
ANALYZING AND VIEWING THE DEVELOPMENT OF CONSTRUCTION OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL VIEW OF POSITIVISM

Ratna Wati

Institut Ilmu Sosial dan Manajemen STIAMI, Indonesia

rw22stiami@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Philosophy is a discipline that aims to seek truth by exploring answers to fundamental questions. In its endeavors, philosophy interacts with the evolving results of science, including schools such as Neo-Positivism. This research aims to analyze and understand the differences in research paradigms, especially in social science, with a focus on positivism, constructivism, and critical paradigms. In addition, this research also describes the positivism paradigm and its three basic assumptions: ontology, epistemology, and methodology. The method used is a literature study with a descriptive-qualitative approach. The results show that the Neo-Positivism paradigm has a significant influence in the development of science and human civilization. Positivism emphasizes that science is the only valid form of knowledge and only observable facts can be used as objects of study. Thus, positivism rejects the existence of forces beyond facts that can be tested empirically. The implication of this research lies in a deeper understanding of how research paradigms contribute to the formation of scientific theories as well as the application of science in people's lives.

Keywords: Positivism Paradigm, Epistemological Assumptions, Ontology, Methodology in the Paradigm.

Corresponding Author: Ratna Wati

E-mail: rw22stiami@gmail.com



INTRODUCTION

The research paradigm, which is mainly in the realm of social science, is a framework of thinking that explains how a researcher's perspective reveals the reality of life and social life and how a researcher views science and theory (Pahux, 2023). Understanding a problem also helps a researcher understand a testing criterion as a foundation for answering a research question (Hidayat, 1999).

Reality becomes biased when viewed from different angles, which causes a paradigm to be created when viewing an object (Prabowo, 2017). By referring to the interactionism theory, the concept of Me and I can explain how a view is biased (Citraningsih & Noviandari, 2022). (Junaedi, 2017) as philosophical thinkers have been very successful in breaking down philosophical thought into several paradigms as a form of understanding of the diversity of views. Both break down the paradigm into 4: The Functionalist Paradigm, The Interpretive Paradigm, The Radical Humanist Paradigm, and The Radical Structuralist Paradigm.

(Sugiarto, 2022) revealed the second difference in the type of paradigm approach, namely with statistical procedural testing of theories by measuring research variables with numbers and conducting analysis being the main emphasis of the quantitative paradigm. On the other hand, the qualitative point of view is an observation paradigm with the main understanding of problems in social life based on real or natural circumstances or reality with holistic, complex, and detailed settings (Murdiyanto, 2020). The growth and development of science in recent decades has been

contributed to the positivism paradigm. The development of science today cannot escape the influence of the positivism paradigm, including the development of economics, as revealed in the book *Research Methodology for Economists, Philosophy, and Practice* by Glenn L. Jhonson. The positivism paradigm, the oldest theoretical reference, has dominated the development of social science.

Domination has been shown by positivism as part of the paradigm of scientific development (Hardiman, 2012). Starting in the 6th century BC, the periodization of the beginning of the development of philosophy influenced the paradigm of science (Wibisono, 1982). Civilization of human progress is driven by the development of science, which is influenced by the magnitude of the long thought of philosophy (Sundaro, 2022). To be able to organize the observed facts is the initial basis for positivist thinking (Nugroho, 2016). Three assumptions form the basis of the positivism paradigm, namely: Ontology, Epistemology, and Methodology (Yuhertiana, 2008).

This study aims to be able to provide an explanation of the ontology in research paradigms, namely how each paradigm views and articulates social reality, to understand the epistemological differences between the positivism, constructivism, and critical paradigms, especially in the context of the relationship between the researcher and the object under study and how knowledge is obtained, to identify the differences in methodologies used in each research paradigm, including the research used and the tools used in data collection and analysis and to explore the axiological aspects in research paradigms, namely the values, ethics and moral choices that influence research in each paradigm.

A deeper understanding of the various research paradigms can help researchers and social scientists choose the research approach that best suits their goals. In addition, researchers will be able to evaluate and critically analyze past research and the values and ethics associated with each research paradigm. Finally, researchers will gain a broader perspective on how knowledge in the social sciences is constructed and understood and its influence on the development of social science theory and practice. Finally, researchers will be able to recognize the relevance of research paradigms to specific scientific fields, especially in the context of broader developments in social science and research.

