Enhancing the inclusion of all pupils: A consequence of a community of philosophical inquiry

Giamakidou Elissavet
PhD Candidate DUTH, Teacher
gelsa2007@yahoo.gr

Abstract

This article presents the results of qualitative research conducted in a public primary school, investigating whether the formation of a community of inquiry and the work of children within it, according to its governing principles, can constitute an inclusive practice. By referring to international literature, the article attempts to clarify the concepts of Philosophy for/with Children (P4C), the Community of Philosophical Inquiry, and inclusion. The research results showed that P4C was able to promote the principles of inclusion within this sample. Students, regardless of their performance, socio-economic background, or learning profile, had the opportunity to coexist, communicate, interact, discuss, disagree, agree, and collaborate.

Keywords: philosophy with children, inclusion

Introduction

Although there has been a significant increase in educational opportunities in recent decades, the existing education system has not successfully responded to the diversity of its students and ensured their equal participation in the learning process (Petrou, Angelides, & Leigh, 2009). As a result, disadvantaged students are unable to achieve success during their schooling, and their later lives are subsequently characterized by a lack of opportunities to participate in the learning process (Petrou, Angelides, & Leigh, 2009). Within UNESCO, there is an urgent need for an inclusive orientation in educational institutions and their practices (UNESCO, 1994). According to the principle of inclusion, educational programs that contribute to the equal treatment of all students foster critical thinking, increase creativity, and promote cooperation among students (Petrou, 2012). These programs should be guided by the values of inclusion, such as equity, participation, community, caring, and respect for diversity (Ainscow, Dyson, Booth, & Farrell, 2006).

However, the cultivation of an inclusive culture in children should be carried out "in an experiential rather than proactive way" (Petrou, 2012, p. 273). One approach that seems to meet all the above prerequisites and puts the principles of inclusion into practice is the philosophy with children. In this approach, students form a community of individuals who investigate collaboratively, think together, ask questions, express their ideas, argue, listen carefully to each other, reflect, and build on the ideas of others (Camhy, 2013; Haynes, 2009). Indeed, if we consider that each class is a microcosm of the relationships that develop in the larger community, then by improving relationships within the class, we may hope for a "more beautiful society" (Dewey, 1916, cited in Kizel, 2013, p. 199).

Philosophy with / for children (P4C)

Examining the literature, one finds two terms related to this approach. The first term is "philosophy for children," which refers to the program developed by the Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children (IAPC). The second term, "philosophy with children," emerged during the second generation of this movement. This change in terminology is significant as it reflects a shift from a model or guidance approach towards an ideal of analytical discourse, towards creating community reflection, contemplation, and communication (Vansieleghem & Kennedy, 2011). In this second generation of the project,

various approaches (such as the democratic-philosophical current developed by Michel Tozzi and the Socratic method of Oscar Brenefier) are included, each with its own methods and strategies. Nevertheless, the founder of this movement was Matthew Lipman.

Specifically, in the early 1970s in America, Lipman started a philosophical and pedagogical movement called "Philosophy for Children." Noting the inadequacy of the American educational system in creating critically thinking citizens and believing that children are capable of thinking for themselves, he concluded that a curriculum was needed to cultivate multidimensional thinking in students (Camhy, 2013; Tozzi, 2013; Chatzistefanidou, 2011). The concept of multidimensional thinking refers to various dimensions of thought, such as critical, creative, and caring thinking (Lipman, 2006). Drawing inspiration from Dewey and Pierce, he introduced the concept of the 'community of inquiry' as a natural environment that transforms students from passive recipients of knowledge into active, thoughtful participants (Nikolidaki, 2011; Petrou, 2013).

Regarding the philosophy with children, this approach does not focus on learning the history of philosophy or familiarizing students with philosophers' names and positions. The main aim of this program is to enable students to think for themselves by exploring questions they believe are worthy of reflection (Vansieleghem & Kennedy, 2011). Philosophy thus offers students an excellent opportunity to work together within a community of inquiry, using dialogue and philosophical reflection as their primary tools (Camhy, 2013; Splitter, 2013). This allows students to explore the boundaries of enigmatic concepts by expressing their ideas, experiences, and feelings. Through this process, they develop critical thinking skills, sharpen their judgment, enhance their creativity, and cultivate an attitude of caring for others (Lipman, 2006).

Lipman conceived of philosophy for children as transforming the classroom into a community of philosophical inquiry. To clarify this transformation, an analysis of the concept of a community of inquiry is provided below. Genealogically, the origins of the community of philosophical inquiry begin with the Socratic practice of dialogue, continue with Pierce's vision of a global scientific community, and finally with Dewey's conception of the terms 'inquiry' and 'community' (Sutcliffe, 2017).

