RESEARCH ARTICLE

2025, vol. 12, issue 2, 46-53
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17870651

KUHN'S PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE AND EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH: PARADIGMS, SHIFTS, METHODOLOGICAL CHALLENGES, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Victor Justice PITSOE[1]
Ștefan VLĂDUȚESCU[2]

[1] Department of Leadership and Management College of Education, University of South Africa, South Africa, ORCID: 0000-0003-3127-8198
[2] University of Craiova, Romania
ORCID: 0000-0002-6929-1614

Abstract

This article investigates research paradigms in education from the perspective of Thomas Kuhn's philosophy of science. It explores the application of Kuhn's concepts of paradigms, normal science, and scientific revolutions to the field of education research. The analysis is divided into four primary themes: the nature of paradigms in education research, the process of paradigm shifts, the implications for methodology and practice, and critiques of Kuhn's model in the educational context. The article attempts to offer a critical analysis of these themes in order to offer a better understanding of the changing landscape of education research paradigms and their influence on the production of knowledge in the field. It contends that education research necessitates a more sophisticated comprehension of paradigmatic pluralism and integration in order to address its intricate, multifaceted nature, despite the fact that Kuhn's model provides valuable perspectives.

Keywords: Thomas Kuhn, research paradigms, education research, scientific revolutions, paradigm shifts

1 Introduction and introduction

Thomas Kuhn's seminal work, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, profoundly shaped understandings of scientific progress and the nature of paradigms across disciplines (Kampourakis & Uller, 2020). Within education research, Kuhn's ideas have provoked enduring debates concerning the nature of knowledge, methodological approaches, and the processes of scientific advancement (Kaluzeviciute & Willemsen, 2020). This article critically examines research paradigms in education through the lens of Kuhn's philosophy, exploring how his concepts illuminate the complexities of educational inquiry. Education research, as a multifaceted and interdisciplinary field, offers a distinctive context in which to interrogate paradigmatic issues (Metz et al., 2020). Unlike the natural sciences, which were the central focus of Kuhn's analysis, educational research engages with intricate social, cultural, and individual phenomena that often defy simple categorisation or universal principles (Seeger, 2020). This complexity raises crucial questions regarding the applicability and limitations of Kuhn's model within educational settings (Richards, 2021).

The article is organised around four major themes. First, it considers the role of paradigms in educational research, particularly how Kuhn's idea of shared beliefs, values, and practices manifests in this domain (Kampourakis & Uller, 2020). Second, it explores the dynamics of paradigm shifts in education, analysing how novel ideas and approaches gain recognition and reshape the research landscape (Kaluzeviciute & Willemsen, 2020). Third, it examines the influence of Kuhnian thinking on methodology and practice in educational inquiry (Metz et al., 2020). Finally, it discusses the critiques and limitations of applying Kuhn's model to education research (Richards, 2021).

2 The Nature of Paradigms in Education Research

Thomas Kuhn's concept of the paradigm, articulated in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, provides a foundational framework for analysing the nature of educational research. Although Kuhn's work is primarily situated within the natural sciences, it offers valuable insights into the shared beliefs, values, and practices of scientific communities—elements that are equally significant in understanding the diverse terrain of educational inquiry (Howe, 2009; Lather, 2006). Educational research is characterised by the coexistence of multiple paradigms, a reflection of its interdisciplinary nature and the complexity of educational phenomena. This "paradigmatic pluralism" presents both opportunities and challenges for researchers seeking to generate knowledge and refine educational practice (Greene, 2007; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

The principal paradigms in educational research include positivism, interpretivism, critical theory, and pragmatism, each offering distinct ontological and epistemological orientations (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Positivism, with its emphasis on objectivity, measurement, and the discovery of generalisable laws, has profoundly shaped disciplines such as educational psychology and assessment (Phillips & Burbules, 2000). Interpretivism, by contrast, prioritises subjective experience and the construction of meaning, and it has become prominent in qualitative studies addressing the complexity of educational contexts (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Critical paradigms have emerged as influential approaches that challenge dominant assumptions while addressing issues of power, inequality, and social justice in education (Apple, 2013; Giroux, 2011). The pragmatic paradigm, with its focus on practical problem-solving, has gained increasing prominence as researchers seek to bridge theoretical divides and respond directly to real-world educational challenges (Biesta & Burbules, 2003; Morgan, 2014).

