

**The Philosophical Inquiry Community Approach in Secondary School French Classes as a
Second Language**

Rosalie Halls

Department of Education, University of New Brunswick

ED 6096: P4C Workshops

Dr. Melissa Dockrill

Dr. Josée Le Bouthillier

April 13, 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Context	4
Origin and Background	4
Definition	6
Process and Practices	7
Curriculum and Pedagogy	7
Inquiry-Based Education	11
Student-Centered Approach	13
Teaching methods and implementation	15
Impact	17
Diversity, Inclusion, and Social Justice	17
<i>Agency and Empowerment</i>	20
Autonomy and Democracy	21
Social and Emotional Competencies	23
<i>Critical Thinking and Reasoning</i>	23
<i>Engagement</i>	26
<i>Self-Regulation</i>	26
<i>Creative Thinking</i>	28
Moral Growth and Development	29
Dialogue and communication	33
Second language and learning development	35
Language teaching and oracy development	40
Conclusion	44
Independent Study: P4C Workshops FSL	46
Project Introduction	46
Philosophical Workshops	52
Philosophical Discussion Workshop #1	52
Philosophical Discussion Workshop #2	58
Philosophical Discussion Workshop #3	63
Conclusion	68
References	71

Introduction

The purpose of this literature review is to explore current research on the Philosophy for Children (P4C) approach to gain a deeper understanding of its principles and importance to the field of education with attention given to language to examine the benefits of P4C within a second language context. The review encompasses qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-method studies, including quasi-experimental designs, case studies, meta-analyses, and conceptual analyses.

This review examines 29 peer-reviewed articles, theses, and research reports published between 2015 and 2025, to provide a comprehensive overview of the literature. To identify these sources, the search process used three databases valuable for educational research, which were ERIC, PsycINFO, and Google Scholar. The search process was facilitated and narrowed down by applying Boolean operators. The filter “past ten years” and the use of all three search bars with several keywords associated with well known P4C themes were employed. These strategies produced articles specific to the subject at hand. Furthermore, particular attention was given to identifying specific themes that related to language and P4C because it was a vital research interest. The chosen articles were selected based on their relevance to P4C theory, practice, and outcomes, with particular interest in studies examining P4C’s implementation and impact across diverse educational settings. The literature also focuses on international contexts and addresses P4C applications with different populations, such as children in early childhood, students in middle school to teachers in training.

For this purpose, this literature review is organized into four domains. The first domain establishes the contextual foundations and historical development of P4C by examining the evolution of the concept with a section dedicated to defining P4C. The second domain explores the processes and practices that characterize P4C implementation, including inquiry-based

education, student-centered approaches, curriculum design, and teaching methodologies. The third domain investigates the impacts of P4C on student development, with a focus on critical thinking and reasoning, social and emotional competencies, moral growth, autonomy, empowerment, agency, engagement, self-regulation, creative thinking, diversity and inclusion, and the components of communities of inquiry. Finally, the fourth domain addresses the important role of dialogue, communication, and language development in P4C practice, including implications for second language development.

By conducting a thorough examination of relevant literature, this review illuminates the positive impacts of the Philosophy for Children approach, which is seen as a vital framework for education that prepares children for active, ethical participation in a democratic society.

Context

Origin and Background

The Philosophy of Children (P4C) approach was introduced by Matthew Lipman in the early 1970s due to the lack of importance given to reasoning and critical thinking in the traditional education system. Lipman (1976) believed children were not often taught to engage in metacognition, which he described as the ability to “think about thinking” (p. 21). This motivated Lipman to develop a pilot project in 1970 and 1971 involving fifth grade students in Montclair, New Jersey. In this project, Lipman had students read a chapter of his book *Harry Stottlemeier*, which explores how children naturally learn logical thinking, using the character Harry’s mistaken idea about comets as a model for exploratory learning (Lipman, 1974) with the goal of stimulating philosophical dialogue and reasoning skills. Lipman structured the sessions around classroom discussions, encouraging students to question, reason, and reflect on the ideas presented in the text. His research indicated that students engaged in philosophical inquiry and

logical reasoning enhanced their academic performance and surpassed their peers on relevant assessments. This suggests that young students are capable of engaging in and benefiting from philosophical inquiry. This successful outcome paved the way to the development of P4C, a pedagogical approach that promotes philosophical inquiry among children.

Furthermore, the foundations of P4C were greatly influenced by the philosopher John Dewey (1944). Lipman believed that P4C had a democratic component, and Dewey's focus on democracy and education as a way for cultivating responsible and reflective citizens resonated with Lipman as he was developing P4C (Garcia et al., 2020). Therefore, the P4C approach is structured with some of Dewey's views in mind, which focus on the importance of a student-centered classroom that encourages a community of inquiry in which students construct meaning collaboratively rather than passively (Işıklar & Abali Öztürk, 2022).

More recent studies using a P4C approach elaborate on Lipman's ideas that formed the concept of P4C. Asgari et al. (2023) further clarify Lipman's goals with P4C by specifying his aim to promote critical, creative, and caring thinking, known as the "3 Cs" to support children's reasoning and reflective skills. Similarly, Austin (2020) suggests that P4C is understood as a dialogic, community-based approach that encourages children to engage in discussion, problem-solving, and philosophical reflection.

These foundational principles continue to shape the pedagogical approach of P4C that goes beyond traditional instruction. Garcia et al. (2020) propose that P4C offers a framework for developing well-rounded thinkers who are not only academically capable but also socially responsible. P4C also emphasizes dialogue, collaboration, and inquiry to create learning environments where children become active students and engaged citizens. As research continues

in this field, P4C remains a relevant and valuable approach for meeting the current educational demands and preparing students to navigate complex and diverse societies.

Definition

Philosophy of Children is an educational approach that has been developed and refined over the years, yet the meaning of this concept is not commonly understood outside of those familiar with philosophical inquiry in education and who have previously engaged with it. Across the literature, researchers offer various definitions of P4C that emphasize philosophical inquiry, dialogue, and critical thinking as important components.

According to Wahab et al. (2022), P4C can be defined as a student and community centered approach that aims to strengthen students' inquiry, promote reasonable judgements, and encourage critical thinking and philosophical reflection based on their personal experiences. The authors suggests that P4C also promotes creative thinking to increase self-confidence and improve academic achievement. Similarly, Gaedi (2015) describes P4C as a program of philosophical inquiry with children, where children are involved in class discussions around "big questions" (p.292). Gaedi also suggest that P4C encourages children to search, question, think critically, as well as form and examine various concepts. Therefore, P4C also seeks to develop children's reasoning skills and to cultivate and encourage deeper thinking.

In line with these perspectives, Işıklar and Abalı-Öztürk (2022) define P4C as a curriculum based intervention that encourages critical thinking through philosophical inquiry to enhance problem-solving skills in children. The researchers suggest that dialogue-based activities using philosophical themes enhance children's cognitive and problem-solving abilities. To extend this understanding, Asgari et al. (2023) describe P4C as an educational approach that aims to cultivate democratic dialogue with critical, creative, and caring thinking. Based on Lipman's

(2003) work, the authors believe that P4C provides children with opportunities to reflect and reason, while developing an understanding of different perspectives and questioning skills. In addition, Asgari et al. (2023) also believed that P4C influences the development of empathy and reasoning.

Therefore, these definitions describe the specific components that form P4C, which are dialogical and inquiry-based educational practices that nurture critical, creative, and caring thinking. Though specific definitions vary across different studies, core values and principles remain consistent, which allows us to understand that P4C enables children to engage with philosophical questions, develop reasoning and problem-solving skills, and cultivate empathy and reflection through collaborative dialogue.

Process and Practices

Curriculum and Pedagogy

To gain a comprehensive understanding of the Philosophy for Children approach, it is essential to explore both its curriculum and its pedagogical foundations. The examined literature provides extensive insight into the structure of a P4C curriculum and its pedagogical approaches. P4C is designed for primary and secondary students, and this approach perceives educators as facilitators who guide dialogue to promote philosophical discussions. According to Andal (2021), the goal is to support children's reasoning skills and promote the development of philosophy within school settings. Andal also explains that P4C focuses on "children in dialogue towards critical thinking" (p.139), which highlights the importance of dialogue in this pedagogical approach. This suggests that dialogue serves as a form of expression that encourages reflection on the topic of discussion, and the author also mentioned this idea here: "The classroom dialogue

becomes a process jointly achieved by each student to acknowledge not only ideas but different ways of expressing them” (p. 141).

Moreover, Anderson (2020) builds on Andal (2021)’s descriptions of P4C pedagogy by explaining that it gives children opportunities to express themselves while developing the ability to make reasonable decisions. Anderson identifies P4C as a child-centered approach. Similarly, Balci and Eryılmaz (2024) describe P4C as an approach that values the development of thinking abilities, particularly inquiry and critical thinking skills. Balci and Eryılmaz indicate that a P4C curriculum encourages students to engage with complex concepts through discussion to support them with their own reasoning. The pedagogy also promotes an environment where many perspectives and solutions are explored through critical dialogue.

Additionally, Austin (2020) propose that an important element of the P4C curriculum is the idea of a community of inquiry. Austin explains that a community of inquiry is an integral part of P4C because Lipman focused on Dewey’s (1944) belief that reflection is essential for learning. Austin describes that through a community of inquiry, children are encouraged to bring their personal experiences into the classroom to engage in a collaborative reflection. Therefore, a community of inquiry allows children to develop critical and creative thinking, and it is considered essential for the overall effectiveness of P4C.

Furthermore, Asgari et al. (2023) complement Austin’s (2020) emphasis on a community of inquiry by highlighting that it is a fundamental aspect of P4C pedagogy. The authors also provide a comprehensive overview of the components involved in this approach. They explain that P4C often involves reading philosophical novels or engaging with other stimuli, followed by developing of topics, formulating questions, and leading a discussion based on those questions. Specifically, Asgari et al. emphasize the value of this approach for children: “During classroom

discussions, children have the opportunity to think, reflect, and reason with others, see others perspectives and learn that the power of understanding lies in being able to see a situation and the world from another person's viewpoint" (p. 28-29). This illustrates that P4C pedagogy is an enriching educational tool that goes beyond traditional learning and supports children's cognitive and social development.

Bowden (2021) further explains that P4C differs from traditional teaching because of the adult's role as a facilitator rather than a direct instructor. In this pedagogy, children are placed at the centre of the learning process, while the adult supports them. This allows children to direct their own learning experiences. Therefore, facilitators play an important role by encouraging and guiding students in addressing philosophical questions, which promotes critical thinking.

Bowden highlights that dialogue in P4C contributes to the development of a community of inquiry and allows for "meaningful co-construction of ideas and for children to enact their participatory rights" (p. 4). Overall, this pedagogical approach aims to accentuate the role of children in their learning environment.

Furthermore, Gaedi (2015) reinforces the objectives of the P4C curriculum by explaining its cognitive and social goals for children. P4C's cognitive aspect "forces the mind to operate" (p.293) through thinking and what they call "structured interaction" (p. 293). Through the social aspect, the curriculum aims to teach children the process of democratic decision making and as Lipman (1976) stated, the goal of the program is to teach students about thinking. Since its introduction in the 1970s, the program has evolved considerably. During their thinking sessions, Gaedi (2015) explains that children can focus on a wide variety of materials such as poetry, news reports, children's games, music, and picture collections, allowing them to explore multiple perspectives.

Gaedi (2015) outlines the key components of the P4C curriculum and suggests that there are two specific approaches: the integrated and the philosophical approach. The integrated approach brings together various mental, philosophical, and cognitive elements, along with resources and methods from different subjects, in a community of inquiry. It prioritizes the development of reasoning skills as the foundation and guiding focus of the curriculum. This approach combines all aspects of the P4C approach to achieve educational goals with psychological, social, and cultural factors within the philosophical and educational principles. Therefore, Gaedi proposes that P4C focuses on the strengths of various educational traditions while avoiding their weaknesses through thoughtful interaction.

On the other hand, Gaedi (2015) explains that the philosophical approach encompasses all ideas that come from philosophical thought or reasoning. It emphasizes dialogue as an element that structures understanding and includes other components such as the narrative approach, play approach, dialogue approach, and the activity approach. The narrative approach uses stories to facilitate philosophical inquiry rather than directly teaching the concepts. This approach can lead to a dialogue process that encourages students to participate in a community of inquiry. Therefore, the dialogue approach is facilitated by the narrative approach and values collaborative dialogue where people share and build ideas.

Furthermore, Gaedi (2015) suggests that the play approach focuses on Gadamer's (1975) idea of play. This indicates that in a community of inquiry, dialogue works like a shared "game" where no one controls the outcome, instead everyone participates and explores ideas together. This experience creates new meanings and understandings. Likewise, the activity approach in the P4C curriculum places students at the centre of learning through playful activities, which maintain their attention, and it make the process more engaging.

Finally, based on the many aspects of the P4C curriculum, it is evident that this dynamic pedagogical approach aims to help students develop fundamental skills that will benefit them throughout their lives. It highlights children's ability to think for themselves with a strong focus on developing cognitive skills through various approaches, particularly a community of inquiry with the help of a facilitator. Thus, it is important to ensure that teachers have a solid understanding of the P4C curriculum to effectively implement this pedagogy into the classroom.

Inquiry-Based Education

Inquiry is a vital aspect of Philosophy for Children due to the importance of a community of inquiry within its curriculum. Inquiry is a method used in P4C pedagogy that facilitates students' thinking and their ability to philosophize (Karadag & Demirtas, 2018). The importance of inquiry is reinforced in many studies on P4C pedagogy, such as Daniel et al. (2017). The authors in this study provided useful insight into the effectiveness of inquiry by examining types of questions and critical thinking within this pedagogical approach.

