

Preliminary Communication UDC [37.014:37.017]:378

Received January 4th, 2013**Janez Vodičar**University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Theology, Poljanska cesta 4, SI-1000 Ljubljana
janez.vodicar@guest.arnes.si**University: A Place of Formation for
Achievers or Thinkers?****Abstract**

Knowledge has become a resource that the modern society increasingly wishes to exploit in the market of competitiveness. One of the first requirements on the evaluation list is usefulness and competitiveness of the profile of graduates in the workforce market. The Bologna study Process, which strived to enable modern university to successfully prepare the modern student to enter the workforce market, in many scholars opinion did not achieve this goal. Despite having more resources invested in higher education, the society of knowledge is increasingly further from our reach. Additionally, modern university is facing new methodological and technological challenges in the process of education. Must one acknowledge the anthropological findings of M. Wesch about the new “internet” human, who not only has a different path to knowledge, but also defines this knowledge differently? The discussion finds that methodological change is not enough; instead we need to re-evaluate knowledge as well as the role of student and teacher. One of the solutions is a new community of teachers and scholars supported by imagination, where cooperation is a way of work and life.

Key words

university, Bologna Process, education, knowledge, imagination, Konrad Paul Liessmann, Michael Wesch

Introduction

“In 2006, the University of Connecticut set out to discover how much learning happens in a student between entering as freshmen and graduating as a senior. Five academic areas were selected to measure, using 14,000 students at 50 American colleges, including Yale, Brown, and Georgetown. At 16 of those 50 – including Yale, Brown, and Georgetown – graduating seniors knew less than incoming freshmen. Negative growth had occurred. In the other 34, no measurable change had taken place.” (Taylor Gatto 2009, 37–38)

This is a fact that many professors at European universities would probably confirm, despite thinking that something like this surely cannot be taking place at famous American higher education facilities. In order to prevent these kinds of devastating results, almost the whole of Europe implemented the Bologna (study) Process, which was meant to update higher education, in order to be competitive with the American system, especially in regard to research and innovation.¹ If the goal of implementing the Bologna Proc-

1

“Research as an objective process based on logic, reasoning, and measurements was generated in the European antiquity. Since then, the European sciences as a part of the Euro-

pean culture had no equal and developed rapidly both in natural sciences and the humanities. Though in the XX century the situation has considerably changed and the American



ess in 2010 was to be “the most competitive and dynamic, knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs, and greater social cohesion,” we could say that with the reform, which in many ways follows the American system, we imported their problems as well. European universities consistently place behind leading American schools various international study comparisons. Initial results after the implementation of the reform do not give much hope for the successfulness of the reform.² We cannot forget that, despite accessibility of education, many European leaders find that the process of integration of immigrants has failed (for example extremists who were educated in European universities). Therefore, both areas that the authors of the Bologna Process have influenced can hardly be called a successful intervention in higher education. If we take into account other research from this field, then, according to many people, we cannot expect to accomplish anything other than a structural renovation with the help of higher education. However, we need much more than that, in order to empower a young person to live, in the spirit of humanistic tradition, as a citizen in a globalized world.³

1. In between knowledge and wisdom

The goal of all education should be an increase of knowledge. But the behaviour of modern man, which Liessmann compares to the behaviour of television shows “Who Wants to be a Millionaire,” is becoming a standard end result of modern education (Liessmann 2011, 13–25). With this kind of knowledge, the purpose is not so much useful, comparative knowledge, but trivial knowledge, which serves for entertainment and profit. Knowledge loses meaningful connections and is separated from the basic general insight which used to be a mark of a true humanist.

