Contemporary Understanding of Education in the Rift between Ontological Relativity and the Transformed Media Culture

Sara Pejaković[1,*]

[1]Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Pedagogy, University Josip Juraj Strossmayer, Lorenza Jagera 9, 31 000 Osijek, Croatia

*Correspondence: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Pedagogy, University Josip Juraj Strossmayer, Lorenza Jagera 9, 31 000 Osijek, Croatia. E-mail: skakuk@ffos.hr; sara.pejakovic.87@gmail.com

Received: January 28, 2016 Accepted: February 25, 2016 Online Published: March 28, 2016

doi:10.5430/wje.v6n2p33 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/wje.v6n2p33

Abstract

The transformation of the developmental process from animal rationale, through homo communicans into the (un)aware homo symbolicum and the man receiving and distributing media information today, available through multimedia tools in his everyday life, encourages thought on the contemporary man, as well as the purpose, point and sense in contemporary education. The fact is that an individual's life today cannot function deprived of virtual communication. It is possible to state that the world of mass and new media, changed the perception of reality in an essential way. Given the ontic nature of new media being based on technology i.e. the matrix of technical mediation of the real, fiction becomes reality and facts are (re)interpreted as media information. They not only aren't the measure or the guide in a theoretical context, they can also lead to an uncontrolled and unpredictable course of media information, due to their truthfulness not being questioned. That is how the global presence of media sets the forms of social life and sometimes relativizes the unquestionable nature of information, thus hiding the fundamental questions of the survival of humane values. In such a context, ontology and ontological relativity provide a landmark in the review of the truthfulness of facts, theories and scientific theoretical settings, especially when (re)defining the notion of contemporary education in the so-called "cyber" world. For those reasons precisely, taking into consideration the causality of the relationship between contemporary media and the multimedia reality in which an individual is located, and in the context of ontological relativity, this paper attempts to search for the understanding of contemporary education of man and of the true, without which true education as such is not possible.

Keywords: *education; ontological relativity; media; values; cultural changes*

1. Thoughts on Man and the Influence of Ontological Relativity

Although education is the totality of possible measures using which we help the youth in becoming a man, lasting until the person being raised is deemed mature (Dilthey, 1961), showing that the man we are raising is not considered a man. The humanity of a man is fulfilled by his maturity, thus showing an anthropological presumption of a notion according to which one surely requires education in a comprehensive sense because one is still not "a true man". Education is equally significant in the life of an individual as it is in the historical development of mankind. These noticeable differences in definitions of education arise from the dependability on the point of view of the person using it and the scientific conception represented by that person.

The always actual and almost hard to define question "What is man?" is aimed at by various sciences dealing with it from different aspects (Lenzen, 2002). Pedagogy, as a scientific discipline, makes questions about man fertile for science of education by striving to further consider them in a pedagogical way. This is a context in which we can observe the notion of education. Knowledge of a purposeful etiological analysis of definitions through history has two parts even today. The first part consists of observation and imitation and the other, more complicated, process is of a semantical nature. Precisely that semantical part is the indicator in the disclosing the significance of ontological relativity in the contemporary notion and definition of education. Ontological relativity may not and cannot demand that theories are completely interpreted, apart from a relative sense of the expression, if anything today can be considered contemporary theory at all.

Contemporary anthropological cognitions point to the conclusion that phylogenesis and ontogenesis are necessarily based on education in concrete circumstances. Human existence is, most directly, dependent on education and, as such, education is also one of the most important characteristics of the human species (Ogurcov, 2002). According to that, man is the only creature which requires education, the only creature in need of education. On the one hand, we have the openness of man and the freedom to shape his own creature and his surroundings, and on the other we can interpret the openness of man as pessimistically as his flawed nature. Therefore, man is a "flawed creature" (Gudjons, 1994) and, despite that, is forced to make up for biological insufficiencies with technology and to adapt the natural world he sees around himself into his own nature i.e. culture (Gehlen, 1940).

