

**Ivica Kelam (Croatia)**

Faculty of Education, J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek  
kelamivica@gmail.com

**Jasmina Sagadin Vučić (Croatia)**

Faculty of Education, J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek  
sagadinj@gmail.com

## THE APPLICABILITY OF THE SOCRATES METHOD OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATION TODAY

### Abstract

In the global world, changes that strike our educational system occur daily. In that matter, most of the traditional guidelines have been thrown away in order to strive towards new goals and methods, the external ones, which satisfy the continually changing labor market. The purpose of an individual in that kind of a system is to adapt in order to satisfy its needs while Socrates searches for happiness inside a man itself - a man possesses knowledge and wisdom for himself and his freedom, not others. With his method of dialectic speech, he seeks his truth and that of others and offers lots to think about. His teaching, which emphasizes love and desire for learning and real knowledge that leads to becoming an independent man, has been inspiring people for over twenty-five centuries, and it should be taken into consideration when thinking about youth, younger generations, and their future. In this paper, we are comparing and showing the differences in education today and the one in Socrates' time. This paper highlights changes brought by the Bologna Declaration, but also the directionality in the labor market today, which makes the universities entrepreneurial centers. What does that mean for the knowledge economy we are striving for? Can we even state that we really are a knowledge society if we only aspire to knowledge that is dictated by the constantly changing labour market? We compare the knowledge to which we aspire with the knowledge which Socrates searches for and show the disadvantages of today's educational system along the way. Here we offer Socrates' ideas and opinions, which lead to possible progress towards genuine wisdom.

**Keywords:** labour market, knowledge society, Socrates, truth, freedom

## **Introduction**

The world is moving forward with high speed, in an economic, political, cultural, as well as an educational sense. If we want to be in line with the time we are living in, we must adapt to it. This paper touches on the changes created in the educational system and the way they reflect on our society. We oppose the system of today with Socrates, a significant philosopher, and thinker who dedicated his entire life to studying others, and we discuss his way of thinking and the engagement, to which he remained faithful until the end of his life.

We consider this topic to be very contemporary. The importance of education in the educational sector needs no special highlighting. For that reason, thinking on this kind of topic can further contribute and enrich all those encompassed by this sector, but also every individual and the entire social community that does not only think about its future but thinks long-term and continually works on a better future for future generations.

Wholly speaking, this paper is divided into two major parts, the first of which is about the current situation in education, the aims and purpose of which strive towards exclusively satisfying the needs of the market. The other part is set in the opposite way to the first and does so with the help of Socrates as a great philosopher and thinker. In order to gain better insight and image on education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, which in a way puts the individual into the background, the first part begins with the notion of globalization and neoliberal capitalism, which have a strong influence on education and educational politics of a country. The consumerism phenomenon is inevitable today when education is just another product on the market. In such an economically oriented society, education is subjected to external determination, instead of internal ones.

Given that the needs of society, and then also the labour market, are constantly changing, the universities are also starting to be managed in an entrepreneurial spirit. They offer knowledge for trades dictated by the labour market, create income from that, and promote entrepreneurship among students and academics along the way. The Bologna Declaration introduced changes in universities which change the contents and aims of education and highlight the development of competences. Given that all the changes mentioned earlier change our society, the next chapter is about the knowledge society, what it is, and what kind of knowledge that society possesses.

The topic of the second part of the paper is what the relationship was like towards education in Antiquity and Socrates' time. It begins with a brief

exposition on the Sophists who, in a way, shaped Socrates' view on education. After that, we go into a more in-depth analysis of Socrates' life, his thoughts, and his works. Socrates proves that it is not possible to live your best life without knowledge and wisdom. With Socrates as a guide, who did not want to make others smarter and more skilful, but wiser by leading them into thinking about what they (do not) know and, by doing so, ennobling them for their life and freedom, which we strive for today maybe more than ever, we try to offer an answer to the question how much does the notion of education differs today from what it was in Socrates' time and what are the values that he, as a man, shows us and which would could copy not only to education but life in general.

### **Globalization and neoliberalism**

The world that works as a unique system, and with that the global market which is becoming available to everyone, is only one of how we can describe globalization. Thanks to it, people and their relationships are becoming different, they are starting to think globally and understand and discover the world in a different way.

Kukoč (2006: 23) defines globalization as an “attitude, teaching, and ideology which promotes the principle of interdependence and unity of the entire world, all nations and countries at the expense of national and state particularism.” This is all going on at once in the economic, political, and cultural domains. One of the most important aspects of globalization is precisely the economic one. Multinational companies can include a large number of people in their business this way from all over the world, regardless of the distance. They control resources, technology, capital, and do business without any obstacles this way. There is, perhaps, a possibility of an intention to create an economic and cultural hegemony of western countries. As far as the cultural sense goes, we are talking about a common world language, the English one, which dominates in all sectors, bringing into question the survival of national and local cultures. The imposition of the “Americanization” phenomenon is greatly felt in linguistics, but also in everyday life, where a particular lifestyle is promoted.

It is impossible not to mention how people interact today. In globalization, the ways of interaction and socialization are changed, whereby we cannot deny the influence of social networks on the everyday life of an individual. We can say that globalization has crept into every pore of our lives, which Kregar (2006: 77) confirms when he says: “Institutions, such as nation, family, job, tradition,

nature, seem to be as they were before, however, even if the outer crust remains, within it everything is different, and it becomes a shell of an institution.”

Thanks to globalization, other cultures and nations are closer to us than ever before (thanks to different technologies). We have more material goods and services at our disposal than ever before, our options and desires are becoming more prominent than ever, creating a sense of freedom and life in a man in a society where options are equal, while Kukoč (2006: 24) cites Khor Martina and says: “Globalization is what we in the Third World have been calling colonialism for several centuries.” Kukoč (2006) adds to that the fact that the differences between the rich and the poor are more and more deepened, as are the differences between Western and non-Western countries. He also states that it is precisely the globalization processes which are guilty and cause the constant financial and economic crises which we are in today, and Kregar (2006) thinks that a crisis is created in institutions because they are unable to withstand accelerated social changes and new tasks created by globalization. Kukoč (2006) further concludes that globalization is the most important and effective tool of supremacy of Western civilization over the rest of the world.

In globalization, during which there was obviously a creation of a transnational educational area, apart from governments, we also received some new participants in that process, whose influence on educate became one of extreme importance. International organizations are considered the most significant contributors, who influence governments of many countries with their mechanisms, during which they have the option to promote their own ideas, characterized by one common point – neoliberalism. The supporters of neoliberalism strongly advocate a free market and are opposed to interventions of the state, as confirmed by Kanić and Kovač (2017: 75) “strongly relies on individual responsibility and independence, meaning that everybody is responsible for their own economic status, considering that the prosperity of workers depends on their ability to trade with their own skills, knowledge and entrepreneurial spirit on the global market.” Hromadžić (2008) reveals another face of neoliberalism when he states that, by referring to private entrepreneurial rights, free market and trade, without the meddling of the state, of course, neoliberalism promotes economic development to the economically poorer, as well, by having more money reach the underdeveloped by a more massive profit of the investors. By that approach, the vast differences between the developed and less developed existing until then would be lessened, and all states would be allowed prosperity, equal chances for success, and the ultimate goal would be the well-being and advancement of

the entire society. Hromadžić (2008:44) concludes why neoliberalism is found under strike by many critiques: “However, today, when the main characteristics of ‘neoliberal fundamentalism’ have already been clearly outlined (the insatiable desire for profit, uncontrolled desires for ever greater and higher consumption, a drop in the meaning of values, solidarity...) and when it has become apparent that neoliberal recipes for economic growth rarely ever succeed in practice, and already the visible consequences of neoliberal politics are shown (falseness of theses that uninterrupted enrichment of individuals brings benefits to the entire community, catastrophic consequences that the reduction of the state’s influence is having on education, healthcare, and social security, the disappearance of social solidarity as a consequence of a competitive spirit of radical individualism, the degradation of the environment, the fall of neoliberal politics in the countries of Southern America ...).” Neoliberalism is a controversial notion that is assessed from two extremities – either it is exclusively bad or good. Given that this paper deals in education, we will not further delve into the discussion surrounding the philosophy of neoliberalism as such, just its influence on education.

