Education Quarterly Reviews

The Asian Institute of Research *Education Quarterly Reviews* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of education, linguistics, literature, educational theory, research, and methodologies, curriculum, elementary and secondary education, higher education, foreign language education, teaching and learning, teacher education, education of special groups, and other fields of study related to education. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Education Quarterly Reviews* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of education.

Online Learning in Marcuse's Critical Theory Perspective

Marselus Ruben Payong[1]

[1] Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus Ruteng. Email: marselpayong@yahoo.com

Abstract

This article examines Marcuse's critical theory of online learning practices. Some of Marcuse's criticisms of modern society have important relevance for observing the phenomena of learning innovations that are offered today. This research is a literature study with discourse analysis of a number of Marcuse's writings, both written by himself and collected by his followers in a collection of papers after his death. The results of the study show that: 1) educational practices that utilize modern management principles, especially in the form of standardization and homogenization of policies, have the potential to produce a one-dimensional society as criticized in the 1960s. 2) Online learning, as one of the important revolutions in education that uses technology, has the potential to be a new form of slavery; 3) through the use of artificial technology, online learning can be a form of instrumentalization and manipulation in teacher and student interactions; 4) online learning also has the character of automation, which in the end can lead to alienation processes for students, especially psychological alienation and cultural alienation.

Keywords: Online Learning, Critical Theory, Instrumentalization, Alienation

1. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic that has afflicted mankind worldwide since the virus was first discovered in Wuhan, China in December 2019 has fundamentally changed the order of learning. The learning situation has changed completely due to health protocols that must be strictly adhered to prevent or reduce the spread of this outbreak. Something that still feels strange if almost all the learning is done without direct interaction of teachers and students in a certain space and time as usual. Gradually, teachers and students have to become familiar with the new learning mode, namely media learning. Almost all learning content is carried out using media, whether online with various platforms or conventional media such as books, modules, student worksheets, and so on.

The presence of communication and information technology with the support of increasingly sophisticated computer technology lately has also helped increase effectiveness and efficiency in learning. This technology provides the possibility for teachers to use it as an innovative learning medium. Computer technology has also given a new colour to today's learning and has changed the paradigm of education and learning as well as the role of the teacher.

Have the changes, especially in the technology of learning, been in line with the ideals and goals of real education? Has education in these various modes helped real human development and, in the end, created an ideal society,

namely a democratic, fair, and equal society? This article will use Marcuse's critical theory perspective to dissect these phenomena and changes. Because of these changes, whose origins were triggered by extraordinary developments in the field of communication and information technology, Marcuse's perspective deserves to be used as an important critique to open the insights and perspectives of practitioners or stakeholders in the field of education so as not to be lulled by the promises of technology but should continue to direct attention and various efforts to the ideals of ideal human formation through education.

2. Discussion

2.1. Marcuse's Critical Theory of Education

Herbert Marcuse was one of the 20th century philosophers and social thinkers born in Berlin (1898-1979). He joined the Frankfurt School, and with his colleagues, Max Horkheimer, Th. Adorno, and J. Habermas, they developed critical theory. This school of thought is often referred to as neo-Marxism. Herbert Marcuse's works, especially his critique of modern society, are contained in his famous book, *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (1964). According to Marcuse, humans, in principle, crave happiness and are entitled to it. But the realization of that happiness always brings new forms of oppression. Technology, for example, has created various conveniences for mankind, but, on the other hand, has degraded human dignity. The forms of slavery are becoming increasingly sophisticated, which means they are not carried out by humans on humans but by technology on humans (Kellner, 2001). Technological rationality has become a new mode of life for mankind in this century and has brought the situation of human life into a certain dimension that is characterized by several characteristics such as: instrumentalization, homogenization, standardization, and automation.

In relation to education, Marcuse always sees school in relation to the domination of one-dimensional society's culture. Marcuse strongly opposes such educational practices because they replace the negative with the positive, and on a behavioral and psychological dispositional level, they replace an unhappy consciousness with a happy consciousness. Comparing one-dimensional schools (as social reproduction) with *Bildung* (as a future critical and reconstructive movement) shows a very interesting dialectical analysis of schools according to Marcuse (Marcuse, 1964).

