

# Review of: "Profile and scientific nature of pedagogy"

Matt McLain<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Liverpool John Moores University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

I was looking forward to reading this article, having read the abstract and title, to discover the author's basis for describing pedagogy as a science. I wondered whether they used the term in the traditional sense, that science was in the past akin to philosophy. However, I was disappointed and disturbed to read the line "...those who despise pedagogy as a science, the enemies of scientific research of education, continue to argue about the scientific content of pedagogy, about the name of the science of education, on the semantic, linguistic and etymological level out of supine ignorance, rejecting the entire universal experience of pedagogues, schools and educational processes in universal history, rejecting the pedagogical tradition and even the objective reality itself...", where the author appears to lambast those who might justifiably say: "I think that you might find it is a little more complicated than that".

My stance on education tends towards the pragmatism of John Dewey and, more recently, Gert Biesta, and I do not see the scientific approach to education and completely problematic. However, having read the article, I found it lacking in the use of empirical evidence to support the claims made, with limited use of citations (particularly to recent research) to support, let alone critique them. I would say that this article is an interesting position piece, as it will most certainly elicit critical responses from a range of educators - many of whom will hold very different views than the author, yet be well-established educational thinkers and researchers. The arguments are somewhat a priori, but largely unjustified or explained, assuming that the reader could not possibly have a different view.

Having said this, I found the middle section of the article interesting and readable, and not altogether objectionable. But I would argue that what is presented here as 'laws' are not scientific, but social principles and beliefs about the nature of education. If I had not read the introduction, which seems somewhat uncritically positivist, my review would be as thus:

There are some interesting principles discussed in this section, which drawn on the historic experiences of educators and generally held beliefs about education. I would have like the author to explain what the aims of the article were and how the reader might benefit from reading it. Furthermore, the limited use of citations in the text and relative lack of reference to recent research does not instil confidence or present the article as a significant scholarly insight into education, learning and/or schooling. As an English speaker, reading an article in English, I would also like to read the Figures in the language that it is written in, as my Spanish is (sadly) insufficient to benefit from their inclusion. Finally, if the article's title is converted into a research question (i.e. What is the profile and scientific nature of pedagogy?), I do not believe that the author has made the case for pedagogy as science, but has taken this position as beyond reproach.

I recommend that the author rethinks their intention in publishing this article and makes a concerted effort to justify and

support the claims; and counsel them to moderate their tone towards those who might disagree, taking a more conciliatory and scholarly approach. I wish the author well in their future studies and hope that they are able to read this review in the spirit that it is written in.