

- aimed at self-discovery of the inner resources and encouraging their use in everyday life.

Given that every young person at certain times and in certain areas of development has experienced setbacks due to incoherency of the Self, this paper emphasizes the need to provide targeted psychological and pedagogical support of the globalization process in the school age period.

The importance of promoting the philosophy of global education as the educational policy for formation of cultural relativism identity has the following core projections:

- support for adequate polycultural integration;
- effective establishment of inner psychological state;
- creating conditions for equal access and symmetrical social interactions, regardless of the cultural differences;
- identification of one's own needs, aspirations and intentions and implementation of life situation tasks.

It is necessary to promote the philosophy of global education as a conceptual model of educational policy for development of cultural relativism skills in the school age period in order to reflect the interconnected changes in various areas of pupils' development regardless of their social and personal identity.

The participation of young people in educational activities for raising awareness of the concept of cultural relativism is a guarantee for overcoming critical situations in the school age stage and for opening of vital perspective towards growth and maturity in the context of polycultural perspective of individual development.

## References

- Antsiferova, L. (1991). *K psihologii lichnosti, kak razvivaiushtejsia sisteme*. Moskva.
- Bakracheva, M. (2009). *Identichnostta v 3 stypki*. Sofii.
- Berger, P., T. Luckmann. (1996). *Socialno konstruirane na realnostta*. Sofia.
- Goldman, D. (2008) *Novata socialna inteligentnost*. Sofia.
- Stojkov, I. (2004). *Vyzzrastova i pedagogicheska psihologiiia*. Veliko Tyrново.
- Kennerly, H. (1997). *Preodoliavane na trevozhnostta*. Sofia.
- Kozuhar, S. (1994). *Model razvitiia lichnosti i ee prakticheskoe priminenie v psihologicheskoi rabote s uchiteliami*. UFA.
- Selye, H. (1997). *Stres bez distres*. Sofia.
- Stamatov, R. (2000). *Detska psihologiiia*. Plovdiv.
- Winnicott, D. (1999). *Igra i realnost*. Sofia.
- Shulman, L. (1997). *Umeniia za podpomagane na hora, semejstva, grupi i obshtnosti*. Sofia.

## TODOROVSKA Marija

*University "Ss. Cyril and Methodius",*

*Faculty of Philosophy – Skopje, Institute for Philosophy*

## LEARNING TO LEARN (WISDOM): INTRODUCING STUDENTS TO PHILOSOPHY

**Abstract:** The aim of this text is to illustrate some of the features of the Introduction to philosophy course at the Institute for philosophy. In the hope that the way to wisdom can be illuminated through teaching, the Introduction to philosophy course's objectives center around the inauguration and elaboration of philosophical concepts and categories, the promotion of critical thinking, and the improvement of oral and written expression in the students (who are in their first semester of the first year of the degree).

Some of the key roles and functions of the teacher are overviewed, mainly against the backdrop of introducing philosophy to first-year students. The duality of seriousness and silliness is emphasized as an important characteristic in teachers, as is the complexity (on many levels) of covering vast areas of philosophical material in one intense semester's work, constantly aware of the discrepancies in the students' previous philosophical education.

The text shows the process, the challenges, and the outcomes of teaching, the criteria for selecting, framing, and communicating the main philosophical problems and categories through the structured reading of philosophical texts, and offers some main pointers applicable to the students starting their degrees. The need for a proper balance between maintaining a solid comprehensive introductory philosophical conceptual basis, while leaving sufficient room for flexibility in adapting the material in light of the particular groups' intellectual needs is highlighted.

**Keywords:** Philosophy, Introduction, Course, Teacher, Goals

## **Introduction**

It is frequently said that wisdom is acquired by teaching others. The origin of the quote is often attributed to Solomon Ibn Gabriol's thought that the first step in the acquisition of wisdom is silence, the second – listening, the third – memory (remembering), the fourth – practice, and the fifth – teaching others. If attaining wisdom is possible through the teaching of others, then teaching the acquirement of wisdom (if possible), or the love for wisdom, i.e. philosophy, is self-referential and meta-imposed on the teacher. In teaching philosophy, the guidance expected from the practice of pedagogy is abundantly clear, not only in respect to the students, but also to oneself. The teacher leads the students towards knowledge about wisdom, and hopefully, the striving for wisdom itself, while attaining better, deeper insights into the meaning and importance of wisdom. This view is perhaps rather limiting, illustrating pedagogy as guidance from-to (which is not wrong, given the etymology of the term). However, since neither the “from” nor the “to” are clear (what is the starting point of the students? How do we use any previous knowledge on the topics? What are the particular objectives of each phase of the introduction to philosophy? How realistic are the didactic goals of the course? How can we make sure the envisaged tasks have been successfully fulfilled? etc.) the view is far from narrow.