Marcuse claimed in a 1968 lecture at Brooklyn College (Kellner, Lewis, Pierce, and Cho, 2009) that schools have become more paradoxical institutions in a one-dimensional society. On the one hand, sophisticated industrial countries' economies are driven by unrestricted access to and development of information, necessitating the establishment of a stronger universal education system. Education guarantees equality and access to information for people of all social classes. On the other hand, knowledge and reason must be filled with the concepts and ideals of all sections of a developed society, limiting the possibilities of democratic public education. The rise of professional education (e.g., the establishment of corporate institutions such as DeVry and the University of Chicago) helped to overcome these problems.

As a result, Marcuse claims that "modern education is actually sick" (Kellner, Lewis, Pierce, and Kho, 2009), and that it is a type of anti-educational education based on market and military logic masquerading as democratic expansion. Marcuse's one-dimensional social theory can be linked to Erich Fromm's (1955) concept of an insane society. One-dimensional thinking becomes an illness as a result of schooling because it loses its manner of reasoning and is indoctrinated into a full way of life that integrates the conscious, unconscious, and human body into a total administrative system. As education becomes more vital to the economy—which demands educated people like doctors, attorneys, scientists, and technicians—the critical and transformational aspects of education are increasingly controlled, resulting in more types of education. The extreme focus on the production of socially "useful" knowledge in schools, according to Marcuse, is the result of the actual adoption of a militaristic and corporate value framework as opposed to the humanistic one. For Marcuse, this conception of hegemonic rationality that glorifies a one-dimensional, rigid, and neutral attitude towards reality needs to be overcome through education, because in the individual it is inspired by tolerance for the false needs of an aggressive, destructive, and competitive capitalist society.

Therefore, inculcating established one-dimensional societal values through education requires a subjective component that transforms the emancipatory potential of education into a process that accelerates alienation and standardization in the individual learning environment (Saeng, 2012). This process, for Marcuse, begins with the formation of a branch of the human sciences into the humanities, which maintains a transcendent and critical mode of reasoning and the empirical-positivistic social sciences, which are oriented towards rational and scientific organization and understanding of society. For Marcuse, the dominance of empirical-positivistic social science in universities is due to a sterile and uncritical form of knowledge that promotes and demands specialization, professionalization, greater technocratic control, and a strong tendency to venerate methodological models. This division of disciplines led to increasingly branched thinking that was no longer able to conceptualize the totality of social relations and thus remained purely instrumental. The result is a disease of one-dimensional beings that undermines Bildung's multidimensional concept.

When Marcuse examines the contradiction between the welfare state and the military state in the 1960s and 1970s, his thoughts stand out. This can be seen in America's two contradicting policies, A Nation at Risk and No Child Left Behind (both of which demand "fair educational opportunity") yet are based on capitalism, competition, and state bureaucracy. In the rhetoric of the Cold War, bureaucratic federal measures like these were connected to equality and social dominance through educational standards. In reality, discourses on the welfare state and the development of the state from aggressive wars, in which educational repression is much more prevalent, have begun to alleviate the tensions Marcuse sensed in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

On that basis, Marcuse's criticism became the starting point for theorizing about the current trend in education, which is becoming increasingly intense with one-dimensional standardization. From these irreconcilable tensions, Marcuse theorized new ideas about education. Unlike other radical left thinkers of the time, Marcuse rejected the idea of abolishing universities or public schools, as proposed by Ivan Illich in his *Deschooling Society* (1970). Marcuse uses the term "reschooling" (Kellner, Lewis, Pierce, and Cho, 2009, p. 43). Indeed, for Marcuse, students and higher education institutions should be the mouthpiece of rejection of the one-dimensional society that promotes standardization in schools and universities.

