

The Problem of Education between Ontology and Epistemology and Application of Kierkegaard Thought to the Problem*

Olcay Bayraktarⁱ
Ondokuz Mayıs University

Mehmet Ali Dombaycıⁱⁱ
Gazi University

Abstract

Ontology and epistemology are two different basic disciplines of philosophy. In the course of philosophy history, the priority given to these two different disciplines varied between antique age and middle age and modern era. For sure, this central change was realized in the basis of the connection made by philosophers with metaphysics. The change in question is of power to influence human life in many aspects. As for education, it is a field prone to such kind of influences. Existentialism and existentialist philosophers are aware of this course of events in the history of philosophy. Kierkegaard is a philosopher coming to the forefront with his different stand in the modern era. The fact that he regards human being as an existence of synthesis and his style of approaching to the field of faith gave him an opportunity to examine philosophical problems on the ground of metaphysics and ontology. In the current study, the change in question will be evaluated with its dimensions reflected on education. Kierkegaard thought will be taken into consideration in order to answer the problem with a more holistic mind instead of producing some solutions-in-pieces. In this sense, related documents will be analysed in line with the above-mentioned problem and with its dimension related to education.

Keywords: Education, Ontology, Epistemology, Kierkegaard

DOI: 10.29329/ijpe.2020.280.15

* This article was made out of the doctorate thesis which is still being carried out at Gazi University, The Institute of Educational Sciences

ⁱ **Olcay Bayraktar**, Research Assistant at Faculty of Education, Ondokuz Mayıs University; Ph.d. Student at Gazi University Graduate School of Educational Sciences, ORCID: 0000-0002-2538-2960

ⁱⁱ **Mehmet Ali Dombaycı**, Assoc. Prof. Dr., Philosophy and Related Sciences Education, Gazi University, ORCID: 0000-0002-2428-8884

Correspondence: dombayci@gazi.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

There are a great many studies in the literature of educational philosophy written with the impacts of existentialism on education and the sense of existentialist education. As an example, the books of philosophy by such names as Nel Noddings (2016), Gerald L. Gutek (2006), Cevat Alkan (1983), Sabri Büyükdüvenci (1991), Necmettin Tozlu (1997), Mustafa Ergün (1996), İbrahim Arslanoğlu (2012) are just some of a great many examples giving existentialism with its general terms. The reflections of common features of existentialism on education by Bayraktar and Bayraktar (2016) was studied as a subject in the context of a course investigation. Eryaman (2008) evaluated the existential education within the hermeneutical style writing practice. In this study, it is noteworthy that especially the ontological dimension is considered for the contribution it will provide in writing education due to its various deficiencies in current writing education. Moreover, the subject of writing was evaluated depending on the changing paradigms in education and existential education was emphasized as an alternative. The work of Philosophy of Education by Cevzici (2012) discussed existentialism with its general terms but examined the sample of Martin Buber closely as a different way from others (p. 147-170). As is clear, these kinds of studies were mostly fictionalized upon common feature of the movement. On the other hand, there are some studies evaluating the views of Kierkegaard particularly in the sense of education. Such studies as Mcpherson (2001), Gary (2007), Rocca, Foley and Kenny, C. (2011), Jaarsma, Kinashuk, and Xing (2016), Sharma and Marwaha (2016) were closely interested in the interpretation of Kierkegaard in the context of education. Yet, the number of the studies discussing an existentialist philosopher in the educational contexts in particular is limited compared to those dealing with the common features of existentialist education.

It is likely to find the impact of general features of existentialism to some extent in the modern educational theories fed from the eclectic approach. Nevertheless, upon close examination, it is possible to see the effects of mostly the atheist existentialists. It is caused by positive or negative settings created by such movements as empiricism, positivism, materialism, pragmatism and modern scientific approaches. In other words, both some dominant movements in philosophy and the basic doctrines in modern science has an impact on the fact that atheist existentialism is effective in education. Even though existentialism, with its popular theme, oppose to the fact that modern sciences embody human being, thoughts flowing from existentialism towards education with their weak effects compromise with the basic doctrines of modern science in the basis of metaphysics. As an example, even though atheist existentialists oppose to the basic doctrines of modern science while regarding human being depending on the condition of freedom instead of causality, it is basically a compromise that they take only the 'concrete' sides of human being in the basis of metaphysics. The compromise in question, as will be explained below, results actually from being trapped in epistemology and from a shallow ontology, staying away from the subject matters discussed in the Antique Age and the Middle Age. With the same grounds, the views of philosophers like Kierkegaard (2014a) such as the one regarding human being as an existence of synthesis (p. 21-23) would not be able to be evaluated in their own senses.

The distinction between philosophy and sciences was realized much faster in the modern era. As far as the relation of philosophy with religion and science is concerned, it is likely to see that stricter fronts are formed against each other compared to the earlier times. This case is reflected in a way to close such sciences as sociology and psychology not to close education to philosophy to comprise the whole philosophy history of education. Nevertheless, the basic reason lying behind these developments is itself in the philosophy history. A study into the central change realized from ontology towards epistemology in the history of philosophy. For that reason, it is significant that the content of the distinctions between philosophy, religion and sciences leaking in education be regarded by staying on philosophical ground.

Humanities are more integrated in Antique Age and Middle Age philosophy compared to modern age. Even though they were discussed within integrity, a great many subjects and problems were put forward regarding human being in Antique and Middle ages as well. As for modern age, subjects and problems were made more profound with the share of the subjects and problems in the basis of disciplines. In terms of the basic problems of education, it would be more convenient to

present all the views and discussions regarding human being rather than carrying them on the agenda of the theory and practice of education. In the current study, Kierkegaard thought is studied in this sense. Kierkegaard is a theist philosopher bringing the importance given to faith in the customs of Antique and Middle ages as the first representative of existentialist philosophy. In other words, he saw the central change between ontology and epistemology and developed his philosophy in this sense. Additionally, degrading existentialism to certain common features for the sake of education leads to some mistakes. This mistake is to miss out the depths in the thoughts of the existentialist philosophers. Therefore, the study aims at investigating the relation of Kierkegaard philosophy in order to stay away from the mistakes and basic problem mentioned.

In line with the purpose of the study, basic works of Kierkegaard will be analysed and commented within the problems of current education. While reaching the comments, the similarities and differences of the Kierkegaard philosophy with other theories in the philosophy of education will be highlighted. As a result of such an investigation, the educational purpose which Kierkegaard philosophy comprises will be analysed.

It is likely to focus on three major cases to determine the importance of the study. The first one is that as abovementioned, a general review of 'existentialist education' approach in the literature of the educational philosophy is much more common, conversely, it was pointed out that the number of the studies investigating the educational view of Kierkegaard individually is fewer and its sphere of influence is limited. Therefore, a Kierkegaard study alone is of originality in terms of going beyond the determined patterns of existentialist education. The second one is that discussing the current deficiencies of education in the sense of central change between ontology and epistemology in the history of philosophy means giving an opportunity to developing an alternative and original perspective to current educational theories. In this way, an opportunity of being able to develop a perspective is given out of a faith-based holistic and out of the ordinary with regard to the education of human being by extending the limits of modern and popular social sciences. The third one is the problem of education that would be considered in terms of philosophical bases in its full sense. A solution will be tried to be found the problem with a philosophical basis by applying the Kierkegaard thought on again philosophical ground.

METHOD

Knowing and explaining in terms of the philosophy of education does not mean the discussion of educational problems just on philosophical grounds. For that reason, it is essential that the sciences which are the basis of education be included in the subject in certain intervals. Similarly, the explanation in the field of educational sciences according to Charlot (2010) "... means showing how a case emerges as the game of processes articulated each other ..." (p. 40). The study requires to *explain* some basic problems of education at theoretical level without acting. According to Värri and Pulkki (2015), the framework being the source for it is the *critical analysis* of the educational cases in the current society. The texts used for the critical analysis of the current education will be evaluated depending on their position in the history of philosophy and within their relation with education (Aktulum, 2009, p. 2-3, 14). In this sense, the analysis of Kierkegaard philosophy will be commented in line with the basic principles of education. Based on the views of the philosopher, ideas concerning educational theories will be formed. In this way, the tracks regarding the field of education within his philosophical thought will be found. The answers to be collected will be related to the popular views of the modern age happening between ontology and epistemology and reflected upon education. The problematic sides of these views will be mentioned and a critical perspective will be developed.

In the current study, as Brauner (1987) pointed out, the analytical, evaluative, speculative and integral features (p. 49) of philosophical activity were taken into consideration. The integral feature was paid attention in terms of the fact that education is a separate whole from disciplines each. For that reason, it will be tried to have a look at the sociological and psychological bases of education from the perspective of philosophy and philosophy of education. The differences between theories in these fields and Kierkegaard philosophy will be dealt in a way to lead to a new "*argument*" (Aktulum, 2009, p. 14) in the sense of the problems of current education. The views of Kierkegaard will be

reached by making a connection between the results of the argument obtained and Kierkegaard philosophy. For the sake of realizing these features of the philosophical activity, the method of *document analysis* was used in the study. According to Yıldırım and Şimşek (2011, p. 187) the method of document analysis is the investigation of written materials comprising the subject matter or the ones related to it in a research.

Thanks to this method, the study was divided into parts in order to compile the argument to be carried out. In the first instance, historical and theoretical framework will be tried to be determined. Following that, the connections of Kierkegaard thought with education will be collected under the sub-titles determined. In this sense, some sub-titles such fields as subjectivity and truth, communication thought, use of psychological concepts and existentialism will be given in the study. After deciding (more or less) that the arguments to be discussed under the sub-titles are collected in their full and true senses, a general evaluation will be made regarding the subject matter in the conclusion part.

Kierkegaard in the Historical and Theoretical Framework of the Study

Kierkegaard is known with his versatility such as “*Journalist, psychologist, a religious writer, a satirist, a literature critic and the ‘father’ of existentialism*” (Sharma & Marvaha, 2016, p. 368). Upon approaching Kierkegaard with stereotype or negative point of views, some serious challenges and problems are likely to appear both in his philosophy and in terms of the comment in the educational contents of his philosophy. As an example, anti-intelligent, fideist one making his own masochist sorrows romantic could be regarded as an extreme anti-social individualist etc. With this kind of point of view, it is likely to describe his educational content difficult in terms of analysis, dangerous in terms of its results and even destructive for the modern age. However, to illustrate, his works are as valuable as Emile of Rousseau in terms educational development and forming oneself on his own (McPherson, 2001, p. 160).

Before examining the educational value of Kierkegaard in detail, it is essential to give some basic findings regarding the style of associating the educational theories with existentialism. Following that, how the central change between ontology and epistemology is realized in the history of philosophy will be explained in general senses. In this way, some basic evaluations concerning the position of Kierkegaard in the history of philosophy, existentialist philosophy and existentialist education will be reached.

Noddings (2016) indicated that current studies in the philosophy of education benefit from the existentialist literature (p. 67). As an example, the approaches trying to develop a critical alternative against behaviourism which is a learning theory having a strong impact on the educational theories of the twentieth century sometimes benefitted from the existentialist literature. For that reason, it is likely to investigate the reasons of constructivist approach against behaviourism and the intersecting points (Bayraktar, 2015, p. 44.47, 75-76, 88-90). In addition, it is possible to put forward that such approaches as anti-pedagogy and critical pedagogy are of similarity with existentialism in some terms. While the individual-centred approach of existentialism makes it closer to such educational theories constructivism, anti-pedagogy, critical pedagogy etc., it brings about staying distant from such movements of educational philosophy as empiricism, positivism, pragmatism etc. On the other hand, one feature of existentialism completing the individual centred approach of it, as Birand (1964, p. 100-101) and Koç (1999, p. 333) pointed out, is that it is considered within the limits of concreteness and concrete connections of individual. Even though the fact that existentialism considers individual as a general characteristic of it makes the mentioned approaches of educational philosophy distant from existentialism at first sight, its consideration of individual within his concreteness and concrete limes could be regarded as its consistence with these approaches in the metaphysical and ontological basis. It is assumed that considering individual in his concreteness and concrete limits provides a great many opportunities particularly in the educational setting as it means being in tangible time and space.

