



HAL
open science

Twenty years of research into the practice of collaborative philosophical inquiry at school: current perspectives

Emmanuèle Auriac-Slusarczyk, Mylène Blasco, Lidia Lebas-Fraczak, Richard Ryan

► To cite this version:

Emmanuèle Auriac-Slusarczyk, Mylène Blasco, Lidia Lebas-Fraczak, Richard Ryan. Twenty years of research into the practice of collaborative philosophical inquiry at school: current perspectives. *Adult Learning, Educational Careers and Social Change*, 2017, 978-84-617-8989-4. halshs-01683746

HAL Id: halshs-01683746

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01683746v1>

Submitted on 14 Jan 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Twenty years of research into the practice of collaborative philosophical inquiry at school: current perspectives

Actes publiés dans

Barbara Merrill, José González-Monteagudo, Adrianna Nizinska, Andrea Galimberti, Miguel A. Ballesteros-Moscio (Eds): *Adult Learning, Educational Careers and Social Change*. Seville: University of Seville / ESREA, pp.156-170.

Authors: Auriac-Slusarczyk, E. * (*), Blasco M.**(**), Fraczak, L.**(**) & Ryan, R.**(**) * Université Blaise Pascal Clermont Ferrand (*) Laboratoire ACTé, (**) Laboratoire LRL

Contact: emmanuele.auriac@univ-bpclermont.fr; mylene.blasco@univ-bpclermont.fr; lidia.fraczak@univ-bpclermont.fr; Richard.ryan@univ-bpclermont.fr

Abstract of symposium: In the course of this symposium, each contributor will endeavor to highlight what, in the school classroom (understood as a first locus in socialization), can promote lifelong active thinking as a citizen. In this frame, the place taken by the practice of collaborative philosophical inquiry (CPI), implemented from kindergarten to middle school, experimented in adult education, or offered in citizens' philosophy events and cultural discussion workshops in universities, will be taken as a reference. Each communication will support the argument for wider knowledge and use of CPI. The coordinators of the symposium will provide a general overview of practice in schools over the last 20 years among French speakers in France, Belgium, Switzerland, and French-speaking Canada.

Abstract: Our research team, which has gradually grown into a multidisciplinary group (Auriac-Slusarczyk, Lebas-Fraczak, Blasco, Daniel, Colletta, Simon, Fiema, Auriel, Henrion, 2012, Blasco & Auriac, 2013, Auriac & Colletta, 2015) has been regularly collecting transcriptions of collaborative philosophical inquiry (CPI) sessions during the last ten years (see <http://philosophemes.univ-bpclermont.fr>). More narrowly targeted studies had previously brought out certain factors linked to the positive impact of CPI on pupils' social and cognitive development (e.g. Auriac, 2007). Our purpose here is to present the salient features emerging from 20 years of research, in order to appraise the utility of introducing CPI in adult training (graduate courses, lifelong learning, education for citizenship, etc.). We emphasize features of CPI that prove richer than they may seem at first sight: syntactic aspects (ordinary but original productions, see Blasco, 2016), pragmatic aspects (specific reasoning mode, see Lebas-Faczak, 2016) and ethical aspects (diversity tolerance, integration of otherness, see Auriac-Slusarczyk, 2015). We comment on some selected corpus excerpts, using tools for the analysis and description of spoken language, that underline how language use in CPI contributes in an original way to linking language and thought. The *Philosophemes* corpus (Blasco & Auriac-Slusarczyk, 2013, Auriac-Slusarczyk & Colletta, 2015) shows how language is used spontaneously in context. This rich ordinary-language resource, made up of authentic utterances of pupils and teachers, reveals at least four features that deserve further research: (i) syntactic production that structures the way discourse is built, (ii) mutual understanding, facilitated by repetition and the rhythmic effect this produces, (iii) cohesion, strengthened by repetition, which helps to organize the discourse and make it a shared dialogue, and (iv) interaction, whereby the relevance of successive utterances is strengthened as turn-taking proceeds. These features argue for wider knowledge and more extensive use of CPI in adult education, where, like at school, they could facilitate difficult learning paths.

1. Introduction

Over the past ten years our research team, which has gradually grown into a multidisciplinary entity (Auriac-Slusarczyk, Lebas-Fraczak, Blasco, Daniel, Colletta, Simon, Fiema, Auriel, Henrion, 2012, Blasco & Auriac, 2013, Auriac & Colletta, 2015) has been regularly collecting and analyzing transcriptions of collaborative philosophical inquiry (CPI) (see <http://philosophemes.univ-bpclermont.fr/>). Our research brings together expertise in the fields of philosophy, linguistics, psychology and the sciences of education. This multidisciplinaryity meets a need to draw upon varied research methods in the cross-analysis of CPI transcripts collected in the *Philosophemes* corpus. Earlier more narrowly-targeted studies had already highlighted some factors linked to the positive impact of CPI on schoolchildren's social and cognitive development (e.g. Auriac, 2007). Here we describe the most important findings that have emerged from 20 years of multidisciplinary research, to argue for the implementation of CPI in adult education settings (higher education, lifelong learning, open universities, etc.).

