Original Paper

The Contribution of Education to the Formation of the Democratic Citizen

Anastasia Dimitrakopoulou[1]

[1] Hellenic Open University, Patra, Greece

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is twofold; firstly, we will attempt to highlight the contribution of education to the formation of the democratic citizen. However, the reason for our study was the ideas of the ancient Greek thinkers regarding the relationship between education and the citizen. In the course of the work, we ascertain the topicality of their theories, as well as their influence on modern researchers, which will constitute the second purpose of our research. People have the same desire for glory, power and material wealth as the citizens of ancient Greece, that's why their texts acquired a timeless value. To support our proposal, we will invoke the proposal of T. Parsons, who argues that Western societies originate from the ancient Greek ones (Parsons, 1966).

In the study at hand, we will also be concerned with the issue, if education still plays a primary role in the formation of the democratic citizen, given that there are now many educational institutions, such as the Internet. In addition, we will deal with whether the concept of democracy has been differentiated in relation to the way it was understood by the ancient Greek philosophers, who believed that the citizen should be active and participate in the commons. Nowadays, do education systems promote political participation or passivity, serving the interests of the ruling class of states?

Keywords

Citizen, democracy, politics, globalization

1. Introduction

In ancient Athens, for the first time, citizenship was combined with the law and a political theory of virtues and institutions, and is essentially linked to the state of democracy; because only in this particular state does the citizen actively participate in the political process (Gosewinkel, 2001). All Athenians participated in the democratic state, which held the status of citizen, which demonstrates the priority of the public sphere of life over the private. Citizens, having the privilege of parsimony and defense (παρρησία και ισηγορία), were involved in the commons, as involvement in politics ensured their social position and entity in the political context (Farrar, 1991).

The democratic citizen over time acquires the qualifications required to support the state, primarily through education, which inculcates in the student the basic principles of the state. However, in recent years with the rise of liberalism, democratic work in schools has been undermined and tends to be sidelined due to the divergence of priorities dictated by the political and economic system of our time. In our opinion, it is necessary to redefine the terms of citizenship and education based on the new political, social and economic data. The impetus for this effort is given by the speech of the ancient Greek thinkers, whose perceptions formed the basis of our reflection for the present study.

Therefore, the question is not whether the educational system promotes the concept of democratic citizenship, but what kind of democracy is promoted, that is, whether students are encouraged to become responsible citizens and participate in political life or not (Westheimer & Kahne, 2003). This is exactly the question that we will ask in this work, that is, what exactly are the principles that govern democracy in our time and in what way will the education system create the corresponding citizen, who will support the specific state. This question is important because we observe that the changes that are taking place in the educational programs of the various states, in several cases, do not promote the concept of the democratic citizen, who has a critical point of view, sharpness of mind, freedom of speech and imagination, but are based on providing sterile knowledge, which lends itself to the pattern of a well-qualified official who is a passive citizen with no interest in what is going on.

2. The Role of the Citizen and the Importance of Education in Its Politicization

Aristotle perceives the citizen as an organic member of the city-state, characteristically saying that man is: "φύσει πολιτικὸν ζῷον" (Aristotle, *Politics*, 1253 a 3), which means that man by nature is destined to live within the social and political context and participate in the electoral process. The citizen, according to the philosopher, always decides with a view to the common good, setting aside his personal benefit for the sake of the happiness of the city and the citizens, because he has realized that the same benefit depends on the well-being of the whole. The concept of citizen in Stageritis is always defined in exclusively political terms and within the political context. The citizen, in other words, is contrasted with the concept of the Stranger, who is "the non-citizen" and is excluded from the commons of the city (Chourdakis, 2003). In this sense, the terms of the city and politics are set, as well as the system of organization that exists between citizens and the state, demonstrating the limits of

23

coexistence, but also a given collective economic, political and social context (Kalogiannakis, 2003).

The role of education is important in the process of socialization and politicization of individuals, because it transmits the values, norms and perceptions of the specific society. The organized state, through education, teaches students citizenship, so that they can correctly and harmoniously fulfill their role as adult citizens. Certainly, many claim that education serves the enforcement of the ruling class, reproducing the ideological system on which it is based (Curle, 1964). Education, however, must aim at individual and social development, which means that individuals need to be able to participate actively in public life, defend democracy and coexist harmoniously with their fellow citizens, develop individually and to defend human rights (Ballias, 2008).

