

UNDERSTANDING PHILOSOPHY AND IDEOLOGY PRESENT EDUCATION

Lanny Laras¹⁾ Daniel Tumbel²⁾

1) Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Injili Indonesia-Surabaya

E-mail: lanny_laras@yahoo.com

2) Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Injili Indonesia-Surabaya

E-mail: lannylaras@outlook.co.id

Abstract

Modern methods of education are structured on the basis of modern ideological and philosophical. Various methods of a human nature or humanism, make the human being the center or center of learning. Modern science has created a great many moral problems in the environment of modern society. It is generally worrying that modern education is influencing values to children. Moral values can be taught through literature and textbooks but nevertheless the atmosphere or atmosphere of learning also needs to be considered. The modern view considers that with the education of good ethical values, children will automatically turn out to be good. If the situation or environment is improved structurally and economically, education and good moral ethical values, then society will automatically also change for the better. Is that really the case? The reality that is happening in the world is very contradictory.

Keywords: Educational philosophy, Present-day education, John Dewey, Theodore B. Brameld, Educational Ideology

INTRODUCTION

There are many modern thoughts in today's world of education. Some of them are John Dewey and Theodore Brameld. Both are educational figures who greatly influence the world of education today. John Dewey wrote in his writings, "if we are willing to understand education as a process of forming fundamental, intellectual and emotional opinions about nature about fellow human beings, then philosophy can be formulated as "a general theory of education." [1] He

continued later, "(hence) education is not subordinated (subordinated) by anything to save more education." [2] : There is no better way to realize what the purpose of philosophy is when he is alive, not when it becomes an 'antique', except by asking ourselves what criteria, what goals, and what role models, should control education policies and their implementation. Such questions, if asked and answered systematically, will shed light on the

following: that which is morally and intellectually the basis of human activities . . . [3]

RESEARCH METHOD

The research method used in this research is the Library Research Method. Literature research is a type of qualitative research that is generally carried out by not going into the field in search of data sources so that this research is carried out only based on works, including research results both already and not.

Literature research has four main characteristics, namely:

1. Researchers directly deal with text (nash) or numerical data and not with direct knowledge from the field or eyewitnesses in the form of events, people, or other objects.
2. Library data is 'ready to use. This means that researchers do not go anywhere, except to deal directly with source material already available in the library.
3. Library data are generally secondary sources, which means that researchers get material from second-hand and not original data from first-hand in the field.
4. The condition of library data is not limited by space and time. Researchers deal with static, fixed information.

There are 3 kinds of library research, namely: 1. Study of Thought Figures, 2. Analysis of Textbooks, and 3. Study of

History.

The method used in this paper is Research on Character Thinking. Thought research seeks to explore or understand specific thoughts through the works left behind. The work can be in the form of books, letters, messages, or other documents that reflect his thoughts. In this journal, the authors focus on John Dewey and Theodore Brameld on the philosophy and ideology of contemporary education. Both are figures of modern thought that are very influential today.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Three Modern Approaches to Educational Philosophy.

Considering the development of Education in recent years, it seems that what Dewey calls for contains many things that need to be taken into account. If the ability to formulate a philosophy [4] is the highest and most systematic development in human reasoning, then the philosophy of education is very important and vital.

On the other hand, the philosophy of education is a very difficult subject for discussion. There is something that plays no small role in making philosophy difficult to talk about, namely the fact that it has traditionally been approached in at least three fundamental ways: First, as an active process of 'educational philosophizing',

using problem analysis or analytical approaches; second, as a formal systems approach in which the fundamental systems of philosophy — for example, realism and idealism — are applied to education; and third, behind the guise of philosophy of education that more or less contains the color of the self (beliefs, personal predictions) of the person with that philosophy.[5]

A. Problem Analysis

In the approach commonly called 'problem analysis', there is generally no attempt to formulate a specific educational philosophy. Instead, the emphasis is on "philosophizing"[6] in relation to certain educational problems (usually various theoretical situations related to educational goals or objectives, the nature of the curriculum, or teaching methods and learning activities) that enter the intellectual analysis. Most types of philosophical analysis of this kind involve one or more of the following approaches:

1. semantic analysis, where an attempt is made first to clarify the meaning of certain terms or statements used in educational discourse
2. rational analysis, in which the first attempt is made to determine whether a particular form of reasoning is logical and properly structured (coherent), or not.

3. empirical analysis, where the essence of the effort is directed to determining whether certain statements can be proven to be real (factual) based on accepted experimental verification procedures, usually by the scientific method.

