
12-1-2024

Demystifying Research Paradigms: Navigating Ontology, Epistemology, and Axiology in Research

Lynette Pretorius

Monash University, lynette.pretorius@monash.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr>



Part of the [Educational Methods Commons](#), [Epistemology Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), [Philosophy of Science Commons](#), [Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons](#), [Technical and Professional Writing Commons](#), and the [Theory, Knowledge and Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pretorius, L. (2024). Demystifying research paradigms: Navigating ontology, epistemology, and axiology in research. *The Qualitative Report*, 29(10), 2698-2715. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2024.7632>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the The Qualitative Report at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Qualitative Report by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.



THE QUALITATIVE REPORT
DISCOVER ONE OF OUR VIRTUAL
QUALITATIVE RESEARCH WORKSHOPS
WITH INDUSTRY EXPERTS.

JOIN US ONLINE. LIMITED SPOTS AVAILABLE. BOOK YOURS NOW!

TQR
THE QUALITATIVE REPORT
WHERE THE WORLD COMES TO LEARN
QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Demystifying Research Paradigms: Navigating Ontology, Epistemology, and Axiology in Research

Abstract

A sound understanding of research paradigms is crucial for developing coherent and philosophically grounded research designs, particularly in the humanities and social sciences. This paper offers an accessible overview of the most common research paradigms: positivism, post-positivism, constructivism, social constructionism, interpretivism, pragmatism, and critical realism. These paradigms differ in their approaches to ontology (the nature of reality), epistemology (the nature of knowledge), and axiology (the role of values in research). The paper also discusses the methodological and ethical implications of these paradigms. Reflexivity and ethical responsibility are emphasised, where researchers must account for how their own biases and values influence their work. By exploring these paradigms and their philosophical foundations, this paper aims to help researchers identify the paradigm that best aligns with their views about the world, ultimately enabling them to coherently design studies that are methodologically sound, ethically informed, and practically relevant. This article contributes to academic discourse by offering a clear and practical guide to research paradigms, fostering a deeper understanding of the philosophical underpinnings that shape research practices across disciplines.

Keywords

research paradigms, ontology, epistemology, axiology, methodology

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Acknowledgements

I did not receive any specific grants from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors for the preparation or publication of this manuscript. I disclose that I earn a small income from my YouTube channel, where I have previously posted videos discussing the topics covered in this manuscript. This manuscript is exempt from ethical approval as it does not include any data collected through research. This manuscript was previously made available via pre-print on Monash University's institutional research repository. The pre-print can be accessed here: <https://doi.org/10.26180/27013843> It is also important to note that this manuscript is an academic version of a blog post that I wrote for my website in February 2024. In recognition of the numerous requests for an academic source that could be referenced in articles, books, and theses, I decided to convert it into this short article. The original blog post can be found here: https://www.lynettepretorius.com/the_scholars_way_blog/demystifying-

research-paradigms/ I acknowledge that I used a customised version of ChatGPT 4 (OpenAI, <https://chat.openai.com/>) to help me refine my phrasing during the preparation of both the original blog post and this manuscript. The output from ChatGPT 4 was adapted to reflect my own style and voice, as well as during the peer review process. I take full responsibility for the final content of this manuscript.

Demystifying Research Paradigms: Navigating Ontology, Epistemology, and Axiology in Research

Lynette Pretorius

School of Curriculum, Teaching, and Inclusive Education, Faculty of Education, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

A sound understanding of research paradigms is crucial for developing coherent and philosophically grounded research designs, particularly in the humanities and social sciences. This paper offers an accessible overview of the most common research paradigms: positivism, post-positivism, constructivism, social constructionism, interpretivism, pragmatism, and critical realism. These paradigms differ in their approaches to ontology (the nature of reality), epistemology (the nature of knowledge), and axiology (the role of values in research). The paper also discusses the methodological and ethical implications of these paradigms. Reflexivity and ethical responsibility are emphasised, where researchers must account for how their own biases and values influence their work. By exploring these paradigms and their philosophical foundations, this paper aims to help researchers identify the paradigm that best aligns with their views about the world, ultimately enabling them to coherently design studies that are methodologically sound, ethically informed, and practically relevant. This article contributes to academic discourse by offering a clear and practical guide to research paradigms, fostering a deeper understanding of the philosophical underpinnings that shape research practices across disciplines.

Keywords: research paradigms, ontology, epistemology, axiology, methodology

Introduction

A sound methodological design is not merely a technical requirement but the backbone of any successful research project, influencing every stage from data collection to analysis and interpretation. In the humanities and social sciences, this process requires researchers to not only select appropriate methods but also articulate the philosophical foundations that guide their inquiry. These foundations, encapsulated in what is known as a “research paradigm,” serve as a lens through which the researcher views the world, impacting their understanding of reality (ontology), their beliefs about how knowledge is generated (epistemology), and their stance on the role of values in research (axiology). The challenge, however, lies in effectively communicating these abstract concepts. Ontology, epistemology, and axiology can be difficult to grasp, especially since they are interpreted differently depending on the researcher’s perspective. This complexity often leads to oversimplifications or omissions in research methodology discussions, resulting in a lack of clarity for novice researchers and those attempting to engage more deeply with these philosophical underpinnings.

