



Extirpation of the scholarly profession in pedagogy

ABSTRACT: Bogusław Śliwerski, *Extirpation of the scholarly profession in pedagogy*. Interdisciplinary Contexts of Special Pedagogy, no. 25, Poznań 2019. Pp. 13-31. Adam Mickiewicz University Press. ISSN 2300-391X. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14746/ikps.2019.25.01>

In the article I am dealing with the issue of unscientific depreciation of pedagogy as a science, which manifests itself either in the lack of reliable scientific criticism of dissertations in this discipline or the escape of some educators into politics to implement their own social intervention projects. The dispute about the scientific nature of pedagogy arises from various research traditions, scientific schools, so the author presents several such methodological approaches, whose creators emphasize the criteria of scientificity and indicate the resulting limitations and their incompatibility. Meanwhile, self-awareness of the academic criteria of pedagogy is important in the way of reviewing the scientific achievements of young academic staff. Based on reviews in post-habilitation proceedings, I present various types of arguments in favor of the unscientific status of someone's research and the reaction of those whose publications are reviewed.

KEY WORDS: science studies, methodology of scientific research, scientific criticism, scientific argumentation, pedagogy, resistance to criticism

Extirpation is a medical term, and more precisely - a dentistry one, as it means the rooting out, the complete extraction of an organ. However, it has one more meaning, one related to the extirpa-

tor, a cultivator used to erase the weeds and to scarify the soil. In the linguist circles we already see a phenomenon of the (...) *out-voting of scholars that offer a better calibrated scholarly materials (not mentioning sheer extirpating action)* (P. Wierzchoń 2009, s. 17) as an exceptionally unreasonable activity. I intend to examine the institutional, academic pedagogy, as a scholarly environment, that faces internally contradicting tasks.

On the one hand, every professor of academic pedagogy intends to ensure the highest possible scholarly level, and the education of those who just enter the path of the scholarly profession. However, on the other hand – apart from “scarifying own soil with science” to – preventively act against the appearance of “husks” and to root out “weeds” at the right moment. I am aware, that the metaphor is not friendly, probably as the visit at the dentist for some. However, one must notice the inflammatory condition of our circles, in order to stop tolerating it, to heal it in the short run with parapharmaceuticals, as, according to the closest parametric evaluation of the pedagogy as a scientific discipline, per analogiam for the patient, it may be unable to continue life.

Here, I do not intend to demand the scientific work ethos, as Polish pedagogy parted ways with it to a large degree, a few dozen years ago. Paradoxically, during the totalitarian period, it caused more sensitivity, and the feeling of obligation towards its internalisation among the scholars, than it is during the period of freedom started in 1990 with the post-socialist act on higher education. The subsequent generations of academic teachers focused in their publications, on arguing that pedagogy is a science, and on to what degree, and aspect it cooperates with other disciplines, but the more the mass access to academic education increased, i.e. the demand for lecturers that ensure the staff minimum, the more the senior academic staff members, would turn their eyes from the extirpation of science from our discipline, including the institutional. A UoI, i.e. a University of Ignorance, could be established in every town, as it was the most profitable business in the public sphere.

More than 100 thousand scholars are employed in Poland, in more than 1600 academic entities, which, according to Hubert Izdebski, do not perform scholarly work, but scholarly production, as the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, had qualified more than 2 thousand journals as scientific. More than 10 thousand scientific books are published yearly. *It is accompanied by the increase of the mediocrity of the level of scientific works (...) which must result in the quality itself (there are reasons to speak of the 'littering of the world with scientific overproduction, or, more accurately, quasi-production'), and this in turn results in side-effects in the of scientific dishonesty of varying forms* (H. Izdebski, 2018, s. 11). The ethos of academic science in a Humboldtian aspect, transforms into an ethos of corporate, service, enterprise, commercialised science, departing from the autotelic values of scientific research, that is subjected to massification, egalitarianism, and the globalisation of higher education. However – as Leszek Kołakowski stated – the logic of thought is different from the logic of interest (after: H. Izdebski, p. 138).

