

Rethinking Dialogue: Reflections on P4C with Autistic Children

BENJAMIN LUKEY

Introduction

One of the interesting directions that P4C has taken in Hawaii is work with autistic children. A fellow graduate student and P4C Hawaii alumnus introduced me to Loveland Academy, a local private school that specializes in educating children with special needs, specifically autism. I have been working with the children in their after-school program for almost two years, attempting to bring P4C to children who are not in the mainstream curriculum.

One of the most rewarding aspects of this work is its richness. Like P4C in general, someone who engages in the challenge of creating communities of responsible thinkers works from two perspectives. One perspective is the academic challenge presented by the work we do. The other perspective is the pedagogical challenge of creating activities and programs that are effective in achieving our goals. In working with children with autism and other special needs, these two perspectives have at times seemed discordant. This paper is an attempt to explore the source of this seeming tension, and to highlight the fact that Philosophy for Children *is* philosophy in the fullest sense, i.e., a theory/methodology intertwined with practice.

Although I think the academic and pedagogical issues of this paper are of interest to all who study and do P4C, the inspiration behind this paper is largely personal. In working with the children at Loveland, I came to question the efficacy of my approach, which in turn was the result of my philosophical convictions. As an academic, I began to study accounts of autism and attempted to understand the disorder. I also examined some of the literature on what I felt was the most exciting, and most problematic, aspect of P4C, dialogue. This research was manifested in my classroom time with the students, which in turn colored my research, which continued in a circle. I do not presume to be an expert on P4C, autism, or pedagogy. This paper will merely whet the appetites of those interested in the scholarship surrounding autism or dialogue, nor will it be completely satisfying for those who seek complete lesson plans and the complete details of my work at Loveland. My primary concern is to find a way to make learning more satisfying and enriching for “special needs” children by intro-

ducing them to P4C. Thus, this article serves two functions. First, it brings to the fore a potential limitation in the P4C methodology, an academic problem regarding the scope and meaning of dialogue. Second, it serves as an invitation for others doing similar work to engage in dialogue about how to bring together the wonder, thinking and community of P4C with the education and enrichment of special needs students.

Autism 101

For those not familiar with children with autism or autistic behaviors, it is extremely difficult to describe. Two books, *Exiting Nirvana*, by Clara Park, and *Thinking in Pictures*, by Temple Grandin, have been most helpful in my own understanding of autism. There are of course, many texts replete with technical, psychological theorizing, but both of these books succeed in putting a human face on experiences with autism. As an educator, this is extremely important since it is individuals with whom I work, not diagnoses. Diagnoses, however are a helpful starting point, and so I borrow from Grandin:

Today, autism is regarded as an early childhood disorder by definition, and it is three times more common in boys than in girls. For the diagnosis to be made, autistic symptoms must appear before the age of three. The most common symptoms in young children are no speech or abnormal speech, lack of eye contact, frequent tantrums, oversensitivity to touch, the appearance of deafness, a preference for being alone, rocking or other rhythmic stereotypic behavior, aloofness, and a lack of social contact with parents and siblings. Another sign is inappropriate play with toys. The child may spend long periods of time spinning the wheel of a toy car instead of driving it around on the floor.¹

The above description reveals the extreme range of the behaviors and symptoms, many of which may be exhibited by

Benjamin Lukey (lukey@hawaii.edu) is a Ph.D. candidate in philosophy at UH/Manoa focusing on Chinese philosophy and ethics. He has been a graduate teaching assistant with P4C since 2001.

children without autism, that make diagnosis of the disorder challenging. There are many related categories that some consider subgroups of autism and others consider separate disorders. Grandin calls this spectrum “The Great Continuum.” “It appears that at one end of the spectrum, autism is primarily a cognitive disorder, and at the other end, it is primarily a sensory processing disorder. [...] Both the severity and the ratio of these two components are variable, and each case of autism is different.”² Almost every child at Loveland is at a different point within this spectrum. Some are only dealing with cognitive (in which I include social) challenges, and others struggle with sensory challenges, but each of these individuals has required a different strategy in achieving effective communication.

I relate these few observations about autism to call attention to two important points regarding my P4C work with the above-mentioned local school. First, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible to make generalizations about autistic children. This is true of all children, but it becomes painfully obvious within a small group of “special needs” children where it is very rare for more than two individuals to positively respond to an activity. Second, given this extreme uniqueness, group discussion, or even communication, becomes exponentially more difficult. Yet one-on-one interaction, the strategy that is most fruitful for these children in the academic setting, seems to deflate the goals of P4C, which are centered around group dialogue and respectful communication.

