



AN EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY PERSPECTIVE ON TEACHING IN CONTEMPORARY CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Eko Ariwidodo¹

¹Center for Southeast Asian Studies in Madura, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Madura, Indonesia; and
Visiting scholar in Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University, Japan



<https://doi.org/10.36052/andragogi.v11i1.325>

Submitted: March 30, 2023 | Accepted: May 17, 2023 | Published: June 29, 2023

Abstrak

Penelitian terkini mendukung pentingnya pengembangan kesadaran kritis (*critical consciousness*) dalam proses pendidikan. Penelitian tentang pembelajaran partisipatif reflektif dan kesadaran kritis untuk menumbuhkan kesadaran kritis di perguruan tinggi mungkin jauh lebih unggul, meskipun ada beberapa kekurangan. Diperlukan lebih banyak penelitian untuk menentukan sifat kesadaran kritis dalam filosofi pendidikan kurikulum pendidikan tinggi dan cara terbaik untuk mendukung pengembangan kesadaran vital para siswa ini. Metode kesadaran kritis digunakan dalam kajian ini dan kesadaran kritis sebagai paradigma teoretis dalam filsafat pendidikan berupaya mengatasi penindasan multi-sistemik. Semua inisiatif pendidikan, termasuk keputusan kurikuler didasarkan pada filsafat. Kesadaran kritis mendorong pendidik dan peserta didik untuk mempertimbangkan sudut pandang identitas lain ketika membaca dan mengevaluasi teks. Hal tersebut memperluas tujuan pendidikan pada lingkungan sosial yang lebih unggul; metode kritik dan analisis konten tersebut memanusaiakan proses pembelajaran. Filsafat mencari dan memperlihatkan kebaikan yang harus dikejar semua orang dan memfokuskan pendidikannya. Kurikulum dalam filsafat bersifat preskriptif karena menentukan pedoman luas, kursus, dan disiplin ilmu yang harus diselesaikan untuk memperoleh nilai atau standar tertentu. Seperti halnya filsafat, kurikulum bersifat normatif dan mempunyai ide-ide dan teori-teori yang membimbing. Filsafat menjadi tolak ukur untuk mengevaluasi tujuan, pilihan kurikulum, dan metode penyampaian pendidikan. Kurikulum harus dipahami yang secara terus-menerus dihadapkan pada pengambilan keputusan dan filsafat memainkan peran penting dalam proses pengambilan keputusan.

Kata kunci: kesadaran kritis, filsafat pendidikan, kurikulum kontemporer, pragmatism baru

Abstract

Current research supports the significance of critical consciousness development in the educational process. The research on reflective participatory learning and critical consciousness to foster critical consciousness in higher education may be far superior, notwithstanding a few shortcomings. More research is needed to determine the nature of critical consciousness in the higher education curriculum's philosophy of education and the best ways to support these students' vital development of consciousness. The critical consciousness technique was used in this investigation, and critical consciousness as a theoretical paradigm in education philosophy seeks to address multi-systemic oppression. All educational initiatives, including curricular decisions are grounded on philosophy. Critical consciousness encourages educators and students to consider other identities' viewpoints when reading and evaluating texts. It extends the goal of education to a more excellent social environment; this content critique and analysis method humanizes the learning process. Philosophy looks for and makes visible the good that all people should pursue and focus their deliberate education toward. In philosophy, the curriculum is prescriptive since it specifies the broad guidelines, courses, and disciplines that should be completed to earn a particular grade or standard. Like philosophy, the curriculum is normative and has guiding ideas and theories. Philosophy becomes a benchmark by which to evaluate the objectives, curriculum choices, and education delivery methods. Curriculum must be understood that they are constantly faced with making decisions about curricula and that philosophy plays a significant role in the decision-making process.

Keywords: *critical consciousness, philosophy of education, contemporary curriculum, neo pragmatism*



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License



INTRODUCTION

It is clear how important the problem method is when teaching philosophy. As a humanistic science, philosophy, by its very nature, requires communication between the subject (student) and the object of study. It goes beyond being a simple history of ideas. Instead, it is how the person develops their thought process. Every chance we have to improve our decision-making skills entails advancing our philosophical education to a new level. We have advanced in our philosophical education whenever we demonstrate greater independence in critical thinking and decision-making. There are two common approaches when using the problem technique in the classroom. First, in the natural and exact sciences, a *problem's solution* is instrumental conditioning, in which the subject chooses between two or more options, poses questions, and addresses those questions. The second inclination holds that the problem is inherent in the subject matter under investigation and that the topic's content should contain the problem's formulation and the framework for its resolution. As a result, in this instance, the problem is somewhat thrust on, has no instrumental restrictions, and the subject cannot create the problem on their own. As a result, in the humanities (philosophy), the problem technique (instruction) depends on the subject of study and the researcher. Only a few of the problem method's important facets will be covered in terms of teaching philosophy.

One of the main elements that influence the curriculum's objectives, content, and organization is philosophy. The philosophy is typically accepted at a specific school. Schools frequently endorse many philosophies. This kind of approach gives the curriculum a dynamic quality. According to Ornstein and Hunkins (2015), philosophy aids educators in general and curriculum developers in 'determining what schools are for, what subjects have value, how students learn, and what methods and materials to use. The curriculum's goals are made evident by its ideologies, which also explain the methods of instruction and learning while emphasizing the school's primary activities. The philosophy behind the curriculum also affects the choice of textbooks, the nature of the assignments, the format of exams, and the subjects covered in the course (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2015). Existentialism and pragmatism will be combined to form the foundation of the proposed curriculum.

Aspects of teaching philosophy have a crucial role in curriculum implementation in educational institutions. It is used in research projects, teaching-learning scenarios, and policy development (Bar-Yam et al., 2002; Fry et al., 2009). The philosophy of education contributes to comprehending philosophical topics in educational institutions through curriculum practices. It is used in research projects, teaching-learning scenarios, and the creation of educational policy. The foundation of any teaching philosophy is the faculty's concept, beliefs, vision, and attitudes regarding education and how they integrate them into the teaching-learning process. It affects curriculum development, pedagogy, facilitation and assessment of learning, and classroom management. (Chan, 1997; Ogwora et al., 2013; Fry, Ketteridge & Marshall eds., 2009)

The debates among philosophers regarding the relative significance of sensory data and ideas, i.e., perception and conception, in determining the truth have kept both questions controversial throughout the ages. An adequate consideration of the debate between Anglo-American empiricism and Continental rationalism, which has persisted since Bacon and Descartes in the early 17th century, necessitates a brief account of the role of controversial issues in education, specifically in our education regarding the contentious issue of truth in teaching. It will help establish the moral parameters of what Suzanne Rosenblith calls the epistemic ethos (Rosenblith, 2004).

It may shed light on what is good knowledge, what knowledge is helpful for, and what truth in teaching. The issues have been "presented." In this type of philosophy, knowledge is viewed as something limited, a particular intellectual datum, and the target of study, or rather "analysis," is the entirety of knowledge or the totality of pieces (citations). The definition of a term, its use, and the affirmation of its application are the only ways the philosophical truth may be understood. A term's inclusion in a philosophical lexicon is regarded as sufficient evidence of its highly narrow range of use. Learn it only, please. Learning many terms—especially the "basic" ones—seems to help one grasp the overall philosophical issues. After being "acquainted" with philosophy, the learner appears to have completed the mission.

Instead of rushing into the matter by selecting either empiricism or rationalism, based on a personal preference for the perception of sense data or the conceptualization of ideas, and instead of rejecting both in the postmodern skepticism that questions the credibility of any normative theory of knowledge as such, only to substitute semiology or sociology of knowledge for epistemology in a category error of catastrophic proportions, a touch of Socratic irrationality would be more appropriate. Socratic ignorance encourages a neutral approach to education in this legitimate controversy, lest one be deceived by a sophist who cares more about defending a position than establishing the truth. In other words, neutrality toward the various theories of knowledge may assist in resolving epistemological questions precisely where the truth is most challenging to ascertain, i.e., in the context of the study of controversial issues in education, where the truth is all the more essential to their proper comprehension and deserves the utmost respect rather than the optimistic, false "spin" of the proponents of their biased viewpoints.