Someone would say that there is no reason to formulate claims for the scientification of pedagogy, as, from Johann Friedrich Herbart, the fact that pedagogy is a science, is universal knowledge on our continent. However, from the methodological viewpoint, the humanities and social sciences in the 21st century stand before a dilemma of justifying own scientific nature, not in a historical, administrative-legal, social, or institutional aspect, but in the methodological one. The matter at hand is the imperative of meeting the methodological criteria that are appropriate for the contemporary social sciences and humanities, that without a doubt are different from natural, technical or strict sciences, and have no chances of achieving their scientific status. What brings pedagogy closer to medical sciences, technical or other social sciences, it its application character, orientating its achievements towards a broadly perceived pedagogical, educational, and upbringing practice, directly and indirectly serving people, regardless of their age and other instrumental, or cultural features. Our discipline must serve practice, however, it should also go beyond the common knowledge on

upbringing and schooling, and, with the use of the conducted empirical studies, create an appropriately grounded knowledge, that may, but does not have to have a practical application. What is important, that it should allow to describe and explain phenomena, events or processes, that are not visible to laymen, but allow some of them to understand them, and allow the educated to project the subsequent research.

As in the case of legal sciences (...) *three words of the legislator, may trash entire legal libraries* (H. Izdebski, 2018, p. 36), the ideological war of the authorities with one of the normative pedagogies may, for a period of time, render its constitutive sources useless, or – as in the case of a totalitarian country – render them censored, partially or entirely. The authorities, who intend to use pedagogy, or a different social science to steer the society, to manipulate the society for the purpose of accomplishing own political and ideological interest, expect the submission of science to the ideology of the party of power by applying e.g. economic instruments, and desire to fuse science with the only true ideology of the “better sort”. The accomplishment of the axio-normative function by science is unequivocal with performing it, when it appears in an ideological form.

Therefore, some scholars, following science determined as such, accept positions in the government or for the government, in order to announce an ideological truth and indoctrinate the society starting with children and youth, and ending with their parents and family members, instead of pursuing and discovering the real truth. *However, fulfilling the ideological function cannot be considered as doing science. This could be the peak of science only in an official science of totalitarian countries, in essence identical with the ideology. The ideological function of science cannot be identified with its axiological determinants, that do not have to, and should not stand in the way of practising its appropriate, traditional epistemic virtues* (H. Izdebski, 2018, pp. 96-97). The social sciences and humanities are particularly prone to the authorities’ intervention, if the position assumed by the scholars is incoherent with the interest of the government in power with a populist orientation, i.e. a government that rejects the results of

scientific studies that question the sense of the reforms, or, of the changes in legal regulation. *Additionally, this may become a point of reference for some scientists, who, in order to speed up their careers, will question the position of their elder colleagues due to essentially non-scientific reasons (...)* (Izdebski, s. 122).

The scientific criteria

The common criterion in the procedures of granting all scientific degrees, is the expert agreement about the scientific nature of these dissertations, which are characterised by an independent, original solution to a scientific issue. An original work is a work, that contributes something new to the existing state of the science represented by the scholar. However, this feature is so general, that the new contribution to science may be almost everything, that was not previously presented or published in the form and content given by the author. The lawyers are right to note that (...) *the higher the level of dishonesty, the lesser the level of the scientific level of a given "scientific production"* (...). (H. Izdebski, s. 143)

Table 1. The criteria of the scientific character of pedagogical studies (source: own research)

Author	Criterion	Self-awareness of the limitations
The paradigm of quantitative studies		
Heliodor Muszyński	<p>Scientific knowledge is a type of knowledge, that expands beyond the current moment, current situation, and beyond individual experience. It is, and at least it may be a common property of people, informing them of something relevant regarding the world. (H. Muszyński 2018, p. 17).</p> <p>Three ranges of scientific knowledge, depending on the degree of its applicability: 1) very high degree (for the general range); middle degree of applicability (e.g. on a national range, or at a given time), 3) low degree (e.g.</p>	<p>In the relations between people, not everything is empirically available, particularly, as it refers to the spiritual sphere of a person. There is no way of identifying all the factors that determine the human behaviour, or assume control over them.</p> <p>One cannot apprehend the reactions and behaviour of people, into laws without exceptions, but only in probabilistic propositions. Educational phenomena are unique and contextual, and so one is unable to generalise the knowledge on them.</p>