This research aims to analyze and understand the differences in research paradigms, especially in the social sciences, focusing on the positivism, constructivism, and critical paradigms. As a result, this research has the potential to be a useful resource for researchers who want to choose the research technique that best suits the research objectives and questions. The benefits of this study may also contribute to a more in-depth knowledge of research paradigms in the social sciences.

METHOD

This research approach uses a descriptive-qualitative literature research method, which explains neopositivism as a philosophy of science. Philosophy can obtain the view (complexity, checking and verifying the validity and accountability of thoughts and concepts that can be accounted for intellectually and scientifically) (Sundaro, 2022). Studi literatur adalah serangkaian kegiatan yang berkenaan dengan metode pengumpulan data pustaka, membaca dan mencatat, serta mengolah bahan penelitian. Literature Study is a research conducted by researchers by collecting a number of books, magazines related to research problems and objectives (Fitriani et al.,

2023). This technique is carried out with the aim of revealing various theories that are relevant to the problems being faced/researched as reference material in discussing the research results. Another understanding of literature study is to look for theoretical references that are relevant to the case or problem found. In general, literature study is a way to solve problems by tracing the sources of writing that have been made before. In other words, the term literature study is also very familiar as a literature study. In a research to be carried out, of course, a researcher must have broad insight related to the object to be studied. If not, then it can be ascertained in a large percentage that the research will fail.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A Brief History of the Development of Philosophy

According to its etymology, the term philosophy comes from the Greek *philosophia*, which is formed from the words *philos*, meaning love or *philia* (friendship, attraction), and *Sophos*, which implies knowledge, wisdom, experience, intelligence, and practicality (Endraswara, 2021). Therefore, philosophy tells much about love and wisdom (Tarigan et al., 2022). This shows that humans must strive for ideal knowledge because they can never fully understand all that wisdom encompasses (Muktapa, 2021).

The definition of philosophy put forward by previous philosophers (Widyawati, 2013) among others:

1. Plato, a student of Socrates who lived between 427 and 347 BC, defined philosophy as the knowledge of all that exists; there is no boundary between philosophy and science.
2. Aristotle, Plato's student (382-322 BC), said philosophy is a very general science, namely the science that includes the truth contained in the sciences of metaphysics, logic, rhetoric, ethics, economics, politics, and aesthetics. He also argued that philosophy investigates the causes and principles of all things.
3. Cicero's (106-43 BC) philosophy is the mother of all world sciences. Philosophy drives and gives birth to various sciences because it spurs experts who conduct research.
4. Al Farabi (870-950 AD) was a Muslim philosopher who defined philosophy as the science of nature and how it is.
5. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) defined philosophy as the basic science and the base of all knowledge, which includes four issues, namely:
 - a. Metaphysics (what we can know)
 - b. Ethics (what we can do)
 - c. Religion (where is our hope)
 - d. Anthropology (what is man).
6. In his book *History of Philosophy*, H.C. Webb states that philosophy implies investigation—not only of specific and certain things but even more so of nature—the nature of our world and the way of life that we should carry out in it.
7. Harold H. Titus, in his book *Living Issues in Philosophy*, finds several definitions of philosophy, namely:
 - a. Philosophy is an attitude toward life and the universe.
 - b. Philosophy is a method of reflective thinking and reasoned inquiry.
 - c. Philosophy is a group of problems.

d. Philosophy is a group of systems of thought.

Positivism Paradigm

Auguste Comte (1798-1857), a student of the French philosopher and sociologist Henry Sain Simon (1760-1825), is credited with developing the positivism paradigm in social science throughout the 19th century. (Adian, D. G., 2011). This process was a precursor to the advancement of sociology, or the science of society, based on ideas learned from the natural sciences. The three developments - Social Positivism, Evolutionary Positivism, and Logical Positivism - emerged from the worldview of (Sudiyana & Suswoto, 2018). Thus, positivism is a school of philosophy that consists of human views, ideas, and judgments of the subject of study based on objective and factual knowledge of the object as it is.

The word positivism comes from the word "positive," which denotes a theory attempting to organize observed facts objectively. Three fundamental assumptions underlie the positivism paradigm: methodology, epistemology, and ontology.