2. An emerging innovative and socially progressive practice

2.1. Definition

What is CPI? What is a philosophy workshop?

CPI, as practiced in the classroom, can be defined as a shared discourse involving several interlocutors – the pupils and their teacher – oriented by a starting question. The shared objective is to find a collective answer to a question that requires a high degree of discursive interactivity. Historically, since its inception by Mathew Lipman (1995) in the US (bi-annual conference of the NACCI), research on CPI has been accompanied by concrete presentations. A philosophy workshop is primarily a text, produced collectively. Data extracted from the *Philosophemes* corpus (see Blasco & Auriac-Slusarczyk, 2013, Auriac-Slusarczyk & Colletta, 2015) or from a discussion stemming from the public demonstration made at UNESCO during the annual meetings on philosophical practices (corpus: “Why do we say it’s not fair?” (see Simon *et al.*, 2015) illustrate this type of collective text.

2.2. The study corpus

Here, for example, is a transcribed excerpt from a discussion on “Effort”, by 1st grade pupils, Loire-Atlantique (*Philosophemes* corpus):

TP: 177 Léna: to make an *effort* you've got to *try* to *succeed* (...)

TP: 185 Soizic: I agree too with Awen to make an effort you've always got to keep... if the first time you don't succeed, you've always got to keep on trying or you don't succeed (...)

TP 186: Elsa: yes, because sometimes we make an effort, and sometimes we don't make an effort and don't keep trying, but sometimes we try to succeed to make an effort and then we can write or count or write numbers.

Below is an excerpt from the UNESCO corpus, 5th grade pupils, Paris.

Michel Tozzi: alright / so we start off by giving say a few examples, and then we explain why we think it's not fair // here you give me an example between a brother and so his sister she goes to bed later she's not :: much older than him, so **you find that's unfair**

Melvil: hm hm hm

Lou: well I think it's more for the unfairness like :: sometimes it's unfair like um right Melvil's example was good so :: // sometimes there's brothers and sisters where there's unfairness but sometimes it's you who's / who's luckier and sometimes it's the other one who's luckier so sometimes we say it's not fair // but well we really think that // well maybe we think that but not much not much.

When we work on orthographic transcriptions of spoken language, we are dealing with material that is hard to process because it is difficult to write down (everything we actually hear is recorded in the transcription, unlike in ordinary listening), to read (speech transcribed as such does not take the same form as the written language we are used to seeing), and to analyze (grammar as we use it cannot account for those language phenomena that we all too readily identify as bad speech or failed communication).

CPI, which produces concomitance between speaking and thinking, may appear trivial in its production mode (Blanche-Benveniste, 1990, 2010). However, it offers interplay that is not of the question-and-answer type, and it is clear that some steps in the process have not yet been fairly assessed.

For example, it has been shown that schoolchildren construct reasoning collectively (Fiema & Auriac-Slusarczyk, 2013; Auriac-Slusarczyk & Fiema, 2013). In learning to think, from the pupil's point of view, the pupils carry out a great deal of preparatory argumentation to clarify the initial question, which they appropriate (the examples form conceptual steps in "extension", while chosen lexical items describe "intension" (Fraczak-Lebas, 2016¹). As regards the teaching activity, the morphosyntactic organization describes those instructive passages where the teacher plays a part, i.e. that serve to elucidate how the reasoning is constructed.

2.3. Close-up on some aspects linked to the effects of CPI

It is now agreed that CPI makes a positive impact on pupils' social and cognitive development (Millett & Tapper 2012; Topping, & Trickey 2007). We consider that our knowledge of these speech exchange processes can be improved through a focus on certain fine observations. By addressing different aspects and offering other viewpoints, this approach will help us gain greater insight.

For the syntactic aspects, the language spoken in this setting is a material that is both ordinary – because it is composed of spontaneous utterances – and original, by the situation and the questions addressed (see Blasco, 2016). It is thus likely that the grammar as observed will display specific features. For the pragmatic aspects, we can identify specific reasoning modes (*cf.* above, Lebas-Faczak, 2016)². Ethical

¹ "[...] *an analysis in intension* is when pupils undertake to define a concept-expression (beginning with the one addressed by the starting question) via a proposition indicating its "essential character". *An analysis in extension* is when the pupils give instances to associate experience or types of experience with the concept-expression.