The appearance of neoliberalism in the 1970s resulted in the presence of market solutions with an accent on efficiency, competition, and freedom of choice, which, thanks to globalization, permanently planted roots into the educational systems of almost all countries. The fact that the presence of neoliberalism intrigued many authors into researching its effects and appearances in education also speaks to the effect of its ideology on educational politics.

Neoliberalism, just like globalization, has a strong influence on education and the educational politics of a particular country. The most important outcomes of neoliberalism in education are apparent in raising the efficiency of educational systems and redefining the role of the state in education. As was mentioned earlier, according to neoliberalism, the state should have no role when education is in question. Alfred et al. (2007) claim that there are opportunities for everybody who is motivated and wants to work, and the elements necessary for a just economic independence assumes a competitive market, individual initiative, and a state that does not meddle in the market. According to some scientists, neoliberalism appeared precisely as an answer to the inefficiency of the state apparatus. Therefore, neoliberalism advocates the notion of efficiency. According to the interpretation of particular authors (Doherty, 2007; Allais, 2012; Davidson-Harden and Majhanovich, 2004) the key aim of neoliberal reforms in education is to reshape the educational process so that it adapts to the needs of the market and, through the increase of competitiveness, contributed to the

economic growth. It is entirely logical that the reforms which will follow will relate to the achievement of efficiency and successfulness of education, and the role of a national curriculum will bring forth a standardization in education. The standardization enables the enforcement of national testing, which we use to measure the efficiency, so ranking lists have also been introduced. It is precisely on the example of the ranking lists that we can see what the value of knowledge itself is in an educational system. Namely, ranking lists have become an inescapable source of information on the value of schools on the market and their position in the eyes of the users, and by way of that the market as well, depends on those ranking lists. The educational sector is not being led by cognition, scientific curiosity, and academic freedom anymore. Those have been replaced by efficiency and adapting. What value does knowledge have in and of itself in this kind of system, and if we are even talking about knowledge anymore will be analyzed in one of the following chapters.

Given that the goal of education is to contribute to the economic growth, we can say that the result itself and education itself is becoming a product, and such a product at that so that it should be produced, sold, and bought, managed by somebody, just like raw materials. According to Tolofari (2005), education is becoming a product on the market which should be as efficient as possible, the students are becoming buyers of services, and market mechanisms determine the supply and demand.

### **Consumerism**

A phenomenon that appears as the result of the very functioning of neoliberalism, the foundation of which is a product or merchandise, is called consumerism. According to Čolić (2002), when we talk about consumerism or the “culture of consumers”, we then talk about a culture in which the primary and central preoccupation is consumption. Stanić (2006: 4) states that the consumer society is a “society which rests on the consumption of material goods and services and, in recent years, experiences, which are becoming available to the majority of the population.” What differentiates the consumer society from other types of society is mass production, which offers a maximum supply of services and goods on the market. Consumption today receives a label of trend which not only takes place in people’s free time, but is becoming a mark of a lifestyle which is today seen as a measure of success in life. Despite many significant industrial changes, technological development, and extreme acceleration of the way of life, consumption has become the version of modern society.

In a short review of the history of consumerism, Hromadžić (2008) mentions Edward Bernays as the “father of modern PR” who did not believe in the fundamental idea of democracy and who considered consumerism as the perfect principle of how to give people the illusion of control over their own lives while the corporate elites are actually controlling society and development. Hromadžić goes on to state that Bernays himself, after the propaganda campaigns he did for the American president Woodrow Wilson, made it clear that manipulating people, i.e., the public, is a necessary path to democracy. From then on, the goal of consumerism ceases to be the satisfaction of biological and social needs, and there is a change from the culture dominated by needs into a culture where we highlight desires.

In the previous chapter, we stated that it is possible to call education a product or commodity. Therefore, a question of whether the educational service can be sold on the market by forming a price based on supply and demand is asked. There are no obstacles to this. In this context, education is just like every other service with a price on the market. When speaking of education, we cannot say that there is a lack of demand. However, there are numerous questions here which come one after another, such as the morality of selling such a service, then whether the market is an adequate regulatory apparatus of determining the price of education, all the way to the question of which categories should even be deemed necessary when we declare education as merchandise – moral or interest? Zlatar Violačić (2009: 208) claims that “the process of complete commodification of knowledge should be specially highlighted which, in the name of cost-effective and techno-purposeful market knowledge, underestimates and rejects social and humanist research, social and humanist education.” Therefore, not only does the market dictate the demands, it also marginalizes the positioning of social-humanities faculties. It is actually about the fact that some other trades, i.e., knowledge themselves, are somewhat successfully adaptable to the demands set by the labor market.

In such an especially economic surrounding, education is adapted with external determinations, not internal ones, which was the case in the Antique or humanist ideal of education. Therefore, the fact that it is precisely the faculties of philosophy, the places where the knowledge which cannot be used for market purposes or be profited on is taught and is therefore deemed worthless, that are the sites of protests with slogans saying knowledge is not merchandise. It is important to mention that interests and the general understanding of the ones included in the decision-making process are of great importance, as well as the

amount of power they wield. When man is focused on performing those tasks which are set upon him by economy with the promise of the realization of a good life, he becomes a satisfied slave. Hromdžić (2008: 7) reached this conclusion by saying that we are dealing with: “actual dimensions of the consumer culture, contemporary consumerism, its characteristics, dimensions and rituals which seem to be one of the key and moving levers of the global, neoliberal capitalist system of today.” The constant economic insecurity, which is characteristic of neoliberalism, has a significant influence on people.

Consumerism has deep roots in modern society, but it is evident that, with the period of neoliberal market ideology, consumerism became an economic and socio-cultural dominant. This consumerist climate, with all its consequences, has also been implemented at the institution of the university and its users, i.e., consumers.

### **Industrialization of the university**

The need to adapt to the economy of knowledge, the using of knowledge in commercial purposes, the development of competitiveness and efficiency, also appeared in places that were traditionally intended to teaching knowledge, research, and academic freedom – universities. The universities have not been spared by the global changes which are grasping developed countries, but also the ones in transition, such as Croatia. The traditional mission of the university was replaced by entrepreneurial thinking for the benefit of economic growth.

The precursor to universities we know today are the Antique schools dealing with scientific research. The first university, in today's sense of the word, is considered to be the University of Bologna, founded in 1088. The universities of the Middle-Ages focused their work on strengthening the intellectual sphere of life and developing the critical attitudes towards the community. Wilhelm von Humboldt had a significant role in the development of universities, and many authors and scientists still speak of the great importance of the humanist ideal of education. Humboldt proclaimed an emancipated and educated, therefore free individual with the knowledge focused on the traditions of the great cultures. Etzkowitz (2008) describes the transformation of the universities through two revolutions. The first one is the revolution, which began in Germany in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century in which universities cease to be simply teachers of the existing knowledge, but instead, they begin to produce new knowledge. They become research universities. The second revolution is tied to the appearance of the

entrepreneurial university according to which the universities should be included in the economic growth and responsibly think about the means of financing their research and budget in general, the roots of which reach before World War II. The work of the university under the state becomes questionable, and they are forced to take care of financing. As we mentioned earlier, neoliberalism advocates the absence of state intervention.

