

1: Educational Philosophy Quotes (quotes)

Metaphysics / Philosophy of Education: Discussion on Educational Philosophy, Teaching Philosophy, Truth and Reality - Famous Philosophers (Albert Einstein, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Michel de Montaigne, Aristotle, Plato) Quotes Quotations on Education, Educational Philosophy, Teaching Philosophy.

How does Philosophy Influence the Field of Education? Particularly, it influences the following aspects:

Relationship between the state and education Depending upon the philosophy a country believes in there are rigidly controlled and free schools. In the totalitarian states the schools have to teach what the state wants with strict discipline and rigid schedule enforced in them. In democratic countries there is ample freedom for the schools. Philosophy of Education Influences the Aims of Education The aims and ideals of education, too, are determined by the philosophy of education a country believes in. Different philosophies of education have different views on education. A country that tends to believe in the philosophy of idealism will stress on creating a spiritual environment in the school as that pupils develop spiritual values and attain self-realization. Naturalism will like to see that the child is made to learn from nature in a natural way and realizes his potentialities. Pragmatism does not accept any universal or eternal and preconceived aim of education. Like that aims of education are necessarily influenced by the philosophy of education. Philosophy of Education Influences the Curriculum What should be taught in the schools is also influenced by the kind of philosophy of education a society supports. Various philosophies of education advocate differing views on curriculum. Naturalism, for example, lays stress on subjects that help in self-expression and self-preservation. It advocates teaching of basic sciences, physical and health education. Idealism emphasizes teaching of higher values through ethics, religion, art and subjects of humanities. Philosophy of education influences teaching methods. Methods of teaching, too, are influenced by the philosophy of education a society adopts. A system of education based on naturalism stresses learning by doing, learning through experience and learning through observation. Societies which tend towards idealism prefer to have a system of education which prescribes rigid methods of teaching such as lecturing and prefer learning through imitation, memorization and discussion. Pragmatism stresses problem solving and project methods of teaching. Philosophy of education influences theory and practice of discipline also. The concept of discipline and its practice also are influenced by the philosophy of education. To naturalists discipline is to be learnt by natural consequences. The child enjoys maximum freedom. Self-discipline is preferred to external control. The idealists on the other hand wish to enforce discipline through cultivation of higher values, moral and religious teachings and strict control over the child. In the same way several other aspects such as the place of the child in education, the importance of the teacher, preparation of textbooks, etc. Philosophy and Aims on Education Every educational system must have some goals, aims or objectives. These act as guides for the educator in educating the child. In fact, we cannot think of any process of education without specific aims and objectives. The aims and ideals of life, in their turn, are determined by the philosophy of the time. It is, therefore, that aims and ideals of education vary with the different philosophers. It is the philosophy of the time which determines whether the aim of education should be moral, vocational, intellectual, liberal or spiritual. Philosophy formulates what should be the end of life while education offers suggestions how this end is to be achieved. He then suggests ways and means of dealing with them. Thus he lays down ultimate values and explains their significance to the community. In this way, he tries to convert people to his own beliefs and philosophy. These ultimate values, as formulated by the philosopher, become the aims of education for that community. The training of the younger generation, according to those aims and values, then lies on the shoulders of the educator in the field. He selects the material for instruction and determines the methods of procedure for the attainment of those aims. In this way, the entire educational programme proceeds with its foundations on sound philosophy. Philosophy and Curriculum Curriculum is the means through which we realize the aims of education. Naturally, therefore, our educational aims determine the curriculum of studies. But aims of education, in their own turn, are determined by philosophy, as we have noted above just now. So we can say that philosophy also determines the curriculum. As is the philosophy so will be the aims of all education and courses of study. It is philosophy and

courses of study. Thus they are closely inter-related. It is philosophy which will decide why a particular subject should be included in the curriculum and what particular discipline that subject will promote. It changes in accordance with the aims of education determined by philosophy. It is, therefore, that curriculum differs with different schools of philosophy, according to their own beliefs. The naturalists advocate the selection of subjects according to the present needs, interests and activities of the child. They insist that adult interference should be reduced to the minimum and that the child should grow up in a free atmosphere. They are, therefore, of the opinion that curriculum should include subjects which are useful for the present life situations, experience and interests of the child. Those subjects must, in no case, be included in which the child is not interested at all. The idealists, on the other hand, approach the problem of curriculum from the point of higher values in life rather than from that of the child or his present needs. Their emphasis is on the experience of human race as a whole. They, therefore, advocate that curriculum should be graded in such a way as may enable that child to march gradually towards self-realization. The pragmatists emphasize the principle of utility in the choice of subjects. They are of the opinion that only such functional subjects should be included in the curriculum as are useful to the child in the present day world. The curriculum should give knowledge and skills which the child requires for his present as well as future life as an adult. Only that bookish knowledge, which stuffs the mind with abstract ideas, is condemned as it does not equip children to face the real problems of life. Instead, curriculum should consist of subjects who may improve the health, vocational efficiency and social fitness of the child. Realists also put greater premium upon the vocational education. Thus, we conclude that philosophy not only influences the curriculum, it also determines the subjects of study that meet its requirements. Philosophy and Text-books Text-books are important instruments, through which the aims of education are realized. In the selection of text-books, therefore, there is as much need of ideals and principles as in the choice of subjects. Those who select text-books must have a standard of judgment, which should enable them to select the right type of books. This standard is supplied by philosophy. Again, a good text-book must reflect the prevailing values of life, fixed by philosophy. If it does not, it is out-of-date and inappropriate. An appropriate text-book, therefore, must be according to the accepted ideals of the society as a whole. Then and only then it will be able to serve its desired purpose. In the case of text-books also, there is difference of opinion among the different schools of philosophy. While the naturalists are in favor of illustrations, pictures and diagrams for capturing the interest of children, the pragmatists are satisfied only with the objective statement of generalization in a logical order. The idealists, on the other hand with the text-books should reflect the individuality of the author. They are in favor of the subjective presentation of the subject-matter so that there may be interaction of the personalities of the author and the reader.