Inclusive Dimension of Philosophy with Children

Since the early 1990s, a new movement of inclusion has emerged and developed in various parts of the world (Stasinos, 2013). According to the Salamanca Declaration, adopted in 1994, it is recognized that every child has unique characteristics, abilities, interests, and educational needs and educational programs should be designed to embrace the diversity of students. Furthermore, general schools should adopt an inclusive orientation to effectively combat discrimination, create favorable learning conditions, and provide education for all (UNESCO, 1994; UNESCO, 2005). Over the past years, various definitions of inclusion have been proposed; resulting in confusion about the term's meaning (Ainscow, Farrell, & Tweddle, 2010).

World organizations such as UNESCO declare that every child, regardless of physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic, or other characteristics, has a fundamental right to succeed in education (UNESCO, 1994). In line with the philosophy for/with children, it is argued that this approach significantly impacts all pupils by developing their confidence to think for themselves and express ideas recognized as valuable (Haynes, 2009). Specifically, this approach allows students to free themselves from the stress of finding the "right" answers the teacher expects and to feel proud of their ideas (Lipman, 2006; Murris, 2013). The 'openness of philosophical thinking' does not allow for 'guaranteed, final answers,' thus giving children the freedom to explore different questions and follow their own inquiries (Marshal, 2013; Murris, 2013). In a philosophical inquiry community, the views of all children are respected, and each child's contribution is treated as valid, important, and valued (Haynes, 2009).

Another inclusive feature of this approach is that diversity is seen as a stimulus, enhancing research and learning rather than hindering it. The heterogeneity of the student population, their diverse experiences, and the plurality of their views are considered necessary and valuable in the philosophical inquiry community (Go, 2013; Gregory, 2011). According to Lipman, individual differences among students should not lead to the fragmentation of a class or create barriers between its members. Instead, he emphasizes that no one is excluded from community activities, regardless of differences in religion, ethnicity, or other factors (Lipman, 2006). Children participating in philosophical inquiry communities express pleasure in hearing various opinions, and Haynes notes that changing their opinions is a natural part of the process (Haynes, 2009). This experience allows students to engage in 'dissonance within peaceful coexistence,' listening to and respecting differences, which broadens tolerance and prevents violence (Tozzi, 2013).

In the community dialogue, all participants are equal partners, fostering a relationship of reciprocity where each individual is responsible for their own thinking and that of others (Camhy, 2013). Through their efforts to understand themselves and others and their curiosity to explore the boundaries of enigmatic concepts, students collaboratively rethink (Marshal, 2013). In other words, children learn to think together 'in terms of a collective sensibility,' realizing that the ideas, feelings, and actions that arise belong to the whole community (Kizel, 2013). The socialization of thought is a necessity and a precondition of philosophical inquiry. This community is a friendly, non-antagonistic environment where curiosity, philosophical imagination, deliberations, and cognitive products are shared. The community draws from the experiences and ideas of all children, ensuring that each member has access to the meanings produced (Lipman, 2006).

Another important element of inclusion inherent in philosophy with children is the attention and space given for children's voices to be heard. This approach opposes educational policies that perceive childhood as limited and inadequate, focusing on what the child will become in the future and providing standardized, manipulative education (Haynes, 2009). In contrast, 'doing philosophy with children means listening to their thoughts and taking them seriously' (Camhy, 2013). Students' lived experiences, subjective ideas, feelings, and explanations of things are not dismissed as invalid but serve as the starting point for philosophical dialogue. An interesting dynamic occurs when students, to support their own or others' positions, share their experiences, thus creating a valuable, collective mosaic (Lipman, 2006).This fully agrees with Article 30 of the Salamanca Declaration, which states that teaching should be based on students' experiences to enhance motivation (UNESCO, 1994).

As can be seen from the above, philosophy with children not only stimulates thinking and improves cooperation among community members but also does justice to the ethos of the community (Murris, 2013). Participation in the exploration community undoubtedly impacts the formation of children's ethos and character. This is because values such as respect, solidarity, peaceful coexistence, and tolerance cannot be taught but rather experienced and put into practice. This approach, therefore, achieves this through a process driven by the students' concerns, offering them satisfaction and helping them to give meaning to their lives (Camhy, 2013; Lipman, 2006).

Process of a Philosophical Investigation
Below is a presentation of the steps that are usually followed in the process of an investigation within the community. It is worth noting, however, that the above steps should not be seen as a rigid mechanical routine, but as a process based on the quality of the interaction and dialogue that takes place (Haynes, 2009).

