Philosophy for Children (P4C): A New Zealand School-based Action Research Case Study

LEON BENADE
New Zealand Tertiary College

ABSTRACT

This paper considers whether Philosophy for Children (P4C) can contribute to the development of the 'thinking' key competency of The New Zealand Curriculum. Additionally, it seeks to demonstrate what 'action research' looks like in relation to a seven month trial in a New Zealand school of P4C and its associated methodology of the Community of Philosophical Enquiry (COPE). The action research methodology outlined here is broadly a form of practitioner enquiry, which affirms the role of the researcher, thus breaking with conventional positivistic and rationalist research that hides the researcher from view. Several data sources are tracked to reach the conclusion that P4C does indeed encourage critical thinking and deep questioning – but not for all students, and not to the same extent for all in this study, thus creating a new 'problem'. The mixed success of the trial suggests good grounds for further exploration of the practice of P4C in schools such as that under study here.

INTRODUCTION

Are there ways of improving the ability of students to think critically and ask probing questions? How does a school in New Zealand meet the requirement to develop the key competency of thinking, as specified in *The New Zealand Curriculum* (NZC)? These are some of the questions that were at the forefront of a small-scale action research project, which investigated whether Philosophy for Children (P4C) and its associated methodology of the Community of Philosophical Enquiry (COPE) could answer these questions. This action research project was partly an assessment and assertion of the validity of P4C, and also demonstrated to teachers how action research may be conducted.

The NZC (Ministry of Education, 2007) emphasises: the development of 'innovation, inquiry and curiosity, by thinking critically, creatively and reflectively' (p. 10); that learning experiences will allow students to 'critically analyse values and actions based on them; discuss disagreements … negotiate solutions [and] make ethical decisions' (p. 10); and, that thinking is one of the so-called 'key competencies' requiring that students be able to 'ask questions, and challenge the basis of assumptions and perceptions' (p. 12).

Effective and sustainable support of teachers to meet the 'thinking' requirements of the curriculum came up for discussion while I worked as an

independent consultant with 'All Saints Primary School' in 2010 to facilitate its implementation of *The New Zealand Curriculum*. I suggested to its Senior Leadership Team that we undertake a small-scale action research project, which I conducted as a volunteer researcher and practitioner. The research question was: Can Philosophy for Children (P4C) encourage and develop the ability of students to think critically and meet the requirements of the 'Thinking' key competency of the NZC? At a later stage, when it became apparent that this research would be put into the public domain, an ethics approval process was set in place. Participant information was sent home to students who were chosen for a focus group, and relevant permission sought from parents and the Board of Trustees. Confidentiality has been maintained by using pseudonyms for participants and a fictitious school name.

ACTION RESEARCH

Action research encourages teachers to drive their own research, and break with the 'research and development' model of research conducted by 'experts' that treats teachers as mere subjects or participants (Pine, 2009). Pine sees action research as fundamental to 'building a knowledge democracy' in which teachers, students and even parents become joint collaborators in the acquisition and development of knowledge (p. 26). Action research is a concurrent process of multi-method research, and taking action as a result of on-going findings. In this way, teachers come to own both their knowledge and their practice.

The action research process is a recursive one that identifies and/or selects a problem area requiring action. This part of the process usually involves hypothesis formulation (in common parlance referred to as a 'hunch'), specification of a goal and an outline of a procedure to reach the goal. Actions taken as a result are recorded along the way and results data are gathered. From these data, generalisations are inferred and developed about the relationship between the action and the goal. Reflection on the process and emerging results and retesting of the generalisations is on-going, and replanning is possible along the way.

Several approaches can be taken to action research:

1. *The teacher as researcher* involves a 'systematic, intentional inquiry' by teachers into their own classroom work (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993, cited in Pine 2009, p. 50). Such a study can be conceptual (ideas and reading-based) or empirical (observational study). It can focus narrowly on the outcomes of teaching and its effects on learning or more broadly on the idea of teacher learning and practice in the context of reform;

2. *Collaborative action research* requires teachers working together as critical friends, focused on the common objective of improvement: 'Embedded in [collaborative] action research is a moral/ political ethos that evokes congruence between inquiry and service to improve the human condition' (Pine, 2009, p. 75); and

3. *Participatory action research* is allied to social justice and transformation of teachers, students and/or communities (Atweh, Kemmis, & Weeks 1998). It focuses on changing social realities by investigating them in collaborative and participatory ways.