Daniel et al. (2017) had teachers guide students through philosophical dialogues centered on open-ended questions, which encouraged them to think critically, justify their ideas, and engage with other students' perspectives. This process supports inquiry-based learning, where students construct knowledge through dialogue with guidance from a facilitator. The findings showed that when teachers used open, philosophically based questions, they allowed for more diverse perspectives and students engaged in dialogical thinking. This dialogical thinking did not occur with closed questions and limited student responses, suggesting that inquiry in P4C is more effective with open questioning. It also highlights the critical role of inquiry in P4C by showing that the types of questions asked by teachers have significant effects on students' thinking processes.

Likewise, Lam (2022) also addressed questioning in an inquiry-based approach and reinforced the importance of open questioning. Lam proposed that open questioning allows students to engage in inquiry through a scaffolding process. Therefore, inquiry is an important part of the P4C curriculum and emphasis should be placed on the types of questions asked to students. According to Lam, open questioning allows students to explore different concepts while encouraging various perspectives. Teachers can facilitate this process by encouraging inquiry-based education when implementing the P4C curriculum in their classrooms and focusing on creating a community of inquiry.

Additionally, Lam (2022) explained the role of inquiry in the classroom and discussed how to use an inquiry-based approach within the P4C pedagogy. Lam specifically discussed the role of the teacher and suggested that there are various approaches that they can take. Teachers can guide an inquiry-based approach by asking students questions, which allows exploration that might lead to unexpected conclusions. Alternatively, they can also take an outcome-led approach, which directs students towards specific answers. However, Lam proposed that teachers should engage in inquiry with their students and maintain an open attitude rather than guiding them towards a specific idea. Lam reinforced this by citing the following statement shared by Haynes and Murriss (2011):

Inquiry teachers should act like a stingray that paralyses not only others but itself, allowing themselves to be as perplexed as students, being willing to experiment and play with new ideas, and opening up a space for fulfilling their role as a co-inquirer (p. 3).

Overall, these studies demonstrate that an inquiry-based approach is a fundamental aspect of P4C that shapes the learning experience. Open questioning, dialogical engagement, and a teacher's willingness to participate alongside students can create a positive learning environment. Daniel

et al. (2017) and Lam (2022) specify that through inquiry-based education, students can construct meaning through dialogue, which supports philosophical exploration.

Student-Centered Approach

There has been a significant focus on the student-centered approach in Philosophy for Children pedagogy because it supports the development of essential skills, including critical thinking and problem-solving. Therefore, it is vital to examine how this student-centered approach unfolds in P4C sessions. Asgari et al. (2023) conducted a study focused on implementing a student-centered approach. The researchers examined 10 classrooms of middle school students, who were assigned to either a control group or an intervention group. Instead of traditional instruction, students engaged in weekly community of inquiry sessions led by students. Initially, students developed “rules” for their community of inquiry, and then the facilitator presented a stimulus that prompted students to engage by developing their own philosophical questions and discussing them. Furthermore, students engaged with these questions in their community of inquiry through reflection and various exercises.

This process encouraged autonomy, critical thinking, caring thinking, and respect within a supportive environment. The facilitators acted as guides rather than instructors, which allowed students to work together and build on their peers’ contribution. This is considered to be a core aspect of student-centered pedagogy. However, the study’s results did not show significant improvements in empathy, perspective-taking, or altruism compared to control groups. It also revealed a decline in perceived classroom autonomy and teacher-rated social and emotional competencies. The results demonstrated that students with higher initial social and emotional skills seemed to benefit more from P4C. This suggests that while student-centered dialogue

promotes engagement and reflection in P4C, its impact on social and emotional competencies is more variable (Asgari et al., 2023).

On the other hand, Xu (2022) suggests that the student-centered approach is a critical aspect of P4C and is valuable because it allows children to be heard and to become actively involved in their learning process. The author specifically mentions that:

It is important to hear the voices of every child. Encouraging them to express their points of view will not only increase their class participation and school attendance but also give them a new and novel understanding of learning as they encounter education (p. 24).

This demonstrates that the student-centered approach can help children increase their motivation to learn while developing competencies needed to become responsible citizens. Furthermore, Xu (2022) offers a perspective on the community of inquiry and indicates that it is important to change the traditional teacher-student relationship when engaging in this process. The author specifies this relationship as a “symmetrical teacher-student relationship” (p. 26), which allows many people to be heard and contribute to the lesson rather than only focusing on one. Xu believes that a student-centered approach is essential because it allows teachers to learn from students and develop a growth mindset, which is fundamental in P4C.

Similarly, Xu (2022) clarifies that teachers are not removed from their role in P4C and a student-centered approach, but they lose the aspect of control and learn with their students. Xu explains this concept by suggesting that teachers implement Vygotsky’s (1978) Zone of Proximal Development during P4C. He implies that children’s questions and responses allow teachers to comprehend their “level of development” and “moving the child to the next level of cognitive challenge.” (Xu, 2022, p. 26). Therefore, a student-centered approach has significant impacts that

enhance the effectiveness of P4C pedagogy. To ensure that students have a direct role in their learning, this must be implemented efficiently.

Teaching methods and implementation

Based on the processes and practices already identified, it is essential that teachers understand how to implement effective strategies for integrating P4C pedagogy into their classrooms. This section explores teaching methods that promote the P4C approach by examining literature focused on these concepts.

Lam (2022) suggests that educational practices across nations have often been monologic, which focuses on a teacher's voice. However, the author believes that there should be a shift towards dialogic teaching approaches, which are more student-centered and highlight "the teacher's non-manipulation of students and co-creation of meaning with them" (p. 1). Dialogic teaching is an effective teaching method that offers numerous benefits, including developing a better grasp of concepts, strengthening inferential comprehension of texts, and improving students' argumentative writing. Thus, Lam's study illustrates how P4C pedagogy can help teachers develop dialogic and inquiry-based teaching practices. To support the development of dialogic teaching strategies, Lam (2022) highlights the importance of incorporating a community of inquiry as a teaching method. As discussed earlier, a community of inquiry provides a supportive environment where students can engage in reasoning, explore and evaluate various ideas, and respect different views within a shared space. Therefore, to implement P4C pedagogy effectively, teachers must use inquiry-based strategies but also understand how to apply these approaches in their classrooms practice.

In addition, Lam (2022) conducted a study with teachers in Hong Kong to explore how teachers learn about inquiry-based strategies. Through lesson observations, teacher reflections

and analysis of teaching materials, Lam examined how participation in professional development based on P4C influenced teachers' classroom practices. The findings revealed that teachers became more capable of using dialogic and inquiry-based teaching approaches. Teachers created learning environments that encouraged student questioning and reasoning rather than relying on monologic practices.

According to Lam (2022), teachers developed more inquiry-based curriculum materials, engaged in deeper reflection on their pedagogical practices, and began to recognize students as active thinkers. More importantly, many teachers transferred these dialogic strategies to non-P4C lessons. However, Lam indicated that cultural norms, exam pressure, and limited time created challenges to completely integrate inquiry-based pedagogy. The results demonstrate that while challenges can arise, teachers can effectively incorporate dialogic teaching strategies aligned with P4C when they are provided with appropriate support and professional development opportunities.

Additionally, Tian and Liao (2016) explained that to help students experience the full benefits of P4C, teachers should prepare them through introductory activities. These activities can help students feel more at ease when they are participating in philosophical dialogue. During P4C sessions, teachers should encourage students to express their thoughts freely, listen, and guide the discussion. Consequently, effective implementation of P4C pedagogy depends on teachers' ability to adopt dialogic and inquiry-based approaches that help students become active participants in their learning. Lam's (2022) study demonstrates that with appropriate professional development, teachers can change their practices from traditional monologic practices to student-centered learning. This can be done by establishing a community of inquiry and to avoid challenges, Tian and Liao (2016) highlight that preparatory activities can help students ease into

philosophical discussions. Overall, when appropriately supported, teachers can successfully integrate P4C strategies into their classrooms.

Impact

Diversity, Inclusion, and Social Justice

Thus far, the fundamental principles of P4C have been explored with a focus on how it unfolds within educational settings. It is now important to consider the impacts of P4C, particularly its potential to contribute to diversity, inclusion, and social justice. Funston (2017) discussed how integrating critical pedagogy and P4C could cultivate a more inclusive form of philosophical inquiry. P4C has the goal of amplifying a variety of voices within a community of inquiry to ensure that everyone feels heard and valued. Similarly, Paulo Freire's (1987) concept of critical pedagogy also emphasizes the importance of dialogue that includes multiple voices, specifically, those of marginalized peoples.

To further expand on the notion of critical pedagogy, Funston (2017) proposed that Freire's (1987) critical pedagogy encourages learners to examine oppressive structures that exist with the hope of transforming them. With inclusivity in mind, Funston mentioned that when P4C is combined with critical pedagogy, it can develop reasoning skills and also help individuals confront injustices: "Critical P4C develops critical thinking in both these senses, to provide a set of reasoning skills and dispositions that aid in uncovering injustice within the status quo." (p. 11). To build on these ideas, Funston suggested that critical P4C should focus on students' shared experiences and that teachers should ensure that they are aware of students' lives before engaging in dialogue. Therefore, they should inquire about their knowledge on philosophy, social issues, their communities and their cultural context. Funston highlighted the importance of this

by writing that: “a critical P4C situates philosophical dialogue in the lived experiences of students” and “dissolves the distinction between the classroom and the world” (p. 12).

Furthermore, Funston (2017) mentioned that it is vital that teachers ensure that the dialogue modeled in critical P4C is specific to the important themes identified by Freire (1987), which he categorizes as love, faith, humility, trust, and critical thinking. This type of dialogue can help students use philosophical inquiry to think critically about their lives and to examine hierarchies shaped by race, gender, class, and social status. Thus, a critical P4C promotes diversity and inclusion by valuing each student’s voice and cultural background and seeing it as essential to the community of inquiry. It also advances social justice by empowering learners to critically examine and aim to change their social realities.

To extend this further, Austin (2020) conducted a thesis that focused on a qualitative case study method to investigate how teachers promote critical thinking through P4C. A key contribution of this thesis is the argument that P4C promotes social justice by helping diverse learners, particularly those who require additional support to succeed academically, develop both their critical thinking and language skills. Austin’s study involved 104 primary school students aged eight to eleven and their teachers from schools in New Zealand. Data was collected from audio recordings of classroom discussions, semi-structured student focus groups, open-ended teacher interviews, and student thinking journals. For a six month period, students participated in a weekly one hour P4C session focused on philosophical inquiry and critical thinking development.

According to Austin (2020), P4C is a pedagogy that allows primary teachers to help learners develop knowledge in ways that promote social justice. The author also suggested that P4C can help learners change the way they view themselves, their knowledge, and their learning.

In the study, the author mentioned that some students in the focus group stated that the P4C discussions felt more relevant and connected to real life than other things they learned at school. Also, due to P4C dialogues designed to value students' thoughts and ideas, learners with different backgrounds felt more comfortable and confident to think and express their viewpoints. Furthermore, Austin stated that many expressed that through P4C their sense of self developed, and they discovered their own voice. This allowed them to appreciate their own and their peers' perspectives. These findings demonstrate that P4C can contribute to social justice and inclusion, and they highlight the importance of critically engaging with different viewpoints.

Additionally, Austin (2020) suggested that P4C can influence teachers' perspectives, attitudes, beliefs, and practices. This was particularly observed in the area of social justice as teachers' assumptions about diverse learners were questioned during P4C sessions. Austin proposed that through P4C communities of inquiry, teachers recognized levels of potential and capability in their students that they had not previously acknowledged. This led teachers to raise their expectations of what students could achieve and of their own role in explicitly teaching critical thinking skills. Therefore, by allowing students to participate in P4C, injustices experienced by learners were identified and it demonstrated the unconscious biases in education. It also allowed teachers to change their perspectives to create a more appropriate approach to teaching. This is further explained by Austin (2020):

Teachers identified that the core, common, contestable nature of philosophical questions means that everyone has some experience and ideas to bring to the dialogue. This contributes to epistemic justice for all learners, making the COI open and accessible to all learners, regardless of their background or capital (p. 185).

This shows that P4C pedagogy, and specifically the use of a community of inquiry, not only promotes social justice in the classroom but also allows for inclusion of all learners. Similarly, Gorard et al. (2015) proposed that teachers who participate in P4C should be aware of their own biases because they could have an influence on students' learning and participation. The authors mentioned that in their study, students felt more comfortable participating and sharing their thoughts when they had established a relationship with the teacher and they knew that they could share their views without judgement. This indicates that to ensure full participation from students in P4C, students need to feel respected and important.

Furthermore, Bowen's (2020) study revealed that the community of inquiry in the P4C approach can have inclusive benefits for autistic children. The author identified findings from Cassidy et al. (2018) that states that allowing autistic students to be part of communities of inquiry can have positive benefits for them as it can allow them to "understand and express themselves." (p. 48). This further indicates that inclusion can be achieved through the P4C approach and multiple voices can be heard in this pedagogy, including those of autistic children.

Agency and Empowerment

Many of the articles identified in this literature review address aspects that relate to the ideas of agency and empowerment. Bowden (2020) suggested that approaches that value inquiry, such as the P4C approach can allow teachers to be more accepting to children's ideas. This permits them to give children more "authentic opportunities to become social agents in their learning environments" (p. 40) and demonstrates that agency is promoted through philosophical inquiry.

Similarly, Austin's (2020) qualitative study demonstrated interesting results that related to agency and empowerment. Specifically, students who participated in philosophical inquiry were

considered “co-constructors.” By conducting communities of inquiry in their classes, teachers noticed that power dynamics changed when they incorporated P4C methods, which allowed children to become “co-constructors”. This not only promoted empowerment but also allowed children to deepen their learning, which is explained here: “This co-construction was inquiry in action; students refined their understanding of philosophical concepts by listening to and evaluating each other’s perspectives and reasoning, modifying their prior knowledge, together making progress towards deeper, more nuanced understandings.” (p. 114). This suggests that through P4C, children can learn how to ask questions, challenge ideas, and justify their thoughts, which empowers them while also developing agency in the classroom.