Traditionally, with the role of teaching and later on research as well, the universities today are adopting a new role, which is contributing to the economy. The commercial component which the universities of today have in producing knowledge challenges the reaction of the academic community with a message of harmfulness for the autonomous and free development of science, and, according to Carroll and Beaton (2000), this is all part of a more massive complex of neoliberal hegemony. Carroll and Beaton and the other authors who are a kind of adversaries to the concept of an entrepreneurial university think that searching for truth and knowledge is a worthier calling than searching for material wealth and that, this way, they betray traditional academic values purely for profit.

As we might have noticed until now, the term “entrepreneurial university” is being used more and more, and it is becoming a synonym for a new standard of higher education institutions based on entrepreneurship. According to Ahmed et al. (2016), the universities today are demanded to take the role of transferring knowledge and commercial activity in order to achieve income, but bringing entrepreneurship closer to students and academics is also expected at the same time. It is expected that the workers of the university themselves successfully handle entrepreneurial skills and knowledge and that they integrate them in education and assist the development of entrepreneurship at their universities. It is considered that this way, the problems of the employability of young people, creating income at the university, and the entire economic growth will be solved.

### **The Bologna Declaration**

Given that the developed, but also innovation-wise less developed, countries are exposed to globalization, the Croatian universities are also forced to change, i.e., to modernize. As was the case at the European universities, so it is at ours. Apart from a significant orientation towards the labor market, one of the conditions of their modernization is precisely the enforcement of the Bologna process. The document which began the reorganization of the higher

education system is the Sorbonne Declaration from 1998, which was signed by the ministers of Germany, Italy, France, and the United Kingdom. After that, a joint declaration of European ministers of education ensued under the title European Higher Education Area, commonly known today as the Bologna Declaration. The Republic of Croatia signed it in 2001 and, by doing so, took on the commitment to adapt to its principles and demands, whereby the core of this reform is stated to be the students and their educational needs.

By signing the Bologna declaration, we accepted a unique system of the studying cycle, i.e., undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate studying. The problem which this system attempted to resolve was the mitigation of the too-long studying time until then and the increase in the number of students who completed their education. Given that the efficiency criteria possessed the universities, the aim is to enable a young man as soon as possible and send him to the labor market, making universities look like vocational schools. The thing that is begrudged to such short-term studies is the absence of their scientific character. According to Liessmann (2008: 92), only the magister programs offer a form of a scientific nature, which should be the marking of a university. For students wanting science and education, the studies will still be more extended, but also more expensive. The next principle is the promotion of mobility and removing the obstacles of free movement of students and professors. According to Liessmann (2008), not even this justification is what it seems at first because only 10% of students of a study year use the mobility program, and it is not to be expected that the number will increase due to economic reasons. The European Credit Transfer System or ECTS for short is another one in a series of adjustments to the Bologna system, which measures the load on students for mastering a class. According to Liessmann (2008), study places are no longer measured by classes, but by the results, the students must accomplish. Liessmann (2008: 94) also has an opinion on the unique all-European dimension of higher education: "Now what we need to accomplish, considering the European study plans, is for the names of classes and modules to sound the same everywhere, to later have classes in English everywhere, after which you lay hope into the normative power of those guidelines; in that way, European higher education is united in a way which permits truly studying the same everywhere, so we can just as easily stay home."

What Liessman suggests excellently in *Theory of Miseducation* (2008: 75-88) in the chapter *How much does knowledge weigh* is what is truly the idea of today's education at universities marked by parameters of planning, standardization,

control and networking on the example of Immanuel Kant. Namely, in the scientific world of today, he would not stand much of a chance. He barely left his hometown. In ten years of working, during the time he performed the duties of Dean at the Faculty of Philosophy, he published nothing but two articles. Today, when there is more and more accent being placed on competences, outcomes, and achievements, this way of working would not be acceptable. However, it is not that Kant did not do anything during that time. That is when his most famous work was created, the *Critique of Pure Reason*, in his mind. In a world that highlights efficiency, results, constant readiness for mental labor, demanding original solutions in a continuous process presents a significant burden to those faced with such a way of working. Time is precisely the key ingredient in finding specific solutions and shaping thoughts, which is no longer possible in an age where there is less and less time for thinking. An individual is no longer a free person, but rather a part of a more extensive system which functions by fulfilling tasks under given deadlines.

Changes which occur with the application of the Bologna process are becoming an area of interest not only for academic, but also social and political communities. One of the main ones is the focus on the outcome of learning, as opposed to the focus on the content and aim of education we had previously. Particular accent is being put on competences which need to be developed in order to respond to the demands of the contemporary market successfully.

### **“Dehumanization”**

Universities have found themselves under pressure of having to change the way they work, their role, and the position they had until then. According to Kokić (2013), the concept of new universities takes an industrialized shape of action so that it uniforms tools, i.e., professors, production processes, that are methodology, and products, i.e., students. That way, universities are subjugated to the interests of economy, trade, and profit, not the acquiring of knowledge, freedom, and independence.

There is no more mention of the so-called freedom, personal and professional development. Education, which was guided by the ideals of Antiquity and humanities attempted to develop the body, spirit, soul, which would, in turn, contribute to the development of individuality to function successfully in its community. Today, the knowledge created at university must have visible effects, and the value of knowledge is estimated by the goals reached with it. We can

state that instrumentality of knowledge is at work here. According to Humboldt, neither the teacher nor the student are there for one another, but rather something bigger than themselves, for science. Today, it seems that both are there because of the interests of economy, the labor market. Students are becoming users who do not have to physically be present in class, because it can be done via Skype and similar methods of long-distance teaching, while in Antiquity, especially Socrates, taught directly, by touch. The personal relationship between student and teacher, as the underlying relationship in acquiring knowledge, is becoming unnecessary and redundant. The assumption that we are all the same and that it is possible to make us that way is also to blame. Namely, that is precisely what the universities are attempting to achieve with their approach, i.e., they are subjugating us to that same production process wherever we turn. Kokić (2013: 431) concludes: “From this perspective, one could claim that an industrialized university is a project with a mind to make man a means and that it does so, it degrades him to a biological foundation without morals, thus dehumanizing him.”

### **“Knowledge society”**

The syntagma “knowledge society” is composed of content relating to knowledge, information, education, learning, communication, etc. Liessmann attempted to answer the question of what kind of knowledge does the knowledge society requires and what it is precisely in his book *Theory of Miseducation*, published in 2008. He claims that, in such a society, nobody learns because of knowledge itself anymore, but exclusively because of learning. He thinks that knowledge is outdated quickly and loses value in the process. In the political rhetoric, the knowledge society is replaced with the information society, so he looks at the value of information in more detail. The information we are always in contact with have no connection with knowledge and cognition. He even goes so far as to consider the weather forecast the only relevant piece of information necessary for the future that we can hear in the media and claims that information has no connection to knowledge. What knowledge allows us is to take the vast multitude of information, the number of which increases with every day, and extract the ones with value. Therefore, in order to know something, understand it or conceive it, we first have to know something. Due to the immense overflow of information, the average man feels helpless and disorientated because it is hard to start somewhere, and even harder to finish. For that reason, Liesmann believes that every demand for knowledge has to lead to despair. The author

concludes that someone who wields with many factual pieces of information does not know much, and we only talk about knowledge when you connect information so that they result in a meaningful and trustworthy relation to one another. Those who advocate the so-called knowledge society persuade us that knowledge should represent one of the most significant values of modern society. However, the author concludes that knowledge, as such, in a knowledge society represents no value at all.