MY ROLE AS RESEARCHER

Whereas traditional research often disguises the researcher, action research gives the researcher/s an overtly political role in the search for an improved situation (Davidson & Tolich, 1999), hence the following analysis. My background as a teacher, school middle manager and school leader has been underpinned by my interest in the philosophy of education, and recent study has been around teacher agency and critically reflective pedagogy. These areas of interest stem from the extent to which my schooling failed to develop my own critical thinking. I therefore resolved that my primary mission as a teacher would be to ensure that my students would develop as critical thinkers. The route to such a state, I argue, is primarily through philosophy, which provides tools, skills and dispositions that discourage the individual from accepting anything at face value.

Such radical questioning is coupled with a vision of 'the good life' based on a sense of justice. Critically reflective pedagogy enables teachers to become attuned to the desirability of developing critical thinking (their own and that of their students) and also orients them toward a sense of justice and thus an ethical consideration of factors in the wider world which impacts on them and their classrooms.

These reflections brought me to enquire into P4C, particularly to verify the claims made on its behalf (see for example, Hand & Winstanley 2008a) that it develops critical thinking and philosophical questioning in children. A further claim is that it develops democratic dispositions (Brighouse, 2008). Therefore, P4C and its methodology, the community of philosophical enquiry (COPE), promise to attain the aims I believe are important.

A further reason for my interest in, and desire to promote philosophy, is to challenge the psycho-cognitivist dominance over the 'thinking' discourse, which conceptualises 'critical thinking' in narrow terms that characterise the stages of learning or the dispositions of successful learners. A student may be using these methods or displaying these characteristics but not recognise that there is injustice in the world. Furthermore, such approaches encourage the plethora of packaged kits which Winstanley (2008) regards as 'programmes of questionable educational worth' (2008, p. 94).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Despite the difficulties teachers may have in relation to workloads and despite the challenge of bridging the academic-professional practitioner divide, Pine (2009) argues that when conducting action research, teachers should conduct a literature review at least in order to become familiar with the area of study and to better inform the research question. Counter arguments may suggest that school-based action research is not 'real research' or that a literature review will merely confirm the findings ahead of the enquiry.

Philosophy for Children (P4C)

Philosophy for children (P4C) and its associated teaching methodology, the community of enquiry (COPE), have become well-established internationally (Hand & Winstanley, 2008b). Developed in the 1970s by American philosopher Matthew Lipman, P4C initially had primary students in mind. The COPE is, however, a methodology that can be (and is) employed with secondary age students (McCall, 2009).

The official website of Philosophy for Children New Zealand (P4CNZ) (www.p4c.org.nz/About_P4C.php) notes that 'the subject matter of Philosophy for Children is those common, central and contestable concepts that underpin both our experience of human life and all academic disciplines' (n.p.). Without requiring student research or knowledge and understanding of philosophy, P4C encourages discussion and enquiry of questions that relate to epistemology (theory of knowledge), ontology (theory of existence), ethics, logic, aesthetics and theology. The COPE encourages students to consider different answers to questions raised, but significantly, P4C 'is not based on the assumption that there are no right or wrong answers. Instead, it is based on the belief that, even if final answers are difficult to come by, some answers can reasonably be judged better – more defensible – than others' (n.p.).

The COPE is a circular formation of perhaps no more than twenty participants, with some suggesting fifteen to be optimal (McCall, 2009). Larger classes can be subdivided into smaller units. Status is irrelevant, and each participant (including the teacher, if seated) is arranged so that no-one appears to be 'in authority'; each participant is able to have eye contact with everyone else in the group.

The facilitator guides the community through a text or a series of exercises. Participants are taught to generate philosophical questions arising from the text. All questions and questioners are validated. The public sharing of questions hones questioning skills. The community agrees to a set of ground rules governing discussion and mutual respect is a consistent focus for the facilitator and participants. The facilitator may prompt further questions or may merely silently record whatever is said.