Man, in order to survive, draws profit from the select knowledge of previous generations. He is open to the world, overwhelmed with stimuli and the multitude of impressions he most overcome, which is an enormous burden for a man. By Gehlen's law of relief, man relieves himself by acting and, by doing so, turns his shortcomings and deficiencies into his advantages (Gudjons, 1994). As one of the ways of relieving, Gehlen states the habits which turn the behavior of man into habitual behavior. Habits, for man, are the replacement for his instinctive shortcomings. The fact that man can set a *hiatus* between stimuli and its response i.e. an inter-space in which he finds his space to think and decide freely (Senković, 2007), the biologist Johannes Uexhülla (1864 – 1944) calls a functional circle. This circle consists of essentially two different, but cooperative and balanced, systems – the »receptor« (Merknetz) and »effector« (Wirknetz) (according to Džinić et al.). Cassirer (1978) expands Uexkhüll's theory in his reflections by claiming that man has developed a new "symbolic system" of adapting. In other words, man's reality is mediated by symbols. This world of symbols consists of individual symbolic forms, such as language, myth, art, and religion. They make up the multiple network of symbols which is enriched and constantly strengthened by all the human rational and experiential progress. Due to the inability of direct confrontation with pure reality and the impossibility of dealing with things themselves, man is forced, in a way, to deal with himself because he is the creator of the world of symbols. Man is so caught up into linguistic forms, paintings of art, mythical symbols or religious rituals that he cannot see or know anything without the mediation of that artificial medium. Therefore, it is justified to claim that man is a creature that has yet to make his own nature because no surrounding is sufficient for survival to him without the influence of education. Due to his instinctive insecurity, man would collapse without the influence of previously raised people, leading to the cognition that between the one being educated and the one doing the deed, there is a vitally unbreakable caretaker bond.

Philosophical definitions and thoughts on man are partially formed even before biological attempts. Kant is the first philosopher setting pedagogy at the base of anthropology: "Man can become man only by way of education." (Haeffner, 2003). There is also Rousseau's thought: "Man is what education makes of him". Furthermore, Scheler (Scheler, 1960) calls man a reflexive creature, a creature of spirit, "open to the world", a self-conscious creature. What makes man a man is the principle opposed to life – a spirit encompassing the notion of mind, the thought of ideas, a certain kind of emotional and volitional acts. He considers man to be a creature whose very mode of being is still an open decision about what he wants to be and become (Scheler, 1996). Man has the freedom of self-forming, he forms, determines, changes, and directs himself. Under that freedom of self-forming hides the possibility and development of man by way of education. Glasser (1990) thinks similarly. He portrays the possible degrees of human self-realization with five human figures of various sizes. These sizes range from the extreme of unfulfilled possibilities to the extreme in which a person completely achieves his or her human possibilities, highlighting the fact that man chooses his own behavior, further confirming his freedom and openness to the world. Man is driven to act by basic needs, under which he assumes the need to belong, love, and cooperate, the need for power, competition, and respect, the need to play, be creative, and have fun, as well as the need for the possibility of choice and freedom. Anthropologist and philosopher H. Plessner (1964) calls man an eccentric creature, thinking that distancing from himself i.e. hoisting above everything that surrounds man and what man perceives is a specific characteristic of the human position. On the other hand, in the manipulative world of media of today, man's alienation from himself with the help of his own creative role promotes symbols which have, by way of media, commercialized life.

We can also say that the understanding of man, developed in philosophical anthropology, forms a new sense, gives new landmarks in treating man. It can become and is becoming the core of a pedagogical notion of man because various conceptions of man all come down to one thing – perceiving man as an open creature, a creature constantly questioning itself. Here, we can see Cassirer's concept of the symbol which sees man's specificity and distinctiveness precisely in his ability to develop symbols. Symbols are instruments using which man comes to know the world and himself. Cassirer, by way of that, comes to his basic thesis on the need of reshaping the classic definition of man as "animal rationale" into a new definition of man as "animal symbolicum", while highlighting the too narrow perception of the mind for the interpretation of man's rich and plentiful cultural life, consisting precisely of all symbolic forms. Man's *differentia specifica* is not his metaphysical or physical nature – it is his actions. Language, myth, religion, art, science,

and history are all constructive parts and various areas of that sphere. Therefore, according to Cassirer (1978), the question of man and the question of culture are actually the same question i.e. philosophy itself is challenged to find the depth of man's cultural creation in order to understand the very essence of man. According to that, man's activities, when seen from the corner of self-realization and his own upgrading, represent the philosophically and pedagogically significant educational action at the same time.

On the other hand, in order to better understand the influence which ontological relativity has on the ontological reduction of the philosophical understanding of man, it is useful to consider the philosophical importance of Lȍwenheim-Skolemov (1967). Why? Because ontology per se is uninterested, as well as it is towards the hesitant educational theory which does not have a final universe because it needs to question itself constantly according to the needs of an individual and the functioning of society, now and in the future. Due to the fact that the discussion on the contemporary definition of education has various aspects, so does ontology have variably strict demands which need to have a background metatheory and need to bring purposeful links between the goal, task, and purpose of contemporary education to consciousness in an integrative way. Therefore, it is key to also analyze the cultural aspect of the anthropological definition in order for the influence of ontology in it to be multiply relative and in order for it not to belong only to transcendental metaphysics. As "Aristotle claims at the beginning of Metaphysics: "…the life of mankind happens in art and reasonable thought, where the philosopher points to some special characteristic of man which differentiates him from other living things" (Akvinski, 2005: 35). Man's creation of symbolic media surrounding him is also one of his eminent characteristics. Contemporary social circumstances of the development of the Internet, cyberspace, network communication, mobile communication, and virtual space have enabled the media to transfer mass media communication through virtual media space, thus enabling man's transformation from *homo symbolicus* to a man residing in an imposed media consumerism. The aforementioned statement presents a basic question – what are the values in education to strive for today?