After my first six months of working with the students on a one-to-one basis, I realized that I was not doing P4C or anything that would count as a stepping stone towards P4C. I realized that we were not having anything close to a dialogue, or even a discussion, because I was merely pulling thoughts and ideas from the children. It seemed that they really didn’t understand the purpose of dialogue or even the structure of it (more accurately, they weren’t behaving as if they understood). I went back to square one and tried to structure activities that would slowly build an understanding of group discussion and perhaps even dialogue. I will return to these attempts later. I wanted to mention the practical challenges I was discovered, because it was these challenges that made me step back and examine the work I was doing. I began to wonder if it was even possible to achieve at Loveland the same kind of experience (what I defined as a successful P4C session) that was familiar in my work at other “regular” schools in Honolulu.

P4C and Dialogue

The goal of P4C in Hawaii, as I assume most readers already know, is to develop communities of inquiry, where individuals learn to be responsible thinkers. One of the strengths of our program here in Hawaii is our weekly meetings where we (Dr. Jackson and as many P4C practitioners as can make it) discuss issues ranging from the general (e.g., What is safety?) to the specific, (What are we going to do in Ms. Smith’s class on Monday?). These meet-

ings weave together the two perspectives of P4C. We tackle theoretical problems and these discussions are manifested in our classroom actions. We also create lesson plans and think about pedagogical “tips” that, after they have been implemented, become fodder for our theoretical discussion. Thus we maintain a healthy balance of theory and practice.

Our weekly teacher meetings, as instantiations of P4C itself, almost always involve, sharing experiences from the classroom. During these sharings, the excitement is palpable as someone relates a session where a child shared a thought or question and the community immediately coalesced around this idea, adding, wondering, and digging deeper. The community dialogue both enriches and is enriched by the participation of the members of the community. Every time a vocal student steps aside and passes the ball to someone who hasn’t had a chance to speak yet, we slap high-fives. Every time a child identifies an assumption within a response, we inwardly cheer. These are things that we recognize as good for the children’s education and good for the community. And, unfortunately, these are things that are frustratingly rare in my work at Loveland Academy. Thinking together about an idea, displaying sensitivity and interest towards others in the community, and thinking critically about one’s own thoughts are all elements in an enriched notion of “dialogue” or “inquiry” that we share in P4C. Thus, I question whether this notion of dialogue could ever be realized within the specialized communities of the Loveland students.

Before I talk more about these specialized communities, I feel that the notion of dialogue I am working with deserves more explication. When there is genuine dialogue in a P4C classroom, it is more than just talking. David Bohm, a pioneer in the philosophy and practice of dialogue serves as a logical starting point for examining what we mean by dialogue in P4C. His work offers a scholarly context for the successes that we celebrate in our weekly P4C meetings while at the same time revealing challenges of dialogue with a group of students such as I have at Loveland Academy.

In Bohm’s work, *On Dialogue*, he emphasizes several aspects of dialogue that we can recognize in P4C. First, dialogue is a collective endeavor. It is a “stream of meaning” in which our culture (i.e., collectively shared meaning) is revealed. It requires that we play with each other, not against each other; “everybody wins”³. Bohm recognizes the importance of sitting in a circle and the necessity of trust and safety if the dialogue is to “scratch beneath the surface.” He also recognizes that the community in the circle must be an “empty space where we are not obliged to do anything.” This acknowledgment that freedom from a fixed purpose or agenda can be transformative for introspective, interpersonal, and cultural relationships is akin to Dr. Jackson’s reminder, “We’re not in a rush to get anywhere, but that doesn’t mean we aren’t going somewhere.” Though Bohm does not use the term, it certainly seems that he is

very much concerned about community. I like to think that he would celebrate with us when a normally quiet student is given a chance to participate and seizes that opportunity.