“In modern times, the roles that are assigned to knowledge and understanding have changed. We can summarize this change with a simple formula which may be blunt, but expresses the essence: knowledge and understanding used to be freeing, now they are crippling (or at least potentially crippling). Knowledge and understanding used to represent the independence of reason, which stood against the slavery of prejudice; they embodied the emancipation of human spirit, which stood against the supremacy of religion, prison of dogmatism, chains of authority, and threat of autocracy. This aura no longer surrounds knowledge and understanding. And the only thing that has changed is simply that knowledge that is based on reason now actually won; it obliterated all its former enemies and opponents; now it is in charge, controlling everything. Knowledge became the law, the frame, and even the principle of foundation of our societies (and increasingly of their economic foundation). For those involved, knowledge therefore no longer has even the slightest freeing magic, because it itself sometimes performs a role of disunity and dictatorship, or as a symbol of prison in which man is pushed by his rationality.” (Blais, Gauchet, and Ottavi 2011, 69–70)

Even these French studies show that knowledge, understanding, whatever we want to call this, is becoming just another object of a postmodern society which can be used freely, in any way we wish to use it, for purposes that are limited to current interest. The idea of enlightenment about the power of true understanding is forgotten, and humanity is no longer subordinate to this light of reason. The key question here is, whether it is a crisis of knowledge itself, a crisis of general education, or a crisis of simply the educational system that is to blame for increased speculations about the end of the Western civilization.⁴ University, as one of the foundations of the Western civilization, should at least “understand” this problem and start solving it in some way, but it seems that it itself is one of the core sources for Western society’s stagnation.

The majority of European university institutions have spent the last few years reconstructing the organization of education and implementing a renewed study system. During this time, the economic crisis caused additional financial problems, which many educational facilities cannot handle in this increasingly technically and financially burdensome study system. Loading the new financial burden on the students, which non-European universities know as tuition, seems like a reasonable option to many politicians and even educators. At the same time, the above mentioned American studies on the successfulness of school system cannot fill us with too much faith in success of these kinds of interventions. Attempts to implement tuition have brought, and could again bring, strong conflicts between the students and the leaders of universities, which certainly does not lead to the goals that the proponents of the Bologna Process had in mind. We would like to show that it is because of the increased financial component of the whole educational system that we can deduce a lesser need for knowledge and an even lesser need for culture that used to be attributed to an educated man. Knowledge that can simply be “bought” can only increase learning that does not focus on the human, but on the profitability, capital, competitiveness, and of course competition no matter what the cost.⁵ Science has great power in itself and we still see a sort of unconditional, almost mythical, faith in scientists. Because opponents of knowledge are always condemned in advance, and because it brings great power, it is necessary to find a responsible way of knowledge transference, especially in a globalized world, in which consequences of a certain discovery can be devastating for everybody, especially the weak.

science began to manifest itself on a global scale, the American achievements were incontestable in the industrial sphere, in the sphere of technological, postindustrial science, and Europe remained the bearer of traditional fundamental theoretical knowledge.” (Makovich 2005, 121)

2

Liessman shows that simply forming a behavior, which can be indirectly marketed, increasingly leads to an end of man’s desire for knowledge, because he is being involuntary given a message that knowledge is needed only for profit and not for its own value. “Man wants to know and be known. Whoever forgets that and believes that only managers, research institutes, and institutions of excellence can fulfill this role, will probably be surprised soon – as long as he is still sensitive enough for it – to see that, by stressing the importance of increasing the society of knowledge, which is capable of new insights, this need will be obsolete.” (Liessmann 2011, 157–158)

3

“Since the antique concept of the Paideia – here the little remarked circumstance is interesting to note – education has continuously been in danger of capsizing into lack of education. The so-called crisis in education – has been a permanent old European topic. Thus, Theodor Litts’ diagnosis continues to apply to contemporaneous educational reformers:

In earlier times, people lived an educational ideal they did not review critically; today, we take a critical view of an educational ideal that we cannot live. This means that there cannot be prescribed education.” (Pfeiffle 2005, 134–135)

4

“If the power of production takes over the world, Mankind’s path to the essential core of being human becomes questionable. This is where understanding the traditional concepts of the idea of humanity ends and where the future of humanist education will be decided.” (Pfeiffle 2005, 143)

5

The race in innovativeness and power of knowledge cannot be compared to a healthy competition in a different field, such as sport, technological advancement, etc. If there are clear rules in a political race, for example, which limit and guide the competitors, science has no rules other than success and new discoveries, which bring prestige and ability to sell. In a world where almost anything can be sold, these criteria are weak, but, on the other hand, incredibly encouraging in the struggle for first place, first discovery, the most expensive patent, which the modern media especially highlights and thus encourages this limitless race.