Compounding this challenge is the scarcity of accessible introductory materials that offer clear overviews of the various research paradigms. Researchers frequently turn to general methodology texts or complex philosophical treatises (some commonly used sources include Bryman, 2016; Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Crotty, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 2016). This gap in the literature inspired me to write a blog post in early 2024 aimed at demystifying the most

common research paradigms for my students. I also developed a series of videos covering the basics of the most common research paradigms. The overwhelming interest in this topic and the subsequent requests for a more formal academic source that others could cite led to the transformation of my blog post and videos into this article.

The purpose of this article is to provide an introductory overview of the most common research paradigms: positivism, post-positivism, constructivism, social constructionism, interpretivism, pragmatism, and critical realism, each of which shapes how researchers understand reality, generate knowledge, and integrate values into their work. All these paradigms can be used in qualitative research, though it is important to note that positivism and post-positivism are more frequently seen in quantitative research. This article aims to guide researchers in identifying which paradigm best aligns with their worldview. As this article is designed as a practical tool for novice researchers, each paradigm overview is accompanied by suggestions for further reading. In this way, readers can then pursue a more detailed understanding by engaging with the complex philosophical discussions that underpin their chosen paradigms.

What Is a Research Paradigm?

A research paradigm explains what the researcher believes reality is, how they think knowledge can be understood, and what they value in research. The technical terms used to articulate a research paradigm are ontology, epistemology, and axiology.

Ontology interrogates the nature of reality. A realist ontology assumes that reality is objective, external, and independent of human perception. This view posits that there is a single, tangible reality that can be observed, measured, and understood through empirical evidence. Realist researchers rely on methods that aim to uncover universal truths by minimising subjectivity and personal biases. For example, in experimental and quasi-experimental research, a realist ontology would guide researchers to seek out observable phenomena that exist regardless of individual interpretation. Their approaches would focus on quantifiable data to support their findings, such as questionnaires, experimental methods, and statistics.

In contrast, a relativist ontology suggests that reality is not a fixed entity but is instead shaped by individual and collective experiences. According to this view, reality is subjective and can vary from one person or group to another, influenced by social, cultural, and historical contexts. Researchers who adopt a relativist ontology emphasise the importance of understanding how people make sense of their world. Here, the focus is on capturing the richness of human experience, acknowledging that multiple realities may coexist. Reality is seen as fluid and negotiated, with knowledge being constructed through interactions between the researcher and the subject. Researchers working within this ontology tend to use qualitative methods to explore how individuals or groups interpret their experiences, recognising that these often-times different interpretations are equally valid reflections of reality. Their approaches focus on establishing rapport, encouraging participants to reflect on their experiences, developing empathy, using active listening, and engaging in storytelling to represent their participants' realities.

Epistemology explores the nature of knowledge and the processes through which we come to understand it. There are three common epistemologies. The first common epistemological position asserts that reality can be objectively known through empirical observation, if researchers use the right tools and methodologies. This epistemology is grounded in the belief that knowledge exists independently of human perception and can be uncovered through careful measurement and testing. Proponents of this view focus on quantifiable data, seeking to establish universal truths that can be verified and replicated. In the

natural sciences, for example, researchers often operate under this epistemology, designing experiments to measure variables and draw conclusions that are free from personal bias. The goal is to generate reliable and objective knowledge about the world that holds true across different contexts. This approach assumes that if the right tools are used, the researcher can objectively capture the essence of reality without their observations being influenced by personal interpretation or external factors.

In contrast, the second epistemological view suggests that reality is partially knowable, but only through the subjective lenses of individuals. From this perspective, knowledge is not objective but rather constructed by individuals based on their experiences, beliefs, and social interactions. Researchers who adhere to this epistemological view argue that reality is created in the minds of people and, therefore, can only be understood through studying the interpretations and meanings that individuals attach to their experiences. This epistemology often leads to qualitative research methods, in which the goal is to explore the diversity of perspectives rather than uncover a singular, objective truth.

Finally, a third epistemological perspective holds that reality is constantly evolving, making it impossible to fully know or understand at any given moment. This view, often associated with pragmatism, recognises that knowledge is dynamic and context-dependent. Pragmatists believe that reality and knowledge are not static entities but are always in a state of flux, shaped by ongoing experiences and changing conditions. As a result, they argue that knowledge is always incomplete, and researchers must remain flexible, adapting their methods and interpretations as new insights emerge. This epistemological stance encourages a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative techniques to capture the complexity of reality at a particular moment while acknowledging the limits of what can be known.

