CONCEPT AND POLICY OF EDUCATIONAL MODERNIZATION

Stanislav Ivashevsky, Nizhniy Novgorod Academy of the Ministry of the Interior of Russia
Zhanna Nikonova, Linguistics University of Nizhny Novgorod
Irina Savchenko, University of Nizhny Novgorod
Anna Gorokhova, Linguistics University of Nizhny Novgorod
Nikita Martyushev, Tomsk Polytechnic University

ABSTRACT

The article is aimed at substantiating and concretizing the theoretical and methodological aspects of modern educational policy development. The work is a comprehensive study of the evolution of educational culture in the context of shifting its value orientations as well as political and legal regulations. The paper studies the dialectical relationship of educational values and political and legal attitudes in the system of the education management general theory, analyzes and objectivizes the principles for ensuring the education system modernization.

The article positions the values of educational culture as the determining nucleus of the educational policy development. The authors overcome the underestimation of methodological problems in education sciences, and, on this basis, conduct an axiological analysis of the modern education system, the laws of its construction and development. The article reveals the dialectic relationship of educational policy and the evolution of social values, which shapes a new approach to the study of educational problems, the modernization ideology of education.

The study touches upon the current contradictions between the need for the harmonious development of public education, the ways of its formation and the degree to which this need is met by political decisions. It also contributes to understanding what methods can help build up a political and legal education system, that justifies the needs and requirements of a modern person and society as a whole.

Keywords: Education, Politics, Political Ideology, Educational Culture, Values, Ideals, Educational Ideology, Educational Psychology

INTRODUCTION

Today the problems of forming a society-consolidating political ideology and reforming education systems apparently stand among the most acute, important and debatable ones worldwide. Bringing them together in the present research, we aim to justify the deep interconnection between the ideological unity of society and the state of its educational environment. The development of the educational system and the education of society contribute to its unification, success and achievements in various spheres of life, which, in turn, is fertile ground for the development and public recognition of an effective state ideology foundation. The presence of an ideological consensus sets clear priorities for the public education system, makes it more sustainable and productive, increasing the prestige of national education inside and outside the country. Achieving such a result is possible with a balanced attitude towards the desire to deideologize the sphere of education, and, taking into account the peculiarities of national development, the formulation and creation of a distinct ideological basis for the development of the state.

The doctrine of the "end of ideologies" in political science appeared in the middle of the 20th century in the context of the unfolding scientific and technological revolution, which opened up new opportunities for society. Supporters of the concept of 'deideologization', contrasting science and ideology, tried to prove that science possesses objectively true knowledge, while ideologies express subjective, social-class interests. They claimed that political ideologies lost any ideological consistency by the middle of the 20th century, whereas modern industrial society is capable of dealing with its difficulties outside ideological dogmas. Of course, this position has developed in the direction of recognizing a new status attached to ideologies and their role in the system of public relations (Apple & Beane, 2007). However, the idea of the possibility of deideologizing social life has remained and is updated in the difficult moments of history that are crucial for countries and nations.

In the 70-80s of the 20th century, the question of the relationship between science and ideology was resolved as follows, based on the concept of 'reideologization': the scientific criterion of truth and objectivity is unacceptable for an ideology, its significance for society is assessed in relation to the degree at which the ideas affect society members. On this basis, a brand-new, constructive view on ideology is being developed. According to the latter an ideology is an objectively necessary phenomenon, containing values orienting and guiding the development of the domestic and foreign policy. At the same time, the nature of social dynamics is made dependent on non-political forms of social life, acting as new ideologies (Laursen, 2006).

Habermas proposed to distinguish between two forms of ideology – political ideology typifying past eras, and modern 'ideology', that arose in an industrial society – technocratic consciousness. The latter is free from certain constituents of the 'false consciousness' inherent in the preceding form (Habermas, 2006). G. Marcuse also shared the idea of science and technology as the latest projections of ideology. He interpreted the very concept of 'technical intelligence' as a possible new ideology. Technology has become an element of 'repressive management' and public control, and has, thus, gained a political and ideological dimension. According to G. Marcuse, industrial culture is more ideological than the sum total of its former incarnations, as modern ideology has been introduced into industry, *i.e.,* has become the very essence of such a society (Marcuse, 2002).