Epistemological, Ontological, and Methodological Assumptions in the Paradigm

There is no one research technique in social science, as the discipline has several paradigms. Rather, research methodologies are specific applications of a paradigm. Each research methodology deviates from the choice of methodology and research methodology and is based on different paradigms or theoretical and epistemological perspectives. (May & Perry, 2022) provides a summary of the relationship between research methodology with methods and paradigms, which, among others, can be explained through the help of the following Table 2:

Table 1. Epistemology-Theoretical Perspectives-Methodology-Methods

Epistemology	Theoretical Perspective	Methodology	Methods
1 Objectivism	Positivism (and Post-Positivism)	Experimental Research and Survey Research	Measurement, Scaling Sampling Questionnaire
2 Constructivism	Interpretivism: a. Symbolic Interactionism b. Phenomenological c. Hermeneutics	→ Ethnography → Phenomenological Research → Grounded Theory → Heuristic Inquiry	a. Observation b. Participant Observation c. Interview d. Focus Group e. Case study f. Life History
4 Subjectivism (and its variants)	Critical Inquiry	a. Action research b. Discourse Analysis	a. Document Analysis b. Interpretative Methods c. Content Analysis d. Comparative Analysis

Crotty summarizes three paradigms from Table 1 above, basically the same as the previous paradigm groupings. As shown in Paradigm 1 in Table 1 above, the Classical paradigm paradigms 2 and 3 are constructivism and critical theory. Each paradigm has its theoretical perspective and epistemology; in addition, each theoretical perspective and epistemology has methodological implications that must be followed. Finally, each methodology follows certain procedures belonging to one paradigm.

For example, the theoretical perspective of symbolic interactionism is based on an epistemology known as constructivism. Epistemology itself can be defined as a theory of knowledge grounded in a symbolic perspective and methodology (Hammond & Wellington, 2019). The theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism, which is based on constructivism as an epistemology, is closely linked to the use of certain procedures, such as ethnographic methodology. Ethnographic methodologies favor suitable approaches, such as data collection techniques through participant observation.

A certain group of scientists use paradigms as mental models or worldviews to explore their scientific topics, and these models can be conflicting and challenging to reconcile. According to Denzin and Lincoln, "a paradigm includes three elements: epistemology, ontology, and methodology" (Denzin et al., 2023).

Table 2. Paradigm elements

Ontology	Epistemology	Methodology
Assumptions about "reality."	Assumptions about the relationship between the researcher and the researched	Methodological assumptions about how researchers gain knowledge
What is the nature of "reality."	What is the nature of the relationship between the inquirer and the knowable?	How should the inquirer go about finding out knowledge?

Source: Guba, 1999

For example, Burrell and Morgan's four paradigms (in Rosengreen, 1979) completely diverge from proposing social theories on a continuum between conceptions that emphasize objectivity at one pole and subjectivity at the other. This continuum contains at least four assumptions about the social sciences.

First, there is the ontological debate between positivism and anti-positivism; in epistemology, there is the methodological debate between nomothetic and ideographic; and finally, in terms of human assumptions, the objectivist pole starts from deterministic assumptions, while the subjectivist pole starts from voluntary assumptions (Rosengreen, 1979, pp. 186-187). Several other scholars believe that a paradigm includes an axiological component, either explicitly or implicitly, in addition to epistemological, ontological, and methodological dimensions (See Littlejohn, 1992: 30-34). The differences between paradigms relate to moral decisions, ethics, and the researcher's judgment of society's values when conducting research. Therefore, the four (4) aspects below can also be used as a basis for distinguishing between paradigms:

1. Epistemological includes assumptions about the relationship between the researcher and the researched in obtaining knowledge about the object of research. They are all concerned with the theory of knowledge inherent in the perspective of theory and methodology.
2. Ontological relates to assumptions about the object or social reality under study.
3. The methodology contains assumptions about how to gain knowledge about an object of knowledge.
4. Axiology relates to the value judgment position, ethics, and moral choices of researchers in a study.

Tables 3a-3d synthesize or summarize the literature and show the differences between constructivist, critical, and classical paradigms based on each paradigm's four components (axiology, methodology, ontology, and epistemology).

