

Review

Philosophy of education: Aims, theory, common sense and research (Richard Pring, 2004. London: Continuum, 289 pages; \$20.85)

Kindu Ayechew Ayenalem^{1*} and Samuel Zinabu Desta²

¹Department of Educational Planning and Management, College of Education, University of Gondar, Ethiopia.

²Department of Lifelong Learning and Community Development, College of Education, University of Gondar, Ethiopia.

Received 18 June, 2023; Accepted 18 July, 2023

This paper evaluated a Richard Pring's book titled "Philosophy of Education: Aims, Theory, Common Sense and Research", specifically part three of the book. In this review, we found that the book is valuable for anybody interested in education, especially professionals, practitioners, and researchers. Throughout the book, the author advocates his ideas consistently regarding educational theory, goals, and the effects on both the nature and conduct of educational research. From our evaluation, we obtained that the following points are good qualities of the book: Pring clarifies his point of argument by using illustrative examples and support it with adequate and pertinent empirical evidence. He also indicates the implications of each philosophical argument for research and practice. In addition, he thoroughly shows the critics of educational research as many times as he can. Finally, the author introduces a novel approach to the ethics of educational research. Despite these positive traits, the book has certain shortcomings such as use of difficult language, needless repetition of ideas in different chapters, failure to indicate ways in which the tarnished reputation of educational research might be improved and the quantitative- qualitative paradigms can work together. However, our overall evaluation finds the book as an excellent work on educational research and related issues that deserves praise and keenly recommend it to readers to be benefited from its outweighed strengths than the limitations. In addition, we suggest concerned individuals in education to review the whole chapters of the book to come up with better insights and comprehensive lessons essential to practitioners and the academic discourse.

Key words: Evidence, knowledge, virtues, research.

INTRODUCTION

British educator Richard Pring, who is currently retired, has had a long and illustrious career. Pring authored more than 20 important works, edited more than six books both alone and with his colleagues, and had two books published in his honor. We chose Pring's book for

review out of several books that our professor had suggested to us as essential readings for the course on the philosophy of education for a number of reasons: (1) As professionals in the field of education, we were interested in having and sharing insights about

*Corresponding author. E-mail: ayechem.k@gmail.com. Tel: +251918151273.

educational research and we found that Pring's book is much more comprehensive and suitable to our purpose than most other philosophical books in education; (2) From the author's biography, we learned that Pring has dedicated his entire career to dealing with and writing about critical and important educational issues, and (3) As far as our reading is concerned, Pring pays more attentions in his book to educational research than most other philosophical books in education. Thus, we chose this particular book for our review analysis because of the author's enormous and relentless contributions to education over a lengthy period of time, as well as the reasons mentioned so far. The book has three sections and 15 chapters that were separately published on various dates before edited as a book. Aims, values, and standards are the focus of the first section, which is divided into seven chapters. These chapters are (a) education as a moral practice, (b) educating people, (c) the goal of education, liberal or vocational, (d) the context of education, monastery or marketplace, (e) subject-centered versus child-centered education, (f) standards and quality in education, and (g) political education: the relevance of the humanities. In the second section, the author discussed the theme of common sense and educational theory, which has three unique chapters such as common sense and education, the language of curriculum analysis, and Knowledge out of Control. The last section, the subject of our critics, contains five independent but interconnected concepts about educational research.

As have already been stated, the authors did not review the entire book's chapters, they just pay attention to part three, which discusses educational research, and contains five chapters. In part three, the author discusses evidence-based policy and practice, truth, knowledge, and power, the erroneous duality between quantitative and qualitative research, the good and bad traits of educational researchers, and the future of educational research. As a result, the authors' assessment of the book's merits and flaws is discussed below based on those five chapters. Even though they have not cover a full assessment of the book's contents, they think readers can learn about some of the following important topics from both the book and their own reflections: (a) the significance of evidence-based policy and practice for the field of education; (b) the need for careful and appropriate application of some key concepts, such as reality and objectivity, truth, facts, theory, and knowledge in the practice of educational research; (c) the misguided, extreme debate between the quantitative and qualitative research paradigms; and (d) the necessity of integrating personal virtues with research principles, rules, and standards for effective practice of research ethics, and (e) the future of educational research in terms of understanding the context and the necessity to develop solid and independent funding and quality control systems and institutions.