The revision of the traditional attitude towards understanding the core and significance of ideology reveals a special role of education in the approval and evolution of ideological construction systems. M. Weber characterized this role from a critical point of view. He considered irresponsible the widespread teachers' practice of using their proficiency and scientific experience not in order to benefit students, but in order to instill their personal political views in them (Weber, 2013).

The French scientist Althusser showed that the 'official' ideology inevitably becomes dominant thanks to the education system, which, according to him, has assumed the role of the church as the main institution that preserves the unshakable ideology of class society, and therefore society itself. "The professors of philosophy," he wrote, "are teachers, that is, intellectuals working within the framework of this educational system, subordinate to this system and, for the most part, fulfilling the social function of crushing students with the values of the dominant ideology" (Althusser, 2001). Such relevantly disputable statements have, nevertheless, paved the road to understanding the significance of studying the process of interaction between state ideology and education. Moreover, new living conditions make it possible to consider education not only as a system that transmits the dominant political ideology, but also as the one that shapes it.

Political pluralism, popular today, prohibits the existence of an obligatory unified state ideology, but, simultaneously, retains the opportunity for ideological creativity and healthy political competition. The problem is that modern society, having faced a variety of tested Western models, was not ready for creativity in this area (Gutek, 2013), and, hence, political

competition was determined not so much by an ideological factor, but by other factors – financial or administrative.

It should be recognized that ideological creativity and competition are very much in demand today worldwide. The political realities of the 21st century have demonstrated that modern society cannot step forward, relying on the political and ideological ideas of the past era. The ideas of the political ideology of the West in all its forms (neoliberalism, neoconservatism, social democracy) have run out of their historical capabilities, by the end of the 20th century (Toffler, 2008). Thus, society today faces the historical prospect of creating a new ideology, which, in our opinion, should be based on humanistic values. It should be a synthesis of the best and time-tested practices that contain classical political ideologies, a synthesis based on what is generally understood as the most promising value system.

We are convinced that such a system of values has already shaped within the framework of educational culture as a keeper and producer of the best examples of spiritual creativity, but is not yet sufficiently perceived as such, and is clearly deprived of the opportunity to influence real politics. It is more common for us to talk about the opposite processes, characterized by the concept of 'education ideologization'. This phenomenon, posing as an established practice of relations between political ideology and education, should be critically analyzed. It will serve as the basis for substantiating a new model of the 'ideology – education' interaction. Thus, the public consciousness will cease to look upon the process of ideologization as 'hostile' to the interests of ordinary people. And the latter will move to a qualitatively new level associated with massive awareness of education value, a qualitative change in society education, the status and role of an educated person in the management system and all social relations.

Problem Statement

The variety of changes taking place in modern society, determines the fundamental importance of methodological and theoretical studies of various spheres of public life. In the field of education, reforms have become so significant and contradictory that both science and practice have been unable to promptly and adequately respond to these challenges (Kaplan, 2015; Lundie, 2015; Turkle, 2011). The most significant function of the philosophy of education is connected with the substantiation of the most general guidelines for the development of all components of the education system – the goals, content, methods, tools and organized forms of students' training, education and development at different education levels. However, the most essential, initial task of such a systemic justification is undoubtedly educational values. It is completely obvious that, without deciding on this issue, it will not be possible to conduct a reasonable, consistent search for the rest of substantive-procedural and organizational-managerial components of educational policy with a proper logical sequence and continuity.

Today, there is an urgent need for 'cultivating' positive values. It is especially important to take it into account in the education system, the results of which will determine the future of humanity and each person individually (Kutyrev, 2012).

Values as a phenomenon of the ideal have energy activity and *exist* in activity. Therefore, political and legal innovations are, first and foremost, a reflection of new ideals, a new attitude to education, the meaning of education, its forms and methods.

