

Lesson 3.

Body Piercing – The Debate.

Context of Lesson:

The regulation of body piercing.

Learning Objectives:

To understand that people have different opinions and that this can depend on their experience.

To be able to see that opinions can affect decision making.

Learning Outcomes: (W.I.L.F. - What I am looking for...)

All to know that body piercing has associated risks and that we need to take the risks into account when making informed decisions.

Most to know that the risks involved must be considered when making decisions on legislation.

Some to understand that looking at all opinions can be helpful in formulating a strong argument to support a decision.

Resources:

PowerPoint presentation: *"Body Piercing – The Debate"*.

2 x video sequences – embedded links within the PowerPoint.

"If you were Prime Minister" worksheet.

Starter Activity:

Reminder of Christina's campaign.

Show video 8 – *"View from the Street 2"*.

Discussion views and opinions.

Main Activities:

Show video 9 – *"The Debate"*.

Feedback: how did the opinions of Christina Anderson, the MP and the local authority Environmental Health Officer differ?

In groups, using the opinions from one of the version of the *"If you were Prime Minister"* worksheets chosen to suit the groups' abilities, formulate a strong argument for or against strengthening body piercing legislation. [Note Version 1 of the worksheet is for groups with the most ability to debate issues, and version 3 is for groups with a lesser ability in that area. Version 2 sits between 1 and 3.]

Plenary Activity:

Groups present their arguments to the class.

Like lesson 2, this lesson can also be regarded as an extension activity. It returns to the story of Daniel Hindle and gives the students the opportunity to debate the issues and opinions that are to be considered when legislating for the way body piercing is regulated. It presents students with the scenario, 'what would you do if you were Prime Minister?'