The transformative potential of philosophical dialogue: space for children and young people to explore their multi-storied lives.

Lauren Elizabeth Bowden

Doctorate in Educational Psychology

School of Education, Communication and Language Sciences

Newcastle University

June 2021

Declaration

This thesis is being submitted for the award of Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology. I declare that it is my own work and does not include material that is the work of others without acknowledgement, that I have consulted all materials cited, and I have not submitted this assignment for any other academic award.

Overarching Abstract

This thesis explores experiences of philosophical dialogic inquiry as a pedagogical approach with children and young people (CYP), for example, the use of Philosophy for Children (P4C). It contains four chapters: a systematic literature review, a critique of ethical and methodological choices, an empirical research project and a reflexive chapter, which considers personal and professional implications of the thesis.

Chapter 1: How do children and young people experience the process of philosophical dialogic inquiry and the wider implications of this pedagogical approach?

This systematic literature review explores children and young people's (CYP's) experiences of philosophical dialogic inquiry, a pedagogical approach that invites CYP to engage in critical thought and discuss a philosophical topic together. A meta-ethnography was used as a process to search and synthesise qualitative literature. Five papers were selected and reviewed. The key themes identified were features of a dialogic process, experiences of learning as a sociocultural experience and, reconstructed perceptions of the self, others, and learning. The influence of the context on the experiences of CYP was also identified as a critical theme. A line of argument was expressed in a visual form to illustrate the relationship of these themes to one and other. The review highlights the momentary experience of engaging in a dialogic process and wider implications for CYP, such as, engagement in dialogue outside of the school context and shifts in perceptions. Teacher accounts in the synthesised research also illustrated how philosophical dialogic inquiry can challenge adults' perceptions of CYP and what they are capable of. This may illustrate the potential for transformative change for CYP and adults.

Chapter 2: An ethical and methodological critique

This chapter explores ethical and methodological considerations during the development of the research project outlined in Chapter Three. The philosophical orientation of the research was social constructionism; therefore, the construction of language and power were critically considered throughout. The research was informed by participatory principles and narrative inquiry. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the research was facilitated virtually. Thus, virtual methodologies, and the associated implications of this, were continually reflected upon.

Relational ethicality guided the process of the research as there was ongoing attunement to interpersonal dynamics. This is arguably an aspect of quality and rigour in qualitative research (Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2007).

Chapter 3: A narrative inquiry with autistic young people and teachers in their school: how are the narratives they have constructed about themselves and their experiences woven and explored during philosophical dialogue?

The purpose of this empirical research is to understand how stories can be constructed and enacted in P4C. The project was undertaken in a specialist school / sixth form in the North East of England and adopted a qualitative approach. Autistic CYP, and teaching staff participated in the construction of the research approach, analysis, and dissemination decisions. Virtual semi-structured interviews were carried out to explore biographical stories and experiential stories. The interviews were constructed and analysed using Narrative Orientated Inquiry, Collocation Analysis and Critical Narrative Analysis. Findings are discussed with regards to the connections in the rich life stories and experiential stories shared by an individual, this aims to address how narratives can be woven and explored during a P4C process. By developing an understanding of the transformative potential of philosophical dialogue, I hope this will inform holistic understandings of CYP, and creative pedagogical practice.

Chapter 4: How did I shape the research and how did the research shape me? Personal and professional implications.

This chapter explores personal and professional implications of the research project outlined in Chapter Three. Engaging in participatory processes had implications on how I negotiated a relational dynamic when working alongside CYP and teachers. The use of narrative psychology was therapeutic and transformational, this consolidated narrative ways of 'being' as a key aspect of my professional practice. The stories shared in the research also prompted me to rethink pedagogy and how I could construct space for shared reflection on pedagogical approaches, and the underpinning philosophical principles, in education. Unpicking and understanding moments of reflexivity during the research has highlighted my key values as a person, researcher, and Educational Psychologist (EP).

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Chapter 1. How do children and young people experience the process of philosophical dialogic inquiry and the wider implications of this pedagogical approach?[1]

Abstract

This systematic literature review explores children and young people's (CYP's) experiences of philosophical dialogic inquiry, a pedagogical approach that invites CYP to engage in critical thought and discuss a philosophical topic together. A meta-ethnography was used as a process to search and synthesise qualitative literature. Five papers were selected and reviewed. The key themes identified were features of a dialogic process, experiences of learning as a sociocultural experience and, reconstructed perceptions of the self, others, and learning. The influence of the context on the experiences of CYP was also identified as a critical theme. A line of argument was expressed in a visual form to illustrate the relationship of these themes to one and other. The review highlights the momentary experience of engaging in a dialogic process and wider implications for CYP, such as, engagement in dialogue outside of the school context and shifts in perceptions. Teacher accounts in the synthesised research also illustrated how philosophical dialogic inquiry can challenge adults' perceptions of CYP and what they are capable of. This may illustrate the potential for transformative change for CYP and adults.

Key words: *philosophical dialogic inquiry, pedagogy, children and young people, experiences, perceptions.*

---

[1] I have prepared this for submission to the 'Journal of Philosophy of Education'

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 The purpose of education

There are contrasting ideas about the purpose of education. Lipman (2003) offers two differing paradigms in educational practice. One paradigm, the banking model proposed by Freire (1972), suggests the purpose of education is the acquirement of knowledge from teachers who are perceived as 'holding' this knowledge. From this perspective, children and young people (CYP) may passively receive knowledge rather than contribute to the construction of their learning in the classroom (Alam, 2013).

An alternative educational paradigm constructs education as a reflective process; "the focus of the educational process is not on the acquisition of information but on the grasp of relationships within and among the subject matters under investigation" (Lipman, 2003, p. 19). This can be referred to as education *through* democracy: CYP can learn through participatory processes that enable an exploration of subjectivity through human interaction (Biesta, 2007). From this perspective, education may support CYP to learn how to be 'human' due to developing relationships and mutuality with others (Macmurray, 2012).

Some teaching staff may shift between these paradigms depending on the lesson or topic. However, some argue that the philosophical assumptions, concerning what 'learning' is and the positioning of 'the learner', underpinning these two paradigms are juxtaposed and lead to fundamentally different perceptions and goals (McManus, 2001). Despite these varying positions, a political climate can influence an educational paradigm. In England, there may be an emphasis on performativity and the use of outcome-driven measures (O'Riordan, 2016). This has led to a shift in the values and principles underpinning the pedagogical approaches adopted in the classroom and how CYP and teaching staff experience their educational environments (Gibbs, 2018b).

1.1.2 Children's learning environments

A culture of performativity can shape pedagogical choices at a classroom level (O'Riordan, 2016). For example, didactic teaching practice can lead to content-driven

teaching methods to ensure CYP are acquiring subject-specific knowledge (Quarmby et al., 2019). This can encourage a pattern of teaching which emphasises recital, closed questioning, recall and minimal feedback (Galton & McBeath, 2008). This practice can cultivate teacher-student relationships which consist of a teacher 'giving' whilst students listen and receive (Alam, 2013).

This teaching practice has been subject to debate due to the possible positioning of CYP as passive learners in the classroom (Barrow, 2010). UNESCO (2011) states that Member States should "refuse to reduce the education process to training for instrumental techniques and competences" (p. 2). A dialogical and relational approach to education can embed the active role of a child in their own learning and enable a shared meaning-making process between teacher and child (Lyle, 2008). This counters a transactional learning environment which can be regarded as oppressive classroom practice as it denies CYP opportunities to authentically engage in their own learning (Alam, 2013).

1.1.3 Philosophical dialogic inquiry

One programme that may cultivate dialogical and relational encounters in the classroom is 'Philosophy for Children' (P4C) (Lipman, 2003). This pedagogical approach involves CYP coming together to discuss a philosophical question or topic, their discussion can be stimulated by visual resources or literature. In doing so, CYP engage in criticality and curiosity towards an idea that may otherwise have been considered as 'truth' or 'reality'. This pedagogy can contrast didactic teaching approaches as the adult's role is constructed as a facilitator and CYP can direct their own learning experience, rather than be constrained by the expectation of mastering content for recall purposes (McManus, 2001).

A range of practices have developed since the initial introduction of P4C in the 1970's. This may correspond with a rise in post-modern ways of thinking about knowledge and truth (Vansieleghem & Kennedy, 2011). These practices still maintain some of the core assumptions and values of the approach, but there is a greater emphasis on the communal process of dialogue and reflection, rather than an individual CYP's intellectual pursuits, such as the improvement of critical thinking skills (Vansieleghem & Kennedy, 2011). To reflect this shift in focus, a second generation of this pedagogy emerged; 'Philosophy *with* Children' (PwC)

(Vansieleghem & Kennedy, 2011). In practice, a facilitator of PwC may dwell upon the diversity of perspectives and encourage the critical exchange of ideas between CYP. A focus on communal aspects of dialogue has also led to the development of 'Community of Philosophical Inquiry' (CoPI) which can be used with adults and CYP in a variety of community-based settings (Bovill & Anderson, 2020).

Nevertheless, there may still be an emphasis in research on the development of specific skills when CYP are involved in this pedagogical practice (Murris, 2008). This may reflect current educational expectations and priorities. This can risk overlooking the democratic potential of this pedagogy; it can provide space for meaningful co-construction of ideas and for CYP to enact their participatory rights (Barrow, 2010). This pedagogical approach aims to centralise the active role of CYP in their learning environment. However, CYP's participation in existing research varies, this may implicate the assumptions made about children and the construction of childhood (Christensen & Prout, 2002). Research that aims to listen and act upon CYP views moves beyond tokenistic research and sets out to respect CYP's right to influence and participate in decisions made about them (Lundy et al., 2011).

Arguably, P4C, PwC and CoPI all involve the process of "philosophical dialogic inquiry" as CYP are asked to reflect upon a philosophical topic in discussion with one and other (Scholl, 2014, p. 90). In this systematic literature review (SLR), the term 'philosophical dialogic inquiry' has been adopted to encompass the pedagogical practice covered across the research papers. However, the specific practice noted in each of the selected research papers will be discussed so the impact of theoretical context on CYP's experience can be explored.

1.1.4 The current review

This SLR explores research on CYP's experience of philosophical dialogic inquiry so future research can be more authentically informed by CYP. A meta-ethnography approach was adopted due to the nature of the research question: *How do CYP experience the process of philosophical dialogic inquiry and the wider implications of this pedagogical approach?* Meta-ethnography is an approach within an interpretivist paradigm, it aims to "seek an explanation of social or cultural events based upon the perspectives and experiences of the people being studied" (Noblit & Hare, 1988, p.

4

12). As the purpose of the SLR question is to explore CYP's experience, a meta-ethnography was deemed the most appropriate method of synthesis.

1.2 Method of synthesis: A meta-ethnography

This SLR was guided by the seven-stage process associated with the meta-ethnography approach:

1. Getting started: providing the context and interest
2. Deciding what is relevant to the initial interest
3. Reading the studies
4. Understanding how the studies are related
5. Translating the studies into one another
6. Synthesising translations
7. Expressing the synthesis

(Noblit & Hare, 1988)

The aim of a meta-ethnography is to produce new meaning by comparing, contrasting, constructing overarching concepts and creating a holistic interpretation of the phenomena (Barnett-Page & Thomas, 2009). Due to ongoing reflexivity, my interpretation and meaning-making in this SLR was an iterative process (Barnett-Page & Thomas, 2009).

1.2.1 Researcher rationale

I have reflected on how my own history has shaped how I perceive and experience education. Whilst training to be an Educational Psychologist (EP), I have engaged in discussion and criticality alongside other trainees. Prior to this training, I experienced limited opportunities for this.

Furthermore, I have reflected on the pressure I experienced as a Teaching Assistant (TA) in a specialist school to ensure CYP were meeting educational standards. I believe this was reflective of wider political agendas and policies in England (O'Riordan, 2016). This created a barrier when trying to implement creative pedagogical approaches for the CYP I worked alongside. Thus, I have become interested in pedagogies that cultivate curiosity, reflection, and criticality.

1.2.2 Locating the relevant studies

A range of searching methods can be applied during phase two of a meta-ethnography (France et al., 2014). I carried out an exhaustive literature search using electronic database search engines (Education Abstracts EBSCO, ERIC EBSCO, Scopus, Psych Info, Taylor and Francis Online – Journal of Educational Psychology in Practice). Supplementary search strategies, such as, reference harvesting, were also used. Searches were refined by applying criticality and appraising the relevance of concepts used within the research. The key search terms accumulated and were altered in an iterative way according to each database. Overall, search terms derived from five key areas: 'philosophy', 'dialogue', 'pedagogy', 'student impact' and 'participant group'.

Inclusion criteria

SLR searches can be refined based upon relevance to the review question (Atkins et al., 2008). I recognised the need to refine criteria due to my developing knowledge of the literature and my methodological considerations in relation to the review question. Therefore, my inclusion and exclusion criteria were continually developed (See Table 1).

Searching took place between July and October 2019. Inclusion and exclusion criteria (Table 1) and a PICOSS table (Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome, Study design, Setting) (See Table 2) were used to monitor the relevance of research. Five papers were selected for review: Barrow (2015), Dunlop et al. (2015), Gasparatou and Ergazaki (2015), Cassidy and Heron (2018) and Michalik (2019). The databases and search terms used to yield these research papers are outlined in Appendix A.

Date	Inclusion and Exclusion criteria
9.8.19	- Must be academic literature and an empirical study - Must be published in English - Must be peer reviewed - Must be published from 2007 onwards. This date was decided due to the introduction of UNESCO (2007). - The title, key words and abstracts of the paper will be reviewed to determine relevance to the research question. Search engine exclusion measures (exclude based on publication type and subject area) will be applied if searching produces a lot of research that seems irrelevant to the research question.

22.8.19	- Must not refer to 'taught philosophy'. The literature must be referring to philosophy as a pedagogical approach. - Must not be based in a University setting as this literature mostly refers to philosophy as a subject area. - The literature must be published within the past ten years (from 2009 onwards). This will generate literature that is situated in more current political and cultural agendas.
2.10.19	- Must not refer to computer mediated pedagogies. - Must not be based upon teacher education, teacher training and teacher training programmes. - Must not be a case study that focuses on anecdotal information. There must be a form of empirical analysis. - Must not be based on the skill acquirement of CYP. Such as, cognitive skills, language skills, verbal behaviour, and attainment. This also applies to the enhancement of citizenship as this has links to a specific taught curriculum. Research must be phenomenological and based on CYP's experiences. There must be a method that asks CYP for their views. This will therefore exclude research where the *only* method used is observation and/or coding of philosophical inquiry sessions. - Must draw upon some qualitative data as this may provide rich insight into CYP's experiences. - The inquiry process discussed in the research must have a philosophical aspect to it. This distinguishes it from 'Enquiry Based Learning', 'Problem Based Learning', 'Interactive Groups' or 'Thinking Skills'.

Table 1: Inclusion and Exclusion criteria

Review Questions	How do children/young people experience the process of philosophical dialogic inquiry? How do children and young people experience the wider implications of this pedagogical approach?
Population	Children and young people
Intervention	Pedagogy that enables philosophical dialogic inquiry
Comparator	None
Outcomes	Subjective outcomes identified through a qualitative data collection method. The aim of this meta-ethnography is phenomenological.
Study design	Phenomenological: to explore the experiences of children Qualitative: to give rich accounts of CYP's subjective experiences
Setting	A setting that provides education or cultivates learning experiences for children and young people (for example, Early Years Setting, Primary School, Secondary School, Specialist settings, Alternative Provisions)

Table 2: A PICOSS table (Boland et al., 2017)

1.2.3 Reading the studies

This phase involved repeated reading of the chosen studies. This was complemented by noting key information about each research paper (See Table 3). Distinguishing a theoretical framework can provide insight into the "structure and scaffolding" of a research process as well as the paradigm the research is situated in (Merriam, 2009, p. 11). This was particularly important given conceptualisations of philosophical

7

dialogic inquiry, and how it is transferred into practice, may impact the experiences of CYP.

Phase 3 also involves consideration of "interpretative metaphors" in the research (Noblit & Hare, 1988, p. 28). This refers to explanatory ideas proposed by the researchers. Therefore, I explored second order constructs: the researchers' interpretation of participant data, and first order constructs; the words and expression used by participants (Britten et al., 2002) (See Appendix B).

Using a fixed quality criteria can be problematic due to differing philosophical and epistemological assumptions in research papers (Howe & Eisenhart, 1990). In this review, quality was assessed when reviewing the ethicality of the research, rather than the application of a fixed, comparable criteria (Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2007). From this perspective, one criterion for assessing quality is ethical justification. This assesses whether research methods are compatible with "both educational aims and democratic human values" (Altrichter, 1993, p. 77). In the context of philosophical dialogic inquiry, educational aims should centralise the participation of CYP. Research methods that align with this ethical statement should directly ask CYP about their experience. Thus, the overarching quality criteria for the review papers were concerned with the participation of CYP in the research methods.

1.2.4 Determining how the studies are related

I noticed themes and patterns across the research papers so I created concepts that would encompass the 2nd order constructs across the studies (See Table 4). Then, I noted how each concept mapped, or did not map, to each study whilst also recognising how the experiences of each concept for CYP differed across the studies. Noblit and Hare (1988) proposed three methods of translation: i) the concepts identified are comparable and reciprocal; ii) concepts are contradictory and refutational; iii) a translation based on how the parts create a whole, creating a line of argument. A reciprocal and refutational translation were utilised in this SLR to explore how the studies were comparable and to identify any "competing explanations" across the studies (Noblit & Hare, 1988, p. 47).

1.2.5 Translation

To understand how the concepts relate to each other, they were grouped using overarching categories. The studies were reciprocally translated by noting down how the research addressed each of the overarching categories and individual concepts. I also revisited first order constructs to understand whether any participant quotes could fall under another category, therefore, ensuring that CYP's views were central to the meaning-making in this SLR.

I also questioned whether concepts were refutational, or, whether contrasting ideas reflected the fluidity of individual experience. Refutations in research can occur because of differing individual experiences, or, due to underpinning ideology of each study (France et al., 2019). It became apparent that some concepts were constructed in varying ways depending on the philosophical and contextual influences in each research. Therefore, the refutational translation in this SLR reviewed concepts in tension with each other as this may offer a critique of differing interpretations (Noblit & Hare, 1988). Please see Appendix C for evidence of the reciprocal and refutational translation.

1.2.6 Synthesising translations

This phase involved synthesising the reciprocal and refutational translation to create a holistic interpretation. This process did not aim to amalgamate the occurrences of each concept. Drawing upon Geertz (1973) and the idea of "thick description" (France et al., 2019, p. 2), the aim was to provide a rich understanding of the meaning underpinning the concepts drawn from the 2nd order and 1st order interpretations, and the relationships between these concepts across the studies. Third order constructs emerged from this process of synthesis; new, higher-order interpretations that encompassed concepts and the variety of experiences across the studies (Noblit & Hare, 1988). These constructs are presented in Table 5.

Study	Sample	Data Collection	Setting	Purpose	Theoretical framework
Barrow, W. (2010). Dialogic, participation and the potential for Philosophy for Children. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 5*(2), 61-69.	One class of 22 children aged between 9-10 years old participated in the intervention. 7 children were interviewed.	Children were involved in weekly Philosophy for Children (P4C) sessions within a 3-month period. 7 children engaged in semi-structured interviews with the researcher. Discussion in the interview was aided using visual tools.	Primary school Rural Scotland	Can P4C provide a participatory pedagogy for children and young people? Does it have democratic potential?	• A dialogical and relational approach to child participation. • The theorisation of dialogic education - Ideas mostly stem from Wegerif (2007) and Bae (2009)
Dunlop, L., Compton, K., Clarke, L., & McKelvey-Martin, V. (2015). Child-led enquiry in primary science. *Education 3-13, 43*(5), 462-481.	364 children that were aged between 8-11 years old. 19 teachers	Questionnaires with quantitative and qualitative response options. Children completed a questionnaire after experiencing 8 teacher-led sessions of Community of Scientific Enquiry (CoSE). Teachers also completed a questionnaire.	Key Stage 2 classes in a Primary School. Northern Ireland	To evaluate child led CoSE. To develop a strategy for teaching and learning in science and to meet the needs of learners.	• CoSE is an adaptation of P4C (Lipman, 2003). • Learning through community and during the process of enquiry and dialogue • 'Socratic Teaching' and Thinking skills
Gasparatou, R., & Ergazaki, M. (2015). Students' Views about Their Participation in a Philosophy Program. *Creative Education,* 6(08), 726.	16 young people that were aged between 14-16 years old. 9 girls and 7 boys	7 philosophy sessions designed by the researchers and informed by P4C ideas/methods. Semi-structured interviews	Village high school Rural West Greece	Phenomenological purpose Exploring children and young people's perceptions	• Child-centred pedagogy and child-centred research methods • P4C as a way of "challenging the mind and cultivating the heart" (p. 727)

Cassidy, C., & Heron, G. (2018). Breaking into secure: Introducing philosophical discussions to young people in secure accommodation. *Journal of Social Work,* 1468017318815399.	4 male young people (aged between 13-17) 7 male, 4 female young people attended less frequently 5 members of staff – always one staff member observing but had a supervisory role.	10 Community of Philosophical Inquiry sessions Dialogue was recorded and notes made Semi structured interviews with 6 young people and 5 staff.	Secure Accommodation Scotland	Impact of P4C for young people in Secure Accommodation – do they engage? Challenges and opportunities associated with this approach.	•'Getting it Right for Every Child' – Scottish government legislation •Collaborative approaches to learning
Michalik, K. (2019). Teacher and learner perspectives on philosophical discussion – uncertainty as a challenge and opportunity. *Childhood & Philosophy, 15*, 1-20	11 Primary School teachers/Special Needs teachers/Social Education workers 2 groups of 70 children (aged between 6-9 years and 10-12 years)	Semi structured interviews with teachers "Group discussions" with children. This was coded and analysed (p. 6).	Primary School Hamburg, Germany	Exploring the feeling and experience of 'uncertainty' when engaging in philosophical discussion How do children experience the challenges of uncertainty?	Transformative education – teaching beyond skill acquirement.

Table 3: Demographic information and theoretical framework of each study under review

Concepts	Explanation
Pattern of talk	This refers to dynamic of dialogue between CYP and adults and who is perceived to be directing the dialogue.
Engaging in discussion with others and 'arguing'	CYP's experience of other perspectives and mapping them to their own. Sometimes, this is in tension and can feel argumentative.
Open and uncertain dialogue	This refers to dialogue that does not work towards a concrete answer and often goes in different directions.
Questioning and inquiry	CYP asking questions, investigating ideas and/or concepts and discovering new ideas/concepts.
A sense of self-expression	CYP's experience of being provided with the space to express their ideas 'freely'.
Emotional response	This refers to words/phrases associated with emotions that CYP use to describe their experience.
Engagement	CYP did not seem to talk about this concept. However, adults and authors of the studies discuss engagement in relation to how enthused and motivated CYP seemed when involved in the dialogue.
The experience of philosophical process and philosophical concepts	Some CYP discuss how different ideas were introduced, explored, and focused on. Often, this process can incite a variety of different responses.
Subject matter/topics	This refers to CYP's experience of a specific topic, for example, 'Friendship'
Relevance to personal life vs thought experiments	Some CYP experienced sessions differently depending on whether the session related to something familiar or if they were based on something more abstract.
Learning in a topic area	This refers to whether CYP noted any learning within a topic area / curriculum.
Learning beyond the classroom	CYP discuss instances when they have shared what they have learned in other contexts, other than school. For example, in the home with family members.
Learning new skills and skill development	This refers to discussion of new skills, often these are learning 'process' skills such as questioning, listening etc.
Structure/rules	Some CYP discuss their experience of structure and rules applied, or if not applied, to the dialogue they engaged in. For example, an 'agree/disagree' structure.

Challenges of facilitating sessions	This refers to any challenges noted when sessions were facilitated, for example, classroom constraints, group dynamics.
General Knowledge	This refers to CYP 'gaining' general knowledge or CYP 'lacking' general knowledge and this impacting the experience of the dialogue.
Changes in CYP thinking and/or behaviour	Some CYP and adults note changes in CYP behaviour or their thinking, for example, CYP's behaviour perceived as less 'disruptive'
Repositioning of child/teacher role and dynamic; a shift in power	Some CYP and adults experience a process where CYP lead the process and the teacher takes on a different role.
Expectations/perceptions	Expectations and perceptions of CYP and teachers shifting after experiencing the sessions. For example, one teacher noted surprise at how CYP think about philosophical topics.
Change in ideas about the facilitation of learning and pedagogical approach	This refers to a shift in thinking about how CYP learn and how learning can be facilitated.
Collaboration and support	Adults and CYP discuss the feeling and practice of being together and negotiating dialogue as a group.
An awareness of others, listening to others and demonstrating empathy	This refers to CYP encouraging, understanding, and respecting each other's feelings/ideas/contributions.
Unity/community vs Individual view/difference in opinion	This refers to how CYP talk about their own ideas in relation to others and the tension faced when trying to maintain individuality whilst also adapting their view after hearing other viewpoints.
An experience of difference… a comparison to other lessons	Some CYP describe their experience of the sessions by comparing/contrasting to their experience of other lessons in school.

Table 4: Concepts synthesised from the 2nd order constructs. [2]

[2] Please note - terminology was sometimes adapted to ensure concepts reflected interpretations across multiple papers.

Overarching category	Concepts drawn from the second order and first order constructs	Third order constructs
• Dialogue • Being together • Change	• Pattern of Talk • Discussion and arguing • Open and uncertain dialogue • Questioning and inquiry • Unity / community vs the individual view/difference in opinion • Child/teacher role and dynamic; a shift in power	**Addressing the 'other':** CYP seemed to experience an 'open' process during philosophical dialogic inquiry and connections were made between the 'self' and the 'other'. For example, some CYP discussed how other CYP's contributions shifted their views. Openness seemed to cultivate more questioning, 'weighing' ideas, an acceptance of mistakes and different opinions being held in tension. A refutational translation highlighted how dialogue sometimes became directed by more dominant peers. When an adult adopts a facilitator role and the process is open, there may not be an equal spread of dialogue, rather, a complex group dynamic can emerge.
• Personal/Affective factors	• Self-expression • Emotional response • Engagement	**Spacious interactions:** Some CYP discussed how P4C/CoPI provided opportunities to express their opinion. This seemed to be an emotionally charged experience for CYP. In "spacious interactions", CYP's individual expression is validated and there is a recognition of the 'other' in dialogue, often these interactions can stimulate playfulness (Bae, 2012, p. 60). In Dunlop et al. (2015) and Cassidy and Heron (2018), CYP may have experienced an interactional and experimental atmosphere which may have cultivated their 'engagement' . Some CYP expressed worry and uneasiness which may reflect familiarity with 'narrow' interaction patterns where questions constructed by adults have a predetermined answer. In spacious interactions, CYP's initiatives are received and attuned to (Bae, 2012).
• Experience of philosophy	• Philosophical process and concepts • Subject matter • Personal vs thought experiments	**Active curiosity and thinking:** Some CYP discussed the process of philosophical discussion and their exploration of philosophical ideas/concepts. Some CYP wanted to know more and welcomed opportunities to grapple with challenging ideas/concepts. P4C/CoPI seemed to offer space for exploring 'how' to think and for thinking 'deeply'. For example, Some CYP liked to analyse topics (Gasparatou & Ergazaki, 2015) and go through a process of figuring something out (Dunlop et al., 2015). **Resonance and 'everydayness':** Some CYP commented on how they perceived and engaged in philosophical dialogic inquiry differently depending on whether it resonated with their personal, everyday experiences. Some CYP discussed how simulations aided their participation.
• Learning/skill development	• Learning in topic area • Skill development • Learning 'beyond the class'	**Learning as a sociocultural experience:** CYP and staff discussed how CYP developed communication skills, skills related to dialogue and personal skills such as confidence. Furthermore, some CYP developed skills related to thinking, for example, critical thinking skills. Some CYP shared their learning experiences beyond the classroom into other areas

		of their life. This may reflect a sociocultural interpretation of how CYP can engage in learning; the skills developed may have affected CYP's participation in other contexts (Ten Dam et al., 2004). The refutational translation highlighted how Dunlop et al. (2015) was the only research to note domain-specific learning. This may reflect the set-up of CoSE as a method to deliver science lessons.
• Change	• Change for CYP • Child/teacher role and dynamic; a shift in power • Expectations/perceptions	**Reconstructed perceptions of the self and others:** 'Shifts' were experienced by both CYP and staff. This occurred across the following areas: CYP's perception of their own abilities, CYP's perception of other children's abilities and behaviour, the stance of the teacher/facilitator/adults, how staff felt they were perceived by CYP, staff's perceptions and attitudes towards CYP, how teachers perceived their role. There may be differences, noted in the refutational translation, in how CYP notice and describe changes compared to adult's interpretations of this.
• Comparison and difference to other lessons • Change • Facilitation	• Difference in comparison to other lessons • Change in ideas about learning and how teachers delivered/facilitated learning • Challenges, structure/rules.	**Reconstructed perceptions of learning:** CYP and staff discuss how P4C/CoPI/CoSE contrasted other lessons and some CYP discussed how their positioning and interactions in sessions differed compared to other lessons. Sessions that enable philosophical dialogic inquiry may challenge how a setting constructs 'learning'. The refutational translation highlighted how the culture of a setting may impact how this shift in perception is experienced.
• Being together	• Collaboration and support • Empathy and listening to others • Unity / community vs the individual view/difference in opinion	**Working _in_ a group and _as_ a group:** Some of the comments made by CYP suggest that they worked as a group during dialogue, some CYP commented on making connections between their views and the views shared by others. During philosophical dialogic inquiry, CYP may think together and challenge each other's ideas (Mercer & Littleton, 2007). There may be differing views about how the teacher worked alongside the CYP. In Barrow (2015), some CYP believed the teacher showed partiality by helping some CYP more than others.
• Facilitation • Dialogue	• Challenges • Structure/rules • Open and uncertain dialogue	**Tension and uncertainty:** CYP and staff experienced tension when engaging in the process of philosophical dialogic inquiry due to it being uncertain and unfamiliar. CYP and adults also note a variety of different challenges when preparing for and managing philosophical dialogic inquiry. Staff seem to experience challenges facilitating dialogue but also, systemically, in the wider school culture.
• Facilitation	• General knowledge	**Cultural and linguistic experiences:** In Cassidy and Heron (2018), the researchers discuss how CYP displayed weak general knowledge during dialogue. The authors suggest that this may have acted as a barrier during discussion. Therefore, dialogue may illuminate different cultural and linguistic experiences which can affect how CYP participate.

Table 5: Third-order constructs.

1.2.7 Expressing the synthesis

A line of argument can be described as an overarching model that outlines how each study relates to the new third order constructs and how each construct may be interrelated (Atkins et al., 2008). The expression of this synthesis is presented in Figure 1. This is expressed in a visual form so it is accessible to a range of educationalists and to illustrate the relationships between the concepts (Noblit & Hare, 1988).

1.3 Discussion

The line of argument in this meta-ethnography proposes that CYP and staff experienced a dialogic process, which may offer a new, unfamiliar learning experience. The experience of philosophical dialogic inquiry can also instigate transformative change as it reconstructed perceptions of the self, others, and learning. Figure 1 illustrates how this change is bidirectional and expresses the impact of contextual factors on experience. The following sections will explore this interpretation in greater depth.

Figure 1: A visual expression of the line of argument

1.3.1 A dialogic process

Some of the third order constructs in this review reflected features of a dialogic process (See Figure 2) (Wegerif, 2011). This may reflect a wide body of literature that explores the dialogic underpinnings of P4C and CoPI (Barrow, 2010; Fisher, 2007; Hardman & Delafield, 2010; Lyle, 2008; Smith, 2017).

A dialogic pedagogy can have inter, intra and extra personal features (Lysaker & Furuness, 2011). The interpersonal can be defined as the interactions between different CYP and between adults and CYP. The intrapersonal can refer to how CYP construct the 'self' in interactions with the 'other'. An extra personal experience can be the relationship formed between an individual and the topic under discussion (Lysaker & Furuness, 2011). In this review, the third order constructs that encompass experiences of the interpersonal and intrapersonal illuminate how CYP navigate the dynamic between the 'self' and the 'other', connect and relate to others during dialogue and explore different possibilities in the context of an interaction. Some CYP may also have an extra personal experience when they explore philosophical subjects during inquiry.

Figure 2: Inter, intra and extra personal features of a dialogic process

1.3.1.1 Interpersonal and Intrapersonal features

Conceptualisations of a dialogic process are often underpinned by the philosophical assumption that dialogue expresses and constructs social reality (Sampson, 2008). Knowledge and the process of knowing can occur in interaction between the 'self' and the 'other'. Experiences of this encounter were encompassed under the third order construct 'Addressing the other'. Philosophical dialogic inquiry may construct space for individuals to identify, demonstrate openness to and assimilate different 'voices', which can widen and enrich understanding (Bakhtin, 1981).

The third order construct 'Addressing the other' highlights the power dynamic between the 'self' and the 'other' when CYP and adults engage in a dialogic process. In Barrow (2015), Dunlop et al. (2015) and Michalik (2019), CYP and teachers discussed how CYP formed the dialogue and teachers had less input. CYP and teachers discussed feeling equal during philosophical dialogic inquiry; "she [the teacher] has the right to express her own opinion like us" (Barrow, 2015, p. 80). This may highlight differing experiences concerning the positioning of the adult in dialogue; some CYP may experiment with more authority over classroom talk whilst some CYP and adults may feel 'closer' to each other (Barrow, 2015; Michalik, 2019). The latter may reflect the emergence of a symmetrical relationship (Vansieleghem & Kennedy, 2011) and epistemic equality as the power differential is narrowed during co-construction (Murris, 2013).

A dialogic process can sometimes lack a distinct authoritative voice (Barrow, 2015). This may explain why some CYP become more dominant in dialogue, and the differing perceptions about teachers as part of the group (Barrow, 2015). Some CYP may find the dynamic of teachers being 'closer' unsettling (Barrow, 2012). However, some CYP can collaborate with each other during dialogue as a result of joint commitment towards a shared goal (Mercer & Littleton, 2007). This process can be a practical, emotional and an ontological experience. This may correspond with some of the experiences shared by CYP which may suggest CYP worked 'in' and 'as' a group (Mercer & Littleton, 2007). CYP may have been sensitive and responsive to subjectivities whilst also challenged by it when thinking out loud together (Littleton & Mercer, 2013).

