

The Community of Philosophical Inquiry as a Regulative Ideal

Dina Mendonça

IFILNOVA-FCSH-UNL

mendonca.emotion@gmail.com

Magda Costa-Carvalho

NICA-UAc/IFIL-NOVA-FCSH-UNL

magda.ep.teixeira@uac.pt

CV

Dina Mendonça is a research fellow at IFILNOVA, FCSH NOVA, New University of Lisbon, Portugal. She took the Master's degree at Montclair State University with Matthew Lipman and Ann Sharp, and holds a Ph.D on John Dewey's Concept of Experience from the University of South Carolina, USA. Her research focuses on Philosophy of Emotions and Philosophy for Children. She is an invited collaborator of the Master Course in Philosophy for Children at University of the Azores and offers Philosophy for Children sessions in a variety of settings (schools, museums, in preparation of creative projects, and pedagogical projects meetings, etc.).

Magda Costa-Carvalho teaches at the University of the Azores, Portugal, and is a research member of IFILNOVA, New University of Lisbon, Portugal. She holds a Ph.D. on Henri Bergson's Concept of Nature. Her research focuses on the ethical dimension of P4C, as well as on Environmental Philosophy. She holds Levels 1 and 2 of SAPERE's P4C training (UK). She coordinates a Master Course in Philosophy for Children at University of the Azores and offers Philosophy for Children sessions in a public school.

ABSTRACT

The paper proposes that understanding the notion of 'community of inquiry' as a *regulative ideal* is a valuable working move for the refinement and improvement of the practice of Philosophy for Children (P4C). Reed (1996) and Sprod (1997) have already drawn attention to this, stating that the community of inquiry is more a regulative idea than a typical occurrence. Building on these claims, we will show that taking the notion of community of inquiry as such gives new light to many of the items and aspects of the description of what constitutes a community of inquiry. Consequently, it provides ways to identify important moments in the philosophical practice that consolidate the community of inquiry, and a working tool to grasp and handle some of the crucial moves that the facilitator makes, as well as other participants, to install and strengthen the community in the sessions.

KEYWORDS

Regulative ideal; Utopia; Community of Inquiry; Methodology; Reasonableness.

RESUMEN

Este artículo propone que entender la noción de "comunidad de investigación" como un ideal regulativo es una iniciativa de trabajo valiosa para el refinamiento y la mejora de la práctica de la Filosofía para Niños (FpN). Reed (1996) y Sprod (1997) ya han llamado la atención

sobre esto, afirmando que la comunidad de investigación es más una idea regulativa que un caso concreto. Sobre esta base, demostraremos que tomar la noción de comunidad de investigación como tal aporta nueva luz a muchos de los ítems y aspectos descriptivos de lo que constituye una comunidad de investigación. En consecuencia, proporciona formas de identificar momentos importantes en la práctica filosófica que consolidan la comunidad de investigación, y una herramienta de trabajo para captar y manejar algunos de los movimientos cruciales que hacen tanto el facilitador como los otros participantes, para instalar y fortalecer la comunidad en las sesiones.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Ideal regulativo, utopía, comunidad de investigación, metodología, razonabilidad.

The Community of Philosophical Inquiry as a Regulative Ideal

The concept of a ‘community of inquiry’ can be usefully considered an *ideal* such that it becomes valuable for the refinement and improvement of the practice of Philosophy for Children (P4C). Reed (1996) and Sprod (1997) have already argued that the community of inquiry is more a regulative idea than a typical occurrence. Building on their work, we show that taking the notion of a community of inquiry under the guise of the notion of an ideal gives new light to many of the descriptions of its own structure and nature. In addition to highlighting the notion of a community of inquiry in the relevant manner, it provides ways to identify important moments in the philosophical practice that consolidate the group as a community. Thus, the paper shows how the notion of a community of inquiry is a working tool to grasp and handle some of the crucial moves that the facilitator, as well as other participants, can make in order to install and strengthen the community itself.