Axiology plays a pivotal role in shaping the ethical and moral dimensions of research. It prompts researchers to consider the role of their own values, beliefs, and biases in the design, conduct, and interpretation of their studies. Researchers must reflect on the values that guide their choice of topics, methods, and even the way they present their findings. For example, a researcher may choose to study topics that align with their personal or societal values, such as social justice, equity, or sustainability. In doing so, axiology forces them to confront the ethical implications of their work, including how their own perspectives may shape their approach to research and the potential impact their findings may have on the world. This reflection is essential for maintaining integrity and transparency in research, as it highlights the ways in which personal and cultural values influence the research process, from the formulation of questions to the dissemination of results.

A key debate in axiology concerns whether research can and should be value-free. Some researchers, particularly those aligned with positivist paradigms, strive for objectivity, believing that research should minimise personal bias and that knowledge can be discovered independently of the researcher's values. This approach promotes the idea that scientific inquiry can achieve neutrality through rigorous methods that exclude subjective influences. However, achieving complete objectivity is often questioned, as the very act of choosing a research question or interpreting data is shaped by the researcher's worldview and cultural context. Critics of the value-free ideal argue that no research can ever be entirely objective because all researchers bring their own beliefs, biases, and ethical considerations to the table, consciously or unconsciously. Even in studies that rely on purely quantitative methods, decisions about what to measure, how to measure it, and how to interpret the results are influenced by the researcher's values.

Many researchers, especially those working within constructivist, social constructionist, interpretivist, and critical paradigms, acknowledge that research is inherently value-laden, and that subjectivity is not only unavoidable but can, in fact, be a strength. These researchers argue that embracing the role of values in research allows for deeper insights into

human experiences and societal structures, so researchers should continuously examine how their own values and those of their participants influence the production of knowledge. Braun and Clarke (2022), for example, developed a comprehensive prompting strategy to help researchers explore their positions of power and marginalisation to help them better articulate their positionalities. Through reflexivity (the ongoing process of self-examination by researchers to identify and account for the ways their values influence their work), researchers can foster greater trust and accountability in the research process. For example, in studies involving marginalised or vulnerable populations, the researcher's commitment to ethical principles such as respect, empathy, and social justice would shape the entire research process, from data collection to analysis. Consequently, rather than striving to eliminate subjectivity, researchers embracing the value-laden nature of research view their positionality as an integral part of the research, which can lead to richer and more nuanced understandings of complex social phenomena.

What Are the Most Common Research Paradigms?

Table 1 summarises the ontologies, epistemologies, and axiologies which make up the most commonly used research paradigms: Positivism, Post-Positivism, Constructivism, Social Constructionism, Interpretivism, Pragmatism, and Critical Realism. These are described in more detail in the rest of this section, with reference to additional sources for further information.

Table 1

Ontologies, Epistemologies, and Axiologies of Common Research Paradigms

Paradigm	Ontology	Epistemology	Axiology
Positivism	Realist: Objective reality exists independently of human perception.	Objective: Knowledge is discovered through empirical observation and measurement.	Value-Free: Research should strive for objectivity and eliminate researcher bias.
Post-Positivism	Nuanced Realist: An objective reality exists, but it can only be imperfectly understood.	Critical and Fallible: Knowledge is theory-laden and subject to revision through empirical testing.	Value-Aware: Complete objectivity is unattainable, and researchers must be reflexive about biases.
Constructivism	Individual Relativist: Reality is subjective, constructed by individuals through personal experiences.	Subjective and Socially Constructed: Knowledge is socially co-constructed by individuals based on their experiences and interactions.	Value-Laden: Values influence knowledge construction. Subjectivity is embraced and reflexivity is encouraged.
Social Constructionism	Social Relativist: Reality is subjective, constructed through collective human interaction and cultural norms.	Subjective and Socially Constructed: Knowledge is constructed through social processes, discourse, and cultural contexts.	Value-Laden: Social factors and power dynamics play a role in shaping knowledge. Subjectivity is embraced and reflexivity is encouraged.

Interpretivism	Individual Relativist: Reality is subjective and can only be partially known through individual interpretations.	Interpretive: Knowledge is gained by understanding the meanings individuals attach to their experiences.	Value-Laden: Values are central to interpretation. Reflexivity is encouraged with the aim of privileging participants' perspectives and context.
Pragmatism	Dynamic: Reality is ever-changing and shaped by experiences and practical outcomes.	Practical: Knowledge is judged by its usefulness and the outcomes it produces.	Value-Driven: Values are important in shaping research goals, focusing on practical solutions and real-world impact.
Critical Realism	Stratified Realist: An objective reality exists, but it is layered and composed of observable events and hidden structures.	Explanatory: Knowledge is gained by understanding both observable events and their underlying mechanisms.	Value-Laden: Researchers acknowledge the role of values. Researchers must be reflexive about biases.