In the ancient Greek intellect, the citizen's relationship with the city was structured through education, i.e., children were educated, through school, in dealing with the commons and the harmonious coexistence of future citizens within the social and political framework. The ultimate goal of education was the formation of the citizen's personality based on the values that the city espoused in the political, social and economic fields. The ancient Greeks had realized the importance of political education and set it as the fundamental purpose of human education. The citizen in ancient Greece lived within the political society and was involved in politics throughout his life, as mentioned in the Platonic work Protagoras: "ἡ δέ παιδεία μέχρι τῶν ἐνηλίκων διέτεινεν" and "ἐκ παίδων σμικρῶν ἀρξάμενοι, μέχρι οὗπερ ἂν ζῶσι, καὶ διδάσκουσι καὶ νουθετοῦσιν" (Plato, Protagoras, 325 c-d). These views are accepted in our time as well, as the school is perceived as an institution that directly or indirectly shapes the pro-political attitudes and behaviors of students, although in our time there are many educational institutions, such as the internet and the Mass Media. The students in the classroom exchange opinions, disagree, discuss and generally find themselves in a process of expressing public discourse.

In the days many definitions of the concept of citizen have been formulated, which often highlight a part of his status. For example, Marshall referring to citizenship says that it is "a social status conferred on all who are full members of a community", adding that all citizens have the same rights and the same obligations towards the state (Marshall-T. Bottomore, 1997). This definition has received objections and has been characterized as passive, because "someone can have the status of a citizen and do nothing with it, except to fulfill the minimum legal requirements" (Manville, 1990), as the concept of political participation is absent. We consider this observation to be correct, because citizenship is absolutely intertwined with political participation, at least in the democratic state; otherwise we are talking about other types of states. In our opinion, the following definition of D. Gosewinkel (2001) more fully encompasses the work that the citizen is called upon to perform within the political framework, and therefore, we would say that the citizen is a member of a politico-legal regime, in which he participates on equal terms with the other members of the political community having the same rights and the same obligations. The concept of a citizen indicates his behavior towards the community and accordingly his attitude towards all citizens; he is characterized as a good and

24

responsible citizen. The conduct of the citizen reflects "the ideal of political virtue as assumed by the prevailing social morality". Education must keep pace with citizen perception. That is why the state must decide the qualities necessary to govern the citizen.

In the first year of the Peloponnesian War Pericles delivered the funeral oration in honor of the dead Athenian warriors, in which he mentions the following sentence: "μόνοι γὰρ τόν τε μηδὲν τῶνδε μετέχοντα οὐκ ἀπράγμονα, ἀλλ᾽ ἀχρεῖον νομίζομεν" (Thucydides, II 40). The Athenian politician aimed to extol the virtues of the democratic polity by pointing out the importance of political participation and the expression of public discourse by citizens. Political socialization is not a feature of all societies and states, but is related to the political, educational, social, economic and ideological framework of society. It is, in other words, a multifaceted issue with many ramifications. The process of political socialization takes place throughout human life, but especially during childhood and adolescence, when "the reception of messages and the formation of attitudes and forms of behavior are usually carried out unconsciously, indirectly and often decisive for the individual's subsequent development as a citizen" (Kalogiannakis, 2003). At this age, the students' experiences, which have a political character, are easier to turn into political stimuli or political orientations.

Nowadays, efforts are being made to inculcate students in political participation through the educational process. Nowadays, however, due to the political and social changes brought about by globalization, it is necessary to develop, in addition to the national consciousness, the universal consciousness of the modern student. The student is called to become an active citizen, who will participate in the processes of the political society in which he lives and at the same time will demonstrate responsibility and sensitivity to national and universal values, as well as a critical spirit towards politics and social events. In this sense, political socialization takes on a broader meaning than in the past and "reduces to an essential question of establishing an important relationship: the relationship of the ego to the otherness of the Other" (Kalogiannakis, 2003).

Many question the school as an institution and blame it in relation to the role it performs, the dysfunctions it exhibits its relationship with the state and civil society. In addition, there is talk of educational and cognitive inadequacies, degradation of studies, authoritarianism and social discrimination. The education system is also going through periods of crisis, which do not exclusively concern the institution of the school itself, but are linked to the crisis of society, politics and moral values, because between these parameters there is an inseparable unity and therefore they are perceived together. Undoubtedly, in our time, due to globalization, as we have already mentioned, citizenship acquires an expanded meaning, as it is shaped under a universal dimension. This new dimension is holistic and its extremes are the personal dimension and the universal dimension. They include: the family, the local community and the national community. Another reason that dictates the differentiation of democratic citizenship and the acquisition of a global dimension is the existence of global problems, such as economic, environmental and international security issues (Kymlicka, 2010).