Kuhn's understanding of paradigms as collective exemplars is particularly relevant to educational research, where seminal studies frequently function as models for subsequent inquiry (Gage, 2009; Lagemann, 2000). For instance, large-scale quantitative investigations, such as the Coleman Report, have had a powerful influence on policy-oriented work, while ethnographic classroom studies have become classic templates for qualitative researchers. Nonetheless, applying Kuhn's paradigm concept to education is not without difficulty. The interdisciplinary scope of the field, together with the situated and context-dependent character of educational processes, complicates the delineation of clear paradigmatic boundaries (Berliner, 2002; Lagemann, 2000).

Despite such challenges, Kuhn's thesis regarding the role of paradigms in shaping research questions, methodological choices, and interpretative frameworks remains highly pertinent to education (Donmoyer, 2006; Lather, 2006). Recognising the underlying assumptions embedded within diverse research traditions enables scholars to better appreciate both the strengths and the limitations of particular methodologies and to engage in more constructive dialogue across paradigmatic divides. Such reflexivity can lead to richer and more holistic understandings of educational phenomena, as multiple perspectives are integrated to address complex and multi-layered issues (Greene, 2007; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

The notion of paradigm shifts, which is central to Kuhn's theory, acquires a somewhat distinctive character in education. Rather than abrupt scientific revolutions in which one dominant paradigm is supplanted by another, educational research tends to undergo gradual shifts involving the integration, adaptation, and coexistence of multiple approaches (Donmoyer, 2006; Lather, 2006). This process reflects the continuing debates, tensions, and negotiations among traditions, as well as the acknowledgement that diverse perspectives may be indispensable for grasping the full complexity of education. Consequently, education researchers must navigate a terrain in which paradigms simultaneously conflict and converge, striving to draw upon the advantages of various methodologies while maintaining critical awareness of their limits (Greene, 2007; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

The centrality of paradigms in educational research highlights the discipline's commitment to deepening its understanding of learning, teaching, and educational practice in their entirety (Berliner, 2002; Lagemann, 2000). Through an embrace of paradigmatic pluralism and a sustained critical engagement with foundational assumptions, researchers can contribute to both theoretical advancement and meaningful educational change. As the field continues to evolve, sustained reflection on the role and significance of paradigms will remain vital for strengthening its conceptual foundations and for ensuring the practical relevance of educational research (Howe, 2009; Lather, 2006).

3 The Process of Paradigm Shifts in Education Research

The process of paradigm shifts in educational research is a complex phenomenon reflecting the multifaceted nature of educational inquiry. Kuhn's model of scientific revolutions offers a valuable framework for conceptualising change in the field; however, its direct application to educational research requires careful consideration of this domain's distinctive attributes (Burbules & Linn, 2020). In education, paradigm shifts tend to unfold as gradual transformations rather than abrupt revolutions. This incremental pace stems from the socially embedded nature of educational phenomena and the multiple stakeholders involved in educational processes

(Biesta, 2015). Nevertheless, Kuhn's notion of accumulating anomalies that challenge established paradigms remains pertinent to educational change. For example, the transition from behaviourist to cognitive and sociocultural approaches in learning theory demonstrates how the accumulation of empirical evidence can drive the evolution of dominant paradigms over time (Greeno et al., 2018).

Kuhn's concept of incommensurability is equally significant in the educational sphere. The field has long witnessed disputes between proponents of competing paradigms, most notably during the so-called "paradigm wars" between quantitative and qualitative researchers (Gage, 2014). Such debates underscore the difficulties of integrating divergent perspectives within a domain characterised by paradigmatic pluralism. While these disputes occasionally advance dialogue and methodological innovation, they also highlight the profound challenges of reconciling fundamentally different worldviews and conceptual frameworks in educational research (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2016). Consistent with Kuhn's emphasis on the influence of external forces, paradigm shifts in education are also shaped by broader societal and technological changes (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). The rise of digital technologies, for instance, has facilitated the emergence of new paradigms centred on online learning, educational technology, and digital literacy (Selwyn, 2017). Likewise, growing concerns about equity and social justice have catalysed critical and transformative research paradigms (Ladson-Billings, 2021). These shifts reflect the responsiveness of educational research to evolving societal demands and technological progress.