### **Educated, half-educated, uneducated**

The paradox of today is the fact that the more you summon the value of knowledge, the quicker it loses its value. Education is reduced to mere training and is, thus, humiliated. When talking about three notions – educated, half-educated, and uneducated – in his book, Liessmann calls upon two authors and their works of historical value. The real idea of education, according to Liessmann, was represented in Wilhelm von Humboldt who published his work *The Theory of Man's Education* in 1793. The essence of Humboldt's idea is knowing the world and good disposition with nature, and the condition of this is self-cognition and freedom. Real humanist education had its most exceptional role-model in the Greek ideal, which was reflected in the grammar schools of the day which were focused on the languages and culture of Antiquity. Also, the fundamental idea was studying on examples. The ideal of Antiquity went from a developed individuality and dealing with the content which did not obey the dictation of current usability. After that period, only a slow degradation of that idea of education will follow, and Humboldt's ideas will be marginalized as overly complex and demanding, only favoring knowledge based on facts. The civil-humanities notion of education was expressed in special care for literature, music and visual art, philosophy and works of Antiquity. Nietzsche will conclude that the so-called "educated citizenry", due to its economic weakness, fixated on the idea of the spiritual education of the elite, which is talked about in Rupčić (2015: 103): "Namely, by compensating the lack of economic wealth and political power with the possession of education and the force to dispose with educational goods, which was clearly seen and biting and cynically laughed at by Nietzsche, that layer began to believe and see itself as someone who is better and more sublime to others and transform itself into its own caricature." An opposition to these understandings of education is the standpoint of today that all subjects without a direct relationship with practice should be avoided. It can be said that education today is a sort of utopia of a provincial fantasizing that he is being emancipated

from the lower layers with education. Education is understood as the hope of the working class (Liessmann, 2008: 43) which should prevent unemployment and enable the overcoming of the challenges of the future. However, Liessmann states that things are not going on that way and that there have never been as many lies said as there have been in educational politics. That is how education becomes a stimulus and a means to appease and a permanent promise for better days. However, education is no guarantee for the functioning of economies focused on efficiency today. Liessmann, namely, does not prefer educational reformers and claims that reformers always strive to abolish the traditional ideas of education and they want capable clones who will function flawlessly. Furthermore, he claims that the real weaknesses of the educational system began in the 1960s. This is where a state he calls half-education appears, and he connects it to the work of Theodor W. Adorno under the title *Theory of Half-Education (Theorie der Halbbildung)*, published in 1959. Adorno thought that leisure is needed for a humanist education and that, if there is not one, education is reduced to half-education. This is precisely what happened, education because “socialized half-education” (Liessmann, 2008: 58), which transformed into a mix of cultural institutions and the institutionalization of education began. It will all be to adapt the youth, and the corruption of education with medialization will ensue, and the contents of classical education will deteriorate. In the end, there is the clarification of the notion, i.e., state of uneducated. For Liessmann, it is not an individual failing, nor a failed educational policy, but what is inevitable because it will be a necessary consequence of the capitalization of the spirit. What is more, the idea of education will disappear. While there were battles led against the uneducated state before, the very process of being uneducated will go on at the centers of education. “To not think with your own head seems to be the program of teaching today.” (Liessmann, 2008: 61) Liessmann also wishes to avoid the wrong understanding of the notion of uneducated, so he claims that it is no intellectual deficit or a lack of information but a straightforward disavowal of the desire to understand something at all.

### **Lifelong learning**

Given that the labor market is constantly changing, it also requires lifelong learning, i.e. people who are ready to take responsibility for their progress and invest their time in a constant learning process. It is precisely that kind of a concept which ties in the aims of an economic nature, like employability or greater competitiveness on the labor market. Today’s knowledge society

highlights the need for lifelong learning so much that one could think that previous societies neither cared about learning so much nor did lifelong learning ever cross their minds. Even back in Antiquity, there was no single period in life intended for learning. What is more, according to Liessmann (2008), the ancient notion *sophia* is the result of the acquired knowledge, abilities, insights, and experiences which could only show its full glory after a long life, united in a true unity. Lifelong learning, therefore, is not an unknown for the societies before the knowledge society, but this society highlights it especially. However, this aim that the Greeks worshipped in Antiquity is far away from the aim of lifelong learning today. Today, there is no talk about learning, which is not subjugated to immediate usability. Moreover, in the case of failure of such learning, you can always place the blame on man himself – as much as you learn, it is not enough, as many skills as you acquire, not enough. We can go on like that forever. We are forced to be in line with fashion, with the current actual and desirable knowledge.

What the knowledge society likes to highlight and gain importance by doing so is the ideology of lifelong learning, which binds us to be in line with the current needs of the labor market. According to Liessman (2008), it is a tool using which you can, at any time, demand an adapted service to the real and existing proprietary relations.

### **Labor society**

As we previously concluded, there is still inequality and an uneven division of wealth and life opportunities in human society, despite the neoliberal and global ideology proclaiming otherwise. The situation is similar when talking about knowledge and education. Čavrak (2013: 6) claims: “Political and economic elites in all phases of human society attempted to distribute knowledge and education very carefully considering their needs and goals of maintaining power.” He goes on to discuss that the situation is like that today, claiming that education is organized exclusively according to the needs of the labor market. The STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) revolution goes in support of this, and it will, according to the claims of its advocates, lead to an individual developing the skills necessary to succeed in the business world: communication, research, creativity, working in groups, solving problems, critical thinking.

Moreover, the advocates claim, the STEM revolution will enable children and all other the development of skills necessary in order to be equal participants of the 21<sup>st</sup>-century society. The knowledge needed to do that is precisely covered by

STEM, and those are science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, with a spotlight on robotics (with the help of which programming skills are adopted). The STEM revolution is, according to its advocates, currently going on in Croatia, as well. It is possible to read astonishing pieces of information on it on internet portals – on its high popularity, enormous sums invested in it, the satisfaction of its participants, and also the satisfied parents who ensured a successful business future and life for their children (Gaščić, 2018.). The whole story also highlights the altruistic originators and financial investors who are selflessly investing precisely into the quality future of children (Boltižar, 2017). Ideal timing, we would say, because significant changes are going on in the educational system by way of reforms that are grasping the attention of the public, while public investment into education was never of consequence. The STEM revolution gives hope for a better future, the future of educated, employed intellectuals appreciated in their area. The author Chen spoke on the potential intentions of the originators of STEM with his text on the web portal [www.jacobinmag.com](http://www.jacobinmag.com). He works in the technology industry and speaks on the breakthrough of STEM as a person of expertise. He (Chen, 2018) claims that large companies like Google, Microsoft or Apple offer financially acceptable educations that have sleek slogans like: “To empower every student to achieve more” and similar. What worries is their potential strategy to create a future workforce. Not just any kind of workforce, a poorly paid one. Workforce is precisely one of the more significant and more essential expenses for large corporations, and, this way, they could ensure an army of uniformed workers who they taught how to work and do the job for them in the future. Great investors highlight that anybody can become a great entrepreneur or innovator, but in reality, very few achieve that goal. What about the others? Chen believes that, under the guise of education, the poor and undeveloped, women and minorities, this vast majority awaits a destiny of digitally educated and poorly paid workers lucky if they are even employed. If they have even less luck, they were serving the founders as an excuse to reduce the already low pay to existing workers.