Author	Criterion	Self-awareness of the limitations
The paradigm of quantitative studies		
Heliodor Muszyński	<p>in a given institution or even a group, or an organisational unit). Scientific knowledge is a certain knowledge that gives a high level of certainty, that its claims are in accordance with the actual state, therefore – it causes our trust (Ibidem); it is a reliable knowledge, empirically confirmed, therefore, it is infallible.</p>	
Krzysztof Rubacha	<p>A scientific study is (...) regulated by the norms created by the community of scholars (Rubacha 2008, p. 9) (...) quantitative studies, the results of which are a consequence of the statistical analyses performed on data in form of figures, they serve the purpose of formulating general regularities referred to a particular population. On their basis, one may formulate and verify the theoretical propositions. The more verifications can a given proposition “handle”, the broader the range of explanation it gains. (Rubacha 2008, p. 10) Quantitative studies serve the purpose of building a theory of a range referred to a population, therefore a rather wide one. (p. 23)</p>	<p>The probabilistic character of the explanations, results in the fact, that we do not gain, the so called complete interdependencies; the theory denotes the limitations of the study, it enforces the schema of scholarly proceeding and the categories, to which the study must answer. Pedagogy does not create a theory on the object of its studies, reducing them solely to a range referred to the diagnosed population. Practical studies do not serve the development of science, but the development of educational practice. (p. 25) (...) generally, education can do well without science, e.g. pedagogy, psychology or social sciences. The remark (...) allows to understand that science does not create educational practice, but can only regulate it, or – from its own point of view – regulate its course. (p. 26)</p>
Krzysztof Konarzewski	<p>The scientific study results from the curiosity of the phenomenon, their understanding and synthetic apprehension. Here, the strict scholarly proceeding is in motion, a clear and unambiguous language, almost obsessed control of each phases of the scholarly proceeding, and enabling their repetition. <i>The scholar serves no cause other than the matters of cognition. He renounced the conscious manipulation of data in order to prove a previously assumed thesis, he tries to identify the stereotypes in own thinking, and stops himself from valuating the examined objects. However, he feels responsible for the consequences resulting from conducting research, and announcing their results.</i> (Konarzewski 2000, p. 8) The study must be credible due to the application of instruments of a determined reliability</p>	<p>The lack of knowledge regarding the object of study, the scholar’s inability to agree with himself, whether how he understands the object of own research, what he wants to achieve by the research, how he justifies his methods and study techniques. Evading confrontation of own project with other scholars-specialists. The awareness of the possible omission of facts, or not seeing their association with concepts. The feeling of uncertainty, whether the regularity established by the scholar is not ruled by a factor, previously unconsidered. (...) in social sciences the correlation indicators are never close to unification (...). (p. 37)</p>

Author	Criterion	Self-awareness of the limitations
The paradigm of quantitative studies		
	and accuracy, and the strict observation of the scholarly procedure.	
Wladyslaw Zaczynski	<p><i>The scientific study is a multi-phase process of varied activities in order to provide us with objective, accurate, and comprehensive cognition of a given element of natural, social or cultural reality. (Zaczynski 1980, p. 9)</i></p> <p><i>The scientific results consist of the knowledge of pedagogical facts 1 – described in a profound way, in the entire abundance of its features and the circumstances of occurrence, regarding time, place, and conditions; 2 – ordered in appropriate classes based on the identified common features; 3 – explained by showing their interdependencies. (ibidem p. 11)</i></p> <p>Scholarly proceeding must be subject to rigorously effective methodological procedures.</p>	Pedagogy is dedicated to very complex phenomena (upbringing, schooling, etc.) that cannot be demonstrated in a satisfactory way, due to the insufficient surplus of facts, and the insufficient capabilities of reaching them. The danger of receiving <i>subjectively “bent reality images in research.</i> (p. 15)
Marian Nowak	<p><i>Pedagogy is a philosophically-empirically-practical science, with an enormous assortment of particular concepts and their tradition in the history of the development of scientific methodologies (...) Above all, it is a humanities’ science, thus, to a degree, it is required to display a certain attitude and a certain selection of proper scholarly procedures. (M. Nowak 2010, p. 15) A scholar obtains knowledge that is almost objective in the result of respecting certain regularities, norms and means of establishing relations (p. 17) in the study process.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, pedagogy is not a rigorously scientific knowledge in a positivist sense, divided and functioning in accordance with defined rules, but it is a certain dynamic knowledge, which places sense on events considered from a certain epistemological perspective. (p. 27)</i></p>	<p>Due to the complexity of the phenomena in the open human world (...) <i>the scientific studies, also empirical, are much more complex, and more problematic than one would have seemed. Due to such complexity, they cannot be as objective. (p. 16)</i></p> <p>Empirical research is realistic-probabilistic, considering various perspectives.</p>
Tadeusz Lewowicki	<p><i>The continuous reason for dilemma, remains the “independence” of the methodology of pedagogy (abundant with imports from methodologies of varying sciences) and – particularly “the scholarly maturity” of pedagogy (compared to – in accordance with the scientific approach – with “strict sciences”). (T. Lewowicki 1995, p. 12)</i></p>	<p><i>The understanding of pedagogy remains ambiguous. Contrary to the majority of sciences or scholarly disciplines, there is no at least general, but universally accepted definition of it, it is not defined in a way that would situate it among the sciences (or beyond them). (...) Various weaknesses of pedagogy (and its methodology encourage a signi-</i></p>