2. True Education for Values and the Role of Pedagogy

If education truly is education with values – what are those values today? It is very confusing to analyze the distinctions of the definitions of education in an etiological way if one neglects the significance of ontological relativity. It's systematic consideration may force not only the rejection of certain definitions of education, consequently branding some terms as non-referential, but may also refer to those terms in other definitions of education. In other words, ontological relativity enables the educational, media, and other truths to be reconstructed under the guise of the "freedom of man and the purpose of education". In this context, Komar states (2012, p. 37): … "purpose unites the ways of man's existence and, at the same time, funds the entire survival in purposeful thought and gives it meaning". The thesis of the vagueness of the meaning (reference) of terms also the same argumentative standpoint as the one on the irrefutability of scientific hypotheses and theories. In other words, the reference of a term can only be surmised in relation to a background (meta)language. Quine (1969) here also implicitly connects language and theory – to define the meanings of language expressions is the same as to define the universe and the interpretation of a theory, and the latter is possible only in relation to a metatheory. What is a bit forgotten in the postmodern period is precisely metaphysics and metatheory, as well as any possibility of thought in the classic sense, which is necessary when thinking about true education.

Given that the purpose of education is to make man a man, the question today is – what does that mean, in the full sense of the expression? What is man supposed to be like today? How can we have operative values and goals of education when man cannot be defined? Finally, what educational purpose needs to be idealized and what values need to be sought? If the goals of education are ideals, they cannot be operationalized. On the other hand, functionalism and structuralism strive to shape an individual according to social norms. The educational purpose is imposed 'from the outside'. The imperative is society functioning and the individual is an asset. The purpose is, therefore, 'predetermined' through the ideas of predictability and efficiency and the educational system is a part of a wider system the performativity[1] of which must be supported by the idea of functionality. A question is asked – where is the individual here, his individual capabilities and tendencies, his specialties, his freedom? In that context – where is true, free-thinking pedagogy? It is necessary to search for real causes of this state, which reflects onto the position of pedagogy as a science, its constantly lacking thinking and theoretical position.

The fact that all the great minds of human intellectual history (Plato, Aristotle, Locke, Rousseau, Kant, Humboldt, Dilthey, Durkheim, Dewey, Tolstoy etc.) wrote about education is not finding fertile ground in the final synthesis of thoughts on education. The notion of education still has various references, such as: "The entire process of the development of man as a human being" (Bašić, 1990), that is the process of the development of man's personality, or

"the social actions using which people attempt to permanently improve the frame of psychic dispositions of other people with psychic and socio-cultural means, or to preserve their components which are deemed as valuable" (Brezinka, 1973). For those reasons, the notion of ontological relativity is of extreme importance. Also important is the connection to the multimedia influence on an individual in discovering the true meaning of education in social sciences when taking the modern context into consideration. Also, out of the theses of related sciences, what is possible to imply in the theoretical definition of the purpose, goal, and the very sense of education? Why? On the one hand, social sciences strive for an ever clearer, more precise understanding of the phenomena related to education and the necessities of education today. On the other, they are having a harder and harder time with the difficulties of the cause and effect transformations of values and accepting them. It is inevitable that the cause of the transformation of values must be seen in the context of globalism today, the influence of media, pluralism of ideas, the technicality, and multiculturalism, which are the main characteristics of the complex contemporary reality we live in. For those reasons precisely, ontological relativity is necessary in the understanding of the notion of education to discover not only the ideas of other disciplines which have been used and their authors, but also to really understand the true meaning and purpose of every thesis and put it into context of the circumstances under which they are stated. One asks the question – What kind of education do we need today? If, by way of an etiological analysis, it is discovered that the purpose, goal, and tasks of education have been changed according to the need of society through history, we come to the need to know which values we have to strive for with educational implications in social sciences. In other words, not to raise towards something and for something from the outside – something imposed. In such a context, pedagogy understood as the research of educational phenomena with an important purpose of finding regularities due to technical management (for society) of educational processes and for pragmatically set and often ideological "purposes", is a consequence of materialism and pedagogical theoretical insufficiency.