A distinctive feature of the sociocultural processes, typical of modern society, is value reassessment and reconsideration (Amrein-Beardsley, 2014). What was perceived as an unshakable postulate not long ago, is now either completely rejected, or raises doubts about its usefulness and significance. Having lost faith in old values, a person loses objects for their projection outside. This leads to the fact that they close within themselves, and the world around them becomes alien and even hostile. Such a situation is not conducive to the development of legal relations in society and requires speedy resolution, including educational means (Robertson, 2005).

The actual lack of continuity in the strategy and policy of education development is due to indifference to the solution of deep philosophical and educational problems, inattention to the analysis of the connection of times – past, present and future – in such a crucial, vital sphere of modern society. The evolution of these ideas seems to be an important link in education modernization.

Research Questions

The concept of 'ideologization' in relation to education is often perceived negatively. It is majorly avoided in official documents and scientific research. Values – accessibility, spirituality, tolerance, quality, etc. – are mostly spoken and written about (Laursen, 2006). But ideology is, above all, a system of values of a high scientific and theoretical level of justification. Recognizing cultural values as the means and purpose of education, it is necessary to perceive the ideologization of education as an objective process.

A cautious and even negative attitude to the process of ideologization of education is due, in our opinion, to historical experience acquired in previous periods of world history. Closer to us is the experience of Soviet history, when political ideology became the basis for the formation of official ideals and legal norms of education. In accordance with it, the traditional values that form the basis of the national ideal of education (science, all-roundness (harmony), spirituality, patriotism) received a slightly new interpretation. Politics determined the limits of science and the laws of harmony in the formation of personality. Spirituality was directly connected with religion and, therefore, was in disgrace, and was, in essence, replaced by communist morality and ideology. Patriotism demanded a person's complete surrender to the interests of the regime established in the country. This dominance of political ideology in the structure of Soviet education gave rise to a categorical rejection of the political as a whole and, as a consequence, a negative attitude to the influence of politics on the domestic education system.

Nevertheless, it is impossible to deny interconnection of political ideology and education. By its very nature, political ideology is extremely educational and close to educational activities. It affects the subject, inducing the latter to perform social actions in a direction, not chosen by it independently, but predetermined by special (pedagogical or ideological) means. The main points of their contact are as follows:

- Political ideology – a form of high-level public consciousness; one of the conditions of its existence is the education system and the presence of a layer of highly educated people;
- Creators of political ideology, as a rule, are representatives of the intellectual elite of society, which also indicates its connection with the education system;
- Political ideology in modern society appeals to science as the most authoritative form of knowledge. This authority is formed by education, the nature of which creates a public attitude towards science (or other forms of culture);
- Political ideology uses methods and means of education. The pedagogical arsenal, historically evolving to solve educational problems, finds direct application in the political and ideological spheres;
- Like any education system, political ideology claims to manifest the truth. Education and ideology strive for the opportunity to answer all questions, and indicate what is to be done in any situation and how;
- Man is the main goal of political ideology and education (and, as many people as possible), they strive to transform people and the world around them on the basis of established priorities – values.

It is in their value scope that political ideology and education find the basis for unity, the first one aiming at disseminating and consolidating certain worldviews, the second one striving for self-development, which requires clear guidelines and state support. Thus, education ideologization appears to be a natural and even necessary process. A purposeful systemic state policy in the field of education is non-existent outside ideology. At the same time, political priorities should not dominate educational values, but be in balance with them, rely on them and develop due to the high potential of educational culture.

To attain this, we must admit that education, which experiences the influence of political ideology, and even needs it, nevertheless retains independence in its development and is not subject to purely political interests and attitudes. Ideology exists outside of politics. It is omnipresent in all crucial social spheres – economics, education, science, etc. Ideology, constituting a level of public consciousness, in principle, as well as public consciousness, cannot belong only to politics. Of course, political ideology most effectively determines the life of society, since it has the resources of power, the force of law, coercion tools, controlled by the media and the education system. But at the same time, other ideological forms, including educational ideology, influence it as a part within a whole. Educational psychology is inextricably linked with it, which, through life experience and emotions, affects the political consciousness and the ability to express it with the help of a language (Woodhouse, 2020).