Čavrak (2013: 6) concludes: “Therefore, the wide social layers are welcome in the system of education only if they accept that they are ‘quality and productive workforce’, a workforce which will be able and know how to ‘accept new technologies’, that wants (or needs to) accept the self-reproduction of its personal and social position.” According to Šundalić (2012), the perspective of the development of society lies in the investment into education, while he believes education to be the most cost-effective investment in the economy. He

calls education the “fuel” of the economy. This way, an expert becomes a worker, and the company becomes a sort of university. Is the growing value of knowledge of these areas enough to call our society a knowledge society?

That the STEM revolution will change our future, as can be read on internet portals or heard in the media, is entirely unquestionable. According to them, the priority of new education, leading us to a better future is the knowledge offered by STEM. The critics (Postnikov, 2019), on the other hand, highlight that it is a kind of illusion created around us with great pomp, while we wholly accept it with high expectation, i.e., it is a ruse of technological education with the only goal of creating an army of cheap workforce for itself.

### **Sophists**

We will deal with Socrates as an axis against everything said so far in the following chapters, primarily on the part concerning education. However, we cannot go around the sophists who had a significant influence on Socrates and who will significantly help us to understand Socrates and his philosophy. Therefore, in order to better understand Socrates, we will begin the second portion of the paper with a few of the most significant characteristics of sophists and then say something more on Socrates, his philosophy, and his method of dialectics.

The Greek words *sophos* or *sophia* are usually translated as wise or wisdom. According to that: “sophists write or teach because he has a special gift or knowledge to offer.” (Guthrie, 2006:30). According to Polić (1993: 23), the sophists appear as an answer to the spiritual needs of the people who were no longer able to be satisfied by the traditional way of education. Therefore, they synchronized their education with the time they lived in and taught a skill they used to prove that there is a counter-argument to everything (Guthrie, 2006: 254). They did so in smaller groups or at public expositions. They were the first to see the importance of education for an individual, and the questions they asked have not ceased to be essential or the subject of discussion until this day. With that fact alone, they greatly influenced Socrates, and it is impossible to write about Socrates and not mention the sophists. Sophists are professional teachers who taught young men for money, but they also publicly spoke in order to demonstrate their oratory talent. They are, in a way, considered the founders of oratory skills, skills of persuasion, but also proving skills necessary for participation in the public and political life. Among the more famous sophists were Gorgias, Hippias, Critias,

Prodicus, Antiphon, and as the most distinguished among them is Protagoras, who profiled himself as the best and most famous among them (Polić, 1993: 24). The thing that enabled a successful political career in 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C. Athens was precisely rhetoric, i.e., the art of oration, which marked the sophists so much. To be an effective orator meant having the means to achieve social reputation and power (Polić, 1993: 26). They won over a large number of their students that way, who listened to them speak on any topic and answer any question. The sole goal was to become a good speaker, and they used it for personal gain, for personal prestige and money, not for knowledge as such (Guthrie, 1993: 45). The interest of young men was great, as were the amounts of money that were needed for some of them. That was precisely one of the reasons why Socrates criticized them and became a fiery adversary of the sophists. Socrates believed that sophists deny themselves freedom that way because they only teach those who can pay them, sometimes exorbitant sums, while he was free to talk to whomever he wanted, while wisdom can and should be freely shared (Guthrie, 2006: 39). Polić (1993: 25) states Hegel's thought on the sophists that their charging for that service could not go without consequences because, by taking money for profit, they easily slid into manipulation. Competitiveness was another characteristic of the sophists. For Protagoras, every discussion is a verbal battle in which there is only one winner, which is the opposite of Socrates' help for one another in finding the truth. The sophists themselves were individualists among each other, adversaries competing for the favor of the public, and a higher number of potential students with that. Protagoras was well aware of that (Guthrie, 2006: 21): "Art of speaking cleverly, he said, is everything he taught and everything an ambitious young man is supposed to learn. That was the main art because a man with a sense of persuasion had all the other experts under himself."

Sophists, even though they initially considered themselves wise men who speak cleverly, ended up not being overly loved. By teaching only those skills and knowledge which could bring their students only fame and useful political functions, they themselves could not reach those functions and become such men (Guthrie, 2006: 39). What they promised others for money, they could not make happen for themselves, so they decided to use their talents to teach others. The fact that the goal and final result are not as ideal as the sophists stated, Socrates knew as well, and according to Guthrie (2006: 36) he compared the teaching of sophists to salesmen who feed the soul and mind and who praise their commodity without anyone knowing what the commodity is. However, the difference between the food and the teaching is that the teaching goes directly

into the mind, while we will keep the food in jars until we decide what we will eat and in what amount. A vast difference between Socrates and the sophists is that the sophists were truly superficial and intentional cheaters, while Socrates showed himself to be a true philosopher in love with wisdom. Their goal was not to teach the truth about man but ensure the young men's victory in all circumstances. The truth did not matter to them, only being right mattered, and they taught their students to be effective in pleasing their personal desires. Guthrie (2006: 10) concludes that: "the teaching of even the finest sophists, in the end, focuses only on reducing everything to individual priority and prejudice and divert philosophy from its path of finding the truth into a means to satisfy the needs of selfishness and vanity; and the only path out of that is Socrates', who aspired to use reason to regain deeper, more secure foundations for knowledge, as well as morality."

One thing is for sure, and that is that if it were not for the sophists and their philosophy, there would not be Socrates and his philosophy. What cannot be taken from them nor lessened is the fact that the sophists were the first professional teachers and educators who set the grounds and benefited the development of many areas such as rhetoric, grammar, logic, dialectics, and others. As was already said, rhetoric had a reputation as the central skill to be possessed in their time. Given that today's success is measured by achieving results in those trades demanded at the labor market, today's equivalent of rhetoric could be ascribed to marketing (Guthrie, 2006), which played an enormous role in our consumer society. Their role was tremendous, and it manifested in the preparation of young Athenians for the challenges of democracy in the form of developing skills that suited the needs of that time. It did not matter if those skills were used for purposefully deceiving your interlocutor. A real love of truth sets himself as the answer here - Socrates.

### **Socrates' life**

Twenty-five centuries separate us from Socrates' time, and his deliberations, thoughts, and methods do not age. His work has great importance for philosophy, even though he did not give it as much importance. The fact that he did not write down anything to leave for future generations, instead he lived his philosophy, speaks of the power of his influence. His teaching is known to us from the testimony of others, such as Aristotle, Xenophon, and the most valuable source of Socrates' life is undoubtedly his student Plato, who portrayed Socrates' life in the work *The Defence of Socrates*.

Socrates' was a philosopher in Antiquity who lived and was active in a period from 469 – 399 B.C., an age which brought the city of Athens to the peak of Greek civilization. From a historical side, that was the period when the Persians, who fought the Persian Wars against Greece at the beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, were beaten. However, wars took their toll, dozens of thousands of citizens paid with their lives, cities were depopulated, and numerous families were rooted out. Those were only some of the horrors which befell Greece. After setting up democracy, Greek cities came alive, they took control of the Mediterranean, slowly gaining and conquering the world. A new feeling of freedom appeared, along with the need to express.