In order to contrast them with the teaching of valid, non-controversial knowledge of the truth in school curricula, a few neutral methods of teaching controversial topics will be briefly described. Then, the teaching of the truth will be supported by a version of postmodernism articulated by Maxine Greene to preserve the epistemic ethos of sound knowledge. A distinct view of postmodernism will be rejected to demonstrate how the neutrality appropriate to the study of the controversial issue that sparked the development of Western educational philosophy will lead to a neomodern perspective of truth in education.

The notion of 'defensible partiality' i.e., the idea that teachers of social studies should be openly committed to the resolution of social problems in favor of the majority of the people in society or the world, was expressed initially by Theodore Brameld (1969), who argued that it should not interfere with the student's objective, critical study of social problems, as it would lead them to the same conclusion. Why is it necessary to contend that the educator should be demonstrably transformative? Thus, the question of neutrality significantly concerns socially contentious issues in which the controversy is entirely justified. It is not a question of whether or not teachers can be neutral, but rather whether or not they should be and how they should go about it. In descending order of complexity, six strategies will be described. Following Horace Mann's suggestion (Mann, 1957, p. 97), a classroom can be considered cognitively neutral at the primary level if controversial topics are merely excluded. The second level includes controversial issues, but only those aspects that can be dealt with objectively, such as when students learn about drugs or sex without examining value and morality-related concerns. At the third grade level, 'both sides' of the issue are presented objectively and without commentary so that students can learn about the various perspectives. On the fourth level, the instructor describes the benefits and drawbacks of each viewpoint in turn. These higher levels promote critical thought regarding the issues discussed.

The fifth level is attained when the teacher critiques each viewpoint internally and abstracts its partial truth. For instance, the debate between conservative and progressive educational philosophies in the West began with Plato's endeavor to have the most intellectually gifted students acquire the best knowledge available to society by inventing higher education. By the time he retired, his Academy's curriculum had included the empirical disciplines that Aristotle believed belonged in education, such as biology, chemistry, and medicine, emphasizing their conceptual aspects as delineated in the third level of Plato's 'divided line.' In honor of Plato's Academy, these are still emphasized in today's academic disciplines. Progressives such as Rousseau, Froebel, Pestalozzi, Francis PERSPECTIVE s Parker, and John Dewey correctly insisted that genuine education depends on building the curriculum from the bottom up, i.e., on the child's actual development, by beginning each lesson with the child's own, strongly refuted the half-truth that education involves building the curriculum from the top down.

Thus, the most significant conservative and progressive educational theories ever penned contain an essential truth: maintain the best knowledge in society by having elite students acquire it at the university but always base one's pedagogy and curriculum on the current level of pupil development. On the one hand, no advanced industrial society will abandon the academic paths in secondary schools that prepare students for university (and other modes of tertiary education), even though Plato's rationalistic epistemology is highly dubious. Dewey's instrumentalist pedagogy needs more room for dialogue with the teacher and the acquisition



of organized knowledge. On the other hand, experienced teachers will always try to begin where the children and youth are and take them as far as they can, regardless of whether they are college-bound.

On the fifth level of neutrality, an educational philosopher involved in teacher education can explain the strengths of both Plato and Dewey without indicating a preference for either rationalism or empiricism. This juxtaposition of opposing viewpoints is likely to induce critical thinking, notably if conducted at the sixth-grade level, where the teacher is like an actor, playing the role of spokesperson for each view in turn because one truly believes each view is a legitimate expression of a human being's dignity, perhaps following Dewey, for example, with Buber (1965:83-117) and Freire (1970) to consider both dialogical and problem-posing pedagogy.

The importance of neutrality to the epistemic ethos of teaching the truth can be made more transparent by comparing the roles of controversial issues and valuable knowledge in schools. Only knowledge from the arts, crafts, trades, sports, professions, and academic disciplines qualify as curriculum content in publicly funded institutions (Vandenberg, 1990; Higgs, 1998: 141-148). Since much of their knowledge is not controversial, it can be objectively taught and learned. Even in the natural sciences, the knowledge of the disciplines is more controversial the closer it is to the frontiers. Due to their variable basis in evidence, teaching contentious topics across disciplines necessitates careful consideration of their epistemic properties. The student should always learn the degree of acceptance a fact or theory enjoys within a discipline and how well it is supported by evidence as part of acquiring knowledge, as knowledge is becoming aware of the degree of trust one can place in it. For instance, biological evolution is merely a theory, but it is supported by so much evidence that it can be accepted with absolute certainty (Morowitz & Trefil, 2005: 6-8). On the other hand, the theory that human intelligence is reducible to brain processes is speculative. It should be studied alongside other speculative theories of the mind/body relationship (Carson, 2003: 30). Otherwise, such theories' epistemic basis and veracity are only partially recognized.

This study explores an empirical territory by examining authenticity work in higher education learning environments. This research casts doubt on the widely held belief that educational authenticity is a socially produced characteristic of learning environments in two significant ways. First, the results show that the study of authenticity may be helpfully viewed as an ideological undertaking, and they also imply that the endeavor necessitates a reevaluation of the discourse in both the professional and educational spheres. It casts doubt that authentic work only aims to address and modify attitudes about learning environments. Second, the results imply that authenticity work might have a double-edged effect, supporting the legitimacy attached to educational settings while inhibiting students' ability to think critically about their education and careers. It casts doubt on the more basic belief that aiming for realistic learning settings is intrinsically beneficial. We encourage educators and scholars to take a more critical view of educational authenticity in light of our findings. More specifically, we ask scholars further to explore the affordances of authenticity work for critical thinking, and we invite instructors to be inspired by critical pedagogy to develop discursive techniques for authenticity work that are consistent with developing critical thinking (Sveinsson et al., 2022: pp. 83-84).

According to Wilt et al.'s recent research, authentic experiences for Western culture students include expressing one's perceived true nature, being at ease and content, accepting responsibility for one's decisions, resisting peer pressure, and maintaining connections based on openness and honesty. On the other hand, experiences that are not authentic include pretending, giving in to pressure from others, holding down one's feelings, and demeaning oneself. Scenes from real stories that exemplified authenticity or inauthenticity thus resembled concepts from well-known theories of philosophy and psychology. Evaluations of narrative authenticity/inauthenticity were connected to self-report evaluations, but they were different from them. This relationship allowed narrative techniques to offer a particular perspective on the psychology of the natural and false selves (Wilt et al., 2019, p. 10).

Establishing a classroom consensus on a contentious issue, as transformative pedagogy proponents frequently desire, alters the nature of its cognitive components by obscuring the real issue through a severe lack of truthfulness. This sectarian use of the classroom demonstrates a semi-liberated consciousness. It is contrary to human dignity, mainly when it occurs in teaching educational philosophy by emphasizing one

epistemology at the expense of others or by demeaning all epistemologies (Freire, 1970, pp. 21-23; Freire & Shor, 1987, pp. 11-20).