The issue of education is even more complex, because it is not only about the content of education or access to it for all students, but, due to multiculturalism, there is an urgent need for an education that recognizes the cultural elements of all children. This view contrasts with what Young (2011) refers to as "cultural imperialism", which is essentially the non-imposition of the standards of a particular culture. Otherwise, we cannot speak of fair education, but of education that marginalizes a section of students. In human societies there is social stratification, i.e., societies are divided into social classes with a hierarchical distribution. Education is the most important element for social stratification and "takes into account the knowledge, skills and attitudes learned at school for the maintenance and development of a society" (Putnam, 1993). Every person has a right to education, for this reason, teaching should not only involve an individualistic dimension, but also a social one, otherwise education becomes ineffective.

Under these conditions, the question arises regarding the meaning of education and the conditions under which it could become the purpose of human life. R. S. Peters, defining the concept of education, criticizes the subordination of education to purposes external to it and suggests "a normative interpretation of the above concept as a set of criteria based on which specific educational processes can be evaluated and the result they aim at, which is the educated man" (Peters, 1977). Hutchins (1953) underlines the political dimension of education, as he considers that the purpose of education is to prepare citizens for participation in the democratic state. However, the fundamental task of education, as Pavlidis (2008) points out, is the cultivation of the intellect and the development of consciousness: "consciousness consists in knowing and understanding the world and ourselves as an object and on the other hand in the conscious, in knowing and understanding ourselves as a subject as a carrier of consciousness, as well as in understanding the unity of the self-subject with the other people-subjects". This means that the education of man lies primarily in the cultivation of consciousness and the formation of man as a personality.

From the above, we understand that the need for change in the field of education is imperative, given the changes observed at the international level in the knowledge field and in the skills that one must possess in order to cope with the developments. Various theories have been formulated on this, often conflicting, such as the neoliberal one, which focuses on the responsibility of the individual to be able to cope with the financial demands of his life. Within this context, they extol "markets as a school of political virtue, where important virtues such as self-confidence, initiative, decorum and the full participation of all in society are promoted" (Kymlicka, 2010). Undoubtedly, markets teach the citizen to take initiative, but they do not automatically cultivate in him a sense of justice or social responsibility (Kymlicka, 2010). On the other hand, communitarianism, which is opposed to liberalism, perceives the citizen moving "within expanded autonomy, both at the individual and community level, able to claim the substitution of existing power structures and the transformation of values in the perspective of redefining the of democracy against the ideology of the market" (Petrou, 2010). The representatives of the communitarian view argue that "the culture of Western modernity is doomed to

26

failure, since the conditions do not allow the coexistence of two of its most basic goals: the autonomy of thought and the assumption of a social role on the part of citizens" (Leontsini, 1999). In addition to these two views, there are others that have been formulated, such as the ideological trend of inclusive democracy and inclusive democracy, which pose as a central issue the re-meaning of the concept of the citizen (Kymlicka, 2010).

Many studies refer to the research of Lipset (1959), who stated that the maintenance of democracy depends on the provision of a high level of education. Subsequently, several studies were conducted, which confirmed Lipset's views, such as Barro, (1999) and Glaeser et al., (2004). Of course, there have been scholars who disagree or question Lipse, as they do not accept that the increase in education is correlated with the increase in the level of democracy, as stated in a research by Acemoglu et al. (2005) (Castelló-Climent, 2006). The sustainability of democracy depends, according to Amparo Castelló-Climent (2006), not on increasing the average years of education, but what really matters for democracy is the improvement of the education acquired by the majority of society. This finding is consistent with Lipset's view (Castelló-Climent, 2006).

Democracy requires the participation of citizens in the affairs of the state. Through educational strategies, students will be able to identify aspects of society that need improvement, be supportive of their peers, and develop the skills needed to effectively work for change (Westheimer & Kahne, 2003). Almond and Verba (1989, 1st ed. 1963) have highlighted the link between education and political participation, considering that limited education has a different weight in the formation of a person's political identity compared to a person who has received a high level of education. There are many examples from the international political scene, which validate the above proposition and demonstrate the reaction of the educated to the decisions of their political leaders, such as the student protests that overthrew Peron in Argentina in 1955, Peres Jimenez in Venezuela in 1958, the Hungarian Revolution in 1956, the Prague Spring in 1968 (Westheimer & Kahne, 2003) and of course, the student uprising in Athens in 1973 against the dictators.