Education is the exclusion of man from his time and the release from the imposed circumstances of media manipulations. Scientific and expert authorities become less actual than the life of a "reality show" actor or a popular football player – consumerism of the media instead of the content, one could say. The culture industry thus becomes entertainment which enslaves man's spiritual component. The consumerism of esthetics and art as the most important content area of esthetic education is almost non-existent as a creation. It is becoming commercialized, indifferent, expendable merchandise and a servant in the entertaining wheel of the everyday media. The media, in that way, openly commit, enslave a man in the wasteland of multimedia influence. Man, under that media control and bombarded by facts of questionable origin, absorbs them, relates to them and transfers the same or similar content and information, with a note of a judgment in his accent, present in the multimedia sphere which he has been manipulated into and in which he lives. Therefore, one can justifiably ask oneself has not what once was considered "absolute truth" been transformed into "the truth of (media) culture", which further transforms the very idea of sociability? Or, in what way have these transformed processes been presented and then verified?

On the other hand, the questioning of pedagogy and its role in the process of man's growth is taken into consideration. Can education shed light on the correct, the only way towards truth? Most certainly the answer to this is yes, with the condition that we have knowledge of what true education is per se and the person it is intended for. The earlier presented foundations of education and the educational process, thoughts on education and its necessity ask questions touching upon the educational possibilities and power which have attracted the attention of those seeking to know this phenomenon for centuries (and still do). They want to use scientific knowledge in order to advance the results of educational activities. Educational pessimism points to the understanding of man as a creature that cannot be educated, by giving primacy to heritage and internal factors. The philosophical foundation of this is laid by the German philosopher Schopenhauer, who is also a philosophically oriented pessimist and who believes in the immutability of character. The Italian anthropologist Cesare Lombroso ("Crime, Its Causes and Remedies") did not believe in the possibility of education a man because he gave far too much importance to family heritage (Ellwood, 1912). The one born with hereditary burdens will care them their entire life, without the possibility of improving significantly. The American pedagogue Stanley Hall also stood by biological determinism (according to Lerner, 2002) with his theory of naivety, as well as Kretschmer (1925) did by studying the typology of the human body and thinking that the physical construction is what sets human life and education. S. Freud explains man's psychic life and awareness by his instinctual determination. His psychoanalysis leaves very little room for education. Therefore, the basic though of pedagogical pessimism is that man's development is predetermined and based on biological factors of inheritance. It is impossible to change that predetermined set in man by outside influence and education because it sets his destiny. Science cannot accept the dictatorship of biological determinism. Pessimism resides on wrong assumptions that the one who is to be raised is born determined. Practical consequences of pedagogical pessimism would be deadly for social life because by their extent man would lose his sense of openness to the world and the possibility of learning and

progressing. The opposing point of view, pedagogical optimism, resists the negating educational attitude and power of the pessimists by giving faith into the unlimited powers of education – even Plato set education into the foundations of his ideal State. The humanist-oriented pedagogues F. Rabelais, M. de Montaigne, E. of Rotterdam firmly give education the highest accolades in forming an individual. The English philosopher John Locke confirmed the optimistic educational thought that nothing but the possibility of shaping is brought into the world with the birth of a child when he interpreted it as a "tabula rasa". The social environment and education are the most powerful assets which determine the developmental path of the person being educated. Such trust in the educational possibilities was shared also by the pedagogical classics J.A. Komensky, J.H. Pestalozzy, A. Diesterweg and others. Contemporary sociologists also are mostly inclined towards pedagogical optimism. To them, the outside and social elements are far more powerful than the inner predetermined ones in the very person being educated. The thing that functionalists are blamed for in sociology, by looking from a pedagogical standpoint, is the knowledge on the goal of education as a process of adapting an individual to society.

The attempt to overcome the one-sidedness of the relationship between pedagogical optimism and pessimism is seen in pedagogical realism. "Education is not powerless, but it is also not all-powerful" (Filipović, 1965). Those are the foremost boundaries set by the human nature. The further development of psychology and genetics in the 19th century enables deeper understanding of heritage. Hereditary dispositions are the condition for development. However, what will come of them and in what manner is dependent on outside influence, the social environment and education. W. Sunkel (2011, 46 according to PAlekčić, 2015, 63) continues in that context by speaking of education like "…the mediated adoption of non-genetic dispositions for action". According to that, "dispositions for action" are subjective presumptions which a subject, a person needs to carry in themselves in order to be able to appropriately perform their action – "the knowledge, skills, motifs", "knowledge, art, wanting" (Palekčić, 2015, p. 171). Furthermore, Sunkel (Sunkel, 2011 according to Palekčić 2015) claims that dispositions are the object of usurpation and that is the object of mediation. Without dispositions, there is no usurpation. However, without usurpation, at least for that generation, there is no disposition. Usurpation holds primacy over mediation and disposition over usurpation. All three things are relevant for the notion of education. According to that, synchronized action of one and the other, interconnection, permeation and upgrading will give the best perspective to education and remove inefficient usurpation and unconvincing competition. In other words, hereditary genetic bases become manifest properties only by way external educational influences and it is of extreme importance to take into consideration the internal and external factors of man's development. That primarily means certain biological, physiological and psychological qualities of each individual, but also surrounding elements such as the environment in which an individual is raised, social relations, family atmosphere, traditions and laws, economic, residential and cultural conditions etc. On those foundations W. Stern sets his theory of convergence, which connects the inner and outer factors of man's development. However, man is passive in this process and his own active role is disconnected. He is at the mercy of the natural-social influence and organized educational action, which is very insufficient for education as such. Namely, an active attitude and conscious activity by the one being educated, his freedom and the possibility of individual self-determination is what pedagogy strives for i.e. it understands education in an activist kind of way. The activity of an individual, work and learning are the necessary conditions, along with previously spotted factors of heritage, social environment and education, in order to developed acquired dispositions into active capabilities. By following this train of thought, one acquires a more complete explanation of man's development on which contemporary multi-factor theory is based.

