Rethinking Dialogue Practices among Children: Philosophy for Children and Phenomenology as Approach towards Conflict Resolution in a Diverse Classroom

Aireen Grace Andal

Abstract: This work takes off from the key concepts of Paul Weller's thoughts on contemporary challenges to dialogue, which it adapts to the context of children's dialogue in diverse classroom settings. The challenge in a diverse classroom is how to adapt a strategy to acknowledge the diversity of participants and reach a peaceful and productive dialogue. This article shows how Philosophy for Children (P4C) together with a phenomenological approach can be used as a tool for addressing the challenges Weller has mentioned to address the issue of children's differences. Then, this article shows the potential of using a phenomenological approach and lived experience to establish a bridge between Philosophy for Children, critical reflection and understanding differences in the classroom. This work argues that phenomenology as an approach is useful for P4C to have a dialogue aimed at understanding diversity, solidarity, and even pluralistic democratic engagement. Such discussions have implications for facilitating dialogue in linguistically diverse classrooms, intercultural and interethnic classrooms, and digital classrooms. Finally, this article identifies key areas for future research. This work seeks to speak and contribute to the literature on dialogic research by problematising children's discursive positions as learners and participants of dialogue.

Keywords: Philosophy for Children, Phenomenology, Critical reflection, Dialogue, Pedagogy, Classroom

---

Aireen Grace Andal is a PhD researcher in philosophy and ethics at Ural Federal University, Russian Federation. Her research focus is on ethics and children's spaces in urban settings. She is also a research fellow at the Centre for Comparative Studies of Toleration and Recognition and Centre for Global Urbanism in the same university. She holds a bachelor's degree in sociology (University of the Philippines) and a graduate degree in Political Philosophy (Ural Federal University). She publishes in scholarly journals on topics related to the fields of children studies, urban spaces, bioethics and international relations. She also co-authors some papers and book chapters with colleagues from different departments in her university. Majority of her recent academic and research experiences involve children spaces, international studies and assisted reproductive technologies.

Introduction: Challenges to Dialogue in the Classroom Setting

Diversity in the classroom has emerged as a key dimension in pedagogical affairs within and between educational systems and teachers. In recent years, there has been a rise in awareness of the importance of diversity in the classroom, with an emphasis on producing the processes and structures of group cohesion and a sense of unity that cross-cuts various backgrounds (Ungemah 2015; Hyry-Beihammer et al. 2019; Schwarzenthal et al. 2019). Pedagogical approaches have been applied by various educators to teach children diversity through dialogue. However, the persistent challenge is how to adapt a strategy that acknowledges the diversity of participants towards a peaceful and productive dialogue (Bush & Saltarelli 2000). Contemporary classroom settings remain challenged in terms of how to approach the growing diversity in classrooms. For instance, there are an estimated 31 million migrant children all over the world (UNICEF 2017). While not all migrant children attend schools in host countries, schools have to be ready to accommodate students of many cultural backgrounds with a diversity of traditions, values, and beliefs. In such situations, conflict can easily arise given the different backgrounds among students. In most instances, communication is limited because migrant children struggle to express themselves well in the language used in a host country (Global Education Monitoring Report 2019). About two thirds of refugees live in areas that do not speak the language of their country of origin (UNICEF 2017). Moreover, the rise in digital classrooms through online learning has paved the way for a more diverse set of students in a virtual setting (Gallagher et al. 2020). This poses challenges in how to administer a harmonious dialogue among virtual participants who have less personal interaction with each other (Siergiejczyk 2020). As such, facilitating a productive dialogue in a classroom calls for attention to address the growing diversity of classroom interaction.

To discuss the dynamics of diversity and dialogue in the classroom setting, this article has a twofold task: First, it adopts Paul Weller's (2020) key concepts in the challenges to dialogue from the workshop titled 'Rethinking Dialogue in the Age of New Challenges and Opportunities' to sharpen our approach towards facilitating and understanding differences in the classroom. Weller offers a relevant discussion on the dangers of amplifying terror by dismissing the validity of the argumentative approaches of all interlocutors and favouring only some ways to have dialogue. Likewise, these cultural conflicts can be witnessed in the everyday classroom (Hess & Avery 2008). For instance, cultural and historical narratives and practices in schools can lead to intergroup conflict (Bekerman et al. 2009; See also Funk & Said 2004). Second, this work discusses how current practices in classroom dialogue can use Philosophy for Children and phenomenology as a way to realise Weller's approach to conflict resolution. P4C encourages a diverse community of children to think for themselves and have an exchange of ideas (Splitter & Sharp 1995, 245). In addition,

this work argues that phenomenology as an approach is useful for P4C to have a dialogue aimed at understanding rather than winning. As such, this work discusses the possibilities of achieving conflict resolution through examining how issues could become opportunities for understanding diversity, solidarity, and even pluralistic democratic engagement (Freire 1998). Finally, this article identifies the implications of such discussions to contemporary classroom settings and key areas for future research.