Positivism

Positivists argue that there is one objective reality that can be observed and understood through scientific inquiry, regardless of individual experiences or perspectives. In this paradigm, phenomena are assumed to follow universal laws and can be measured accurately through systematic observation and experimentation. In positivism, the goal of research is to discover these objective truths using methods that reduce subjectivity and bias. For instance, in fields such as physics or biology, researchers aim to uncover generalisable facts about the natural world that apply consistently across different contexts. This approach treats reality as stable and unchanging, allowing for the development of theories and models that can explain and predict natural or social phenomena. Central to the positivist paradigm is the belief that the researcher is independent of the subject they are studying. Positivists maintain that research should be conducted in a way that minimises the influence of the researcher's values, biases, or personal interpretations on the findings. This separation between the researcher and the subject allows for what is considered objective observation, where knowledge is generated solely from empirical evidence—data that can be observed, measured, and verified through the senses.

Further Readings: Positivism

- Karupiah, P. (2022). Positivism. In M. R. Islam, N. A. Khan, & R. Baikady (Eds.), *Principles of social research methodology* (pp. 73-82). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5441-2_6
- Park, Y. S., Konge, L., & Artino, A. R. (2020). The positivism paradigm of research. *Academic Medicine*, 95(5), 690-694. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000003093>
- Popper, K., & Bartley, W. W. (1985). *Realism and the aim of science: From the postscript to the logic of scientific discovery*. Routledge.
- Ryan, G. (2018). Introduction to positivism, interpretivism and critical theory. *Nurse Researcher*, 25(4), 14-20. <https://doi.org/10.7748/nr.2018.e1466>

- Schrag, F. (1992). In defense of positivist research paradigms. *Educational Researcher*, 21(5), 5-8. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X021005005>

Post-Positivism

As the name suggests, the post-positivism paradigm is closely related to positivism in terms of its ontology and epistemology, but it introduces a more nuanced understanding of the research process, particularly with regard to the role of values. Like positivists, post-positivists believe in an objective reality that can be studied and understood through empirical investigation. They still rely on rigorous scientific methods to collect data and test hypotheses, maintaining that observable phenomena exist independently of human perception. However, post-positivists differ in their recognition that complete objectivity is an ideal that is ultimately unattainable. They argue that researchers, being human, inevitably bring their values, beliefs, and biases into the research process, whether consciously or unconsciously. In this way, post-positivists acknowledge that choices about what to study, the methods employed, and how results are interpreted are all influenced by value judgements. As a result, post-positivists emphasise the need for reflexivity. While they continue to strive for objectivity, they recognise that research is not entirely free from the researcher's influence. Consequently, post-positivist researchers take deliberate steps to minimise the impact of these biases on their work. Post-positivists also encourage transparency in the research process, openly discussing the potential value implications of their choices and interpretations. By being reflexive and critical of their role in the research, post-positivists aim to produce knowledge that, while not entirely free from bias, is credible, reliable, and reflective of a realistic approach to studying the complexities of the world.

Further Readings: Post-Positivism

- Henderson, K. A. (2011). Post-positivism and the pragmatics of leisure research. *Leisure Sciences*, 33(4), 341-346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2011.583166>
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Little, D. (2019). Postpositivism. In P. Atkinson, S. Delamont, A. Cernat, J. W. Sakshaug, & R. A. Williams (Eds.), *SAGE research methods foundations*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036837553>
- Panhwar, A. H., Ansari, S., & Shah, A. A. (2017). Post-positivism: An effective paradigm for social and educational research. *International Research Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 45(45), 253-259. <https://sujo.usindh.edu.pk/index.php/IRJAH/article/view/927>
- Phillips, D. C., & Burbules, N. C. (2000). *Postpositivism and educational research*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Constructivism

Constructivists believe that reality is subjective and that this reality can only be partially known because it is constructed in the minds of individual people. This means that each person's reality is unique, reflecting their personal experiences, emotions, and interactions with their environment. As a result, constructivist researchers acknowledge that individuals can only partially know reality because it is filtered through subjective perceptions. What one person perceives as reality might be different from another's, even if they are observing the same situation. A key aspect of constructivism is its emphasis on the role of social interactions in

shaping individual realities. Constructivists believe that people do not construct their realities in isolation but through ongoing interactions with others and within the broader social, cultural, and historical contexts in which they live. For example, a person's understanding of identity, gender, or social norms is influenced by the people they interact with, the cultural values they are exposed to, and the historical events through which they have lived. Consequently, constructivist researchers aim to uncover how shared experiences and cultural contexts influence the formation of individual realities.