METHODS

The critical consciousness (CC) technique was used in this study. A critical consciousness theoretical paradigm aims to address multi-systemic oppression. Most individual (drug misuse, for example) and social (community violence, for instance) dysfunctions are caused by internalized and institutional oppression (Chronister & McWhirter, 2006; Mullaly, 2002; Windsor et al., 2014a). Developing critical consciousness involves identifying generative themes, which Freire defines as iconic representations that profoundly affect learners' daily lives on an emotional level. Like a virus, social injustice spreads throughout the host system, affecting individuals, families, and institutions. This self-perpetuating phenomenon is caused by the cyclical relationship between the processes (like community policing practices) and outcomes (like racial disparities in mass incarceration). The absence of CC, or the underappreciated role of systemic inequality in individual and social problems, provides the ideal conditions for oppression to spread wildly through systems from the micro to the macro levels, leading to severe, pervasive system failure. The hallmark of moral consciousness is ever-widening circles of agency in the service of humanity. It demonstrates a commitment to meaning and the possibility of altering one's social reality. This understanding is necessary to handle the problems of the twenty-first century successfully. This ethical awareness was named 'critical consciousness,' and the primary determinant of whether men are rendered objects or subjects, dehumanized or humanized, is their ability to understand the themes of the times and, more importantly, how they behave in the context of the world from which these themes originate. Men will adjust to change and actively alter reality if they cannot assess the prevailing themes of their time (Freire, 1973, p. 13). Thus, the term "critical consciousness" refers to the capacity to recognize and resist social and political injustice and the awareness of one's capacity for change. A critical transitivity condition is the outcome. The goal of education should be to liberate people from a sense of knowing that keeps them from perceiving the structural and historical forces that have domesticated them, as well as to change the institutions of society. As a facilitator, the teacher asks insightful questions and offers guidance rather than giving the students directives and answers. In contrast to the more conventional banking form of education, which involves robbing phenomena of their spatial and temporal context and preventing the oppressed from obtaining a more authentic understanding of the broader context of contingency to which the phenomenon in question relates, Freire argued for a problem-posing approach to education, describing the proper function of education as radical conscientization.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Result

Teaching Philosophy in Contemporary Curriculum

When a teacher is loyal to the knowledge or skill being taught, he or she maintains respect for human dignity and human possibility. Regarding controversial issues, it is maintained when the teacher is forthright about the various perspectives on the issues, such as Plato and Dewey as conservative and progressive exemplars in educational philosophy. It transcends the nihilism caused by negative postmodernism and naive constructionism and makes education possible. The sophistry of dissident postmodernism is evident when its leading spokesperson asserts that meta-narratives of knowledge' lack credibility, but in a subsequent publication reveals that he is a Christian apologist (Lyotard, 1990) defending his faith in the doctrines of the Judeo-Christian tradition that the natural sciences have falsified. These doctrines cannot be restored by questioning the veracity of scientific knowledge, to which all educators must be devoted. Foucault's confession, "I have never written anything but fiction" (Foucault, 1980, p. 193), is also indicative of sophistry.



A way to maintain the epistemic ethos and truth in teaching in the face of postmodernism can be found in two claims by Harry Broudy: 'Each discipline has its method of investigation,' and 'To persuade the learner to perceive, classify, and relate as does the expert in a given domain of knowledge is the unabashed objective of the Realistic teaching method' (Broudy, 1961, pp. 339-340). With a minimum degree of realism, both instruction and truth are possible. For instance, teachers in the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities teach students about actual things in the natural, societal, and lived worlds. They do so honestly (Vandenberg, 1988, pp. 63-74). As Charles Sanders Peirce asserted (Peirce, 1958, pp. 133-134), the real is discovered by communities of qualified investigators after sufficient investigation (Peirce, 1958, pp. 133-134). They refer to it as minimal realism, which permits subsequent investigations by competent investigators, paradigm shifts, etc.

Teachers who majored at the university level in the subject they teach in high school understand the domain-specific empirical, rational, quantitative, qualitative, historical, and interpretive methods and canons of inquiry used in their area of expertise. According to Alfred Schütz, each discipline is a distinct province of meaning with its cognitive style and epistemic protocol (Vandenberg, 1997, pp. 9-12). Consequently, the importance of perception, conception, experimentation, quantitative, qualitative, historical, or interpretive research can vary by domain to promote truth in education. A meta-narrative of knowledge applicable to all domains is not required to establish truth in teaching within a particular domain (Vandenberg, 1983, pp. 201-212).

Accepting a loose, flexible combination of the significant theories of knowledge that retains each half-truth is a second method to uphold the epistemic ethos of truth in teaching and learning. David Hume, for instance, awoke Kant from his dogmatic, rationalistic slumber when he asserted that concepts without perceptions are void, just as perceptions without concepts are ignorant. This combination of rationalism and empiricism can be viewed as an aggregate, as opposed to a synthesis, to account for the fact that some domains of knowledge must be more conceptual to reveal the truth, while others must be more perceptual. The aggregate is compatible with late modernism or, preferably, neomodernism-based versions of postmodernism. It does not attempt to elevate empiricism in the footsteps of Bacon, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Spencer, and Popper, nor rationalism in the footsteps of Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, Kant, Hegel, and Habermas, despite incorporating both of their modernist traditions substantially. Broudy suggests that, unlike Kant, the proportion of perception to conception and the nature of their interrelation to constitute an epistemic ethos that permits the teaching of truth can remain domain-specific.

The epistemic ethos can indeed remain lesson-specific. Perception of sense data through showing, describing, pictures, demonstrations, computer imagery, doing something, laboratory work, and field trips ensures that students are learning about something in the world, i.e., that the conceptual framework employed does indeed open up something in the world to students. This truthful disclosure prevents concepts from being hollow. On the other hand, conceptualization through telling, explaining, defining, quantifying, questioning, discussion, silent reflection, reading, and writing may open the students' eyes to things in the world that they cannot yet perceive. Their conceptualized disclosure prevents perceptions from being 'blind.'

Modernist philosophy places a strong emphasis on the mental and physical realms in the curriculum, with particular attention paid to literature, history, philosophy, religion, science, and mathematics. Conversely, postmodern curricula place more emphasis on social experience, the formation of new social structures, and individual freedom. From a modernist standpoint, instruction consists of lectures and demonstrations as well as teaching for factual knowledge and fundamental abilities. On the other side, the postmodern educational approach emphasizes the problem-solving project technique. Modernity places a strong emphasis on teaching people moral principles, but postmodernism emphasizes considering the effects of group actions when making decisions. Perennialism and essentialism, which emphasize the universality of truth through the lessons of great literature, art, philosophy, and religion, as well as the unification of culture and mind, are related modernist educational ideologies. The postmodernist educational philosophies of progressivism and reconstructionism/critical theory center on concepts that should be put to the test through active experimentation and learning that should be centered on the needs of the students. In order to create a better

social reality, it also prioritizes critical pedagogy and examination of global events. Behaviorism and information processing are two related modernist learning philosophies. Contrary postmodern conceptions of learning include humanism and constructivism/cognitivism. The idea of information processing explains how data is taken in, processed, saved, and then retrieved from the mind. According to behaviorism, learning happens when responses to stimuli are reinforced. Constructivism and cognitivism hold that students actively create their conceptions of reality through interactions with their surroundings. Conversely, humanism emphasizes individual autonomy, decision-making, accountability, child-centeredness, and social engagement (Ekanem, 2021, pp.92-93).

Epistemological Problem

In philosophical of education, epistemological issues have always held a prominent position alongside metaphysical, moral, and social or political difficulties. Kingsley Price adeptly covers the whole history of the topic, from the Pre-socratics to John Dewey, in this encyclopedia's entry "Philosophy of Education, History of." The subsequent decades are covered in this entry, emphasizing epistemological concerns. The analytic movement, which stressed the value of precision, thorough analysis, strong argumentation, and meticulous attention to language as methodological matters, began dominating philosophy in the English-speaking world by the time of Dewey's death (in 1952). The philosophy of education was different from this general trend. Richard Peters and Paul Hirst in the United Kingdom and Israel Scheffler in the United States were influential in creating the analytical philosophy of education. Peters and Hirst's work represented two distinct schools of analytic philosophy: the 'ordinary language' school of analytic philosophy, which focused on explaining meanings through everyday language, while Scheffler's style of analysis gave more weight to logic and related formal techniques, and was more likely to disregard everyday language in favor of theoretical advancement. Despite these differences, both schools aimed to improve the clarity and sophistication of philosophy, which needed to be improved in some areas, and to integrate philosophy of education with general philosophy. Some of the most essential epistemological problems in education philosophy are covered in the following (encyclopedia.com, Dec. 2021).

