Philosophy For, With, and Of Children

Philosophy For, With, and Of Children

Edited by

Monica B. Glina

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS

P U B L I S H I N G

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

BEATE BØRRESEN
OSLO AND AKERSHUS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

We know that knowledge and understanding are the result of dialogue and argumentation—with ourselves, with our experiences, with texts, and with others. However, we also know that there is little dialogue and little argumentation in schools across the world. What is often referred to as *dialogue* is dominated by the teacher and consists of exchanges of information, fact checking, or just an exchange of opinions. In philosophy, one participates in a dialogue in which the goal is to reach something true and good or truer and better, and the way to do this is to listen to different ideas and pieces of information, argue for and against, evaluate what is said, and make a choice. We do not exchange opinions but try to find out how things are, might be, or should be. A philosophical dialogue is structured and focused, and in it, everyone must participate, at least through listening, understanding, and connecting to what is said.

After many years of having philosophy in the schools, we know that doing philosophy with children is possible and valuable. Several research projects, for example, in Clackmannanshire, Scotland, and in Stockholm, Sweden, have shown that students who engage regularly in structured philosophical dialogue over a longer period of time develop cognitive and oral skills. Their schoolwork improves, especially in languages and mathematics, and they get better at listening, asking questions, and giving reasons. These projects also reveal that a number of elements need to be in place if we are to begin achieving a favorable outcome. Specifically, the success of these projects relies on teacher determination, a faithful adherence to doing philosophy at least once a week, quality stimulus material, training, and administrative commitment. We have also seen that it is difficult to continue with philosophy once the project that brought it to the classroom ends. Both teachers and students soon fall into old routines. Most teachers either will not or cannot do the work that is required for practicing good philosophy in the classroom.

What shall we do then? I am sorry to say that I do not think it is possible to get teachers to do philosophy regularly in their classrooms.

They lack training, time, and support. However, what they can do is to take the general attitudes and implement ways of working that are associated with the practice of doing philosophy into the classroom, and they can better challenge the students *and* use their questions and problems as starting points for work in the classroom. What does this mean in practice?

Attitude

Philosophical activity is based on the recognition of ignorance. The philosopher's thirst for knowledge is shown through attempts to find better answers to questions even if those answers are never found. At the same time, a philosopher also knows that being too sure can hinder the discovery of other and better possibilities. In a philosophical dialogue, the participants are aware that there are things they do not know or understand. The goal of the dialogue is to arrive at a conception that one did not know or understand beforehand. In traditional schools, where philosophy is not present, students often work with factual questions, they learn specific content listed in the curriculum, and they are not required to solve philosophical problems. However, we know that an attitude of ignorance or awareness of what one does not know can be a good way to acquire knowledge. Knowledge and understanding are developed through thinking and talking. Putting things into words makes things clearer. Therefore, students must not be afraid of saying something wrong or talking without first being sure that they are right. They must get experience with how mistakes and misunderstanding can lead to knowledge. In turn, teachers must value mistakes and use them for better understanding. The students must be given time and space to express their ideas and thoughts even if they are themselves unsure of those ideas and thoughts. Then, the class together shall find out if and in what ways these ideas may or may not be good. In this way, students can use their knowledge, experience, and reason to try find a good answer instead of guessing or just repeating what is in their textbooks.

Structure

Philosophers work in a systematic way. They formulate a problem, collect different suggestions, and compare, evaluate, and decide what the best possible answer is, and they do not go to the next step until everything is as clear as possible. Furthermore, we can use these methods in day-to-day work in the classroom, for example, by not answering or explaining

something before we are sure that everybody has heard and understood the question or the problem and by letting students instead of the teacher offer answers and explanations. It is also important to let students have time to think and make notes before they answer questions and to explain their answer before the teacher evaluates it. In addition, when students are engaged in dialogues or discussions, it is helpful to keep a discussion map on the board to keep track of what has been done. This might help students focus on one thing at a time and delve into matters more deeply instead of just exchanging opinions.

Students can be helped to be more aware on a meta-level by having to say what they are about to do, for example, "I am going to ask a question," "I will explain in what way John disagrees with Ann," or "I will show how Sara's reason is not sufficient." In this way, it is easier for those who listen to grasp what is said and for the dialogue to be more accurate. In the same way, a concluding final round of meta-talk, during which students explain what was difficult, what they have learned, and so on, can help the class to be more aware of what they have understood, what skills they have mastered, and what they still have to practice.

