



# childhood & philosophy

núcleo de estudos de filosofias e infâncias [nefi/uerj]  
international council of philosophical inquiry with children [icpic]

e-issn: 1984-5987 | p-issn: 2525-5061

## *review 2*

**reviewer:** pieter mostert

the philosophy foundation, london, united kingdom

## exploring the application of empirical research in philosophy for children: analysis of two case studies in caring thinking

### **author**

hye in ji

ewha institute of philosophy, seoul, south korea

e-mail: [hyeinji@ewha.ac.kr](mailto:hyeinji@ewha.ac.kr)

<https://orcid.org/0009-0003-0280-5021>

### **citation of evaluated article:**

HYE IN, J. (2025). Exploring the application of empirical research in philosophy for children: analysis of two case studies in caring thinking. *childhood & philosophy*, 21, 1-42. doi: 10.12957/childphilo.2025.88956



In general, the submission meets the reviewer guidelines: 1) It is suitable for publication in *Childhood & Philosophy*. 2) Its topic is relevant and timely. 3.1) the abstract summarises the main issues, 3.2) the article reflects current literature, 3.3) the objectives are well-defined; 3.4) the ideas are clear and well-developed, 3.5) the arguments are well-founded, 3.6) the conclusions are clearly expressed.

Regarding specific parts of the content, I have four recommendations for revisions:

Ann Sharp is absent, both in the references and in the description of how the concept of caring thinking evolved. Her 2004 article "The other dimension of caring thinking" deserves a prominent place.

The article advocates a "multidimensional approach to thinking" through "integrating caring thinking with critical and creative thinking". The reader wants to know whether the author agrees or disagrees with a similar approach by Roberto Tibaldeo in his 2023 book "Matthew Lipman and Ann Margaret Sharp. Philosophy for Children's Educational Revolution", specifically Chapter 3. Please read this book and give your arguments for agreeing or disagreeing with Tibaldeo's description.

In an online research meeting, a few months ago, we discussed an article on the conceptualisation of caring thinking. It has not yet been published, but I do have permission from the author to provide the title and his e-mail address, so that the author of the submission can contact him. The title is: "Philosophy for Children and Educating for Wisdom: A Conceptual Analysis of Caring Thinking for Effective Assessment" His e-mail address is: bakironur@gmail.com. His name is: Onur Bakir.

Finally, I recommend that the description of the students' activities during the sessions (which were object of the quantitative and the qualitative study) is extended and more precise, so that the reader can assess how the P4C practice that is researched in this study relates to the reader's own practice. Four questions as a guide: 1) did all sessions follow a similar model or pattern of a dialogue? 2) how different were such dialogues from common classroom conversations? 3) were there other elements added to the dialogue, like exercises (as is done in the manuals which accompany Lipman's novels)? 4) what was the role of the teacher/

facilitator: what did and what did not belong to this role? For example, some facilitators raise questions and ask for responses from the students. Others don't do that; instead they encourage the students to raise questions. Another example: what is the facilitator's role in ending / concluding / summarising the session?