His view of universities in advanced capitalist societies is not entirely negative, as is generally assumed, because in fact, his theoretical approach in his critical theory of society is actually dialectical, as conveyed in his lectures on education, as well as in his interactions with students who fight for a democratic society (Students Democratic Society = SDS) and in his proposed Radical Education Project. Likewise, with his entire life as an educator and radical activist involved with the student movement. Marcuse's publications in the mid-1960s dealt with the rise of the SDS, the anti-war movement, and the groups collectively known as the New Left (Kellner 2005).

Marcuse was fascinated by educational critique and reconstruction, and he recognized how universities and schools could be used as vehicles for progressive social change. Marcuse's commitment to "reschooling," as well as his commitment to critique, is demonstrated in these cases. Marcuse never gave up on critical theory initiatives, and he even urged activist action. Marcuse's university activities were not limited to a few large universities and a few radical student organizations. Marcuse claims that, in the face of growing governmental repression and violence, changes in individual emancipation become the responsibility of tiny educational, political, and psychological groups working together as a single unit, practicing self-education and refusing official education. This job, as a political educator, is primarily intended to remove the mystique and mystery surrounding politics (Kellner, Lewis, Pierce, and Cho, 2009).

Marcuse's conclusion is that students should work together to decolonize objective truth that has become internalized in a one-dimensional society. Marcuse contends, in other words, that education is politics at the psychological heart of the individual. The issue has become politicized as a result of one-dimensional society's repressive and nonsensical status quo, with educational institutions playing a significant role in this process. As a result, Marcuse reminds us that in order to understand progressive and conservative trends in schools, universities, and student movements, liberation must remain a key capacity.

Marcuse's entire dialectical analysis of the school ultimately boils down to another set of higher contradictions that exist between revolution and education. As Marcuse said in his 1975 speech at Berkeley, "We cannot change the goals of education without changing the society that sets these goals," but at the same time, "we cannot wait for revolution." (Kellner, Lewis, Pierce, and Cho, 2009, p. 39). Thus, education is necessary but never in itself a complete answer to the problems of social inequality, racism, classism, imperialism, and sexism. Marcuse's comments here quote the comments of Marx, who once stated, "On the one hand, changes in social conditions are necessary to build a proper educational system; but on the other hand, a proper education system is needed to bring about a change in social conditions." (Marx 1975, 32).

2.2. Marcuse and Online Learning

According to Ally (2004), the phrase "online learning" (e-learning) is often used in the following forms of learning: internet learning, network learning, virtual world learning, computer-assisted learning, remote learning, web-based learning, and so forth. All of these ideas suggest that students are in a location where they are separated from the teacher or teacher, and therefore they need technological aid (typically computers) to obtain learning materials and connect with teachers or even other students.

E-learning, according to Carliner (2004), is educational information displayed on a computer. E-learning is defined by Khan (in Ally 2004) as an innovative strategy to deliver learning to audiences in remote regions via the internet as a medium. E-learning, on the other hand, is more than just the presentation and distribution of information over the internet. According to Ally (2004), e-learning is the use of the internet to gain specific knowledge, construct personal meaning, and grow from the learning experience by accessing learning materials, interacting with learning content, instructors, and other students, and seeking support during the learning process. From the definitions above, it is obvious that online learning (e-learning, online learning) is a style of learning that uses online media to deliver learning and involves interaction between students.

During Marcuse's lifetime, the distance learning mode has developed for a long time by utilizing technology, ranging from correspondence technology to radio and television technology and the internet. From a search of Marcuse's works, there are hardly any specific criticisms or reviews about the mode of distance learning, let alone online learning. Online learning only developed following the revolution in the world of computer technology and integration with telecommunications technology that occurred massively and widely in the 1990s, long after Marcuse's death in 1979. It is therefore natural that this mode of learning escaped Marcuse's spotlight and criticism. However, because distance learning and online learning are part of modern technology, Marcuse's critiques of modern society and civilization gain relevance.

