

## University, society and economy in John's Dewey's thinking

Ioannis Galanis<sup>1</sup>, Pantelis Kiprianos<sup>2</sup>

University of Patras

### Abstract

*John Dewey (1859 - 1952) is one of the most important philosophers and educators with immense contribution to science. With his democratic approach to society and education, Dewey deconstructed authoritarian schemes and traditional methods of teaching and teaching projects.*

*On the other hand, the liberal approach based on the general theory of Adam Smith believes that the market's invisible power regulates everything. Education cannot be excluded from this general rule. The solitary function that education must have, according to a category of economists, is to prepare the student throughout his/her educational course as best as possible in the job market. In essence, education desires a close connection between University and the Market so the latter's goals can be achieved.*

*Dewey's opposite opinion is analysed in our current intervention. He was considering without grounds that University would be in the market's service. He was defending University's independence from all the forces that could use it for their benefit. In our proposal, we present Dewey's approach in correspondence with the economists' thinking which supports the downgrade of the University to the Market's needs.*

### Keywords

University, society, market, democratic reformation.

### Introduction

John Dewey (1859-1952), educator and “realist” philosopher, supported the vision of an open and democratic learning society. In that constitution, the university's community needs to find the golden rule between the general and the specialist scientific education, in tandem with the ability of rational critical analysis. Experiential and critical learning based on learner's experience, erudition, and the comprehension of the notion as

---

<sup>1</sup> PhD candidate at the University of Patras, School of humanitarian and social studies at the Department of Sciences of Education at the preschool age, [Ioannis\\_gal@yahoo.gr](mailto:Ioannis_gal@yahoo.gr)

<sup>2</sup> Professor at the University of Patras, [kiprian@upatras.gr](mailto:kiprian@upatras.gr)

abilities that a trainee must have, constitute the central pillars on which the monument of university education will be based. Dewey's perception is being developed contemporary, in tandem and in contrast with a widespread current perception, mainly in the sectors of the economy and those economists who desire University to be at the service of the Market. More specifically, in the last few years new statements have been expressed regarding University's relationship with the economy and the reason for the first to serve the latter. These are the following:

- a) Bolstering entrepreneurship
- b) Inconsistency of graduates' qualifications and jobs' demands
- c) Appropriate productive model that every country must follow
- d) Decrease in unemployment and
- e) Need for connecting University and the Economy

This paper's topic is about the demonstration of Dewey's views in correspondence to some economists' argument who desire the University to be dependent on the Market. The paperwork mentions John Dewey's approach; he would object to the University becoming at the service of the Market and he would be in favour of an independent University that will serve society. Dewey's arguments and approach are demonstrated; he was aiming at the connection between university and society. More specifically, this paper analyses the frame and the prerequisites of a learning society, how Dewey's educational model consists of a means of society's members' identity development as well as the vision for a democratic society. Regarding academic education, he gives more weight to an individual's metacognitive skills and acquirement of moral, practical and philosophical principles and experiential learning, as a counterweight to instrumental targeting of the individual in the economy. Finding the balance between general and specialised scientific training as well as the ability of logical and critical analysis are topics that are at the centre of his concern.

## **1. Connecting University and Society: Dewey's approach**

### **1.1 Identification of quality dimensions covered by institutional rankings**

Against the economists' approach to the need of connecting the University and the Market, Dewey opposes the need for a connection between the University and Society. Economic theories and financial tools are understood as developmental cognitive tools for the effective solution of the pressing personal and social problems that confront

developing individuals in their daily lives. Dewey viewed education as a means that can offer future citizens the opportunity to develop in every aspect and the ability to find solutions to everyday issues. Any form of knowledge is of utility value if it can be used for individual and social well-being. This is essentially the basis of the movement of Pragmatism, the ideas whereof were promoted by Dewey. This, however, also means that the knowledge offered by education institutes and more specifically by higher education institutes needs to be aligned with the qualifications set by the market in order for knowledge to become sustainable for the individual and social context (Saltmarsh, 2008).