Community deepens the thinking of its participants. By exploring our own thoughts juxtaposed against those in the circle we become more aware of our own thoughts. As Bohm describes it, “the whole group becomes a mirror for each person”²⁴. This reflection reveals one’s assumptions, another aspect of dialogue that Bohm greatly values. Bohm argues that everyone has assumptions or closely held beliefs that are felt to be “absolutely necessary,” meaning that an individual cannot turn that assumption or opinion aside; it is a part of that individual. When individuals have differing assumptions that are “absolutely necessary” there is conflict. But Bohm argues that if one becomes aware of these “necessary” assumptions and recognizes that others also have “necessary” assumptions (which may be different), then one will realize that conflict will not end unless one questions the “necessity” of these assumptions and suspends them to a certain extent. Thus, people are able to share meaning rather than butt heads. We think together and meaning flows, rather than fighting to prove that we are right. Again, I think Bohm would recognize the importance of our efforts to get children to identify assumptions and learn from themselves and others; and he would share our enthusiasm when these efforts bear fruit.

Another aspect (and the final one that I will address) that Bohm emphasizes is the importance of sensitivity and empathy for dialogue. Again, this is something that receives a fair amount of practical and academic attention in our weekly P4C meetings. For Bohm, the attitude of dialogue – what happens when one enriches one’s relationships in society and is able to participate in and to hold all of these coherent meanings in one’s own mind – can permeate any encounter, and thus dialogue can occur in small groups or one-on-one. This idea is especially enticing considering that working in large groups at Loveland is so challenging. However, in order to develop all these relationships through dialogue, Bohm argues that sensitivity is necessary. Relationships, though a fundamental part of who we are, are not easy and require a kind of cultivated perception (sensitivity) in order to develop these relationships and the meaning that flows from them. Indeed, it is the seeming lack of this kind of cultivated sensitivity that makes P4C so challenging with autistic children. As Bohm points out, sensitivity in relationships requires the *senses*. Yet this is not all, “The senses will tell you what is happening, and then the consciousness must build a form, or create some sense of what it *means*, which holds it together”²⁵. We excitedly notice the development of such sensitivity in our P4C classrooms; it is yet another source of “warm fuzzies” during our weekly meetings.

Before I move into discussing dialogue and autism, I think it is interesting to consider a perspective on dialogue that is not from the field of education. Dialogue is a concept that has not only benefited education, but also business

and government. Daniel Yankelovich is an expert on dialogue and an adviser to corporations, government, and organizations. He acknowledges David Bohm as one of his influences, and, indeed, his book, *The Magic of Dialogue*, shares many features with Bohm’s general philosophy of dialogue. One of the more valuable contributions of his book is his distinction between discussion and dialogue. Yankelovich proposes three key features that are necessary for dialogue (and which distinguish it from discussion): (1) equality and the absence of coercive influences, (2) listening with empathy, and (3) bringing assumptions into the open. One can see the obvious similarities with Bohm, but Yankelovich has turned Bohm’s insights into necessary conditions for the practice of dialogue. Furthermore, Yankelovich has focused Bohm’s notion of sensitivity into the concept of empathy. Yankelovich describes “the gift of empathy” as “the ability to think someone else’s thoughts and feel someone else’s feelings,” and claims that it “is indispensable to dialogue” (43). Even given the earlier brief description of the behaviors associated with autism, one can already see the difficulty in attempting dialogue with autistic children. I turn now to examine those challenges more closely.

Autism and Dialogue

As noted above, autism can be viewed as a cognitive disorder and a sensory processing disorder. As a sensory processing disorder, the kind of sensitivity that Bohm says is necessary for dialogue to flourish may be physiologically impossible for some students. Indeed, it is often the lack of this kind of sensitivity that prompts the diagnosis of autism. Clara Park theorizes that the sensory disorder of autism can be seen as an inability to direct attention to multiple things at once and rapidly shift one’s attention among the various sensory stimuli. Temple Grandin admits that a pager can completely distract her from a lecture. Hearing tests have confirmed that her ability to process and attend to one voice against the background of another is severely impaired. Grandin reports stories about individuals who cannot process visual and auditory stimuli at the same time, or who get the stimuli mixed up so that sound comes through as color, or who hit themselves not realizing that they are injuring themselves. The ability to sense body language and the subtle meaning suggested by minute facial changes is something that Grandin herself has difficulty with. Given that there are such challenges in sensory processing, the kind of behavior that we consider successes in a regular P4C classroom may be close to impossible with some individuals. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine that a P4C community or empathy would be possible among students who can’t be sure that they are perceiving in the same way as their fellow participants.