There are several examples of using this analytical approach. Using problem analysis, for example, books such as *Ethics and Education*, Karva R.S. Peters, *Conditions of Knowledge*, by Israel Scheffler, and *An Introduction to Analysis of Educational Concepts* by Jonas Soltis.[7]

Many philosophers assume that the problem analysis approach is intrinsically neutral (or, at least, more objective than more systematic approaches to educational philosophy, because a problem analyst only uses internal criteria, such as the stability or consistency of logic and clarity of language (linguistics) Such a criterion can be accepted by a variety of different philosophical positions regardless of more specific differences.

Some of it is true, but such assumptions are also misleading. There are at least two things that show that philosophical analysts do more than just philosophize about problems. First, it analyzes certain statements or ideas that have been selected, which have already been identified as relevant and problematic statements or reviews. This step already

involves philosophical predictions. Second, if he does something more than just clarify the meaning of language and logic, he will be involved in determining the value (evaluating) the truth of a statement or idea. Here the problem analyst will do so based on his own assumptions about what evidence needs to be present to show that the statement or idea is true, or false. Even if this activity is followed by the demand for scientific proof of knowledge claims, and no further, it still implies an unspoken commitment (or tacit commitment) to a certain set of philosophical beliefs about what it is possible to know and how it is possible to know. that matter. So it is neither neutral nor more objective than other, more systematic approaches to educational philosophy.

B. Formal Systems Approach [8]

The second approach, which is perhaps the most commonly used approach to the philosophy of education, is the formal systems approach (or “philosophical systems as applied to education”). This approach is used by J. Donald Butler in his book *Four Philosophies and Their Practice in Edification and Religion*. This method traditionally accepts philosophical systems (such as idealism, realism, existentialism, and pragmatism) - which are identified and formulated, while their implications for the

organization and implementation of education are systematically developed. This approach is usually implemented in three steps:

1. identification (introduction) of fundamental philosophical systems (such as realism or idealism)

2. giving examples of these philosophical systems, usually by presenting the philosophy of one or more particular 'spokesmen' for each system (eg Aristotle's philosophy as an example of classical realism)

3. the presentation of the educational philosophy implied or included in the various philosophical systems. (For example, discussions of educational 'perennialism' are usually attributed to Aristotle, the classical realist).

In J. Donald Butler's aforementioned book, he takes a position that is more or less representative of the formal systems approach; he summarizes the position of an idealist in relation to educational philosophy as stated below:

1. The teacher is the creator of the student's educational environment and a source of inspiration for him.

2. An important and valuable way in which student responses are generated is through imitative activities, especially if directed by role models in terms of creative work and virtuous teacher personalities.

3. Another stepping stone towards student responses is interest. It is better if interest is the basis of most student activities. Sometimes, of course, it must be accompanied by the student's own efforts to apply it. And occasionally these efforts may need to be strengthened by the emphasis on discipline from outside the student.

4. In all teacher actions, the result that must be achieved is an active response from those who are learning (students). Only when the student becomes attached to activities on his own initiative can growth and self-development begin.

5. As for the curriculum, if you want to achieve stability in education and in students, there must be a lot of objective curriculum content and lots of textbooks. However, if education is not intended to be merely a sharing of knowledge, then the curriculum must be more than textbooks and subjects must also include direct experience linked with actuality.

6. Teaching methods should be used in such a way as to create a fleeting feeling of tension (suspense) in the student, a tension that can only be resolved through his own decisions or active efforts. Questions from the discussions will be very useful for this purpose, but it is also very useful if given solid instructions, for example through lectures, as well as directing student activities, as in projects involving

constructive and creative work.

Others who choose to use a formal systems approach tend to prefer less direct relationships between philosophical systems and educational theory. This method, which is perhaps the most popular among those who have recently adopted a formal systems approach, seeks to find a conformity between various philosophical systems, on the one hand; on the other hand, he seeks to find far more limitless theories called “educational philosophies” – theories that are seen as having more specific implications for educational practice at the 'very less abstract' level. This approach contains the notion that philosophical systems are coherent, which includes full consideration of the larger problems of education.

It is often stated, for example, that conservative philosophies — that is, systems of absolute belief based on metaphysical presuppositions, such as classical realism and idealism — logically exclude certain educational beliefs. Thus, for some philosophers of education, it could be argued that all idealists (often including Aristotelian and Thomistic realists as philosophical successors to Thomas Aquinas) tend to be viewed as educational perennials—a philosophical position that is similar but not quite as long ago as the educational intellectual as the term is used.

in the conceptual model that will be developed here. The more contemporary, or 'scientific' realists (unless their orientation is very traditional) tend to be regarded as educational essentialists — that is, a position that in many ways relates to the ideology of educational conservatism.