According to Pierce (2009), Herbert Marcuse was one of the first generation of Frankfurt School intellectuals who were obsessed with the function of technology and its impact on society. According to him, the exploitation and formation of human technology through capitalist production machinery characterizes the historical epoch of advanced industrial civilization. It expands the range of social and cultural relations as well as imprisons and debilitates. Under capitalist society, technology and science, for Marcuse, are seen as cultural forms that promote the growth of instrumental reason that seems to constitute human liberation. However, he emphasized that science and technology are by no means neutral or apolitical activities, because they both contribute to and accelerate the decline of the individual's capacity to master critical perspectives on the existing conditions that support developed societies.

All human efforts to improve the quality of life for Marcuse cannot be seen as something that is only based on noble motivation. In the field of education, efforts to improve the quality of education that is carried out systemically should be suspected of being part of a disguised oppression mechanism. This oppression can then be perpetuated, benefiting certain parties at the expense of others, and becoming an inseparable part of all human endeavors to effect change. For example, distance learning or online learning is intended to expand the reach and equitable access to education and produce mass education. But who benefits from this mode? At first glance, many people who have limitations, especially in funds and time, seem to benefit from this mode. But they are actually victims of a wider system, namely the qualifications regime and the credential regime. Because the demands for

qualifications, of course, are not only for their own interests but more for the interests of bureaucrats and capitalists. Work demands, which are partly dictated by technology, make people compete to improve their knowledge and skills. Here, Marcuse sees that there is a hidden oppression carried out by capitalists and bureaucrats using technology.

Before examining specifically, the relevance of Marcuse's critique of online learning, let us consider some of Marcuse's critiques of society and the technology used to advance society. In the book *One-Man Dimensional* (1964), Marcuse highlights the hidden forces behind various masks of goodness that have consciously or unknowingly created oppression and disguised injustice. If we analyze the nature of education comprehensively and systemically, we will come up with several aspects that are the targets of Marcuse's criticism.

Marcuse distinguishes between "technology" (as a mode of production, the totality of instruments, devices, and inventions that characterize a machine) and "technique" (as an instrument and practice, e.g., "industry, transportation, communication") to distinguish systems of mastery of technology from technical devices and their uses. Marcuse distinguishes between technology as a whole and "a means of regulating or changing social relations, a manifestation of prevalent patterns of thought and behavior, an instrument for control and domination," with engineering referring to production techniques and such instruments as automobiles or computers.

Marcuse's critique of technology as a system of domination is an example of how technology, society, and a rationalized economy function as instruments of totalitarian domination, described as a form of "technocracy". Marcuse concludes that technique can bring about abundance for all, eliminating the need for excessive hard work and increasing the realm of freedom. For him, however, technique hinders individual development to the extent that they become so attached to the social apparatus that perpetuates scarcity, and this same apparatus has unleashed a destructive power. For this reason, for Marcuse, all anti-technology programs and all propaganda to carry out an anti-industrial revolution are based on the intention to eradicate the phenomena and impulses of certain parties who only regard human needs as a by-product of using technology. The technique itself has the potential to promote authoritarianism and freedom, scarcity and abundance, expansion and the abolition of hard work (Marcuse in Kellner, 1998: 41). He further wrote:

> *Under the impact of this apparatus, individualistic rationality has been transformed into technological rationality. It is by no means confined to the subjects and objects of large-scale enterprises but characterizes the pervasive mode of thought and even the manifold forms of protest and rebellion. This rationality establishes standards of judgment and fosters attitudes which make men ready to accept and even to introcept the dictates of the apparatus* (p. 44).

In this context, Marcuse is on the side of the opponents of technology, especially with the aim of mass production, and thus ignores the growth and development of individuality and freedom. For him, technology is a necessity, but it should be for the glory and enhancement of human dignity, not the other way around, degrading it. For example, technology designed to discipline humans in their work must be able to make humans find their noble dignity in knowing themselves rather than treat them as robots.

2.3. Distance Learning Technology as a New Style of Repression in Learning

Technology, in Marcuse's eyes, is not neutral. It promises ease and efficiency for the work and life of mankind, but at the same time, it can also bring certain disasters (Bertens, 2019). This is not a matter of the negative impact of using technology, but the hidden consequences caused by it, whether we realize it or not. In the context of distance learning or online learning, the use of technology is inevitable because it is also a medium or vehicle for delivering learning.

