What does philosophy do?

Understanding the work that philosophy does: A review of the literature on the teaching and learning of philosophy in schools

Lynne Bowyer

Claire Amos

Deborah Stevens

The New Zealand Centre for Science & Citizenship

Correspondence: lynne@nzcsc.org

Abstract

This paper is based on a literature review of articles discussing the teaching and learning of philosophy in primary and secondary schools. The purpose of this review was to address two research questions:

What *is* philosophy?

What does philosophy do?

This paper addresses the second question—What does philosophy do?—by gathering together research that focuses on and discusses the impact of philosophy in the classroom.

Two distinct claims emerge from the literature. The first claim is that philosophy improves academic and cognitive abilities, where the idea of 'cognition' is captured by forms of reasoning that can be tested and measured. The evidence for improvement in academic and cognitive abilities takes the form of IQ scores, Cognitive Abilities Test (CAT) and school academic assessments, including norm-referenced tests of reading, reasoning, and other curriculum-related assessments. The second claim is that engaging with the world philosophically promotes the art of living well together. It is argued that philosophical engagement is a collaborative endeavour, aimed at cultivating understanding through respectful interactions that are open to exploring, questioning and challenging aspects of the world. The outcome of engaging in philosophical conversations is personal and social transformation.

Key Words

academic ability, cognition, collaboration, creativity, emancipatory practice, improved relationships , inclusiveness, living well, reasoning, respect

Introduction

This is the second of two articles based on research conducted by people at the New Zealand Centre for Science and Citizenship. This research takes the form of a review of the literature concerned with the teaching and learning of philosophy in primary and secondary schools; a subject that a number of commentators have argued, since the 1970s, should be included in the school curriculum.

The purpose of this review is to address two research questions that relate to the teaching and learning of philosophy in schools, and the arguments put forward for its inclusion in the classroom. These two questions are:

What *is* philosophy?

What does philosophy do?

This review was undertaken in response to expressions of need made by participants at Australasian philosophy conferences, including the New Zealand Association of Philosophy Teachers (NZAPT) and the Federation of Australasia Philosophy in Schools Association (FAPSA). During conversations at these events it became apparent that what was meant by the term 'philosophy', and what the work of philosophy was, differed in people's minds. Before embarking on this project we corresponded with international commentators in the field, asking if they were aware of a literature review that explored the questions *'What is philosophy and what does philosophy do?'* These correspondents were unaware of any work of this kind and responded enthusiastically that a review article of this sort was needed and would be a valuable contribution to the literature.

Our first article, published in the *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, (Bowyer, Amos, Stevens 2000) attends to the first question: What *is* philosophy? The research gathered together the various understandings of the word 'philosophy' circulating in the literature, and ten dominant understandings were identified: philosophy as a 'foundational concept'; philosophy as thinking—a skill, a disposition, a practice;

philosophy as method or process; philosophy as a tool or instrument; philosophy as a creative task; philosophy as enquiry; philosophy as a search for truth; philosophy as non-dogmatic teaching, and hence the emancipation of thought; philosophy as a communal activity; and philosophy as a way of life.

This article addresses the second question: *What does philosophy do?* The Grounded Theory approach was used to gather and analyse the literature (Glaser 2003). The systematic collection and analysis of articles enabled the conceptualisation of fundamental latent patterns of thought emerging from the literature (Glaser 2003, p. 189). These patterns were noted and the themes indicated by the research data were used to guide and shape the analysis of information into two distinct claims.

One claim is that philosophy improves academic and cognitive abilities, where the idea of 'cognition' is captured by forms of reasoning that can be tested and measured. The evidence for improvement in academic and cognitive abilities takes the form of IQ scores, Cognitive Abilities Test (CAT) and school academic assessments, including norm-referenced tests of reading, reasoning, and other curriculum-related assessments. Some researchers also argue that not only are academic and cognitive abilities improved, but they are sustained without further formal lessons of philosophical enquiry. Both the words 'enquiry' and 'inquiry' are used by different authors to discuss the activity of engaging with and grappling philosophically with an idea.

The second claim about the work that philosophy does can be captured by the notion that engaging with the world philosophically promotes the art of living well together. Researchers claim that this is the case because engaging with the world philosophically aims at cultivating understanding through respectful interactions that are open to exploring, questioning and challenging aspects of the world. Researchers have reported that working philosophically fosters: collaborative engagement with others; attentive listening; the confidence to express one's point of view; fairness to opposing viewpoints; the exchange of ideas; patience; and reciprocity. The outcome of such philosophical conversation is personal transformation. This transformation is not about transforming an isolated 'inner self', as Cartesian understandings of the self would imply; rather it is a transformation of our ways of approaching, interacting and responding to the world of others. In this way, personal transformation opens up the space for social transformation. A transformation of the social space will in turn further transform the personal, as social forces sculpt our way of being. Our thoroughly embedded, integrated and embodied self, whereby 'our flesh is

inseparable from the flesh of the world' (Merleau-Ponty 1968, p. 146) is recognised by people from a range of research fields (for example: Freire 1970; Gallagher 2005; Heidegger 1962; MacIntyre 2009; Mead 2003). Such transformation affects both students and teachers, and—due to the nature of transformation—flows into our interactions in other domains of life, as 'we teach each other, mediated by the world' (Freire 1970, p. 80). The evidence for this work of philosophy is based on testimony from teachers, principals, parents and students themselves.

A review of the literature on the teaching and learning of philosophy in schools shows that a significant amount of articles published are concerned with the 'Philosophy for Children' (P4C) programme, which grew out of Matthew Lipman and Ann Margaret Sharp's work, beginning in 1974, at Montclair State University. P4C is now a diverse practice that has grown in different ways over the ensuing years, and is recreated and enacted in a variety of forms in over 60 countries around the world (Gregory, Haynes & Murris 2017, p. xxi). It is also important to acknowledge that there are other ways to work philosophically in the classroom than utilising a 'P4C approach'. Consequently, our research does not differentiate any findings based on particular approaches for working in/with a philosophical classroom. Instead, the purpose of the article is to ascertain what commentators claim philosophy *does* in the educational setting, regardless of the pedagogical approach.

When taken together, the two articles that have arisen from this research project lay out the diversity and the nuances of the interpretations and understandings of philosophy and the work that philosophy does, which are circulating in the literature. As the articles draw together a range of interpretations and understandings that have been articulated over time, they provide an accessible overview for interested people—especially teachers—who do not always have ready access to a range of journal articles, nor the time to trawl through those articles to address these questions themselves.

This second article—that looks at the understandings of what philosophy does—is also important because it sheds light on how we are affecting our young people through the work of philosophy in the classroom. Of course, the work that philosophy is allowed to do is dependent on how one conceives of philosophy. When our first and second article are read in conjunction with one another, the reader will be able to see the way that various interpretations of what philosophy *is* manifest themselves in what philosophy *does*. This article opens up for consideration whether we fully grasp the potential for philosophy to sculpt ways of thinking and being, and what the

implications of that work in education means. This latter point forms the basis of subsequent important research that can be used to shape the future of education. Whilst we have made comments and raised questions that point to areas of further investigation, we hope that this overview of interpretations and understandings will also initiate comments and questions for others to pursue.

Following a brief overview of the approach taken towards the literature review, this article lays out examples of evidence given for philosophy's role in improving an individual's cognitive and academic ability, along with challenges to this claim. We then present examples of the evidence for and challenges to the work of philosophy in regards to living well together.

In reviewing the claims made we conclude that philosophy's strength as a practice would seem to lie in its ability to inculcate a way of life that has a constant commitment to questioning, exploration and reflection on the world through collaborative dialogue, with a view to challenging ways of thinking and acting that are oppressive, and a threat to living well together.