Rather than attempting to eliminate bias, constructivist researchers embrace the value-laden nature of research, understanding that their involvement in the research process shapes the knowledge that is produced. This leads to a co-construction of knowledge, where the researcher and participants work together to create a shared understanding. This collaborative approach not only deepens the research findings but also ensures that the perspectives and voices of the participants are respected and valued. Additionally, constructivist researchers are often motivated by a desire to create positive social change. They are concerned with the ethical implications of their work, aiming to use their findings to challenge existing power structures, address social inequalities, and contribute to societal wellbeing.

Further Readings: Constructivism

- Denicolo, P., Long, T., & Bradley-Cole, K. (2016). *Constructivist approaches and research methods*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526402660>
- Fosnot, C. T. (2005). *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2016). *The constructivist credo*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315418810>
- Paley, J. (2024). *Constructivism and the metaphysics of qualitative research*. Routledge.
- Steffe, L. P., & Gale, J. (Eds.). (1995). *Constructivism in education*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Social Constructionism

At this point, it is important to note that there is often a certain amount of confusion between the use of “constructivism” and “social constructionism.” This confusion arises because these two paradigms share a similar ontological foundation and have closely aligned epistemologies and axiologies, which can make them appear interchangeable. Both paradigms operate from a relativist ontology, in which reality is not viewed as an objective, independent entity but rather as something that is constructed through human thought, interactions, and social processes. Reality, from this perspective, is understood as inherently shaped by social contexts, historical moments, and collective practices, which constantly evolve as societal values and beliefs shift. The epistemology of both paradigms also centres around the idea that knowledge is socially constructed rather than being a discovery of objective truths. Concepts such as class, race, and even scientific knowledge are not seen as static truths waiting to be discovered but are instead constructed through social interactions, discourse, language, and cultural norms. Similarly, both paradigms share the view that research is value-laden.

The difference between constructivists and social constructionists becomes clearer when their research foci are examined. While constructivists are primarily concerned with how individuals personally construct meaning and understand their experiences, social constructionists place greater importance on “collective meaning-making” and the role of society in shaping knowledge. Social constructionists focus on how social engagement, societal

structures, and power dynamics influence shared realities, making collective processes central to their analysis. As a result, constructivist researchers often emphasise “individual perspectives,” exploring how unique personal experiences shape understanding, while social constructionist researchers seek to examine how societal factors such as language, culture, and social norms, come together to create and maintain “shared realities” across communities. This distinction highlights the more personal ontological orientation of constructivism versus the broader social and collective orientation of social constructionism.

Further Readings: Social Constructionism

- Burr, V. (2015). *Social constructionism* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Dombrowski, P. M. (2020). Social constructionism. In P. M. Dombrowski (Ed.), *Humanistic aspects of technical communication* (pp. 81-96). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315231433-5>
- Gergen, K. J. (2015). *An invitation to social construction* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- McNamee, S., & Hosking, D. M. (2012). *Research and social change: A relational constructionist approach*. Routledge.
- Phillips, M. J. (2023). Towards a social constructionist, criticalist, Foucauldian-informed qualitative research approach: Opportunities and challenges. *SN Social Sciences*, 3, Article 175, 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-023-00774-9>

Interpretivism

Interpretivists also believe reality is subjective and that reality can only be partially known because it is constructed in the minds of individual people. Interpretivists acknowledge that knowledge is inherently partial; we can never fully understand someone else’s experience in an objective sense, but we can strive to interpret and make meaning of it. This paradigm highlights the importance of recognising the diversity of human experience and the idea that multiple, equally valid realities can coexist, depending on the perspectives of those involved. At the heart of interpretivism is the notion that individuals are the experts of their own experiences. Interpretivists focus on uncovering the meanings that people attach to their experiences. This paradigm values the subjective interpretations and emotions that shape people’s understanding of the world around them, and it emphasises the importance of context in shaping these interpretations. Consequently, interpretivist researchers encourage participants to reflect on their own experiences and articulate their interpretations. For example, when studying a social issue like immigration, an interpretivist would seek to understand how different individuals within immigrant communities interpret their own experiences, such as feelings of belonging, identity, or alienation, rather than analysing immigration statistics or policy impacts. Interpretivists aim to capture the richness and complexity of these personal narratives, recognising that individuals are the best sources of insight into their own lives. While interpretivism acknowledges the influence of both researcher and participant values, its central focus is on understanding and interpreting the values, meanings, and experiences that participants attach to their own experiences.

