

Swamping the Limitations of Substantiating the Phenomenological Stand Point in the Research Methodology Leading to an Antithetical Paradigm of Philosophy

Namrata Singh^{1*} Dr. Velassary Sebastian²

¹ Research Scholar, Panjab University, Chandigarh

² Professor, Philosophy Department, Panjab University, Chandigarh

Abstract – Before carrying out the empirical analysis of the role of management culture in corporate social responsibility, identification of the philosophical approach and the paradigm on which the research is carried out is necessary. Therefore, this chapter deals with the philosophical systems and paradigms of scientific research, the epistemology, evaluating understanding and application of various theories and practices used in the scientific research. The key components of the scientific research paradigm are highlighted. Theories on the basis of which this research was focused is on the identification of the level of development of the management culture in order to implement corporate social responsibility are identified, and the stages of its implementation are described.

Keywords: Phenomenological, Antithetical, Philosophy

-----X-----

INTRODUCTION

Scientific research philosophy is a system of the researcher's thought, following which new, reliable knowledge about the research object is obtained. In other words, it is the basis of the research, which involves the choice of research strategy, formulation of the problem, data collection, processing and analysis. The paradigm of scientific research, in turn, consists of ontology, epistemological methodology and the methods. In the field of research, several philosophical approaches are possible; however, according to the authors, more extreme approaches can be delimiting.

Only intermediary philosophical approach allows the researcher to reconcile philosophy, methodology, and the problem of research. This allows preparing for the research and understanding the analyzed problem better. The theories of research philosophy and paradigms, on the basis of which the research in the monograph focuses on identifying the level of development of the management culture in order to implement corporate social responsibility are presented in figures that distinguish the levels of organizational culture and their interaction that is, corporate social responsibility stages which reflect the philosophy and paradigm of this research.

Each researcher is guided by their own approach to the research itself. In the same way as their education appeared from philosophical and theological frames that limits them. Social sciences accepted this advice. A assumption is perceived as a preliminary statement of reasoning but it is based on philosophizing person's knowledge and insights that are born as a product of intellectual activity.

Scientific research philosophy is a method which, when applied, allows the scientists to generate ideas into knowledge in the context of research. There are four main trends of research philosophy that are distinguished and discussed in the works by many authors: the positivist research philosophy, interpretivist research philosophy, pragmatist research philosophy, and realistic research philosophy.

The opposite to the above-mentioned research philosophy is the interpretivist research philosophy, when a researcher states that on the basis of the principles it is not easy to understand the social world. Interpretivist research philosophy says that the social world can be interpreted in a subjective manner. The greatest attention here is given to understanding of the ways through which people experience the social world. Interpretivist research philosophy is based on the principle which states that the researcher performs a specific role in

observing the social world. According to this research philosophy, the research is based and depends on what the researcher's interests are.

In addition, pragmatism does not belong to any philosophical system and reality. Researchers have the freedom of choice. They are "free" to choose the methods, techniques and procedures that best meet their needs and scientific research aims. Pragmatists do not see the world as absolute unity. The truth is what is currently in action; it does not depend on the mind that is not subject to reality and the mind dualism.

Analyzing symbolic interpretivism through the prism of ontology, it can be said that it is the belief that we cannot know the external or objective existence apart from our subjective understanding of it; that, what exists, is what we agree on that it exists (emotion and intuition: experience forms behind the limits of the five senses). Analyzing symbolic interpretivism through epistemological aspect, all knowledge is related to the one who knows and can be understood only in terms of directly related individuals; the truth is socially created through multiple interpretations of knowledge objects created in this way, and therefore they change over time.

Pragmatism, as a philosophy trend, considers practical thinking and action ways as the main, and the criterion of truth is considered for its practical application. For example, what happens when it is established that two similar organizations have very similar company values recorded in documents and published, principles, ethics and visions in which their employees believe and adhere to – i.e., described as their culture and reflecting their core values – for all that, the natural formation and working styles of the two organizations are very different, even if they have similar supported values".