However, the effectiveness and efficiency of using technology are not only beneficial but, at the same time, can be detrimental to certain groups or parties. Richard Clark criticized distance learning or mediated learning in an article entitled "Reconsidering Research on Media" (Clark, 1983). Clark made a controversial statement that the media had no effect on learning outcomes. He analogized learning media to trucks carrying nutritious food to be

distributed to consumers. It is not the trucks that affect the change in consumer nutrition, but the food in the trucks. Parallel to that, Clark sees the media as not being a dominant factor in influencing the learning process and outcomes, but rather the messages or learning materials that influence learning outcomes.

Clark's opinion caused great controversy, especially among educational technologists at the time, because research on the influence of media on learning outcomes documented for 60 years by Wilkinson (1980) showed relatively consistent results, especially research on the influence of audio and audio-visual media on learning outcomes. study. According to the researchers, the influence of the media varies depending on the learner's competence. There are media that excel in influencing cognitive competence but are weak in affective or psychomotor competence. On the other hand, there are media that have a superior effect on attitude and behavioral competence but are less effective for cognitive competence. However, in general, the media is still one of the dominant factors, in addition to student psychological factors and other environmental factors that affect human learning outcomes.

Where is the element of "oppression" in the use of this learning technology? *First*, the use of media, on the one hand, benefits students or teachers, but, on the other hand, has worsened the relationship between students and teachers. Dialogic, authentic, and human communication is the hallmark of an educational praxis – because education itself is an "association" that requires neglected affective relationships between teachers and students. Students do not get educational services directly but through the mediation of technology. The presence of the media at the same time has turned the relationship that should be dialogical, authentic, personal, and equal into a subject-object relationship. Students are treated as objects. This kind of system, at the same time, has robbed students of the right to get warmth and relationships that should be personal and affective from the teacher.

Second, oppression is also seen in terms of dependence on technology and its various supporting facilities. In online learning, for example, neither students nor teachers are actually free. They are highly dependent on equipment features, internet signal quality, electricity, data pulses, and so on. They are actually controlled by tools, internet networks, data pulses, and so on. Research results on problems in online learning in the era of the COVID-19 pandemic have confirmed this claim (Hidayat, Hashim, and Hamzah, 2020). Third, other oppression actually arises from technology that is completely unrelated to learning. The results of research by Fitri and Lestari (2020) show that because the technology that contains online learning content is in student smartphone devices that also have entertainment features, games, and so on, the concentration and attention of students in learning is actually damaged and deceived by the presence of games and entertainment available on the student's smartphone or tablet. Students prefer to play games and enjoy entertainment (music or movies) rather than do learning tasks given by the teacher. Because for Marcuse, this technology is not neutral. It should be suspected that there are parties who use this technology as a means of slavery for certain groups while other groups hide under the shadow of pleasure gratification.

2.3. Instrumentalization and Manipulation

In Marcuse's view, schools or educational institutions are only tools of certain cultural production. Its presence is to satisfy the needs and pleasures of certain groups. Marcuse's critique relates primarily to the never-neutral use of technology. Instrumentalism appears in terms of the use of technology, which makes the rationality of this era technological rationality (Marcuse, 1964). Everything is valued insofar as it can be mastered, used, manipulated, or handled. The key word in technological society is instrumentalization (Bertens, 2019). That is, at first, the instrumentalization way of thinking was only applied to nature, but then it became commonplace to be applied to humans and various other fields of social life. In other words, not only nature and machines are manipulated and manipulated, but also humans can be manipulated and manipulated.

In his famous book, *High Tech, High Touch*, Naisbitt (2001), says that humans in this century live in a zone called the technologically intoxicated zone. Technology has mastered all aspects of human life, and the way humans think and act is also controlled by technology. Allocca (2020) also provides an example of how Youtube has dictated and influenced the tastes of mankind worldwide. Likewise, studies on internet addiction have shown adverse effects on human psychology (Price, 2011; Young & Abreu, 2011; Bozoglan, 2018; Nakaya, 2015; Montag & Reuter, 2017).

