
Methodology in educational studies – the disciplinary status and the social conditions for discussion

Jacek Piekarski

Introduction

Any statement of the disciplinary status of methodology in the educational studies is branded with the risk of *rudimentary, theoretical prejudice, historical relativity and specific particularism* resulting from one's own research experience. Regardless of the above, choosing to signal selected problems of methodology in educational studies, we were guided mainly by the character of the meeting which poses the problem of theoretical nature of educational studies in a much wider context of the formation of the area of research and of education in European standards. This has inspired us to discuss the issue of distinctiveness of traditions, schools and sets of opinions concerning education and educational studies, in the way which enables the identification of at least some selected problems from the perspective of possibility to compare and contrast them as well as of their further development. Therefore, we will dedicate our further comments to the main question that could be phrased as follows – *which conditions for methodological discussion, existing within the acquired perspective, are worth considering as the basis for initiating a debate and its development in the research practice?* This pronouncement may suggest that in the statement we have included a rather introductory themetization of these issues, possibly in the case of stimulating a debate, not discussing them exhaustively, a little more broadly introduced in other studies.¹

1 Based on articles published earlier, dealing with the above issues, in particular: Kryteria waloryzacji praktyki badawczej – między inhibicją a permissywnym tolerancją (Piekarski, 2009a); O wybranych warunkach zmiany w tworzeniu i przekazie wiedzy – odniesienia do praktyki kształcenia nauczycieli (Piekarski, 2009b); Estetyzacja praktyki akademickiej – uwagi na temat perspektywy uczestniczącej (Piekarski, 2009c).

In the first part, the most general prerequisites of the presentation and reservations related to these are mentioned. Furthermore, *the methodological and theoretical problems* present in the current methodological discussion in Poland are signalled, perceptible from the social and historic perspective. In their complementation, some social conditions are also presented for the creation of knowledge and its *properties*, which may seem worth considering in the situation of the tendency towards building a universal area of research being displayed.

Such structure of statement enables us to present in the conclusion the basic *elements of the acknowledged theoretically methodological perspective*, and to show the problems of methodology as broadly conceived research and educational practice seen from this perspective.

Reservations related to terminology

The study has been based on the wide understanding of methodology. It is seen as a discipline dealing with the rank of science in the system of human knowledge, the results of scientific concept and the research processes by means of which these results are achieved. A more narrowly defined scope of methodology; limited solely to the analysis of research processes – the method of scientific cognition – remains specific for each discipline of knowledge.² In the discipline dealing with education, its description remains naturally highly problematic; similarly to the relationship between methodology and the character of the whole of the knowledge created in these disciplines, therefore, it is worth pointing out both the factors constituting the understanding of disciplinary specificity and the understanding of knowledge included in the present study. Their concept has been based on three prerequisites.³

A. The field of educational studies is regarded as *an element of cultural transfer*, which means that disciplinarily defined educational knowledge is seen as an element of culture, creating specific practice and including the products of this practice. The image of disciplinary knowledge has also been treated as being unceasing in the process of formation, demanding interpretative reflection⁴ in which we should also allow for social conditioning.

2 Following Marek Sikora (1997).

3 As prerequisites for the analysis of the situation of methodology in social pedagogics, I have presented them more fully in the study: *U postaw pedagogiki społecznej. Zagadnienia teoretyczno metodologiczne*, (2007).

4 As Hans-Georg Gadamer claims “Gaining awareness of certain situation is still in each case a task of specific difficulty. Definition of the situation means we are not outside it, therefore, we cannot have any objective knowledge of it [...] Elucidation of this situation is impossible to be done completely.” H.-G. Gadamer (1993: 286).

B. In the assumed perspective, what is important is the conviction of *communicative character* of all *educational phenomena* and consequently, the thesis that the process of communication lies at the basis of transformations occurring within the discipline as well. The creation of knowledge is also referred to communicative practice and seen as an interpretative task rather than as an established element of theoretical equipment of the discipline, which is not to be questioned. When considering *education as a practice motivated by sense and realizing its potential in the discipline*, this kind of interpretative practice grows out of personal engagement as well.

C. *The formative aspect of the knowledge submitted* and its hypothetical character as re-constructional practice is exposed in it.⁵ Owing to such expression, we could ask ourselves how the content of historic transfer, in socially determined conditions, shapes the horizon of contemporaneity, providing application to the specific situation of the interpreters.⁶

Knowledge is also understood not so much as *a content of individual awareness*, but rather as *a shared set of (cultural) contents regarded due to their social functioning*. It reveals itself in the meaning of “the social activities connected with pursuing, storing, and sharing different kinds of knowledge”.⁷ Such an expression attracts our attention to *the social foundation of the transformations* occurring in the meaning of these activities, specified in different concepts and methodological orientations, finding completion in social practice. The guidelines found in this practice could be related to the field of *research work constituting also certain kind of social practice in which the sense of an activity is defined more precisely in terms of the very guidelines significant for the quality of the knowledge created*. As Zdzisław Krasnodębski states, following Wolfgang Welsch, “the condition of ascribing a sensible action, a behaviour at the basis of which there is a reason to a person, is, in the first place, the existence of an appropriate social context, a system of rules and secondly, demonstrating certain knowledge of the context by the person acting”.⁸ The process of research activities, decisions concerning the method of their specification and directing them, could also find a more precise definition in the description of accompanying conditions and social phenomena.

5 To re-constructional-explanatory work, our reflection usually attaches its own project, as it is a production of certain subject, it occurs in historically defined form of culture, the type of educational formation of the interpreter and experience related to it.

6 Cf.: comments by Gadamer on this subject. H.-G. Gadamer (1993: 290–291).

7 J. Szacki (1984: XVII).

8 Z. Krasnodębski (1986: 227–228). “All behaviour which is sensible (i.e. all behaviour specific for humans) is ipso facto guided by a rule. Rules ex definitione are intersubjective: without a context we could not decide, whether a person acts in accordance with a certain rule, or not” (226–227).

The present situation – main problems

The reservations mentioned above may suggest the need to distinguish in the description, theoretically methodological *diversification of two principal dimensions* - the diversification *established socially (institutionally)*, whose expression is the differentiation of institutional models of conducting research and institutional specialization. This kind of diversification is displayed, among other things, in an amazing variety of rules for knowledge creation and the conditions for acceptance of the products of the research work. Among its results, beside the theoretical – scientific treatise or an empirical study, there is probably room for an essay, a gloze, a report, a description, a project and a performance.

Diversification in the field of theory and methodology that is warranted by diverse *concepts of social functions comprising of the understanding of the research process* and the interpretative practice possible in the context. It encourages institutional diversification, particularly in the situation of the clear demonstration of relativistic attitude to knowledge creation, which is specific for the phase referred to as the time *after the turning point – the crisis of representation and legitimacy*. There is a consolidation of the existential and theoretically methodological belief that there is no method that could guarantee access to the truth, and “both ordinary people and researchers are mortals living in the era of relativism” (Smith and Hodkinson, 2009: 403). Having credible results in mind, we turn our attention to identifying the sense of every research activity. Writing, reading, speaking, joining in community, building relationships – the activities which, until recently, have not given us any reasons for methodological worry – after being recognized fully, they prove a source of numerous problems. As a result of the recognition, they also gain a relatively self-dependent theoretical status – they become relatively independent *theoretical complexes*, which require specific and diverse interpretative rules.