In this breadth of thought, the central question is the one of educating the contemporary man as a receiver and distributor of information. The questioning of power is unquestionable and equal to the questioning of man's existence as a living thing. Truly, the educational capabilities in the context of multi-factor theory are vast, with the condition that we have knowledge of true education as such and the one it is meant for. Here it is inevitable to mention the fact that properties and heritage, as well as self-regulation of an individual are mutually conditioned and intertwined in a way that the actions of socio-cultural influences are dependent on the properties, heritage and self-regulation; the actions of properties and heritage are dependent on the influences of the socio-cultural surroundings and the kind and way of self-regulation; the kind and way of self-regulation are dependent on the genetic predispositions of an individual and his socio-cultural surroundings; the same genetic properties and the same way of practicing his freedom under various social-cultural circumstances will have different effect; the same type and way of practicing one's freedom in the case of various environment properties and heritage will have different effects on the educational action of an individual (Hobbmair, 1993). Such various interactions of heritage, environment factors and self-regulatory activities of the one being educated are a pointer for the complexity of the educational process and the process of forming an individual, especially when you are dealing with the pluralism of ideas, terms, theories, approaches and perspectives using which we view an individual. In this context, pedagogy, as a science of education, has the

possibility to more clearly understand such a complex phenomenon as is education, the purpose of which is man. It does so with the help of other scientific disciplines dealing with man (psychology, biology, anthropology, philosophy, theology, sociology etc.) However, in order to better understand the aspect of the phenomenon of education and the very purpose of it, it is necessary to distinguish that notion from a cultural aspect and to understand why education and culture are in a purposeful relationship.

3. The Cultural Aspect of Contemporary Education

Education and culture are tightly connected. Human culture as a whole can be described as "the process of progressive self-liberation of man" (Cassirer, 1978, 288.). Therefore, we can think of education as a fact of culture, while culture is reproduced and developed by education. As an attempt for man to reshape what he has acquired into some purposefulness, to point it and transfer it to man himself, culture means the development, spreading, strengthening the entire psychophysical nature of man and the forming of his life, taking guidance from some pointers and ideas (Schultz, Lavenda, 2009). In a phylogenetic way, as well as ontogenetic, man has been give "the fact of development" (he does not come into this world complete) and educational action is required with the purpose of upgrading man as an imperfect creature. From man's imperfection i.e. from his need to be educated follows the necessity of the social reaction and practice by way of which man will gain his substantial designation. It points towards thinking about free, versatile-developed characteristics of an individual who can, knows how and has the ability to actively take part in contemporary social circumstances. From this briefly portrayed essence of education comes the drive for the wide and diverse, versatile advancement of a young man, of building his valued dispositions and of introducing him into the cultural reality. Man is, therefore, raised through culture and, as such, puts effort into the survival and development of culture because it is what enables him an authentic mode of survival by mediating axiological givens to him. However, in order to understand contemporary culture, it is necessary to determine its value, which will lead to the understanding of what education is supposed to be like in contemporary culture that has been transformed into media culture. The reason for this is because everything cultural is transferred by communication and every communication is transferred through culture. Therefore, one must understand contemporary mass media communication and the (non)values it "promotes" and/or strives for. Apart from the market, as it is written by Miroljub Radajković in his study called Medium sindrom (2006), "the actually derived communication revolution impressed an inevitable seal on culture". Therefore, it is a question of values in contemporary media culture. Only when the possible consequences of determining the values of contemporary media culture are understood, one can speak of neglected values in speaking of true education. Contemporary man lost himself in the so-called media empiricism, he got "suffocated" in the everyday swarm of data in which there are violations of ethical standards, all the while forgetting that empiricism in itself comes from the fact or a phenomenon that is considered "objective" and independent from thought. Empiricism developed this prejudice probably due to complete superficiality and bad knowledge of philosophy (Komar, 2012). In it, the problem of the objectness of an object, as well as showing doubt that an object would be something independent of thought itself is deduced and portrayed in various ways. In this case, the media and virtual space is pointed towards "showing the fact of the matter" and it is considered to be true and objective, as such. Furthermore, the very appearance of an object is also the way in which it is shown to the mind. In that sense, it is naïve to think of facts as something given as pure objectness of an object per se.

