

---

<https://doi.org/10.31874/2520-6702-2020-10-2-3-12>

УДК 37.017

Mohammed Akinola Akomolafe

### Philosophy of Education and the Ideological Underpinning of the Curriculum

#### **Abstract**

The seeming corpulent connection between theory and practice informs this inquiry. Whereas there have been claims from several quarters that the decline in the quality of pedagogy lies with poor theory but where there is a sound one, its deleterious practice or application is considered a foremost culprit. Consequent upon this, this research takes a twist on this issue. Through the method of critical analysis and interpretation, the study employs the Marxist theory of education as its theoretical framework. In other words, the paper takes its cue from a Marxist perspective to posit that the society is a battle ground of ideologies. What is perceived as failed theory and/or practice in pedagogy is actually the fulfillment of an ideology of the ruling class who are not only the ruling material force but also the society's *ruling intellectual* force. This clearly portends that there is an ideology behind any curriculum and its application. It is always a curriculum put in place by the ruling class. It is calculated to produce minds that would condone and uphold the hegemonic status quo of the *ruling intellectual force*. It therefore does not matter whether or not society develops. For development is defined by the prevailing ideology. Contrary opinions are repressed and exterminated usually through force or rhetoric. If this is the case, the question of theory and practice in pedagogy does not arise. On the contrary, the main impetus ought to be how to deal with what kind of ideology persists in a society's educational curriculum. Hence, the current study proposes a re-thinking away from the perceived and seemingly wide abyss between theory and practice. This is because every fact and practice is theory-laden. It is the submission of this paper that the ideological basis of a curriculum demands more attention.

**Keywords:** Curriculum, Ideology, Marxist Philosophy, Pedagogy, Philosophy of Education

#### **Introduction**

In this study, the role of the curriculum and the kind of society as well as the individuals that live in the society would be exposed from a Marxist perspective as an ideological goal. Put otherwise, the curriculum, teaching methodology and early childhood care of the individual are primed according to dictates of the ruling class. This is in line with the assertion that the class which is the ruling material force of a society is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal has control at the same time over the means of mental production...hence among other things [they] rule also as thinkers, as producers of ideas, and they regulate the production and distribution of the ideas of their age (Marx & Engels, 1972).

It is from the above contention that the inference is not incorrect – the kind of curriculum that exists and persists in pedagogy is tailored towards some ends. Its precise aim is to produce thinkers who would think in a particular way but not otherwise (Harris, 1988). In the face of this reality, it is glaring that the outcome of any educational theory or curriculum is guided by some prior assumptions. There is

the education ideology which is foisted over the hoi-polloi by the ruling class. It is then pertinent to query: What kind of pupils could a curriculum that is guided by the ideology of the ruling class produce? How does this inform the merger between theory and practice? Conversely, could an ideology and curriculum put in place by the ruling class not stifle and serve as an impasse against the connection between educational theories and practices? Given this possibility, what is to be done? What are the dangerous connections between ideology and pedagogy? Does ideology bridge or sever the gap between theory and practice of education untainted by the dictates, whims and caprices of the ruling class?

Responding to the foregoing posers, this study proposes that the gap between theory and practice in the educational curriculum is a product of the society, particularly the ruling intellectual force. It is therefore up to the social reformer of pedagogy to check whether or not the educational ideology wields and promotes class hegemony to produce stereotype pupils who will remain subservient. Unless this is the case, education would be tilted towards producing individuals with minimal impact towards the quest for meaningful development, without class preference. Hence, it is important to disinter the meaning and nature of ideology. The role of ideology in pedagogy would make this excursion rewarding. This is precisely the task of the next rift of this essay. The consequence of a pedagogy that is steeped in the ruling ideology produces a curriculum that serves the interest of the ruling class. This is the curriculum that will produce minds tailored towards maintaining the status quo, instigated by the ruling class at the expense and inconvenience of the ruled. At this stage, the question of bridging the gap between theory and practice does not arise. The real aim is to be armed with the appropriate means to identify ideology and how it impedes pedagogy. The precise manner regarding how this may be attained, through philosophizing on education is the focus of the third section. In the fourth section, we conclude the study.