Additionally, Austin (2020) also identified that students who were often quieter in class were able to express themselves and contribute to the discussion during the community of inquiry. This demonstrates that students who were not as comfortable in a regular classroom setting felt empowered enough to share their thoughts with their classmates. The author explained that this was likely due to the structure of the community of inquiry. This finding further supports the idea that P4C can promote empowerment and provides further evidence that the community of inquiry can be a powerful way of including all students in dialogue.

Autonomy and Democracy

Autonomy has been identified as an important social-emotional competency in the P4C approach, and it is important to understand its role and significance. Anderson (2020) used a conceptual analysis to explain that there is a connection between autonomy and authentic expression in a community of inquiry. Anderson referred to Young Bruehl’s (2017) concept of *Childism* to argue that adults prejudiced beliefs about children had a negative impact on children’s ability to speak freely. Anderson explained this by expressing that P4C could play a

significant part in diminishing this concept because of the way that it is structured. P4C highlights the importance of autonomy by encouraging children to come up with their own thoughts while considering other perspectives. Anderson (2020) specifically mentioned that P4C allows for the following:

Conceived both as an education for democracy and an education for autonomy, P4C provides children with a safe haven in which to express themselves on matters of fundamental importance to human existence such as the nature of moral action, personal identity, and knowledge (p.21).

Anderson (2020) expanded this idea and expressed the importance of cultivating children's autonomy by allowing them to develop their own questions within a community of inquiry. The author highlighted that this is a vital aspect of children's ability to express themselves freely without the fear of judgement. The author proposed that Lipman (2003) believed that permitting children to ask their own questions was "anti-authoritarian and sees it as allowing children to put the world in question" (p.29). Therefore, this suggests that the P4C approach values children's autonomy and allows students' voices to be heard instead of suppressed.

Furthermore, Bowden (2021) highlighted the power dynamics that exist in the philosophical inquiry process and suggested that children are seen as "in charge" within the inquiry process and teachers are not as involved in the process. This implies that children's voices are amplified and it increases autonomy. Bowden also proposed that teachers and children are seen as "equals" within a community of inquiry, which challenges the idea of *Childism* mentioned by Anderson (2020). Bowden furthered this thought by mentioning that authoritative voices are not always defined in philosophical inquiry, which makes some children more present in dialogue. This aligns with Anderson's (2020) ideas about children having a greater presence in

communities of inquiry. It also indicates that children's voices deserve to be heard without an authoritative figure silencing their thoughts.

Social and Emotional Competencies

Social and emotional competencies are essential skills that students need to develop and according to current literature, P4C has a direct influence on the development of these skills. Gorard et al. (2015) found evidence that participation in philosophical dialogue supported the development of many social and emotional skills that surpass academic skills. In their report, they found that confidence, communication, patience, self-esteem, and open-mindedness developed through P4C interventions. These findings indicate that P4C is a valuable approach that directly influence social-emotional competencies, specifically, critical thinking and reasoning, engagement, self-regulation, creative thinking, and moral growth and development. Therefore, this section will focus on exploring how these specific skills are enhanced through the P4C approach.

Critical Thinking and Reasoning

P4C has significant impacts on various skills, notably critical thinking and reasoning. The study by Karadag and Dermirtas (2018) examined the effectiveness of P4C on preschool children's critical thinking skills. The researchers used a quasi-experimental design without a control group to examine critical thinking. They collected data before and after the study using the *Scale of Critical Thinking through Philosophical Inquiry*, which was designed for preschoolers. They also conducted semi-structured interviews with the participants and the teachers who were present during the study.

Karadag and Dermirtas (2018) found that implementing the P4C curriculum significantly improved preschoolers' critical thinking and reasoning abilities. After participating in the

program, children's scores on the *Scale of Critical Thinking through Philosophical Inquiry* increased from medium to high levels, which demonstrated cognitive growth. Specifically, the P4C sessions enhanced important components of critical thinking, including reasoning, justification, perspective-taking, questioning, and evaluation. Children began to explain the reasons behind their ideas, considered different points of view, and asked more varied and thoughtful questions.

Furthermore, Karadag and Dermitas (2018) suggested that children were more capable of defending their opinions, comparing ideas, and engaging in reflective thinking. They also showed better listening skills, considered different opinions, and used better language structures. The P4C approach encouraged preschoolers to think independently, justify their beliefs, and engage in reasoning collaboratively. Overall, the findings indicate that philosophical inquiry has valuable impacts on the cognitive aspects of critical thinking, which helps children not only think, but also think about their own thinking.

Likewise, Kilby (2025) conducted a meta-analysis that examined quantitative evidence from 30 studies and 62 datasets to review the impact of P4C pedagogy. Kilby used a meta-analytic method to calculate the effect size, which was 0.65. This indicated a moderate to large positive effect of P4C on students' learning outcomes. Kilby found strong effects in critical thinking skills, with an effect size of 0.89. There were also academic and cognitive outcomes that showed some improvements. The benefits varied across different age groups and contexts, which suggests that philosophical dialogue is effective for various individuals, including students of different ages. Additionally, studies that were conducted in Eastern contexts had higher effect sizes than those in Western settings. This demonstrated that cultural or pedagogical factors can impact P4C. Overall, this reveals that allowing children to engage in philosophical inquiry

significantly enhances their reasoning skills, which makes P4C pedagogy a well supported approach.

Considering the findings from both Kilby (2025) and Karadag and Dermitas (2018), it is evident that the development of critical thinking skills is a strong outcome from P4C sessions. To further understand critical thinking skills, it is also essential to understand the brain structures involved in P4C pedagogy and the individual differences that can occur within this approach.

Khodagholi et al. (2025) conducted a narrative review study examining how neuroscience can explain how P4C can impact children's critical, creative, and caring thinking. The authors described critical thinking as the ability to analyze information, evaluate arguments, question and make reasoned judgements, which are all goals of P4C. Khodagholi et al. (2025) reviewed existing literature, and proposed that participation in philosophical dialogue affects reasoning and problem-solving, which are primarily processed in the prefrontal cortex and anterior cingulate cortex. These brain regions are essential for regulating thought and they also mentioned that P4C has an influence on metacognition, which is a process done in the medial prefrontal cortex.

Likewise, Khodagholi et al.'s (2025) review proposed that children who participate in P4C demonstrate abilities in reasoning, conceptual understanding, and argument evaluation, which indicates cognitive growth and brain development. However, the authors mentioned that the strength of these outcomes can vary by age, gender, and socioeconomic status because these factors can influence the development of critical thinking skills. Therefore, the authors propose that understanding P4C through a neuroscience lens can illuminate its role in strengthening brain and cognitive foundations of critical thinking.

Engagement

Engagement in P4C is also considered an important aspect of the pedagogy as it allows students to gain more from the program. Some studies discussed students' levels of participation and engagement in P4C. Gorard et al. (2015) suggested that P4C sessions helped improve students' engagement and confidence when teachers participated with them in the community of inquiry, specifically, when teachers stepped back from their traditional role of authority.

Furthermore, Andal (2021) explored how combining P4C and phenomenology could create more meaningful engagement and help resolve conflicts in diverse classrooms. Andal suggested that traditional classroom discussions often focus too much on correct answers or logical arguments, which can make students from different cultural backgrounds feel excluded. The author used P4C's community of inquiry and proposed that students should be treated as "co-thinkers" who ask questions, share ideas, and learn from one another. This approach encourages active participation and respect for various views. The phenomenology aspect allows the focus to also be on students lived experiences and the importance of listening. Therefore, engagement is not just about participating in P4C, but also about being present and open to understanding others. When students learn to listen and reflect in this deeper way, classroom dialogue becomes more inclusive, and conflicts become opportunities for connection and understanding.

Self-Regulation

Self-regulation is an essential skill that children need to develop to function in society and there are studies that indicate a connection between self-regulation and P4C. To consider the relationship between these two aspects, Heron and Cassidy's (2018) study explored how structured philosophical dialogue could support self-regulation among young people in a

controlled residential setting. The authors highlighted that in a secure accommodation, children's behaviour is often managed which does not allow for much autonomy or self-control.

In the study, community of philosophical inquiry sessions were implemented and through a qualitative analysis of these sessions, Heron and Cassidy (2018) found that children sometimes demonstrated self-regulation by following discussion rules such as turn-taking, listening, and responding respectfully. Even though this behaviour was inconsistent and varied between individuals, the community of philosophical inquiry provided a supportive environment that allowed for regulation and encouraged participants to take ownership of their behaviours. The authors suggested that involving vulnerable young people in structured philosophical dialogue could allow for reflection, self-discipline, and agency. However, it is important to understand that the effects were specific to one context, and a secure accommodation can still be a challenging environment for the development of self-regulatory skills.

Furthermore, it's important to consider these findings in relation to other studies. Youssef et al. (2016) conducted a quasi-experimental study to examine the effectiveness of a community of inquiry on reading comprehension, mathematics, self-esteem, prosocial behaviours, and emotional well-being. The authors hypothesized that participating in a community of inquiry would enhance students' pro-social behaviours compared to those who did not participate. This hypothesis was based on the idea that philosophical dialogue encourages empathy, cooperation, and respect for others' ideas. Youssef et al. (2016) used the *Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire* to measure pro-social behaviours. This was completed by teachers before and after the study.

However, the results demonstrated that there were no significant differences between the P4C group and the control group, which indicates that participation in the program did not show

improvements in prosocial behaviours. Youssef et al. (2016) suggested explanations for this finding, including differences in group dynamics, the possibility that behavioural changes take longer to develop, and limitations in teachers' ability to capture these changes. They also mentioned that the program may have focused more on cognitive reasoning than emotional or moral development. Overall, the findings demonstrate that philosophical inquiry may not be sufficient to produce observable behavioural benefits without specific attention to social-emotional learning.

Creative Thinking

Creative thinking is also an essential skill that is promoted by implementing a P4C approach in a classroom. Gorard et al. (2015) proposed that teachers not only motivated students to incorporate imagination into P4C sessions, but they also observed students coming up with original ideas, exploring alternative perspectives, and approaching specific topics in different ways during inquiry-based discussions. Furthermore, Yan et al. (2018) conducted a meta-analysis that focused on 10 studies to understand the effectiveness of P4C on students' cognitive abilities. One of the studies used *Abedi's Test of Creative Thinking (TTCT)*, which is based on the *Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT)*, to assess participants' creativity. The results demonstrated that P4C had a positive influence on student's cognitive outcomes and creativity was one of the outcomes measured.

Considering the findings above, it is clear that creativity has a role in P4C. Xu (2022) complements these ideas by explaining how creativity is promoted in this approach. The author proposed that a vital aspect of P4C is *Socratic dialogue*, which he explained as "encourages combining people's interests, love of wisdom, and pursuit of truth throughout the dialogue." (p.27). Xu mentioned that this type of dialogue encourages creativity and imagination. Similarly,

Xu suggested that teachers can also show paintings in the P4C curriculum to allow children to participate in discussions surrounding the art piece, which allows them to develop ideas and thoughts based on their observations. Xu specified that this type of discussion helps promote critical and creative thinking skills. Likewise, this creative process can also be done with music. Therefore, it is evident that children engage in creative thinking while participating in P4C and it should be considered as an important aspect of this pedagogical approach.

Moral Growth and Development

The study by Unal and Gunes (2024) aimed to investigate the effect of P4C on the development of moral perception and understanding of social rules among preschoolers. The authors used a quasi-experimental, mixed-methods design to conduct this study. There were 48 children attending public school in Turkey involved and they were divided in an experimental and a control group. The experimental group participated in a 10 week P4C program with weekly philosophical inquiry sessions, while the control group followed with the regular curriculum. Data was collected using the *Preschool Children's Conceptions of Moral and Social Rules* scale and through the use of observations and interviews. The quantitative findings showed that following the intervention, the experimental group scored much higher in the moral rules and total scale scores compared to the control group. This indicated that P4C positively influenced children's understanding of moral and social rules.

Furthermore, the qualitative results from Unal and Gunes' (2024) study supported these findings and revealed that children in the experimental group demonstrated more empathy, tolerance, cooperation, and moral reasoning in their interactions. Therefore, this study demonstrates that allowing preschoolers to engage in P4C contributes to their moral perception and understanding of social rules.

Additionally, Garcia et al. (2020) proposed that communities of inquiry support individuals' self-esteem and self-confidence. They also believed that it helped them learn to be responsible and independent. The authors suggested that participating in this dialogue within a community of inquiry strengthens these positive attitudes and habits, which are important for moral development. The authors also mentioned that P4C pedagogy aims to promote moral growth and specifically compared it to Lipman's (1995) idea of "caring thinking".

According to Garcia et al. (2020), being part of a community of inquiry helps shape participants into who they are and allows them to build important moral skills, which is elaborated here:

Thus, participation in the community of philosophical inquiry helps to forge the character of its participants in such a way that, by increasing self-consciousness, along with self-esteem and empathy, the person builds a moral sensibility, and acts with the conviction that it is possible to build reasonable and just forms of living together (p. 6).

This reveals that P4C, particularly the community of inquiry, allows for moral growth and development. It also accentuates the importance of dialogue to achieve this growth in specific competencies such as autonomy and solidarity (Garcia et al., 2020). Xu (2022) further proposed that the use of *Socratic dialogue* in P4C also plays an important part in moral growth and development. Xu mentioned that because there are multiple ways to answer questions without only one correct response, it allows students to develop autonomy, open-mindedness, courage, curiosity, and confidence.

Community of Inquiry

As previously discussed, the idea of a community of inquiry has a strong importance in the P4C curriculum. This essential element of P4C allows the program to flourish. Tian and Liao (2016) offered a description of a community of inquiry based on Kennedy and Kennedy's (2012) perspectives: "a community of philosophical inquiry involves an ongoing process in which, through social interaction and dialogue, participating members undergo continuous deconstruction and reconstruction of concepts, both interpersonal and intrapersonal planes" (p. 42). This description suggests that a community of inquiry is a learning community that allows for continuous reflection and questioning. Therefore, it is important to illuminate the vital role of questioning and reflecting within communities of inquiry as well as their impacts on students.