Time and space are two valuable concepts in terms of the position of education upon human being. Both time and space are the concept which educational thinkers pay special attention and are not excluded from educational theories. Jaarsma, Kinascuk and Xing (2016, p. 446) stated that a

great many thinkers wanted to benefit from this feature of existentialism in view of the practical sides of education. This desire appeared for such challenges of philosophy as abstract, spiritual and concreteness problem. It is essential to express that the central transformation between ontology and epistemology is of a similar desire.

As Brubacher (1987, p. 115) expressed, the problems that existentialists deal with are also the problems of education and they are not temporary but basic problems. Existentialists are not indifferent to educators in view of the expectations of educational theoreticians from philosophy with regard to the problems of human being. Existentialist philosophers roughly aims at “*bringing back the status of human being which he lost in a high-level technological and mechanized community...*”, which is completely organized for science (Sharma & Marvaha, 2016, p. 369). In other words, it reaches the discourse of objecting the traditional religious approaches which hold individual over system and where obedience instead of preference is emphasized (Noddings, 2016, p. 62). In this sense, upon the analysis of different discourses deeply, it is likely to say that the general features attributed to existentialism could change depending on people. As an example, the inconsistent sides between the determinations of Noddings with Kierkegaard thought could be put forward. In short, depending on the perspective of the researcher, there would appear different preferences over the general features of existentialist philosophy. Despite the differences in preference, it is of convenience that the reciprocation of a great many views of existentialist philosophy in life could be turned into one of the suitable tools. As Berner (2013) pointed out, educational theory, its practice and institutions are available for being tools and for impact factor (p. 39, 7-8). The demands of as philosophy, philosophy of education and such other sciences which are the basis of education, the expectations of the public or their disturbances about education, the sides of education prone to impact could all be gathered in one point. The mutual expectations between existentialist philosophy and educational sciences and educational systems could be understood at this point.

The expectations of individuals from the education today are at a large scale and in different content. Nevertheless, it is likely to say that their expectations match up with such market expectations as getting a job, using knowledge well materially. Such kind of expectations as being a part of humanity and the education found by him and taking his place in this meaningful whole are of secondary importance. The PISA criticism (2014) of a group of academics is also in the way that the organization constructed in the basis of economy makes the real objectives of education forgotten. The thinkers of education determining such kind of deficiencies like these thinkers head for the disciplines and theories dealing with human being for the sake of expectation in the secondary importance.

The reason for the emergence of the reciprocal expectation between existentialism and education depends on the important and historic change in the history of philosophy. Gellner (1985) defined change as follows. “*If we were to define modern philosophy in terms of just one feature, it would be: The importance of knowledge for life. Up to this time, knowledge is something among other things; it is important, but there are other problems; namely, knowledge is something existent in the world. What defines the thought of modern age is that the world becomes something in knowledge. There is something upside down here.*” Gellner added that there is a failure in the fields out of natural sciences and that it reduces the feeling of trust in human being, thinking that the case is actually the reduction of knowledge (p. 349). Again, this change is related to being irreversibly transferred to industrial community from agricultural community in many countries and seeing industrial community as a community just based on scientific and technological accumulation. It brought about such results as the institutionalization of education, its being compulsory, its being widespread to large masses and serving for an expertize sense having different characteristics between the agricultural community and industrial community. For that reason, the practice of education is only known as a task that must be guided by science. In this way, an important part of the traditional evaluations related to education regarding human being is excluded (Gellner, 2008, p. 117, 129, 166).

Despite the mentioned changes, the major question of what kind of a person we should train in education still remains there. At first sight, it might look that all the crime is upon education. However, at a deep look, other components having an impact on education could be reached since it is vulnerable to external effects just as a component besides being full of the experiences of other human

disciplines. As an example, it was pointed out in a study by Arkonaç (2015, p. 10-15) that there are philosophical discussions at the backstage of psychology stage. Dikeçligil (2017) indicated the dimensions of forgetting the ontological acceptance of sociology. The similar situation in both psychology and sociology is the same in education as well. In other words, the case in these sciences is also involved in education. In short, in both human sciences and education, in the background of the paradigm change emerging with the passing to the modern age is the effect of grounding the philosophical movements.

Obtaining the basic ontological perception of the theories within the content of human sciences is a style of a study that is not focused adequately today. It is because a critical investigation requires offering a new alternative view around the same subject. As is clear, such kind of a study has to turn around the question of “What is human?” in any case. According to Morris (1987), it is easy to find reality in the question of “What is the distance between home and market?” rather than looking for the reality in the question of “What is human?”. The second question brings a series of new questions with uncertain limits together (p. 1-3). It is a fact that an educational theory does not act with a question like “what is the distance between home and market?”. However, the abovementioned educational paradigm does not want a mass of philosophical discussions whirling around the question of “what is human”, in other words does not want to be sucked into a vortex full of uncertainties. That is to say, the sciences constituting the basis of education act depending on the concreteness/objectivity pointed by a simpler question. As a matter of fact, it is required that these sciences be ontologically accepted, but as the acceptance of these sciences makes ontology forgotten in a way too shallow to discuss over ontology. From that time onwards, the action point stays in the epistemological circle completely.

Cevizci (2012) pointed out that epistemology made the centre of philosophy slid with the modern age (p. 236-237). Guénon (1991, s. 33) considered “... change in direction for human activities as a whole...” as the most important collapse of the last few centuries. According to Morris (1987, p. 3), despite based on an ontological acceptance, the style of action which will not interrogate this acceptance is to abandon the “sought” which is a task of philosophy.

There are a lot of basic concepts with which human problem is discussed actually on the ground of ontology. However, these are either recorded or have a changed content. One of the major recorded concepts is the concept of “principle”. In the past, sciences developed information depending on the principles determined on the ground of metaphysics and ontology bases. These principles also offered a societal direction in terms of getting to an agreement upon them. On the other hand, with the loss of such kind of principles, sciences lost their objectivity and their depth with the claim of they were liberalized. Knowledge that used daily, changeable and instantly applicable is preferred more. This preference resulted in loss of power not winning of power for humanity (Guenon, 1991; pp. 42-43, 58-59, 60-61). In line with this result, Mengüşoğlu (2014: 18) pointed out that sciences investigating human being make man unknown rather than introducing him. According to Carrel (1965, p. 24-39), the information offered by science has been effective in human life out of all measure. Carpenter (2008, p. 9-49) mentioned about the mechanization of human being, consumerization, being a mass person, environmental, social and individual disagreements emerging as a result of his living on property purpose. It is clear that there is a connection between these evaluations regarding central change and general characteristics of existentialist approach. To illustrate, this connection is clearly seen upon the consideration of the views of Jaspers (2010, p. 104, 260 -261) saying that human being cannot be regarded with animal resemblance and natural events and that even though the theories based on modern science talk about integrity, they have some limitations.

It is true that the changes in education did not occur all of a sudden. At this point, the question by Charlot (2010) “... How did the desire for producing knowledge depending on the exact rules over education become a fashion suddenly?” (p. 32) leads necessarily us to the idea that there became a change in the history of philosophy. However, in order to understand the change itself, even the comparative investigation of Aristotle and Descartes thought will be enough as an example. Yet, general course in the history of philosophy must be studied.

Acting on the Arche problem, the philosophy of nature in the antiquity was included in ontology as the ‘first philosophy’ with Aristotle. In the Aristotle period when science and philosophy were not still regarded in different terms, ontology investigating the absolute first principles of existence or the general principle of everything defines all other disciplines including epistemology and logic. Accordingly, logic, as an example, is a science of tool. ‘First principle’ (metaphysics) as the starting point principles is of importance for ontology. The field of this principal knowledge is not empirical and it can never be reached empirically. What’s more, empirical science depends on the knowledge of principle. Ontology basically interests in this first principle intuitively. At the same time, the determinant title of this discussion is the discussion of substance. To Aristotle, ‘Substance’ is the principle of everything and individual beings are single substances upon which other qualities could be loaded. After Aristotle, the criterion in the style of dealing with such kind of problems by mediaeval age thought became Christianity. The argument of substance was considered with the trinity belief and the Aristotelian objectivist ontological approach was changed. The knowledge approach around this new subjectivist ontology started to change. For instance, both scientific and truth knowledge are accepted in the unity of knowledge and faith at Augustin. Depending on the temporary knowledge that science explains by dividing, direct knowledge of truth is reached in the unity of faith and knowledge. Furthermore, all the elements included in knowledge was cleaned through the method known as Ockham’s Razor and the idea of experience and external world regarding the source of knowledge changed with the desire to reduce it to the sensory data of knowledge. At the current point, with the appearance of subjectivist and empiricist approaches of ontology, the being was started to be regarded not in the context of just a first principle with metaphysics in Aristotelian sense but as the principles of the arrangement of experience and obtaining knowledge. For that reason, by means of these approaches, no harm was seen ontologically in increasing the law of nature to the position of a principle, multiplication of principles and using principle in terms of service function (Çüçen et al., 2011, p. 23, 27-28, 30-33; Diemer, 1997, p. 101-102, 118; Krings & Baumgartner, 1997, p. 209, 211; Ülken, 2008, p. 50, 53).

The process of change in the philosophical thinking centre from ontology towards epistemology up to now appeared in the discussions peculiar to ontology. Yet, the dominant thought is based upon Aristotle and ontology based on metaphysics principle is the primary discipline in the arguments of almost all philosopher. Schumacher (1990, p. 17) pointed out with these words that in the current time the perspective of the Mediaeval Age regarding knowledge depends on existence and its theoretician Aristotle, *“the weakest knowledge to be obtained from the mightiest things deserves more desire than the surest knowledge to be obtained from the smallest things”*.

Epistemological problems were dealt by philosophers before they became a discipline as well. However, it is mostly based upon the ontology arguments explained above and built upon which knowledge is more valuable depending on the sources of obtaining knowledge. In other words, the reliability of the sources to obtain knowledge and the value of knowledge is arranged by the view of existence hierarchy. William of Ockham is a pioneer in the fact that Epistemology says ‘Count me in’. In its evolution into a discipline, there is Descartes. Its founder is John Locke with his formulations made upon its tasks (Çüçen, 2005, p. 140, Diemer, 1997b, p. 168-170, Heineman, 1997b, p. 181, Çilingir, 2014, p. 92-93).

In the period of Renaissance and Reform, there became an activation in a way leading to scientific basis. Following that, the focus was on the sought for a method to reach the absolute knowledge reading the explanation of the universe. Respectively, depending on the ontological understanding as the first philosophy, some thoughts emerged for the purpose of replacing such logical principles as identity, noncontradiction, sufficient reason. As an example, quantitative use of casualty as a law in sciences of nature was discussed at Descartes and Galileo. In the context of these discussions, Locke had chance of being the founder of this discipline with his empiricism pointing to epistemology by looking at the content and foundation of knowledge as the main subject of philosophy. Again, in terms of putting metaphysical concepts aside, the approaches of such philosophers as Hobbes and Hume to knowledge has been effective in reaching current evaluations.

As an example, the concept of reason with Hume, was redefined in a different way from the four reasons at Aristotle and another breaking was experienced from the conventional ontology. At this point, a clear distinction was made between nature and spiritual field. While the issue takes place between determinism – indeterminism, some basic thoughts put forward, which would deeply effect every aspect of both spiritual and natural fields. In this way, it seems that such principles as sufficient reason which is the ontic side was replaced by the laws which are contextual –like the law of casualty– by extending just the fields of intellectual and knowledge (Diemer, 1997, p. 109-113; Krings & Baumgartner, 1997, p. 211-215, Ülken, 2008, p. 49-50, 65, 67). In short, new sense of science and new philosophy started to be identified with each other from that time onwards. In and after that period, philosophers like Kant and Hegel did not change this process, actually were not able to change it (Jaspers, 2010, p. 258).