The paper will start by focusing on the nature of the community of inquiry, engaging with Lipman’s and Sharp’s definition. Taking it as an epistemological infrastructure and a pedagogical tool, we refer to the community of inquiry as an ideal, through the work of two major philosophers from the Western tradition, Thomas More and Immanuel Kant. This second part of the paper will show that the concept of ideal is only complete if we take up these two dimensions of the ideal – as a regulative ideal and as a utopia. Using More and Kant’s uses of the notion of the ideal will make even more visible two dimensions of the ideal that stand as two axes of analysis that pertinently intersect. This will allow us to explain that the ideal nature of the community of inquiry must be understood through its perception as a *concept*, a *methodology* and an *attitude*, leading to the conclusion that if we miss one of the dimensions, the community of inquiry will end up being a fragmentary notion. However, if practitioners acknowledge all these dimensions and see how they interact creatively, they will do justice to the notion of community of inquiry as claimed by P4C, and growth and development will inevitably occur in the philosophical sessions.

1. What is a community of inquiry?

We assume Matthew Lipman and Ann Margaret Sharp’s notion of a *community of inquiry*, based on the pragmatist tradition: a group of persons (that may be of different ages) *similarly dedicated to the use of like procedures in pursuit of identical goals* (Lipman, 2003, p.20). The community uses philosophical procedures (such as raising questions, examples, assumptions, reasons, hypothesis, etc.), and it also draws on philosophical contents (such as specific perspectives and concepts of the philosophical tradition), installing a communication based on a reasoned attitude, so that the practitioners *are willing*

to reconstruct what they say and what they hear and submit it to the self-correction process of further inquiry (Sharp, 1987).

A community of philosophical inquiry is an intentional speech community who dialogues regularly about philosophical concepts (Kennedy, N. & Kennedy, D, 2012, p.97). The community of inquiry also envisions communal action, such that it seeks to build consensus or compromises beyond a merely theoretical level (Weber, 2008) because participants adopt concepts and perspectives under discussion while they experience the community of inquiry, and acquire a general posture towards knowledge and reality.

This means that the community of inquiry amounts to much more than a set of classroom learning activities, and both Lipman and Sharp already pointed out that it carries normative (ethical as well as political) commitments to the world, facing questions about how we want to live and the kind of persons that we want to become (Lipman, 2003).

2. The community of inquiry as an ideal: More and Kant

The normative role of the community of inquiry may be explained by two different philosophical uses of the concept of ‘ideal’ – as a *utopia* and as a *regulative ideal*. When we look at the community of inquiry through the glass of the philosophical concept of *utopia* of Thomas More (More, 1975), and through Kant’s use of the notion of *regulative ideal* (Kant, 1998, B222-223), we acknowledge that, despite the complexity of the community of inquiry, it is not an unrealizable enterprise; and that those two ways of conceiving the concept of an ideal must be necessarily present in the way that P4C practice is structured such that they become pertinently intertwined.

2.1. Immanuel Kant: the ideal as regulative

Kant’s notion of a regulative ideal is a core concept of his *Critique of Pure Reason*, being essential for the author’s understanding of the faculty of reason, in its theoretical as well as in its practical use (Kant, 1998, B222-223). The regulative ideal functions as an orientation for *praxis*, being a *focus imaginarius* (Emmet, 1994, p.11) that, as a transcendental idea, stays outside the bounds of possible experience (Kant, 1998, A644/B672).

Taking Kant’s use of the notion of regulative ideal highlights the practical function of the community of inquiry because it becomes, in the mind of all its participants, an imaginary point. That is, it becomes a precious element to stand as criteria for cognitive and metacognitive judgment during the dialogue. Thus, the regulative dimension of the community enables facilitator and participants to be guided by certain patterns of questioning and discussion (Lipman, 2003, p.156). These epistemological patterns have been previously settled by its members, and stand in a continuous test for the refinement of the practice with subsequent and continual sessions.

When the community of inquiry stands as an end in view, it illuminates the concrete practice of the group and reinforces the need for the establishment of rules, and sharing responsibility for the ongoing process of thinking with others. It is also important to highlight that the need to adapt and accommodate the rules to make the community of inquiry a solid and comfortable environment for insightful thinking practices is also recognized within the ideal nature of the community. The continuous adaptation of the rules, respecting the sensitiveness to contexts claimed by Lipman (2003, p.219), does not jeopardize the integrity of the community of inquiry’s structure and purpose, and is an integral part of the establishment of the rules.