Those who hold a pragmatic philosophical view are presented as progressive educators, or, if they adhere to a radical political direction, as social reconstructionists. While existentialists — unless this term is used to denote an educational philosophy or a philosophical system in general — tend to be seen as a progressive, reconstructionist, or both.'

C. Educational Philosophies

The third approach is based on the belief that it is possible to identify and formulate educational philosophies that are separate from other types of philosophers (which are not educational philosophies). Also that educational philosophies are at least seen as philosophies that, conceptually, can be separated from the formal systems of traditional philosophical thought.

In other words, if the formal systems approach (which still plays a very important role in the philosophy of education) tends to start its study with the highest general philosophical similarities, or with

generalizations, then move towards the specifics of philosophy in the field of education on the basis of reference. rational; the approach to educational philosophies tends to negate this procedure. It begins with more specific designs, usually in the area of social ethics studies, which are more directly related to the fundamental problems of schooling. Then he organizes or organizes the principles and policies into a logical system of ideas about the nature and purpose of education.

The term social ethics covers areas of study that are usually described as moral philosophy and political philosophy. Both are referred to as ethics, in the sense of a general theory of interpersonal (interpersonal) responsibility, and are linked to the practical implications and/or application of certain ethical positions in social action.

In this approach, there is little attempt to trace these particular educational philosophies back to more fundamental differences in the area of traditional first philosophical principles.[9]

Approaches to educational philosophies differ in two fundamental ways when compared to approaches that center on educational conclusions in established philosophical systems. First, educational philosophies are not really philosophies in common sense. They do not

start from an ordered (coherent) system of general beliefs, which are directed to the fundamental philosophical questions of 'knowing' and 'knowledge'.

Instead, they use intermediate theories, usually in the area of the study of social ethics, and these less abstract considerations are used as the basis for establishing a comprehensive approach to various schooling problems. In other words, rather than starting with a system of fundamental philosophical principles and systematically developing their applications and implications for schools, the educational philosophies approach tends to operate at a less 'exalted' level; it focuses on educational expressions in major contemporary philosophies. After that, in the second priority level (and even if there is a number two priority), then they are involved with the first really basic philosophical principles, which often underline this kind of the point of view.

A. Second, the approach to educational philosophies tends to focus on two fundamental questions in education: a. What basic relationship exists between the school and the community? (How should educational goals relate to overarching social goals?)

B. What are the implications of this relationship in terms of the nature and structure (nature and organization) of

teaching? (What are the goals of education, and how should they be embedded in the curriculum and teaching instructions?)

B. Classification of Educational Philosophy According to Theodore Brameld

A first-rate educational theorist, who has developed an expression with an approach to educational philosophies, is the famous educational philosopher, Theodore Brameld. Brameld was a successful writer, and he has been an influential figure in American philosophy of education for more than a generation. Brameld's ideas are exposed in a number of books, but the most effective is perhaps the *Philosophies of Educational in Cultural Perspective and Toward a Reconstructed Philosophy of Education*. The first was published in 1955, the second was published in 1956.[10]

Brameld, like Butler, also presents a variety of educational philosophies. But Brameld uses a fundamentally different classification of distinctions from Butler's four systems of educational philosophy. The classification of the basic approach to philosophy according to Brameld is as follows: the classical philosophical tradition developed from the theories of Plato, Aristotle, and Saint Thomas Aquinas, more modern expressions of realism and traditional idealism, pragmatism, what

might be called dots. view of 'Sociology of Education' which is generally associated with the ideas of Karl Marx and Karl Mannheim. Karl Marx (1818-1883), Karl Mannheim (1893-1947).

The origins of sociological epistemology are difficult to trace. Brameld's point of view does not seem to derive from Marx's and Mannheim's approaches to the sociology of knowledge, but perhaps both are closer to Brameld's than the other. What is important to note is that Brameld was not a Marxist because it would be misleading if the proposed reconstructionism was steered toward Marxist predictions about the nature of reality.

Closely related to the four approaches to educational philosophy, according to Brameld, there are four basic educational philosophies which he calls perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, and reconstructionism.[11]

According to Brameld, perennialism is basically a point of view in which the worthy goal of education is "possession of the principles of reality, truth, and value; eternal, timeless, spaceless".[12] Perennialism has its roots in a philosophical tradition that can be traced back to the philosophies of Plato, Aristotle, and Thomas Aquinas, and it proposes the existence of unchanging and universal

patterns that underlie and determine all objects and events that exist in reality. (actual objects and events). The overarching cultural perspective in perennialism is highly regressive; it seeks to restore the absolute standards that governed the ancient and medieval world and is inherently opposed to genuine democracy.

