

ADULT EDUCATION AND COMPETENCIES – APPROACHES OF RESEARCHERS IN POLAND

Hanna Kostyło

FOUR PHILOSOPHIES OF EDUCATION. IN THE SEARCH OF CITIZENSHIP COMPETENCE

Key words: education, democracy, Brameld, social change, social reconstructionism

Abstract: The article deals with a proposal of understanding democracy in different cultures and educational systems connected with them. Four philosophies of education distinguished by the American author Theodore Brameld, i.e. perennialism, essentialism, progressivism and reconstructionism, are a subject of an analysis. Each of these philosophies suggests a way of understanding reality, knowledge and values, and points to the desired concepts of teaching, effective curricula and the proposed role of the school. Each of them also understands democracy in a different way. Social reconstructionism is the most innovative concept of the four mentioned above. It proposes to change the social situation through education. New reconstructionist curricula are able to make social change, to change people's thinking for them to be able to recognize their proper needs. Reconstructionists convince us that it can be done in one way, i.e. by means of conducting a continuous democratic debate. Opening to culture and care for observing democratic principles distinguish reconstructionism from extreme emancipatory approaches in education.

Introduction

Reflecting on different concepts of democracy, it is easy to notice that the issue of human education is directly, or by implication, included in each of them. This concerns both individual education and education of entire social classes or strata. In order to be able to function in a democratic society, people must have knowledge, skills and social competences. They need to learn appropriate behaviour, assimilate standards, adapt to procedures, and recognize

the primacy of the universal law over particularistic morality. The ability to live in a democratic system is not natural to humans, it does not come as easily as breathing, digesting, or even feeling sympathy for other people. Therefore, it is justified to say that one of the major challenges faced by the modern liberal-democratic state is the education of the young generation for democracy.

Education for democracy is a challenge for every community, ranging from the family, through to the national or supranational community. Learning that the will of the majority can and should be done, even if the minority does not agree with it, is an elementary point of democratic education. So is the assimilation of the principle that the minority has a right, and even an obligation, to criticise the majority and force through – certainly within the limits of the law – their own point of view. A classroom, a whole school, various non-governmental organizations, professional associations and local governments, political parties and representative bodies at various levels – these are the places where people learn democracy, and they do it mostly through practising it. The results of this education are varied and if a rule that applied to this practice could be formulated, it would read that every success in this area is paid for with great effort.

This effort can be attested to by all educators who introduce the young generation to the democratic process, regardless of the level of social life. If this undertaking is so difficult in class or school, then how much harder is it going to be on the forum of the local government or the state? What is more, there is a concept of education which emphasizes the need for education for democracy at the global level. Such a proposal was formulated and presented in the works of T. Brameld (1904-1987), an American philosopher of education.¹ He considered democracy not only as a means, but also as a goal of education, common for all people. This radical educational concept is called social reconstructionism.

Social reconstructionism is based on the concept of culture, which, according to Theodore Brameld, is a central category of social sciences. Brameld made a diagnosis that the American culture contemporary to him (we are talking about the middle of the previous century) was sick, and more specifically, bore the hallmarks of schizophrenia. The crisis of culture consisted in the inadequacy of attitudes, the awareness of reality and the internal development of people towards advanced industrial technology and economic progress of developed countries. The „schizophrenia” of culture was based on the fact that culture attempted to affirm contradictory values at the same time.

¹ T. Brameld (1904-1987) – an American philosopher of education, the author of a division of all concepts of education: perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, and reconstructionism. Brameld wrote three books on the philosophy of education: *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971 *Philosophies of Education in Cultural Perspective*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1955, and *Towards a Reconstructed Philosophy of Education*, New York: The Dryden Press Publishers, 1956.

Ordinary people – participants in culture – were not aware of this process. As a result, a number of tensions appeared in the daily life of Americans. They were the tensions between self-interest and public interest, equality and inequality, planlessness and planning, nationalism and international cooperation, absolutism and experimentalism, man „hostile to himself” and man „friendly to himself.” Brameld pointed out that not everybody recognized the presence of a cultural crisis; what is more, most Americans seemed to think that we could not speak about any crisis at all. This belief of the majority resulted, among others, from the fact that after World War II, the United States took the position of a superpower, and the so-called American way of life became a benchmark for other cultures, including very different and distant ones. This state of affairs, as noted by Brameld, led many Americans to complacency, and even to the belief that their way of life should be an example to the rest of the world.