This malleable aggregate is well illustrated in Maxine Greene's (1973) instructional materials. After examining critical theories of knowledge, she turned to the phenomenology of the child's world, citing Merleau-Ponty (1962, 1964), before offering pedagogical suggestions. The young infant perceives the world in such a way that it comes to inhabit the primary world of the senses, which is structured by nonverbal activities and the family's informal language. This tacit knowing, to borrow a phrase from Michael Polanyi (1964), who appears to be a solid parallel for Merleau-Ponty, persists independently of school learning, sometimes in opposition to it, unless a pedagogy brings these preconceptions of things, these prejudices, into explicit awareness by having students explore their inner horizons. When the inner exploration leads to the exploration of outer horizons in the world through curriculum content, it enables the child or adolescent to pursue truth as well as its being in the world by allowing things in the world to be revealed by the curriculum's knowledge--under the guidance of the teacher, of course. After describing how the child lives in the primary world of perception, which will shape the remainder of his or her life if not altered by education, Greene suggests: Self-awareness and critical cognitive action are crucial for obtaining perspective on one's life and reforming the social domain. How should the educator determine if this should be his main focus? How might the disparities in philosophical perspectives influence his practical judgment? Can he not act as a modern rationalist on occasion and an empiricist on other occasions? While functioning as a pragmatist, can he need to pay more attention to the truth of a student's being to combine a notion of liberation with a Deweyan conception of what is most important? Greene (1973, p. 168).

This perspective is postmodern because it does not elevate one of the theories of knowledge as if it were the only valid meta-narrative. However, it also does not entirely reject them. It is neomodern because it functions on the sixth level of neutrality, as did the aggregate of Plato, Dewey, Buber, and Freire mentioned earlier in this paper. It retains the partial truths, i.e., the disclosures of at least four epistemologies. It presupposes that public schools should transmit good knowledge, i.e., the truth, which has been a core belief



of modernism since the invention of the printing press and remains paramount after the invention of the computer and mass communication systems.

However, in encouraging such structuring by learners and claiming to capture information about their actions, some argue that we are simply reifying the constructs we have set out to investigate. In other words, if we are interested in epistemic beliefs and set up a system to compel students to make their epistemic beliefs explicit, it does not matter whether these students have underlying epistemic beliefs because the system forces them to make them explicit. While this is a problem for psychologists who desire to uncover underlying beliefs using the psychometrics described above, it is not a concern for our project, as our discursive, sociocultural, pragmatic approach focuses on beliefs as 'theory-in-action.' In this view, the claim is not that it is impossible to measure beliefs but that when we conduct measurements, the discursive context is fundamental to the observed practices and how beliefs are actualized in action (Knight et al., 2014, pp.39). Consequently, learning analytics addresses the static, decontextualized view of epistemic beliefs generated by questionnaire methods, providing a more authentic perspective on epistemic action than experimental contexts.

If Greene's inclusion of Dewey's and Freire's social concerns among the others seems too progressive, the aim is to include their epistemic ethos. Teachers frequently hear students inquire, "So what?" after learning something new. What is the purpose of this? What significance does this have? With Dewey's pragmatism, the query of what a piece of knowledge is helpful can be answered. It is beneficial when it is relevant to the student's encountered problems. Similar to Freire's pedagogy, if Merleau-Ponty was correct about how the child's development of its perceptual world influences the rest of its life, there should be frequent consciousness-raising to ensure that previous mis-learnings do not interfere with the acquisition of new knowledge through curriculum content. Moreover, the critical thinking stimulated by these pedagogies is supplemented by the inclusion of rationalism and empiricism in Greene's flexible aggregate because these allow for the presence of factual, propositional knowledge and its conceptualization in the modes of the standard, academic disciplines of conservative education when the teacher who is offering new knowledge deems it appropriate to emphasize the perceptual aspects of propositional knowledge and the experiential aspects of propositional knowledge.

The complexity of epistemic cognition suggests a particular perspective on how these beliefs should be comprehended. No method mirrors reality with an accurate, unchangeable, and unquestionable understanding of a student's epistemic cognition. It is a dual concern. First, it is a methodological issue with our ability to "get at" and access the outside world. Second, it is a philosophical and psychological question about whether epistemic cognition is inherently stable throughout development and domains or if external factors like resources or beliefs influence it. The literature on epistemic beliefs addresses these two issues. First, multidimensional perspectives (Hofer, 2001; Schumer, 1990) suggest that epistemic beliefs can be divided into dimensions, within which levels of sophistication can be identified. In contrast, cognitive developmental models (King & Kitchener, 2004; Kuhn & Weinstock, 2002) suggest that individuals progress through increasingly sophisticated epistemic beliefs (Greene et al., 2010, p. 248). However, Both presuppose a static, unidirectional developmental trajectory in which ideas are viewed as universal within and across domains. In contrast, the resources approach emphasizes the relationship between the believer and the resources, emphasizing that a cognizer may call upon different resources at different job stages (Hammer & Elby, 2003).

Many education systems today are built around assessment regimes that aim to validate students' knowledge and abilities through formal assessments, which are frequently exam-based. Proponents contend that such tests are the most equitable means of evaluating knowledge and skill in safe, dependable settings. Although pedagogy, curriculum, and assessment are inextricably linked (Harlen, 2007), many testing regimes referred to as high stakes are condemned. For instance, there are numerous issues with standardized tests, such as the English National Curriculum Assessments, American Standardized Assessment Tests, and the Programme for International Student Assessment. The exams are heavily criticized (e.g., Davis, 1999; Gardner, 2011; Hopmann et al., 2007) for failing to adequately represent two primary validity criteria: the first is that they do not adequately represent the kinds of problems people are likely to encounter in their daily lives (external validity); the second is that they do not adequately represent an adequate conceptualization of

what knowledge is (internal validity). The latter asserts that although tests undoubtedly measure something, mastery is not always shown by a high grade (Davis, 1999). A significant corpus of research (Davis, 1999; Gardner, 2011; Hopmann et al., 2007) highlights these fundamental challenges, and one of the goals in authoring this work is to elucidate the consequences of these issues for the learning analytics community.

The teacher can sometimes do a, b, c, or d. Together, these unanswered questions comprise the epistemic ethos that requires teachers to decide when to emphasize perception, conception, practical application, or the student's existential becoming someone. These queries are domain-specific for Broudy but lesson-specific for Greene. Not only can the lessons in one subject vary to focus on perception, conception, practical use, or existential comprehension, but these variations can occur within a lesson to help promote truth as disclosing something in the world. It all depends on the specific teacher in the specific classroom with the specific students, i.e., the exigencies of the immediate situation. To accurately interrelate these aspects requires lesson-specific research, but epistemic flexibility may very well fulfill the goals of multicultural education and critical thinking.

Säljö asserts an epistemological claim, more precisely a socio-cultural, pragmatic one: language and discourse are crucial filters on our understanding of the outside world, and significant literacies and practices must be mastered in learning. These claims should be evaluated in and of themselves. An epistemology like this has ramifications for what we evaluate, how we teach, and which analytics methods we can use. "Success" is no longer limited to memorizing the correct answers in a two-hour exam without assistance (Säljö, 2012, pp.5-19). We contend that such an epistemology also explains why information processing and searching via the Internet and search engines is a significant challenge for students, even in technologically advanced societies like Denmark that evaluate knowledge in less abstracted, socially embedded ways (UAGU, 2010, pp.15). Though information is more widely accessible because of the Internet, information is not the same as knowledge. When it comes to learning, students should consider propositional or fact-based knowledge and what is sometimes referred to as transferable competencies or skills, such as higher-order talents like metacognitive abilities. In this situation, information management and searching promote interaction with a complicated information network and a means to a goal.

2. Discussion

Teaching Philosophy in Contemporary Curriculum

Ricard Rorty and Willard Quine are the two most influential figures of new pragmatism. Regarding its conception of science, they both challenged Dewey's pragmatism. However, whereas Rorty completely undermined Dewey's reliance on the scientific method, Quine provided early pragmatism with a refined conception of science. According to Rorty, the primary flaw of early pragmatism was its dependence on the scientific method. In his article "Pragmatism Without Method," Rorty (1991) argued that pragmatism would be more encouraging if it abandoned its methodological obsession. Instead of a rigorous scientific method, Rorty suggested that communication and looking for better conversation methods are needed in philosophy and education. Rorty, influenced by Hans Gadamer's concept of *Bildung* (self-formation), sought a desirable conception of education. Referring to his preferred concept as "edification," he stated, "Since 'education' sounds a bit too flat, and *Bildung* a bit too foreign, I shall use 'edification' to stand for this project of finding new, better, more interesting, and more fruitful ways of speaking" (Rorty, 1979, p. 360). Rorty saw a novel method to describe the missing element in education and gave instruction two dimensions. One dimension is the hermeneutical activity of edifying others and their cultures. In this activity, the ability to make the unfamiliar familiar is required. In other words, an educated individual should be able to comprehend unfamiliar cultures rather than being closed-minded about their own cultural beliefs.