The approach

The literature review involved: searching ProQuest's Education Database, regarded as the principal education database; identifying websites promoting teaching philosophy in schools; listening to podcasts discussing this subject; locating media articles on the teaching and learning of philosophy in primary and secondary schools; and communication with people writing in the field. The literature search did not consult Masters and PhD theses, which is a limitation to this review. Further, the references offered in support of the claims made are not exhaustive but are representative of the ideas circulating.

The key words and phrases that were used in the search included: 'teaching philosophy in schools'; 'understandings of philosophy'; 'conceptualisations of philosophy'; 'interpretations of philosophy'; 'what does philosophy do; 'philosophy for children'; 'teachers' understanding of philosophy'; 'teachers role in philosophy education'; 'teachers' beliefs about philosophy'; 'philosophy beliefs'; 'teacher interpretations of philosophy'; 'teaching philosophical enquiry'; 'teaching philosophy for children'; 'critical thinking'; 'What do you mean by philosophy?' Approximately 2000 texts were identified, and their abstracts read. Through this reading process, texts

that spoke to the research question were filtered out. This narrowed the research field to approximately 160 texts, which were then comprehensively read and analysed. Fifty-six texts that contained material that would meaningfully address the research questions emerged from this process. It is acknowledged that this process, which involved a judgement by us as readers in determining whether an abstract was indicative of appropriate content for in-depth analysis, is a further limitation to this review.

Philosophical enquiry improves an individual's cognitive and academic ability

A number of authors have conducted research or commented on research which reports that philosophical enquiry improves an individual's cognitive and academic ability.

Early research work carried out in the field of teaching philosophy in schools was undertaken by Lipman and Bierman in 1970 (reported in Lipman & Bierman 1980), with the aim of determining the feasibility of teaching 'reasoning' to fifth grade students. This was a small study using a pre- and post-test experimental design involving a total of 40 pupils from two schools in the Montclair District of New Jersey. Lipman and Bierman claimed that the students in the study showed 'impressive gains in reasoning and reading'. They also noted however that the course was taught by 'a professor of philosophy and not by a regular classroom teacher', which could markedly affect the outcomes (Lipman, Sharp & Oscanyan 1980, pp. 217-218). Accordingly, a follow-up study in 1975 with fifth and sixth grade students was undertaken. This time regular classroom teachers who were 'trained to encourage philosophical thinking in their own classrooms' were involved (p. 218). Further studies looking at the impact of teaching philosophy in schools were conducted between 1976 and 1978. Each of these studies showed significant gains for students' reading and mathematical ability. They also showed significant improvement in creative reasoning, including the ability to generate new ideas, discover feasible alternatives, and provide reasons for a position. Improvements in formal reasoning was also noted, along with increased 'academic readiness'. The notion of academic readiness included being better oriented towards tasks and being more curious about things (p. 224).

However, Fields (1995) comments on Lipman and Bierman's 1970 research, arguing that the results of their study do not support the assertion that reading ability and

fluency is increased. Fields claims that an analysis of the results show that 'there was no significant difference between the experimental groups and the control groups in either of the two schools' (p. 117) participating in the study. Students involved with the philosophy programme and those participating in regular classes (the control group) showed an increase in performance and an overall improvement between the pre-test and the post-test, which would normally be expected over an academic year. From her own study, which evaluated the outcomes of P4C with 123 randomly selected children aged 7-8 years over one academic year, Fields reported statistically significant differences between the experimental group and the control group on measures of reasoning (Ravens Matrices, the New Jersey Reasoning Test, and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children), but not on reading ability or fluency or mathematics.

In the Haas (1980) study of 200 students, conducted in 1975 and reported in 1980, 100 students were taught a 'thinking skills intervention' led by teachers, with a further 100 students in a control group. Significant improvements in 'logical thinking' were noted in the experimental group (p. 371-372).

A study conducted by Williams in 1993 was reviewed by Gorard, Siddiqui and See in 2015. William's 1993 study was one of the earliest studies conducted in the UK that examined the effects of P4C in the secondary school classroom. The study was run in one school in Derbyshire, England with students at Year 7. A total of 42 students took part, with results reported for 32 children. From these 32, fifteen received 27 one-hour P4C lessons using Lipman's materials, and seventeen received extra English classes. The research reported that 'pre- and post-test comparison of reading comprehension using the London Reading Test showed that P4C pupils made significantly bigger gains than control pupils' (2015, p. 6). Also, the P4C group registered improvements in reasoning behaviour, while the control group showed no such improvements. These improvements were measured using both bespoke evaluation tools and video recordings of students' interaction during lessons (Gorard, Siddiqui & See 2015).

In a study conducted by the Dyfed County Council in 1994, and reviewed by Trickey & Topping (2004), a whole class approach was employed with five year old students. The research looked at a 'Teaching Philosophy with Picture Books' intervention, and a P4C intervention. Six schools used the two interventions—P4C and 'Teaching Philosophy with Picture Books'. The teachers implementing the P4C intervention received three separate days of training, between which school visits were made by the project team to provide ongoing support. The P4C group ran two one hour

sessions each week with their students, for 83% of the academic year. Six schools used the 'Teaching Philosophy with Picture Books' intervention alone with a small group of children with reading difficulty. Six schools had no intervention. The schools were randomly selected and a total of 229 children were involved in the study. Research assessment included teacher questionnaires, a measure of student attitude to reading based on pupil questions, a reading miscue analysis procedure, reading comprehension questions, and two tests from the British Abilities Scale: the Word Recognition Test (reading) and the Matrices Test (nonverbal reasoning). The standardised tests yielded no evidence of differences between the groups. However, from the other measures (not specified) it appeared that children gained from both P4C and the 'Teaching Philosophy with Picture Books', gaining most from these two interventions carried out together (Trickey & Topping 2004, p. 373).

In 2003, Hinton reported on the 'far-reaching and extraordinary' changes occurring at Buranda State School in Queensland, over the space of six years. These changes included a significant increase in enrolments, improved programs and facilities, improved work practices, a fiercely supportive school community and, most significantly, positive changes in student learning outcomes. In systemic Year 3/5/7 tests that measured aspects of literacy and numeracy conducted in 1996, students performed below the state mean in most areas. However, from 1998, after implementing a school-wide philosophy programme, the results began to improve. These academic improvements have been maintained since that time and indicate that there is an enhancement and transfer of learning skills across disciplines when philosophy is taught in schools (p. 55).

The current website of Buranda State School confirms that philosophy remains a specific part of the school's curriculum:

> Philosophy has been taught to all of our students since early 1997. All children participate in one hour a week of philosophical discussions, concept development activities, and activities designed to improve their reasoning and inquiry skills. These lessons are taken by the classroom teachers, all of whom have undertaken training in this field. (Buranda State School 2019)

Trickey and Topping (2004) conducted a meta-analysis of controlled outcome studies of the P4C method in primary (elementary) and secondary (high) schools. The criteria for inclusion in their meta-analysis were studies that used pre–post measurement of experimental and comparison groups. Ten studies met these criteria. Trickey and

Topping acknowledge the limitations of this methodology but, for the purpose of their meta-analysis, they wanted to minimise other variables as far as possible (p. 370). Outcomes were measured using norm-referenced tests of reading, reasoning, cognitive ability, and other curriculum-related abilities, together with measures of self-esteem and student behaviour. Student and teacher questionnaires were also used. 'All studies showed some positive outcomes after being involved with P4C. The mean effect size was 0.43 with low variance, indicating a consistent moderate positive effect for P4C on a wide range of outcome measures' (p. 365).