The concept of social reconstructionism was not the only educational concept aimed at clarifying the condition of American culture, and the condition of education as its part. Theodore Brameld believed that understanding education is impossible in isolation from the social context. For education depends on the condition and functioning of society, and this relationship is mutual, which means that ways of thinking about education, educational concepts and their implementation affect the functioning of society. Brameld distinguished four models of such relationships, each of which was characterized by a different degree of dependence between education and society, that is to say, in each of them the analysis of the interaction of these two realities was presented differently, depending on the dynamics of that interaction. These models included perennialism, essentialism, progressivism and social reconstructionism. Brameld called these models philosophies of education. Each of these philosophies proposed (and still proposes) a way of understanding reality, knowledge and values, and points to the desired concepts of teaching, effective curricula and the proposed role of the school. Each of them also understands democracy in a different way.

Perennialism

Perennialism² focuses the hope for proper education and, indeed, also for a healthy culture in returning to the idea of the Middle Ages, to the eternal

² The term of „perennialism” was first used in the meaning of interest to us by G.W. Leibniz in the 17th century. „Perennialist” means „ever-lasting”, „resurgent” and „returning to the previous form”. Patterns and forms of natural phenomena or cultural ones remain stable for centuries giving man a sense of rootedness and orientation in the world. Sources of the perennialist thought can be found at the beginning of philosophical reflection. Plato, Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas are its three biggest representatives. Today, we encounter most references to perennialism in the neo-scholastic current and in neo-Thomism. Brameld cites here primarily the

principles of truth, good and beauty. The medieval educational system was based on the rigidity and deductive certainty in relation to these basic principles. Perennialists recognize as the main purpose of education today the training of intellectual leaders, who would be equipped with such developed intuitive abilities that would allow fundamental and eternal principles to be recognized.

Perennialist philosophy recognizes the authority of reason as the source of freedom. Therefore, the main task of education is to maximize the development of reason. This allows us to understand in what sense perennialists talk about liberating education. The superior purpose of this education is to liberate in a person his rational I, i.e. to bring him to the maximum potential of his freedom. This is tantamount to the maximum development of the rational (mental) potential, which is learning how to philosophize rising to intellectual virtues. The ultimate point of thinking is full intuition, which gives us a sense of absolute freedom.

A characteristic feature of the philosophy of perennialism, which is fully revealed in school curricula at primary and secondary levels, is the assumption that the period of education is just a preparation for future life and maturation. According to this view, the child has a certain potential for the future, which at the beginning of education is not yet actualized. The task of education is to develop it, and the method used is developing specific habits by continuous exercising and repetition, and communing with proper content. Perennialists acknowledge the three „R's”, i.e., reading, *writing and arithmetic*, and certain elements of history, geography, literature, science and foreign languages as proper content at the basic (primary) level. In the first years of schooling, greater emphasis is placed on the development of character, the so-called moral virtues, and in the later periods on the development of intellectual virtues.

Since the rules of perennialism are axiomatic, timeless and super-spatial, they refer to each culture, because they have no connection with its particularistic dimensions. Brameld notes, however, that perennialism, first, does not take into account in its deliberations the course of history and, second, it does not unambiguously advocate a democratic system of government, and, what is more, it does not see in democracy the ideal that should be spread throughout the world.

Perennialist education was born in the perennial culture, whose model description can be found in Plato's *The Republic*. The presence of this model of education in today's societies is made possible owing to democratic rules giving parents the right to choose such education for their children which they consider the most appropriate. However, it would be difficult to look for democratic principles in the perennialist model of education itself. We can rather speak here

names of three French thinkers: Etienne Gilson, Gabriel Marcel (called a Christian existentialist) and the most influential in the United States, Jacques Maritain. One cannot overlook here one more representative, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin.

of an approach to the issue of access to education which is opposite to the democratic one. The most capable should be trained in this model of education, because by providing them with an above-average efficiency of mind, God showed them their place at the top of society. It is through a perennial school, where all aspects of learning and teaching are already established, that the road leads to responsible social positions. Consistency and strict adherence to accepted patterns of conduct are a guarantee of success. And success means bringing the mental makings of pupils, and their evolving potential, to the peak of capability. There is no reflection in this concept on equalizing opportunities, on the impact of pupils on the selection of content or teaching methods, or the change of the hierarchical distance between the teacher and the pupil. In the system of perennial education, as in the corresponding culture, there is no enacting of any democratic rules. They are imposed from above, and mechanisms of their implementation are time-honoured with tradition or established pursuant to the absolute will of rulers/teachers. This model of education does not evolve and there are no plans to change it. This eliminates entirely the democratic dimension from the inside of the system of perennial educational. Democracy would threaten the established, eternal order, which is considered to be ideal.