Added to the sensory challenges are the cognitive challenges of communicating with others, collective reasoning, and identifying assumptions. It is theorized that one of the defining features of autistic children (particularly those with Kanner’s syndrome, a categorization of lower-functioning

autism) is that they lack a theory of mind. In the field of developmental psychology, a theory of mind is “a set of ideas about mental activities”⁶. Many autistic children are unable to imagine what other people are thinking and often fail to recognize others as thinking and feeling persons. The inability to recognize other minds means that the group would not be able to serve as a mirror for the individual. Likewise, if one isn’t aware of others in the group as thinking beings, then it is extremely unlikely that one will think together with them.

As for Yankelovich’s three necessary conditions for dialogue, it is difficult to imagine three criteria that would be more difficult to satisfy in working with autistic children. Merely requiring some autistic children to talk is often coercive, and often rewards must be established to motivate a child to interact with his peers and teachers. This may be because the meanings of words are too abstract to grasp for some autistic children. Although Grandin is highly articulate her verbal ability is something that does not come naturally to her (it wasn’t until Grandin was in college that she realized that some people think entirely in words). She says that she thinks in pictures; something like a videotape of images in her head that she can edit at will. She translates these images into words and words into images. The Lord’s Prayer was incomprehensible to her until she broke it into specific visual images⁷. Images have meaning for Grandin, and spoken words must be translated into images to acquire meaning. This may also be why many children at Loveland have already learned to read even though they still have difficulty using and understanding words. Printed words are more readily memorized and translated into meaningful images. Spoken dialogue may be an ineffective and unnecessarily coercive activity to get these children to communicate their thoughts.

Empathy may also be a criterion that is unreasonable to expect from some autistic students. Some autistics are in a constant state of agitation, somewhat akin to the fight or flight response, that precludes the feelings of warmth and togetherness associated with empathy. Grandin herself couldn’t understand or feel empathy until she built a pressure machine that helped her control her sensory overstimulation. Her “squeeze machine” gave Grandin soothing feelings which she realized she needed to cultivate with others. The machine sufficiently calmed her so that she could feel affection and togetherness with others (though she still admits that she is denied the pleasure that people take in natural beauty, such as a landscape). Yet, Grandin herself notes that this treatment is not something that will work with all autistics. There are also cognitive barriers to empathy. If an autistic student lacks a theory of mind and is unable to recognize that a fellow student has feelings and thoughts of

her own, then the autistic student is unlikely to feel any empathy towards the other student.

Given that prompting a student to speak may be coercive, and that empathy may be unattainable, bringing assumptions into the open is an achievement that rarely happens on the level which we would recognize in regular P4C classrooms. Still, I think that this criteria of Yankelovich’s might be satisfied if we alter our understanding of “assumptions.” For a student to realize that another perceives things differently is a great accomplishment, and yet this realization might come from a directed activity that the student is initially uninterested in. Likewise, for a student to use the correct pronouns to correctly describe that what he did that morning was different from what another did is an event that causes high-fives among the facilitators. Thinking that she is the only person thinking or feeling, and that everyone experiences the world as she does are the assumptions being recognized and overcome in such behavior (though I wonder whether the individual actually *thinks* these thoughts). They may not be beliefs, but they are “necessities” that must be put aside if communication is to be possible.



Ultimately, I think Grandin’s work confirms many of the insights offered by Bohm and Yankelovich, but I also think that her perspective forces us to recognize some presuppositions of dialogue. Because Grandin adds her voice to the discussion about education, learning and autism, we are made aware of our own assumptions, and she of hers. Grandin’s book is especially fascinating because she herself is extremely articulate (she has Asperger’s Syn-

drome, a high-functioning form of autism). We come to see that thought is not merely internal language and that the very way our senses process the world is an “assumption” which some individuals do not share. There is much within Grandin’s book that serves as a mirror for identifying our own assumptions about how we engage the world. There is also much that Grandin herself gains from reading and questioning others. She has come to better understand her own differences and is therefore such an effective communicator, because she can articulate how her experiences differ from others.

Even though Grandin’s writings and lectures may reveal assumptions on all sides and help deepen our engagement in meaning, it doesn’t seem as if such interaction is properly labeled “dialogue,” as Bohm or Yankelovich defines it. First of all, communication through writing is not sitting around a circle. When someone writes a book or presents a lecture, there is a purpose. It is neither as free and open as a group sitting in a circle, nor is everyone on equal footing since there is a presenter and an audience. Furthermore, as

one comes to know others in the group, one grows more sensitive to their non-verbal communication. This may be unfeasible for some autistic children, which might affect the level of communication occurring within the circle. Yet, I think that these differences and challenges are not critical for dialogue. I think that Grandin is an excellent example of someone who has adopted what Bohm calls “the attitude of dialogue.” What I suspect, and what I want to confirm, is that this attitude may be fostered without creating a circle of thirty students spontaneously sharing their thoughts and feelings. In attempting to foster this attitude, I think Grandin’s narrative and the general scholarship on autism suggest something that all practitioners of P4C should keep in mind.