Moving on, in culture itself there is an obvious conflict of two tendencies: the tendency to bring individualism and, on the other hand, collectivism to life. Individualism is based on the concept of freedom and collectivism is based on the concept of equality. Collectivism grasps enculturation as the process of entering a cultural area and accepting cultural achievements, introducing new generations into a cultural area. Those things, along with socialization and individuation (the central notion of individualism), if taken in a pedagogical sense, help the very process of forming a man to the level of him becoming an independent, autonomous and self-aware creature. Here, I stress the role that personalization has in the process of shaping a man and self-realizing an individual to a complete personality. That is also one of the basic assignments of understanding the transformation from *homo sapiens, homo symbolicus, homo communicans* into completely new coexistences of man tightly connected to multimedia influence of processing and transferring information. ON the other hand, if we take the attempt of philosophy to search for the essence of man in the understanding of his creative culture, the product of his symbolic media, into consideration, we can make conclusions on the identity of the very man and individual. If man is developed in a network of symbols and symbolic forms, a question can rightfully be asked – is not then the identity of an individual also constructed through acceptance, articulation, intensity and the width of influence from one or more symbolic forms that are his creative result on his life? Furthermore, when we talk about symbolism and the transition of *homo symbolicus* to today's influence of media transformations on the lives of individuals, and by extension the education, we can also ask the question of co-creators

of culture, society and values.

By taking biological and philosophical theses into consideration, the primary question is how to develop independence in a helpless, dependent individual? The answer lies in the pedagogical consideration of education in a way that dependence and referring to others during education does not mean a mode of action that does not, at the same time, include cooperation and communication. In the opposite case, it is manipulation in which one is deprived of freedom and that is in conflict with individuation, personalization and his own reaction to created symbolic forms that shape culture. Freedom of an individual is an important factor in the process of education. Education, as the totality of actions by which, on the basis of a historically achieved cultural level, one supports the development of a child's freedom and personality, is liberating and self-fulfilling. If a child's aspirations and needs are not respected, education cannot fulfill those goals. Here we can see the role and importance of the educator and making a process out of such an action. The educator, therefore, does not shape the person undergoing education for some social function or a desirable role as a manipulator does with a child. He is helping the child to shape itself, to personify i.e. to stand on his own two legs, become its own, free. Simply put, to become a person, a man. Being a man is precisely "being yourself or immediately dependent on yourself or act as an autonomous creature" (Polić, 2007). By doing so, education separates two purposes: the purpose of the one being raised shown by the activation of the aforementioned important existential values, and the purpose of the educator's work shown in the tendency that, by the act of activating values, the one being raised will one day become an educator. In this context, the influence of ontological relativity would follow from searching for the truth of Thomas Aquinas: "As we must reduce arguments on certain principles which are conceivable to the mind per se, so must we also act in researching the definition of every "thing"; otherwise, in both cases, we would go into infinity and every knowledge and every cognitive matter would fail" (Akvinski, 2005: 61). From this context we arrive to the cognition that an educator, when acting, must look on a child as a subject that inherently has rights and freedom belonging to it. Therefore, the educator requires a certain pedagogical tact as a way of estimating and deciding in the philosophical-pedagogical practice. That is characteristic only to a pedagogue-educator that takes individual situations and cases into consideration. As a holistic philosophical-pedagogical awareness with the characteristic of senses (Palekčić, 1999), a philosophical-pedagogical tact is necessary in order for the art of transferring and submerging into a culture of the one being raised to be performed with a certain measure of a free process of a child's own engagement and the development of personality, independence and autonomy. That is primarily a pedagogical notion which confirms a unique philosophical-pedagogical scientific shaping of the phenomenon of education. In that context, the significance of ontological relativity is reflected in the question of ethics in education. Even though Aristotle considers that "every art and every science, and so every action and commitment strive for something good" (Akvinski, 2005: 111), the basic shaping of the phenomenon of education needs to constantly be questioned in the integrative continual process because the philosopher, theologian, pedagogue, culturologist and others look at it from various points of view.