Both dimensions of diversification appear significant for the discussion on the disciplinary status of methodology in educational studies.

A comment on historic transformation

The present discussion on the condition of disciplinary – educational – knowledge highlights its significant transformation. It is also occurring in the field of methodology of other disciplines – provided, the distinctions preserved in this area are still of much importance nowadays (the debates of humanistic orientation in educational studies lost their disciplinary identity long ago – problems arising in this area display the unity rather than disciplinary boundaries). Assuming that what is given to us, *in the research of human practice*, is the *transformation*, it is reasonable to ask how it is marked in

the awareness of the researchers themselves – how it reveals itself in the critical debates on transformations and the condition of educational knowledge.

In the description of these transformations, we share a belief that the general tendency, their direction in the field of theory and methodology depends on *abandoning the phase* of their *orthodoxy*, exceeding the phase of heteronomy *towards the state of heterogeneity* – the acceptance of diversity in which “being heterogeneous” generates a specific transformation-making potential and views to positive creation (T. Hejniocka-Bezwińska). The historic transformation described in such a way underlines the metamorphosis for which, what is symptomatic, is *the decline of the canon* obligatory in practicing scientific knowledge, which indicates numerous problems.⁹ The mentioned tendency for change does not determine the character of the transformation in respect to its contents and quality,¹⁰ suggesting rather an arrival of a new problem – “*a problem with heterogeneity*”.

There are, however, attempts to characterize the canon of practicing education studies, obligatory in the past, sufficiently confirmed in the contents of methodological handbooks (the first papers of this kind were published in Poland in the 1960’s). The solutions reached in them were contained in the broadly conceived positivistic mainstream, particularly popularized in the field of educational studies which were the main point of reference to them developing empirical pedagogics. The humanistic approach, corresponding with the German thought (of W. Dilthey, Max Weber), or with social pragmatism (based on the idea of anti-naturalism, interactionism, subjectivity, the demand to understand and treat social knowledge as the source of self-knowledge) (Szacki, 1981: 494–496) was left aside the mainstream research. Pedagogics was directed towards introducing innovations, notably ascribing to it research tasks of diagnostic-exploratory-distinctive intention (Radziejewicz-Winnicki, 2004: 146–147).

Such a situation is also of certain importance for the present day methodological discussion in pedagogics. Its current state is characterized by a largely neglected institutional diversification and thematic dispersion, combined with a *massive transfer* of various concepts created nowadays in different cultural circles and academic centres, which raises the question of the ability of the *reception* of popularized ideas and the scope of their possible *applications in research practice*. The question cannot be answered wholly, though we should observe that the methodological discussion in peda-

9 The conviction of existence of a canon of knowledge does not necessarily mean its complex reception, or, what is more, homogeneous consideration for it.

10 From this perspective, we could express our doubts concerning the reasonableness of historic periodization referring to the condition of methodological debate. Cf. N.K Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln (2009: 22–23).

gogics, vastly influenced by social sciences, was, to a lesser degree, open to the achievements of the studies of culture, language, literature (history, ethnography, ethnology, or anthropology). This encouraged the consolidation of *utilitarian and methodological attitude to methodology* that seemed to continue. The adoption of model solutions, borrowed from social studies does not always rest on critical reflection of concurrent arguments and solutions. The *question of the theoretical status* of the methodological solutions designed and recommended for practice, just as their establishment in certain concepts of science *frequently plays a secondary* role. The specialist reflection on the status of knowledge – methodology of science¹¹ – appears in methodological debate much in the same marginal way. Moreover, the discussion of the theoretically methodological status of pedagogics reaches *a low level of institutionalization*.

The statement that arises after the initial historic comments, that we *were all positivists* (referred, for example, to the generation educated in pedagogics in the 1970's and 1980's), seems highly ambiguous. How well the positivistic canon is established, how much it is admired and the scope of its creative applications are difficult to estimate – yet, *the passing of this canon does not have to equal deliberate abandonment, rational questioning, all the more methodological and theoretical conversion*.

The general condition of disciplinary self-knowledge in the scope discussed, could also be generally defined as *“a problem with diversity”*. It is well reflected in the subject matter of the V Pedagogical Congress in which the problems arising in connection with it were clearly manifested – *the vagueness of epistemic field, the sense of chaos in the field of theory, linguistic dispersion – blockage of disciplinary communication (Tower of Babel)*.¹² Overcoming the problems in all these aspects is not conducted by attempts to order the condition of the discipline, made for formal and organizational reasons which many a time contribute to the increase of ambiguity (whether pedagogics belongs to the discipline of social or to humanistic studies) which, among the representatives of the discipline, additionally seems to strengthen the conviction of conventionality of all – particularly administrative – institutional orders.

Against this background, all the more, it is worth pointing out some problem areas that still remain the areas of major disputes around which a methodological debate could also be organized.

11 Dealing, for example, with different types of science and their methodological diversity. Cf. A. Grobler, (2006: 209–251).

12 More in: M. Malewski (2005).

Selected methodological problems

We have a problem with the truth. The symbolic and expert systems that manifest themselves in human knowledge, sometimes remain autonomous from practices and needs of everyday life (Giddens, 2001: 23–26). However, the problem of truth combines the practice of everyday life with the quality of research conducted and the specialist reflections in the field of methodology of science (in everyday life, the truth is for us necessary as the air, though we can easily leave dealing with it to others – the specialists). The problem of truth is far from reaching a unanimous, mutually agreed solution, only its concepts appear deeply rooted in various theoretically – methodological trends and are significantly different (from Arthur Fine’s deflationary concept of the “absence of truth”, through the concepts of truth as representation, understanding it as the ideal state of science, to seeing truth as a disguised form of defining the effectiveness of resources to manage in the world.¹³ When concentrating on the institutional – social thread, what is worth noticing, is the subject of truth included directly in the discipline of the social phenomena (the truth is sometimes perceived as a social relationship – Zygmunt Bauman). *Theoretical doubts also have their references to the institutional mechanics and rules (and instances) established within them, concerning the qualification of beliefs in terms of veracity.* The awareness of the absence of an unambiguously highlighted institutional agenda – also the individual location – which could provide a deeply satisfying cognitive perspective in this area, manifests itself also in the attitude of the institutionally accepted knowledge engaged in in the research processes¹⁴ which is marked by a characteristic stamp of doubt. Within institutional practice, it is sometimes easier to become convinced rather than to persist to doubt the veracity of collective convictions. It creates a problem of *politization of truth – its total identification with the recognized state of agreement in the sphere of opinions, values or beliefs, reached and shared in a certain, local frame of social reference.* The reference to truth is an important political category, which does not have to mean that the political character is the only point of reference for truth.

It is worth adding that *the range of contexts in which the category of truth is used is vastly expanding* (it seems to be the subject of *diverse contextualizing* – the truth revealed, biographical, meeting standards of authenticity, histor-

13 Detailed discussion of this subject matter - A. Grobler, op. cit. (R. Rotry’s concept of truth, 2006: 299).

14 Knowledge, as K.O. Hondrich (also scientific thesis) claims, is adopted and accepted not only because it has been confirmed by the means of methodologically – empirically for instance – defined strategy, but it *lasts as long as it corresponds with the collective, existential feeling.* S. Krzyżala (2007: 69).

ical compatibility, aesthetic truth, or the truth of fiction) (Lalak, 2010: 301–307). Thus, not settling the main problems arising in connection with the question about truth, it is worth observing that despite the noticeable distance towards using this category, it is still of significance for most methodological analysis. A radical parting with truth could be considered irrational, at least in the meaning of depriving the rule of doubt, which seems to constitute the rule of all practice showing research inclination of regulatory sense. It does not alter the conviction that, although, through their practice, a researcher promises to tell the truth, they do not have to express the only truth, it could also be a culturally possible truth.