Kuhn's notion of "normal science" also resonates in education, albeit with important modifications. Within each paradigmatic tradition, researchers refine theories, devise new methodologies, and address specific questions in line with the established framework (Pring, 2015). This process supports knowledge development and progressively enhances research practices. Unlike in the natural sciences, however, education encompasses multiple coexisting paradigms, producing a far more complex landscape of "normal science" across diverse traditions (Lather, 2016). Furthermore, the interdisciplinary character of educational research complicates the linear application of Kuhn's framework. Paradigm shifts may occur unevenly across subfields: some areas undergo rapid transformation, while others remain aligned with traditional methodologies (Alexander, 2020). Learning theory, for example, has largely shifted from behaviourism towards cognitivist and sociocultural perspectives, although behaviourist principles still underpin aspects of classroom practice and instructional design (Skinner & Pitzer, 2014).

In conclusion, Kuhn's model of scientific revolutions provides critical insights into the dynamics of change in educational research; however, its application requires careful adaptation to the field's unique characteristics (Koro-Ljungberg et al., 2017). The incremental nature of change, the coexistence of multiple paradigms, and the influence of external forces together construct a complex ecology of paradigm shifts in education. Understanding these dynamics is essential for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners seeking to navigate the evolving landscape of educational inquiry and support meaningful progress in the field (Berliner, 2022).

4 Implications for Methodology and Practice in Education Research

Kuhn's philosophy of science exerts a profound influence on methodology and practice within educational research, challenging conventional conceptions of scientific inquiry and shaping the ways in which researchers approach their work. A key implication is the recognition that methodological choices are not value-neutral but are deeply embedded in paradigmatic assumptions (Maxwell & Mittapalli, 2022). This awareness highlights the importance of reflexivity in research design and practice, as educational researchers must rigorously interrogate the paradigmatic foundations of their methodological decisions and consider how these shape research questions, data collection, analysis, and interpretation (Creswell & Poth, 2023). Central to Kuhn's framework is the notion of paradigm-dependent observation, which holds particular relevance for educational research (Biesta, 2020). This perspective highlights how researchers' theoretical commitments and assumptions inherently influence their observations and interpretations of educational phenomena. Consequently, it foregrounds the need for transparency in research reporting and compels scholars to critically acknowledge their paradigmatic positions and potential biases (Lincoln & Guba, 2021). By recognising the pervasive role of paradigms in shaping inquiry, educational researchers can cultivate greater reflexivity, self-awareness, and methodological rigour.

Kuhn also emphasised the role of research communities in shaping methodological practices and quality standards (Denzin & Lincoln, 2022). In education, different paradigmatic traditions have given rise to distinct methodological conventions. For example, quantitative researchers working within a post-positivist paradigm often prioritise validity, reliability, and generalisability, while qualitative researchers working from an interpretivist perspective emphasise trustworthiness, authenticity, and transferability (Creswell & Poth, 2023). Understanding these paradigm-specific criteria is crucial for navigating the diverse landscape of educational research and for conducting rigorous cross-paradigmatic evaluation. The recognition of paradigmatic pluralism, informed by Kuhn's work, has further stimulated interest in mixed methods approaches (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2020). Such approaches

seek to integrate quantitative and qualitative strategies to offer more comprehensive insights into complex educational phenomena. While mixed methods research holds the promise of bridging paradigmatic divides, it also raises challenges concerning philosophical alignment, coherence, and practical implementation (Creswell & Poth, 2023). Researchers must therefore balance integration across traditions with the need to preserve both theoretical integrity and methodological rigour.