Arguably, the third order constructs 'Addressing the other' and 'Working in and as a group' draw attention to the critical, creative and caring aspects of a dialogic process and may highlight a sense of community (Fisher, 2007; Lipman, 2003). Barrow (2015) and Michalik (2019) discuss how CYP may have grappled with the individual in relation to the community. Furthermore, some CYP acknowledged that their view shifted in response to other opinions; "I'm completely different when I come out than when I went in…" (Michalik, 2019, p. 14). This may reflect relational democracy in a dialogic process as 'otherness' developed new insights (Barrow & Todd, 2011).

'Tension and uncertainty' was also developed as a third order construct in this review. Some CYP discussed the uncertainty of no 'right' and 'wrong' answers (Barrow, 2015; Michalik, 2019) and the challenge of disagreeing with others (Gasparatou & Ergazaki, 2015). Arguably, the experiences shared by CYP and staff in relation to this construct may highlight tension in response to the openness and fluidity of a dialogic process (Haynes & Murris, 2011; Murris, 2008).

In a dialogic process, meaning can be constructed in the 'space' between individuals (Wegerif, 2011). This space can allow for the "opening, closing, widening and deepening" of interpretation (Wegerif, 2011, p. 180). This can spark creative tension as there is a process of deconstructing and reconstructing concepts to form new understandings (Kennedy & Kennedy, 2011). The refutational translation highlighted how some CYP perceived openness as an opportunity for expression (Michalik, 2019) whereas some CYP did not enjoy this (Dunlop et al., 2015; Gasparatou & Ergazaki, 2015). This may reflect feelings of threat or discomfort when CYP navigate an 'open' dialogue (Gurevitch, 2000; Michalik, 2019) rather than teacher-directed forms of talk (Lyle, 2008).

The third order constructs 'Spacious Interactions' and 'Active curiosity and thinking' highlight how the dialogic process can be an experimental, exploratory experience for CYP. This was sometimes expressed in this review as "freedom" (Barrow, 2015, p. 82; Gasparatou & Ergazaki, 2015, p. 731; Michalik, 2019, p. 10). A sense of freedom alongside CYP's feelings of fun, joy, excitement (Barrow, 2015; Cassidy & Heron, 2018; Dunlop et al., 2015; Gasparatou & Ergazaki, 2015) and surprise (Dunlop et al., 2015) may highlight how a dialogic process offers spacious interactions and stimulates "joyful vitality" (Bae, 2012, p. 60). CYP may have also demonstrated

eagerness to explore and discover, for example, some teachers noted how CYP appeared motivated and wanted to know more (Dunlop et al., 2015). A dialogic process can position CYP as social agents, how a CYP negotiates this in a classroom community is dynamic (Kumpulainen & Lipponen, 2010), this can incite vigour as "each move sets up a train of countering or supporting moves" (Lipman, 2003, p. 93). This may be reflected in Dunlop et al. (2015) when a teacher discusses a "buzz" in the classroom (p. 476).

The third order construct 'Tension and uncertainty' also highlights challenges when implementing and facilitating philosophical dialogic inquiry. Some staff discussed constraints, issues with sessions as isolated lessons and challenges embedding this approach within a wider organisational structure (Dunlop et al., 2015; Michalik, 2019). This created tension in some relationships with other staff members and for professional identities (Michalik, 2019). In Dunlop et al. (2015), despite CoSE being implemented as a curricular approach to teaching Science, one Teacher discusses issues when CYP adjust to the contrasting expectations of the wider school context. Thus, the implementation of philosophical dialogic inquiry can be challenging as the values underpinning this practice may seem incongruent with a school system influenced by wider political agendas (O'Riordan, 2016). Some CYP may wish to uphold the orthodoxy of philosophical dialogic inquiry without it being influenced by the wider demands of the school context. For example, some CYP wanted sessions to be detached from school or as a separate course option (Gasparatou & Ergazaki, 2015).

1.3.1.2 Extra-personal features

An extra-personal experience in a dialogic process can refer to how an individual relates to the topic of discussion (Lysaker & Furuness, 2011). The third order construct 'Resonance and everydayness' highlights how some CYP found sessions more engaging when philosophical concepts resonated with personal experiences and/or they were presented through a visual medium (Cassidy & Heron, 2018; Gasparatou & Ergazaki, 2015). CYP may value processes that help them to feel heard and valued during dialogic activities (Sharp, 2014). Perhaps, 'everyday' topics and visual resources shaped opportunities for CYP to participate in the process. This may also offer scaffolding opportunities as adults can link CYP's previous experience to new learning (Muhonen et al., 2016).

1.3.2 Learning; a sociocultural experience

Figure 1 illustrates how a dialogic process can have a 'ripple' effect. Change may be bidirectional as enhanced learning may also impact CYP's experiences and engagement in the dialogic process as well as perceptions of themselves, others, and learning. CYP and staff members discussed the varying skills CYP had developed after being involved in P4C/CoPI/CoSE (Barrow, 2015; Dunlop et al., 2015; Gasparatou & Ergazaki, 2015; Michalik, 2019), CYP bridged learning into other contexts (Cassidy & Heron, 2018; Dunlop et al., 2015; Gasparatou & Ergazaki, 2015) and there was behaviour change, for example, developing patience in other aspects of their life (Cassidy & Heron, 2018).

CYP may experience both skill development and relational encounters with others during philosophical dialogic inquiry (Barrow, 2015). As discussed earlier, a dialogic process can involve the negotiation of meaning between the 'self' and the 'other' (Sampson, 2008). Therefore, there may be a social and individual plane in dialogue (Renshaw, 2004). The individual plane may be reflected in CYP's skill development and their experience of sharing learning into other contexts. CYP may internalise their process of reflection which may afford them with cultural resources for engaging in dialogue in other contexts (Renshaw, 2004).

Arguably, some of the skills CYP developed, for example, communication skills (Barrow, 2015; Dunlop et al., 2015; Michalik, 2019), may reflect how CYP learned "through" participation in philosophical dialogic inquiry (Ten Dam et al., 2004, p. 80). CYP may have developed knowledge and skills in 'action' which helped CYP contribute in and out of the classroom context. This may be reflective of a sociocultural interpretation of learning as CYP made connections with learning outside of formal education which affected their participation in these spaces (Scholl et al., 2016; Ten Dam et al., 2004).

1.3.3 Reconstructions

In all the research under review, the experience of philosophical dialogic inquiry seemed to reconstruct CYP's perceptions of their own abilities. In some research, it also reconstructed the role of the teacher (Barrow, 2015; Michalik, 2019) and shifted adults' perceptions of what CYP can do (Cassidy & Heron, 2018; Michalik, 2019). A

process of reconstruction can involve the deconstruction of ideas and beliefs and then exploration of alternative ideas which can transform understanding (Morgan, 2000). This often links to 'narratives' as alternative ideas can reconstruct the stories individuals construct about themselves and/or others (Morgan, 2000). This review highlights how philosophical dialogic inquiry may offer space for an alternative story to be constructed about the abilities and role of CYP and adults; "I was surprised when I realised that the children had a lot to say and they were able to think deeply" (Michalik, 2019, pp. 7-8).

Reconstructed perceptions about CYP may suggest philosophical dialogic inquiry instigated a reflexive experience for adults (Scholl, 2014). Teachers may have adapted their ideas and practice in response to CYP's contributions thus influencing how CYP, and pedagogy were perceived (Brownlee et al., 2014; Jenkins & Lyle, 2010; Scholl, 2014; Snell & Lefstein, 2018). This may reflect the "apprenticeship of observation"; observing CYP exceeding expectations can challenge teachers' existing views about the capacities of CYP (Brownlee et al., 2014, p. 185).

There seems to be limited research on how philosophical dialogic inquiry may impact CYP's perceptions of themselves. This may be indicative of the limited amount of research on CYP experiences using participatory methods to explore their perceptions in depth. The refutational translation highlighted how adults can apply meaning to CYP's experiences using educational language which may be unrepresentative of how CYP think and feel about philosophical dialogic inquiry. For example, CYP did not seem to note a change in their internal, personal skills as frequently as teaching staff did.

Philosophical dialogic inquiry may reconstruct CYP and adults' perceptions of how learning opportunities occur and how learning can be experienced. Teacher epistemology, how teachers perceive knowledge and the process of knowing, can change after practising philosophical dialogic inquiry (Brownlee et al., 2014; Haynes & Murris, 2011). Teachers can revaluate the transmission model of teaching and view learning as a student-led process (Brownlee et al., 2014). Engaging in this process can shift CYP's views about knowledge from absolutist to multiplist; CYP can view other CYP perspectives as sources of knowledge (Tabak & Weinstock, 2011).

This shift in epistemology can provoke anxiety, tension, and uncertainty for both CYP and adults.

The reconstructed perceptions of the self, other and learning may highlight the transformative potential of philosophical dialogic inquiry (Barrow, 2010). The dialogic process that CYP experience may allow them to encounter the 'other' in an authentic way (Barrow, 2010). This may be liberating for CYP as they can challenge assumptions and explore new possibilities (Jenkins & Lyle, 2010). Figure 1 illustrates how the experiences of a dialogic process and learning can reconstruct narratives but also how altered narratives may influence participation in dialogic processes.

1.3.4 Contextual factors

This review highlighted how philosophical dialogic inquiry may be influenced by the contextual experiences of a CYP and the context of the research/researcher. This may reflect the interactional nature of the systems in an individual's life when they engage in philosophical dialogic inquiry within their microsystem.

The third order construct 'Cultural and linguistic experiences' highlights how some CYP may face barriers when engaging in philosophical dialogic inquiry. The new role of the teacher can expose inequalities between CYP (Barrow, 2012). A dialogic process can reproduce certain types of dialogue associated with the cultural capital of a particular class, this can devalue other forms of dialogue and cultural value systems (Lambirth, 2006; Vansieleghem & Kennedy, 2011). Thus, some CYP may prefer philosophical concepts that resonate with everyday experience as it provides an inclusive basis for discussion.

The refutational translation highlighted disparities between Cassidy and Heron (2018) and the other research in this review. In Cassidy and Heron (2018), CoPI offered a different approach to challenge and control. This research was undertaken in secure accommodation where there may have been wider structures and legislation in place to ensure 'control' and 'care' (Roesch-Marsh, 2014). In a classroom, a differing culture may be constructed, one where there are curricular objectives and a focus on learning (Leftstein, 2010). Therefore, the line of argument aims to illustrate how philosophical dialogic inquiry can be impacted by the wider system in which it is

implemented. This is also important to note as the research under review was undertaken in differing countries (Scotland, Northern Ireland, Greece, Germany) which is likely to impact how philosophical dialogic inquiry was constructed in each study.

The proposed experiences of philosophical dialogic inquiry may also be impacted by research methodology. For example, in Dunlop et al. (2015), CYP responded to a Likert scale for the statement "The CoSE classes were interesting" (p. 472). It is arguable that 'interest' was only noted as an aspect of CYP's experience due to this question construction. Therefore, the context of the research and the researcher should be considered when exploring literature on the experiences of CYP and staff.

1.4 Conclusion

This review has explored how CYP, and adults experience philosophical dialogic inquiry. Emphasis has been placed on CYP's accounts so future research can be informed by CYP. The line of argument in this SLR has proposed that CYP and adults can experience inter, intra and extra personal features of a dialogic process (Lysaker & Furuness, 2011). CYP may also develop ways of learning that supports them beyond the context of formal education. The experience of philosophical dialogic inquiry may enable transformative change as it can offer alternative narratives about CYP and staff. The nature of change in this line of argument is bidirectional. The refutational translation in this review offered a critical lens as it highlighted the impact of contextual factors on CYP's and adults' experiences.

Evidence exists for the promotion of philosophical dialogic inquiry based upon its effectiveness (Education Endowment Foundation, 2015). However, the implementation of dialogic processes may be unrealistic in education given the systemic pressures and expectations teaching staff can experience (O'Riordan, 2016). This review has illuminated the tension this can incite. Nevertheless, the line of argument illuminates the transformative potential of philosophical dialogic inquiry and the alternative narratives it can construct. EPs should be seeking ways to reconstruct perceptions of CYP's behaviours and abilities so that CYP can be holistically supported and celebrated. Social justice agendas are embedded in the EP role as they advocate for equity, promote non-discriminatory practice, and strive for fairness (BPS, 2017; HCPC, 2015; Schulze et al., 2017). It could be reasoned that

EPs are well placed as 'critical friends' to walk alongside school staff as they implement, monitor and evaluate philosophical dialogic inquiry (Golby & Appleby, 1995). Consultative conversations with staff could support the exploration of philosophical dialogic inquiry as a participatory, pedagogical approach.

A meta-ethnography aims to construct social explanation (Noblit & Hare, 1988). It is inherently subjective as the perspective of the synthesiser is integral to the process. This review has offered interpretation and meaning, it aimed to uphold CYP's and staff members' status as "experts by experience" (BPS, 2017, p. 23). The next step is to consider what can be learned and acted upon with regards to the experiences explored in this review.

Chapter 2. An ethical and methodological critique

Abstract

This chapter explores ethical and methodological considerations during the development of the research project outlined in Chapter Three. The philosophical orientation of the research was social constructionism; therefore, the construction of language and power were critically considered throughout. The research was informed by participatory principles and narrative inquiry. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the research was undertaken virtually. Thus, virtual methodologies, and the associated implications of this, were continually reflected upon. Relational ethicality guided the process of the research as there was ongoing attunement to interpersonal dynamics. This is arguably an aspect of quality and rigour in qualitative research (Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2007).

2.1 Introduction and research focus

Existing research focuses on the dialogic nature of philosophical dialogic inquiry (Barrow, 2010; Fisher, 2007; Smith, 2017), the democratic potential (Bartels et al., 2018; Di Masi & Santi, 2016) or the skills gained from involvement in this pedagogy (Topping & Trickey, 2007). The line of argument in Chapter One presents an area that is perhaps under-researched; how children and young people (CYP) and adults construct and reconstruct narratives about themselves and others during Philosophy for Children (P4C). A P4C pedagogy may shift or transform perceptions about an individual. For example, alternative stories may be constructed about CYP's abilities.

The research outlined in Chapter Three involved three CYP and two teachers who engage in P4C in a specialist school in the North East of England. The CYP involved in this research had a diagnosis of autism. A narrative inquiry approach was adopted as the life stories and experiential stories shared by participants were central to the research question: how are the narratives CYP and teachers have constructed about themselves and their experiences woven and explored during philosophical dialogue? The research was also shaped by participatory research principles therefore questions, analysis and interpretation were co-constructed alongside participants thus acknowledging CYP and teachers as experts in their own lives. This

chapter sets out to critically consider the ethical and methodological principles that underpinned this approach to the research.

2.2 Philosophical principles

The ontological framework of the research, how the nature of truth and humanity is perceived, was relativist as it aimed to explore the subjective meaning that CYP and teachers applied to their lives and their experiences of P4C (Willig, 2013). The epistemological stance, how the world and human experience can be explored and understood, was social constructionist (Burr, 2004). Core philosophical assumptions associated with this suggest that language constructs meaning, some language can be bound up with 'power' as it creates perceptions about knowledge and can inform social practice (Burr, 2004).

2.2.1 Social constructionism and 'language'

A social constructionist perspective proposes that language is not simply an expression of thought, language embodies how people understand and apply meaning to their lives in interaction with another (Darlaston-Jones, 2007). Therefore, there is an interrelation between language and how people construct themselves in relation to the world around them (Crossley, 2000). The current research builds upon this assumption by exploring an individual's 'story'; a mode of language that constructs meaning systems and structures in an individual's life (Crossley, 2000). Underpinning this, is the assumption that people can organise experience using symbols and metaphors (Mead, 1934) which can offer coherence, ordering and significance in their life (Gergen, 2005).

However, there may be conceptual tension underpinning the role of language when forming stories in social constructionist research (Smith & Sparkes, 2006). The research focused upon connections and integration of core narratives throughout the stories shared. This may imply that some stories, and the meaning applied to language, is stable across time and contexts (Smith & Sparkes, 2006). However, the research did not aim to produce objective claims that suggest an individual has a consistent inner world or that an individual's experience is static. Rather, the research explored, alongside participants, their multi-storied lives and how resonant stories concerned with who they are, and their values, may be performed in a

particular social context (P4C). It is my view that stories can offer an "orientating conceptual framework" that supports both researcher and participant, in partnership, to reflect upon language in a meaningful way (Willig, 2012, p. 42).

2.2.2 Social constructionism and the construction of 'power'

From a social constructionist paradigm, language can also create "discourse"; a set of ideas and meanings that form representations about a phenomenon (Burr, 2004, p. 64). Some discourses may be considered as reflecting 'truth', this holds explanatory power as it can affect how a person/action is defined by others (Hibberd, 2005). In Chapter One, it was discussed how some CYP's and teachers' perceptions of themselves, their abilities and role were reconstructed in P4C. This acknowledges, before the experience of P4C, the possibility of powerful discourses constructed about the 'child' and 'teacher' in an educational space.

This research project was facilitated with autistic CYP. A diagnosis of autism can be associated with medical discourses which can construct autism as 'unfortunate' or 'abnormal' (Saunders, 2018). A diagnosis may influence the beliefs of teaching staff about CYP (Gibbs et al., 2020). From my experience as a TA in a specialist school, I noticed how a diagnosis affected how staff talked to and about CYP. Thus, I became interested in pedagogies that reframed how CYP are perceived and interacted with.

Participants as partners

Research with CYP that focuses on 'collecting' or 'gathering' voice may reflect a power imbalance as research is done 'on' rather than 'with' CYP (Murris, 2013). In the current research, CYP and teachers were not 'subjects' for investigation, they were considered partners as they actively collaborated in the research process (Cohen, 2018; Fielding, 2001). Research that aims to listen and act upon CYP views moves beyond tokenistic research on 'voice' and sets out to respect CYP's right to influence decisions (Lundy et al., 2011).

Participants participated in varying stages of interpretation. This offered participants an opportunity to reflect on their interview, co-construct meaning and 'own' their data (Cridland et al., 2015). This may counter approaches to research that focus on how P4C may improve attainment (Gorard et al., 2017), or skills such as moral reasoning (Zulkifli & Hashim, 2020), which centralise researcher interpretation as the

measurement and analysis of specific phenomena is interpreted as requiring expert knowledge (Willig, 2013).

There may be a delicate balance between interpretation in research and authenticity to participants' words and meaning (LeCompte, 2015). I argue, researchers should uphold epistemic responsibility in research by reflecting on the power and implications of their knowledge claims (Doucet & Mauthner, 2002). I constructed my role as a researcher as decentred but influential; my 'otherness' offered insight and promoted curiosity when co-constructing meaning alongside CYP and teachers.

2.3 Methodology

The research was concerned with exploring the rich meaning underpinning experience (Willig, 2013), ethical sensitivity towards people's lives and aimed to uphold the active role of participants in research processes (Birch & Miller, 2002). The key methodological approaches drawn upon were participatory research principles, narrative inquiry, and virtual methodology.

2.3.1 Participatory principles

The research drew upon participatory principles throughout. Initial and analysis co-production meetings were facilitated, the information shared by participants was authentically listened to, valued, and acted upon (Boswell & Woods, 2021). CYP and teachers participated in initial question construction as well as analysis interpretation.

This approach may be not reflect a "full" model of participation (Clark, 2004, pp. 5-7). I engaged in interactive participation as decision-making was negotiated throughout (Kindon et al., 2007). However, decisions about the research focus were not democratically constructed alongside participants as I was required by the University to submit a project proposal before collaboration began. Furthermore, the research was undergone during the COVID-19 pandemic, so teachers were experiencing additional pressure. My approach had to be pragmatic and compassionate given the parameters of these contextual factors. I believe that everything researched is constantly in flux, thus, rather than becoming stuck in an endeavour to apply fixed criteria, flexibility in the "muddiness" of research was required (Beuthin, 2014, p. 130).

Participatory research can be constructed as a continuum rather than a set of dichotomous criteria (Kindon et al., 2007). An ongoing process of reflection and action helped me be flexible and responsive to the context whilst also reflecting upon how the research moved on the continuum (Kindon et al., 2007). Initial co-production meetings helped me build relationships and collaboratively adapt research tools. We built upon each other's ideas and negotiated during dialogue. This dialogic approach to co-researching offers an alternative to a stepped approach to participation (Hardy & Hobbs, 2017). From a dialogic perspective, participation is a process therefore there may be conditions in a context at a particular time that inhibits how people can participate (Hardy & Hobbs, 2017). Framing the research using this theoretical lens aided the research approach during the COVID-19 pandemic.

A key principle of participatory research is the transformative potential of the process (Van der Riet, 2008). As well as being part of the construction of the research, narrative inquiry may also contribute to a transformative experience for participants as this methodology can help participants reflect upon their stories and make sense of them (Riessman, 1993).

2.3.2 Narrative inquiry

In this research, narrative inquiry informed the questions I asked and the analysis process (Crossley, 2000; Mueller, 2019). This methodology is based upon the idea that people organise their life into stories, people can enact the stories they share about themselves as well as the stories others construct about them (Murray, 2008). Dominant stories can impact a person's perceptions of themselves, their abilities, and their views for the future (Morgan, 2000; Tellis-James & Fox, 2017). The current research explored how life stories shared by participants may interact with their stories about P4C. Underpinning this is the assumption that stories are dynamic, they can shape experiences and experiences can re-shape stories (Engel, 2005).

This application of narrative psychology aligns with my values as a professional, researcher and as a person. Whilst training to be an Educational Psychologist (EP), I have personally engaged in narrative therapy and facilitated this process with CYP. I have witnessed how this approach, applied therapeutically, can support people to explore, understand and redefine their relationships with experiences. It is a

respectful approach that helps people consider their lives in an alternative, hopeful way (Morgan, 2000). Thus, the current research is underpinned by the belief that people should have the opportunity to explore and reclaim their stories.

However, it is arguable that life story exploration is an abstract process that may be challenging for those with additional communication or learning needs. Nevertheless, I believe these challenges can be appropriately planned for. For example, the emotional safety of CYP during a narrative inquiry can be supported by checking-in, noticing shifts in emotions and allowing participants to re-direct dialogue when necessary (Douglas et al., 2019). Research guided by a disability rights perspective should "stretch the boundaries of conventional methodological approaches" (Lyons & Roulstone, 2018, p. 19). Therefore, the narrative questions and format of the interview were influenced by ways in which autistic CYP can be supported in research (Cridland et al., 2015).

2.3.3. Virtual interaction

Due to COVID-19 restrictions, the research consisted of synchronous online interviews and meetings (O'Connor et al., 2008). It may be reductionist to compare online methodology to in-person approaches and make judgements about what is inherently better or worse (Adams-Hutcheson & Longhurst, 2017). Alternatively, online methods can be considered as a unique medium for communication but with some core ethical principles, comparable to in-person approaches, that should be upheld (Adams-Hutcheson & Longhurst, 2017; Lobe, 2017).

An ethical challenge when engaging in online methodology is how the affective atmosphere is impacted (Adams-Hutcheson & Longhurst, 2017) as the online dynamic may implicate how body language is read and responded to (Cater, 2011). Participatory research methods emphasise a "shoulder-to-shoulder" approach; the researcher sits alongside CYP, there is cooperative interaction and a shared focus (Griffin, 2019, p. 66). In Adams-Hutcheson and Longhurst (2017), the authors discuss how sharing a cup of tea with an adult in an interview can create a relaxed, relational environment. Therefore, online methods may not enable small, micromomentary moments of connection with another. This may incite ethical tension concerning the quality of online research.

However, the research attempted to cultivate a relational climate through the application of online-specific guidance (BPS, 2020; Liamputtong, 2007; O'Connor et al., 2008). The use of the 'sharing screen' function meant that visual tools could offer moments of secondary intersubjectivity as these tools promoted joint attention and collaborative dialogue (Cross & Kennedy, 2011). I was also still able to attune to, name and respond to participants' non-verbal initiatives, such as, facial expression and tone of voice. The virtual co-production meetings and interviews were all contracted from the outset to cultivate a safe atmosphere with appropriate relational boundaries (BPS, 2020).

Virtual methods may also offer more accessible opportunities for CYP due to their extensive insight and skills in the virtual world (Gray, 2018). CYP may feel comfortable in a virtual dynamic as there is a democratisation of exchange; they can control the interaction by choosing different ways of communicating and when they would like to disengage (Liamputtong, 2007). Furthermore, computer-assisted interviewing can support autistic CYP if the demands of in-person social interaction is intimidating (Barrow & Hannah, 2012). Thus, the virtual methodology in the research may have offered a safe space for CYP to express their views.

2.4 'Quality' in qualitative research

Qualitative research can involve researchers thinking reflexively about their epistemology and methodological decisions. Researchers may need to consider alternative methods that could have answered the research question, and how these methods may influence the understanding of a particular phenomenon (Palaganas et al., 2017). The methods adopted in this research may contrast research which draws upon observations of CYP during P4C dialogue (Gorard et al., 2017; Topping & Trickey, 2007). The use of observation may imply that an 'outsider' can understand the meaning of experience without interaction with the person. Although exploring differing approaches offers critique about the conclusions drawn, it is arguably futile to compare research methods underpinned by philosophical dualities when the benchmarks for 'quality' differ (Meyrick, 2006).

'Quality' in qualitative research may involve an examination of philosophical coherence; the transparent connections between a researcher's values, epistemology, and method (Carter, 2010). However, coherence may never be

entirely achievable (Rolfe, 2006). For example, I needed to respond to ethically important moments in the research to ensure CYP could participate (Guillemin & Gillam, 2004). CYP sometimes required closed questions to support them which may counteract traditional interviews informed by social constructionism (Cohen, 2018). Thus, ethicality was more than a set of procedural ethical conditions, it was a process that underpinned my relational encounters and the adaptations within them (Barrow et al., 2014).

Ethicality may be an aspect of quality in qualitative research (Cohen, 2018; Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2007; Walsh & Downe, 2006). Ethicality can link to varying degrees of validity, for example, democratic validity refers to how a researcher engages and interacts with participants during an inquiry (Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2007). In this research, the welfare, protective, provision and participatory rights of participants were continually reflected upon (Hill, 2005). Consent, choice, and access are key areas that illustrate how reflections on ethicality developed into praxis.

2.4.1 Consent, choice, and access

In some research, consent can be constructed as a functional, one-off event (Hill, 2005). In the current project, discussion about consent occurred throughout, for example, during the negotiation of ground rules and discussion about alternative ways of 'opting out' in interview. The research was also differentiated in response to CYP's communication needs to ensure full, informed understanding. For example, the use of 'Comic Strips' (Gray, 1994), video Introductions and 'One Page Profiles' (Sanderson, 2000). Initial co-production meetings allowed for discussion about what 'research' and 'research interviews' are, and the key research questions shaped by the literature review were openly explored. This transparency was integral to the ethical and epistemological stance of the research.

Some may question whether ethical principles need to differ when research involves CYP and adults (Hill, 2005; Punch, 2002). Key differences with respect to researching CYP are often linked to ability, power, and vulnerability (Hill, 2005). Recognising difference and adapting to this can be constructed as socially just practice (Fraser, 2001). Therefore, it was important that CYP were not marginalised by the research process and were able to express their views throughout. The

strategies and resources applied in the research facilitated opportunities for CYP to do this.

The coproduction meetings and interview process needed to be accessible for CYP. Before engaging with CYP, parents were consulted about the best methods of communication for their child, their child's strengths and how I could adapt to support CYP (Urbach & Banerjee, 2019). CYP were also asked what could help them understand and engage in the research (Hill, 2006). For example, one young person discussed how he liked regular reassurance and encouragement, so this was continually offered. CYP's and their parents' views also informed the development of the research tools (Cridland et al., 2015; Goodall, 2020). Some of these resources offered visual mediums for CYP to share views, they eased tension in the 1:1 interview dynamic and cultivated a fun, interactive atmosphere (Goodall, 2020). See Figure 3 for an example of a visual sorting activity used.

Figure 3: An example of a visual sorting activity used in the virtual interviews with CYP

2.5 A bridge to Chapter 3

This aim of this chapter was to illustrate the social constructionist assumptions underpinning the research and the approach taken when researching with CYP and teachers. Arguably, outlining the reflexive decision-making processes and the ethical underpinnings are facets of quality and rigour in qualitative research (Carter, 2010).

The research was shaped by the social constructionist assumption that language constructs social reality and powerful discourses can influence or perpetuate certain

perceptions about CYP (Burr, 2004). Ethicality in the research was not constructed as an implication, it guided the process of the research and supported how I could 'be' with others (Barrow et al., 2014). Ongoing reflection in supervision and via a research diary helped me understand and appreciate tension in research as integral to 'real world' research with people (Robson, 2011).

The research adopted participatory principles so CYP and teachers were actively involved in the research process and the facilitation of narrative inquiry supported participants to reflect upon their stories. Thoughtfulness, transparency, and compassion were needed throughout so I could collaborate with others in a way that was sensitive and responsive to their needs, wishes and context. Chapter Three will outline the research project and explore the stories shared.

Chapter 3. A narrative inquiry with autistic young people and teachers in their school: how are the narratives they have constructed about themselves and their experiences woven and explored during philosophical dialogue?[3]

Abstract

The purpose of this empirical research is to understand how stories may be constructed and enacted in a Philosophy for Children (P4C) pedagogy. The project was undertaken in a specialist school / sixth form in the North East of England and adopted a qualitative approach. Autistic children and young people (CYP) and teaching staff participated in the construction of the research approach, analysis, and dissemination decisions. Virtual semi-structured interviews were constructed and analysed using Narrative Orientated Inquiry, Collocation Analysis and Critical Narrative Analysis. Findings are discussed with regards to the connections in the rich life stories and experiential stories shared by an individual, this aims to address how narratives can be woven and explored during a P4C process. By developing a critical understanding of P4C, I hope to inform the implementation of socially just, creative pedagogical practice for autistic CYP.

Key words: *pedagogy, Philosophy for Children (P4C), autistic CYP, teachers, narrative inquiry.*

3.1 Introduction

This introduction will explore existing research on the stories autistic CYP share about themselves and their experiences. It will then discuss approaches to learning promoted in the UK education system when supporting autistic CYP. This will contextualise the current research and explore why philosophical dialogue may be a beneficial pedagogical approach for autistic CYP. The warrant and key research questions will be outlined.

A note on terminology

In the UK, there may not be a universally accepted term used to talk about autism (Kenny et al., 2016). However, the use of identity-first terminology may counter pathologising language and acknowledge autism as part of an individual's identity (Bottema-Beutel et al., 2021; Bradshaw et al., 2021). Therefore, this research uses identity-first language as this aligns with an autism advocacy stance that centralises the views and lived experience of autistic individuals.

3.1.1 What does 'autism' mean to autistic CYP?

Participatory research with autistic CYP highlights how a diagnosis can have different meanings for CYP (Mogensen & Mason, 2015). Some CYP find a diagnosis oppressive as it can become the central focus of their identity and positions them as an "outsider" (Mogensen & Mason, 2015, p. 259). Some find a diagnosis liberating as it offers security and supports them to better understand themselves (Mogensen & Mason, 2015). Receiving a diagnosis of autism can help CYP make sense of their experiences, however, it can also lead to a loss of control (Mogensen & Mason, 2015). Autistic CYP may make attempts to reclaim agency by challenging assumptions and expectations that underpin a diagnosis of autism (Samra, 2016)

When invited to explore their identity, many autistic individuals discuss their experience with 'difference' (Humphrey & Lewis, 2008; Samra, 2016; Winstone et al., 2014). Autistic CYP may self-categorise based upon perceived differences between themselves and others, as well as express their experiences of being categorised by others because they are autistic (Humphrey & Lewis, 2008; Samra, 2016). This often links to perceptions of 'normality' and the impact of this on discourse and the positioning of neurodiverse people (Billington, 2000). This can incite various feelings for autistic CYP, for example, some may celebrate their view of the world whereas

others can feel conflicted about what autism means to them (Humphrey & Lewis, 2008). Overall, the experiences shared by autistic CYP suggest they may grapple with understanding who they are and how they belong (Billington, 2006; Humphrey & Lewis, 2008; Samra, 2016; Winstone et al., 2014).

School experiences can influence the stories autistic CYP construct about their identity and their capabilities (Samra, 2016). Attitudes and practices in school contexts can sometimes frame the individual autistic child as the 'problem'. Thus, some autistic CYP can feel misunderstood (Goodall, 2020) and police themselves from "doing autistic things" (Gilling, 2012, p. 36). A shift in attitudes and pedagogical approach may be needed to help autistic CYP become social agents in their school environment (Goodall, 2020). Arguably, educational settings should engage in pedagogies which allow autistic CYP to participate and make sense of their experiences (Begon & Billington, 2019; Madriaga & Goodley, 2010).

3.1.2 Educational approaches in the UK to support autistic CYP

In schools, teaching staff may feel impelled to rethink their usual assumptions and practices when working with autistic CYP (Tutt et al., 2006). In the UK, teaching practice with clear links to psychological theory can be perceived as effective pedagogical practice (Tutt et al., 2006), for example, the explicit teaching of social skills may be underpinned by theory that suggests autistic CYP demonstrate 'egocentric' behaviours (Lombardo & Baron-Cohen, 2011). Adapting pedagogical approaches is often constructed as inclusive practice as it involves recognising and responding to the needs of individual autistic CYP (Glashan et al., 2004).

However, this may have led to "autism education" dominated by "a techno-rationalist approach that conceptualises teaching as the delivery of pre-packaged programmes" (Conn, 2018, p. 594). Pedagogical approaches marketed for autistic CYP may be based upon models of deficit that 'other' autistic CYP (Billington, 2000, 2006; Conn, 2018), embed essentialist assumptions, for example, that autistic CYP should be treat as a homogeneous group (Sainsbury, 2010; Treweek et al., 2019), and lead to a focus on behaviour modification (Begon & Billington, 2019). Rigid ideas of what autistic CYP can/cannot do can construct totalising identities for autistic CYP, staff may then perceive and interact with autistic CYP in a fixed way that aligns with a dominant story (Gilling, 2012). The power of this discourse can impact how thinking

and learning is perceived for autistic CYP. For example, the idea that autistic CYP have rigidity of thought can restrict active, explorative learning opportunities (Billington, 2000).