According to Daniel et al. (2017), a community of inquiry is a supportive atmosphere where students feel encouraged and safe to share uncertainties, perspectives, and opposing views. The authors proposed that a community of inquiry promotes collaboration and develops students' cognitive abilities, emotional intelligence, and their social capabilities. This is also highlighted by Safriyani and Mustofa (2021), who mentioned that a community of inquiry can support critical, creative, and caring thinking. Furthermore, Daniel et al. (2017) proposed that collaboration in a community of inquiry is vital because the philosophical questions students explore do not have predetermined correct answers. Instead, students need to think critically and reflect collaboratively about these questions to develop valuable responses. This process promotes reflection, which is an essential part of a community of inquiry. Teachers can also facilitate the process of reflection through philosophical and critical discussion within a community of inquiry.

Moreover, Bowden (2021) further emphasized the role of a community of inquiry in P4C pedagogy by sharing Daniel et al.'s (2017) point of view of the importance of collaborating and reflecting together. Bowden suggested that a community of inquiry allows for “communal reflection and the social nature of knowledge” (p. 39). This implies that a community of inquiry permits social interactions and shared reflections, which highlights the idea of learning from one another. Additionally, the author shared that this process allows students to become “active participants” in their learning and student contributions are respected during the inquiry process. This demonstrates that reflection, specifically shared reflection, is invaluable in communities of inquiry. Similarly, Garcia et al. (2020) have a similar perspective regarding the idea of a shared reflection. The authors suggested that when people come together in a community of inquiry, they bring many individual perspectives, but through collaborative reflection, they can develop more balanced and less biased perspectives.

Regarding the importance of questioning within a community of inquiry, Xu (2022) proposed that *Socratic dialogue*, which is part of the P4C approach, values the aspect of questioning because it demonstrates critical thinking and allows students to use cognitive skills. Garcia et al. (2020) also highlighted the importance of *Socratic dialogue* within a community of inquiry, and they suggested that students can become “active subjects of their own learning” (p. 5), which permits them to question reality including troubling parts and human experiences. Additionally, Safriyani and Mustofa (2021) discussed *Socratic dialogue* and its role in the development of the P4C approach as well as its goal to enrich critical thinking skills in students. The authors specified that this critical thinking is enhanced by questioning within a community of inquiry, which they describe here: “cooperate to build and answer their own philosophical questions out of a certain input resource which can encourage them to take responsibility for

their own learning.” (p. 1023). This demonstrates that questioning is a vital part of P4C, and it is needed to effectively implement a community of inquiry and encourage students’ growth.

This indicates that a community of inquiry is essential for the efficiency of P4C pedagogy, and it incorporates many valuable components such as questioning, reflecting, and working collaboratively, which contribute to students’ overall development and their ability to become “active” learners.

Language

This paper has explored various topics related to P4C and its impacts. It is now essential to consider how P4C can be applied in the domain of language and in a second or foreign language context. This section will examine literature that focuses on enhancing speaking, writing, and reading as well as the desirability of using P4C as a pedagogical approach in language learning. It will also explore philosophy-based language teaching approaches and those that can be used in second or foreign language contexts.

Dialogue and communication

When considering dialogue and communication, it is important to focus on speaking skills. The P4C approach is seen as a good way to enhance language abilities, especially speaking skills, because according to Balci and Eryılmaz (2024) it “promotes critical, creative, and reflective thinking through dialogue and inquiry” (p. 2). There are also implications that P4C can create an environment where students can express themselves without judgement due to the open-minded and inclusive nature of the discussions. Thus, it could be a suitable approach to develop speaking skills while reducing speech anxiety. Balci and Eryılmaz conducted a study that explored how the P4C approach can improve the speaking skills of gifted students and

reduce their speaking anxiety. The authors aimed to determine if the positive effects of P4C, such as strengthening communication and critical thinking would be observed in gifted students who often have advanced thinking skills but could still face challenges in verbal expression or confidence when speaking.

Balci and Eryılmaz (2024) used a mixed-methods design for this study. They used quantitative data to measure speaking skills and anxiety, and qualitative data for student opinions. The data was collected using the *Speech Observation Form*, which focused on different aspects of speaking and the *Speech Anxiety Scale*, which focused on levels of speaking anxiety. There were 60 participants, who were students in grades four to five enrolled in *BILSEM*, a Turkish Science and Art Centre. In the study, participants were involved in 10 Turkish language lessons that incorporated P4C activities. Each session involved reading a short story, followed by open-ended philosophical questioning and group discussion, which encouraged reasoning and respectful dialogue.

The quantitative results of Balci and Eryılmaz (2024) suggested that there was significant improvement in all areas of speaking skills after P4C sessions. Students' pronunciation, fluency, language use, and interaction strategies improved, and their speaking anxiety also decreased. This demonstrated that students became more comfortable and confident expressing themselves. It is also important to mention that these benefits were similar across gender and grade level, which means that P4C benefited various students. Additionally, the qualitative results also supported the social-emotional benefits of P4C such as students felt more curious, confident, empathetic, and open-minded after participating in the P4C sessions. The article specifies that it helped them listen better, think more critically, and express their opinion more clearly.

On the other hand, Tian and Liao (2016) conducted a quasi-experimental study that explored the benefits of using a P4C approach in an English as a Foreign Language course in Taiwan using picture books. The study included 62 participants with a P4C and a control group. They engaged in a 10 week English storybook instruction using P4C instructional methods, including the community of inquiry. Students received training regarding the community of inquiry because many were unfamiliar with the concept. Contrary to Balci and Eryılmaz's (2024) outcomes, the results demonstrated that the P4C group's anxiety regarding English language use was not reduced. However, the P4C group reported a higher level of motivation after the intervention. This demonstrates that P4C had some positive effects on secondary students English as a Foreign language learning, but it did not help reduce their anxiety as the researchers had hoped. The researchers indicated that this was probably due to the oral skills required in the community of inquiry.

Therefore, Balci and Eryılmaz (2024) demonstrate that P4C can be an effective approach to help gifted students develop speaking skills. However, Tian and Liao (2016) demonstrated that secondary Taiwanese students experienced higher levels of anxiety when participating in P4C. This demonstrates that the benefits of P4C can vary based on language level and across different contexts. Nevertheless, the research provides evidence that incorporating P4C approaches into language lessons can enhance speaking skills and motivation in learning a second language. P4C should be considered as a helpful tool for educators hoping to develop oral language development in their classes.

Second language and learning development

Second language learning is often seen as a complex process that requires specific competencies, and uncertainties about the use of P4C to support second language development

are expected. Capili (2021) suggested that it is possible to use P4C to help children develop competencies in a second language. Capili addressed the questions and concerns that surround the idea of using P4C to help with language development and explained how it is achievable. Capili proposed that: “Philosophizing with children and young people actually activates the most fundamental, creative, and searching impulses in philosophy, such as wondering, questioning, and the natural desire for meaning” (p. 41). This demonstrates that P4C stimulates children’s cognitive skills, which is a necessary component in language development.

Furthermore, Capili (2021) elaborated that some people believe children may not have the capabilities to philosophize let alone in a second language, but the author cited Karin Murriss (2000) who suggested that children should not be in the same “category” as adults when abilities are compared. The author continued by mentioning that children can receive training to develop the language skills needed to participate in P4C in a second language context and that it should not deny them the opportunity to be taught how to philosophize in a second language.

The author further contributed to this discussion by indicating that when children philosophize, it often allows for learning opportunities, such as the process of asking additional questions regarding the comprehension of words and concepts that are mentioned in discussions (Capili, 2021). It is suggested that children’s vocabularies are still growing, and they are more likely to ask for the meaning of words in P4C sessions. Capili indicated that children taking part in these activities could be advantaged.

Similarly, during philosophical sessions children can take part in “code-switching” between languages, which can support the development of an additional language if they are given enough time and can find ways to express themselves in that language (Capili, 2021). The author stated that Vansieleghem and Kennedy (2011) also suggested: “The practice and teaching

of philosophizing generate communal reflection, contemplation, and communication” (p. 48). This demonstrates that the student-centered approach of a community of inquiry can be effective for second language learning because of the way that it is structured. Capili specifically said: “Learning becomes organized and goal-oriented pooling together of individuals’ already extant foreknowledge, linguistic competencies, and skills” (p. 49). Murriss (2000) further explained the reason that children are suitable for philosophizing and indicated that they are well prepared to participate in philosophical discussions because their thinking is less rational and they do not have prior knowledge or experiences. This allows them to be more open-minded and curious during questioning (Capili, 2021). Evidently, P4C can help children develop competencies in a second language.

Similarly, Dabbagh and Noshadi (2016) also proposed that philosophy could help students within a second or additional language context by using the Philosophy-based Language teaching (PBLT) approach developed by Shahini and Riazi (2011). This method aims to facilitate teaching additional languages to students and incorporates specific aspects such as setting up a classroom as a “social community” (p. 1024) where students can collaborate on philosophical tasks and use language actively to explore ideas. They believed that this approach permitted enhanced critical and creative thinking as well as improvement in speaking and writing skills in students’ additional language.

Furthermore, Dabbagh and Noshadi (2016) explained how PBLT was implemented in an English Language Teaching. The students began by engaging with a stimulus, they then proceeded to the task of creating philosophical questions that encouraged critical thinking. These questions were shared and discussed. Throughout the dialogic process, similar to Capili’s (2021), code switching was permitted during this process to help develop skills in the additional

language. However, in this context, the teacher also highlighted vocabulary and translated students' contributions in the target language in addition to facilitating communication and monitoring discussions. The authors also clarified what the teacher is supposed to do at the end of the philosophical inquiry: "At the end of the discussion, the instructor works on the linguistic points raised up within the philosophical dialogue exchange among learners and puts them on the board" (p. 1024).

Moreover, Capili (2021) mentioned specific findings that supported her ideas regarding students' ability to philosophize in an additional language. The author discussed Schleifer and Courtemanche's (1996) study, which involved 20 children aged 10 to 12 who struggled with French, which was the language used at school. For over eight months, the students were part of bi-weekly discussions based on Lipman's philosophical novel *Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery*. The results showed that most children made significant progress in seven evaluated areas, such as using logical connectors and forming more complex sentences (Capili, 2021). These findings provide another piece of evidence that philosophizing allows children to develop language abilities and specifically mention a French context, which is an area of interest in this literature review.

Additionally, Capili (2021) conducted a study that examined how philosophizing influenced students in a secondary ethics class. The author used methods and strategies from a course called "philosophizing with children and the youth." She conducted a session with a group of students, which allowed them to consider a question about lying. Capili described that before the session, the students had already explored concepts from Buber (1986) *The Elements of the Interhuman*. In this session, students watched two short videos on lying and worked in small groups to discuss a related question. Each group developed and presented arguments on the

issue, and they reviewed and voted on the most convincing points as a class. This activity demonstrated that students were capable of meaningful philosophical engagement in their second language. Capili mentioned that although grammatical errors appeared in their written work, the students showed active participation, critical thinking, and collaboration, which revealed an effort to communicate with each other.

Similarly, Safriyani and Mustofa (2021) offered a fascinating view that also emphasized meaningful philosophical engagement and critical thinking within language learning. The authors conducted a qualitative study in Indonesia to explore how P4C could be integrated into reading instruction within an English as a Foreign Language course, through the use of fairy tales. It was suggested that fairy tales were an effective tool for foreign language learning because they allowed students to think critically through discussions and encouraged them to reflect philosophically on the stories they read. Safriyani and Mustofa proposed that language learning goes beyond grammar and vocabulary and also involves moral skills. Due to the importance of moral development in P4C, the authors suggested that it is beneficial to use P4C to teach moral values through the content of fairy tales. The authors described the importance of this approach within a language context here:

Language learning must encourage children to acquire and develop their moral knowledge, awareness, and identity and learn linguistic abilities such as grammar and vocabulary. As a result, EFL teachers can use a range of social circumstances in language textbooks to convey various moral principles. Because learning any language entails moral training, it is critical to openly teach moral ideas by the use of Philosophy for children (p. 126).

This demonstrates that fairy tales are effective texts to use during this process because they often incorporate moral principles. Safriyani and Mustofa (2021) suggested that students may experience language difficulties with advanced vocabulary, which is why teachers should also use scaffolding strategies while teaching them how to read. The authors mentioned that the scaffolding process focuses on students' questioning skills through *Socratic questioning*. They indicated that this process could help students ask and reason about philosophical questions. It can also allow them to connect the fairy tales to their experiences, which helps develop better reading comprehension and critical thinking skills. Similarly, Tian and Liao (2016) also integrated P4C instructional methods in an English as a Foreign Language class with the use of picture books and the results showed that there were some positive outcomes related to reading comprehension in English, meaning that P4C through picture books can be a helpful pedagogical approach to integrate into a language classroom.

Language teaching and oracy development

Language teaching includes many components such as writing, reading, listening and speaking skills. While teaching with the aim of developing output, it is also important to consider comprehension. The previous section mentioned the enhancement of reading comprehension in a second language through P4C pedagogy, and it is important to also consider the effect that it can have on a child's native language. To begin, Erginer et al. (2024) conducted a study that examined how children's books can be used as a tool in P4C to promote environmental philosophy in youth. This qualitative study did not take place in a second language context, but there were still interesting results that indicated the usefulness of picture books in P4C to enhance reading comprehension. Specifically, the authors found that using children's picture books positively supports children's reading comprehension and helps struggling students

improve their reading comprehension. The author specified that it improved their critical thinking and understanding. These reading comprehension results can be compared with Tian and Liao's (2016) and Safriyani and Mustofa's (2021) findings, even though they focused on English as a Foreign Language context.

Based on the studies above, it is likely that reading comprehension can be enhanced through P4C pedagogy. Youssef et al. (2016) supported this idea with their study, which proposed that participating in a community of inquiry improved students' reading comprehension. The authors suggested that the components of a community of inquiry could have assisted the development of reading comprehension skills, which is explained here:

The talking, questioning, and listening, during the philosophical COI, interwoven with these other activities, could have aided reading comprehension as the program involved conversations that were ultimately and intrinsically linked with thinking" (p. 12).