Author	Criterion	Self-awareness of the limitations
The paradigm of quantitative studies		
Tadeusz Lewowicki		<i>significant number of pedagogues, and even more, the representatives of other sciences, to treat pedagogy more like a specific technology, a discipline that is dedicated to the practical application of the elements of knowledge of other sciences and – what is worse – the elements of politics and ideologies. In such definition, pedagogy is an area of the practice of social life, but is not seen as a science. (T. Lewowicki 1995, p. 12)</i>

The analysis the postdoctoral proceedings in the pedagogy discipline in Poland, shows that the level of science in science is getting lesser, not because 1) the academics have no access to the source literature on the methodology of social studies, or 2) due to the lack of knowledge regarding what pedagogy is as a science, or 3) because they lack knowledge, but of the lack of the self-education effort, the methodological self-awareness, as they make fundamental mistakes in their scientific studies. Therefore, it would be difficult for the situation to not result with a pedagogical “sad layer”, if some components were not fresh, were not selected carefully, or were combined in wrong proportions, or, mixed in the wrong order. With concern, I examine the students’ mistakes in scholarly procedures, in the conceptualisation of studies, or in the way of realising them, as well as, of discussing them by persons, who had already received the doctoral degree, and even a professor’s title in humanities or social science, within the pedagogy discipline. They ridicule not only themselves, but they disgrace our discipline and the academic units they represent.

So what motivates academic and titular professors, when they review someone’s scholarly accomplishments? Some write about their opinions directly, and the majority would probably agree with the criteria of the substantive evaluation of someone’s accomplishments: “(...) *I will answer three questions: what does the Postdoctoral Candidate study, and how does it fit into the scientific discipline? How does the Postdoctoral Candidate perform the study? Eventually, where*

does the Postdoctoral candidate present his research findings, in what form and in what language? (...) an essential point of reference for the formulated opinions will be the accordance of the conducted research with the identity of the listed discipline. The identity consists of four elements: 1) the object of research, 2) the theories and schools of thought, 3) the study methods; 4) the conceptual system, therefore, the language of the discipline. One must highlight, that it is imperative to treat aforementioned four elements, that constitute the identity of the scientific discipline, in an integrated manner." For some reviewers, in the evaluation of the accomplishments of the postdoctoral candidate, is the active participation in scientific conferences, and particularly, in international conferences.

No one would believe, that quasi-scientific dissertations, scientific slops, are created, and published in the printing houses of the Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, the Jagiellonian University, the Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, the Maria Curie Skłodowska University in Lublin, the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, the Pedagogical University of Cracow, the University of Gdańsk, the University of Łódź, the University of Silesia, the University of Szczecin, the University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, the University of Warsaw, the University of Wrocław, the University of Zielona Góra (the order is alphabetical). Obviously, great works are also written and published there, however, we are facing increased displays of tolerance regarding pathologies, or even their legitimisation, in result of the decisions of the by the unit councils' decisions on giving the postdoctoral title to persons that in no way meet at least the statutory requirements. Reading the reviews of some professors we may – in result of examining the evaluated accomplishments – conclude that they, for own reasons, assume the devil's advocate position, simply to second the application, and to vote in favour of conferring the scientific degree to a person who has little to do with science.