Conflict in a Diverse Classroom

Weller (2020) notes that dialogue disagreements will only be reinforced when the other party is not acknowledged to have an equally legitimate way of arguing about a certain issue.[1] Although there have been efforts to cater for a diverse classroom setting, forming group cohesion still remains a challenge in a diverse classroom. When applied to classroom settings, conflicts can root from culturally shaped competing beliefs, values, and interests (Ross 1993, 2007). For instance, some students' ways to start or keep an on-going dialogue can be repressed; that is, if some subjects and modes of communication are more favoured, valued and encouraged than others. This is especially experienced by minority children. Previous studies have pointed out that students from lower-income families, immigrants or minority groups seem to have fewer chances to engage in critical dialogue and thoughtful discussions in comparison to those with privileged status (Campbell 2007; Dull & Murrow 2008). For instance, dialogue that employs conventional terms from a given culture is privileged while adversarial and overly critical modes from the minority are downplayed. While educators recognise the diversity of student backgrounds, they run the risk of only allowing certain ways of having a discussion among children (Conover & Searling 2000). This reinforces the same danger of amplifying resistance rather than arriving at a productive dialogue among children. This is tricky because what was initially intended to be a platform for dialogue to engage in critical discussions can be transformed into a space that expects only certain forms of dialogue. Not only do schools turn into spaces for manufacturing workers for economic productivity, but also educators themselves expect one mode of critical reflection, discussion and debate: there are privileged ways to be critical, which may impede a greater appreciation of the limits of our dialogical knowledge and capacity. More than the question 'how can students be taught to be critical?', another pressing concern is 'how can both educators and students reflect on the ways of being critical?' Diversity in critical engagements is important because 'to have any meaning, self-direction, like critical thinking, must include being responsible for relating new ideas and experience to previous knowledge as well as actively sharing

1 Weller's original statement is that 'governments must learn from history that to combat terror with methods that undermine human rights will only strengthen those forces that use terror as a means for advancing their cause.'

that new understanding in order to justify and validate it' (Garrison 1992, 146). The relevance and quality of a critical engagement may be over- or underestimated and pre-judged based on each participant's, both student's and educator's alike, personal background. This, in turn, may deter inclusion of various participants and prevent them from being fully heard because some opinions are marginalised and not properly considered and weighed. Instead, the participants can be encumbered with the complicated task of ensuring that the dialogic process continues without checking the balance and quality of the dialogue itself. As the dialogue continues, it can be limited to meet the short-term demands of the syllabus or lesson, and consequently, the dialogic outcomes can be expected to be also limited.

Weller also points out that failing to acknowledge and to take seriously the reasons of others will not advance a resolution. Similarly, participants of the classroom, educators and students alike, may not be making efforts to understand their differences and may set expectations for each other's way of thinking and expression. One source of classroom clashes is the belief that there is only one method to resolve an issue. This resonates with Weller's (2020) key points on his scale of 'Othering': 'we are different; we behave differently, we are tight; we are right and you are wrong; you are a less adequate version of what we are; you are not what you say you are; what you are doing is evil; you are so wrong that you forfeit ordinary rights; you are less than human; you are evil; you are demonic'. While differences in the classroom cannot be immediately resolved, these collisions can threaten the learning community; thus, some resolutions have to be generated, at least temporarily, to enable the continuity of a healthy learning environment. However, it may be difficult for different participants to arrive at a common understanding if diversity is downplayed in the classroom culture. As van Eemeren and Grootendorst (2004) argue, in a situation where different parties acknowledge the need to arrive at a common understanding, every part of the dialogue must be contributory not only towards arriving at a shared understanding but also towards settling differences of judgement. Otherwise, dialogues will be either futile and irrelevant or coercive. While opposing sides resolve the current issue, this resolution may not be based on a shared understanding that both parties could agree with.

In recent decades in education spending there have been discussions on re-assessing the standardization of education and criticising the 'teaching to the test' culture, in which lessons and classroom experiences are determined by the requirement to prepare for examinations (See Moon et al. 2002; Jennings & Bearak 2014). In this type of setting, pedagogy is not directed towards open-ended discussion or enquiry, but on teaching what students 'need to know' to meet the requirements of whichever examination is next on the curriculum (Anderson 2012). This has been challenged by schools that have adhered to some experiential learning (Kolb 1984) such as

problem-based (Savery 2006) and project-based learning (Bell 2010) in primary and secondary schools. These methods help facilitate the conduct of dialogue in school. However, while some schools and classroom settings have already started to open spaces for free enquiry, this practice has led to another issue which is both directly and indirectly related to dialogue. Schools are becoming sites for standardised ways of critical thinking and engaging communication processes. Whether overtly or covertly, the school is imbued with critical undertones and value judgements about what kind of critical thinking is supposed to be demonstrated, and what kind of dialogue should be produced. Students have to adhere to certain standards of being critical. The process of classroom dialogue is affected in the sense that some dialogic cultures can be employed at the expense of others. Alternative forms and styles of engaging in dialogue may overlook some positions. Dialogue plays an integral role in classroom communicative processes, and it is through the distinct process of exchanging and properly weighing reasons that fair and legitimate resolutions can be achieved. In order for a classroom dialogue to be considered inclusive, both students and educators must be able to define the bases on which their correspondence is anchored and treat this as an output of a legitimate discussion in which each participant had equality in voicing their reason.