At the start of a philosophical investigation, the teacher and the students together set some rules of interaction. In the second phase, it is necessary to identify the element that will motivate the investigation. The starting point for the investigation can be children's literature, a piece of music, a picture, or even an experience of the children themselves. After the

stimulus has been presented, time is allowed for the pupils to reflect and record their ideas or questions. Students can then make connections and group their questions. A question is then selected, and the investigation begins. The teacher encourages students to listen carefully, consider the answers, and explore in depth. The essential thing is that not just a mere juxtaposition of opinions or experiences takes place, but a dialogue aimed at producing meaning and understanding. When necessary, the teacher may design concept maps or histograms to help students achieve a more insightful view of the course of the discussion. The process concludes with a summary of what was said or recorded, as well as student reflection on the process itself (Trickey & Topping, 2004).

As mentioned above, for an investigation to take place, some material is required to activate students' reflection and contemplation around a topic, creating the need for further examination (Nikolidaki, 2011). This material serves as the stimulus and essentially acts as a catalyst for philosophical dialogue, as well as a reference point to which students can return during an investigation. Examples of such stimuli include the philosophical novels by Matthew Lipman and Ann Margaret Sharp, whose content focuses not on well-known philosophers but on the everyday lives of children expressing thoughts and questions that are philosophical in nature. Other stimuli can be myths, such as Platonic myths (Petrou, 2013), children's literature (Chirouter, 2013), or picture books (Murris, 2013). Finally, stimuli from the children's own experiences are particularly beneficial, as they reflect their needs and interests (Nikolidaki, 2011).

The stimulus, therefore, by presenting problematic situations and questionable concepts, encourages students' reflection and the application of mental tools such as mental operations, propositional stances, introductory questions, consolidation questions, and judgments (Lipman, 2006). This process is then reinforced through dialogue, where students internalize concepts and skills. As Lipman explains, stimuli and the community of inquiry provide an appropriate environment for the cultivation of thinking. He analogizes this to how the natural environment provides "ecological services" for the development of species, suggesting that the community of inquiry and stimuli offer similar services for the development of thinking (2006, p. 178).

Previous Investigations

It would be interesting to have evidence from research on whether or not P4C may be valuable in promoting educational inclusion. The review of the literature reveals a significant gap in research on inclusion in our country. Internationally, most research has focused primarily on the cognitive benefits arising from the approach (Ventista, 2019). However, since this research focuses on the social skills and attitudes cultivated through P4C, an attempt to present the results of relevant studies will follow below.

A seven-month study conducted by Trickey and Topping (2006) demonstrates that significant benefits in academic self-esteem can be achieved through this approach. Specifically, the study found a substantial reduction in students' dependency and anxiety and an increase in their self-confidence and self-efficacy. The results were consistent across the schools where the study was conducted. Furthermore, according to Sasseville (1994), children with low self-esteem viewed the research community as a way to value themselves, as it provided an environment where they were listened to and taken seriously by their peers.

According to Topping and Trickey (2007), collaborative philosophical inquiry enhanced the communicative interaction between children in the classroom, both in quantity and quality. Specifically, it was reported that students' participation in discussions, rational support and justification of their viewpoints, teachers' use of open-ended questions, and the student/teacher ratio of discourse increased. Another study showed that pupils who worked with the principles of P4C gained significant benefits in terms of thinking, listening, language skills, and self-confidence (Dyfed County Council, 1994, cited in Trickey & Topping, 2004). The

phenomenon of enhanced self-confidence among pupils was also observed in earlier research, which, among other things, pointed to a reduction in negative verbal interactions between pupils (Fields, 1995).

The results of another study endorsed the enhancement of attentive listening (Dyfed County Council, 1994, cited in Trickey & Topping, 2004), finding that pupils became better listeners as the P4C programme progressed, and intensifying their concentration and interest in others' views. Similarly, data from another study (Campbell, 2002) showed that P4C activated children's listening and participation in discussion groups. Students became more willing to speak up in front of the class and accept others' ideas. Data also showed that children presented more arguments when expressing their views. Furthermore, the teachers of these children argued that some of the gains made through the FMP were transferred to other contexts in the school curriculum. Finally, an improvement in the students' social skills was also observed.

Research in Australian schools (Burgh, Field, & Freakley, 2006) indicated that students who participated in community research seemed less impatient with each other, more ready to discuss problems as they arose, and more willing to accept their mistakes as a normal part of the learning process. Additionally, the interaction between the children and their behavior outside the classroom reflected the collaborative environment of the research community in their classroom. It was also reported that incidents of violence and bullying were greatly reduced.