From the earlier settings of man's imperfection and flawed nature we can see a need for education and practice that enables man to self-determine himself. This goes along with the aforementioned problem of contradiction of the educational process which questions the addictions of the one being raised and his direction to others, as well as the development of his independence. In this context, ontological relativity would help to answer the question of the final purpose of man and education, the aspect of which would have several sub-questions: Is contemporary education necessary in order for man to perform his actions to some purpose or vice versa? Furthermore, is there a purpose to be derived from the scientific shaping of the phenomenon of education for the final purpose of human life? Ontological relativity would transform the question into whether the phenomenon of education can have multiple purposes and what is their point if the goals are not clearly set nor valued. True scientific shaping of the phenomenon of education must arise from the question of value and the ontology of relativity. That ontology is based on Luhmann's concept of "coding" theses in order to prevent false scientific shaping of the notion of education which sometimes, in the contemporary technological society, appears and is presented as the only truth. That especially relates to the dangers of technological advancement in which the so-called "visual knowledge" is created that often serves as a false measure and a guide in forming the notion of education. Popular contemporary (web) media (social networks etc.) are today one of the basic generators of distaste we live in. Behind it lie the fundamental questions of the survival of education as a notion. To return to man and true educational values is a necessary imperative. On the other hand – what are those values?

The pluralism of value judgments and commitments today sets a life in which status, physical appearance and bountifulness are enjoyed as one of the goals of the only life worth living (Hedges, 2011: 39). Therefore, it is not hard to arrive to an answer to the question of what are the social strivings and attempts when we talk about the purpose, goal and sense of education. However, is there room for an individual and his latent capabilities and affections here? This social-individual relationship of causality needs to be observed within the framework of the

technological-developmental revolution of contemporary media of today and it is pointless to observe it outside of that framework. Also, if we strive to achieve true education, then it is inconceivable to observe this problem only from a theoretical pedagogical perspective. Interdisciplinarity and integration are the terms which absolutely must find their place in the pedagogical science when we think about the contemporary education of man.

4. Conclusion

This paper attempted to portray the role of media and ontological relativity in thinking of and theoretically questioning (but also relativizing the interpretation) of theories which are connected to the phenomenon of education in the contemporary context. It is beyond questioning that education is as old as man himself. Its purpose is man and, therefore, it is necessary to observe the phenomenon of education in an interdisciplinary cooperation with other sciences dealing with questions of man. The genesis of man's development, anthropologically, sociologically, psychologically speaking has enabled the advancement of man's emotional, cognitive and affective cognition, knowledge, his environment and culture which he built with his own creative capabilities by giving it a symbolic accent visible in all spheres of his advancement. Man's creative potentials and products are reflected in the contemporary age, what we call "post-modern" age, marked by the pluralism of transforming values in the context of globalism, the influence of media, ideas, technology and multiculturalism the roots of which we must find in man himself. On the other hand, an individual attempts to confirm his position with educational influences, with the goal of personal growth of individuality and sociality, as well as the co-existence in contemporary circumstances he finds himself in. Arguments on the ideal values directed towards contemporary man are in the process of searching and questioning many social-humanitarian sciences. A confusion of values is in effect. To put it in a better way, it is a truth of values with a questionable character. As such, man is a product of the transfer of information and facts by way of multimedia tools the truthfulness of which needs to be questioned. Therefore, the significance of ontological relativity is multiple in order for it to discover not only the relativity of ideas and thoughts of interdisciplinary cognitions, but also to understand the true meaning and sense of each thesis and put it into the context of circumstances in which the factual truthfulness is given and, as such, questioned. This would lead to a more clear understanding of man and the phenomenon of education. Visible use in such an approach would be in the contextual shape of the theses of related sciences which are valuable if we observe them in the contemporary context. In that, we are looking for the true meaning and sense of each thesis of related sciences in order to be able to implicate them in the theoretical definition of the purpose, goal and the very sense of education. On the one hand, social sciences strive for a clearer, more precise understanding of the phenomena related to education and the need for it today. On the other, they are having more and more trouble dealing with the difficulties of the cause-effect transformations of values and the acceptance of them. Ontological relativity, therefore, enables the educational, media, and other truths to be reconstructed if they are observed in the context in which education and man are in today. Furthermore, the importance of defining an individual theory is possible only in relation to metaphysics and metatheory which becomes a bit forgotten in postmodernism. Therefore, it is necessary to return to the roots in order to actualize the possibility of thought in the classical sense of past times in the context of today. This enables ontological relativization, constant questioning of theories in relation to the circumstances and needs of an individual and society in the present, as well as the future. By doing this, we arrive to the cognition that almost nothing can be thought of as a universal theory because man cannot be defined. This also tightly reins in the questioning of contemporary educational theories, the purpose and goal of which is man. Here we can see the influence of ontological relativity and the media, if we take contemporary circumstances into consideration. According to that, pedagogy has a demanding role (as the most deserving for true educational attempts) which is always actual, heavily one-sided and universal in theory, of wide cognitions, integrative in perspective, but with only one purpose – educating Man.