Kant is a significant haunt for the philosophy historians in this process from ontology towards epistemology. His views, as a revolution as Copernicus in his own words, became weak with the criticisms towards metaphysics and also weakened the ontological view. Kant put forward new and original views but at the same time he followed empiricism and rationalism which were the philosophical approaches established before him in terms of epistemology. What is the most important is that epistemology upgraded to the position of a field of expertise with his views. While the thinker is based on knowledge on the one hand, he develops intellectual forms on the other. According to him, one becomes an object thanks to categories, the sense of self for love, which is common among subjects, is reached and a unity in the mind of abundance is perceived. What gives birth to knowledge is confrontation of such a consciousness in finality state with the sensory content. Logic is formed as a result depending on this epistemological approach. Even though an open door is left for metaphysics with these views of transcendence and finality, metaphysical knowledge for him is just speculative and mental which is not scientific (Çüçen et al., 2011, s. 23, 33; Krings & Baumgartner, 1997, p. 216; Ülken, 2008, p. 50-51, 53, Çilingir, 2014, p. 101-104). With these approaches of Kant, some concepts started not to be used in their old meanings. As an example, the term of transcendence lost its meaning of "... God going over universe or something exceeding consciousness..." anymore, and the meaning of "... the style with which subject apprehends subjects..." (Diemer, 1997, p. 130).

With Hegel, with a dialectical ontology approach, reality began to be perceived as 'changing, alive and active' using the concept of existence. In this way, a former principle of ontology, identity had the risk of being abandoned (Diemer, 1997, p. 108-109). The criticisms of the speculative effort in a transcendental way aiming at the real knowledge in the knowledge approaches of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel led to positivism in the nineteenth century on the one hand and to the subjective truth thoughts of Kierkegaard (Krings & Baumgartner, 1997, p. 217/220).

At the end of this period, a logician approach emerged in an effort to combine logic and mathematics as a basic separation from the Aristotelian ontology and as an alternative to epistemology after Descartes. According to logical approach, empirical knowledge can only be reached by means of logic which is an abstract and absolute way of thought and the unity and integrity problem of philosophy between logic and being in ancient times was solved. The solution is the definition of the ontological-metaphysical problems discussed by philosophy as 'nonsense' as they are not verified scientifically in terms of language and logic. In this way, the field of issues in philosophy was restricted and it had a risk of falling into a position of 'so called problems'. As an example, the problem of substance, such thoughts as seeking for a 'meaning' for the place of human being in the universe are the extension of a primitive mentality. Again, Wittgenstein's verification based on this idea was effective in taking root for the logical idea. These views all have certainly affected the discussion style of the existence of sciences. From that time onwards, existence was started to be discussed as a bilateral way by such sciences as physics, biology, psychology and sociology and the principle of identity like 'A is A.', which is independent from proof in the ontology of the antique age was replaced by a relationalist approach like 'everything is both at itself and at the other'. However, when it comes to human being, the identity principle of the antique age had the function of being commented in terms of oneness, personality, being aware of oneself. The concept of substance was completely ignored and such perpetuating concepts as 'personality' emerged for the humanistic field. The criticism of this logical-verificationist approach was made by Popper (Diemer, 1997, p. 104-105,

119, Krings & Baumgartner, 1997, p. 220-225, Ülken, 2008, p. 52-56). For sure, this new 'logical way' adopted together with sciences had an impact on education as well. However, this new path is another crossroad diverted from the road where epistemology enters the centre of philosophy.

In the centuries in question, there are some philosophers who cannot be ignored, staying out of this process with their ideas. For instance, the idea that knowledge understandings are actually a trap by moralists and that knowledge is an important value for 'life' is of importance at Nietzsche as well. Based on this idea, a philosophy of life was born with such names as Bergson, Simmel, Dilthey, Scheler. At the same course, there was Husserl taking knowledge as intentionality as a different line and also such other approaches as personalism following it. As for Hartmann, he regarded existence as the last thing in a different way from the views given above and depending on the phenomena, he regarded knowledge a kind of existence just like other beings and connected it to ontology and metaphysics. Heidegger, on the other hand, is a very important thinker of this century with his fundamental ontology approach. In particular, there was an attempt to enter the main road at the beginning with Hartmann and Heidegger. It is likely to say that they provided metaphysics with carrying on its place in philosophy with their views (Çüçen et al., 2011, p. 23, 34; Diemer, 1997, p. 104-105, 119; Heinemann, 1997, p. 188; Krings & Baumgartner, 1997, p. 220-225; Ülken, 2008, p. 52-54, 62-63). However, thanks to these philosophers, the fact that metaphysics and ontology still have a correspondence in philosophy did not correspond at sciences at the same level. The ontological and metaphysical argument guiding the scientific understanding of the Antique and Middle Ages was completely excluded from the agenda of the sciences dominating education in the twentieth century.

As is seen, some philosophers and movements at the stage of nineteenth and twentieth centuries for the history of philosophy particularly preferred the approach of forming an epistemological centre and guided the change. The philosophers who were aware of possible problems regarding this case tried to go out of the circle. As for the institutions in the educational field did not divert from the target of developing a scientific theory of education even though it was referred to philosophy or a few philosophers. In particular, in the educational theories of sociology and psychology, ontological basis was fixed at a narrow passage. Putting epistemology in a centre was virtually regarded as the necessity of making the educational problem of human being a science – making it an educational science. However, whether the field of education is scientific or not, which sciences guide it, whether education is just one science alone or interdisciplinary is still being discussed.

Kierkegaard is the thinker who is aware of this central change. Because of the fact that his philosophy is the first ring of the existentialist approach, it expresses a period when reciprocating theoretical and practical connection were still not made clearly at education.

Existentialism is a name which any existentialist thinker mostly regards as a limitation and does not accept. In the existentialist corridor of the history of philosophy, there are common traits at some points and separations at some others. Common naming does mean taking on all common traits. Nevertheless, the saying of "... *there are as many existentialist philosophies as the number of existentialist philosophers ...*" is still valid (Foulquie, 1973, p. 28). Despite this originality, the common traits of existentialism have been taken as an axis by the scientific disciplines interested in existentialism. What's more, considering in terms of philosophers individually, perceiving existentialism as an école of different philosophers led to the wrong perceptions of scientific disciplines (Bayraktar & Bayraktar, 2016, p. 535-536, Hoffman, 2015, p. 371, Gündoğdu, 2007, p. 98-99).

For the sake of explaining such kind of misconceptions, it is likely to go on with the example of orienting towards what is concrete – as mentioned above. Regarding human being with his concrete side as a characteristic of existentialists (Koç, 1999, p. 333), as Hoffman (2015, p. 369-375) pointed out, led to the fact that the views of atheist existentialists in the field of psychology came to the forefront. However, when the past of existentialism was analysed, it is likely to say that Kierkegaard in particular carried the concept of and content existentialism on the global agenda before it was first called as existentialism. It is known that most science circles depended on it and there became some

misunderstandings in the literature. Hoffman (2015) displayed these evaluations in terms of the reflections of existentialism in the field of American psychology. Noddings (2016, p. 63) highlighted that students are mostly made to be aware of the atheist and pessimist side of existentialism. It is clear that the presence of this problem which was highlighted by Hoffman and Noddings in the disciplines based on education. In particular, it is possible to say that there are some misconceptions in the educational sciences with the effect of psychology. The purpose of the current study was to determine these misconceptions in detail. A single study was preferred just for the purpose of staying away from them.

Up to now, it was pointed out shortly that highlighting the general features of existentialism resulted in missing the details. Depending on the same example, even in the investigation of Sartre, one of the atheist representatives of existentialism, it is likely to say that he can be regarded in terms of his communication with God as of the concrete connection of human being. In this sense, regarding human being as a concrete being does not mean leading only to his material sides and connections. It is possible to see easily that the spiritual side of human being is also given importance in existentialism when we stay at the philosophical level. It is clear that the pessimist and atheist theories mentioned above by means of Noddings ignore this side. Out of Kierkegaard, such philosophers as Jaspers (2010, p. 101-103) and Marcel put the material and spiritual unity to the forefront. In short, it is true that the issues of philosophical investigations must be made in details and the focus of human integrity are ignored in the adaptation of philosophical theories to other disciplines. This is the case without considering the values that the intentions of the related disciplines contain or the limitations of disciplines.

It is known that the difference of Kierkegaard both in the history of philosophy and in the existentialist approach emerges around the concept of faith. This difference must be explained a little more in terms of the fact that it provides a rising point for the ideas below. At this point, the basic question is: What kind of an educational definition do the faith-based views of lead to? There are two major justifications over faith in the history of philosophy, rational and irrational. In addition, there are some others declaring faith as irrational in the scientific limits. This argument between faith and mind is the determinant in the formation of Kierkegaard philosophy. Hegel and Kierkegaard are two characteristic representatives of the effort of reconciliation for the sake of strengthening faith in philosophy and theology. Hegel attempts to make a reconciliation with logic. On the contrary, Kierkegaard says that mind and faith do not reconcile. Furthermore, he believes that this reconciliation will lead to losing faith (West, 2005, p. 193-194, Kierkegaard, 2009, p. 2).

Individuals accept the faith systems by means of a great many ways such as authority, research, imitation etc. Faith is mostly formed by the 'evaluations' man makes depending on his experiences. These evaluations are sometimes determined by differentiating from the objective bases of the world of phenomena and events. As pragmatics mostly apply, the dimension of faith affecting human actions is a basic explanation regarding the concept. This means that faith is open to the changes in its content and quality depending on the experienced changes of human being (Tüzer, 2015, p. 88-90). These evaluations are considered in terms of both rational and irrational approaches. However, upon looking at the issue from the perspective of Kierkegaard philosophy, there appears another scene. Man and field of faith can be evaluated based neither on the objectivation of scientific research nor on the need for adducing of rational abstractions (Gündoğdu, 2007, p. 101). For as much as, since Kierkegaard (2014c, p. 21) focuses on the proceeding idea of these objective approaches, he says that they are deprived of the sceptical sensitivity of Descartes. As a matter of fact, different from them, Descartes proposes pausing in a radical and individual scepticism in his manner. Because of this deprivation, the approaches in question ignore the concreteness and individuality of human being and many other features. What's more, when they neglect being an individual, they carry the misconception that they proceed starting from the points where some prestigious personalities reach (Gündoğdu, 2007, p. 103).

The idea of proceeding and sustaining between generations depending on the prestigious personalities has a considerable effect on the sense of the last a few centuries. With its side, education is the means of this view. When the leading educational theories and definitions are analysed, the

dominance of this idea on education could be verified. Kierkegaard (2014c, p. 23) stands against such a sense of the age whether it is religious, or scientific. According to him, instead of fascinated by this focal point, an educated person should ask the question ‘where’.

There is no harm in telling about the educational sense lying under the basis of Kierkegaard’s views just at the beginning instead of leaving it to the final part in terms of supporting the arguments that will be given below. In this sense, there are two general characters to be taken out for the sake of understanding the definition of education in the views of Kierkegaard. The first one is that education is designed as an individual process for each child. The second one is that the basis of faith should not be ignored just to obey mind in educational theory and application.

Commenting the faith-based stresses of Kierkegaard thought on behalf of education and educational sciences means to emerge a perception out of what is accustomed to. As a matter of fact, when the details in Kierkegaard thought are analysed, it is likely to catch different information from the current perception regarding a great many issues and perceptions used by education today. As an example, it is possible to say that it gives different and valuable information about the concept of individual and development of self at first hand.

While making the connection of Kierkegaard thought and education below, the difference in the basis emerging in adoption of only theism by other existentialists will not be mentioned. Instead, the fact that his views and concepts are regarded as a need in terms of current education upon which the central change between ontology and epistemology is reflected will be determined. For that reason, the adaptability of the views and concepts in question will be dealt.