Individuals are encouraged to request clarification and examples, and critique, in a mutually supportive way, the additional questions and truth claims of their peers. The on-going discussion is not conversation as it requires cognitive effort and a search for meaning (Daniel & Auriac, 2011). The unique self-correcting quality of the COPE makes demands on participants to present their views logically and to engage in logical analysis (McCall, 2009). Self-correction is deepened by the group summation at the end of an enquiry and the reflection of its members on the quality of discussion (Fisher, 2003). A sense of 'community' develops over time as participants feel supported, affirmed and able to 'take risks'. Well-being grows from increasing self-esteem, thinking becomes sharper and critical faculties are honed in the mutual quest to satisfy the curiosity of participants (Cassidy, 2007; Splitter & Sharp, 1995).

Critical thinking

Freire (1985, p. 68) argued that critical thinkers seek to transform the world through the creative power of thought and work. So it may be suggested that 'critical thinking' has the elements of creativity, impartiality, reflectivity and fortitude. The disposition to critical thinking will mean that the individual takes nothing for

granted and constantly questions and inquires. This is, however, discomforting, hence the virtue of courage. For Bailin and Siegel (2002), critical thinking is defined by: 1) the value of good reasoning to critical thinkers; (2) their search for reasons and assessment of those reasons; and, 3) the willingness to be guided by this process.

Efforts at strictly defining critical thinking are, however, sometimes followed by taxonomies, lists and outcome statements, which stand in contrast to what has been described above. Taxonomies are associated with commercially available 'quick fixes' that 'tend to focus on improving cognitive processes … rather than forming the habit of acting and believing in accordance with reasons' (Winstanley, 2008, p. 90). Unfortunately, the NZC encourages such approaches: 'Thinking is about using creative, critical, and metacognitive processes to make sense of information, experiences, and ideas' (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 12). This implies that creativity, reflection and critical thinking are separate 'kinds' of thinking, showing a failure to recognise first, that the other 'types' of thinking are actually contexts for critical thinking (Bailin & Siegel, 2002), and second, that one could be engaged in reflective or creative thought without being critical, just as suggested with abstract thinking.

Key competencies

The high profile given to key competencies in the construction of the NZC can be traced to the curriculum stock take process (Benade 2009) which reflects the development of a response to globalisation, the knowledge economy and new forms of personal identity that are forged by these contexts. The foregrounding of key competencies takes its lead from the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) which sought a tool to ensure an underlying unanimity of approach to its testing programmes (Hipkins, 2006). The resulting Definition and Selection of Competencies: Theoretical and Conceptual Foundations (DeSeCo) (Rychen & Salganik, 2000, p. 5) defined a key competency as 'more than just knowledge and skills. It involves the ability to meet complex demands, by drawing on and mobilising psychosocial resources (including skills and attitudes) in a particular context' (OECD, 2005, p. 4). Competencies, therefore, include 'knowledge, cognitive and practical skills, as well as social and behaviour components such as attitudes, emotions, and values and motivations' (OECD, 2003, p. 2). The OECD categorised 'key competencies' as individuals acting autonomously, using tools interactively and interacting in socially heterogeneous groups, all considered essential to successful and sustainable economic life in a democratic society (OECD, 2003, p. 2). Finally, reflective thought and action underpin this key competency framework (OECD, 2005, p. 8).

The NZC represents the three OECD key competency categories as 'thinking, using language, symbols and texts, managing self, relating to others, and participating and contributing' (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 12). The OECD concern with reflective, critical and metacognitive thinking is a theme that can be traced throughout the Curriculum. The key competencies are also focussed on the development of 'soft, prosocial' skills, enabling individuals to respond to the challenges of globalisation by being competent 'self-managers' or effective citizens who 'participate and contribute', showing that they can 'balance rights and responsibilities' (Ministry of Education, 2007, pp. 12-13).

SCHOOL CULTURE/ LEARNING CONTEXT

All Saints School is a high decile Catholic primary school in Auckland with a diverse population. The school and its community places very high premium on learning and respectful relations with school and teachers. The following core school statements are relevant as they couple very closely with the concerns of the action research question:

- The school Charter vision aim is for: *Students who are educated, successful and active citizens with Catholic faith in their hearts*.