In philosophy, we find answers and understand more by entertaining other peoples' ideas and different possible answers. We become suspicious when everyone agrees with a general belief and no one argues against it. Rather than simply accept that belief, it is exactly at this point that we should try to explore the belief in a deeper way by listening to more ideas or by looking at the matter from a different angle. It is, therefore, important for a teacher or facilitator not only to let those who raise their hands speak but to involve all students by distributing opportunities for students to talk in class by using dice, pulling names out of a box, or letting the students listen to each other in rounds. For this to work well, students must be encouraged to speak even if they are not sure what to say and to help each other develop their ideas and not simply repeat what has already been said.

Challenge

Understanding often occurs when we are confronted with a perspective that is different from or goes against the views that we initially had, and we are forced to think about how things are or might be. In philosophy, there is an ideal that one shall seek other views and other ways before one decides on a problem or question. For students to learn, they have to be put in situations where they must think, give reasons, and evaluate their words and actions and those of others by listening to themselves and each other

and by having to present their ideas. In such situations, students are confronted with a wealth of information and opinions to which they have to actively relate. So, even if it might be faster for the teacher to tell students what to think, the students will learn by arriving at these notions themselves with help from the teacher.

The process of giving reasons and evaluating words and actions is central to education in Norwegian schools and educational politics. Each student has to formulate and evaluate goals for his or her work. Pedagogically, they learn by having to be aware of what they need to do, why they need to do it, and in what ways they have been doing it well. Philosophy is helpful in this process because it is open, it seeks different views, and it helps individuals decide on what and why something is good. Philosophy with children, in particular, emphasizes that understanding and learning are processes in which we engage in together, with others, and with help from others' knowledge, experiences, and ideas.

One can increase room for thinking by presenting students with problems that cannot be solved immediately instead of concrete tasks with easily found, short, and clear answers. When the students, instead of the teacher, are allowed to describe a problem, present and discuss different solutions, try them out, and evaluate the results, they are forced to build strategies for school work and to reflect on and explain what they are doing. To enable students to find good answers, it is necessary that their discussions be more than general conversations during which everyone "has a right to their own opinion" and in which they are never challenged. Instead, they have to go deeper by relating to what is said, require clarification and explanation, take a stand, and evaluate their words and their actions. They need to involve themselves in an inquiry, as people who do philosophy with children would argue.

Apart from these attitudes and ways of working, one can also introduce philosophy to students by letting them work with philosophical questions connected to different subjects, for example:

- "Where are the numbers when we don't use them?" (math)
- "Are languages invented?" (language)
- "Is someone in a prison free?" (social studies)
- "Do laws take away our freedom?" (social studies/civics)
- "Who decides what is just?" (law)
- "What makes something beautiful?" (art)

Although this volume offers a number of suggestions for ways in which this can be done, this breadth of options also reminds us to be aware

that there are many ways of working in a classroom. When there is more variety in the kinds of teaching methods, the hope is that students will learn more. In the end, we must not forget that both philosophy and school are about being better persons and creating better communities. As Gregory underlines in his chapter, work in school must focus not only on how philosophy can help children to be better students or get ahead but also on the fact that philosophy is also about living well.

INTRODUCTION

MONICA B. GLINA
UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

Philosophy for Children (P4C) is more than simply a way to engage in shared, substantive inquiry into narrative or informational text; it offers ways to open discourse channels for interacting with and contemplating the perspectives of others. This volume illustrates the considerable diversity of perspectives that can be brought to P4C, and the ways in which these agendas sometimes complement and sometimes undermine one another. Although approaches and conceptions vary, there is an undercurrent of pervasive themes that flows throughout P4C practice, which is represented in these chapters. First, there is an emphasis on the active, reasoned role of the participants in the community of inquiry (CI). Many of the authors in this volume directly or indirectly reference the transformation that can occur for the individual thinker and the community, as well as the symbiotic impact that they can have on one another. Second, there is an epistemological requirement and practical commitment from the teacher to divest himself or herself from the trappings typically associated with being the classroom expert and the authority to allow for the recalibration and redistribution of power. Third, P4C can be viewed as a systematic, process-driven pedagogy that promotes powerful cognitive and social dispositions whose outcomes follow from the rigor associated with reasoned inquiry. Engaging in sustained, collaborative thinking helps students learn how to think and how to think about thinking. Lastly, the content of philosophical inquiry can range from the exploration of contestable concepts within and across school subjects to social and ethical quandaries to the biggest theoretical concepts and existential questions about the meaning of personhood and how to live a worthwhile life.