It is necessary for schools to cultivate in students the idea that political participation is an important component of democracy and that this should not be limited to rhetorical effort but should also be cultivated through various educational methods. In this way, students will immerse themselves in the obligations of civic mindedness, participation in the electoral process, constant information on political issues and the expression of speech with pride on issues concerning collective issues.

An important parameter in the education of the democratic citizen is the process of socialization, which is promoted through textbooks and is the pillar of curriculum design. The purpose is for students to develop cooperative relationships, self-regulate their behavior and strengthen the relationship with adults (Glaeser, Ponzetto & Shleifer, 2006). E. Glaeser, G. Ponzetto, A. Shleifer (2006) state that the relationship between education and democracy is clear, but the reason for the association is not. In their study they try to explain the correlation between the two parameters. They argue that education is linked to political engagement. Schools aim at the socialization of young people and possibly political

27

involvement is a form of socialization (Glaeser, Ponzetto & Shleifer, 2006). The consolidation of democracy depends on the support of the vast majority of citizens and in this process the assistance of education is very important, because educated states preserve and protect democracy from interventions by factors that lead society to political deviation.

3. Public and Common Education

According to Aristotle, the relationship between the city and the citizen is dialectical. The achievement of the virtue and well-being of the city depends on the morals of its citizens, in the formation of which the state contributes directly and decisively: "σπουδαία γε πόλις ἐστὶ τῷ τοὺς πολίτας τοὺς μετέχοντας τῆς πολιτείας εἶναι σπουδαίους" (Aristotle, *Politics*, 1332 a 33-34). The education of citizens needs to go hand in hand with the principles of the state, because the alignment of the principles of the state with the educational system is the distinguishing feature of the superior state: "Δεῖ γάρ πρός ἑκάστῳ παιδεύαισθαι" (Aristotle, *Politics*, 1337 a 14 Dimitrakopoulou, 2012). According to Aristotle, education is a moral, political and social institution and has as its ultimate purpose the creation of virtuous and just citizens (Aristotle, *Politics*, 1332 a 30-b 10). Therefore, it is required that it agrees with the state of the city and, of course, that it is public and common to all citizens and that it is not left to private initiative, because the purpose of the city is common and it is not possible for each of the citizens to the educates his children-the future citizens-with the values that he himself desires, given that the citizen primarily becomes the recipient of the values of the society in which he lives (Aristotle, *Politics*, 1337 a 21-26). Democratic and public education develops in student's political competence and a sense of community so that democracy is established.

Aristotle's views on the importance of the public and the character of education have influenced modern education systems. Modern education accepts the political and social role that Aristotle gave to education, considering that the student, through the educational process, softens his egocentrism and acquires social consciousness. The social character of the modern school is made evident by the methods and practices it uses, as through cooperative forms of teaching and the observance of school rules, students are prepared to take on a political role.

We must point out that Stagiritis is opposed to the provision of vocational education, as it is considered that this type of education is contrary to the type of education that aims to build the healthy character of students. Therefore, he wonders about the content of education: "πῶς χρὴ παιδεύεσθαι" (Aristotle, *Politics*, 1324 a 5-7), that is, in which areas will the education system focus; on shaping the best life, on providing knowledge or on serving the daily needs of life? The answer is essential, because it is the foundation on which the moral, intellectual and spiritual education of citizens is built. Aristotle rejects the utilitarian dimension of education as inappropriate for free people (Aristotle, *Politics*, 1338 b 2-4). The educated man acts as a universal being and not as an individual. Aristotle characterizes manual workers as unfree, because they submit to purposes alien to themselves, while their work destroys them physically and mentally (Aristotle, *Politics*, 1337 b, 1338 a). Commenting on Aristotle's view, H.

28

Marcuse says that "in idealism a special historical form of the division of labor and the structuring of society into classes takes the eternal, metaphysical form of the relationship between necessity and beauty, between matter and idea" (Marcuse, 1985).

The question that concerns us is the following: if we assume that education is related to social inequalities, what are the particular processes with which it is associated? Could it be that education is not only a derivative but also a producer of inequalities, which confirms the utopia that a truly equal education is only possible in an equal society? Education, to the extent that it is an active activity in the creation of social reality, has the ability to turn towards the ideal of a different society and to fight for it.

