

The concept of paradigm research paper examples

[Science](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Many scholars have researched on the issue of paradigm and found that there are several classifications. The commonly known concept is given by the American philosopher Tomas Kuhn, who explains the natural science as the process of experiencing revolution and claims in such a way that these revolution periods are eroded when the old paradigm is replaced by a new and thoroughly different one. He further dictates that a paradigm is a central huddle of concepts, theoretical assumptions, rules and standards for scientific practice, which shape the approach scientists take to their subject (Psillo s& Curd, 2008 p. 24).

Also, he explains that the characteristics of a paradigm are made of a collection of common understanding of what type of event is being researched as well as the types of questions that are valuable to ask about the phenomenon, this involves how researchers should develop their strategy to answer their research questions and the method of interpreting the findings (Kuada, 2011, p. 42).

Arbnor and Bjerke in their analysis also tried to explain the concept of paradigm. Their conception of a paradigm is based on the thinking of the scientific theorist Tornebohm who explores that a paradigm is made of a conception of reality, a conception of science, a scientific ideal as well as ethical or aesthetical aspects. The conception of science side defines the concepts, knowledge and beliefs achieved through education about objects and subjects that are being researched.

The scientific ideology views it as the way in which a researcher wants to be professed in a given field of study. Ethical and aesthetical aspect reflects upon the morality of the researcher or what may be appropriate and not in his or her views (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2009, p. 15). This involves what a person

<https://assignbuster.com/the-concept-of-paradigm-research-paper-examples/>

sees has morally right or wrong.

Arbnor and Bjerke's considered Kuhn's revolutionary theory in their analysis, where a new paradigm can only substitute an old one, to be insufficient for the social sciences, though it is more appropriate in the physical science area of research. Following this, they adopted the paradigmatic evolutionary thinking of Törnebohm, where old and new paradigms can coexist. They considered to be more proper in explaining different thoughts and approaches toward methodology in social sciences (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2009, p. 15).

Methodology

There are many several methodological ways that can be adopted in business studies According to strategic management decisions however, the most important way of approaching certain business research area will be dependent on several factors which need to be considered. In such a situation, the author has chosen to combine comprehensive works of prominent authors like Arbnor and Bjerke, and Bryman and Bell, as they present, explain, and understand a very wide variety of methodological approaches.

Methodological approaches

According to Arbnor & Bjerke, methodological approaches can be defined just as paradigm. Arbnor & Bjerke have develops their analysis based on the exemplary view by Hakan Tornebohm. According them there was extensive knowledge to acquire from Tornebohm who built his work on the ground of natural science but he later developed paradigm theories, which were anchored to the natural science knowledge that he had gained. In this case, <https://assignbuster.com/the-concept-of-paradigm-research-paper-examples/>

Tornebohm defined elements of the paradigm concept, which include; the conception of reality, science conception, scientific ideal, and ethical aspects.

Based on a Tornebohm paradigm concept Arbnor and Bjerke associated the theory of science to the presumption with the methodological. Through this analysis the two authors define the methodological view as the clarification to the methods of choice in conjunction with the study area. This has brought in ample platform for solving a research problem. The conception of reality constituent means the philosophical opinions and ideas on the structure of reality, either in or by itself, as a cause and effect process. Also, it may be a product of the actors involved own interpretation. Methodology is based on three main views which define and explores its workability and dependability. The three views are; the Analytical view, the actors view and the systems view as shown in the figure below;

Arbnor and Bjerke's methodological view

Systems view

The systems view is one of the most critical methodological views that involves some important elements. One of the main factors that define the view is the conception of reality. This is an objective reality that consists of wholes, which is the stupendous characteristics of which is synergy. This means that there must be testing of some reality in the research being undertaken. It is also defined by the dependence of knowledge on systems. It tries to explain that reality can only be explained in the existence of pictures, which give the true meaning of systems. These systems should not only be general but specific for certain system classes. In this view the

researcher has to find out whether he or she should give explanation or should call for understanding. In this case, the researcher is seeking finality relations, which are relations among forces as well as results of explanations. The researcher may also come up with interpretations which may be in the form of understanding (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2009, p. 295). Through excellent explanation and understanding techniques, it has become easy for classification in research as well as advancement of research methodology.

Assumptions

The system view is based on certain assumptions that define the direction of a research methodology. One of the assumptions is that when researching on new issues, the researcher should be free to come up with analogies or metaphors that may be influenced by earlier results for similar researches. The other assumption is that those analogies must be inclined to certain case which may indicate a relatively unique image of a new system (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2009, p. 338).

Limitations

The major problem of this approach is on the holistic representation by the two authors. These authors try to give so much detailed information on a given situation at the same time. On this analysis, these authors have used interpretations that are inconsistent with the formulations that can impose negative traits to the methodological view of the systems approach (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2009, p. 358).

Actors view

This view is also very important in the definition of research methodologies. It is a socially developed reality that is made of varying levels of meaning. Human beings who are the generating actors as well as the reality which is the product generated stand in a reciprocal dialectic relation with each other. In the actors view, knowledge is dependent on individuals, as well the researcher. The reality is defined at various levels which depend on how various actors look at certain element, interpret it and act according to its provisions. The researcher aims at an explanation that is extremely difficult as it has been undertaken severally with consistent different meanings (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2009, p. 369).

One of the main challenges of this view is based on poor approaches on any problem on how knowledge is created. The approach has the aim to conceptualize all actors engaged. Arbnor & Bjerke, acknowledged that results of this view could only provide slanted knowledge that may not be applicable in explaining complex situations. (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2009, p. 338).

Analytical view

On the other hand is the analytical view which is a factual reality made of collective components. Here, the explanations of reality are absolute and general in practicality. In this view of research methodologies, analytical researchers seek causal relations. This gives a definition of sufficient and necessary relations that exist between cause and effects or necessary but not adequate relations that exist between cause and effect, which are defined as stochastic relation (Psillos & Curd, 2008).

Through this view of the research methodology the reality theory becomes

better as time goes by. It consists of various hypotheses that have been proven to be true. In this view when studying new issues, the research may develop ideas on dominant theories for the defined problem that is being tested. In this case, new results may nullify earlier results (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2009, p. 359).

There are various obstacles that are related to the analytical view. The main challenge on the approach is a poor emphasis on determinism. In such cases knowledge is forced to fit in categories with no details. The approach has been misleading in defining factual and measurable issues while it neglected issues that deal with potential of certain situations and actions. The approach does not accept the existence of freedom of actors (Arbnor & Bjerke, 2009, p. 333).

Works Cited

Arbnor, Ingeman, and Björn Bjerke. Methodology for creating business knowledge. 3rd ed. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2009. Print.

Kuada, John E.. Research methodology: a project guide for university students.. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur, 2011. Print.

Psillos, Stathis , and Martin Curd. The Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Science. NewYork: Routledge, 2008. Print.