The result of instrumentalization is the existence of certain manipulations in the form of engineering in the environment and circumstances, including the learning environment. And what Marcuse hinted at is currently happening. Our current social life is colored by various engineering (social engineering), namely tactics or designs for certain social innovations that have good goals or are "as if" good, but behind them contain hidden goals for the benefit of parties or groups. certain. Good ideas or ideas that, when implemented, have unintended consequences that benefit certain parties, whether they realize it or not.

Online learning or media clearly has an instrumentalization character because it utilizes technology for delivery. The packaging of teaching materials in learning technology also naturally contains elements of manipulation and engineering. Since the technology in Marcuse's perspective is neither value-free nor neutral, what needs to be scrutinized is who benefits and who is disadvantaged in using this technology.

For students and teachers, it may be a temporary advantage because obstacles such as space and time can be overcome. The learning process can run well. But on the other hand, engineering learning technology can be ridden by other actors who may have noble intentions. For example, telecommunications actors, internet providers, programmers, and computer vendors can benefit from this phenomenon. Distance learning technology is a high-tech technology that, of course, requires a large amount of capital to provide it. The government's large investment in the provision of these services, of course, requires funds that are obtained from the public through taxes. Therefore, even though the government initiates and provides financing related to online learning services, many people, especially those who are less fortunate, are in a weak position. Moreover, until now, some online learning devices are still borne by students (smartphone devices, laptops, even internet credit).

2.4. Automation and Alienation

Technology also hints at the automation of work processes. If the work is done by a machine, following the workflow and logic of the machine without extensive human control, the process is an automated process. In media learning or online learning through programming of the content, appearance and learning environment, the human relationship in this case the teacher and student is controlled by technology that transcends space and time. In online learning with asynchronous mode (asynchronous), the interaction between teachers and students or students with students is limited. Students only deal with technology that has been set up to deliver learning automatically. This automation process runs en masse, involving many parties ranging from policy makers, executors, namely from the design stage (there are curriculum experts, pedagogues, psychologists, media and communication experts, field experts, and computer programmers) and students as consumers. This long process then produces products in the form of learning media, learning resources, printed teaching materials, teaching materials in media packaging, and online teaching materials, including an evaluation system and determination of student competencies. The environment is also engineered in such a way through technology, imitating the social and psychological environment of humans, so as to make learning interactions that are actually artificial become as if authentic.

This automation process takes place repeatedly so that it follows a one-dimensional pattern, and makes human relationships one-dimensional. This means that what is experienced by students from various parts of the world in online learning at least follows the same flow and way of working, let alone using a relatively similar learning management system (LMS). So, the result is a one-dimensional mindset, way of working, and assumptions. Take, for example, students who study in synchronous mode such as Zoom, Google Meet, Microsoft Teams, following the same technological flow and logic. Likewise, those who use asynchronous mode such as Moodle, Google Classroom, although with different features, but have the same relative rationality. This process gave birth to homogenization in the way of thinking and working.

The automation process was born from the logic of technological thinking which is linear and this logic is forced on anyone to use. Teachers and students in their learning interactions also follow this kind of linear logic of technological thinking. Technological logic comes from a positivist way of thinking which is strongly opposed by Marcuse (Saeng, 2012). Technological logic does not know the language of love or the language of the heart. Technology has its own logic that cannot be intervened by humans. How can technology understand the language

of the human heart? This is hard to do. For example, students who take a promotion exam or final exam online. The exam mechanism has been regulated through the system such as implementation time and completion time limit. Following the logic of such a system, students do not have real freedom, it is not even easy to use their creative thinking to solve problems. Due to time demands, students are forced to work according to the time frame that has been set through the system. If the student is late in pressing the button or clicking the computer mouse too late, the opportunity for him will be lost. The technological system does not recognize the language of the heart that puts forward human considerations so that this kind of phenomenon cannot be forgiven. This is quite different from if teachers and students interact in a certain space and time, human considerations can be one of the bases for deciding student learning abilities and performance.