There is a lot of talk today about the so-called society of knowledge, but according to professor K.P. Liessmann it is far removed from what has for centuries been valued in European tradition – wisdom (2011, 26). His critique is directed at the core of the Bologna Process, which is achieving economic productivity of modern education, where knowledge is supposed to be a personal investment that can be sold in the market and used to compete with others. Every study on the Bologna Process stresses these things:

“In all advanced industrialized countries the economy increasingly determines the demands and challenges that education has to meet. The reason for this are the permanent increase of knowledge and technical advances, companies are engaged in worldwide competition, costs have to be constantly reduced, the development for new products is becoming more and more lavish, and new production methods are coming into use. This leads to the fact that employees today require a higher education than ever before while their acquired knowledge becomes obsolete quicker than ever. The quality of education is directly related to the companies and regions ability to be competitive.” (Schenkel 2005, 160)

Even though we can read these kinds of reports practically everywhere, statements like this (due to certain simple and understandable logic of everyday life) closely resemble political declarations of those who were involved in the process of preparing the Bologna Process or many supporters of educational politics, which does not even remotely resemble the actual state of this field. Because of this understanding of higher education, the need for knowledge became a necessity of the modern advertising economy. It is only interesting because it sells, not because of truth or dignity, let alone some sort of humanness.⁶ Our society is increasingly becoming a society of the informed, even learned, but uneducated. “We cannot blame the individual or the failed educational politics for the lack of education; it is a destiny of us all, because it is a necessary consequence of a capitalization of the spirit.” (Liessmann 2011, 10) Even Ivan Illich wrote:

“School is the advertising agency which makes you believe that you need the society as it is. In such a society marginal value has become constantly self-transcendent. It forces the few largest consumers to compete for the power to deplete the earth, to fill their own swelling bellies, to discipline smaller consumers, and to deactivate those who still find satisfaction in making do with what they have. The ethos of non-satiety is thus at the root of physical depredation, social polarization, and psychological passivity.” (Illich 2002, 113)

Liessmann agrees that it is marketing that leads to an uneducated society. According to him, the goal of education has long seized to be the person, education, and reflection, but qualification for the market, flexibility in employment, and economic growth. All we need is a “brain” that is capable of inventing a competitive product faster than the one in Shanghai (Liessmann 2011, 151). The effort in education reform, which strives to increase economic competitiveness, does not reach its goal. The level of competitiveness is lowering; opportunities for the youth to increase their societal image are slimming. If Illich thinks that the school system is largely responsible for promoting the ideology of competitiveness, proving oneself, and capital, then university is the highest institution that serves this goal.⁷ Knowledge is no longer, in the sense of humanism, primarily a way to wisdom and growth in the spirit of humanism of an individual and society; instead it is a means to be more successful in the struggle for higher profit. As a result, university is becoming less effective in its principal goal of educating and not just researching; more and more people complain that students have a lesser desire for knowledge. “If the problem lies in the reasons for learning, than it is not enough for school to simply ‘pass on’ the knowledge.” (Blais, Gauchet, & Ottavi

2011, 8) The authors are convinced that, in order to learn, it is necessary to trust in authority. But the authority in the process of education is no longer the teacher, who passes on the knowledge; instead, the authority is the market. The marketed knowledge is hard to pass on in school, because it is considered ‘old fashioned’, irrelevant, and therefore not interesting for marketing. On the other hand, knowledge that is passed on as a commodity to be bought on the market has become less desired, because anybody has easy access to it. Therefore, it is understanding which can be marked as knowledge of a person with their own stance and dignity that can be considered the goal of higher education, because it would provide a critical approach to economization of the whole society.

2. A change in a didactic approach is not enough

In order to prevent failures of higher education, we often turn to psychology, neurology, and new methodology. This is much more acceptable if we define all these branches as scientific.