Interpretivism is also often confused with constructivism due to these paradigms’ similar ontologies and axiologies. However, there is a key epistemic difference between constructivism and interpretivism: the researcher’s understanding of their role in relation to the participants’ realities. In constructivism, knowledge is seen as actively co-constructed through the interaction between the researcher and participants. Constructivists believe that the researcher plays an integral part in shaping the understanding of reality, as their own perspectives, biases, and interpretations inevitably influence the research process. This

paradigm sees knowledge as something fluid, created through dialogue and interaction. The researcher is not a neutral observer but a collaborator who engages with participants to jointly develop insights about the research topic. In contrast, interpretivism places more emphasis on the researcher as an interpreter of meanings rather than a co-creator of knowledge. The interpretivist researcher is more passive in shaping the findings, instead focusing on uncovering and interpreting the subjective meanings and experiences that participants bring to the study. Therefore, while constructivists view the research process as a shared construction of meaning, interpretivists maintain a certain level of separation, seeking to understand and explain participants' realities without actively influencing or creating them through the research relationship.

Further Readings: Interpretivism

- Ryan, G. (2018). Introduction to positivism, interpretivism and critical theory. *Nurse Researcher*, 25(4), 14-20. <https://doi.org/10.7748/nr.2018.e1466>
- Schwandt, T. A. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 189–213). Sage.
- Schwartz-Shea, P., & Yanow, D. (2020). Interpretivism. In P. Atkinson, S. Delamont, A. Cernat, J. W. Sakshaug, & R. A. Williams (Eds.), *SAGE research methods foundations*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036915455>
- van Manen, M. (2016). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315421056>
- Yanow, D., & Schwartz-Shea, P. (2015). *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*. Routledge.

Pragmatism

Pragmatism is a flexible paradigm that suggests research methods should be chosen based on what best addresses the research question. Pragmatists believe reality is constantly changing or debated, so they do not commit to a single reality or method of inquiry. This allows for a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods as is deemed necessary for the topic under investigation. For example, in a study on the impact of educational interventions, a pragmatist researcher might collect quantitative test scores to measure academic improvement alongside qualitative interviews to explore students' personal experiences with the intervention. This flexibility enables researchers to draw on the strengths of both approaches, providing a more comprehensive understanding of complex issues. While pragmatists value objective evidence such as measurable, replicable results, they also appreciate the importance of subjective experiences in shaping our understanding of reality. This integrative approach allows pragmatists to balance the need for factual, reliable data with an understanding of the social, cultural, and emotional dimensions of the research context.

Ultimately, pragmatism is grounded in a philosophical stance that prioritises practical outcomes and real-world applications of research. For pragmatists, the value of research lies not in its ability to produce abstract theories or universal truths but in its capacity to generate knowledge that can solve real-world problems. This means that pragmatist researchers are often focused on the implications of their work, aiming to create actionable solutions that can improve people's lives.

Further Readings: Pragmatism

- Biesta, G. (2010). Pragmatism and the philosophical foundations of mixed methods research. A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods research for the social & behavioral sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 95-118). Sage.
- Biesta, G. J. J., & Burbules, N. C. (2003). *Pragmatism and educational research*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Cersosimo, G. (2022). Pragmatism. In P. Atkinson, S. Delamont, A. Cernat, J. W. Sakshaug, & R. A. Williams (Eds.), *SAGE research methods foundations*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036837556>
- Morgan, D. L. (2013). *Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods: A pragmatic approach*. Sage.

Critical Realism

Critical realism offers a stratified perspective on the nature of reality, bridging the gap between the objective and subjective aspects of knowledge. Critical realists assert that an objective reality exists independently of human perception, but it is not entirely accessible through direct observation. Instead, this reality is understood as being layered, comprising observable phenomena as well as deeper, often hidden structures or mechanisms that shape those phenomena. For instance, critical realists may argue that we can observe social behaviours and outcomes but the underlying causes, such as economic systems, cultural norms, or power relations, are not always immediately visible. This layered view of reality encourages researchers to dig beneath surface-level observations and seek out the often-complex interactions between different levels of reality.

A key tenet of critical realism is the recognition that an individual's understanding of the world is subjective and shaped by societal, historical, and cultural contexts. While an objective reality exists, people's interpretations of it are influenced by their personal experiences, social positions, and the power dynamics within which they are embedded. For example, two individuals may experience the same event but interpret it differently based on their socio-economic background, cultural and/or religious beliefs, or historical context. Critical realism acknowledges this complexity and aims to balance an appreciation for the subjective nature of human understanding with the pursuit of objective truth. This dual focus on both objective structures and subjective experiences allows critical realism to explore how power, history, and culture shape knowledge and reality. Critical realism is deeply intertwined with a commitment to understanding the world as it is while also striving to transform it for the better. Critical realists believe that researchers bring their own beliefs, biases, and values to the research process and urge researchers to critically reflect on and disclose their values and how these might impact their research.

Further Readings: Critical Realism

- Archer, M., Bhaskar, R., Collier, A., Lawson, T., & Norrie, A. (1998). *Critical realism: Essential readings*. Routledge.
- Bhaskar, R. (2008). *A realist theory of science*. Routledge.
- Bhaskar, R., & Hartwig, M. (2016) *Enlightened common sense: The philosophy of critical realism*. Routledge.