The second component of edification is self-edification. Rorty referred to this aspect as poetic activity, defined as the capacity to render the familiar strange. In other words, a person with a university education should be able to query and critique the fundamentals of one's cultural concepts more deeply. At this level of education, the desirable individual is known as the "liberal ironist."



Rorty (1989) criticized Dewey's excessive emphasis on teaching and mastering problem-solving in pre-university education. According to Rorty, however, learning cultural content is essential to term this period's enculturation during this education period. Rorty sides with E. D. Hirsch in his dispute with Dewey over supporting content versus method. In a conversation with Olson, in response to the query, "Do you share E. D. Hirsch's desire for increased 'cultural literacy,' a shared vocabulary and body of knowledge?" Olson responded, "Yes, I do." Rorty replied, "Yes, I believe he is correct. The current system has the effect of preserving education for children from relatively well-educated, middle-class families who acquire the common knowledge of society as a whole" (Olson, 1989, p. 7). Quine's (1981) iteration of the new pragmatism focuses on the neglect of an all-encompassing holism. According to Quine, neither Dewey nor the other architects of early pragmatism (i.e., Charles Peirce and William James) considered the holistic nature of knowledge to be significant. Following his rejection of the foundational theory of epistemology, Quine believed that strong coherence tended to exist in our knowledge and thus discussed the theory of evidence coherence. According to this view, the scientific method is not supreme; instead, there is a strong interaction between theory and experimental evidence so that they compromise to maintain the coherence of knowledge.

Walker and Evers (1982) argued that any form of compartmentalization of knowledge, such as Paul Hirst's (1974) forms of knowledge, is unacceptable, thus rejecting the distinction between disciplines and searching for a pluralistic methodology for various disciplines. Instead, in Quine's (1966, p. 56) words, knowledge should be taken to be a "single sprawling system, loosely connected in some portions but no disconnected nowhere." It necessitates an intensive problem-based education in which the distinction between subjects is deemed artificial. Instead of having significant epistemological gaps between disciplines, dividing subjects based on their utility is only permissible. Separating books in libraries for easier retrieval exemplifies such a practical application. Therefore, subject-matter curriculum design is permitted if it serves a practical purpose.

Regarding Rorty's new pragmatism, his proposed dichotomies appear unjustifiable. Rorty favored solidarity over the objectivity of science, undermining the latter in favor of the former. The query is why he believed that these two poles were incompatible. Moreover, he established a distinct connection between pre-university enculturation and the development of university education. The query here is how can a university student suddenly become a stern critic or liberal ironist without a background in critique during their pre-university education. It has addressed these questions elsewhere and demonstrated that they point to flaws in Rorty's position (Bagheri Noaparast, 2014).

Pragmatists believe that reality constantly shifts and depends on what we observe and experience. John Dewey, for instance, asserted, 'experience is not a mental state within us; rather, we are within experience.' Because experience is not an internal mental state but rather an external one, Dewey believes that learners or pupils must adapt to one another and their environment in education. Therefore, schools must emphasize social experiences in their curriculum. Place, time, and environment are crucial for all learning. Diverse racial and cultural communities learn to collaborate and contribute to a democratic society. The end aim is to establish a new social order. Schools are, therefore, not only academic institutions but also social institutions that prepare students for life in society and democracy. As a microcosm of society, schools provide opportunities for teachers and students to actively engage in learning, experimenting with new methods of thinking, acting, problem-solving, and constructing social consensus.

Pragmatists base educational theory and practice on two fundamental principles: First, education must serve a social purpose, and second, education prepares students for real-world experiences. This real-world experience is also contingent upon Thought and Action. According to pragmatism, action is prioritized over contemplation. Action is subordinate to thought. Reason is merely a tool for determining the appropriate meaning of an action. For this reason, pragmatism is also known as instrumentalism, and on this foundation, pragmatism employs experimental scientific methods in its teaching methodology.

Regarding the teacher's duty, pragmatism holds that the ideal teacher can assist students in growing by giving them the knowledge, abilities, and moral fiber to make wise decisions in life. Teachers are not restricted to using textbooks or conventional scientific buildings, for instance (Thahir, 2022, pp. 141). Teachers can

provide subjects that pique students' attention and are relevant to their everyday experiences. Beyond that, the instructor serves as a guide and a point of reference for pupils, assisting them in learning using various techniques and active learning methodologies. The instructor creates a supportive learning atmosphere, promotes student communication and teamwork, plans the learning process, and helps students use their knowledge to solve challenges.

The ideas that shape society and give educational philosophy its significance are called philosophy. It makes clear to society the goals that people have for their education. Education is any action or encounter that shapes a person's character, intellect, or physical prowess. It is also how society consciously uses institutions to pass along its acquired information, abilities, and values from one generation to the next. The word curriculum comes from the Latin word *race-course*, which describes the series of events and actions leading to a child's development into adulthood. All of the chosen social activities that are included in the educational process make up the curriculum. A learner must be able to produce and comprehend language used in class, solve issues, and make judgments. It is a planned learning and instruction experience.

In the words a curriculum comprises all the different actions and experiences that a youngster has as he grows into an adult in a society, whether or not they are planned. He sees education as a field of social engineering. He concluded that curricula need to have two key components. First and foremost, the curriculum needs to be designed to include the real-world experiences that students need to have to grow up to be the adults they should be. Second, curriculum designers need to understand what makes an adult society desirable. Philosophical understanding of the good in society is appropriately valued. It establishes a close relationship between philosophy and curriculum. Philosophy seeks and reveals the good to which all men should aim and direct their intentional education. Similarly, the curriculum is prescriptive in philosophy since it lays out the general rules, subjects, or courses that must be taken to meet a particular grade or standard. So, to put it simply, curriculum is normative in the same way that philosophy is. The base of the curriculum is social, psychological, historical, and philosophical as a whole. The curriculum has its own set of theories and guiding principles. For instance, 'curriculum' describes a subject with many intricate details. Educational philosophy, curricular goals, and learning objectives are some of the learning principles used in developing curricula at universities, colleges, and training facilities.

Choosing an educational philosophy is a decision that goes into curriculum preparation. Curriculum goals and objectives are derived after the philosophical tenets have been determined. These are then implemented as intended learning outcomes in the classroom. Since philosophy gives educationists, instructors, and curriculum developers a framework for organizing, carrying out, and assessing school curricula, philosophy most likely has a more significant impact on curriculum development and access. Philosophy is essential for the development of any kind of curriculum. Philosophy is the foundation for determining curriculum objectives, material, classroom delivery, and evaluation. Philosophy is a prerequisite for developing any curriculum type. Philosophical foundations inform curriculum objectives, content, classroom delivery, and evaluation procedures. With philosophy, educators could plan, organize, and carry out any goals we may have for the educational system. It is well-established that our educational selections, choices, and alternatives are greatly influenced by and determined by our philosophy. It is so because the curriculum is the entirety of the setting that the school establishes to encourage and direct the children's healthy growth and development (Shah, 2019, pp.53).

We now refer to it as philosophy across the curriculum, given the current state of pre-college philosophy, Scheffler's suggestion to teach it appears more relevant. Scheffler may have yet to anticipate that educators who research the philosophies of their numerous subjects would attempt to teach their pre-college pupils this knowledge, even though we are not witnessing a rise in requests for teachers to take that exact action. In addition to the favorable response to efforts to offer philosophy classes in secondary education, philosophy is promoted as a cross-disciplinary subject in several countries. Not only does Trevor Norris support encouraging (teacher candidates) and equipping them to promote philosophy directly in their curricular areas when they are teaching in schools, and he also argues that philosophical thinking can be infused into teacher education



by connecting philosophy with mainstream subjects or 'teachable' like geography, history, English, math, and science (Norris, 2015, p. 39).