“Psychology, despite all the talk about science and scientific research in education, is not a science like physics and biology. And education is not like technology, because it is filled with values, which technology never is. Education is not like medicine; medicine can assure the doctor what the goal of a procedure is, and it is usually not questionable (even though we can sometimes argue the popular definition of ‘health’). But a goal like that does not exist in the conceptual boiling of ‘educating,’ where there is a lively battle of radically different purposes and goals.” (Egan 2009, 158)

Despite this different sphere of education, which includes much more than just technical transference of knowledge, many people try to find answers for modern problems with new didactic solutions, which are offered by modern technology. Michael Wesch, a professor of anthropology, has shown in his study, which was conducted with the help of his students,⁸ the problems of learning approach in modern higher education. He made a video to recap the research which included the students’ opinions of their own studying and uploaded it on the internet:

6

“As far as I can tell, education has undergone a fundamental change in the course of the last years and decades. Currently, education is all about the attainment of degrees and qualifications in order to stay in the competition. The humanistic concept of education as an idea of the development and maturing of a person into a personality has been forgotten – as has the idea that universities also ought to be hot spots of social development, where decisive questions of our time are impartially and critically studied, discussed and researched.” (Liessmann 2010)

7

“The reforms associated with the Bologna Process and the strategy of the EU for a ‘Common European Space of Education, Science and Culture’ are undoubtedly related to, and largely determined by the requirements of the increasingly transnationalised capital.” (Lioudakis 2005, 105)

8

“In spring 2007 I invited the 200 students enrolled in the ‘small’ version of my ‘Introduction to Cultural Anthropology’ class to tell the world what they think of their education by helping me write a script for a video to be posted on YouTube. The result was the disheartening portrayal of disengagement you see below. The video was viewed over one million times in its first month and was the most blogged about video in the blogosphere for several weeks, eliciting thousands of comments. With rare exception, educators around the world expressed the sad sense of profound identification with the scene, sparking a wide-ranging debate about the roles and responsibilities of teachers, students, and technology in the classroom.” (Wesch 2008a)

“The video seemed to represent what so many were already feeling, and it became the focal point for many theories. While some simply blamed the problems on the students themselves, others recognized a broader pattern. Most blamed technology, though for very different reasons. Some simply suggested that new technologies are too distracting and superficial and that they should be banned from the classroom. Others suggested that students are now ‘wired’ differently. Created in the image of these technologies, luddites imagine students to be distracted and superficial while techno-optimists see a new generation of hyper-thinkers bored with old school ways.” (Wesch 2008a)

Based on the results of his study he concludes that this is a different generation which is not only versed in new technologies, but also perceives knowledge in a different way.

“They don’t look at these technologies the way that most of us do because they come to these technologies as habitual users. This habitual use in turn shapes their ideas, ideals, attitudes and values. They have grown up with the ability to click on any piece of media or information and view it on their own terms. It is not surprising that they are impatient with long linear lectures. They demand choice—lots of choices—and if as a teacher you do not have choices for them, you need to at least create the illusion of choice. In order to accommodate a plethora of choices, information needs to be delivered in fairly small bits, with a choice following from each small bit. This can be seen in the quickly growing “clip culture” of online videos.” (Wesch 2007, 13)

Undoubtedly, all the theories that talk about how a change in technology brings a change in human thinking, and consequently a change in learning, apply to the new generation of youth as well. Higher education cannot remain separated from the everyday life and work of the youth; especially because many critiques (which were attempted to be avoided by the Bologna Process) are geared towards the isolation of the learning process from the everyday life. Everyday life of a modern student is filled with modern technology, which shapes the ways and possibilities of their thinking and learning. If studying used to be founded on transference of knowledge, which the experts shared from their wealth of knowledge to a select crowd, and tested this knowledge themselves, it is nowadays accessible to a much wider audience and in a much easier way. That is why Wesch’s deduction that today we cannot work as we used to anymore, is a consequence of societal and cultural connections, which are taught by the university. Therefore we cannot simply change the methodology, but we must change the approach which will elevate the university from a knowledge supplier to a sort of laboratory of understanding.⁹ If we cannot achieve this then consequently, according to a number of studies, the level of knowledge will drop to the point where not even competitiveness can correctly point it to a responsible life in a society.