- Danermark, B., Ekstrom, M., Jakobsen, L., & Karlsson, J. C. (2001). *Explaining society: An introduction to critical realism in the social sciences*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203996249>
- Elder-Vass, D. (2022). Critical realism. In G. Delanty & S. P. Turner (Eds.). *Routledge international handbook of contemporary social and political theory* (pp. 241-249). Routledge.

The Influence of Paradigms on Research Processes

Understanding and choosing a research paradigm is crucial because it shapes the entire research process, from framing the research question to deciding on methodologies and methods, and finally analysing and reporting the results. By understanding and consciously choosing a research paradigm, researchers ensure that their work is coherently designed. In other words, by clearly identifying a paradigm, the researcher ensures that the theoretical assumptions about reality, knowledge, and values align with the chosen methods and analytical techniques. This coherence strengthens the study's internal logic and makes the research design more transparent and defensible. Articulating the paradigm thus provides a structured, consistent approach, allowing the researcher to align all aspects of the project and maintain clarity throughout the study.

Without a clear articulation of the research paradigm, there is a risk of mismatching methods and philosophical assumptions, which can lead to confusion, lack of clarity in the study's goals, and potentially invalid findings. Imagine a researcher who is studying the impact of a new educational technology on student engagement in a secondary school. The goal is to understand how the use of this technology affects student participation. Without carefully considering their research paradigm, the researcher might be tempted to dive straight into data collection using a questionnaire and data analytics. Through this realist approach (e.g., positivism or post-positivism), they might treat the data as if it will provide objective, universal truths about the technology's effectiveness in improving student participation. However, this approach might miss important, subjective elements of how students experience the technology. This could result in overlooking factors such as emotional engagement or social dynamics that cannot be captured through numerical data alone.

On the other hand, if the researcher adopts a more relativist approach (e.g., constructivism, social constructionism, interpretivism, or critical realism), they will approach the study differently. Instead of relying on data analytics, they might focus on understanding the students' lived experiences while using the technology. Through qualitative methods such as semi-structured interviews, observations, or focus groups, the researcher would uncover how individual students interpret the technology based on their unique backgrounds and interactions with their peers and teachers. This approach could reveal that while the technology boosts engagement for some students, others may find it isolating or difficult to use, adding a deeper layer of understanding that purely quantitative data might not capture. Consequently, the choice of research paradigm shapes not only the methods used but also the type of knowledge the researcher generates. By carefully aligning their research questions and design to their paradigm, the researcher ensures that the study is coherent, ethically sound, and methodologically appropriate which ultimately leads to more nuanced and useful findings.

Research Questions

The paradigm a researcher adopts fundamentally shapes the nature of the questions they ask. For instance, in positivism, research questions are often framed to test hypotheses or measure variables, seeking to establish causal relationships or correlations. Constructivist,

social constructionist, interpretivist, and critical realist paradigms, however, encourage researchers to develop questions that explore the meanings, experiences, and perceptions of participants, with the aim of understanding the complexity of human behaviour in particular contexts. These questions are then further refined based on the focus of the paradigm, leading to studies that focus on either societal change or a deeper understanding of lived experience. Pragmatism allows for flexibility, meaning research questions can be designed to solve specific problems.

Methodological Choices

Methodological choices are also profoundly influenced by the researcher's paradigmatic stance. Positivists might lean towards structured methodologies that mimic the scientific method, employing quantitative measures such as surveys or experiments. Constructivists, social constructionists, and interpretivists tend to prefer qualitative methods such as in-depth interviews, participant observation, or reflexive thematic analysis, which allow for a deep dive into participants' experiences and the meanings they ascribe to them. Pragmatists select methods based on what best answers the research question, often combining qualitative and quantitative approaches in a pragmatic, problem-solving orientation. Critical realists might use a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods to explore both the surface phenomena and the underlying social or structural mechanisms contributing to these phenomena. Table 2 provides a summary of some commonly used methodologies and methods for the different paradigms.

Table 2
Common Methodological Choices for Different Research Paradigms

Paradigm	Common Research Designs	Common Methods
Positivism and Post-Positivism	Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Designs, Grounded Theory, Survey Research	Predominantly Quantitative Approaches <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quantitative Questionnaires, Scales, Experimental Methods - Descriptive Statistics, Inferential Statistics
Constructivism	Action Research, Autoethnography, Case Study, Document or Policy Analysis, Ethnography, Grounded Theory, Narrative Inquiry, Survey Research	Predominantly Qualitative Approaches <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Diaries, Focus Groups, Interviews, Observations, Photos/Videos/Artefacts, Narratives, Qualitative/Open-Ended Surveys, Reflections - Content Analysis, Discourse Analysis, Thematic Analysis
Social Constructionism	Action Research, Autoethnography, Case Study, Document or Policy Analysis, Ethnography, Grounded Theory, Narrative Inquiry, Survey Research	Predominantly Qualitative Approaches <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Diaries, Focus Groups, Interviews, Observations, Photos/Videos/Artefacts, Narratives, Qualitative/Open-Ended Surveys, Reflections - Content Analysis, Discourse Analysis, Thematic Analysis
Interpretivism	Action Research, Autoethnography, Case Study,	Predominantly Qualitative Approaches