Our authors take the common position that humility and a certain kind of scholarly ignorance can be seen as keys to philosophical inquiry. In this collection, we offer multiple and divergent perspectives on philosophy for, with, and of children and hope that it will arouse reactions, critical examination and discussion.

Gregory opens the volume by reviewing the variety of purposes that have been articulated for pre-college philosophy historically, and by arguing for a more ambitious purpose: to relate thinking well with living well. He draws on the tradition of ancient schools that undertook philosophy as the pursuit of wisdom and proposes that P4C practice be broadened to combine discursive with ethical and contemplative practices. In a similarly ameliorative vein, Kennedy and Kennedy suggest the need to continually deconstruct and reconstruct our ideas of how things are and how they should be, not only in individual classrooms but within the school as a whole. They argue for exploration of the potential connections among content areas by extending and relating contestable concepts across disciplines, and they begin to explore the potential for these relationships in the mathematics classroom.

Parker moves the discussion from the school setting to cultural venues, where kids are inspired to develop poetry within the CI and to use their poetry as stimuli to inspire further and future inquiry. Parker argues that poetic thinking cultivates pertinent behaviors, such as addressing individuals in the community, responding to one another respectfully, and being empathetic.

Splitter makes a case for the unique moral value of each person as one among others and applies a Davidsonian model of triangulation in which the person, those with whom he or she is in a dialogical relationship, and the world as a whole are conceptually and epistemologically intertwined. In the classroom, this model is the CI. The theme of language and, specifically, the role of dialogue in understanding moral and ethical issues are picked up by other contributors, including Rogers, who revisits the importance of empathy, emotion, and thinking, and argues that ethics not only should not be but cannot be taught as a prescribed formula. Room must be made for deliberation and choice about ethical concepts, and this room is absent when a didactic approach to teaching morality is present. These themes manifest themselves practically in my own investigation of structured philosophical dialogue as a means by which to explore issues of aggression. In this study, I analyzed indicators of dialogic interaction to assess whether complex notions of caring, empathy, fairness, and respect were operationalized and, ultimately, internalized by participants in a CI.

Lin makes the case that the CI can help us meet the theoretical demands of conceiving dialogic pedagogy as a means for delivering democracy, and Sequeira explains the impact that such a democratic practice can have on the cultivation of a compassionate citizenry in which the individual differences and perspectives of the marginalized are valued and celebrated. The discussion comes full circle to Gregory's suggestion

that philosophy can help us to live well. Should individuals be able to explore content domains, their surroundings, and those around them in a thoughtful and respectful manner, this may indeed be the outcome.

In traditional P4C practice, the philosophical story is the traditional stimulus from which students derive contestable questions and launch their own inquiries and explorations. Because there is a broadly personal and psychological domain of background knowledge that is shared among people, the narrative form of the philosophical novel is a highly egalitarian tool. For example, we all know from a young age what it means to feel sad or hurt, so people reading narratives about sadness or hurt can readily relate to these emotions. On the other hand, specific ways of thinking are required for accessing domains, such as history, mathematics, and science. These domains, however content-specific, offer manifold opportunities for inquiry around contestable concepts and questions. Many of the words and phrases that we see emerge during philosophical inquiry, including *practical application, proficient, theory, test, hypothesize, reinforce, factor, elaborate, confirm,* and *negotiate,* are core terms in other domains as well, streaming fluidly from one content area to another.

Analogous to Kennedy and Kennedy's recommendation that content should be considered across different domains because of the inherent and pervasive connections that exist among them, so, too, is the case with the chapters in this volume. What has preceded is a summative, if intentionally cursory, introduction. We hope that this volume serves as a stimulus from which to mine and explore contestable concepts and questions; readers are invited to engage its material, weigh it against their existing dialogues, and respond to those elements that they find inspiring, as well as those with which they disagree or deem problematic.

This volume is by no means the beginning of the dialogue but represents our own modest contribution to an already robust discourse.

