

## From Measurement to Mind

# Why Persistent Underperformance in Literacy and Mathematics Strengthens the Case for Philosophy in High Schools

### Abstract

Persistent underperformance in reading and mathematics is often treated as a measurement problem—something to be corrected by new tests, tougher accountability, or tighter alignment. This paper argues that this policy reflex misidentifies the underlying issue. Standardized assessments can describe outcomes, but they do not build the cognitive and interpretive capacities that make strong performance possible. When foundational skills remain weak, a durable remedy must address how students reason, interpret, and justify claims across domains. The paper proposes philosophy in high school as a practical, evidence-informed intervention: philosophy instruction cultivates argument analysis, concept formation, and reflective judgment—capacities that support literacy and quantitative understanding while also strengthening civic reasoning. The aim is not to replace assessment, but to rebalance curriculum toward the cognitive foundations that assessment presupposes.

### 1. The policy pattern: measurement as the default remedy

When large shares of students perform below expected levels in reading and mathematics, federal and state systems predictably intensify assessment and accountability. The underlying assumption is understandable: if outcomes are weak, we must measure more carefully, diagnose more precisely, and pressure systems to improve. But “more measurement” does not automatically yield “more cognition.” Measurement can reveal deficits; it does not, by itself, supply the intellectual tools required to overcome them. (Koretz 2008; Campbell 1979).

## **2. The empirical trigger: persistent weakness in foundational domains**

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) provides one of the most reliable long-term indicators of student achievement in the United States. The 2024 Grade 12 assessments show that national reading and mathematics scores are lower than in 2019, indicating continued weakness in foundational skills rather than a clear recovery. (NCES 2024; NCES 2023).

## **3. Why “more testing” is an intellectual category error**

Testing measures downstream outcomes; it does not create the upstream cognitive capacities those outcomes require. Overreliance on quantitative indicators risks distorting instruction, narrowing curricula, and encouraging strategic behavior rather than deep understanding. Measurement can identify a fever; it cannot cure the infection. (Koretz 2008).

## **4. Accountability and its limits**

Research on accountability policies such as No Child Left Behind demonstrates that testing can produce gains in certain contexts, particularly in elementary mathematics. However, these gains coexist with evidence of stagnation, curriculum narrowing, and limited transfer to higher-order reasoning. Testing is therefore insufficient as a primary reform strategy. (Dee and Jacob 2011; Hamilton et al. 2007; Au 2007).

## **5. The missing variable: instruction in reasoning itself**

By adolescence, reading difficulties increasingly reflect problems of inference, conceptual organization, and argument tracking rather than decoding alone. Mathematical underperformance often reflects weaknesses in abstraction and multi-step reasoning. These skills do not reliably

emerge as byproducts of content exposure; they require explicit instruction. (Snow 2002; Nippold 2017).

## **6. Philosophy as cognitive infrastructure**

Philosophy, properly taught, trains students in argument analysis, conceptual clarity, logical structure, and intellectual humility. These capacities directly support literacy and mathematics by strengthening comprehension, reasoning, and transfer across domains. (National Research Council 2001; Snow 2002).

## **7. Empirical support for philosophical inquiry**

Research on philosophy-based interventions, including Philosophy for Children programs, provides evidence that structured philosophical inquiry can improve reasoning and, in some contexts, academic outcomes. While results vary by implementation, the literature supports the claim that philosophy can strengthen cognitive capacities without harming core achievement. (Trickey and Topping 2004; Topping and Trickey 2007; Education Endowment Foundation 2016; Education Endowment Foundation 2021).

## **8. Why high school is the strategic location**

High school is where systems often intensify testing to remediate deficits, yet it is also where students are developmentally prepared for explicit training in abstract reasoning. A required or strongly supported philosophy course can consolidate the cognitive toolkit that other disciplines presuppose. (NCES 2024; Snow 2002).

## **9. Policy implications: from assessment-first to cognition-first**

This paper does not argue for eliminating testing. It argues for rebalancing priorities. A cognition-first approach would treat philosophy as foundational instruction, use assessment

diagnostically rather than punitively, and align reasoning standards across disciplines. (Koretz 2008; Black and Wiliam 1998).

## **10. Conclusion**

Persistent underperformance in reading and mathematics under extensive testing regimes strengthens the case for a shift in educational emphasis. Measurement alone cannot cultivate the intellectual capacities it measures. Philosophy, taught as disciplined reasoning rather than cultural ornament, offers a rational and evidence-supported path toward strengthening the cognitive foundations of learning. (Koretz 2008; Snow 2002).