Regarding moral values, researchers Zulkifli and Hashim (2020) reported that the community of philosophical inquiry is an effective way to teach them. Russell (2002) also argued that children have a strong sense of morality, which seems to be significantly promoted through P4C. Additionally, other research has detected positive effects, including increased student participation and active listening within the philosophical inquiry community, as well as more caring and respect among the children (Commonwealth of Australia, 2008). Indeed, students seemed to experience and enjoy the mutual benefits within a school environment focused on moral values.

Finally, research by Dunlop, Compton, Clarke, and McKelvey-Martin (2015) highlighted the interest and enjoyment that students experience when participating in a community of philosophical inquiry. Specifically, students found the stimuli interesting and enjoyed the freedom to explore ideas and concepts without fear of failure. This research reported that many students tended to take their discussions beyond the classroom or were willing to share what they learned with family members.

The purpose of the research

The approach of philosophy with children, according to the literature, can offer multiple benefits to students, both instrumental (e.g., cultivation of reasoning skills, investigation, organization) and intrinsic (e.g., enjoyment, improvement of self-esteem) (Petrou, 2012). While all of these benefits are highly important for children's all-round development, this paper will focus more on the intrinsic benefits of this approach, particularly those related to the principles of inclusion. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to investigate whether the community of philosophical inquiry in the classroom contributes to the inclusion of all students.

The purpose of the research can be specified in the following research questions:
➢ Does student interest within the philosophical inquiry community increase?
➢ Can the active participation of all students in the classroom be enhanced through the approach of philosophy with children?
➢ Is active listening to the ideas of all children sharpened through this approach?

➢ Does it improve the level of cooperation between students and the quality of their interaction?
➢ Is students' self-confidence boosted through this approach?
➢ Are feelings of tolerance, respect, and care for others cultivated within the community of philosophical inquiry?

The reasoning process of the research will follow a deductive method, as the individual and more specific research questions, linked together, are intended to lead cumulatively to the general research question:

➢ Can the approach of philosophy with children contribute to the inclusion of all students in the classroom?

Methodology

The qualitative research method was considered the most appropriate for this study, which aims to investigate a specific case in depth, based on the assumption that "each individual is unique and worthy of study" (Papanastasiou & Papanastasiou, 2014, p. 221). This research is an example of action research, which is conducted by teachers with the aim of improving their practice (ibid.). According to Elliott, action research is "the study of a social situation with the aim of improving the quality of action within that situation" (1991, p. 69, cited in Altrichter, Posch & Somekh, 2001, p. 22).

This research arose from the recognition of the diverse educational needs of students, which sparked interest in providing a more inclusive education that respects the characteristics of all children and fosters meaningful interactions among them. However, achieving these objectives would be challenging under the current dominant educational model, which is characterized by pre-prepared curricula, a focus on covering the syllabus, strict timetables, a passive student attitude, and an emphasis on individual performance and assessment. In a context where success depends on organization, method, and expertise, there is a need for a more humane approach to education—a community where communication, cooperation, care, and joyful interactions among its members are encouraged. This vision thus drives the present research.

The identification of the problem was followed by the organization of the research process. After carefully studying both Greek and foreign literature related to inclusion and PD, the research purpose was formulated, giving shape to the "mental puzzle" (Mason, 2011, p. 36). The more specific research questions were then developed to explore the factors influencing the research purpose. The existing design aimed to ensure that the interconnected specific research questions would cumulatively lead to addressing the overall research question.

Next, the research sample was selected, and an action plan was developed, defining the methods for data collection and analysis. Observation, reflective diaries, and qualitative interviews were deemed appropriate tools for data collection. The subsequent coding and analysis of the data were to be open-ended. Initially, a letter was sent to the students' parents to obtain their signed consent for their children's participation in the study. This letter included the researcher's personal details, described the research purpose, outlined the research procedure, and explained the expected benefits. Parents were also informed that sessions and interviews would be recorded. There was a commitment to maintaining student anonymity and privacy, and participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time. Additionally, they were given the option to access the survey data if desired. After obtaining informed consent from both guardians and students, the survey was implemented.

The practical application of the research lasted three months and was conducted in a primary school classroom in Komotini. Initially, non-participatory observation was carried out to understand the students' learning profiles and their level of participation and interaction in the educational process. Discussions with the class teacher provided valuable data and

insights about the students. The researcher's implementation began shortly thereafter, with the initial sessions focused on piloting authentic data collection to refine the research questions and assess the suitability of the research methods. Participants were reminded that they could withdraw from the study at any time. Formal data collection then commenced, and the data was studied throughout the research to gain an in-depth understanding. Sessions were held twice a week, each lasting one teaching hour, as part of the Flexible Zone course.