Dewey's attitude cancels ideological thinking and the instrumental, technocratic conception of society and education. At the same time, the afore-mentioned attempted to detach thought from ideology and to move away from technocratism requests as well as to instrumentalize society and education. He believed that the academic and professional success of citizens is a result of free thinking which has equipped them with the appropriate solutions to everyday difficulties through experimentation. The obsession with thought formalism and the tendency to exclusively have intellectual technocrats make decisions are not strategies that identify with the values of democracy. Higher Education Institutions are centers of democracy only if they operate within the framework of granting a degree of autonomy to students and within a supporting environment where innovative ideas may become negotiable and subject to control practices (Bacon, & Sloam, 2010). This practice aims to cultivate a Democratic Ethos and co-construct knowledge for the benefit of society.

In doing so, Dewey challenges economists to attempt an empirical use of their cognitive tools so that they subsequently modify or abandon their tools if the empirical evidence proves that these tools have failed to solve the various problems that are supposed to be settled (Stickers 2011). Based on these considerations, which shape the philosophical aspect of his work, Dewey urged economic policy makers to exploit knowledge capital, after it has undergone controls. The spirit of investigation pervades Dewey's philosophical thinking, positioning the search for appropriate economic models as the optimal strategy for a democratic society. Acting in this way, economic policy makers can actually test if theories can become reality in society. This experimentation can offer the best options to promote values of democracy and consequently to make the most of policies that will change education and society in general (Tarrant & Thiele, 2016).

The strengthening of the individuality of the citizen is opposed to political totalitarianism, as it supports the critical and logical examination of facts and stereotypes, setting the conditions for a model of progressive education (Hopkins 2017). This means that education cannot serve economic purposes but instead should serve the state and society.

Dewey desired the direct and lasting interconnection between University and Society. University cannot be a "market servant" as the market fails to distinguish between purely formal-legal freedom and real freedom of thought and action". In essence, the university must be the institution in which the cultivation of unique skills and abilities that will allow students to actively participate in society through its own reformation and reshaping.

Dewey believed that universities and the educational services they provide students with, on the one hand, need to be restructured, and on the other hand, their curricula need to be re-examined to order to find the extent to which the learning outcomes provide receiving students with competencies and skills and whether knowledge has a positive effect on the social setting. This goal may only be reached if students take it upon themselves to act on academic knowledge and mainly if the university institutions are reformed and restructured. This restructuring concerns the complete replacement of the operation of the University and its transformation to an upholder of Democratic Ethos. Respectively, the restructuring of Higher Education Institutes constitutes a second strategy which aims to achieve a democratic society, but changes the means to achieve this change. Both ideas can change the character of higher education and because of that, push students to acquire the necessary resources to improve society (Lawson, 1975). In this model, therefore, the focus of higher education, and in particular the focus of university education, must be the ultimate goal of the transformation of society as a whole. To achieve this, however, requires the energy of the educational environment that will produce individuals - components of society who will be able to contribute, taking an active role in this transformation.

In summary, Dewey saw education as a means of serving the democratic process by correcting economic difficulties and achieving political goals that would lead to the progress of society (Dewey, 1916).

## **1.2 About strengthening entrepreneurship**

Entrepreneurship in higher education, which is the norm for liberal economists and liberal governments, is not a term that should be rejected outright and in advance (Dewey, 1916). This is because entrepreneurship, as a neutral concept, could be linked to experience, which in turn is the driving force for the continuous learning and overall development of the young scientist. Through the fruitful combination and interaction between experience and learning, students gain deeper and more substantial knowledge and at the same time greater skills (Dewey, 1916). In Dewey's line of thought, entrepreneurship, although it cannot be considered the purpose of education, can be effectively promoted through it, where the necessary conditions for the educator are met. In Dewey's view, entrepreneurship is acceptable when it is accompanied by the interaction of experience and learning. The experience-learning polarity turns out to be a fruitful combination, because experimentation and the application of knowledge can lead to better products and services and consequently to entrepreneurship in higher education. Accordingly, the positive results of this effect that change the nature of education benefit society in general (Dewey, 1938).

In any case, learning should be linked to practice and experience in universities, as well as in the preceded levels of education. Students should be involved in the learning experience themselves, not as recipients of choices derived from external factors, such as the anarchic free market, but as protagonists in the process of learning and knowledge production. They should also be involved in decision-making related to the learning process in practice, which brings them face to face with various situations, as a result that knowledge acquires a personal meaning for them and becomes more substantial (Dewey, 1938). The afore-mentioned believed that thought originates from observation. This way a meaning is created in each thinking person that is identified with their observations and experience in general (Dewey, 1910). By placing this relativistic view of things, according to Dewey, in the educational context of a university, knowledge becomes negotiable, as it is defined by the personal perspective of each student. This situation, however, requires students to seek to actively participate in the learning process and to take initiatives to build knowledge based on their continued involvement.