The use of the concept of the community of inquiry as a regulative ideal is already clear in Lipman's work when he writes in *Thinking in Education* (2003) that democracy and reasonableness are regulative ideals for an *inquiry-driven society* (Lipman, 2003, p.204). Even though we build the notion of a regulative ideal upon Kant's work, it is important to state that Lipman and Sharp's notion of a *community of inquiry* has its base on the pragmatist philosophical tradition and thus the use of Kant's regulative ideal is in line with Peirce's statement that the choice of the name pragmatism is made under Kantian terms, 'expressing a relation to some definite human purpose' (Peirce, 1955a, p.252). Thus, it should be interpreted in view of Peirce's claim that the problem of fixation of belief is not to be considered simply within the individual's perspective but within a community (Peirce, 1955b, p.13) because ultimately 'the very origin of the conception of reality shows that this conception essentially involves the notion of COMMUNITY, without definite limits, and capable of definite increase of knowledge' (Peirce, 1955c, p.247). And this notion of a community as an ideal is not only 'within the bounds of human experience' (Splitter & Sharp, 1995, p.18) but also, as Splitter and Sharp point out, 'prominent in the writings of the Pragmatists' (Splitter & Sharp, 1995, p.18). When Dewey writes in *Art as Experience* that, 'in the degree in which art exercises its office, it is also a remaking of the experience of the community in the direction of greater order and unity' (Dewey, 1989, LW 10: 87) he is describing the very dynamics of the notion of the ideal.

One of the important consequences of this perspective is to recognize that 'if the community of inquiry is a regulative ideal, it is one that is non-static.' (Reed, 1996, p.93) Thus, *when* there is a community of inquiry it continually and increasingly gets transformed into a community of inquiry in the full sense of the concept. First, because time and a well-oriented experience of P4C practice necessarily reinforces itself, and second because P4C embodies the idea that reasonableness is acquired in several degrees (Pritchard, 1996, p.53) to the point of creating the conditions for a reasonable community of inquiry in itself. This is why previous work showed how P4C does not aim to teach members of a community of inquiry to merely think for themselves individually, but it understands that an individual thinker can only become fully reasonable by thinking and acting as a participant of a community. Consequently, to think with others constitutes a necessary part of being reasonable. Ultimately this means that, 'what begins with the ability to reason in a community has to grow into the practice of reasoning *as* a community.' (Costa-Carvalho & Mendonça, 2017, p.128).

Thus, Kant's notion of regulative ideal allows us to highlight two important features about the ideal nature of the community of inquiry, the first having a heuristic value, and the second asserting itself as a guiding role. On the one hand, just like a regulative ideal guides reason and action, the notion of a community of inquiry unfolds the features that practitioners ought to recognize as marks of quality within the sessions (in terms of dialogues and attitudes). On the other hand, just like a regulative ideal stands as a guiding role, it postulates what should be accomplished and refers to a concept that is 'not realizable in particular instances but which has a role in setting standards for practical reason.' (Emmet, 1994, p.2)

The community of inquiry as a regulative ideal is not just present in the methodology but is also implicit in Lipman's novels. Lipman claims that his stories reveal *an infrastructure correspondent to the paradigm of inquiry* (Lipman, 2008, p.150), meaning that the way the fictional characters think and act is meant to model philosophical practice for the real P4C participants. This is also an important feature of the community of inquiry as an ideal and has a significant impact on the second way of conceiving an ideal: through the glass of the concept of utopia.

2.2. Thomas More: the ideal as *Utopia*

Concerning the normative role of the community of inquiry, and in addition to looking at the concept as a regulative ideal, the notion's semantic richness can be made explicit when also considered through the philosophical concept of utopia of Thomas More.

Thomas More's *Utopia* (1975) held an image of a better society and encapsulated hopes for the future, including a revision of educational practices (Halpin, 2001, p.307). The notion of a Utopia does not 'negate the present in the name of some inconceivably alternative future' (Eagleton, 2000, pp.25-26); it aims to 'bridge between present and future in those forces within the present which are potentially able to transform it' (Eagleton, 2000, pp.25-26). And More thinks that if one does not have a clear and lively experiential take on the utopian state it is impossible to think according to it. Thus, he writes, 'I'm not surprised that you think of it this way' he said 'since you have no image, if only a false one, of such a commonwealth. But you should have been with me in Utopia and seen with your own eyes their manner and customs, as I did – for I lived there more than five years, and would never have left, if it had not been to make that new world known to others'. (More, 1975, p.39).