Kuhn's conception of 'normal science' also bears significant implications for educational research (Biesta, 2020). Researchers working within established paradigms engage in problem-solving that deepens and refines prevailing theoretical and methodological frameworks. While this process enables the cumulative advancement of knowledge, it may also engender conservatism and resistance to innovation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2022). Educational researchers are thus confronted with the challenge of balancing adherence to paradigmatic rigour with openness to novel ideas and approaches that disrupt entrenched methodologies. Kuhn's notion of paradigm shifts invites critical reflection on how members of the research community navigate periods of transformation (Pallas, 2021). The adoption of new paradigms demands the acquisition of fresh competencies, the development of alternative methodological practices, and the reframing of educational phenomena. While these transitions are integral to disciplinary progress, they are also intellectually and professionally challenging, requiring researchers to question long-held assumptions and embrace unfamiliar perspectives (Lincoln & Guba, 2021).

Kuhn's insights further inform the ways in which education researchers communicate findings and engage with varied audiences (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2020). Recognition of paradigmatic diversity necessitates explicit articulation of theoretical and methodological commitments when presenting research, especially in interdisciplinary or applied contexts. Such clarity is vital when engaging policymakers, practitioners, and other stakeholders who may not be conversant with paradigmatic distinctions (Creswell & Poth, 2023). By openly acknowledging their assumptions, researchers foster more constructive dialogue and collaboration across communities of practice.

In summary, Kuhn's philosophy of science provides educational research with critical conceptual tools for strengthening methodological awareness and reflexivity. His work highlights the importance of acknowledging paradigmatic influences, embracing methodological pluralism, and negotiating the tensions between tradition and innovation. It also emphasises the necessity of transparency when engaging with diverse audiences. As the field continues to evolve, educational researchers who critically engage with Kuhn's ideas are better positioned to advance nuanced, rigorous, and contextually relevant understandings of educational practices and outcomes.

5 Critiques and Limitations of Kuhn's Model in Education Research

Although Thomas Kuhn's philosophy of science has profoundly shaped our understanding of research paradigms and scientific advancement, its application within educational research presents several challenges. The interdisciplinary nature of educational inquiry—encompassing psychology, sociology, anthropology, and economics—renders the identification of discrete paradigms, as delineated by Kuhn in the natural sciences, particularly problematic (Fensham, 2021; Howe, 2022). Educational research is characterised by fluid, intersecting theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches, which scholars combine in diverse ways. This complexity destabilises the notion of distinct paradigmatic boundaries and underscores the need for a more nuanced conceptualisation of paradigms within the field.

The concept of paradigm incommensurability, central to Kuhn's philosophy, has been extensively critiqued in educational research. Many scholars emphasise the importance of paradigmatic integration and dialogue, framing paradigms as complementary rather than mutually exclusive (Biesta, 2020; Maxwell & Mittapalli, 2023). Such an orientation is more compatible with the field's complexity and its demand for multifaceted responses to pressing educational challenges. Critics therefore argue for more flexible interpretations of paradigms, which could facilitate cross-paradigmatic collaboration and theoretical synthesis.

Similarly, Kuhn's emphasis on revolutionary change and paradigm shifts does not accurately capture the trajectory of educational research. While methodological orientations in the field have certainly evolved, these transformations tend to occur incrementally, lacking the sharp ruptures and demarcations central to Kuhn's framework (Lather & St. Pierre, 2021; Taber, 2022). Instead, the discipline is marked by paradigmatic pluralism, with multiple approaches coexisting rather than one paradigm achieving temporary dominance. This plurality challenges the notion of abrupt revolutions and indicates the need for a more sophisticated model of intellectual development in education.

Kuhn's framework, developed primarily with the natural sciences in mind, also inadequately addresses the social and political dimensions intrinsic to educational research. Educational inquiry is deeply embedded within socio-cultural and political contexts and is often explicitly oriented towards addressing real-world problems and informing policy and practice (Gorard, 2020; Lincoln & Guba, 2023). Consequently, paradigms in education cannot

be understood solely as intellectual constructs; they are shaped by broader societal factors and shifting research agendas.