One example of a study in Trickey and Topping's meta-analysis was undertaken by The Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children, based at Montclair State University, New Jersey, which provided a report of research conducted in 1993-1994 with students across four sites who had been involved with P4C from age 5 to age 15 years. The P4C intervention groups and control groups were deemed comparable in socio-economic status. The study ran two intervention-control 'post-test only' comparisons and one 'pre-test/post-test' comparison for a single group. On the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills, students who had used P4C showed significant gains in comparison to control groups. However, Trickey and Topping (2004) note that 'the post-test only comparisons between P4C and control groups obviously have to be regarded with caution' (p. 374).

The 'Thinking Skills Review Group' (2005) also undertook a meta-analysis that evaluated the impact of thinking skills interventions. The group found that 'when thinking skills programmes and approaches are used in schools, they are effective in improving pupils' performance on a range of tested outcomes, relative to those who did not receive thinking skills interventions' (p. 3).

García-Moriyón, Rebollo and Colom (2005) conducted a meta-analysis that evaluated the impact of teaching philosophy for children. They reported that 'the implementation of P4C led to an improvement of students' reasoning skills of more than half a standard deviation, a gain of roughly seven IQ points. The result is especially impressive if we note that P4C was never applied for more than one school year in all the studies reviewed' (p. 19).

In 2007, the longer-term impact of P4C was assessed in a study by Topping and Trickey, as they followed 177 students from eight schools and eight classes in Dundee, UK, over two years. Matched and randomised, 105 students received the P4C intervention programme, with 72 students in the control group. Students in the intervention group received a one hour per week collaborative enquiry lesson, while

control students continued regular lessons. Students were tracked from the penultimate year of primary school to the first year of secondary school. Students' cognitive abilities were measured using CAT. After 16 months of intervention (with one hour of P4C per week) the students had made substantial improvements in their test scores, whereas the control group performed worse on post-test than on pre-test (ES = 0.7). Results two years later indicated that the group involved with the P4C intervention maintained their advantage in follow-up test scores, compared to the control group. The intervention effect for the CAT score appeared to be maintained for the more able pupils in the follow-up, but not for the lowest-achieving pupils. Complete data was available for only 115 pupils (Topping & Trickey 2007, table 3, p. 794, reported in Gorard et al. 2015, p. 6).

In their 2012 paper, Millett and Tapper make similar claims, stating that a 'whole population of children gained on average 6 standard points on a measure of cognitive abilities after 16 months of weekly enquiry (one hour per week)' (pp. 553-554). It was noted that when students left primary school, they did not have any further enquiry opportunities yet their improved cognitive abilities were sustained two years into secondary school (Millett & Tapper 2012).

A longitudinal study of the long-term impact of P4C was conducted in Madrid and reported in a paper by Colom, Moriyón, Magro and Morilla (2014). This study tracked children attending two private schools over 20 years. A total of 455 children from one school, aged six to eighteen—first year of primary through to final year of high school—were trained in the P4C programme. Another 321 pupils from another school matched on demographic characteristics formed the control group. Data on children's cognitive, non-cognitive, and academic achievements were collected at three time points, at ages 8, 11/12 and 16. Preliminary analyses of 281 treatment children and 146 control children showed that the programme had positive impacts on general cognitive ability (ES = 0.44). When this study was written up and published, the effects of P4C on academic achievement were not available, although the authors imply that the programme was particularly beneficial for lower-ability pupils.

However, Gorard et al. (2015), commenting on Colom, Moriyón, Magro, and Morilla's 2014 study, argue that this claim was not clear from the presentation of their analysis. Gorard et al. also point out that, although the study was large scale and long term, students were not randomised in terms of receiving P4C instruction, and therefore the study may not be generalisable, as participants came from relatively prosperous

families. They warn that 'the results from this preliminary analysis should be treated with a high degree of caution' (p. 3).

Research published by Fair, Haas, Gardosik, Johnson, Price and Leipnik (2015a) showed that P4C could be used appropriately in other culturally diverse settings and with 'economically disadvantaged' students to improve student cognitive performance. They reported on positive gains in students' Cognitive Abilities Test scores (CogAT, administered in the USA) and students' CAT scores (UK) after teaching P4C. In a follow up study, Fair, Haas, Gardosik, Johnson, Price and Leipnik (2015b) found that these positive gains had not faded after three years. They argued that, given the strength of these confirmations of the positive durable impact of the P4C programme, along with the relatively low cost of implementing the programme, P4C should become a standard part of the school curriculum.

For Golding (2017), if philosophy is to be part of a classroom programme, we must be able to make what he calls 'epistemic philosophical progress' and judge when such progress has been made (pp. 65-72). This requires a framework that enables teachers to track a philosophical inquiry, plan a path forward and judge whether they are 'getting somewhere' (p. 72).

Worley (2018) argues that the significance of teaching philosophy in schools is that philosophy is not only well-placed, but also is much better placed, than other school subjects for developing *metacognition* (p. 83). For Worley, the significance of developing the individual as a metacognitive subject is that it enables learner-agency—independent and autonomous learning, which he suggests is an important educational aim (p. 78). Philosophy's requirement that we have an 'eye on our own thinking' (p. 84), its ability to provide 'opportunities, structures, strategies, and tools' (p. 85), and to help the individual understand what we can know in different subject areas, whilst developing knowledge of themselves as a learner, means that creating independent, autonomous learners is part of its remit.

Although not talking in terms of *measuring* cognitive abilities, Hand (2018) argues that developing the cognitive ability to reason and inquire are key for preparing children to deal with issues faced in adult life, particularly 'problems of justifying subscription to moral, political and religious standards' (p. 18). Hand states that philosophy, with its distinctive forms of argument and analysis, is the discipline best placed to cultivate these skills.

Discussion

Research that argues for the significance of teaching philosophy in schools in terms of improving academic and cognitive abilities—often measurable—has been used to provide evidence and advocate for the importance of including the teaching and learning of philosophy in the school curriculum. However, for the most part, the research has taken the isolated individual as the basic unit of cognition, whose 'cognitive and academic abilities' are an abstract intellectual affair, removed from the grounded, engaged, lived world of people in their community.

Tests for assessing 'progressive achievement' and 'cognitive achievement', as well as psychometric tests, involve a series of abstract questions which isolate a particular aspect of cognition, losing sight of the integrated cognitive activity of a person living in the world with others, at a particular place and time. Within the current education system, the individual is required to complete abstract tests which are claimed to measure such things as reading comprehension, recall of 'facts', literacy and numeracy, and their performance is scored against a quantifiable scale, from which generalisations about their 'ability' are made.

The emphasis on gathering measurable data through standardised procedures that focus on static, isolated moments of abstract thought and action takes a reductive approach to our cognitive life, focusing on a range of 'functions'—and as a corollary 'dysfunctions'. We fail to understand cognition if we take it as something that can be revealed by a range of abstract tasks designed to fit impoverished models, a point John Searle makes with his example of the Chinese room (1980, pp. 417-457).

Not only are these tests showing no more than an arbitrary snapshot of a person's response to an abstract task at a particular moment, from which many unwarranted inferences are made, the tests themselves arise from a particular way of thinking about and organising the world, which does not sit comfortably with many other cultural perspectives. We fail to understand and hence appropriately nurture our young people if we consider them to be the sum total of an arbitrary list of measurable 'cognitive functions,' just as we cannot understand people as simply the sum of certain anatomical parts, chemical components or neurophysiological mechanisms and events.