Subjectivity and Truth

There is no objective truth in the philosophy of Kierkegaard. However, it is possible for individual as long as the effort to perceive truth is not mixed with factivity and is not taken with a static approach. Truth could be known in the context of being in harmony, passion and existing between the subjective practice and internality of human being. Even though it is open for individual perception, it cannot be conveyed verbally. As it cannot be conveyed, it is not scientific but vital. What is essential is the discovery of the way that God wants man how to live by human being rather than knowing it. In this sense, it is considered with its changing aspects depending on the content and sizes of belief and faith (Çetin, 2016, p. 360-368). This subjectivity and truth approach of Kierkegaard is a kind of objection to the Western philosophy, particularly to Hegel (Gödelek, 2008, p. 359). In addition, in return for accepting the concept of reality with an objective content instead of truth itself, Kirkegaard put forward the style the concept of truth highlighted in the Antique Age (such philosophers as Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus) and in the Middle Age (such philosophers as Boethius, Augustinus). Yet, he made it in the way of perception and an up-to-date evaluation by some elements from his views. The truth approaches of the Antique Age and Middle Age are a way of trying to offer at a static scale without leaving the discovery of truth to individual.

From the perspective of educational philosophy, the views of the philosopher could be related to the subjectivity seeking of the current educational institutions. Kierkegaard philosophy is the first example of existentialism which is against objectivity, putting individual in the centre in the history of philosophy. With this respect, it is not possible think that this case is out of the attention of the approaches seeking to highlight subjectivity at education and putting individual to the forefront. The approaches of putting individual to the centre at education with subjective truth naturally support each other. Those who would like to place individual in the centre at education mostly object to the passivity of him against objective reality. However, every view which is in favour of individual-centred education do not regard it in a way that is knitted with traditional religious approach as did Kierkegaard. In order to find a place for traditional-religious approach in current educational senses, ‘subjective truth’ view of Kierkegaard is facilitating. On the contrary, an educational system organized according to traditional religious approach could benefit from the views of Kierkegaard with regard to the communication of God and individual in the cases where it cannot put individual in the centre.

The words of Kierkegaard (2014a, p. 132) “... *humanity is something different from being an animal which an only animal always carries a valued less than being a species. Human being is not only different from other species because of his generally known superiorities; actually, the structure of individual different with his superiority on genre particularly.*” explaining why he put individual in the centre are of important for both the custom of philosophy and education. Philosophy offers an originality in combining theology and philosophy in its tradition in terms of human sense. In addition, it guides existentialist movement by dealing with contingency in relation to the genre of individual. This determined direction is able to affect the evaluations of human being and individual in the field studies such as education regarding human being.

Every educational theory should primarily have certain acceptations regarding human being. Whether the individual or species side of human being will be adopted is a compulsory stop of the educational theory. As a matter of fact, the practice is made by taking the preference at the theory into consideration. The emphasis on individual in the application of theories and applications for the up-to-date educational approaches come to the forefront. As an example, constructivism is the up-to-date expression of the orientation towards individual in the field of education. According to Jaarsma et al., (2016, p. 445), the question of ‘how’ in the subjectivity and truth approach at Kierkegaard leads to the emergence of being against of objective truth of individual and status quo of originating from it. Depending on the same study, this approach of the philosopher provides the connection with constructivism. However, as of other features, it must be expressed that there are considerable differences with constructivism.

In Kierkegaard theism, the fact that a central importance is not attributed to a concept of a material-based experience as in constructivism for the sake of learning is the basic difference. Such that, the examples of experience indicated in experience based learning which was also indicated by both are different. The approach of Kierkegaard to such issues anxiety, existence fields, hope and hopelessness supports this difference.

The opposition of Kierkegaard toward rationalism means that he is not for just a speculative learning. According to Gary (2007), it is not possible to perceive the trueness or wrongness of an ideal just speculatively, in line with the subjectivity and truth views of Kierkegaard (p. 154). The function of eclecticist teaching will be narrow depending on it. For that reason, the approach of subjectivity and truth result from an argument determining teaching and learning regarding how to obtain knowledge.

According to Kierkegaard (2014c), one can turn the essence of faith into conceptuality. However, conceptuality does not adequately explain how to realize the mutual relation between faith and person (p. 24). For that reason, a full (complete) understanding cannot be obtained. What’s more the conceptual certainty offered by objective theoretical knowledge is attributed to the removal of freedom which is highlighted by Kierkegaard (West, 2005, p. 199) and truth for Kierkegaard will be possible by just discovering the subject (Çetin, 2016, p. 369). In this sense, one is sincerely adhere to knowledge personally (Rocca, Foley & Kenny, 2011). Current educational institutions are in harmony with these ideas emerging in Kierkegaard thought. What is recommended in the current educational sense is not to transfer knowledge to student but to make them adhere to it sincerely by means of discovering themselves. Nevertheless, the answers with regard to what the truth to be discovered is and how the process of discovery will be realized are different from the Kierkegaard philosophy.

Not being able to reach the conceptual is a result of the freedom of choice. Man is responsible this freedom (West, 2005, p. 199). Freedom choice is to make way to the relativity of knowledge and experience. Accordingly, as a result of the choices of individual, their knowledge is formed by what they adhere to through discovery. When it becomes certain, freedom is removed. The relativity of knowledge does not mean its impossibility. Both the possession of knowledge for a person because of free choices and that a person is not able to free from the responsibility of choice make knowledge possible. In this way, ‘knowing’ in Kierkegaard is a task of man which he cannot ignore. However, knowledge cannot be reduced to the information obtained from phenomena and events and there are some others with a priority. As West (2005, p. 199) pointed out, not reaching the certainty at

knowledge does not mean giving up seeking truth. Factual certainty and truth must exactly be separated from each other.

Upon the analysis of Kierkegaard's views, it is likely to see that what is permanent is a plain 'knowing' but the content of knowledge could be changed as of the evaluations of freedom, truth and faith. Depending on these views, it is necessary to focus on human conditions from which this knowledge rather than the content of knowledge in education emerge. There is a peak, with a usual expression, of these human conditions experienced completely individual. One can reach this peak internally not from the outside. The peak in Kenny's (2017) words can be explained as "... *fully possession of his own personality by an individual as a unique being of God...*". There is of course a series of educational correspondence for such an acceptance in the field of education, which does not go against the Kierkegaard thought. As an example, as Gary (2007, p. 155) expressed, it is of priority at an individual to own certain truths on purpose, instead of generating intellectuals by means of eclecticism in Kierkegaard. It is based on their acceptance of a way of life not on a cognitive perception. In this way, moral and religious issues are not dealt as objective knowledge.

Way of life that cannot be dealt as objective knowledge cannot be transferred to the coming generations in an eclectic way. As a matter of fact, Kierkegaard (2014c, p. 153) pointed out that "*No matter what any generation learns from another generation, there is no generation learning the most humanistic element from the other one*". In other words, no intergenerational transfer is observed in the just epistemological basis in the Kierkegaard thought. Therefore, it is acceptable to investigate the educational view of the philosopher in ontological basis. In this respect, Kierkegaard inclines to the individual acting on various relations of human being with the sustainability of communication. Such an inclination means that the individuals of the new generation, not of the former generation, should be trained in his own originality. This priority means that a Kierkegaard based educational thought is separated from conventional pedagogical approaches ontologically. However, this ontological basis does not mean ignoring any kind of knowledge to be obtained from a former generation.

Another issue which the arguments of educational theory are based and closely interested is the human nature. Ontologically, two approaches come to the forefront in the philosophical argument regarding the nature of child. The first one is that he is good but he is pushed to what is bad by the environment. The second one is that he is bad in his nature and can be change by means of education. Kierkegaard explains these two basic approaches in a different way. Kierkegaard (2009, p. 70-71) points out that a child can both be innocent and be criminal at the same time depending on his own comment with regard to creating faith. As a result, the likelihood of this case adopted by Kierkegaard separated him from essentialist approaches regarding human nature.

Making a preference for whether a child is good or bad in birth determines the content of the education to be given in terms of philosophy of education. Compared to Rousseau and Hobbes, Kierkegaard does not put forward any idea which are loaded a preliminary determination and content regarding the nature of child. Instead, the mentioned views of Kierkegaard are closely related to the groundings of anxiety of which object is nihilism. It takes its place in subjectivity of this anxiety offering species but also individual perspectives. Moreover, these views of the philosopher do not give the right to make a strict determination over nature, community or politics. In detailed analysis of the views of the philosopher, it is likely to see that there appear a great many alternatives for individual over against the components determining individual.

In a detailed explanation, Kierkegaard (2009, p. 73-74), in the argument regarding the nature of child, makes egoism an issue of investigation. Accordingly, as traditional thought does, explaining sin as egoism and making a species explanation addressing to the objectivity of intelligence. Instead, priority should be given to the explanation of "I". Explaining "I" is not something to be explained by sciences. At this point, what Kierkegaard recommends is that one should rather think over himself. Thinking over himself is realized by with the target of knowing himself.

The traditional saying of 'know yourself' coming to the forefront from Socrates onwards was lost with modern life or its context was changed. It is as a result of the central change between

ontology and epistemology. The teaching of knowing oneself in the Antique and Middle Ages requires an active condition of mind based on the view of existence and approaching human being to God. For that reason, the ways of knowing out of senses and reasoning must be active. Roughly, there is a holistic approach of knowing regarding existence in traditional thought. Yet, in the modern period epistemology, as Arkonaç (2015) pointed out in psychology, a passive sense of knowing emerged for the sake of objective knowledge of the object which is basically outside (p. 45-47, 99). As for sociology, depending on the views of Durkheim (2015), it is likely to see the fact that the same objectivity could only be found in knowledge of the outsider (p. 49) is a tightly bounded opinion. The first result obtained from these approaches is that the subject cannot investigate itself. The second result is the opinion that expertise is indispensable. These ideas offer a convenient ground for ideologies. In this way, traditional teaching of knowing oneself lost its former meaning in human sciences. Up against this case, knowing oneself in Kierkegaard thought is brought on the agenda once again with an original content.

By never making such a definition as ‘good’ or ‘bad’ regarding the human nature, the philosopher did not develop a lever point which will lead to an ideological content in his philosophy. In this way, the idea of ‘being’ and the sustainability of communication came to the forefront. As for educational perspective, communication and process could be brought to the forefront without breaking away from ontological basis instead of focusing on the knowledge to be transferred. In other words, the educational meaning of the Kierkegaard thought does not make student equipped with the knowledge that will guide him in line with certain external objectives determined. Instead, the internal objectives he could catch in line with his own being and communication should be discovered within the unity of material and spiritual senses. Technically, irrational components are taken into consideration in educational application. According to Berner (2013, p. 59), spiritual sciences pedagogy regards irrational components as an important value in pedagogical relation. What’s more, the pedagogical approach in question is criticized for the fact that it does not take interaction between education and society into consideration and does not deal with such cases as social reality and political reality. Such kind of concepts are the products of an epistemological centred sense of sociology. As a result, when this side is taken into consideration, the educational thought of Kierkegaard looks like ‘spiritual sciences pedagogy’.

Even though it is partly pointed out in the discussion above, isn’t a ‘mental condition’ necessary out of freedom and choice in order to reach existence by means of obtained uncertain knowledge an individual designed? The answer for this question in Kierkegaard philosophy is given in detail in ‘individualizations’ he wrote without organizing according to any experiment and scientific principles. Both the communication thoughts and psychological evaluations of the philosopher taking their places in the philosophy content should be investigated in this sense.

Communication Thoughts

West (2005) indicated that Kierkegaard writes in the style of a series of educational speeches (p. 198). In parallel with it, Noddings (2016) pointed out that he and other religious existentialists had a great many nice and fluent paragraphs that could be used in high school courses. These texts do not only present argumentations but also arrangements in the style of stories. As West and Noddings indicated, all texts of Kierkegaard are indeed of a quality preparing student for a future life. Particularly, in his individualizations in the work called *The Sickness unto Death* (2014a), the interrogations that could happen any person are given in detail. In this work, philosophical thought and individualization are used together and skilfully. Under having such kind of content, style and technique for sure lies a philosophical perspective. Moreover, these individualizations act over a basic (principal) philosophical view and moves towards metaphysical field with an ontological perception. Depending on the philosophical perspective in question, it is likely to say that the educational action based upon Kierkegaard will not allow activities repeating themselves. An educational theory and practice based on the views of the philosopher should be process-oriented, vital and active. Besides containing interaction with internal speech and environment, this process, in its most important side, refers to communication with God in line with the internality of the person.