Window of Opportunity for Dialogue in a Diverse Classroom

For educational institutions, the ideal consequence for children is to have a somewhat nuanced perspective in terms of being able to defer immediate judgement and independently assess given situations. While the literature is loaded with different definitions of the concept of reflection (Zeichner and Liston 1996; Darling-Hammond and Snyder 2000; Loughran 2002), one common attribute can be traced back to Dewey (1933), who understands reflection as an active and intentional action and to learn from an experience is to make a connection through reflecting on that which is both forward and backward in the experience. In a more research-oriented fashion, Moustakas (1994, 74) argues that reflection occurs throughout a phenomenological research approach and it provides the researcher with 'a logical, systematic, and coherent resource for carrying out the analysis and synthesis needed to arrive at essential descriptions of experience'. As for resolving differences in critical assessments, an important consideration is to 'resolv[e] differences of opinion (its problem validity) in combination with its acceptability to the discussants (its conventional validity)' (van Eemeren and Grootendorst 2004, 132). This work discusses combining two approaches to manage classroom dialogue: Philosophy for Children (P4C) and critical reflection.

Children in dialogue towards critical reflection

One approach can be drawn from Matthew Lipman's (1993) Philosophy for Children or P4C. P4C aims to train children in primary and secondary school to be critical and creative and, less commonly, in extra-curricular contexts. Likewise, pedagogical training is at the heart of P4C to facilitate thinking among groups of children in dealing with philosophical situations to arrive at reasonable judgements through thoughtful dialogues and critical reflections. Rather than a conventional introduction of philosophical canonical concepts, P4C educators facilitate semi-structured dialogues or collaborative inquiries that foster familiarisation with philosophical discussions. Kohan (1995) notes that P4C offers a physical and metaphorical avenue to listen, speak, or remain observant, thereby enabling children to see for themselves the consequences of their decisions and actions, however simple or complex they are. P4C is interested in training young citizens to exercise their faculties of reason, as is evident in many of the programme initiatives which support the development of philosophy in schools. As Rainville (2000, 67) puts it, 'Philosophy for Children must be willing to incorporate historical detail and socio-cultural awareness into any programs which are meant to be truly liberatory'. Philosophy for Children has the opportunity to substantiate the previous efforts of education practitioners.

This work argues that Philosophy for Children can be seen as adhering to the reflective practice and experiential learning theories first introduced by John Dewey (1933), who recognised reflection as an active and intentional action. The reflective approach in this work obviously departs from the typical arrangement in the hierarchical school setting, where the dialogic culture of classroom positions is expected to be maintained. The strategy to use diverse ways to be critical for students to express their perspectives through creative means can provide new normative ways to assess students' critical thinking. Following Dewey's ideas, Schön (1983) reiterated that it is via experience that theory has significance, developing the concepts of *reflection-in-action* (reflection during the event) and reflection-on-action (reflection after the event). Given this theoretical frame, this work proposes that the experiences of children undergoing P4C can be used by philosophy scholars as indirect reflections for the purpose of obtaining a better understanding of their own thinking. This design hinges on the challenge for philosophy scholars to uncover structures and agencies that can offer a variety of directions for Philosophy for Children. Rivage-Seal (1987) argues that teaching critical thinking skills is useless unless its use is informed by relevant contextual details.

This is in recognition that children are deliberators themselves (Nishiyama 2017). While children are suspected of being 'not capable of elaborating or reflecting on moral principles" (Christiano 2001 as cited in Nishiyama 2017), assuming that children are 'too young' might be misguided since empirical studies show that children were able to articulate complicated questions which are existential and challenging

(Hyde 2008). Children therefore can be considered as dialogic agents who have potential to contribute to better dialogic processes as measures of critical credentials of a given classroom. Through children's engagement in dialogues in the classroom, sharing perspectives through guided ways to recognise differences can improve the communicative culture in class as they are able to reconsider their thoughts, listen to others and to assess their own logical skills (Cassidy 2017). This contributes to achieving the kind of 'instruction [that] requires students to think, not just report someone else's thinking' (Nystrand et al. 1997, 72).