² Studies on intellectual operations that demonstrate that the language *performs* thought rather than simply *expressing* it (Lev Vygotski 1934/1997, p. 107) are relevant here. The ways in which syntactic productions account for this relation need to be explored.

aspects also deserve study (Auriac-Slusarczyk, 2015). We will examine corpus excerpts from a syntactic viewpoint to show how the use of language in CPI contributes in an original way to the articulation of language and thought.

3. Syntactic viewpoint

Syntactic description offers an analytical approach that is plainly of value. CPI elicits and develops an ability to think about subjects that are mainly ethical, through mobilizing spoken language. The speech exchanged between pupils and the teacher (Blasco & Auriac-Slusarczyk, 2013, Auriac-Slusarczyk & Colletta, 2015) is authentic. Our purpose in addressing language phenomena in this setting is to explore the relations they form between saying and thinking, through detailed observation. We focus here on fine language observations, which at first sight may seem unimportant, but which deserve closer attention.

On the basis that (i) the fine language observations will prove relevant, and (ii) the articulation between language and thought takes place both individually and collectively (Blasco & Auriac-Slusarczyk, 2013), we can gain a fuller understanding of how the speech grammar operates, and how the language serves to construct the text.

3.1. A methodological tool: the syntactic chart

Linear reading can cause us to see the oral utterances as a weakly structured production, sometimes chaotic, repetitive or monotonous. However, the recorded data characteristic of the production process have to be analyzed as indicators of a true activity of language construction. To make sense of this information and help analyze it, we use syntactic charts (a tool for reading and understanding oral utterances, cf. Blanche-Benveniste and the Aix school, 1990; Auriac-Slusarczyk & Blasco-Dulbecco, 2010). The aim is to allow the transcriptions of these sound recordings to be read using a specific mode, outside our usual listening and reading habits. The syntactic chart is a method of presentation that displays the text produced in two dimensions, instead of linearizing it as in an ordinary left-right transcription of speech. Through a prior syntactic analysis, the chart highlights the regularities or variations that structure sequences through an orthogonal representation with horizontal and vertical axes. Below is an excerpt from a transcription, followed by its syntactic chart.

Michel Tozzi: alright you you say it's not fair 'cos we have to do a certain number of things that we **wouldn't want to do** // is that what you're saying?

(...)

Candice: me I think there's several, so um // several meanings of it's not fair because there's / um there's // it's not fair that can cause a disagreement so um that's really not equality um // so um : // I dunno really {laughter} // then there's um the it's not fair fff a bit fff // sort of being awkward // so you don't think about it // that's more um um it's not fair um but actually it's fair so um there and so after um it depends on the situation but:

me I think there's		several			
		so um			
		several meanings of it's not fair			
because	there's/ there's //	um	it's not fair	that can cause a disagreement so	
				um	
				that's really not equality	I dunno really
	then there's	um			
		the it's not fair	fff		
			sort of a bit awkward so		
				you don't think about it	
				that's more um um	it's not fair
					but actually it's fair
so um there					
and so after um it depends on the situation					
but:					

Importantly, as the sentence is being constructed syntactically from left to right, there is a pause when paradigms of potentially substitutable units are elicited. This is a fruitful way to look at phenomena linked to the mode of speech production; a mode that keeps a record of its construction. This record often deters ordinary readers, and goes mostly unnoticed in conversation.

Several things can be seen in a syntactic chart. Some pertain to the syntactic (and even macro-syntactic) organization; others concern the relation between grammar and thought. Here:

1- Horizontally, there are five construction zones. Each one enables us to read what is or is not redundant in the use of lexicon, and the syntactic schemes that help make the discourse coherent.

- The left-hand zone introduces the items that show the utterer's point of view: *me I think, I dunno really, sort of* and those that concern the time sequence, e.g. of the explanation and conceptualization: *because, so, and, but*

- The middle zone shows the verbs: *there's; there's; then there's; it depends*. The verb is central in the syntax because it governs the subject-complement relations.

- What we call the right-hand zone actually depends on the central zone, because it is the place where the (non-pronoun) complements are placed. Syntagmatic expansions are placed here. It is the place for syntactic progression and developments. Here we transcribe relative clauses and adjectives, which are essential in the process of definition: *(that can) cause a disagreement, (that's) really not equality, a bit awkward, (you don't think) about it, (that's) more*.

2- From this observation of the syntactic and lexical organization of each zone, we can identify what contributes to the construction and development of the reasoning. This is therefore the link between language and reasoning.

For example, here the pupil lists several meanings; she is challenging the initial question. We are no longer talking about *why*. We are talking about the expression itself.

This is why we stated above that in CPI, pupils seek fairly systematically to clarify the question asked before they set about answering it. However, this step is not always seen. The relative clauses are thus modalized: *can/really*, the construction is very progressive, with semantic associations: *not fair/disagreement/not equality; awkward/so you don't think about it /not fair/but actually it's fair*.