Therefore, this demonstrates that the P4C approach, specifically through the community of inquiry, can enhance students' language skills.

Furthermore, Kerslake and Rimmington (2017) focused on oracy, an important component of children's language skills. The authors suggested that thinking and language are connected and proposed that oracy could be developed in various ways. Kerslake and Rimmington identified P4C as an effective pedagogical approach to examine the association between thinking and oracy skills. They examined this association by expressing that "when children philosophize, they are not learning the canon of philosophical thought, but are engaged in an active process. The nature of that process centres on the relationship between thinking and speaking" (p. 23). This highlights a key component in the P4C approach, which is that

individuals participate actively in a community of inquiry and by using critical thinking skills they can engage in thoughtful dialogue.

Kerslake and Rimmington (2017) suggested that previous studies identified an association between improved oracy skills and P4C. Specifically, the UK's Educational Endowment Foundation (EEF) conducted a study that focused on the dialogic aspects of P4C. Participants from various socio-economic backgrounds participated in a weekly P4C session. The results demonstrated that P4C led to better reading outcomes and improvements in self-esteem, listening skills, and confidence in speaking. This shows that P4C can have a positive influence on children's language abilities, which builds confidence due to the development of oracy skills. Thus, the authors suggested that oracy skills should be taught and P4C is an effective pedagogical approach that can allow for this. Another piece of evidence that supports the idea that P4C allows for the development of oracy skills is Gorard et. al's (2015) study which showed that students and teachers believed their communication skills improved through P4C participation. It also helped them express their thoughts and develop new vocabulary. Ultimately, P4C cultivates speaking and oracy skills.

Likewise, Dabbagh and Noshadi (2016) highlighted the Philosophy-based language teaching approach (PBLT) in their article. They mentioned that certain researchers reported positive results when implementing PBLT in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) course that focused on oracy skills. The authors examined Hemmati and Hoomanfar's (2014) study, which suggested that PBLT could improve EFL students' speaking abilities and their desire to communicate. The authors pointed out similar results in Shahini and Riazi's (2011) study, which investigated writing and speaking skills using PBLT in EFL classes and also found an enhancement of these skills. These examples of studies incorporating PBLT demonstrate that

philosophy-based education can have a positive influence on components important in language development, specifically in enhancing oracy skills.

Based on the findings above, P4C pedagogy has an influence on language development, whether that is reading, writing, or speaking. Studies demonstrated that benefits resulted from implementing the P4C approach within a second or foreign language context and within a native language context. Students who have the opportunity to engage in P4C while learning language skills experience multiple benefits, including enhanced speaking skills, improved reading, and many other advantages. Therefore, this suggests that P4C should be considered as an appropriate and comprehensive approach to supporting students with their linguistic competencies in a possible French as a Second Language context or other language-based settings.

Conclusion

This literature review focused on the Philosophy for Children approach and investigated the processes and practices, its impacts, and the role of language in this approach. The findings revealed several advantages of P4C regarding the enhancement of social-emotional competencies such as self-regulation, creative thinking, and engagement. This literature review also highlighted autonomy, agency, and empowerment that students can develop through P4C. Furthermore, P4C is seen as an effective approach that promotes diversity, inclusion, and social justice in educational contexts. While research on P4C's role in language learning is limited, the studies examined suggest that it can also be a valuable approach for developing linguistic competencies. Overall, this literature review allowed for a comprehensive understanding of the significance of P4C in education.

Despite the positive findings, gaps in research were identified. Some studies outlined the influence of P4C on creativity, which demonstrated the importance of this competency in this pedagogy, but there is still limited information regarding this impact. A similar limitation applies to engagement, which appears to be positively influenced by P4C, yet only a few studies examine this association in a concrete way and the rest implied that engagement is enhanced through P4C.

Although some studies focused on P4C in the context of English as a Foreign Language, it is important to mention that few focused on French as a Second Language, with the exception of a brief study mentioned by Capili (2021). Therefore, it is vital to conduct further research to examine the effects of P4C within FSL contexts to better understand how it can support students in developing competencies in French. Many of the studies that explored the association between language learning and P4C mentioned the importance of using strategies that are essential within

an FSL context for success in developing language skills such as scaffolding and promoting interaction through a supportive communicative environment. This suggests that P4C could be a valuable approach that can help students develop their French competencies within an FSL context. Thus, it is necessary to investigate the implications of incorporating P4C pedagogy with scaffolding and supportive interaction strategies in FSL secondary or elementary classrooms.

The richness of existing research demonstrates that P4C pedagogy should be recognized as an appropriate approach that allows children to become well-rounded individuals. This pedagogical approach not only helps students enrich their thinking abilities but also develops essential competencies that permit them to become empathetic and engaged learners. P4C should continue to be promoted in education, especially in language courses, to help children reach their full potential. To help increase the recognition of P4C, further research should be conducted on this topic.

Independent Study: P4C Workshops FSL

Project Introduction

Philosophy for Children (P4C) also known as Philosophical Inquiry Community Approach (PICA) views the classroom as a collaborative community of inquiry where knowledge is co-constructed through dialogue. As a student-centered pedagogy, PICA focuses on philosophical questioning and the exploration of concepts, assumptions, and values through critical thinking, while teachers act as facilitators who guide inquiry (Austin, 2020; Wahab et al., 2022). PICA integrates critical, creative, and caring thinking, which encourages learners to create and analyze ideas, listen respectfully, develop empathy and engage ethically in dialogue. This approach promotes democratic classroom practices, which allows students to actively participate in decision-making and become responsible citizens (Asgari et al., 2023; Garcia et al., 2020).

PICA is also important for social-emotional growth. Through participation in a community of inquiry, students can develop a greater sense of belonging, increase their autonomy, and become more engaged and confident communicators (Bowden, 2021; Gorard et al., 2015). Its inclusive structure values all students' voices regardless of prior knowledge or ability, which promotes learner agency and empowerment. Therefore, PICA helps students feel recognized and capable in their learning environment.

The emphasis on inquiry-based dialogue in PICA supports reflective thinking, collaborative problem-solving, and expressive language use (Gaedi, 2015). As Gagnon and Yergeau (2016) mention, philosophical dialogue incorporates social, cognitive, linguistic, and emotional aspects that promote metacognitive awareness, argumentative competence, and oral communication. This suggests that PICA is a beneficial approach to incorporate in lessons.

Overall, PICA is a multidimensional approach that is well-suited to second language learning. Research on PICA in second or additional language education remains limited and has primarily focused on English as a Foreign Language (EFL). These studies indicate that philosophy-based instruction enhance students' willingness to communicate, oral proficiency, and engagement through collaborative and dialogic practices (Hemmati & Hoomand, 2014; Shahini & Riazi, 2011). However, no research has examined PICA in the context of French as a second language in Canada and to address this gap, PICA will be explored within the Post-Intensive French program at the secondary level.

Post-Intensive French programs aim to enhance students' oral proficiency, communicative competence, and engagement through exposure to the language, which demonstrates that PICA could be well suited to this context. PICA can promote authentic language use by integrating communication in purposeful and student-centered discussions, which is valuable in Post-Intensive French. Also, in PICA, through a community of inquiry, students use language to express opinions, ask questions, and explore various ideas, which are critical components of communicative competence (Austin, 2020). This type of interaction is essential for second language development, as it supports language production and comprehension (Wahab et al., 2022). The New Brunswick Department of Education and Early Childhood Development highlight the importance of purposeful communication in its pedagogical document for the Post-Intensive French program, stating that instruction "uses a learner-centered approach, emphasizing language modelling and meaningful communication" (NB Department of Education, 2025). Therefore, PICA encompasses elements that are fundamental in FSL programs.

Moreover, learning a language involves developing competence in interaction. Marian and Doehler (2025) explained the concept of conversation analytic second language acquisition (CA-SLA), which can be defined as follows: to become competent in a second language, an individual must understand L2 use in interaction. CA-SLA views second language learning as developing through people's participation in social activities using language. However, this interactional approach focuses heavily on social interactional experiences and the authors suggest that there has not been a lot of focus on the socio-relational aspects of second language learning. According to Marian and Doehler (2025), the socio-relational aspects of language learning are essential, which is mentioned here:

The fine-grained details of social interactions constitute the core foundation for language learning, especially when it comes to developing the ability to effectively engage in spoken L2 communication with others. Learning unfolds as an integral component of the process of L2 speakers becoming members of specific communities in specific social environments (p.8).

Therefore, the language socialization approach to second language acquisition involves more than seeing language as a social practice. It also highlights the importance of social and cultural knowledge and allowing learners to become active participants. This interaction perspective is relevant to the use of PICA in Post-Intensive French contexts, because learning language is supported by dialogue, collaborative meaning-making, and interaction within a community of inquiry.

In addition to the importance of interaction in incorporating PICA in a Post-Intensive French context, the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)* also outlines the action-oriented approach, which is vital to linguistic development. The action-

oriented approach views language learners as social agents who use language to participate in meaningful social action (Council of Europe, 2020). This is described here: “acting in the social world and exerting agency in the learning process (Council of Europe, 2020, p. 22). This approach prioritizes collaboration, student initiative, and the co-construction of meaning through purposeful tasks, which are foundational to PICA. The action-oriented approach emphasizes the value of seeing a class as a “social context” and focuses on students' capabilities through “can do” descriptors rather than on their challenges (North, 2022, p.7).

The integration of PICA and the action-oriented approach in an FSL classroom would allow students to practice linguistic structures and engage in inquiry that requires them to use critical thinking skills to advance shared understanding. This type of exchange corresponds to the interactional tasks proposed by the CEFR, particularly in relation to oral interaction and oral production competencies (Council of Europe, 2020).

Likewise, PICA can enhance student engagement and motivation, which are critical elements in language acquisition. When students are intellectually invested in discussing ideas that matter to them in a supportive atmosphere, they are more willing to take communicative risks and actively participate in classroom interactions (Wahab et al., 2022). Gagnon and Yergeau (2016) highlight the importance of a respectful, structured dialogical space where students feel safe expressing their ideas (pp. 33–35). This type of inclusive environment reflects best practices in second language pedagogy, as it reduces speaking anxiety and views errors as natural moments in the learning process (Gagon & Yergeau, 2016, p. 38). Thus, open-minded and non-judgmental discussions can encourage participation, particularly among hesitant or less confident language learners.

In addition, PICA cultivates critical thinking skills that directly support interpretive and interpersonal communication tasks in FSL. Students engaged in philosophical dialogue in a community of inquiry are required to analyze, evaluate, and clarify ideas, which strengthens language comprehension and promotes more precise and purposeful language use (Gaedi, 2015). Gagnon and Yergeau (2016) suggest that dialogical practices promote reflective and analytical thinking through structured questioning and argumentation (pp. 41–44). These cognitive processes align with the CEFR’s emphasis on reflective learners and strategic competence (Council of Europe, 2020). This is also consistent with the Post-Intensive French pedagogical document in New Brunswick, which states that “social interaction contributes to the cognitive development of the individual” (NB Department of Education, 2025, p. 70).

Incorporating PICA into FSL instruction can help teachers establish their classroom as a social learning community where students work collaboratively in the target language. Through instructional scaffolding strategies, such as the Socratic questioning method and modelling, teachers can adopt a facilitative role to help students engage in PICA and improve their language skills. This pedagogical approach can reinforce language structures while also strengthening questioning and reasoning skills. Overall, PICA offers a powerful pedagogical framework that integrates language learning with thinking, dialogue, and community, making it particularly well suited to FSL programs.

Therefore, integrating PICA workshops into French as a second language classes would greatly benefit secondary students by supporting linguistic development and socio-emotional growth within a student-centered, strengths-based framework. PICA workshops would provide more authentic opportunities for students to develop French skills. From a socio-emotional perspective, these workshops would create an inclusive classroom community where students

feel safe to express ideas and develop confidence in their linguistic skills as second language learners (Gagon & Yergeau, 2016). Likewise, PICA values students lived experiences, perspectives, and reasoning abilities, which allows learners to be viewed as capable thinkers who already have important strengths (Austin, 2020). This sense of agency and belonging can increase engagement and strengthen students' willingness to communicate in French, especially in Post-Intensive contexts where student motivation is often lacking.

Additionally, Berger and Pekarek's (2020) study of mediation in L2 classrooms proposes that effective learning is co-constructed. Teachers do not simply provide answers but respond to learners' verbal and nonverbal cues, which creates opportunities for collaborative understanding. This aligns with PICA because teachers are seen as "facilitators" who guide discussions, respond to students' questions and reasoning to help enhance their critical thinking (Bowden, 2021). Similarly, in Post-Intensive French classes, teachers act as mediators who scaffold learning based on students' needs to help them negotiate meaning and practice language structures. Berger and Pekarek's (2020) classroom model can be applied in PICA and Post-Intensive French contexts to promote learning through engagement, shared negotiation of meaning, and the joint creation of knowledge. Thus, PICA has the potential to improve language proficiency and support the emotional and social elements necessary for successful second language learning in secondary FSL classrooms.