Active learning best takes place when learners are able to reflect on their own understanding and are able to recognise when they need more information, time, and strategy (Bransford et al. 2000). Assessing one's own understanding is 'key at all levels of experience' (Balls et al. 2011, 102). Here, reflection can be seen as a prerequisite of intelligence. This work therefore advances that through engaging in children's activities and lessons, philosophy scholars are able to think and reflect on the diversity of philosophical discussions and the manners in which these discussions can be framed. This is anchored in the notion that experience is the main source of learning, which occurs in cycles. Experiential learning is the melting pot of experience, perception, cognition, and behaviour and is a 'holistic integrative perspective on learning' (Kolb 1984, 21). In this sense, P4C can be a legitimate exercise as a critical reflection process while engaging in a dialogue itself and should not only be assessed in terms of students' speaking time. Here, learning and reflecting becomes 'an emergent process whose outcomes represent only historical record, not knowledge of the future', and, further, concepts of learning are 'derived from and continuously modified by experience' (ibid., 26). The cycle of learning is a continuous process based on reflection which occurs before, during, and after. Therefore, P4C is a hospitable ground for this practice because it can monitor children's reflection and progress.

But reflection for what ends? And if P4C is proven not to be helpful, will all the effort for this attempt be futile? Dewey believed that we learn just as much from our failed attempts as we do from our successful endeavours. As such, perpetual learning can be seen as an end in itself wherein '[t]he outcome of the process is changed from conceptual perspective... the shift from one perceptual perspective to another, which... has always been the focus of those who seek to understand human growth' (Boyd and Fales 1983, 101). Practices from the field are instructive in this regard. Evidence, at best, is mixed. For instance, the Lockean understanding of a child in a *tabula rasa* state, which viewed children as future citizens who need training for participation in civil life, is accepted positively in some parts of South Africa (Ndofirepi and Thokozani 2011). This kind of experience is used in democratic citizenship education in post-apartheid South Africa, which argued that Philosophy for Children can be helpful in individual enlightenment as triggers to enhance capacity to think (ibid). However, for

other instances, this may trigger critical thinking but the kind that does little to render emancipation from taken-for-granted dogma. For instance, feminist Marie-France Daniel (1994) attacks the P4C curriculum as a male-dominated arena, especially Lipman's novels in P4C. In other words, experiences of P4C vary, and therefore this makes a case for an agenda to reflect on diversifying ways to be critical in P4C.

Phenomenological approach to critical reflection

While dialogue is given emphasis in P4C, dialogue alone might not be sufficient to make children understand that some identities may be less familiar, and/or less accepted, for the majority in a given classroom. Students' personal understanding of a subject matter is to be taken into consideration in order to create a plurality of ideas to brood over in class. The classroom dialogue here becomes a process jointly achieved by each student in order to acknowledge not only ideas but different ways of expressing them. Here, using a phenomenological approach to critical reflection (Brocki and Wearden 2004), participants of a dialogical process can explore and make sense of the P4C experience. This approach maintains that 'human beings are not passive perceivers of an objective reality, but... come to interpret and understand their world by formulating their own biographical stories into a form that makes sense to them' (ibid., 88). This is in line with Heidegger's existential phenomenology wherein human beings create meanings in a reciprocal, mutual relationship between subject and object which are inseparable Zimmermann 1996). Moran (2000, 13) extended this notion by arguing that 'Humans are always already caught up in a world into which they find themselves thrown, which reveals itself in moods, the overall nature of which is summed up by Heidegger's notion of "Being-in-the-world"'. In other words, the aim is to place the scholar's 'subjectivity in touch with the knowledge of what it is to be-in-the-world' (Brown 1992, 48). The phenomenological approach has an overlap with narrative accounts of lived experiences, that is, keeping solid students' critical narratives as told from their perspectives and in their voice (Elbaz-Luwisch 2005; Riessman 2008). Central to the arguments and critical thinking are narrative inquiries in which stories are sources of meaning (Clandinin and Connelly 2000). As Freire and Macedo (2000) claim, when dialogue sparks in each participant's personal experience and in the classroom, one is led to apply and acquire valuable insights.

Combining P4C with a phenomenological approach may serve as a vehicle for students to share their critical position, fostering others to understand their views better than when setting up a detached and carefully constructed logical argument (Sanders 2001). Also, distanced and 'rational' dialogue that may often be privileged may be a disservice especially if unmonitored with jargon as a way of excluding others in the discussion. A critical take on narratives can facilitate classroom conflicts because students are allowed to judge others' critical thinking while understanding where they are coming from. This is to thwart some classroom norms that have very

fixed goals but may also be driven by an impetus toward crossing out a checklist rather than serving as an intervention to resolve misunderstandings. This suggests that classroom norms are subject to either being informed by fixity of dialogue norms or flexibility thereof, which can ascertain how particular classroom norms can build a context to resolving or exacerbating differences in critical opinions. Opening up to alternative perspectives, however, is different from Rational Choice Theory, which assumes a stability of alternatives. The phenomenological approach rather considers beyond self-interest in evaluating and (dis)agreeing with critical assessments of peers. It prioritises a plurality of exchanges of reasons and the opportunity to defend and reconsider perspectives and reasoning. Instead of having preferences and arriving at a categorical evaluation, the phenomenological approach considers a perpetual accumulation of fragmented reasoning and knowledge.