Data collection instruments

Data collection in qualitative research relies primarily on human resources rather than measurement tools (Papanastasiou, 2014). The aim of data collection is to enable the researcher to gather all necessary information to answer the research questions. This process should be reflective, progressively guiding the researcher to solve the problem (Vrasidas, 2014). In this study, at the initial stage, the observer-non-participant observation method was applied to understand the students. The students were observed during scheduled lessons to profile them and ascertain the degree of participation and the quality of their interaction in the educational process.

Once the implementation started, the participatory observation method was carried out. Participant observers, mainly researchers, become participants in a social situation to investigate it. A necessary quality of an observer is sensitivity towards what is being observed. However, observers should avoid simplistic assumptions based on their biases (Altrichter, Posch & Somekh, 2001). In this study, a participant observer conducted observations for 9 weeks, during which 18 observations took place. During this time, students' reactions to various stimuli were observed. Each observation provided valuable feedback, which assisted in organizing and redesigning the methods to avoid forgetting information and to "capture" as much detailed information as possible. With the participants' agreement, a mechanical means of recording the teaching process was used, and transcripts were carried out as soon as possible after they were taken.

Another data collection tool was the reflective diary, one of the simplest methods of data collection. In the diary, brief notes, ideas, and reflections of the researcher can be recorded. As Altrichter, Posch, and Somekh state, the diary becomes the researcher's companion throughout all stages of the research (2001). It helps the researcher reflect on the journey, reviewing and analyzing successes or weaknesses. The diary may contain data collected by other tools, such as participant observation and interviews, and is often enriched by the researcher's comments. In this study, a reflective journal was kept, recording thoughts, ideas, fears, and concerns. This recording was usually done after leaving the research field, as it was difficult during the teaching practice, and also during the data processing. Decisions made when planning subsequent actions were also recorded in the journal. The final length of the diary kept in this research was approximately 90 pages.

Finally, another tool used for data collection was the qualitative interview, which was recorded with the consent of the participants. Interviews allow the researcher to access the way research participants see things, particularly their thoughts and opinions about their behavior (Altrichter, Posch, & Somekh, 2001). The qualitative interview typically has an informal and conversational style. It is structured with open-ended questions, having a semi-structured or loosely structured format (Mason, 2011). Questions should be characterized by clarity and help the interviewee explore their thinking. Prior to conducting the interviews, a pilot interview was conducted with two students. The pilot interview helps to avoid unforeseen weaknesses and contributes substantially to the validity of the research data (Papanastasiou & Papanastasiou, 2014). The interviews, fifteen in number, with the students were conducted during the last week of the research and lasted an average of nine minutes. They were semi-structured and included open-ended questions. At the beginning, and in order to make the interviewees feel more comfortable, the researcher applied the icebreaking

method by reminding them of the purpose of the research and assuring them of the anonymity of the interview. The aim was to formulate clear and unambiguous questions. Specifically, question one was about the students' impressions of the approach, question two was about the group climate before implementation, question three was about the group climate after implementation, questions four and five were about the benefits of the approach, and question six was about the difficulties of the approach. To facilitate data analysis, the interviews were transcribed as soon as possible after being conducted. An attempt was also made to decode non-verbal communication during them. Thus, non-verbal cues such as joy, discomfort, or skepticism were recorded and triggered further questions aimed at interpreting them.

The context of the investigation

The present study was conducted in a public primary school in the city of Komotini. This school is one of the largest in the region and has a particularly diverse student population. The research focused on a class of sixth grade, consisting of 15 students - five girls and nine boys. The academic level of the students is considered moderate, with several variations among the students, which is confirmed by the teacher of this class. The socio-economic background of the students varies. Also, the class is attended by a pupil whose mother native language is Albanian and a pupil with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) diagnosed by the Centre for Diagnostic Differential Diagnosis and Support.

Results

Does student interest within the philosophical inquiry community increase?

One characteristic of philosophy with children is the emphasis on children's own questions and experiences (Haynes, 2009). Similarly, in line with the principles of behavioral education, it is considered particularly important to involve children in activities based on their interests and needs (Booth & Ainscow, 2002). This seems to activate their motivation to learn. Through this research, it was evident that the pupils particularly enjoyed the approach we took. Among other things, they stated that they had a good time, gained new experiences, had the opportunity to talk with their classmates and thus get to know each other better, and were able to discuss age-related issues.

Can the active participation of all students in the classroom be enhanced by approaching philosophy with children?