Theist existentialists drew the attention to “... *the capacity of directly communication of individual with God (without the channelling of priests)*” (Noddings, 2016, p. 62). This communication is realized by jumping in Kierkegaard (2104c, p. 60-70). The movement of a person as a faith-related action towards eternity is just like the jumping of a dancer. The central tool concept of this jump is not contemplation but passion. The person making the movement of jumping is still in what is finite every time. It looks like a usual person when looked outside. Realization of the movement in terms of time and space means reliance. Complete reliance makes the relation of person with eternity continuous. One who realizes complete reliance in full sense has the chance of seeing the sincerity in the complete reliance of another person. As well as everyone can succeed it, everyone must succeed it on his own. However, complete reliance is not the same as faith. Complete reliance means giving up his beloved one for love. Faith, on the other hand, is winning one by enduring what seems meaningless when necessary. As is seen, religious field is a field of passion rather than a field of thought. In the form encountered in the hopelessness individualizations, there is a communication even if an individual does not choose the way of dialogue on purpose. It is likely to see that there is not only communication with God but also with another one in this field. In other words, there is no sudden or gradual retreat from the world of from people. An emphasis on complete reliance was made to prevent a misunderstanding regarding Kierkegaard. In his theory, not retreating from the world and other people will provide the adaptation of this important content to the educational tools.

In the communication thought of Kierkegaard, not external but internal speech is acceptable in the evaluations of God and faith (Taşdelen, 2013, p. 726). According to Mcpherson (2001), when the communication thought which is the major issue in almost all of the works of the philosopher is related to the skill of perception, it has a converting function in terms of education (p. 160). That's to say, there is a mutual connection between the perception skill mentioned by Mcpherson and the internal speech mentioned by Taşdelen. However, Bringing the idea of communication on one hand and the internal speech on the other to the forefront must not be regarded as a contradiction. Internal speech in Kierkegaard means a real communication. Nonetheless, it is not regarded as not communicating but that himself. At that point, besides the frequent references made by Kierkegaard to Socrates, the example of Farinelli quoted from a theatre text could be taken into consideration. Accordingly, Kierkegaard (2014b, p. 16-17) identifies himself with Farinelli performed in the theatre text with his saving a king from melancholy in 18th century. Saving a king from melancholy is just one of a great many examples. Thanks to this example, he reveals what to do in similar cases. One of the things to be done is to be charming and the other is to be confidant. Being charming and confidant could be shown among hard skills to be emerged for a teaching in the practice of education. Even though these are the skills that a teacher must have, achieving the internal objectives pointed out by Kierkegaard depends on student himself. As is clear, Kierkegaard includes both the communication of individual in his internal speech and the communication of individual with another one but that himself in the evaluation.¹

According to Kierkegaard (2014a, p. 105), understanding is pertinent in the communication of human with human not faith. Faith is present in the communication with God. In this context, it is essential that human being must make a jumping in his communication with God (Taşdelen, 2013, p. 719) and endure what is absurd. In this sense, teacher must take on a task to allow not only understanding but communication with God. This task must not exceed the level of being only an admonisher. What's meant by being an admonisher is to use the way of irony in Socratic terms; since irony in the communication world of Kierkegaard provides diverting from the intellectual knowledge which is misleading by giving the impression of wholeness. It is of importance in terms of the fact that individual is the initiator of a process of an active, subjective understanding/knowing instead of intellectual knowledge (West, 2005, p. 196-198).

As is clear, depending on the Kierkegaard thought, teacher is not at no value at all in the relation between teacher and student. On the contrary, there is no mutual interaction where student is

¹ Moreover, as Taşdelen (2013, p. 726) pointed out, the idea of communication was carried on by such existentialist educational thinkers as Buber giving explanations regarding student and teacher relation in terms of its side comprising an orientation and dependence between God and human being.

in the centre; since according his approach, *“Every action of a person is affected by other people in a subjective way and he gets inspiration.”* and *“Being encouraged by teachers and being accepted strengthens the sense of trust and faith”* (Sharma & Marvaha, 2016, p. 369).

No ‘labelling’ is made aiming at teachers and students in the existentialist education environment in terms of teacher-student relation. Instead, the atmosphere where existence is realized must be organized (Sharma & Marvaha, 2016, p. 369). When we take what was expressed up to now into consideration, the fact that individual relation between teacher and student must be a preliminary acceptance rather than the education in the classroom setting in terms of Kierkegaard existentialism. In this way, as Berner (2013, p. 59) stated, teacher and student relation in the spiritual sciences pedagogy of Nohl has to be individual completely and classroom setting is not considered as a social system. Teacher could be an example but this case is not reduced to realist measures.

In the works of Kierkegaard, it is possible to find some clues regarding both how to form this atmosphere and the qualifications of teacher. The expressions of Kierkegaard regarding a person making a psychological observation reveal what a psychological consultant must do in his communication with the consultee in terms of existentialist style. However, the communication between the same individuals before the classroom communication is realized between teacher and student. For that reason, this example explains how a teacher must approach to a student. According to Kierkegaard (2009), there is anxiety at person, being little or more, partly or changeable. The question here is: How can wholeness and what is unchanged be revealed depending on partly and unchangeable in the observer subject who is aware of such an anxiety? Explaining this question will make the role of teacher in the formation process of knowledge and value at a student understandable. Firstly, in order that the observer can reach the subject, it is essential for the observer to be more comfortable than a wire-walker, be attractive with his silence to allow the subject open himself through talking by establishing the sense of trust, carry the soul of a poet in order to create the wholeness and what is unchangeable, make his mind tidy permanently and try to discover the correct subject (p. 50-51). These expressions show that teaching profession requires expertise. However, this expertise cannot be regarded as the one in sciences. Similarly, Eryaman (2007) also mentions some current shortcomings in teacher education. Accordingly, narrowing the scope of teacher education by considering it only on scientific ground is a problem. This problem is an event that reduces the teacher's abilities. Alternatively, the teacher should be educated in a more versatile way and social practices such as beliefs, values and ideologies that are effective in the formation of the child's identity should be taken into account. Even the concept of practical wisdom presented by Eryaman in the aforementioned study takes into account the distinction between ontology and epistemology. As underlined by the author, practical wisdom is a well-established and historical concept coming from Aristotle to the present. Considering Kierkegaard's philosophy, there are undeniable connections between the teacher education alternative put forward by Eryaman and the views on the teaching profession based on the philosopher. Thus, rather than being limited to a scientific framework guided only by epistemological concerns, such views, especially based on ontology, aim to expand the limits of the teacher's expertise.

Kierkegaard (2014a, p. 32-33) mentions about the issue of expertise by making an analogy between doctors and psychologists. At this point, a qualitative and high-level teacher training based on developing skills comes to the forefront. Even though teacher makes a careful pass from the passive condition toward what is active, he carries on depending on internal speech. In spite of the fact that the efficiency of teacher in general atmosphere as of the basic objective of education increases, the central position where student is more active and, what is important, the communication is by no means given up. For that reason, an expertise envisaged by Kierkegaard does not claim that the solution is at the expert by turning the person to himself at the end. It is different from the view of expertise emerged by modern science in terms of the fact that it requires being versatile and holistic, being able to discover the profound meaning without depending on just materialistic principle.

As was explained above, some information that would be learned completely based on the internal speech are related to truth. The effort to reach truth deprives teacher from the chance of being in the centre of educational setting. In terms of Kierkegaard (2009, p. 44-45), it is essential that one must run his own psychological processes completely in order to realize understanding some religious

issues in their full senses. Confining oneself to expecting teacher to convey such kind of issues only will cause misunderstanding. Let alone, it is out of influence of teacher in the end. Kierkegaard thought seems that it does not accept an external purpose in any sense in terms of the basic objectives of education. This side separates it from traditional ontology and makes it stay out of modern epistemology in its full sense. However, its separation from modern epistemology is much more rooted.

Using Psychological Concepts

Kierkegaard existentialism separates itself from getting stuck in epistemology depending on a narrow ontology peculiar to empirical or rational modern science senses. As an example, it stays out of the knowledge and faith evaluations of the modern sense. In a more special plan, it relates the concreteness of human being with the field of faith. Besides that, it examines the subjective content of human being by highlighting such concepts finding their correspondence in psychology as freedom, fear, anxiety, passion, hope and hopelessness which are all peculiar to man. In this sense, it offers the opportunity of making plural and special evaluations for the human sciences today.

As Jaarsma et al. (2016, p. 445-446) pointed out, the style of investigating the psychological concepts in Kierkegaard offers important examples to be benefitted in educational setting. It is likely to say that, Kierkegaard (2014a, p. 126) uses the description the conditions of soul just like a kaleidoscope. He points out that each condition of soul is necessary to pass from one condition to another. In this context, according to Sharma and Marvaha (2016, p. 368-369), existentialism and Kirkegaard existentialism “... is a philosophy calling individual to make choice regarding the following existence in his life with a quality of consultant...”.

Existentialism does not ignore the epistemological transformation of student. However, it provides by depending on concepts that look negative and suspicion without needing this certainty. Such concepts of Kierkegaard as anxiety and hopelessness are the clear examples for it (Jaarsma, Kinashuk, Xing, 2016, p. 448). A faith, view etc. is not imposed on human being for this transformation. It is provided that man should be aware that the decisions he will take will determine his following condition and that he will not be disturbed by means of irony (Gary, 2007, p. 153). The style of dealing with these psychological concepts in Kierkegaard becomes a function of increasing the sufficiency of teacher in *understanding* student, as an example being aware of what the meanings of *disturbing* are.

Anxiety

In the anxiety evaluation of Kierkegaard (2009, p. 1-15), sin is explained by decreasing the investigation criteria neither to the *psychology* science, nor to *ethics*, and nor to *dogmatics*. In addition, just logical explanations out of the field of faith regarding sin forget just where they completely belong to. Just making do with reasoning is in the illusion where it reaches truth. What emerges illusion brought by the limitation through reasoning is science and expertise. Then again, there are some contradictions in terms of investigation of religion by different disciplines and what they attribute of sin. The philosopher is aware of this case in the evaluation of anxiety based on the concept of sin. He draws a framework between the disciplines to which he will be loyal. However, it is just a framework and it does not divert from the starting point.

The trouble of investigating human existence as a whole is generally eliminated by the idea of benefitting from the data of various disciplines. For example, the field of education benefits from a great many different disciplines in suitable line with this evaluation. Whether educations could be regarded as a science is the primary argument of the philosophy of education. It is the second important argument of the field of education that if it is a science, is it just one science or an interdisciplinary study happening out of the combination of different sciences. However, when the Kierkegaard thought is analysed, it must be recommended that an interdisciplinary quality in the style where some views are attributed to education (educational sciences) cannot be offered and that on the

contrary, one cannot break away from the argument with a primary importance. In this respect, the method of the studies of Kierkegaard evaluating human being and the relation he makes between the disciplines sets an example in terms of the difference in choice in naming *education*, *science of education* or *educational science*. In addition to this formal contribution of Kierkegaard's evaluation of anxiety, it is also possible to examine his contribution to content dimension.

While examining the species of human, Kierkegaard starts from the primitive man. Adam is not different from the species of human in terms of existence. In this sense, he is regarded as both himself and the self of human species. The concept of hereditary sin as the first sin of Adam is explained with this dependence between individual and species (Kierkegaard, 2009, p. 21-22). The main view that must be taken into consideration in terms of education here is the dependence between the species and individual in the basis of hereditary sin. As in the example of primitive man, the originality of individual does not put him out of the limits of the species. Any individual in the limits of the species carries the hereditary characteristics of other individual of the species. However, what is the most important is that the decisiveness of the species does never ignore originality; since the example of Adam appears as a good example of originality. In terms of educational theory, Kierkegaard thought is different from other senses education putting a complete emphasis on the features of the species. In which context it brings individual to the forefront becomes clearer thanks to the quotes given above. In these evaluations, a central importance is attributed to the concept of anxiety. The concept of anxiety is of a key role in understanding the individual in the species whose "originality" cannot be ignored.