But what is the role of education in modern society? According to P. H. Hirst, education aims at the "multifaceted development of the mind, the acquisition of knowledge and the cultivation of the ability to understand experience in a variety of ways". Education does not consist in imparting specialized knowledge but basic forms of knowledge, which are considered to contribute to the goals that have been set, such as the development of the mind and the pursuit of the good life or, using Aristotle's term, the happy life (Hirst, 1973a). Hirst accepts the passage from Plato's Republic, according to which human beings know the nature of things through knowledge and thereby attain the happy life. Like the myth of the cave, believing that people through the use of logic can escape the cave and ascend to the real world (Hirst, 1973a). Hirst referring to the modern era argues that liberal education has as its main purpose the development of people based on what our time perceives as valuable. Education, however, should not be subject to the whims of politicians or other powerful groups in society (Hirst, 1973a). This perception of the author is accepted because education must serve the purpose of each society and therefore it is necessary not to be subject to or serve the interests of the ruling class, perpetuating a certain social regime. Education, of course, transmits the values of the specific society and the specific state, therefore, it is reasonable to respond to the social, moral and political requirements of the democratic state and not to the model of life that the economic agents want to shape with their assistants politicians and the representatives, mainly, of the social sciences. Therefore, the purpose of education is to provide knowledge, which covers all levels of social life, aiming to create virtuous and just citizens. In support of the above, we refer to the proposal of R. Pring, who, referring to the modern professional dimension of education, says that: "it serves the new class of managers perfectly, but it does not result from any analysis of what it means to be an educated person" (Pring, 2002).

Hirst (1973a) worries about the utilitarian approach to education, because through the educational system, the acquisition of skills by students is sought, in order to respond to the ever-changing environment of the workplace. Unfortunately in our time the economy sets the rules of politics and not the other way around, resulting in the widening of the gap between the rich and the poor. This tactic drives society into disequilibrium and disintegration, as conflicts arise between the poor and wealthy citizens. Society must promote the well-being of all citizens, because in this way the occurrence of events that would cause social conflicts is prevented. This view was first formulated by Plato and

Aristotle. In particular, in Stagirite's texts it is mentioned that there must be a reasonable relationship between wealth and poverty, because excessive wealth or excessive poverty undermines political stability (Aristotle, *Politics*, 1266 b 8-15). Therefore, neither an individual nor a social class is allowed to acquire too much power. Social balance and order is ensured by the existence of a strong middle class, which manages to offset the excessive claims of the extremes: "ἡ δε πενία στάσιν ἐμποιεῖ και κακουργίαν" (Aristotle, *Politics*, 1265 b). Aristotle considered that the impoverishment of citizens is against democracy: "τοῦτο γάρ αἴτιον τοῦ μοχθηροῦ εἶναι τήν δημοκρατίαν" (Aristotle, *Politics*, 1320 a 34) and for this reason he considered the middle class as the condition of development and order within the city, which is accepted and Nowadays.

4. The Role of Education in Shaping the Democratic Citizen

The school is recognized as the institution of socialization and politicization of young people, but at the same time criticisms are made against it, as it is considered to be the most important mechanism within which capitalist relations of production and social inequalities are reproduced. In addition, there are doubts whether the school is able to promote the virtues of the state better, at least than the church or the family. On the other hand, the school "can and must be (re)shaped, with the support of other social institutions, in order to become an effective nursery of state virtues, covering an important gap, since it is not self-evident that children are taught the full range of state virtues in the family or other social groups but certainly not in the market" (Kymlicka, 2010). "The educational system consists in teaching the class education of the dominant social groups, traditionally maintaining the elements of individualism and competition, which are necessary for the adaptation of future adults to today's structures". Even group forms of teaching, when proposed, do not aim to build a society based on human solidarity, but rather are used as a means to develop cooperative skills, which "are required by modern socio-economic conditions" (Matsangouras, 2003).

Citizenship education is now a key parameter in modern education systems, which aim to develop the virtues appropriate to a democratic citizen and the development of active participation in political processes (Papadopoulos, 2016). The school system transmits the dominant ideology through the pedagogical act, which "objectively is nothing more than a symbolic violence, understood as an imposition, on the part of an arbitrary power, a political arbitrariness" (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1970). For these reasons, the role of education needs to be redefined, because in our time, economic growth is emphasized, while the other aspects of the human condition are neglected. Man needs to be treated as a whole and not in an isolated and fragmented way. According to M. Nussbaum, internationally the situation is hopeless, in terms of civic education in primary and secondary education. The education system fails to assess critical thinking, imagination and empathy because there is no adequate way of assessment. Thus, the student becomes passive and the teaching becomes routine, because creativity and individuality do not find room to develop (Nussbaum, 2003).