Within the process of reviewing the scientific accomplishments of the postdoctoral candidates, the phenomenon of pedagogizing pathologies and quasi-sciences occurs, by academic and titular professors, who use various arguments, such as:

- the education argument: *“she will learn sooner or later”*; However, it is imperative for the postdoctoral candidate for the role of an “independent” senior staff member, a teacher of upcoming generations, to work on her methodological culture in studies.
- the social-geragogical argument: *“he is at such an age, that no harm will be done”*;
- narrow competency argument: *“he knows English”*, *“he has been working here for so long”*, *“he knows statistics”*; *“His accomplishments are modest in terms of publications. However, in general, his work was published in a leading world renowned journal from the given discipline. On the other hand, his accomplishments are entirely in English, therefore it is accessible to scholars worldwide”*.
- environment argument: *“he is in such good scholarly circles”*;
- perverse argument: *“the more someone criticises, the more I am in favour of the postdoctoral candidate”*;
- quasi-methodological argument: *“(…) however it has once again failed to reflect in the scholarly premises, discussing the subject in the monograph...; Refers to the scholarly trends present in the country. (...) in a matter not entirely realised in accordance with the adopted assumptions, however it contributes to the research within the given subject.*
- an argument that justifies the postdoctoral candidate: *“The author of the research realises this flaw, as, in a certain place, she argues (...), however it is not a convincing argument”*; *“The subject examined within the monograph cannot be ascribed to the leading or priority studies in Poland, however, that does not mean, that the discussed subject is deprived of cognitive value or practical usefulness.*
- the self-justifying argument of the reviewer: *“I know that it is difficult to formulate critical remarks regarding a dissertation being an attempt to solve a difficult scholarly issue. Therefore, the presented remarks to the empirical sections, are not aiming to depreciate the discussed publication. It is more of an attempt to alert the postdoctoral candidate to certain issue, if she intends to continue the studies regarding the subject in the future”*; Despite the lack of “clarity” of this criterion, and the previous critical remarks, I wish to highlight

that the postdoctoral candidate's accomplishments, meet the requirements of a significant contribution to the development of the discipline; "Despite the references being fragmentary, and consider the research results to a lesser degree, they provide a proper background for data presented later on...".

- *an argument that covers auto-plagiarism or plagiarism: "I will not discuss the articles, that are dedicated to the subject similar to that discussed in my postdoctoral book; Within the postdoctoral candidates, the publications in English deserve words of criticism. They are a rather accurate translation – in terms of contents – of works published previously or simultaneously in Polish. (...) If you want to appear in the international forum with your publication, you should be more careful in submitting your articles, and take care of their better language quality; "The book is theoretical and empirical, it is the crowning of the postdoctoral candidate's scientific-scholarly work, within the framework of the given discipline (partially examined and published by Her in different sources); "the published article ... is a re-examination of the data presented in section 1 and 3 of the monograph. Within the context of the modest number of the postdoctoral candidate's works, it is difficult to consider the text as an entirely independent publication.*
- *advisory, publishing argument: "The issue deserved an additional section in the monograph – the value of the issue deserves it".*
- *quantitative argument (by weight): "Summarising the published works (...) I would like to highlight, that despite the fact that it is not quantitatively extensive, each of her publications (both original and in co-authorship) is a significant contribution to the discipline; "However, quantitatively, the presentation of the research results at conferences and scientific symposiums, is decent, however, one must notice, that the majority of them was held at her University; My concerns are raised by the very modest amount of published works, and no independent publications;*
- *the shortcoming reduction argument: "However, regardless of the remarks about the lack of consequence, and the lack of precision regarding the categories applied in the section titles, one must state,*

that it is a thoughtful scholarly idea; "Apart from listing the names of authors, whose publications were useful for the monograph, the introduction lacked a more comprehensive study of the state of research, and of determining how the reviewed monograph stands out in comparison to the existing research"; In favour of the author, I consider the doubts regarding the paucity of the theoretical basis of the work, indeed the volume of the theoretical section, in comparison to the analytical, looks unfavourable. However, must the author prove own competencies in regard to theory in a postdoctoral dissertation? Does it not suffice, that he sketches out the theoretical context and present the conceptual system of the dissertation, as in the book? Some authors treat the theoretical sections as a specific "obligatory course", which serves the purpose of displaying knowledge regarding theory. Then, it happens, that the erudite presentation of the theory is not applied in the analytical part of the work. (...) The author abandoned the tedious overview of the theoretical positions, probably hoping to address not only the academic reader, but also seeking readers among practitioners."