The chart reading of passages chosen from CPI not only shows a general organizing principle in speech; it also confirms that each oral text develops its own grammar. The two-dimensional representation shows the text architecture and reveals the language-thought co-construction by the study of regular or irregular language features linked to the deployment of reasoning. We thus see what is generated by the individual and what is collective, and we can see how the grammar operates to shape the discourse.

3.2. Commentary of chart reading

The first chart has already been worked on in a conference presentation³ and a paper in press (Blasco, 2016 in press, journal *REE* 24). We describe it again here, as it is a complex material that casts light on various issues through its multiple readings.

Chart 1. Effort: Lena/Soizic/Elsa

In the first text, the question at the centre of the exchange is: “*Why do we make an effort?*”

Léna: to make an effort you've got to try to succeed (...)					
Soizic: I agree too with Awen to make an effort					
		<i>if the first time you don't succeed,</i>		<i>you've always got to keep...</i>	<i>you've always got to keep on trying or you don't succeed</i>
Elsa:					
yes, because		sometimes	we make	<i>an effort</i>	
	and	sometimes	we don't make an effort		and don't <i>keep trying</i>
	but	sometimes	<i>we try</i>		to <i>succeed</i> to make an effort
			and then		we can write
					or count
					or write numbers

This chart shows various characteristics:

1- The question asked, which expects an answer, is first of all analyzed.

³ Education, transmission. Contribution of neurosciences and psychoanalysis in contemporary clinical practice to the sciences of education, 7th Conference on Medicine and Psychoanalysis, Clermont-Ferrand, October 2015. “Quand les enfants parlent philosophie : étude linguistique ou comment écouter ce qu’il y a à entendre”.

Although the initial question was *why do we make an effort*, Léna starts the discussion with *to*, i.e. she sidesteps the question to define what we mean by *make an effort*⁴. This shift, though here inconsequential, shows nonetheless that the proposition-question ***Why do we make an effort*** presupposes for the pupil the proposition ***We make an effort***. The pupil evidently verifies and justifies what is presupposed before answering “why”. She thus starts a reply with *to... you’ve got to*.

2- The other pupil’s discourse is genuinely taken into account. The construction is collective, though visible to varying degrees: *I agree, yes*.

As in all CPI, the utterances of each pupil are impregnated by those made by the others. The concept worked on evolves through listening and taking into account arguments, which are reworded, extended or explored.

The frame of utterance initiated by Léna – and earlier by Awen *to make an effort* (TP 185) is maintained by Soizic. She concurs and says so with *always*. We can say that each pupil advances in their conceptualization, but that the construction is achieved jointly.

3- Analysis of the different zones shows that the lexical and morphosyntactic phenomena take part in forging the language-thought relation.

We see that this text is constructed around three concepts: *effort*, *try*, and *succeed* announced in Léna’s utterance (TP 177).

But very quickly, Soizic moves away from the initial proposition *try* by introducing another concept: *keep on trying*, first with just *keep*. She then stops the progression and goes back to state and justify the use of this word with a conditional *if the first time you don’t succeed you’ve always got to* – an addition that the spoken language readily allows.

The discourse can then resume its progression; it ends with *or you don’t succeed*.

In the spoken discourse there is an apparent concern for coherence in the reasoning and argumentation. You’ve got to *keep on trying* i.e. *try once more to...*, which is indeed the definition of effort. At this moment, Elsa gives an example in the form of *yes because sometimes* placed at the beginning. The *yes* validates the way *make an effort* is understood. At the same time it carries implicit meaning.

Placed on the left of the chart – frame of utterance – and via a modification (*to* is dropped in favor of *because*), the sequence can now be unfolded with the verb *make*, first affirmative and then negative. The whole is framed and paced by *sometimes, and sometimes, but sometimes*.

The repetition of the verbal construction *we make an effort* and the time marker *sometimes* bring a rhythmic effect. No new lexical information is introduced, but the repetition itself takes part in the conceptualization.

The positive / negative modality and the conjunctions *and, but* play an important role in the progression of the demonstration, which relies on the contrast between the verbs *we make/we don’t make (...)* *don’t keep trying; but sometimes we try to* until there is a new opening with the verb *succeed*. The paradigm *to succeed to make an*

⁴ Analysis: “decomposition of a whole into its parts”; “decomposition of concepts”; “a definition is the analysis of a concept” (Lalande, 1926, pp. 45-46); “all the effort of analysis is in multiplying the facts that a name designates” (*ibid.*, p. 46); an example is thus also part of analysis.

effort is then exemplified by an enumeration of lexical productions: *read, write, write numbers*.