The first is that P4C can and should be sensitive and accommodating to other modes of thought. Grandin’s account belies the assumption that words and speech are necessary for thought, and so we must be careful, or at least explicit, about what we are trying to cultivate in children. By focusing on words and abstraction, we may be neglecting some forms of imagination or meaning that children more readily understand and share. We must be cautious about generalizing Grandin’s kind of visual thinking to all people with autism, but it does at least establish that there are different modes of thought which P4C, as I imagine most people practice it, may have difficulty accommodating. For someone who has not yet learned how to translate from a visual form of thought into a verbal form of thought, the practice of dialogue must shift in order to achieve its goals—shared meaning and the bringing of assumptions into the open.

Part of this accommodation should be a willingness to teach in both directions. We are certainly attempting to bring autistic children into the world of speech, relationships and empathy. I would be overjoyed if the students at Loveland mastered the translation skills that Grandin has acquired so that they could articulate their difficulties with and assumptions about abstraction, empathy, spirituality and other aspects of life with which many of us identify. But we must also be willing to try and enter their world to the extent that this is possible. This may mean using more pictorial cues and doing more visual activities so that we share meaning in pictures rather than in words. The exchange must be bi-directional. Language has helped Grandin and several of my students to understand themselves and others better. It is because they have access to our language-based way of thinking that they can participate in discussions and dialogues with peers. This may be a necessity; yet, it seems unfair to only acknowledge someone as a participant in a dialogue if she “speaks our language.” Furthermore, if we undertake to become more familiar with their mode of thought, we might hold even more meanings in our mind (Bohm’s characterization of the attitude of dialogue). I admit that I am genuinely curious, and often skeptical, as to how much I can really understand the perspective of an autistic student, but I am reluctant to

forego the attempt.

What To Do?

It is with intentional irony that I extend an invitation for dialogue about the bias and limitation of dialogue as it applies to autistic children, and, more generally, different kinds of thinkers. I will admit upfront that I am extremely challenged as to how to conduct P4C in a way that is open to other modes of communication. My academic ruminations present me with a practical dilemma: Is P4C *fundamentally* an activity and way of learning and developing for those who are able to verbally communicate and process thoughts and who can empathize with others to form a “community?” If it is, then my efforts at Loveland are futile, and those children are fated to “miss the P4C bus,” something that makes me uncomfortable as a P4C facilitator and educator. If not, then how do we expand our activity, our communities of inquiry to include those who don’t communicate in a way we typically understand? I am ultimately hoping that others will help me formulate an answer to this question. I put forth my own thoughts and attempts in order to contribute to the dialogue.

As I mentioned above, after my first six months of working at Loveland Academy, I realized that there was no community of inquiry, and it was not in the process of being formed. My overall goal was to get the students communicating with each other, or at least to acknowledge that other students were sources of unknown information. Digging beneath the surface, revealing assumptions, and shared meaning were eventual goals but seemed far off on the horizon. Listening was the first important element. Sitting at a table, I tried to structure activities so that only one person would speak at a time and the children would know what they were supposed to be listening for.

Once I felt that the children had a handle on listening I introduced the concept of questioning and answering, since many did not seem to understand the practice of asking and answering questions. They would ask questions in order to get something they wanted (e.g., Can I watch a video?) but they rarely asked questions out of curiosity. Furthermore, when they answered questions, they often seemed unconcerned as to whether their answers were understood. In regular P4C sessions, children are often eager to ask questions of an individual if she has related an interesting event or fact, and children are concerned if others ignore or misunderstand their answers. Asking and answering questions is an important element of P4C because it makes the inquiry the project of the community.