“School living, which is founded on cooperation, can be the only real practice for future life in society, because in societal life, cooperation is more useful to the individual, as well as society, than competitiveness, which was so highly valued by Spenserians, for example.” (Blais, Gauthier, and Ottawi 2011, 195)

3. University should not be reformed, but evaluated

Liessmann criticises the Bologna Process by referring to Austrian example, where they changed higher education system three times in one decade. Even though the results after each reform are poor, and fixing their mistakes is getting more expensive, they have the ideology of progress, because anybody who makes a reform today considers themselves to be progressive (Liessmann 2011, 161–168). In the process, students do not gain anything, but lose a little with every reform, as American studies show (Taylor Gatto 2009, 9–12)

– by increasing school funding by 350% in less than half a century, illiteracy jumped from 4% to 27%. In the above mentioned video, students clearly state that they wish for education which will consider their status, needs, and to be treated as a subject in the process – a person and not just an individual who needs to be stuffed with knowledge.¹⁰

In order to achieve this we do not need an organized reform of higher education, but a reform in the approach, the place of presenter and the student in the process of education:

“As most of us know from our own experience, the best learning almost always occurs in the absence of a teacher, for it is then that learners are free to pursue with great passion the questions that are meaningful and relevant to their own lives. Focusing on the quality of learning, rather than the quality of teaching transforms the entire educational agenda. As for myself, I have increasingly focused less on simply trying to convey good information and more on inspiring good questions. It struck me that all learning begins with a good question, and if we are ultimately trying to create ‘active lifelong learners’ with ‘critical thinking skills’ and an ability to ‘think outside the box’ it might be best to start by getting students to ask better questions.” (Wesch 2008, 5)

With this kind of approach, knowledge becomes a means which prevents a possibility that learning would become a way to illiteracy as is understood by Liessmann. A student is not just a means of educational politics, which has a goal “to alienate them from families, traditions, religions, cultures – so no outside source of advice could contradict the will of the political state.” (Taylor Gatto 2009, 13) Even if the above mentioned statements, which are founded on statements of leading American politicians, are not taken literally, it is clear that with an increased apathy of the youth, we need a sort of reactivation of critical thinking in the youth, if we wish to preserve democracy. This is supposed to be the goal of the Bologna Process, which was essentially supposed to unify an often divided Europe with its simplicity. However, according to Liessmann it is making Europe very uniformed and alienated from its rich diversity, making it more like industrialized management which looks the same everywhere in the world (Liessmann 2011, 122). This does not bring us on the path of better education, but instead to more knowing without real qualification for responsible application of acquired knowledge. American experts are not surprised that the majority of successful young people, who became famous by implementing modern technology, are actually failed students (Taylor Gatto 2009, 36–37).

Especially because, as we said before, modern technology does not only bring new methodologies but a new way of understanding:

“Unfortunately, many teachers only see the disruptive possibilities of these technologies when they find students Facebooking, texting, IMing, or shopping during class. Though many blame

9

“At the most simple and practical level, we need to teach them how to find the right information. At a slightly higher level, we need to teach them how to interpret what they find. At a still higher level, we need to teach them how to ask questions about what they find, what we often call “critical thinking.” And at perhaps the highest level, we need to teach them “creative thinking,” which encompasses all of the lower levels while also inviting them to create their own works, knowledge and information to add to the human story.” (Wesch 2007, 13–14)

10

“For me, the ultimate promise of the web is that it might enable us to truly see one another once again and all the ways in which we are interconnected. The web is an enormous accomplishment in this way. It has never been more possible for us to truly have a global view and understand the world and how it works in such a complete way. It might help us create a truly global view that can spark the kind of empathy we need to create a better world for all of humankind.” (Wesch 2007, 16)

the technology, these activities are just new ways for students to tune out, part of the much bigger problem I have called ‘the crisis of significance,’ the fact that many students are now struggling to find meaning and significance in their education.” (Wesch 2009)

It is because of this crisis of meaning on the level of higher education that we must move from mere teaching of subjects, to a subjectivity of teaching. Students can access information faster than their professors. The problem is that they have no motivation for it, which can only be ignited by making the content relevant. Suggested content becomes really relevant when it lively interacts with students, therefore Wesch insists that a good approach to higher education has to evoke questions, which will speak to the youth as a person:

“As an alternative, I like to think that we are not teaching subjects but subjectivities: ways of approaching, understanding, and interacting with the world. Subjectivities cannot be taught. They involve an introspective intellectual throw-down in the minds of students.” (Wesch 2009)