We have a problem with universality of knowledge and its binding force. The problem is particularly serious in connection with the increasing conviction of the historic changeability of conditions of knowledge creation as well as the locality of its establishment in a social-cultural space. The concept in which the order of actions is considered not a context, but a fundamental basis for knowledge creation, shows considerable dynamics in this respect. An example of this could be provided in the short history of assessment research in which the early solutions, relying on recognizing large sample tests, based on different versions of experimental procedures (Campbell, 1963) have created arguments supporting the theory of programs (Chen and Rossi, 1987) which has the character of consciously, *politically engaged change-evoking practice*. In the research, what proved crucial was the axiological orientation (references to the concept of social justice) (House, 2009: 604–607 and 603–621) and at the same time, earlier solutions – the rule of causality (changing concepts into a concept of local credibility), or the axiological neutrality of knowledge – being subject to criticism.

The assumption that the knowledge created as a consequence of national research projects, planned on a large scale, could justify actions designed on equally large scale has also been proved. It has rather demonstrated that *such research is unable to generate a general, shared, social theory, which would have enough explanatory power in relation to such projects. More localized knowledge* proves more accurate, particularly in the field of exposing causations, put in a precisely defined local context (House, 2009: 604–607), the area of actions or institutions in which social actions are generated and executed. However, the problem of making generalizations, which could provide a basis for theoretically accurate universalization and make decisions that hold a value binding also beyond local dimensions, has not been solved satisfactorily.

We have a problem with the credibility of research – the reliability of judgment. The problem of the credibility of research could refer both to the question *what is an accurate research* and to the means applied to *measure the accuracy of its results*. In answer to the question of what is considered accurate

research, a constant betterment of the criteria for the evaluation of theory takes place, also within the already fixed research orientations. Kathy Charmaz, for instance, suggests that in the evaluation of the studies comprising the result of developing grounded theory - criteria such as *credibility, originality, significance, utility* should be applied, at the same time indicating the fact that even traditional solutions, adopted in this concept (i.e. using the category of saturation) still call for extending development.¹⁵ This could illustrate theoretical specializing of scientific approaches in the case of adopting them in a specific discipline, and a certain type of issue, which pose specific problems and produce solutions to them.

The *process of construction of validity itself* is included in the scope of issues concerning studies of validation, which assume the character of a social process described as *social construction of validity*.¹⁶ In addition, highly developed types of practice are employed to test the validity of knowledge. Among them, we can distinguish between the numerous forms of verification of the validity of conclusions: for instance a) *descriptive validity* (the necessity to verify the reliability of accounts of the study), b) *interpretive validity* (the accuracy of the account in relation to the description by participants of the study), c) *theoretical validity* – concerning conceptual categories used in the description, and the explanations built by the means of these categories, d) *generalizability* - the ability to extend them to people not directly studied (internal) and the anticipation of how the phenomena studied could occur in different conditions (external), e) *evaluative validity*, demanding the criticism of the evaluative judgments (Maxwell, 1997: 175–176). There is also the concept of *emancipatory validity*, which demands evaluation of how far the research has contributed to improving the situation of the participants of the study. Beside a) *triangulation validity* (measurement) and b) *construct validity* (the appropriacy of the concepts to the experience of the participants of the study), the studies also require estimating the c) *testimonial validity* (the agreement between the researcher's interpretation and the opinions of the participants of the study), and d) *catalytic validity* which demands the evaluation of the change in consciousness of the participants, and their self-regulation. As the study is supposed to serve not only to create new knowledge, but to contribute to solving problems *by for the participants themselves* as well (Szkudlarek, 1997: 176–177).

15 K. Charmaz (2009: 737–739). The extension of the category of saturation is suggested by applying the criterion of “interpretative sufficiency” (Christians and Denzin).

16 The problem of “social construct validity” in the qualitative research has been discussed more widely by Steinar Kvale in a publication available on the Polish publishing market. He raises three ways of this type of validating knowledge, referring to: a) the quality of the craftsmanship of research, its b) communicative validity, and c) pragmatic validity. Cf. S. Kvale (2004: 232–255).

The *criterion of validity* can also be applied to the *text analysis* and its significance in social practice. The possibility to accomplish it is based on *situational* validity (a kind of voice externalized in the text – immaterial vs. personified, emotional, reactive), rhizomatic (multiplicity of voices defining the situation), *ironic* (a kind of invitation to further interpretation), or *reflexive* (the readiness to question the validity claim).¹⁷

The problem of research validity – as we can see, approached from various ways – definitely appears relevant also for the *estimate of trust* which could be developed upon the results achieved, the authors of research work and the institutions they represent. The convictions expressed in the studies, not only reflect, but also shape the social practice – to have an opinion of a thing means to know how to react to it. The above-mentioned rule refers to both accurate and inaccurate observations.

We have a problem with the role of the researcher – with the status of scientific knowledge as unengaged knowledge. The validity of judgment could also be something different for those who want to be in the right and for those who want to promote positive transformations in social practice. The awareness of entanglement of research work in various kinds of practice makes *maintaining the image of “impartiality of knowledge” at least as troublesome as enumerating the kinds of its engagement*, partiality or self-interest. The quality of this engagement seems to be becoming the centre of methodology and attention. Within the range of methodological issues, we can nowadays find the studies of strategies aimed at successfully soliciting funds (Cheek, 2009: 549–622) and also analysis showing *political entanglement* of the research qualification criteria constructing process (Smith, 2009: 391–417) (which also suggests the fundamental conflict arising between the openness of research to an unexpected result, and the necessity to preliminarily specify such expectations). The scientists themselves, as John K. Smith and Phil Hodgkinson show, become engaged in actions aimed at “such *reform of research to make it more rigorous and serviceable for politics*” (Smith, 2009: 409). The criterial concepts of the valorisation of knowledge are becoming a field of dispute reaching beyond theoretically methodological reasons, yet clearly articulating the interests of specific types of research – resulting from specific theoretical attitude and specific political practice.

The research practice seems to be more and more aware of its engagement in political and bureaucratic mechanisms and the interests arising in them. It does not change the fact that it can be easily suited in an image of an audit society and culture. The problem is not only limited to the question how the political process in which we are participating practically, and

17 In this perspective, a precise statement of validity is suggested by P. Lather - cited in: H.Ćerwinkowa, B.D. Gołębnik, (2010: 149).

therefore morally, is taking place (Smith, 2009: 413). Its significance also depends on how we identify the tension between defining politics as a means of achieving a common good and treating it only as an instrument for gaining influence upon the distribution of a limited quota of goods.

In the above-mentioned historical monopoly of one, the definite (positivistic) concept of science, the problem was a *syndrome of methodological inhibition*.¹⁸ Nowadays, as the partiality of knowledge and the qualifications of its various kinds can be observed, the problem is posed by the *quality of criticism and the opportunity to express it*, clearly related to the kind of practical engagement observed. The fact that the philosophy of science cannot be criticised is no longer a problem connected with the understanding of the rule that “all scientific thesis could be questioned critically”. It can become an attribute of interpretative practice, restricted by its own engagement – and susceptible to the elements of “dictatorial strategy” it contains.¹⁹ In such practice, being non-criticisable acquires a status of a standard, while the very *postulate of criticism may become institutionally, environmentally, and politically* – relative.