Philosophical Workshops

Philosophical Discussion Workshop #1	
Subject	<i>L'identité</i>
Grade Level	Post-Intensive French (Grade 9) <u>CECR Level</u> : A1-A2
Intellectual Abilities:	Philosophical Question
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define a concept • Justify opinions • Build on/challenge ideas 	<p style="text-align: center;">What does it mean to be yourself? <i>(Qu'est-ce que ça veut dire être toi ?)</i></p>
Social-emotional goals	Language needed
<p>Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build self-awareness and respect diverse identities. • Recognize and express emotions connected to identity. • Practice empathy by considering classmates' perspectives. <p>Scaffolds</p> <p>Emotions: Provide a visual emotion chart with faces + words.</p> <p>Sentence Frames: for each intellectual skill targeted.</p>	<p><u>Language for Intellectual Thinking:</u></p> <p><u>Defining:</u> <i>Pour moi, c'est.../ Être moi, c'est... C'est important parce que...</i></p> <p><u>Giving Examples:</u> <i>Par exemple..., Un exemple est... Comme...</i></p> <p><u>Justifying:</u> <i>C'est important parce que..., C'est bon parce que..., C'est mauvais parce que...</i></p> <p><u>Agreeing / Disagreeing:</u> <i>Je suis d'accord parce que..., je ne suis pas d'accord parce que..., Je comprends..., mais..., je pense autre chose...</i></p>

<p>Discussion Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colour code agreement/disagreement phrases for easy reference. • Provide sentence cards with the language for intellectual thinking sentence starters for quick reference during speaking/writing. 	<p>Questioning: <i>Pourquoi ? Peux-tu répéter ? Peux-tu expliquer ?</i></p> <p>Express conflict: <i>C'est difficile de..., J'ai peur de..., Je veux plaire...</i></p> <p>Express pressure : <i>Je change parce que... mes amis aiment..., Les autres disent..., J'ai de la pression des pairs..., Je veux être accepté(e)...</i></p>
---	---

<p>Language needed to discuss the theme:</p> <p>Identity: <i>Je suis, Je ne suis pas, J'aime, Je n'aime pas, Je préfère, Pour moi, c'est important, Pour moi, Je suis différent.e, Je suis pareil / pareille.</i></p> <p>Emotions: <i>Ca me rend, Je me sens, Heureux / Heureuse, Triste, Nerveux / Nerveuse, Fier / Fière, Timide, Confiant.e, Stressé.e, Content.e</i></p> <p>Social Identity: <i>Je viens de, Ma famille est, Mes amis sont...</i></p>

<p>FSL objectives:</p> <p>Oral: Express and justify opinions. Ask clarifying questions. Agree/disagree respectfully.</p> <p>Listening: Understand classmates' opinions, identify main ideas in peers' responses, respond appropriately.</p> <p>Reading: Comprehend short text or story excerpt in French.</p> <p>Writing: 2-4 sentences defining "être soi-même" with their ideas in French.</p>

<p><u>Accessibility Suggestions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide text in large font and high-contrast colours. ○ Offer audio recordings of the story for repeated listening. ○ Use visual supports (images, comics, emoji/faces) to illustrate abstract concepts and emotions. ○ Provide a short video, dramatized read-aloud_or illustrated storyboard/comic strip of the Amélie story with clear visuals and subtitles. ○ Use real objects/props related to the story (drawing tools, manga book). ○ Break tasks into small, manageable steps with checklists. ○ Give sentence starters and word banks to support expression. ○ Pair students strategically for peer support.
--

Duration	Lesson 1
----------	----------

10 minutes

Impetus

Triggering Element: Short illustrated story and read aloud

Present story with multimodal input as described above. Include image symbols during the oral reading to reinforce important vocabulary.

Story:

Amélie aime dessiner des mangas. À l'école, elle cache son cahier parce que ses amis pensent que c'est bizarre. À la maison, elle se sent libre et heureuse. Un jour, l'enseignant trouve son dessin et dit : "Bravo, tu as du talent !" Amélie doit décider : est-ce qu'elle va continuer à cacher son dessin ou montrer qui elle est vraiment.

Illustrations below:



Multimodal Input:

☺ L'histoire d'Amélie

🏫 **Partie 1: Le secret à l'école**

Amélie aime dessiner ✍ des mangas 📖. À l'école 🏫, elle cache 📁 son cahier parce que ses amis 🧑 pensent que c'est bizarre 😕.

🏠 **Partie 2: La liberté à la maison**

À la maison 🏠, elle se sent libre 🕊 et heureuse 😊. Elle peut exprimer sa créativité sans crainte.

👩 **Partie 3: La découverte de l'enseignant**

Un jour, l'enseignant 👩 trouve son dessin 🖼 et dit: « Bravo, tu as du talent! ✨ » Amélie doit décider 😕: est-ce qu'elle va continuer à cacher 📁 son dessin ou montrer 🧑 qui elle est vraiment ?

Comprehension Questions:

- Qu'est-ce qu'Amélie aime ?
- Où se sent-elle libre ?
- Pourquoi cache-t-elle son cahier ?

	<p>Frames options: <i>Amélie aime..., Elle aime..., Elle aime faire, Elle est libre..., Amélie est libre..., A la maison..., Elle cache son cahier parce que..., Ses amis pensent que...</i></p> <p>Scaffolds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide image symbols for activities (<i>dessin, sport, école, maison</i>). • Students can respond orally, by pointing to images, or by drawing. • Use an emotion chart (<i>heureuse, triste, nerveuse</i>) to support discussion of feelings. <p>Understanding of the theme: Ask students to identify the theme of the story before transitioning.</p> <p>Transition Question: <i>Est-ce qu'Amélie est elle-même à l'école ?</i></p> <p>Frame options: <i>Oui / Non / Je ne sais pas.</i></p> <p>Follow-up: <i>Pourquoi ?</i></p>
15 minutes	<p>Problematization</p>
	<p>Central Question: <i>À l'école, est-ce que tu es différent(e) ?</i></p> <p>Follow up questions (suggestions for teacher guidance): <i>Est-ce que tu changes avec tes ami.e.s ? Est-ce que tu es la même personne à l'école et à la maison ? Est-ce que tu dis toujours la vérité ?</i></p> <p>Frame options: <i>Oui, je change..., Non, je ne change pas..., Avec mes amis, je..., Je suis différent(e)... Je suis pareil(le)...</i></p> <p><i>A l'école, je..., A la maison, je... Je suis la même personne... Je dis la vérité quand... Je ne dis pas la vérité quand...</i></p> <p>Modeling Conceptual Thinking:</p> <p>Teacher asks: <i>Qu'est-ce qui est important pour toi ?</i></p> <p>Teacher rephrases using sentence frames: <i>Pour moi, c'est important de, Je suis moi quand je, Je me sens bien quand je, À l'école, je, À la maison, je, C'est important de</i></p> <p>Scaffolds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For A1 learners, allow yes/no or short sentence answers using simple frames: <i>Oui, parce que / Non, parce que</i> • For A2 learners, encourage expanded reasoning with phrases like <i>Parfois</i> or <i>Je pense que</i> • Model and rehearse sentence frames explicitly before discussion.


	Exploration
25 minutes	<p>Seating: Circle Norms: One person speaks at a time, listen actively, respect ideas</p> <p><u>Identity internal conflict:</u></p> <p>Teacher asks: <i>Quel est le problème d'Amélie ?</i></p> <p>Teacher introduces: <i>Un conflit interne (Quand tu veux deux choses différentes.)</i></p> <p>Write on board: <i>Elle veut être acceptée, Elle veut être elle-même.</i></p> <p>Ask: <i>Est-ce qu'Amélie a un conflit interne ? Pourquoi ?</i></p> <p>Frame: <i>Elle veut..., mais...</i></p> <p><u>Students create the questions:</u></p> <p>In groups, students generate questions about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Être soi-même</i> • <i>Changer avec les amis</i> • <i>Avoir peur</i> • <i>Être différent.e</i> • <i>Dire la vérité</i> <p>Question frames provided: <i>Est-ce que...? Pourquoi...? Quand est-ce que...? Est-ce que c'est important de...? Est-ce que c'est difficile de...?</i></p> <p>Groups share their questions and class votes on questions to select the question they want to explore in more detail.</p> <p>Student led inquiry: Choose one student question.</p> <p><u>Sentence supports visible:</u> <i>Je pense que... Pour moi... Je suis d'accord parce que... Je ne suis pas d'accord parce que... Elle veut..., mais... Par exemple...</i></p> <p>Clarification: <i>Peux-tu expliquer ?</i></p> <p>Justification: <i>Pourquoi ? / Parce que...</i></p> <p><u>Scaffolds:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher acts as a facilitator and provides support or guidance. • Explicitly model how to agree or disagree respectfully in French. • Practice asking for clarification using simple frames.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentence frames displayed visually <p>Optional words to express opinion: <i>Je suis d'accord / Je ne suis pas d'accord</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After discussion, add a brief paired oral sharing activity where students practice the reflection sentence frames aloud before writing. • (Teacher prompts if needed to support students but students lead discussion with questions they come up with): <i>Si tu changes à l'école avec tes amis, es-tu pareil/pareille ? Es-tu la même personne à la maison et à l'école ?</i>
	<p>Reflection</p>
<p>10 minutes</p>	<p>Written Reflection Prompt: <i>Être moi, c'est...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give 1 example • Include 1 justification phrase <p><i>Sentence Frames:</i> <i>Être moi, c'est... C'est important parce que... C'est bon parce que...</i></p> <p>Emotional Closure:</p> <p>Exit card: <i>Aujourd'hui, j'ai appris... Une question que j'ai...Je suis...</i> (students circle a word + draw emoji)</p> <p>Scaffolds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Word banks for feelings, hobbies, activities • Optional bilingual glossary <p>Before writing, students share orally in pairs/small groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete "<i>Pour moi, être soi-même est...</i>" orally. • Give one example orally using "Par exemple..." • Justify orally with "C'est important parce que..." or simpler "C'est bon parce que..." (with gestures). • Encourage peers to respond with "Je suis d'accord" or "Je ne suis pas d'accord." • Provide simplified frames from earlier section on handouts or visible posters to support emerging writers.

Philosophical Discussion Workshop #2	
Subject	<i>Le bonheur</i>
Grade Level	Post-Intensive French (Grade 10) <u>CECR Level</u> : A1-A2
Intellectual Abilities:	Philosophical Question
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • Define a concept • Justify an opinion • Comparing perspectives • Recognizing subjectivity 	<p>What is happiness? <i>(Qu'est-ce que le bonheur ?)</i></p>
Social-emotional goals	Language needed
<p>Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and name simple emotions related to happiness. • Recognize that happiness is different for each person. • Listen respectfully to classmates' ideas about happiness. • Show openness to changing their ideas. <p><u>Scaffolds</u></p> <p>Emotion Chart</p> <p>Sentence Frames: for each intellectual skill targeted.</p> <p>Discussion Support: Colour code agreement/disagreement phrases for easy reference.</p>	<p><u>Language for Intellectual Thinking:</u></p> <p><u>Defining/expressing an opinion:</u> <i>Pour moi, le bonheur c'est..., Je suis heureux/heureuse quand..., Le bonheur est important parce que...</i></p> <p><u>Justifying:</u> <i>Par exemple..., Parce que..., C'est important parce que..., Je suis heureux/heureuse parce que...</i></p> <p><u>Agreeing / Disagreeing:</u> <i>Je suis d'accord parce que..., Je ne suis pas d'accord parce que...</i></p> <p><u>Questioning:</u> <i>C'est quoi le bonheur ? Pourquoi ?</i></p> <p><u>Comparing ideas:</u> <i>C'est different de..., C'est similaire à..., Pour moi..., mais pour toi...</i></p> <p><u>Expressing Mixed Emotions :</u> <i>Je suis heureux/heureuse, mais aussi _____.</i></p>

<p>Provide cards with sentence starters for quick reference during speaking/writing.</p>	
<p><u>Language needed to discuss the theme:</u></p> <p>People, animals, relationships: <i>la famille, les amis, les personnes, l'amour, les animaux.</i></p> <p>Feelings and Emotions: <i>le bonheur, la joie, le plaisir, les émotions, être heureux/heureuse, être content(e), être triste, être stressé(e), être fatigué(e), nerveux/nerveuse.</i></p> <p>Daily Life and Activities: <i>l'école, le travail, les loisirs, partager, donner, aimer, jouer.</i></p> <p>Health and Well-Being: <i>la santé, la liberté, la paix</i></p> <p>Success and Achievement: <i>la réussite, possible, facile, nécessaire, changer.</i></p>	
<p><u>FSL objectives:</u></p> <p><u>Oral:</u> Express an opinion using sentence frames (<i>Pour moi, le bonheur, c'est...</i>), justify opinion using <i>parce que....</i>, agree/disagree respectfully (<i>Je suis d'accord / Je ne suis pas d'accord</i>), compare perspectives, express mixed emotions (<i>mais aussi...</i>)</p> <p><u>Listening:</u> Understand classmates' opinions, identify reasons introduced with <i>parce que....</i>, recognize key vocabulary related to happiness.</p> <p><u>Reading:</u> Read and understand short sentences about happiness, match sentences to visuals or vocabulary.</p> <p><u>Writing:</u> Write 3-4 short sentences about happiness, give one reason with <i>parce que....</i> use basic vocabulary for feelings, people, and activities.</p>	
<p><u>Accessibility Suggestions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide visual supports such as emotion chart with labeled faces, Agreement / Disagreement colour-coded poster (e.g. <i>Je suis d'accord...</i>(green), <i>Je ne suis pas d'accord...</i>(red) and a concept anchor chart with vocabulary related to workshop (<i>sentiments, situation, personne, temps.</i>) ○ Break tasks into small, manageable steps with checklists. ○ Give sentence starters and word banks to support expression. ○ Pair students strategically for peer support. 	