References

Akvinski, T. (2005). *Izabrano djelo*. Zagreb: Globus.

Bašić, S. (1990). Odgoj. In A. Mijatović, *Osnove suvremene pedagogije*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko pedagoško književni zbor, 175-203.

Brezinka, W. (1973). *Die Pädagogik der Neuen Linken. Analyse und Kritik*. Stuttgart: Seewald.

Cassirer, E. (1944). *An essay on man.*. New York: Doubleday&Company, INC. Garden City.

Dilthey,W. (1961). *Paedagogik: Geschichte und Grundliniendes Systems*. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Ellwood, C.A. (1912). Lombroso's Theory of Crime. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *5*(2), 716-723. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1132830

Filipović, V. (1965). *Filozofski rječnik*. Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska.

Gehlen, A. (1956). *Urmensch und Spätkultur. Philosophische Ergebnisse und Aussagen*. Frankfurt a. M., Bonn.

Gehlen, A. (1940). *Der Mensch. Seine Natur und seine Stellung in der Welt*. Berlin: Junker und Dünnhaupt.

Giesecke, H. (2004). *Einführung in die Pädagogik*. Weinheim: Juventa.

Glasser, W. (1990). *The quality school*. New York: HarperCollins.

Gudjons, H. (1994). *Pedagogija temeljna znanja*. Zagreb: Educa.

Haeffner, G. (1989). *The Human Situation: A Philosophical Anthropology*. University of Notre Dame Press.

Hedges, C. (2011). *Carstvo opsjena- kraj pismenosti i trijumf spektakla*. Zagreb: Algoritam.

Hobmair, H. et al. (1993). *Pädagogik.* München: Stam.

Kant, I. (2003). *Pravno-politički spisi*. Zagreb: Politička kultura.

Komar, Z. (2012). *Teorija pedagogije s obrizom na pojam svrhe* (doctoral thesis). Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet.

Kretschmer, E. (1925). *Physique and Character*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubingen & Co, LTD.

Lenzen, J. (2002). *Orientierung Erziehungswissenschaft: Was sie kann, was sie will*. Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag.

Lerner, R.M. (2002). *Concepts and Theories of Human Development*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers

Lyotard,L. F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ogurcov, A.P. (2002). *Educational Anthropology: search and prospects*. Chelovek. Man. № 2. Pp. 100-117.

Palekčić M. (2015). *Teorijska pedagogijska perspektiva*. Zagreb: Erudita.

Palekčić, M. (1999). *Pedagoški takt – temeljni pedagoški pojam*. U: Nastavnik kao čimbenik kvalitete nastavnog rada. (Zbornik radova – Znanstveni kolokvij s međunarodnom recenzijom). Rijeka: Filozofski fakultet, str. 116-125.

Plessner, H. (1964). *Condicio humana*. Pfullingen: Neske.

Polić, M. (2002). Odgoj i stvaralaštvo. *Metodički ogledi*. *Zagreb, Br. 9, 2*(16), 9-17.

Quine, W. V. O. (1969). *Ontological relativity and other essays*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Radajković, M. (2006). *Medium sindrom*. Novi Sad: Protocol.

Rousseau, J. J. (1911). *Emile or education*. Translated by Barbara Foxley MA: London & Toronto: J.M. Dent & Sond LTD & In Newyork By E.P. Dutton & CO.

Scheler, M. (1947). *Die Stellung des Menschen im Kosmos*. München: Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung.

Scheler, M. (1966). *Ideja čovjeka i antropologija*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus.

Schultz, E., A, & Lavenda, R., H. (2009). *Cultural Anthropology: A Perspective on the Human Condition*. New York: Oxford UP, Incorporated.

Senković, Ž. (2007). Antropološki temelji odgoja. *Život i škola*, br. *17*(1).

Skolem, T. (1967). Logisch-kombinatorische untersuchungen ¨uber die erf¨ullbarkeit oder beweisbarkeit mathematischer s¨atze nebst einem theoreme ¨uber dichte mengen. *Videnskapsselskapet Skrifter, Matematisk-naturvidenskabelig Klasse, 6*, 1–36.

Note

Note 1. Performativity is, after. Lyotard (L.F.Lyotard, 1984. The Postmodern Condition), became an almost derogatory term to be used for ideology and efficient practice of those institutions based on social sciences in which bureaucracy dominates more and more, while the goals are set in ever stricter demands of reporting and where responsibilities are measured in production.