Arguably, autistic CYP should be supported holistically and be offered space to understand their experience (Billington, 2006). Teaching staff should be encouraged to be open and curious to what autistic CYP bring to each interaction (Conn, 2018). As outlined in the preceding section, autistic CYP can grapple with who they are and what autism means to them. Therefore, space within education may be needed for autistic CYP to externalise and explore their experiences, and understand their relationship with autism (Gilling, 2012).

3.1.3 Philosophical dialogue

A relational and dialogic pedagogical process in the classroom can centralise the active participation of CYP and offer space for shared meaning-making between CYP and adults (Lysaker & Furuness, 2011). Pedagogical practices that cultivate this process can involve CYP creating philosophical questions together that stimulate an engaging discussion in which CYP and staff work together to co-construct different questions, ideas and meaning. (Lyle, 2008). A specific pedagogy that enables this process is known as 'Philosophy for Children' (P4C) (Lipman, 2003).

P4C involves thinking 'with' and 'through' dialogue; CYP exchange different ideas in dialogue with each other which can prompt further questioning and different ways of understanding the world (Hardman & Delafield, 2010). Learning is therefore an interactive, social process as meaning can be constructed and transformed in the 'space' between individuals (Wegerif, 2011).

This pedagogy can also be known as 'Philosophy *with* Children' (PwC) and there have been further developments in this practice, such as 'Community of Philosophical Inquiry' (CoPI). This shift in terminology reflects an emphasis on communal reflection and the social nature of 'knowledge' and 'knowing' (Vansieleghem & Kennedy, 2011). This emphasis also has implications on the positioning of the adult and child during a learning process. This is emphasised by Scholl (2014) whom explores the multiple learning interactions and scaffolding

opportunities that can develop in the 'space in-between' adults and CYP during CoPI. Please see Figure 4 for a visual representation of this space (Scholl, 2014).

Figure 4: The communal learning space constructed during CoPI (Scholl, 2014, p.101)

PwC/CoPI can enable space for CYP to actively participate in their learning; their questions/contributions to discussion are authentically valued as part of the developing learning process thus contributions are received, dwelled upon and scaffolded (Barrow, 2010). Given the preceding discussion about the educational opportunities constructed for autistic CYP, it is arguable that pedagogies which aim to cultivate philosophical dialogue may offer an approach that supports staff to be open and curious to CYP's initiatives and offer authentic opportunities for CYP to become social agents in their learning environment.

Qualitative findings in Cassidy, Marwick, et al. (2018) highlight how the process of participating in CoPI can help some autistic CYP understand and express themselves. The authors suggest that CYP with Additional Support Needs (ASN) *can* engage in a dialogic process which may contradict established approaches in the wider school context. This pedagogy can support educationalists to be reflective about what CYP with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) contribute and offers CYP the opportunity to negotiate their own learning process (Cassidy, Christie, et al., 2018). It also challenges perceptions about the engagement of CYP with SEND in education, for example, some CYP who may be considered 'disruptive'

or 'challenging' in the school environment can flourish in philosophical dialogue as they are offered space to express their views and be heard (Cassidy, Christie, et al., 2018).

Findings from my systematic literature review in Chapter One illustrated how philosophical dialogue may have transformative potential. It can shift CYP's and teaching staff's perceptions as well as challenge the construction of learning and roles in learning environments. Arguably, pedagogies that cultivate philosophical dialogue may have potential to counter powerful, deficit-orientated discourses about autistic CYP and may deconstruct the notion of "autism education" (Conn, 2018, p. 594).

3.1.4 The current research

This research aims to develop a critical understanding of P4C as a pedagogical approach for autistic CYP. Although 'PwC' may now be a term more readily used within the discourse of this pedagogy, 'P4C' is the term adopted in this research as this is congruent with the terminology used by the staff and CYP in the research setting.

The focus of the research is "context-changing rather than person-fixing" to further develop an emergent counter-narrative about autistic CYP (Begon & Billington, 2019, p. 189). The research is underpinned by ontological relativism as it involves working with autistic CYP to understand their subjective experience, I believe it is their right to share and reauthor their own stories (Begon & Billington, 2019). Teachers' stories are also explored to understand how they experience philosophical dialogue and the stories they construct about the autistic CYP they work alongside.

The key research questions are:
- How are the key stories that CYP share about who they are, and their values explored and developed during philosophical dialogue?
- How are the key stories that teachers share about who they are, their values and role as a teacher explored and developed during philosophical dialogue?

3.2 Recruitment and participants

An enhanced ethical approval was approved by the Newcastle University Ethics Committee. The BPS (2018) and HCPC (2016) codes of conduct were incorporated in this ethics application.

Due to my interest in schools who adopt P4C, PwC and/or CoPI, and my connections with other professionals who are also interested in this pedagogy, I became aware of relevant schools in the North East of England and those which may be interested in research opportunities. Therefore, I contacted a lead practitioner of teaching and learning (pseudonym: Alice) of a specialist school/sixth form in the North East of England via email to discuss the research project. This setting has engaged in P4C since 2005. They aim to adopt the ethos of this pedagogy across the curriculum and use other approaches such as 'Image of the Week' and 'Dramatic Enquiry'. They received an 'Advanced Thinking School Accreditation' in 2016.

Alice expressed interest via email, so we met virtually to discuss the project and possible participants. Information sheets were emailed to parents, staff and CYP. A week later, consent forms for CYP, parents and staff were sent via email. Please see Appendix D for the resources and forms sent to participants. Once written consent was received, I engaged in telephone consultations with parents and staff to introduce myself, discuss the purpose of the research and remind them of their right to withdraw.

Three autistic CYP (age range: 12-17) and two teachers took part in the research. All CYP were male and both teachers were female. Kenny (pseudonym) had been involved in P4C for six years, A1 had been involved in P4C for two years and Crafty had been involved in P4C for seven years. Hannah completed the 'Level 1 P4C Foundation Course' and had been facilitating P4C in school for three years. Amelia is trained as a Level 2 P4C practitioner and had been facilitating P4C for fifteen / sixteen years in school.

3.3 Methodology

As outlined in Chapter Two, the epistemological underpinnings of this research were based upon a social constructionist understanding of language and reality (Burr, 2004; Hibberd, 2005; Willig, 2012). A qualitative methodology was developed using

participatory principles; CYP and teachers were involved in the co-production of the research. A narrative inquiry underpinned the approach taken in semi-structured interviews. I adopted an emic approach by centralising the views and experiences of autistic CYP and the teachers who support them.

3.3.1 The participatory framework

Reflexivity is integral to my training and practice as a trainee Educational Psychologist (EP) thus I have considered how my values shape my micro-momentary interactions with others. Participatory principles were not applied in a mechanistic way, my way of 'being' stemmed from authentic interest in the participants' lives (See Table 6).

The overarching participatory framework of the research is outlined in Table 7. This Table summarises the participatory principles underpinning each step in the research process. As discussed in Chapter Two, this framework may not reflect a "full" model of participation (Clark, 2004, pp. 5-7). The initial focus of the research and methodological approach were decided prior to meeting participants. I also facilitated each step in the research process. Thus, the initial planning, formulations and execution of the research project was mostly directed by the researcher. However, decisions and processes to support *how* CYP and teachers engaged in each step of the process were negotiated via multiple co-production meetings and a creative interview process. Furthermore, there was shared dialogue and reflection on the stories shared and what these may mean, as well as the possible impact of the research on themselves and others. These processes may have supported meaningful participation as participants' views were respected and their views informed action (Hill, 2006).

The approach taken may reflect an adult-initiated model of participation which incorporated structures for shared decision-making with CYP (Hart, 2008). However, categorising research in this way may not reflect the contextual, dynamic nature of 'real world' research which is carried out in relation to others (Robson, 2011), and may, paradoxically, lead to researchers' imposing certain criteria on participants in order to attain 'good' participatory research (Birch & Miller, 2002). Instead, the core participatory principle underpinning the process of the research was the development of a compassionate research relationship whereby we could exchange ideas whilst

acknowledging and understanding each other's wishes, needs and parameters at any given time (Birch & Miller, 2002).

When evaluating and reflecting on the research together, CYP and teachers noted various benefits of virtual interaction which may have supported their participation during the research process. Both teachers discussed how they felt more comfortable as they were able to engage in the research in a familiar environment. Hannah (Teacher) discussed how it made the research seem "less formal" and this supported the "easiness" of the conversation. Crafty (CYP) stated "it's not managed to interfere with the experience, we've still managed to have a full conversation", he also went on to note that "it made it easier that you're very patient and understanding". Crafty also reflected on how he could have turned the camera/video call off if he had wanted to during the interview. Kenny (CYP) also seemed to benefit from a virtual discussion as he was able to share online videos/images at times when he needed to communicate or emphasise a point.

This may highlight how virtual methodology can create a friendly, comfortable atmosphere and participants can easily navigate the dialogue as they can choose how and when to contribute (Liamputtong, 2007). Crafty's comment may also suggest that the relational qualities of the researcher are integral to an online or in-person exchange. Thus, the participatory methodology of this research may have been strengthened by the ethicality of virtual interaction and ongoing attention to the relational dynamic throughout the process.

Participatory principle	Action
Use of familiar settings	CYP engaged in co-production meetings at home and their interviews in school. Teachers engaged in meetings and interviews at home. These places have established routines and can help participants feel comfortable.
Small talk	At the beginning of the meetings and interview, I engaged in small talk with participants. This can help participants feel comfortable.
Sharing personal information	I shared information about myself when appropriate. This often happened when I was invited to by participants. For example, CYP asked questions about my interests during our initial co-production meeting.
Recapping	I recapped the purpose of the research at the beginning of our meetings together and at the outset of the interview. I set out that the interview was a conversation about them and their experiences, there were no right or wrong answers and stated my role was to listen.
Assent	Participants were continually reminded of their right to withdraw. When creating ground rules with CYP, CYP also developed a visual card they could hold up to the camera if they no longer wanted to take part. I noticed and responded to any signs of fatigue or anxiety.
Meaning making	I built upon participants' contributions in our meetings and in interview. I tailored my language to meet CYP needs, used their terminology where possible and continually checked my understanding with them. The use of visuals helped me illustrate meaning. CYP could then agree, challenge, or expand on their answers. I prompted, repeated back phrasing, and summarised what I had heard. I also allowed for silence and thinking time.
Noticing, naming, and responding to non-verbal cues	I was attuned to non-verbal indicators that could suggest how participants thought or felt about a particular subject. For example, one CYP smiled when talking about their family. I shared how I had noticed this, and this facilitated further discussion about his family.

Table 6: The participatory principles underpinning interactions with participants (Goodall, 2020; Griffin, 2019)

Steps in the research	Approach	Underpinning participatory principles and values
Step 1: **Preparation with Alice (Gatekeeper)**	- Discussion about the research purpose and approach, the school context and the pedagogical approaches adopted by the school. - Possible interview questions were shared and Alice's hopes for her school's involvement was explored. Differentiated consent forms and information sheets were created for CYP.	- Understanding the interacting contextual factors (Czerniawski & Garlick, 2011) - Collaborating with someone who knows the CYP well about readability of questions and possible barriers (Goodall, 2020)
Step 2: **Telephone consultation (Parents & staff)**	- Discussion about the research purpose, any questions, and reminder of their consent / right to withdraw. - Parents were asked questions so I could learn more about the children (what differentiation and support they may need, e.g., a video introduction?)	- Adapting the approach from the outset to support CYP's access and communication (Goodall, 2020) - Collaborating with parents as they are experts in the CYP's lives (BPS, 2017; Urbach & Banerjee, 2019)
Step 3: **Initial co-production meeting (CYP and parents, staff)**	- Discussion about the purpose of the research, recapping information sheets, right to withdraw and addressing questions. Exploring what 'research' and 'research interview' may mean. Participants were asked if they had been involved in research before and about their thoughts on the research aims. They were asked if anything else should be included. - Explaining the interview process - where it will take place and the resources needed. Interview questions were shared, discussion of any changes needed and other questions they would like to be asked. - Planning methods to support expression and help them feel comfortable. Participants were invited to prepare or bring something with them for the interview. - Discussion about possible wider impact (for example, how the research could help other CYP with autism). Participants selected a pseudonym.	- Exploring terminology, interview questions, adapting them, and co-constructing new questions (Ness, 2019) - CYP shared their views on methods that could help them communicate (Hill, 2006). Participants were invited to prepare something to aid reflection (Hill, 2006; Stalker & Connors, 2003) - Participants were invited to explore wider impact of the research - how it could enrich the understanding of others in their community (Lodge, 2005) - There may be power in the choice of how someone is represented in research so participants were asked to choose a pseudonym (Griffin, 2019)
Step 4: **Interview (CYP and staff)**	- Setting out the researcher's position as a 'curious listener', exploring their questions/worries, reminding them of their choice to take part. - Creation of ground rules and a 'Stop Card'. Opportunities to draw, sort and use visual frameworks to organise ideas. Methods suggested in the co-production meeting were utilised. - Revisiting and outlining the interview questions at the beginning of the interview. Use of the questions they had developed and reflecting on anything they had prepared.	- Ensuring appropriate boundaries were negotiated and CYP have various ways they can withdraw (BPS, 2020; Westcott & Littleton, 2005) - The use of multiple, creative activities to aid expression (Goodall, 2020) - Incorporating participant questions, ideas, and methods from the co-production meeting
Step 5: **Analysis co-production meeting (CYP and staff)**	- Reflect on the interview– how was it for them? - Sharing illustrative quotes that are linked to patterns and core motifs and engaging in discussion. - Discussion about dissemination and how the project should be presented. Examples of different formats were explored with CYP.	- Opportunities for shared dialogue and reflection (Lodge, 2005) - Co-constructing interpretation and meaning making (Cook, 2011) - Space for participants to change or expand upon their responses from the interview (Cridland et al., 2015) - Joint discussion about final format and dissemination possibilities (Cridland et al., 2015; Urbach & Banerjee, 2019)

Table 7: The overarching participatory framework of the research

3.3.2 Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews took place virtually via 'Zoom'. The school ensured CYP, and staff had access to a device and internet due to COVID-19 restrictions.

Interview questions were shaped by narrative inquiry to cultivate discussion about 'big' and 'small' stories (Bamberg, 2006; Georgakopoulou, 2006). Questions were constructed to prompt description of a life story (Crossley, 2000) and episodic stories about P4C (Mueller, 2019). Some questions were also based upon the line of argument developed in Chapter One, for example, how P4C influences perceptions of others and other lessons in school. In the initial co-production meeting, participants also constructed their own questions. Please see Appendix E for an example of an interview schedule.

Flexibility was needed to ensure participants could access and engage in the research (Boswell & Woods, 2021). Thus, methods to support autistic CYP in interviews were also considered and incorporated (Cridland et al., 2015). For example, single faceted questions were offered to CYP if they struggled to answer an open question (Cridland et al., 2015). Visual frameworks and activities also assisted understanding and offered a basis for further discussion (See Figure 5).

The adaptations made to the research design to support autistic CYP are not the focus of this research. However, these adaptations, alongside participatory principles, were essential when interacting with CYP in an ethical way.

My life story...

Past
Chapter 1: being born. My mam remembers this.
Chapter 7: I am 7. My dad died
Chapter 11: Starting School. I was 11. I remember moving to my current class because the work was too easy.
Multiple chapters: Meeting friends. I was nervous when I met new friends.

Present
Chapter 20: Coronavirus starting
Starting year 8: Strange, different to what I expected.

Future
I am expecting that in 2022 that coronavirus will go.
Becoming a famous Palaeontologist

Figure 5: Example of a CYP's 'life story' book created in interview via the 'sharing screen' function.

3.4 Analysis

Interviews were transcribed and analysed using Narrative Orientated Inquiry (NOI) (Hiles & Cermák, 2017), Collocation Analysis (Mello, 2002) and Critical Narrative Analysis (Emerson & Frosh, 2004 cited by; Hiles & Cermák, 2017). Each interview was analysed individually to explore connections between biographical (life story/identity) narratives and episodic (P4C) narratives.

In interview, participants were firstly invited to describe themselves and share stories about their life. This data was analysed using NOI (Hiles & Cermák, 2017). The first step was to identify the fabula (the content of the stories) and sjuzet (the tone and form of the stories) in each transcript (See Appendix F) (Hiles & Cermák, 2017).The interpretative perspectives adopted to analyse this data were holistic-content and holistic-form (Lieblich et al., 1998). Please see Table 8. This interpretation can illuminate how the stories thread together, meaningful aspects of a person's life and possible plot lines (Hiles & Cermák, 2017).

Holistic-Content
• Note patterns in the stories told.
• Rewrite the story based on fabula, sjuzet and patterns whilst also noting any contradictions.
• Identify the repetitive themes that seem meaningful to the story as a 'whole'.
• Note how these themes relate and crossover then identify which themes are vivid and which are marginal.
• Establish a core narrative and identify quotes reflective of this.
Holistic-Form
• Question what the plot of the story may be. For example, comedy or tragedy?
• Identify the movement in the stories, for example, progression and turning points.
• Reflect over the content and form and question how the 'whole' creates meaning.

Table 8: The steps involved in a Holistic-Content and Holistic-Form interpretation (Hiles & Cermák, 2017)

In interview, participants were also invited to explore their perceptions and experiences of P4C. This data warranted a Collocation Analysis as stories shared were not an organic extension of the life story, they were prompted by questions about a particular phenomenon (Squire, 2013). This form of analysis is suitable for episodic narrative interviewing, it identifies textual, transactional, sociocultural, educative operations and functions of topic-centred stories (Mello, 2002; Mueller, 2013, 2019). This can illuminate relationships between 'small', bounded stories and thick, identity narratives (Georgakopoulou, 2006).

Illustrative quotes were shared with participants in analysis co-production sessions. These quotes were reflective of any patterns noted between the Collocation Analysis and the NOI analysis. To make this process accessible for CYP, quotes were shared visually, and three key questions formed the basis of discussion: what do you think these quotes tell me about you? What do you think is important about what you shared with me? What should I go away knowing? Meaning was co-constructed, and notes were taken; this formed the main source of data for the final stage of analysis.

A Critical Narrative Analysis involves a reflexive engagement with overall coherence and functionality of the stories shared (Emerson & Frosh, 2004). The following questions were adapted from Hiles and Cermák (2017) and applied to the data to arrive a core themes and patterns across the data:

- What sort of account of their life are they offering?
- What sort of account are they offering about P4C?
- How do they position themself in their life story and in their stories about P4C?

Please see Appendix G for an example of the analysis process for a CYP.

3.5 Stories shared

People's lives are multi-storied and differing stories are constructed in varying interactions. Due to the nature of the research question, the critical themes presented here are those that emphasise each participant's constructions about themselves, and the meaning applied in their experiences of P4C. This section will present CYP's stories first followed by the teachers' stories.

3.5.1 Kenny

Kenny was sixteen years old at the time of the interview. Kenny described himself as caring, loyal, helpful, understanding and knowing. There are two critical themes that resonated in the stories Kenny shared.

Exploring his relationship with 'autism'

Kenny was sometimes hesitant to share memories and was unsure if people would like his story. Kenny seems to have some difficult memories linked to how he

perceives himself and how others perceive him. During exploration of a key memory, Kenny told me it has been hard for him in the past as he finds it difficult to speak.

"Kenny: When I was young, I really didn't fit in most places
Lauren: Ok, would you like to tell me a little bit more about that?
Kenny: like, people see me differently
Lauren: ok
Kenny: because I am autistic and weak and sensitive, that's why people pick on me."

I invited Kenny to tell me a story about P4C. He used an image from the school website that had been used as a stimulus to help him express his thoughts (See Figure 6):

"Lauren: Do you remember any of these [images on school website]?
Kenny: well, I do remember a lot of these
Lauren: ok, could you tell me about one?
Kenny: well, different – I am talking about the one – the colourful one [indicating an image] … I think that reminds me of me, I was with all the other adults and I don't know, I kinda lost my colour a bit. Not my skin colour but my emotional colour and I don't know."

The stimulus Kenny drew upon and the associated P4C session may have offered an opportunity for Kenny to explore 'autism' and the challenging memories and/or emotions associated with this. Currently, Kenny seems to be in the process of trying to cultivate courage about who he is, his experiences and what he is capable of.

Figure 6: The stimulus Kenny used to discuss his experiences of P4C.

Interactions with others and feeling safe

Kenny values his relationships with his family, there was a shift in his tone and expression when he discussed humorous memories with them. Kenny shared some 'sparkling moments' (Monk et al., 1997) that seem to emphasise the nurturing role his family take during difficult times in his life:

> *"Kenny:…like I was saying, when I was young, I couldn't speak because I was autistic, this made me angry and frustrated and the only thing that would cheer me up were my Mums hugs or my dad's or my sisters."*

Kenny told me his family were important because they help him, and he "*needs*" them. His family seem to offer a sense of safety. For example, Kenny discussed a memory of not wanting to go to school as he did not want to leave his Mum as he felt safe with her.

Kenny can feel vulnerable and unsafe talking aloud in group discussion during P4C. The P4C space may expose him to a type of interaction that he finds difficult which prompts him to notice aspects of life he is "not very good at":

> *"Lauren: ok, now let's have a look at these feelings you have picked Kenny. Can you tell me a bit more about a time when you feel like this in P4C or Image of the Week?*
> *Kenny: well, it is all the time actually*
> *Lauren: ok. Can you pick one to talk to me about?*
> *Kenny: embarrassed.*
> *Lauren: ok, why does it make you feel embarrassed?*
> *Kenny: because I am not very good at talking in big crowds."*

Kenny also noted that he can feel scared of the facilitator in P4C. Kenny may find it difficult when the P4C facilitator challenges the group. I noticed how this contrasted his family's gentle approach with him, this may make him feel guarded or unsafe.

3.5.2 Anonymous 1

Anonymous 1 (A1) was eight years old at the time of the interview. A1 has ambitions to be a palaeontologist and a youtuber. A1 likes to use his imagination and loves Science.

Expressing and actualising his special qualities and capabilities

A1 described himself as "definitely" clever, curious, and creative. When creating chapters for his life story, A1 told me about a time when he moved classrooms because the work was too easy for him. During a drawing activity, A1 discussed being better at sketching and digital drawing. I noticed a pattern in A1's story; he seemed to value opportunities to express his special qualities and capabilities.

One special quality is A1's love of learning, thinking and being challenged. This was reflected in his thoughts and feelings about P4C:

> "A1: it makes me think about … hmmm *… let me think, it makes me think about hmm let me think, it makes me think about how things – how I could – it makes me think harder than I would have normally
> A1: it makes me think about how things could be, more than normal
> …
> A1: I feel happy because it makes – because I am happy – because I am happy – because errr I thought of these and I am calm because erm thinking about things makes me calm."

Group discussion in P4C seems to provoke a positive emotional experience for A1 as he is enthusiastic about engaging in a thinking process and it is an opportunity for him to actualise this special quality. A1 shared a memory of P4C where everyone offered their own interpretation, A1 was confident in his own interpretation and he found it challenging to consider other views. Nevertheless, A1 told me that this makes him feel happy because his peers are thinking too. Therefore, A1 may value P4C as it can offer an opportunity for mutuality during a thinking process that he values.

Arguably, the content of philosophical dialogue can also offer A1 insight into his special qualities and capabilities. In this instance, the content of a stimulus may have helped A1 apply meaning in his life and reflect upon his actions:

> "A1: oh wait, I remember one [a quote]
> Lauren: mhmm
> A1: ermmm 'sometimes the bravest thing to do is to ask for help'
> Lauren: ok, can you tell me a little bit more about that?
> A1: basically, you know how some people have a lot of pride and don't like to ask for help
> Lauren: *nods*
> A1: sometimes it takes a lot of bravery, it takes a lot of bravery to ask for help
> Lauren: ah ok, ok, ok *pause* what made you pick that one?
> A1: … 'cause it is about being – it is about asking for help and I am not scared to ask for help."

Being 'real' with others and feeling secure

Feeling secure and trusting others also seemed important to A1. In our analysis co-production session, A1 told me that he finds it difficult to trust substitute teachers because they disappear and don't stick around. A1 values consistency in his life. A1 organised his life chapters in a logical way and discussed how he had his whole life set out for himself.

In our analysis co-production session, A1 told me that the ground rule, "don't be too serious" was important to him because; "if people are too serious then you don't capture the real person". A1 may feel more secure around others when he shares moments of humour with them as he believes this can provide an authentic understanding of someone. Throughout the interview, the sjuzet and fabula emphasised how A1 enjoyed moments when we laughed together.

A1 shared a story of P4C which may reflect a playful encounter with other CYP. The fabula and sjuzet emphasised how A1 found this memory humorous:

"A1: everyone just said what they thought, what they felt, what they saw, what they wondered and one person, not naming who, said a giraffe *confused face and laughing* huh, it's a wolf
Lauren: and how did that make - how did that make you feel?
A1: good *pause, confused face* how can you see a giraffe *smiles/laughs*"

3.5.3 Crafty

Crafty was seventeen years old at the time of interview. Crafty is very thoughtful about the changes he would like to see in the world. In the future, Crafty would like to be a baker so he can bring joy to people.

Feeling conflicted and learning acceptance

Crafty began by sharing his experiences of primary school which emphasised being misunderstood and/or unnoticed. One incident that Crafty shared was when he "escaped" school and staff had not noticed he was gone.

Crafty then discussed how his experiences growing up have helped him learn more about himself and the world. Crafty has developed some feelings of anger towards the beliefs and actions of others:

"Crafty: … that's [vandalizing of Grandad's grave] always left us with a massive layer of anger, because it's not just an attack on a personal family member who I've lost, it's an attack on war veterans, you know, people who fought for this country. People who fought so people like me can be alive. Because I've heard about what happened in the Second World War and how they executed with people with disabilities like my own. So, you know, without people like my granddad, I wouldn't be allowed to exist. And I kind of like being alive. You know, I like who I am."

This quote illustrates cultural and historical messages about disability. Crafty goes on to communicate problematic narratives constructed about people with autism and how his parents counter these by accepting him:

> *"Crafty: … when I was being bullied by people, it's easy to let yourself feel worthless and like you don't have place in the world, but then you come home to two loving parents who tell you that you belong here and no-one can tell you otherwise, it makes you feel like you don't have to be sad about being in the world. You deserve to be there, no-one else has the right to tell you don't deserve to exist… And that's why - and that's definitely what made us the most comfortable with meself, I couldn't have made it through life without them, because everyone - because everyone either thinks you shouldn't exist or feel sorry for your existence and then you have two shining role models who tell you that you're no different and you have a right to be here."*

Crafty also seems to experience conflict in P4C as he battles with what he should show of himself and what he thinks he should hide:

> *"Crafty: … to quote the old Japanese philosophy, we all have three faces, the face we show to the world, the face we show our friends and the face that only we see - and that's - I've never really understood that more than when doing P4C because I've had opinions on images that I've never really shared because I've had this face I've been wearing in front of me friends, the jokester but also the rebel, the guy who doesn't – who doesn't always do the work, who speaks up when he thinks something – when he thinks the work isn't good enough."*

> *"Crafty: … It's a massive internal conflict because a lot of the time, I'll have me head on the desk and everyone will just assume I've dozed off … But what's really happening is I'm deep in that sort of massive internal thought - thoughts of why do I give an opinion on this, I can understand it and I have my own opinions, but what will that show about me, what will people think? And sometimes I do let that 'what will people think' hold me back from what I can do…"*

When invited to share memories of P4C, he shared a time when he had "let a crack show in the mask". He had received praise because of his contribution and felt embarrassed. He can find it difficult to have a "spotlight" on him. Crafty can also find it difficult to reveal parts of himself in P4C because there can be individuals in the group who he does not trust. He links this to historical experiences of being bullied. This seems to cause conflict for Crafty as he is learning to accept himself and believes he should show more of himself in P4C: "it's just a constant conflict of who I am vs who I want to be".

Hope and growth

Crafty discusses turning points in his life story that are changing his relationship with aspects of his life that he previously found challenging, such as, control and change. For example, Crafty discusses how he has learned more about himself by overcoming a fear of heights. When reflecting on the chapters he constructed for his life, Crafty noted the following:

> *"Crafty: I guess in every one of them, they've all had a major change on me as a person and have helped me grow a bit at each time…"*

A recent turning point in Crafty's life story was when he started "*unburdening*" his experiences with a teacher he trusts: "the mask didn't just slip; it straight up fell off". Crafty wants to be more emotionally honest with himself and his life. This is also something he considers during P4C as the stimulus can help him think about his life and the process can make him reflect upon an authentic way of being:

> *"Crafty: I shouldn't wear this mask in front of people when it damages who I am and I should keep my morals intact and when something needs to be said, I should say it."*

The form and movement of Crafty's story is one of gradual progression, he begins by sharing memories that emphasise conflict and anger then discusses experiences that are helping him learn acceptance.

Being an individual and part of a community

The tension Crafty experiences in P4C between showing his 'real' self and keeping it hidden seems to be underpinned by a core belief that every individual can offer something unique:

> *"Crafty: I always fear about showing my face – showing my private face to people who I don't want to show it to, but at the same time, maybe I should show it a bit more because maybe I can offer perspective that couldn't be found elsewhere because we are all unique people even a world of 7 billion, we're all unique, they'll never be another like us, there will be similar people but never us, we will never happen again and that's why we shouldn't just let our lives go to waste. We should contribute what we have because we're all good and we all have a potential that some of us will go our whole life without discovering and it's sad."*

Crafty also thinks about how he relates to others in P4C and the unity of thinking and feeling together. He wonders whether his peers and staff experience similar conflicting feelings:

> *"Crafty: It definitely gives us a sense of intrigue because it makes me see these people as more than just, you know, random people who I see in me life. It makes us think, that yeah, these are all people like me and this makes us think well people are just like me. They're not just like random creatures like MPC's in a video game. These are people with genuine thoughts and feelings that I'll never see…"*

Being an individual and part of a community is also resonant in Crafty's life story. His current school has helped him reflect upon how he connects with other autistic people whilst also acknowledging that everyone is different. This has helped him

understand others and consider 'difference' in a positive way: "you know we're all on the spectrum but we're all at different sides. So, we're all the same, but we're also all different and you start seeing things from an angle that's hard to describe you just start understanding the world more"

3.5.4 Amelia

Amelia is a teacher and a tutor. She also has a pastoral role for the CYP in her class. Amelia describes herself as a caring, helpful person.

Mutuality and trusting relationships

Amelia shared feelings of mutuality for the CYP she has worked with. Amelia had a significant operation, so she understands and emphasises with CYP when others disregard them because they are "*different*":

"Amelia: … you're kind of walking around and you meet people that you know but I found that they were kind of talking to my mam, instead of me. And I just - that just made me very aware so when I was at work at *name of current school* a lot of - when you took the students out, that happened a lot there. They would talk to me rather than to them. So that's something that I was just trying to kind of get across to people that you know, that they are still people, they are still there, they can hear you and they can communicate with you, just because they look different erm so yeah that had an impact and I think that lack of confidence comes a lot from there as well."

In our analysis co-production meeting, Amelia discussed how building confidence has been a reciprocal process; the students have helped Amelia build confidence and she also values developing their confidence too.

In P4C, Amelia often learns *about* children and *with* them. She values the moments that offer insight and understanding about CYP, she thinks teachers can learn about CYP's past experiences during discussion. Some of the stories shared emphasised a mutual learning experience in P4C:

"Amelia: I just think that they come out with things I'd never thought of. So, we did one the other week and I saw in the picture, erm a lady, a man and a baby at the bottom. And they were saying, but it's about a wolf, and I was saying, I don't know what you mean. Erm they said, well look in the middle because I just saw a white blob, but in the middle, these figures had actually made up the shape of a - of a wolf or a dog or something in the middle. And I'd never seen that. Erm, it – it is just, the things they come out with that make me think, that I would never have even contemplated without them saying it."

In our analysis co-production meeting, Amelia told me she knows she can go to her friends for help, they "know" her and understand her. Amelia seems to value the security of these relationships and acknowledges the importance of this for CYP. Amelia describes her role in school as one which is built upon safety and care:

"Amelia: They need a lot of - lot of support, a lot of guidance, a lot of reassurance erm lots of care. Love isn't the right word, but I think a lot of them come to school and it is a relief for them. Erm, because of the stressors and the strains that they have at home, I think that they feel safe erm and secure and I think that is part of my job to make them feel like that, to make them feel happy and cared for."

In P4C, Amelia believes it is important to build trusting relationships so that a climate of respect can develop. She constructs group rules so CYP have responsibility for the group. Amelia discussed how CYP need to know they are safe and won't be judged by their peers. In our analysis co-production session, Amelia discussed how CYP cannot build confidence and challenge other people's expectations of them until they feel safe and respected. She emphasised this in a story she shared:

"Amelia: I remember one of the students who had never participated before erm or found it really difficult, he had a bit of a stutter and didn't feel confident in front of others and he joined in and I said to him at the end, what made you join in today when you haven't before, what was different about today? And he said, I just know that I am safe now, I know that I am safe, and people aren't going to laugh at me."

Challenging expectations

Once CYP feel safe in P4C, Amelia discussed how they can participate, their behaviour changes, they can challenge the perceptions of their peers, and demonstrate what they can do:

"Amelia: …it is a chance for those who maybe aren't academically brilliant, if they can't read very well, write very well, it is a chance for them to excel or not just excel, but to show people that, I might not be able to write, I might not be able to read but erm, I can still communicate and show an understanding and that can gain respect..."

In Amelia's life story, she shared how, after her operation, her initial assumptions about CYP were challenged. Amelia also shared a memory of her time at University when a tutor had questioned whether Amelia should be a teacher, and this had impacted her confidence whilst also fuelling her determination. Arguably, Amelia felt this tutor had assumed what she was capable of, and she wanted to challenge this.

Making a difference

Amelia began her life story by discussing her career journey. In a previous school, she felt she wasn't *"doing enough"* and was "keeping the crowd under control rather

than doing anything else". Amelia believes that, to make a difference for CYP, it is important to help them with their emotions and social skills.

In interview, Amelia shared a story about P4C and what it was like to be her in this moment:

> *"Amelia: I think you just feel that you've made a difference, you feel like you've obviously made them feel comfortable erm that they know, that they know they can trust you. Erm, and the other people within the erm group. Erm, yeah, it just makes you feel good, doesn't it, you feel like you've done something to help somebody or improved confidence and self-esteem."*

This quote illustrates how Amelia can feel she makes a difference in P4C and is able to notice change. She discusses how consistency is needed; seeing the same group make progress. She discusses how other staff may not always see the benefit of P4C if they don't have a consistent group so cannot "see any progress".