It also aids in addressing questions about the purpose of schools, the subjects that should be taught, how students should learn, and the appropriate tools and resources to employ. The foundation and heuristic vitality for decisions on education as a whole are provided by philosophy. Philosophy provides a smooth foundation (environment) for more logical problem-solving in the face of complex challenges in educational policy. It also makes a significant contribution to the development of education in general. It exercises the boundaries, legitimization, and connection between educational theory and practice within the academic discipline of education.

The popular idea focuses on the similarities between philosophy and literacy, pointing out that philosophical inquiry and thinking are highly disciplinary and enhance one's capacity to succeed in any subject. Additionally, most educators likely possess unintentional knowledge of fundamental philosophy, just as they must have attained a minimum literacy level to be admitted to college. It is partially true, but we have maintained that we would be negligent if we ignored the parallels between philosophy, physics, and Spanish. If we object to non-specialist teachers pushing these subjects across the curriculum, then we ought to be wary of the idea of teaching philosophy across the curriculum. If we take the ethics of promoting philosophy across the curriculum seriously, other significant ethical issues arise. Nevertheless, once we find out that teachers can genuinely teach philosophy across the curriculum in a way that fulfills its educational usefulness, these problems remain speculative.

A particular metaphysical epistemology and axiological presumptions serve as the foundation for philosophy, which unites pedagogy, curriculum, learning theories, and the goal of education. This philosophy informs the formulation of educational policy. According to philosophy, higher education facilitates the soul's quest for truth. It will teach someone to respond to situations and analyze critically, which will help formulate concepts like educational policies. Elementary education is introduced and reinforced through philosophy, and it has the potential to play a significant role in educational policy. The length of time each curriculum takes is specified in educational policy, which is taken from philosophy. It is bolstered by curricula designed to accommodate students of all ages. Philosophers focus on education in diverse ways, but logically. Kant, for example, bases his argument on the distinction between education, training, and thought. He also backed learning by doing, which educational laws and regulations mandated. Instead of merely listening to their lecturers, students learn more when active and involved.

Philosophy is, therefore, the starting point for all future curriculum decisions and the first thing to consider when making any curriculum decision. Philosophy becomes a standard by which to judge the goals, selection of curriculum, organization, and execution of instruction in the classroom, according to this point of view. Answers to general questions like what is the point of education and what subjects are worthwhile can be found in philosophy. Teachers, particularly those in charge of developing curricula, might better organize classrooms and schools by using the framework provided by philosophy. It provides a framework, for instance, within which they can determine the goals of education, the content and structure of the curriculum, the mode of instruction and learning, and, in general, the experiences and activities they wish to prioritize in the classroom. Curriculum specialists must understand that they are constantly faced with making decisions about curricula and that philosophy plays a significant role in the decision-making process. The curriculum ought to represent the beliefs of the community and school. Given the interconnectedness of curriculum, teaching, and learning with school operations, these areas should embody the school's and the community's philosophies. It is how philosophy maintains its role as the cornerstone of curriculum development. From an essentialist standpoint, this will project both the spiritual and physical components of the human being to create a creative techno-nature endowed with both cognitive and emotive goodness, resulting in the dual nature of man.

Epistemological Problem

The problem with traditional epistemologies is that their authors reify perception and cognition or aspects thereof, such as sense data, hypotheses, quantitative data, clear and straightforward ideas, primitive axioms, basic concepts, signs, paradigms, falsifiable sentences, etc., as well as so-called processes such as induction, deduction, abduction, experimentation, quantification, etc. These reifications and their parallels in critical thinking recipes must be bracketed, removed from consideration, if one is to grasp and describe phenomenologically the swift stream of consciousness as simultaneously perceptually and conceptually conscious of things in the world, at least when one is wide-awake and possesses a holistic consciousness of things in the world that is neither alienated from the world nor its perceptual or conceptual modes of being. Moral consciousness demonstrates an engagement with meaning and positive change in one's social environment and is characterized by ever-expanding circles of agency in the service of humanity.

Freire characterized this moral consciousness as critical consciousness: whether or not men can perceive epochal themes and, more importantly, how they respond to the reality in which these themes are generated will largely determine whether they are humanized or dehumanized, affirmed as subjects or reduced to objects. If men cannot critically discern the themes of their time and intervene actively in reality, they will be carried along by change (Freire, 1973, pp.13). Critical consciousness refers to the capacity to perceive social and political oppression and act against such inequalities, constituting a state of critical transitivity in which subjects recognize and act upon their capacity to effect change. The focus of education for Freire is bringing about a new social order by changing the structures of society and liberating the individual from a false consciousness that is oblivious to the structural and historical forces that have domesticated her/him. The instructor is a facilitator who guides and asks questions rather than providing answers and instructions to the student. Freire described the actual function of education as radical conscientization and advocated for a problem-posing approach to education as opposed to the more traditional banking form of education, which involves stripping phenomena of their spatial and temporal context, thereby preventing the oppressed from gaining a more accurate understanding of the larger context of contingency to which the phenomenon in question relates (Freire, 1970).

There are numerous reasons why the distinction between critical consciousness and critical reasoning is essential. The distinction could be made between what is useful and what is valuable. The value is moral or ethical, and Freirean Pedagogy is undeniably an ethically valuable method. However, models of critical thinking are also beneficial, and nowhere is this more evident than in academia. Critical thinking and critical pedagogy share some common concerns on a generalized level. They both envision a general population deficient in the abilities or dispositions that would enable them to recognize certain types of inaccuracies, distortions, and falsehoods. Critical thinking and critical pedagogy are occasionally indistinguishable, but the delicate distinction between the two is crucial to teaching writing. Critical thinking is highly compatible with what we refer to as academic discourse.

Like critical thinking, academic discourse concentrates on argumentation, supporting assertions, and evaluating evidence. Critical thinking and academic discourse share a history associated with traditional rhetoric in many ways. Education has long emphasized the concept of critical thinking. "...It is woven throughout the Western educational tradition, from the Greeks to the Scholastics to the present." Once, the art of rhetoric was exclusively associated with principles of logic and how to evaluate argumentative evidence and data. It resembles a description of contemporary academic discourse, in which thesis, organization, and evidence are essential components of academic papers. "The primary objective of critical thinking is to replace sloppy or distorted thinking with reasoning based on trustworthy inquiry procedures." Therefore, academic discourse is predicated on critical thinking or rhetorical maxims of logic, reason, and rationality. "What the critical thinking movement has emphasized is the notion that specific reasoning skills underpin the entire curriculum; that the purpose of education is to foster critical thinking; and that the skills and dispositions of critical thinking can and should permeate teaching and learning at all levels" (Burbules & Berk, 1999, pp. 46-48)). Critical thinking is essential to the teaching of writing, and academic writing in particular because the goal is to teach students to communicate clearly and persuasively so that their voices and ideas are heard.



Critical thinking enables students to assess the validity of their assertions by analyzing the reasons and evidence they provide.

Furthermore, the stream of consciousness should not be reified as a thing that exists apart from the embodiment-independent disclosure of things in the world of which an existing person is aware. The teacher should be perceptually and conceptually aware of the objects and phenomena in the region of the world to which he or she is introducing students through domain-specific relevant and appropriate inquiry aspects. The teacher should, therefore, use inquiry, expository, didactic, dialogical, collaborative, and other pedagogies interchangeably, perhaps switching between them within a lesson, as Greene suggests, in order to utilize those overemphasized aspects of traditional epistemologies that nevertheless disclose some partial truths of the epistemic ethos to open-minded critical theorists. This epistemic flexibility necessitates an ongoing dialogue with students so that the instructor can assist them in exploring their world, not the instructor's world, but the world as the students perceive it. Then, the truth disclosed by the teacher will open the world to the students as they open to it in a genuine co-disclosure that occurs when the teacher and students have their being in the same thing or phenomenon in the world (Heidegger, 1962, pp. 145-334).