PART I:

PHILOSOPHY FOR CHILDREN IN THE SERVICE OF EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

WISDOM AND OTHER AIMS
FOR PRECOLLEGE PHILOSOPHY EDUCATION

MAUGHN ROLLINS GREGORY
MONTCLAIR STATE UNIVERSITY

The diversity of materials and methods developed for precollege philosophy programs signifies different conceptions of what it means to engage children in philosophical practices. The development of program-specific objectives and standards would make it possible to judge the relative merits of various programs and to prevent the unfair comparison of programs with very different objectives. Precollege philosophy programs commonly work toward four objectives: the development of cognitive skills and dispositions, the understanding of inquiry and the development of inquiry strategies, the development of dialogical skills, and the development of familiarity with philosophical content. These objectives might lead to a wider appreciation of the educational merits of studying philosophy but might also reinforce education aimed at students getting ahead rather than living well. The Stoics distinguished three components of living well that can provide categories of wisdom-oriented objectives for precollege philosophy education: a moral component of living ethically and virtuously, a psychological component of maintaining tranquility in the midst of chaos, and an intellectual component of disciplined thinking and the construction of a value-oriented vision of the world. Reinstating these objectives in the context of precollege philosophy education could help to return philosophy to its original identity as the disciplined study and practice of living well.

The Need to Develop Objectives for Precollege Philosophy Education

The year 2009 marked the 40th anniversary of Matthew Lipman's first philosophical novel for children, *Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery,*[1] which was piloted in schools in Montclair and Newark, New Jersey. Today *Harry* has been translated into scores of languages and dialects, and

Philosophy for Children has become a worldwide movement. However, the diversity of curriculum materials and pedagogical protocols that this movement has spawned signifies not merely different approaches to teaching philosophy to children but also different conceptions of what it means to teach philosophy to children or to engage children in philosophical practices. Other disciplines that have become a regular part of children's education, such as mathematics, science, and history, have initiated educational objectives and standards that describe the knowledge and skills that children should be able to demonstrate at various stages in their education. These objectives make it possible to judge the merits of various educational approaches, to make formative and summative program assessments, and to regulate the consistency and equity of educational experiences across diverse populations. Also, the formulation of educational objectives and standards occasions professional dialogue about what it means to practice a discipline well and about likely means for initiating newcomers into the discipline, and this dialogue benefits the discipline itself.

All of this is instructive for precollege philosophy and, in particular, Philosophy for Children, which aspires to make philosophy a standard school subject for all age groups (see Cam, 2006; Splitter & Sharp, 1995). Although philosophy is a relative newcomer to precollege and especially presecondary education, the proliferation of materials and methods in the last few decades has resulted in four important problems for this field that we can solve only by giving attention to the issue of objectives and standards for meeting them. First, approaches to teaching philosophy to children and youth are so diverse that it is difficult to compare their relative merits. There has been confusion and unfairness in comparing and criticizing programs with widely different objectives. This confusion is increased when philosophers argue (correctly) that school programs in critical thinking, ethics, art, democratic citizenship, and character education have, or ought to have, philosophical components.

Second, precollege philosophy programs are rarely evaluated even about their own objectives, or they are evaluated for external objectives, such as raising grades or test scores. Most of the empirical evaluation of Philosophy for Children has been done with regard to its effect on children's thinking skills (Garcia-Moriyón, Rebollo, & Colom, 2004), which is only one of the program's objectives. As a result, the program is often misconstrued (e.g., Willingham, 2007) as a nondisciplinary thinking curriculum rather than an introduction to the discipline of philosophy. The lack of authentic program evaluation is a problem for precollege philosophy because, without it, neither program developers nor their

clients have evidence of the program's effectiveness for either internal or external objectives (see Reznitskaya, 2005).

Two obstacles to the authentic evaluation of precollege philosophy education are that (a) philosophers are not trained in methods of empirical research and so must cross-disciplinary boundaries to collaborate with colleagues in the social sciences, who themselves may not be interested in philosophy, and (b) authentic objectives for philosophy education, such as dialogical competence and acumen with philosophical concepts, have been difficult to observe and measure empirically until relatively recently. Most evaluative studies of precollege philosophy education (e.g., Dolz, 1996; Morehouse & Williams, 1998; Shipman, 1983) have relied on measurement tools, such as standardized vocabulary, reading comprehension, and logic tests, which capture only a small range of the outcomes that are important to philosophy education. However, recent advances in qualitative and quantitative research methods in education, influenced primarily by sociocultural learning theories (see Reznitskaya, 2005), make this work increasingly suitable for the evaluation of philosophy education and particularly classroom dialogue (e.g., Alexander, 2003; Kuhn, Shaw, & Felton, 1997; Mercer, Wegerif, & Dawes, 1999; Nystrand, Wu, Garmon, Zeiser, & Long, 2003; Soter et al., 2008).