EVIDENCE-BASED POLICY AND PRACTICE

The author outlined some significant objections and charges made against educational research in this chapter. Pring lists a few of the criticisms of research in the field of education, including:

...too fragmented (too little of the large-scale and bold hypotheses thoroughly tested); based on different assumptions, samples, and data; often less than rigorous in method; not unambiguously addressed to a specific question to which the policy maker or the practitioner needs an answer (Pring, 2004: 197).

By highlighting the successes of the Cochrane and Campbell collaboration centers, which benefited from their strict adherence to evidence-based approaches to policy and practice, Pring has successfully capitalized his argument for evidence-based policy and practice. Here ported to us that education authorities acknowledged that the Cochrane and Campbell strategy is necessary for the quality of research in education to guide both government policy and practice using the success of the two centers as a showcase. However, the application of Cochrane and Campbell's evidence-based methodology to the subject of education has elicited a range of responses. The author identified three philosophical issues as the core of the distinctions between hostile and hospitable responses as well as criticism of educational research. The first concern is the type of evidence. The book's main argument here is the risk of using evidence from constrained and context-free viewpoints. Because, in the author's opinion,

...there are different forms of discourse, each characterized by different ways of looking at the world, different kinds of truth claims, and different ways of investigating the truth. What counts as evidence will depend upon the types of discourse one engages in. As a result, there is a danger of criticizing a piece of evidence because it does not meet the standards of evidence in different forms of discourse (Pring, 2004: 197).

Pring listed four instances in which evidence was used in the education field incorrectly. First, some supporters of the evidence-based method argued in favor of it by blurring the lines between scientific and non-scientific forms of discourse and dismissing some unfounded claims. Second, other opponents who only use one type of evidence to refute an argument's validity may completely disregard it as being unrelated to the intricate issues at hand in educational policy and professional practice. Third, although evidence and proof are two quite distinct concepts, they are sometimes used interchangeably. Politicians that promote evidence-based

policy as the best course of action frequently make arguments like this. However, when a policy that was implemented based on study findings ends up being insufficient, they feel let down. They missed that being supported by evidence does not always imply being right. Instead, it indicates that one course of action appears to be the most logical one over the other in light of all the evidence and a comparison of it, either *for or against*. Fourth, educational discourse is by definition eclectic. It uses various types of evidence, including historical, psychological, and scientific data as well as personal experience. The book's rigorous distinction of evidence misuse and a powerful comment on its potential future application within various contexts and goals might be seen as a positive attribute in light of the evidence.

The extension of the methods of the natural sciences to the understanding of humans is seen as the second philosophical issue within the core of educational research criticisms and different levels of acceptance to that of the Cochrane approach to the field of education. The state of the human mind, according to many philosophers and academics, constitutes a different form of reality than that which is the focus of the natural sciences. In other words, science cannot study Man because it might not be able to comprehend social structures and human beings as a whole.

Although there is some evidence supporting such beliefs, the author vehemently contends that it is possible to articulately predict the prevalent habits and practices of human beings. If people do not fall prey to the uniqueness fallacy, it is possible to learn more about human beings using research techniques from natural science. The author attempted to demonstrate the viability of applying the Cochrane evidence-based approach of health science to the education sector without undermining the significance of appreciating the distinctive characteristics of human nature in general and the education field in particular. This is another strong point of the book.

The adoption of logically separated educational ends/goals from the means of reaching them is the third philosophical problem of concern. Pring asserted that:

...within the now prevalent managerial discourse, the means/end model of educational planning and engagement seems almost self-evidently correct; there is a logical separation of the ends of education from the means of achieving those ends (Pring, 2004: 205).

Although the author's expression seems indirect, the aforementioned phrase implies that higher-level authorities and politicians created the aims and goals of education, while lower-level practitioners, in this case, teachers, are responsible for pursuing those ends. As a result, the decision-making process and the goal/means of the educational planning model are logically separated.