This text is not a scientific paper in pedagogy, but rather a summary of experience, of practice; a brief overview of the main points regarding the (somewhat) daunting, but wonderful task of introducing first-year students to philosophy. The completion of this formidable task and the fruits of one's labor can be assessed throughout the following years of study, which is easily achievable, given the structure of the degree in philosophy, where one teacher covers two or more courses, available in different years. The idea of this text is to outline the role and the functions of the teacher, especially of Introduction to philosophy, to show some of the main features of the course as offered at the Institute for philosophy, and to offer some mini-guidelines for the students enrolled at the Institute, pursuing their degrees in philosophy, thus learning the love of wisdom.

## **The Point of the Course Introduction to Philosophy**

The first question that arises about introducing students to philosophy is “how?” (not counting here the all-pervasive, underlying philosophical “why?”). The students should get acquainted with how philosophy can be defined, what it represents, and how important it is. They should understand the didactic goals of the course, so that they know what is to be reasonably expected from all parties involved; and how to best dedicate themselves to the fruitful study of philosophical disciplines, categories, principles, mechanisms and all other necessary features of the curriculum. The students should also gain a clear grasp of their starting position, in order to plan out the ways in which they can most efficiently and most thoroughly understand and learn the principles

and mechanisms of the study of (the love of) wisdom, which includes the basic principles of a general theory of rationality, and the key points in developing a general metaphysical sensibility.

All this needs to be accomplished in the circumstances at hand, which is an almost insurmountable discrepancy between the previous preparation of the students (the accent on “almost”, otherwise we would be doomed to fail from the point de départ). Some students have a solid basis of philosophy, having taken multiple courses from the philosophical corpus (Philosophy as an obligatory, complemented with Philosophy as an elective course, Logic, Ethics, Aesthetics) for secondary education (high-school), and/or have read philosophy, have been exposed to philosophical concepts, are aware of the intricacies and complexity of the material. Some students have never had a philosophy class in their lives, and know virtually nothing about philosophy, except that they want to pursue a degree in it. While some students have experience in reading philosophical works (often in a foreign language), some struggle with their reading with understanding skills, the ability to follow a structured argument, and have absolutely no practice in critical thinking, argumentation, and engaged discussion with peers. The task of the teachers at the Institute who teach in the first year is not only to introduce the students to philosophy and whichever courses they cover, but to also try and remedy years of educational neglect, by actively teaching the less prepared students reading with understanding, critical thinking, basics of logical arguments, exercises of styles, academic writing skills, and openness for diversity. This should be done by also making sure it does not affect the potential for achievement and faster improvement of the better prepared students. Introducing the students to philosophy, therefore, is not merely showing what philosophy is and how to start to “do philosophy”, it is also guidance in all relevant directions, and on all levels, in getting the students to a point where learning to learn is not only a prelude, an overture, a daunting necessary precondition, but an integral part, and one of the main goals of the course Introduction to philosophy.<sup>55</sup>

The students ought to read philosophical texts, ponder philosophical questions, and understand that there are never any final answers, and that the essence of philosophy is mostly in how one arrives to new (and new) questions. This cannot be done without knowing the basics, like, for example, the sources of philosophical thinking, the cosmology of the pre-Socratics, Aristotle’s ethics, empiricism’s positions on knowledge, rationalism’s theories on the innate notions and the preestablished harmony, the ideas of freedom and engagement, etc.