Finally, after reflection comes processing reflection and documentation through writing. Firstly, writing can provide guidance on the kinds of arguments delivered during dialogue for critical reassessment. This can give space for other potentially pertinent critical thoughts to emerge. While students can choose not to document their critical engagements as they feel that conversations must be based on trust, writing helps them to further reevaluate their thoughts and the dialogue even after the encounter. Documentation also serves as a factor for extra caution among those who engage in dialogue especially in keeping an eye out for inconsistencies in the dialogue and to ensure that opposing sides' narratives are fairly represented in the process of dialogue. Aside from documentation, writing enables the thinker to process reflection for which Van Manen (2001, 127) notes that '[w]riting separates the knower from the known, but it also allows us to reclaim this knowledge and make it our own in a new and more intimate manner. Writing constantly seeks to make external what somehow is internal'. Writing is deeply reflective of the experience of reflection. It transforms not only the experience but also the thinking process into an external, communicable medium. This can only occur after the reflection stage. And it is crucial that the scholar reflect first and foremost, within the questions posed to children, prior to the attempt to write and communicate. The process of writing solidifies the reflection from children's answers. This gives rise to a 'a philosophy that would give credence to ordinary conscious experience and would not dichotomise appearance from reality' (Ehrich 2003, 48).

Implications and Key Areas for Future Studies

Having an understanding and recognition of the various legitimate ways to have a dialogue among children can resolve some pressing issues in a diverse classroom of contemporary times. First, acknowledging differences will help in linguistically diverse classrooms. Lack of academic language and literacy skills limit the participation of students (Gottlieb & Ernst-Slavit 2014; Ernst-Slavit & Pratt 2017). To acknowledge

linguistic diversity means to pave the way for the 'rich and diverse array of cultural and linguistic resources that are currently vastly underutilized and systemically devalued in schools' (Alim et al. 2015, 80). Language awareness not only on the side of the teacher but also among students themselves can make a well-informed dialogue in the classroom. As such, future studies are encouraged to seek to establish long panel research that observes changes in how students engage in dialogue for at least 5 or 10 years after the students have left the classroom. Such studies can also examine how diverse classroom contexts are related to one's dialogue engagements later in life such as in higher education or in the workplace.

Second, intercultural and inter-ethnic classrooms can benefit from recognition of diversity. As previously pointed out, when diversity and differences are neglected, conflicts in classroom discussion and pedagogical strategy may be particularly consequential for minority students. Differences in the background of students contribute to conflicts, which can escalate to discrimination (Sturgis et al. 2014; Titzmann et al. 2015). But when students acknowledge the perspective of others from a different upbringing and belief system, it can facilitate openness, enhanced empathy (Miklikowska 2017), and even close friendships (Bagci et al. 2014). Thus, for further studies, two specific areas would benefit from more research on dialogues in intercultural and inter-ethnic classrooms: first, more research is needed on identifying specific situations in which conflicts arise in a heterogenous classroom. This information will enable educators to anticipate specific conditions to be dealt with. Second, dialogue strategies that support the success of students from a variety of cultural, ethnic and economic contexts are needed. Heterogeneity in classrooms also serves as an opportunity to observe whether intergroup interaction can actually contribute to improved dialogue exchange between in- and out-groups in the classroom (Stark et al. 2015).

Finally, the coronavirus pandemic has propelled the use of digital classrooms, which can be both beneficial and challenging in terms of dialogue and conflict resolution. Technology-assisted learning allows for a diverse set of students to develop intercultural competence (Elboubekri 2017). Yet this is also challenging because managing an intercultural digital classroom calls for informed and adaptive pedagogical strategies (Gallagher et al. 2020; Siergiejczyk 2020;) without non-verbal cues (i.e. understanding emotions; See Frühholz et al. 2016) that are normally found in offline classrooms. Similarly, there is a concern that immersion in digital classrooms might foster social isolation and apathy (Leek 2016) and that students can be 'passive consumers of data rather than agents of creation and change' (Upchurch 2014, 31). Thus, further research is encouraged to pay attention to investigating effective online educational designs to foster dialogue among children from diverse lifestyles and contexts. For instance, it is critical that digital textbook publishers and learning technology developers allow

for diversity and representative reading materials. Students of diverse backgrounds themselves should be consulted through participatory action research so that their perspectives are included in the discussion. Ultimately, this work also makes an appeal for collaboration among philosophers, educators, learning technologies experts, IT specialists, web designers, students, textbook publishers, and policymakers because successfully meeting the needs of increasingly diverse students in a digital classroom requires interdisciplinary and collaborative action from people committed to both educational quality and equality.