2: How does Philosophy Influence the Field of Education?

The Nordic Society for Philosophy of Education is a society consisting of Nordic philosophers of education with the purpose of fostering dialogue among philosophers of education within and beyond the Nordic countries, and to coordinate, facilitate and support exchange of ideas, information and experiences.

Waldorf education Waldorf education also known as Steiner or Steiner-Waldorf education is a humanistic approach to pedagogy based upon the educational philosophy of the Austrian philosopher Rudolf Steiner, the founder of anthroposophy. Learning is interdisciplinary, integrating practical, artistic, and conceptual elements. The approach emphasizes the role of the imagination in learning, developing thinking that includes a creative as well as an analytic component. Schools and teachers are given considerable freedom to define curricula within collegial structures. Schools are normally self-administered by faculty; emphasis is placed upon giving individual teachers the freedom to develop creative methods. Early childhood education occurs through imitation; teachers provide practical activities and a healthy environment. Steiner believed that young children should meet only goodness. Secondary education seeks to develop the judgment, intellect, and practical idealism; the adolescent should meet truth. Democratic education Democratic education is a theory of learning and school governance in which students and staff participate freely and equally in a school democracy. In a democratic school, there is typically shared decision-making among students and staff on matters concerning living, working, and learning together. Neill[edit] Main article: He wrote a number of books that now define much of contemporary democratic education philosophy. He felt that deprivation of this sense of freedom during childhood, and the consequent unhappiness experienced by the repressed child, was responsible for many of the psychological disorders of adulthood. Educational progressivism Educational progressivism is the belief that education must be based on the principle that humans are social animals who learn best in real-life activities with other people. Progressivists , like proponents of most educational theories, claim to rely on the best available scientific theories of learning. The two most influential works that stemmed from his research and study were *The Child and the Curriculum* and *Democracy and Education* We get the case of the child vs. His theory of cognitive development and epistemological view are together called "genetic epistemology ". Piaget placed great importance on the education of children. As the Director of the International Bureau of Education, he declared in that "only education is capable of saving our societies from possible collapse, whether violent, or gradual. According to Ernst von Glasersfeld , Jean Piaget is "the great pioneer of the constructivist theory of knowing. His books *The Process of Education* and *Toward a Theory of Instruction* are landmarks in conceptualizing learning and curriculum development. He argued that any subject can be taught in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development. This notion was an underpinning for his concept of the " spiral " helical curriculum which posited the idea that a curriculum should revisit basic ideas, building on them until the student had grasped the full formal concept. He emphasized intuition as a neglected but essential feature of productive thinking. He felt that interest in the material being learned was the best stimulus for learning rather than external motivation such as grades. Bruner developed the concept of discovery learning which promoted learning as a process of constructing new ideas based on current or past knowledge. Students are encouraged to discover facts and relationships and continually build on what they already know. Unschooling Unschooling is a range of educational philosophies and practices centered on allowing children to learn through their natural life experiences, including child directed play , game play, household responsibilities, work experience, and social interaction , rather than through a more traditional school curriculum. Unschooling encourages exploration of activities led by the children themselves, facilitated by the adults. Unschooling differs from conventional schooling principally in the thesis that standard curricula and conventional grading methods, as well as other features of traditional schooling, are counterproductive to the goal of maximizing the education of each child. John Holt educator In Holt published his first book, *How Children Fail* , asserting that the academic failure of schoolchildren was not despite the efforts of the schools, but actually because of the schools. Not surprisingly, *How Children Fail* ignited a firestorm of controversy. Holt was catapulted into the American national consciousness to the extent

that he made appearances on major TV talk shows, wrote book reviews for Life magazine, and was a guest on the To Tell The Truth TV game show. Contemplative education[edit] Contemplative education focuses on bringing introspective practices such as mindfulness and yoga into curricular and pedagogical processes for diverse aims grounded in secular, spiritual, religious and post-secular perspectives. Parker Palmer is a recent pioneer in contemplative methods. Contemplative methods may also be used by teachers in their preparation; Waldorf education was one of the pioneers of the latter approach. Zigler suggested that only through focusing on their own spiritual development could teachers positively impact the spiritual development of students.