3.5.5 Hannah

Hannah is a primary-trained teacher who teaches the whole curriculum to a single class of CYP. She also has a pastoral role. Hannah describes herself as nurturing, loyal and dependable.

A learning journey; the experience of change and uncertainty

When discussing life chapters, Hannah described her difficult journey with illness in the family. She set the scene by stating: *"so we've been through the mill, can I just say"*. Hannah's story consisted of fluctuating periods of progression and regression. Now, Hannah celebrates the journey her family have been on. She is continually learning and feels proud that her family has been on a rocky journey but continues to make the best out of things.

The 'journey' construct also underpinned Hannah's exploration of her career path. She shared varying experiences that shaped her values. For example, Hannah discussed thriving in challenging situations and an enthusiasm towards learning.

In P4C, Hannah seems to value the shared journey she embarks on with CYP. She likes to witness the change in their opinions, the realisations CYP make and how the

process extends thinking. The story Hannah shared to emphasise this also illuminated a change in CYP's sociocultural beliefs:

"Hannah: Erm, it was two young boys [referring to a stimulus]. I don't know where they were, it was like a third world country, erm and they were cooking something, on like a hot bowl, it looked a bit like a wok, but it was on like on a fire and they were really little and were watching them cooking and things and the class talked about that erm and some of the conversations, one of the boys, I remember saying that the parents were irresponsible because erm they shouldn't have been allowed to do that, erm 'they shouldn't have been allowed to do that. It's dangerous.' and another one was saying, 'well, he's the older brother and he's teaching his younger brother how to cook and that'. And I was like, well, hang on. So, 'we've just said that the parents are irresponsible, and they shouldn't be allowed to do that, but has anyone been hurt do you think, or?' Erm, you know, 'did he look like he knew what he was doing?' And they're like, 'well, yeah'. So, their initial reaction 'well that's not right, they are only little, they shouldn't be allowed to do that' to then thinking, 'well, actually, they're not being - they're not hurt, they know what they're doing, and they have been able to feed themselves' you know, that was yeah, that was a really, really good one.
Lauren: what was it about that time that –
Hannah: I think, I think it's the change, it's the, it's the change in opinion, like that. So, he was so – he was quite cross at the fact that the parents weren't there and then to think, 'Well actually it's not a bad thing' You know, and yeah and changing in that opinion or just thinking or just looking at it a different way."

In our analysis co-production meeting, we discussed how Hannah may feel comfortable with the uncertainty when entering a P4C discussion because she has experienced lots of uncertainty in her life and has learned from this.

Connecting with CYP and being dependable

When sharing experiences of family illness, Hannah discussed how it was her job to protect others and be dependable. She shares stories that emphasise moments of connection with her family and the sjuzet highlighted the joy these moments offered her.

In Hannah's career journey, she discusses how her role as a TA helped her realise how much she valued building relationships with individual children. In our analysis co-production meeting, she discussed how she likes to get to know CYP in depth rather than rely upon *"data"*. Hannah shared a story about her work with "challenging students" and how this emphasised the importance of being dependable and showing genuine care.

59

In P4C, she discussed how you get to "*know*" individuals as you work closely with them. She notices what their behaviour suggests about what they may need from her. For example, how she can help young people who put "walls up":

> *"Hannah: …Erm, yeah and last year I had, I had a student who will go, 'I dunno, I dunno'. And then at the end of it, he was really – I'd say, 'come on, just have a think about it a minute' and then he would come out with something amazing. And again, this year, I've got that student, a different student who also says, 'I don't know. I don't know' and we're getting there – we -you know, kind of teasing it out of him…"*

Some of Hannah's main goals for P4C are for them to "get along and grow as people" and "get the best out of them" which emphasises the interpersonal goals she constructs for CYP in P4C and her attentiveness to every individual.

3.6 Discussion

This section will critically consider the stories woven and explored in P4C for the CYP and teachers who took part in this research. Implications on pedagogical practice and for educationalists, such as Educational Psychologists (EPs), will then be outlined.

Children's stories

3.6.1 Reflecting on 'autism'

In Kenny's story, he discussed a visual stimulus used in P4C that prompted him to consider his thoughts and feelings about 'difference' (See Figure 6). This may reflect how the open, abstract nature of visual stimuli in P4C can invite CYP to engage in a process of meaning-making (Haynes & Murris, 2013). The use of visual images, with their own style and shape, can offer CYP space for semiotic engagement: an exploration of how visual signs connect and relate to their own affective experiences (Haynes & Murris, 2013). P4C can be considered a pedagogy of 'connectedness' as it can prompt CYP to reflect upon their past experiences that may have shaped how they view and interact with the world around them (Scholl et al., 2016). CYP can then re-engage with meaning and reconstruct perceptions of their experiences (Scholl et al., 2016).

The *process* of P4C also invited Kenny and Crafty to reflect on their relationship with 'autism'. Crafty's stories highlighted conflict as P4C cultivates opportunities for him to contribute his views but this can feel exposing. Similarly, Kenny feels embarrassed when asked to talk in front of a group. CYP may engage in "inner dialogue" during

P4C as they consider their experiences and values in relation to the questions and viewpoints shared (Kumpulainen & Rajala, 2017, p. 24). Therefore, reflections can be very personal and intertwined with questions about who they are and how they fit. As there is no pre-determined answer in P4C, all contributions are valued as part of the developing dialogue; CYP's initiatives are received and dwelled upon. This may feel threatening for Kenny and Crafty given their vivid stories of feeling rejected. For example, Crafty made links between his experience of wanting to contribute in P4C and memories of primary school when he was *"himself"* and was humiliated.

Autistic CYP may benefit from a pedagogy that allows them to explore who they are and their relationship with difference (Billington, 2006). Although P4C may construct space for this personal reflection, the social conditions of P4C risks reinforcing the normative ideal that autistic CYP should change to fit a pedagogy (Conn, 2018). Past experiences of being misunderstood and rejected by others has made Kenny and Crafty wary of how others will respond to them, so verbally expressing ideas in P4C can provoke challenging feelings for them. Some autistic CYP may benefit from time to understand and prepare comfortable ways to express themselves prior to engaging in P4C. This moves beyond a fixed perception of 'voice' by exploring different ways CYP can express themselves.

3.6.2 Exploring their multi-storied lives

A1's stories illustrated how he can flourish in P4C because he can demonstrate what he 'can' do. Since building a key relationship with a teacher and expressing his feelings, P4C also presents opportunities for Crafty to 'become' who he would like to be. This may illuminate how P4C can construct space for pedagogical openness whereby CYP actively experiment with varying possible ways to 'be' in the unfolding dialogic space between themselves and others (Conn, 2018).

Arguably, the dialogic space in P4C may prompt 'rhizomatic' thinking as CYP may react to the fluid, evolving dialogue, following lines of thought, and forming connections with past experiences (Goodley, 2007). As highlighted by Walther and Carey (2009):

"lines of rhizomatic enquiry can initiate off -shoots of stories which can then take root and develop as distinct but linked accounts of preferred story. A broad ground of

storied terrain can be developed that is territorialised by these 'difference-becoming' possibilities and provides new platforms for taking action" (p. 5).

This process may be reflective of dialogue in P4C as it may allow autistic CYP to explore preferred ways of being thus constructing thicker descriptions about themselves and what they can do. P4C can offer CYP an 'audience' and 'influence'; teachers and peers can extend CYP's diverse contributions (Cassidy, Christie, et al., 2018; Lundy et al., 2011) and witness their preferred stories (Walther & Fox, 2012).

This may differ from pedagogical practices in school contexts that risk embedding fixed perceptions of what autistic CYP can do (Billington, 2006; Conn, 2018; Madriaga & Goodley, 2010). This is often reflective of autistic CYP being perceived and interacted with through the lens of 'deficit', which can constrain how autistic CYP negotiate their identity (Begon & Billington, 2019). If we consider the stories shared by A1, such as, how P4C can allow him to cultivate his love of learning, thinking and being challenged, then the pedagogical openness of P4C may support CYP to be agents in the construction of their own preferred stories.

3.6.3 Stories of mutuality

Stories concerning how they relate to others were woven throughout A1 and Crafty's experiences of their life and P4C. A1 seemed to value opportunities to be playful and share laughter with others in P4C, he discussed how you get to know the "real" person by not being too serious with them. The P4C process may help A1 to be 'human' with another by sharing joyful moments and connectedness (Macmurray, 2012). Perhaps, the spacious interactional space in P4C offers moments of attunement and vitality during a mutually playful encounter (Bae, 2012). A1's story of a P4C session may liken to a play interaction as it involved shared discovery, wonder and entering an imaginary space together (Stanley & Lyle, 2017). In this space, CYP may share, "other worlds in which to dwell – and make them available to others to dwell in also" (Lipman, 2003, p. 245).

In P4C, Crafty thinks about what it means to be an individual and also part of a community (Bleazby, 2006). P4C invites an individual to bring their 'raw' ideas to discussion, but it also involves questioning and reconstruction so there is a communal, critical inquiry (Bleazby, 2006). Therefore, the 'individual' and 'community'

are arguably inter-related in a P4C process. Some perceive community as a precondition for autonomy as self-awareness can be developed in inquiry (Bleazby, 2006). However, this notion of a bounded self may detach the person from the community (Gergen, 2015). Arguably, Crafty may be experiencing tension due to the differing possible 'ways of being' in the varying relations to others in a P4C context (Gergen, 2015).

Crafty seems to experience feelings of mutuality with his peers in school. The tension Crafty experiences between the 'individual' and the 'community' in P4C may highlight how this pedagogy can enable exploration of the "dilemma of difference"; autistic CYP can explore commonalities whilst also thinking about ways of being that feel unique to them (Humphrey & Lewis, 2008, p. 41).

Teachers' stories

3.6.4 Relational values

In her life story, Amelia discusses her trusting, caring relationships with family and friends. Hannah reflects on her dependable role in her family and how she is always "*there*" for those she cares about. Amelia and Hannah's reflections about P4C may illustrate how P4C helps them develop meaningful relationships with CYP. The stories they weave about their role in P4C emphasise their relational values (Verschueren & Koomen, 2012; Vogt, 2002; Wubbels et al., 2014).

A dialogic pedagogy such as P4C can construct opportunities for relational encounters; the 'I' does not work *on* the 'other', rather, there is mutual attentiveness to each other's ideas (Gergen, 2015). Amelia and Hannah discuss various ways they 'are' with CYP and the classroom climate they try to cultivate for CYP. Amelia's stories illustrate emotional closeness (warmth and security) as a fundamental aspect of her relational encounters with CYP (Verschueren & Koomen, 2012; Wubbels et al., 2014). Hannah puts time and effort into ensuring CYP know she is there to support them. Hannah's reflections seem to emphasise her ongoing commitment to genuine care for CYP (Vogt, 2002). Hannah and Amelia's stories position them as relationally sensitive and responsive practitioners who want to construct a safe space for CYP in P4C (Verschueren & Koomen, 2012).

Their stories also suggest they learn more about CYP and their lives through the P4C process. P4C can engage CYP in philosophical questions about humanity and prompt CYP to reflect on their own personal history (Lamb, 2015). As discussed in the preceding sections, this may support CYP to explore their multi-storied lives. This may also prompt teachers to construct richer, holistic understandings of CYP as they begin to understand the purpose and meaning CYP apply to their lives and can appreciate why CYP may feel/behave in certain ways. This is arguably a condition of a relational process (Roffey, 2011) and may offer an emancipatory pedagogy for autistic CYP. For autistic CYP, pedagogies that can enable others to perceive them holistically may counter attitudes and practices that "split the autistic body in two, conceptually separating what autism is from who autism is" (McGuire, 2012, p. 65).

The relational values that Amelia and Hannah centralise in their stories about P4C may highlight how a P4C process can offer pedagogical intersubjective moments with autistic CYP (Conn, 2018). This may contrast approaches for autistic CYP which are based upon rigid assumptions about autistic CYP's behaviour and associated techniques (Conn, 2018). P4C also seemed to offer Amelia and Hannah a chance to integrate and actualise their "stories to live by" about who they are and what is important to them (Craig, 2011, p. 25). Perhaps, the openness of a P4C process offers teachers opportunities for this which may not be found elsewhere in the curriculum (O'Riordan, 2016).

3.6.5 Witnessing change

Amelia and Hannah both discussed how they see change during P4C. Amelia shared how CYP's confidence develops, Hannah discussed how she can see CYP change their opinions/make realisations. Being able to witness change was a positive experience for both teachers, this is reflected by Amelia: "…yeah, it just makes you feel good, doesn't it, you feel like you've done something to help somebody…"

This may reflect enhanced efficacy beliefs. P4C dialogue can offer an "apprenticeship of observation" as teachers may witness change in CYP during their facilitation of P4C (Brownlee et al., 2014, p. 185; O'Riordan, 2015). The positioning of teachers as facilitators and their capacity for autonomy in a P4C process may mean that, when change is witnessed, this affirms their actions and develops trust in their own abilities. As discussed in the preceding section, Amelia and Hannah try to

cultivate their relational values in P4C. Perhaps, Amelia's and Hannah's efficacy beliefs are developed in the P4C process as they are able to see change as a result of being 'human' with CYP and from being able to work in a value-led way (Macmurray, 2012). Amelia discussed how teachers can witness change when they work consistently with the same group of CYP, therefore, developing relationships with CYP may support teachers to observe, monitor and celebrate meaningful change for CYP in P4C.

Flexibility and being able to change may highlight how P4C can be transformative for CYP and facilitators (Barrow, 2010). The ideas grappled with during P4C dialogue may be 'threshold concepts' as they have potential to shift beliefs and value-systems (Meyer & Land, 2003). Teachers witnessing CYP negotiate these concepts may contribute towards thicker stories of autistic CYP with regards to assumptions made about their ability to change their opinions and engage in active learning processes.

3.7 Implications

P4C may offer a socially just pedagogy for autistic CYP (Begon & Billington, 2019). The participatory process of P4C seemed to support both CYP and adults to explore and sometimes transform their stories. Some of the CYP in this research exercised agency in P4C dialogue by exploring their preferred stories about who they are and what is important to them. This may counter pedagogical approaches that work 'on' autistic CYP and aim to reduce or 'treat' autistic behaviours (Begon & Billington, 2019). P4C also seemed to help some CYP think about what autism means to them and how they have been treated by others because of their diagnosis. Thus, P4C may construct critical dialogue that helps autistic CYP deconstruct dominant assumptions made about them and explore their lived experience (Madriaga & Goodley, 2010). The experience of mutuality in P4C may also highlight how this pedagogy can develop a culture of understanding and support for autistic CYP (Davidson & Henderson, 2010). For example, Crafty discussed his wish to be part of something "greater" with other CYP. Nevertheless, it is important to note that some autistic CYP may benefit from time to understand and prepare comfortable ways they can contribute to discussion prior to engaging in P4C.

The proposal of P4C as a socially just pedagogical approach for autistic CYP may require critical engagement with the purpose of education. Conn (2018) draws upon

Biesta (2010) to suggest that education is "to see their [CYP] humanity and recognise them as fully moral subjects who have agency and can act in unexpected ways" (p. 597). Therefore, the application of a technique because it is designed for autistic CYP may be reductionist and may risk diminishing the moral purpose of education (Conn, 2018). Amelia and Hannah's (Teachers) stories suggest that P4C constructs space to develop safe, understanding relationships with CYP as a foundation of a learning process. This may reflect a relational purpose of education as the teachers are guided by intersubjective moments with autistic CYP (Conn, 2018; Gergen, 2015; Macmurray, 2012). Thus, P4C may offer a pedagogy grounded in relational vision for education, consequently, when considering the implementation of P4C, I believe there needs to be wider consideration of the philosophy and purpose of education in the school context.

The educational processes currently adopted in the UK can be described as instrumentalist and teachers can experience a high amount of pressure (O'Riordan, 2016). Thus, educationalists may need to advocate for pedagogies that are emancipatory for both teachers and CYP (Goodley & Billington, 2017). Amelia and Hannah's stories emphasise their autonomous, value-led approach in P4C which suggests P4C may offer a pedagogical approach that enables teachers to be human with CYP (Gibbs, 2018a). I argue, those working alongside educators, such as Educational Psychologists (EPs), should support approaches that enable teachers to be relational and autonomous alongside CYP, and encourage thicker descriptions and alternative stories for CYP.

3.7.1 Limitations

It is important to consider the context in which participants shared their stories. The CYP and teachers were part of a 'Thinking School' so the ethos of P4C was adopted across the whole curriculum. Thus, the sociocultural context is likely to have impacted the perceptions and experiences of participants shared in this research, for example, efficacy beliefs of teachers are likely to be impacted by a school ethos and prevalent attitudes (Gibbs & Powell, 2012). However, Amelia and Hannah discussed some teachers in school who do not see value in P4C. Therefore, it may have been illuminating to explore the perceptions of P4C for these staff members and how these perceptions link to their personal and professional stories.

Furthermore, it is important to consider my role as a researcher in this project. I value P4C as an approach owing to my own experiences of education both personally and professionally. Therefore, the key questions and interpretations will have been influenced by my own experiences and worldview. Given my epistemological stance, generalisable claims have not been made (Willig, 2013). Rather, I have drawn upon the participants' stories when critically considering P4C as a pedagogical approach. The transparent reporting of the research process aims to support other researchers who wish to build upon interpretations developed in this research.

3.8 Concluding thoughts

As Walther and Fox (2012) note, "life identity projects are fluid and ongoing processes, full of possibility and without conclusion" (p. 16). Therefore, Kenny's, A1's, Crafty's, Amelia's and Hannah's life stories will change and adapt over time. However, the biographical and episodic experiences shared in this research illustrated how a P4C pedagogy may have offered space for CYP to reflect on their relationship with autism, explore their multi-storied lives and offered moments of mutuality. P4C may be a promising, transformative pedagogy for autistic CYP as it can support them to be autonomous agents in the thickening and reauthoring of their stories.

For teachers, P4C allowed Amelia and Hannah to cultivate their relational values and witness change, both of which were important to them personally and professionally. Nevertheless, the implementation of P4C in schools may require critical engagement with the purpose of education as the stories shared in this research highlighted how a P4C pedagogy may align with relational vision for education.

Next steps in the current research involve further discussion and collaboration with teachers and CYP about dissemination possibilities. Future research may wish to explore the pedagogical implications of this research for other CYP with SEND. P4C may offer an approach that supports other CYP to thicken their preferred stories and challenge existing discourse constructed about them.

Chapter 4. How did I shape the research and how did the research shape me? Personal and professional implications.

Abstract

This chapter explores personal and professional implications of the research project outlined in Chapter Three. Engaging in participatory processes had implications on how I negotiated a relational dynamic when working alongside CYP and teachers. The use of narrative psychology was therapeutic and transformational, this consolidated narrative ways of 'being' as a key aspect of my professional practice. The stories shared in the research also prompted me to rethink pedagogy and how I could construct space for shared reflection on pedagogical approaches, and the underpinning philosophical principles, in education. Unpicking and understanding moments of reflexivity during the research has highlighted my key values as a person, researcher, and Educational Psychologist (EP).

4.1 Introduction: reflexivity and transparency in research

Personal and epistemological reflexivity in qualitative research involves examining how a researcher's experiences and values may have influenced the methods and interpretations made (Willig, 2013). It also involves researchers exploring ways they may have been transformed by the research process (Liamputtong, 2007; Palaganas et al., 2017). Transparency about the researcher's positioning and their experience of change can emphasise the subjective nature of interpretation and enrich the research context, as readers can critically engage with the subject matter (Mauthner & Doucet, 2003).

I acknowledge my responsibility to the CYP and teachers involved in the research to understand the influences and context on interpretation (Doucet & Mauthner, 2002). Thus, this chapter offers a critical, reflexive account whilst also outlining personal and professional implications. The most resonant learning experiences during the research will be explored, with hope to evidence the following:

- ❖ The experience of "shaping and being shaped": my role in the construction of the research project, the impact of the decisions made and how the process/outcome of the research led to insights and/or shifts in my values (Palaganas et al., 2017, p. 430).

- ❖ The construction of any key assumptions: how the research process/design influenced certain understandings about CYP, teachers and their experiences (Willig, 2013).
- ❖ The context: acknowledging how interactions and interpretations are situated in a particular socio-political and cultural context (Burr, 2004; Palaganas et al., 2017).
- ❖ The interpersonal dynamic: researchers should recognise the "silence" in their research (Liamputtong, 2007, p. 11). I interpret this as sensitivity to relationality, possible power relations, and the socially constructed nature of the research process (Burr, 2004; Doucet & Mauthner, 2002).

4.2 Participation: "holding the door open"

In an evaluative discussion about the research, Crafty stated *"… we were always locked in. You open the door, we – it might be our words, but you were the one who unlocked the door for us"*. Initially, I understood this as indicative of an adult's responsibility to advocate for societal structures that uphold CYP's rights. Upon further reflection, I considered whether my role as a non-disabled adult and dual role as a trainee Educational Psychologist (EP) may have positioned me as a gatekeeper who 'holds' power. This highlighted the possible issue of speaking 'for' a social group I do not belong to (Gillies & Alldred, 2003). Thus, I questioned how I could thread critical disability studies into further research and practice (Goodley & Billington, 2017) and how I could support autistic CYP to self-advocate and 'unlock the door' themselves.

Arguably, autistic CYP may find it difficult to self-advocate if wider systems diminish opportunities for this. Therefore, Educational Psychologists (EPs) may need to reflect upon the structural conditions of the micro, meso and macro systems that may hinder this (Prilleltensky & Nelson, 2010). Promoting self-advocacy may be a process of everyday interactions that involves various people, working within their ecology, in an autistic child's life (Petrie et al., 2014). Together, perhaps, a community can 'hold the door open' for an autistic child.

A conceptual framework may also offer a basis for shifting beyond knowledge to action when developing self-advocacy processes (Test et al., 2005). However, my experiences as a trainee EP have highlighted a tendency to consider the 'needs' of

CYP, rather than their rights. Kay (2019) links self-advocacy to outcomes in Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Code of Practice (Department of Education, 2014), which may support me to demonstrate the value of self-advocacy in my work with CYP.

Furthermore, I reflected on relational dynamics when engaging in participatory research processes. The participatory methodology allowed me to authentically learn about and with CYP, CYP discussed feeling comfortable, and they often asked questions about my life. However, it was sometimes challenging to construct relational boundaries (Blackstock et al., 2015; Mayan & Daum, 2016). In the final co-production meeting, some CYP seemed apprehensive about the research coming to an end. Although I tried to cultivate democratic decision-making, there may have been perceptions that I was the sole agent of change. Thus, I wondered how I could adapt research, so it was facilitative of a sustainable research community for CYP.

As a researcher and trainee EP, the application of community psychology and the associated action principles, may support facilitation of democratic communities in educational contexts (Prilleltensky & Nelson, 2010). In the future, the development of the research focus could be initiated by CYP, and facilitation could construct group processes that allow CYP to collaborate and develop their own research community. Hannah (Teacher) discussed supporting CYP to bridge their thinking in Philosophy for Children (P4C) into action in the community (for example, projects on climate change). Perhaps, this pedagogy can engage CYP in planning and discussion in school-based action research.

4.3 Narrative psychology: "no matter how much I've been torn down I will always manage to get back up"

The narrative principles that guided my way of 'being' with participants and the questions asked may have validated CYP's and teachers' experiences and helped them gain further insight into their lives (Tellis-James & Fox, 2017). For example, when unpicking future chapters in the analysis co-production session, Kenny found a way to summarise a key principle in his life; *"no matter how much I've been torn down I will always manage to get back up"*. The process of narrative inquiry was mutually therapeutic and transformational which may distinguish it from other

approaches that focus on gathering information (Duncombe & Jessop, 2003). The research process supported me to reflect on my own relationships with my experiences and perceptions about how I define myself.

However, I experienced some theoretical and philosophical tensions. Firstly, I questioned whether the construction of stories as a shared conceptual framework (the aesthetic of 'stories') offered a therapeutic organising principle, and/or, if the significance of the process was reflective of individuals being able to choose what information they shared with me (the ethical process of narrative exploration) (Skalin, 2017). Furthermore, I grappled with ontological questions concerning whether lives were inherently storied or whether the research interaction organised experiences into a storied form (Skalin, 2017). This made me question key assumptions constructed in the research. For example, exploring connections between stories may have positioned 'coherence' as an ideal and influenced the lens I adopted to view the data (Smith & Sparkes, 2006). I wondered whether the proposal that stories may be woven and explored in P4C was imposed because of the epistemological and methodological approach of the research.

Supervision and journaling supported me to grapple with the tensions I experienced but I realised it was not possible to arrive at an answer or fixed solution. An ongoing process of reflexivity helped me arrive at a place of acceptance about my inherent role in the production and understanding of the stories shared in the research (Willig, 2013). Continual re-engagement with philosophical questions helped me recognise a relativist understanding of 'narrative' in my belief that people construct themselves differently in diverse social interactions and how these constructions help them or are performed can depend on their social context (Willig, 2013).

As a researcher and EP, I plan to continue adopting narrative approaches in my encounters with CYP, families and staff. Stories shared by Crafty and Kenny illustrated a dominant, problem-saturated narrative associated with a diagnosis. EP's can challenge dominant stories constructed about CYP by making critical distinctions: between a diagnosis and a child, between knowledge of the child and interpretations created about them, between descriptions of a child and the child's descriptions of themselves (Gilling, 2012; Goodley & Billington, 2017). Currently, the educational context in the UK and notions of inclusion are impacting the lives of CYP

who demonstrate behaviours perceived as 'challenging'. I argue, EPs should be facilitating conversations that re-story these CYP's lives and challenge discourses that position them as 'mad', 'bad' or 'sad' (Macleod, 2006). I have developed a framework to support narrative dialogue in my practice when encouraging a shift away from a constructed problem towards hopeful solutions (See Appendix H).

4.5 Rethinking pedagogy: "sometimes the bravest thing to do is to ask for help"

The research aimed to shine a critical light on pedagogical approaches adopted in the UK to support autistic CYP (Billington, 2006; Conn, 2018). This interest stemmed from frustration about the current political context and its influence on education. As a Teaching Assistant in a specialist school, I felt torn between attuning to CYP and meeting fixed curricular outcomes that often felt unfeeling and artificial. I believe I was drawn to P4C because it aligned with my wish to cultivate space for CYP to explore ways of being and understanding the world.

The CYP's and teachers' stories highlighted how P4C can help CYP explore meaningful aspects of their lives, and for teachers, it may align with ways of working that resonate with their relational values. Before engaging in this project, I risked solely perceiving pedagogy as an application of principles and concentrating on the associated implications for CYP. However, owing to the stories shared, I experienced a conceptual shift as I realised that pedagogy can be a shared existential and ethical endeavour for both CYP and teachers (Clandinin, 2018; Haynes & Murris, 2011; McLeoud, 2016; Zembylas, 2019).

There seems to be a sense of vulnerability and precariousness in pedagogies that emphasise an openness to difference (Zembylas, 2019). A1's experiences of philosophical dialogue and his reflections on the quote "sometimes the bravest thing to do is to ask for help", illustrated how CYP can draw upon their life and humanity during learning experiences, when the environment allows them to do so. In the classroom, CYP's and teachers' stories may be interrelated and continually shaped by each other:

> *"… if you think about children as composing their lives in classrooms, you're really called to think about them differently as more than a child who does or does not do*

the activities that you make in the classroom. It really calls you to think about: "So, who am I in this child's life and how can I come alongside this child, not to remake this child, but to come alongside in ways that he or she might be able to tell his or her story and our stories differently." (Clandinin, 2018, p. 22)

Although, EPs can challenge fixed perceptions of CYP in consultation (Begon & Billington, 2019), this research prompted me to consider whether EPs can also support teachers to critically reflect upon pedagogical practice to facilitate alternative ways of perceiving CYP and themselves in relation to CYP. Amelia (Teacher) discussed how the research had offered her space to think about what is important to her and how this influences her practice. Amelia's views suggested that the culture of education may not regularly offer time or space for this reflection. However, in practice as a trainee EP, I have noticed the benefit of EP-facilitated supervision with teachers and TA's, this has supported them to reconnect with their morality, values and beliefs which can underpin their personal and professional narratives.

By viewing pedagogy through an existential lens, this has also helped me consider how the philosophy of P4C could underpin my everyday interactions with others (Haynes & Murris, 2011). For example, ongoing curiosity about teachers' implicit epistemological values and priorities, and perhaps noticing and externalising any possible tensions between their values and action (Haynes & Murris, 2011). P4C may have offered A1 and Crafty space to explore their multi-storied lives, to encourage this understanding of CYP in my everyday interactions, I will continue to reflect upon how I speak and write about CYP (Begon, 2017).

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter has offered a reflexive account of resonant learning experiences during the research. I have unpicked some of the key assumptions, contextual influences, and the interpersonal dynamics during the research process. In summary, key learning points and some possible next steps for practice are outlined in Table 9. My aim is to develop as a holistic practitioner who perceives and engages in everyday practice as micro action research projects (Parker, 2013). I aim to embody my philosophical values and beliefs in all my interactions with others. I would like to end my thesis with Crafty's words as I believe this emphasises guiding principles that should underpin all interactions, professional and personal, with autistic CYP:

"…they don't understand us so they ignore us, but when someone like you chooses to listen, you can help people come to an understanding of us and once they accept people like us, we can all help change the world too."

Key learning point	Summary of next steps
Creating a sustainable community of change in education settings	• Drawing upon community psychology, values, and principles for action (Prilleltensky & Nelson, 2010) • Promoting P4C as part of action research processes
Supporting self-advocacy	• Reflecting on a CYP's ecology: how are systems diminishing and/or promoting CYP's self-advocacy? • Facilitating process consultation and joint problem-solving about how each key stakeholder can support a CYP to self-advocate • Utilising approaches / frameworks that can frame self-advocacy in a formative, proactive way (Kay, 2019; Test et al., 2005).
Being a narrative research-practitioner	• Utilising narrative frameworks for therapeutic conversations, questioning and challenging constructions. • Challenging dominant narratives – working to develop thick descriptions of CYP
Commitment to creative, critical pedagogies	• Facilitating staff supervision – shared reflection on pedagogy • Integrating P4C into the 'every day' – continually reflecting on my values/philosophy and reflecting upon how I speak, write, and listen to, about and with CYP (Begon, 2017)

Table 9: Key learning points and some possible next steps for practice

References

Adams-Hutcheson, G., & Longhurst, R. (2017). 'At least in person there would have been a cup of tea': interviewing via Skype. *Area*, *49*(2), 148-155.

Alam, M. (2013). Banking model of education in teacher-centered class: A critical assessment. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, *3*(15), 27-31.

Altrichter, H. (1993). *Teachers investigate their work : an introduction to the methods of action research*. Routledge.

Atkins, S., Lewin, S., Smith, H., Engel, M., Fretheim, A., & Volmink, J. (2008). Conducting a meta-ethnography of qualitative literature: lessons learnt. *BMC medical research methodology*, *8*(1), 21.

Bae, B. (2009). Children's right to participate–challenges in everyday interactions. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, *17*(3), 391-406.

Bae, B. (2012). Children and teachers as partners in communication: Focus on spacious and narrow interactional patterns. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, *44*(1), 53-69.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination.* University of Texas Press.

Bamberg, M. (2006). Stories: Big or small: Why do we care? *Narrative inquiry*, *16*(1), 139-147.

Barnett-Page, E., & Thomas, J. (2009). Methods for the synthesis of qualitative research: a critical review. *BMC medical research methodology*, *9*(1), 59.

Barrow, W. (2010). Dialogic, Participation and the Potential for Philosophy for Children. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *5*(2), 61-69.

Barrow, W. (2012). *A dialogic exploration of philosophy for children as a participatory tool in a primary classroom.* Newcastle, UK: University of Newcastle.

Barrow, W. (2015). 'I think she's learnt how to sort of let the class speak': Children's perspectives on Philosophy for Children as participatory pedagogy. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *17*, 76-87.

Barrow, W., Barrow, R., & Glockling, T. (2014). Beyond Procedures: a case study from educational psychology. In D. Jindal-Snape (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of personal, professional and interprofessional ethics*. Policy Press.

Barrow, W., & Hannah, E. F. (2012). Using computer-assisted interviewing to consult with children with autism spectrum disorders: An exploratory study. *School Psychology International*, *33*(4), 450-464.

Barrow, W., & Todd, L. (2011). Beyond therapy: Supporting a culture of relational democracy In H. Kennedy, M. Landor, & L. Todd (Eds.), *Video Interaction Guidance: A Relationship-Based Intervention to Promote Attunement, Empathy and Wellbeing*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Bartels, R., Onstenk, J., & Veugelers, W. (2018). Philosophical Enquiry as Part of Democratic Education. *Curriculum and Teaching*, *33*(1), 23-38.

Begon, R. (2017). Critical educational psychology: Using 5 critical questions as a guide for practice. *DECP Debate*, *165*, 43-48.

Begon, R., & Billington, T. (2019). Between category and experience: constructing autism, constructing critical practice. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *35*(2), 184-196.

Beuthin, R. E. (2014). Breathing in the mud: Tensions in narrative interviewing. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *13*(1), 122-134.

Biesta, G. (2007). Education and the democratic person: Towards a political understanding of democratic education. *Teachers College Record*, *109*(3), 740-769.

Biesta, G. (2010). *Good Education in the age of measurement: Ethics, Politics and Democracy.* Routledge.

Billington, T. (2000). *Separating, losing, and excluding children : narratives of difference*. Routledge.

Billington, T. (2006). Working with autistic children and young people: sense, experience and the challenges for services, policies and practices. *Disability & Society*, *21*(1), 1-13.

Birch, M., & Miller, T. (2002). Encouraging participation: Ethics and Responsibilities In M. Mauthner (Ed.), *Ethics in qualitative research*. SAGE.

Blackstock, K., Dinnie, L., Dilley, R., Marshall, K., Dunglinson, J., Trench, H., Harper, K., Finan, K., MacPherson, J., & Johnston, E. (2015). Participatory research to influence participatory governance: managing relationships with planners. *Area*, *47*(3), 254-260.

Bleazby, J. (2006). Autonomy, democratic community, and citizenship in philosophy for children: Dewey and philosophy for children's rejection of the individual/community dualism. *Analytic teaching*, *26*(1), 30-52.