Conclusion

The modest attempt to take on the task of this work and the related debates is by no means comprehensive or in any manner definitive. The goal is to set the scene for the questions to generate further investigations by locating these concerns in the field of dialogical studies. It aims to spark reflection and spur dialogues among scholars of philosophy of education about the ways in which the norms of dialogue should be judged in different contexts. This process of engaging students in dialogue borrowing the skills from P4C and phenomenological approach 'is intended to serve a heuristic purpose, not to be translated into a checklist to which teachers are required to conform. If that were to happen, its dialogic intention would be defeated' (Alexander 2017, 41). Indeed, much has happened in dialogic research in terms of education. For instance, the inflation of academic merits, the transformation to the digital age and the post-truth era demonstrate the susceptibility of education. Observers now speak of the crisis of dialogue in schools, reflect on what educators could have done differently, and imagine possible ways forward. Philosophy for Children and phenomenology are just two of the many ways to lead students to 'make an effort to get their facts right and make explicit their evidence behind their claims or explanations' (Michaels et al. 2008, 283). While there are contesting notions on the dialogical processes in schools, what is clear is that it makes a case for the relevance of continued discussions, at the same time also acknowledging the limits of fixation to what can be done with it. This situation leaves enough room for reflection while politically viable agreements are reached on what can be done, albeit for different reasons. The activities proposed by this work are just partial potentials of P4C and phenomenology together, suggesting that the dialogical process can borrow more approaches from different fields of studies. This work thus argues that dialogue rests on an advantageous, normative position by virtue of becoming a venue for merging different approaches in pedagogy. Moreover, expecting a reflection to arrive at a particular end is problematic to say the least. The connection of thoughts is typically not a straight line but a long, fragmented and complicated route.

Dialogue is a fluid affair and can be haphazard, requiring a reasonable sense of judgement to ensure which dialogic processes are relevant for a given classroom. It is

through engaging into deeper reflection that that the process of dialogue continues which helps students to 'recognise that knowledge is not only transmitted but also negotiated and re-created' (Alexander 2010, 399). But this dialogical development takes time, and time for constant critical reflection might be scarce if all that occurs in the classroom. This approach facilitates inclusion in dialogue that encourages different kinds of critical ethos, rendering respect to students' views that might be disregarded in traditional dialogical engagements. Note that this can be traced back to Habermasian classical deliberative theory (1998) wherein inclusion, especially of those who have to deal with the consequences of decisions, is at the heart of discussions. What is needed is to be able to reflect on how and why accepting or rejecting a specific argument occurred. It will provide a space for nuanced dialogue and will serve as a leveller, considering a diversity of levels of reception of ideas and different ways to acknowledge various sides. It is also worth pointing out that the form of exclusion that students may experience can be ascertained because by examining the classroom conditions, culture and the different communication styles used by students.

These discussions go on to show the continued relevance of diversity in dialogue and the role of the schools in it. As schools welcome new generations of students, it is hoped that dialogue continues to flourish with more participants, optimistically children. In line with this, one also ought to consider that there are stages of learning and maturation and that dialogue is not the first thing to start with in educating children. Yet it is encouraged to engage younger participants to join dialogical processes. Dialogue is worth the endeavour just as it has always been done in a community of participants, making progress one person at a time even if some participants successively struggle with much the same subjects, with no answers ever labelled as the 'right' ones. Theories alone do not and cannot create a great classroom dialogue and critical thinkers, just as mere colours do not immediately generate a sublime painting. Content, classroom culture, dialogic strategies and pedagogy have to be orchestrated well enough to produce valuable minds. Classroom dialogue is most worthwhile when there is a well understood reason to participate in it, and when the most effective means to manage new methods of dialogue are understood. This sort of understanding is enriched best by educators who understand the importance of classroom context and the corresponding pragmatic circumstances at hand, in order to invoke the most promising dialogue results. The students will, as well, know if they had understanding of critical thinking and of how to marshal their minds in the dialogic process. The challenge of stimulating insightful perception from a generation with speedy access to information is genuine; that is not to say it is impossible, though. But an unmindful management of classroom dialogue may only result in pointless abstractions of ideas, rampant in the work done during previous decades. In the same manner, P4C and the phenomenological approach can be also practised and understood otherwise. Dialogue, resolution and communication are just several words that may represent

a way by which human beings can hope to understand each other. That 'knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other' (Freire 2001, 71–72) implies that dialogue is not formulaic and can continue trying new ways of reflecting.

Bibliography

Alexander, R. J., (ed). (2010) *Children, their World, their Education: Final Report and Recommendations of the Cambridge Primary Review*. London: Routledge.

Alexander, R. J. (2017) *Towards Dialogic Teaching: Rethinking Classroom Talk*. 5th ed. York: Dialogos

Alim, H. S., & Paris, D. (2015) 'Whose language gap? Critical and culturally sustaining pedagogies as necessary challenges to racializing hegemony'. In N. Avineri, E. J. & Johnson, (Eds.). Invited Forum: Bridging the 'Language Gap'. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 25(1), 66–86.