### ***Ideology and its Role in Pedagogy***

In this research, the word 'ideology' is a key concept and it demands serious scrutiny. Ideology is a collection of beliefs held by an individual, group or society. It can be described as a set of conscious and unconscious ideas which make up one's beliefs, goals, expectations, and motivations. Elsewhere we glean that:

An ideology is a comprehensive normative vision that is followed by people, governments, or other groups that are considered the correct way by the majority of the population, as argued in several philosophical tendencies. It can also be a set of ideas proposed by the dominant class of society such as the elite to all members of society as suggested in some Marxist and critical-theory accounts. While the concept of 'ideology' describes a set of ideas broad in its normative reach, an ideology is the idea expressed in concepts such as worldview, imaginary and ontology (Steger & James, 2013:2).

Ideology refers to the system of abstracted meaning applied to public matters, thus making this concept central to politics. Implicitly, in societies that distinguish between public and private life, every political or economic tendency entails ideology, whether or not it is propounded as an explicit system of thought. In the Althusserian sense, ideology is «the imaginary relation to the real conditions of existence» (Steger & James, 2013:2). Kevin Harris, on his own part, notes a very important connotation of the term 'ideology'. This is that «ideology is represented as the lived consciousness of the actual political/social events that are taking place (or are being aimed for). Ideology, then, is *perception* of the world and as

such it is governed and affected by those various aspects...» (Harris, 1988:63). We understand Harris to be saying that in every society, what is considered as good or bad has already been set even before an individual comes into the world. These things are put thus by the ruling class who oversee various sectors of the socio-economic and political life of the state. This view is what he terms «received view» (Harris, 1988:70-2). Now that there has been a terse exposition of the key term in this study, the next task is to unveil how it infiltrates the arena of pedagogy, especially the curriculum. The theoretical underpinning of this section would rely on the Marxist interpretation given to the discourse by Kevin Harris. Some other scholars whose ideas are closely related will also be consulted as well.

In *Education and Knowledge: The Structured Misrepresentation of Reality*, Kevin Harris sought to reveal that the kind of theory, knowledge and even education that prevails in the status quo is being sponsored by the ruling class. What is the main tool used by the ruling class to perpetuate the status quo across all levels? Ideology is this key concept. In his own words, Harris reiterates that he intends to «...indicate in greater detail the way that ideology functions, and to outline certain conditions whereby ideology necessarily projects and presents distortions and misrepresentations, and disguises the real nature of existing state of affairs» (Harris, 1988:63). As we stated earlier that he employed a Marxist framework, he took as his starting point, Karl Marx's classic statement in *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* that, «Just as our opinion of an individual is not based on what he thinks of himself, so can we not judge such a period of transformation by its own consciousness; on the contrary, this consciousness must rather be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflicts between the social forces of production and the relations of production» (Feuer, 1972:85).

From Marx's statement as summarily stated in the foregoing, Harris goes on to reveal how a single ideology turns out to be prevailing one through the means of repression of any competing one. He avers that:

One sure way to create a situation where only one view (or one set of views) prevails or is tolerated is to use forces of repression to stamp out those people with contrary beliefs – by goaling them, exiling them or killing them (Harris, 1988:74).

The above is very true because in the Nigerian society, for instance, people who hold opposing and contrary views to the 'received view' are usually maltreated. The case of people like the late Ken Saro Wiwa<sup>1</sup> and late Fela Anikulapo Kuti<sup>2</sup> are easily recalled.

---

<sup>1</sup>This is one of the human rights activists in Nigeria during the military regime of the late General Sanni Abacha. His activism centered on the neglect of the people of the Niger Delta region – the crude oil hub which serves as the main centre of the country's revenue. He was executed by the Abacha regime for calling attention to the aquatic and terrestrial implications of oil spillage in the region. Within the context of this research, it is clear enough that his ideology seems to contravene the prevailing one initiated by the then military regime in Nigeria.