A democratic society requires changes in education in order to educate the kind of citizen that is needed to function properly and the traits that are considered necessary are critical thinking, dynamism, reflection, empathy and exchange of ideas based on mutual respect and mutual understanding with people belonging to different groups. The functioning of the democratic state is left to the forces of rationality and imagination. In today's age, education systems produce useful people, who bring profit, but have limited imagination. Results in democratic citizens falling into logical errors, acting sloppily, behaving selfishly and narrow-mindedly. "Education primarily aimed at profits in the context of the world market magnifies these defects, producing greedy idleness and a technically cultivated gullibility that threaten the very survival of democracy and are sure to hinder the cultivation of universality" (Nussbaum, 2003). Education and democracy are inextricably linked and the relationship is broken only by human fault.

Althusser notes that no class can maintain state power without exercising its hegemony over and within ideological state apparatuses. The school, in other words, is an institution through which children acquire the ideology that suits the role they will fulfill in the future in class society. Individuals are fashioned into subjects suited to the needs of capitalism (Althusser, 1983). The school, in other words, is an institution through which children acquire the ideology that suits the role they will fulfill in the future in class society. Individuals are fashioned into subjects suited to the needs of capitalism. In addition, in school children are taught "how" things happen but by methods that ensure submission to the dominant ideology. Education does not seem to offer future workers the possibility of a "total understanding of the production process" (Grollios, 2005). While the "development of any critical and creative thinking aims one-sidedly at the understanding of school knowledge", as the discussion of social becoming has no place in a teaching act that aims, for example, to succeed in exams (Liambas & Kaskaris, 2007). In the book *Schooling in Capitalist America*, Bowles & Gintis argued that there is a strict correspondence between the type of social relations that develop in the school and the relations of the economic environment. Education, in other words, is perceived as a purely passive reflection of the world of work. The effort to liberalize education and the democratization of economic life are inextricably linked. Education is governed by interactions in relation to other parameters, social, political, economic and cultural, and should be approached in this way (Bowles & Gintis, 1976).

5. Pedagogical Love and Democracy

Plato focuses on the way of teaching and on the relationship between the educator and the educated, with the ultimate goal that the encounter between the two persons should be fruitful. The philosopher refers to the dangers faced by the young, when he does not have the appropriate teachers: "χρῆ ἐραστη μᾶλλον ή μή ερωντι ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων χαρίεσθαι» (Plato, *Protagoras*, 318 E). The work of teachers is essential because it refers to the moral formation of young people, so great care is required in the selection of people who undertake the education of children. The wrong choice of the teacher undermines the future development of the young person as a citizen, as well as the achievement of the happy life (Plato, *Protagoras*, 313A-B). Socrates, talking to the young people of the city, reveals to them the beauty of his soul and leads them to the development of their personality, while they themselves win him over with their physical qualities, combining at the same time their spiritual gifts (Plato, *Symposium*, 209 B). Man, according to Plato, is a deficient being and needs knowledge; otherwise he cannot survive in the world. However, this learning process is a difficult road, which a deficient existence, i.e., man, must travel, so that with effort and anxiety he can shape his life (Plato, *Protagoras*, 531 B-C, 522B).

The educational process is the relationship of dominance of the adult over the minor, which is approved and validated by the holding social system. This situation is justified because the child is unable to act independently, without meaning that the children are the property of the parents or the teachers, anyway, if the education of the children is defective, the state intervenes. The child gradually joins the world of adults, which in his eyes appears inaccessible and elusive and because it is difficult to take part directly, the coming of age and maturity, as well as the learning that necessarily accompanies them, have become problematic (Karakatsanis, 2015).

A large part of children's education takes place at school, so new problems arise regarding the relationship between school and life. However, many differences are observed in the upbringing and education of children, which are a consequence of the social and economic background of the students. First of all, the children of the higher social strata are familiar with the language code of the school, since their environment works with this code, and coming to school they do not change the language code, but continue with their environment, which means that they are familiar with the educational environment (Karakatsanis, 2015).

The purpose of learning is the independence of the child from parents and teachers and subsequently, the ability to create new autonomous relationships both with peers and with other people. The school develops the child's abilities that correspond to each evolutionary field and must be promoted or they will fade. That is why every lesson taught is taught at the specific developmental fade; otherwise the smooth development of the child is harmed, as it results in compulsive learning (Karakatsanis, 2015). Choices in the area of education must be made based on the three concepts: maturity, participation and emancipation. This is necessary because democracy requires mature people and citizens. Adorno notes: "every attempt to promote ideals from the outside that do not spring from the mature consciousness of

32

the individual and do not express it, is a collectivist reaction" (Adorno, 2006).