The requirement of the Bologna Process to include students in the process of education, presupposes this subjectivities of an individual. University, as a community of research, is founded on this principle. With this approach we can move from mere factual knowledge to real understanding, education, as is understood by Liessmann. This makes it difficult to measure successfulness as some PISA studies require, or placing universities in different international ranking systems according to their successfulness; instead we will equip the youth on their way to independence and true education:

“Schooling is organized by command and control from without; education is self-organized from within; school disconnects its clientele from other primary sources of learning. It must do that to achieve administrative efficiency; education sets out to provide a set of bountiful connections which are random, willful, promiscuous, even disharmonious with one another – understanding that the learning of resourcefulness, self-sufficiency, and invention will inevitably involve surprising blends of things, things impossible to predict or anticipate in advance.” (Taylor Gatto 2009, 177)

This way, at least according to a majority of critical thinking, the real purpose of humanistic education will be achieved – a free and responsible person.

Conclusion

Introductory question, should the university be a place of formation for the successful or the thinking, seems more and more irrelevant. Despite the complexity of the question and the demands of the modern society, it is possible to connect the needs of society, modern technology, and the options that universities already possess. Experiences, as well as critique, of developers of modern educational reforms agree that we can only form successful people if they become more thinking, in the sense of deeper inclusion of such thinking in the global context of science, with the help of cooperative approach in the whole educational process. This cannot be achieved with new reforms of education, which are forced from the outside, but with an internal return to what is the foundation of university: *universitas magistrorum et scholarium*, roughly meaning “community of teachers and scholars.” Only this kind of community will dare ask questions and will be able to quickly and responsibly collect information for creative activity. Real creative learning will not happen, especially in the university, if imagination is not included in the process of teaching again. It is imagination that knows no limits. For this reason we can expand the community of the university over its walls and include anybody who wishes to be included in it. By doing that, we can overcome

Illich's critique that university is most responsible for social, political, and cultural inequality.¹¹

With the options that modern technology offers, we can overcome many obstacles, which have limited human creativity so far. We need, in addition to already achieved and well developed educational processes in universities, a higher integration of imagination in the entire process of university life.

"Imagination is too often seen as something peripheral to the core of education, something taken care of by allowing students time to 'express themselves' in 'the arts,' while the proper work of educating goes on in the sciences and math and in developing conventionally efficient literacy. In the approach described here, imagination is at the center of education; it is seen as crucial to any subject, mathematics and science no less than history and literature. Imagination can be the main workhorse of effective learning if we yoke it to education's central tasks." (Egan 2005, xii)

Aided by this imagination, a student is not only more innovative, but he or she enters the emotional level which is very important for the necessary motivation. In this task, the teacher cannot be a performer, but can participate, which is essentially the foundation of university and a presupposition of modern technologies if we wish to successfully use them. The responsibility of the teacher is to point and encourage innovativeness, the student's independence, and remind them of responsibility.¹² "We can't 'teach' them. We can only create environments in which the practices and perspectives are nourished, encouraged, or inspired (and therefore continually practiced)." (Wesch 2009) And university is the environment where creativity, cooperation, and responsibility should be formed, if we wish to achieve the goals of the Bologna Process – competitiveness and successfulness of Europe, which would make the whole world better and kinder to all people. While this slightly reeks of ideology of the future, which is criticized by Liessmann (2007), the kind of future that will come to fruition in an individual's free creativity in a community of the thinking, does not alienate people, but turns them to their essence in the sense of the highest ideals of humanism, to the culture in its most precious meaning.¹³ In the process, Humboldt's idea is not forgotten; it is just made possible to a wider range of people.