Kierkegaard (2009) separates the original sin and any other sin from each other. Traditional explanations approach these sins only quantitatively and cannot explain the qualitative difference by separating the original sin and any other sin. Not being able to do this distinction brings about to miss some cases regarding sin. The spring made with the help of the first one from the original to the new one and the appearance of the original sin in the new one is ignored. Thanks to these qualitative separations, main concept was focused by the philosopher. Putting the moment in the focal point means to make it special. In addition, depending on the concept of moment, the historicity of individual is included in the issue. In this way, Kierkegaard reaches a significant result in the sense of individual view. Individual is not only a meaningless repetition in the quantity of the birth event historically. Every individual is a new start of his species. This result that Kierkegaard achieves detains the child from being any student in terms of education (p. 22-27). The child is regarded in his singularity without reducing him to a numerical data. However, this evaluation does not require an isolation from the species history and does not the position of the initiator of the species. The child is a starting point with the general characteristics of his species. In this sense, anxiety was regarded that would allow both to belonging to species and individuality.

With his expressions both in the work of *The Concept of Anxiety* (2009) "... like blue children named by number..." (p. 27) and in *Repetition* (2014b) "... I wanted an ordinary name like the blue child no. 14...", Kierkegaard makes a reference to the issue in question. These expressions show that sensitivity and criticism were made by Kierkegaard in a quite early century in return for seeing the child as an ordinary one by reducing him to numerical data in education. This critical reference reminds anti-pedagogy approaches developing towards the last quarter of the twentieth century, which was pointed out by Berner (2013, p. 222) or the fair criticisms of the current educational movements making an emphasis on the fact that every child is special at any opportunity. However, the important difference of Kierkegaard from these movements is that it does not ignore other possible conditions which will be in relation with the special being. In this way, he does not attribute an extreme meaning to this special being to empty it. The reason why he succeeds it might be that he explains the special being around a spiritual concept of anxiety which could be evaluated in species and individual sense of psychology.

Kierkegaard (2009, p. 28-34, 38) supposes that there is a tension between innocence and guiltiness in the history when human species moves silently. According to him, guilt and aesthete existed because of curiosity and by moving innocence. In the historical progress of humanity, it mostly took the name of sinfulness. In this sense, sinfulness is inside human being more or less. What causes

the elimination (and decrease) of innocence regarded in the same meaning of illiteracy is not knowing but the extreme desire evoked by prohibition. This desire also evokes the knowledge of “being able to do” in freedom. The desire evoked by prohibition is not sentenced as a bad thing but transferred. This transfer is obtained for the sake of learning. For that reason, what must be taken care in these evaluations in the educational context is the difference between the concepts of knowing and will; since the concept of will, differently from knowing, makes more reference to being able to do at the same time. This basic view of Kierkegaard is closer to the view making an emphasis on ‘experience’ more rather than the one with an emphasis on ‘knowing speculatively’, in the arguments with regard to learning. Accordingly, the purpose is to bring it together with the learning theories bearing the effect of pragmatism in their bases, only with this side. As an example, its similarity and difference with constructivism was explained beforehand. However, the fact that Kierkegaard focuses on the concept of anxiety as an internal process and his synthesis of soul regarding human being makes him stay away from these learning approaches and be original.

Anxiety comes out in possibility and freedom as “... *a result of hereditary sin and as the existence at the singular individual...*” and as a result orienting to future. This feature makes anxiety different from regret. Thanks to anxiety, individual discovers futility etc. In this sense, anxiety steps in between the human being and phenomena and leads to interrogation. It is also anxiety that makes individual go beyond these discoveries by means of discovering his own being. For that reason, the teaching function of such a sense is much more than that of the reality concept (quo. Gülten, 2014, p. 32-34). Confined to the condition of body, man cannot experience freedom just like an angel, since it is under the pressure of what is earthly. It has a spiritual side other than its body. In this sense, the evaluations of Kierkegaard over human being is established over the fact that human is a being of synthesis. Man becomes a spirit/ego in the various relations of this synthesis. Thanks to spirit, the continuation of the relation between soul and body is provided. Spirit is loaded on man as a quality. In this sense, anxiety is what provides spirit with making connection to itself and adhere to itself. Anxiety is the thing that makes this process shared in the processes of pushing and pulling human being by freedom and obligation. Even though its object is not shown clearly, it increases or decreases depending on the approaching conditions to spirit and body. However, it is seen more in those coming after Adam compared to Adam as a result of joining in the species. The mental condition of man in the processes of choosing is an anxiety coming from nothingness. What leads child to seek an adventure is this anxiety. In this respect, it is not a concept that we must get rid of (West, 2005, p. 200-201; Kierkegaard, 2014a, p. 21-23; Kierkegaard, 2009, p. 34-37, 47).

In this respect, anxiety, the central concept of Kierkegaard, is at the position of the engine of learning process. His description of anxiety as a mental condition, creating it being peculiar to individual and indispensably in terms of origin in individual make the concept an issue that must be taken into consideration particularly in the education setting. In this way, the importance that is attributed to the concept of anxiety by the philosopher could be shown as one of the dynamics of the process making educational science come closer to psychology. However, even though he gives a central position to the concepts of the field of psychology, he particularly includes the metaphysics-based ontology with the profoundness of his ideas in the educational arguments. In this sense, it will not be true to limit the theory and practice of education with only the epistemological content of psychology and with its concepts on a quantitative plane in the Kierkegaard-based view of education.

Hope and Hopelessness

Thanks to the fact that ‘I’ mentioned above orients into itself, one dives into the power with which he reveals himself. As a result of the internal incompliance of the synthesized man, hopelessness appears. This hopelessness is actually an advantage as of making man different from animal. It is a movement of ascending which allows a transition from hopelessness to hope. It is God that turns man into this synthesis relation. God allowed man to flee in order to that he can find his way. Putting the details of different hopelessness styles aside, it is likely to say in general sense that there is a fixated *I* by the creator. Man escapes from this *I* in different styles, even if he is a devoted person, or lives without being aware of it. It is like a rule for human life. A real hope against the hopelessness hidden inside man is a rarely encountered condition. Even though the happiness of living

in masses shadows it, it is possible to have a conscious in dealing with hopelessness. For that reason, it is like a universal purpose for individual to overcome hopelessness. In this sense, an individual process is defined without getting lost in the purpose. One can obtain the gain of his eternity in the consciousness that the existence of God and his own self exist for God (2014a, p. 23-37).

Individualization of Hopelessness which examines in his book *The Sickness unto Death*, the Third Book, has a content aiming at life (practice) beyond being any philosophical study of existentialist conditions (Kierkegaard, 2014a). This text as a whole contains educative elements for the purpose of investigating life in terms of Kierkegaard reader. Supposing in line with the purpose of the current study that there is an education system based on Kierkegaard existentialism. In such a setting, Individualism of Hopelessness would be the main source of the teacher. The text in question is knowledgeable as it defines the point the student must arrive practically as a result of the transformations he must pass at the target of educational objectives.

In a study examining hopelessness by Gülten (2014, p. 25), this feature of the text is striking in the quotation of “*Conceptual analysis of hopelessness in reality is a tool for the educational objective*”. According to Gary (2007, p. 156), careful investigation of individualization of hopelessness would in fact encourage critical thinking. In addition, it closely encourages moral development instead of merely making a doctrinal transfer to ethical subject. It materializes the issue in terms of existence and does not offer a recipe with an imperious language.

Indeed, the main idea obtained at the end of his work *The Sickness unto Death* does not have chance of being completed in a formal educational process comprising just a part of human life. Let alone, in a Kierkegaard based educational theory, it is not aimed to make the student reach a ‘completed thought’ at the end of the formal education. In this sense, the educational service of the Kierkegaard thought must be perceived as a preliminary for the adult education. In the current time, making what formal education gives student a material of adult life is an important problem for educational systems. Instead of such a claim in the Kierkegaard thought, education could be evaluated as a preparatory towards the target indicated by the philosopher. Yet, the value that he gives to individual makes do with offering this target to human being without making it the only choice. More clearly, the typing emerging in the context of individualization of hopelessness in Kierkegaard are mostly adults. Furthermore, overcoming hopelessness does not appear as a compulsory thing. For that reason, the suggestion of overcoming hopelessness by Kierkegaard is not the major objective of education but is at a lower position. Attaining this lower value in formal education process aims at being aware of the main idea of this work. With such an approach to the Kierkegaard thought, it would be possible to catch a more universal dimension by getting free from the idea that his philosophy belongs to Christianity.

Saying that “... *what a big foolishness it is to think that faith and wisdom is formed slowly on its own just like growing of teeth and beard...*” Kierkegaard (2014a, p. 69) determines a target of life for human being who is being educated in the basis of wisdom. Besides that, he draws attention to the developmental difference between the mental condition in terms of wisdom and faith and other things (tooth, beard etc.). This mental condition and target of life is understandable in the connection he makes from hopelessness toward hope.

The educational side of the Kierkegaard individualizations is that every person can find a place in it. With the development of this educational perspective, learning can be guided by highlighting the critical and reasoning manner at individual at the starting point of knowing oneself. The individualizations in question are classified by the philosopher in more basically. These classifications are called as fields of existence.

Fields of Existence

The thinker offers three existentialist field as aesthetics, ethics and religious. The details regarding these fields give the person the chance of forming the awareness of peculiarity instead of making the belongings of the person randomly. According to Gödelek (2008, p. 363-364), one can

experience some characteristics of these three fields at the same time. However, the crisis conditions emerging during life will force him to choose one of them. According to Gödelek, one must test which one of the existentialist fields is suitable for him before the crisis condition happens.

We must consider the fact that Kierkegaard writes about the individualizations of hopelessness and the fields of existence in the way that he assumes that one involves preparedly in the fields of existence by knowing himself not randomly. It is this need of 'preparation' leads to the idea of education which Kierkegaard existentialism bears in it. It is likely to reach the content of these fields, the types emerging in this field and how the leaps between the fields are realized in the details of his works.

According to Gödelek (2008, p. 362-368), there is mainly individualism in the aesthetic field. Without being aware of his spiritual being, individual lives an indirect life based on tastes. It is not obligatory to pass from an existentialist field bearing a lot of different types inside to another one. However, as a result of being aware of the negative sides of the aesthetic field, one passes into the ethical field by making a free choice between good and bad. There are such conditions in the ethical field as living in a community, socialization, responsibility of being a family for individual. It can be surprising for many people to pass from the ethical field to religious field. For Kierkegaard (2014a, p. 55-56), the person both in the aesthete and religious fields cannot recognize himself mentally in parallel with hopelessness. He is lost in the universal abstraction or in the taste taken from life.

The importance given on the religious field rather than aesthete and ethic field in the Kierkegaard thought shows that it does not comply with the educational theories based on the tangible world in terms of purpose and content. In this sense, the Kierkegaard thought is the criticism of the commonly accepted theories regarding the current education. Compared to traditional religious approaches, Kierkegaard describes the religious field as a third existence field in a critical and unusual way.

Kierkegaard (2014c, p. 48-49, 54-55, Gödelek, 2008, p. 368) foresees a one to one communication with God in religious field. With an evaluation as God might have an unreasonable wish (example of Prophet Abraham), a difference comes to the fore. The universality of ethical field and rationality and religious field are different from each other. Solitude in the communication with God is explained with the concepts of passion and faith emerging in the absence of a certain proof. There is no singularity in the ethical field like this; since the issues regarding faith are considered to be nonsense. Furthermore, it is likely to desire to be pushed out of community. The existentialist philosophy fictionalized by Kierkegaard for the sake of subjectivity is consistent with these views of him. The philosopher does not look down on the 'tragical hero' one of the existentialist forms of the ethical field accepted by most people. However, as he experiences fear and trembling more, he idealizes 'the knight of faith' in religious field and brings it to the forefront.