We can see that, for some commentators keen to get philosophy into the classroom, buying into the dominant model of educational 'success' by trying to show that philosophy improves 'cognitive and academic ability' may be a way to be heard. However, we propose that the focus on a limited range of intellectual capabilities perpetuates an educational model that is intent on producing individuals who can be

ascribed functional roles that serve the economy. This does a disservice both to our humanity and to philosophy as a human practice. Others have written about how our current way of thinking suppresses education as a practice of freedom, where freedom is understood as a liberating and humanising activity—which requires the cultivation of our critically responsive and creatively responsible consciousness. Freire (1970) writes:

> Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity, or it becomes the practice of freedom, the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world. (p. 34)

If we agree that education is and should be the practice of freedom and not the practice of repression, a practice of liberation and not oppression, and one of transformation not of marginalisation and domination, then it would be imperative to include human practices that can achieve this. A number of commentators agree that the most significant outcome of working philosophically comes through having people thinking together in ways that foster attentive engagement with the world, cultivating the confidence and ability to challenge oppressive practices, with a view to living well together. Nurturing the art of living well together requires a collaborative approach to enquiry, in which respectful interactions with one another open up our understanding of the world in ways that honour peoples' lived experiences, their particular questions and their ideas. Commentators note that fostering the abilities and dispositions to listen attentively and patiently to various points of view—whilst at the same time becoming socially confident and self-critical in regards to expressing one's own position in the reciprocal exchange of ideas—strengthens students' relationships with the world and with one another. The following section points to the literature that argues for philosophy as a practice concerned with fostering ways of living well together. Not all the literature in this regard takes the additional step of fostering real-world social action based on critically responsive enquiry, so that philosophy becomes a way of life.

Philosophical enquiry develops the art of living well together

A visiting academic to Buranda State school commented that at Buranda, 'children don't fight, they negotiate' (Hinton 2003, p. 55). Hinton goes on to say that respect for others, the increase in individual self-esteem, the need for patience and the discussion of problems generated in the community of enquiry have permeated all aspects of school life. Children expect good behaviour and courtesy from one another, and bullying behaviour is rare (Hinton 2003). As one Year 5 Buranda student stated: 'Philosophy is a good example of how you should behave in the playground with your friends' (p. 59).

This ability and willingness to engage thoughtfully with one another in negotiation requires people to listen attentively and patiently to other points of view, and have the social confidence to express their own position in the reciprocal exchange of ideas. It requires being open to exploring and questioning aspects of the world, and having the courage to challenge ideas about the world. Such activity fosters greater understanding through respectful interactions, and transforms both student-student and student-teacher interactions. It constitutes the art of living well together, and is something that has been commented on by a number of researchers investigating the work of philosophy in schools, including some of those researchers who made claims regarding gains in the academic and cognitive aspects of students' lives. Importantly for some commentators, it is the real-world impact of philosophy that is the most salient; philosophy becomes a way of life when it enables students to question, challenge and work to change existing damaging or oppressive practices, in the service of living well together. As a way of life, philosophy enables self-transformation which is at the same time, socially transforming.

The positive impact that incorporating philosophy in the classroom has on transforming relationships and enabling a school community to flourish has been noted over time, from the early writing in the field through to the present day. When Lipman conceived of and established the P4C programme he had at its heart that it would enable young people to become 'more thoughtful, more reflective, more considerate and more reasonable individuals' (1980, p. 15). To this end, philosophy—understood as a collaborative project—nurtures 'multi-dimensional' thinking, which includes critical, creative and caring components, in order to make possible concern for others, patience, openness to other points of view, thoughtful dialogue and the ability to make good judgements (Lipman 2003, p. 198, 269; 1993, p. 21).

Williams (1993) research with students aged between 11 and 12, who had been engaged in 27 one-hour sessions of philosophical enquiry, showed that the students found the discipline involved with thoughtful discussion demanding at first. Disagreement was often seen as a form of insult and tempers were sometimes quite frayed. It took about ten weeks to build an appropriate working forum to hold such discussions. This included specific coaching for some students on how to ask questions appropriately and phrase statements of agreement and disagreement without belittling or insulting another student (p. 3). Over the course of the study teachers observed that group members became considerably more supportive and patient with one another, significantly improved their ability to listen to and consider other points of view, and comments designed to belittle others almost disappeared. Students valued the work they were doing together and the progress they were making and it became an additional motivating factor in their participation (pp. 3-4).

Similar findings came from the 1995 study carried out by Fields over one academic year with children aged 7-8 years. As well as reporting on statistically significant differences on measures of reasoning for the group who had been involved with P4C in comparison to the control group, Fields also noted that, for the P4C students, 'one of the most striking and most positive results of this study was the heightening of children's own self-image and their personal view of themselves as thinkers, who were being taken seriously by adults and peers' (p. 118). This change in self-perception led to a significant decrease in negative verbal interactions between students. Observations by teachers who did not know which students were involved with P4C and which were in the control group identified students who had been through the P4C programme as displaying markedly more motivation, curiosity, commitment, and concentration (p. 118).

Sigurborsdottir (1998) presented comments given by parents of children who had taken part in a P4C programme. The comments captured what those parents valued about the opportunities the programme gave their children, and what it enabled them to do:

> He speaks about everything he is frightened of, what he finds beautiful, he talks about everything between heaven and earth.

> He is better able to talk about things and argue his case, and he demands the same from others. (p. 16)

Fisher's (2001) research conducted in the UK highlights the impact that teaching philosophy has on changing the whole school ethos. Fisher notes that teachers and principals reported that their own abilities had been enhanced by the inclusion of philosophy in the curriculum. One principal stated that incorporating philosophy had made 'the school as a whole more reflective and thoughtful' (p. 72). Another principal stated that 'we are now a thinking school. We now have a philosophy which underpins the curriculum and we have philosophy in the curriculum' (p. 72). By philosophically sensitising teachers, a school's ethos changed, which in turn engaged the students in becoming philosophically and critically literate as they do the work required to live well together.

According to Russell (2002), one of the most rewarding aspects of doing 'Thinking Time–Philosophy' with children was the improved student–teacher relationship. In his research he also noted that relationships between students improved as they learned to communicate in a way that respected other viewpoints and individual difference. Safety and trust between students and teacher, as well as between students themselves, became apparent through the development of philosophical discussions (p. 151).

As part of their meta-analysis looking at teaching philosophy in schools, Trickey and Topping (2004) looked at Sasseville's Canadian study published in 1994, which focused on the impact of P4C on students' self-esteem. A group of 124 children received P4C instruction while a control group of 96 children did not. The study provides no details of how the groups were selected or their comparability, the size of the classes, or of any equivalent time on a particular task for controls. The teachers working with the P4C programme received 12 hours pre-project training, plus four other training days during the five-month period of the research. Using the Pierce-Harris self-esteem test, P4C students showed an overall statistically significant gain compared to controls. However, Trickey and Topping note that the greatest gains in self-esteem were made by students with the lowest pre-test self-esteem. They also noted that students who started out scoring highly in regards to self-esteem showed a relative loss compared with the control group. Trickey and Topping suggested that it is a debatable point to what extent this might be attributable to regression to the mean (p. 372).

Millett and Flanagan (2007) conducted a study over two terms with a group of Year 8 students labelled as 'talented' in a state high school in Perth, Australia. Their work gathered together a range of student responses to the opportunities a philosophical

classroom provides for them. A summary of positive responses include: having the opportunity to express and share ideas; developing and building onto one another's thoughts through collaborative conversation; and valuing different perspectives (p. 7). All responses indicated that students were learning attributes that contributed to them living well together.

Research undertaken by Bereznicki, Brown, Toomey and Weston (2008) showed similar evidence of more care and respect in student-to-student interactions, something that was noticed by the students themselves. Students reported enjoying the respectful attention they received whilst working with philosophy in the classroom (pp. 27-29). Surveys taken by the students indicate that they preferred the open, seminar style of the Socratic circle to that of the regular classroom. Philosophical conversations were centred on intercultural matters and involved students from different cultural backgrounds. Opportunities to directly experience the cultures of one another both inside and outside the classroom had reinforced and deepened student learning. The meeting of philosophy with the students' real-world situation affected the way they interacted and lived with one another. It had been a meeting of 'head and heart' that has led to greater cultural awareness and interpersonal understanding (p. 29).