Linked to practice and experience, entrepreneurship could indeed have a place in modern universities. Entrepreneurship in universities, however, cannot be aimed at

starting individual businesses or developing individual skills related to individual profit. Dewey opposed the focus placed on the liberalization of Higher Education Institutions and the strategy to emphasize exclusively the increase of profits and the promotion of entrepreneurship. The university is not entirely dedicated to the production of goods and services that will provide citizens with surplus value. On the contrary, the educator opted for the existence of a connection between the university and the labor market to the extent that this interaction would lead to the improvement of the social context and not to the increase of the income of entrepreneurs. Any Higher Education Institution curriculum which aims at acquiring knowledge, abilities and skills solely to help future citizens make a profit ignoring the importance of education for social reformation, is considered not to lead to the formation of a democratic society (De Falco, 1992).

Nor should he cultivate sterile competition and the idea that every scientist works for his benefit, indifferent to society as a whole. Instead, entrepreneurship must go hand in hand with the development of innovation and creativity and at the same time with the cultivation of social responsibility and collective work. Such entrepreneurship would turn higher education graduates into dealing with complex issues for the benefit of society as a whole. Through this type of entrepreneurship, students would have the opportunity to learn through practice and develop their initiative. This individual initiative, however, can neither be dishonest nor can it be subordinated only to the private interest. On the contrary, individual initiative and activity, as well as entrepreneurship in education, to make sense, should aim on a specific social vision.

Only in these terms would knowledge within universities be combined with the acquisition of experience and at the same time with the social commitment, awareness and development of cooperation and interaction of the individual with other individuals and with other groups (Dewey, 1916).

### **1.3 About the mismatch between graduates' qualifications and job requirements**

Regarding the requirements of the neoliberal model, the market should have the initiative in the organization and determination of the syllabus at the university institutions. In this way, university programs will create the skills that the market needs to increase its financial turnover and profits.

However, in a democratic society, the content of the syllabus is an issue that has to do with the organization of knowledge itself, the organization of life, with the organization of society. Indeed, it is impossible to separate the theoretical discussion

around the curriculum and the problem of the practice of effectiveness from the spiritual and social conditions (Dewey, 1901).

The professional orientation of people receiving higher education in universities is indeed a serious issue. Dewey viewed the relationship between Higher Education Institutions and the labor market in a positive light. However, the professional orientation of young people, according to him, needs to aim at improving the conditions of society (Dewey, 1916). Universities should not serve the needs of entrepreneurs. To this end, the professional profile of a future employee must be structured based on the particular needs of each society, freed from the pressures of the economic elite. The aim of university institutes must be aligned with social progress without serving individual interests. Besides, any differences that arise between the curriculum and the needs of society in a professional level only magnify inequalities.

Dewey suggested there should be a reciprocal relationship between the university programs and the professions or specialities that a society's economy needs. This does not mean that university education should be subordinated to the needs of the economy, but that between the qualifications one acquires at university and the needs of the economy there will be the search for a collective, conscious change, which will utilize skills in the workplace that individuals acquire through university education (Dewey, 1901). Dewey's critical assessment of a university education, which prepares the future employee to succeed in the labor market, is remarkable. The needs of society are of greater significance for the educator and must be met. Higher education can function as a means to suppress individual pursuits by training students to function in a democratic society and by cultivating abilities and skills that promote social reformation. This can come true when society recognizes issues that need change and by choosing good practices based on students' knowledge backgrounds to their advantage (Pérez-Ibáñez, 2018). Dewey would disagree with those who argue that the acquisition of professional skills should be separated from academic education. In contrast, freedom in scientific knowledge (i.e. that there should be no intervention from forces outside the university for their own benefits) may well be combined with serving practical purposes (Dewey, 1916). University syllabus could, in addition to teaching the academic subject, also include the acquisition of work experience, through an internship for example (Dewey, 1901).