Essentialism

Similarly to perennialism, another current, essentialism, is predominantly focused on cultural transmission. Although change is not one of its goals, the notion of democracy is understood much more broadly in it. Historically, the emergence and development of another current associated with essentialist educational ideas is connected with such thinkers as Erasmus of Rotterdam, John Locke, Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, Friedrich Fröbel and Johann Friedrich Herbart. The essence of essentialism is to strive to maintain the legacy of past cultural patterns. According to essentialism, these patterns are not only real, but also good. It follows that the main goal of education should be their transmission.

Bringing essentialist education closer to readers, Theodore Brameld distinguishes in essentialism between two directions or trends: idealistic and realistic. Although there are fundamental differences as to the interpretation of the nature of the object of knowledge between idealism and realism, according to Brameld the verification process of ideas in both cases is the same. Truth is the conformity of a statement with a fact. The expectation that the pupil will be closely watching and „absorbing” what reality brings is a consequence of such a theory of truth. The role of the teacher in this process is to select the material to be „absorbed” by the pupil, as well as to organize educational situations in a way that favours the transmission of selected elements of knowledge. This concept of the acquisition of knowledge also makes it possible to clearly define

which students should be promoted and rewarded, and which should not. The measure of progress in learning is a more perfect representation of the reality of the subject of study.

The idealistic approach to learning assumes that you first learn about the structures of our mind, the microcosm. However, since the mind as a microcosm is a part of the universe as the macrocosm, the knowledge acquired is always objective and always goes beyond the subjective self. It is the immutable laws of the universe that we get to know. The realistic approach to learning is mainly connected with the name of Burrhus Frederic Skinner, who believed that humans can be conditioned and determined in such a way so as to create such a world that they want and deserve.

Simplifying the rules of developing an essentialist curriculum, one can say that it should be based on the irreducible body of knowledge, skills and attitudes that are shared in democratic culture. The curriculum in essentialism is a miniature of the world. Knowledge should be acquired by pupils adequately, and its presentation should be to the maximum extent concise and economical. Clearly defined standards of progress at school should be the condition for the promotion of pupils.

The essentialists' deep belief in democracy is an interesting point worth emphasizing here. Unlike perennialism, essentialism is open to the idea of democracy. However, the adopted assumptions of this model make the understanding of democracy inflexible and closed. Its understanding is closer to the meaning of democracy developed by John Locke than to that by John Dewey. Democracy is understood by the essentialists as the whole of the democratic principles acquired from the past that schools must convey to citizens, whereas citizens are obligated to respect them. This understanding is static, different from the dynamic understanding of Dewey, where experimenting on the lines 'individual-society' and 'means-goals' is located in the foreground. Similarly to perennialism, essentialism assumes that the cultural patterns socially inherited from ancestors are good and true, so the best purpose that education should serve is their transmission to future generations. Since the goal of education is to transmit a miniature of an objectively existing real world, it is obvious that there is some content of democracy in this education. Yet education is not in the least organized around it. We can rather talk here about the obligation to learn and teach about democracy, and not about democratic processes within society, or in this model of education. The last statement can be mitigated with respect to later neo-essentialist concepts, which already included suggestions recognizing the importance of the phenomena of current social life and „cultural change”.

Progressivism

Progressivism evolved under the influence of four factors: the industrial revolution, modern science, the development of democracy and the favourable cultural environment in the United States. It is worth mentioning that it competed with the current of essentialist education in the U.S.A. for over twenty years, and that this rivalry ended with the victory of essentialism. But before essentialism began to dominate in the 1930s, progressivism had been the most influential philosophy of education in America in the first decades of that century. The most significant theorists of education were recruited from among progressivists. Educational practice at every level of society, from kindergarten to adult education, remained under the influence of this philosophy. Taking into consideration Brameld's division of all educational concepts into four groups, progressivism is undoubtedly the philosophy which is the best-known and most accurately recognized, even by persons not professionally engaged in pedagogy. As part of the traditional dual rationality of thinking about education, progressivism situates itself, along with reconstructionism, definitely on the side of change and emancipation, and not of adaptation and adjustment, where perennialism and essentialism can be found.