The lack of institutional and professional rapprochement between philosophers and educational researchers also contributes to a third problem facing the field of precollege philosophy: many programs are uninformed by research literature in the educational sciences, including pedagogy, educational psychology, and even cognitive science, in the way that programs in other subjects are. As a result, philosophy programs may not be developmentally appropriate or pedagogically sound. Philosophy has an important role to play in the critique of educational aims, concepts, and methods, but philosophy educators also have much to learn from educational research, particularly when it comes to the development of a curriculum for philosophy education.

A fourth problem is the lack of collaboration or even communication among precollege philosophy program developers, with the result that new programs often do not build on the successes or deliberately avoid the mistakes of past programs. Over the past 4 decades, a body of philosophical and empirical research on philosophy for, of, and with children and adolescents has been built up; this amounts to thousands of academic books, articles, and doctoral dissertations from scores of countries. Precollege philosophy is the topic of dozens of academic conferences and special conference sessions every year in every part of the world and is the primary thematic focus of four academic journals[2] and a

frequent focus of numerous other journals in philosophy and education. The problem is not merely that many programs touted as new or unique are actually neither but, more importantly, that they are uninformed by the past 40 years of scholarship on precollege philosophy. Today, it is simply uncreditable for developers of precollege philosophy programs to claim ignorance of this field of scholarship, and the creation of new materials or methods for use in schools, let alone their sale, without consultation of this scholarship is not merely unprofessional but unethical.

The articulation of objectives and standards for precollege philosophy education would help to solve or alleviate these problems. Of course, professional and educational standards can be misused and can have unintended negative consequences, one of which, for precollege philosophy education, could be the insulation of a majority opinion on aims and methods from minority criticism and innovation. More serious negative consequences could be the fragmentation of teaching and learning in precollege philosophy into discreet, measurable outcomes and the valuing (i.e., assessment) of predetermined, narrowly defined performance objectives over the experience and process of philosophical inquiry itself (see Hyland, 1994, p. 54) and the unexpected but educationally significant outcomes that might emerge from that process (Osberg & Biesta, 2008). As Kotnik (2008, p. 8) argued, this consequence would be particularly damning to Philosophy for Children, for whom the educational benefit of philosophical inquiry depends on its being a holistically meaningful experience for children.

The setting of standards also raises the perennial danger of the determination of program objectives on the basis of what can be readily assessed instead of the determination of what and how to assess on the basis of authentic program objectives.[3] Moreover, despite the tremendous amount of work done in the past 40 years, precollege philosophy is still an experimental field, in that there is no meaningful consensus about the proper aims of precollege philosophy education, and few of the aims that have been advanced have been studied empirically with regard to the kinds of materials and methods likely to achieve them. For these reasons, rather than attempt to promulgate standards with any official status, the work that needs to be accomplished by practitioners and theorists working in precollege philosophy includes the following:

- The articulation of authentic purposes, objectives, and standards for their programs.
- The defense of these with value-oriented arguments and with arguments and evidence from relevant philosophical and

educational research.

- The formulation of research-based guidelines for educational materials, methods, and professional development likely to achieve their stated objectives.
- The determination of ways to gather evidence for whether or not those objectives are being achieved.

This kind of work has been occurring over the past 4 decades (e.g., Lipman, Sharp, & Oscanyan, 1980, section II) but not systematically enough or to the extent that the problems will be alleviated or bring the benefits described previously.

Some Common Objectives for Precollege Philosophy

A review of Philosophy for Children and other precollege and undergraduate philosophy programs and the academic literature examining them reveals four kinds of objectives commonly stated or implied for these programs:

1. To help students acquire cognitive skills and dispositions, enabling them to make sound inferences and other reasoning moves (Cannon & Weinstein, 1985; Gratton, 2000; Weinstein, 1988), construct and critique logical arguments (Imbrosciano, 1993; Slade, 1989; Splitter, 1988), and learn broader inquiry strategies, such as identifying problems, formulating inquiry questions, constructing original hypotheses, and finding and analyzing relevant data (Dalin, 1983; Haynes & Haynes, 2000; Matsuoka, 2004).
2. To help students learn the concept of philosophical inquiry as the disciplined, open-ended, self-corrective search for reasonable beliefs and values (Dewey, 1933/1997; Fisher, 2008b; Lipman, 1991; Splitter & Sharp, 1995; Walton, 1998).
3. To help students learn the concept of dialogue as a method of collaborative inquiry and peer accountability (Fisher, 2008a; Gregory, 2008; Kennedy, 2004; Sternberg, 1999) and learn to dialogue with cognitive and social competence (Splitter & Sharp, 1995).
4. To help students learn canonical philosophical content, including questions, problems, concepts, arguments, and some of the key figures within the subdisciplines of ethics, aesthetics, metaphysics, political philosophy, and logic (Lim, 2003; van

der Leeuw & Mostert, 1987), and learn to discern philosophical concepts and issues wherever they arise. This is sometimes referred to as the development of "a philosophical ear" (Gregory, 2008, p. 1).

In addition to alleviating the problems mentioned previously, the establishment of objectives, such as these for precollege philosophy, could bring the additional benefit of a wider appreciation among educators and parents of the educational merits of studying philosophy and especially the cultivation of cross-disciplinary habits of rigorous intellectual engagement and a nuanced understanding of philosophical concepts, such as justice, person, mind, beauty, cause, number, truth, citizen, good, and right, which are foundational to the arts and sciences. The recognition that these merits come not merely from the study of philosophy as a high school elective but from "growing up with philosophy" (Lipman & Sharp, 1978) would also, no doubt, benefit the profession with more college philosophy majors.

However, to work for the wider inclusion of philosophy in precollege education on the basis of its intellectual and academic merits alone is to risk allowing precollege philosophy to be co-opted in the enterprise of education for socioeconomic advancement, an enterprise severely criticized by philosophers since ancient times:

> Sophists had claimed to train young people for political life, but Plato wanted to accomplish this by providing them with a knowledge …inseparable from the love of the good and from the inner transformation of the person. Plato wanted to train not only skillful statesmen, but also human beings. (Hadot, 2002, p. 59)

The timeless distinction that Plato drew was between education aimed at getting ahead and education aimed at living well, or wisdom. "Getting ahead" means acquiring the disciplinary knowledge and the intellectual, social, and technological skills necessary for academic and professional advancement. "Living well" means learning to cultivate personal and collective well-being, which involves the regulation of one's desire and action in ways that bring meaning and purpose to one's life. Of course, making a living is part of living well, and being wise does not preclude being successful, but education that focuses exclusively on getting ahead prepares students ultimately to be successful at pursuing unexamined desires in a free-market economy. Indeed, as Sternberg (1999) observed, this is the intended aim for many parents and educators:

> Education is seen more as an access route…toward obtaining…the best possible credentials for individual socioeconomic advancement. Education is seen not so much as a means of helping society but of helping one obtain the best that society has to offer socially, economically, and culturally. (p. 62)

It is ironic that this distinction between getting ahead and living well applies to teaching philosophy, which originated as the disciplined pursuit of wisdom. However, precollege philosophy has often been used for getting ahead, especially in its instrumental role of teaching excellent thinking, which has been justified in the following terms:

- To help children do better in school by helping them to make more sense of subject content, to develop cross-curricular skills (Haynes, 2002, pp. 127–129), to think in ways characteristic of particular disciplines (Lipman, 1991, p. 18), and to offer them more intellectually stimulating experiences that will increase their motivation (Fisher, 2008b, pp. xi and 2–3).
- To prepare students to do well in college and to perform better on college entrance exams (Willingham, 2007, p. 8).
- To prepare students to be successful in business (Willingham, 2007, p. 8) and other sectors of employment, particularly given the rapid "rate of change within society" (Fisher, 2008b, p. 3).
- To prepare students to participate in democratic decision making (Lipman, 1998) and thereby strengthen democratic society, which is characterized as a thinking society (Fisher, 2008b, p. 3).

These largely instrumentalist aims contrast dramatically with the following, which are also offered as aims for teaching thinking but are focused on improving the quality of children's lives more immediately:

- To allow students to experience the enjoyment of intellectual challenge (Fisher, 2008b, pp. 1 and 3).
- To give students cognitive tools and dispositions to solve current life problems and to achieve personal autonomy by avoiding manipulation (Murris, 2008; Splitter, 1986).
- To help students learn to make better moral, aesthetic, and other kinds of judgments that will enhance their life experiences (Lipman, 1991, p. 19).