The core of the argument is that teachers are less

empowered to create these goals/ends while officials abuse their authority to craft educational objectives in the form of targets and force teachers to meet those targets. The Amharic proverb “*ገምገል የለበት ከብት ለቀማ*” (literally to mean “going out to pick up the dung where the cows were never there”) best describes this situation. Although the teacher is the expert in the educational interaction (ideally based on the necessary evidence) in knowing what means will most successfully reach those aims, according to the author, their competence does not lay in the discussions about the ends themselves. This would mean that the educational endeavor would not succeed in achieving its goals or objectives. This implies that the book preaches to us the importance of teachers' genuine and empowered engagement in both the development and implementation of the planned objectives.

Pring made a scathing statement for educators as the chapter's final comment. Teachers, ministers, and other government officials in the field of education claim to be using evidence, but proponents of evidence-based policy and practice contend that the evidence has not been gathered and applied in a rigorous enough manner; it lacks the systematic investigation, in fact, the scientific rigor (Owens, 2004), that has revolutionized other spheres of public life. Educationists are criticized for not conducting thorough enough systematic evidence searches. The worst aspect was that Pring, using Salvin's suggestion, disclosed that:

At the dawn of the twenty-first century, education is finally dragging, kicking and screaming into the twentieth century. The scientific revolution that utterly transformed medicine, agriculture, transportation, technology, and other fields early in the twentieth century almost entirely bypassed the field of education (Pring, 2004:206).

As a professional in education, we feel that this is a bitter news. It is from this point that we want to criticize the book. The author does not offer any sound justifications for the failure of the education field compared to its equivalents, except for the philosophical justifications mentioned above. The author provided thorough documentation of the criticisms of educational research as well as the key justifications for how and why they were misrepresented. However, as someone who has dedicated his entire life to improving education, it would have been preferable if the author had pointed out the underlying reasons why this field has lagged behind so far more than others. Is it really because evidence-based policy and practice aren't being used, or is it due to the peculiar nature of the field, or is it because the educational industry as whole employed dimwits, or is there another reason? All of these issues, in our opinion, should have merited discussion in the book. On the other hand, although it is admirable to find similarities between the natural sciences and education, we think the

idiosyncrasies of the area outweigh the similarities. Consequently, for the most part, the education field generally needs its atypical methods, theories, practice, evidence, and approaches to do so. Otherwise, it was strongly believe that, with the use of borrowed methods, educational research and its practice would never be able to overcome their far-reaching problems. However, except for insistently advocating the copying and adoption of the already developed research methodologies in natural science, the book says nothing about introducing novel approaches to research in the field of education.

TRUTH KNOWLEDGE AND POWER

Pring discussed what he deemed the essential notions in this chapter, including reality and objectivity, truth, facts, theory, and knowledge. The author's position was that:

...analysis of these concepts might be best in approaching the divisive controversies which prevail in educational research. They are indispensable in our conversation with other people and thinking about and ordering of our experience. Despite their indispensability, the appropriate application is a matter of disagreement, and where one position oneself in these debates affects ones views about the practice and the validity of the research (Pring, 2004: 209-210).

The author offers a thorough explanation of those essential concepts and demonstrates how understanding them is beneficial to educational research. Pring advised cautious and integrated use of those fundamental ideas for better implications in educational studies. The author attempted to maintain a balanced knowledge of most of these fundamental themes with strong argumentative features. In this regard, the author makes every attempt to steer clear of the notions' extreme meanings. For example, a significant number of philosophers denied the existence of one independent reality at all. Because, they believe in multiple and socially constructed realities and conclude that a single reality would not exist independently of individual creations against which they might assess or evaluate their perceptions. The author, however, firmly argues that adopting the aforementioned viewpoint is incorrect, contending that the opposite of such a viewpoint rejects any social reality at all-it has no existence outside of what we choose to construct. In support of this claim, the author noted:

The realism, however, which I argue for, must not be confused with the naive realism that critics have in mind. Naïve realism is the view that there is a one-to-one relation between our description of reality and reality itself - that our language, as it were, mirrors reality (Pring, 2004:212).