LIMITATIONS OF SUBSTANTIATING THE PHENOMENOLOGICAL STAND POINT IN THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY LEADING TO AN ANTITHETICAL PARADIGM OF PHILOSOPHY

The scientific research paradigm helps to define scientific research philosophy. Literature on scientific research claims that the researcher must have a clear vision of paradigms or worldview which provides the researcher with philosophical, theoretical, instrumental, and methodological foundations. Research of paradigms depends on these foundations.

The scientific research paradigm is also characterized by a precise procedure consisting of several stages. The researcher, getting over the mentioned stages, creates a relationship between research aims and questions. The term of paradigm is closely related to the "normal science" concept.

Scientists who work within the same paradigm frame are guided by the same rules and standards of scientific practice. "That is how the scientific community supports itself.

The scientific research paradigm and philosophy depend on various factors, such as the individual's mental model, his worldview, different perception, many beliefs, and attitudes related to the perception of reality, etc. Researchers beliefs and values are important in this concept in order to provide good arguments and terminology for obtaining reliable results. The researcher's position in certain cases can have a significant impact on the outcome of the research.

Such consensus is difficult to achieve in social sciences. Academic philosophers claim this fact by the statement that "multi-paradigmatism" is characteristic to the humanities and social sciences, i.e., the permanent coexistence and competition of many different theoretical paradigms.

According to the author, when some old ideas are being replaced by the new ones, i.e., better, more advanced, etc., then the progress in science is stated. In natural sciences, this is going on confirming the hypothesis by logical arguments and empirical research. When the scientific community reaches a consensus, there appears accepted theory on its basis.

A paradigm is the whole of theoretical and methodological regulations, that is, regulations adopted by the scientific community at a certain stage of development of science and applied as an example, the model, the standard for scientific research, interpretations, evaluation and hypotheses to understand and solve objectives arising in the process of scientific knowledge. The transition from one competing paradigm to another is the transition from one non-commensurable thing to the other and it cannot go step by step promoted by logical and neutral experience.

The most important questions that differentiated the research by far are threefold and depend on whether differences among assumptions are associated with different reality construction techniques (ontology) where, the majority of questions asked are "what are the things in reality?" and "how do they really happen?".

Ontological questions are usually associated with real existence and operation matters varying forms of knowledge about reality (epistemology), since epistemological questions help to ascertain the nature of relationship between the researcher and the respondent and it is postulated that in order to make an assumption about the true reality, the researcher must follow the "objectivity and value distancing position" to find out what things are in

reality, how they occur and certain reality cognition techniques (methodology). With the help of methodological questions, the researcher mostly tries to figure out ways by which he can get to know his concern.

According to the author, in order to see these "imbalances," you need to realize that "unhindered behavior leads to a deeper level of thought and perception." In shared mental models, for understanding this "deeper" level of culture, one should study the history of the organization, that is, what were the original values, beliefs and assumptions of its founders and key leaders which led to the success of the organization? Over time they have become common and are accepted as self-evident as soon as the new members of the organization realized that the original values, beliefs, and assumptions of its founders led to organizational success, that is, through common cognition/assimilation of "correct" values, beliefs, and assumptions.

DISCUSSION

Further analysis of the epistemology terminology presents different interpretations by various authors. Epistemology is closely related to ontology, because the answers to these questions depend on the ontological assumptions about the nature of reality and, in turn, help to create them.

It is said that in order to understand the reality there are three main types of paradigms to be employed, namely positivism, interpretivism, and realism. The conception of positivism is directly related to the idea of objectivism. Using this philosophical approach, the researchers express their views in order to assess the social world and instead of subjectivity, they refer to objectivity.

Under this paradigm researchers are interested in general information and large-scale social data collection rather than focusing on details of the research. In line with this position, the researchers own personal attitudes are not relevant and do not affect the scientific research. Positivist philosophical approach is most closely associated with the observations and experiments, used for the collection of numerical data.

In the sphere of management research, interpretivism can still be called social constructionism. With this philosophical point of view, the researchers take into account their views and values so that they could justify the problem posed in the research.