In this progression, *effort* is rewarded. The syntax (repetition, contrast, connectors *and then, but*) clearly takes part in the shaping, and helps to represent the *effort* and its achievement through a progressive, varied rightward extension: *effort, effort to try, succeed; to write; to write numbers*.

In this very rhythmic and regular syntactic construction, it is as if the pupil enacts the situation. The syntax describes the *effort*; it materializes it.

Hence in this passage, there is a construction of reasoning with two voices, those of Soizic and Elsa, initiated by Léna's relatively simple statement. The study of the zones and their content shows how the discourse is shaped.

Chart 2. "It's not fair": Lou

well	I think	it's more for the unfairness
so :: sometimes		there's unfairness
like		
um right	Melvil's example	was good
so:::		
sometimes		there's brothers and sisters where there's unfairness
but sometimes	it's you	who's
and sometimes	it's the other one	who's luckier
so somstimes	we say	it's not fair
but well	we really think that	
well	maybe we think that	
but	not much	
	not much	

1- The initial question was "Why do we say it's not fair?", but Lou sidesteps the proposition to define what we mean by "not being fair": she clearly says that it is more to do with a feeling of unfairness.

2- From the organizational point of view:

The chart can be read vertically and horizontally.

On the vertical axis, in the general progression, the chart is organized in three periods, according to the verb constructions:

- what / think;
- example *there's, it's*;
- return to the starting theme *we say, we think*. To explain *what it means to say "it's not fair"*.

Horizontally, the left-hand zone receives the utterance markers *well, sometimes, like, right, so*. There is no dense content, because we are no longer in an enacted situation with examples, but in the drawing out of a definition on unfairness.

In the center, there are verbs: *I think, he was, we say, we think* and their subject pronouns, which vary according to the purpose of the discourse. The *we* comes at the end when the reasoning steps have advanced, and the discourse enters a generic frame.

On the right are the items that carry information to drive the reasoning forward with examples or definitions. The examples that support this reasoning operate on the persons who are contrasted: *brothers, sisters; you, the other one*; the forms are lexical or pronominal, and come with presentative items *there's, it's*. These syntactic structures prevail in the construction of examples. The morphosyntactic confrontation of these two lexicalized forms and the two pronominal forms illustrates and strengthens the idea of unfairness and its expression. Here again the syntax materializes the subject being addressed.

At the end of the chart, we note a series of adverbs: *really, maybe, not much not much*. The “it’s not fair” is then pronominalized: *we think that* so as to focus on the adverbs and the progressive construction of what composes the assertion “it’s not fair”. The rightward progression stops. The constructions around the verb become concise, as if a conclusion is being reached.

In fact, the reasoning meets a caveat: is saying “*it’s not fair*” really expressing true unfairness? Do we really think that, or maybe not... much, not... much?

This construction is clearly very coherent. The chart shows that there is a grammatical construction of the text for which the lexical and syntactic choices help to express the relativity of the value judgment “not fair”.

4. Utility of implementation in other sectors

In the light of the studies conducted on CPI it seems regrettable that philosophy workshops are not better known and more widely practiced with adults, to facilitate difficult learning paths like at school. The *Philosophemes* corpus, collected since 2010, along with discussions filmed at UNESCO over the last ten years, illustrate only school classroom practice. This practice runs from kindergarten to 12th grade (technical high school). At the new practices in philosophy event hosted by UNESCO in Paris every November⁵, practitioners and researchers have structured the area into several fields: care philosophy, for workshops in hospitals, school philosophy for schools, and training philosophy for the sector interested in producing tools for group leaders and teachers, irrespective of the domain of application, but generally for schools. The journal *Diotime*⁶, a French-speaking publication echoing the journal *Thinking, The Journal of Philosophy for Children*⁷ created by Matthew Lipman, offers

⁵ See <http://rencontrespratiquesphilo.unblog.fr/>. The Philolab Association supports the event and organizes the activities.

⁶ See <http://www.educ-revues.fr/diotime/>. Review directed by Michel Tozzi, scientist and promotor of practise in schools since 1996.

⁷ See <https://www.montclair.edu/cehs/academics/centers-and-institutes/iapc/thinking-journal/>. The journal is published by the Mont Clair Institute of New York. *Le Journal de Philosophie pour enfants* was published from 1979 to 2014 by [l’Institut pour la promotion de la philosophie pour enfants \(IAPC\)](http://www.institutphilosophie.org/), a non-profit teaching institute at Montclair State University. The journal was a forum for the work of two theoreticians and practitioners of philosophy for children, and published this work in all its forms, including philosophical

a scientific and professional space for papers describing, developing, exchanging and making known practice in philosophy for children. After some 30 years of successful experimentation in the field in North America, and 20 years of experience in French-speaking countries, the question now arises of the extension of CPI to other sectors.