Socrates' was born in a modest family. His mother was a midwife, and his father was a little known sculptor. Taking after his father, he learned the sculptor trade and, from his mother, whom he can thank for his love of life, he inherited the thought that all people are born equal and the very art of coming into the world (Guthrie, 2003: 362). Even though he never received money for his instructions, he practicing philosophy by asking people questions on the squares and streets of Athens, and he threw away the illusion of intellectualism as something above man, something that man cannot know and created a new way of thinking. He wanted to help people to start with an admission that they know nothing, that is that nobody knows anything, which he often said for himself as well, put in effort, always study and work on themselves and then get to know the real truth and that is a life worth living instead of one chained in material things. Socrates truly lived his words. In his forties, he released himself of the cares of the material world and dedicated to his truly preordained work – questioning others as an eternal pursuit for truth and wisdom in order for everybody to know the true path of living. Socrates' attempted to convince the old and the young not to worry so much about the body and money, but to take care of the soul. He compares himself with a gadfly by saying (Platon, 2000: 95): “Precisely – even though it may seem ridiculous – god placed me by the side of this city, like a great and noble horse, but that grew languid due to its side, so it requires a gadfly to prod it. So it seems that Gods sent me to this city as such a (gadfly) to, by shifting this way and that, awaken, encourage, stimulate, poke you, one by one, without stopping.” With this statement, Socrates discovers that his calling actually has no end and that it will always be necessary to point to the need for finding true knowledge and wisdom. This is a lifelong pursuit, which was also his life mission, and, in the end, it cost him his life.

Not everybody appreciated Socrates' method of searching and uncovering the truth and his persistence in proving that nobody actually knows anything. It is, actually, obvious who would have a problem with such a diagnosis. Socrates went from door to door, questioning everyone thought to be educated and wise in Athens; builders, priests, painters, craftsmen, politicians, etc (Platon, 2008: 28). Plato, in the *Defence of Socrates* describes that Socrates, when exploring wisdom, talked to chosen men – politicians, poets, and craftsmen and proved what he claimed, in this case referring to politicians (Platon, 2000: 29): “Only this one thinks he knows something, while actually, he knows nothing, while I, given that I know nothing, do not even think I know anything. It seems that I am only in this little thing wiser than he: to not think that I know something I do not.” He realized that they may be experts in their domains and that they push those domains to the heights of wisdom possible to possess, but that had nothing to do with true wisdom he aspired to. Socrates' goal is to shed light on the need to search for higher things, for the truth by using the dialectic method of questions and answers. With this public presentation of ignorance, Socrates, in time, created opponents and acquired accusations. We can say that he publicly expressed what many might have thought but dared not say out loud and what he said brought into question the behavior of individuals, but also the functioning of institutions.

### **Socrates' method of dialogue**

Much effort is being put into designing and editing the planning, regulating, performing, and evaluating the educational process, which we are witness to ourselves. The national curriculum for preschool education, as well as the entire school education, regularly fills the media, which report to us the reforms necessary in order to adapt education to the time we are living in. A lot has been said about the organization of the educational process, synchronizing it with evaluation, aims, expectations, outcomes, the experience of children, etc. However, what is rarely talked about or not at all I show to learn, encourage, strengthen, and nurture that desire and love for learning and cognition that little children, especially in their preschool age, have from their earliest days. Extrinsic motivation seems to dominate when talking about the desire to acquire new knowledge, given that the primary goal has become an external motive, something visible, tangible. Intrinsic motivation, which comes from within, is much more difficult to awaken, but that does not mean it should not be done.

Maybe one of the possible answers to this problem, or an aspect worth thinking about, is precisely Socrates' method of dialogue or one of its derivatives.

According to Zorić (2008: 28), Socrates' method of cognition is dialectics, which we can describe as synchronizing different opinions in which Socrates pointed out flaws in the knowledge of others and their apparent knowledge. The starting point of his method is in the fact of ignorance. Opposite of sophists, he claims not to know anything while they know everything, but he offers a way in which that can be changed. It is comprised of three degrees: irony, maieutic, and defining a notion (Zorić, 2008: 28). Socrates uses irony to, in a way, systematically cleanse the field for the research of truth. In order to reach true knowledge, first, the wrong and fake one must be pointed to and be made aware. With the second level, he tries, without coercion, to use the skill of asking questions to help in the realization of knowledge and, in the end, to use it to reach the definition of a particular notion. Socrates did not always reach this point, but he always, at least, got close to it. What Socrates strived for was the definition of the content of a notion, which was the starting point of the conversation. This method had the aim of pointing out that, contrary to sophistic teachings, every matter has something constant and generally valuable.

It is precisely in the dialogue of Socrates that the central place is taken by setting up the problem, which pushes the students to discover the new. This is not about accepting what we are teaching or what we are taught as absolute, but what is said motivates us in order to point ourselves towards searching for truth. In other words, we are talking about the readiness to, without prejudice and attitudes, be open to question and verify everything. According to Zorić (2008), the advantages of such a method are many: the increase in activity, ability to reason, developing critical thinking, and many others but the most important one, as the author states, is the active work of the mind which enables the acquiring of knowledge and conclusions on what is studied.

Socrates asked his interlocutors seemingly simple questions, sometimes so simple that it seemed that the answer is implied. After an answer, he would ask a series of questions that would not only enter into the depth and real meaning of what was discussed but also leave his interlocutor discouraged because he would realize that what he thought is, actually is not. Socrates attempted to encourage his interlocutor to conclude himself out of what he thought to be true and to search for knowledge in himself. What differentiated him in this procedure and took him to a whole new level from the sophists is his desire to have both speakers by mutually helping each other, reach true knowledge, liberating truth.

That reaching the truth was sometimes a rough and arduous work, but also that Socrates was dedicated to his calling, is confirmed by the fact that in his trial, where he was accused of corrupting the youth of Athens, he remained true to himself until the end, and he did not waver despite being convicted to death.

Socrates believed his mission to be made aware of the wrongful beliefs on the existence of knowledge with his interlocutors, which they did not bring into question. His interlocutors thought they possessed some knowledge on the topic they discussed with Socrates, but he showed them it was not so. (Zorić, 2008: 30) Although, as he states himself, he does not know too much or almost anything on the topic, he warns his interlocutor that he possesses real knowledge in himself, only he is not aware of it. (Zorić, 2008: 29) Given that they could not master knowledge themselves, it turns out that they, besides that, do not possess neither the skill needed to acquire knowledge. From this, a two-sided role of Socrates in reaching true knowledge may be shown: he knows that there is knowledge relating to the knowledge of a notion, but he also knows how to reach the knowledge, i.e., the skill of discussion. (Zorić, 2008: 31)

Socrates used this method in researching important moral concepts of his time, such as the virtues of respect, wisdom, modesty, bravery, and justice. In such situations, Socrates admitted his ignorance while others claimed to know. Socrates believed that his admittance of ignorance made him wiser than those who, even though they are ignorant, claim to know.

Although, at first glance, it does look like a paradox (or ironic), it gave Socrates a chance to right his wrongs where others thought they were right.

Teaching, which promotes love towards learning and a desire for knowledge is far more than mere learning of needed and unneeded information which are, little by little, at the hands of modern reformers being proclaimed relevant and then irrelevant. Their necessity is continuously changing. Socrates has a lot to offer with his example for the one who, first and foremost, appreciates truth, i.e., knowledge. Not the knowledge which is current, not the one with a high rating at the labour market, not the one bringing material security, but the one liberating a person from all the shackles of the earthly way of life and making a person an autonomous individual and a free man who does not wait for somebody else to think and make decisions for him. From the example of sophists, we can see their limitations by the demands of the market of their time, which Socrates stood up to and, as a true thinker and educator, entirely and passionately gave himself to one activity. (Polić, 1993: 31) If we would place this situation into the context of

today, it is clear why true wisdom which Socrates demanded should be strived for. Socrates' thoughts, attitudes, and methods do not lose their actuality, not even so many centuries after his life.