<sup>2</sup>Fela is a crucial and important Nigerian who opposed the military government of Nigeria through his songs. He initiated the genre of African music called 'Afro-beat' and was constantly revealing the shortcomings and corrupt practices of the despotic regimes of Nigeria via his songs. Obviously, this often brought him into conflict with successive ruling governments. Hence, he was made to suffer and unjustly imprisoned on many occasions for the crimes he did not commit. As a consequence of his intransigence, on one occasion, his 80-year old mother, the late Olunfunlayo Ransome Kuti (the first woman to drive a car in Nigeria, who was also an activist), was thrown down from a storey-building by the agents of the then military government. The injuries sustained by the octogenarian led to her death shortly after the incident.

After showing how the 'received view' is perpetuated usually through force to maintain a particular status quo, Harris shows how the 'received view' gains popularity. He begins with the place of every socio-political institution in a state revealing how they help the ruling class.

He opines that:

...institutions tend to depersonalize and disembody the ruling class as holders and formulators of the received view. For instance, ... it appears as if 'the law', and 'the law' as represented by the learned impartial judges, and as concretized through courts – not any particular individual ruling interests (who might have no obvious connection with the legal system) and that (somehow) decrees that there shall be private property, and that protects private property (Harris, 1988:76).

He stresses further that, «Institutions further strengthen and stabilize the status quo through impinging more and more on the everyday existence of the members of a society» (Harris, 1988:77). The educational sector is not in itself or by itself excluded from this problem. But we shall deflect the connection between ideology and education when we take a closer look at the 'supportive rhetoric' usually employed to make an ideology the ruling one. This line of thought has been given by Paulo Freire. Paulo Freire (1997) for instance, brings to our understanding the fact that «authentic education is not carried out by 'A' for 'B' or by 'A' about 'B', but rather by 'A' with 'B' mediated by the world – a world which impresses and challenges both parties, giving rise to views or opinions about it.»

Harris employs various instances to reveal the position of rhetoric in ideology. He states that, «It has been said that if you keep people running all their lives, they might become excellent runners, but they will never know how to swim» (Harris, 1988:78). Harris expatiates that various authorities and statements are used to make a 'received view' subliminal. He then uses all the foregoing to assess the realm of education. He announces:

Given this, it is not surprising that the philosophy of education from 1966 to the present – that is what *really counted* as philosophy of education and made up the courses and reading in that subject – explored *Peter's* field, studied *Peter's* structure, and followed the direction of *Peter's* furrows. Philosophers speaking 'more or less the same language' turned out a plethora of books and papers analyzing concepts as a necessary preliminary to answering philosophical questions about education (Harris, 1988:80).

What Harris seems to be saying is that the philosophers' contribution to the realm of education is a far-cry of what really is the case. They have set parameters as to what kind of things to pursue and what not to. They have also set the 'received' methodology that rules out other possible methods. He takes as critique, Wittgensteinianism, which for him, «left everything as it is...but revealed little if anything about education» (Harris, 1988:80).

He then proceeds to show two instances of how supportive rhetoric is used to make a prevailing view of education the case. Firstly, Harris looks at the matter of assessment. He raises the question whether or not examinations, essays and attendance are some of the adequate ways of assessing the intelligence quotient of an individual.

Secondly, Harris purports to debunk the 'received view' that unless a person is learned, society will not recognize him. This, for him, is another supportive rhetoric used within the boundary of education to maintain the 'received view'. In this connection, the statement of E.B. Castle comes handy:

On leaving school, many of them will enter the world of the conveyor belt. In this world, young persons are living two lives at the same time – a nut-tapping life and a dream life. The problem for teacher is: how shall we enrich young workers' dream life? And the solution thoroughly Greek probably lies in rightly-educate emotions, so that while he is turning his screws and she is filling her cigarette packs, day dreams arise from healthier subconscious (Castle, 1961:200).