But this should not be done at the expense of the scientific and general education of students. For Dewey, the curriculum should include at least two academic years of

general education, which would allow young people to get to know themselves and the world (Dewey, 1901). Syllabus may be aligned with the labor market requirements where they can benefit students so that they can develop skills which will facilitate them in the carrying out of the work, while allowing them to develop professionally. Such skills concern the cultivation of ethics, the utilization of experience and the production of ideas with a social tone (Dewey, 1916). Dewey believed that professional skills in education are erroneously developed in order for the elite to make a profit. This is to the detriment of the employee and constitutes an act of blind obedience to hierarchy. This development of skills pushes employees to tolerance, lack of initiative and thinking.

Syllabus could then be focused on acquiring professional skills. It is important, on the one hand, that academic education does not lead to the creation of graduates who despise work and have no professional skills, and on the other hand, that the university does not submit to the logic of qualifications determined by the market, with the result of creating graduates who although they have some temporary skills, on the other hand, have no breadth of mind and are not able to understand the scientific and social significance of the work they offer (J. Dewey & E. Dewey, 1915). Even if institutions cultivate skills in students, this does not necessarily mean that they will succeed professionally and personally. The tendency to create skills in the educational context for the growth of entrepreneurship, causes the emergence of a portion of graduates that constitutes "working hands" (Dewey, 1930). This way, graduates act with obedience to the hierarchy and with absence of self-motivation over the product or service they offer. At the same time, creative thinking is also alienated, since they exclusively possess skills that respond to the requests of organizations and businesses, without satisfying their needs for self-realization.

#### **1.4 About the appropriate production model to be followed by each country**

Dewey would oppose the economists' view that the university should aim at mass production, suggesting that general education should focus on students' daily experiences and solving personal and social problems (Wirth, 1981). Therefore, such humanitarian education (i.e. the connection of education with universal values of civilization) should operate based on the quality of students' subjective experience and not based on increasing learning outcomes (Lucas, 2006). The education that Dewey favors as more appropriate for the social well-being corresponds to the wholeness of human existence which is interwoven with experience. In the context of this liberal



education, which does not ignore the value of experience and its social aspect, the educator favors the enrichment of experiences that provide solutions to improve everyday life, rather than the transmission of learning results that are incompatible with everyday experience. The real purpose of education, which is no other than individual success and the improvement of participation in society, can be realized based on the increase of students' experiences (Dewey, 1938).

Undoubtedly, nowadays no one can imagine the development of a democratic society without taking into consideration the needs of production (Dewey, 1888). For this reason, in modern society, the contradiction between issues related to practice and issues related to theory should be eliminated, and this should be expressed at all levels of education. In Dewey's consciousness, theory and practice are inseparable parts that need to be treated as two dimensions that follow each other in order to provide solutions to everyday problems that need solving. These dimensions need to be expressed through educational systems, as they can provide a basis on which students and graduates will be able to face current challenges. Theory disconnected from practice, i.e. the application of its principles in real situations, can only bring difficulties upon students as it does not correspond to their experience. Problems caused by the disconnection of theory and practice usually include under-performance and academic failure (Williams, 2017).

Obstacles that perpetuate the opposition between theory and practice must be removed, and all university graduates must learn to work for a common goal, which can only include the productive development of society (Dewey, 1901). Obstacles that reproduce the unification of theory-practice are the curricula and the attitudes of the teachers themselves (Dewey, 1940). Syllabus that include lengthy and long-term goals are usually adapted to market demands and change based on supranational organizations that form frameworks of qualifications and goals for citizens (e.g. the EU). This way, requests of an exclusively economic nature are satisfied, erasing educational goals that respond to the social reformation and improvement of the world. At the same time according to Dewey (1940) the behavior of educators can reject any opportunity for educational scenarios based on experience, on practice. The educator emphasized that teachers seek the homogeneity of the student population and therefore tend to stick to the adoption of traditional practices that only reproduce theoretical knowledge. However, one should not overlook the fact that the economy needs to be subject to democratic social control. Private interests alone, as they tend to

ignore the needs of society, can lead to a state of anarchy capable of harming society as a whole (Dewey, 1934).

Based on the above, it can be concluded that Dewey considers as a problem that the modern productive economy erroneously separates the ends from the means of production and, therefore, approaches the economy solely as means to other desirable or higher ends. The suggested argument is that economical activity should reflect intrinsic and aesthetic values that go hand in hand with economic growth, which is embedded in human development (Stickers, 2011).