The author acknowledges the notions of postmodernists' multiple realities and recognizes that social forces might be in charge of different realities that are socially constructed. The goal of the book, however, is to show that there is a reality that can be found by applying objectivity, a method by which one goes on to describe an objective state of affairs, that is, a state of affairs that exists independently of personal wishing it to be so. Many authors, especially those associated with postmodernism, underlined the futility of seeking the truth in their writings. Instead, they engaged in negotiation to reach a consensus. Nevertheless, the search for it (truth), according to Pring, is by no means unavoidable occurrence, although there are numerous interpretations, theories, and conditions around it. The author makes a compelling case for how an accurate understanding and application of truth will significantly advance education research while failing to acknowledge this has weird and inexplicable repercussions on both the theory and practice of research. The concept and use of facts are also clarified by the author. He underlined that understanding facts should be viewed concerning theory and descriptions of reality since facts are embedded in theory-laden representation. The book also takes a strong stance in favor of theory and practice's logical interdependence. For the theory-phobic groups, it offers sufficient justifications and examples that are supported. Pring stated the following to illustrate the importance of theory in both study and practice:

...the much-despised theory, in the sense of a framework of concepts and beliefs, far from being separate from practice, is implicit in it. Those, who want researchers to cut the theory and say what works, forget that what counts as working makes many unquestioned assumptions that need to be examined (Pring, 2004:220).

The author introduces a critique of educational research before discussing knowledge, another crucial notion.

Critics argue that educational research does not create a body of knowledge upon which policy makers and professionals can rely. First, lots of the education research are small-scale and fragmented; hence, there are no cumulative growth of such knowledge. Second, educational discourse seems to be full of people criticizing others research such that there is nothing conclusively verified - no knowledge. Research conclusions seem more like transient beliefs than well-established knowledge (Pring, 2004:220).

Pring develops his argument and specifies what should be in such a body of knowledge using such critiques as a starting point. He considered that:

...these bodies of knowledge are the theories,

propositions, and explanations accumulated through inquiry, criticism, argument, and counter-argument. They are what have survived testing and criticism. They are, as it were, public property. And indeed, their credential depends upon their being open to public challenge and refutation. Thus, any well corroborated body of knowledge, can only be provisional and open to further change through criticism. In fact, the link between knowledge and certainty is broken (Pring, 2004:221).

The author believed that teachers should encourage young students to understand these publicly established bodies of knowledge instead of passing along their personal beliefs and convictions. The book's strength lies in its aspiration that educational research to have its own body of knowledge with unique ideas and concepts, principles and theories, modes of inquiry, and accepted truth tests. This body of knowledge might be grown through criticism, experiment, testing, and reflection, and it is this body of knowledge that a policymaker or professional can confidently draw upon when deciding what to do.

Despite the positive qualities stated above, we have observed some flaws in chapter 2 of part three of the book. First, although the chapter's topic is "power", which is written alongside "truth" and "knowledge", the book does not adequately describe the influence of power, either as a promoter or an inhibitor of educational research. Of course, he discussed some aspects of the influence of power, linking it to the postmodern embrace. But in my opinion, it is insufficient, and the case has nothing to do specifically with the practice of educational research. The impact of power on educational research and teachers was instead briefly covered by the author in the next chapter, which did not include power as a topic. This demonstrates the needless repetition of similar ideas in different chapters.

Second, the author clearly defines the role of teachers as familiarizing their students with the body of acquired knowledge. On the other hand, he restrains teachers not to impart their own beliefs and convictions in the classroom.

Here, two limitations was noticed:

(A) the accumulated body of knowledge constitutes more of, if not at all, the knowledge organized and obtained through scientific procedures/research. It might exclude important facets of social values, morality, and cultural legacies, and there might be other facets of knowledge that are not subject to scientific investigation.

(B) Teachers may have fundamental beliefs and convictions for their students based on their professional and personal experiences. As a result, they should not be limited to imparting merely the body of existing knowledge.

Third, the author claims that bodies of knowledge are,

as it were, public property. This statement seems to be an unverified assertion. What does "public property" mean first—is it in terms of open access or criticism? The argument lacks clarity in this regard. Scientific rigor, in our opinion, has produced the majority of bodies of knowledge and such body of knowledge is not a public property if we look at the issue in terms of access. We don't think the body of accumulated knowledge is or will be public property, even though the source of evidence for it may be more or less open to and from the public. Undoubtedly, one of the most valuable economic resources for individuals, groups, organizations, and countries is scientific knowledge. However, everyone could not access it for free; it is heavily privatized and protected instead. If we assume that teachers' primary responsibility is introducing their students to the existing body of knowledge, the question is whether they can easily access such a body of knowledge. In practice, it might be impossible for them. For instance, if our professor did not provide us with this book to evaluate, we would not have had access to it under our privilege even though it is the outcome of scientific investigation and is regarded as public property (*as to the author's expression*).