- *the error-reducing argument: "The number of research hypotheses subject to verification seems to be too large. (...) A certain issue, that affects the quality of the conducted analysis, is the lack of a consequent application of the principle of going from the general to the particular; one must highlight, that the methodological aspect of the work is its rather significant weakness. However, that does not mean, that the dissertation deserves criticism. The postdoctoral candidate is aware of the study methods, and surely, is able to apply some of them well; "The determinations made by the author, surely possess substantial practical value, their cognitive value is not as obvious. Primarily – the claim which the candidate presents in the introduction – in her studies, she did not display theoretical ambitions, limiting herself to the comprehensive description of the practical issue that interests her; In my opinion, the monograph is not consistent in quality: it is great empirically, and significantly worse in the theoretical aspect (a narrow apprehension of the phenomenon, sporadic mistaking of terms). "The postdoctoral candidate, by con-*

structuring models and explanations, did not refer to the source literature to a satisfactory degree, and even if he did the aforementioned, the references were general.

- *the argument of transferring responsibility to others: “A certain explanation – however, not a justification – of the erroneous thinking of the X analysis, may be the reference, made by the candidate, to a certain handbook, in which the method is wrongly interpreted.*
- *the argument of the alleged value and appeal of the dissertation: “the analysis of the reviewed considerations is aided and made more appealing by the 14 tables, despite the fact, that they were created by other authors”; Many of the remarks made by the author of the reviewed work, should be considered as accurate. While, in a majority of cases, they are not Her scientific discoveries, it is valuable that He learns them by means of a comprehensive analysis of the presented phenomena, and processes, displaying knowledge, demonstration skills, the knowledge of life, and the awareness of its complexity; Not all conceptual innovations of the Postdoctoral Candidate deserve recognition. However all his semantic innovations are backed with a profound understanding of the functioning of the particular mechanisms.*
- *the ad infinitum argument: “Despite the fact, that the examined issue has received much interest and was examined on numerous times, the dynamics of the processes that cause the phenomenon, or are its consequence cause the results of the research results to become out of date quickly. This require to continue or conduct a new type of efforts to verify the existing results, and to continuously update the examined processes.*
- *a ingratiation-deconspiring argument: “In his postdoctoral dissertation the candidate considers himself not only an author, but also a reviewer, i.a. writing about the “comprehensive analysis”, “accurate conclusions”, “profound observation”, “accurately selected research methods”, etc.”*
- *the “basically” and essential contribution argument: “Basically, the author answers satisfactory to the questions presented in the introduction, however...”; “The postdoctoral book should be considered*

as an essential contribution to the scientific discussion about its title issue. It should be considered as a legitimate element in the application accomplishments leading to achieving scholarly independence.

- the organising argument: *“The complaint above, is of organising nature, indicating the necessity for scholarly care in regard to the biased presentist examinations of the X issue. Does that affect the truth behind the theses of the candidate? Paradoxically, no.”; “The indicated errors and inconsistencies, surely lower the scholarly level of the reviewed work, however, they do not nullify it.*
- etc.

Wojciech Pisula referred to the critical reviews, that negate the fundamental competencies and the scholarly level of the dissertation, and still end with a positive conclusion, as the “Polish reviews”, stating that it is phenomenon on a world scale. However, he is incorrect, as if he would examine the postdoctoral reviews from Slovakia, he would see, how low the level of scholarly proceedings can be (B. Śliwerski 2018).

The issues with the scholarly self-evaluation of academic teachers

The accomplishments of the scientist, submitted for evaluation in the proceeding for a degree or a scientific title, should meet the minimal standards of the scientific level, however, it is not defined by the law, and there is no agreement for it, from the circles of each of the scientific disciplines, particularly in humanities and social sciences. If such existed, none of the majors, doctors, or postdocs would appeal to the Central Committee, in a situation of receiving at least one negative review of their own scholarly accomplishments. However, there is a number of scientists with a very high self-evaluation, who appeal even when all three reviews are negative, and the remaining members of the postdoctoral committee vote in favour of refusing to give them the postdoctoral degree. In this case the degree of science in science is a result of the feeling of

(in-)justice. Such persons do not know the quote of Cicero, on laws: “(...) *the belief that all agreements and proclamations of various communities should be considered as just, is a display of utmost tomfoolery*” and “*if these laws were established only due to the will of the commonalty, or by the decision of the leaders, one could legitimise mugging, adultery, last will forging, if only the majority would vote in favour* (H. Izdebski, op. cit., p. 39).