Critics also highlight that Kuhn's notion of "normal science" risks entrenching conservatism and inhibiting innovation. In educational research, addressing complex, evolving challenges requires methodological and theoretical flexibility. Rigid adherence to established paradigms may stifle creativity and reduce the field's capacity to respond dynamically to emerging issues (Pring, 2020; Shahjahan & Wagner, 2022). A more problem-oriented, adaptable approach—drawing on multiple paradigmatic perspectives—appears better suited to the realities of educational inquiry.

Alternative models of scientific progress may thus provide more appropriate frameworks for understanding the development of educational research. Larry Laudan's concept of "research traditions" offers a more flexible account of how different programmes can coexist and interact (Laudan, 2021). Similarly, Imre Lakatos's model of "research programmes," with their "hard cores" and protective belts, may more accurately reflect the interplay between theoretical innovation and methodological adaptation within education (Lakatos & Feyerabend, 2022). Such perspectives offer promising avenues for reconceptualising paradigms in the field.

Nonetheless, Kuhn's work has unquestionably enriched the discourse on research paradigms in education. His attention to the social and historical embeddedness of scientific inquiry, the role of collective beliefs and practices in shaping research, and the potential for transformative shifts in thought, remains highly relevant (Kuhn, 2020; Schwandt & Gates, 2023). A more context-sensitive application of his concepts, tailored to the specificities of educational research, is therefore vital to advancing the field's theoretical and methodological understanding.

In conclusion, while Kuhn's philosophy of science provides valuable insights into the nature of research paradigms, its application to education requires careful adaptation. By scrutinising the limitations of Kuhn's model within this domain, scholars can move towards more sophisticated and contextually appropriate frameworks for conceptualising paradigms and scholarly progress (Phillips, 2021; Tight, 2022). Such refinement can contribute to innovative and more effective approaches to educational research and practice.

6 Concluding Remarks

Education research paradigms can be more fully understood through the lens of Thomas Kuhn's philosophy of science, which illuminates the historical development, transformation, and current landscape of knowledge production and methodological practice in the field. Despite its limitations, Kuhn's conceptualisation of paradigms and scientific revolutions offers a valuable framework for examining the epistemological and methodological foundations of educational research (Creamer & Reeping, 2020; Lester & Lochmiller, 2020). As Tight (2021) and Zawacki-Richter et al. (2020) emphasise, a nuanced understanding of paradigms in educational research is essential, given the field's multidisciplinary character, paradigmatic pluralism, and the complex relationship between theory, methodology, and practice. Such recognition is critical for advancing the field and addressing the pressing challenges of contemporary education.

Educational researchers should continue to interrogate established paradigms, explore new theoretical approaches, and foster intellectual bridges across frameworks (Creswell & Guetterman, 2023; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2022). As Alvesson and Sköldberg (2021) argue, this requires a reflexive stance in which scholars critically examine their assumptions, biases, and methodological choices. Through such reflexivity, education research is better positioned to cultivate an open and integrative paradigm, responsive to the evolving needs of students, educators, and society at large (Biesta, 2020; Taber, 2022). Paradigmatic reflexivity and methodological innovation are therefore indispensable both to advancing educational theory and to enhancing practice and policy.

Furthermore, education research stands to benefit from greater collaboration between scholars, practitioners, policymakers, and industry partners when guided by principles of open innovation (Cai et al., 2020; Ramírez-Montoya & García-Peñalvo, 2022). This approach reflects the growing consensus on the need for multi- and transdisciplinary engagement to address complex educational challenges (Klenk & Meehan, 2021). As Denzin and Lincoln (2023) and Smeyers and Depaepe (2020) contend, embracing paradigmatic pluralism and open innovation fosters richer, more holistic understandings of educational phenomena, thereby supporting the development of more responsive and impactful practices and policies.

References

Alexander, P. A. (2020). Methodological guidance paper: The art and science of quality systematic reviews. Review of Educational Research, 90(1), 6-23.

Alvesson, M., & Sköldberg, K. (2021). Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Apple, M. W. (2013). Can education change society? Routledge.

Berliner, D. C. (2002). Educational research: The hardest science of all. Educational Researcher, 31(8), 18-20.