When the learning process enhances students' interest, as shown above, and the knowledge is not theoretical but connected to children's everyday life, children who tend to be marginalized in the traditional classroom show more active participation in learning procedure (Booth & Ainscow, 2002). In line with the principles of inclusive education, learning activities should encourage the participation of all children, who should be actively involved in their own learning (Ainscow, Dyson, Booth & Farrell, 2006). Research conducted by Topping & Trickey (2007) and Campbell (2002) reports that through philosophy with children, students' participation in discussion, rational support and justification of their points of view, teachers' use of open-ended questions, and the student/teacher ratio of discourse increased. Similarly, in this study, there was also an increase in the degree of student participation.

Initially, some children were very interested and involved, while others were hesitant to speak and simply observed. This situation concerned me, and I often recorded my thoughts in my reflection diary. However, over time, there was a gradual change in participation, which was evident through their dialogues. While certain students were prominent at the beginning, others began to join in. Although some students still participated more intensely, everyone's views were heard in the dialogue. It was particularly striking that while some children noted low participation and reduced interest in their traditional classroom (according to my initial

observations and the teacher's comments), within the philosophical inquiry community, they actively participated, asked questions, and often took the floor.

Is active listening to the ideas of all children sharpened through this approach?

Active listening sets aside the teacher's tendency to bombard students with questions and avoids premature decisions by encouraging all participants to partially suspend their answers and beliefs so that everyone listens and understands others (Haynes, 2009). In this study, there was a significant improvement in active listening compared to our first sessions, as students made considerable efforts in this regard. Despite the establishment of rules from the beginning, it took several sessions for students to become attentive listeners. The change was not entirely due to the establishment of rules; the genuine interest that students developed along the way, since the discussion was guided by their questions and interests, also played a crucial role. However, it took several meetings to achieve this change, and initially, the students' listening skills were not encouraging. According to my first observations, students were disruptive, talking among themselves, not listening to the speaker, or having several people speak simultaneously.

Does it improve the level of cooperation between students and the quality of their interaction?

One of the key elements of behavioral education is to promote cooperation and encourage children to learn from each other (Booth & Ainscow, 2002). The philosophical community appears to build meaningful collaborative relationships between members in practice. Research conducted by Burgh, Field, & Freakley (2006) showed that children's interactions and behavior outside the classroom reflected the collaborative environment of the research community in their classroom. Similarly, other research (Campbell, 2002) reported that through philosophical community, students significantly improved their social skills. In this study, there was an increase in collaboration and an improvement in the quality of interaction between the children. Over time, students interacted more meaningfully. Initially, children's ideas were merely paraphrased versions of each other's ideas, but over time, they began asking each other questions, building on each other's opinions, asking for clarification, challenging arguments, analyzing opinions, and synthesizing ideas.

Is the students' self-confidence boosted through this approach?

According to the principles of behavioral education, schools should encourage children to feel good about them, and to be critical and confident thinkers (Ainscow, Farrell & Tweddle, 2010; Booth & Ainscow, 2002). Research (Sasseville, 1994; Fields, 1995; Dyfed County Council, 1994, cited in Trickey & Topping, 2004) argues that within the community of philosophical inquiry, students value themselves more highly because they are listened to and taken seriously by their peers. In this research, students' enthusiasm for the process, their increasing participation, and the quality of their ideas indicated that their confidence as thinkers was stimulated. The enhancement of students' confidence was most evident in those who appeared isolated, introverted, and insecure at the beginning of the research but became more confident and notable contributors by the end. Some children, initially described as 'invisible' and passive, developed into more cheerful, outgoing, and active participants over time.

Are feelings of tolerance, respect, and care for others cultivated within the community of philosophical inquiry?

Inclusive education promotes mutual respect among all participants and develops shared values such as justice, tolerance, acceptance of differences, and solidarity (Ainscow, 2005; Angelidis, 2011; Boyle, Scriven, Durning & Downes, 2011; Anderson, Boyle & Deppeler, 2014).

Similarly, the formation of a community of philosophical inquiry requires an atmosphere of trust and a community ethos conducive to thought and dialogue. Our attempt to form a community of inquiry began with a rather negative relational climate. Initially, there were derisive comments towards classmates' opinions, impoliteness in disagreements, tendencies to interrupt, impatience, and other disruptive behaviors. This element was also evident in other research (Burgh, Field, & Freakley, 2006), where students became more willing to discuss problems and accept their mistakes as part of the learning process.

Over time, there was a gradual change in students' behavior as they internalized the attitudes fostered by the inquiry community. While I initially regulated interactions, students eventually began to self-regulate. Incidents of disruptive behavior decreased, and students developed a community ethic. Other research (Fields, 1995; Burgh, Field, & Freakley, 2006) found a reduction in negative verbal interaction and incidents of violence through the philosophy with children approach. In this research, children's descriptions highlighted the positive change in classroom climate.

Can the approach of philosophy with children contribute to the inclusion of all students in the classroom?