Still, the moral flexibility perceived as such, is taking place “here and now”, in Polish universities, in 2018. There are sessions of the councils of scientific units, during which some of their participants, do not bother with the consequences of own decisions. It is enough to gain the support of minimum four members of the postdoctoral commission, to, contrary to facts, forget about science, and by immunising to criticism and foolishness, vote in favour of giving a title of the postdoc to a person who absolutely fails to meet not only the statutory, but also ethical requirements. Then, they will vote in favour of every, even the most absurd proposal, only to “fix” someone with a postdoc, because they have certain obligations in regard to the person, or his protectors. These are morally flexible, irresponsible persons, and that might be the way how they advanced within the academic environment. Corruption has different faces, not necessarily financial.

Yes, some provide postdoc degrees to doctors from own or other departments without caring about their own academic circles, as – to their understanding – they will not be affected. The council members, who de facto initiate a resolution about bestowing an academic title upon someone, may, during the presentation of the council, read a newspaper, engage in private conversations, evaluate the tests of students or PhD students, etc. They don’t have to analyse anything any more. They are like the parliament representatives of the party of power, that are subject to the academic “discipline”, and instead of discussing, they are to defend their position against all odds. The fact, that arithmetically someone is IN FAVOUR, does not necessarily mean the TRUTH about the actual state of the accomplishments of a postdoctoral candidate. Additionally,

if, during the proceedings, there was “customarily” little time given to a given case, it will pass easily and painlessly. Everyone is in a hurry, and everyone wants to leave the hall. Who examined all the reviews between the council? Who wrote the protocol contents? The less people did it, the better for the candidate, but that is even better, because there will not be additional voices during the discussion. So easy. No reform will change this. We all know that. Instead of your academic accomplishments, the support of the senior academic teachers is important, also in such devalued councils. As Lech Witkowski wrote in the *“Applied Humanities”* („*Humanistyka stosowana*”) – “(...) *always, behind actions laid with good intentions, some evil lurks*” (L. Witkowski, 2017, p. 299).

The issues with criticism, i.e. the mechanism of sweet lemons

Some academic teachers believe, that the postdoc degree of a scientific title of a professor should be handed for everything but the scientific accomplishments. They do not understand and do not want to accept in their consciousness, that they must display necessary methodological and substantive competencies in the submitted scholarly achievements. How are we supposed to expect the future doctors or postdoctoral candidates to display original contributions to science, if we ourselves have contributed little? How is a person supposed to educate PhD students, if they have not conducted any meaningful scientific studies, and have not received funds for a scientific project, in a contest?! Why someone, who is a politician, a media commentator of events, and is a representative for the European Parliament, should be exempt from scientific requirements? Does playing such social roles constitute scientific qualification? What does it change if he submitted publications for evaluation, as the members of the postdoc commission, or the members of the faculty council would follow the good of science, and not the good of his media or political status?

As seems from the reviews of professors – the leading specialists on political science, within the previous term of the Central Commission for Degrees and Titles – the low scientific quality of persons appealing in regard to the refusal of giving them a title of a postdoc is apparent. These persons have not taken to their hearts and minds, that one should expect more from an author of a dissertation for the postdoctoral title, than from a student that writes a major. However, they choose the self-defence mechanism, with the inadequate, heightened self-evaluation. They communicate to the society, a feeling of injustice and they refuse the evaluations of the professors-reviewers. They do not bother to cite the critical fragments of the reviews of their dissertations, nor answer to them in a substantive way. The Polish science reform A.D. 2019, will save this people, as they, for different reasons, will be appointed professors of universities without having a postdoc. They will not have to be subject to the evaluation of the postdoctoral commission, as the postdoc will not be required.

Many fear criticism

It is untrue, that within the scientific circles, the scientific criticism is allowed. Criticism is the greatest hazard to those, whose actions contradict the law in motion, and the good customs. *Criticism is a statement, that within the comparable, the similar is different. The similar, however, different – is the aims of the actions on the one side, and the effects on the other. As the difference is large, and obvious, being a natural consequence of your intentional bungling (parasitism), and as – let us continue – the statement is, as is said, independent of You, you have found yourself in peril* (M. Karwat 1983, p. 109).