Given that the P4C program can be seen as an educational practice that aims to contribute to a better society, it is easy to establish a similarity with utopian projects inspired by Thomas More's work. The community of inquiry is also a 'master educational paradigm' (Lipman, 2003, p.83) because, just like a utopia, its main goal is not about going from where we stand to a different place, but rather about using those different places as reflexes of our present location (Eagleton, 2000, p.33). This could be the etymological meaning of a *ou-topos*, for the community of inquiry is a 'no place' that the children can bring to every (philosophical) dialogue. Similarly, the community of inquiry projects an ideal to aim for, so as to refine and correct present practices, and it does not look at the real contexts as something that should necessarily be overcome. The context of a community of inquiry mirrors what practitioners can reasonably look at, in a cognitive and in a metacognitive way, helping participants to ground the foundations for their actual as well as for their future choices as individuals, and as a community.

The similarity in the projected revision of educational practices brings to the surface other similarities between Lipman and Sharp's notion of a community of inquiry and that of Thomas More's utopia.

First, both make use of the fictional space as a way of opening possibilities. That is, they both present literary playfulness as a way to create a space in which people can question ideas, as well as ways of thinking that have been fixed for a long time. This would be equivalent to creating a space of freedom that enables deeper thinking beyond the usual boundaries set for thought and action.

In addition, the free playfulness of the fictional space not only opens up possibilities for future thinking but also explores these possibilities effectively. This can be seen in the way that the characters (mainly children, in the case of Lipman's novels) speak and think, for they probe, discover and explore desirable ways of thinking and speaking. The fictional space becomes, then, an illustration and a model for the possibilities it suggests. And, just as Lipman states, what is modeled by the fictional characters in the novels is 'subsequently continued by internalization and appropriation, by the live children in the classroom, as they talk about what they have learned.' (2003, p.156).

Third, the fictional space is also used to experiment with ideas because it explores in dialogue the philosophical concepts at stake, and enables participants to freely develop the consequences of the positions put forward in practice. This experimentation with ideas also

allows participants to assimilate habits of empathy for people who argue such stances (D'Olimpio & Teschers, 2017, p.147). In sum, by giving such a crucial place to fiction to bring forth, illustrate and explore the ideal of a community of inquiry, Lipman and Sharp use the same procedures that Thomas More used to make the utopia real.

Therefore, we think that the notion of a community of inquiry as utopia is complementary to the notion of a community of inquiry as a regulative ideal, and the overall concept of an ideal can only be fully understood when considered within the intersection of these two axes. When the community of inquiry is presented as an ideal, just like Kant's regulative ideal, it has both a heuristic role, enabling interpretation of events within the practice, and a guiding role, helping the community of inquiry to continuously grow into a solid group. At the same time, just like More's fictional utopia, the notion of a community of inquiry opens possibilities and illustrates them, enabling an experimental space in which to test and explore ideas.

Consequently, we think that when we miss one of these axes, the notion of a community of inquiry ends up being a fragmentary one, not doing full justice to its total impact within the practice of P4C. If considered only in a utopian perspective, the community of inquiry might appear as an impossible-to-reach state of affairs, unleashing frustration and disbelief in its members. However, if only the regulative ideal side of the notion is considered, it might easily slip into a closed and fixed concept and its meaning and potential scope will be established only by the adults that prepare the practice pedagogically and philosophically. Without Kant's inspiration, the community of inquiry will turn ineffective; without More's insight it may become an educational resource with a second order agenda.

The dialogue that a community of inquiry, in the full sense of the word, aims to empower is a practice that helps to develop ideas in thoughtful communication that is a crucial and necessary tool for joint action. It does so by combining these two aspects of the ideal: its regulative role and its utopian impact. Likewise, the facilitator necessarily embodies an understanding of the community of inquiry not as an end in view which when accomplished provides a closure, but as a guiding principle for an open future that goes beyond the school walls, adopting a posture which makes use of the concept both as a regulative ideal and as a utopia.

3. The community of inquiry as a *concept*, a *methodology*, an *attitude*

In addition to the varied dimensions of P4C recognized in the literature, the added awareness that there are different roles for the notion of community of inquiry as an ideal, as we have specified, can help participants (including the facilitator) to maintain a continuing care for the integrity of its practice. Despite the unattainable character of an ideal, it is possible for practitioners to recognize a community of inquiry while experiencing it whenever they experience P4C sessions. This is why, as Phillip Cam states, 'the Community of Inquiry is as near a philosophically neutral way of engaging in philosophical inquiry as any other cannot easily be gainsaid.' (Cam, 2011, p.119).