As a phenomenon of political life, ideology focuses on values that contribute to the acquisition and retention of power, implementation of managerial functions. As a phenomenon of educational culture, ideology focuses on other value orientations associated with ensuring the development of personality. Political practice has given rise to the tradition of using the education system in the interests of state ideology. Today, the role or education in society has grown tremendously, which means it can help politics to form a new ideological platform for society *via* its system of ideas and values.

Purpose of the Study

The objectives of the current study are to identify and justify the value foundations of the ideology of up-to-date education modernization, to develop the theoretical and methodological base for the formation of an effective political and legal education system as an integrated socio-cultural complex, determining the factors of building a post-industrial society.

The following cornerstone research tasks are set:

- To analyze the historical tradition connected with interaction patterns of political ideology and the education system;
- To determine the value foundations of modern education ideology;
- To trace the nature of progressive social values demanded by the course of historical development;
- To point out the specific features of the formation and development of the political and legal education system in the present-day type of modernization.

RESEARCH METHODS

The methodological and theoretical grounding for the research under consideration is rooted in the ideas of scientists developing the principles of the dialectic of social cognition (Horkheimer & Adorno, 2007). It leads to using a complex of methods: dialectic, value-normative, comparative-historical, and structural-functional, the method of system analysis.

The formation of ideas about new educational opportunities is based on a geo-spatial analysis of its specifics in the modern world (Cobb, 2020). An introduction to the problems of a philosophical-cultural approach to the study of the role of values in shaping the image of future education, related to the need for theoretical generalizations and practical implementation of modernization process management with reference to the new conditions of civilizational development of society, is based on the use of an interdisciplinary approach.

Insufficient knowledge of the characteristics defining mutual influence of political ideology and educational culture, the social consequences of the development of such interaction, the need to harmonize the nature of man and new models for the formation of people's personal qualities, corresponds to the methodological principle of a systematic approach to the problem of the current study. The principles of historicism and systematicity resorted to in the work, are complemented by structural-functional and sociocultural approaches to the study of

the phenomenon of educational space modernization in the context of modern society development.

FINDINGS

The ideological factor has always played a peculiar role in education. Ideology has been used as a targeted means of mobilizing population to ensure the interests of political power subjects, which over time has led to the destruction of its social base. Various ideologies, being contemporary political monopolists, have substantiated a complete picture of the world and its development prospects at the macro level. However, at the micro level, they have not been able to ensure the maintenance of a set featuring values and attitudes that motivate appropriate people's behavior in real life, for a long time, without political competition and attention to the dynamics of social development. As a result, they have become a formality, no longer fulfilling the function of organized social life beginning, not prompting to act in accordance with the principles proclaimed. This, in many respects, has predetermined the fate of the communist regimes. Historical experience demonstrates close relationship between political ideology and the education system activities. In this dichotomy, politics has always dominated (Ivashevsky, 2011).

The modern era is characterized by the development of political pluralism, varied values and goals at the individual and social levels. The absolutized virtue of diversity has turned out to be a serious miscalculation. The irresponsible pluralism of social values has returned the world to a state of a kind of 'paganism', where everyone has their own 'gods', and their own 'faith'. Under such circumstances, one can neither answer the question "Where are we going?", nor the question "Can we go together?"

Turning to the problem of the ideological crisis in the present work, we emphasize the vital importance of its speedy resolution. Without ideological, value, worldview unity, without mutual understanding and mutual trust between the government and people, as well as all social groups of our complex social organism, it is impossible to create the welfare society, widely dreamed, talked and written about.

In solving this problem, three consecutive interwoven questions are clearly distinguished. The first one is "What is needed?" In our opinion, it assumes the answer "a new ideology". The second question we specify is "What ideology should it be?" And the answer option we offer is "It should be an educational ideology". The next fundamental question is "Who should be responsible for it?" In this case, as ideologists, we imagine scientists, representatives of the philosophy of education.