The critic is the mirror of those who forgot, what they were supposed, i.e. what they should do. Therefore, he excludes the explanation of reasons, that something has not occurred, or something couldn't be done, as he reminds the authorities about their duties and abolishes the foggy attempts to evade particular explanations.

The person who exercises power in an authoritarian way, not only does not need critique, but is clear in the fact that it does not play well with him. That person does not need reproach/reminding of what he was supposed to do, or what he promised to do (what she should have done), as he would allow his subordinates to remind him, that he hadn't done something that he couldn't or wouldn't do. Substantive, accurate and principle-based criticism of dissertations, becomes a hazard for the publishing reviewer, as it reveals his own, personal responsibility, although resulting from various motivations, but primarily, from his actions or the lack thereof.

What does the scientific community do when they notice that the true face of a dishonest professor was revealed? It fights the criticism and not the cause of the pathology, and eagerly. For years we have been getting used to the fact, in order to, if only possible, to not allow any criticism, excluding critics with various means, and tactics, or scaring off criticism so it would not appear. If a criticism appears, everything is done, simply not to accept it. *You can accomplish this in various forms: you can negate it, receive it as not criticism at all, as well as, act as if it wasn't there in the first place. You must lead to a situation in which it is no longer certain, whether the criticism is a fact* (M. Karwat, p. 113). Some attempt to deprive us of the critical right to criticism, or at least, efficiently question the possibility of criticism in given academic circumstances. If the aforementioned strategies were unsuccessful, the critic, *whom you failed to stop and incapacitate, must be destroyed (institutionally)* (M. Karwat, p. 114).

Young pedagogues, under the PAN Pedagogical Sciences Committee (Komitetu Nauk Pedagogicznych PAN), founded the "*Parezja*" ("*Parrhesia*") journal. Its editorial team assumed the premise, that it will provide the young scholars with the space to raise voice in important, actual issues, taken from the ethical perspective, as well as, the dialogue between pedagogy and other disciplines. They encourage polemics, to go beyond the narrow boundaries of scholarly areas, as well as, to combine the scientific methods. What is more important, they share critical remarks with the authors, regarding the structural, methodological, pragmatological, or even lin-

guistic issues found in submitted papers, that should be evaded (A. Korzeniecka-Bondar 2017). It is better to be wise before the event, so that the extirpation of the ethos of scholarly work will unnecessary.

Bibliography

- Izdebski H. (2018), *Ile jest nauki w nauce?*, Wolters Kluwer, Warszawa.
- Karwat M. (1983), *Poradnik pseudodziałacza*, Warszawa.
- Konarzewski K., *Jak uprawiać badania oświatowe. Metodologia praktyczna*, Warszawa, WSiP 2000.
- Korzeniecka-Bondar A. (2017), O trudnościach w pisaniu - uwagi na marginesie lektury tekstów przesłanych do redakcji „Parezji”, *Parezja*, vol. 2, pp. 127-137.
- Lewowicki T. (1995), *Dylematy metodologii pedagogiki*, [in:] *Dylematy metodologiczne pedagogiki*, (ed.) Tadeusz Lewowicki, Wydział Pedagogiczny Uniwersytetu warszawskiego, Instytut Pedagogiki Uniwersytetu Śląskiego - Filii w Cieszynie, Warszawa-Cieszyn.
- Muszyński H. (2018), *Metodologiczne vademecum badacza pedagoga*, Poznań: WN UAM.
- Nowak M. (2010), *Epistemologiczne, aksjologiczne i metodologiczne podstawy badań pedagogicznych*, [w:] *Podstawy metodologii badań w pedagogice*, red. Stanisław Palka, Gdańsk, GWP.
- Rubacha K., *Metodologia badań nad edukacją*, Warszawa, WAIp 2008.
- Śliwerski B. (2018). *Turystyka habilitacyjna Polaków na Słowację w latach 2006-2015*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź.
- Wierchoń P. (2009). *Dlaczego fotodokumentacja? Dlaczego chronologizacja? Dlaczego emendacja? Instalacja gazowa, parking podziemny i „odległość niezerowa”*, Instytut Językoznawstwa UAM Poznań.
- Witkowski L. (2017). *Humanistyka stosowana*, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”, Kraków.
- Zaczyński W., *Praca badawcza nauczyciela*, wyd. 3, Warszawa, WSiP 1980.