### Policy Implications for High School Curriculum

If persistent underperformance in literacy and mathematics reflects deficits in foundational reasoning rather than mere content exposure, then education policy must expand its conception of academic remediation. Current policy approaches often respond to low test scores by intensifying tested subjects through additional instructional time, standardized interventions, or accountability pressures. The evidence reviewed here suggests that such strategies risk reinforcing the very limitations they aim to correct by privileging measurable outputs over cognitive development.

Philosophy education offers a policy-relevant alternative that does not compete with core subjects but supports them indirectly by strengthening reasoning, conceptual clarity, and metacognitive awareness. Introducing philosophy at the high school level—through structured inquiry, argument analysis, and dialogical reasoning—can address foundational cognitive gaps that standardized instruction alone struggles to remediate. Importantly, existing evidence

indicates that philosophy-based interventions can improve reasoning and language-related skills without harming performance in tested subjects, making them compatible with accountability-driven policy environments.

From a policy perspective, philosophy should be understood not as an enrichment elective, but as a cognitive infrastructure investment. Pilot programs, curriculum frameworks, and teacher preparation initiatives can integrate philosophical reasoning into secondary education without displacing existing standards. For policymakers seeking cost-effective, scalable approaches to improving academic resilience and transfer across domains, philosophy education deserves serious consideration as part of a broader strategy to address persistent underachievement.

## References

Au, Wayne. 2007. "High-Stakes Testing and Curricular Control: A Qualitative Metasynthesis." *Educational Researcher* 36(5): 258–267. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X07306523>.

Black, Paul, and Dylan Wiliam. 1998. "Assessment and Classroom Learning." *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice* 5(1): 7–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>.

Campbell, Donald T. 1979. "Assessing the Impact of Planned Social Change." *Evaluation and Program Planning* 2(1): 67–90. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-7189\(79\)90048-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-7189(79)90048-X).

Dee, Thomas S., and Brian A. Jacob. 2011. "The Impact of No Child Left Behind on Student Achievement." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 30(3): 418–446. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.20586>.

Education Endowment Foundation. 2016. "Philosophy for Children – First Trial." Project page and evaluation summary.

<https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/projects-and-evaluation/projects/philosophy-for-children>.

Education Endowment Foundation. 2021. Evaluation of Philosophy for Children: An Effectiveness Trial. Final report (NFER).

[https://d2tic4wvo1iusb.cloudfront.net/documents/projects/Philosophy\\_for\\_Children\\_report\\_-\\_final\\_-\\_pdf.pdf](https://d2tic4wvo1iusb.cloudfront.net/documents/projects/Philosophy_for_Children_report_-_final_-_pdf.pdf).

Hamilton, Laura S., Brian M. Stecher, Jennifer A. Marsh, et al. 2007. Standards-Based Accountability Under No Child Left Behind: Experiences of Teachers and Administrators in Three States. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

<https://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG589.html>.

Koretz, Daniel. 2008. Measuring Up: What Educational Testing Really Tells Us. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). 2023. “NAEP Long-Term Trend Assessment Results: Reading and Mathematics.” The Nation’s Report Card.

<https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/highlights/ltt/2023/>.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). 2024. “NAEP Report Card: Grade 12 Reading.” The Nation’s Report Card.

<https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reports/reading/2024/g12/>.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). 2024. “NAEP Report Card: Grade 12 Mathematics.” The Nation’s Report Card.

<https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reports/mathematics/2024/g12/>.

National Research Council. 2001. *Adding It Up: Helping Children Learn Mathematics*. Edited by Jeremy Kilpatrick, Jane Swafford, and Bradford Findell. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Nippold, Marilyn A. 2017. "Reading Comprehension Deficits in Adolescents: Addressing Underlying Language Abilities." *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools* 48(2): 125–131. [https://doi.org/10.1044/2016\\_LSHSS-16-0048](https://doi.org/10.1044/2016_LSHSS-16-0048).

Snow, Catherine (ed.). 2002. *Reading for Understanding: Toward an R&D Program in Reading Comprehension*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

[https://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\\_reports/MR1465.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1465.html).

Topping, Keith J., and Steve Trickey. 2007. "Collaborative Philosophical Inquiry for Schoolchildren: Cognitive Gains at 2-Year Follow-Up." *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 77(4): 787–796. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709907X193032>.

Trickey, Steve, and Keith J. Topping. 2004. "'Philosophy for Children': A Systematic Review." *Research Papers in Education* 19(3): 365–380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267152042000248016>.