Fourth, the author made the point that conducting effective educational research requires a thorough understanding of and use of essential ideas including reality, objectivity, truth, facts, theory, and knowledge. That's great! The book's shortcoming is that the author does not define education research when he develops his thesis. Does he think it falls within basic, applied, or both categories of research? Except for subliminal cues that lead one to surmise that the author might have focused on fundamental research, the book offers no explicit evidence of this.

FALSE DUALISM OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

In this part of the study, the author firmly argued against the illusory dualism of quantitative and qualitative paradigms in educational research. In doing so, Pring stressed four crucial circumstances: First, he attempted to show a key book that influenced the dichotomy (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). Second, he critically analyzed dualism's underlying philosophical presuppositions. Third, he briefly discussed the argument's political and moral ramifications. Finally, he considered how the quantitative and qualitative paradigms' duality is deceptive. The author's fundamental view in supporting this claim is that the quantitative-qualitative paradigm is a false duality. Before presenting his counterarguments, the author summarizes the positions of the two paradigms as shown below:

Countless texts and theses in educational research distinguish between quantitative and qualitative

research - and demonstrate a loyalty to one, or the other. Often, quantitative and qualitative are seen in opposition that invoke different paradigms and epistemologies. The division between the two has become quite sharp, reflected in their respective languages or different logical configurations of familiar words such as objectivity/subjectivity, reality/multiple realities, truth/consensus, knowledge/opinion, understanding/perception (Pring, 2004:229).

Pring further shows where the disagreement between the two paradigms lies on. He stated that:

The contrast is drawn between the objective world (out there independently of our thinking about it) and the subjective worlds (in our heads, as it were, and individually constructed); between the public discourse and private meanings; between reality unconstructed by anyone and the multiple realities built by each individual (Pring, 2004:229-230).

Nonetheless, the author condemned that such type of extreme discourse between the two paradigms is not genuine and relevant enough for the practice of educational research. He noted that:

The tendency to dichotomize this way is understandable but misleading. By emphasizing one particular distinction, it obscures or eliminates other, more subtle ones. And educational research has therefore too often been seduced by those false dualisms and reflected in or guided by those who theorize about it (Pring, 2004:230).

Further, it seems that the author criticizes the supporters of social constructivists or fans of a qualitative paradigm (Altheide and Johnson, 1994; Berger and Luckmann, 1966; Guba and Lincoln, 1994; Kuzel and Like, 1991; Secker et al., 1995; Smith, 1983) for their presupposition that:

In resisting the quantitative paradigm, one is inevitably forced to adopt qualitative paradigm. That, however, is a mistake (Pring, 2004:236).

The implication and the good quality of the book here are that there might be weak points in the quantitative paradigm. As a result, identifying, critiquing, correcting, and filling those gaps and problems is expected from any scientific procedure, discourse, and the person who works in the area. However, this does not necessarily call the destruction of the basics of the existing paradigm for the sake of coming up with another paradigm with its problems in the name of opposing the former one. The other strength of the book in this area is the author's persuasive argument that the current split between

qualitative and quantitative paradigms in educational research is unhelpful, impractical, and even misleading. The apparent distinction shown above is insufficient for any paradigm to stand alone and provide researchers with enough confidence. The two paradigms have several flaws in addition to their merits. This forces them to avoid the dichotomy and instead calls for combining the best aspects of the two paradigms. And we believe that's why mixed research methodologies are becoming more accepted today.

The author's attempt to maintain balance while arguing and asserting that the dualism between the quantitative and qualitative paradigms is a false dichotomy is another positive aspect of the book concerning the subject at hand. He made an effort to be objective and avoid putting himself in one of the categories. In other words, this chapter maintained his prior chapter's balanced perspective toward independent reality and socially constructed multiple realities. This neutrality is essential for readers to be objective to form their own opinions.