There is no doubt that the philosophers of education, in the opinion of Harris, have failed to articulate a better way forward. One which overcomes some of the supportive rhetoric employed to promote a prevailing ideology in a society. This is exactly why Harris sees education as a form of political manipulation and he puts a lot of energy into proving his point.

Firstly, he sees education in a class society as a «political act having as its basis the protection of the interest of the ruling class» (Harris, 1988:140). This is very true as this study agrees with the thoughts of Harris in this reasoning. Education in this sense then becomes a 'mechanism' for securing the continuation of the existing social relationships, and for reinforcing the attitudes and beliefs that those social relationships will continue to be accepted (Harris, 1988:140).

Secondly, another arena of education as a political manipulation comes handy when one considers the way that syllabuses and curricula are drafted. In his own words, Harris announces:

Clearly, those who are concerned with formulating educational curricula are all guided by at least one common principle ... they all believe that the particular content they champion is the most important content that can be included in a finite and severely limited curriculum (Harris, 1988:148).

It is worthy to stress that for Harris, those who draft the syllabuses have thought about exactly how they want the young one to think. This is another way of manipulation in the hands of the ruling class.

The third place of political manipulation has to do with the kind of experiences, prejudices, concepts, theories, methodologies as well as the mental sets that are built in us. Given the belief that education is a form of transmission of ideas, Harris wants us to believe that there is a manipulation that is in play specifically focused to pull down any attempts for one person to think outside the box. He concludes his thoughts on ideology and education by stating that:

It should go without saying by now that education in a capitalist liberal democracy does present a way of seeing the world that is distortive, misrepresentative, and against the best interests of the educands. Education, as a state institution, is controlled by the ruling class, the capitalists, to serve their interests, and thus function against the best interests of the majority of the educands (Harris, 1988:157).

From the foregoing, it is not incorrect to maintain that what holds in Harris's (1988) Marxist interpretation of the educational system is that which misrepresents reality. It is not in error to deduce from the discourse that: does the question of bridging the gap between theory and practice present itself as a critical issue? We do not think so. However, any attempt to sweep the place of ideology under the rug but call for the merger of theory and practice is a case of flogging a dead horse. However, the consequence of this false move is not far-fetched – the promotion of a ruling ideology. The connection between ideology and pedagogy is not limited to the reflections of Harris (1988). Other Nigerian scholars have also pondered deeply over this.

Specifically, Babajide Olugbenga Dasaolu (2019:41-42), while speaking in this connection, opines that «much as pedagogy and parenthood are crucial, the prevailing ideology of the society is more

cardinal.» And ideology for him «refers to the system of abstract meaning applied to public matters, thus making this concept central to politics» (Dasaolu, 2019:42). As a result of this, Dasaolu (2019:45) recommends that «it is now glaring that before any form of human development can take sway in Africa, we must first of all address the ideological battle that is vivacious but silent.» A similar line of thought presents itself in the reflections of Emmanuel Ofuasia (2019:139) that «between positive parenthood and the emergence of the nurtured minds that will effect social upliftment, ideology plays a very crucial role. It is not enough for parents to just impart positive values.» It is within the pages that follow that this research seeks to articulate the proper task of a philosophy of education and explain how to attack the ideology of the ruling intellectual class.

### **Philosophy of Education and the Task of Unearthing the Ideological Essence of the Curriculum**

It is the case that a proper appreciation of the role of ideology in social ordering makes the call for the bridge between pedagogic theory and practice trivial. Unless one understands that the gap between theory and practice is a deliberate ideology initiated to perpetuate the status quo, one would labour in vain. It is in this vein that we concern principally with what we perceive as the central task of a philosophy of education, which would be to put the ideology of the curriculum in the right perspective for the benefit of the hoi-polloi, rather than fuelling class ambitions and views. But what is philosophy of education?