In order to summarize the basic assumptions of progressivism, one must say that its purpose is to prepare people to develop in themselves a feature of continuous rational adjustment to the social environment that surrounds them. The main purpose of education does not even mention the transmission of large amounts of content regarding the external world. The use of a scientific method, i.e. effective thinking, is central here. Analysing, criticizing, the ability to distinguish between alternatives and to make a selection, as well as the awareness of risks associated with it, are the most important components in understanding thinking in the progressivist concept. A progressivist school is an institution different from a traditional school, because all experience is the subject of curricula in progressivism. Curricula are of a laboratory nature, constantly open to experimentation, and therefore, fairly unstable and unpredictable. But their function is to stimulate interest and the effective use of thinking. Educational experience is real, it is happening „here and now”, and reality, according to progressivists, is changeable; it evolves. Therefore, the task of the experimental method is not to deduce the existing knowledge, but rather to induce pupils' own ideas and to create knowledge. Values in progressivism, unlike their understanding in the previous two currents, are recognized as dynamic, temporary and changeable. One of them is democracy.

Democracy in progressive philosophy is a value that is associated with a more fundamental question of freedom. Progressivists understand it positively as an opportunity of individuals living next to one another to take full advantage of their capabilities for the sake of self-development and the development of the community. Freedom is humans' potential materializing in democracy. It is

everyone's participation in the common experience of all people that is the foundation of the progressivist understanding of democracy. Freedom, understood as a continuous discussion of individuals and groups to express their needs and views, is its condition. The social order emerging from behind the practice of everyone's full participation in every point of the discussions or activities undertaken constitutes the order developed by people. Such an order is created at any time. Needs, goals or spontaneous actions of specific individuals modify it.

Democracy understood in this way is an ideal. It is an expression of people's permanent aspirations to dignity, respect, bonds and responsibility, to the height of their potential at all times.

Social reconstructionism

The most innovative concept of the four mentioned above is social reconstructionism.³ According to reconstructionists, being too heavily burdened with transmission, and too prone to adaptation, education loses sight of the most pressing social problems. The originality of reconstructionism, however, does not lie with the fact that it assigns the task of emancipation to education. In the case of reconstructionism, the road that leads to this general goal is much more important than the goal itself. The road of democracy. Theodore Brameld, who developed reconstructionist philosophy, said that reconstruction cannot destroy that which it finds, that any change is possible only under the condition that we will first thoroughly get to know the culture that we want to change. Respect for the existing culture and being aware that education, trying to change the world, cannot do this in isolation from it, are the two attitudes characterizing reconstructionism. The absolute primacy of democracy is their practical expression. Effective cultural change through education is possible only while observing democratic procedures. Only the majority can determine the directions of change. Opening to culture and care for observing democratic

³ Wanting to locate reconstructionism within the historical framework, one would say that it was born in the 1920s and 1930s in the United States, having its origins in progressivism. Liberal and experimental principles of progressivist education were supplemented in reconstructionism with far-reaching social goals, which, according to the developers of the current, should be implemented by schools. Progressivism was for reconstructionists too individualistic and focused on means, while, in their opinion, collective actions aimed at goals are needed. This current was not entirely new in the sense that it had already had a long tradition of self-education, undertaken primarily by working class circles. Reconstructionism was born during the Great Depression and was in many ways a reaction to the crisis. In the face of the collapse of the economy based on the free play of market forces, demands to base the economy on planning and joint implementation of the objectives began to emerge in the United States. Not without significance was the fact that even at that time the efficacy of the Soviet planned economy was quite widely believed in and the results of the economic performance of the country published annually won acclaim. The socialist sympathies of reconstructionism were obvious and it was certainly one of the reasons why this educational concept never found universal acceptance in the United States.