3: Philosophy of Education (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Philosophers on Education offers us the most comprehensive available history of philosopher's views and impacts on the directions of education. As Amelie Rorty explains, in describing a history of education, we are essentially describing and gaining the clearest understanding of the issues that presently concern and divide us.

Suffice it to say that some philosophers, as well as focusing inward on the abstract philosophical issues that concern them, are drawn outwards to discuss or comment on issues that are more commonly regarded as falling within the purview of professional educators, educational researchers, policy-makers and the like. An example is Michael Scriven, who in his early career was a prominent philosopher of science; later he became a central figure in the development of the field of evaluation of educational and social programs. See Scriven a, b. At the same time, there are professionals in the educational or closely related spheres who are drawn to discuss one or another of the philosophical issues that they encounter in the course of their work. An example here is the behaviorist psychologist B. Skinner, the central figure in the development of operant conditioning and programmed learning, who in works such as *Walden Two* and *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* grappledâ€”albeit controversiallyâ€”with major philosophical issues that were related to his work. What makes the field even more amorphous is the existence of works on educational topics, written by well-regarded philosophers who have made major contributions to their discipline; these educational reflections have little or no philosophical content, illustrating the truth that philosophers do not always write philosophy. However, despite this, works in this genre have often been treated as contributions to philosophy of education. Finally, as indicated earlier, the domain of education is vast, the issues it raises are almost overwhelmingly numerous and are of great complexity, and the social significance of the field is second to none. These features make the phenomena and problems of education of great interest to a wide range of socially-concerned intellectuals, who bring with them their own favored conceptual frameworksâ€”concepts, theories and ideologies, methods of analysis and argumentation, metaphysical and other assumptions, and the like. It is not surprising that scholars who work in this broad genre also find a home in the field of philosophy of education. As a result of these various factors, the significant intellectual and social trends of the past few centuries, together with the significant developments in philosophy, all have had an impact on the content of arguments and methods of argumentation in philosophy of educationâ€”Marxism, psycho-analysis, existentialism, phenomenology, positivism, post-modernism, pragmatism, neo-liberalism, the several waves of feminism, analytic philosophy in both its ordinary language and more formal guises, are merely the tip of the iceberg. Analytic Philosophy of Education and Its Influence Conceptual analysis, careful assessment of arguments, the rooting out of ambiguity, the drawing of clarifying distinctionsâ€”all of which are at least part of the philosophical toolkitâ€”have been respected activities within philosophy from the dawn of the field. No doubt it somewhat over-simplifies the complex path of intellectual history to suggest that what happened in the twentieth centuryâ€”early on, in the home discipline itself, and with a lag of a decade or more in philosophy of educationâ€”is that philosophical analysis came to be viewed by some scholars as being the major philosophical activity or set of activities, or even as being the only viable or reputable activity. The pioneering work in the modern period entirely in an analytic mode was the short monograph by C. Hardie, *Truth and Fallacy in Educational Theory*; reissued in *In his Introduction*, Hardie who had studied with C. Richards made it clear that he was putting all his eggs into the ordinary-language-analysis basket: The Cambridge analytical school, led by Moore, Broad and Wittgenstein, has attempted so to analyse propositions that it will always be apparent whether the disagreement between philosophers is one concerning matters of fact, or is one concerning the use of words, or is, as is frequently the case, a purely emotive one. It is time, I think, that a similar attitude became common in the field of educational theory. Ennis edited the volume *Language and Concepts in Education*; and R. Archambault edited *Philosophical Analysis and Education*, consisting of essays by a number of prominent British writers, most notably R. Among the most influential products of APE was the analysis developed by Hirst and Peters and Peters of the concept of education itself. A criminal who has been reformed has changed for the better, and has developed a commitment to the new