It is important to stress, as early as possible in the duration of the course that it is highly unlikely that we will discover what the meaning of life is, and that no one expects one self-content person doing philosophy to convey to the others that they have solved the conundrum of life, universe, and everything. Instead, what will be tackled, perused, formulated, reiterated, analyzed, revisited, is how to talk about being, about ontological questions; about goodness, beauty, knowledge and truth; how to approach the discourse on God, (im)mortality, infinity, omnipotence, freedom and self-deliberation; how to underline the importance of the understanding of values, moral actions, social relations and dimensions; and all other major themes and problems pertaining to the fields of the philosophical disciplines. The most crucial task is to properly outline, and offer the tools to achieve, a theoretical core – a proper knowledge of the material, which will, immediately

---

<sup>55</sup> Learning to learn applies to situations where people acquire some abilities required to effectively learn within the circumstances in which they are placed, and towards the objectives that they have outlined as successful outcomes of the process. Self-understanding and self-awareness are needed both from the educator (teacher or instructor) and from the students who are learning (to learn).

<sup>On</sup> the question whether learning about learning itself and improving learning skills is as desirable an outcome as the learning of something (x and y) about something (z), and on the principles, generalizations, and challenges of the concept of learning to learn, see Smith, 1983. This text is not on the topic of learning (how to) learn in general, so this line of inquiry is not pursued on this occasion. Useful points critiquing the concept of learning to learn, beginning with the claim that we are born to learn, as well as the confusion between capacities and abilities, in Winch, 2008.

and long term, serve as a starting point and a baseline for the students' philosophical endeavors (in their other courses, and generally).

## The Role of the Teacher

The first idea for this presentation (and the subsequent text) was to show the role of teachers in our folklore, a research opportunity inspired by the wide-ranging survey on the hypothesis that folktales can offer an insight into teaching in higher education (Sturm & Nelson, 2017), and with that, on the possibilities to learn (wisdom included) the practice of virtue. With that in mind, the corpus of Macedonian folktales collected by Marko Cepenkov (Цепенков, 1989) was analyzed, through the Aarne-Thompson motif classification index, and through content-analysis. Unfortunately, in no relevant place can a coherent story about a teacher be located; there are no stories featuring someone teaching someone something, or someone gaining knowledge on something (excluding here the elements with religious teachings, which also feature as parts of longer narratives, and not as tales in their own merit). Although it was not initially expected to find any formalized teaching process in the preserved folktale tradition, the lack of stories (motifs, notions, characters etc.) about teachers or educators, and pupils or apprentices, in less formal capacities, was surprising.

In their research, Sturm and Nelson analyze thirty-nine tales on teachers and teaching, from twenty-nine different countries, using motif-indexes, and quantitative content analysis, in order to discover topics which would be relevant for the contemporary education process. The teachers in the stories are most often outside of any formal education, and they use different methods to convey certain wisdom (this might be directly, before some moral or social decision-making, or indirectly, and in a post-error capacity, to make a point about some failing of the moral agents in question). The teachers in the tales analyzed use mainly a constructivist approach to teaching (learning by models, or through experience), they differ in their levels of wisdom or virtue shown, and face the problems of power and authority which the teacher has (or ought to have) over his/her pupils, the authors find (Sturm & Nelson, 2017). The depictions of teachers and teaching can be noticed reflected in other cultural milieux, especially considering the paradigm of the teacher as an inspiration, almost saint-like, as opposed to the insulting stereotype of teachers as incompetent (or) bullies.<sup>56</sup> From the massive amount of data available from the analysis, the authors conclude that, generally speaking, better teachers are those open for collaboration, in contrast to those rooted in positions of dominance; and those who facilitate a learning process guided mainly by the pupils, as opposed to those who only transfer or disseminate knowledge (Ibid.).

The most fascinating finding (out of the abundance) from this research, applicable to the course Introduction to philosophy, and thus, this occasion, is the mutually dependent nature of being wise and being silly. These topics are quite frequent in the folktale tradition, as illustrated by the classified motifs in the Thompson index (the wise and the fool opposition). This might seem contra-intuitive: the wise person surely must be as far as possible from the foolish person on the intelligence spectrum, and this is often true, as the paradigms of a purely wise or purely foolish person exist. But an interesting fact, extremely relevant to the study of wisdom, is that the

---

<sup>56</sup> A broad survey on media representation of teachers across different countries, in Alhamdan et al., 2014. The paper analyzes the relevant sources on teachers' work and media studies, revealing the construction of four categories of teacher identity: the caring practitioner; the transparent (un)professional; the role-model (moral and social); and the transformative intellectual.