One important consequence of recognizing the regulative ideal and the utopian traits of the sense in which the community of inquiry is an ideal is to provide a way to better understand how previous research has clearly stated that 'if the community of inquiry is a regulative ideal, it is one that is non-static' (Reed, 1996, p.93). Thus, we can easily add that the non-static nature of the community of inquiry still maintains a coherent process because practice reinforces what is given, and the content can only be vivid when clearly mirrored in

the practice. And it is precisely because of its dynamic and lively nature that it is of the utmost importance to better describe the interconnectedness of what it means to take the community of inquiry as an ideal.

Ultimately, in order to explore the far-reaching consequences of the community of inquiry as an ideal, it is important to recognize how it is visible not only in its theoretical conception, but also in how it mirrors the general conditions for its membership. The suggestion here is that the ideal nature of the community of inquiry requires unfolding different connections between the different meanings of a community of inquiry. Similarly to the way in which Dewey interprets the sentence ‘the cure for the ailments of democracy is more democracy’ as meaning that ‘the need of returning to the idea itself, of clarifying and deepening our apprehension of it, and of employing our sense of its meaning to criticize and remake its political manifestations,’ (Dewey, 1988, LW2: 325) we think that the way to grow the sense of community of inquiry is in a more conscious and critical practice of the community of inquiry.

In light of the theoretical suggestion just stated, we propose that to fully understand the community of inquiry, in theory and in practice, requires understanding it as a theoretical *concept*, as a pedagogical and a philosophical *methodology* and as an inner *attitude* of its members. We state that it is only when the ideal as regulative and as utopia is further described under these three categories that the community of inquiry can be grasped in its full sense.

3.1. The community of inquiry as a *concept*

The community of inquiry is a notion of a paradoxical nature, for it unites two concepts that are not ordinarily found together (Lipman, 2003, p.83). Communities can be fixated and closed entities, where rules and practices are well prescribed and settled. In the case of P4C communities of inquiry, the traditional reading is a misfit because it is rather an open and much more unconventional notion, supported by its determinant: “of inquiry”. When together, the two words create a totally different entity: *the transformative notion of a community of inquiry* (Lipman, 2003, p.84). This notion represents a contrast between securely belonging to a group and being permanently challenged to go further in building its own aims and structure.

To probe the sense of the community of inquiry as a theoretical concept seems important to establish how it grows and develops. Framing it as an ideal might help its members to differentiate what nurtures it and identify what threatens its integrity. In this line of thought, we highlight two important tendencies that support the concept: its procedural nature and its dialogical, intersubjective and multidimensional dynamic.

As such, the community of inquiry does not live from its substantive dimension, meaning that the specific philosophical concepts and perspectives that are present in the dialogues are not its main mark. To be a part of a community of inquiry is much more about experimenting with new ways of thinking and discovering its positive impacts on life, than about learning what to think, and consequently the procedural instances that build it are crucial for the nature of the community of inquiry.

The second tendency that structures the community of inquiry is its dialogical practice. The linguistic dynamic is built upon an intersubjective model of reason (Daniel *et al.*, 2002), and the dialogues produced in the pedagogical circle aim to establish a set of parameters (rational and reasonable) from which to deliberate (Lipman, 2003, p.92). It is not a derivative conversation nor is it just a logical discourse; it is rather lively communication among

different people that brings together rationality, creativity and care into the multidimensionality of thinking.

As we have stated, these two aspects of the concept need to be framed in the regulative use of the ideal in order to warrant the integrity of the practice and bring its members together around the same focus. However, the utopian dimension of the concept serves also as a way of opening up to different contexts, and enables a reworking of what it means to belong to a community of inquiry. In fact, in spite of having been at the heart of Lipman and Sharp's P4C program, the community of inquiry is an autonomous framework and stands at the core of different programs and projects all around the world.

3.2. The community of inquiry as a *methodology*

The community of inquiry can also be envisaged as a *pedagogical and a philosophical methodology*. In a very broad understanding of what a methodology might be, as a path through which one puts certain goals in practice, it is possible to enumerate some of its specific moments and some of its crucial traits. The methodological nature of the community of inquiry does not have to do with a sequence of strict pedagogical moments, chronologically established, but with three main aspects that should be present in the intentionality of the practice:

- a) the democratic circle reinforces communication because, among other things, its spatial closeness and democratic approach to everyone's position, promotes reading people's eyes. The dual function of gaze—collecting information from the environment (an encoding function) and communicate one's mental states to others (a signaling function) (Risko *et al.*, 2016, p.70) —has been identified as a factor for strengthening communication;
- b) the group makes things that come up in the dialogue obvious because the conclusions reached within thinking in a community reach different levels of expertise and depth than does individual thinking, as is now commonly accepted in research and scientific inquiry;
- c) meta-cognition & meta-emotion: stand as reflexivity of both thinking and of emotional activity which increases depth and widens scope of ideas and strengthens the impact of learning process (Brandford *et al.*, 2000, Costa-Carvalho & Mendonça, 2017).