Boland, A., Cherry, G., & Dickson, R. (2017). *Doing a systematic review: A student's guide.* SAGE

Boswell, N., & Woods, K. (2021). Facilitators and barriers of co-production of services with children and young people within education, health and care services. *Educational & Child Psychology*, *38*(2), 41-53.

Bottema-Beutel, K., Kapp, S. K., Lester, J. N., Sasson, N. J., & Hand, B. N. (2021). Avoiding ableist language: Suggestions for autism researchers. *Autism in Adulthood*, *3*(1), 18-29.

Bovill, M., & Anderson, C. (2020). Changing the subject: A community of philosophical inquiry in prisons. *European journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults*, *11*(2), 183-198.

BPS. (2017). *Practice Guidelines* (3rd ed.). The British Psychological Society.

BPS. (2018). *Code of Ethics and Conduct.* The British Psychological Society.

BPS. (2020). *Considerations for psychologists working with children and young people using online video platforms.* The British Psychological Society.

Bradshaw, P., Pickett, C., van Driel, M. L., Brooker, K., & Urbanowicz, A. (2021). 'Autistic' or 'with autism'? *Australian Journal of General Practice*, *50*(3), 104-108.

Britten, N., Campbell, R., Pope, C., Donovan, J., Morgan, M., & Pill, R. (2002). Using meta ethnography to synthesise qualitative research: a worked example. *Journal of health services research & policy*, *7*(4), 209-215.

Brownlee, J., Curtis, E., Davey Chesters, S., Cobb-Moore, C., Spooner-Lane, R., Whiteford, C., & Tait, G. (2014). Pre-service teachers' epistemic perspectives about philosophy in the classroom: it is not a bunch of 'hippie stuff'. *Teachers and Teaching*, *20*(2), 170-188.

Burr, V. (2004). *Social constructionism* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Carter, S. (2010). Enacting Internal Coherence: As a path to Quality in Qualitative inquiry. In J. Higgs, N. Cherry, R. Macklin, & R. Ajjawi (Eds.), *Researching Practice: A discourse on Qualitative methodologies* (pp. 143-153). Sense Publishers.

Cassidy, C., Christie, D., Marwick, H., Deeney, L., McLean, G., & Rogers, K. (2018). Fostering Citizenship in Marginalised Children through Participation in Community of Philosophical Inquiry. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *13*(2), 120-132.

Cassidy, C., & Heron, G. (2018). Breaking into secure: Introducing philosophical discussions to young people in secure accommodation. *Journal of Social Work*, *20*(3), 287-306.

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 & Behavioural Difficulties*, *23*(1), 81-96.

Cater, J. K. (2011). Skype a cost-effective method for qualitative research. *Rehabilitation Counselors & Educators Journal*, *4*(2), 3.

Christensen, P., & Prout, A. (2002). Working with ethical symmetry in social research with children. *Childhood*, *9*(4), 477-497.

Clandinin, J. (2018). Reflections from a narrative inquiry researcher. *LEARNing Landscapes*, *11*(2), 17-23.

Clark, J. (2004). Participatory research with children and young people: philosophy, possibilities and perils. *Action Research Expeditions*, *4*(11), 1-18.

Cohen, L. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.

Conn, C. (2018). Pedagogical intersubjectivity, autism and education: can teachers teach so that autistic pupils learn? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *22*(6), 594-605.

Cook, T. (2011). Authentic Voice: The Role of Methodology and Method in Transformational Research In G. Czerniawski & W. Kidd (Eds.), *The Student Voice Handbook: Bridging the Academic / Practitioner Divide* (pp. 307-321). Emerald Group.

Craig, C. J. (2011). Narrative inquiry in teaching and teacher education. In *Narrative inquiries into curriculum making in teacher education*. Emerald Group.

Cridland, E. K., Jones, S. C., Caputi, P., & Magee, C. A. (2015). Qualitative research with families living with autism spectrum disorder: Recommendations for conducting semistructured interviews. *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability*, *40*(1), 78-91.

Cross, J., & Kennedy, H. (2011). How and Why does ViG work? In H. Kennedy, M. Landor, & L. todd (Eds.), *Video Interaction Guidance: A relationship-based intervention to promote attunement, empathy and wellbeing*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Crossley, M. (2000). *Introducing Narrative Psychology*. Open University Press.

Czerniawski, G., & Garlick, S. (2011). Trust, Contextual Sensitivity and Student Voice. In G. Czerniawski & W. Kidd (Eds.), *The Student Voice Handbook: Bridging Academic / Practitoner Divide.* Emerald Group.

Darlaston-Jones, D. (2007). Making connections: The relationship between epistemology and research methods. *The Australian Community Psychologist*, *19*(1), 19-27.

Davidson, J., & Henderson, V. L. (2010). 'Coming out' on the spectrum: autism, identity and disclosure. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *11*(2), 155-170.

Den-Heijer, A. (2018). *Nothing you don't already know: Remarkable reminders about meaning, purpose, and self-realization*. On-Demand Publishing, LLC.

Di Masi, D., & Santi, M. (2016). Learning democratic thinking: a curriculum to philosophy for children as citizens. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *48*(1), 136-150.

Doucet, A., & Mauthner, N. (2002). Knowing Responsibly: Linking Ethics, Research Practice and Epistemology. In M. Mauthner, M. Birch, J. Jessop, & T. Miller (Eds.), *Ethics in Qualitative Research*. SAGE.

Douglas, L., Usher, K., Woods, C., & Jackson, D. (2019). Potential challenges of using narrative inquiry with at-risk young people. *Nurse Researcher*, *29*(2).

Duncombe, J., & Jessop, J. (2003). 'Doing Rapport' and the ethics of 'Faking Friendship'. In M. Mauthner, M. Birch, J. Jessop, & T. Miller (Eds.), *Ethics in Qualitative Research.* Palgrave Macmillian.

Dunlop, L., Compton, K., Clarke, L., & McKelvey-Martin, V. (2015). Child-led enquiry in primary science. *Education 3-13*, *43*(5), 462-481.

Education Endowment Foundation. (2015). *Philosophy for Children: Evaluation report and Executive summary*. Durham, UK: University of Durham.

Emerson, P., & Frosh, S. (2004). *Critical Narrative Analysis in Psychology.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Engel, S. (2005). Narrative analysis of children's experience. In S. Greene & D. Hogan (Eds.), *Researching children's experience : methods and approaches.* (pp. 199-217). SAGE.

Fielding, M. (2001). Beyond the rhetoric of student voice: New departures or new constraints in the transformation of 21st century schooling. *Forum for Promoting 3-19 Comprehensive Education*, *43*(2), 100-110.

Fisher, R. (2007). Dialogic teaching: Developing thinking and metacognition through philosophical discussion. *Early Child Development and Care*, *177*(6-7), 615-631.

France, E. F., Ring, N., Thomas, R., Noyes, J., Maxwell, M., & Jepson, R. (2014). A methodological systematic review of what's wrong with meta-ethnography reporting. *BMC medical research methodology*, *14*(1), 119.

France, E. F., Uny, I., Ring, N., Turley, R. L., Maxwell, M., Duncan, E. A., Jepson, R. G., Roberts, R. J., & Noyes, J. (2019). A methodological systematic review of meta-ethnography conduct to articulate the complex analytical phases. *BMC medical research methodology*, *19*(1), 35.

Fraser, N. (2001). Recognition without ethics? In *Theory, Culture & Society* (Vol. 18, pp. 21-42). Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* Herder and Herder. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/64a7/9f89a714dc4d2d845597bb342a72443ace71.pdf

Galton, M., & McBeath, J. (2008). *Teachers Under Pressure.* SAGE

Gasparatou, R., & Ergazaki, M. (2015). Students' Views about Their Participation in a Philosophy Program. *Creative Education*, *6*(08), 726.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. Basic books.

Georgakopoulou, A. (2006). Thinking big with small stories in narrative and identity analysis. *Narrative inquiry*, *16*(1), 122-130.

Gergen, K. (2005). Narrative, Moral Identity and Historical Consciousness: a Social Constructionist Account. In J. Straub (Ed.), *Narration, identity, and historical consciousness* (pp. 99-119). Berghahn Books.

Gergen, K. (2015). *Relational being : beyond self and community*. Oxford University Press.

Gibbs, S. (2018a). *The assault on teachers' identities, autonomy and efficacy or Can education in a troubled world help us in becoming human?* DECP Annual Conference 2018: Education and Well-Being., Jurys Inn Brighton Waterfront. https://eprints.ncl.ac.uk/245037

Gibbs, S. (2018b). The Immorality of Education: A Position Paper for Educational Psychologists. *Educational & Child Psychology*, *35*(3), 86-96.

Gibbs, S., Beckmann, J. F., Elliott, J., Metsäpelto, R.-L., Vehkakoski, T., & Aro, M. (2020). What's in a name: the effect of category labels on teachers' beliefs. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *35*(1), 115-127.

Gibbs, S., & Powell, B. (2012). Teacher efficacy and pupil behaviour: The structure of teachers' individual and collective beliefs and their relationship with numbers of pupils excluded from school. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *82*(4), 564-584.

Gillies, V., & Alldred, P. (2003). The ethics of intention: research as a political tool. In M. Mauthner, M. Birch, J. Jessop, & T. Miller (Eds.), *Ethics in Qualitative Research* SAGE.

Gilling, J. A. (2012). 'When the powerfulness isn't so helpful': Callum's relationship with autism. *Educational and Child Psychology*, *29*(2), 32.

Glashan, L., Mackay, G., & Grieve, A. (2004). Teachers' experience of support in the mainstream education of pupils with autism. *Improving Schools*, *7*(1), 49-60.

Golby, M., & Appleby, R. (1995). Reflective practice through critical friendship: Some possibilities. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *25*(2), 149-160.

Goodall, C. (2020). *Understanding the voices and educational experiences of Autistic young people: from research to practice.* Routledge

Goodley, D. (2007). Towards socially just pedagogies: Deleuzoguattarian critical disability studies. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *11*(3), 317-334.

Goodley, D., & Billington, T. (2017). Critical Educational Psychology and Disability Studies: Theoretical, Practical and Empirical Allies In A. Williams, T. Billington, D. Goodley, & T. Corcoran (Eds.), *Critical Educational Psychology*. Wiley.

Gorard, S., Siddiqui, N., & See, B. H. (2017). Can 'Philosophy for Children'improve primary school attainment? *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *51*(1), 5-22.

Gray, C. (1994). *Comic strip conversations: Illustrated interactions that teach conversation skills to students with autism and related disorders*. Future Horizons Inc.

Gray, L. (2018). Exploring how and why young people use social networking sites. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *34*(2), 175-194.

Griffin, K. M. (2019). Participatory Research Interviewing Practices with Children. In A. Eckhoff (Ed.), *Participatory Research with Young Children.* (Vol. 17, pp. 55-73). Springer.

Groundwater-Smith, S., & Mockler, N. (2007). Ethics in practitioner research: An issue of quality. *Research Papers in Education*, *22*(2), 199-211.

Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research. *Qualitative inquiry*, *10*(2), 261-280.

Gurevitch, Z. (2000). Plurality in dialogue: A comment on Bakhtin. *Sociology*, *34*(2), 243-263.

Hardman, M., & Delafield, B. (2010). Philosophy for Children as dialogic teaching. In K. Littleton & C. Howe (Eds.), *Educational Dialogues: Understanding and promoting positive interaction.* Routledge

Hardy, J., & Hobbs, C. (2017). The future: Where next for educational psychologists? In J. Hardy & C. Hobbs (Eds.), *Using qualitative research to hear the voice of children and young people.* (pp. 174-183). The British Psychological Society

Hart, R. A. (2008). Stepping back from 'The ladder': Refl ections on a model of participatory work with children. In *Participation and learning* (pp. 19-31). Springer.

Haynes, J., & Murris, K. (2011). The provocation of an epistemological shift in teacher education through philosophy with children. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *45*(2), 285-303.

Haynes, J., & Murris, K. (2013). The realm of meaning: imagination, narrative and playfulness in philosophical exploration with young children. *Early Child Development and Care*, *183*(8), 1084-1100.

HCPC. (2015). *Standards of Proficiency; Practitioner Psychologists.* Health & Care Professions Council.

HCPC. (2016). *Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics.* Health & Care Professions Council.

Hibberd, F. J. (2005). *Unfolding social constructionism.* Springer.

Hiles, D., & Cermák, I. (2017). Narrative Psychology. In C. Willig & W. Stainton Rogers (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in psychology* (Second edition.. ed., pp. 147-164). SAGE.

Hill, M. (2005). Ethical considerations in researching children's experiences. In S. Greene & D. Hogan (Eds.), *Researching children's experience : methods and approaches* (pp. 61-87). SAGE.

Hill, M. (2006). Children's voices on ways of having a voice: Children's and young people's perspectives on methods used in research and consultation. *Childhood*, *13*(1), 69-89.

Howe, K., & Eisenhart, M. (1990). Standards for qualitative (and quantitative) research: A prolegomenon. *Educational researcher*, *19*(4), 2-9.

Humphrey, N., & Lewis, S. (2008). Make me normal' The views and experiences of pupils on the autistic spectrum in mainstream secondary schools. *Autism*, *12*(1), 23-46.

Jenkins, P., & Lyle, S. (2010). Enacting Dialogue: The Impact of Promoting Philosophy for Children on the Literate Thinking of Identified Poor Readers, Aged 10. *Language and education*, *24*(6), 459-472.

Kay, D. (2019). On the participation of children with medical conditions in risk assessment: a case for development of self-advocacy. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *35*(4).

Kennedy, N., & Kennedy, D. (2011). Community of philosophical inquiry as a discursive structure, and its role in school curriculum design. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *45*(2), 265-283.

Kenny, L., Hattersley, C., Molins, B., Buckley, C., Povey, C., & Pellicano, E. (2016). Which terms should be used to describe autism? Perspectives from the UK autism community. *Autism*, *20*(4), 442-462.

Kindon, S., Pain, R., & Kesby, M. (2007). *Participatory action research approaches and methods: Connecting people, participation and place* (Vol. 22). Routledge.

Kumpulainen, K., & Lipponen, L. (2010). Productive interaction as agentic participation in dialogic enquiry. In K. Littleton & C. Howe (Eds.), *Educational Dialogues: Understanding and promoting productive interaction.* Routledge.

Kumpulainen, K., & Rajala, A. (2017). Dialogic teaching and students' discursive identity negotiation in the learning of science. *Learning and Instruction*, *48*, 23-31.

Lamb, W. (2015). Philosophy for Children and the 'whole child'. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, *2*(2).

Lambirth, A. (2006). Challenging the laws of talk: ground rules, social reproduction and the curriculum. *The Curriculum Journal*, *17*(1), 59-71.

LeCompte, M. (2015). Ethical Problems of Interpretation in Educational Research. In P. Smeyers, D. Bridges, N. C. Burbules, & M. Griffiths (Eds.), *International handbook of interpretation in educational research.* Springer.

Leftstein, A. (2010). More helpful as problem than solution: Some implications of situating dialogue in classrooms. In K. Littleton & C. Howe (Eds.), *Educational dialogues: Understanding and promoting productive interactions* (pp. 170-191). Routledge.

Liamputtong, P. (2007). *Researching the vulnerable: a guide to sensitive research methods.* SAGE.

Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R., & Zilber, T. (1998). *Narrative Research: Reading, analysis and Interpretation.* SAGE Publications.

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

Littleton, K., & Mercer, N. (2013). *Interthinking: Putting talk to work*. Routledge.

Lobe, B. (2017). Best Practices for Synchronous Online Focus Groups. In R. S. Barbour & D. L. Morgan (Eds.), *A New Era in Focus Group Research: Challenges, Innovation and Practice* (pp. 227-250). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-58614-8_11

Lodge, C. (2005). From hearing voices to engaging in dialogue: Problematising student participation in school improvement. *Journal of Educational Change*, *6*(2), 125-146.

Lombardo, M. V., & Baron-Cohen, S. (2011). The role of the self in mindblindness in autism. *Consciousness and cognition*, *20*(1), 130-140.

Lundy, L., McEvoy, L., & Byrne, B. (2011). Working with young children as co-researchers: An approach informed by the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Early education & development*, *22*(5), 714-736.

Lyle, S. (2008). Dialogic teaching: Discussing theoretical contexts and reviewing evidence from classroom practice. *Language and education*, *22*(3), 222-240.

Lyons, R., & Roulstone, S. (2018). Listening to the voice of children with developmental speech and language disorders using narrative inquiry: Methodological considerations. *Journal of communication disorders*, *72*, 16-25.

Lysaker, J. T., & Furuness, S. (2011). Space for transformation: Relational, dialogic pedagogy. *Journal of Transformative Education*, *9*(3), 183-197.

Macleod, G. (2006). Bad, mad or sad: constructions of young people in trouble and implications for interventions. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, *11*(3), 155-167.

Macmurray, J. (2012). Learning to be human. *Oxford Review of Education, 38*(6), 661-674.

Madriaga, M., & Goodley, D. (2010). Moving beyond the minimum: Socially just pedagogies and Asperger's syndrome in UK higher education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *14*(2), 115-131.

Mauthner, N. S., & Doucet, A. (2003). Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in qualitative data analysis. *Sociology*, *37*(3), 413-431.

Mayan, M. J., & Daum, C. H. (2016). Worth the risk? Muddled relationships in community-based participatory research. *Qualitative Health Research*, *26*(1), 69-76.

McGuire, A. (2012). Representing autism: A sociological examination of autism advocacy. *Atlantis: Critical Studies in Gender, Culture & Social Justice*, *35*(2), 62-71.

McLeoud, N. (2016). Education as a philosophical endeavour In B. Anderson (Ed.), *Philosophy for children: Theories and praxis in teacher education*. Taylor & Francis.

McManus, D. A. (2001). The two paradigms of education and the peer review of teaching. *Journal of Geoscience Education*, *49*(5), 423-434.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self and Society*. University of Chicago Press.

Mello, R. A. (2002). Collocation analysis: A method for conceptualizing and understanding narrative data. *Qualitative research*, *2*(2), 231-243.

Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and the development of children's thinking: a sociocultural approach.* Routledge.

Merriam, S. (2009). Qualitative Research. In V. Anfara & N. Mertz (Eds.), *Theoretical Frameworks in Qualitative Research*. SAGE.

Meyer, J., & Land, R. (2003). *Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: Linkages to ways of thinking and practising within the disciplines.* ETL Project: University of Edinburgh.

Meyrick, J. (2006). What is good qualitative research? A first step towards a comprehensive approach to judging rigour/quality. *Journal of health psychology*, *11*(5), 799-808.

Michalik, K. (2019). Teacher and learner perspectives on philosophical discussion – uncertainty as a challenge and opportunity. *Childhood & Philosophy*, *15*, 1-20.

Mogensen, L., & Mason, J. (2015). The meaning of a label for teenagers negotiating identity: Experiences with autism spectrum disorder. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, *37*(2), 255-269.

Monk, G., Winslade, J., Crocket, K., & Epston, D. (1997). *Narrative therapy in practice: The archaeology of hope*. Jossey-Bass.

Morgan, A. (2000). *What is narrative therapy?* Publications Adelaide.

Mueller, R. A. (2013). *Models of organizational values in the administration of University student services.* Canada: University of Saskatchewan.

Mueller, R. A. (2019). Episodic narrative interview: Capturing stories of experience with a methods fusion. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *18*, 1-11.

Muhonen, H., Rasku-Puttonen, H., Pakarinen, E., Poikkeus, A.-M., & Lerkkanen, M.-K. (2016). Scaffolding through dialogic teaching in early school classrooms. *Teaching and teacher education*, *55*, 143-154.

Murray, M. (2008). Narrative Psychology. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative Psychology: a practical guide to research methods* (2 ed., pp. 111-132). SAGE.

Murris, K. (2008). Philosophy with children, the stingray and the educative value of disequilibrium. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *42*(3-4), 667-685.

Murris, K. (2013). The epistemic challenge of hearing child's voice. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *32*(3), 245-259.

Ness, M. (2019). When Students Generate Questions: Participatory-Based Reading Instruction in Elementary Classrooms. In A. Eckhoff (Ed.), *Participatory Research with Young Children* (Vol. 17). Springer.

Noblit, G. W., & Hare, R. D. (1988). *Meta-ethnography: Synthesizing qualitative studies.* SAGE.

O'Riordan, N. (2015). Implementing P4C in the primary classroom: Some fuzzy predictions. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, *2*(2).

O'Riordan, N. (2016). Swimming against the tide: philosophy for children as counter-cultural practice. *Education 3-13*, *44*(6), 648-660.

O'Connor, H., Shaw, R., Clare, M., & Wellens, J. (2008). Internet-based interviewing In N. Fielding, R. M. Lee, & G. Blank (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of online research methods*. SAGE

Palaganas, E. C., Sanchez, M. C., Molintas, V. P., & Caricativo, R. D. (2017). Reflexivity in qualitative research: A journey of learning. *Qualitative Report*, *22*(2).

Parker, R. (2013). Educational psychology practice as research: a little regarded aspect of Cyril burt's legacy. *Educational & Child Psychology*, *30*(3), 84-95.

Petrie, K., Burrows, L., & Cosgriff, M. (2014). Building a community of collaborative inquiry: A pathway to re-imagining practice in health and physical education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *39*(2), 4.

Prilleltensky, I., & Nelson, G. (2010). *Community Psychology - In pursuit of liberation and wellbeing.* Palgrave Macmillian.

Punch, S. (2002). Research with children: The same or different from research with adults? *Childhood*, *9*(3), 321-341.

Quarmby, T., Daly-Smith, A., & Kime, N. (2019). 'You get some very archaic ideas of what teaching is…': primary school teachers' perceptions of the barriers to physically active lessons. *Education 3-13*, *47*(3), 308-321.

Renshaw, P. D. (2004). Dialogic learning, teaching and instruction. In J. Linden & P. Renshaw (Eds.), *Dialogic learning* (pp. 1-15). Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative analysis. Qualitative Research Methods*. SAGE.

Robson, C. (2011). *Real World Research* (3 ed.). Wiley.

Roesch-Marsh, A. (2014). 'Out of control': making sense of the behaviour of young people referred to secure accommodation. *British Journal of Social Work*, *44*(2), 197-213.

Roffey, S. (2011). *Developing Positive Relationships in Schools.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-2147-0_9

Rolfe, G. (2006). Validity, trustworthiness and rigour: quality and the idea of qualitative research. *Journal of advanced nursing*, *53*(3), 304-310.

Sainsbury, C. (2010). *Martian in the Playground: Understanding the Schoolchild with Aspergers Syndrome.* SAGE.

Sampson, E. (2008). *Celebrating the Other: A dialogic account of human nature.* Taos Institute Publications.

Samra, H. (2016). *A narrative exploration of sense-making, self, and identity in young people diagnosed with an autism spectrum condition.* Birmingham, UK: University of Birmingham.

Sanderson, H. (2000). *Person-centred planning: Key features and approaches.* Joseph Rowntree Foundation. http://www.familiesleadingplanning.co.uk/Documents/PCP%20Key%20Features%20and%20Styles.pdf

Saunders, P. (2018). Neurodivergent rhetorics: Examining competing discourses of autism advocacy in the public sphere. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, *12*(1), 1-17.

Scholl, R. (2014). " Inside-out Pedagogy": Theorising Pedagogical Transformation through Teaching Philosophy. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *39*(6), 7.

Scholl, R., Nichols, K., & Burgh, G. (2016). Connecting Learning to the World beyond the Classroom through Collaborative Philosophical Inquiry. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *44*(5), 436-454.

Schulze, J., Winter, L. A., Woods, K., & Tyldesley, K. (2017). Investigating the significance of social justice in educational psychology practice–A systematic literature review. *Educational and Child Psychology*, *34*(3), 57-73.

Sharp, R. (2014). Ready, steady, action: what enables young people to perceive themselves as active agents in their lives? *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *30*(4), 347-364.

Skalin, L.-Å. (2017). Turning Life into Stories - Turning Stories into Lives. In B. Schiff, A. E. McKim, & S. Patron (Eds.), *Life and narrative : the risks and responsibilities of storying experience*. Oxford University Press.

Smith, B., & Sparkes, A. C. (2006). Narrative inquiry in psychology: Exploring the tensions within. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(3), 169-192.

Smith, J. (2017). Negotiating meaning in classrooms: P4C as an exemplar of dialogic pedagogy. In B. Anderson (Ed.), *Philosophy for Children: Theories and praxis in teacher education.* Routledge.

Snell, J., & Lefstein, A. (2018). "Low ability," participation, and identity in dialogic pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *55*(1), 40-78.

Squire, C. (2013). From experience-centred to socioculturally oriented approaches to narrative. In M. Andrews, C. Squire, & M. Tamboukou (Eds.), *Doing narrative research* (2 ed., pp. 47–71). SAGE.

Stalker, K., & Connors, C. (2003). Communicating with disabled children. *Adoption & Fostering*, *27*(1), 26-35.

Stanley, S., & Lyle, S. (2017). Philosophical play in the early years classroom In M. Gregory, J. Haynes, & K. Murris (Eds.), *The Routledge International Handbook of Philosophy for Children* (pp. 53-63). Routledge

Tabak, I., & Weinstock, M. (2011). If there is no one right answer?: The epistemological implications of classroom interactions. In J. Brownlee, G. Schraw, & D. Berthelsen (Eds.), *Personal epistemology and teacher education* (pp. 180–194). Routledge.

Tellis-James, C., & Fox, M. (2017). The stories young people with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD) tell about their futures In J. Hardy & C. Hobbs (Eds.), *Using qualitative research to hear the voice of children and young people*. The British Psychological Society.

Ten Dam, G., Volman, M., & Wardekker, W. (2004). Making sense through participation: Social Differences in Learning and Identity Development. In J. Lindon & P. Renshaw (Eds.), *Dialogic Learning*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Test, D. W., Fowler, C. H., Wood, W. M., Brewer, D. M., & Eddy, S. (2005). A conceptual framework of self-advocacy for students with disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, *26*(1), 43-54.

Topping, K. J., & Trickey, S. (2007). Collaborative Philosophical Enquiry for School Children: Cognitive Effects at 10-12 Years. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *77*(2), 271-288.

Treweek, C., Wood, C., Martin, J., & Freeth, M. (2019). Autistic people's perspectives on stereotypes: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Autism*, *23*(3), 759-769.

Tutt, R., Powell, S., & Thornton, M. (2006). Educational approaches in autism: What we know about what we do. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *22*(1), 69-81.

UNESCO. (2007). *Philosophy, a school of freedom: teaching philosophy and learning to philosophize; status and prospects.* United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization: Social and Human Sciences Sector.

UNESCO. (2011). *Recommendations on the Teaching of Philosophy in Europe and North America.* United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. http://www.portalefilosofico.com/portale/unesco_mi_2011.pdf

Urbach, J., & Banerjee, R. (2019). Participatory Research with Young Children from Special Populations: Issues and Recommendations. In A. Eckhoff (Ed.), *Participatory Research with Young Children* (Vol. 17). Springer.

Van der Riet, M. (2008). Participatory research and the philosophy of social science: Beyond the moral imperative. *Qualitative inquiry, 14*(4), 546-565.

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.

Verschueren, K., & Koomen, H. M. (2012). Teacher–child relationships from an attachment perspective. *Attachment & human development*, *14*(3), 205-211.

Vogt, F. (2002). A caring teacher: Explorations into primary school teachers' professional identity and ethic of care. *Gender and education*, *14*(3), 251-264.

Walsh, D., & Downe, S. (2006). Appraising the quality of qualitative research. *Midwifery*, *22*(2), 108-119.

Walther, S., & Carey, M. (2009). Narrative therapy, difference and possibility: Inviting new becomings. *Context*, *105*, 3-8.

Walther, S., & Fox, H. (2012). Narrative therapy and outsider witness practice: Teachers as a community of acknowledgement. *Educational & Child Psychology*, *29*(2), 8-17.

Wegerif, R. (2007). *Dialogic education and technology: Expanding the space of learning* (Vol. 7). Springer Science & Business Media.

Wegerif, R. (2011). Towards a dialogic theory of how children learn to think. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *6*(3), 179-190.

Westcott, H., & Littleton, K. (2005). Exploring meaning in interviews with children. In S. Greene & D. Hogan (Eds.), *Researching children's experience: Approaches and Method*. SAGE.

Willig, C. (2012). *Qualitative Interpretation and Analysis in Psychology*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Willig, C. (2013). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Winstone, N., Huntington, C., Goldsack, L., Kyrou, E., & Millward, L. (2014). Eliciting rich dialogue through the use of activity-oriented interviews: Exploring self-identity in autistic young people. *Childhood*, *21*(2), 190-206.

Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., Den Brok, P., Wijsman, L., Mainhard, T., & Van Tartwijk, J. (2014). Teacher–student relationships and classroom management. In *Handbook of classroom management*. Routledge.

Zembylas, M. (2019). A Butlerian perspective on inclusion: the importance of embodied ethics, recognition and relationality in inclusive education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *49*(6), 727-740.

Zulkifli, H., & Hashim, R. (2020). Philosophy for Children (P4C) in Improving Critical Thinking in a Secondary Moral Education Class. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *19*(2), 29-45.

Appendix A: Search Terms and Databases

The search terms and databases used to yield the five papers for the SLR.

Paper	Database	Search date	Search Terms
Cassidy and Heron (2018)	ERIC EBSCO • No. of results after 'peer reviewed', 'academic literature', 'published in English' were selected: 138 papers → No. of results after eliminating based upon relevance and whether it was an empirical paper: 6 papers • Updated inclusion/exclusion criteria and PICOSS Table applied to the 6 papers → Cassidy and Heron (2018) met the criteria.	15.8.19	• "philosoph* inquiry", "philosoph* enquiry", "philosoph* learning", "philosoph* education", "critical dialogical exchange" • "children", "adolescents", "youth", "child", "teenager" • "engagement", "motivation", "involvement, "participation"
Dunlop, Compton, Clarke, and McKelvey-Martin (2015)	ERIC EBSCO • No. of results after 'peer reviewed', 'academic literature', 'published in English' were selected: 174 papers → No. of results after eliminating based upon relevance and whether it is an empirical paper: 3 papers • Updated inclusion/exclusion criteria and PICOSS Table applied to the 3 papers → Dunlop, Compton, Clarke, and McKelvey-Martin (2015) met the criteria.	27.8.19	• "philosoph* inquiry", "philosoph* enquiry", "philosoph* learning", "philosoph* education", "communities of practice", "community of philosophical inquiry", "community of philosophical enquiry", "educational philosophy", "thinking skills" • "Cooperative Learning", "Experiential Learning", "Problem Based Learning", "Student Participation" • "Learning Motivation", "Self-Motivation", "Student Attitudes", "Student Satisfaction", "Student Motivation", "Student Participation", "Academic Freedom", "Learner Engagement" • "Elementary school", "primary school", "grade school", "secondary school"

Barrow (2015)	Scopus • No. of results after 'peer reviewed', 'academic literature', 'published in English' were selected: 110 papers → No. of results after eliminating based upon relevance and whether it is an empirical paper: 2 papers • Inclusion/Exclusion criteria and PICOSS Table applied to the 2 papers → Barrow (2015) met the criteria.	12.9.19	• "collaborative philosophical inquiry", "philosophical inquiry", "philosophical enquiry" • "Critical pedagogy", "Learner-centred pedagogy", "Inclus*", "inclusive culture", "Inquiry learning", "Inquiry pedagogy", "Inquiry pedagogy intervention", "Inquiry curriculum-based intervention" • "Inquiry behaviours", "Social outcomes", "Learning attitudes", "Learning behaviours", "Learning preferences", "Attitude", "Motivation", "Engagement", "Creativity", "Autonomy", "Participation"
Michalik (2019)	Reference Harvesting: Used the 'cited by' option in Scopus for Barrow (2015) and found Michalik (2019). This research met the inclusion/exclusion criteria.	12.9.19	Key words associated with Barrow (2015) & Michalik (2019): • "Philosophy for Children", "philosophizing", "theory of education" • "Democracy", "Dialogic", "Dialogue" • "Epistemic injustice", "Participation", "Pupil 'voice'" • "uncertainty"
Gasparatou and Ergazaki (2015)	Reference Harvesting: Gasparatou and Ergazaki (2015) found when searching references from Michalik (2019). This research met the inclusion/exclusion criteria.	13.9.19	Key words associated with Michalik (2019) & Gasparatou and Ergazaki (2015): • "philosophizing", "theory of education", "Philosophy Sessions", "Philosophy for/with Children" • "uncertainty" • "High School" • "Phenomenological Study"

Appendix B: Phase Three of the SLR

Phase 3 of the SLR: 1st order and 2nd order construct extraction.