Through the above attempt to answer the six specific questions of the survey, it is clear that there were significant results in these areas: student interest, active participation, active listening, cooperation and interaction between students, enhancing self-confidence, and fostering feelings of respect and care for others. Through observations, meeting transcripts, reflection journal entries, and student interviews, it was evident that students benefited in these areas during the research.

By assessing students' initial status in these areas and comparing it with the end-of-survey status, one can ascertain that the purpose of the survey has been achieved. Thus, answering the individual research questions leads to answering the general question: whether philosophy with children can promote the inclusion of all students in the classroom. In conclusion, it could be argued that the community of philosophical inquiry in the classroom effectively promotes the inclusion of all students.

Limitations of the research

The meetings with the students took place twice a week as part of the Flexible Zone course, scheduled during the seventh and last hour of the timetable, limiting the time to forty minutes. This timing often made the students anxious as the session neared its end. Since the class schedule could not be changed, the researcher adapted to this fact. Initially, the lack of time was a source of stress as it was impossible to complete activities with the students. Consequently, adjustments had to be made, which, although not ideal, were in line with reality.

Discussion

In this qualitative research, which lasted three months in a sixth-grade class of 15 students, significant achievements were observed. The students increased their participation compared to both their traditional classroom and the beginning of our sessions. They also became more attentive listeners, as discussions were guided by their questions and interests, and they strengthened their confidence as their contributions were highly valued within the community. Furthermore, they improved their cooperation and the quality of their interactions, which was evident through their dialogues. Feelings of respect and care for each other were fostered, radically changing the group's climate and the students' attitudes and relationships. These findings corroborate other relevant international research.

The sample size in this research does not allow for generalizations. However, the findings could indicate potential implications for student inclusion when working within the principles

of a community of philosophical inquiry. Despite this, we cannot assure the durability of these results over time. In other words, while the research seemed to produce results regarding student inclusion within the community of inquiry, these effects may not persist after the research ends. Inclusion is an ongoing journey rather than a destination, and the effort to overcome barriers preventing the participation of all children is a continuous struggle. Additionally, the difference between the community of philosophical inquiry and the classroom or school community makes it difficult for children to internalize the program's attitudes, challenging the maintenance of these attitudes post-research. This criterion could be explored in future research.

Another important factor impacting the benefits derived from the P4C is time. This includes the time needed for students to think, understand the investigation processes, and internalize the program's attitudes. Finding time for the sessions, which literature suggests should be weekly, also arises. Thus, while time is critical in P4C, in contemporary teaching models, it tends to become a source of stress as teachers struggle to achieve specific and measurable learning objectives imposed by the Analytical Programme.

Regarding the possible introduction of P4C in the Analytical Programme, several issues arise. First, we must ask what the purpose of such an introduction would be and whether it aligns with the program's philosophy. If the P4C resembles the dominant educational model of our times, the question of avoiding its instrumentalization inevitably arises. In such a case, P4C could become just another method or technique, thus distorting and losing its original context. Another issue is that such a transition requires adequately prepared teachers. Cultivating a conversational climate in an atmosphere of trust and forming a community of philosophical inquiry requires proper teacher training. Additionally, teachers must respect and consider each child's context and uniqueness. Otherwise, it becomes just another application rather than a meaningful practice (Theodoropoulou, 2014).

In conclusion, this research demonstrated that the P4C could promote inclusion principles in this sample, as students, regardless of performance, socio-economic background, origin, or learning profile, had the opportunity to coexist, communicate, interact, discuss, disagree, agree, come closer, and collaborate. Future studies should explore, validate, reject, or enrich these findings more thoroughly. Besides being interesting, future research on this topic is particularly important because, by uniting students through shared exploration, P4C may allow them to see differences not as obstacles but as stimuli that enrich and liberate them from the slavery of homogeneity (Petrou, Angelides & Leigh, 2009). In other words, P4C may achieve the condition of 'dissonance within peaceful coexistence, listening, and respecting difference' (Tozzi, 2013: 153).

References

Ainscow, M., & Sandill, A. (2010, Jan). Developing inclusive education systems: the role of organizational cultures and leadership.International Journal of Inclusive Education , pp. 401-416.

Ainscow, M., Dyson, A., Booth, T., & Farrell, P. (2006) Improving Schools, Developing Inclusion, Routledge.

Ainscow, M., Farrell, P., & Tweddle, D. (2010, Nov). Developing policies forinclusive education: a study of the role of local education authorities. International Journal of Inclusive Education , pp. 211-229.

Altrichter, H., Posch, P., & Somekh, B. (2001). Teachers researching their work : An introduction to action research methods. Athens: Metahmio.