In summary, the pragmatic proposal for democratic higher education is based on the connection between academic education and work, at the same time that extreme neoliberalism seeks to extract these two social realities (Hachem, 2016). Universities can indeed contribute to the knowledge they produce in the development of production and the economy, but they must be actively and democratically involved in determining the conditions for this development and not succumb to the de facto limiting needs of private interests. (Dewey, 1938).

### **1.5 Dewey's approach to the argument of some economists for reducing unemployment**

This view (reduction of unemployment) is open to a first objection, which stems from the relationship between the market economy and underemployment and job insecurity. The market benefits from underemployment and job insecurity to squeeze in wages, while on the other hand, its anarchic nature leads to underemployment and job insecurity. Even if the university curriculum is fully linked to the needs of the market and adapted to the data of supply and demand, it is not certain that this strategy can lead to the reduction of unemployment. As the number of prospective employees for the same industry increases, saturation is inevitable, since prospective employees outnumber the number of jobs positions available. The university-market connection strategy cannot solve the problem of unemployment, because there will be a large number of employees who will apply for the same job positions thus leading to underemployment and job insecurity. Such a decision reproduces the phenomenon of unemployment in a different work context and sector.

After all, Dewey emphasized the need to disconnect the exclusive connection between education and the market, because it only served the financial interests of

entrepreneurs and he believed in the reform of education based on experience and consequently scientific thinking to solve social problems (Dewey, 1962).

The market has the tendency to turn the universities towards its own interests (interests of market). The unspecified implications and consequences of the market are accompanied by attitudes of reserve and embarrassment on the part of the employees. As one experiences the challenging market situation as unregulated, uncontrollable but capable of "adjusting" itself, a portion of graduates with qualifications that cannot contribute to taking up jobs emerges. This results in unemployment and underemployment (Keeley, 2015). Respectively the large labor force supply leads to ever lower wages and job insecurity. All of the above consequences benefit the market and the financial elite, as they can exploit the abundance of employees to make greater profits.

This trend removes the university from the development and promotion of the scientific spirit and the scientific method in the whole society, while at the same time the university is forced to cooperate with persons and institutions outside the university. But even without this direct collaboration between the university and the market, the excessive specialization that the university's subsuming to the market may impose has a negative effect on the university, as professors and scientists, in general, tend to work harder for the interest of their discipline and to be indifferent to the general education and educational policies of the university as a whole (Dewey, 1915).

The university should be based on the coexistence of all sciences and should be addressed to as many people as possible. This point is very important, because the market may promote specific scientific training at the expense of others, with the result that in the long run the needs of society are not fully met. According to Dewey, university education should be both global and diverse in its content, so that all graduates of higher education, regardless of their specialization, can participate in the collective solution of serious problems, while at the same time their differences they will work positively, as they will enrich the collective reflection (Dewey, 1938). In a democratic society, the university should also promote diversity, participation and democracy, which cannot be done if a few private interests are imposed on the organization of university institutions.

The connection of the university with the market, under the argument of tackling underemployment, carries the risk that the market will bring under its control the institution of the university and the scientific research itself. In that case, the university

no longer serves the needs of society as a whole, but the needs of a limited number of individuals.

It was mentioned above that the phenomenon of unemployment most often serves the needs of the market. But let the link between the university and the market really help to fight unemployment, even in the short term. What are the consequences of this connection?

First, the connection between the market and the university carries the risk that university degree programs will lead to over-specialization to adapt the needs of the university to the temporary needs of the market. This puts students at risk of making decisions about their academic future motivated by interest and thus losing the opportunity to discover new areas that have not yet been revealed to them (Dewey, 1929a). According to Dewey, this controversy is reinforced by the already existing gap between theoretical knowledge and practical skills (Dewey, 1938), a gap which for pragmatic educators is a great waste of energy that must be eliminated (Dewey, 1929b). The power of the free market is great in capitalist societies. Often market demands on human resources can shift the goals of education towards a goal that satisfies its interests. This occurs because education is separate from the needs of the society and its moral aspect. The self-serving objectives of the free market may affect the curricula of Higher Education in order to service the goals of entrepreneurship. These goals however do not always align with the improvement of the social context. On the contrary there are cases where the pursue of a greater profitability may have adverse effects for the society. Universities, in their attempt to adapt to market changes wrongly modify their curricula, even though these changes could adversely affect society. Dewey had noted this danger underlining the necessity of shifting the goals of these programs towards the training of graduates in real situations with a positive social impact (Dewey, 1938).