As an academic field, philosophy of education is «the philosophical study of education and its problems...its central subject-matter is education, and its methods are those of philosophy» (Noddings, 1995:1). This is where the idea that philosophy assesses the claims of other intellectual fields becomes justified. Furthermore, Nel Noddings informs that:

The philosophy of education may be either the philosophy of the process of education or the philosophy of the discipline of education. That is, it may be part of the discipline in the sense of being concerned with the aims, forms, methods, or results of the process of educating or being educated; or it may be meta-disciplinary in the sense of being concerned with the concepts, aims, and methods of the discipline. As such, it is both part of the field of education and a field of applied philosophy, drawing from fields of metaphysics, epistemology, axiology and the philosophical approaches (speculative, prescriptive, and/or analytic) to address questions in and about pedagogy, education policy, and curriculum, as well as the process of learning, to name a few (Noddings, 1995:32).

The above is very clear showing how philosophic methods are extrapolated for the use of other intellectual cognitions. In describing the field of philosophy, and in particular the sub-field of philosophy of education, one quickly runs into a difficulty not found to anything like the same degree in other disciplines. For example, although there are some internal differences in opinion, nevertheless there seems to be quite a high degree of consensus within the domain of quantum physics about which researchers are competent members of the field and which ones are not, and what work is a strong (or potential) contribution (Phillips & Siegel, 2013). The very nature of philosophy, on the other hand, is 'essentially contested'; what counts as a sound philosophical work within one school of thought, or socio-cultural or academic setting, may not be so regarded (and may even be the focus of derision) in a different one. Coupled with this is the fact that the borders of the field are not policed, so that the philosophically untrained can cross into it freely. Indeed, over the past century or more, a great number



---

of individuals from across the spectrum of real and pseudo disciplines have for whatever reason exercised their right to self-identify as members of this broad and loosely defined category of 'philosophers' (Phillips & Siegel, 2013).

In essence, then, there are two senses of the term 'philosopher' and its cognates: a loose but common sense in which any individual who cogitates in any manner about such issues as the meaning of life, the nature of social justice, the essence of sportsmanship, the aims of education, the foundations of the school curriculum, or relationship with the Divine, is thereby a philosopher; and a more technical sense referring to those who have been formally trained or have acquired competence in one or more areas such as epistemology, metaphysics, moral philosophy, logic, philosophy of science, and the likes (Phillips & Siegel, 2013). If this bifurcation presents a problem for adequately delineating the field of philosophy, the difficulties grow tenfold or more with respect to philosophy of education. But this is not the task of the day. The task is to articulate a precise aim of philosophy of education. One that is foreign or alien to the present one that not only makes distinction between theory and practice but calls for a bridge.

A critical look at the ideological foundation of the curriculum, from a philosopher's vantage reveals that there is a correspondence between values learnt at school and the way in which the workplace operates. The values, they suggested, are taught through the 'Hidden Curriculum'. The Hidden Curriculum consists of those things that pupils learn through the experience of attending school rather than the main curriculum subjects taught at the school. So, pupils learn those values that are necessary for them to toe the line in menial manual jobs, as outlined below:

School values correspond to exploitative logic of the workplace; passive subservience (of pupils to teachers) corresponds to passive subservience of workers to managers; acceptance of hierarchy (authority of teachers) corresponds to authority of managers; and motivation by external rewards (grades not learning) corresponds to being motivated by wages not the joy of the job.

The foregoing not only validates the Marxist view of education, it has also been echoed by the Brazilian educator Paulo Freire (1997), who emphasizes this form of education as a tool in the hands of the oppressor to make sure that the oppressed class is kept in check. Now that we have been able to concern ourselves with the nature of ideology and how it impedes pedagogy, the next focus is to equip ourselves with the necessary tools to identify the ideological when it comes to us 'dressed up'. One of the ways that ideology presents itself is usually through 'supportive rhetoric'. For instance, the Church, during the Middle Ages, held a geocentric view of the world. This sprang from the belief that the Earth is the centre of God's attention as well as the theological astrophysics which conceives the earth motionless but the Sun and the Stars on the move. The ideology intends to promote the belief in the existence of God from whom every being derives and from whom every existence must be interpreted. The 'supportive rhetoric' therefore would be to employ things in nature to justify the existence of God, the stationary position of the earth in the cosmos, as God's attention. But this need not announce itself as an ideology. It takes a critical mind with a contrary opinion with evidence to reveal that this, indeed, is ideological.