- Curriculum at the school: *seeks to attain our vision. It encompasses deliberate and informed teaching and learning which is designed to meet the individual needs of all students, empowering them with transferable knowledge and skills.*

- The 'thinking' NZC key competency is called 'critical thinking': *At* [All Saints School] *I learn how to become aware of thinking critically by asking inquiring questions, reflecting on what I learn, transferring my knowledge to different contexts and actively applying my understanding.*

- In this 'critical thinking' strand, the element of 'inquiry' is especially relevant: *'Why' and 'how' questions are given priority and modelled throughout the school day and across the curriculum. Inquiry is a search for reasons. Students are able to look at any issue from a range of perspectives and are encouraged to take nothing at face value. Student questions are deep and challenging, and are addressed in ways that are fair and unbiased. Inquiry requires the dispositions of courage, justice and tolerance and encourages curiosity.*

METHODOLOGY/ INTERVENTION

The P4C action research project at All Saints School

The initial problem of how to implement the 'critical thinking' key competency was associated with a 'hunch' that the children were not critical thinkers and questioners. The goal was to evaluate a teaching strategy that would develop these attributes in a group of students with a view to establishing this practice school-wide in the future. The suggested plan was to implement P4C with one of the Year Five classes for an hour each week, over roughly 30 weeks.

The chosen class had a roll of twenty-seven; eleven boys and sixteen girls. Base-line school wide assessment data collected in March 2010 indicated deep thinking, inference and critical thinking scores to be below the national average of similar Year Five students in all New Zealand schools (supporting the hunch). The specific goal was to attain a class average of Level 3 Basic by October in the areas of Inference, Deep Thinking and Thinking Critically on the Assessment Tools for Teaching and Learning (asTTle) reading test (TKI, n.d., n.p). At this level students must show that they can:

- ask questions …

- sequence ideas …

- infer and interpret the underlying meaning of a text …

- use opinion based on the text or own understanding …

- answer questions logically …

- [engage in] high level lateral thinking …

- infer and answer higher order questions.

The research method

A weekly philosophy lesson using the COPE methodology was prepared, and recorded on a template designed for the purpose. The plan included explicit ideas for integrating key competencies and values. I recorded my thoughts and observations after each lesson and assessed whether students were asking philosophical questions, developing dispositions such as tolerance and giving reasons, and to what extent discussion was facilitator dominated. I would check in with the class teacher from time to time to gain her impressions of possible changes in class responses during the week.

Data sources

Quantitative data used were limited to the asTTle bench-marking (March) and asTTle value-added (October) results. Qualitative data were broader, including my lesson plans and reflective log, the teacher's observations, a written review carried out by the students, and a one hour focus group interview with a third of the class.

FINDINGS

asTTle analysis

The asTTle reading test measures a student's reading level against the eight national curriculum levels. Each level is further sub-divided into three sub-levels, 'Basic', 'Proficient' and 'Advanced', which takes the average student two years to move through. By the end of Year Five, the required national asTTle reading norm is curriculum level '2 Advanced' (2A).

The data recorded in initial school-wide base-line testing in March 2010 had 35% of the class (9/26) at or above 2A in the curriculum function of 'Thinking Critically' and 38% (10/26) at or above 2A for 'Inference'. The average for this class of twenty-six students (increased by one after March) was '2 Proficient' (2P); therefore as a whole, it scored one sub level below the target norm for the end of Year Five.

By October, the class had, on average, attained 2A in the areas of Inference, Deep Thinking and Thinking Critically. Thus, the class reached the level required of Year Fives, but did not reach the level of 3 Basic (3B) which I had hoped for. However, between 42% and 46% of the class did attain 3B (or higher), compared with March, when only 15% – 26% of the class were above 2A. The magnitude of shift for the group was significant (2.2 sub levels). As about 16 months is required by the average student to shift two sub levels, this shift has occurred in less than half the time. Indeed, 22% of the class (6/27) shifted between 3 and 5 sub levels. Thus 2 – 2 ½ years' development occurred in seven months.