In response to the demand for better market preparation proposed by the modern economic and social system, Dewey opposes an education that would be against the alteration of the individual's personal identity. Modern industrial society has invested in the functioning and efficiency of individuals as working individuals and tools of economic development, with the result that school and university education is oriented towards the creation of future employees and their professional preparation (Dewey, 1930). Dewey supports the opinion that democracy should reinforce in economic organizations a sense of fullness in life coexisting with social visions. The educator believed that the democratic spirit should permeate the field of entrepreneurship and

aim for social improvement. The profit of companies cannot be the main focus of the employee, as the ultimate goal is the reform of the social context to the interest of all. Employees can experience self-realization when they carry out social goals and activities in the workplace which are within their interests (Bazzoli & Dutraive, 2019). Only then will employees experience the true feeling of fulfillment, as individual pursuits will be inescapably identified with the needs of society. This approach attempts to find a middle ground between over-specialization (Dewey 1940) and the utilitarian attitude towards knowledge which leads to conformism and a barren homogenization of university graduates (Dewey, 1940).

In summarising, Dewey, in the face of the argument for greater specialization, opposes the view that university education should strengthen the identity of a volume as a citizen in modern societies. The training of students needs to go beyond the pursuit of mass production and build on the capabilities of each individual, without ending up with the daily work becoming a routine for the employee (Dewey, 1916). Emphasis on aspects of the work related to interest, joy, ingenuity when performing the job is very important for the educator, as he pointed out that all citizens need to develop uninterruptedly on a professional, personal and scientific level. These levels that need emphasis are also the most important, as they can become motivations for improving everyday life, and should be included in university syllabus. The extreme specialization of knowledge included in a curriculum cannot benefit citizens in everyday life. This view goes back to a 1990s debate over citizenship in modern higher education, which argued that universities could not be impartial and neutral but rather partially represented state policy, ideology and constitute a tool for developing the identity of members of a society as citizens (Annette, 2000). Education and thus the operation of higher education institutions reproduces identities and expresses attitudes and claims of the dominant ideology. These structure the syllabus for the student population based on the ideology of the time (Marginson, 2008). Education institutes need to transcend influences of leadership ideology. However, syllabus cannot be detached from ideologies.

Both the completely removal of the ideological aspect of knowledge and the non-construction of homogeneous identities are impossible. Since, as mentioned above, thought is a process based on everyday experience, then knowledge that is transmitted in the university space is affected by the subjective perception of things on the part of the teachers.

Accordingly, the uptake of knowledge by students is a personal process, which is influenced by their level of perception, cognitive and behavioral background. Therefore, the knowledge capital produced in higher education institutions cannot be considered neutral, not charged by the perceptions and requirements of educational policy makers. More importantly universities become means of constructing citizen identities that reproduce positions and influence consciousness. This strategy has a positive impact when the identities constructed promote social improvement and a negative impact when they reproduce traditional, non-democratic practices of formalism.

## **Conclusions**

Some economists argue that human existence should be subject to economic development. They support economic growth in quantitative terms based on the maximum mass, quantitative production of commercial, consumer products (Roser, 2013). Through this reasoning, university education operates based on the amount of academic output and work completed in the fastest time, as the effectiveness of scientific research is evaluated based on strict quantitative criteria. Education is therefore becoming a marketable consumer product, which leads to the interconnection between University and the economy and against the connection with Society. In conclusion, citizens perceive themselves as the human capital (Becker, 1964) that is put at the service of the economy. When young people are trained they acquire the embodied productivity (human capital) that employers use. Promoting education as an "Investment" yields returns in due course to the individual in terms of pay and to the state in terms of employment and economic development. The theory therefore promotes state education systems as components in the knowledge economy and as determinants of economic development (Gillies, 2015). In fact, in the context of a globalized society, the economic pursuits of universities erode the substantial academic freedom in which the pursuit of objective knowledge is pursued, with the result that the market controls the degree of academic freedom within the universities. The underfunding of higher education pushes institutions to accept sponsorships from private entrepreneurs, a tactic that can affect the free thinking and choice of scientific fields by the research staff. The autonomy of university institutions, when accompanied by limited funding, is influenced by the political elite and market forces, who thus control both the curriculum and research results (Buchbinder, 1993). Academic freedom

is being undermined and university becomes a means of achieving profitability for organizations. This attitude has also direct effects on the knowledge produced and transmitted in higher education. Knowledge essentially loses its social orientation.