mode of life if one or other of these conditions does not hold, a speaker of standard English would not say the criminal has been reformed. Clearly the analogy with reform breaks down with respect to the knowledge and understanding conditions. The concept of indoctrination was also of great interest to analytic philosophers of education, for, it was argued, getting clear about precisely what constitutes indoctrination also would serve to clarify the border that demarcates it from acceptable educational processes. Thus, whether or not an instructional episode was a case of indoctrination was determined by the content taught, the intention of the instructor, the methods of instruction used, the outcomes of the instruction, or by some combination of these. Adherents of the different analyses used the same general type of argument to make their case, namely, appeal to normal and aberrant usage. Unfortunately, ordinary language analysis did not lead to unanimity of opinion about where this border was located, and rival analyses of the concept were put forward. Snook First, there were growing criticisms that the work of analytic philosophers of education had become focused upon minutiae and in the main was bereft of practical import. It is worth noting that an article in *Time*, reprinted in Lucas, had put forward the same criticism of mainstream philosophy. Fourth, during the decade of the seventies when these various critiques of analytic philosophy were in the process of eroding its luster, a spate of translations from the Continent stimulated some philosophers of education in Britain and North America to set out in new directions, and to adopt a new style of writing and argumentation. The classic works of Heidegger and Husserl also found new admirers; and feminist philosophers of education were finding their voices. Maxine Greene published a number of pieces in the 1970s and 1980s, including *The Dialectic of Freedom*; the influential book by Nel Noddings, *Caring*: In more recent years all these trends have continued. APE was and is no longer the center of interest, although, as indicated below, it still retains its voice. Areas of Contemporary Activity As was stressed at the outset, the field of education is huge and contains within it a virtually inexhaustible number of issues that are of philosophical interest. To attempt comprehensive coverage of how philosophers of education have been working within this thicket would be a quixotic task for a large single volume and is out of the question for a solitary encyclopedia entry. Nevertheless, a valiant attempt to give an overview was made in *A Companion to the Philosophy of Education Current*, which contains more than six-hundred pages divided into forty-five chapters each of which surveys a subfield of work. The following random selection of chapter topics gives a sense of the enormous scope of the field: Sex education, special education, science education, aesthetic education, theories of teaching and learning, religious education, knowledge, truth and learning, cultivating reason, the measurement of learning, multicultural education, education and the politics of identity, education and standards of living, motivation and classroom management, feminism, critical theory, postmodernism, romanticism, the purposes of universities, affirmative action in higher education, and professional education. The *Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Education* Siegel contains a similarly broad range of articles on among other things the epistemic and moral aims of education, liberal education and its imminent demise, thinking and reasoning, fallibilism and fallibility, indoctrination, authenticity, the development of rationality, Socratic teaching, educating the imagination, caring and empathy in moral education, the limits of moral education, the cultivation of character, values education, curriculum and the value of knowledge, education and democracy, art and education, science education and religious toleration, constructivism and scientific methods, multicultural education, prejudice, authority and the interests of children, and on pragmatist, feminist, and postmodernist approaches to philosophy of education. Given this enormous range, there is no non-arbitrary way to select a small number of topics for further discussion, nor can the topics that are chosen be pursued in great depth. In tackling it, care needs to be taken to distinguish between education and schooling—for although education can occur in schools, so can mis-education, and many other things can take place there that are educationally orthogonal such as the provision of free or subsidized lunches and the development of social networks; and it also must be recognized that education can occur in the home, in libraries and museums, in churches and clubs, in solitary interaction with the public media, and the like. In developing a curriculum whether in a specific subject area, or more broadly as the whole range of offerings in an educational institution or system, a number of difficult decisions need to be made. Issues such as the proper ordering or sequencing of topics in the chosen subject, the time to be allocated to each topic, the lab work or excursions or projects that are appropriate for

particular topics, can all be regarded as technical issues best resolved either by educationists who have a depth of experience with the target age group or by experts in the psychology of learning and the like. Is the justification that is given for teaching Economics in some schools coherent and convincing? The justifications offered for all such aims have been controversial, and alternative justifications of a single proposed aim can provoke philosophical controversy. Consider the aim of autonomy. These two formulations are related, for it is arguable that our educational institutions should aim to equip individuals to pursue this good life—although this is not obvious, both because it is not clear that there is one conception of the good or flourishing life that is the good or flourishing life for everyone, and it is not clear that this is a question that should be settled in advance rather than determined by students for themselves. Thus, for example, if our view of human flourishing includes the capacity to think and act autonomously, then the case can be made that educational institutions—and their curricula—should aim to prepare, or help to prepare, autonomous individuals. A rival justification of the aim of autonomy, associated with Kant, champions the educational fostering of autonomy not on the basis of its contribution to human flourishing, but rather the obligation to treat students with respect as persons Scheffler []; Siegel It is also possible to reject the fostering of autonomy as an educational aim Hand Assuming that the aim can be justified, how students should be helped to become autonomous or develop a conception of the good life and pursue it is of course not immediately obvious, and much philosophical ink has been spilled on the general question of how best to determine curriculum content. One influential line of argument was developed by Paul Hirst, who argued that knowledge is essential for developing and then pursuing a conception of the good life, and because logical analysis shows, he argued, that there are seven basic forms of knowledge, the case can be made that the function of the curriculum is to introduce students to each of these forms Hirst ; see Phillips In the closing decades of the twentieth century there were numerous discussions of curriculum theory, particularly from Marxist and postmodern perspectives, that offered the sobering analysis that in many educational systems, including those in Western democracies, the curriculum did indeed reflect and serve the interests of powerful cultural elites. A closely related question is this: Scheffler argued that we should opt for the latter: The function of education—is rather to liberate the mind, strengthen its critical powers, [and] inform it with knowledge and the capacity for independent inquiry. Or should every student pursue the same curriculum as far as each is able? Medically, this is dubious, while the educational version—forcing students to work, until they exit the system, on topics that do not interest them and for which they have no facility or motivation—has even less merit. For a critique of Adler and his Paideia Proposal, see Noddings Over time, as they moved up the educational ladder it would become obvious that some had reached the limit imposed upon them by nature, and they would be directed off into appropriate social roles in which they would find fulfillment, for their abilities would match the demands of these roles. Those who continued on with their education would eventually become members of the ruling class of Guardians. The book spurred a period of ferment in political philosophy that included, among other things, new research on educationally fundamental themes. Fair equality of opportunity entailed that the distribution of education would not put the children of those who currently occupied coveted social positions at any competitive advantage over other, equally talented and motivated children seeking the qualifications for those positions Rawls Its purpose was to prevent socio-economic differences from hardening into social castes that were perpetuated across generations. One obvious criticism of fair equality of opportunity is that it does not prohibit an educational distribution that lavished resources on the most talented children while offering minimal opportunities to others. So long as untalented students from wealthy families were assigned opportunities no better than those available to their untalented peers among the poor, no breach of the principle would occur. Even the most moderate egalitarians might find such a distributive regime to be intuitively repugnant. All citizens must enjoy the same basic liberties, and equal liberty always has moral priority over equal opportunity: Further, inequality in the distribution of income and wealth are permitted only to the degree that it serves the interests of the least advantaged group in society. But even with these qualifications, fair equality of opportunity is arguably less than really fair to anyone. But surely it is relevant, given that a principle of educational justice must be responsive to the full range of educationally important goods. Suppose we revise our account of the goods included in educational distribution so that aesthetic