3.3. The community of inquiry as an *attitude*

In his autobiography, *A Life Teaching Thinking* (2008), M. Lipman recalls the beginning of the work with A. Sharp at the IAPC in the terms that follows: 'New or modified methods of teacher education had to be devised, and new or modified relationships for the children with each other had to be worked out in the classroom. (The most successful entity in this respect has been what we called the community of inquiry.)' (p.125).

When it was born, the community of inquiry was much more than a pedagogical methodology, it was an *entity* through which children, and adults worked out a different way of connecting and communicating with each other. We might now add that the community of inquiry was born inside the P4C project as a new focus for thinking and acting, one that demands practitioners to be more than judicious individuals. The community of inquiry as *an attitude of its members*, that the participants take with themselves, and which allows an examination of the conditions for its membership, as well as the place of marginality and exclusion within communities.

Taking the community of inquiry within means two things. First, while participants internalize what it means to be in a community of inquiry, their participation changes and develops. Some will speak more, some less, they will be more precise about knowing when and how their participations can richly contribute to the dialogue, and when to ask questions to others, which overall makes them develop a more sophisticated criteria for philosophical inquiry (Laverty & Gregory, 2007). Second, participants will take the community of inquiry within them and will participate, act, and think in other communities with the same principles (Lipman, 1997; Costa-Carvalho & Mendonça, 2017).

In order not to fall into the traps of ambiguity we need to find ways to become aware of the plurality of meanings of the ideal dimension of the community of inquiry, and aim to find how these different meanings interact. For example, when we elaborate on how the community of inquiry is internalized by the participants, it becomes clear that the concept entails a sense of shared responsibility that can be taken into the methodology as part of its traits. Similarly to the way that Dewey states that, ‘democracy must begin at home, and its home is the neighborly community.’ (Dewey, 1988, LW2: 368).

Lipman himself established closeness between the community of inquiry and democracy through the lens of the concept of ideal, when he writes: ‘What are the chief regulative ideas of an inquiry-driven society? There are at least two. The first has to do with the sociopolitical character of the society, or with procedures in that society, while the second has to do with the character of the individual citizen. The first is *democracy* and the second is *reasonableness*’. (Lipman, 2003, p.235).

Conclusion

Family resemblances

Each and every community of inquiry is as unique as each individual, and no community of inquiry is equal to any other. Reinforcing its ideal nature is a way to recognize that all communities of inquiry are connected by a series of similarities that are perhaps best grasped by the notion of family resemblances. We inevitably ‘see a complicated network of similarities overlapping and crisscrossing in the same way: sometimes overall similarities, sometimes similarities in detail’. (Wittgenstein, 1958, p.66).