11

"There is no question that at present the university offers a unique combination of circumstances which allows some of its members to criticize the whole of society. It provides time, mobility, access to peers and information, and a certain impunity-privileges not equally available to other segments of the population. But the university provides this freedom only to those who have already been deeply initiated into the consumer society and into the need for some kind of obligatory public schooling." (Illich 2002, 37)

12

"The beauty of the current moment is that new media has thrown all of us as educators into just this kind of question-asking, bias-busting, assumption-exposing environment. There are no easy answers, but we can at least be thankful for the questions that drive us on." (Wesch 2009)

13

"Education today is often used as a means of securing 'location advantage' and as a synonym for investments in 'human capital'. Konrad Paul Liessmann strongly opposes such a reduced definition. Discussing education, he says, makes sense only in the context of a given cultural framework. Culture, on the other hand, means that the ability to perceive things from an aesthetic point of view is considered equal to abstract thinking – and to insist on this equality is not old-fashioned but necessary if we are to rescue the achievements of civilization from sacrifice on the altar of economic interests." (Word.world-citizenship 2006)

References

- Blais, Marie-Claude, Marcel Gauchet & Dominique Ottawi. 2011. *O pogojih vzgoje*. Ljubljana: Krtina.
- Egan, Kieran. 2005. *An imaginative Approach to Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Egan, Kieran. 2009. *Zgodovina pedagoške zmote*. Ljubljana: Krtina.
- Illich, Ivan. 2002. *Deschooling Society*. London: Marion Boyars Publishers.
- Liessmann, Konrad Paul. 2007. *Zukunft kommt!* Wien–Graz–Klagenfurt: Styria.
- Liessmann, Konrad Paul. 2010. Interview with Paul Konrad Liessmann. In: *Academic Bulletin*. http://abicko.avcr.cz/en/sd/news/main-page/news_0016.html (Accessed 9 August 2012).
- Liessmann, Konrad Paul. 2011. *Theorie der Unbildung*. München: Piper.
- Liodakis, George. 2005. Increasing Social Conflict from the European Reforms in Education and Research. In: *The Common European Space of Education, Science and Culture*. Ed. G. V. Makovich, p. 105–109. Chelyabinsk: Southern Ural State University.
- Makovich, G. V. 2005. A Uniform Conceptual Field as a Condition of Creating an All-European Realm of Education, Science and Culture. In: *The Common European Space of Education, Science and Culture*. Ed. G. V. Makovich, p. 117–123. Chelyabinsk: Southern Ural State University.
- Pfeiffle, Horst. 2005. Some Remarks on Education Concerning Its Tradition and Future. In: *The Common European Space of Education, Science and Culture*. Ed. G. V. Makovich, p. 133–143. Chelyabinsk: Southern Ural State University.
- Schenkel, Judith. 2005. New Learning Culture in Universities. In: *The Common European Space of Education, Science and Culture*. Ed. G. V. Makovich, p. 160–164. Chelyabinsk: Southern Ural State University.
- Taylor Gatto, John. 2005. *Dumbing Us Down*. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers.
- Taylor Gatto, John. 2009. *Weapons of Mass Instruction*. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers.
- Wesch, Michael. 2007. An In-Depth Look at the Cyber Phenomenon of Our Time: Web 2.0. In: *Lawlor Review*. XV (2): 10–16.
- Wesch, Michael. 2008. AntiTeaching-Confronting-the-Crisis-of-Significance. In: *Education Canada* 48(2):4–7.
- Wesch, Michael. 2008a. A Vision of Students Today. <http://www.britannica.com/blogs/2008/10/a-vision-of-students-today-what-teachers-must-do/> (Accessed 8 August 2012).
- Wesch, Michael. 2009. From Knowledgable to Knowledge-able: Learning in New Media Environments. In: academiccommons.org/commons/essay/knowledgable-knowledge-able/ (Accessed 6 August 2012).
- Word.world-citizenship 2006. <http://word.world-citizenship.org/wp-archive/396>. (Accessed 9 August 2012).

Janez Vodičar

**Sveučilište: mjesto formacije
izvršnika ili mislitelja?**

Sažetak

Znanje je postalo resurs koji moderno društvo sve više želi iskoristavati na tržištu konkurentnosti. Jedan od prvih zahtjeva na evaluacijskom popisu je korisnost i konkurentnost profila diplomiranih na tržištu rada. Bolonjski proces, koji je težio omogućiti modernom sveučilištu uspješnu pripremu modernih studenata za ulazak na tržište radne snage, prema mišljenju mnogih istraživača, nije postigao ovaj cilj. Unatoč sve većem ulaganju resursa u visoko obrazovanje, društvo znanja je sve više izvan dohvata. Usto, moderno sveučilište se suočava s novim metodološkim i tehnološkim izazovima u obrazovnom procesu. Moramo li prihvatiti antropološka istraživanja M. Wescha o novom »internetskom« čovjeku, koji ne samo da ima drugačije putove prema znanju, nego također znanje drugačije definira? Rasprava pokazuje da sama metodološka promjena nije dovoljna; umjesto toga trebamo ponovno procijeniti znanje kao i ulogu studenta i profesora. Jedno od rješenja je nova zajednica profesora i studenata nošena imaginacijom, gdje je suradnja način rada i života.