Automation that occurs continuously gives birth to humans like robots who must obey the system and how it works. This phenomenon can give birth to alienation, namely a sense of alienation and self-emptiness. Pappehnheim (1959) notes that many people perceive alienation differently. For example, theologians and philosophers have long warned that advances in scientific knowledge have not been able to enable humans to unravel the divine mysteries, and on the contrary, make humans increasingly alienated from their natural environment. Meanwhile, by critics or social scientists, alienation is the result of the increasing mechanization of life due to technological advances that lead to automation.

Powell (1995) says that the most tragic paradox of this era is that humans discover so much about their world but are increasingly alienated from it, from the reality of their environment. The technology that has been produced by humans has hindered humans from interacting with their world even with each other by default. You can imagine, to communicate with neighbours, even convey condolences to friends, they use the media, even though they are still in the same city. There is an emotional void that results from being replaced by technology.

Criticisms of human alienation have long been voiced, especially by Karl Marx and the adherents of Marxism (Wendling, 2009; Comninel, 2019). For Marxists, human alienation is rooted in the problem of capitalism, which exploits human power for the purpose of accumulating capital. As a result of the exploitation of human labour, humans lose the freedom to realize themselves. In the context of media learning, alienation of course does not arise as a result of slavery as criticized by Marx and his supporters, but alienation can arise because individual students can be uprooted from their cultural roots, are not free to explore nature and their environment, lose opportunities to interact with their peers. friends or people around. In the context of online learning due to the Covid-19 pandemic, alienation is getting stronger due to the limited interaction of students with teachers, students with students and even with their game friends due to the demands of the health protocol.

3. Conclusion

Marcuse's ideas and critiques on education remain relevant in today's information technology age, as evidenced by the above description. Although Marcuse's criticism of technology at that time was more related to manufacturing technology, which had robbed and deceived humans under the shadow of modern capitalism, Marcuse's criticism was still very relevant and actual to the living conditions of mankind in the information age.

In the context of 21st century learning, where most learning modes use media or online, Marcuse's criticism targets several things: 1) homogenization of learning modes can result in a decline in students' reasoning and critical thinking. Students are not given sufficient space to express their freedom of thought because their thoughts have been programmed to focus on a certain truth; 2) The technology of learning can also result in the emergence of new forms of slavery that are real and vague under the pretext of efficiency and effectiveness. It is possible for capitalist players to enter through invested technological innovations, and this also deprives students of individual freedom in choosing and expressing educational aspirations; 3) standardization of the management of education and learning openly maintains the character of a one-dimensional society. This character emerges and is maintained because it is dictated by technology, which increasingly robs and enslaves human freedom.

Not all of Marcuse's criticisms can trigger dialectics and discourses to develop new innovations both in the management of education and in learning, but Marcuse's criticisms still open our horizons and awareness not to

entrust the fate and future of mankind solely to technology. Marcuse's criticism also made people aware of this century, especially policymakers in the field of education, to always be careful and maintain their critical awareness in deciding policy innovations aimed at improving the quality of education. Any good intentions to update and improve services are something that should be welcomed, but we are still reminded to be aware of the dangers of certain groups who can benefit or otherwise who will become victims of policy innovations. In its deepest essence, all policies and innovations to improve the quality of education should be returned to the highest measure of educational attainment, namely the nobility of autonomous human dignity. Marcuse does not offer new or creative ideas for how to achieve these lofty goals, but rather reminds us through his sharp analysis of various situations and conditions in modern society that they should always be the starting point for consideration when developing innovations or policies for the benefit of many people.

References

Ally, M, (2004), "Foundations of Educational Theory For Online Learning", in Anderson T., & Elloumi, F., (ed), *Theory And Practice Of Online Learning*, Canada: Athabasca University.