Class review: July

In early July, after ten hours of P4C, the students were asked to recall the quality of their thinking in mid-April, when they were first introduced to P4C:

Karleen: My thinking was not as strong like now. I didn't think to much of other possible ways to do something. I thought it was fine but I was thinking inside the box.[1]

Stefan: My thinking was a bit fuzzy because I diden't discuse and ask questions with my friend.

Peter: My thinking was unclear because I didn't discuss my questions and answers.

Andrea: My thinking was muddled. I could still give some good answers.

Grant: Before this my opinaes [opinions] were not strongt and add no resons.

Kylie: My thinking was plain and weak because I did not know how to think and inquire with others.

This selection, which is consistent with most of the rest of the class responses, highlights internalisation by the students that effective thinking is clear (logical, structured) and that effective thinkers develop strong arguments through discussion and enquiry with others. Significant too is the understanding that discussion and enquiry is seen to occur in the community also adding credibility to the claim that the community of philosophical enquiry supports its participants in their quest for understanding.

The July review also asked students to describe their thinking at that point:

Kylie: My thinking is focused and logical. I try to focus on the subject and try to give my opinons.

Graham: If thinking helps me with ideas I would wonder how did I get that idea?

Andrea: My thinking will have a reason for that answer.

Peter: My thinking is reasonable because I give my answers reasons, and I discuss my and other peoples answers or questions.

Leonard: In Room 8's phosolipy thinking I say I've tried hard to listen, but I was not giving good quistions to the teacher.

Rebecca: My thinking is strong and checking because when I have an answer in my head I proof-read to see if the answer is sutible.

Karleen: My thinking is focused. I try to explain how I got ideas of my own.

---

[1] Spelling errors retained from original writing by students.

These responses show that reason has a prominent role, either in terms of providing reasons or perhaps because some associate it with logic. Significantly, most of these students have internalised the unique self-correcting quality of the community of enquiry where individuals ask their peers for clarification, request examples, and critique, in a mutually supportive way, their additional questions and truth claims.

My personal log and lesson notes
Rules for the community were co-operatively established over the first fifteen weeks, and some on-going amendments were suggested by the group. The rules were reinforced each week. After three weeks, the class considered attributes of appropriate philosophical questions. This list was subsequently and frequently reinforced. The use of texts displaying explicit themes assisted students to ask complex questions implied by the text.

A final note about the journal or log – 'writing and journaling' is one of the 'fundamental practices for teacher action research' set out by Pine (2009). His argument is that writing externalises one's thoughts, and is a form of honest self-correction. It is critical that this writing be immediate (as soon as possible after the lesson or the day is done) and that it be undertaken in the first person. In terms of action research as outlined earlier, the researcher does not wait to reach the end of the project to see what its results are – if observation, documentation and self-reflection (other instances of 'fundamental action research practices') are occurring on an on-going basis then fine-tuning should be occurring along the way. On reflection, I tried several methods and techniques, while making others (such as the repetition of the rules of the COPE and the qualities of good philosophical questions) a core activity.

The teacher's observations
The teacher remarked that on the occasion of a visit by a careers speaker, the P4C Year Fives not only asked the most questions of the speaker but also asked obviously more penetrating questions than were being asked by any of the other groups of students. A further comment by the teacher was that the P4C students had raised such penetrating and profound questions of certain Religious Education topics that she felt she required the assistance of the school priest to help her to answer.

The focus group
After discussion with the Senior Leadership Team a list of questions was formulated that captured the purpose of the action research and our desired outcomes. Questions therefore related to: the effectiveness of the COPE in delivering on some of its claims; the effects personally experienced by participants on their own lives and thinking as a result of their P4C experience; whether critical questioning had become part of their wider school and personal lives; the issue of the ability of second language speakers of English to manage this activity; and, more general justifications of P4C. A sample follows.

Q 1: What do you like most about the COPE?

Andrea: I like speaking to other people.

Joey: I like that we discuss a topic and work together on it.

Karleen: You get to hear what others think … you to hear about other people's ideas.

LB: What's good about that?