principles is what distinguishes reconstructionism from extreme emancipatory approaches in education. As I wrote in the introduction, Brameld's diagnosis of the American society was „crisis”. Since it was visible in this rich society of the 1950s, which was growing in strength, it is difficult to assume that the rest of the societies of the world were free from crisis. Reconstruction of societies is a cure for a diagnosed crisis. Brameld believed that it is possible through proper education. Its first goal should be to convince the members of society of the need to take action for social change. Reconstructionism assumes a possibility of effective change. It is characterized by meliorism and utopianism. All projects and activities undertaken for the sake of change must be subject to a continuous democratic debate of free citizens. The responsibility to teach citizens to develop and participate in a democratic process rests with schools. Reconstructed education must emphasize the shared responsibility of all of us for the current form of culture, and the need to focus not on individuality and privacy, but on thinking and acting in the dimension of a broader community. The fundamental issue raised by reconstructionism relates to the continuous effort to recognize their own cultural situation by each society and the concern of all people for communication between cultures. The cultural dimension of our lives is the most important here. It does not „happen” by itself. We have to keep learning it, observing it, and working on it. Reconstructionism does not propose any final goal to achieve, nor does it impose any specific solutions to the problems recognized. The assumption that underlies its sources says only that we need to understand the problems that arise, in order to be able to consciously act in our personal life, in our local community and broader social structures. Reconstructionism focuses on educating the younger and older generations on issues related to culture. It makes us realize that culture is a bedrock, a foundation of our life, and that without „practising” it we stop taking care of ourselves. Reconstructionist analyses are a warning against the recognition of culture as an obvious part of the world in which we operate. We find it in this world when we are born into it, but we are fully responsible for its development, which is possible only through conscious education.

Brameld perceived social reality as a continuous struggle of classes, nations, races and religions, as well as beliefs and ideologies related to them. Values within the meaning of reconstructionism are never absolute, but their existence should not be treated as independent of other aspects of experience. In fact, values are a satisfaction of the needs rooted in individuals and groups to seek and achieve goals.

Values, as I said, are inherent in reality, therefore, they must be understood as social goals. The implementation of values is equivalent to the realization of objectives, and these always have a social dimension. Listing these objectives, Brameld first indicates what most people do not want, and then deduces from it a value, which is affirmed. „Most people do not want to starve: the value of *a sufficient amount of food* is dear to them. Most people do not want to freeze or

walk in rags: the value of *having proper clothes* is dear to them. Most people do not want to be exposed, in an uncontrolled manner, to the activity of the elements or to contacts with others: the values of *shelter* and *privacy* are dear to them. Most people do not want to live in celibacy: the value of *sexual expression* is dear to them. Most people do not want to fall ill: the value of *physiological* and *mental health* is dear to them. Most people do not want to remain in a constant state of uncertainty: the value of *a permanent job*, of *permanent earnings* is dear to them. Most people do not want to live in solitude: the values of *being in company*, of *mutual devotion*, of *belonging* are dear to them. Most people do not want indifference: the values of *recognition*, *appreciation*, *status* are dear to them. Most people do not want to keep slogging, to remain in monotony or routine: the values of *novelty*, *curiosity*, *change*, *relaxation*, *adventure*, *growth*, *creativity* are dear to them. Most people do not want to remain in the state of ignorance: the values of *reading skills*, *efficiency*, *information* are dear to them. Most people do not want constant dominance: the value of *participation*, of *taking part* is dear to them. Most people do not want to remain in the state of confusion: the value of *a sincere and direct meaning*, *sense*, *order*, *orientation* are dear to them” (Brameld 1952, p. 46)

The list of values-objectives postulated by reconstructionism is a minimum list. To determine them is the first task in the process of preparing social change. However, one should bear in mind three issues. Firstly, the very agreement as to the objectives, even at the universal level, is not enough yet. The identification of the obstacles that stand in the way of their implementation is equally important. These obstacles include, among others, cultural contradictions and frustrations not allowing the full realization of socially desirable values. Secondly, the objectives of which we speak cannot be considered in isolation. In fact, they are connected with each other and, as Brameld says, some of them assume and imply the others. Such a relationship can be clearly seen, for example, between the value of love and the value of religion in society. It can also be seen between the value of community and the values of mutual recognition, participation and sometimes of a sexual relationship. Thirdly, one should be aware that some values may be in conflict with each other. It is a natural situation especially in times of crisis. On the one hand, for example, people expect safety, on the other, they seek new discoveries, adventures, challenges, which necessarily involves risks. The complexity of human goals makes the implementation of several objectives at the same time, even in the life of an individual, not always possible. It is also worth mentioning that some of the objectives are either suppressed or considered taboo in a given culture. Reconstructionism emphasizes, however, that a homogeneous, uniform and, if one may say so, „well-behaved” society is not an ideal one. Brameld admits that „the most important task of our times is to build a sufficiently broad and flexible world civilization, in order to ensure the possibility of expression and satisfaction for the rich diversity of human needs. It is not the diversity of values