We have a problem with participation in methodological transformation. The locality of the knowledge created, the diversity of its products, the multiplicity of its engagement in various types of practice, the differentiation of intellectual traditions and methodological concepts, makes the search for a “community of problems” remain an important factor in shaping the research practice – despite the particular solutions adopted in it. The problems in the question cannot be easily ignored either, apparently in any responsible research work. They motivate the search, however hard it is, to persist in any conclusive or at least shared position. Furthermore, it is also worth seeing the social conditioning, accompanying the initiation of methodological discussions. They gain significance particularly in the situation of intensified transfer of various kinds of knowledge and methodological inspirations. The quality of their reception, even more of the applications, is probably in connection with the quality of social and research practice, they may be referred to. The practice is consolidated and maintained by the means of varied social factors and community mechanisms. Their significance was expressed by *Ludwik Fleck* in a lapidary statement: “*We look through our own eyes, but we see with the eyes of the community*” (the 1930’s, 20th cent.).

18 The category of methodological inhibition was introduced by Charles Wright Mills, who, by its means, characterized the problems of formation of knowledge in the neopositivist period. Comp. J. Szacki (1981: 766).

19 Dictatorial strategy (term proposed by J. Giedymin) reproached to pan-critical rationalism, in which the premise of “the openness to all criticism” cannot be subjected to effective criticism, since if such criticism has been expressed, it would confirm the premise. Paradoxically, the attitude presented here (the concept of W.W. Bartley III) acquires the authoritarian and dogmatic features. Cf. R. Kleszcz (1998: 155–158).

Social conditions for the methodological discussion

The perception of social determinants of discussions in the field of methodology has significant importance not only due to the ways of formulating problems - methodological problems. These conditions also appear important to explain the mechanisms for the formation of disciplinary knowledge and valorising its products. In the case of accepting a variety of ways to create knowledge, theoretical and methodological reflection also dissuades from easy acceptance of any form of fundamentalism.²⁰ It seems to exhibit rather a new problem - a *minimum of science* (or a minimum of rationality), necessary to allow for the continuation of scientific creativity and its role in preserving the culture of academic science. Defending the principle of the rationality of science, this “minimum” contains linguistic accuracy, compliance with the rules of logic, criticism and problems solvability (Kleszcz, 1998: 109 –125). It should be noted, however, that compliance with this minimum raises very stringent requirements for research practice.

The rules for creating pedagogical knowledge and their conditions

What may also be sought is the exploration of shared *knowledge creation rules* that would constitute a common reference – a specific consent space within which one can additionally find a place for a variety of methodological research. Clarification of such rules, even the most general and obvious however shows how far they are involved in a social context and cultural change.

Knowledge can be considered from the perspective of *rules defining its continuity*. Although it can be perceived as a problem, instead it appears to be an important element of knowledge regardless of whether we want to refer it to the historical, institutional, cultural or biographical dimension. The continuity is a mechanism for change in which the earlier achievements undergo a specific transformation, not so much as a result of simple addition, but precisely as a result of a significant transformation and modification. These changes are easily visible from the viewpoint of the history of science and they both have institutional and personal dimension. A widely understood idea of continuity of knowledge is probably the underlying formulation of any statements that are created, after all, with the obvious hope to take them

20 Cognition may be reached through various methods, which dissuades both methodological beliefs associated with *fundamentalism*, and *its institutional and sociological variety*, based on the belief that there are institutions that have undisputable knowledge in their range of methodological knowledge. Variations of *technological fundamentalism*, based on the belief that the realization of methodological recommendations on the basis of a provision in a particular model of research will ensure the achievement of significant cognitive outcomes is not substantially justified either.

up and continue. The continuity of the narrative is also a reference to the biographically recognized processes of knowledge creation, irrespective of how complex they are.

Continuity of knowledge, its presence (in change), how to problematize the past and refer to tradition, may also be explained by the emergence of broader communications support mechanisms with the past. This problem appears particularly clear today in connection with the issue of *detraditionalization - the disappearance or death of tradition*. As a consequence, both the scope and quality of communication about cultural assets, interpretative schemas of understanding the world, patterns and values, and symbolic resources of relevant experience for the formation of individual and collective identity are weakened. What is also radically changed is the status of tradition, understood as a tool for building self-knowledge of theory enabling to obtain a fuller knowledge of different types of historical narrative, as well as modern varieties of thinking about education. In this context, when talking about “*abandonment*” of earlier theoretical orientation, it is always worth asking about *how* they were taken.

Knowledge may be seen from the perspective of *consistency rules (rules of coherence)* by which their different variants can be distinguished from each other and treated as a relatively homogeneous whole. Using the formulation of the rules of coherence, as does Janusz Gnitecki, what is exposed is an understanding of the consistency with which it turns out to be a constitutive factor in clarifying and disclosure of differences, not just a static attribute of the type of knowledge or methodological variations of its creation. The rules according to which certain methodological ideas acquire the *status of differences* are obviously very different; they represent a majority of the content of methodological textbooks. They regulate both *methodologies of proceedings* in research (rules of research activities), the *rules of creation of scientific expression - building the theory, methods of reasoning* and critical conditions of created knowledge. They contribute not only to the creation of a reasonably isolated whole variety of knowledge, but also to its continuity and its possible transmission.

The diversity of these rules produces a discussion about the quality criteria of scientific knowledge in which both the option of denying and the possibility of defining appear,²¹ and stringent criterion attempts to distinguish it from other varieties of knowledge.²² This problem is also re-

21 One of the statements quoted by M. Hammersley. Quoted after. M. Nowak (2006: 160).

22 T. Sozański indicates the following criteria of scientific knowledge. 1. Intersubjective communicativeness 2. Methodical research activities, 3. Systematization of terms and statements 4. Consistency 5. Intersubjective justifiability and testability of theories 6. Confidence expressed in the high-level reasoning 7. Versatility 8. Generality 9. 10. High information content, 11. Economy and simplicity, 12. Abstractness 13. Conditionality 14. Cumulative nature

flected in the discussion of *social, institutional conditions to ensure consistency of knowledge and clarifying its social functions*. This suggests a correlation between institutional processes and the capacity to create valuable learning theory which depends, inter alia, on whether the professional scientific organizations are able to move the laymen away from the impact of knowledge creation, to compete with other scientific institutions in order to gain control over resources and the legitimacy of certain lines of research in order to produce a centralized dependency reducing the uncertainty involving the performance of research tasks and standardise cognitive orientations as well as the criteria for defining the intellectual problems (Sozański, 1998: 7–8). Those words show very clearly how you can recognize the link between institutional rules with the possibilities of creating a specific type of knowledge. Consistency of knowledge, understood as a social and cultural formation, is also connected with *the institutionalization* of the social processes, which constitute both a consolidation of the norms and the rules of its formation, as well as their differentiation. It is also revealed in the *institutional specialization* - dispersion - in which certain varieties of thinking and speaking (language) teaching staff acquire the status of autonomy.