<sup>0n</sup> the self-perception of teachers, implicitly or explicitly, through the metaphors: gardeners nurturing their students; clay-shaping potters; mechanics working on engines (without intelligence); business managers; stage directors or orchestra and choir conductors, see Efron & Joseph, 1994. On the metaphors about teachers as soldiers, shepherds, keepers of faith, and even saints, perpetuated by cultural texts of our time, see Carter, 2009.

teachers are often depicted as both wise and foolish (or silly). Or rather, the wisdom of the good teacher consists in their ability to act silly. One of the stories mentioned in Sturm and Nelson, which is quite famous in this corner of the world, is the story about Nasraddin Hodja and the ass.

In this story, the teacher faces a difficulty: he hesitates whether to lead his students through the village with them walking in front of him, which would be disrespectful to his figure as a teacher, or with him preceding his students, thus turning his back to them, which would be disrespectful to them as students. He solves this by mounting his donkey backwards, while riding in front of the pupils. Although this behavior seems strange and rather silly, it perfectly solves the problem: a teacher should be both in front of his/her pupils, as that is a place suited for the teacher, and also behind them, which means that he/she will never turn his/her back on them, which is a main responsibility, or a duty, of the teacher. He achieves wisdom by allowing for silliness.<sup>57</sup>

The silly behavior, humor, and play have a large role in contemporary education (Banas et al., 2011). If applied properly, and not aggressively, they can be a key part of the educational experience, for they facilitate joy, which breaks the intellectual tension building up with complex materials. Of course, humor cannot fully break the tension of the existentially intricate situations of the introduction to philosophy – humor, for example, fails in the problems of boundary situations of loss, pain, mortality, the very randomness and necessity of existence, or in matters of the suffering of innocents, of wickedness and forgiveness, of profound evil and loss, and many others, in which it would be insulting and plainly wrong to try and “lighten up the mood”.

One of the definitions of man is “homo ridens”. Man capable of laughter (of humor, not necessarily joy in this sense), homo ridens, and homo metaphysicus are by no means mutually exclusive homospeciations, or incompatible features in a teacher, on the contrary. A teacher must also have the preparedness to experience (and show) levels of sincerity and vulnerability (Albritton, 1994). To demonstrate that he/she can be deeply involved in the active philosophical speculation on key matters is a large part of the role of the teacher who should be introducing students to philosophy. In this respect, the teacher who is guiding the students towards the ways of wisdom, is him/herself actively striving for wisdom.

## The Features of the Course Introduction to Philosophy

Anyone is capable of doing philosophy. An important point for the course to bring across is, nevertheless, that at university, we are supposed to channel the capability to philosophize, to arm it with the necessary categorial apparatus, plenish it with a multitude of references from the different philosophical disciplines and the millennia of accumulated (converging and diverging) positions, ideas, systems. How does a philosopher (or a person trying to become a philosopher) differ from friends discussing the meaning of life in front of the grocery shop, or over drinks, in a relaxed conversation and quotidian banter? It is not that one is sillier or more substantial than the other. The one studying philosophy will not automatically become smarter, and perhaps it is

---

<sup>57</sup> Another story, very well known and joyfully retold in our education process is the one about Nasraddin Hodja and the congregation, applicable to the collaborative aspect of learning, where students are encouraged to help each other with the material (and afterwards discuss their experience, their achievements and problems with the teacher). Namely, in this story Nasraddin Hodja invites the entire congregation (it varies whether the mosque or the village), and asks the people whether they know why he has called them there. They respond negatively, and he leaves, without saying anything, with the explanation that he does not want to waste time with clueless people. He calls them again the next day, and asks them whether they now know why they have been convoked there. This time the people answer with a resounding “yes”. Nasraddin Hodja leaves again, saying that, since they know why they are there, he should not waste his time by telling them. Thwarted again, the people decide to diversify their answers, so when he calls them for a third time, half of them say “yes” and half say “no”. Nasraddin Hodja leaves, saying that since some of the people do know why they have all been called, the ones who know should simply tell the ones who do not know, thus leaving them flabbergasted, and in want of answers once more. (Hikmet, 1962).

good to be aware that while he/she is indubitably well equipped to properly do philosophy, one should remain humble in one's expectations, and maintain (or first develop and then maintain) the ability to not take oneself too seriously.