Although the book possesses the traits mentioned above, it also has substantial and minor restrictions. The author discussed in detail to demonstrate and persuade his audience about the false dualism of the two paradigms. According to Pring's final statement in the chapter, qualitative research paves the way for the quantitative, and the latter will be suggestive of distinctions investigated in a more interpretive approach (Pring, 2004: 243). In this understanding, this single line is insisting on the employment of both qualitative and quantitative at a time. Although the suggestions and comments are commendable, it is far less satisfactory to direct researchers who are/were ardent proponents of a specific paradigm, either quantitative or qualitative. We think it is insufficient to merely state that the widely held dualism between qualitative and quantitative camps considering as it is wrong. The author needs to talk more about how monism might effectively combine the better of the two paradigms. Of course, this may be the responsibility of research methodologists, but the author, who is also an educator and a philosopher, would have an opinion on the viability of mixed use of the quantitative and qualitative paradigms in educational research projects. Other philosophers, including Noddings (2015), argued more about how to combine the two research paradigms than this book does.

The author explored the criticisms of educational research in four separate chapters, on pages 197, 220, 228, and 260, which presents the book's second minor flaw. That merely amounts to a repeat and redundancy of the same problem in other locations. This illustrates the less stringent effort made throughout the book's edition. As we mentioned in the opening, the author assembled the book using 15 previously published papers. Such repetitious situations ought to have been removed when Pring edited the book. But that seems doubtful, and we do not believe that it was done on purpose.

VIRTUES AND VICICES OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHER

Pring makes an argument regarding the limitations of thinking about research ethics in terms of just principles, codes, and rules in this section. From an ethical standpoint, he maintained that taking into account the researchers' virtues or qualities is more important than the ethical principles they support. According to him,

Moral dilemmas which arise in research are often dealt with by appealing to certain general principles. However, that code or those principles do not precisely tell what one should do on any occasion. As a result, there is no chance of escaping from moral deliberations- the complex judgments required for seeing, first, the relevance of particular principles or codes to this or that situation, and second, the priority given to this or that principle when it is conflicting with another (Pring, 2004: 247).

On the other hand, the author argued that the gap between high-level principles on the one hand and action on the other depends on moral deliberation. Again, moral consideration depends on the general dispositions one inclines this way or that. That is:

A courageous person sees danger differently from a coward; the kind person will recognize redeeming features that the uncharitable fail to see; the loyal friend will focus on ways to help that a mere companion will not detect (Pring, 2004: 247).

The main claim made here is that how researchers approach moral discussion depends on the type of person they are or the propensity they have to act or react in a certain way as opposed to another. Pring suggested that for researchers to successfully reconcile opposing principles, rules, or regulations using their virtues, they should focus on their dispositions or virtues. However, the author cautions that improving the researchers' virtue could not be effective if:

(a) Government policies and practices increasingly control those social and personal virtues; (b) there is unsupportive social context to personal virtues, and (c) there is no virtues research community that requires the necessary virtues from its members and encourages the practice of it (Pring, 2004: 259-260).

With all of the aforementioned justifications, it was concluded that the book has merit since it addresses the most important aspect of research ethics, which calls for the highest caliber of moral and intellectual virtue. The book discusses the significance of adding such moral and intellectual virtues in addition to the practice of following research principles to maximize the benefits of research for the researcher, the researched, and the larger

community. The book offers concrete examples that clearly and logically explain the case for the necessity to apply moral and intellectual virtues in research ethics while also stressing the need of doing so. But the author also acknowledged that integrating and balancing moral and intellectual values into research ethics is not a straightforward process. The author hopes that by doing this, we will be reminded of the need for thorough, cautious, and patient methods and efforts that are crucial to cultivating moral and intellectual virtues to work under research principles, codes, or standards.

THE FUTURE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Pring focused on two topics in the final chapter to synthesize the main points of part three of the book: the context of educational research and its future directions. In the initial instance, the author contended on the existing contexts in that:

(a) The government and its agencies are not interested, generally speaking, in research or in evidence-based - despite claims to the contrary; (b) There is too much fragmented and low-level research to serve a purpose as it might, either professionally or in policy terms, and (c) The changing shape of higher education will inevitably lead to a hierarchy of institutions in terms of research funding, academic status, and research students (Pring, 2004:263-265).