Jacob: Because you have to listen carefully …

P4C validates student voice. In the process of working and collaborating with others, self-correction is exercised as answers are compared with those of others. Students hear the views of others thus broadening their own perspective. It could be argued of course that these outcomes may eventuate from any other teaching and learning exercise; however, it may equally be suggested that these outcomes would be rather incidental to other areas of the curriculum whereas here they are deliberately intended and planned for.

Q 2: What do you like least about the COPE?

Bella: I like least when others muck around … they stop our learning.

Karleen: People interrupting, but they don't listen to what you're [i.e., the student] saying.

Grant: My problem was I can't work with others.

Andrea: When you [i.e., the student] say something, and others don't listen then they don't know what you've just said.

LB: So what rule is being broken there?

Karleen: The rule about not interrupting.

Bella: I hate it when people interrupt … because then they say something that isn't on the subject.

Karleen: When they put their hands up when you say your idea, and then they say the same idea you have just come up with.

LB: So there can sometimes be needless repetition?

Karleen: Yeah.

Drawing attention to their displeasure at off task behaviour, interruptions, tangential discussion and repetition, suggests that a standard of accountability is set by the group. I sensed annoyance that some students 'tune out' or choose not to listen to the answers or opinions of their classmates thus failing to observe the rules of the COPE at two levels: first, by contravening the procedural rules pertaining to interruptions and talking over the top of others; and, second, by behaving selfishly, putting forward their case, but not listening to what others have to say in response. The needless repetition is probably the result of excessive building on of the ideas of others by simply repeating the same points.

Overall, 'moral outrage' was being expressed by members of the Focus Group. Their objection was not to the concept of the COPE, but to behaviour or actions of certain class members that was undermining the integrity of the COPE. They seemed to have a notion of what the COPE had intended to achieve and were at odds with those whom they perceived stood in the way of that ideal.

Q 4: How have you changed as a person this year because of the P4C class?

Karleen: I changed because my brain stretched in philosophy.

LB: Can you give me an example or reason?

Karleen: My brain stretched because there were heaps of questions …

Grant: I've improved in my learning … it's [P4C] put knowledge into my brain …

Bella: I think philosophy has improved some of my reading, yes? because there were some like questions that we should have in reading, like that we had in the readings that you gave us, and there were like words I haven't seen before.

Patricia: I wasn't really good at speaking, like but now I know, like I learnt that I can do it.

The P4C activity is perceived to be beneficial to the general reading levels of the students, including improved vocabulary, and the students reflected a sense that their thinking had improved. As a result of the challenging nature of P4C some felt that they found schoolwork less difficult. The various groupings in the P4C classes have required the students to mix with and talk to other students they would otherwise ignore, and for some (like Patricia), having to talk openly to the whole class has developed her self-confidence.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION/ DISCUSSION

What do the data suggest? Clearly the P4C classes engaged the students who demonstrated an ability to engage in serious and critical debate on a range of issues that included: epistemology (What is knowledge and how do we know?); ethics (Why do we choose the best? What is capitalism? Should people share their wealth?); and, ontology (What is health, and can apparently unhealthy people feel healthy? What happens to me when I die?).

By October, up to 46% of the class had outstripped the level expected at the end of Year Five for Inference, Deep Thinking and Thinking (up from 15% – 26% in March). Student self-reflection suggests that they perceived the benefits of the COPE in terms of its ability to give them the confidence to advance their own opinions, supported by reasons, which had the effect of giving them greater self-confidence. This reflection, and lesson observation suggests that they were developing dispositions of tolerance, openness, open-mindedness and flexibility.

Useful amendments to this research would include: the nomination of a 'control' group at the outset; the assessment of both groups at the start, mid and endpoints, using asTTle; and, the use of a question survey at the start for the trial

group to self-evaluate its attitudes to thinking and perception of thinking ability. In this particular project, I should have designated a data collection role for the teacher, perhaps in the form of written reflections each time there was an important milestone or high-point for any of the students which could be related to the P4C activity.