Given the convergence of views and findings concerning the positive impact of philosophy practiced in a spirit of intellectual inquiry rather than as one more school subject, and the link between thought and language in syntax as we describe here, we consider that the time is ripe to move on to developing these practices in adult education.

Adult education is a vast area, and at the same time one that permits experimentation. But do adults discuss issues in a way comparable to what we have described above?

We present the following excerpt of a pupil, Dimitri, aged about 10. After Danaé has spoken, Dimitri speaks:

Danaé: well when we say it's not fair it's often that we don't agree with something

Michel Tozzi: alright, so you have the idea then a little bit of disagreement can you give an example

Danaé: um uh I dunno

Michel Tozzi: can someone help Danaé find an example to uh say um when we say it's not fair because we don't agree // let's hear those of you who haven't said much

Mathéo: Dimitri have you got anything to say

Dimitri: well yes um I think we we say / when we say it's not fair sometimes // like if our parents tell us to do our homework we say it's not fair 'cos we'd rather not do it // but we've got to

Michel Tozzi: alright, you say it's not fair because we have to do some things we don't really want to do // is that your argument?

Dimitri: well yes

Danaé:
well **when we say** it's not fair **it's** *often* that we don't agree with something

Dimitri:

well yes um I think we	we say /
	when we say it's not fair
sometimes // like if our parents tell us to do our homework we say it's not fair 'cos we'd rather not do it	
	but
	we've got to

Without reproducing the detailed study in a syntactic perspective, it is clear that the subjectivity illustrated by the children (shift from “*when*” to “*it's*”, “*like*”, i.e. from conjunctural to definitional, is not the children's own. Each uses language to redirect their first thoughts, through secondary or complementary verbalizations, to develop their thinking. The term “*when*” uttered by Dimitri is not to be interpreted as having

argument and reflection, class transcriptions, programs, empirical research, and field reports. The journal also maintained a tradition of publishing papers in childhood hermeneutics, a cross-disciplinary field, including cultural studies, social history, philosophy, art, literature and psychoanalysis. *Thinking* ends with Volume 20, No. 3-4 (2014) and IAPC takes no more subscriptions or submissions.

any particular temporal value. Its function is not temporal: “*when*” here is a thinking frame, which allows the introduction of the example. An adult would do the same: “*when we say it’s not fair*”... “*sometimes...*”; “*like...*”, etc.

The models of grammatical construction presented show that the ways in which pupils aged about 10 go about discussing the question are no different from those that adults would use to argue, exemplify and conceptualize. Our knowledge of the language, though based on an internal grammar used from infancy, remains passive and unconscious.

We are convinced that taking part in philosophy workshops for adults could help pacify relations by enabling everyone to reflect together in a collective setting. It’s never too late to think.

5. Conclusion/discussion

Studying the syntax of utterances casts new light on the CPI corpus collected over the last 20 years. Syntactic analysis of the language offers a new viewpoint that highlights the complexity of the exchanges. CPI is a type of discourse that elicits initiatives translated into linguistic entities. The language is enlisted to serve what is to be said. These are fine features that help us grasp the link between language and thought. It would have been difficult to predict these forms of organization. Oral utterances thus make sense if we know how to listen. In adult education, this approach could be used to develop more attentive listening. One major impact of philosophy workshops lies in their pacifying quality. This pacification probably arises in part from the fact that taking the time to put our thoughts into words, shown up by syntax in a very fine and detailed way, gives each participant satisfying positive feedback on their mechanisms of mental production. Thinking is important, and thinking together can extend our minds. Having to verbalize our thought leads us to choose wording and vocabulary. Both children and adults can thus find inner concord in CPI, provided it is properly directed.

References

- AURIAC, E. (2007). Effet de discussions à visée philosophique sur le processus de génération d’idées. *Enfance*, 2007(4), 356-370.
- AURIAC-SLUSARCZYK, E. & BLASCO-DULBECCO, M. (2010). *Dialogue, Signification, Réflexion (DIASIRE)*, recension et étude interdisciplinaire de corpus de dialogues réflexifs entre enfants pour contribuer à l’étude des rapports pensée-langage à l’école, projet retenu dans le cadre de l’appel à projets interdisciplinaires de la MSH de Clermont-Ferrand au sein de l’axe 3, Cognition et Comportement : de l’individuel au social, Université Blaise Pascal/CNRS, UMS 3108.
- AURIAC-SLUSARCZYK, E. & LEBAS-FRACZAK, L. (2011). *Etude des phénomènes interlocutifs dans les discussions citoyennes à visée philosophique pratiquées à l’école et au collège*, projet subventionné par la Région Auvergne, sur appel d’offre dans le programme « Projet structurant en SHS », Convention 939.92-65731/19474.
- AURIAC-SLUSARCZYK, E. & BLASCO-DULBECCO, M. (2013). Quand les enfants philosophent. Analyses plurielles du corpus Philosophèmes. Cahier du *L.R.L.*, 5, Presses de l’UBP.
- AURIAC-SLUSARCZYK, E. & COLLETTA J-M. (2015). Au cœur de l’atelier de philosophie. Presses universitaires de l’Université Blaise Pascal : Sphère Educative.
- AURIAC-SLUSARCZYK, E. & FIEMA, G. (2013). Raisonner et discuter : définitions et principe d’étude pragmatique du corpus Philosophèmes (chantier, part. I). In E.

