

# Review of: "The End of Objectivity and Subjectivity in Education Sciences"

Jakob Lundgren<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Göteborg University

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

This article is ambitious in its scope: to reconsider (and ultimately reject) the objectivity/subjectivity-distinction in the education sciences. Fundamental reflections of this kind should to my mind always be encouraged. However, there are some points where this article could see some improvements.

1. While the author presents an appropriate overview of some of the classic discussions in theory of science, they limit themselves to discussions focusing on the natural sciences. As education sciences concerns itself with the Human, it would be appropriate to also include discussions pertaining to the humanities and qualitative social sciences. I am thinking primarily of hermeneutics in the tradition after Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer. While I am not an expert in how this tradition has been applied in the field of education, a quick look on google scholar revealed a number of works discussing this, such as Gallagher (1992) *Hermeneutics and Education*; Kerdeman (1998) *Hermeneutics and Education: Understanding, control, and agency*; Peters & Lankshear (2002) *Education and Hermeneutics: A Freirean interpretation*. It would also be appropriate to include discussions by theorists in a critical tradition, such as Derrida, Foucault, or Habermas. There have been extensive discussions about the objectivity/subjectivity-distinction in the context of studies of the Human in these traditions, and the paper would be strengthened by taking these discussions into consideration.
2. As the article concerns itself with such a fundamental question, it is somewhat strange to not see some of the classic perspectives in education and developmental psychology referenced in the discussion. It would be useful to contrast the classical positions of Skinner, Dewey, Freire, Vygotsky and their different views of the processes of learning and the objectivity of these processes. Of course, not all fundamental discussions need to go back to the classics in a field, but I deem that the discussion about the complexity of education (section 3) could be strengthened by referencing different views of the nature of learning. In its current form, this section seems to discuss complexity in general without really referencing the particularities of complexity in the field of education. The classics in the theory of learning, or perhaps some more recent works, would help the author persuade the reader as to why education is complex.
3. As noted by a previous reviewer, the author has made a number of assumptions about the field of education science that can be questioned. The article would be strengthened if the author provided a clearer description of the characteristics of the field. To my mind, the author seems to assume that education science is (or should be) a homogeneous field with a single set of epistemological and methodological assumptions. However, many successful fields are successful precisely because they apply a plurality of epistemological and methodological perspectives on a complex phenomenon; fields such as sustainability and cultural studies. These kinds of interdisciplinary knowledge

production challenge traditional epistemological conceptions, e.g. Andersen (2015) Collaboration, interdisciplinarity, and the epistemology of contemporary science; Max-Neef (2005) Foundations of transdisciplinarity. As education science can involve a variety of approaches from psychology, sociology, or other fields, I would characterize it as one such interdisciplinary field.

The strength of this article lies in the analytical creativity of the author as illustrated by the contrasting tables and the concluding suggestions for the field. If the author addresses these three points:

1. Discussion of perspectives from the theory of the humanities and social sciences,
2. Characterization of the object of study of the education sciences and why it is complex,
3. Clearer characterization of the field of education science itself;

it is my belief that the paper could make a contribution to a discussion about the notions of objectivity and subjectivity in education science.