appreciation, say, and the necessary understanding and virtue for conscientious citizenship count for just as much as job-related skills. An interesting implication of doing so is that the rationale for requiring equality under any just distribution becomes decreasingly clear. That is because job-related skills are positional whereas the other educational goods are not (Hollis). If you and I both aspire to a career in business management for which we are equally qualified, any increase in your job-related skills is a corresponding disadvantage to me unless I can catch up. Positional goods have a competitive structure by definition, though the ends of civic or aesthetic education do not fit that structure. If you and I aspire to be good citizens and are equal in civic understanding and virtue, an advance in your civic education is no disadvantage to me. On the contrary, it is easier to be a good citizen the better other citizens learn to be. At the very least, so far as non-positional goods figure in our conception of what counts as a good education, the moral stakes of inequality are thereby lowered. In fact, an emerging alternative to fair equality of opportunity is a principle that stipulates some benchmark of adequacy in achievement or opportunity as the relevant standard of distribution. But it is misleading to represent this as a contrast between egalitarian and sufficientarian conceptions. Philosophically serious interpretations of adequacy derive from the ideal of equal citizenship (Satz ; Anderson). This was arguably true in *A Theory of Justice* but it is certainly true in his later work (Dworkin). The debate between adherents of equal opportunity and those misnamed as sufficientarians is certainly not over. Further progress will likely hinge on explicating the most compelling conception of the egalitarian foundation from which distributive principles are to be inferred. In his earlier book, the theory of justice had been presented as if it were universally valid. But Rawls had come to think that any theory of justice presented as such was open to reasonable rejection. A more circumspect approach to justification would seek grounds for justice as fairness in an overlapping consensus between the many reasonable values and doctrines that thrive in a democratic political culture. Rawls argued that such a culture is informed by a shared ideal of free and equal citizenship that provided a new, distinctively democratic framework for justifying a conception of justice. But the salience it gave to questions about citizenship in the fabric of liberal political theory had important educational implications. How was the ideal of free and equal citizenship to be instantiated in education in a way that accommodated the range of reasonable values and doctrines encompassed in an overlapping consensus? Political Liberalism has inspired a range of answers to that question (cf. Callan ; Clayton ; Bull). Other philosophers besides Rawls in the 1980s took up a cluster of questions about civic education, and not always from a liberal perspective. As a full-standing alternative to liberalism, communitarianism might have little to recommend it. But it was a spur for liberal philosophers to think about how communities could be built and sustained to support the more familiar projects of liberal politics (e.g.). Furthermore, its arguments often converged with those advanced by feminist exponents of the ethic of care (Noddings ; Gilligan).

Philosophy of education is the branch of applied or practical philosophy concerned with the nature and aims of education and the philosophical problems arising from educational theory and practice.

See Article History Philosophy of education, philosophical reflection on the nature, aims, and problems of education. The philosophy of education is Janus -faced, looking both inward to the parent discipline of philosophy and outward to educational practice. This dual focus requires it to work on both sides of the traditional divide between theory and practice, taking as its subject matter both basic philosophical issues e. These practical issues in turn have implications for a variety of long-standing philosophical problems in epistemology , metaphysics , ethics , and political philosophy. In addressing these many issues and problems, the philosopher of education strives for conceptual clarity, argumentative rigour, and informed valuation.