Auriac-Slusarczyk & Blasco-Dulbecco, Quand les enfants Philosophent. Analyse plurielle du corpus *Philosophèmes*. *Cahiers du LRL*, 5, 41-74.

AURIAC-SLUSARCZYK, E. (2015). L'altérité comme plaque tournante des dialogues et raisonnements critiques. Suivi des prises de parole d'une élève culturellement située. XVII Conference of International Council for Philosophical Inquiry with Children (ICPIC). University of British Columbia. Vancouver.

AURIAC-SLUSARCZYK, E., LEBAS-FRACZAK, L., BLASCO, M., DANIEL, M-F, COLLETTA J-M, SIMON, J-P., FIEMA, G., AURIEL, A., HENRION, J. (2012). *Philosophèmes*. Congrès national du réseau des MSH, Quelles sciences humaines et sociales pour le 21e siècle ? Caen, 6 and 7 December 2012.

Link: http://www.msh-reseau.fr/IMG/pdf/poster_philosophemes.pdf.

AURIEL, A. & LEBAS-FRACZAK, L. (2015). Les traces linguistiques de la conceptualisation collective dans la discussion "Partager", In E. Auriac-Slusarczyk & J.-M. Colletta (dir.), *Les ateliers philosophiques à l'École : les conduire, les analyser*, Clermont-Ferrand, PUBP.

BLANCHE-BENVENISTE C., BILGER M., ROUGET Ch. & van den EYNDE K. (1990). *Le français parlé. Etudes grammaticales*, Paris, Editions du CNRS.

BLANCHE-BENVENISTE, C. & MARTIN, Ph. (2010). *Le français. Usages de la langue parlée*, Paris, Peeters.

BLASCO, M. (2016, in press). Une lecture grammaticale de séquences choisies dans les échanges philosophiques

DANIEL, M-F, GAGNON, M. & AURIAC-SLUSARCZYK, E. (2015, to appear). Thinking critically as early as kindergarten? Philosophy for Children is still in debate. In M. Gregory, J. HAYNES & K., MURRIS (Eds.). *The Routledge International Handbook of Philosophy for Children*.

FIEMA, G. & AURIAC-SLUSARCZYK, E. (2013). Raisonabilité en discussion : illustration sur les sous-corpus « Efforts », « Vie prêtée » et « Amour ». *Cahiers du LRL*, 5, 203-244.

FIEMA, G. (2014). Étude des mouvements de pensée collective lors des ateliers philosophiques au primaire et au collège. Extraction de philosophèmes en tant que structures formelles de raisonnement, thèse de doctorat nouveau régime, soutenu en 12/2014, Espé-UBP, laboratoire Acté. Clermont-Ferrand.

LEBAS-FRACZAK, L. (2016, à paraître). Les opérations intellectuelles des élèves et la perception de l'enseignante dans trois discussions philosophiques en classe de CP. *Recherche en Education*, 25.

LIPMAN M. (1995). *À l'école de la pensée* (N. Decostre, Trad.), Brussels, De Boeck Supérieur.

MILLETT, S., TAPPER, A. (2012). Benefits of Collaborative Philosophical Inquiry in Schools. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 44 (5), 546-567.

Simon et al., (2015). La conceptualization collective dans des discussions à visée philosophique, In E. Auriac-Slusarczyk & J.-M. Colletta (dir.), *Les ateliers philosophiques à l'École : les conduire, les analyser*, Clermont-Ferrand, PUBP.

TOPPING, K. J., TRICKEY, S. (2007). Collaborative philosophical enquiry for school children: Cognitive effects at 10-12 years. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77, 271-288.