The teacher is now perceived as a professional mediator between the student and the world, "connecting with reality and acquiring an entity with which every teacher could identify" (Karakatsanis, 2015). Children have no possibility of rejecting the agents of socialization and necessarily accept the existing conditions. From the above, the question arises in education regarding freedom, given that the parameters of "freedom, the participation of the students, their differentiation with the teachers, the selection of the necessary material and the use of the appropriate textbooks" are included. The educational system needs to be structured on the basis of regularity and freedom in the educational process without dogmatism and arbitrariness (Karafillis, 2007). Education differentiates and modifies human nature, leading man to the perfection and acquisition of his humanity, as Menander said, the purpose of man is the fulfillment of his natural destiny and the highlighting of his essence, which make him graceful "Ὡς χαρίεν ἄνθρωπος, ὅταν ἄνθρωπος ᾖ". Man is the being of nature "who manages to escape definitively from the shackles of nature, to escape from the center of the oppressive power of repetitive natural laws and thus to become the eccentric being, the essential being, the being differentiated from. it manages to position itself and acquire its uniqueness" (Karafillis, 2007). In this difficult path of educating the young person, the role of the competent teacher is fundamental and essential.

Socrates as a teacher did not treat his students as knowledgeable, but his discourse was aimed at shaping the student's "ethos" and developing the powers of his soul. Modern teachers can learn from the Athenian philosopher's approach to young people. Therefore, the Socratic teacher exchanges arguments with his student and through the dialogue their correctness is checked, then new arguments are reformulated and created (Kalfas, 2011). In this way, the philosophical discourse develops, i.e., with the exchange of discourses. Of course, students during the educational process must be receptive to the teacher's words, so that the discussion that will be held is constructive and fruitful (Plato, Phaedrus 277a). The souls of young people are always receptive and offer the fertile ground for sowing the teacher's words and through creative dialogue, young people acquire the supplies they need to meet their duties as citizens (Kalfas, 2011).

The Socratic teacher inspires the students and leads them to the virtuous life. But in modern times, most educational systems focus on highlighting technical and scientific skills and not on how to form the virtuous citizen, consequently stifling creativity and personality for the sake of success in school exams. Our society is fixated on the pursuit of wealth and the aim of education is for future citizens to serve this process of profit and not to create thinking citizens. Democracy does not need people who will submit to authority and the pressure of the social environment, but who will have the courage to express their individual dissent. We must mold children according to Socratic values, so that they become "active, critical and inquisitive spirit, able to resist authority and environmental pressure" (Nussbaum, 2013).

6. Epilogue

In the study at hand we dealt with the effect of education on the construction of the status of the democratic citizen of the modern society, however, we referred to previous manifestations of this status, as we referred to the intellect of the thinkers of Ancient Greece. The reason for the mention was compelling, because modern European citizenship is largely based on the characteristics of the citizen of the ancient Athenian democracy and the theory of the ancient Greek philosophers. Athenian democracy promoted equality and freedom as the basic characteristics of the citizen. The ancient Greek philosophers proclaimed the engagement of the citizen with the commons and the promotion of the common good of the city. In our opinion, these elements can be the foundation for the creation of a modern democracy, in which the leader will make decisions based on the interest of all citizens and not the social class that supported him for his election and themselves citizens will be active, deciding their own lives.

References

Acemoglu, D. et al. (2005). From Education to Democracy? *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, *95*, 44-49. https://doi.org/10.1257/000282805774669916

Althusser, L. (1983). *Theses*. Athens: Themelio.

Balias, S. (2008). Human rights. Citizenship and education. In S. Balias (Ed.), *Active Citizen and Education* (pp. 198-220). Athens: Papazisis.

Barro, R. (1999). Determinants of Democracy. *Journal of Political Economy*, *107*, 158-183. https://doi.org/10.1086/250107

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1970). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage Publications.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. NY: Basic Books.

Castelló-Climent, A. (2006). *On the Distribution of Education and Democracy* (pp. 1-18). Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/7151204.pdf

Curle, A. (1964). Education, Politics and Development. *Comparative Education Review*, *7*(3), 226-245. https://doi.org/10.1086/445002

Dimitrakopoulou, A. (2012). *Aristotle's Teaching on Education: Effects on Plutarch's work, as well as on Byzantine and modern pedagogy*. Athens: Ennoia.