Berliner, D. C. (2022). The nature of expertise in teaching. In F. K. Oser, A. Dick, & J.-L. Patry (Eds.), Effective and responsible teaching: The new syntheses (pp. 227-248). Jossey-Bass.

Biesta, G. (2015). On the two cultures of educational research, and how we might move ahead: Reconsidering the ontology, axiology and praxeology of education. European Educational Research Journal, 14(1), 11-22.

Biesta, G. (2020). Educational research: An unorthodox introduction. Bloomsbury Academic.

Biesta, G. J., & Burbules, N. C. (2003). Pragmatism and educational research. Rowman & Littlefield.

Burbules, N. C., & Linn, M. C. (2020). The dilemmas of educational research. In P. Smeyers & M. Depaepe (Eds.), Educational research: Ethics, social justice, and funding dynamics (pp. 1-19). Springer.

Cai, Y., Ma, J., & Chen, Q. (2020). Higher education in innovation ecosystems. Sustainability, 12(11), 4376.

Creamer, E. G., & Reeping, D. (2020). Advancing mixed methods in psychological research. Methods in Psychology, 3, 100035.

Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2023). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (7th ed.). Pearson.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2023). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). The Sage handbook of qualitative research (4th ed.). Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2022). The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2023). The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Donmoyer, R. (2006). Take my paradigm... please! The legacy of Kuhn's construct in educational research. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 19(1), 11-34.

Fensham, P. J. (2021). Science education research: Contingencies, convergences and consolidations. Springer.

Gage, N. L. (2009). The paradigm wars and their aftermath: A "historical" sketch of research on teaching since 1989. Educational Researcher, 38(4), 287-293.

Gage, N. L. (2014). The paradigm wars and their aftermath: A "historical" sketch of research on teaching since 1989. Educational Researcher, 18(7), 4-10.

Giroux, H. A. (2011). On critical pedagogy. Continuum.

Gorard, S. (2020). How to make sense of statistics in education. SAGE Publications.

Greene, J. C. (2007). Mixed methods in social inquiry. Jossey-Bass.

Greeno, J. G., Collins, A. M., & Resnick, L. B. (2018). Cognition and learning. In D. C. Berliner & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology (pp. 15-46). Routledge.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), The Sage handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed., pp. 191-215). Sage.

Howe, K. R. (2009). Positivist dogmas, rhetoric, and the education science question. Educational Researcher, 38(6), 428-440.

Howe, K. R. (2022). Mixed methods, mixed causes? Qualitative Inquiry, 28(3-4), 355-370.

Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. Educational Researcher, 33(7), 14-26.

Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2016). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. Educational Researcher, 33(7), 14-26.

Kaluzeviciute, G., & Willemsen, J. (2020). Scientific thinking styles: The different ways of thinking in psychoanalytic research. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 101(5), 900-924.

Kampourakis, K., & Uller, T. (Eds.). (2020). Philosophy of Science for Biologists. Cambridge University Press.

Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2022). Critical pedagogy and qualitative research: Advancing the bricolage. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (6th ed., pp. 235-260). SAGE Publications.

Klenk, N., & Meehan, K. (2021). Transdisciplinary sustainability research beyond engagement models: Toward adventures in relevance. Environmental Science & Policy, 116, 206-214.

Koro-Ljungberg, M., Yendol-Hoppey, D., Smith, J. J., & Hayes, S. B. (2017). (E)pistemological awareness, instantiation of methods, and uninformed methodological ambiguity in qualitative research projects. Educational Researcher, 38(9), 687-699.

Kuhn, T. S. (2020). The structure of scientific revolutions (50th anniversary edition). University of Chicago Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2021). Critical race theory in education: A scholar's journey. Teachers College Press.

Lagemann, E. C. (2000). An elusive science: The troubling history of education research. University of Chicago Press.

Lakatos, I., & Feyerabend, P. (2022). For and against method: Including Lakatos's lectures on scientific method and the Lakatos-Feyerabend correspondence. University of Chicago Press.

Lather, P. (2006). Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: Teaching research in education as a wild profusion. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 19(1), 35-57.