Barrow, W. (2010). Dialogic, participation and the potential for Philosophy for Children. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 5(2), 61-69.	
2nd order	**1st order**
Right to express opinion (main theme)	"because in other lessons you don't get to speak your opinion that much" (child)" "if you say something you can never be wrong so…coz it's your own opinion…other people might think you're wrong but it doesn't matter because it's your own opinion"
Equally sharing/collaboration and responding to other people's opinions (subtheme)	"she [the teacher] has the right to express her own opinion like us" (child) "it was quite hard because some people had own view and other people had the other view" (child) "I just think, other peoples opinions… that not every opinion is right, but you don't really want to say that." (child)
Managing challenges (subtheme)	"I've got better at like… well saying my own opinion and stuff like that. And erm… like, listening to all the other people, even if they've got something different to say… it's like philosophy has helped us understand the things and do like more talking and talk to other people and understand their opinions and stuff like that . . . to link to other people's opinions and what to think, how to link them together" (child) "They've gained like, how to discuss things with people . . .how to agree and disagree . . .like how to express yourself. . . like not being offensive." (child)
Respecting your own and others opinions / working together (subtheme)	"In Philosophy you kind of have to work in a sort of a group with the rest of the class to respect your own opinion and come up with new ideas." (child)
Changes in behaviour from CYP who had previously been disruptive (subtheme)	"now the boys aren't being that silly on the space because they actually have something to say. . . X was messing about in it but since Philosophy he's just stopped coz he... coz he thinks he can state his own opinion any time." (child)
Supporting talk (main theme) – need for support	"It's like one of the lessons where I need quite a bit of help to know what to say and stuff." (child)
Worry about talking in front of others (subtheme)	"they were nervous to speak." (child) "Well, sometimes when they've said the wrong thing they think, "Oh I regret saying that." (child)
Facilitation from others/support from peers/specific strategies used by peers (subtheme)	"Every time I got help it taught me something else that I could like say or do." (child) "yeah I think I learnt to work well with others a bit more and like... not be scared to just say what I think." (child) "it helps by just talking to each other and saying, "It's fine that moment's passed" and then you can try and do it again" (child) "I said 'what we're saying is…' that helped her." (child) "They said like, simplified it and said erm what erm, I could have said . . . and what like other people had said and stuff." (child)
Teacher clarification (subtheme)	"she understands you and explains it even better to the class" (child)
Democratic support/change in teacher approach… teacher learning about children and learning through children (subtheme)	"Well she's been watching us like, asking us during the discussion when she's like passing on the discussion...." (child) "learned a little bit about us because we're like confident to speak. Or like, we're a little bit shy." (child) "I think she's learnt how to sort of let the class speak instead of... she's speaking all the time." (child)
Ground rules … thinking time … no hands up – different views about the implementation of these rules (subtheme)	"rules stop people thinking others are mean." (child) "even if they don't have anything to say she'll ask them a question to see if they do have anything to say. And if they don't, and if they can't think of anything they have thinking time where we go to some other people and then come back to them. And they normally could have an answer by then." (child)

	"I enjoyed the no-hands rule because well everybody got their turn because they just said it." (child) "we like learnt to pass the discussion on with the no-hands up rule" (child) "with the no hands up rule we've got the freedom just to go and talk and state our own opinion." (child) "No hands up rule lost one speaking at a time." (child) "when we did no-hands up, and then, when the next day, people would like shout out....... it wasn't like fair on them because they were used to not putting their hands up." (child) "Well the no hands up rule, is kind of annoying because, it's annoying because every now and then you just put your hand up because... you've been stuck into that rule so long and then, you just suddenly have to get out of it." (child)
Skills to pass discussion on and make connections (subtheme)	-
Teacher support for specific children – partiality (subtheme)	"I know they need to learn but she'll stick with them as... like a dog, as a pet, and it's like she like constantly asks them and stuff like that." (child)
Control of talk (main theme) – control exercised by pupils, exercised by teacher and equity	"it was nice for everybody to speak because normally erm. . . no offence to Miss xx because she's the teacher but she... normally talks a lot and we don't get enough chance to speak so it was nice." (child) "I thought it was really good because everybody was taking part." (child) "felt like more people were involved." (child)
New voices being heard (subtheme)	"Well, sometimes Miss XXX doesn't actually go to everyone, but with the no hands rule you can jump in at the very last minute and say what you have to say." (child) "because he usually sticks his hand up and he hardly ever gets picked so now he can just like say stuff" (child)
Teacher stance – shift in position/shift in pattern of talk (subtheme)	"she's started to climb down." (child) "I think she was with people" (child_ *(children used a visual tool to express this)* "like we're on our own to like, just to move the discussion on." (child) "No-one's in charge it just depends who stops speaking and it depends on who starts speaking. And after that we just sort of listen." (child) "She's [teacher] less in charge." (child)
Challenging the teacher – different views (subtheme)	"Well not like cheeky but wrong. To do that to the teacher." (child)
Dominant voices/dominant friends (subtheme)	"some people might keep speaking and speaking … and other people might just like not say anything." (child) "when we had no-hands up it was just going back to her [a pupil] constantly… And it was like, coz I was sitting here and she was sitting there, and all you could hear was going vibration... in my ear of XXX speaking." (child) "obviously I don't tell her that I thought 'You talk too much.' Coz I don't want me and her to break up as friends." (child)

Dunlop, L., Compton, K., Clarke, L., & McKelvey-Martin, V. (2015). Child-led enquiry in primary science. *Education 3-13, 43*(5), 462-481.

2nd order	1st order
Learning	"I found it a better way to learn." (child) "The scientific enquiry classes have helped me to learn more about science." (child) "I have really enjoyed learning a lot about scientific enquiry. It has really made me think a lot. It was wonderful doing them with my friends so we can discuss them together." (child)
Developing scientific questioning / vocabulary / understanding / making observations	"with poor literacy skills demonstrated great oracy and understanding" (teacher) "CoSE has developed children's scientific knowledge very well. Children are retaining knowledge much better and can relay it orally several weeks after doing enquiry sessions. They have brought in research on Richard Branson and the Montgolfier brothers off their own back." (teacher)

Learning beyond the classroom	"I loved all of the classes. I would try them at home because they made me think about science." (child)
	"Now I am looking forward to science next year in high school." (child)
	"We found out stuff and you could show your parents at home." (child)
Enjoyment	"Science is really exciting and fun. I wish I could do loads more!" (child)
	"I very much enjoyed [CoSE] and think it was a very good idea as the normal lessons in primary school don't include science." (child)
	"I really enjoyed the lessons and I had fun because you were allowed to talk and discuss your answers and opinions." (child)
Interest	"All of the classes were very interesting and brilliant." (child)
	"Doing these experiments has made me more interested in science. Science is now one of my favourite subjects. I've enjoyed working in groups so we can share our ideas." (child)
Engagement & motivation Keen to participate	"The best thing was pupil engagement and ability to discuss and listen. It really challenged them to think." (teacher)
	"I loved the experiments that caught the children's attention. The questions developed were also fantastic. They carried out extra individual research at home without prompting, cheered when they were told we were doing another session and asked fantastic questions. I loved this and so did the children." (teacher)
	"The class in general have become more motivated by the enquiry lessons. They are keen to participate. It has encouraged pupils to ask more challenging questions and find out more.
	The investigations get the class buzzing. They talked readily about what they had seen and generated questions. The children were enthused and they carried out extra individual research at home without prompting." (teacher)
	"a real buzz about science was created" (teacher)
	"They can see science in the real world more" (teacher)
ENGAGEMENT – Emotional Confidence to take risks	"I never really liked science but now I do. I think it's really interesting" (child)
	"When my teacher said "you are doing a science experiment" I got very excited" (child)
	Some children didn't like it – no 1st order constructs
ENGAGEMENT - Sensory	"looked magical" (child discussing stimuli materials)
	Some children didn't like it – messy, holding hands – no 1st order constructs
ENGAGEMENT – Sharing	"my parents really enjoyed listening to what experiments we did" (child)
	"you found out stuff and you could show your parents at home" (child)
ENGAGEMENT - Surprise	"I didn't know what would happen" (child)
	"I didn't know that could happen" (child)
	"you would never think about doing that" (child)
	"fun things happened that were weird and exciting" (child)
LEARNING - Learning science	"science is one of the most best things I have ever done in school" (child)
	"it helped me learn lots about Earth" (child)
	"It was a fun way to learn about electricity. It benefitted me" (child)
	"It has made me think about science more and hopefully will help me when I go to high school" (child)
LEARNING - Thinking skills	"It helped me learn how to communicate better with other people and to pick other people's ideas" (child)
	"I liked listening to other people's ideas" (child)
	"I liked making up questions with other people" (child)
	"this was fantastic for us to get together and have fun even though we were still learning" (child)
	"children have developed a much more forensic attitude towards all questions and problem solving" (teacher)
	"children really blossomed in terms of their thinking skills and ability to formulate and argue opinions." (teacher)
PEDAGOGY - Practical	"it was best when the tension built" (child)
	"when you got to talk about bubbles" (child)
	"it was like dancing, and I like dancing" (child)
	"these have made me love science" (child)
	"I'd love to do this about the environment." (child)

	"When we started some of the experiments I was bored but when I listened and participated I started to like it and enjoy it" (child) Some found the practical aspect challenging: "too many chemicals" (child) Some children said that "we didn't do it ourselves" when talking about stimuli
PEDAGOGY - Group work – whole class/groups/with friends	No 1st order constructs for why children liked this Some children found this difficult: "working with my partner because she never agreed with me" (child)
PEDAGOGY - Questions - making questions, thinking of questions in groups, choosing questions and answering questions.	No 1st order constructs for why children liked this Some children did not like this – "because there were so many things I wanted to know all of them" (child)
PEDAGOGY - dialogic enquiry/ dialogue/ expressing opinions/ take part in discussions ('particularly the academically less able' or those who would normally be quiet) Discussion/sharing knowledge/ asking questions/ making mistakes	"when you got to the right answer without the teacher" (child) "the discussion was best because I learnt more" (child) "loved trying to figure out what happened" (child) "'find out how it works" (child) "It was a challenge to figure out what happened" (child) "I liked that we did it ourself and the teacher doesn't help" (child) "Children learnt new facts and through discussion and debate they connected experience to newly acquired knowledge. [CoSE] enhanced children's ability to learn from their mistakes." (teacher) "Children are more enquiring and have developed questioning skills. They are now more ready to use scientific language to explain what they have seen. They go off and research on their own if they feel we have not explained the reasoning." (teacher) "My children have been able to talk about some scientific concepts which would never have arisen through their WAU topics. Scientific understanding is growing with every CoSE" (teacher) Some children did not like it – when asked to talk but had no ideas, didn't like evaluating the dialogue – no 1st order constructs
PEDAGOGY - Active learning/variety/games	Children liked to do different things – no 1st order constructs
Aspects of facilitation/organisation that present limitations/challenges - Preparation (child) - Frequency and Duration (chid) - Writing (child) - Direct instruction (child) - Starter (child) - Classroom behaviour (child) - Curriculum constraints (teacher) - restriction of the discussion to one question (teacher) - Taught as an isolated lesson (teacher) - Needed more topics/resources (teacher)	worst part of the CoSE was "the end because you just want more" (child) "people were standing" (child) "people didn't listen" (child) "people did things before they were meant to" (child) "people speaking when I was meant to be speaking" (child)
Teacher ability/teacher attitude /teacher role in class/teacher confidence/child-friendly – children control their learning/ children allowed to make mistakes	"My pupils are excited by the notion of doing a CoSE lesson. They love the fact that it is practical with loads of thinking…many pupils have become increasingly confident in sharing their opinions. CoSE has encouraged my pupils to reason out why they think the way they do – it has pushed them to come up with a scientific theory, even if it might not be correct." (teacher)

Gasparatou, R., & Ergazaki, M. (2015). Students' Views about Their Participation in a Philosophy Program. *Creative Education,* 6(08), 726.

2nd order	1st order
EXPECTATIONS - Improve thinking/argumentation skills	"learn to justify" (child) "be able to ground" (their views) (child)
EXPECTATIONS - Try something new, different, and interesting	"hadn't tried before" (child) "different" (child) "interesting" (child)
EXPECTATIONS - Get familiar with philosophy	"I was curious to see what philosophy is all about" (child) "You hear about philosophy, but you can't understand what it is they do exactly" (child)
EXPECTATIONS - Relate to schoolmates	"learning how to relate with others" (child)
EXPECTATIONS - Improve linguistic & dialogue skills	"should learn how to talk and not always jump in a discussion" (child)
EXPERIENCES – feelings… enjoyment**/**pleasure/enthusiasm/ interest/discomfort	"The things we discussed were very interesting; we couldn't stop thinking about them" (child) "joy & enthusiasm" (child) "I felt fine" (child) "Joy" (child) "All full of enthusiasm" (child) "I was so happy I was here" (child) "I felt very uneasy when we wrote and erased [ideas from the blackboard]" (child) "It was disturbing to disagree" (child) "At first I felt a little bit uncomfortable when I was talking; but after a while it was fine" (child) "depending on [their] mood" (child) "got lost in the discussion" (child) "pride" … "because [she] could think of something to say" (child) "free and responsible" … "made [them] think" … "say what [they] would do" … "how [they] see things" (child) "I was uneasy when I didn't know what to think and happy as well for wondering, or sometimes I was uneasy at first, but happy when I made up my mind" (child) "it would be fun to do it again" (child)
EXPERIENCES - thinking, enquiry and argumentation skills	"I put my mind at work" (child) "We were analyzing stuff" (child) "We discussed so many different ideas every time" (child)
EXPERIENCES - belonging and community	"were a team" (child) "there was companionship" (child) "were with [their] friends" (child) "to feel as a member of a community" (child) "to get together" (child) "be a group again" (child)
EXPERIENCES - Sharing	"with [their] sisters" (child) "at Sunday lunch when [they] get home" (child) "Sure, I asked my grandmother what she would do with the train [*i.e.* the trolley problem]; we still talk about it whenever we feed the sheep" (child)
EXPERIENCES – reflecting	"before [they] go to bed" (child) "whenever [they are] alone" (child)
EXPERIENCES – topics	"I'd come again for the topics" (child) "more such interesting topics to discuss" (child) "I would like to be able to analyze more subjects" (child)
EXPERIENCES – enquiry, critical thinking.	"to continue getting better at looking at things from both sides" (child) "to understand complicated stuff" (child) "to see the consequences of each side" (child) "to be able to analyze everything deeply" (child)
EXPERIENCES – Dialogic skills	"learn more how to discuss" (child) "learn to express [themselves] better". (child)
EXPERIENCES – other courses	"it helped [her] with other courses at school" (child)

UNDERSTANDING - promoting dialogue, linguistic skills and tolerance	"to learn how to listen to the others" (child) "to communicate better" (child) "to understand the others and discuss with them" (child) "I was talking very immaturely before" (child) "I can discuss better now" (child)
UNDERSTANDING – skill development in enquiry, skills in arguing and critical thinking	"learn how to think" (child) "learn to examine something from different perspectives" (child) "Now I examine the decision I want to make, the pros, the cons, I think about the consequences, I ask others and listen to them, I participate, I see if it is all right and if it isn't… I retreat!" (child) "try to see all sides" (child) "think of the consequences" (child) "try to find arguments, good arguments" (child) "rush in to defend whatever [their] best friend is saying or whatever suits [them] as [they] did before" (child)
UNDERSTANDING - clarification and understanding of concepts	"We had a theme every time and [we] wanted [them] to learn, to understand what it is to talk about equality, about truth, about friendship" (child) "I learned a lot about friendship, equality, right and wrong" (child) "I understand [those] concepts better" (child)
SUGGESTIONS – more topics and more people involved	"more dilemmas" (child) "more enigmas" (child) "more discussions" (child) "more points of view of each topic" (child) wanted more meetings so … "could discuss more on each topic" or "could discuss more topics" (child)
SUGGESTIONS – changes to dialogue and facilitation	"reach some conclusion in the end" (child)
SUGGESTIONS – facilitation aids/site of facilitation…simulation / going outdoors, more rules	"I could sit right here with some of the others, and one could come towards us with the bike, and another should decide if they should push us or throw down the biker or what" (child) "would rather we did not do it at school next year" (child) "go outside, away from the school-culture" (child) "to be a school-course; just like the other things we do at school" (child)
SUGGESTIONS – thought experiments vs real life scenarios	no 1st order constructs

Cassidy, C., & Heron, G. (2018). Breaking into secure: Introducing philosophical discussions to young people in secure accommodation. *Journal of Social Work,* 1468017318815399.

2nd order	1st order
Dialogue: • Enthusiastic/eager to discuss • Change in behaviour in other areas of life/talking to others about it	No 1st order constructs
Nature of the dialogue • Philosophical ideas (thought experiments) • Engagement • Connections made between each other • Calm/patient dialogues/listening behaviours	**Example from the long dialogue extract from observation/recording of session:** "I think about this all the time, what if you wake up one day and you are still a baby lying in your bed?" (child) "I agree with everybody again, but listen to this, you've got to listen to this. See what KJeff was saying there about the dead thing, that you die and wake up, I agree with that, but see when you wake up as a child, how do you know you have just died?" (child) "I disagree with Jeff … obviously uou know that you're real because you think you are dreaming as well" (child) "How do I know that? Because it is a fact. Well, it is not a fact because I've not got anything to back it up. Because I can feel, I can feel pain and all that. If this was a dream I could've controlled it. Obviously you can control your life to an extent but if I'd done something wrong and I'm here [in the centre] now, if that was the case [that

	it wasn't real] I could've just flown away or something into space and not let anybody catch me. That means one dream" (Child)
Structure • Rules/control – constricting or liberating	"sticking to the rules is hard" (child) "getting your point of view across and you don't have to shout over everybody" (child) "I was just fascinated by how well the young people ought into it, how well they were able to follow the rules, they were able to stay silent and really actively listen to the points of view of other young people" (staff member) "What shone through was that there was control in the sessions without having to challenge that behaviour [swearing]"… "it was almost as if it will be challenged in a different way" (staff member)
Structure • Able to agree/disagree • Empathy/encouraging	"Derek you've not said anything yet, brother, come on" (child) "Come on Ann" (child) "I agree with you to a certain extent" (child)
Structure • Humour/laughter • Using humour to articulate their point of view	"funny, a good laugh" (child) "I'm going to do a Dave" (child)
Experiences • Liked to 'argue' • Lack of 'general knowledge' and lack of vocabulary • Using their personal experiences/relied on 'personal' relevance	Although, this theme is labelled as 'experiences', these themes were created from observation/recording of sessions as well as the interviews. Lack of 'general knowledge' : "that Leonardo Da Vinci, he cut his ear off for art" (child)
Change in expectations of the young people's ability • Change in young people's perception of themselves • Children sought other outlets for expression	"a huge turning point for him and he was devastated when they came to a close" (staff member) People do not expect those "in secure to be able to talk about ideas like that" (child) "Carla's questions were unbelievable. You'd think that people in secure didn't have the ability to come out with questions like that . . . Most didn't go to education when they were out [of secure], so you'd think they were NEDs – non-educated delinquents – but they're not." (child)

Michalik, K. (2019). Teacher and learner perspectives on philosophical discussion – uncertainty as a challenge and opportunity. *Childhood & Philosophy, 15*, 1-20

2nd order	1st order
PERCEPTIONS OF CHILDREN • Change in perception of children • Different attitude towards children	"I was astonished how seriously and deeply the children were able to think about existential questions." (teacher) "I was surprised when I realised that the children had a lot to say, and that they were actually able to think deeply about a wide range of issues, and were able to do so as a group." (teacher) "Well, I was amazed how much they already understood about the world. It's incredible how they interpret things." (teacher)
PERCEPTIONS OF CHILDREN • Perception of children's ability • Increased interest in how children think	"think much more freely than we do as adults if they have the confidence and are given the opportunity." (teacher) "very curious to find out what drives children, what children know, what kind of picture children have of the world. [...] Whether, as usual, their thinking runs along different lines. And it's not only the children who are getting something from this - I am too, a very great deal." (teacher)
PERCEPTIONS OF CHILDREN • Revised opinion of individual children • Revised opinion of children with additional needs	"And I'm always surprised by how quickly children who are normally very quiet [...] participate in philosophical discussion and share their thoughts." (teacher) "The children who really get their teeth into philosophy are completely different – they are often the ones who have real difficulties with reading, writing and maths. Philosophy brings out different strengths." (teacher) "Children with behavioural difficulties really threw themselves into this kind of discussion." (teacher)

PERCEPTIONS OF CHILDREN • Children perceived and valued teachers differently • Closer interpersonal contact between children and teachers.	Children perceived and valued teachers differently, and this was … "to do with the attitude you, as an adult, have towards children in these kinds of sessions." (teacher)
IMPACT ON PEDAGOGY/ROLE OF TEACHER • Transformation	"I take a completely different approach to discussions than I did ten years ago, even with young children - I simply value children's thought processes more highly." (teacher)
IMPACT ON PEDAGOGY/ROLE OF TEACHER • Better listening skills and restraint.	"I had to learn to hold back, and that was a very important step for me, not to be constantly leading and guiding the discussion. [...] And I really had to work at it – I didn't know how to do it." (teacher)
IMPACT ON PEDAGOGY/ROLE OF TEACHER • Lesson planning	"Before, if you were tackling the topic of puberty, for instance, you'd have decided in advance what the content of the discussion with the children would be, whereas now you turn it round and ask, what are you interested in? What goes through your mind when you think about this topic? So you're working more on the basis of the children's questions, and what interests them." (teacher) "When I opened the questions box for the first time with a group of learners, I was stunned by the fantastic questions they had come up with. And that was the moment when I said to myself, you don't have to turn up to lessons with umpteen pre-prepared questions [...], you can discuss questions that the children have thought up themselves. And that's what student-centred, autonomous, individualised learning is all about." (teacher)
IMPACT ON PEDAGOGY/ROLE OF TEACHER • Reducing the power gap • Transformation of relationships	"dialogue of equals" (teacher) "What happens of course, is that your image as the teacher changes [...], because you step out of the role of being the provider of answers [...] and you and the children all have to come to terms with the fact that you aren't providing them [...]." (teacher) "I keep being surprised by the issues groups are interested in, and then having to reconsider them myself [...] and there aren't any answers to the questions that they raise. Then you think things through with the children, and you have to think like a child again, or at least try to. And to follow their train of thought, just as they try to follow mine." (teacher) "band of equals" (teacher)
CHALLENGE OF UNCERTAINTY • Philosophical issues • Open-ended • Cannot plan for	"Of course, you have to be well prepared to be able to lead this kind of open discussion. And yes, you are entering into a kind of uncertainty. Because of course you don't know where the lesson will actually end up." (teacher) "You can't plan or predict these kinds of discussions […] and that's a challenge. It's to do with your attitude, how you see yourself as a teacher, whether you can live with the fact that maybe there are things you don't know, either" (teacher)
CHALLENGE OF UNCERTAINTY • Challenge to teacher role: expectations/self-image	"But that's how you feel as a teacher, that you always have to have everything under control. So the first thing you have to do really is accept that you can't direct it all, and just go with it. Then the children will actually come up with the questions." (teacher) "You're kind of expected to be a perfectionist, really, you always have to be meticulously prepared and get everything right and not make any mistakes. It's not easy to be that way and then become quite free and open." (teacher) "Sometimes you hear people object that it's difficult to do philosophy with children at school because as a teacher, it puts you in a position where you don't know it all, either." (teacher) "It's ok to make mistakes and not know things, and that has to start with me." (teacher)
OPPORTUNITY OF UNCERTAINTY • Making links	"Rather than being focused on results, you have to really enter into it and accept that it could go in directions that you weren't expecting. But this can also be very rewarding." (teacher) They don't categorise their experience by subject, and this allows them to engage with it in a more flexible way." (teacher)

IMPACT ON TEACHER • Personal/professional life • Change in thinking/children's point of view	"It's always a great gift for me at a personal level to do philosophy with children, because I see the world through the children's eyes and get their perspective on it. And that always reminds me of what life's all about. [...] What are the fundamental questions?" (teacher) "I'm thinking about things that I haven't thought about before. [...] I'm taking a completely new and different interest in things. So my perspective really has broadened" (teacher) "I often think about the world in a completely different way, or suddenly see the world with different eyes" (teacher) Philosophy sessions "strengthen your perception, they make you more aware of your attitude to social issues." (teacher) "Philosophy is enriching my life and my professional practice in a new way [...] It's a kind of oasis in the middle of school." (teacher)
Children behaviour/change • Communication skills/behaviour in discussion • Respectful behaviour • Reflection • Confidence and awareness of themselves as learners • Can be too demanding for some children	No 1st order constructs
Conditions • Time constraints • Organisational structures • Lack of support from colleagues and management	No 1st order constructs
CHILDREN'S EXPERIENCES • Content/subject matter – comprehensive (life, the world)	"Now I know more about life and the world, about the whole world somehow as well." (child) You learn things about the whole world in philosophy – not just how to do maths problems or some facts about animals, but proper things about the whole world." (child) "I'm completely different when I come out than when I went in [...]. I learn much more then, because it's very important to know something about the world, too, that's why I store it all up in my head." (child) "Well, you just have more general knowledge afterwards." (child)
CHILDREN'S EXPERIENCES • Different to other subjects	"The fact that you can actually talk about anything, and that you can say anything that comes into your head about the topic." (child)
CHILDREN'S EXPERIENCES • Space to discuss their opinions freely	"I think it's good that you can say what you think." (child) "I like that we can discuss things." (child) "You're not forced to do anything and you can give your own opinion." (child)
CHILDREN'S EXPERIENCES • Openness – no definitive answers • Uncertainty – demanding/challenging	"I think it's good that no opinions are wrong and none are right, either. So you could see things one way, but you could see them the other way as well." (child) "I think it's good that there isn't any right or wrong." (child) "I don't really like that nothing is right, because then you can't say anything right." (child) "If one person says something's right and another says no, you can't just agree with them both and that's very difficult." like that nothing is right, because then you can't say anything right." (child)
CHILDREN'S EXPERIENCES • Process of the sessions	"It's a proper conversation, not like someone putting their hand up and saying something, then the teacher saying something, then the next person putting their hand up and saying something else – it's great." (child) "Doing philosophy isn't like other lessons, where one person always puts their hand up and says something and then the teacher says something and then everyone has to work. In philosophy, you can say what you think, it's more open." (child)
CHILDREN'S EXPERIENCES • Exchange of views and ideas – negotiation	"I think you learn something about the others too, but that benefits you as well, you get to know the others and you can understand what they think." (child)

	"When you do philosophy, you find out what other people think, and you can understand them better." (child)
CHILDREN'S EXPERIENCES • Challenging own ideas	"I also think it's good because you can be influenced by other children and then think about your opinion, which may not be quite right, because then other people might say something that you have to think about some more." (child) "Well, I also think it's great when someone says, that's right and someone else says, well maybe not. Then you have to think again. I like that – I think it's good." (child) "You change your opinion every time you talk about something, not completely, but you think about it and think, hmm, yes, it could be like this or like that." (child) "I often change my opinion when I hear other people's opinions and their reasons [...] but the reasons are important." (child)
CHILDREN'S EXPERIENCES • Change in own thinking	"Well, I think that I think a bit more now about different [other] things." (child) "Well, when someone says something, you think things through more than you used to." (child) "I'm better at thinking things through now – I don't know why, but I think it might be from doing philosophy." (child) "We think about more things, you think more carefully when you do it as a group." (child)
CHILDREN'S EXPERIENCES • Exchanging/collective searching	"If there are different opinions, I think again, is that right? Then I just say it and we all think about it again together." (child)

Appendix C: Reciprocal and Refutational Translation

1. The reciprocal translation as part of Phase 5 in the SLR. Please note the 'Key' which outlines the differences between red and green font.

Key
• **Red font refers to 2nd order constructs (the ideas conceptualised by the researcher in each paper)**
• **Green font refers to my interpretation of the data presented in each piece of research. For example, if I interpret any 1st order constructs (participant quotes) as reflective of any of the other concepts created as part of this review. This interpretation also includes any concepts that the 2nd order constructs may overlap with. This interpretation has been included in my synthesis.**
• Empty grey boxes indicate the papers that did not address the concept.

Concepts	Barrow (2010)	Dunlop et al (2015)	Gasparatou and Ergazaki (2015)	Cassidy and Heron (2018)	Michalik (2019)
Dialogue					
Pattern of talk	• CYP discussed how the "control" of talk and distribution of talk changed. CYP suggested that both CYP and teachers could equally express their opinions. • New voices were heard as more CYP were involved. • "she's learnt how to sort of let the class speak" (child views) • Some CYP became more dominant in the sessions than others; "some people kept speaking and speaking" (power differential?)	• One CYP discussed their experience of getting to the right answer independently in dialogue and doing things by themselves without the teacher's help. • Some CYP did not like a lot of explanation from the teacher. No 1st order construct associated with this. • "I had fun because you were allowed to talk and discuss your answers and opinions" …The use of the word 'allowed' could suggest that this CYP felt they were given permission to engage in this type of dialogue. • Some CYP did not like demonstrations that did not allow them to be independent or take control		• CYP liked the 'calmness' of the dialogue – opportunities to argue but with a clear structure • Researchers said it was a safe space to air views	• Teachers report that they have learned to listen more and have learned 'restraint' during discussion; "it was a very important step for me, not to be constantly leading and guiding discussion" (teacher views) • Teachers not turning up to sessions with pre-prepared questions (teacher view)
Engaging in discussion with others and 'arguing'		• CYP discuss their involvement in dialogue and trying to figure things out. • Teachers reported that CYP learned more due to discussion and debate.	• CYP: Justifying, grounding views • Discussion of different ideas between CYP	• CYP were eager to discuss (observational data). • CYP were making connections between each other, this developed the dialogue (observational data).	• CYP seem to value the nature of the discussion, they contrast this to CYP putting their hand up (child views)

		• Discussion helped CYP to learn from mistakes (teacher views) • Teachers reported that CYP were connecting experience to new knowledge through discussion. • One CYP said that they learned more because of discussion.	• CYP talked about seeing the consequence of both sides/different perspectives • Examining their decision, looking at pros and cons, thinking of consequences, asking others, participating • CYP said they thought the purpose of the sessions was to engage in discussion – understanding others and discussing with them	• CYP liked the "calmness" of the dialogues • CYP offering reasoning and making extended contributions and connections between their views and other people's views (observational data) • Agreeing/disagreeing with each other (with friends and peers they disliked) (observational data) • Those interviewed said they initially came to the sessions because they liked arguing • Researchers state that CYP sought other outlets to engage in discussion	
Open and uncertain dialogue	• Some CYP may have felt tension because they did not want to get an answer "wrong" and because of beliefs that there is a 'right' way to respond. • One CYP said "you can never be wrong because it is your own opinion" … this could link to the open nature of dialogue in the sessions.	• Authors note that CYP experienced "surprise"; CYP reported not knowing what was going to happen. However, authors linked this to CYP being engaged. • CYP said it was best when "tension built". This could suggest a positive experience of tension. • CYP use the phrase "figuring things out" and "finding out"	• CYP: disturbing to disagree, got lost in discussion, uneasy to disagree • CYP proposed that discussion should reach a conclusion at the end		• Teachers discuss the open-ended nature of philosophical questions (teacher views) • Openness as an opportunity and advantage (teacher views) • Openness was discussed as a good thing; "I think it's good because there isn't a right or wrong" (child views) • "…you say what you think, it is more open" … openness linked to ability to express themselves. • Some CYP found the uncertainty of the dialogue demanding and challenging; "I don't really like that nothing is right" (child views)
Questioning and inquiry		• Authors report that CYP liked to make questions, choose questions, and answer questions. No 1st order construct associated with this. • Some CYP did not like this; "so many things and wanted to know them all". Authors note that some CYP didn't like it when they didn't understand the inquiry, when they were asked to talk and had no ideas and when dialogue was evaluated.		• CYP eager to discuss questions which related to their everyday life (observational data) • CYP worked together to generate questions about existence and reality.	• CYP discuss the process of different opinions, thinking and then thinking about it together again as a group.

| | | • Teachers reported that CYP were enquiring or researching so they could explain their reasoning.
• Teachers said that CYP asked "fantastic questions" and CYP are "asking more challenging questions"
• CYP liked listening to others and making questions with other CYP. | | | |

Personal/affective factors

Concepts	Barrow (2010)	Dunlop et al (2015)	Gasparatou and Ergazaki (2015)	Cassidy and Heron (2018)	Michalik (2019)
A sense of self-expression	• CYP discussed how the sessions helped them express their views. They compare this in contrast to other lessons in school. The researcher links this expression to participatory pedagogical practice. • Some CYP discussed "saying the wrong thing" The use of the word "wrong" may suggest a lack of confidence in personal meaning making. • One CYP related the "no hands rule" to more freedom for expression	• "I had fun because you were allowed to talk and discuss your answers and opinions" … this could suggest that CYP enjoyed the experience because of the freedom to engage in dialogue. • Teacher: CYP have "more confidence to share their opinions"	• CYP: felt free and responsible; sessions made them think about what they would do and how they think. • CYP would want more opportunity to learn "how to express themselves better"	• One CYP said that they liked "getting your point of view across without shouting over people". • Researchers state that CYP sought other outlets for expression and one CYP volunteered to be on the Centre's committee.	• CYP able to discuss their views and opinions freely; "I think it's good that you can say what you think" (child views) • "The fact you can actually talk about anything" This could suggest that this CYP appreciates the freedom that the sessions offer.
Emotional response	• Feelings of fun, satisfaction, and joy. Fun because of the freedom to express views in a non-judgmental space. • Feelings of worry about getting something "wrong" and speaking in front of others.	• CYP reported "enjoyment", "excitement" and "fun". Feelings as a result of a contrast to "normal lessons". Enjoyment also linked to being able to talk and discuss. • CYP feeling like they want to do more. Some CYP found it boring, not exciting, cool, interesting or amusing. • CYP wanted more sessions • Authors note that CYP experienced "surprise"; CYP reported not knowing what was going to happen. Authors linked this to CYP being engaged.	• CYP report that sessions were different and interesting in relation to other lessons. • CYP experienced enjoyment, joy, pleasure, pride, enthusiasm and interest. Some experienced discomfort and uneasiness.	• Enthusiasm (observational data) • Humour and laughter – to illustrate their point, when CYP were stuck or confused they used humour to help themselves (observational data) • CYP were focused and excited when they discussed philosophical ideas (observational data) • One CYP noted that she attended the sessions because they were funny and "a good laugh"	

98

				• Researchers state that CYP wanted to attend sessions in school holidays	
Engagement		• Authors discuss interest as a theme. However, this may be because the questionnaire posed the statement "I found the CoSE classes interesting". One CYP discussed how she is now more interested in science as a subject. • Teachers report that CYP were more engaged, motivated, participating, enthused. Teachers linked this to CYP being challenged, asking questions, wanting to do more, did more independently. • Teachers said a wider range of CYP were engaged – no 1st order • Authors discuss how CYP were more engaged because of the sensory nature of the sessions. One child said stimuli materials "looked magical". Authors report that some CYP didn't like the sensory element – messy, holding hands. However, no 1st order constructs associated. • Authors note that CYP experienced "surprise"; CYP reported not knowing what was going to happen. Authors linked this to CYP being engaged. • Whole class engagement? "a real buzz about science was created"		• Researchers state that CYP demonstrated engagement with philosophical ideas and engagement with each other's ideas (observational data)	
The experience of philosophy					
Concepts	**Barrow (2010)**	**Dunlop et al (2015)**	**• Gasparatou and Ergazaki (2015)**	**• Cassidy and Heron (2018)**	**• Michalik (2019)**
The experience of philosophy process and philosophical concepts	• The researcher discusses how CYP raised philosophical questions which could demonstrate a process of 'interproblematicity'.	• CYP said "it has really made me think a lot" … This could relate to philosophy. • "pushed CYP to come up with scientific theory" (teacher views) • CYP use the phrase "figuring things out" and "finding out"	• CYP were curious about philosophy and wanted to understand more about it. • CYP said they would like opportunity for more complicated stuff and opportunities to analyse things deeply.	• Dialogue was sometimes abstract – researchers discussed young people's engagement with these philosophical ideas (observational data) • Researchers state that stronger philosophical dialogues had more	• The nature of philosophical issues raised means there could be a variety of answers (teacher views) • Teachers feel they can't plan for these sessions (teacher views)