The former set of aims for teaching thinking are largely compatible with the latter, but the latter cannot be realized by education that focuses exclusively on the former, nor will educational aims for living well be realized if they are merely added onto to the standard curriculum for getting ahead, even if some kind of balance is attempted between the two sets of aims. Rather, as a growing number of educational philosophers and psychologists are proposing (Gregory & Laverty, 2009; Noddings, 2005; Sternberg, 2003), living well must become the primary educational aim to which other aims should be expected to contribute.

Wisdom Objectives for Precollege Philosophy

In contradiction to philosophers for whom "to apply philosophy is not thereby to do it" (Pollack, 2007, p. 246), a number of philosophers have argued the reverse: that philosophy is most authentic as a way of life:

> Philosophy is love of wisdom; wisdom being not knowledge but knowledge-plus; knowledge turned to account in the instruction and guidance it may convey in piloting life through the storms and the shoals that beset life-experience as well as into such havens of consummatory experience as enrich our human life from time to time. (Dewey, 2008, p. 389)

> The philosophical search for truth is a meditative way of living out the answers it finds and the questions it asks such that they are felt, understood, and incorporated in growing wisdom; it is a gradual, not only theoretical but also emotional and practical transformation of the philosopher. (Peperzak, 1999, p. 124)

> There is no essential opposition compelling us to choose between philosophy as theory and as artful life-practice. Indeed, we must not choose between them….We surely should build our art of living on our knowledge and vision of the world, and reciprocally seek the knowledge that serves our art of living. Philosophy is strongest when both its modes of practice are combined to reinforce each other as they did in ancient philosophy. (Shusterman, 1997, p. 4)

> Reflection on our ways of living…has always been a vital function of philosophy….The ancient questions, "Am I living as I am supposed to live?" "Is my life something more than vanity, or worse, mere conformity?" "Am I making the best effort I can to reach…my unattained but attainable self?" make all the difference in the world. (Putnam, 2008, p. 12)

The Stoics distinguished three interrelated components of living wisely: a moral component of living ethically, virtuously, and with integrity; a psychological component of maintaining composure and tranquility in the midst of chaos and tribulation; and an intellectual component of disciplined thinking and the construction of a value-oriented understanding of the world and one's place in it.[4] The Stoics correlated these three components of well-being with the disciplines of ethics (behavior), physics (perspective), and logic (thinking), respectively, and indicated that each discipline involved both a theoretical component and an applied or lived component (Hadot, 1995, p. i24). This tradition provides us with categories of wisdom-oriented objectives for philosophy education, including precollege philosophy. Here are some objectives that might be included in those categories:

Theoretical Ethics

- To help students develop skills of interpersonal communication and to provide opportunities for them to develop empathy through learning about the values and interests of others and about their own complex relationships to their social and natural environments (Schertz, 2006; Sharp, 1993, 2006).
- To familiarize students with relevant ideas, personalities, and episodes from the history of philosophy in an age-appropriate manner as options for living well (Cam, 1994).
- To familiarize students with alternate ethical theories.
- To help students understand the procedures and develop the skills of collaborative inquiry to resolve social conflict (Gregory, 2004, 2005b).
- To provide students opportunities to reflect philosophically on the rewards and responsibilities of many kinds of interpersonal relationships and community membership.
- To provide students with opportunities to reflect philosophically on a variety of paradigms of human physical and mental health as options for living well (Gregory, 2005a).

Lived Ethics

- To help students wake up to the ethical dimension of their experiences—to recognize when issues of right and wrong, good and evil, duty, justice, and compassion arise in their

experience—and to conduct ethical inquiry toward making sound ethical judgments in the course of their everyday lives (Lipman, 1987; Sharp, 1987; Sprod, 2001).

- To encourage students to cultivate particular, self-chosen habits of moral feeling and action, such as curbing appetites and egocentric passions, maintaining physical and mental health, and exercising compassion and concern for social justice, all as episodes of meaningful experience.

- To provide students with the opportunity to construct personal and collective agendas for worthwhile passionate engagements.

Theoretical Physics

- To help students understand the relationship between suffering and egotism[5] and to familiarize them with the teachings of philosophers, sages, prophets, and playwrights from a variety of traditions on this point, including, for example, Socrates, Samkya, Confucius, the Buddha, Jeremiah, Jesus, Mohammad, Epicurus, Marcus Arelius, and Aeschylus.

Lived Physics

- To provide students with the opportunity to reflect on their emotional lives and to practice emotional self-regulation (Gazzard, 2000; Lipman, 1995).