Sutcliff (cited in Millett & Tapper 2012, pp. 553-554) discusses the findings of Topping and Trickey's 2006 study, remarking that as well as noting the improvements in cognitive ability, both teachers and students recognised significant gains in communication, confidence, concentration, participation and social behaviour following six months of philosophical enquiry.

Charman and Hill's work (2012) reports on the impact of P4C on staff, students and the ethos of four primary schools and three secondary schools across Wales. Staff and students at the schools working with a P4C programme noted a number of significant positive changes in regards to:

> understanding and respecting perspectives other than their own;
>
> speaking out and being heard;
>
> confidence;
>
> improved listening;
>
> an increased ability to question;
>
> better concentration;

> learning to challenge and be challenge;
>
> strengthened interpersonal relationships (p. 1, 6-7).

All of these aspects contribute to creating a nurturing environment in which young people can work out how best to live well together.

Teachers also value that P4C provides students with the opportunity to question more, explore concepts at a deeper level, and not accept things at face value. Students understand and embrace this opportunity that P4C provides, as well as valuing the space P4C gives them for changing their ideas on things. Students are also given the opportunity to explore the consequences of various ideas at a deeper level, and such exploration enables shared meaning-making, which in turn contributes to exploring ways of living well together (Charman & Hill 2012, p. 14).

Student perspectives on P4C include valuing the 'rules' of P4C, such as taking turns to speak, being required to listen attentively, and working to understand what others were saying (p. 1). One student commented: 'I used to shout out loads of the time and P4C has helped me to wait. It's made me understand more. I understand things like racism more.' (p. 6). Students also value the opportunity to work with ideas that are relevant to their life at a deeper level:

> The work you do is more personal it has more meaning—like in art after
> the philosophy café, it made me think more. (Charman & Hill 2012, p.
> 15)
>
> It makes me reconsider important things in life. It makes you consider
> doing things differently, like explaining the nature of God, and asking
> why. It strengthens views and it allows you to prove things to friends.
> If you think about why you act and make claims, you're more likely to
> act and feel good about that. (Charman & Hill 2012, p. 14)

Students also noted that their classrooms became more cooperative and that P4C made it possible for them to understand one another better. This can be attributed to both the mode of the enquiry (active listening to an exchange of ideas) and the content of the enquiry (for example, questions around racism and bullying) (Charman & Hill 2012, p. 6). The abilities that students acquired from participating in P4C were transferred appropriately to other contexts, for example, the playground and home situation (pp. 1, 7).

During informal conversations with students who have been part of a P4C programme in their school, Gorard, Siddiqui and See (2015) report that several students, from a range of schools, stated that they got to know what their peers thought about different things during their P4C sessions, and that such interpersonal understanding was difficult to aspire to in other classroom situations. Such understanding enabled better relationships between them: 'I never had talked much with Adam. We were kind of strangers from each other. I know him now—he gives good points when we do P4C. I like to be his partner in making questions' (p. 29). Other students reported that P4C sessions provided an opportunity for solving their grievances with their peers. One student commented that children fight less in the playground because they had improved the way they talk together (p. 27). Gorard et al. also noted that during P4C sessions some of the low-achieving and quiet pupils started gaining confidence through participation. Feedback from teachers and students reported the beneficial impact on students' confidence to speak, patience when listening to others, and self-esteem (pp. 3-4). Comments included: 'It has been fascinating to see children who are usually quieter or more reticent developing their thinking and becoming more confident' (p. 28). Although some of the older pupils who had never worked in this kind of way before found it difficult to develop enquiry questions in the beginning, overall students felt that P4C was a liberating experience in terms of asking, sharing and arguing (p. 27).

In 2017, Siddiqui, Gorard and See provided a meta-analysis of a number of studies on the interpersonal effects of teaching and learning philosophy in schools. The schools were from diverse geographical regions of England, and each had a high proportion of disadvantaged pupils, as indicated by pupil eligibility for free school meals. Sixteen schools had a P4C intervention, while 26 schools had 'education as usual'. There were 1,099 pupils in the P4C group and 1,623 in the comparison business-as-usual group. Of the sixteen P4C intervention schools, eight reported improvements in students' social skills, concentration, their ability to question one another and their interpersonal relationships and increased confidence in self-expression (p. 14). It was also noted that children were more able to articulate how they felt and had become more confident in disagreeing with others without it being seen as a cause for quarrelling (pp. 29-30). Working in the P4C programme also helped children appreciate that others may think differently from them, and they became more able to accept alternate viewpoints, without viewing these as criticism of themselves (pp. 32-33). Unprompted feedback from staff who visited one of the P4C intervention schools every six months to work with students on a long-term animation/art project stated:

'the children have become far more capable at explaining their ideas and concepts in lesson times' (p. 31). Comments from students involved in this study include:

> I really enjoy P4C because I love to share my feelings in class because I feel my classmates and teacher will listen to me. I also enjoy looking at videos because we get to talk about things together.

> P4C is a great opportunity to share our feelings and share the things that are troubling us. I also enjoy talking about things happening around the world.

> We can say our own opinions on what we think and the teacher helps us we also build on each other's opinions. And after school I go home and speak to my parents about the things that we done in P4C. (pp. 33-34).

Work undertaken by Makaiau (2017a) focuses on the real-world impact of philosophy in changing understanding, attitudes and relationships through respectful and challenging enquiry. Incorporating philosophy in a high school Ethnic Studies course through a seven-step enquiry process enabled students to develop critical attitudes towards discrimination, justice, equity, prejudice, racism and violence. Students made meaningful connections between the Ethnic Studies content and their own lives, becoming more understanding of their own lives and the diversity and lived reality of other people in their community (p. 20-21). For some, this led to social action, challenging oppressive social norms by speaking out, and engaging in activities to stop violence both on and off their school's campus. One student—Dayton—helped to create a 'Safe Schools Task Force', comprised of a group of students who came together to work on facilitating school-based activities to raise awareness about the causes of violence, and to help reduce violence in their school community. These activities included: 'organising an orientation day for incoming students, arranging a "Movie and a Message" night, and working with adults on campus to think about innovative ways to create a more positive school culture' (p. 21).

Reed-Sandoval and Sykes (2017) support the democratic goals of P4C and the work it aims to do towards creating flourishing communities. However, they argue that the current idea of 'democracy' itself must be subject to philosophical critique and P4C cannot remain philosophically neutral about socio-political issues (p. 221). To do so legitimises structural injustices, and ignores how our so-called 'democratic institutions' have arisen out of and continue to perpetuate the political, cultural,

ideological and economic oppression of certain people (p. 221). To be inclusive, philosophy needs to take seriously how people are socio-politically, culturally and economically positioned, and find ways of philosophical expression that enable all people to participate fully in a critical democratic process; a process which goes beyond 'rational debate' (p. 219, 224).

Oliverio (2017), who talks in terms of a 'community of philosophical inquiry' (CPI), argues that philosophical inquiry is always situated in the lives of people at a particular place and time, and it implies a co-philosophising, in which philosophical friendships are formed through communication with one another (pp. 94-95). This communication, in which things are shared and agreed upon, and through which the emergence of meaning occurs, enables philosophical inquiry to *take place* (pp. 95-96). Philosophical inquiry, when facilitated well, allows a community to grow, as participants irrupt into unknown territories of thought together.

Makaiau (2017b) embraces a P4C approach that is culturally responsive to children in Hawai'i (p4cHI). Drawing on Freire's work (1970, p. 34), Makaiau talks in terms of philosophy as a democratic or emancipatory practice, which enables 'reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it' (p. 21). The point of such transformation is to 'create a more equitable and just civil society' (p. 23).