Principal historical figures The history of philosophy of education is an important source of concerns and issuesâ€”as is the history of education itselfâ€”for setting the intellectual agenda of contemporary philosophers of education. Equally relevant is the range of contemporary approaches to the subject. Although it is not possible here to review systematically either that history or those contemporary approaches, brief sketches of several key figures are offered next. The Western philosophical tradition began in ancient Greece , and philosophy of education began with it. The major historical figures developed philosophical views of education that were embedded in their broader metaphysical , epistemological, ethical , and political theories. This view of the central place of reason in education has been shared by most of the major figures in the history of philosophy of education, despite the otherwise substantial differences in their other philosophical views. In his dialogue Republic he set out a vision of education in which different groups of students would receive different sorts of education, depending on their abilities, interests, and stations in life. PlatoPlato, marble portrait bust, from an original of the 4th century bce; in the Capitoline Museums, Rome. Detail of a Roman copy 2nd century bce of a Greek alabaster portrait bust of Aristotle, c. Unlike Plato, Rousseau also prescribed fundamentally distinct educations for boys and girls, and in doing so he raised issues concerning gender and its place in education that are of central concern today. While these Deweyan themes are strongly reminiscent of Rousseau, Dewey placed them in a far more sophisticatedâ€”albeit philosophically contentiousâ€”context. He emphasized the central importance of education for the health of democratic social and political institutions, and he developed his educational and political views from a foundation of systematic metaphysics and epistemology. Of course, the history of philosophy of education includes many more figures than Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Rousseau, and Dewey. Peters in Britain and Israel Scheffler in the United States , have also made substantial contributions to educational thought. It is worth noting again that virtually all these figures, despite their many philosophical differences and with various qualifications and differences of emphasis, take the fundamental aim of education to be the fostering of rationality see reason. No other proposed aim of education has enjoyed the positive endorsement of so many historically important philosophersâ€”although, as will be seen below, this aim has come under increasing scrutiny in recent decades.

Problems, issues, and tasks There are a number of basic philosophical problems and tasks that have occupied philosophers of education throughout the history of the subject. The aims of education The most basic problem of philosophy of education is that concerning aims: What are the proper criteria for evaluating educational efforts, institutions, practices, and products? All such proposed aims require careful articulation and defense, and all have been subjected to sustained criticism. Both contemporary and historical philosophers of education have devoted themselves, at least in part, to defending a particular conception of the aims of education or to criticizing the conceptions of others. Clarification of educational concepts A perennial conception of the nature of philosophy is that it is chiefly concerned with the clarification of concepts, such as knowledge, truth , justice , beauty, mind, meaning, and existence. One of the tasks of the philosophy of education, accordingly, has been the elucidation of key educational concepts, including the concept of education itself, as well as related concepts such as teaching, learning, schooling, child rearing, and indoctrination. Such analysis seeks not necessarily, or only, to identify the particular meanings of charged or