### **The application of the dialogue method in contemporary classes**

By using Socrates' dialogue method, interlocutors are encouraged to active work of the mind through discussion on a specific subject. We can say that one of the elements of this method is the development of critical thinking, which is one of the highlighted aims of contemporary education. Critical thinking should be developed at all levels of learning. Given that, in Plato's dialogues, the central role is played by Socrates and his students, the contemporary process of learning should mirror that situation. Instead of that, today in the teaching process, we see more and more independent learning, online classes which exclude the presence of the teacher, and that is all being pointed out as a positive movement in the world of education where traditional forms of teaching are being denied. Socrates' method does not need to be necessarily used in its original form but also in one of the derived forms. Some of these forms are group work in larger or smaller groups, individual work of students led by instructions of the teacher, etc. However, what is characteristic and in common for all those forms is the application of the questions which are stimulating and which reach the development of a higher form of thinking. (Zorić, 2008: 32)

The question is in the center of every Socrates' dialogue. (Zorić, 2008: 33) Therefore, dialogue should be characterized by methodically guided questions by the teacher in contemporary classes. A teacher should, in every moment, be able to react to students' answers and encourage them to ever higher forms of thinking. Questions make the basis of preparation for the application of Socrates' dialogue method, and the way of formulating and making questions determines the quality and outcome of the dialogue itself. It is essential to determine the main question, which will be the basis for discussion and sub-questions which would be answered and which would enable finding an answer to the main question. Given that it is impossible to predict the answers of students, a good knowledge of the content to be taught is necessary, which enables the adaptation of questions to the content, and that is an essential prerequisite for the successful application of this method. According to that, responsibility and preparation of the teacher and determining the way of working, means, contents, aims, and outcomes of teaching is the prerequisite for the successful application of this method.

However, responsibility and contribution to this method inevitably falls on the students, as well, who contribute by (self)reflection to their personal experience and by their own examples. What is essential is that they, during dialogue, verbalize their thoughts clearly and concisely in order to enable others insight into the diversity of the opinions of others, which contributes to the development of their own. In order for this method to be successful for all students, those who do not understand something should ask questions. If we take into consideration that students differ among each other in attitude and beliefs, it is essential to encourage them to participate in dialogue when there is a disagreement because that is precisely the condition that makes researching the question the teacher asked successfully continue. (Zorić, 2008)

### **Socrates as a teacher and role model**

Socrates was and still is known for his dialogues, but our image of him would be distorted if we would only observe him in that regard. His place in the history of education is an important one and must not be neglected. His way of life and calling with which he wanted to awaken everyone he talked to about their (lack of) knowledge and the possibilities of reaching it, at the very least, encourage us to expand and recognize our view on educational methods and theories. Socrates, in a way, with his personality and with the example of his own life through consistency and honesty, which followed him to the end of his life, work on people like a magnet. He followed his conscience rather than adopt the beliefs or legal regulations only because the state prescribed them. It was not because he did not recognize the rule of the state, but because of a moral obligation towards himself and others. What he lived, he wanted to enable for others: internal freedom and human dignity. He encouraged others all his life to continually question what is right for a man and in what way they can realize that good. He did not consider his calling to be answering questions, which would be considered direct teaching of others, but clarifying the intellectual need to people. He shows us that, even when a teacher knows an answer, what is right is not to show the student the answer but lead him step by step until he reaches the answer on his own.

Socrates' life is proof that man is not condemned to being a victim of fate and that he can decide on his fate independently. Even though there were so-called trends that people tried to follow even in his day, in the form of sophist sermons, he pointed out the defects of such a life. He thought that the best life

could only be lived by possessing knowledge and wisdom which were reached by shedding light on truth. He diverted others from prophets and a useless life and encouraged them to search for the truth. His intention was not to make others smarter, more skillful or effective, but wiser. He did not consider himself a teacher, and the closest he had to students were those who tried to mimic his way of having a dialogue by listening to him. Guthrie (2006: 432) states what it means to be a follower of Socrates: "This particularly presumes a state of mind and intellectual humility which can easily be mistaken for arrogance, given that a real follower of Socrates is convinced not only in his ignorance, but the ignorance of all men." Nobody likes to have someone's ignorance publicly pointed to and called out, not only because it makes the person vulnerable, but because many people are convinced of their knowledge and the fact they know everything about everything. It is precisely such a person who would dare to say something like that publicly who would be called arrogant and self-important. However, a follower of Socrates, in his humility, does not only call out the ignorance of others but also his own because he is aware of it, and it is precisely what makes him worthy of his role.

### **Conclusion**

The time we live in is full of constant, fast, and unpredictable changes affecting every aspect of life, whether it be private or business-related. Changes have not bypassed the educational sector, and they changed the way we look at and experience the traditional educational process. The causes are ascribed to globalization trends and an ever-greater information, economic, media networking of the world. The successfulness of accommodation to the globalization processes and changes in the environment in which individuals, companies, and national economies live, work, and act is manifested in the evaluation of knowledge as the primary and strategic economic resource.

Proclaiming a "knowledge society", which is a strategic goal of developing a society in which the acquisition, creation, and application of knowledge is accessible to all members of the community and where knowledge is in the function of strengthening and developing the economy, and thus economic growth. It is far from the knowledge that in antiquity create a man an individual who was fully and comprehensively educated.

It is not because he learned all his life, as the society we live in highlights that lifelong learning is one of its main characteristics, but because he tasted freedom in the process of forming himself and became free.

The system of a free and self-regulating market brings the main demands which greatly determine the outcomes of economic, political, and, what is most important for this paper, educational aims. From the introduction of changes at universities, accepting the Bologna Declaration, to the adaptation of educational aims to the needs of the labour market, everything leads to rejecting the knowledge which does not respond to the demands of the time and focusing exclusively on that which develops the entrepreneurial spirit, a competitively disposed individual who is, in any moment, ready to respond to the needs of a constantly changing labour market.

The opposition to this way of thinking is precisely Socrates, who, with his life, a personal example of living his words instead of serving the goals of others, offers truth and freedom. He offers that true knowledge thanks to which we can have the experience of truth – the truth we already carry in ourselves but need to make manifest. His method of dialectics is undoubtedly one of the ways in which it is possible to know and discover how much we know, but it is also the way we should go if we want to do more for ourselves and the society in which we live, and by which he warns us of all seeming knowledge and all its traps. Socrates himself, his way of life, thinking about it, and the application of his dialogue method is one of the possible ways of motivating and encouraging students and professors to reach a higher degree of knowledge in order to think about the world around us critically.

This method is contrary to the front way of teaching, which dominates our system and in which students are passive and absorb information to which they are exposed and consume them exclusively as such. Socrates believes that someone like that can be implanted with knowledge just as it is possible to give sight to a blind man. Furthermore, while some schools and faculties recognize this way of thinking and teaching, that is not the case with all of them. Only individuals have no use for it because the primary purpose is not to beat your interlocutor but to reach a new level of thought with joined forces. Even though educational reforms go on all the time, little or nothing is said on the ways of encouraging and strengthening the desire for real and in-depth understanding of the world around us.

Maybe we should ask ourselves if Socrates is not applied today in the educational system as a higher goal for a comprehensively educated and emancipated man, does it not say more of us as a society that is not appropriate and worthy of Socrates' philosophy? As a "knowledge society", we consider it our obligation to free the mind of wrong conclusions and, in a mutual action, enable it to accept the right way of cognition, which makes every man an autonomous one if he wishes it. Despite the information and knowledge which are outdated fast today, we should strive towards something bigger and more significant – a wisdom which does not adapt to trends of today, but rather enables true happiness which is not subject to weather changes. In that, we can look for help in Socrates' example of searching for wisdom and a deeper and more secure basis for knowledge, which is truly necessary in the knowledge society.