Farrar, C. (1988). *The Principles of Democratic Thought in Classical Athens*. Athens: Papazisi. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511552489

Glaeser, E., LaPorta, R., Lopes-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. (2004). Do Institutions Cause Growth? *Journal of Economic Growth*, *9*, 271-303. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOEG.0000038933.16398.ed

Gosewinkel, D. (2001). Citizenship, historical development of Citizenship. In N. J. Smelser, & P. B. Bakes (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences* (pp. 1852-1857). New York: Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/02682-6

Grollios, G. (2005). *Paulo Freire and the Syllabus*. Thessaloniki: Vanias.

Hirst, P. H. (1973a). Liberal education and the nature of knowledge. In R. S. Peters (Ed.), *The Philosophy of Education* (pp. 87-111). Oxford University Press.

Hourdakis, A. (2003). Hospitality City or Foreign Citizen? The stranger, the neighbor and the barbarian in Greek antiquity. In A. Kazamias (Ed.), *Education and Citizen: The education of the citizen of Greece, Europe and the world* (pp. 78-96). Athens: Atrapos.

Hutchins, R. M. (1953). *The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society*. N.Y.: Harper and Row.

Kalfas, V. (2011). *Love in Plato. Archaeology & Arts* (issue 109, pp. 10-15). Retrieved from December 10, 2023, from https://www.archaiologia.gr/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/109-2.pdf

Kalogiannakis, P. (2003). Political Socialization and School: Comparisons, aspects and perspectives. In A. Kazamias (Ed.), *Education and Citizen: The education of the citizen of Greece, Europe and the world* (pp. 151-172). Athens: Atrapos.

Karakatsanis, P. (2015). *Philosophy of Education*. Athens: Gutenberg.

Karaphyllis, G. (2007). *The Philosophy of Education*. Athens: Vania.

Kymlicka, W. (2010). The rise and fall of multiculturalism? New debates on inclusion and accommodation in diverse societies. *International Social Science Journal*, 97-112. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2451.2010.01750.x

Liambas, A., & Kaskaris,, I. (2007). *Critical Postmodernism, critical pedagogical and the ideological forms of neophile liberalism in education*. Retrieved November 5, 2023, from http://www.theseis.com/index.php?optio

Lipset, S. M. (1959). Some Social Requisites for Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy. *American Political Science Review*, *53*, 69-105. https://doi.org/10.2307/1951731

Lipset, S. M. (1960). *Political Man: The Social Basis of Modern Politics*. New York: Doubleday.

Manville, P. B. (1990). *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens*. Princeton: University Press.

Marcuse, H. (1985). *On the "Affirmative Character of Culture"*. Athens: Ypsilon.

Matsangouras, C. (2003). *The School Class*. Athens: Grigori.

Nussbaum, M. (2003). *Not for Profit*. Princeton. University Press.

Papadopoulos, K. (2016). For a citizenship education with a democratic orientation under conditions of neoliberal ideological hegemony. *Erkyna, Review of Educational-Scientific Issues*, *8*, 19-32.

Papanaoum, Z., & Tzika, Z. (1989). *Political Socialization and School*. Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis.

Parsons, T. (1966). *Societies: Evolutionary and comparative perspective*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Pavlidis, P. (2008). Education as the purpose of life. In K. Voudouris (Ed.), *Education in the Age of Universality* (pp. 238-253). Athens: Ionia.

Peters, R. S. (1977). *Education and the Education of Teacher*. London.

Petrou, A. (2010). Education, education, ethics of emancipation and democratic citizenship. In M. Sakellariou, M. Zebylas, & A. Petrou (Eds.), *Ethics and Education* (pp. 119-152). Dilemmas and Perspectives, Athens: Critique.

Pring, R. (2002). Neglected purposes of Education. In R. Marples (Ed.), *The Purposes of Education*. Athens: Metaichmio.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). The prosperous community: Social capital and public life. *American Prospect*, *4*(13), 35-42.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2003). *Democracy and Civic Engagement Reconnecting Education to Democracy: Democratic Dialogues* (pp. 9-14). https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170308500105

Young, A. (2011). La diversité linguistique à l'école: Handicap ou ressource? In C. Dorison, & N. Lewi-Dumont (Eds.), *La formation des tous les enseignants à la diversité, Suresnes: INS-HEA* (pp. 93-109). https://doi.org/10.3917/nras.055.0093