The boundaries between the disciplines of knowledge however are exceeded, which leads to highlighting the next group of rules - *the rules of translation*. They are related to methodological issues of disciplinary borders, which are sometimes interpreted in numerous ways (Kwiecinski Witkowski, 1990; Pluta, 1997: 49-78; Piekarski, 1997: 252–302). These rules may also be referred to as an extensive practice in which various types of knowledge (concepts, narratives) are cross-referenced, while being subject to change, authorizing their presence around giving a distinguished institutional context. Methodological recommendations associated with this practice are very diverse and include a *definition, introducing new concepts, terminology conventions*, expanding *the theoretical base* for new statements, etc. Seeking fundamental *concepts unity*, even paradigmatically different approaches may be combined, which is sometimes emphasized also in contemporary interpretations of the theory of science (e.g. the concept of Thomas Kuhn).²³ What turns out to be very important is also linguistic affinity of different varieties of knowledge, formed by a variety of practices. Their most elementary variation, allowing for expansion of understanding of language is certainly one of *terminology borrowings*, leading sometimes to the *similarity of the state-*

- a rigorous model, because the underlying values in the case of any omissions deprive the right to use the concept of theoretical sociology of science as normal science (1998: 24).

23 Problems with translation of Kuhn's opinion usually relate only to certain concepts and categories, which are referred to as »local incommensurability.« Cf. M. Sikora (1997: 29).

ments, which also appear in various disciplines of knowledge. Distinct types of interdisciplinary convergence are *general assumptions analogies*, which determine the conditions for understanding the *sets of expressions*. The latter are the basis for deep analogies that are sometimes possible to reveal, expressing *the similarity of structures*, putting various strands of thinking in order. Although the methods to establish mutual linguistic repertoire in the humanities disciplines are sometimes difficult to identify in a clear way, their disclosure usually creates a new context of knowledge, grounded in the cultural circle, or a particular philosophical tradition. They form the basis for *knowledge transformation and are important factors in their cognitive perspective convergence*.

The last group of rules – *the rules of knowledge use* – seems to be important in the disciplines dealing with education because it determines the social meaning of practices created by those rules. The applicability, usefulness, or even effectiveness is also regulated by numerous methodological principles related to linking knowledge with practice activities. Rules for knowledge use a) allow the identification of the area of operation (professional) as an area of sovereign activity, independent of other areas of practice, b) allow the valorisation of the tasks and the course of professional activities, and c) entitle the particular way of constructing relationships with other people in the range of a particular type of interaction. In each of these cases, they refer to different problems and different methodological exploration.

The identification of activity areas involves the question of “*limits of development*” considered *objectively*, as an area of relatively autonomous set of applications of specific theories. These *limits* have, of course, *institutional location*; they divide both the knowledge exploitation areas and scientific disciplines, leading sometimes to a kind of cognitive self-restraint.²⁴ Valorising their own institutional practices as well as the formation of knowledge also happens in relationships with others. Is it not solely a cognitive process either – *it is* equally a process of interaction which is expressed in the social elaboration of new forms and possibilities for actions (Urbaniak-Zajac, 2003: 286). It remains, therefore, under the influence of social mechanisms of institutional *specialization and professionalization* of teaching activities. Obtaining new knowledge and the ability to act constituting the practice of interfering in the social sphere is also a “*professional interest*” and is subject to *professional control regulation*.

24 Attention to this is drawn by Andrzej Radziewicz-Winnicki, indicating that the source of such constraints are often habits of researchers not going beyond these areas of research which, in popular belief, are related to another scientific field A. Radziewicz-Winnicki, A. Roter (2004: 195).

Properties - quality of knowledge and their selected conditions

Postulating certain “minimum rules” on the basis of which you can thematize methodological discussion remains largely a formal procedure. Seeking such rules in the body and mechanisms of knowledge creation may be naturally considered as reasonable, however, the way these rules are met in methodological solutions remains highly diverse and conditioned by numerous social and cultural factors. These factors seem to determine not only the nature of the theory or methodology practiced, but also the relationship to cognitive performance results. The question of *the quality of knowledge* that arises against this background is not only a question of methodology, but also the important problem of scientific institutions (Śliwerski, 2011: 21–30).

The dispute over the quality of knowledge is sometimes dismissed in certain positions, in others – previously mentioned – solved on the basis of criteria-referenced assessment. It also happens to be the subject of heated debate, as the on-going controversy surrounding the issue of the quality of research in social engagement - the political practice (the dispute about the quality of qualitative research). Therefore, it is even more tempting to distinguish between the attributes of knowledge, which the dispute appears to relate to and display them on the background of some factors of socio-cultural change, which have already been partially mentioned.

Table 1: Properties of knowledge and cultural and social contexts of the process of its creation.

Properties of knowledge (References to the content of activities)	Type of process	Implications for the course of activities	The sphere of relations - personal individuality vs. collective socialization
Truth	Specialization	Dispersion of objectivity	Institutional
Versatility	Institutional dispersion	Politicization of truth	
Verifiability	Professionalization	Exclusivity of trust	
Certainty	Expertization	Limiting (minimization) of the risk	

Properties of knowledge (References to the content of activities)	Type of process	Implications for the course of activities	The sphere of relations - personal individuality vs. collective socialization
Utility	Bureaucratization of knowledge management	Formalization of rules (criteria) of knowledge creation	Organizational
Creativity	Standardization	Standard unification - ritualization of procedures for knowledge creation	
Communicativeness	Mediatization	Iconicity - change of the language communication brevity	Cultural
Language grounding	Detraditionalization	Post-memory instead of tradition – reduction of the knowledge continuity	
Link with the good	Mercantilization	Instrumentalization of activities - commercialization of knowledge	The Community
Ethicality	Privatization of ideological beliefs	Aestheticization of ethical sphere	

In a limited – out of necessity - commentary²⁵ on the table, it is worth noting that the attributes of knowledge included there may be related to various products of research. However, they remain important regardless of how various and detailed the methodological problems are brought by their fulfilment. The list of processes involved in changes in the organizational, institutional, cultural and community sphere indicated in the table (much as the consequences for the quality of research practices that were previously mentioned) is likely to remain in a clear relationship with these properties of knowledge. The way in which these interdependencies are defined is, of course, debatable. The range of elements of socio-cultural changes that may be seen today and highlighted in the table, however, is worthy of articulation, as it indicates both the possible reasons for the differentiation of the knowledge products and the practices surrounding its creation. As from

25 I refer here to the characterization of knowledge which I discuss more in the development of knowledge in practice (biography) of teachers (Piekarski, 2007: 15–22).

the completion of the previously reported observations, it can be noted that the processes of change and differentiation are clearly marked at the institutional level. They are expressed in specialization and institutional differentiation of research practices. Institutional fragmentation and diversity is also expressed in the wealth of *knowledge assessment and its legitimacy acceptance rules (reliability and security)*. Two phenomena may be marked here - *professionalization* and *expertization*. They result in the differentiation of fields of social activity in which various areas of activity gain social autonomy – they require a special process of professional socialization, they are becoming socially exclusive, they produce a peculiar form of a common culture, permanent facilities for knowledge exchange, codes of ethics, etc.²⁶ *Professionalization*, by specifying the rules of competence development (professional) resulting from the extensive improvement process, substantially direct the public *trust* that may be bestowed both upon a person and institutions represented by them.