## References

1. Adorno, T. W. (1959) *Theorie der Halbbildung. Gesammelte Schriften, Band 8: Soziologische Schriften I*, pp. 93–121.
2. Ahmed, N. H., Abdul Halim, H., Ramayah, T. (2016) Dilema oko ideala poduzetničkog sveučilišta: prevladavajuće akademske tenzije“. *Croatian Journal of Education*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 519-543.
3. Alfred, M., Butterwick, S., Hansman, C., Sandlin, J. (2007) *Neoliberal welfare reform, poverty and adult education: identifying the problem and engaging in resistance*. Halifax: New Praire Press.
4. Boltižar, M. (2017) NENAD BAKIĆ STEM Revolucija, koju je počeo, dosad je došla do 50 000 djece u Hrvatskoj, ali tu nije kraj. Sljedeći korak su roditelji. *Jutarnji list*, 27. 12. 2017.
5. Bušljeta, A. (2010) Globalizam – ideologija globalizacije?. *Socijalna ekologija*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 127-150.
6. Carroll, W., Beaton, J. (2000) Globalization, Neo-Liberalism, and the Changing Face of Corporate Hegemony in Higher Education. *Studies in Political Economy*, Vol 62, pp. 71-97.
7. Chen, J. S. (2019) *The tech education con*. <https://jacobinmag.com/2019/01/stem-coding-bootcamp-education-scam-philanthropy>, accessed 16. 9. 2019.
8. Čolić, S. (2002) *Kultura i povijest*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada

9. Čvarak, V. (2013) *Obrazovanje za dobro društvo. Ekonomsko obrazovanje u Republici Hrvatskoj - jučer, danas, sutra : zbornik radova znanstvene konferencije*, pp. 3-26.
10. Dabić, M., Švarc J. (2011) O konceptu poduzetničkoga sveučilišta: ima li alternative?. *Društvena istraživanja*, Vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 991-1013.
11. Davidson-Harden, A., Majhanovich, S. (2004) Privatisation of education in Canada: A survey of trends. *International Review of Education*, Vol 50, No. 3-4, pp. 263-287.
12. Doherty, R. A. (2007) Education, neoliberalism and the consumer citizen: After the golden age of egalitarian reform. *Critical Studies in Education*, Vol 48, no. 2, pp. 269-288.
13. Etzkowitz, H. (2008) *The Triple Helix. University-Industry-Government, Innovation in Action*. London: Routledge.
14. Gaščić, D. (2018) „STEM Revolucija: učenici će programirati od prvog razreda“, *24 sata*, 6. 11. 2018.
15. Guthrie, W. K. C. (2006) *Povijest Grčke filozofije*, knjiga III. Zagreb: Naklada Juričić d.o.o.
16. Hromadžić, H. (2008) *Konzumerizam: Potreba, životni stil, ideologija*. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk.
17. Humboldt, W. von (1969) *Theorie der Bildung des Menschen*. In: Flitner, A., Giel, K., *Wilhelm von Humboldt, Werke in fünf Bänden: Vol. 1 Schriften zur Anthropologie und Geschichte*. Darmstad: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, pp. 234–240.
18. Kanić S., Kovač. V. (2017) Neoliberalizam i obrazovanje u kontekstu globalne obrazovne politike. *Zbornik Odseka za pedagogiju, Filozofski fakultet u Novom Sadu*, Vol. 26, pp. 69-92.
19. Kokić, T. (2013) Industrijalizacija sveučilišta i dehumanizacija. *Filozofska istraživanja*, Vol 33, no. 3, pp. 425-432.
20. Kregar J. (2006) Globalizacija i regulacija. In: (eds.) Vidović, D., Pauković, D., *Globalizacija i neoliberalizam: Refleksije na hrvatsko društvo*. Zagreb: Centar za politološka istraživanja, pp. 83-97.
21. Liessmann, K. P. (2008) *Teorija neobrazovanosti: Zablude društva znanja*. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk.

22. McPherran, M. L. (2010) Socrates, Plato, Erôs and liberal education. *Oxford Review of Education*, Vol. 36, No. 5, pp. 527-541.
23. Platon (2000) *Obrana Sokratova*. Zagreb: Demetra filofska biblioteka Dimitrija Savića.
24. Polić, M. (1993) *K filozofiji odgoja*. Zagreb: Znamen & Institut za pedagojska istraživanja.
25. Postnikov, B. (2019) STEM - Revolucija jede svoju djecu. *Novosti*, 19. 1. 2019.
26. Rupčić, D. (2015) Humanističko obrazovanje kao posljednja svrha ljudskog opstanka. *Metodički ogledi*, Vol. 22, pp. 95-115.
27. Šundalić, A. (2012) Između društva rada i društva znanja. *Media, culture and public relations*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 120-130.
28. Tolofari, S. (2005) New public management and education. *Policy Futures in Education*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 75-89.
29. Zlatar Violić, A. (2009.) Komercijalizacija obrazovanja i merkantilizacija znanja. *Revija za socijalnu politiku*, Vol.16, No. 2, pp. 208-208.
30. Zorić, V. (2008) Sokratova dijaloška metoda. *Život i škola*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 27-40.

**Ivica Kelam**

Fakultet za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti, Sveučilište J. J. Strossmayera u  
Osijeku  
kelamivica@gmail.com

**Jasmina Sagadin Vučić**

Fakultet za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti, Sveučilište J. J. Strossmayera u  
Osijeku  
sagadinj@gmail.com

## PRIMJENJIVOST SOKRATOVE METODE ODGOJA U ODGOJU I OBRAZOVANJU DANAS

### Sažetak

U globalnom svijetu promjene se događaju svakodnevno i zahvaćaju odgojno-obrazovni sustav. Tome u prilog govori činjenica da se većina tradicionalnih smjernica odbacuje, te se teži novim ciljevima i metodama, onim izvanjskim koje zadovoljavaju neprestano mijenjajuće tržište rada. Svrha pojedinca u takvom sustavu jest prilagoditi mu se odgovarajući na njegove potrebe, dok Sokrat traži sreću unutar čovjeka – čovjeka koji posjeduje znanje i mudrost ne zbog drugih već zbog sebe i svoje slobode. Svojom metodom dijalektičkog govora traži istinu u sebi i drugima te nudi mnogo toga za promišljanje. Njegovo poučavanje koje ističe ljubav prema učenju i želju za istinskim znanjem koji stvaraju zrelog i autonomnog čovjeka svakako nadahnjuju već 25 stoljeća te bi ga trebalo uzeti u obzir kada se promišlja o budućnosti mladih generacija koje dolaze. U ovom radu uspoređujemo odgoj i obrazovanje danas s onim koje je bilo uvriježeno u Sokratovo doba te nastojimo ukazati na razlike. U radu se ističu promijene koje su zahvatile sveučilišta u vidu Bolonjske deklaracije ali i kako ih usmjerenost prema tržištu rada pretvara u poduzetničke centre. Što to znači za društvo znanja kojemu težimo i možemo li uopće tvrditi da zaista jesmo društvo znanja ako stremimo isključivo znanjima diktiranim od strane neprestano mijenjajućeg tržišta rada? Uspoređujemo znanje kojemu težimo sa znanjem kojega je tražio Sokrat ukazujući pri tome na nedostatke današnjeg odgoja i obrazovanja te nudimo Sokratove ideje i mišljenja kao mogući pomak prema istinskoj mudrosti.

**Ključne riječi:** tržište rada, društvo znanja, Sokrat, istina, sloboda