Even though critical pedagogy is frequently portrayed as equally capable of cultivating critical thinking, it is essential to note that critical thinking and Freirean "critical consciousness" are notably distinct in many ways. Critical consciousness refers to an awareness of the social aspect of one's existence, whereas critical thinking focuses on the logic and reason of assertions. In the language of critical pedagogy, a critical person is empowered to seek justice and emancipation. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Paulo Freire describes his approach as follows: "In order for the oppressed to wage the struggle for their liberation, they must perceive the reality of oppression not as a closed world from which there is no escape, but as a limiting situation that they can transform." The power of critical pedagogy lies in its hope for social transformation, which occurs when the subjugated are empowered through education to see themselves as agents in the world. Freire's objective is to teach literacy to the "dispossessed" peasantry of Brazil and Chile in order for them to gain power and liberate themselves from their oppressors.

One of the most challenging aspects of this pedagogical approach is its application in universities, where most students are privileged, Caucasian, middle-class, and upper-class. Freire cautions against the application or use of critical pedagogy by those not oppressed: "...the oppressors cannot develop or practice the pedagogy of the oppressed." It would be a contradiction in terms if oppressors not only advocated for but also implemented liberating education" (Burbules & Berk, 1999, pp. 36-50). Whether or not the American academy is oppressive, the application of critical pedagogy has begun to gain traction. In many instances, it has successfully lent a voice to the oppressed. Critical pedagogy may be the key to helping minorities establish a community within the larger academic discourse community, giving them a voice, and altering the oppressive socio-political climate, given the gradual increase of minority students in the university system. If we view education as a liberatory function, the problem of assimilation also arises, as it seems counterintuitive to argue for liberation while simultaneously promoting assimilation into the university. However, this is precisely the case in universities across the country.

The complexity of epistemic cognition suggests a particular perspective on how these beliefs should be comprehended. No method "mirrors" reality with an accurate, unchangeable, and unquestionable understanding of a student's epistemic cognition. It is a dual concern. First, it is a methodological issue with our ability 'to get at' and access the outside world. Second, it is a philosophical and psychological question about whether epistemic cognition is inherently stable throughout development and domains or if external factors like resources or beliefs influence it. The literature on epistemic beliefs addresses these two issues. First, multidimensional perspectives (Hofer, 2001; Schumer, 1990) suggest that epistemic beliefs can be divided into dimensions, within which levels of sophistication can be identified.

In contrast, cognitive developmental models (King & Kitchener, 2004; Kuhn & Weinstock, 2002) suggest that individuals progress through increasingly sophisticated epistemic beliefs (Greene et al., 2010, p. 248). However, Both of these presuppose a static, unidirectional developmental trajectory in which ideas are viewed as universal within and across domains. In contrast, the resources approach emphasizes the relationship

between the believer and the resources, emphasizing that a cognizer may call upon different resources at different job stages (Hammer & Elby, 2003). This description of truth differs slightly from the notion that factual statements or propositions are true when they correspond to some aspect of something in the world because students can learn factual information verbally without seeing what is being referred to if the concepts are void. However, they are only in the truth if the factual information reveals something about the world. According to Martin Heidegger, truth is not a characteristic of correct propositions asserted of an "object" by a human "subject" and then valid somewhere, in what sphere we do not know; instead, truth is a disclosure of things through which an essential openness unfolds.

In other words, propositional knowledge is improper because it corresponds to objects or phenomena in the world as if truth were an inherent quality of linguistic statements. It simply reifies sentences into true propositions if and only if they disclose things or phenomena in the world to a person who allows them to disclose themselves by allowing them to open up in one's lived world, i.e., by allowing them to be. As Greene suggests, these disclosures require the teacher to sometimes function as an empiricist, rationalist, pragmatist, or consciousness raiser so that propositional and conceptual learning enables the world to open itself up to the students as the students open themselves up to them. It does not diminish propositional knowledge but grounds it ontologically in the being of the students and the being of the thing or phenomenon depicted. It merely brings propositions back to life; for instance, 'water freezes at 32 degrees' and 'water freezes at 0 degrees' are both true not because they correspond to reality but when and only when they reveal some possibilities in the world to someone. Either can be used to alter the thermostat of a refrigerator.

Therefore, truth in teaching necessitates that the teacher be neutral regarding the controversies regarding various epistemologies, as Greene recommends. It includes maintaining a neutral stance toward any model of critical thinking that isolates thinking from a domain and a domain-specific epistemic ethos, as truth in teaching requires a flexible, domain-specific epistemic ethos in the classroom. It simultaneously opens one to the world and the world to one. It facilitates the coming into existence of the universe and the students. Good knowledge, the truth, enables one's existence in the world just as it enables the world's existence (Soreghan, 2005); and the truth also allows being to be beautiful and beneficial.

CONCLUSION

Philosophical issues may only be gradually understood, differing from philosopher to philosopher and from one era to the next. As a result, there is no problem domain created by teaching concepts, definitions, and general inquiries in fragments. The information that philosophy lecturers impart should be as systematic as feasible. Consequently, providing a problem presentation of information in a short course on such a vast field as philosophy is not feasible. The constant tension of problem-solving and the uninterrupted flow of information between lectures and discussions are essential because during discussions, the creative approach to solving the aroused conflict of cognition is directed, and the student is motivated to learn and grow. Talks should be conducted in an environment where people feel free to say anything they want and are not pressured to respond immediately. Being a self-regulating system, the student learns from his mistakes on his own. Knowledge is the foundation of the problem-teaching approach as a whole. Philosophy is the source of educational policy, which specifies how long each curriculum should take. It is bolstered by curricula designed to accommodate students of all ages. Philosophers focus on education in diverse ways, but logically. A curriculum's preparation process involves choosing an educational philosophy. Curriculum goals and objectives are created when the philosophical tenets are established and utilized in the classroom as predetermined learning objectives. Philosophy likely has a more significant impact on curriculum development and accessibility than other academic fields since it offers a framework for developing, implementing, and assessing school curricula.



REFERENCES

- Bagheri Noaparast, K. (2014). Richard Rorty's conception of philosophy of education revisited. *Educational Theory*, 64(1), 75–98. <https://philpapers.org/rec/NOARRC>.
- Baghrei Noaparast, K. (2016). On William Frankena's model for analyzing philosophies of education. In M. Peters (ed.), *Springer Edition of EEPAT*. Springer Publications.
- Brameld, T. (1969). *Education for the Emerging Age*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Broudy, H. S. (1961). *Building a Philosophy of Education*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Buber, M. (1965). Education, and, The Education of Character, trans. R. G. Smith, in *Between Man and Man*. New York: Macmillan.
- Burbules, Nicholas C. and Berk, Rupert. (1999). Critical Thinking and Critical Pedagogy: Relations, Differences, and Limits. in *Critical Theories in Education: Changing Terrains of Knowledge and Politics*. eds. Thomas S. Popkewitz and Lynn Fendler. New York: Routledge.
- Carson, B. (2003). *Your Mind Can Map your Destiny*. Columbus, GA: Ledger-Enquirer.
- Chan, Steven M. (1997). *Classic and Contemporary Reading in the Philosophy of Education*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Chronister, K.M., & McWhirter E.H. (2006). An experimental examination of two career interventions for battered women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 53(2), 151–164. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2006-04241-001>.
- Davis, A. (1999). *The Limits of Educational Assessment*. Hoboken. New Jersey: Wiley Blackwell.
- Davis, A. (2005). Learning and the social nature of mental powers. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 37(5), 635–647. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2005.00148.x>
- Davis, A. (2006). High stakes testing and the structure of the mind: A reply to Randall Curren. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 40(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14679752.2006.00492.x>
- Davis, A., & Williams, K. (2002). Epistemology and curriculum. In N. Blake, P. Smeyers, & R. Smith (Eds.), *The Blackwell guide to the philosophy of education*. Blackwell Reference Online.
- De Brun, Christa. (2019). Teaching Critical Thinking and Critical Consciousness through Literature in Third Level Education. *AISHE-J*, 11(3). <https://ojs.aishe.org/index.php/aishe-j/article/download/393/691/1961>.
- Ekanem, Samuel Aloysius. (2021). Philosophy of Education: A Brief Analysis from Modernist and Post-Modernist Perspective. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosiologi Dialektika Kontemporer*, 9(2). <https://ojs.unm.ac.id/elektikakontemporer/article/download/31717/14583>.
- Encyclopedia.com. "Philosophy of Education, Epistemological Issues in." *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://www.encyclopedia.com/humanities/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/philosophy-education-epistemological-issues>.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and other Writings* (ed.) C. Gordon. New York: Pantheon.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, trans. M. B. Ramos. New York: Herder & Herder.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Education for Critical Consciousness*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (2005). The Banking Concept of Education. in D. Bartholomae & A. Petrosky (eds)., *Ways of Reading: An Anthology for Writers*. Boston: Bedford.
- Freire, P., & Shor, I. (1987). *A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming Education*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