At the same time, the globalized market is boosting academic productivity in a highly competitive and utilitarian education system. Through increased productivity and competitiveness, it is argued that there will be a solution to the problem of employment, especially for young people.

In summary:

1. Dewey supports the philosophical stream of pragmatism, which proposes the practical solution to the daily problems of public life and not an idealistic view of an ideal state based on abstract and general definitions.
2. Dewey's main argument for the need for the university to serve society rather than the market is that the modern university should initially contribute to the development of the future citizen's personal identity through an education that is oriented on the learning process and the settlement of personal and social issues.
3. Dewey supports the social nature of education would be related to the question of individual freedom. Public education should enhance the free development as well as the personal expression of the individual, to enable the citizen to function within a democratic society. Dewey at this point bridges economics with politics as he argues that the financial system should provide a sense of fullness to the individual and satisfy intellectual and moral values. The philosopher considers economic development as a subcategory and as an organic part of human development and not the other way around, setting different terms to distinguish the different types of development.

In addition, Dewey considered economics to have a scientific role related to the social field, and through this connection, the philosopher associated university education with society. He believed that a democratic society provides real education to students when the syllabus has a substantial impact on transforming the social context.

His theory was based on the notion that the economy can be linked to Higher Education and therefore to society. In his theory, university institutions should be socially oriented and transmit knowledge, abilities and skills to students to reform society by giving workable solutions to everyday issues that touch on ethical, social and economic aspects

(Saltmarsh, 2008). This way, university education can be linked to society, if the economy serves the interests of society.

From this perspective, the individual is presumed to be actively involved in democratic processes, without remaining a passive recipient of events. The political education of the individual presupposes the learning of the principles and the way of life required by the respective political leadership and is contrary to the exclusively professional preparation of the individual who will participate in the economic life. Dewey viewed school as a medium which reflects aspects of society. Rather, he saw it as an "embryonic society" whose members are trained to meet everyday challenges. The educator did consider it necessary to teach knowledge, abilities and skills that could help future citizens cope with their daily life, but he focused on cultivating a new way of thinking based on critical spirit, experimentation, development of social sensitivity and conscience (Dewey, 1899). The exclusive emphasis of school on preparation for work success devalued the value of education in Dewey's view.

The reason is that for Dewey the individual must first be mentally and spiritually prepared with the appropriate education and training and then introduced to economic life. In this context, Dewey directly links science with development. In fact, development is associated with experiential learning which is valued on a qualitative rather than quantitative basis, considered the highest moral purpose of education (Dewey, 1940). In this way, the philosopher denies the utilitarian and competitive nature of education, while at the same time emphasizing the humanistic, democratic and open dimension of the university as opposed to the economic interests and needs of the market. Dewey criticized aspects of university education that reproduced practices which led to competition and exploitation of knowledge. He argued that university institutions should be "fields of democracy" and aimed at improving society for all citizens without exception (Dewey, 1977). When higher institutions serve market purposes rather than the needs of society, democratic demands for social reform cannot be promoted. Accordingly, this way universities do not promote their humanitarian character, as they do not prepare students to actively participate in social life.

According to Dewey, the dominance of hegemonic market discourse can only be combated by strengthening the qualitative, scientific, aesthetic, value and social dimensions of a democratic university that emphasizes critical thinking. Market forces are strong in modern societies. Market can influence citizens' choices and preferences. Respectively, the market can also invade university institutions by commercializing



knowledge and cultivating abilities and skills that go hand in hand with its demands. Dewey believed that the goal of education needs to include social ramifications without serving selfish interests (Dewey, 1908). He combined critical thinking, democratic ethos, experience and scientific spirit to push learners to seek the improvement of society. For this reason, Dewey developed a theory of the education system that defends the model of public education and opposes the individualistic nature of education.