Table 3. Ontological differences

Classic	Constructivist	Critical
<p>Critical realism: There is a "real" reality that is governed by certain rules that apply universally, even though the truth of that knowledge. It may only be obtained probabilistically.</p>	<p>Relativism: Reality is a social construction. The truth of reality is relative and applies according to the specific context considered relevant by social actors.</p>	<p>Historical realism: Observed reality is a "virtual reality" shaped by historical processes, socio-cultural forces, and political economy.</p>

Table 4. Epistemological differences

Classic	Constructivist	Critical
<p><i>Dualist/Objectivist:</i> There is an objective reality as an external reality outside the researcher. The researcher must distance himself from the research object as much as possible.</p>	<p><i>Transactional/Subjectivist:</i> Understanding a reality or the findings of a study is a product of the interaction between the researcher and the researcher.</p>	<p><i>Transactional/Subjectivist:</i> Certain values always bridge the relationship between the researcher and the researcher. Understanding of reality is <i>value-mediated findings</i></p>

Table 5. Axiological differences

Classic	Constructivist	Critical
<p><i>Observer</i> Values, ethics, and moral choices should be external to the research process. The researcher acts as a <i>disinterested scientist</i>. Purpose of research: Explanation, prediction, and control of social reality</p>	<p><i>Facilitator</i> Values, ethics, and moral choices are integral to research. The researcher is a <i>passionate participant</i> and facilitator who bridges the diversity of subjectivity of social actors. Purpose of research: dialectical reconstruction of social reality between the researcher and the researched.</p>	<p><i>Activist</i> Values, ethics, and moral choices are integral to research. Researchers position themselves as <i>transformative intellectuals, advocates, and activists</i>. Research objectives: Social critique, transformation, emancipation, and <i>social empowerment</i>.</p>

Table 6. Methodological differences

Classic	Constructivist	Critical
<p><i>Interventionist:</i> hypothesis testing within the structure of the hypothetico-deductive method through lab experiments or explanatory surveys, with quantitative analysis. Research quality criteria: Objectivity, reliability, and validity (<i>internal and external validity</i>).</p>	<p><i>Reflective/ Dialectical:</i> This approach emphasizes empathy and dialectical interaction between researcher and respondent to reconstruct the reality under study through qualitative methods such as <i>participant observation</i>. Research quality criteria: <i>Authenticity and reflectivity:</i> The extent to which the findings are an authentic reflection of the reality lived by social actors.</p>	<p><i>Participative:</i> Prioritizing comprehensive and multi-level analyses that can be done by placing oneself as an activist/participant in social transformation. Contextual, Research quality criteria: <i>Historical situatedness:</i> the extent to which the research considers the historical, social, cultural, economic, and political context.</p>

Some things that need to be underlined regarding the differences between the three paradigms are:

First, researchers who adhere to the classical paradigm believe they should present themselves as value-free researchers, constantly distinguishing between their beliefs and the objective facts of their research. On the other hand, researchers who adhere to critical and constructivist schools of thought believe this needs to be revised and revised. Value judgments and

alignment with certain values are always part of research. They are choosing what to research (such as the beneficial or detrimental effects of cigarette advertising, a decision based on personal opinion). Furthermore, the attempt to place humans "objectively" alongside the objects of natural science is a value judgment in a science that accepts humans as subjects.

Secondly, although traditional paradigm research rejects the idea that there is an objective social reality, its purpose - to learn more about an object or social reality as it is - must also be objective. Therefore, a researcher needs to keep a distance from the subject of his/her research to avoid subjectivity influencing the subject. The goal is to gain an advantage or interest from a methodological, practical, or academic standpoint.

Instead of an objective reality or a reality that corresponds to the "true nature" that researchers from the critical camp believe that humans and their world should be, critical paradigm researchers see the objects or social reality they observe as an appearance of virtual reality or simply an expression of human false consciousness. Obtaining socially important results is one of the goals. In contrast, reflexive research is a particular variation within the constructivist research tradition that aims to represent social reality based on the perceptions of the people involved in that reality.

Third, the standards used by each paradigm to evaluate research quality are known as "criteria of goodness." As a result, it is difficult, perhaps inappropriate, to evaluate the quality of research based on the ontological and axiological epistemological presuppositions of one paradigm using the standards applicable to the classical paradigm and vice versa.