It is therefore not surprising why the inquisition queried and even tried as much to repress the contrary but more potent articulations of Galileo Galilei and Nicolas Copernicus on the same subject. If the earth moves just like the other planets, as these minds claim, then the earth is not the only place of

---

God's attention. Secondly, this contradicts the scripture which is an eternal truth. The supportive rhetoric that had been employed to justify a geocentric view is found wanting. The heliocentric view of Copernicus was repressed because it is not an ideology that serves the priestly class, which back then was also the ruling intellectual force.

An instance of the foregoing also presents itself in the curriculum. A curriculum drafted to make children and pupils think in a particular way would oppose through supportive rhetoric, any other contrary but more beneficial ideology. The consequential outcome of this is false consciousness. False consciousness «is simply a matter of seeing oneself, the world, and one's relationship to the world in a distorted way. It is much like living under the influence of a perception-altering drug; or viewing the world from the perspective of a degenerate research programme (living in the twentieth century but still seeing the world in terms of Aristotelian cosmology); or being under the influence of distortive class interest-serving ideology (Harris, 1988:108).

It is not incorrect from the foregoing that there are two plausible reasons why one would want to promote a curriculum with an ideology that leads to false consciousness. Firstly, the promoter may not perceive his ideology to be false. Secondly, it is an undeniable fact that such promotion would be a good means of serving one's own interests to conceal or disguise from others what the real situation portends. It is basically in the latter sense that a curriculum steeped in ideology leads to false consciousness or a distorted way of seeing the world.

It is the case that one needs to revisit a curriculum, for a critical assessment. It needs not be emphasized that the widening gap between perceived theory and practice may be the calculated intention of the ruling intellectual force. It is in this mould that E.H. Carr informs us that, «The facts of history never come to us 'pure', since they do not and cannot exist in a pure form: they are always refracted through the mind of the recorder (Carr, 1974:22). In the context of education, those who draft a curriculum, the ruling intellectual force or their delegates, do not produce a curriculum that is pure. Rather, they produce a curriculum whose sole aim is the promotion of class hegemony and production of subservient hoi-polloi. The distinction between what is theory and practice does not arise for such a curriculum. In fact, there is nothing to be bridged until one realizes that the ideological underpinning of a curriculum plays a crucial role in social ordering and the intellectual production capacity of the state.

### ***Conclusion***

Theory and practice of pedagogy have ideological background. It is therefore the case that the perceived bridge is encapsulated in ideology. It is in this spirit that the study has given attention to the place of ideology in curriculum. This essay calls attention to the crucial role of assessing the ideological underpinning of a curriculum. If the prevailing ideology in pedagogy is calculated to produce subservient minds that lack the capacity for critical thoughts for social change, the discourse on whether or not theory meets practice in education merely strengthens this ideology. However, it is the position of this study that the discourse on theory and practice is a secondary and even trivial affair. What ought to be given more critical attention and close monitoring is whether or not the ideology that underlies the curriculum is calculated towards social good for all and sundry or merely to serve the hegemonic interests of the ruling material force who are also the ruling intellectual force. We must remember that the world has changed in several ways. To destroy a nation, one needs not have nuclear arms. One needs



only to infiltrate the education system. When the ideological underpinning of the pedagogy and curriculum is turned upside down and inside out, soon enough, accountants without knowledge of book-keeping would surface; pseudo medical doctors and pseudo-engineers would emerge. Redeemable lives would be lost while engineers put up structures that collapse on individuals. The worst of it all may be inferred; the gradual wane into the abyss of state education. Under such condition, the ruling intellectual force would fly over land and sea for proper medical care and engineering contraction. At this juncture, it is important for stakeholders and academics to focus on ways to reverse this horrible trend. Whereas this research does not boast of having all the answers, it is however optimistic that when more critical researches and energies are directed towards the foregrounding of a viable basis for the emergence of sound minds, the research would have realized its objective of being able to raise the consciousness of the society for the need to be mindful of the ideological underpinning of the curriculum before its negative effects on the society escalate beyond what could be managed.