- Fry, H., S. Ketteridge & S. Marshall [eds]. (2009). *A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice*. New York and London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, third edition. http://biblioteca.ucv.cl/site/colecciones/manuales_u.
- Gardner, J. (2011). *Assessment and Learning* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE.
- Gerrig, R. (1993). *Experiencing Narrative Worlds: On the Psychological Activities of Reading*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gould, D. (1990). Empathy: a review of the literature with suggestions for an alternative research strategy. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 15, 1167–1174.
- Greene, M. (1973). *Teacher as Stranger: Educational Philosophy for the Modern Age*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the Imagination: Essay; on Education, the Arts, and Social Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Greene, M. (1997). *Curriculum and consciousness. The Curriculum Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Gur-Ze'ev, I. (2005). Adorno and Horkheimer: Diasporic Philosophy, Negative Theology, and Counter-education. *Educational Theory*, 55, 343-365.
- Hagvall Sveinsson, O., Adawi, T. & Johansson, A. (2022). Authenticity work in higher education learning environments: a double-edged sword? *High Educ*, 84, 67–84. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-021-00753-0>.
- Hammer, D., & Elby, A. (2003). Tapping epistemological resources for learning physics. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 12(1), 53–90. https://www.doi.org/10.1207/S15327809JLS1201_3.
- Harlen, W. (2007). *Assessment of Learning*. London: SAGE.
- Heidegger, M. (1977). On the Essence of Truth, trans. J. Sullis, in *Martin Heidegger: Basic Writings* (ed.) D. F. Krell. New York: Harper & Row.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and Time*, trans. J. Macquarrie & E. Robertson. New York: Harper & Row.
- King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (2004). Reflective judgment: Theory and research on the development of epistemic assumptions through adulthood. *Educational Psychologist*, 39(1), 5–18. https://www.doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3901_2.
- Kuhn, D., & Weinstock, M. (2002). What is epistemological thinking and why does it matter? In B. K.
- Knight, S., Shum, Simon B., & Littleton, K. (2014). Epistemology, Assessment, Pedagogy: Where Learning Meets Analytics in the Middle Space. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 1(2), 23-47. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1127031.pdf>
- Lyotard, J.F. (1990). *Heidegger and the Jews*, trans. A. Michel & M.S. Roberts. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *The Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. C. Smith, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964). *The Primacy of Perception*, (ed.) J. Edie. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Morowitz, H., Hazen, R., & Trefil, J. (2005). Intelligent Design Has No Place in the Science Curriculum, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (September 2). https://hazen.carnegiescience.edu/sites/hazen.gl.ciw.edu/files/Intelligent%20Design%20Has%20No%20Place%20in%20the%20Science%20Curriculum%20%281%29_0.pdf
- Mullaly, B. (2002). *Challenging oppression: A critical social work approach*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Norris, Trevor. (2015). Philosophical Questions about Teaching Philosophy: What's at Stake in High School Philosophy Education? *Philosophical Inquiry in Education*, 23(1), 62-72. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1140308.pdf>.



- Ogwo, E.T., Kuria, G.K., Nyamwaka, E.O., & Nyakan, B.A. (2013). *Philosophy as a Key Instrument in Establishing Curriculum, Educational Policy, Objectives, Goals of Education, Vision and Mission of Education*. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4, 95-101. <http://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/viewFile/6452/6457>.
- Olson, G. A. (1989). Social construction and compositional theory: A conversation with Richard Rorty. *Journal of Advanced Composition*, 9(1/2), 1-9.
- Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2015). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles and issues*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Quine, W. V. O. (1981). *Theories and things*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Rorty, R. (1989). Education without dogmas: Truth, freedom, and our universities. *Dissent* (Spring Issue), 198-204.
- Rorty, R. (1991). Pragmatism without method. in *Objectivity, Relativism, and Truth vol. 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Säljö, R. (1999). Learning as the use of tools: A sociocultural perspective on the human technology link. in K. Littleton & P. Light (Eds.), *Learning with computers: Analysing productive interaction*. Oxford, UK: Psychology Press.
- Säljö, R. (2012). Literacy, digital literacy and epistemic practices: The co-evolution of hybrid minds and external memory systems. *Nordic Journal of Digital Literacy*, 1, 5-19. <https://www.idunn.no/doi/10.18261/ISSN1891-943X-2012-01-02>.
- Shah, Rajendra K. (2019). Philosophical Foundation for Curriculum Development in Nepal. *International Educational Scientific Research Journal*, 5 (3), 53-66. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/357422954_Philosophical_Foundation_for_Curriculum_Development_in_Nepal.
- Soreghan, G.S. (2005). Lessons From Earth's Deep Time, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51 (45), <https://www.chronicle.com/article/lessons-from-earths-deep-time/>.
- Thahir, L. S. (2022). The Philosophy of Contemporary Education and Its Implications for The Development of Islamic Education. *Paedagogia: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 11(1), 130-146. <https://doi.org/10.24239/pdg.Vol11.Iss1.274>.
- UAGU. (2010). Undervisningsministerie (Ministry of Education), & Afdelingen for Gymnasiale Uddannelser (Department of Secondary Education). Endelig rapport fra følgegruppen for forsøget med digitale prøver med adgang til internettet i udvalgte fag på stx og hhx (Final report of the Monitoring Group experiment with digital samples with access to Internet in selected subjects at stx and HHX). Undervisningsministerie (Ministry of Education). http://www.uvm.dk/~media/Files/Udd/Gym/PDF10/101007_it_rapport_13%20september%202010.ashx
- Vandenberg, D. (1990). *Education as a Human Right: A Theory of Curriculum and Pedagogy*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Vandenberg, D. (1997). Phenomenological Research in the Study of Education, in D. Vandenberg (ed.) *Phenomenology and Educational Discourse*. Johannesburg: Heinemann.
- Vandenberg, D. (1998). Education in Existential Perspective: The Dialectic of Education for Democracy, in P. Higgs (ed.), *Metatheories in Educational Theory and Practice*. Johannesburg: Heinemann.
- Vandenberg, D. (2003). Phenomenology and Fundamental Educational Theory, in A. T. Tymieniecka (ed.), *Phenomenology World Wide*. Lancaster, UK: Kluwer.
- Waite, S. R. (2021). Towards a Theory of Critical Consciousness: A New Direction for the Development of Instructional and Supervisory Leaders. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 4 (2). <https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.4.2.4>.
- Walker, J., & Evers, C. (1982). Epistemology and justifying the curriculum of educational studies. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 30(2), 213-229. <https://philpapers.org/rec/WALEAJ-2>.

Wilt, J.A., Thomas, S., & McAdams, D. P. (2019). Authenticity and inauthenticity in narrative identity. *Heliyon*, 5(7), e02178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e02178>.

Windsor L., Jemal A., & Benoit E. (2014). Community Wise: Paving the way for empowerment in community reentry. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 37(5), 501–11. <https://www.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2014.02.023>.NIHMS576112.