Anderson, K. J. B. (2012) 'Science education and test-based accountability: Reviewing the relationship and exploring implications for future policy', *Science Education*, 96(1), 104–129.

Balls, J. D., Eury, A. D., and King, J. C. (2011) *Rethink, rebuild, rebound: A framework for shared responsibility and accountability in education*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Bagci, S. C., Kumashiro, M., Smith, P. K., Blumberg, H., Rutland, A. (2014) 'Cross-ethnic friendships: Are they really rare? Evidence from secondary schools around London'. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 41, 125–137.

Bell, S. (2010) 'Project-based learning for the 21st century: Skills for the future', *The Clearing House*, 83(2), 39–43.

Boyd, E. M., and Fales, A. W. (1983) 'Reflective learning: Key to learning from experience', *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 23(2), 99–117.

Bransford, J., Brown, A. and Cocking, R. (eds.) (2000) *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Brocki, J. M., and Wearden, A. J. (2006) 'A critical evaluation of the use of interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) in health psychology', *Psychology and Health*, 21(1), 87–108

Brown, R. (1992) 'Max van Manen and pedagogical human science research', in W. Pinar and W. Reynolds, W. (eds.), *Understanding curriculum as phenomenological and deconstructed text*. New York: Teachers College Press, 28–34.

Bush, K., and Saltarelli, D. (2000) *The two faces of education in ethnic conflict: Towards a peacebuilding education for children*. Florence, IT: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.

Campbell, D. E. (2007) 'Sticking together: Classroom diversity and civic education', *American Politics Research*, 35(1), 57–78.

Cassidy, C. (2017) 'Philosophy with Children: A Rights-Based Approach to Deliberative Participation,' *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 25(2), 320–334.

Clandinin, J. D., and Connelly, F. M. (2000) *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Conover, P. J., & Searling, D. D. (2000) A political socialization perspective. In L. McDonnell, M. Timpane & R. Benjamin (Eds.), Rediscovering the democratic

purposes of education. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 91–126.

Daniel, M.-F. (1994) 'Women, philosophical community of inquiry and the liberation of self', *Thinking*, 11(3,4), 63–71.

Darling-Hammond, L. and Snyder, J. (2000) 'Authentic Assessment of Teaching in Context', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(5–6), 523–545.

Dewey, J. (1933) How we think: A restatement of reflective thinking to the educative process. Boston: D. C. Heath. (Original work published in 1910).

Dull, L., and Murrow, S. (2008) 'Is dialogic questioning possible in social studies classrooms?', *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 36(4), 391–412.

Eemeren, F. van, and Grootendorst, R. (2004) A Systematic Theory of Argumentation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ehrich, L. (2003) 'Phenomenology: The quest for meaning', in T. O'Donoghue and K. Punch (eds.), Qualitative educational research in action. London: Routledge Falmer, 42–69.

Elbaz-Luwisch, F. (2005) Teachers' voices: Storytelling and possibility. Greenwich, CH: Information Age Publishing.

Elboubekri, A. (2017) The Intercultural Communicative Competence and Digital Education: The Case of Moroccan University Students of English in Oujda. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 45(4), 520–545.

Ernst-Slavit, G., & Pratt, K. L. (2017) Teacher questions: Learning the discourse of science in a linguistically diverse elementary classroom, *Linguistics and Education*, 40, 1–10.

Freire, P., and Macedo, D. (2000) A Dialogue: Culture, Language, and Race. Harvard Educational Review.

Freire, P. (1998) Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield

Freire, P. (2001) Pedagogy of the Oppressed, M. B. Ramos (trans). New York: The Continuum.

Frühholz, S., Trost, W., and Kotz, S. A. (2016) 'The sound of emotions—Towards a unifying neural network perspective of affective sound processing', *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 68, 96–110.

Gallagher, V., Renner, M. and Glover-Rijkse, R. (2020) 'Public address as embodied experience: using digital technologies to enhance communicative and civic engagement in the communication classroom', *Communication Education*, 69(3), 281–299

Garrison, D. R. (1992) 'Critical thinking and self-directed learning in adult education: An analysis of responsibility and control issues', *Adult Education Quarterly*, 42(3), 136–148.

Global Education Monitoring Report (2019) Migration, displacement and education: building bridges, not walls. Paris: UNESCO. Available at: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000266274 (Accessed 16 October 2020)

Gottlieb, M. and Ernst-Slavit, G. (2014) Academic language in diverse classrooms: Definitions and contexts. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Habermans, J. (1998) Between fact and Norms, Rehg, B. (trans.) Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Hess, D., & Avery, P. (2008) Discussion of controversial issues as a form and goal of democratic education. In J. Arthur, I. Davies & C. Hahn (Eds.), Sage handbook of education for citizenship and democracy. Los Angeles and London: Sage Publications, 508–518.