Pring suggested two solutions for the situations mentioned above. In response to these three contexts, he claimed that (a) a review of the institutional and financial foundations of research is necessary, and (b) a review of the quality assurance mechanisms for the research, particularly the peer review of important journals, is essential to ensure professional, academic, and political confidence in the reporting of research. The book's strongest argument is that it recognizes the current contextual issues in educational research and suggests answers to those issues. However, the book's drawback in this regard is that it only suggests remedies that apply exclusively to the British environment. In other sections of the book, the author argues covering the broader areas of the philosophy of education, particularly in the cases of educational research. However, in proposing the way forward, the author limited the discussion to the British Education Research Association (BERA) affiliated universities. In addition, in contrast to earlier chapters, the author doesn't discuss philosophical topics in the final chapter. Based on his research expertise, he simply offered his suggestion. Of course, this is not an issue in and of itself. However, as the focus of the book is on educational philosophy, readers may anticipate philosophical arguments in each of the chapters.

However, the author does not discuss these philosophical arguments in the final portion of the book.

CONCLUSION

In general, it was thought that the book is valuable for anybody interested in education, especially practitioners and researchers. The author's constant ideas regarding educational theory, goals, and the effects on both the nature and conduct of educational research are reflected in the book. The book also demonstrates the following characteristics in addition to the strengths and limitations that we covered in each section of the main body of the paper: The author first clarifies his point of view by using illustrative examples, then supports each line of argument with adequate and pertinent empirical evidence and sources. Next, the author indicates the implications of each philosophical argument for research and practice. Third, he thoroughly shows the critics of educational research as many times as he can. Finally, the author describes a novel approach to the ethics of educational research (vitreous researchers). Despite these positive traits, the book has certain shortcomings, first, related to the use of difficult language. Although the writing may be plainer and a better representation of British culture, this may not hold for readers in other nations, especially those who are not natives. Second, we noticed some needless repetition of ideas or notions in the five chapters that were viewed.

Readers might find this awkward. Third, even though the author makes a significant effort to examine the shortcomings of research in the field of education, his dedication to demonstrating ways in which the tarnished reputation of educational research might be improved falls well short. Overall, this excellent work on educational research and related issues deserves praise because its strengths outweigh the flaws. In this regard, despite the fact that our deliberate selection of only part three prevents our article from giving a thorough and complete picture of all the chapters of the book, we nevertheless think that it will offer some insights to the academic discourse on the topic. Particularly, those who have not read the book yet will learn from our critiques about its good qualities and limitations.

Others, who may have more in-depth knowledge of the subject, will begin writing their books using the constraints mentioned as a starting point. Still, other people may develop viewpoints on the book that are distinct from our own.

Hence, we encourage all the interested and concerned educators to read such a remarkable work and review the whole chapters of the book to come up with better insights and comprehensive lessons essential to practitioners and more academic discussions on the area.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- Altheide DL, Johnson JM (1994). Criteria for assessing interpretive validity in qualitative research. In: Denzin NK, Lincoln, YS (eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications pp. 485-499.
- Berger PL, Luckmann T (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Guba EG, Lincoln YS (1989). *Fourth Generation Evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Guba EG, Lincoln YS (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In: N. K. Denzin YS, Lincoln (eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage pp. 105-117.
- Kuzel AJ, Like RC (1991). Standards of trustworthiness for qualitative studies in primary care. In: PG Norton, M Steward, F Tudiver, MJ Bass, EV Dunn (eds.), *Primary Care Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications pp.138-158.
- Noddings N (2015). *Philosophy of education (4th Ed.)*. New York: Routledge.
- Owens RG (2004). *Organizational behavior in education: Adaptive leadership and school reform (8th Ed.)*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Pring R (2004). *Philosophy of Education: Aims, Theory, Common Sense and Research*. London: Continuum.
- Secker J, Wimbush E, Watson J, Milburn K (1995). Qualitative methods in health promotion research: Some criteria for quality. *Health Education Journal* 54(1):74-87.
- Smith JK (1983). Quantitative versus qualitative research: An attempt to clarify the issue. *Educational Researcher* 12(3):6-13.