Essentialism, on the other hand, holds to the main statement that "the universe and all its elements are governed by all-encompassing laws and pre-established orders, therefore man's main task is to understand these laws and orders so that he can appreciate and adapt them to their [13] For an essentialist, the main goal of schooling is to introduce students to the basic character of the ordered universe, by introducing them to cultural heritage. Philosophically, essentialism is based on the classical principles of modern realism and idealism.

The ontology can take the form of "objective realism, which holds that reality is a substance (substance) of matter; or objective idealism, which holds that reality is essentially spiritual".[14] His epistemology at the highest level is "the theory of correspondence of knowledge", which believes that truth appears to represent (or correspond to) objective facts. as an overarching social philosophy, essentialism represents "a contemporary

policy and program of cultural preservation"[15] reflecting the classical humanism that developed during the Enlightenment and Revival (Renaissance) in the 15th century and reached its peak in the mid-nineteenth century.

In terms of progressivism, the main goal of the school is to increase practical intelligence and to make students more effective in solving various problems presented in the context of experience in general. Characteristically, this "worldly, exploring, active, evolutionary" educational progressive[16] is primarily oriented towards "an interpretation of the liberal way of life in American culture". Philosophically, progressivism is supported by the philosophy of pragmatism. It does not provide definitive final answers, and it does not validate its conclusions through behavioral consequences.

Finally, reconstructionism, holds that schools should be "dedicated to the achievement of a global democratic order".[17] Philosophically, a reconstructionist believes that theory is at its peak inseparable from the social setting in a particular historical era. Mind, then, is the output or product of life in a particular society at a time.

CONCLUSION

Modern educational methods are structured on the basis of these modern ideologies and philosophies. Various methods that are human-centered or humanism, make humans the center or center of learning. Tara Chand Sharma writes that there are four modern teaching methods being developed today. The four methods are constructivism, comprehensive learning, conceptual pedagogy, and the internet.[18]

Modern science has created a lot of moral problems in modern society. It is generally worrying that modern education is influencing children's values. Moral values can be taught through literature and textbooks, however, the learning atmosphere also needs to be considered. The modern view considers that with the education of good ethical values, children will automatically turn out to be good. If the situation or environment is improved structurally and economically, with good education and moral and ethical values, then society will automatically change for the better. Therefore, various methods and best teaching methods are presented to children and the community.

However, in reality, what is happening in various big cities of the world, where the education and the level of people's lives are getting higher, it seems

that moral values are getting lower and the crime rate is increasing. The values of togetherness and love are becoming very rare and egocentric and only thinking about oneself becomes something that is exalted.

So it turns out that ideological, philosophical, and modern methods or ways that logically seem extraordinary, do not guarantee the success of moral education in society. There are other factors that must always be considered, namely factors from within humans themselves.

REFERENCES

- [1] John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1916, p. 45-46.
- [2] *Ibid.*, p. 60.
- [3] John Dewey, *Progressive Education: The Ideal and the Reality*, edited by Ronald Gross, *The Teacher and the Taught*, New York: Dell Publishings Co. , 1963, p x.
- [4] namely a comprehensive set of views in lines (generalizations) that are at the peak of meaningful abstraction, the type of generalization that allows a person to organize his behavior as a whole systematically and with the least inconsistency (inconsistency) and self-contradiction (contradiction)
- [5] William F. O'neil, *Educational Ideologies* (Jogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2001), p. 12.
- [6] See Thomas katen, *Doing Philosophy* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1973).
- [7] Richard S. Peters, *Ethics and Education* (Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Company, 1966), Israel Scheffer, *Conditions of Knowledge* (Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Company, 1965), and Jonas Soltis, *An Introduction to Analysis of Educational Concepts* (Massachussets: Addison Wesley Co., 1968).
- [8] J. Donald Butler, *Four Philosophies and Their Practice in Educational and Religion*, revised ed., (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951), p. 261-262.
- [9] William F. O'neil, p. 20.
- [10] Theodore B. Brameld, *Philosophies of Educational in Cultural Perspective* (New York: Dryden, 1955), and *Toward a Reconstructed Philosophy of Education* (New York: Dryden, 1956).
- [11] Brameld, *Toward A Reconstructed Philosophy of Education*, pp. 4 – 19.
- [12] *Ibid.*, p. 11.
- [13] *Ibid.*, p. 8.
- [14] *Ibid*
- [15] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
- [16] *Ibid.*
- [17] William F. O'neil, p. 23
- [18] Tara Chand Sharma, *Modern Methods of Teaching Moral Values* (England: Sarup, 2002) p. 22.