Duration	Lesson 1
10 minutes	Impetus
	<p><u>Intellectual focus:</u> Identifying perspectives and defining emotions</p> <p><u>Triggering Element:</u></p>

	<p>Show students simple images representing happiness (4 photos).</p>  <p>Questions to ask students: <i>Quels sont les sentiments des personnes ? Est-ce que ces personnes sont heureuses ? Pourquoi ? Est-ce que toutes ces personnes sont heureuses pour la même raison ?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students use sentence frames and refer to the emotion chart to answer questions. <p>Scaffolds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emotion chart (point to the face that matches the feeling you see in the picture or look at it to describe feelings.) • Use sentence frames to answer questions. • Speak in short sentences. <p>Understanding of the theme: Ask students to identify the theme of the photos before transitioning.</p> <p>Transition Question: <i>Qu'est-ce que le bonheur pour toi ?</i> (This moves students from looking at pictures to conceptual thinking.)</p> <p>Frames: <i>Pour moi, le bonheur, c'est..., Je suis heureux/heureuse quand..., Le bonheur est important parce que...</i></p>
<p>15 minutes</p>	<p>Problematization</p>
	<p>Intellectual focus: Defining a concept and recognizing subjectivity</p> <p>Central Question: <i>Qu'est-ce que le bonheur ?</i></p> <p>Write on the board: <i>Le bonheur, c'est..., Le bonheur n'est pas...</i></p> <p>Follow up with concrete questions: <i>Est-ce que le bonheur, c'est l'argent ? Est-ce que le bonheur, c'est la famille ?</i> (Use visual supports here).</p> <p><i>(Students give examples and reasons using sentence frames).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move from examples to conceptual thinking about happiness. <p><i>Est-ce que le bonheur est différent pour chaque personne ?</i></p> <p>Frame options: <i>C'est différent pour moi parce que..., Pour moi..., mais pour toi...</i></p>

	<p><u>Introduce emotional complexity</u> : <i>Est-ce qu'on peut être heureux et aussi un peu triste, stressé ou fatigué ?</i></p> <p>Model examples : <i>Je suis heureuse avec mes amis, mais aussi stressée à l'école. Je suis heureux avec ma famille, mais aussi triste quand je suis seul.</i></p> <p>Encourage students to think about reasons and different perspectives.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Think-Pair-Share Structure (Scaffolded)</u></p> <p>Students think individually (1–2 min): Use sentence frames to prepare ideas silently.</p> <p>Discuss with partner: Use sentence frames to share opinions and ask questions.</p> <p>Share ideas with group: Listen actively and respond respectfully.</p> <p>Model and rehearse sentence frames before discussion.</p>
	<p>Exploration</p>
<p>25 minutes</p>	<p>Seating: Circle</p> <p>Norms: One person speaks at a time, listen actively, respect ideas.</p> <p>Intellectual focus: Comparing values and exploring internal conflict</p> <p><u>Identify internal conflict in accessible language.</u></p> <p>Write on the board: Un conflit interne = <i>Je veux deux choses importantes et je dois choisir.</i></p> <p>Example: <i>Le bonheur, c'est être avec ma famille... mais c'est aussi être avec mes amis.</i></p> <p>Ask students to complete: <i>Le bonheur c'est _____, mais c'est aussi _____.</i></p> <p>Ask: <i>Est-ce que c'est un choix facile? Pourquoi c'est difficile?</i></p> <p><u>In groups, students generate philosophical questions using frames such as:</u> <i>Est-ce que _____ est important pour le bonheur ? Est-ce qu'on peut être heureux sans _____ ? Qu'est-ce qui est plus important : _____ ou _____ ?</i></p> <p>Groups select one question to explore in a student-led discussion.</p> <p>Teacher Role (Facilitator) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support students by reformulating their ideas clearly. • Model respectful disagreement if necessary. • Encourage deeper thinking with prompts like: <i>Pourquoi ? Peux-tu expliquer ?</i> • Step back to let students lead the discussion as much as possible.

	<p><u>Differentiation Strategies</u></p> <p>For students who needed additional support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide vocabulary sheets and sentence frames. • Encouragement of comparison structures for advanced learners. 				
	<p style="text-align: center;">Reflection</p>				
<p>10 minutes</p>	<p>Reflection activity: Students reflect on their idea of happiness and their experience in the discussion. Students write 3-4 short sentences using sentence frames.</p> <p><u>Sentence Frames:</u></p> <p><i>Pour moi, le bonheur, c'est _____.</i></p> <p><i>Je suis heureux / heureuse quand _____.</i></p> <p><i>C'est important parce que _____.</i></p> <p>Reflection on the discussion (meta-thinking): Students choose one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Avant je pensais _____ . Maintenant je pense _____.</i> • <i>Une personne pense _____ . C'est différent de moi.</i> • <i>Pour moi, c'est difficile de _____.</i> <p>Word Bank with visuals (example, could add more or less words).</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p><u>Feelings and ideas:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>le bonheur</i> • <i>la joie</i> • <i>être heureux/heureuse</i> • <i>être content(e)</i> • <i>triste</i> • <i>stressé(e)</i> • <i>fatigué(e)</i> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p><u>People and Relationships:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>la famille</i> • <i>les amis</i> • <i>les personnes</i> • <i>les animaux</i> • <i>l'amour</i> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p><u>Activities and life:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>jouer</i> • <i>rire</i> • <i>parler</i> • <i>partager</i> • <i>passer du temps</i> • <u>Discussion and thinking:</u> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p><u>Important things:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>la santé</i> • <i>la liberté</i> • <i>la paix</i> • <i>l'école</i> • <i>les loisirs</i> </td> </tr> </table>	<p><u>Feelings and ideas:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>le bonheur</i> • <i>la joie</i> • <i>être heureux/heureuse</i> • <i>être content(e)</i> • <i>triste</i> • <i>stressé(e)</i> • <i>fatigué(e)</i> 	<p><u>People and Relationships:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>la famille</i> • <i>les amis</i> • <i>les personnes</i> • <i>les animaux</i> • <i>l'amour</i> 	<p><u>Activities and life:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>jouer</i> • <i>rire</i> • <i>parler</i> • <i>partager</i> • <i>passer du temps</i> • <u>Discussion and thinking:</u> 	<p><u>Important things:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>la santé</i> • <i>la liberté</i> • <i>la paix</i> • <i>l'école</i> • <i>les loisirs</i>
<p><u>Feelings and ideas:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>le bonheur</i> • <i>la joie</i> • <i>être heureux/heureuse</i> • <i>être content(e)</i> • <i>triste</i> • <i>stressé(e)</i> • <i>fatigué(e)</i> 	<p><u>People and Relationships:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>la famille</i> • <i>les amis</i> • <i>les personnes</i> • <i>les animaux</i> • <i>l'amour</i> 				
<p><u>Activities and life:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>jouer</i> • <i>rire</i> • <i>parler</i> • <i>partager</i> • <i>passer du temps</i> • <u>Discussion and thinking:</u> 	<p><u>Important things:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>la santé</i> • <i>la liberté</i> • <i>la paix</i> • <i>l'école</i> • <i>les loisirs</i> 				

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>une idée</i> • <i>une question</i> • <i>écouter</i> • <i>expliquer</i> • <i>parler</i> • <i>penser</i> • <i>choisi</i> 	<p><u>Examples:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pour moi, le bonheur, c'est la famille.</i> • <i>Je suis heureuse quand je suis avec mes amis.</i> • <i>C'est important parce que je me sens bien.</i> • <i>Une personne pense que l'argent est important. C'est différent de moi.</i>
--	---	---

Philosophical Discussion Workshop #3	
Subject	<i>Le courage</i>
Grade Level	Post-Intensive French (Grade 10) <u>CECR Level:</u> A1-A2
Intellectual Abilities:	Philosophical Question
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define a concept using simple and accessible language. • Express and justify an opinion with a reason. • Reflect on personal experiences and values • Formulate and ask philosophical questions related to the theme. 	<p>What is courage? <i>(Qu'est-ce que le courage ?)</i></p>
Social-emotional goals	Language needed
<p><u>Goals:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect on personal experiences of courage and fear. • Recognize the relationship between emotions and actions in everyday situations. • Understand that courage often involves acting even when we are afraid. 	<p><u>Language for Intellectual Thinking:</u></p> <p><u>Defining a concept:</u> <i>Le courage c'est...</i></p> <p><u>Expressing an opinion :</u> <i>Je pense que...</i></p> <p><u>Justifying an opinion:</u> <i>Parce que..., Le courage est important parce que...</i></p> <p><u>Reflecting on experiences:</u> <i>Je suis courageux/courageuse quand..., Parfois, j'ai peur, mais je...</i></p>

<p><u>Scaffolds:</u></p> <p>Emotion Chart: Faces with labels (<i>la peur, le courage, la confiance, l'hésitation, etc.</i>)</p> <p>Agreement/Disagreement Poster:</p> <p><u>Green side:</u> <i>Je suis d'accord parce que...</i></p> <p><u>Red side:</u> <i>Je ne suis pas d'accord parce que...</i></p> <p>Vocabulary Anchor Chart: Images illustrating words related to courage.</p> <p>Concept Map: Visual diagram linking: <i>le courage to la peur, le danger, aider, essayer.</i></p>	<p><u>Agreeing/Disagreeing:</u> <i>Je suis d'accord parce que..., Je ne suis pas d'accord parce que...</i></p> <p><u>Questioning:</u> <i>Pourquoi ?</i></p> <p><u>Comparing ideas:</u> <i>C'est similaire parce que..., Mon exemple est différent parce que...</i></p>
<p><u>Language needed to discuss the theme:</u></p> <p>Emotions: <i>le courage, la peur, la confiance, l'hésitation, le stress, la nervosité, la surprise.</i></p> <p>Adjectives: <i>fort(e), courageux/courageuse, confiant(e), hésitant(e), nerveux/nerveuse.</i></p> <p>Actions: <i>aider, essayer, protéger, défendre, parler, sauver.</i></p> <p>Situations: <i>le danger, un problème, l'école, la maison, un(e)ami(e), une situation difficile.</i></p> <p>Values : <i>l'amitié, le respect, la solidarité, la responsabilité.</i></p>	
<p><u>FSL objectives:</u></p> <p><u>Oral:</u> Describe personal feelings and opinions using simple phrases about courage.</p> <p><u>Listening:</u> Understand short explanations, videos, or stories about courageous actions.</p> <p><u>Reading:</u> Read short prompts and questions about courage and fear.</p> <p><u>Writing:</u> Write simple sentences reflecting on courage using sentence frames.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Accessibility Suggestions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide visual supports (emotion charts, courage-related images, colour-coded posters). ○ Provide vocabulary word banks and sentence starters. ○ Break tasks into small steps with checklists. ○ Pair students for peer support. 	

- Allow gestures, drawings, or short answers for participation.
- Encourage advanced learners to compare ideas and give examples.

Duration	Lesson 1
10 minutes	Impetus
	<p><u>Intellectual focus:</u> Connect personal experience with the philosophical idea of courage.</p> <p><u>Triggering Element:</u> Students watch two short videos showing acts that could be interpreted as courageous. These videos are shown without sound so students focus on interpreting actions and emotions.</p> <p>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7DbQoQmtXko</p> <p>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yJjZVzqn9Ds</p> <p><u>Questions to ask students:</u> <i>Qu'est-ce que le courage pour toi ? As-tu déjà été courageux ou courageuse ? As-tu déjà eu peur mais tu as essayé quand même ?</i></p> <p>The teacher will model an answer, and students will respond using sentence frames and a word bank.</p> <p><u>Example of frames:</u> <i>Je suis courageux/courageuse quand..., Parfois, j'ai peur, mais...</i></p> <p><u>Scaffolds:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use an emotion chart with labeled images: <i>la peur, le courage, la confiance, l'hésitation.</i> • Display sentence starters on the board. <p><u>Understanding of the theme:</u> Ask students to identify the theme of the videos before transitioning.</p> <p><u>Transition Question asked by teacher:</u> <i>Est-ce que tout le monde pense la même chose sur le courage ?</i></p> <p><u>Students will briefly share their ideas using these frames:</u> <i>Le courage, c'est..., Je pense que...</i></p>

15 minutes

Problematization

PHILOSOPHY FOR CHILDREN

Intellectual focus: Define a concept and question the concept of courage.

The teacher introduces the central philosophical question: *Qu'est-ce que le courage⁶⁶?*

Sentence frames are written on the board: *Le courage, c'est..., Je pense que le courage est important parce que...*

The teacher will follow with a conceptual tension : *Est-ce que le courage veut dire ne pas avoir peur? Peut-on être courageux si on a peur ?*

Teacher prompts to broaden the idea of courage : *Est-ce que le courage, c'est seulement sauver quelqu'un ? Quelles autres actions peuvent montrer du courage?*

Students reflect on the idea that courage can involve fear, risk, helping others or trying something difficult, even in everyday situations.

Scaffolds:

- Provide vocabulary strips: *aider, essayer, difficile, peur, courageux ou courageuse.*
- Encourage the use of a word bank.

The teacher models responses. **Exemple :** *Je pense que le courage est quelque chose de difficile et important.*

Exploration

25 minutes

Seating: Circle

Norms: One person speaks at a time, listen actively, respect ideas.

Intellectual focus: Explore the relationship between fear, action, and values.

The teacher introduces the concept of internal conflict using accessible language:

Je veux faire quelque chose de courageux, mais j'ai peur ou je ne sais pas si je peux.

Provide everyday examples:

- *À l'école: parler en classe, aider un(e) ami(e)*
- *À la maison: essayer une nouvelle activité, aider ta famille.*
- *Avec les amis: défendre quelqu'un, dire la vérité.*
- *Dans la vie: essayer quelque chose de nouveau ou difficile.*

Discussion question that the teacher writes on the board:

- *Est-ce que c'est toujours nécessaire d'être courageux/courageuse?*
- *Est-ce que le courage est le même à l'école, à la maison ou avec des amis?*

Student inquiry: In small groups students will generate their own philosophical questions about courage and create examples of internal conflict.

