy for children in the Philippines. In E. Marsal, T. Dobashi, & B. Weber (Eds.), *Children philosophize worldwide: Theoretical and practical concepts*. Peter Lang.
- Lee, Z. (2015). Nurturing Communities of Inquiry in Philippine schools. *Suri*, 4(1), 1-14. Retrieved February 15, 2021, from https://suri.pap73.org/issue4/Lee_SURI_2015.pdf
- Lee, Z. (2019). Philosophy for children and Community of Inquiry. In *Philosophy and pedagogy. Special intensive courses for philosophy educators (25-29 July) UST Department of Philosophy in partnership with CHED*. See video at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZZwN-qJtTQQ>
- Lipman, M. (2003). *Thinking in Education* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Lowenthal, P. R., & Dunlap, J. C. (2018). Investigating students' perceptions of instructional strategies to establish social presence. *Distance Education*, 39(3), 281-298. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2018.1476844>
- Mancenido-Bolaños, M. A. V. (2018). Narrowing the Gap between Theory and Practice: Community of Inquiry and Its State in the Philippines. *Kritike*, 12(2), 140-156.
- PAP Mid-Year Conference 2012. (2012)*. Philosophical Association of the Philippines. <https://pap73.org/mid-year-2012.html>

- Peacock, S., & Hooper, J. (2007). E-learning in physiotherapy education. *Physiotherapy*, 93(3), 218–228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physio.2006.11.009>
- Peacock, S., & Cowan, J. (2016). From presences to linked influences within communities of inquiry. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 17(5), 267-283. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1117447>
- Redmond, P. (2014). Reflection as an indicator of cognitive presence. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 11(1), 46-58. <https://doi.org/10.2304/elea.2014.11.1.46>
- Rockinson-Szapkiw, A. J., Wendt, J., Wighting, M., & Nisbet, D. (2016). The Predictive Relationship Among the Community of Inquiry Framework, Perceived Learning and Online, and Graduate Students' Course Grades in Online Synchronous and Asynchronous Courses. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 17(3), 18–35. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v17i3.2203>
- Rovai, A. P. (2000). Building and sustaining community in asynchronous learning networks. *Internet and Higher Education*, 3(4), 285–297. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516\(01\)00037-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(01)00037-9)
- Stephens, G. E., & Roberts, K. L. (2017). Facilitating collaboration in online groups. *Journal of Educators Online*, 14(1). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1133614>
- Stewart, M. K. (2017). Communities of inquiry: A heuristic for designing and assessing interactive learning activities in technology-mediated FYC. *Computers and Composition*, 45, 67-84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2017.06.004>
- Szeto, E. (2015). Community of Inquiry as an instructional approach: What effects of teaching, social and cognitive presences are there in blended synchronous learning and teaching? *Computer & Education*, 81, 191–201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2014.10.015>
- UP Department of Philosophy. (2020, November 16). [Now streaming] Teaching ethics in the time of COVID-19: using Community of Inquiry as framework [video]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/watch/live/?v=291240755470001&ref=watch_permalink
- UP Department of Philosophy. (2020, November 16). [Now streaming] Part 2 of teaching ethics in the time of COVID-19: using Community of Inquiry as framework [video]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/watch/live/?v=2624981634431597&ref=watch_permalink
- Wade, S. E., & Fauske, J. R. (2004). Dialogue online: Prospective teachers' discourse strategies in computer-mediated discussions. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(2), 134-160. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.39.2.1>
- Watson, F. F., Bishop, M. C., & Ferdinand-James, D. (2017). Instructional strategies to help online students learn: Feedback from online students. *TechTrends*, 61, 420-427. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-017-0216-y>