contested concepts but also to identify alternative meanings, render ambiguities explicit, reveal hidden metaphysical, normative, or cultural assumptions, illuminate the consequences of alternative interpretations, explore the semantic connections between related concepts, and elucidate the inferential relationships obtaining among the philosophical claims and theses in which they are embedded. Rights, power, and authority There are several issues that fall under this heading. What justifies the state in compelling children to attend school?—in what does its authority to mandate attendance lie? What is the nature and justification of the authority that teachers exercise over their students? Is the freedom of students rightly curtailed by the state? Is the public school system rightly entitled to the power it exercises in establishing curricula that parents might find objectionable?—e. Should parents or their children have the right to opt out of material they think is inappropriate? Should schools encourage students to be reflective and critical generally—as urged by the American philosophers Israel Scheffler and Amy Gutmann, following Socrates and the tradition he established—or should they refrain from encouraging students to subject their own ways of life to critical scrutiny, as the American political scientist William Galston has recommended? The issue of legitimate authority has been raised recently in the United States in connection with the practice of standardized testing, which some critics believe discriminates against the children of some racial, cultural, religious, or ethnic groups because the test questions rely, implicitly or explicitly, on various culturally specific cues or assumptions that members of some groups may not understand or accept. In such controversial cases, what power should members of allegedly disadvantaged groups have to protect their children from discrimination or injustice? The answer to this question, as to the others raised above, may depend in part on the status of the particular school as public state-supported or private. But it can also be asked whether private schools should enjoy more authority with respect to curricular matters than public schools do, particularly in cases where they receive state subsidies of one form or another. These questions are primarily matters of ethics and political philosophy, but they also require attention to metaphysics e. Critical thinking Many educators and educational scholars have championed the educational aim of critical thinking. It is not obvious what critical thinking is, and philosophers of education accordingly have developed accounts of critical thinking that attempt to state what it is and why it is valuable—i. These accounts generally though not universally agree that critical thinkers share at least the following two characteristics: Beyond this level of agreement lie a range of contentious issues. One cluster of issues is epistemological in nature. What is it to reason well? What makes a reason, in this sense, good or bad? More generally, what epistemological assumptions underlie or should underlie the notion of critical thinking? These questions have given rise to other, more specific and hotly contested issues. Do standard accounts of critical thinking in these ways favour and help to perpetuate the beliefs, values, and practices of dominant groups in society and devalue those of marginalized or oppressed groups? Is reason itself, as some feminist and postmodern philosophers have claimed, a form of hegemony? Other issues concern whether the skills, abilities, and dispositions that are constitutive of critical thinking are general or subject-specific. In addition, the dispositions of the critical thinker noted above suggest that the ideal of critical thinking can be extended beyond the bounds of the epistemic to the area of moral character, leading to questions regarding the nature of such character and the best means of instilling it. Indoctrination A much-debated question is whether and how education differs from indoctrination. Many theorists have assumed that the two are distinct and that indoctrination is undesirable, but others have argued that there is no difference in principle and that indoctrination is not intrinsically bad. Theories of indoctrination generally define it in terms of aim, method, or doctrine. Thus, indoctrination is either: These ways of characterizing indoctrination emphasize its alleged contrast with critical thinking: But this apparent contrast depends upon the alleged avoidability of indoctrination, which itself is a philosophically contested issue. The individual and society A number of interrelated problems and issues fall under this heading. What is the place of schools in a just or democratic society? Should they serve the needs of society by preparing students to fill specific social needs or roles, or should they rather strive to maximize the potential—or serve the interests—of each student? When these goals conflict, as they appear inevitably to do, which set of interests—those of society or those of individuals—should take precedence? Should educational institutions strive to treat all students equally? If so, should they seek equality of opportunity or equality of outcome? Should individual autonomy

be valued more highly than the character of society? These questions are basically moral and political in nature, though they have epistemological analogues, as noted above with respect to critical thinking. Moral education Another set of problems and issues has to do with the proper educational approach to morality. Should education strive to instill particular moral beliefs and values in students? If the latter, how should educators distinguish between good and bad ways to think about moral issues? Or are all these approaches problematic in that they inevitably involve indoctrination of an undesirable kind? Moral psychology and developmental psychology are also highly relevant to the resolution of these questions. Teaching, learning, and curriculum Many problems of educational practice that raise philosophical issues fall under this heading. Which subjects are most worth teaching or learning? What constitutes knowledge of them, and is such knowledge discovered or constructed? Should there be a single, common curriculum for all students, or should different students study different subjects, depending on their needs or interests, as Dewey thought? If the latter, should students be tracked according to ability? Should less-able students be directed to vocational studies? Is there even a legitimate distinction to be drawn between academic and vocational education? More broadly, should students be grouped together according to age, ability, gender, race, culture, socioeconomic status, or some other characteristic or should educators seek diversity in the classroom along any or all of these dimensions? Whatever the curriculum, how should students be taught? How, more generally, should teaching be conceived and conducted? Should all students be expected to learn the same things from their studies? If not, as many argue, does it make sense to utilize standardized testing to measure educational outcome, attainment, or success? What are the effects of grading and evaluation in general and of high-stakes standardized testing in particular? Some have argued that any sort of grading or evaluation is educationally counterproductive because it inhibits cooperation and undermines any natural motivation to learn. If these claims are correct, how should the seemingly legitimate demands of parents, administrators, and politicians for accountability from teachers and schools be met? These are complex matters, involving philosophical questions concerning the aims and legitimate means of education and the nature of the human mind, the psychology of learning and of teaching, the organizational and political demands of schooling, and a host of other matters to which social-scientific research is relevant. Finally, here fall questions concerning the aims of particular curriculum areas. For example, should science education aim at conveying to students merely the content of current theories or rather an understanding of scientific method, a grasp of the tentativeness and fallibility of scientific hypotheses, and an understanding of the criteria by which theories are evaluated? Should science classes focus solely on current theories, or should they include attention to the history, philosophy, and sociology of the subject? Should they seek to impart only beliefs or also skills? Similar questions can be asked of nearly every curriculum area; they are at least partly philosophical and so are routinely addressed by philosophers of education as well as by curriculum theorists and subject-matter specialists. Educational research A large amount of research in education is published every year; such research drives much educational policy and practice. But educational research raises many philosophical issues. How is it best conducted, and how are its results best interpreted and translated into policy? Should it be modeled on research in the natural sciences? In what ways if any does competent research in the social sciences differ from that in the natural sciences?

5: My Education Philosophy

10 modern philosophers and their contribution to education 1. 10 Modern Philosophers and their Contribution to Education John Locke and the Tabula Rasa Locke (), an English philosopher and physician, proposed that the mind was a blank slate or tabula rasa.