Angelidis, P. (2011). The pedagogy of providing equal opportunities. In P. Angelidis (Ed.), Pedagogies of Inclusion (pp. 43-72). Athens: Diadrasis.

Burgh, G., Field, T., & Freakley, M. (2006) Ethics and the Community of Inquiry: education for deliberative democracy. Melbourne: Thompson Social Science Press.

Camhy, D. (2013). The Teaching of Thinking - The Practice of Philosophy with Children. In Philosophy, philosophy are you here? Doing philosophy with children (pp. 175-188). Athens: Diadrasis.

Campbell, J. (2002) An evaluation of a pilot intervention involving teaching philosophy to upper primary school children in two primary schools, using the Philosophy for Children methodology, Unpublished MSc Educational Psychology thesis, University of.

Chirouter, E. (2013). What does children's literature think about? Philosophizing with children thanks to reading texts. Athens: Interaction.

Commonwealth of Australia (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 (Carlton South, Curriculum Corporation).

Dunlop, L. C.-M. (2015). child-led enquiry in primary science. education 3-13. international journal of primary, elementary and early years education, 43(5) , pp. 1-22.

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

Go, N. (2013). Children's philosophical education: critical positions and practical issues.

Haynes, J. (2009). Children as philosophers. Learning through inquiry and dialogue in primary education. Athens: Metahmio.

Haynes, J., & Murris, K. (2011) The Provocation of an Epistemological Shift in Teacher Education through Philosophy with Children, in Vansiegelhem and Kennedy (eds) (2011) op. cit.

Lipman, M. (2006). Thinking in Education. (G. Salamas, Trans.) Athens: Pataki.

Marsal, E. (2013). Ekkehard Martens' Five Fingers Model as Methodological Philosophy in Principle. Athens: Diadrasis.

Mason, J. (2011). The Conduct of Qualitative Research. Athens: Field.

Murris, K. (2013). Philosophy with Picture Books: children as semiotic stakeholders. Athens: Diadrasis.

Nikolidaki, S. (2011). Different stimuli and possible ways of approaching them in the field of Philosophy for Children. At: http://philosophicalbibliography.com/attachments/article/6/136_Nikolidaki-Eisigisi-2011.pdf.

Papanastasiou, E., & Papanastasiou, K. (2014). Methodology of Educational Research. Nicosia.

Petrou, A. (2012). Educational equity, justice and the ethics of inclusion. In Inclusive education and school improvement : A two-way relationship (pp. 260-279). Athens: Interaction.

Petrou, A., Angelides, P., & Leigh, J. (2009, Jun 24). beyond the difference: from the margins to inclusion. international journal of inclusive , pp. 37-41.

Splitter, L. (2013) Fighting for authenticity in education. In Philosophy, philosophy are you here? Doing philosophy with children (pp. 83-118). Athens: Interaction.

Stasinos, D. P. (2013). Special education 2020: for an inclusive or total education in the new digital school with digital champions. For a digital digital education in a digital digital age in a digital digital world: Papazisis.

Sutcliffe, R. (2017). the difference between P4C and PwC. in History, theory and practice of philosophy for children (pp. 56-63). in Routledge.

Theodoropoulou, E. (2014). Interview with E. Theodoropoulou by A. Kalafati for tvxs on the topic: "Philosophizing with children". Retrieved from http://tvxs.gr/news/paideia/tvxs-synenteyksi-e-theodoropoyloy-filosofontas-me-ta-paidia

Tozzi, M. (2013) Promoting children's learning of philosophy. In Philosophy, philosophy are you here? Doing Philosophy with Children. Athens: Diadrasis.

Trickey, S., & Topping, K. (2004) Philosophy for children: a systematic review Research Papers in Education , pp. 365-380.

Trickey, S., & Topping, K. (2006, December). Collaborative philosophical enquiry for school children: socio-emotional effects at 11 to 12 years. School Psychology International , pp. 599-614.

UNESCO (1994) The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education, Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2005) Guidelines for Inclusion: Ensuring Access to Education for All, Paris, France: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Vansieleghem, Nancy & Kennedy, David (2011) What is Philosophy for Children, What is Philosophy with Children-After Matthew Lipman? Journal of Philosophy of Education 45 (2):171-182

Ventista, O. (2019) An evaluation of the 'Philosophy for Children' programme: the impact on cognitive and non-cognitive skills (Doctoral dissertation, Durham University).

Vrasidas, Ch. (2014) Introduction to Qualitative Research. Nicosia.

Zulkifli, H., & Hashim, R. (2020).Philosophy for children (P4C) in improving critical thinking in a secondary moral education class.International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 19(2), 29-45.