Kierkegaard does not give ethical and religious truths as a system of ideology and faith. Instead, he develops an explanation depending on the subjective life of human being. His views explaining the difficulty and processes in reaching truths particularly encourage the internal and individual consciousness of human life. This consciousness of man regarding knowing himself could be related to moral and religious education (Gary, 2007, p. 153-154). As an example, he warns that a harsh Christian education regarding the content of a religious education will lead to a belief that Christianity is merciless and push to more sinfulness. The definition of faith by Kierkegaard (2014a, p. 90-92) like "*It is to dive into God by being oneself, wishing to be himself and in his own self transparency*" describes his proposal regarding how the content of a religious education must be.

Now that we mention such fields as moral education and religious education, it will be useful to evaluate the philosophical education in terms of Kierkegaard thought. The separation of mind and faith by Kierkegaard means the separation of philosophy and faith. However, the fact that he is a thinker putting an emphasis on faith does not mean he regards philosophy unimportant. He (2014c) says that "*... I am never of the opinion that faith is lower, on the contrary, it is at the top; on the other hand, I believe that it is not honesty to allow the humiliation of philosophy by replacing faith with*

another thing. Philosophy cannot give us the faith and it must not, either; however, it must understand itself and know what to offer but without getting anything; even if man has little, supposing it as nothing and directly..." (p. 52). These words of him could be regarded in the context of the difference between philosophy education and religious education.

When the difference between the religious and ethical fields in the Kierkegaard thought is analysed carefully, it is likely to bring about to see the results caused by an educational preference limited to just the ethical field (or mind) education. Today, there is a problem of the deprivation of unity and spirituality for man, about which a great many theoreticians of education complain. However, taking the differences between these fields into consideration, the way to a deeper meaning regarding the bases of education will be paved. In this respect, Kierkegaard philosophy particularly allows human being to determine in which existentialist field he is in aesthetic, ethical and religious terms. Besides that, it leads human being to discover himself in the communication with God. For that reason, even though Kierkegaard philosophy brings one of the existentialist fields to the forefront, it does not ignore others. In this sense, it does not envisage an education just based upon religion. At this juncture, it is essential to mention that a style of approach saying that ethical education is designed depending on ethical field, aesthetic education is designed depending on aesthetic field is wrong. Instead, it aims at making student attain a way of thinking and living supposing that there are individuals in three fields each. The tendency to attain the way of thinking and living is the condition of consciousness which a Kierkegaard based educational thought wants to reveal at student.

Depending on what was mentioned in the study, it is likely to reach some results regarding what Kierkegaard would say when it comes to the objectives of education. The objectives of education is an issue that is discussed at a considerable amount in the public. As an example, according to Western ideology, it is difficult to come to an agreement when one says "*official schools must lead to citizenship and the spirit of Christianity*" as an education objective. If we put such a clear objective aside, it is even difficult to agree on the concept of 'education objective'. For instance, according to Dilthey, the objectives of education can be changeable historically. According to Buber, it is not possible to give it explicitly (Berner, 2013, p. 45-48). As is clear, Kierkegaard has close views with Dilthey and Buber. From the perspectives of Kierkegaard, as well as the objective of education can be explicit, it is necessary to oppose to determine a clear external objective. In this sense, gaining a thinking and living way by taking the existentialist fields into consideration is not an explicit determination, and it also bears intergeneration changes in mind. Such issues as aesthetic education, ethic education, religious education or philosophical education must be considered within the basic expression as gaining the way of thinking and living. The functions of formal education like vocational education, preparation for expertise course etc. are of slight importance compared to the feature given in the basic expression in question.

As for the current discussion in the field of education, it is likely to see that subjectivity is decisive in the educational objectives in recent decades. The decisiveness of subjectivity leads to erasing of objectives of education gradually. In an argument over the objective of education, contrary to Kierkegaard, the question of 'how' limits the content through the traditional approach perspective. The relation with the erasing the educational objectives gradually increases the value the question of 'how' rather than that of 'what'. This case is indeed a development that will verify the basic starting point of Kierkegaard philosophy. Yet, it is possible to find and bring a content full of future corresponding the question of 'what' from Kierkegaard existentialism in the context of educational objectives. However, even if such an objective is determined, it is not possible to be away from the question of 'how'; since the main question that Kierkegaard tries to answer in the existentialist fields is the question of 'how'. It is tried to answer how to reach what must be.

On the other hand, according to us, we must pay attention to transition between institutions instead of trying to invent new things just turning around Kierkegaard thoughts. In this respect, it will be enough to have a look at spiritual sciences pedagogy. While writing over pedagogical relation, Nohl, one of the theoreticians of spiritual sciences pedagogy, mentions also about the objectives, effects and starting point of education. The expressions of Nohl quoted from Berner (2013) is indeed the statements of Kierkegaard philosophy in the context of education. Accordingly, "*If the stimulation*

of a spiritual life with a unity is the objective of education, education could develop an individual soul which is successful by means of reunited spiritual life only in an individual soul. Pedagogical effect moves depending on valid values, not on a system but only on an essential person continually like its orienting towards human being realized and on the man himself realized with a strong desire: from unity to form ...”(p. 57). Kierkegaard (2014c, p. 22-23) is not in a misconception of moving through intergeneration transferring. At the same time, in terms of Kierkegaard (2014c, p. 66-67), education has nothing to do with the experiences of the age. A Kierkegaard based education expresses the turning of individual completely around himself in terms of the sense of truth. The fact that an individual gains the way of thinking and living is his learning of dealing with himself neatly.

The starting point of both spiritual sciences pedagogy and Kierkegaard thought is the spiritual part of individual instead of a belief of moving depending on the knowledge and values of the age. What's more, Kierkegaard's systematic opposition for thought is his known side. In addition, the expression of "*a spiritual life with a unity*" put forward in the context of the objectives of education is consistent with his communication thought. What's more, choosing *stimulation* in the objective instead of an expression like "*transfer, formation, arrangement of behaviours, socialization, having consciousness... etc.*" is also consistent with the thoughts of Kierkegaard; since the calling of Kierkegaard (2014a, p. 102) for Socrates and his irony as a need for his own age is not in vain. Again, the thought of "*developing individual soul only in individual soul*" in this quotation is an emphasis similar to the use of such concepts as anxiety, hopelessness, passion etc. in the field of education that are used by Kierkegaard.

CONCLUSION AND EVALUATION

The current study firstly depends on the assumption which Kierkegaard philosophy solved the problem caused by the central change in education realized by ontology and epistemology. As a sub-assumption, it depends on the detection which the common characteristics determined on behalf of the existentialist education caused the missing out of the details that could be related to education in the views of singular existentialists. The views of Kierkegaard examined under the related headings were related to some issues in educational philosophy and up-to-date educational theories. In this sense, it was put forward that as well as the views of the philosopher could be adaptable to education, it is a need in terms of current education.

From the perspective of Kierkegaard philosophy regarding education, there are some views which are worth paying attention in terms of ending the ontological argument in education. In other words, a Kierkegaard based educational view triggers a rooted separation in other educational theories ontologically. In a clearer expression, it gives the opportunity to a complete evaluation of human existence. According to us, neglecting existence depending on epistemology is one of the basic problems of education. This basic problem brings a philosophical perspective to education in terms of being apparent and of its evaluation. Furthermore, a great many apparent educational problems are a series of sub-problems based on this problem. However, Kierkegaard warns modern man at this point: in terms of in terms of the priority it gives such arguments as intergenerational connection, species and individual separation, thought of truth, subjectivity, human nature, decisiveness of freedom and choices of individual, it moves from ontological ground more than epistemological one. In the same context, it is likely to see that the purpose of gaining thinking and living way in Kierkegaard philosophy comes to the forefront, instead of gaining knowledge to the person trained for an educational purpose.

Theories regarding the field of education mostly offer a meeting point between theories and disciplines. As will be remember, the disciplines comprising the basis of educational theories and education comprising Kierkegaard thought and making a connection with it was mentioned. From the modern science perspective, it is likely to see that Kierkegaard benefits from different disciplines in dealing with the issues. In this sense, in the arguments he makes regarding the educational basis of 'the Philosophy of Educational Sciences', Kierkegaard's style of dealing with them sets a sample. Particularly, the style of dealing with psychological concepts in Kierkegaard has a facilitating function with the combination of such fields as educational sciences, religion, culture and philosophy. It is

likely to say that modern approaches based on such as psychology and sociology in the field of education are not adequately familiar with such fields as philosophy, religion and culture. This case, as emphasized above, is a result of negligence of the contribution to be given to human to be trained in the basis of ontology. The success of the philosopher in combining theology and philosophy in the texts shows itself over the individualization regarding individual and community. This concrete style of dealing facilitates approaching to practicable field like education in a metaphysical-ontological-epistemological unity.

Individual in Kierkegaard is regarded as a part of communication process. Individual cannot get out of communication. Communication is realized in his personality. The internal speech emerging in the communication of individual with himself must be related to his perceptual skill in educational position. The condition of communication orienting to God and the other in the effort of understanding in line with faith gains a special content for the materials to be used in the educational setting and teacher-student relation. At this point, in a Kierkegaard based education, as an example, active materials based on dialogue rather than uniform studies based on quotations. In addition, irony is of importance in terms of showing how the relation between teacher and student must be and activating the process of knowing. When the views of the philosopher as to how an expert must be are combined with the communication, what the skills of teacher must be comes to the forefront. The position in the educational theories of the philosopher can also be determined in the context of communication thought. Accordingly, Kierkegaard thought in the context of centralization arguments of teacher-student-communication of the educational philosophy concentrates on student and communication. However, the content of the attitude that teacher must also have cannot be left dark.

Kierkegaard bases the concept of anxiety on what is reflected upon individual as the characteristics of species but in line with the fact that individual has a certain originality of species. This basis sets a versatile light to individual or student based psychological education theories in the field of education. The thinker bases the reasons of this condition instead of giving too much importance on only the 'being special' condition of individual thanks to the investigation of anxiety. With this feature, he offers a more deeply and strongly based thought compared to a great many psychological theories putting individual in the centre in education. At the same time, investigation of anxiety bases the connection between knowing speculatively in terms of education instead of being able to do by asking. It was mentioned that this comment differs the thinker from eclectic educational theories and that brings him closer to the educational theories orienting to life and experience. In particular, it is noteworthy in terms of the fact that its relation of anxiety with the relation of being able to do offers explanations about the mental condition. On the other hand, his evaluations over hopelessness in moral and religious terms offer the variety of both the universal purpose and individual transformation. In this sense, he offers a content that can be updated regarding the objective of education.

Human typing of Kierkegaard in aesthetic and moral fields he reveals in the context of existentialist fields and hopelessness individualizations is worth paying attention in terms of a great many theories approaching critically to educational systems. The types revealed until reaching religious field or level of hope are just like a criticism of man trained in the epistemological age. The fact that individual realizes himself in line with the unity of individual in the depth of religious field could be turned into the objective of education by taking under the heading of the objectives of education. However, it is a process that can be met with individual but not institutional efforts during such kind of self-realization. For that reason, such processes as reaching religious field or hope are not given as an educational objective. Let alone, this process is not essential in Kierkegaard thought as the condition of self-realization because it is not offered as an obligation. In this sense, in a Kierkegaard based education view, a simpler objective is reached in the way 'to gain the way of thinking and living' as an objective of education.

On the other hand, the views of Kierkegaard over existentialist fields are open for commenting in terms of the fact that he reveals the differences and unity of the fields of moral education, philosophy education and religious education. New views could emerge regarding such special

disciplines as moral education, philosophy education and religious education depending on Kierkegaard thought from the perspective of these fields.

By looking at the learning theories or pedagogical theories from the philosophical perspective, their connection and distinctions with Kierkegaard philosophy were explained. The dominance of such popular learning theories as behaviourism and constructivism on educational sciences is known. There are a lot of evaluations regarding the effects of empiricism, positivism, pragmatism, materialism and similar philosophical movements in these learning theories or of atheist comments of existentialism. In this condition, the learning theories in question cause a gap at educational level regarding the spiritual sides of human being. For that reason, there is a humanistic need for the religious field. This humanistic need at educational level could be filled with philosophers like Kierkegaard with their concepts and views adaptable to educational field. In other words, these are the consistent issues with these theories in Kierkegaard philosophy allowing it. In this sense, the consistent and contradictory sides with the learning theories in question were tried to be revealed in the current study. As an example, the uniqueness theory of God and individual communication could be compromised with the modern learning theories like constructivism. There is a similarity between allowing student's discoveries regarding subjectivity and truth and gaining him the way of thinking and living. The objective in question contradicts with the modern theories with a desire that student must be in the centre of educational process.