Ključne riječi

sveučilište, bolonjski proces, obrazovanje, znanje, imaginacija, Konrad Paul Liessmann, Michael Wesch

Janez Vodičar

**Universität: Formungsstätte der
Erfolgsmenschen oder Denker?**

Zusammenfassung

Das Wissen hat sich zur Ressource verwandelt, welche seitens der modernen Gesellschaft auf dem Konkurrenzmarkt zunehmend ausgebeutet wird. Eine der ersten Voraussetzungen auf der Bewertungsliste ist die Nützlichkeit und die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der Graduiertenprofile auf dem Arbeitskräftemarkt. Der Bologna-Prozess mit dessen Ausrichtung, einer zukunftsweisenden Universität die Befähigung des modernen Studenten für ein gelungenes Betreten des Arbeitsmarktes zu ermöglichen, hatte nach Ansicht mancherlei Gelehrter ihr Ziel verfehlt. Trotz aufgestockter Investitionsmittel im Bereich der Hochschulbildung entschwindet die Wissensgesellschaft immer deutlicher außerhalb unserer Reichweite. Fernerhin ist die zeitgenössische Universität genötigt, den jüngsten methodologischen und technologischen Herausforderungen innerhalb des Bildungsprozesses ins Auge zu sehen. Muss man den anthropologischen Erkenntnissen des M. Wesch über den neuen „Internet-Menschen“ beistimmen, der nicht nur ungleiche Wege zum Wissen einschlägt, sondern es gleichzeitig anders definiert? Die Erörterung ergibt, dass die methodologische Herausforderung allein insuffizient ist; stattdessen müssen wir eine Neubewertung des Wissens wie auch der Rolle des Studenten und des Lehrers vornehmen. Einer der Auswege heißt die neue, durch Einbildungskraft getragene Gemeinschaft der Lehrer und Studenten, wo die Zusammenarbeit eine Arbeits- bzw. Daseinsweise darstellt.

Schlüsselwörter

Universität, Bologna-Prozess, Bildung, Wissen, Fantasie, Konrad Paul Liessmann, Michael Wesch

Janez Vodičar

**L'université: un lieu de formation de ceux qui
réussissent ou de ceux qui réfléchissent ?**

Résumé

La connaissance est devenue une ressource que la société moderne souhaite de plus en plus exploiter sur le marché de la compétitivité. L'une des premières exigences figurant sur la liste d'évaluation est l'utilité et la compétitivité du profil des diplômés sur le marché du travail. Le

processus de Bologne, qui visait à rendre l'université moderne capable de préparer l'étudiant moderne à entrer sur le marché du travail, n'a pas, d'après l'avis de beaucoup de chercheurs, atteint cet objectif. Malgré davantage de moyens investis dans l'enseignement supérieur, la société de la connaissance est de plus en plus hors de portée. En outre, l'université moderne est confrontée à de nouveaux défis méthodologiques et technologiques dans le processus d'enseignement. Doit-on reconnaître la recherche anthropologique de M. Wesch sur le nouvel homme de l'« internet » lequel non seulement emprunte un chemin différent vers la connaissance, mais définit également cette connaissance d'une manière différente ? La discussion montre que le changement méthodologique n'est pas suffisant ; nous avons plutôt besoin de réévaluer aussi bien la connaissance que les rôles de l'étudiant et de l'enseignant. L'une des solutions réside dans une nouvelle communauté d'enseignants et d'universitaires, portée par l'imagination, dont le mode de travail et de vie est la coopération.

Mots-clés

université, processus de Bologne, enseignement, connaissance, imagination, Konrad Paul Liessmann, Michael Wesch