Kennedy and Kohan (2017), who also view philosophy as emancipatory, argue that philosophy subverts the hegemony of the conventional curriculum, which assumes that only certain content should be taught in a way that is 'developmental' and 'progressive'. With philosophy's priority on questioning, interrogation and challenge, it enables the disruption of hegemonic practices through shared exploration and conversation that can open up a space for new understandings about ourselves and the world (p. 51). The transforming of personal understanding has a normative dimension, and is done in the service of living well together.

Arguing for the importance of drama in a philosophical classroom, D'Olimpio and Teschers (2017) discuss how deliberate reflection on our gestures—what they say about us, and the effects they have on others—enables us to critique our interactions and change them in accordance with our values (p. 149). Drawing on the concept of *Bildung*, they argue that life is a continual process of self-formation in community, and the art of living requires us to take responsibility for shaping a 'beautiful life'—becoming the best we can be (pp. 148-149). Philosophical engagement (in this case in the context of drama) contributes to the art of living as it stimulates creative and critical thinking; develops listening and speaking; supports social and emotional

development; enables patience, understanding and empathy; and makes explicit personal values (p. 150).

Hobbs (2018) argues that both the teaching of philosophy in schools, as well as taking a philosophical approach to the teaching of other subjects, are vital for individual and communal flourishing. This is because engaging in philosophy enables one to explore what a well-lived life might be, as well as contributing to shape and structure living such a life (pp. 20-37). Drawing on the tradition of Greek philosophy, Hobbs highlights how philosophy is most fruitful when it is undertaken in dialogue with others. Such dialogue not only hones specific philosophical skills—such as questioning in a reasoned, rigorous and constructive way—it increases social-confidence and teaches the importance of both speaking and listening (pp. 25-26). A philosophical classroom not only provides a place for preparing the child for future flourishing as an adult, but is also a 'place where the child can flourish *as* a child' (p. 27). Hobbs recognises that philosophy—as exploring what the good life may consist of—is one of a number of subjects taught to students that can offer 'both different models for thinking and being, and some rational training in how to assess them' (p. 30). However, she argues that, in terms of considering and assessing different ways of thinking and being, with a view to living well together, philosophy is much better equipped to do so than other school subjects. For Hobbs, form and content are intimately intertwined, as the narrative form of a particular way of being is itself part of that way of being. Therefore, when well-taught, philosophy—which facilitates both immediate living and the developing understanding of a good life—is liberating, as it allows the engagement with, and thoughtful deconstruction of, a range of narratives, enabling people to question, counter and resist indoctrination and inchoate narratives in all their forms (pp. 31-36).

The transformation of teachers and teaching as a living practice

Researchers, along with teachers themselves, have also noted that working with philosophy in the classroom transforms teachers, both on a personal level and as educational practitioners.

Teachers working with philosophy at Buranda State school express the profound impact that philosophical enquiry has on the teaching staff, resulting in transformation at a personal and institutional level:

> From being part of a school that no-one seemed to want to go to, to being
> part of a school that has to turn people away is wonderful for staff

> morale. This is a group of people who are part of something successful
> and the job they are doing is publicly appreciated and acknowledged.
> Their work provides enjoyment, satisfaction, challenges, the chance to
> learn from and teach others, and the opportunity to make mistakes
> safely. They visit each other's classrooms to observe good practice, they
> talk together, and they celebrate successes. They are keen to improve
> their own practice through professional development opportunities and
> they are committed to doing the best that they can. They have been
> directly involved in in-servicing many teachers from other schools in the
> teaching of Philosophy. They have become a group of highly competent,
> professional individuals who work well as a team. (Hinton 2003, pp. 52-
> 53)

The effect of this has also transformed the community:

> A parent group was established and continues today, the sole purpose
> of which is to help and support teachers in a practical way. The group is
> called 'HUGS' ('help, understanding, gratitude, support for our
> teachers'), and is responsible for the clean art room, the tidy book
> shelves, the treats that appear on the staffroom table, and so on. (p. 54)

Parents of students at Barunda have also commented that they:

> appreciate the philosophical underpinnings of the curriculum and
> teaching practices at Buranda, the sense of purpose in their children, and
> the pure joy of learning and discovery in evidence. They appreciate the
> vitality of the programs, the genuine respect for their children and the
> obvious commitment to individual needs. As one father so eloquently
> put it, 'At Buranda, the reality matches the rhetoric'. (p .54)

Wikeley (2000) reported on the 'mirror effect' happening in the classroom whereby,
through philosophical enquiry, teachers develop the attributes that they are seeking
to promote in students. Teachers themselves noted that philosophical enquiry
transformed their teaching practice, and this change of practice was carried over to
other teaching-learning settings. Teachers reported that their classrooms had become
student-driven and their role was more of a facilitator. It required them to work with
the students' ideas and not step in with 'answers', making the environment a
collaborative one. It also allows the teacher to become aware of who is participating
and who isn't; who may need extra support and encouragement (Charman & Hill,

2012, p.2, 9, 13). Engendering a collaborative, supportive and inclusive classroom enables students and teachers to live and work well together.

Although changing classroom practice requires transforming teacher pedagogy, the teacher remains crucial in creating a place where students can learn the attributes and dispositions to live well together. Charman and Hill's (2012) research speaks to the importance of teacher confidence in working with a philosophical classroom, one teacher commenting that her own confidence in running an enquiry style classroom was the biggest hurdle to its success (p. 10).

Transforming pedagogy is an iterative process, and a number of commentators have documented how the work of philosophy in the classroom impacts on teachers and their practice. Citing a study conducted by Topping and Trickey (2007), Sutcliffe notes that teachers doubled their use of open-ended questions over a six-month period of philosophical enquiry-based learning and teaching, transforming their interactions with students in the classroom (Sutcliffe, cited in Millett & Tapper 2012, pp. 553-554).

Interviews with teachers conducted by Gorard, Siddiqui and See (2015) showed that all teachers reported enjoying enquiry-based teaching through the use of P4C and that it improved their relationships with their students. One teacher remarked:

> I feel much more comfortable listening to the children and allowing them to share ideas and have a more open classroom environment. Children are much more willing to listen to each other and are able to articulate their ideas towards each other. (p. 27)

Teachers felt that doing P4C had improved their own teaching style. By becoming facilitators in the classroom, gradually giving more freedom to students to create their own questions rather than just answering leading questions asked by teachers, teaching became less authoritative and controlling. Teacher comments reflecting this include:

> The children are more comfortable to question me so the classroom has become a more collaborative learning environment.

> Since beginning P4C a noticeable change has been seen in their questioning and enquiry skills across all subjects and I have become more aware of my own questioning of them.

> I am now seeing a change in the way I respond to pupil discussions and
> my teaching now involves much more speaking and listening and
> encouraging pupil opinions. (Gorard, Siddiqui and See 2015, pp. 28-29)

Teachers also reported on the benefits of P4C for students who are not so capable in traditional academic respects. During philosophical discussion, the voices of these students are respected and their ideas recognised as worthy. This is something that has been reiterated by others (p. 28).

In their research, Siddiqui, Gorard and See (2017) noted that:

> In general the success of P4C sessions were found to rely on the teacher's
> preparation of the session, enthusiasm to conduct the enquiry regularly,
> willingness to accept challenging arguments from pupils, and being
> aware of personal bias and readiness to accept justifications against
> personal beliefs and choices. (p. 29)

One teacher commented: 'I am enjoying listening to the conversations and reasoning when the children give their opinions and are trying to convince others to follow their view. I can see a lot of benefits of doing this regularly in class' (p. 31). It enabled one teacher to realise that, as teachers, 'we are educating children not robots' (p. 31).