Allocca, K., (2020), *Videocracy, How Youtube is Changing the World…. With Double Rainbows, Singing Fixes, and Other Trends We can't Stop Watching,* New York: Bloomsbury.

Bertens, K., (2019), *Filsafat Barat Kontemporer Jilid I, Inggris dan Jerman*, (The Western Contenporary Philosophy, Vol. 1), Jakarta: Gramedia.

Bozoglan, B. (2018), *Psychological, Social, and Cultural Aspects of Internet Addiction,* Harshey, PA: IGI Global.

Carliner, S., (2004), *Overview of online learning.* Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development Press.

Clark, R., (1983), "Reconsidering Research on Media" in *Review of Educational Research*, 53 (4), 1983 pp. 445-459.

Comninel, G.C. (2019), *Alienation and Emancipation in the Work of Karl Marx,* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fitri, S.F.N, dan Lestari, T., (2020), Pengaruh Kecanduan Bermain Game Online pada Minat Belajar Anak Semasa Pembelajaran Daring (The Effect of Online Game Addiction on the Children Interest of Learning During the Online learning)(https://www.jptam.org/index.php/jptam/article/view/1132)

Fromm, E. (1955), *The Sane Society*. New York: Rinehart.

Giroux, H. (2007), *The University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial-Academic Complex.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Hidayat, M.T., Hashim, W., Hamzah, A., (2020), "Pembelajaran Daring Selama Pandemi Covid-19: Solusi atau Masalah Baru dalam Pembelajaran?" (Online Learning During the Covid-19 Pandemic, Solution or New Issue in Learning?) *Journal Civics and Social Studies* pp. 103-111.

Illich, I. (1970/2002), *Deschooling Society*. New York: Marion Boyars.

Kellner, D., (ed.), (1998). *Herbert Marcuse: Technology, War, and Fascism*. London: Routledge.

Kellner, D., (ed.), (2001). *Herbert Marcuse: Towards a Critical Theory of Society*. London: Routledge.

Kellner, D., (ed.), (2006). *Herbert Marcuse: Art and Liberation*. New York: Routledge.

Kellner, D., Lewis, T., Pierce, C., & Cho, D., (2009) (ed.), *Marcuse's Challenge to Education,* New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Marcuse, H. 1964. *One-dimensional man*. Repr., Boston: Beacon, 1991.

Marx, K. 1975. "Compulsory education", in Padover, S., (ed.), *Karl Marx on Education, Women, and Children*, 32–33. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Montag, C. & Reuter, M., (ed.), (2017), *Internet Addiction, Neuroscientific Approaches and Therapeutical Implications Including Smartphone Addiction,* Switzerland: Springer.

Naisbitt, John (2001), *High Tech, High Touch,* New York: Random House.

Nakaya, (2015), *Internet and Social Media Addiction,* San Diego CA: Reference Point Press.

Pappehnheim, F., (1959), *The Alienation of Moden Man, An Interpretation Based on Marx and Tonnies,* New York: Modern Reader Paperback.

Pierce, C., (2009), "Democratizing Science and Technology with Marcuse and Latour", in Kellner, D., Lewis, T., Pierce, C., & Cho, D., (2009) (ed.), *Marcuse's Challenge to Education,* New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Powell, J., (1995), *Beriman untuk Hidup Beriman untuk Mati,* (Faith to Live, Faith to Die), Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

Price, H.O., (2011), *Internet Addiction,* New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

Saeng, V., (2012), *Herbert Marcuse, Perang Semesta Melawan Kapitalisme Global,* (Herbert Marcuse, Universal War Against Global Capitalism), Jakarta: Gramedia.

Wendling, A.E. (2009), *Karl Marx on Technology and Alienation,* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wilkinson, Gene L., (1980), *Media dalam Pembelajaran, Penelitian Selama 60 Tahun,* (Media in Instruction, The Research for 60 Years), Jakarta: CV Rajawali.

Young, K.S. & Abreu, C.N., (ed.) (2011), *Internet Addiction, A Handbook and Guide to Evaluation and Treatment,* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.