## References

- Annette, J. 2000. "Education for citizenship, civic participation and experiential and service-learning in the community", in: D. Lawton, J. Cairns & R. Gardner (eds). *Education for citizenship*. London: Continuum. Vol. 2000, pp. 77-92.
- Bacon, M., & Sloam, J. 2010. "John Dewey and the democratic role of higher education in England". *Journal of Political Science Education*, 6(4), 336-352.
- Bazzoli, L., & Dutraive, V. 2019. *Economia. History, Methodology, Philosophy* "Economic Issues in John Dewey's Social Philosophy: An Evolutionary and Ethical Account". ,Vol 9(4), p. 689-721.
- Buchbinder, H. 1993. *Higher education*, "The market oriented university and the changing role of knowledge".Vol 26(3), p. 331-347.
- Becker, Gary. 1964. *Human capital, A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education*. Chicago., The university of Chicago press.
- De Falco, A. 1992. "Dewey and vocational education: Still timely?," *Review of Research in Education*, 18, 335-381.
- Dewey, J. 1888. "*The Ethics of Democracy*". University of Michigan, Philosophical Papers, Second Series, Number 1. Andrew & Company Publishers.
- Dewey, J. 1899. *The School and Society*. Chicago: The University Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. 1901. *The Educational Situation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. 1908. *Ethics*. New York: Henry Holt and company.
- Dewey, John. 1909. "*Moral Principles in Education.*" , The Riverside Press Cambridge, Project Gutenberg
- Dewey, J. 1910. *How We Think*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Dewey, J. 1915. "Faculty share in university control". *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Seventeenth Annual Conference*. Association of American Universities, Chicago: Chicago University Press. pp 27-32.
- Dewey, J. & Dewey, E. 1915. *Schools of Tomorrow*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company.
- Dewey, J. 1916. *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: MacMillan.

- Dewey, J. 1929a. "General principles of educational articulation". Teachers, leaders and schools: Essays by John Dewey (2010), Edited by Douglas J. Simpson and Sam F. Stack Jr, Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. 1929b. *Construction and Criticism*" New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dewey, John. 1930. *Individualism: Old and New*. Amerherst: Prometheus Books
- Dewey, J. 1934. "Imperative need: A new radical party". Common sense, Vol 2, No 6-7
- Dewey, J. 1938. "*The economic basis of the new society*". LW 13: 309-323
- Dewey, J. 1938. *Experience and Education*. New York: Macmillan Company.
- Dewey, John. 1940. *Education today*. New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Dewey, John. 1962. *Individualism: Old and New*. New York. Capricorn Books.
- Gillies, D. 2015. "*Encyclopedia of Educational Philosophy and Theory*".
- Hachem, A. H. 2016. "The dissociative university: Pragmatist reconstructions in democratic pedagogy". *Policy Futures in Education*, 14(8), 1127-1128.
- Hopkins, E. A. 2017, "John Dewey and Progressive Education". *The Journal of Educational Thought (JET)/Revue de la Pensée Éducative*, 50(1) pp. 59-68.
- Keeley, B. 2015. *Income Inequality: The Gap between Rich and Poor*, OECD Insights, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Lawson, A. 1975. "John Dewey and the Hope for Reform". *History of Education Quarterly*, 15(1), pp. 31.
- Lucas, Christofer. 2006. *American higher education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marginson, S. 2008. "Global field and global imagining: Bourdieu and worldwide higher education". *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol 29, No. 3, pp.303-315.
- Pérez-Ibáñez, I. 2018. "Dewey's thought on education and social change". *Journal of Thought*, 52(3-4), pp. 19-31.
- Roser, M. 2013. "Economic Growth". *Journal Our World in Data*.
- Saltmarsh, J. 2008. "Why Dewey matters". *The Good Society*, 17(2), pp.63-68.
- Stickers, K. W. 2011, "Dewey, economic democracy, and the Mondragon cooperatives". *European Journal of Pragmatism and American Philosophy*, 3(III-2) pp. 210-214.
- Tarrant, S. P., & Thiele, L. P. 2016. "Practice makes pedagogy – John Dewey and skills-based sustainability education." *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 17(1), pp. 54–67.
- Williams, M. K. 2017. "John Dewey in the 21st century". *Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education*, 9(1), pp. 91-100.

Wirth, A. G. 1981, The democratisation of schooling, “Exploring Linkages between Dewey’s Educational Philosophy and Industrial Reorganization”. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, Deakin University Victoria, pp.55-77.