that in the first place bears the blame for conflicts and ambivalence among people. Similarly, one cannot blame the rivalry between values for it. Much more blame for this lies with the frustrations, alienations and negations blocking the development of flexible and effective projects, i.e. ones that would enable humanity to live a life rather *for* oneself (and as a result, for values implemented to the maximum extent), than a life *in spite of* oneself, which is so common” (Brameld 1971, p. 420).

These are the goals set by social reconstructionism, which proposes to change the social situation through education. New reconstructionist curricula are able to make social change, to change people's thinking for them to be able to recognize their proper needs. How to do it, then? There is one way, i.e. by means of a continuous democratic debate.

It is a common belief that democracy is a means of education, that is, a tool used by education, since it is only in a democratic society that the effective functioning of education is possible. Outside democracy it is difficult to talk about creative teaching, freedom of scientific inquiry, unfettered intellectual exchange between individuals and institutions, problematizing all (without exception) cultural phenomena and engaging in a debate over them, or about the freedom to choose the direction of education. Brameld understands democracy not only as a means, but also as a goal of education. He believes that people, not only in the U.S.A, but also around the world, need an inspiring goal that will give them hope for a fairer, that is better, future. Such a target will trigger energy to act and to search for a better way of living together; otherwise, as Brameld fears, the form of democracy existing today is going to be stunted.

Conclusion

The concept of reconstructionism is saturated with the idea of democracy. Theodore Brameld not only looked for arguments in favour of democratic education, but also attempted a practical implementation of this form of education. The Floodwood project, which I write more about elsewhere, was the best-known attempt implemented by him and his colleagues (Zielińska-Kostyło 2005, p. 134-139). The reconstructionist concept of education, emphasizing the central category of democracy, certainly set before pedagogy more questions than it brought answers. Nevertheless, that is what makes its project open and worth discussing. Unfortunately, today, in the second decade of the 21st century, we are still lacking such discussions. Although Brameld presented a rational vision of social repair, based on scientific assumptions (anthropology, psychology, sociology, philosophy, pedagogy), it proved to be impossible to meet. Not only in that culture from the moment of this concept's onset, but also today. After the first decade of the 21st century, we are as far from realizing the vision of a democratic world society as we were in the 1950s and 1960s, when Brameld propagated his ideas. Even entering the path of gradual change towards

a new world civilization proved to be impossible. Why did it happen so and will this inability prove to be something permanent?

Questions posed in this way open various fields of analyses. In my opinion, in the most important of them the proposal of reconstructionism is considered to be a utopia on the grounds that it does not take into account the strength of multinational production, service or financial corporations, which do not include meeting the need for democracy of individual people and whole societies in their objectives. On the contrary, their aim is to use inequalities to achieve higher profits. Theodore Brameld's thoughts were placed in the current of the Enlightenment, which was characterized by, among other things, the ideals of social meliorism and a vision of societies as rational constructs, which have their own decision-making centres, and are controllable by the will of the majority. Meanwhile, the development of societies in Brameld's times and later largely negated these assumptions. It revealed that people do not think rationally in the super-personal dimension, and are satisfied with individual rationality, limited to a single existence. Therefore, they not only accept inequalities, but also reinforce them. Having at their disposal democratic procedures, they do not use them, or use them in such a way that democracy becomes a caricature of itself. These obvious weaknesses of the democratic system do not exempt education from the obligation to nurture democracy. Even if at the moment it is difficult to imagine democracy at the global level, we are still witnessing a demand, by individual people and entire societies, for democracies at the level of specific organizations or even countries. Brameld's faith in democracy may have been utopian, but it was not irrational.