Professionalization is also accompanied by *the formation of the expert roles - expertization*. The scope of competence of the experts includes the solutions related to the *implementation of knowledge with a high level of complexity, specificity and specialized social importance for the image of the profession*. It contributes to reducing the uncertainty of decision-making – *it weakens the sense of risk associated with inappropriateness of the knowledge possessed or uncertainty of the implications of its use*. Expertization may, however, be accompanied by - what Anthony Giddens points out - the process of “unlearning the skills”, which happens, among other things, because of “appropriation” of everyday life knowledge by the experts” (Giddens, 2001: 31). Confidence in the existing institutions is also clearly associated with eradicating results of their operation - detachment of social life from traditional patterns and practices.²⁷

Communication conditions of knowledge creation and its language base are also changing. Expertise - never entirely assimilated by the layman – obviously makes only sense with the option of referring it to the community experience (Podgórecki, 2004: 25) which takes place in complex communication mechanisms. The aforementioned *detraditionalization changes not only the nature of these processes but also transforms their symbolic resources. They*

26 I mention only some of the characteristics of the profession - often regarded as its institutional differentiators.

27 Post-memory as described by Katarzyna Kaniowska in reference to the concept of Marianne Hirsch, is »knowledge about the past, but built on empathic recreation of someone's experience [...]», is »the memory of the second generation that, not having lived reality captured by memory is doomed to build its own identity on the basis of non-personal experience of the past” K. Kaniowska, „Memoria” i „postpamięć” a antropologiczne budowanie wspólnoty (2004: 20).

also *vary* in relation to the progressive *bureaucratization*, *creating* formal criteria of knowledge valorisation, regardless of local traditions and the ways of conducting scientific work. Through bureaucratic regulations, the procedures in light of which such criteria can be considered as fulfilled are specified, which results in *standardization* unifying both the creation practice and the transmission of knowledge (at least in the area in which the fulfillment of formal rules is now provided to initiate research practice).

Transmission and the creation of knowledge is inextricably linked with the community and the ethical context (knowledge is good), its attributes are also worth confronting with the processes of cultural change. Two important phenomena are disclosed in it - *mercantilization* (marketization of social relations) and the progressive *privatization of beliefs*. They favour a certain type of good - market good - and the peculiar atmosphere of socialization to knowledge – the climate of indifferent impartiality. Due to them, knowledge is not so much valorised in relation to meaning, uniqueness or importance, but mainly to *market inter-changeability*. It also fosters *self-treatment as a commodity*, which additionally has the effect that the exchange value majorizes other *values*, limiting their use in relation to knowledge as an important evaluation criterion and even eliminating the making of such valorisation.²⁸

Pluralization and privatization of beliefs in the context of the changing level of confidence in knowledge, the formation of its personalized, local (institutional) varieties, possibly remains in relation to changes in the cultural medium of research and its ethical foundations. (The weaknesses of such grounding appear to lie at the basis of, inter alia, *the sphere of ethical aesthetics* (appearing in the *absence of what is ethical and common, is authentic to the individual*) (Dehnel, 2001: 49–72)). They open the way to the diverse individual scientific creativity, but also for promoting ethical and methodological²⁹ tolerance,³⁰ in which the very desire to seek knowledge loses the value of authenticity and meaningful, communally-shared bonds.

Summary attempt

Organizing the theoretical and methodological discussion in its comprehensive, practical dimension seems to be extremely difficult. An attempt was made to clarify certain conditions to differentiate the methodological

28 This also applies to the category of theoretical pedagogy, very often valorized in a »market« - a good economic approach - not just in terms of meaning and validity, interpretation specific to the humanities. (Contracts, tenders, market education, services, capital, etc.).

29 The consequence of this methodological problem is discussed more in the aforementioned article. Kryteria waloryzacji praktyki..., op. cit., 162–173.

30 Ethical tolerantism abolishes commitment, as well as a sense of duty concerning at least partial promotion and dissemination of their beliefs and behavior. Cf. H. Eilstein (1994: 142–172).

discussion as referred to in the three main approaches - the definition of problems pool, references to the shared rules of knowledge creation and the search for common areas of its quality valorisation. Each of these attempts inevitably reveals, however, albeit in a slightly different way, a similar problem - both theoretical and methodological differentiation of disciplines dealing with education and their socio-cultural grounding. The illustration of the problem does not, of course, present any of its solutions, however as a summary, some generalizations may be risked.

The concept of education science as a “common area of research practice” has a very contractual status. What seems to be expressed is the intention and a postulate serving joint action directing. Reliance on these activities upon a clearly defined initial pool of these arrangements seems to be difficult to achieve. It is rather worth *developing the existing research perspectives including the list of problems that may be reasonably well specified on the basis of the perceived concerns relating to the rationality of the knowledge created and its quality*. The summary is also supposed to indicate the minimum set of theoretical and methodological terms, thus adding the perspective mentioned at the beginning. It may be described as “participatory-interactive” and based on four fundamental methodological postulates.

It is based on the *decentering perspective, which demands you treat yourself as a participant in the events, while maintaining the ability to control the experience of practice in which we participate*. This path may disclose both *the individual and the shared rules* of knowledge creation, which are the result of constant reference to your own experiences. The need to maintain a decentralized position and making the related reconstruction is particularly clearly articulated in the modern, constructivist paradigm - the logic of knowledge creation cannot be translated into explicit, formalized algorithm since it is based on the practices demanding their own reconstruction.³¹ Standards of research practice should also be referenced back to those very - own – reconstructions (Krzychała, 2004: 10), which enable dismissal or abandonment of a single, privileged position or perspective. Practical engagement model included in the decentering postulate may a situation of cognitive decentering, is based not only on keeping track of our own experiences as they may affect others, but also confronting meaning and expression of their own experience. The distance that is formed in such a way may be helpful in, at least, partial comprehension of an occurring change. This means, therefore, that you are able to establish the boundary between your own role (of an investigator) and the play with reality, which gives a cognitive sense of knowl-

31 Cf. S. Krzychała's comments to the concept of Ralf Bohnsack S. Krzychała, Wprowadzenia (2004: 10).

edge, the possibility of its creation and final expression.³² Involvement of this kind is subject to reflective study, in which *both methodological awareness and research practice - a game that* the researchers plays in imparting cognitive sense to the researcher's own search are subject to change. The actual process of knowledge never ends, remaining just as it was at the beginning.

It is also a *perspective based on the postulate of criticism*. It applies both to its cognitive tools – *it assumes a constant willingness to challenge each of the accepted points of view - as well as their possible sources*. Doubt on their legitimacy, their willingness to abandon them in favour of finer explanations of encountered surprises, also opens the possibility of seeking even the most unusual, *critically ground breaking* solutions. Their source is not only their own ideas, but, in equal measure, the perspective identified in others - criticism denotes openness and willingness to remain in dialogue with others.

Ultimately, it is also an involved prospect - formed in relationships with others and engaging all the dimensions of these relationships. It touches the sphere of intimacy and personal beliefs as well as the way in which they are maintained and constructed in the perceived oppositions - „intimacy - public sphere,” „I - others”, „we - they” - and the temporal order of experience. Thus it accepted not only the *distant view* into the self-activity, but also *a kind of experimenting with your own* experience, through which the knowledge created is given both personal reinforcement and social credibility.

The proposed theoretical-methodological perspective obviously does not solve methodological problems that were indicated in the first part of the presentation. It specifies, however, the set of conditions of knowledge creation, which may contribute to solving them in a way that respects the diversity of certain interpretation approaches and some traditions existing in this respect. It may also be helpful in developing common methodological discussions and research practices.