	Barrow (2010)	Dunlop et al (2015)	Gasparatou and Ergazaki (2015)	Cassidy and Heron (2018)	Michalik (2019)
			• CYP thought purpose of the programme was to "learn how to think" • "putting mind at work" and "analysing"	momentum; how ideas were introduced, explored, focused, and excited. • CYP grappling with challenging ideas that they themselves introduce (observational data)	• CYP discuss the philosophical discussion; "it's a proper conversation" (child views)
Subject matter/topics			• CYP said if they were to do this again then they would come so they could analyse more of the topics. One CYP said the topics were interesting. • Some CYP thought the purpose of the sessions was to learn more about concepts – for example, friendship and equality. • CYP suggested that there should be more topics, more dilemmas.		• CYP said they valued the content and subject matter – more comprehensive topics (e.g., life and the world) (child views).
Relevance to personal life vs thought experiments			• CYP discussed how thought experiments would be better if they had simulations or if thought experiments were excluded – some CYP preferred more everyday life stories. Some CYP found science fiction thought experiments disturbing.	• CYP eager to discuss questions which related to their everyday life (observational data) • Struggled to generate dialogue around topics that were not related to everyday, personal experiences (observational data) • Researchers discuss how CYP used a film to explore philosophical ideas and how CYP worked together to generate questions about existence and reality. • CYP found it difficult to move beyond personal experience – relied on personal relevance to help them	
Learning and skill development					
Concepts	**Barrow (2010)**	**Dunlop et al (2015)**	**Gasparatou and Ergazaki (2015)**	**Cassidy and Heron (2018)**	**Michalik (2019)**

Learning in a topic area		• The pedagogy used was Community of Scientific Enquiry (CoSE). CYP discussed learning more about science and scientific topics. Teachers report that CYP were using more scientific language, could talk more about scientific concepts and have an increased understanding of science. • Made one CYP more interested in science as subject.		
Learning beyond the classroom – 'deep' learning, character learning, taking learning into new contexts		• One question in the questionnaire was directly linked to this; "did you talk about the topics after class with others?" • Learning applied in new contexts: CYP reported that they applied learning at home and with parents. One CYP said that they were looking forward to applying it in high school. • CYP sharing experiences with parents. • Teachers said that CYP "can see science in the real world more"	• CYP shared their experiences with adults at home, sisters, grandmother, family. • CYP reflecting on topics when they are alone or when they go to bed. • Helped CYP with other courses.	• Some CYP noted that they were now more patient in other aspects of their lives. • Staff reported to researchers that CYP would talk about the topics after the sessions • CBT therapist said they would talk about the dialogue in their therapy sessions • In interview, CYP said they would talk to staff about the sessions/topics	• CYP: "now I know more about life and the world" (child views)
Learning new skills and skill development (e.g., thinking skills)	• CYP valued the skills they developed throughout the sessions as it was seen to help them participate. Skills such as clarification, elaboration, critique, and synthesis. • CYP discussed the skill of knowing when and how to pass the discussion on and making connections between different people's opinions. • The teacher was perceived as helping them to develop skills.	• Teachers reported that CYP developed scientific questioning skills, vocabulary, understanding and made more observations. Teachers reported that CYP developed a "forensic attitude", developed thinking skills and ability to formulate and argue opinions. • Teachers thought CYP were encouraged to reason and think of scientific theory. • CYP discussed being able to communicate better, listening, questioning (child views)	• Thinking skills, enquiry skills and argumentation skills; CYP stated that they could justify, ground their views. CYP said they were analysing, discussing different ideas, and putting their mind at work. • Linguistic/dialogue skills: One child discussed how they had learned how to talk and not just jump into a discussion. • Space to exercise enquiry skills and critical thinking skills. • CYP said they would like more opportunity to improve dialogic skills. CYP thought the purpose was to improve their dialogue, linguistic skills, and tolerance.	• One staff member commented that they were surprised by some of the vocabulary used and how they were able to explain what they meant. However, this may be more relevant to the category 'change – expectations/perceptions'.	• Teachers note effects in children as; communication skills, behaviour during discussion, respectful behaviour, reflecting, confidence, awareness of themselves as learners (teacher views)

			• Thought purpose was to promote enquiry, critical thinking, and argument – thought purpose was to learn how to think		

Facilitation: strengths and challenges					
Concepts	• Barrow (2010)	Dunlop et al (2015)	• Gasparatou and Ergazaki (2015)	• Cassidy and Heron (2018)	Michalik (2019)
Structure/rules	• CYP had different views towards rules/structure. • Some CYP appreciated the use of ground rules as it helped sustain peer relationships: *"rules stop people thinking others are mean"*. • Some CYP also liked the provision of 'thinking time' as it helped more CYP participate. • CYP had differing views about the 'no hands up' rule. Some CYP liked the analogy the teacher used to explain this, but some thought this rule led to more disorder and said they didn't have experience of this rule.		• CYP wanted stricter rules – taking turns, how long each person spoke.	• Structure offers control but is also liberating; safe space to air views • In interview, one CYP said "sticking to rules was hard" • One CYP found the rules frustrating and removed themselves – eventually contributed from outside the circle (observational data) • After four weeks, CYP understood the structure better. One CYP acknowledged this in interview; "getting your point of view across without shouting over people". • Researchers noted the CYP's ability to follow the structure and how the group modelled and helped peers. • Staff discussed how CYP followed rules, stayed silent, listened. One staff member liked the different approach to control and challenge in the sessions.	• Openness was discussed as a good thing; "I think it's good because there isn't a right or wrong" (child views)
Challenges associated with facilitating sessions	• CYP worrying about talking out loud in front of others and found it difficult to understand when it was their opportunity to speak • There was a mixed response to the new role of the teacher. • Dominant 'voices'; some CYP talked more, and one child	• Aspects of facilitation presented challenges for CYP, preparation, duration, frequency, writing, direct instruction, starter games, classroom behaviour. However, some CYP noted duration was a challenge as they wanted *more* sessions. • CYP noted other CYP's behaviour as a challenge; "people didn't listen"	• CYP would have liked more simulations or to have sessions outdoors. One child wanted sessions to be "away from school culture" • One child wanted the sessions to be more attached to school programme – for it to be a school course.	• CYP struggled to wait their turn to speak, follow an agree/disagree format and provide justifications (observational data) • CYP had limited general knowledge and vocabulary which acted as a barrier in	• Not suited to all CYP – can be demanding, time constraints, organisational structures (not supporting independence of thought), lack of support from colleagues and management (teacher views) • Some CYP found the uncertainty of the dialogue demanding and

				dialogue – difficulty articulating their meaning	challenging; "I don't really like that nothing is right" (child views)
	• Challenges for teachers were classroom constraints, restriction of discussion to one question, CoSE in an isolated lesson and the need for more topics/resources. No 1st order constructs associated. • Some CYP found working together difficult due to disagreement. • Some CYP found practical aspects more challenging.				discussed how this impacted her friendships within the group. • Sometimes support from teachers for specific CYP was discussed by CYP as partiality. • Some CYP struggled with the idea of challenging the teacher.

| *General knowledge* | | | | • Researchers stated that CYP displayed weak general knowledge during dialogue in the sessions. This "stunted" dialogue and acted as a barrier in the sessions. | • Not suited to all CYP – can be demanding (teacher views)
• CYP reported having more "general knowledge" after the sessions. However, this was not linked to pre-existing general knowledge. |

Change					
Concepts	**Barrow (2010)**	**Dunlop et al (2015)**	**Gasparatou and Ergazaki (2015)**	• **Cassidy and Heron (2018)**	• **Michalik (2019)**
A change in CYP thinking and/or behaviour	• Some CYP felt they had got better at managing challenges; "gained like how to discuss things with people … how to agree and disagree" • CYP discussed changes in behaviour from CYP who had previously been disruptive; "he's just stopped because he can state his opinion at any time" • One CYP said they had learned to work well with others and be less scared when expressing what they think.	• Some CYP overcame a fear of making mistakes; "pushed them to come up with scientific theory even if it is not correct". • One CYP with "poor literacy skills demonstrated greater oracy and understanding" (teacher view) • Authors state that teachers think CYP are more open minded and better thinkers after CoSE experience. Teachers state that CYP are retaining knowledge better than before sessions. • One CYP said they can now communicate better. • CYP change in perception of science as a subject. • Some CYP more confident in sharing opinions (teacher views)	• One child discussed how they had learned how to talk and not just jump into a discussion. • After the sessions, one CYP said that they don't just rush in to defend other people anymore. Some CYP said they now try to see all sides, think of consequences, and try to find good arguments.	• CYP think they are more patient after being in the sessions • Staff member said that one CYP, after the sessions, has looked for more projects to be involved with and he is now more confidence articulating his thoughts. • CBT therapist said that it had boosted some CYP's self-esteem because people had listened to the CYP's opinions. • One CYP said the sessions had helped him be a better speaker and have helped him speak out more. • Researchers suggest that CYP regulated their own behaviour	• Sessions challenged CYP's point of view – modified their thinking – "I think that I think a bit more now about different [other] things" (child views) • Changes in their way of thinking (child views)
Child/teacher role and dynamic; a shift in power	• CYP noticed new behaviour from the teacher. • They discussed how the teacher was learning from them.	• Authors note that teachers were more relaxed and had more confidence to let CYP control their own learning – letting CYP find out		• Researchers discuss how the facilitators followed CYP lead in dialogue and there was a power shift.	• Teachers thought CYP perceived and valued them differently - closer interpersonal contact (teacher views)

103

	• CYP discussed a shift in the pattern of talk and the stance of the teacher – using a visual resource, CYP depicted the teacher as closer to them than before the sessions. • Some CYP struggled with the idea of challenging the teacher. • Some CYP became more dominant in the sessions than others.	things for themselves. However, the 1st order construct related to this does not mention this explicitly but instead talks about the change in pupil behaviour. See above.		• Researchers stated that CYP modelled behaviour for other peers and there was a neutrality of power.	• Attitudinal change (teacher views) • Transformation of teacher role. Reduction of power gap. Traditional role of the teacher was challenged; "dialogue of equals" (teacher views) • Openness and uncertainty of dialogue challenged teacher role; "the first thing you have to do is really accept that you can't direct at all" – effect on self-image (teacher views) • Enriched teachers personal and professional lives; "philosophy is enriching my life and my professional practice in a new way" • Curiosity (teacher views)
Expectations/perceptions		• Teacher stated that "children blossomed". This could suggest that the teacher seen CYP thrive when pedagogy was adapted.		• One staff member said that she was surprised by how the CYP listened to each other. • Staff discussed how CYP followed rules, stayed silent, listened – this "shone through" • One staff member commented that they were surprised by some of the vocabulary used and how they were able to explain what they meant – surprised by the dialogues the CYP engaged in and the positive impact. • Staff member talked about one CYP whose behaviour was a serious concern, and the sessions were a "huge turning point" • Staff member commented on being impressed by a CYP's questions and this counteracted a narrative of CYP in secure units	• Teachers report that the sessions changed their perceptions of CYP, and this effected their attitude towards CYP; "I was surprised when I realised that the children had a lot to say, and they were able to think deeply" (teacher views) • Shift in teacher perception of CYP's ability, teachers had an increased interest in how CYP think (teacher views) • Revised opinion of individual CYP and CYP with additional needs (teacher views).

Concepts	Barrow (2010)	Dunlop et al (2015)	Gasparatou and Ergazaki (2015)	Cassidy and Heron (2018)	Michalik (2019)
				• In interview, one CYP suggested they had challenged people's expectations of them and had surprised themselves too.	
Change in ideas about the facilitation of learning and pedagogical approach	• Teacher was learning about the children and learning through them, there was change in teacher approach; "she's learnt how to sort of let the class speak" (child views)	• Authors note that teachers were more relaxed and had more confidence to let CYP control their own learning – letting CYP find out things for themselves. However, the 1st order construct related to this does not mention this explicitly. • CYP doing/watching demonstrations and involvement in starter games • CYP testing and making observations • Being active changed atmosphere in the classroom. • CYP discussed how they liked to do experiments and dancing in their sessions. • Practical/active aspects of the classroom reported as enhancing learning. • Some CYP found practical aspects more challenging. • Authors noted that teachers discussed children controlling learning and can make mistakes. No 1st order presented. • Teacher: "CYP love the fact it is practical with loads of thinking"		• One staff member liked the different approach to control and challenge in the sessions – "challenged in a different way" • CBT therapist said that it had boosted some CYP's self-esteem because people had listened to the CYP's opinions.	• Teachers report a pedagogical impact and shift in how they view themselves as professionals. (teacher views) • Teachers learned better listening skills and "restraint" during discussion. (teacher views) • Sessions had impacted lesson planning; "so you are working more on the basis of children's questions and what interests them" – student centred (teacher views) • Thinking of the world through the child's eyes (teacher views) • A feeling of loss of control because of not being able to plan (teacher views)

Being together

Concepts	Barrow (2010)	Dunlop et al (2015)	Gasparatou and Ergazaki (2015)	Cassidy and Heron (2018)	Michalik (2019)
Collaboration (working alongside/ supporting each other)	• CYP viewed the sessions as a collaborative experience, they identified themselves, using a visual resource, as engaging in a shared activity. • Some CYP felt they required support to know what to say and to learn how to contribute. Emotional	• Authors report that CYP liked to work in groups, as a class and work with friends. "I've enjoyed working in groups" (child views). • One CYP noted how they liked to do it with friends so that they can discuss together	• One child reported that it had helped them relate to others. • CYP feeling there was a sense of community – being together, being a team, companionship. • A suggestion from CYP was to have more CYP involved.	• In interview, CYP said they would talk to staff about the sessions/topics • Researchers noted the CYP's ability to follow the structure and how the group modelled and helped peers.	• Collective negotiation, collective reflection & exchanging views, and opinions between each other; "you get to know others and you can understand what they think" (child views)

105

	support and facilitation from peers were discussed by CYP. • Specific support strategies provided by peers such as clarification and summarising were also discussed. • CYP identified the teacher as offering support as well as them helping the teacher to learn too. Teachers often helped by clarifying. Support needed to help them know how and when to pass the discussion on. • However, sometimes support from teachers for specific CYP was discussed by CYP as partiality. • One CYP talked about how they helped each other by stating "that moment has passed" and encouraging each other to try again.	• "it was fantastic for us to get together and have fun even though we were learning" … Could this suggest that this child's previous perceptions of working together was not linked to learning?		• Researchers note that CYP's confidence when articulating confusion could suggest trust and a sense of community	
An awareness of others, listening to others and demonstrating empathy.	• CYP discussed how the teacher had the right to express her opinion just as much as CYP do. • "Respect" towards other CYP's opinions.	• CYP liked listening to others and making questions with other CYP.	• CYP thought purpose was to learn how to listen to others, understand others and communicate with them.	• CYP waited to be invited to speak (observational data) • When CYP disagreed with an opinion, researchers thought it was clear how their listening had been attentive (observational data) • One staff member said that she was surprised by how the CYP listened to each other. • CYP drew other people into dialogue and would be empathetic and encouraging with each other (observational data)	• CYP talk about understanding other CYP better (child views)
Unity/community vs Individual view/difference in opinion	• CYP discussed working together as a group and demonstrating respectful behaviour. CYP recognised that they needed to respect their own experience whilst also respecting other opinions. CYP discussed the challenges of this: responding to other opinions.	• Some CYP found working together difficult due to disagreement. One CYP seemed to find this balance tricky; "working with my partner because she never agreed with me"		• Making connections between their own and other people's views (observational data)	• Authors discuss the conceptual idea of unity vs difference in their discussion. CYP discuss how the sessions have changed their own thinking as they take on other CYP's opinions and ideas (child views).

	• CYP making connections between their own opinions and other people's opinions.				

Comparison & Difference

Concepts	Barrow (2010)	Dunlop et al (2015)	Gasparatou and Ergazaki (2015)	Cassidy and Heron (2018)	Michalik (2019)
Experience of difference… a comparison to other lessons	• CYP discussed how the sessions helped them express their views. They compare this in contrast to other lessons in school.	• CYP reported "enjoyment", "excitement' and 'fun". Feelings as a result of a contrast to "normal lessons". • "I found it a better way to learn" (child views) … this could suggest comparison; better than what? • "it was a very good idea as the normal lessons in primary school don't include science" … This could suggest that the CYP liked it more than other lessons because of the scientific aspect of discussion.	• CYP report that sessions were different and interesting.		• It offered something different compared to other subjects, there were a range of issues that were important; "you can actually talk about anything, and that you can say anything that comes into your head about a topic" (child views) • Different because you get to express own opinions; "you are not forced to do anything" (child views) • The process of discussion and interaction is different to other lessons; "In philosophy you can say what you think, it is more open". (child views) • Sessions are not categorised by subject; "can engage in a more flexible way" (teacher view)

2. The Refutational Translation

<table>
<tr><td>

Key

B: Barrow (2010)

D: Dunlop et al (2015)

G: Gasparatou and Ergazaki (2015)

C: Cassidy and Heron (2018)

M: Michalik (2019)
</td></tr>
</table>

Dialogue

There were refutations noted for two areas: 'pattern of talk' and 'open and uncertain dialogue':

Pattern of talk

• B, D and M all discuss how the pattern of dialogue shifts during philosophical dialogic inquiry; children become more active and direct the dialogue. The researchers note a shift away from teacher-directed dialogue. However, in B, this shift can lead to more space for dominant peers. This may stand in contrast to D and M where the issue of power is only conceptualised in relation to the teacher/pupil dynamic.

• C argues that CYP enjoy the "calmness" of the dialogue; being able to argue with a structure. However, in D and M, there is a suggestion that there was little structure imposed on the CYP and they were able to independently guide the dialogue. There was no "leading and guiding" from adults (M). This could link to differences in the theoretical framework underpinning this practice or the influence of the wider context.

Open and uncertain dialogue

• D and M both link 'openness' and the experience of 'tension' to engagement and opportunity. However, some CYP in G found this openness "disturbing" and noted feeling "uneasy". Some CYP proposed that discussion should reach a conclusion at the end. This may contrast D and M who seem to value the openness in philosophical dialogic inquiry.

Personal/Affective factors

There were refutations noted for 'a sense of self-expression' and 'emotional response'

A sense of self-expression

• Philosophical dialogic inquiry was discussed as a site for expression. However, some CYP in research by B did not contribute because they did not want to get an answer "wrong". This could suggest, that despite the openness, CYP still believed there was a 'right' and 'wrong' way to respond.

Emotional response

• There seems to be a contrasting emotional response to this pedagogy within individual research papers. In B and G, some CYP noted feeling enjoyment. Whereas some CYP noted feeling worry, discomfort and uneasiness.

Learning and skill development

• Although there seems to be no direct contradictions for this category, it is worth noting that D is the only research to discuss 'Learning in a specific topic area'. This could reflect the theoretical framework of CoSE. This pedagogy is closely linked to science as a topic area. D suggests that this differs from P4C as "many of the answers are known tentatively by the scientific community" (p. 467), this may lead to feelings of 'gaining' more knowledge in a topic area. Furthermore, it is not stated in D whether CoSE was facilitated during a 'science' lesson slot. This could impact how CYP perceive the purpose of the sessions.

Facilitation: strengths and challenges

There were refutations noted for 'Structure and Rules'

Structure and Rules

• In B and C, some CYP wished there had been more structure and rules in place. However, in M, some CYP liked how open philosophical dialogic inquiry was and liked how there was no tight structure in place. In G, some CYP

wanted stricter rules, which could possibly contradict the philosophy of this pedagogical approach. In C, staff note that it provided an alternative to control.

- There were a variety of contradictions and correlations between different individual experiences of the 'challenges associated with facilitation'. I have not commented on this here as 'challenges associated with facilitation' seems very contextual in this case.

Change

There were refutations noted for 'Change in CYP thinking and/or behaviour', 'Repositioning of child/teacher role' and 'Change in ideas about the facilitation of learning'

Change in CYP thinking and/or behaviour

- There were possible refutations between teacher's expression of this change and CYP views on change for themselves. In D, a teacher noted that a CYP with poor literacy skills demonstrated greater oracy and understanding. CYP do not seem to use this type of educational language to explain their experience of change. In B, D, G and C, CYP noted some type of change in how they communicate, discuss, and interact with others. CYP do not seem to note *change* in their internal, personal skills as much as teacher's do (except for M).

Repositioning of the child/teacher role

- In D and C, researchers discuss CYP as taking the lead or taking control of their learning, however in B and M, it seems CYP valued teachers differently, teachers were depicted as being 'closer' or as 'equals' to the CYP. There may be different ideas about the power dynamic in the classroom.

- In B, it was noted that some peers became more dominant whereas in C, there was 'neutrality' of power between peers. Research by C was in a secure accommodation and B was in a Primary School. There may be differing peer relationships and different opportunities for peer interaction in these settings.

- In D, C and M the challenge to the teacher role seems to be discussed as a positive shift, perhaps demonstrating the researcher's perception of how pedagogy should be. In B, it is noted that some CYP find this shift challenging.

Change in ideas about facilitation of learning

- In C, a staff member discusses how she liked the different approach to challenge and control. This seems to be in relation to behaviour management. In M, a teacher discusses a sense of "losing control". This differs from C as this is in relation to how in control teachers felt about planning and the curriculum.

Being together

There were refutations noted for 'Collaboration and support'

Collaboration and support

- CYP across all studies seem to appreciate the collaborative nature of philosophical dialogic inquiry. They feel supported by others. However, in B, when teachers helped students and collaborated with them, some CYP perceived teachers as helping some students more than others. This seemed to cause some tension between CYP.

Appendix D: Information sent to CYP, Parents and Staff

The information sheets, consent forms and debrief sheets sent to parents, CYP and staff.

Information sheet (Parent)

Date: ....
Dear Parent/Carer,

Who am I?
I am a Trainee Educational Psychologist, from Newcastle University. As part of my training, I am doing some research and want to look at children's experiences of classroom sessions that encourage discussion and debate.

What are the aims of the research?
The research aims to develop an understanding of how children experience these sessions. I aim to support educational settings to develop supportive learning environments. Having a greater understanding of young people's views on this may support us to work towards learning that is creative and engaging. I hope to publish a paper on the importance of critical discussion for children. I hope this will help other Educational Psychologists promote, plan, and support creative learning environments for children and young people. If this paper is published, all details of your child's involvement will remain anonymous.

What this research will involve…
The research will involve a virtual interview on 'Zoom' with your child in which I will ask them to share their experiences of being part of the *name of the sessions that they are familiar with in school* sessions. I will ask them what these sessions mean to them, what happened when they were part of them and how this might link to how they perceive themselves.

So I don't miss any of what your child has said, I will use a voice recorder and record the video interview so I can listen back and type everything they said. This interview data will be stored on a computer and password protected, and it will be deleted after it has been analysed. No-one will know who said what and no names will be given to anyone. The only people who will see this will be those who need to because of my research. You have the right to decide that you do not want your child to take part in the interview at any time.

Before the interview, I will contact you to arrange a virtual meeting on Zoom with you and your child. I can provide any additional supportive information so that your child feels comfortable and ready for this meeting. For example, a one-page profile of myself and a video recording of me introducing myself. In this meeting, we will arrange a date and time for the interview.

After the interview, I will send you another letter and I will ask to meet your child on Zoom again so I can check the findings of the research with them. You have the right to withdraw consent at any time. However, it may not be possible to withdraw your child's data after it has been incorporated into the larger data set of the research.

What are the benefits?
A benefit for taking part in this research is that it may help educators have a greater understanding of young people's experiences of P4C and how this may impact the perceptions of themselves or perceptions of others.

Are there any risks?
A potential risk is the emotional or personal response children may experience when responding to questions in their interview. Your child will be supported throughout. Prior to the interview commencing, we will come up with a 'safety plan'. This will involve discussion around how your child can leave the discussion if they feel they need to. Your child does not have to answer any questions if

they do not want to. I will ensure they are provided with support by someone in school, if this is necessary. I am fully conversant with safeguarding procedures and will implement these should the need arise. Please note that confidentiality and anonymity cannot be guaranteed when safeguarding issues arise as part of the research and I will follow local authority and university safeguarding procedures.

Now what?
If you are happy for your child to take part, please complete the consent form that will be sent to you via email and post.

Please contact me or my Supervisors if you have any questions:
Lauren Bowden: L.e.bowden2@newcastle.ac.uk
Emma Miller: Emma.Miller@newcastle.ac.uk
Billy Peters: Billy.Peters@newcastle.ac.uk

School of Education, Communication and Language Sciences, Newcastle University, King George VI Building, Queen Victoria. Road, Newcastle, NE1 7RU

Thank you.

Lauren Bowden
(Trainee Educational Psychologist)

Consent Form (Parent)

Please tick the boxes provided to give your consent. Please scan a copy of your consent form and your child's consent form and send these to me via email: l.e.bowden2@newcastle.ac.uk. If you do not own a scanner, you may wish to use 'CamScanner', this is a free downloadable app that you can download to scan documents. Alternatively, you can pass yours and your child's consent form to Ms/Mr ___ (school gatekeeper) upon return to school in September 2020. Please note that one copy of each consent form is for you to keep.

I will then contact you to arrange a meeting with you and your child on Zoom. We will discuss any information your child may require so they feel prepared and comfortable for the interview. We will decide on the date and time for the interview.

☐ I have read the information document dated …….. for the research. I have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions.

☐ I understand that the consent for my child's participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw this consent without giving any reason and there will be no adverse consequences. I understand that I have the right to withdraw my child's data up until the point of analysis, where data becomes part of a larger data set.

☐ I understand the information collected about my child may be part of a published research paper or used to support other research. Information will remain anonymous.

☐ I consent for the interview to be recorded. These recordings will be stored on a computer and password protected.

☐ I give consent for my child to take part in the research facilitated by Lauren Bowden, the Trainee Educational Psychologist about *name of sessions in school*.

Child's name...

Age of child: ……………

Parent/Carer signature.. Date........................

Telephone number ……………………………………………………

Email address: ……………………………………………………………

Researcher name: Lauren Bowden

Researcher signature……………………………………. Date……………………

Debrief sheet (Parent)

Thank you for consenting for your child to participate in the research.

One of the main aims of this research was to explore children's experiences of discussion and debate after being asked philosophical questions, such as, what makes a good friend? What is the meaning of life? I used virtual Interviews to understand how children experienced these sessions in school.

One of the reasons for studying this is to consider how schools can develop supportive learning environments. Having a greater understanding of young people's experiences and their views on this can support us to work towards learning that is creative and engaging. Therefore, this research may be published so it can aid the work of other teaching staff and other educationalists, such as Educational Psychologists. All information about your child will remain anonymous.

Your child's contribution to this research is therefore very valuable and very much appreciated. Thank you.

I will get in touch with you soon so I can meet with your child again on Zoom. This will allow me to check with your child what I have found, I can thank them, and I can answer any questions they may have. This will not take any longer than 1 hour.

Should you or your child decide that you no longer want to take part it is possible to withdraw your child's consent at any time. However, it may not be possible to withdraw your child's data after it has been incorporated into the larger data set of this research.

If you or your child have been in any way affected by this research and would like further support, please contact Ms/Mr__ (school gatekeeper), Ms/Mr ___ (safeguarding lead) or Mr/Ms ___ (SENDco). They may be able to offer you support or signpost you to an appropriate professional from an external agency.

If you would like more information, or have any further questions about any aspect of this study, or would like to read the final research paper, then please feel free to contact me or my Supervisor, Emma Miller at:

L.e.bowden2@newcastle.ac.uk
Emma.Miller@newcastle.ac.uk
Billy.Peters@newcastle.ac.uk

or

Lauren Bowden / Emma Miller / Billy Peters
School of Education, Communication and Language Sciences
Newcastle University,
King George VI Building,
Queen Victoria. Road,
Newcastle
NE1 7RU

Thank you again for your participation.
Kind Regards,

Lauren Bowden

Information Sheet (Staff)

Date: ....

Dear Mr/Mrs/Ms....,

Who am I?
I am a Trainee Educational Psychologist, from Newcastle University. As part of my training, I am doing some research and want to look at children's experiences of classroom sessions that encourage discussion and debate.

What are the aims of the research?
The research aims to develop an understanding of how children experience these sessions. I aim to support educational settings to develop supportive learning environments. Having a greater understanding of young people's views on this may support us to work towards learning that is creative and engaging. I hope to publish a paper on the importance of critical discussion for children. I hope this will help other Educational Psychologists promote, plan, and support creative learning environments for children and young people. If this paper is published, your details will remain anonymous.

What will this research involve?
This research will involve an interview where I will ask you to share your experiences of being part of the *name of the sessions used in school* sessions. I will ask you what these sessions have meant to you, what happened when you engaged in them and how this might link to who you are as a person and as a professional. Due to the current COVID-19 restrictions, this interview will take place using a video platform.

So I don't miss any of what you have said I will use a voice recorder and record the video interview so I can listen back and type everything that is said. This interview data will be stored on a computer and password protected, and it will be deleted after it has been analysed. No-one will know who said what and no names will be given to anyone. The only people who will see this will be those who need to because of my research. You have the right to decide that you no longer wish to take part in the sessions at any time.

Before the interview, I will contact you to arrange a virtual meeting on Zoom. I would like to understand how you facilitated the sessions, the context of the school setting and discuss any questions you may have. We will arrange a date and time for the interview.

After the interview, I will send you another letter and I will ask to meet you on Zoom again so I can check the findings of the research with you. You have the right to withdraw consent at any time. However, it may not be possible to withdraw your data after it has been incorporated into the larger data set of the research.

What are the benefits?
A benefit for taking part in this research is that it may help educators have a greater understanding of young people's and staff member's experiences of P4C and how this may impact the perceptions of themselves or perceptions of others.

Are there any risks?
A potential risk is the emotional or personal response that may be experienced when responding to questions in the interview. You will be supported throughout, and you can leave the discussion if you feel you need to at any time. You do not have to respond to a question if you do not want to. I am fully conversant with safeguarding procedures and will implement these should the need arise. Please note that confidentiality and anonymity cannot be guaranteed when safeguarding issues arise as part of the research and I will follow local authority and university safeguarding procedures.

Now what?
If you are happy to take part, please complete the consent form that will be sent via email and post.

Please contact me or my Supervisors if you have any questions:
Lauren Bowden: L.e.bowden2@newcastle.ac.uk

114

Emma Miller: Emma.Miller@newcastle.ac.uk
Billy Peters: Billy.Peters@newcastle.ac.uk

School of Education, Communication and Language Sciences, Newcastle University, King George VI Building, Queen Victoria. Road, Newcastle, NE1 7RU

Thank you.

Lauren Bowden
(Trainee Educational Psychologist)

Consent Form (Staff)

Please tick the boxes provided to give your consent. Please scan a copy of your consent form and send these to me via email: l.e.bowden2@newcastle.ac.uk. If you do not own a scanner, you may wish to use 'CamScanner', this is a free downloadable app that you can download to scan documents. Alternatively, you can pass your consent form to Ms/Mr ___ (school gatekeeper) upon return to school in September 2020. Please note that one copy of each consent form is for you to keep.

I will then contact you to answer any questions you may have and arrange a virtual consultation. We will discuss any information you may require so you feel prepared and comfortable for the interview. We will decide on a date/time for the interview.

☐ I have read the information document dated ……. for the research. I have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions.

☐ I understand that the consent for my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw this consent at any time without giving any reason and there will be no adverse consequences. I understand that I have the right to withdraw any of my data up until the point of analysis, where data becomes part of a larger data set.

☐ I understand the information collected may be part of a published research paper or used to support other research. Information will remain anonymous.

☐ I consent for the interview to be recorded. These recordings will be stored on a computer and password protected.

☐ I give consent to take part in the research facilitated by Lauren Bowden, the Trainee Educational Psychologist about *name of sessions in school*.

Name...
Signature…………………………………………………… Date..........................

Telephone number …………………………………………………………

Email address: …………………………………………………………….

Researcher name: Lauren Bowden

Researcher signature……………………………………. Date……………………

Debriefing sheet (Staff)

Thank you for consenting to participate in the research.

One of the main aims of this research was to explore children's experiences of discussion and debate after being asked philosophical questions, such as, what makes a good friend? What is the meaning of life?

I used virtual Interviews to understand how you and children experienced these sessions in school. This involved a discussion where I asked questions about how you found the sessions.

One of the reasons for studying this is to consider how schools can develop supportive learning environments. Having a greater understanding of young people's experiences and their views on this can support us to work towards learning that is creative and engaging. Therefore, this research may be published so it can aid the work of other teaching staff and other educationalists, such as Educational Psychologists. All your information will remain anonymous.

Your contribution to this research is very valuable and very much appreciated. Thank you.

I will get in touch to meet again via Zoom. This will allow me to check with you what I have found, and I can answer any questions you may have. This will not take any longer than 1 hour.

Should you decide that you no longer want to take part it is possible to withdraw your consent at any time. However, it may not be possible to withdraw your data after it has been incorporated into the larger data set of this research.

If you have been in any way affected by this research and would like further support, please contact Ms/Mr__ (school gatekeeper), Ms/Mr ___ (safeguarding lead) or Mr/Ms ___ (SENDco). They may be able to offer you support or signpost you to an appropriate professional from an external agency.

If you would like more information, or have any further questions about any aspect of this study, or would like to read the final research paper, then please feel free to contact me or my Supervisor, Emma Miller or Billy Peters at:

L.e.bowden2@newcastle.ac.uk
Emma.Miller@newcastle.ac.uk
Billy.peters@newcastle.ac.uk

or

Lauren Bowden / Emma Miller / Billy Peters
School of Education, Communication and Language Sciences
Newcastle University,
King George VI Building,
Queen Victoria. Road,
Newcastle
NE1 7RU

Thank you again for your participation.
Kind Regards,

Lauren Bowden

Information sheet (CYP)

Dear ___

I am Lauren. I am a Trainee Educational Psychologist who works with lots of different children and young people. I try to help children and young people learn and feel better. Sometimes I will ask children questions and discuss different ideas.