It is said that while positivistic philosophy's critical trend encourages strict separation of scientific problems solved by research from "speculative" philosophical problems and thus rejects the philosophy, the other trend called interpretivism, on

the contrary states that philosophy cannot be strictly separated from social sciences but it must be incorporated or blended into them.

With the help of this philosophy, the scientists focus on the facts and figures corresponding to the research problem. This type of philosophical approach makes it possible to understand specific business situations. Using it, the researchers use small data samples and assess them very carefully in order to grasp the attitudes of larger population segments.

Realism, as a research philosophy, focuses on reality and beliefs existing in a certain environment. Two main branches of this philosophical approach are direct and critical realism.

Direct realism is what an individual feels, sees, hears, etc. On the other hand, in critical realism, the individuals discuss their experience in specific situations. It is a matter of social constructivism, as individuals try to justify their own values and beliefs.

Tangible factors (formal or officially authorized) are socialization and/or acculturation experience (if the organization takes care of timely and detailed orientation, it is more likely that the manager will use the process of formal discipline); written documents (if the manager is presented with the relevant policy and relevant procedures, it is more likely that the manager will use the formal discipline process); training (if the organization organizes training on discipline issues, it is more likely that the manager will use the formal discipline process); and structure of the organization (if the organization provides the power to the manager and if the manager has more control, it is more likely that the manager will use the formal discipline process). Intangible factors (informal or informally developed) include problematic employees (if the employee does not have good professional skills or high position, it is more likely that the manager will use the formal discipline process); socialization/acculturation which manifests itself in the human resource management subdivision activities (if the manager's solutions are supported and not devalued by organizational management, it is more likely that the manager will use the formal discipline process); the same social status people (if other managers focus on formal discipline process, it is more likely that the manager will use the formal discipline process); groups outside work (if systems of values, partly overlapping, cherished by groups outside, strengthen the organizational culture-supported expectations, it is more likely that the manager will use the formal discipline process).

CONCLUSION

Analyzing other types of paradigms, in a sense, not qualified as the main, constructivism, symbolic

interpretivism, pragmatism should be mentioned. The constructivism paradigm in some classifications of paradigms is called the "interpretative paradigm".

There is no other definition in ontology, epistemology, and methodology; both approaches have a common understanding of the complex world experience from the perspective of the individuals having this experience. The constructivists point out that various interpretations are possible because we have multiple realities.

The reality for constructivists is a product of the human mind which develops socially and this changes the reality. The author states that there is dependence between what is known and who knows. So, for this reason, the researcher must become more familiar with what is being researched.

REFERENCES

- Abt Associates (2015). Education as experimentation: A planned variation model (Vol. IVA-D). Boston: Abt Associates.
- Angen, J. M. (2010). Pearls, pith and Provocation. Evaluating interpretive inquiry: Reviewing the validity debate and opening the dialogue. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10(3), pp. 378-395.
- Ashby, R. W. (2014). Logical positivism. In O'Connor, D. J. (Ed), *A critical history of western philosophy*. New York: The Free Press.
- Berliner, D. C. (2012, November). Educational research: The hardest science of all. *Educational Researcher*, 31(8), pp. 18-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X031008018>
- Blume, J., & Peipert, J. F. (2013). What your statistician never told you about P-values. *The Journal of the American Association of Gynecologic Laparoscopists*, 10(4), pp. 1-6. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1074-3804\(05\)60143-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1074-3804(05)60143-0)
- Burbules, N. C., & Berk, R. (2014). Critical thinking and critical pedagogy: Relations, differences, and limits. In Popkewitz, T. S., & Fendler, L. (Eds), *Critical Theories in Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2016). Critical ethnography of a Sri Lankan classroom: Ambiguities in student opposition to reproduction through ESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, pp. 601-626. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587398>
- Ceci, C., Limacher, L. H., & McLeod, D. L. (2012). Language and power: Ascribing legitimacy to interpretive research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 12(5), pp. 713-720. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/104973202129120106>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2015). *Research methods in education* (6th Edition). London: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2016). *Research design: Qualitative and mixed methods approaches*. London: SAGE.

Corresponding Author

Namrata Singh*

Research Scholar, Panjab University, Chandigarh