Teaching has always been a performance (similar to the cultic telling of myths, which would add some sacred weight, or a trace of some lingering sacredness; or to the singing of teaching ballads), but formal teaching is bound by the syllabus – some predetermined optimal content, with the intention to achieve some educational goals. Teaching should not serve to entertain, of course, or to merely inform, but it should nurture the abilities in the students to think critically, make causal connections, understand and associate abstract entities, correctly use notions and categories, respectfully communicate with others, and many more.

For years, if possible,<sup>58</sup> the course Introduction to philosophy<sup>59</sup> kicks off with a list of philosophical questions (for example “is it always necessary to tell the truth?”, “what is time?”, “who decides what is beautiful?” etc.), and the students (divided in pairs) are asked to choose a few questions that spike their interest, and discuss them. Then, each student explains not their own stance, but that of their collocutors. The other students who disagree with some of the stances, or notice problems with the argumentation, are encouraged to start a dialogue. This is done in order to showcase the many problems of philosophy, which will be part of their studies, as well as the many ways in which discussions will be held. Afterwards, each student is asked to define what philosophy is, and to remember the answer, to be revisited at the end of the course, in order to determine whether, and to what extent, changes have been made to their ideas about what philosophy is.

As determined in the course syllabus (for the current five-year accreditation), the main didactic goals of the course are to introduce students to the foundational philosophical-categorical apparatus, and provide the students with some baseline knowledge on the main philosophical issues and the ways in which they get approached.<sup>60</sup> The students are expected to get acquainted with the different philosophical disciplines; to develop analytico-synthetic thinking abilities, applicable to the problems of metaphysics, theory of knowledge, ethics, aesthetics, anthropology and other disciplines; to recognize their curiosity about the world; to learn the possible approaches to man; to overview (and evaluate) value-systems and different positions with context-awareness etc. The most important general goal is to enable the students to successfully follow the curricula of the other courses, having achieved a satisfactory basis for their further philosophical studies. The methods are: monologue, dialogue (including pair-share techniques), text analysis, Socratic inquiry, engaged listening, autonomous research, and others.

In the available one hundred and fifty hours for the course (including here the almost hundred hours of lectures and seminars per semester, as well as the students' work on presentations, papers, and their learning of the material by reading the selected texts, summarizing the main

---

<sup>58</sup> This practice was not in place in the online format of the course during the pandemic.

<sup>59</sup> An abridged syllabus is available, in Macedonian and in English language, on the website of the Faculty of philosophy <http://zfz.ukim.edu.mk/%d0%bf%d1%80%d0%b5%d0%b4%d0%bc%d0%b5%d1%82-%d0%bf%d1%80-1-2-2-2/>.

<sup>60</sup> The goals have not varied much, despite the course having been restructured, as per the general guidelines for program accreditation: from a two-semester course with four hours of classes per week, into a one-semester course with six hours of classes per week; and the changes in the teachers conceiving and teaching it (prof. Lj. Cuculovski covered the course before retiring nine years ago). The objectives of teaching philosophy remain relatively unaltered, despite cutting the number of classes – if anything, the diminishing allotted time calls for more focused, more succinct and efficient work, to ensure that the students are getting as much access to the topics of the course as their past colleagues. The number of classes per week (and per semester) is inversely proportional to the number of hours of autonomous study, which, on the one hand, encourages students to work on their own, thus developing their research skills, their focus and creativity, but on the other hand deprives them of some of the hands-on informed and engaged intervention by their teachers, available in class.

topics, points and arguments, having discussions, revision work within peer groups etc.), the main topics of the course are the following. The definition of philosophy (the sources of philosophy; the question “philosophy or philosophies?”; the philosophical disciplines with their subjects, main themes, and importance; the relation between philosophy and other sciences or intellectual endeavors), and the points and objectives of philosophical thinking. The basic problems in ontology (the basic ontological categories and questions; an overview of the ways to approach the problem of being; the relations between Being and beings, and different typologies of beings; substance, hyle; time; space; determinism vs. indeterminism, etc.). The nature of the world (types of materialism and of idealism; key points and characteristics of different systems). The basic problems of gnoseology (the sources, possibilities, and limits of human knowledge). Morals, ethics, values and norms (the basic ethical categories; the question about the universality of morals; definitions of values; different approaches to values; intentionalism vs. consequentialism, deontology, Kantian duties, utilitarianism, etc.). The basic notions in aesthetics and several theories of art. The man and the world (basic questions in philosophical anthropology, essentialist and nonessentialist approaches to man); homospeciations; forms of alienation; the issues with freedom etc.