This is me:

I think that having discussions with your friends and other people in school is important because it helps us think about interesting topics such as: what makes a good friend? What is the meaning of life? Mr/Mrs…. has told me that you are part of *name of sessions* in school.

I am doing some research where I would like to find out more about the sessions you have been a part of in school. I would like to arrange to talk with you about *name of sessions* and what you thought of it. I would like to talk to you about this on Zoom.

I will send you another letter where I will give you some more information and you can decide whether you would like to take part in the project or not.

Thank you for reading my letter.

From,
Lauren Bowden

(My supervisors at University are called Emma and Billy: Emma.Miller@newcastle.ac.uk and Billy.Peters@newcastle.ac.uk)

Lauren Bowden / Emma Miller / Billy Peters
School of Education, Communication and Language Sciences
Newcastle University,
King George VI Building,
Queen Victoria. Road, Newcastle, NE1 7RU

Consent form (CYP)

Dear __

Thank you for reading my letter. I would like to arrange a time to talk to you about what you think of *name of sessions* in *name of setting*. We will do this on a virtual platform like Zoom.

You can choose to take part. If you take part, I will ask you some questions about *name of sessions*. I will speak to you for about one hour. You can bring a 'stop' card and you can stop at any time. You can ask me any questions you want.

I will meet with you on the virtual platform before we talk about *name of sessions* so that you can ask any questions and we can make sure you feel comfortable. I can send your parent/carer any information you need to make sure you are comfortable.

We can speak again after we have talked about the *name of sessions*, so I can check what I have found with you, you can ask any questions and I can thank you for helping.

So, I don't miss any of what you have said I will use a voice recorder and record the video interview so I can listen back and type everything that is said. Eventually it will be deleted off the computer and recorder.

I won't write your name on anything so no-one will find out what you have said unless it is something important that we need to tell your parents/carers or teachers to make sure you are safe.

Please tick the box if you understand this information ☐

You can stop talking about things whenever you want to, or you can say you don't want to answer anything I ask.
Please tick the box if you understand ☐

Because I want to remember all the important things you say, I will be recording our video interview and using a voice recorder, but no-one will know it is you talking on it. After a while it will be deleted off the computer and voice recorder.
Please tick the box if you understand and agree to taking part ☐

Are you happy to take part?
Please tick the box to give your consent ☐

Signature: ……………………………………………………
Date: ……………………

Thank you.
Lauren Bowden
l.e.bowden2@newcastle.ac.uk (My Supervisors at University are Emma and Billy –
emma.miller@newcastle.ac.uk and billy.peters@newcastle.ac.uk)
School of Education, Communication and Language Sciences
Newcastle University,
King George VI Building, Queen Victoria. Road, Newcastle, NE1 7R

'One Page Profile' for CYP (Sanderson, 2000)

Who am I?

This is what I look like!

My job is:

My name is... Lauren Bowden

I am a Trainee Educational Psychologist.

I work with lots of children, young people, schools and families.

It is my job to listen and to help if things are tricky. I try to understand your learning environment so that we can understand how it can be changed to help you. Sometimes, I help with learning, behaviour, friendships or emotions.

What people like about me:

People I work with tell me I am:

Kind, enthusiastic, good listener, creative and smiley!

What might we do together?

When we meet, I will introduce myself and ask some questions. It is up to you what things we can talk about.

We might:

- Use some pictures or draw whilst we talk.
- Talk about your life, how things are and get to know what is important for you.
- Think about your hopes for the future.

If you have any questions or would like to know anything about me, feel free to ask.

What is important to me?

Making sure people are heard

Listening and caring about how people feel

Treating people fairly!

Working together.

Comic Strip of research timeline for CYP

Project with Lauren Bowden

If you want to be involved in this project, there will be 6 steps to follow. You can tick these off after you have done each step!

1.	2.	3.
You and your parent/carer can send me back your form.	I will contact you and your parent/carer using email or telephone so we can arrange a date and time to talk about my project on Zoom	We will meet on Zoom to talk about the project, and I can answer any questions you might have. We will arrange a date and time to discuss P4C. I can also send you any more information you might need in the post or by email after we have had this conversation together.
4.	5.	6.
We will meet on Zoom to talk about P4C. This will probably take place in school. I will speak to you for about one hour. You can bring a 'stop' card and you can stop at any time. You can ask me any questions you want.	I will send you another letter and contact you and your parent/carer so we can arrange a date and time to speak again.	Thank you! We will meet on Zoom again so I can check what I have found with you, you can ask any questions and I can thank you for helping me.

Debrief sheet (CYP)

Dear _____,

Thank you for taking part in my project and sharing your experiences with me!

You might like to draw a picture in this box that shows how you found our interview together:

I hope your experience will help me and other people who work in schools create fun and interesting learning experiences for children and young people. I think it is important for children and young people to have a chance to talk about important topics.

Your views will be anonymous. This means no-one will know who you are in my project.

I will get in touch with your parent/carer so we can meet again on Zoom, this will be so I check with you what I have found, I can **thank you** and I can answer any questions you may have. This will not take any longer than 1 hour.

If you decide you do not want to take part anymore, you can let your parents/carers know and they can contact me to let me know.

If you have been affected by this project, please talk to your teacher, Ms/Mr ____ (SENDco) or your parent/carer about this and they can support you.

Thank you so much for taking part!

Best wishes,

Lauren Bowden

Appendix E: Interview Schedule

The interview schedule developed for Anonymous 1 (CYP).

Interview Protocol for A1 **Bold font = resources used** **Green font = The questions A1 constructed in our co-production meeting**	
Introductions and preparation	Hello - A1 it is nice to see you again. How are you today? - Today we are going to have an interview. This means that we are going to have a conversation about you and your experiences, you are the expert in this, so it means there are no right or wrong answers. I am curious and just want to listen. - It should take no longer than 1 hour and 15 minutes. I will ask questions. It will be good if you can say your answer out loud. We will use drawings and pictures to help us. - During this conversation, if you say anything that makes me think you may be unsafe or there may be the possibility of harm to yourself and others then I will need to share this to *gatekeeper*. Do you understand? - If at any point you don't want to be involved, you can use the **STOP** card. Let's create some rules together… (e.g., what will happen if someone loses connection? **Use of prompt cards)** - Are you happy to continue? First, we are going to talk a little bit about you and your life and then we are going to talk about school and P4C…
Perceptions	- Could you tell me a little bit about you? **What are your interests?** - **Sorting of virtual 'Strength Cards' on the screen if necessary** - Prompts if necessary: What is your personality like? What are your strengths or interests? Can you tell me a story about a time when you were *quality*?
Life story	- If your life was a book and it had chapters, what would these chapters be? - **Use of virtual story template if needed** - Prompts: What do you notice? Key events? Themes? Earliest memory? Where you are from? Recent successes/failures? Further prompts if needed: - High / low points: Think of a positive experience. This might be a happy or exciting time. What happened? What were you thinking and feeling? Think of a low point or a difficult time. This might have been a sad or confusing time or a time when you felt angry for example. What happened? What were you thinking and feeling? - Family experiences: What was it like for you at home at this time? - School experiences: What was it like for you at school at this time? - Interactions: Who was there? What was it like being around those people? - Important events: Are there other important events/stories/experiences/memories from this time you want to share? - Thoughts and feelings about yourself: What was it like to be you at this time? What are your memories of yourself at this time?
Perceptions of others / interactions	- Who is important to you in your life? - Explore and expand. Focus on the relationship the child had with this person - Prompts: Who do you look up to? Who is your hero? - **CYP can draw using paper and pens**
Future	- If we were to make a chapter about your future, what would you include? What are your future plans and dreams? - Link back to key themes in life story so far

Episodic interview	
How is P4C constructed?	- Now we are going to talk a little bit about P4C. Can you explain to me what P4C is? **What is my favourite thing about P4C?** - Prompts: What happens in P4C? What do you do in P4C? - Prompt: if you were to describe it to a friend how would you describe it? Use school website as prompt if needed
Perceptions of P4C in comparison to other lessons	- Is P4C the same or different compared to other lessons in school? - What makes it the same/different?
A story about P4C	- Can you tell me about a time in P4C that you remember? **Offer option of drawing** - Prompts: Who was there? What happened? What was it like to be you? **Have you done any P4C things at home? What are your favourite quotes (A1 plans to bring a book to the interview)?**
Perceptions of the self and others in P4C	- What does P4C make you think about? - How does P4C make you feel? - How does P4C make you feel about others (other children, teachers)? **Range of words/faces on screen that A1 can sort.**
Concluding comments	
Anything else?	Is there anything else you would like me to know?
Evaluation and debrief	- The interview is finished. Thank you for taking part. How have you found this interview? - Prompts: How was the virtual nature of it? Would it have been different if it was face-to-face? What went well? What didn't go well? Have you learned anything? What could I change? - Discussion of next steps in the research process. - Signpost - "Thank you again. If you want to talk to someone about anything we have talked about, please speak to *gatekeeper* or someone at home"

Appendix F: Interview Transcription

An extract from an interview transcription with Amelia (Teacher). The 'fabula' and 'sjuzet' are identified in the right column (Hiles & Cermák, 2017).

Key	
Each section = Segment	
Red font = typed on chat	
'Us' – Geordie word for me	
Bold = Key Fabula	
<u>Underlined = Sjuzet</u>	

AMELIA: Morning	Segment: introductions
LAUREN: Hello	
AMELIA: Good morning	**Key Fabula** & <u>Sjuzet</u>
LAUREN: Hello, are you okay?	<u>Erm,</u> <u>well</u>, **I am a little bit, <u>but that's</u>**
AMELIA: I am fine, thank you, yes	**<u>just me.</u> That's just normal for me.**
LAUREN: Oh, great. It's nice to see you again.	*laughs* - responded to Q about
AMELIA: eee I know, bit of a rush this morning but I am here *laughs*	nervousness with an identity statement
LAUREN: Okay, and you have managed to get yourself a drink as well. That's good. You need a coffee or something at this time, don't you? *laughs* I really do appreciate it as it is the time before you go into school. You may want to have that time to just kind of reset and get yourself ready, so I do appreciate you doing this at this time.	
AMELIA: Sorry, I am just going to move my dog	
LAUREN: ok, no worries	
AMELIA: *returns to camera* sorry	
LAUREN: Okay, right. So, we talked about the questions a little bit last time, didn't we, when we met.	
AMELIA: yeah, yeah	
LAUREN: yeah. So, you kinda have an idea of the type of things I will ask today and and - and kind of why I might ask those things. Do you have any questions before we start?	
AMELIA: erm no, I don't think so. Not that I can think of.	
LAUREN: Okay. How are you feeling, because I know you were saying, the last time we spoke that you were feeling a little bit nervous?	
AMELIA: <u>Erm,</u> <u>well</u>, **I am a little bit, <u>but that's just me.</u> That's just normal for me.** *laughs*	
LAUREN: ok. Ok, well, I'll try and put you at ease as much as I can because really, it's just a conversation about your experiences and there's no right or wrong answers. I'm just really curious to	

find out what your experiences are so the types of questions I ask are really just to unpick who you are and your experiences. AMELIA: ok LAUREN: Okay. I'm just going to say a little bit here about what we'll do, if the video breaks off, erm because with technology, things can happen. So, if the video call breaks off, what I'll do is I'll try and call you again over zoom or send you another zoom link by email. So, if it, if it goes off to pop back on to your emails if you can and try to click the new zoom link or, I'll give you a ring and we can all sort out what we're going to do over the phone and if at any time you want to stop or if there are any questions you want to ask just let me know and you don't have to answer anything, you can stop whenever you like. So, are you happy to continue? AMELIA: yes, yeah LAUREN: Brilliant. Ok. So, first of all we are going to talk a little bit about you and your life and then we're going to talk a little bit about school and P4C. The reason why I may ask questions about your life is because I want to understand your life and how this may map or not map on to how you experience P4C. AMELIA: ok	
LAUREN: Ok, so the first place I want to start really is just tell me a little bit about you and a little bit about yourself. AMELIA: erm, well **I trained as a general primary teacher** at *name of college/uni* ermm I came straight out of that and **went into a job in *name of place* in mainstream**. I was between the infant and the Junior School. I worked there for about four years and it kind of got to a point, because it was not such a great area and there were lots and lots of **behavioural issues**, I just got to a point where I thought, I don't feel I can - **I'm doing enough. I don't feel like I'm teaching.** LAUREN: ok AMELIA: I'm kind of keeping the crowd under control, rather than doing anything else. So, then the job came up with *name of current school* which at the time was from primary - So it was age 4 up until age 19 and it was for **physical handicapped.** Erm and I'd heard about it because I only live kind of five minutes away from the school. So, I went for that one because in between time erm **I was treated for cancer** in my neck LAUREN: ah, right, ok. AMELIA: so, kind of in between time there had been a lot going on. I don't know, you kind of – I just felt like I had a bit more	Segment: career trajectory, cancer, empathy, change **Key Fabula** **General Primary Teacher** **Job in mainstream – lots of behavioural issues** **Current job – started when it was for 'physically handicapped' – now 100% autistic - been there a long time** **Treated for cancer** Sjuzet I don't feel I can - **I'm doing enough. I don't feel like I'm teaching**…. I'm kind of keeping the crowd under control, rather than doing anything else

126

empathy, I suppose, towards some of the students there and just wanted to do a bit more. So anyway, I went for the job and got that and been there ever since. So, **I've been there about 25 years now.**	– shift in tone – almost like a running series of thoughts, lots of 'I' statements
LAUREN: wow, wow	
AMELIA: it's very much changed now. It's not physically handicapped anymore. It's - well, I think it's just about going on for **100% now autistic** and other issues relating to it. Yeah, so very different but yeah.	erm **I was treated for cancer** in my neck – hesitance
LAUREN: Right, ok, so you have been there a long time then.	I think you just get - well I do, kind of – not stuck in a rut, but **I don't like change very much and just kind of happens doesn't it** – 'it kind of just happens' (positioning of self)
AMELIA: yeah, I have been there a long time yeah. I think you just get - well I do, kind of – not stuck in a rut, but **I don't like change very much and just kind of happens doesn't it**, you didn't mean to be there this long but yeah.	
LAUREN: Alright. Ok. Thanks for sharing that J. And obviously you touched upon there something that's quite - quite personal to you and something that you went through and that happened to you and please only feel - only feel like you have to share what you feel safe sharing and if at any time you feel upset or anything by anything you talk about, I'm happy to explore that but I'm also happy to not talk about that if that is something you don't want to talk about.	
AMELIA: No, no. I am fine. Yeah, I am fine.	
LAUREN: Okay so if you were to kind of describe who you are as a person, how would you describe yourself?	Segment: lack of confidence, impact of surgery on self and when working with students
AMELIA: erm I would like to think **I was caring, helpful** erm **quite self-conscious**. Erm **lack confidence** I would probably say. Erm *pause* yeah.	**Key Fabula**
LAUREN: and if you were to pick up on one of those erm characteristics that you've talked about there and tell me a little bit about a time when you've been like that. What would you say? So you said caring, self-conscious, helpful and lack of confidence. Those were the things I picked on and if you were to tell me a bit of a story about a time when you've been like one of those things. What would you tell me?	**I was caring, helpful** … **quite self-conscious** … **lack confidence**
	It was a lot of surgery and a lot of reconstruction
AMELIA: Well, the thing that comes to me straightaway is I think the reason for a lot of it is probably through me operation. Erm, so when I found out that I had Cancer, it was a lump in me neck. **It was a lot of surgery and a lot of reconstruction** – a lot of reconstructive sort of surgery. But it's left me erm - and I mean, it's so much better than it was, but it's left me with, kind of, one side	**I think you just become more *pause* self-aware.** **and you're kind of walking around and you meet people that you know but I found that they were kind of talking to my mam, instead of me.**

127

my face that doesn't work properly. So if you smile, one side isn't the same as the other, when you talk <u>erm - just lots of things</u> and **I think you just become more *pause* self-aware.** LAUREN: right, ok AMELIA: <u>so I think, I think when you've been through something like that -</u> I think I remember a time when I was out with my mam. And not long after I had the operation done **and you're kind of walking around and you meet people that you know but I found that they were kind of talking to my mam<u>, instead of me.</u>** And I just - that just made me very aware so when I was at work at *name of current school* <u>a lot of -</u> **when you took the students out, that happened a lot there. They would talk to me rather than to them.** So that's something that I was just trying to kind of get across to people that you know, <u>that they are still people, they are still there, they can hear you and they can communicate with you, just because they look different</u> erm so yeah that had an impact and I think that lack of confidence comes a lot from there as well. <u>Because I don't think I've always been like this – although, I might have, I don't know *laughs*</u> LAUREN: ok. Thank you for that J and thank you for sharing that. Erm - because it sounds quite tough, but it also sounds like you learned quite a lot. AMELIA: <u>oh, yeah,</u> yeah	**when you took the students out, that happened a lot there. They would talk to me rather than to them** Sjuzet <u>Well, the thing that comes to me straightaway is</u> – pace was quicker, almost like a realisation you talk <u>erm - just lots of things</u> – removal, ended on a generalisation <u>that they are still people, they are still there, they can hear you and they can communicate with you, just because they look different</u> – significance, matter of fact / passionate tone <u>Because I don't think I've always been like this – although, I might have , I don't know *laughs*</u> - hesitance Sequence → shift after experiencing cancer and surgery?
LAUREN: yeah, yeah. And J, we talked about this next question a little bit when we met for the consultation and it's probably one of the most tricky ones that - that I might ask you. So, if your life was a book and it had chapters. What do you think those chapters would be? AMELIA: <u>I have probably touched upon that already, erm really,</u> ***name of university/college* was** **a big step** when I left home and went to live somewhere new with people I didn't know. Erm, so yeah, probably *name of university/college* **because that helped us with a lot of independence and – and erm social skills** *pause* <u>lots of things</u>. And then I came home because I was still <u>– although I loved it there and had some great experiences and I still got friends from there</u> erm **I still wanted to come home.** LAUREN: Yeah. AMELIA: So then, I think from there the next chapter would be kind of starting a job and going to *name of first school she	Segment: chapters in life: university, friends at University, supportive students, operation, relationships made in current school, family deaths, dog **Key Fabula** ***name of university/college* was** **a big step** … **because that helped us with a lot of independence and – and erm social skills** … **I still wanted to come home.** **I just remember how fantastic the students and how supportive**

worked at*. Erm, all the experiences there and <u>erm as much as the students were erm quite rough, a lot of them,</u> at the same time I went through the operation and when I did get back to work, I had to wear a kind of erm – I had to carry a little box with me which had little wires and things attached to my face to try and vibrate and pulsate the nerves to get them working again. And erm, I just remember **how fantastic the students and how supportive**, and if they heard anybody within the school saying anything or commenting, <u>they would be the first there and just explaining to them</u>. And I think that is because I was up front with them and explained what was happening. <u>Erm, and they were just fantastic, so yeah, that was another one, I think.</u> Erm, **obviously the operation was a big chapter in my life**, <u>I was 24 when that happened.</u>

LAUREN: wow, ok

AMELIA: <u>erm, so that was a big one. Erm, what happened then</u>. *name of current school* has to be a big chapter because that has been kind of **second family for ages**. Erm, still go away with staff that were there when I first went who now left years ago. We still all go away together. Then I suppose, **getting married and having a family erm would be another one**. Erm *pause*

LAUREN: do you have any recent – erm I am thinking about maybe recent experiences or memories that would warrant being a chapter in your life story?

AMELIA: I was going to say, in the last, how long – in about the last 9 months, <u>erm, well it is a long story but</u> in **the last 9 months we have lost erm my brother-in-law, my father-in-law and my mam**. <u>So that's made a difference, that's made an impact. Not just kind of – not just kind of emotionally but financially as well.</u> So, it's kind of put us in a better position for thinking about erm do I need to work so many days, can I take a bit time off, <u>erm that kinda thing. Yeah.</u>

LAUREN: yeah, that does sound tough, that all happened within the past 9 months?

AMELIA: erm, yeah. 10 months, yeah. <u>And I went to erm –</u> I have always worked 4 days since I had my son.

LAUREN: Mhmm

J: And then when we lost my mother-in-law, my father-in-law had dementia and was struggling and was obviously <u>- erm didn't know what was going on and he was getting lost and having to go and find him all the time and things.</u> So, we made a decision then that

---

obviously the operation was a big chapter in my life

second family for ages

getting married and having a family erm would be another one.

the last 9 months we have lost erm my brother in law, my father in law and my mam

I've got quite a big family who are very supportive

I got a dog

She has just been such a <u>comfort</u> and a support through all of it. And when you have to go out and have a walk with her, that helps your mental wellbeing

Erm, if I went to Sheffield. When I first left home. Erm, independent was definitely a word. Happy. Erm, popular. Erm, funny.

the ones who I shared digs with, I am still in touch with now.

<u>Sjuzet</u>

<u>although I loved it there and had some great experiences and I still got friends from there erm –</u> lots of positives 'but', 'although'

<u>So, I've gone two days and not had the chance of looking after him. Just two days and nothing *laughs*</u> - said 'nothing' in a humorous way

129

I would go two days and I would care for him the rest of the time, so at Christmas I found out that I had two days. Erm, and then on New Year's Eve, he died. So, I've gone two days and not had the chance of looking after him. Just two days and nothing *laughs*
So that was a bit odd to begin with but then all the lockdown and everything and it's just kind of taken over.

LAUREN: Thank you for sharing. I've got a real feeling of kind of how your chapters have progressed and kind of your life story over time.

AMELIA: yeah

LAUREN: I am just wondering, do you feel you have any other kinda positive experiences or negative experiences, not so much negative, that was the wrong word, sorry. More, difficult experiences or a positive experience that you may feel safe sharing as part of your life story?

AMELIA: Erm, I don't know. I think I've already mentioned - the positives would be erm the family, **I've got quite a big family who are very supportive**, we all get along and there are no issues there. Erm, I don't know, me dog, **I got a dog**, that's erm -

LAUREN: I heard him *laughs*

J: he's just been, she probably is one of the positive things, we have only had her for just over a year, we got her last – end of August last year. **She has just been such a comfort and a support through all of it. And when you have to go out and have a walk with her, that helps your mental wellbeing** and erm yeah, so pleased we got her. Erm. That's all I can think of I think.

LAUREN: Fab. That's ok. I think it's worth saying as well, if I ask questions, I have already covered that, my questions are there just to expand on if there is anything else you feel you've not had the chance to share. I'm wondering Amelia whether you could kinda tell me about – so you have talked a little bit about different chapters. And I've made kinda a note of some of these, for example, the first one you talked about was when you went to Sheffield and you left home. And then you talked about starting your job and your operation and how children treated you at that time erm and then you talked about having a family and then more recently losing quite a few family members within a short period of time. I'm wondering if you could tell me what it was like to be you at one of those times? You can kind of choose which one you'd

Erm, independent was definitely a word. Happy. Erm, popular. Erm, funny – said this in a contemplative way, seems a contrast to how she would describe herself now

So I think they have maybe, maybe seen a difference from what I was then 'till now. But then again, maybe not – reflecting out loud – causality → shift as a result of cancer/operation?

like to talk about, what I'd like to know is a little bit about what it was like to be you at that time? AMELIA: erm, trying to pick one. **Erm, if I went to Sheffield. When I first left home.** <u>**Erm, independent was definitely a word. Happy. Erm, popular. Erm, funny.**</u> LAUREN: so who was around you at that time J? Who would have noticed those things? AMELIA: first I was in a hall of residence so there was a very small but close group of friends that we met there together so that kinda expanded to people who I met on my particular course and then, moved in with them. So we shared erm we shared houses together and <u>erm yeah but probably 3 particular friends</u>, **the ones who I shared digs with, I am still in touch with now**. LAUREN: wow, that's great. AMELIA: yeah. Godmothers and erm still go and see each other all the time, yeah. <u>So, I think they have maybe, maybe seen a difference from what I was then 'till now. But then again, maybe not</u>, because I don't see them every day just see them now and again, <u>so, yeah.</u>	

Appendix G: The Analysis Process

The stages of the analysis process for a CYP's (Kenny) narrative data.

Life Story data
1. Holistic content

<u>Initial patterns</u>
- Fabula (the content), sjuzet (the tone and form) and any possible patterns noted in right hand column of transcriptions.

<u>Creating an initial, 'free-flow' story</u>
- Kenny seems to be a young person who can be **hesitant and guarded when asked to discuss his own abilities.** Kenny started the interview stating that he felt exhausted. This feeling seemed more obvious during times when Kenny found it hard to answer questions that required him to think about his memories or think about his future. He could become withdrawn (looking away, distracting self, darker tone of voice)
- Through the process of talking, Kenny seemed to **diminish one of his strengths** – videogaming – "it was a talent, well it is, I'm just – it's just a hobby actually, it's just something I do".
- Kenny can find verbal interactions difficult; this was evident from the start when creating ground rules. Kenny asked to use visual cards rather than provide verbal answers. It seems like he has an awareness of things he might struggle with and methods that help him.
- When describing himself, **Kenny said he was good, kind, caring, sensible, caring, loyal, helpful, and understanding. Kenny also described himself as knowing**, he seemed to place emphasis on this word as identified via the sjuzet. He expanded on this by telling me he knows he can help people with what they have been going through. Kenny didn't think people close to him would say he was a knowing person. This could suggest that Kenny understands that people can go through a lot in their lives, and he can 'know' about this and know how to help them, but he may not think this is something that other people notice about him. As his story is expressed further, it seems that Kenny has some fixed perceptions of what he can / can't do and how others may perceive what he can / can't do. The sjuzet emphasised times when Kenny became **frustrated at himself** for not being able to formulate what he wanted to say verbally e.g., Kenny would say "ah dammit".
- This frustration seemed to link to Kenny's **relationship with 'autism'**. Kenny discussed not fitting in most places, people seeing him as different, people picking on him, him being weak and sensitive. Kenny said he has felt angry and frustrated as he found it hard to speak because he was Autistic.
- **Kenny discussed his family positively and shared happy family memories** (Getting hugs from his family, his memory of his grandparents' dog). Kenny said hugs from his family cheered him up when things were hard for him because he was autistic. The sjuzet illustrated how Kenny talked about his family with a soft tone. He also shared the memory of wanting to stay with Mum when he started school. Kenny said his family helped him and he needed them.

- Kenny said he has a lot of memories and likes to keep a lot of these memories in a graveyard. He said **he wasn't sure that people would like his 'story'.** This would reflect Kenny's guarded and hesitant response when asked to discuss **memories**. It seems that Kenny may have some difficult memories that he finds difficult to talk about. When discussing a happy memory, Kenny said that it has been hard since he got here but he does manage to get the laughs. This could suggest that Kenny believes things can be hard, but he experiences moments of happiness.
- Kenny seemed hesitant to discuss the future. Kenny says he doesn't have it figured out yet and a lot can happen, and it is not worth worrying about.

Noting any possible contradictions/tensions:
- Kenny would often start sentences with broad or unsure statements such as "I'm not sure" or "I have a lot" or "there is a few". With prompting and support, he could express himself, I wonder if this was a quick reaction when asked questions and whether this links to his own perceptions of his abilities.
- "So, you would like to be a yoga teacher?" – Kenny showed interest in my future dreams but didn't want to discuss his own.
- Kenny said he did not look up to anyone but seemed to have a close relationship with family

Repetitive / meaningful themes:
- **Memories** – his relationship with memories, helping others with what they go through
- **Perceived abilities** – frustrated at himself, talking himself out of his strengths, some people not noticing the things he puts emphasis on, fixed perceptions of his abilities – shown through process of interview "I am not good at…", when I offered some support (turning cameras off, using visuals) Kenny didn't want to use them
- **How others perceive him and his life story** – people see him differently, not fitting in to most places
- **Overcoming things, looking for the good** - things can be hard but there is some good, not letting self be bogged down with worrying: things have been hard, fear of dogs but not anymore – overcoming, the future is not worth worrying about
- **Relationship with 'autism'** – weak, sensitive, people pick on me, angry, frustrated, finding it hard to speak
- **Relationship with family** – protection, security, warmth, he "needs" them

How might themes cross over? What are the relationships between themes?
- Crossover – not wanting to discuss memories – some indicators of difficult memories / memories associated with being autistic - "I am not sure about my story, I am not sure people will like it" – how others perceive him, how others have perceived his autism "people pick on me" - Perceived abilities and things he may feel he is not good at → relationship with autism
- Good, kind, caring, - interpersonal qualities – relationship with family
- Overcoming things and looking for the good → a repercussion of having lots of memories he wants to keep in the "graveyard" – looking forward instead of back?

Core narratives (vivid themes), main themes, marginal themes
- **Core:** relationship with self, relationship with autism, how others perceive him and his life story

133

- **Main:** Relationship with family
- **Marginal:** relationship with memories, helping others

Reflective segments of the core themes
- *"well, yeah, I have a lot of happy memories. It has been hard since I got here but I do manage to get the laughs"*
- *"because I am autistic and weak and sensitive, that's why people pick on me"*

2. Holistic form

Plot & Movement
- Snippets of sparkling moments, snippets of harder times = ups and downs
- Plot – "Things aren't figured out yet and that's ok"
- Started off "exhausted" – nervous at the start?
- Not planning the future – staying in the 'present'

How might the story as a 'whole' create meaning?
- "but I do <u>manage</u>" – things have been hard, relationship with autism is tricky … but he has learned ways of coping / accepting
- "because I need them" …. "that's really – <u>that's really all that matters</u>" - lots of tough memories but has security in his family

Stories about P4C
3. Episodic data – Collocation Analysis

Operation	Application in this research
1. Textual Operation	Any repetitive motifs, symbolism, and patterns in the stories
2. Transactional Operation	Meaning constructed in interaction between researcher and participant as well as between participant and others during P4C in the stories shared
3. Sociocultural Operation	Any social, cultural, or therapeutic functions if the stories shared. Any beliefs, associated actions, and identity statements.
4. Educative Operation	Any questions or thinking statements about P4C or about the interview process. Learning and development during the interview process and any impact on beliefs/worldview.

Textual: any repetitive motifs, symbolism, and patterns in the stories
- Unsure/uncertainty - "I am not sure"
- Remembering / memories: "hard to remember" … "I do remember a lot of these"
- Too much to think about / feeling guarded: "too much on my mind", "we have so many, I just not talk about it"
- Difficult feelings when interacting with others / working in groups
- Fear, embarrassment (symbolism for angry, cross)

Transactional: any meaning constructed in interaction between researcher and participant as well as between participant and others during P4C
- Just getting on with it: "for some people it is boring, I just do it"

134

- Talking to peers in class: "just talk to the nearest person"
- When asked question about others – "hard to explain because I normally focus on myself"
- Meaning developed – he relates images to his life: "that reminds me of me… lost my colour a bit"
- Relationship with P4C facilitator: "terrified" of facilitator. She can seem loud and cross.
- Talking in front of others in P4C - Picked 'embarrassed' card – "not good at talking in big crowds" – may be linked to his memories and relationship with autism
- Happy to hear praise: he sent :> (smiley face) via the chat function on Zoom
- Belief about self/abilities: "sorry if I am not really good at thinking" – apologising to me

Sociocultural: Any social, cultural, or therapeutic functions in the stories shared. Any beliefs, associated actions, and identity statements.
- Belief about self/abilities: "I am not a fast writer" … "sorry if I am not really good at thinking"
- Picked 'embarrassed' card – "not good at talking in big crowds"
- Therapeutic function of resonating images: "that reminds me of me… lost my colour a bit" … images in P4C can help him reflect upon his life / autism
- Beliefs affecting his actions: "Going to English scared"

Educative: Any questions / thinking statements about P4C and/or about the interview process. Any learning / development during the interview process and any impact on beliefs/worldview.
- Reflecting out loud, experience of a shift in thinking in P4C: "I don't know … not my skin colour but my emotional colour"

4. Patterns between episodic and life story to be discussed with participants

- Life story themes: things can be hard, not dwelling on this, there can be good things, difficult memories (relationship with self, relationship with autism, relationship with family)
  Related themes in P4C: Fear, embarrassment (symbolism – angry, cross), Meaning developed in P4C - relating images to his own life/resonating: "that reminds me of me… lost my colour a bit", Belief about self/abilities: "sorry if I am not really good at thinking", Therapeutic function of P4C images: "that reminds me of me… lost my colour a bit"

- Life story themes: perceptions of himself and autism - how others perceive him and interact with him
  Related themes in P4C: relationship with P4C facilitator, talking in front of others in P4C, picked 'embarrassed' – "not good at talking in big crowds", seems to be linked to his memories and relationship with autism

Key points from analysis co-production session that add meaning / develop the patterns
- Talked about being helpful/caring person: helped an old man in the street, the man thanked him
- Family is important to Kenny – he helps them in the house, being with Mum feels safe and that's why he initially didn't want to go into school
- "no matter how much I've been torn down I will always manage to get back up" – wanted to write this down so he could remember it
- He showed me the "Life is fun" song – the key message is that there are lots of bad things in life, but you have to get on – lyrics: "we are young, life is fun, got to make the most of it" - This motivates Kenny.

- P4C image – being the only one who doesn't fit in, friends help him fit in
- He believes in anti-poaching – he likes to help animals and wants to look after animals when he is older. He also likes to make things – carving.
- Overcoming fears → fear of dogs, neighbour helped him – they trained a dog together – Kenny said he is "not held back by shackles", "fight back against fear", "proves I'm not weak"
- Dissemination ideas: there should be two different versions: a fun one and professional one. Both should be plain and simple (summarising and short).

5. Critical Narrative Analysis (bringing the analysis together)

What sort of account of their life are they offering?
- Relationship with self & who he is – difficult memories
- Safety provided through family support – understanding, acceptance
- Looking for the 'good' despite things being hard

What sort of account are they offering about P4C?
- Can help him explore his own life experiences and his relationship with autism
- Group dynamic / facilitator can be tricky

How does Kenny position himself in his life story and in P4C?
- Kenny positions himself as someone who may have an uncomfortable relationship with being Autistic but is trying to look for the good in his life → becoming more active in his life story

What are the critical themes of the story (need to emphasise any connections between life and p4c experience)?
- Kenny's relationship with autism
- Being around others – feeling safe

Appendix H: A Narrative Framework for Practice

A narrative framework I created for EP practice to explore a 'problem' then reconstruct it in a collaborative way when working with staff, families, and professionals.