Working under the assumption that if the children were provided with a structured activity to practice asking and answering questions then they would be more likely to ask and answer questions in a more conversational setting, I created cards with six questions words (who, what, where, why, when, and how), six pronouns (I, you, he, she, it, they), some common verbs, and some auxiliary preposi-

tions. There were also cards to indicate who was asking a question and who was answering. It was difficult for several of the students to create questions, so I allowed them to repeat the question that they had heard from the person next to them. The pronoun cards indicated the pattern of response (e.g., if some one asks “What did *you* eat for lunch today?” the answer has to be “*I* ate/had ...”). The proper use of pronouns was challenging for many of the students. It became even more challenging and more interesting when I had the students use certain pronouns for their questions. Students struggled to ask the person next to them questions about themselves or others in the circle (e.g., “What time does Joe go home from school?” “What is my favorite food?”). I often found that students answered from a first person perspective. Likewise, students often didn’t wait for an answer and supplied it themselves (E.g., “Where do I live?... in Hawaii”). It was difficult for the question asker because she either had to ask a question to which they didn’t know the answer, or think of a question that that the other person would be able to answer. Likewise it was difficult for the answerer because she had to answer a question in second or third person, and this required knowing information about others. However, after much practice students were able to recognize and explain that other’s had different answers to the same questions. We still have a long way to go to achieve a true discussion, but I think that having a repetitive, consistent activity provides a structure for developing the awareness and curiosity about others that we take for granted in other P4C classrooms.

I have also tried to move away from verbally centered forms of communication by encouraging curiosity and communication through media other than words. On a blackboard, we play a game of Pictionary where once a student guesses what is being drawn she/he tries to draw something that is conceptually related. By the end of the activity, there is a collage of drawings on the blackboard and we try to retrace the steps of how the different pictures came about. Then, usually with the more verbal and higher-functioning students, we try to create a story that incorporates each drawing. I have also integrated the question/answer activity into more physical games, such as darts (plastic tips of course), bowling, boardgames, and others, so that the focus of the activity is the game rather than the stressful process of asking and answering questions.

While many of these activities have been successful with some students, I do not think there was one that was successful with all the students. And what remains most frustrating is that these activities seem most successful with people at a certain level; i.e., those children who are just beginning to use words effectively to communicate and grasp the existence of other minds. It focuses “lower” functioning children who have no interest in communicating with others so that they respond more readily to questions and can ask questions appropriately. However, it hasn’t yet made them ready for what we would recognize as P4C discussion, much less dialogue. There is no expressed sense of

wonder about themselves or others (and perhaps someone can’t wonder about herself if she isn’t really aware of others); when someone expresses a thought or idea, there is almost never an impulse from someone else in the circle to raise his hand and contribute something else. This may be impossible for the “lower-functioning” students, and the activities may be too simplistic for the “higher-functioning” students. Indeed, the higher functioning students seem capable of a P4C discussion as it occurs in other “mainstream” schools but either share very little experience or interests with children their own age, or they have difficulty feeling comfortable with their peers.

It may be that the very strengths of Loveland Academy function as constraints for doing P4C. Small classes and one-on-one assistance for almost every student means that children are not used to working in groups and when groups greater than three or four students are formed, the difference in abilities and behaviors makes almost any activity frustrating for the participants. Or rather, perhaps P4C needs to create ways to accommodate very small groups of children who require educational aids to provide prompts and mediate differences. The successes achieved in such a context may be different from those in a regular P4C classroom, but they should still be P4C successes. There is a certain child who is very content in his own little world and who often seems deep in thought, wondering about things to himself in slight murmurs. I may never understand how he perceives the world or what he thinks about, but whenever he gives one of his highly original answers or solutions, I consider it a P4C success. With such successes in mind, I appeal to both academics and educators in exploring the philosophical and psychological issue of dialogue with people with autism and the pedagogical issue of how to approach such a challenge.

Notes

1. Grandin, Temple, *Thinking in Pictures: And Other Reports from My Life with Autism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1996), p. 45.
2. Ibid. 58.
3. Bohm, David, *On Dialogue* (New York: Routledge, 1996), p. 7
4. Ibid. 20.
5. Bohm, 40.
6. Berk, Laura. *Child Development* (New York: Allyn & Bacon, 1996), p. 342.
7. Grandin, 33.

Bibliographic References

1. Berk, Laura. *Child Development* (New York: Allyn & Bacon, 1996).
2. Bohm, David, *On Dialogue* (New York: Routledge, 1996).
3. Grandin, Temple, *Thinking in Pictures: And Other Reports from My Life with Autism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1996).
4. Park, Clara, *Exiting Nirvana: A Daughter’s Life with Autism*, (New York: Little Brown & Company, 2001).
5. Yankelovich, Daniel, *The Magic of Dialogue: Transforming Conflict into Cooperation* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1999).