Translation: Beata Luc

Bibliography

1. Brameld T. (1971), *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, New York.
2. Brameld T. (1957), *Cultural Foundations of Education. An Interdisciplinary Exploration*, New York.
3. Brameld T. (2000), *Education as Power*, San Francisco.
4. Brameld T. (1965), *Education for the Emerging Age. Newer Ends and Stronger Means*, New York, Evanston and London.
5. Brameld T. (1952), *Ends and Means in Education: A Midcentury Appraisal*, New York and London.
6. Brameld T. (1955), *Philosophies of Education in Cultural Perspective*, New York.
7. Brameld T. (1970), *The Climactic Decades*. New York.
8. Brameld T. (1956), *Toward a Reconstructed Philosophy of Education*, New York.

Cztery filozofie edukacji. W poszukiwaniu kompetencji obywatelskich

Słowa kluczowe: edukacja, demokracja, Brameld, zmiana społeczna, rekonstrukcjonizm społeczny

Streszczenie: Artykuł dotyczy propozycji rozumienia demokracji w różnych kulturach i związanych z nimi systemach edukacyjnych. Analizie podlegają cztery filozofie edukacji wyróżnione przez amerykańskiego pedagoga i filozofa Theodore Brameld: perenializm, esencjalizm, progresywizm i rekonstrukcjonizm. Każda z tych filozofii proponuje pewien sposób rozumienia rzeczywistości, wiedzy i wartości, a także wskazuje na pożądane koncepcje nauczania, skuteczne programy nauczania i postulowaną rolę szkoły. Każda z nich inaczej rozumie demokrację. Najbardziej nowatorską z tych koncepcji jest rekonstrukcjonizm społeczny. Proponuje on zmianę sytuacji społecznej poprzez edukację. Nowe rekonstrukcjonistyczne programy nauczania są w stanie dokonać zmiany społecznej, zmienić myślenie ludzi, aby mogli rozpoznać swoje właściwe potrzeby. Rekonstrukcjonści przekonują nas, że można tego dokonać w jeden sposób: za pomocą ciągłej debaty demokratycznej. Otwarcie na kulturę oraz troska o przestrzeganie zasad demokratycznych odróżniają rekonstrukcjonizm od skrajnych podejść emancypacyjnych w edukacji.

Vier Bildungsphilosophien. Auf der Suche nach Bürgerkompetenzen

Schlüsselwörter: Bildung, Demokratie, sozialer Wandel, gesellschaftlicher Rekonstruktionismus

Zusammenfassung: Die wissenschaftliche Abhandlung bezieht sich auf die Empfehlung, den Begriff der Demokratie in verschiedenen Kulturen und mit ihnen verbundenen Bildungssystemen zu verstehen. Die Analyse umfasst vier Bildungsphilosophien, die von dem amerikanischen Pädagogen und Philosophen Theodore Brameld unterschieden werden: Perennialismus, Essentialismus, Progressivismus und Rekonstruktionismus. Jede der genannten Philosophien schlägt ein gewisses Verständnis der Wirklichkeit, des Wissens und der Werte vor und weist zugleich auf erforderliche Lehrkonzeptionen, wirksame Lehrprogramme und eine entsprechende Rolle der Schule hin. Jede der Philosophien versteht den Begriff der Demokratie different. Zu den völlig innovativen Konzepten gehört der gesellschaftliche Rekonstruktionismus. Er bietet den Wandel der sozialen Situation durch die Bildung an. Die neuen rekonstruktionistischen Lehrprogramme können zum sozialen Wandel und zur Änderung des Denkens der Menschen insofern beitragen, dass sie imstande sind, ihre Bedürfnisse richtig zu erkennen. Die Vertreter des Rekonstruktionismus überzeugen uns, dass dieser Zustand auf eine Art und Weise erreicht werden kann, nämlich durch die kontinuierlich geführte, demokratische Debatte. Die Offenheit für die Kultur und Sorge um die Einhaltung der Prinzipien von Demokratie unterscheiden den Rekonstruktionismus von extremen Emanzipationsauffassungen im Bildungswesen.

Data for correspondence:

Hanna Kostylo, Ph.D., Associate Professor

Nicolaus Copernicus University Collegium Medicum in Bydgoszcz (Poland)

e-mail: hanna.kostylo@cm.umk.pl