The initial steps in the course comprise of the acquaintance of the students with the topic of philosophy, or rather – since it is not one single topic – the main topics of its disciplines. The most common initial approach is the apophatic one – determining what philosophy is not, and what philosophy does not do, in order to arrive at affirmative formulations, placing philosophy at the basis of human knowledge, at the core of any intellectual invention. “Why philosophy at all?” is a question that is being answered through the overview of the categories of ontology, theory of knowledge, ethics, aesthetics, anthropology, philosophy of law, of language, of politics, etc., and revisited at several junctions in the duration of the course. This is done through the perusing of special parts of philosophical works and a broad discussion.

The fragments of works chosen as most representative of, or most helpful in, certain topics or issues, make the corpus of the assigned reading. These are fragments, or parts of texts, from ancient to contemporary sources. The lack of translations in Macedonian has been challenging, but the situation has been vastly improved in the last decade(s), although still allowing for a more extensive improvement. The reading corpus must contain some core texts, but its content varies depending on the preferences of the group of students. This does not mean that the group dictates the essence of the syllabus, but rather that a greater interest in some problem results in an increased attention to the text covering that problem (for example, if during the seminars’ presentations of the reading and the discussions a special enthusiasm on the problem of being in pre-Socratic philosophy is noticed, instead of working on fragments from three schools/philosophers, fragments of five schools/philosophers will be perused; if Descartes’ *Meditations* peak the students’ curiosity, the number of time-slots allotted to the first and part of the second *Meditation* will be increased). This is simple, but requires a careful attention to the students’ levels of engagement, as well as an open communication, wherein the students are able and free to voice their opinions and preferences, thereby contributing to the directions they want to take and the objectives they want to reach.

The approaches and responses to the chosen (fragments of) works are combined: dominance, negotiation, and opposition (see the proposed ways in Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991). Dominance means taking the information as it is presented (for instance, Parmenides’ fragments read x, and on this level, this is it). Without this level, however, one cannot move forward. In the way, or response, of negotiation, parts of the text are being discussed, and some interpretations offered by later philosophers (contemporaries, or from millennia later) are taken into consideration. In the manner of oppositional reading, having built up on the layers of the previous two ways, or approaches (and thus, levels of knowledge), the text is read critically, the contents are

being evaluated and questioned, attempting to achieve not only a coherent transeunt (through the covered external interpretations), but also an immanent critique. The flow of text analysis goes through several stages, each providing the students with additional layers of knowledge (vaguely inspired by Bloom's taxonomy). The steps are the following questions and areas to be analyzed and answered.

What does the text (fragment) convey?

How does it fit into its context (period, school, system, worldview)?

How does it compare to the things we have covered before (converges, diverges, coincides, corresponds partially)?

Does it bring some other associations to mind?

An important step is to revisit the text after everything planned has been covered, and ask the following.

What new conclusions can be reached?

Did the new material shed more light on the problem?

Did it complicate matters?

Did the new material obfuscate the meaning of the first/previous text(s)?

Did the new material contradict the previous conclusions? If so, in what ways?

This is a matter of practice, thanks to the openness to questions and more new questions, all the available relevant positions, and the awareness of one's intellectual freedom and responsibility. The building and solidification of this foundation is the only way to move onto the other courses from the philosophy curriculum, and to other life situations.

The underlying points that the students should understand (and, to be consistent, possibly try to reevaluate and critique) are that:

Practice does not make perfect, but will render them more eloquent and quick-thinking;

They will not magically discover the meaning of life, universe, and everything;

But will constantly discuss the essential issues and matters of life, universe and everything;

There is no "answer", but some things are answers;

They are welcome to think that the world is meaningless, which does not allow them to refuse to work diligently, since they are there of their own volition and by merit, also because philosophy makes sense, even when the world does not (and often exactly because the world does not, and in this case, simply because we are in this course to intentionally do philosophy).