CONCLUSION

Empiricism is the source of positivism. According to positivism, conceivable historical truths can be discovered, and science is the only true source of knowledge. As such, positivism denies the existence of any force or topic behind the facts and does not approve of any approach other than examining facts. The implication of these findings is that the positivist approach may limit the scope of research in the field of social science, as it only emphasizes empirically observable data. This affects the development of more holistic social theories, where constructivist and critical perspectives may be needed to understand complex phenomena. In addition, the practical implication is that in the world of research, the positivism paradigm can strengthen research methods based on quantitative data, but also encourages the need for balance with methods that consider subjective and contextual aspects.

REFERENCES

- Adian, D. G., & L. A. Y. (2011). *Pengantar Filsafat Ilmu Pengetahuan: Dari David Hume sampai Thomas Kuh*. Koekoesan.
- Citrانingsih, D., & Noviandari, H. (2022). Interaksionisme Simbolik: Peran Kepemimpinan Dalam Pengambilan Keputusan. *Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 72–86.
- Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., Giardina, M. D., & Cannella, G. S. (2023). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. Sage publications.
- Endraswara, S. (2021). *Filsafat Ilmu*. Media Pressindo.
- Fitriani, D., Azzahra, F. F., Putra, R. A., Setiawan, R., Dyantika, R., Sukowati, S., & Nugraha, R. N. (2023). Analisis Kemampuan Metaverse Untuk Inovasi Hospitality Industry Pariwisata di Masa Yang Akan Datang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, 9(7), 133–137.
- Hammond, M., & Wellington, J. (2019). *Education research: The basics*. Routledge.
- Hardiman, B. (2012). *Melampaui Modernitas dan Positivisme*. Penerbit Kanisius.
-

- Junaedi, M. (2017). *Paradigma Baru Filsafat Pendidikan Islam*. Kencana.
- May, T., & Perry, B. (2022). *Social research: Issues, methods and process*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Muktapa, M. I. (2021). Implikasi filsafat ilmu dan etika keilmuan dalam pengembangan ilmu pengetahuan modern. *Jurnal BELAINDIKA (Pembelajaran Dan Inovasi Pendidikan)*, 3(2), 20–29.
- Murdiyanto, E. (2020). *Penelitian Kualitatif (Teori dan Aplikasi disertai contoh proposal)*. Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat (LP2M) UPN" Veteran
- Nugroho, I. (2016). Positivisme Auguste Comte: analisa epistemologis dan nilai etisnya terhadap sains. *Cakrawala: Jurnal Studi Islam*, 11(2), 167–177.
- Pahux, E. (2023). *MAKALAH POSITIVISME" FILSAFAT ILMU SOSIAL"*.
- Prabowo, G. (2017). Positivisme dan Strukturalisme: Sebuah perbandingan epistemologi dalam ilmu sosial. *JSW (Jurnal Sosiologi Walisongo)*, 1(1), 33–64.
- Sudiyana, S., & Suswoto, S. (2018). Kajian Kritis Terhadap Teori Positivisme Hukum Dalam Mencari Keadilan Substantif. *Qistie*, 11(1).
- Sugiarto, I. (2022). *Metodologi penelitian bisnis*. Penerbit Andi.
- Sundaro, H. (2022). Positivisme Dan Post Positivisme: Refleksi Atas Perkembangan Ilmu Pengetahuan Dan Perencanaan Kota Dalam Tinjauan Filsafat Ilmu Dan Metodologi Penelitian. *Modul*, 22(1), 21–30.
- Tarigan, M., Yasmin, F. A., Rifai, A., Yusriani, Y., Azmi, K., & Azmi, K. (2022). Filsafat Ilmu sebagai Landasan Pengembangan Ilmu Pendidikan. *Mahaguru: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar*, 3(1), 175–182.
- Wibisono, K. (1982). *Arti Perkembangan Menurut Filsafat Positivisme Aguste Comte*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Widyawati, S. (2013). Filsafat Ilmu Sebagai Landasan Pengembangan Ilmu Pendidikan. *Gelar: Jurnal Seni Budaya*, 11(1).
- Yuhertiana, I. (2008). Paradigma Positivis : Sebuah Tinjauan Epistemologi Penelitian Ekonomi. In *e-journal UPN Jatim*. UPN Jatim.



© 2024 by the authors. This work has been submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).