In our opinion, the problem of the nature and purpose of education is brought to the forefront in the complex of education philosophy problems. It has a purely world outlook character, and its full solution is beyond the scope of any form of public consciousness, except philosophy. An analysis of the specifics of modern global and regional education development should be imbued with philosophical content. This is because philosophy acts as a methodological basis in the analysis of modern educational policy and, along with this, philosophy produces new areas of scientific research (Sulima, 2017). Philosophical reflection, analysis of the totality of goals, values, ideas, methods, norms that underlie the functioning and development of the theory and practice of education, allow us to see the meaning and requirements that modern society and man face.

Skeptics frequently consider resorting to philosophy, when making decisions in the field of educational policy, to be poorly productive and non-functional. Meanwhile, the development and adoption of educational strategies are impossible without philosophical reflection. It is the latter that raises us above particular problems, enabling to see what is happening in a wider sociocultural context, and aims to clarify the essential foundations of goal-setting (Gryaznova, Kozlova & Sulima, 2018).

Nonetheless, shifting all responsibility to philosophy would be unfair. There should be a common interest shared by various social structures, comprehensive support in the formation of society ideological foundations. One cannot afford being mistaken here, as the question concerns an adequate choice of priorities, our future.

In this regard, power and management functions should be divided between state institutions and society. Decentralization of power is necessary, not in the sense of weakening it, but, on the contrary, strengthening through the unification of power structures and society in joint work based on a common goal, values, and ideals. As a result, a new model of relations between ideology and education should be formed. Politics and education in it will unite in a unified system based on the values of educational culture, concentrated educational ideology (Ivashevsky, 2008).

The status of education philosophy has not been determined for a long time because of the dependence of everything related to education on politics and power. The philosophy of education could not become an independent phenomenon, being a 'consequence' of politics, could not have its own status. It was changing in accordance with political interests. By the middle of the 20th century, when the political ideologies of Western democracies lost their traditional position in the system of social relations and the theory of deideologization emerged in science, the "liberated" philosophy of education began its rapid development. In Russia, similar processes occurred later, in the 90s of the 20th century, after the collapse of the communist state ideology. But the release has turned out to be imaginary. Instead of a pre-existing, clearly defined field of activity, the philosophy of education is confronted with ambiguous ideological pluralism. Philosophy is becoming diverse. But what should education be like?

What is needed is a true "liberation" of the philosophy of education – the creation of conditions that allow the possibility of an objective scientific assessment of reality and development prospects, excluding political order and administrative pressure. There has always been a problem of mutual understanding in the relationship between the government and education (Horn, 2002). It is impossible to understand the prospects for the development of social processes without referring to the activities of educational institutions that, in turn, are initially guided by state-defined priorities (Gerrard, Albright, Clarke, Clarke, Farrell, Freebody & Sullivan, 2013). Understanding should be mutual, but the wisdom of the state today should be realized in enabling education to become the leader, the ideologist of this interaction.

However, the philosophy of education itself must reconsider its positions, go beyond its traditional interests – explaining the principles of education existence, and grasp the being of the whole society, in which education has occupied a fundamentally significant place. Education today pervades all social relations. Therefore, the philosophy of education should expand its scientific interest, recognize its new mission, and take responsibility for determining the course of society development as a whole. The modern philosophy of education should become the philosophy of modern life, and modern society.

At present, an important part of humanity sees the prospects of its existence, and overcoming all natural and social challenges in the development of science and education (Burrows, 1992). In this regard, these social institutions occupy a special place in the system of public relations. Their ideological foundations are seen as promising from the point of view of a political perspective. These are ideas that are in demand in society. People value them and they can serve as the basis for social unity. The system of educational ideals, ideas, means of their achievement can be transformed into the ideology of neo-enlightenment. At the political level, such an ideology is able to unite a variety of social forces, to form an activity foundation for international cooperation. The 2020 pandemic has demonstrated that unification of people is possible in the process of confronting common challenges. The main area consolidating common efforts is science and education, where a culture of survival is emerging under the conditions of common risks and dangers.