## Conclusion

Circling back to the initial musings – wisdom (or, to be less presumptuous, the learning of the love of wisdom) is acquired through silence, listening, memorizing, practice, and teaching. It is possible through the awareness that one should not take oneself too seriously, and the conviction (or, at least, the hope) that philosophy makes sense, even if (and sometimes especially because) the world does not. The underlying precondition of the feasibility of the course is that philosophy can be learned, that wisdom can be pursued (if not reached). Introduction to philosophy is merely the first step.

## References

- Albritton, T. (1994). Teaching, Learning, and Archetypes: Images of Instruction in Cynthia Voigt's 'Dicey's Song'. *ALAN Review*, 21 (3), 56–59.
- Alhamdan, B., et al. (2014). Media representation of teachers across five countries. *Comparative Education*, 50 (4), 490-505.
- Apple, M. W., & Christian-Smith, L. K. (1991) The Politics of the Textbook. In Apple, M. W., & Christian-Smith, L. K. (Eds.), *The Politics of the textbook* (pp. 1-21). Routledge.



- Banas, J. A., et al. (2011). A Review of Humor in Educational Settings: Four Decades of Research. *Communication Education*, 60 (1), 115–44.
- Carter, C. (2009). Priest, Prostitute, Plumber? The Construction of Teachers as Saints. *English Education*, 42 (1), 61-90.
- Цепенков, М. К. (1989). *Македонски народни ѝриказни*. Македонска книга.
- Efron, S., & Joseph, B. (1994). Reflections in a mirror: Teacher generated metaphors from self and others. In J. P. Bolotin and G. Burnaford (Eds.), *Images of school teachers in twentieth-century America paragon, polarities, complexities* (pp. 54-77). St. Martin's Press.
- Hikmet, M. (1962). *Stories from One Day the Hodja*. Tarhan.
- Smith, R. M. (1983). The Learning-how-to-learn Concept: Implications and Issues. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 19, 97-103.
- Sturm, B. W., & Nelson, S. B. (2017). What Can Folktales Teach Us about Higher Education Teaching?. *Storytelling in Higher Education*, 13 (2), 170-194.
- Winch, C. (2008). Learning How to Learn: A Critique. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 42 (3-4), 649-665.

---



---

**TODOROVSKA Marija**

*University "Ss. Cyril and Methodius",  
Faculty of Philosophy – Skopje, Institute of Philosophy*

**POPOVSKA Jasmina**

*University "Ss. Cyril and Methodius",  
Faculty of Philosophy – Skopje, Institute of Philosophy*

**DONEV Dejan**

*University "Ss. Cyril and Methodius",  
Faculty of Philosophy – Skopje, Institute of Philosophy*

**DJEPAROSKI Ivan**

*University "Ss. Cyril and Methodius",  
Faculty of Philosophy – Skopje, Institute of Philosophy*

**DIMISHKOVSKA Ana**

*University "Ss. Cyril and Methodius",  
Faculty of Philosophy – Skopje, Institute of Philosophy*

## THE DIDACTIC GOALS OF THE PHILOSOPHY COURSES IN THE MACEDONIAN HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM

**Abstract:** The aim of the paper is to illustrate the main objectives and goals of the Philosophy courses (obligatory and elective) in the Macedonian high school system, and to determine whether, and to what extent, they align with the contents of the courses syllabi. At a first glance it might seem that the objectives stated in the course programs are unattainable and over-stretched, but a further analysis shows their diversity, applicability, and usefulness for the overall student improvement. These objectives, being directed towards the development of critical thinking, moral deliberation, pluriperspective flexibility, and awareness for the contexts in which people function, are crucial in this age, and necessary for the formation of young adults capable of determining causal relations, of orienting in multiple sources of information and sets of circumstances, and staying in tune with the moral needs of their communities.

The text shows the main didactic goals of the Philosophy courses in the Macedonian high school curriculum in light of the courses' contents, and in the greater framework of the Philosophy courses from several countries from this region (Serbia, Montenegro, Croatia, Bulgaria).