An outline of the abovementioned prospect constitutes also a possible answer to the historically observable process, which *refrains from the transmission model of homogeneous vision of knowledge, grounded in one scientific canon*. In the case of an extensive transfer of a range of varieties of this knowledge, the complexity of the conditions of its reception and the application of particular importance, the problem with the quality of research practices associated with the development of responsible *prospects of knowledge constructing* gains special significance. They are extremely diverse now, both because of the scientific specialization and numerous socio-cultural factors mentioned in this presentation.

32 It is worth noting that the »game« can also obtain the primacy over consciousness, which is clearly exhibited in the hermeneutic interpretations. Cf. A. Rostecka (2006: 273–285).

The role of the methodologist and the methodology itself remains semi-independent, a separate element of the whole process of knowledge creation, a separate segment of the educational process, which, in its content, remains essentially detached from the emerging problems and experiences of those doing the research. As a social role, it is also marked by significant ambivalence – a methodologist is treated as an “expert in difficult situations” – occasionally summoned, when it comes to solving the problem materialized in a specific type of research approach - either as an “harmless outsider” (fascinated by an issue which is “abstract” to others - how do you know what we know and is it certain). The very concept of methodology and its position in the research and educational practice demands perhaps a separate look and a discussion on possible solutions in this area.³³ Recognizing the role of methodology in building a cognitive perspective and its importance for the quality of knowledge can certainly help to build communication space and create the common research practice in it. The problems of theory and methodology are not substantial enough to be simply discussed - the *methodology should be jointly practiced*.

References

- Angrosino, M.,V. (2009). Obserwacja w nowym kontekście. Etnografia, pedagogika i rozwój problematyki społecznej, In: Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research (Metody badań jakościowych)*, PWN SA, Warszawa, Vol 2, 144–146.
- Čerwinkowa, H. Gołębiak, B., D. (Eds.) (2010). *Badania w działaniu. Pedagogika i antropologia zaangażowane*, Wydawnictwo naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej, Wrocław.
- Charmaz, K. (2009). Grounded Theory in the 21st Century. Applications for Advancing Social Justice Studies (Teoria ugruntowana w XXI wieku. Zastosowanie w rozwijaniu badań nad sprawiedliwością społeczną). In: Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research (Metody badań jakościowych)*, PWN SA, Warszawa, Vol 1, 707–747.
- Cheek, J. (2009). The Practice and Politics of Funded Qualitative Research (Praktyka i polityka w badaniach jakościowych finansowanych ze źródeł społecznych). In: Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research (Metody badań jakościowych)*, PWN SA, Warszawa, Vol 1, 549–622.

33 There are various attempts of different positioning of methodology, creating, of course, new issues, but also presenting new opportunities to practice the research. The service learning principle, for example, (learning in the service of society) shows new rules of the organization of knowledge content and academic classes. It emphasizes their link with social nature of the experience of operating entities and in the problems disclosed in practice, which, in turn, leads to treating methodology as an integral part of the body of knowledge. Cf. M.V Angrosino (2009: 144–146).

- Dehnel, P. (2001). Estetyzacja sfery etycznej a prawdziwościowe roszczenia sądów moralnych, In: Dehnel, P. Kaper, N. and Sierocka, B. (eds.), *Etyka wspólnota działanie, Szkice z filozofii współczesnej*, Dolnośląska Szkoła Wyższa Edukacji, Wrocław, 49–72.
- Eilstein, H. (1994). *Humanizm wobec relatywizmu moralnego: Homo sapiens i wartości*. Eseje, PWN Warszawa.
- Gadamer, H-G. (1993). *Truth and Method*. Kraków.
- Giddens, A. (2001). Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age (*Nowoczesność i tożsamość. "Ja" i społeczeństwo w epoce późnej nowoczesności*). PWN, Warszawa.
- Grobler, A. (2006). *Metodologia nauk*. Ureus Znak, Kraków.
- House, E. R. (2009). Qualitative Evaluation and Changing Social Policy (Ewaluacje jakościowe i zmiana polityki społecznej). In: Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research (Metody badań jakościowych)*, PWN SA, Warszawa, Vol 2, 603–632.
- Kaniowska, K. (2004). „Memoria” i „postpamięć” a antropologiczne budowanie wspólnoty. *Codziennie i niecodziennie. O wspólnotowości w realiach dzisiejszej Łodzi*, *Łódzkie Studia Etnograficzne Volume XLIII*, Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze, Łódź.
- Kleszcz, R. (1998). *O racjonalności. Studium epistemologiczno-metodologiczne*, Ed. U. Ł., Łódź.
- Krasnodębski, Z. (1986). *Rozumienie ludzkiego zachowania*. PIW.
- Krzychała, S. (2004). Wprowadzenia, In: Krzychała, S. (ed.) *Spoleczne przestrzenie doświadczenia. Metoda interpretacji dokumentarnej*, Wyd. Nauk D.S.W E – TWP Wrocław.
- Krzychała, S. (2007). Ryzyko własnego życia. Indywidualizacja w późnej nowoczesności, *Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej Edukacji*. TWP, Wrocław.
- Kvale, S. (2004). *InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing (Inter-views. Wprowadzenie do jakościowego wywiadu badawczego)*, Trans Humana Białystok.
- Lalak, D. (2010). *Życie jako biografia. Podejście biograficzne w perspektywie pedagogicznej*. Żak, Warszawa.
- Malewski, M. (2005). Pedagogika jako Wieża Babel. Teraźniejszość Człowiek Edukacja, *Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej Edukacji*. TWP, 2(30).
- Maxwell, A. (1997). Understanding and Validity. *Qualitative Research, Harvard Educational Review*, 62 (3), 288–300.
- Nowak, M. (2006). Metodologia pedagogiki między „naukowością/teoretycznością” a „praktycznością”. In: Kubinowski, D. (ed.), *Metodologia pedagogiki zorientowanej humanistycznie*. Impuls, Kraków.