CONCLUSION

The modern ideology of education modernization predetermines a shift in its political status. The most significant human values are concentrated in educational culture. Their universal significance can serve as the basis for social unity. Political ideology is gaining strength, having received support from mass consciousness. The sphere of education reacts most dynamically to changes in public consciousness. It is a constant dialogue of generations, cultures, and worldviews. The ideals of education form the image of the future and unite broad social forces around it. In modern society, the introduction to the culture of each new generation through education has become the norm. Thus, a huge part of people is embraced by the spirit of education, permeated by its values, and realizes them in practical activities. This is a solid foundation for the formation of a new version of ideology that is capable of enriching modern political life.

Educational ideology can offer the modern world new opportunities. Its groundwork is the value of improving the human personality, the preservation and enhancement of the cultural heritage, the value of knowledge and cognition, the development of people's moral qualities, their ability to preserve and improve this world. We consider it possible to recognize the ideals and values of educational culture as the most demanded by the course of historical development, corresponding to the needs of a large number of people. From this perspective, they can be considered as an alternative to the values of traditional political ideologies that have ceased to fulfill their social functions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Althusser, L. (2001). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. Monthly Review Press. 2001.

Amrein-Beardsley A. (2014). *Rethinking value-added models*. Routledge.

Apple, M., & Beane, J. (2007). *Democratic Schools: Lessons in Powerful Education, (Second Edition)*. Heinemann.

Burrows, A.C. (1992). Inside the outer circle: Productivity, performance and career patterns. *Social Studies of Science, 22*(3), 581-585.

Cobb, C.D. (2020). Geospatial analysis: A new window into educational equity, access, and opportunity. *Review of Research in Education, 44*(1), 97-129.

Gerrard, J., Albright, J., Clarke, D.J., Clarke, D.M., Farrell, L., Freebody, P., & Sullivan, P. (2013). Researching the creation of a national curriculum from systems to classrooms. *Australian journal of education*, *57*(1).

Gryaznova, E., Kozlova, T., & Sulima, I. (2018). *Forming and realizing a pedagogue's philosophical culture (Special edition)*. The Turkish Online Journal of Design, Art and Communication-TOJDAC, 2136–2142.

Gutek, G.L. (2013). *Philosophical, ideological, and theoretical perspectives on education*. Pearson.

Habermas, J. (2006). *The divided west*. Polity. Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T.W. (2007). *Dialectic of enlightenment*. Stanford University Press.

Horn, R. (2002). Understanding educational reform: A reference handbook (Contemporary Education Issues). ABC-CLIO.

Ivashevsky, S.L. (2008). Higher education: Cultural ideals and legal norms. *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii=Higher Education in Russia, 6,* 169–171.

Ivashevsky, S.L. (2011) Education and ideology. *Russian Education and Society, 53*(6), 42–48. Kaplan, J. (2015). *Humans need not apply: A guide to wealth and work in the age of artificial intelligence*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kutyrev, V.A. (2012). Philosophy (for) People. *Questions of philosophy, 9,* 86–96. Laursen, P.F. (2006). Ideological power in education. *European Educational Research Journal*, *5*(3&4), 276-284.

Lundie, D. (2015). The given ness of the human learning experience and its incompatibility with information analytics. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 1–14.

Marcuse, H. (2002). *One-dimensional man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. Routledge.

Robertson, E. (2005). Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life. *Theory and Research in Education, 3*(1), 121-123.

Sulima, I.I. (2017). Social philosophy of science in search of tools. *Epistemology & Philosophy of Science, 4*, 30–33.

Toffler, A. (2008). *Future Shock*. M: AST: AST Moscow.

Tulchinsky, G.L. (2019). Philosophy as the design of new meanings. *Questions of Philosophy, 7*, 64–68.

Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. N.Y.: Basic Books.

Weber, M. (2013). *Economy and Society. University of California Press.* Two Volume Set, with a New Foreword by Guenther Roth edition, 1217.

Woodhouse, H. (2020) Experience, emotion, and aesthetics: Thinking about david olson's the mind on paper: Reading, consciousness and rationality. *Interchange*, *51*(1), 65-77.