### References

- Carr, E.H. (1974). *What is History?* Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Castle, E.B. (1961). *Ancient Education and Today*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Dasaolu, B.O. (2019). «Ideology and Oladele Balogun's Perspective on Parenthood and the 'Educated Person.'» *Filosofia Theoretica*. Vol. 8 (2): 37-45.
- Feuer, L.S. (Ed). (1972). *Marx and Engels: Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy*. London: Fontana.
- Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum Publishing Company.
- Harris, K. (1988). *Education and Knowledge: A Structured Misrepresentation of Reality*. London: Routledge.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1972). *The German Ideology*. Moscow: International Publishers.
- Noddings, N. (1995). *Philosophy of Education*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Ofuasia, E. (2019). «John Dewey's and Julius Nyerere's Views on Education and the Implications of their Ideas for African Development.» *Philosophy of Education*. Vol. 25(2): 127-141 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31874/2309-1606-2019-25-2-7>
- Philips, D.C., & Siegel, H. (2013). «Philosophy of Education» in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/education-philosophy/> retrieved on 25<sup>th</sup> May, 2017.
- Steger, M.B., & James, P. (2013). «Levels of Subjective Globalization: Ideologies, Imaginaries, Ontologies». *Perspective on Global Development and Technology*. 12(1).

Mohammed Akinola Akomolafe

## Філософія освіти та ідейне підґрунтя навчальної програми

**Анотація**

Роботу присвячено дослідженню, здавалося б, стійкого зв'язку між теорією філософії освіти та практикою навчальної програми. Незважаючи на існування думки про те, що погіршення якості педагогіки пов'язано з недосконалістю її теоретичного обґрунтування, але вже сама наявність обґрунтування теорії передбачає спрямованість не те, щоб розглянути це питання з іншої позиції. За допомогою методу критичного аналізу та інтерпретації даних, в статті використано засади марксистської теорії освіти в якості теоретичного підґрунтя. Іншими словами, дослідження ґрунтується на ідеї марксизму, що суспільство є полем бою ідеологій. Те, що в педагогіці сприймається як невдала теорія та/або практика, насправді є реалізацією ідеології правлячого класу, який є не лише правлячою політичною силою, а й правлячою інтелектуальною силою суспільства. Це передбачає, що в основу створення та використання будь-якої навчальної програми покладено ідеологію. Навчальну програму встановлює саме правлячий клас. Вона розрахована на створення «розумів», які потуркують і підтримують гегемоністський статус-кво правлячої інтелектуальної сили. Тому не має значення, розвиватиметься чи ні суспільство. Бо сам розвиток визначається пануючою ідеологією. Прояви інакомислення винищуються, як правило, силою чи риторикою. В такому випадку питання про теорію та практику у педагогіці просто не постає. Навпаки, головною проблемою виявляється питання про те, як впоратися з ідеологією, яка превалює в навчальній програмі даного суспільства. В даному дослідженні запропоноване переосмислення надуманого розриву теорії від практики. Дана позиція дослідника ґрунтується на тому, що в основу кожної події та практики в цілому покладено певну теорію – практики. У статті обґрунтовується думка про те, що ідеологічне підґрунтя навчальної програми заслуговує на більшу увагу.

12

*Ключові слова:* навчальна програма, ідеологія, марксистська філософія, педагогіка, філософія освіти

**Інформація про автора:**Mohammed Akinola **AKOMOLAFE**

- Senior Lecturer (Socio-Political Philosophy)
  - Nigeria
  - Department of Philosophy, Lagos State University, Nigeria.
  - ORCIDiD <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7765-5038>
  - E-mail: [mohammed.ekomolafe@lasu.edu.ng](mailto:mohammed.ekomolafe@lasu.edu.ng)
- Tel:** +2348093377834