Upon commenting Kierkegaard philosophy about education, it cannot be claimed that no human nature view and educational purpose will come out. These two problems discussing educational philosophy could be tried to be solved with Kierkegaard philosophy. The view of the philosopher over human nature and purpose is consistent with the transformations that the rationality of educational approaches has had up to the current time. Objectives apparent in terms of educational theories and essentialist approaches that are dictated to students are losing their earliest values. The supreme objectives revealed in Kierkegaard philosophy in terms of individual cannot be given to individual as a dictation outside. In addition, it is not possible to move over the idea that human being has a nature determined beforehand. In this sense, a Kierkegaard based education is realized in the usual existentialist transformations of individual himself but through small helps of teacher on its own. In this respect, as a result of the research, it was found that the starting point of a Kierkegaard based educational view is mostly consistent with spiritual sciences pedagogy in terms of its style of dealing with pedagogical relations.

REFERENCES

- Aktulum, K. (2009). Felsefî metin okuma ve yazma yöntemleri (ders notları). *Art-e Sanat Dergisi*, 2(3), 1-21. Retrieved from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/193308>
- Alkan, C. (1983). *Eğitim felsefesi*. Bursa: Uludağ Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Arkonacı, S. A. (2015). *Psikolojide bilginin eleştirel arka planı*. İstanbul: Hiperlink Yayınları.
- Arslanoğlu, İ. (2012). *Eğitim felsefesi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.
- Bayraktar, O. (2015). Türk eğitim sistemi içerisinde yapılandırmacılığın kuramsal çözümlemesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Samsun.
- Bayraktar, İ. & Bayraktar, O. (2016). Varoluşçuluğun insan yaklaşımına göre sekizinci sınıf türkçe kitabı örneğinin incelenmesi. *Hedefe Doğru İnsan Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik I*, 532-546. Samsun: Canik Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları.
- Berner, H. (2013). *Pedagojide güncel akımlar* (Z. Uludağ & Ç. Uğursal & N. Bakır, Çev.). Ankara: Nobel Kitap.

- Birand, K. (1964). Existencialisme Üzerine II, *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, Cilt 12, 100-112. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Brauner, Charles J. (1987) Eğitim felsefesi. S. Büyükdüvenci (Ed.), *Eğitim felsefesi yazılar*, (S. Büyükdüvenci, Çev.) içinde (s. 49-55). Ankara: Yargıçoğlu Matbaası.
- Brubacher, John S. (1987d). Varoluşçuluğun eğitim boyutu. Sabri Büyükdüvenci (Ed), *Eğitim felsefesi yazılar* (S. Büyükdüvenci, Çev.) içinde (s. 107-116).
- Carpenter, E. (2008). *Batı uygarlığının krizi* (O. Düz, Çev.). İstanbul: Külliyyat Yayınları.
- Carrel, A. (1965). *İnsan bu meçhul* (V. B. Nazıkoğlu, Çev.). İstanbul: Arif Bolat Kitabevi.
- Cevizci, A. (2012). *Eğitim felsefesi*. İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
- Charlot, B. (2010). Fransa’da eğitim bilimleri: sindirilmiş bir disiplin, ortak bir kültür, belirsiz bir araştırma alanı. L. Işıl Ünal & S. Özsoy (Ed.), *Eğitim bilimleri felsefesine doğru* (S. Özsoy, Çev.) içinde (s.19-43). Ankara: Tan Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Çetin, E. (2016). Kierkegaard’ın öznel hakikate yönelik görüşlerinde öne çıkan hususlar. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 4(29). 360-372. Retrieved from http://www.asosjournal.com/Makaleler/1900917387_1262%20Erol%20%20C3%87ET%C4%B0N.pdf
- Çilingir, L. (2014). *Felsefeye giriş*. Ankara: Elis Yayınları.
- Çüçen, A. (2005). *Bilgi felsefesi*. Bursa: Asa Yayıncılık.
- Çüçen, K., Zafer, M. Z. & Esenyel, A. (2011). *Varlık felsefesi*. Bursa: Ezgi Kitabevi.
- Diemer, Alwin. (1997). Ontoloji. Doğan Özlem (Ed.), *Günümüzde Felsefe Disiplinleri* (Doğan Özlem, Çev.) içinde. (s. 97-135). İstanbul: İnkılâp Kitabevi.
- Dikeçligil, F. B. (2017). *Ontolojiyi hatırlamak sosyolojide yöntem sorunu*. Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi.
- Durkheim, É. (2015b). *Sosyolojik yöntemin kuralları*. (C. B. Akal, Çev.) Ankara: Dost Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Ergün, M. (1996). *Eğitim felsefesi*. Ankara: Ocak Yayınları.
- Eryaman, M. Y. (2007). From Reflective Practice to Practical Wisdom: Toward a Post-Foundational Teacher Education. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 3(1), Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED495074.pdf>
- Eryaman, M. Y. (2008). Writing, method and hermeneutics: Towards an existential pedagogy. *Elementary Education Online*, 7(1), 2-14. Retrieved from <http://www.ilkogretim-online.org.tr/index.php/io/article/view/1840/1676>
- Gary, K. (2007). Kierkegaard and liberal education as a way of life. *Philosophy of Education Archive*, 151-158. Retrieved from <http://ojs.ed.uiuc.edu/index.php/pes/article/view/1451>
- Gellner, E. (1985). Felsefenin toplumsal içeriği Ernest Gellner ile Söyleşi. B. Magee (Ed.), *Yeni Düşün Adamları* (S. Can, Çev.) içinde (s. 347-362). Ankara: Birey ve Toplum Yayınları.
- Gellner, E. (2008). *Uluslar ve ulusçuluk*. (B. Ersanlı, G. G. Özdoğan, Çev.). İstanbul: Hil Yayın.

- Gödelek, K. (2008). Kierkegaard'ın insan görüşü. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, (1)5, 357-371. Retrieved from http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/cilt1/sayi5/sayi5pdf/godelek_kamuran.pdf
- Guénon, R. (1991). *Modern dünyanın bunalımı* (N. Avcı, Çev.). İstanbul: Ağaç Yayıncılık.
- Gutek, G. L. (2006). *Eğitime felsefi ve ideolojik yaklaşımlar*. (N. Kale, Çev.). Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi.
- Gülten, N. (2014). Kierkegaard'ta umutsuzluk, iman ve umut, (Doktora Tezi). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>
- Gündoğdu, H. (2007). Varoluşçu felsefelerdeki ortak özellikler. *Din Bilimleri Akademik Araştırma Dergisi*, 7(4) 95-132. Retrieved from http://www.dinbilimleri.com/Makaleler/626818548_0701040260.pdf
- Heineman, F. (1997b). Bilgi Kuramı. Doğan Özlem (Ed.), *Günümüzde Felsefe Disiplinleri* (Doğan Özlem, Çev.) içinde. (s. 181-203). İstanbul: İnkılâp Kitabevi.
- Hoffman, L., (2015). Varoluşçu psikoloji, din ve maneviyat: metod, uygulamalar ve deneyim. (M. M. Atik, Çev.), *Bilimname*, 28(1), 369-382, Retrieved from <http://bilimname.erciyes.edu.tr/sayilar/201501/20150114.pdf>
- Jaarsma, A. S. & Kinaschuk, K., & Xing, L. (2016). Kierkegaard, despair and the possibility of education: Teaching existentialism existentially. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 35(5), 445-461. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11217-015-9488-x>
- Jaspers, K. (2010). *Felsefe nedir?* (İ. Z. Eyuboğlu, Çev.). İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
- Kenny, A. (2017). *Batı felsefesinin yeni tarihi modern dünyada felsefe (4. cilt)* (B. Doğan, Çev.). İstanbul: Küre Yayınları.
- Kierkegaard, S. (2009). *Kaygı kavramı mevrus günahı konu edinen dogmatik problem üzerine psikoloji açısından yalın bir tefekkür* (T. Armaner, Çev.). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Kierkegaard, S. (2014a). *Ölümcül hastalık umutsuzluk* (M. M. Yakupoğlu, Çev.). Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.
- Kierkegaard, S. (2014b). *Tekerrür deneysel psikolojiye tehlikeli bir teşebbüs* (Z. Talay, Çev.). İstanbul: Pinhan Yayıncılık.
- Kierkegaard, S. (2014c). *Korku ve titreme diyalektik lirik* (N. Beier, Çev.). İstanbul: Pinhan Yayıncılık.
- Koç, E. (1999). J.P. Sartre felsefesinde ben-başkası-iletişim problemi. *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 40(1), 333-347. Retrieved from <http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/search.php>
- Krings, H., Baumgartner, H.M. (1997). Bilgi kuramı tarihçesi. Doğan Özlem (Ed.), *Günümüzde Felsefe Disiplinleri* (Doğan Özlem, Çev.) içinde. (s. 205-229). İstanbul: İnkılâp Kitabevi.
- Mcpherson, I. (2001). Kierkegaard as an educational thinker: Communication through and across ways of being. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 35(2), 157-174.
- Mengüşoğlu, T. (2014). *Kant ve Scheler'de insan problemi*. Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.

- Morris, Van Cleve. (1987). Felsefe ve eğitim ortak görevleri. S. Büyükdüvenci (Ed.), *Eğitim felsefesi yazılar*, (S. Büyükdüvenci, Çev.) içinde (s. 1-3). Ankara: Yargıçoğlu Matbaası.
- Noddings, N. (2016). *Eğitim felsefesi* (R. Çelik, Çev.), Ankara: Nobel Kitap.
- Pisa Eleştirisi. (2014). Retrieved from <https://www.egitimpedia.com/pisa-elestirisi/>
- Rocca, R. D., Foley, M., Kenny, C. (2011). The educational theory of Soren Kierkegaard. Retrieved from <http://www.newfoundations.com/GALLERY/Kierkegaard.html#The%20Educational%20Theory%20of%20Soren%20Kierkegaard>
- Sharma, M. S., & Marwaha, M. S. (2016). The educational philosophy of Soren Kierkegaard: The origin of existentialism. *Indian Journal of Research*, 5(4). 368-369. Retrieved from https://www.worldwidejournals.com/paripex/file.php?val=April_2016_1462204036__128.pdf
- Schumacher, E. F. (1990). *Aklı karışıklar için kılavuz*. (M. Özel, Çev.). İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık.
- Taşdelen, V. (2013). Mevlâna ve Kierkegaard'da birey ve tanrı ilişkisi. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 8(6), 717-728. Retrieved from <http://www.acarindex.com/dosyalar/makale/acarindex-1423932744.pdf>
- Tozlu, N. (1997). *Eğitim felsefesi*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Tüzer, A. (2009). Varoluşçu düşünür Martin Buber'in diyalog felsefesi ve bu felsefi yaklaşımın eğitim açısından uzanımları, *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Felsefe ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8, 17-40. Retrieved from <http://www.flisdergisi.com/sayi8/17-40.pdf>
- Tüzer, A. (2015). Batı felsefesi çerçevesinde epistemolojik ve etik açıdan inanç. *Dini Araştırmalar*, 6 (16), 87-110. Retrieved from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/da/issue/4453/61336>
- Ülken, H. Z. (2008). *Felsefeye giriş-1 doğa bilimleri, felsefe ve metodolojisi*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Värri, V-M., Pulkki, J. (2015). Why ontology of education. Paper presented at ECER 2015, *Education and Transition*, September, 8-10, Retrieved from <http://www.eera-ecer.de/ecerprogrammes/conference/20/network/519/>
- West, D. (2005). *Kıta avrupası felsefesine giriş* (A. Cevizci, Çev.). İstanbul: Paradigma Yayıncılık.
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.