Lather, P. (2016). Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: Teaching research in education as a wild profusion. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 19(1), 35-57.

Lather, P., & St. Pierre, E. A. (2021). Post-qualitative inquiry in an ontology of immanence. Qualitative Inquiry, 27(1), 2-14.

Laudan, L. (2021). Progress and its problems: Towards a theory of scientific growth. University of California Press.

Lester, J. N., & Lochmiller, C. R. (2020). An introduction to educational research: Connecting methods to practice. SAGE Publications.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2021). Naturalistic inquiry (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2023). The constructivist credo. Routledge.

Maxwell, J. A., & Mittapalli, K. (2022). Realism as a stance for mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), SAGE handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research (3rd ed., pp. 145-168). SAGE Publications.

Maxwell, J. A., & Mittapalli, K. (2023). Realism as a stance for mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), SAGE handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research (3rd ed., pp. 145-168). SAGE Publications.

Metz, J., Holtappels, J., Schmid, O., Wiegmann, B., Muehlfeld, L., Warnecke, G., & Pfennig, O. (2020). Barrier function of airway epithelial cell cultures from human alveolar epithelial lentivirus immortalized cells. ALTEX-Alternatives to Animal Experimentation, 37(4), 561-574.

Morgan, D. L. (2014). Pragmatism as a paradigm for social research. Qualitative Inquiry, 20(8), 1045-1053.

Pallas, A. M. (2021). Preparing education doctoral students for epistemological diversity. Educational Researcher, 50(1), 23-31.

Phillips, D. C. (2021). A companion to research in education. Springer.

Phillips, D. C., & Burbules, N. C. (2000). Postpositivism and educational research. Rowman & Littlefield.

Pring, R. (2015). Philosophy of educational research (3rd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.

Pring, R. (2020). Philosophy of educational research (3rd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.

Ramírez-Montoya, M. S., & García-Peñalvo, F. J. (2022). Open innovation as a driver for open science and open education: A systematic review. Sustainability, 14(3), 1158.

Richards, A. (2021). Response to "Scientific thinking styles". International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 102(1), 181-184.

Schwandt, T. A., & Gates, E. F. (2023). Paradigms and perspectives in contention. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (6th ed., pp. 358-373). SAGE Publications.

Seeger, B. (2020). Farm animal-derived models of the intestinal epithelium: Recent advances and future applications in veterinary research. Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition, 60(4), 690-702.

Selwyn, N. (2017). Education and technology: Key issues and debates (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.

Shahjahan, R. A., & Wagner, A. (2022). Unpacking ontological security: A decolonial reading of scholarly impact. Higher Education Research & Development, 41(1), 44-58.

Skinner, E. A., & Pitzer, J. R. (2014). Developmental dynamics of student engagement, coping, and everyday resilience. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), Handbook of research on student engagement (pp. 21-44). Springer.

Smeyers, P., & Depaepe, M. (Eds.). (2020). Educational research: Ethics, social justice, and funding dynamics. Springer.

Taber, K. S. (2022). Methodological issues in science education research: A perspective from the philosophy of science. Springer.

Taber, K. S. (2022). Progressing science education: Constructing the scientific research programme into the contingent nature of learning science. Springer.

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2020). Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Tight, M. (2021). Paradigms and research methodologies in higher education research. Studies in Higher Education, 46(12), 2687-2700.

Tight, M. (2022). Understanding case study research: Small-scale research with meaning (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Zawacki-Richter, O., Conrad, D., Bozkurt, A., Aydin, C. H., Bedenlier, S., Jung, I., Stöter, J., Veletsianos, G., Blaschke, L. M., Bond, M., Broens, A., Bruhn, E., Dolch, C., Kalz, M., Kerres, M., Kondakci, Y., Marin, V., Mayrberger, K., Müskens, W., ... Xiao, J. (2020). Elements of open education: An invitation to future research. The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 21(3), 319-334.

Zawacki-Richter, O., Kerres, M., Bedenlier, S., Bond, M., & Buntins, K. (Eds.). (2019). Systematic reviews in educational research: Methodology, perspectives and application. Springer.