- To provide students with the opportunity to reflect philosophically on their own experiences of discontent, unrequited desire, fear, humiliation, aversion, anxiety, and other forms of suffering and on their experiences of tranquility, gratitude, empathy, reverence, and awe in an attempt to discern ways in which they contribute to their own suffering and contentment.

- To provide students with opportunities to experiment with contemplative practices, such as communal ritual (Sharp, 2007), empathic awareness (Sharp, 2006), aesthetic appreciation, present-moment mindfulness (Hadot, 1995, pp. 84–85), contemplation of nature (Hadot, 1995, p. 97), yoga (Armstrong, 2006, pp. 195–197), and other practices recommended in wisdom traditions for the cultivation of equanimity and autonomy.

Theoretical Logic

- To help students acquire the cognitive skills and dispositions of sound reasoning.
- To help students learn the concept of robust philosophical inquiry and master its constituent inquiry strategies.
- To help students learn the theory of collaborative inquiry and develop dialogical competencies.
- To help students construct stable but fallible value-oriented worldviews that will help them understand the meaning and purpose of their lives and that will both inform and be informed by their experiences.

Lived Logic

- To provide students with the opportunity to experience the enjoyment of intellectual challenge.
- To provide students with the opportunity to use their thinking and inquiry skills to solve problems that arise in their own (nonacademic) experience.
- To help students develop a critical spirit (Oxman-Michelli, 1992) to learn to avoid manipulation and otherwise achieve personal autonomy.[6]
- To help students discipline their inner dialogue (Hadot, 1995, p. 102) to acquire the disposition to engage in ongoing self-examination and self-correction of their beliefs and values (Sharp, 1996) and otherwise to become "more thoughtful, more reflective, more considerate, more reliable" (Lipman, Sharp, & Oscanyan, 1984, p. 15)—in short, more reasonable people (Lipman, 1993).

The call for contemporary education to adopt wisdom-oriented objectives is an important opportunity for philosophers to become as involved in educational policy and practice as they were at the height of the critical thinking movement in education. However, in this instance, philosophy has as much to gain as it has to offer. As Cam (2006) observed:

Unlike many other academic disciplines, philosophers have never thought about how they might reconstruct their discipline for general educational purposes until quite recently; and being effectively cut off from any

concern with school education or education beyond the university, philosophical practice has tended to be narrowly academic and insular. (p. 37)

Many philosophers working in Philosophy for Children have argued that the work of reconstructing the discipline of philosophy in the context of precollege education should be the occasion for a broader reconstruction of professional philosophy (Cannon, 2002; Kennedy, 1999). I suggest that in particular, reinstating philosophy's wisdom-oriented objectives in precollege education could help return philosophy to its original identity as the disciplined study and practice of living well.[7]

References

Alexander, R. J. (2003). *Talk for learning: The first year*. Northallerton: North Yorkshire County Council.

Armstrong, K. (2006). *The great transformation: The beginning of our religious traditions.* New York: Knopf.

Cam, P. (1994). Dewey, Lipman, and the Tradition of Reflective Education. In Taylor, M., Schrier, H. and Ghiraldelli, Jr., P., (Eds.), *Pragmatism, Education and Children*. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B.V., pp. 163–81.

—. (2006). Philosophy and the school curriculum: Some general remarks. *Critical and Creative Thinking: The Australasian Journal of Philosophy in Education, 14,* 35–51.

Cannon, D. (2002). How has involvement with Philosophy for Children changed how I/we understand philosophy? *Analytic Teaching: The Community of Inquiry Journal, 22,* 97–105.

Cannon, D., & Weinstein, M. (1985). Reasoning skills: An overview. *Thinking: The Journal of Philosophy for Children, 6,* 25–26.

Dalin, G. D. (1983). Critical thinking and problem solving in the elementary school curriculum. *Analytic Teaching: The Community of Inquiry Journal, 4,* 23–24.

Dewey, J. (1933/1997). *How we think.* Mineola, NY: Dover.

—. (2008). *The later works of John Dewey. Volume 16, 1925–1953: 1949–1952. Essays, typescripts, and knowing and the known* (Boydston, J. A., Ed.). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Dolz, J. (1996). Learning argumentative capacities. A study of the effects of a systematic and intensive teaching of argumentative discourse in 11-12 year old children. *Argumentation, 10*, 227–251.