Challenges to the work of philosophy in developing the art of living well together

The idea that philosophical enquiry develops the art of living well together does not go unchallenged in the literature. McCall and Weijers (2017) contend that developing good communication, effective listening, patience, tolerance of difference, and respect for others 'could all be achieved in other ways' and are mere 'side benefits of practising philosophy' (p. 91). Understanding the form of philosophy to be a set of logically structured arguments, and the content to be 'philosophical ideas' (p. 84), McCall and Weijers propose that, when doing philosophy with children, the 'focus of the dialogue is the philosophical topic and not the thinking of any individual' (p. 85). They claim that what philosophy does is to provide children with the 'opportunity to gain a fundamental understanding of human life' (p. 91).

As exploring, questioning and challenging aspects of the world is part of philosophy's remit, it makes philosophy a disruptive activity. Several commentators have noted that the disruptive nature of philosophical enquiry can be unnerving for some students at both an academic level and a personal level, especially where 'certainty'

and the need to provide 'the right answer' have been dominant in the classroom approach.

Whalley (1987) notes that not all students feel completely comfortable working in a philosophical/enquiry-based classroom. Students who were most resentful and challenged by her philosophy sessions were the students who were 'clever in the traditional academic sense' (p. 73), and were uncomfortable with situations not amenable to simple, straightforward answers. Whalley remarks that 'such children have unfortunately been trained to perceive educational value only in what can be examined and tested' (p. 73).

Siddiqui, Gorard and See (2017) noted comments from students who were not quite at ease in such an environment, and quote a student who had been involved in classroom philosophy sessions:

> I do not like listening to other peoples' ideas for a long time!; I don't like sharing my ideas in case people don't agree; It upsets me sometimes; sometimes I get a little sad. (p. 34)

Winstanley (2018) remarks that, when engaging in philosophy, some students are 'dismayed to discover that their usual approaches need to be significantly adapted'. Such students are often 'high-achievers' and have strengths in writing or an ability to strictly adhere to formal instructions. They are unnerved by the disruptive nature of philosophical enquiry, which, unlike other subjects in school, does not produce answers that can be 'ticked and verified, rendering feedback different and potentially disturbing for those used to consistent and unambiguous "very good" grades' (p. 123). Nevertheless, Winstanley argues that putting students outside their comfort zone is an educational endeavour valuable for 'developing resilience and for learning to adapt their abilities to overcome different types of obstacles' (p. 123).

Discussion

Some students are comfortable within the current education system which rewards those who adhere to formal instructions, are quick to produce the 'correct answer', and remain obedient to the teacher as 'the one who knows'. For these students, developing a critical awareness through philosophical engagement, in order to question, challenge and propose other ways of being, can be very threatening. Awakening a student's critical consciousness under such circumstances can be a fearful, turbulent and complex activity, as some commentators have noted. It is

important to approach such work carefully in a supportive environment in order to remove a student's fear—which is a fear of the freedom and the responsibility for enacting the future in a different way. Appropriate research could be undertaken to explore situations where students feel unnerved in the philosophical classroom, to ascertain ways in which this fear can be overcome—in the sense of moving through and beyond and into a place of openness.

In order to conceive of oneself as someone whose thoughts and actions are of value, and to have the confidence to question other people's perspectives and actions, we concur with Hinton (2003) and Gorard et al. (2015) that self-esteem is crucial. When we talk of self-esteem we are not subscribing to a pop-psychology notion of self-esteem, in which the notion of self-esteem has been hijacked into something that is fragile and requires the unconditional praising of children—even when their work is of poor quality—and the sheltering of children from adverse consequences and criticism. This has a tendency to produce narcissism and entitlement. On the other hand, genuine self-esteem—which is what we endorse and what seems to be the sort discussed by Hinton (2003) and Gorard et al. (2015), and is also implied in the work of Williams (1993) and Fields (1995)—is constituted by self-respect—the conviction that one's life is worthwhile, and that one is living up to certain ethical standards; and self-trust—the ability to deal with the demands, opportunities and setbacks that life throws up at us. It is formed over time through the sustained effort to live well with others, as we build our character and find our place in the world (Reville 2018). Genuine self-esteem also requires reflective personal effort and perseverance, and must be grounded in real-world concrete, responsible action (Branden 2013). It is perfectly aligned with the work of philosophy and its ability to transform the personal and the social, with a view to living well together.

A number of researchers and commentators have shown that the teaching and learning of philosophy in schools can develop the attributes and dispositions required to think, feel and act in collaboration with others, with a view to living well together. They point to such things as listening attentively and patiently to one another's points of view, and having the social confidence to express one's own position in a respectful reciprocal exchange of ideas, as being crucial to learning the art of living well together. Living well together also requires that students are open to exploring, questioning and challenging ideas, developing the confidence to critique relations of power, dominant forms of 'knowledge', and social structures that undermine a flourishing community. One can argue that every educational practice can claim to develop cognitive and academic abilities, in a system that values these measurable attributes,

if taught in a way that students can grasp. It is also highly plausible that, as McCall and Weijers (2017) note, good communication, effective listening, patience, tolerance of difference, and respect for others 'could all be achieved in other ways' (p. 91), and are not specific to philosophy per se. Therefore, philosophy's strength as a practice would seem to lie in its ability to inculcate a way of life that has a constant commitment to questioning, exploration and reflection on the world through collaborative dialogue, with a view to challenging ways of thinking and acting that are a threat to living well together. It is a way of life that embraces the emancipatory potential of philosophical enquiry, in which habitual ways of thinking, speaking and doing are called into question and an openness to negotiating possibilities prevails. If we value a way of life in which teaching and learning are an emancipatory practice, philosophy will play a pivotal role in our schools.

If we are to re-think the practice of education, then how we prepare teachers to work philosophically and create a critically responsive classroom/school is of paramount importance. The teacher—and teacher education—are key to disrupting the logic that drives the dominant schooling model. Research into the form that teacher education needs to take in order for teachers to nurture critically responsive practices, along with identifying the blocks to successfully achieving this, is vital.

Research conducted with Buranda state school has shown significant change in the way of life of students, teachers, parents and community. Further research with other schools who have integrated the work of philosophy throughout their school is warranted. This will provide insights into a range of ways of building a philosophical community that may be helpful to other schools embarking on this journey. It will also provide schools who have embraced the ethos of awakening critical consciousness through philosophy a sense of solidarity in their work of freedom.

More research into the real-world impact of philosophy for changing oppressive and harmful practices is needed. For instance, it would seem reasonable to investigate whether and how philosophy in schools can empower students to speak and act in response to the multiplicity of situations that are challenging our environment, our climate, and our health, working towards social action that can shape and structure a well-lived life for all.

References

Bereznicki, B, Brown, D, Toomey, R & Weston, J (2008) *At the heart of what we do – values education at the centre of schooling: The final report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools project, stage 2*. Curriculum Corporation and the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relationships, Melbourne, Vic. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/VEGPSP-2_final_3.pdf

Bowyer, L, Amos, C & Stevens, D (2020) What is 'philosophy'? Understandings of philosophy circulating in the literature on the teaching and learning of philosophy in schools. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 7(1), pp.38-67.

Branden, N (2013) What self-esteem is and is not. http://www.nathanielbranden.com/what-self-esteem-is-and-is-not

Buranda State School (2019) https://burandass.eq.edu.au/Curriculum/Teachingandlearning/Pages/Teachingandlearning.aspx

Charman, M & Hill, A (2012) *Wiser Wales: Developing Philosophy for Children (P4C) in different school contexts 2009-2012*. Council for Education in World Citizenship/Welsh Centre for International Affairs, Wales. http://www.cymrudrosheddwch.org/images/user/CEWC%20-%20Wiser%20Wales%20Research%20July%202012.pdf

Colom, R, Moriyón, F, Magro, C & Morilla, E (2014) The long-term impact of Philosophy for Children: A longitudinal study (preliminary results). *Analytic Teaching and Philosophical Praxis*, 35(1), pp. 50-56.