CONCLUSION

This paper commenced by asking whether there are ways of improving the ability of students to think critically and ask probing questions, and how New Zealand schools could meet the requirement to develop the key competency of thinking, as specified in *The New Zealand Curriculum.* I have attempted to suggest in this paper that it certainly is possible to develop critical thinking and questioning skills and dispositions of students through the use of P4C and its related COPE methodology. Indeed, I wish to suggest that this is a preferable approach to the use of pre-packaged 'kits' as it integrates the broader curriculum more sensibly and logically than kits do.

Although, for the purposes of this action research project (and as I was not a member of the teaching staff) the class engaged in P4C for an hour each week, ultimately the school-wide use of P4C could progress from that approach to one where it is integrated across various curriculum learning areas and across the day and week. This is particularly so in secondary schools where students will usually be taught by subject specialists. In such cases, different teachers could develop the COPE method for use at appropriate times within respective subject areas.

This small-scale action research has also endeavoured to illustrate that research need not be confined to 'experts' who are physically distant from the school workplace. Indeed, this paper has attempted to not only show how an action research project could be undertaken in a school by its teachers but also how such a project is written up.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Atweh, B., Kemmis, S., & Weeks, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Action research in practice: Partnerships for social justice in education*. London: Routledge.

Bailin, S., & Siegel, H. (2002). Critical thinking. In N. Blake, P. Smeyers, R. Smith & P. Standish (Eds.), *The Blackwell guide to the philosophy of education* (pp. 181-193). Carlton, VIC: Blackwell.

Benade, L. (2009). The New Zealand Draft Curriculum 2006: A policy case study with specific reference to its understanding of teaching as an ethical profession. *Policy Futures in Education, 7*(1), 5-19.

Brighouse, H. (2008). The role of philosophical thinking in teaching controversial issues. In M. Hand & C. Winstanley (Eds.), *Philosophy in schools* (pp. 61-77). London: Continuum.

Cassidy, C. (2007). *Thinking children*. London: Continuum.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (Eds.). (1993). *Inside/outside teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Daniel, M-F., & Auriac, E. (2011). Philosophy, critical thinking and Philosophy for Children. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *43*(5), 415-435.

Davidson, C, & Tolich, M. (Eds). (1999). *Social science research in New Zealand*. Auckland: Pearson Education.

Fisher, R. (2003). *Teaching thinking: Philosophical enquiry in the classroom* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power and liberation*. London: Macmillan.

Hand, M., & Winstanley, C. (Eds.). (2008a). *Philosophy in schools*. London: Continuum.

Hand, M., & Winstanley, C. (2008b). Introduction. In M. Hand & C. Winstanley (Eds.), *Philosophy in schools* (pp. x-xviii). London: Continuum.

Hipkins, R. (2006). The nature of the key competencies: A background paper. Wellington: NZCER.

McCall, C. (2009). *Transforming thinking: Philosophical inquiry in the primary and secondary classroom*. London: Routledge.

Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2003). *Definition and selection of competencies: Theoretical and conceptual foundations (DeSeCo): Summary of the Final Report*. Göttingen: OECD.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2005). *Definition and selection of Key Competencies: Executive Summary*. Göttingen: OECD.

Pine, G. (2009). *Teacher action research: Building knowledge democracies*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Rychen, D., & Salganik, L. (2000). Definition and Selection of Key Competencies: Overview and First Results of OECD's DeSeCo Programme. Paper presented at the Conference of the International Association for Official Statistics (IAOS) on Statistics, Development and Human Rights, 4-8 September 2000, Montreux, Switzerland.

Splitter, L., & Sharp, A. (1995). *Teaching for better thinking: The classroom community of inquiry*. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Winstanley, C. (2008). Philosophy and the development of critical thinking. In M. Hand & C. Winstanley (Eds.), *Philosophy in schools* (pp. 85-95). London: Continuum.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

LEON BENADE
New Zealand Tertiary College

Leon Benade has a career in education that spans twenty-seven years, the last fourteen of which have been in New Zealand.

In the past three years he has completed Doctoral study at the University of Auckland and engaged in independent consultancy work with schools.

He is now Research Manager at The New Zealand Tertiary College in Auckland where he also leads the postgraduate teaching and learning programme.

Email: leon.benade@nztertiarycollege.ac.nz