	<p><u>Example:</u> <i>Je veux aider mon ami, mais j'ai peur. Je veux parler en classe, mais je suis nerveux ou nerveuse.</i></p> <p>Groups will select one question to explore in a student-led discussion.</p> <p><u>Teacher Role (Facilitator):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reformulate ideas in accessible language. • Model respectful disagreement. • Support deeper thinking with simplified prompts: <i>Pourquoi? Peux-tu donner un exemple?</i> <p><u>Differentiation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide vocabulary sheets and sentence frames. • Encourage advanced learners to compare ideas with simple phrases: <p><i>Mon exemple est différent parce que...</i></p>
--	--

	<p>Reflection</p>
<p>10 minutes</p>	<p><u>Personal Written Reflection:</u> Students write 2-3 sentences connecting emotion, action, and reasoning using sentence frames.</p> <p><u>Sentence frames:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Pour moi, le courage c'est...</i> ○ <i>Je suis courageux/courageuse quand...</i> ○ <i>Le courage est important parce que...</i> <p><u>Peer Sharing:</u> Students share one sentence with a partner, and the partner responds with supportive feedback using simple sentences: <i>Ton exemple est courageux parce que..., Ton idée est intéressante parce que...</i></p>

Conclusion

This project was grounded in intentional pedagogical choices and in metacognitive awareness of how PICA can be adapted to a second-language context where learners require support to engage with ideas and express them. I intentionally selected themes of identity, happiness, and courage because of their relevance to adolescent learners and their potential to connect to learners' lived experiences through philosophical thinking. The themes support linguistic accessibility through the flexible vocabulary students can use to discuss these thought-provoking subjects. The workshops were intentionally designed to meet the needs of Post-Intensive and Core French students by selecting relevant themes, integrating scaffolding strategies and language modelling, and incorporating inclusive instructional methods. Additionally, multimodal stimuli, structured sentence frames, visual supports, and collaborative discussion formats were included to ensure an inclusive learning environment. These supports align with core FSL teaching strategies that promote meaningful communication in Post-Intensive French pedagogy (New Brunswick Department of Education, 2025).

Furthermore, the project demonstrates a coherent pedagogical progression that supports learners in engaging with increasingly complex linguistic and conceptual tasks. The workshops began with more concrete and personal explorations of identity, gradually introducing abstract concepts that incorporated perspective-taking, subjectivity, and critical reasoning. This progression reflects inquiry-based learning principles that focus on the development of higher-order thinking and reasoning through dialogic approaches (Gaedi, 2015; Gagnon & Yergeau, 2016). It also aligns with the CEFR's emphasis on the gradual development of communicative competence and learner agency (Council of Europe, 2020).

A critical examination of the project's learning impacts highlights its strengths and its potential limitations in a real-world context. Linguistically, the workshops create opportunities for authentic communication in French, which supports the development of oral production and interaction skills (Hemmati & Hoomanfar, 2014). Cognitively, learners engage in critical thinking by defining concepts, evaluating perspectives, and constructing reasoned arguments (Gaedi, 2015). Socio-emotionally, the exploration of important personal philosophical themes promotes self-awareness, empathy, and creates a supportive classroom environment that amplifies student voice (Asgari et al., 2023).

However, the implementation of PICA in secondary FSL contexts can also present challenges. The cognitive and linguistic demands of philosophical dialogue may create barriers for learners with lower proficiency levels, which would require the implementation of appropriate differentiation strategies and consistent scaffolding to ensure full participation. Also, time constraints within curriculum structures may limit opportunities for extended inquiry and disrupt the learning process. These considerations demonstrate the need for adaptability and responsiveness when applying PICA in an FSL classroom.

From a personal and professional perspective, this project deepened my understanding of the relationship between language learning and critical thinking. It allowed me to reflect on effective ways to scaffold linguistic elements and maintain students' capacity for critical engagement. It also reinforced the significance of student-centered learning and allowed me to recognize learners' potential to engage with complex ideas in a second language when they are appropriately supported (Austin, 2020). This experience has strengthened my commitment to inquiry-based education and will continue to inform my approach to FSL instruction.

Overall, this project demonstrates the value of integrating philosophical inquiry into Post-Intensive French contexts and positions PICA as a promising pedagogical approach within language learning. It highlights the potential of FSL pedagogy to move beyond a focus on language structures toward dynamic instruction where learners engage with ideas, express diverse perspectives, and build meaningful connections. This shift contributes to a better understanding of how language education can support communicative competence in an additional language and critical engagement with the world.

References

- Andal, A. G. (2021). Rethinking Dialogue Practices Among Children: Philosophy for Children and Phenomenology as an Approach Towards Conflict Resolution in a Diverse Classroom. *Journal of Dialogue Studies*, 8(1), 134–151.
<https://doi.org/10.55207/vzna6175>
- Anderson, A. (2020). P4C and Voice: Does the Community of Philosophical Inquiry Provide Space for Children’s Free Expression? *Analytic Teaching and Philosophical Praxis*, 40(2), 17–31. <https://journal.viterbo.edu/index.php/atpp/article/view/1181>
- Asgari, M., Whitehead, J., Schonert-Reichl, K., & Weber, B. (2023). The impact of philosophy for children (P4C) on middle school students’ empathy, perspective-taking, and autonomy: Preliminary outcomes. *Analytic Teaching and Philosophical Praxis*, 43(1), 26–44. <https://journal.viterbo.edu/index.php/atpp/article/view/1227>
- Austin, M. (2020). *Philosophy for Children and dialogic pedagogy*. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 7(1), 1–15.
- Austin, A. (2020). *Philosophy for all children: enhancing knowledge*. [Doctoral dissertation, Victoria University of Wellington]. Victoria University of Wellington
<https://doi.org/10.26686/wgtn.17147927.v1>
- Balci, E., & Eryilmaz, R. (2024). The Impact of Philosophy for Children (P4C) Activities on Enhancing the Speaking Skills of Gifted Students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1–11.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1451532>

- Berger, E., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2020). La Configuration Conjointe des Processus de médiation en classe de L2. *Babylonia Journal of Language Education*, 3(1).
<https://doi.org/10.55393/babylonia.v3i1.32>
- Bowden, L. E. (2021). *The transformative potential of philosophical dialogue: space for children and young people to explore their multi-storied lives*. [Doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University]. Newcastle University.
- Buber, M. (1986). The elements of the interhuman. In M. B. Dy Jr. (Ed.), *Philosophy of man: Selected readings* (2nd ed., pp. 209-218). Goodwill Trading Company.
- Capili, A. (2021). Is it Desirable to do Philosophy with Students in their Second Language? *Budhi: A Journal of Ideas and Culture*, 25(3), 39–66.
<https://archium.ateneo.edu/budhi/vol25/iss3/3>
- Cassidy, C., Marwick, H., Deeney, L., & McLean, G. (2018). Philosophy with Children, Self-Regulation and Engaged Participation for Children with Emotional-Behavioural and Social Communication Needs. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 23(1), 81–96.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13632752.2017.1388654>
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Dabbagh, A., & Noshadi, M. (2016). Philosophy-based language teaching approach on the horizon: A revolutionary pathway to put applied ELT into practice. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(5), 1022–1028. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0705.25>

- Daniel, M.-F., Belghiti, K., & Auriac-Slusarczyk, E. (2017). Philosophy for Children and the Incidence of Teachers' Questions on the Mobilization of Dialogical Critical Thinking in Pupils. *Creative Education*, 8(6), 870–892. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2017.86063>
- Dewey, J. (1944). *Democracy and education*. The Macmillan Company.
- Erginer, E., Demirsoy, N., & Erginer, A. (2024). Philosophy for Children (P4C) through Children's Books: An Example of a Study on Environmental Philosophy Education. *Journal of Educational Theory and Practice Research*, 10(1), 18–34. <https://doi.org/10.38089/ekvad.2024.161>
- Freire, P. (1987). Letter to North American teachers. In I. Shor (Ed.), *Freire for the classroom: A sourcebook for liberatory teaching*. (pp. 123-130). Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Funston, J. (2017). Toward a Critical Philosophy for Children. *PSU McNair Scholars Online Journal*, 11(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.15760/mcnair.2017.05>
- Gaedi, F. (2015). Philosophy for children: A pedagogy for critical thinking. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 5(6), 1–8.
- Gadamer, H. G. (1975). *Truth and method* (J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, Trans.). Crossroad. (Original work published 1960).
- Gagnon, M., & Yergeau, É. (2016). *La pratique du dialogue philosophique au secondaire*. Presse de l'Université Laval.
- García-Moriyón, F., González-Lamas, J., Botella, J., González Vela, J., Miranda-Alonso, T., Palacios, A., & Robles-Loro, R. (2020). Research in moral education: The contribution of P4C to the moral growth of students. *Education Sciences*, 10(4), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10040119>

- Gorard, S., Siddiqui, N., & Huat, B. (2015). *Philosophy for Children Evaluation report and Executive summary*. Education Endowment Foundation.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED581147.pdf>
- Haynes, J., & Murriss, K. (2011). The Provocation of an Epistemological Shift in Teacher Education through Philosophy with Children. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 45(2), 285–303. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.2011.00799.x>
- Hemmati, F., & Hoomanfar, M.H. (2014). Effect of philosophy-based language teaching on EFL learners' speaking ability and their willingness to communicate. *Journal of Social Issues and Humanities*, 2(10), 240–246.
- Heron, G., & Cassidy, C. (2018). Using Practical Philosophy to Enhance the Self-Regulation of Children in Secure Accommodation. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 23(3), 254–269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632752.2018.1461469>
- Işıklar, S., & Abalı-Öztürk, Y. (2022). The Effect of Philosophy for Children (P4C) Curriculum on Critical Thinking through Philosophical Inquiry and Problem-Solving Skills. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 9(1), 130-142.
<https://doi.org/10.33200/ijcer.942575>
- Karadağ, F., & Demirtaş, V. Y. (2018). The Effectiveness of the Philosophy with Children Curriculum on Critical Thinking Skills of Pre-School Children. *Education and Science*, 43(195), 19-40. <https://doi.org/10.15390/eb.2018.7268>
- Kennedy, D. (2012). Lipman, Dewey, and the Community of Philosophical Inquiry. *Education and Culture*, 28(2), 36–53. <https://doi.org/10.1353/eac.2012.0009>

- Kerslake, L., & Rimmington, S. (2017). Sharing Talk, Sharing Cognition: Philosophy with Children as the Basis for Productive Classroom Interaction. *Issues in Early Education*, 36(1), 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0010.1995>
- Khodagholi, F., Mousavi, M. A., Ghaedi, Y., Salarvandian, S., Vosoughian, F., Javadi, M., Khodagholi, F., Khalifeh, S., Karimi, R., Seddighfar, M., Barzin, S., & Dargahi, L. (2025). Looking at Philosophy for Children and Its Outcomes through a Neuroscience Lens. *Basic and Clinical Neuroscience Journal*, 16(3), 551–568. <https://doi.org/10.32598/bcn.2024.6110.1>
- Kilby, B. (2025). Philosophy for/with Children: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 12(1), 26-38. <https://doi.org/10.52380/ijcer.2025.12.1.703>
- Lam, C. M. (2022). A Philosophy for Children Approach to Professional Development of Teachers. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 53(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764x.2022.2056143>
- Lipman, M. (1995). Caring as thinking. *Inquiry: Critical Thinking Across the Disciplines*, 15(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.5840/inquiryctnews199515128>
- Lipman, M. (1974). *Harry Stottlemeier's discovery*. Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children.
- Lipman, M. (1976). Philosophy for Children. *Metaphilosophy*, 7(1), 17–33. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9973.1976.tb00616.x>
- Lipman, M. (2003). *Thinking in Education* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, K. (2000). Can Children do Philosophy? *Journal of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain*, 34(2), 261–279. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.00172>

- New Brunswick Department of Education. (2025). *Post-Intensive French: Pedagogical framework*. Government of New Brunswick.
- North, B. (2022). The CEFR Companion Volume and the Action-Oriented Approach. *Italiano LinguaDue*, 1–23. <https://rm.coe.int/the-cefr-companion-volume-and-the-action-oriented-approach/1680a97137>
- Safriyani, R., & Mustofa, A. (2021). Promoting Philosophy for Children (P4C) in teaching Reading. *English Teaching Journal: A Journal of English Literature, Language and Education*, 9(2), 120-127. <https://doi.org/10.25273/etj.v9i2.10948>
- Schleifer, M., & Courtemanche, L. (1996). The Effect of Philosophy for Children on Language Ability. *Thinking: The Journal of Philosophy for Children*, 12(4), 30–31. <https://doi.org/10.5840/thinking19961246>
- Shahini, G., & Riazi, A. M. (2011). A PBLT approach to Teaching ESL Speaking, Writing, and Thinking skills. *ELT Journal*, 65(2), 170–179. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq045>
- Skogmyr Marian, K., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2025). Becoming a member in Social Worlds. *Language, Interaction and Acquisition*, 16(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lia.00027.sko>
- Tian, S., & Liao, P.F. (2016). Philosophy for Children with Learners of English as a Foreign Language. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 3(1), 40-58. <https://doi.org/10.21913/jps.v3i1.1299>
- Unal, U., & Gunes, G. (2024). The Effect of Philosophy for Children (P4C) Activities on the Development of Moral Perception and Social Rules of Preschool Children. *Journal of Childhood, Education & Society*, 5(2), 238–255. <https://doi.org/10.37291/2717638x.202452392>

- Vansieleghem, N., & Kennedy, D. (2011). What is Philosophy for Children, what is Philosophy with Children-after Matthew Lipman? *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 45(2), 171–182. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.2011.00801.x>
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wahab, M. K. A., Zulkifli, H., & Razak, K. A. (2022). Impact of Philosophy for Children and its Challenges: A Systematic Review. *Children*, 9(11), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children9111671>
- Xu, A. (2022). The Importance of Philosophy for Children. *International Journal of New Developments in Education*, 4(7), 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.25236/ijnde.2022.040705>
- Yan, S., Walters, L. M., Wang, Z., & Wang, C. C. (2018). Meta-Analysis of the Effectiveness of Philosophy for Children Programs on Students' Cognitive Outcomes. *Analytic Teaching and Philosophical Praxis*, 39(1), 13-33. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1472872.pdf>
- Young-Bruehl, E. (2017). *Childism*. Yale University Press. <https://doi.org/10.12987/9780300178500>
- Youssef, C., Campbell, M., & Tangen, D. (2016). The Effects of Participation in a P4C Program on Australian Elementary School Students. *Analytic Teaching and Philosophical Praxis*, 37(1), 1–19. <https://journal.viterbo.edu/index.php/atpp/article/view/1143>