- Piekarski, J. (2009a). Kryteria waloryzacji praktyki badawczej - między inhibicją metodologiczną a permissywnym tolerancją. In: Piekarski, J., Urbaniak-Zajęc, D. and Szmids, K. (eds.), *Metodologiczne problemy tworzenia i przekazu wiedzy w pedagogice*. Oblicza akademickiej praktyki, Impuls Kraków, 151–175.
- Piekarski, J. (2009b). O wybranych warunkach zmiany w tworzeniu i przekazywaniu wiedzy – odniesienia do praktyki kształcenia nauczycieli. In: Piekarski, J., Szymańskiej, M. and Tomaszewska, L. (eds.), *Pedagogika. Tom 8 – Kształcenie pedagogów - strategie, koncepcje, idee. Język – komunikacja – etyczność – twórczość Część I*, 15–28. PWSZ, Płock.
- Piekarski, J. (2009c). Estetyzacja praktyki akademickiej - głos w dyskusji na temat perspektywy uczestniczącej. In: Piekarski, J. and Urbaniak-Zajęc, D. (eds.), *Innowacje w edukacji akademickiej. Szkolnictwo wyższe w procesie zmiany*, Łódź, Wydaw. Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 235–254.
- Piekarski, J. (2007). *U podstaw pedagogiki społecznej. Zagadnienia teoretyczno metodologiczne*, Ed U.Ł. Łódź.
- Podgórecki, J. (2004). Atrybucje kompetencji komunikacyjnych. In: Mních, M., Paprotna, G. and Budniak, A. (eds.), *Kształcenie podyplomowe nauczycieli czynnych zawodowo*. Wyd. Naukowe Górnośląskiej Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej im. Kardynała Augusta Hłonda, Mysłówice.
- Radziewicz-Winnicki, A. (2004). *Spóeczeństwo w trakcie zmiany. Rozważania z zakresu pedagogiki społecznej i socjologii transformacji*. GWP, Gdańsk.
- Radziewicz-Winnicki, A. and Roter, A. (2004). *Ryzyko transformacyjne nowego ładu społeczno-edukacyjnego*, Ed. Śląska Wyższa Szkoła Zarządzania im. gen. Jerzego Ziętka, Katowice.
- Rostecka, A. (2006). Sztuka jako gra w filozoficznej hermeneutyce Hansa-Georga Gadamera. In: Mikołajczyk, H., Oziębłowski, M., and Rembierz, M. (eds.), *Hermeneutyczne dziedzictwo filozofii*, Scriptum, Kraków, 273–285.
- Sikora, M. (1997). *Problemy interpretacji w metodologii nauk empirycznych*, Wyd. Naukowe IF UAM Poznań.
- Śliwerski, B. (2011). O przewodach habilitacyjnych i profesorskich z pedagogiki społecznej (pracy socjalnej) oraz dydaktyki szczegółowych Polaków na Słowacji w latach 2006-2011, *Rocznik Pedagogiczny*, 43, 21–30.
- Smith, J. K. and Hodkinson, P. (2009). Relativism, Criteria, and Politics (Relatywizm, kryteria i polityka). In: Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research (Metody badań jakościowych)*, PWN SA, Warszawa. Vol 2, 391–417.

- Smith, K. J. and Hodkinson, P. (2009). Relativism, Criteria and Politics (Relatywizm, kryteria i polityka). In: Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research (Metody badań jakościowych)*, PWN SA, Warszawa, Vol 2, 391–416.
- Sozański, T. (1998). *Socjologia teoretyczna jako nauka normalna. Studia Socjologiczne*, No. 4, 5–38.
- Szacki, J. (1981). *Historia myśli socjologicznej*, vol. II, PWN Warszawa.
- Szacki, J. (1984). Introduction (Wprowadzenie). In: Znaniecki, F. (ed.), *Spoleczne role uczonych*. PWN Warszawa.
- Szkudlarek, T. (1997). Poststrukturalizm a metodologia pedagogiki, *Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici, Socjologia wychowania XIII, Nauki Humanistyczno-Spoleczne*, 317. Toruń.
- Urbaniak-Zajac, D. (2003). *Pedagogika spoleczna w Niemczech. Stanowiska teoretyczne i problemy praktyki*, Ed. U. Ł., Łódź.

Key words: Franciscans, Ljubljana, Poland, History of Education, Žiga Škerpin, Baltasar Hacquet, Gabrijel Gruber, Carlo Benvenuti, Rudjer Bošković.

Stanislav Južnič

Edukacijske vede jezuitov in frančiškanov osemnajstega stoletja na Slovenskem in Poljskem v luči tedanjih znanstvenih konceptov

Številni frančiškani so bili pomembni pedagogi, če izpostavimo le Marina Mersenna (* 1588; OFMConv 1611; † 1648). Tako je skrajni čas, da njihovim zgornjim modernim profesorjem pripišemo slavo, ki si jo zaslužijo. Frančiškanski provincial Škerpin je kupil številne sodobne in starejše tehniško zasnovane učne knjige za svojo ljubljansko knjižnico. Filozofija je njega dni še vedno vsebovala tehnologijo, matematiko, fiziko in biološke vede. Poglavitno tehniško vprašanje 17. stoletja so bili poskusi z vakuumom, ki so Škerpina še vedno zanimali, tako da je utemeljil pouk tehniških ved na Kranjskem po bavarskih frančiškanih Zinsmeisterju in Hieberju poldrugo stoletje po Škerpinovi smrti.

Škerpin je svoje obiske Španije opisal v danes izgubljenem potopisu in pri tem nabavil mnogo tehniško naravnanih učbenikov španskih frančiškanov, ki so jih v Ljubljani radi uporabljali. Jezuit Gruber in laični profesor Hacquet sta v Ljubljani drug ob drugem razvijala nekoliko nasprotujoči si Boškovičevi pedagogiki in ateistično šolstvo. Čeprav sta bila po letu 1775 sovražna, sta oba svoj način poučevanja zanesla med Poljake, Gruber pa je svoje pedagoške ideje razširil celo v prekomorske kraje.

Ključne besede: frančiškani, Ljubljana, Poljska, zgodovina izobraževanja, Žiga Škerpin, Baltasar Hacquet, Gabrijel Gruber, Carlo Benvenuti, Rudjer Bošković.

Jacek Piekarski

Methodology in the sciences of education - disciplinary status and practice of education

The methodological and theoretical problems present in the current methodological discussion in Poland are perceptible from the social and historic perspective. Some of the social conditions for the creation of knowledge and its properties, which may seem worth considering in the situation of the tendency towards building a universal area of research, are presented. The role of the methodologist and the methodology itself remains semi-independent, that is to say a separate element of the whole process of knowledge creation, a separate segment of the educational process, which, in its content, remains essentially detached from the emerging problems

and experiences of those conducting the research. Recognizing the role of methodology in building a cognitive perspective and its importance for the quality of knowledge can certainly help to build communication space and create the common research practice within it.

Key words: methodology, knowledge, education, society, quality

Jacek Piekarski

Metodologija v vzgojnoizobraževalnih študijah – disciplinarni status in družbeni pogoji za razpravo

Metodološki in teoretični problemi, ki so prisotni v trenutni metodološki razpravi na Poljskem, so zaznavni z družbenega in zgodovinskega vidika. V predstavitvi teh vidikov prikažemo tudi nekatere družbene razmere za ustvarjanje znanja in njegovih lastnosti, ki se jih lahko zdi vredno premisliti v položaju, ko je zaznavna težnja k vzpostavitvi univerzalnega področja raziskav. Vloga metodologa in same metodologije ostaja še vedno napol neodvisni, samostojni del celotnega procesa ustvarjanja znanja, ločen segment izobraževalnega procesa, ki po svoji vsebini v bistvu ostaja še vedno ločen od nastajajočih problemov in izkušenj tistih, ki opravljajo raziskave. Priznavanje vloge metodologije pri gradnji kognitivne perspektive in njenega pomena za kakovost znanja lahko zagotovo pomaga k ustvaritvi komunikacijskega prostora in skupne raziskovalne prakse v njem.

Ključne besede: metodologija, znanje, izobraževanje, družba, kakovost

Bojan Žalec

Affects and emotions in upbringing and education

The article is divided to three parts. In the first part, the author argues for the importance of body and bodily relations. On this basis, he argues for the importance of living inter-bodily relations between a student and a teacher. Successful distant education is not possible.

In the second part, the author deals with the problems of the modern youth and pupils. He argues for the importance of self-consciousness, identity, recognition and confirmation for the success and good life of young people. Their identity is built up through the relationships with their parents and teachers (significant others). The author points to the fact of the increasing emotional illiteracy of the youth in Europe and the necessity of emotional upbringing. Parents and teachers play the crucial role in it. Alas such upbringing is too often almost totally absent and this leads to indifference, apathy, violent acts and other negative phenomena by our youth. The crucial factor in the development of such phenomena is bad or empty communication between children or students on one hand and adults, parents or teach-