Hyde, B. (2008) Children and spirituality: searching for meaning and connectedness. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Hyry-Beihammer, E.K., Jokikokko, K. and Uitto, M. (2019) 'Emotions involved in encountering classroom diversity: Beginning teachers' stories', *British Educational Research Journal,* 45(6), 1124–1139.

Jennings, J. L. and Bearak, J. M. (2014) "Teaching to the test' in the NCLB era: How test predictability affects our understanding of student performance', *Educational Researcher*, 43(8), 381–389.

Kohan, W. (1995) 'The origin, nature, and aim of philosophy in relation to Philosophy for Children', *Thinking*, 12(2), 25–30.

Kolb, D. (1984) Experiential Learning as the Science of Learning and Development, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Lipman, M. (ed.) (1993) Thinking Children and Education. Dubuque: Kendall / Hunt.

Leek, D. R. (2016) 'Policy debate pedagogy: A complementary strategy and political engagement through service learning', *Communication Education*, 65(4), 397–408.

Miklikowska, M. (2017) 'Development of anti-immigrant attitudes in adolescence: The role of parents, peers, intergroup friendships, and empathy', *British Journal of Psychology*, 108, 626–648

Loughran, J.J. (2002) 'Effective Reflective Practice: in search of meaning in learning about teaching', *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 33–43.

Moon, T. R., Brighton, C. M., and Callahan, C. M. (2002) 'State standardized testing programs: Friend or foe of gifted education?', *Roeper Review*, 25(2), 49–60.

Moran, D. (2000) Introduction to phenomenology. London and New York: Routledge.

Moustakas (1994) Phenomenological research methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Mugerauer, R. (1995) Interpreting environments: Tradition, deconstruction, hermeneutics. Austin: University of Texas Press

Ndofirepi, A. P. (2011) 'Philosophy for Children: the quest for an African perspective', *South African Journal of Education*, 31, 246–256.

Nishiyama, K. (2017) 'Deliberators, not Future Citizens: Children in Democracy', *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 13(1), 1–26.

Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A., Kachur, R. and Prendergast, C. (1997) Opening Dialogue: Understanding the Dynamics of Language and Learning in the English Classroom. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Rainville, H. Y. (2000) 'Philosophy for Children in Native America. a Post-Colonial Critique', *Analytical Thinking*, 21(1), 65–77.

Riessman, C. K. (2008) Narrative methods for the human sciences. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Ross, M. (1993) The Culture of conflict. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Ross, M. (2007) Cultural contestation in ethnic conflict. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Saunders, H. (2001) A Public Peace Process: Sustained Dialogue to Transform Radical and Ethnic Conflicts. New York: Palgrave

Savery, J. R. (2006) 'Overview of problem-based learning: Definitions and distinctions', *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, 1(1), 9–20.

Schwarzenthal, M., Schachner, M., Juang, L. P. and Van de Vijver, A. J. R. (2019) 'Reaping the benefits of cultural diversity: Classroom cultural diversity climate and students' intercultural competence', *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(2), 323–346

Schön, D. (1983) The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Siergiejczyk, G. (2020) 'Virtual International Exchange as a High-Impact Learning Tool for More Inclusive, Equitable and Diverse Classrooms', *European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning*, 23(1), 1–17. -2020–0001

Stark, T. H., Mäs, M. and Flache, A. (2015) 'Liking and disliking minority-group classmates: Explaining the mixed findings for the influence of ethnic classroom composition on interethnic attitudes', *Social Science Research*, 50, 164–176.

Titzmann, P. F., Brenick, A. and Silbereisen, R. K. (2015) 'Friendships fighting prejudice: A longitudinal perspective on adolescents' cross-group friendships with immigrants', *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 44, 1318–1331.

Ungemah, L. D. (2015) 'Diverse classrooms, diverse curriculum, diverse complications: Three teacher perspectives', *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 46(4), 431–439

UNICEF (2017) Education Uprooted: For every migrant, refugee and displaced child, education. New York: UNICEF. Available at: https://www.unicef.org/publications/index_100817.html (Accessed 16 October 2020)

Upchurch, W. R. (2014) 'Public address as the basic communication course', *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 26(1), 8.

Weller, P. (2020) Rethinking Dialogue in the Age of New Challenges and Opportunities [video], Dialogue Society. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6IcSa-sYCsc. (Accessed 2 July 2020)

World Bank (2020) Guidance Note on Education Systems' Response to COVID19, 25 March 2020. Available at: http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/

en/450881585235950757/COVID19-Education-Sector-Guidance-Note-March26.pdf (Accessed 20 June 2020)

Zeichner, K.M. and Liston, D.P. (1996) Reflective Teaching: an introduction. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Zimmerman, M. (1996) 'Martin Heidegger: Antinaturalistic critic of technological modernity', in D. Macauley (ed.), Minding Nature: The Philosophers of Ecology. London: The Guilford Press, 59–81.