I believe that education is an individual, unique experience for every student who enters a classroom. In order for children to benefit from what schools offer, I think that teachers must fully understand the importance of their job. As professionals entrusted with the education of young minds, teachers must facilitate learning and growth academically, personally, and ethically. In order to accomplish these lofty goals, I think it is important first to establish a mutually respectful, honest rapport with students – a relationship in which communication is of the highest priority. Through this relationship, a fair, democratic environment based on trust and caring can be established in the classroom, making it possible to interact confidently and safely in an academic setting. Once this foundation is established, the educator has already accomplished a major goal: Demonstrating these ethically correct behaviors in the classroom and expecting students to model them prepares them for adult interaction and survival in the future. Academic learning must begin with motivation and inspiration. Personal growth is accomplished when a teacher adopts a mentoring role. Displaying warmth and compassion shows students that teachers love them and are empathic, feeling human beings. One-on-one mentoring involves personal conversations about goals, and taking time to share ideas and experiences. To be a mentor to every student, a teacher must project positivity, exhibit flexibility and confidence, set high expectations for oneself, and demonstrate fairness and consistency. In doing so, students can see appropriate adult behaviors first-hand and begin to emulate them as they mature. I believe that all children have the ability to learn and the right to a quality education. All youths, regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, and capabilities should have the opportunity to learn from professional, well-informed teachers who are sophisticated and knowledgeable, both in their area of expertise and life. Certainly, every child has different learning styles and aptitudes; however, by having a personal relationship with every student, a teacher can give each an equal chance of success. I think that teaching and learning are a reciprocal processes. When teachers nurture individual talents in each child, educators can build self-esteem and may encourage a lifelong skill. This mutual respect for individual skills cultivates a professional academic relationship, leading to a give-and-take educational alliance. This liaison allows students to feel that they are on equal intellectual ground with their teachers, thus creating a strong academic atmosphere. Solid communication among teachers will promote the sharing of ideas and methods and provide a network of support. By working as an educational team, teachers will continue to develop their craft and give the best education possible to their students. In choosing to become a teacher, I have made the commitment to myself and my future students to be the best academic, personal, and ethical role model I can be. It is my goal to have a mutually enriching teaching career by keeping an open mind and continually communicating with my peers and students. I am prepared to rise to the challenges of teaching in the 21st century, and I promise to try to provide an honest, well-rounded education to every student I encounter.

6: Lists of philosophers - Wikipedia

In essence, they get back to the basics of what they believe is the best way to inspire learning in their students -- in other words, they revisit and refine their philosophy of education. A school district might ask a teacher or principal applying for a job about her or his philosophy of education.

7: Philosophy of education - Wikipedia

The history of philosophy of education is an important source of concerns and issues – as is the history of education itself – for setting the intellectual agenda of contemporary philosophers of education. Equally relevant is the range of

contemporary approaches to the subject. Although it is not.

8: Philosophers on Education by Amélie Oksenberg Rorty

Philosophers on Education offers us the most comprehensive available history of philosopher's views and impacts on the directions of education. As Amélie Rorty explains, in describing a history of education, we are essentially describing and gaining the clearest understanding of the issues that.

9: Famous Philosophers - List of World Famous Philosophers & Their Biographies

Philosophers turn their hurtful experiences into lessons and share them to save several others from the vices of life. Education does not necessarily make a philosopher, however a degree is often acquired by many.

Community care, ideology, and social policy The Egyptian heaven hell Solutions to exercises and problems for Introduction to organic chemistry The War on Our Freedoms Letters of Philip Gawdy of West Harling, Norfolk, and of London to various members of his family, 1579-16 A mug at Charleys Confirmation of Atomic Energy Commission and general manager. Will Europe Work? Jesus, our man in glory Using Turbo Pascal Open access to scientific and technical information All about rifle hunting and shooting in America Issues In Urban Regional Planning, An Introductory Handbook On The Concept Of Planning Lodewijck Huygens Vocabulary control in library science Great fleet of ships Retrieval from full text 1999, Corn-husking bees and other occasions Nothing Like the Night (Detective Stella Mooney Novels) The organisation of commercial education. Frommers Walt Disney World Orlando with Kids Encyclopedia of the history of psychological theories Law and the States in Modern Times The network of fear in your head Religion and the Order of Nature (Cadbury Lectures) The Newlyweds Guide to Investing Personal Finance Thirty-six stratagems Wimpy kid book hard luck The Disciplines Of Vocal Pedagogy Patterns, themes, and categories, / V. 2. The age of Emperor Wu, 140 to circa 100 B.C. More diligent followup needed to weed out ineligible SSA disability beneficiaries Plan de metro new york Narrative and the Cultural Construction of Illness and Healing Irradiation effects in fissile materials. D&d 3.5 races of the destiney Handbook of culture media for food and water microbiology Official Control; Expatriate Dominance; Nigerian Experiencing genuine forgiveness Forest Days, Volume 2