

A) The epistemological origins of parties being compared should be examined: to examine the epistemological context of both sides of comparison is complicated but necessary. Simplificism in this issue leads to an unreasonable and aspect less comparison and an investigation in a vacuum.

B) Metaphysical origins of the two sides being compared should be considered: what is the origin of the philosophers' cosmology and Anthropology, what is their interpretation of human cognition? etc. are complex however important areas which are necessary to be considered in a comparative study.

C) The study of the works of the parties being compared: Since each philosopher's thought is manifested in his works, the exact study of the two philosophers' works who are being compared, causes a better understanding of them, and provides the possibility of criticizing their works and thoughts.

D) The study of the opposing views of the parties being compared: One of the important areas for understanding the ideas of each educational philosopher is the recognition of this issue: What views are those thoughts made against? The recognition of the opposing views is a hard and complex work without which comparison is not possible.

E) The study of the eras in which the parties being compared lived in: The dominant intellectual and cultural atmosphere of the period which a philosopher lived in would have a great effect on his way of thinking. Entering to the intellectual atmosphere of the philosopher's life era is a very complex work but without entering to it, comparison is not made.

F) The study of the language of the parties being compared: Language is one of the most challenging areas in the comparative study of philosophy of education. When the two parties being compared, speak different languages and therefore have thought differently, it is not possible to compare their ideas easily. Here are two important works that should be done: First, to understand the language of each party being compared and second, to create a common language that can invite them to discuss with each other. Given the above, it could be concluded that doing comparative study in the field of philosophy of education is a complex, technical and elegant work and lack of attention to the complexities of this area leads to apparentism and simplification and keeps researcher far from reaching the comparative study goals.

5. Conclusion and Discussion:

Comparative study in the philosophy of education is a complex procedure. Is complexity in the philosophy of education in general, and in comparative method in particular desirable or not? Is it a strength or weakness? Is it a satisfaction or dissatisfaction for the researchers in this field. Does it make the research process harder or easier? These questions and some other possible questions are the points which should be discussed in the comparative study of educational philosophy. Complexity of comparative research in philosophy of education is one of the strengths of this approach. The complexity of this method does not mean its difficulty but it means this method has many layers. The comparative researcher avoids apparentism, simplification and objectivity by assuming its complexity, and examines the various aspects of the subject. So, comparative researchers want this method to be complex in the field of philosophy of education because in this characteristic a more complete understanding of the parties being compared shall be occurred.

Simplifying the comparative study in the philosophy of education leads to reduction. The result is that comparison will seem to be a worthless neutral act and a comparative researcher will be considered as a technocrat. The comparison process also will be made mechanically and is done without effective attendance of the researcher and he will not have a valuable, effective influence on that. Accordingly, the result of comparison will be a mass of information that is lack luster and does not create movement and dynamics. To evaluate the comparative study nature in philosophy of education, it can be said that on the one hand a comparative researcher thinks complexly because s/he enters in to the area of research by presuppositions, specific values and expectations which cannot be easily separated from him and on the other hand the comparison process is complex because the movement from description to interpretation, from interpretation to adjacent, and

especially of the adjacent to comparison is a complex and time consuming work and finally the third aspect, the issue of comparing the parties (whether the parties are two philosophers or them appropriately) but to do so through simplicity and superficially.

The final note is that the complex look at the comparative study in the philosophy of education does not mean to remove simplicity from it. In other words, the obsolete simplicity in this method apparentism and simplicities. Other wise simplicity with the meaning of understanding comparative research method easily is of interest. A comparative study is acceptable on condition that simplicity does not lead to the elimination of comparative study components, does not put values, does not ignore the role of theory in observation, does not consider mere objectivity a main criterion and creates an atmosphere for studying different aspects of the phenomenon.

References:

- [1] G. Ragin, *The Comparative Method: Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*, 1987.
- [2] M.H. Mirzamoammadi, *Comparative study approaches in philosophy of education, presented at the Second Congress of Philosophy of Education Society of Iran, Tehran, Training University, 2011.*
- [3] G.L. Gutek, *philosophical and educational ideological perspectives on education*, Boston, and Bacon, 1997.
- [4] R. Smith, *Proteus rising: Re-imagining educational research*, Journal of philosophy of education, vol.42 (s 1), pp.183-198, 2008.
- [5] M.H. Mirzamoammadi, *A comparative study of educational goals of Plato and Fa perspective*, *Journal of Psychology and Educational Sciences at Tehran University*, vol.32 pp.225-201, 2000.
- [6] G.Z. F. Beredy, *Comparative method in education*, New York: Winstson. 1966.