The community of inquiry is a place that establishes a lively organized experience of values, which reinforces democratic values, seeking for an interconnectedness of the different values, and maintains the ongoing quest for justice in line with John Dewey’s educational paradigm (Dewey, 1985). This family resemblance must be somehow included in the practice of P4C, for no philosopher can expect to do philosophy in isolation. As Peirce claims, ‘individually [we] cannot reasonably hope to attain the ultimate philosophy which we pursue; we can only seek it, therefore, for the *community* of philosophers.’ (Peirce, 1955c, p.229).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dina Mendonça's research work is supported by the Portuguese Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (SFRH/BPD/102507/2014) and within the research project (PTDC/MHC-FIL/0521/2014). The Authors would like to thank the useful questions and comments received at the presentation at the XVIII ICPIIC Conference of a previous version of this paper, as well as to the reviewers of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Bransford, J.D.; Brown, A.L. & Cocking, R.R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington D.C. National Academy Press.
- Cam, P., (2011). Pragmatism and the Community of Inquiry, *Childhood & Philosophy*, 7 (13), 103-119.
- Costa-Carvalho, M. & Mendonça, D. (2017). "Thinking like a community. Reasonableness and Emotions". In M. Gregory, J. Haynes e K. Murriss (eds.). *The Routledge International Handbook of Philosophy for Children*, (pp. 127-134). Abingdon: Routledge.
- D'Olimpio & Teschers (2017). "Drama, gestures and philosophy in the classroom: playing with philosophy to support an education of life". In M. Gregory, J. Haynes e K. Murriss (eds.). *The Routledge International Handbook of Philosophy for Children*. (pp.145-152). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Emmet, D., (1994). *The role of the unrealizable. A study in regulative ideals* (London: St. Martin's Press).
- Daniel, M. F. et al. (2002). "Pupil Thinking: Relativistic or Inter-subjective?". *Critical Thinking*, 10 (2), 1-19.
- Dewey, J. (1985). "Democracy and Education". In Jo Ann Boydston (ed.) *The Middle Works of John Dewey 1899-1924*, (vol. 10: 1916-1917). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1988). "The Public and Its Problems". In Jo Ann Boydston (ed.) *The Later Works, 1925-1953*. (Volume 2: 1925-1927) Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, pp. 235-372.
- Dewey, J. (1989). "Art ad Experience". In Jo Ann Boydston (ed.) *The Later Works, 1925-1953*. (Volume 10: 1934) Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Eagleton, T. (2000). *The idea of culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Halpin, D. (2001). "Utopianism and Education: The legacy of Thomas More". *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 49 (3): 299-315.
- Kant, I. (1998). *Critique of Pure Reason* (eds. & trans. Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kennedy, N.; Kennedy, D. (2012). Community of Philosophical Inquiry as a Discursive Structure, and its Role in School Curriculum Design, *Philosophy for Children in Transition. Problems and Prospects*. (pp. 97-116). N. Vansieleghem; D. Kennedy (Eds.). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Laverty, M.; Gregory, M., (2007). Evaluating Classroom Dialogue. Reconciling internal and External Accountability, *Theory and Research in Education*, 5, 281-308.
- Lipman, M. (1997). "Thinking in Community", *Inquiry: Critical Thinking across the Disciplines*, 16 (4), 6-21.
- Lipman, M. (2003). *Thinking in Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lipman, M. (2008). *A Life Teaching Thinking*, Montclair: Montclair State University.
- More, T. (1975). *Utopia* (ed. George M Logan, Robert M. Adams) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peirce, C. S. (1955a). "The Essentials of Pragmatism". In *Philosophical Writings of Peirce*. In Justus Buchler (ed.) (New York: Dover Publications, Inc.), pp. 251-268.
- Peirce, C. S. (1955b). Fixation of Belief. In *Philosophical Writings of Peirce*. (pp. 5-22) In Justus Buchler (ed.). New York: Dover Publications, Inc.
- Peirce, C. S. (1955c). Some Consequences of Four Incapacities. In *Philosophical Writings of Peirce*. In Justus Buchler (ed.) (New York: Dover Publications, Inc), pp. 228-250.
- Pritchard, M. S. (1996). Educating for Reasonableness, *Studies in Philosophy for Children. Pixie*, (pp. 52-70) Reed & Sharp (Eds.). Madrid: Ediciones de la Torre.
- Reed, R. (1996) On Marginality, *Studies in Philosophy for Children. Pixie*. (pp. 82-95) ed. Reed & Sharp, (Eds.). Madrid: Ediciones de la Torre.
- Risko, E.; Richardson, D.; Kigstone, A (2016). "Breaking the Fourth Wall of???"
- Cognitive Science: The Real-World Social Attention and the Dual Function of Gaze" *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, Vol. 25(1) 70–74.
- Sharp, A. M. (1987). What is a 'Community of Inquiry?', *Journal of Moral Education*, 16 (1), 37-44.
- Splitter, L. & Sharp, A. M. (1995). *Thinking for Better Teaching. The Classroom Community of Inquiry*, Melbourne: ACER.
- Sprod, T. (1997). "What is a Community of Inquiry? Considerations on an email discussion list", *Inquiry: Critical Thinking Across the Disciplines*, 17 (1), 4-28.
- Weber, B. (2008). "J. Habermas and the Art of dialogue: The Practicability of the Ideal Speech Situation", *Analytic Teaching*, 28 (1), 1-8.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1958). *Philosophical Investigations* (trans. G.E.M Ascombe). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.