D'Olimpio, L & Teschers, C (2017) Drama, gestures and philosophy in the classroom: Playing with philosophy to support an education for life. In MR Gregory, J Haynes & K Murris (eds) *The Routledge international handbook of Philosophy for Children*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, London, pp. 145-152.

Fair, F, Haas, LE, Gardosik, C, Johnson, D, Price, D & Leipnik, O (2015a) Socrates in the schools from Scotland to Texas: Replicating a study on the effects of a Philosophy for Children program. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 2(1), pp. 18-37.

Fair, F, Haas, LE, Gardosik, C, Johnson, D, Price, D & Leipnik, O (2015b) Socrates in the schools: Gains at three-year follow-up. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 2(2), pp. 5-16.

Fields, J (1995) Empirical data research into the claims for using philosophy techniques with young children. *Early Child Development and Care*, 107(1), pp. 115-128.

Fisher, R (2001) Philosophy in primary schools: Fostering thinking skills and literacy. *Reading, Literacy and Language*, 35(2), pp. 67-73.

Freire, P (1970) *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum, New York, NY.

Gallagher, S (2005) *How the body shapes the mind*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

García-Moriyón, F, Rebollo, I & Colom, R (2005) Evaluating Philosophy for Children: A meta-analysis. *Thinking: The Journal of Philosophy for Children*, 17(4), pp. 14-22.
https://www.pdcnet.org/thinking/content/thinking_2005_0017_0004_0014_0022

Glaser, BG (2003) *The grounded theory perspective II: Description's remodeling of grounded theory methodology*. Sociology Press, Mill Valley, CA.

Golding, C (2017) Getting better ideas: A framework for understanding epistemic philosophical progress in philosophy for children. In MR Gregory, J Haynes & K Murris (eds) *The Routledge international handbook of Philosophy for Children*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, London, pp. 65-73.

Gorard, S, Siddiqui, N & See, BH (2015) *Philosophy for Children evaluation report*. Durham University, School of Education, Durham, UK.
https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/public/files/Projects/Evaluation_Reports/EEF_Project_Report_PhilosophyForChildren.pdf

Gregory, MR, Haynes, J & Murris, K (eds) (2017) Editorial introduction. *The Routledge international handbook of Philosophy for Children*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, London, pp. xxi-xxxi.

Haas, H (1980) Appendix B: Experimental research in Philosophy for Children. In M Lipman, AM Sharp & F Oscanyon (eds) *Philosophy in the classroom*. Temple University Press, Philadelphia, PA, pp. 217-224.

Hand, M (2018) On the distinctive educational value of philosophy. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 5(1), pp. 4-19.

Heidegger, M (1962) *Being and time*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Hinton, L (2003) Reinventing a school. *Critical and Creative Thinking: The Australasian Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 11(2), pp. 47-60.

Hobbs, A (2018) Philosophy and the good life. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 5(1), pp. 20-37.

Kennedy, D & Kohan, WO (2017) Childhood, education and philosophy: A matter of time. In MR Gregory, J Haynes & K Murris (eds) *The Routledge international handbook of Philosophy for Children*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, London, pp. 46-52.

Lipman, M (1980) *Philosophy in the classroom*. Temple University Press, Philadelphia, PA.

Lipman, M (1993) Unreasonable people and inappropriate judgments. *Critical and Creative Thinking: The Australian Journal of Philosophy for Children*, 1(2), pp. 10-18.

Lipman, M (2003) *Thinking in education*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lipman, M & Bierman, J (1980) Appendix B: Experimental research in Philosophy for Children. In Lipman, M, Sharp, A & Oscanyan, FS (eds) *Philosophy in the classroom*. Temple University Press, Philadelphia, PA, pp. 217-224.

Lipman, M, Sharp, A & Oscanyan, FS (eds) (1980) *Philosophy in the classroom*. Temple University Press, Philadelphia, PA.

MacIntyre, A (2009) *Dependent rational animals*: *Why human beings need the virtues.* Duckworth, London.

Makaiau, AS (2017a) Using a philosopher's pedagogy to teach school subjects: The case of ethnic studies at Kailua High School. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 4(1). pp. 4-26.

Makaiau, AS (2017b) A citizen's education: The Philosophy for Children Hawai'i approach to deliberative pedagogy. In MR Gregory, J Haynes & K Murris

(eds) *The Routledge international handbook of Philosophy for Children*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, London, pp. 19-26.

McCall, CC & Weijers, E (2017) Back to basics: A philosophical analysis of philosophy in Philosophy with Children. In MR Gregory, J Haynes & K Murris (eds) *The Routledge international handbook of Philosophy for Children*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, London, pp. 83-92.

Mead, HM (2003) *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values*. Huia Publishers, Wellington.

Merleau-Ponty, M (1968) *The visible and the invisible*. Northwestern University Press, Evanston, IL.

Millett, S & Flanagan, S (2007) Philosophy in the talented year 8 classroom: Improving thinking (and a lot more) through philosophical inquiry. *TalentEd*, 25(1), pp. 1-10.

Millett, S & Tapper, A (2012) Benefits of collaborative philosophical inquiry in schools. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 44(5), pp. 546-567.

Oliverio, S (2017) Dimensions of the *Sumphilosopheîn*: The Community of Philosophical Inquiry as a palimpsest. In MR Gregory, J Haynes & K Murris (eds) *The Routledge international handbook of Philosophy for Children*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, London, pp. 93-100.

Reed-Sandoval, A & Sykes, AC (2017). Who talks? Who listens? Taking 'positionality' seriously in Philosophy for Children. In MR Gregory, J Haynes & K Murris (eds) *The Routledge international handbook of Philosophy for Children*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, London, pp. 219-225.

Reville, W (2018) Self-esteem is great – so long as it is rooted in reality. *The Irish Times*, 15 November. https://www.irishtimes.com/news/science/self-esteem-is-great-so-long-as-it-is-rooted-in-reality-1.3692374

Russell, J (2002) Moral consciousness in a community of inquiry. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(2), pp. 141-153.

Searle, J (1980) Minds, brains and programs. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 3, pp. 417-457.

Siddiqui, N, Gorard, S, & See, BH (2017) *Non-cognitive impacts of Philosophy for Children project report*. Durham University, School of Education, Durham, UK. https://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/non-cognitive-impacts-philosophy-children

Sigurborsdottir, I (1998) Philosophy for Children in Foldaborg. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 30(1), pp. 14-16.

The Thinking Skills Review Group (2005) *A meta-analysis of the impact of the implementation of thinking skills approaches on pupils.* The EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.

Topping, KJ &Trickey, S (2006) Collaborative philosophical inquiry for school children – socio-emotional effects at 11-12 years. *School Psychology International*, 27(5), pp. 599-614.

Topping, KJ & Trickey, S (2007) Collaborative philosophical inquiry for school children: Cognitive gains at 2-year follow-up. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(4), pp. 787-796.

Trickey, S & Topping, KJ (2004) Philosophy for Children: A systematic review. *Research Papers in Education*, 19(3), pp. 365-380.

Whalley, MJ (1987) Unexamined lives: The case for philosophy in schools. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 35(3), pp. 260-280.

Wikeley, F (2000) Learning from research. In S Askew (ed) *Feedback for learning*. Routledge/Falmer, London, pp. 97-109.

Williams, S (1993) *Evaluating the effects of philosophical enquiry in a secondary school*. The Village Community School Philosophy for Children Project. Derbyshire, UK. https://www.thinkingscripts.co.uk/pdf/villagep4c.pdf

Winstanley, C (2018) Deep thinking and high ceilings: Using philosophy to challenge 'more able' pupils'. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 5(1), pp. 111-133.

Worley, P (2018) Plato, metacognition and philosophy in schools. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 5(1), pp. 76-91.