Barbara Merrill, José González-Monteagudo, Adrianna Nizinska, Andrea Galimberti, Miguel A. Ballesteros-Moscósio (Eds): *Adult Learning, Educational Careers and Social Change*. Seville: University of Seville / ESREA

SOMMAIRE

INTRODUCTION

BARBARA MERRILL, JOSÉ GONZÁLEZ-MONTEAGUDO, ADRIANNA NIZINSKA, ANDREA GALIMBERTI, MIGUEL A. BALLESTEROS-MOSCOSIO

SECTION I

PERSPECTIVES FROM ADULT LEARNING AND HIGHER EDUCATION

1. UNA DOBLE Y DISCONTINUA IDENTIDAD PROFESIONAL: LOS DIRECTORES ESCOLARES EN ESPAÑA EN UNA DIMENSIÓN BIOGRÁFICO NARRATIVA

ANTONIO BOLÍVAR, MAXIMILIANO RITACCO

2. NARRATING EMERGING ADULTHOOD AT UNIVERSITY

SOLEDAD ROMERO RODRÍGUEZ, PILAR FIGUERA GAZ, MONTSERRAT FREIXA NIELLA

3. REPRESENTAÇÕES DE PERCURSOS FORMATIVOS DE LEITORES UNIVERSITÁRIOS. QUEM É REALMENTE O LEITOR?

RODRIGO MATOS DE SOUZA, RAFAEL M. HERNÁNDEZ-CARRERA

4. PROFILES OF ADULT STUDENTS IN BASIC VOCATIONAL TRAINING IN THE PROVINCE OF SEVILLE (SPAIN): SELF-EXPECTATIONS OF ACHIEVEMENT AND GENDER

ANTONIO CORONADO-HIJÓN, CRISTINA GINEL CAMPOS

5. EDUCACIÓN FÍSICA EN EL DIÁLOGO Y LA FORMACIÓN CON LA EDUCACIÓN DE JÓVENES Y DE ADULTOS

ROSA MALENA CARVALHO

6. WHAT KIND OF ADULT EDUCATION IS REQUIRED IN THE RISK SOCIETY?

MICAELA CASTIGLIONE

SECTION 2

PERSPECTIVES FROM COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL EDUCATION

7. LA HISTORIA DE JUANA. LA EDUCACIÓN DE ADULTOS EN ASPERONES (UN BARRIO CON MUCHAS DIFICULTADES)

DAVID HERRERA-PASTOR, LORENA MOLINA-CUESTA, JESÚS JUÁREZ PÉREZ-CEA

8. FROM FIBRE TO FABRI. CREATING INNOVATIVE LEARNING PERSPECTIVES ON YORKSHIRE'S WOOL HERITAGE THROUGH COLLABORATIVE PRACTICE

SHARON BAINBRIDGE

9. MODELLING THE NEEDS OF YOUNG FAMILIES IN RECONCILING CAREER AND FAMILY

VAIDA JURGILÉ, ILONA TANDZEGOLSKIENÉ, ELENA TREPULÉ

10. THE ATTITUDE OF EMPLOYERS TO PARENTHOOD AND WORK RECONCILIATION OPPORTUNITIES AND RELEVANT MEANS IN RESPECT OF YOUNG FAMILIES

ILONA TANDZEGOLSKIENÈ, VAIDA JURGILÈ

11. TRAJETÓRIAS MAMBEMBES E GRADIENTES, PERCURSOS DESCONTÍNUOS: TRABALHO X ESCOLA - O DUELO QUE RONDA AS JUVENTUDES DAS CLASSES POPULARES

NOELIA RODRIGUES PEREIRA REGO

SECTION 3

PERSPECTIVES FROM SCHOOLS AND E-LEARNING

12. TWENTY YEARS OF RESEARCH INTO THE PRACTICE OF COLLABORATIVE PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY AT SCHOOL. CURRENT PERSPECTIVES FROM SCHOOL TO CITIZENSHIP

EMMANUÈLE AURIAC-SLUSARCZYK, MYLÈNE BLASCO, LIDIA FRACZAK, RICHARD RYAN

13. A PREVENTIVE ROLE FOR COLLABORATIVE PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY IN ELEMENTARY AND EARLY MIDDLE SCHOOL IN THE BREAK IN COGNITIVE INTEGRITY DEVELOPMENT OBSERVED IN 8TH GRADE

BERNARD SLUSARCZYK

14. DISCUSSIONS À VISÉE PHILOSOPHIQUE À L'ÉCOLE PRIMAIRE: POUR UNE CULTURE DE LA VERBALISATION

LUC BAPTISTE

15. FORMARSE EN LA MOVILIDAD CON MOODLE CONTEXT. DESARROLLO DE UNA APLICACIÓN DE MOBILE LEARNING SENSIBLE AL CONTEXTO

CARLOS MARCELO GARCÍA, JUAN ANTONIO ÁLVAREZ GARCÍA, CARMEN YOT DOMÍNGUEZ, ÁLVARO ARCOS GARCÍA

16. FORMAR EN COMPETENCIAS PROFESIONALES PARA EL DESEMPEÑO EN E-LEARNING

CARMEN YOT DOMÍNGUEZ, CARLOS MARCELO GARCÍA