	Document or Policy Analysis, Ethnography, Grounded Theory, Narrative Inquiry, Phenomenology	- Diaries, Focus Groups, Interviews, Observations, Photos/Videos/Artefacts, Narratives, Reflections - Content Analysis, Discourse Analysis, Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis, Thematic Analysis
Pragmatism	Action Research, Case Study, Document or Policy Analysis, Ethnography, Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Designs, Grounded Theory, Narrative Inquiry, Survey Research	Combination of Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches
Critical Realism	Action Research, Case Study, Document or Policy Analysis, Ethnography, Experimental or Quasi-Experimental Designs, Grounded Theory, Narrative Inquiry, Survey Research	Combination of Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches

Findings

Paradigms also dictate how data are collected and analysed. Positivist researchers tend to emphasise objectivity and detachment, aiming for a neutral stance that minimises the researcher's influence on the data. Findings are usually presented as objective truths or confirmed hypotheses, using statistical analyses to support conclusions. In contrast, constructivists, social constructionists, and interpretivists view the researcher as a key instrument in the research process, engaging in reflective practices to interpret nuanced meanings within data, acknowledging their subjective influence. Findings are usually presented as insights into the participants' perspectives, often narratively or through rich, descriptive accounts, emphasising the subjective nature of knowledge. The pragmatist researcher focuses on practical outcomes, guiding the selection of data collection and analysis techniques that are most likely to produce actionable insights. Results are usually presented in a way that highlights their practical implications. Critical realists analyse data to identify not just what is happening but why it is happening, looking for patterns that reveal the influence of hidden structures or power relations. Findings are usually presented in a way which highlights or critiques the underlying societal mechanisms leading to a particular phenomenon.

Ethics of Paradigms

The ethical considerations surrounding research paradigms are critical. First, it is important to highlight that the seven paradigms discussed in this article are by no means the only ones that exist. Historically, some perspectives and bodies of knowledge have been overlooked or marginalised in research. This extends to the development and recognition of research paradigms as well. As such, I encourage you to also explore other diverse paradigms, especially those that may be considered non-traditional or originate from non-Western contexts. Embracing a broader spectrum of paradigms can enrich our research approaches and outcomes, offering a wider range of valuable insights and perspectives.

Second, different paradigms inherently shape the relationship between researchers and their participants. This is especially important in qualitative research, where participant voices and experiences should be at the forefront. Constructivists and social constructionists, for example, emphasise the co-construction of knowledge between researcher and participant, which raises ethical questions about how power dynamics are navigated. In these paradigms, participants are not just sources of data but active contributors to the research process. Researchers must be mindful of the ethical responsibility to honour the voices of their participants, ensuring that they are represented accurately and with respect. This requires a deep reflection on power imbalances, particularly when working with vulnerable or marginalised groups, such that the researcher's positionality may affect how the research is conducted and how findings are interpreted.

Third, reflexivity requires researchers to continuously examine their own biases, assumptions, and values throughout the research process, acknowledging how this influences their interactions with participants and their interpretation of findings. This introspective approach is ethically significant because it encourages transparency, but it also demands that researchers take responsibility for how their perspectives shape the research outcomes. For instance, in critical research that aims to challenge societal structures or highlight inequalities, the researcher's values are explicitly tied to the research agenda. While this can lead to socially impactful research, it also means that ethical reflexivity is crucial to ensure that the researcher is not imposing their own agenda on participants or misinterpreting their voices to fit a preconceived narrative. The ethical dilemma here is to balance the researcher's values with a commitment to faithfully represent the participants' perspectives.

Finally, paradigms that acknowledge research as inherently value-laden explicitly position the researcher's values as integral to the research process. In value-laden research, researchers must navigate the tension between advancing their own ethical commitments and remaining open to the voices and experiences of participants, even when these do not align with their own values. Thus, the ethical dimensions of paradigm choice are closely tied to axiology, as researchers must be aware of how their values influence every aspect of their study, from design to dissemination. By engaging with the ethical implications of their chosen paradigm, researchers can foster more transparent, accountable, and ethically sound research practices.

Conclusion

Ontology, epistemology, and axiology form the philosophical backbone of a research project, shaping the methods used and the interpretation of findings. The purpose of this article was to provide a foundational understanding of seven key research paradigms (positivism, post-positivism, constructivism, social constructionism, interpretivism, pragmatism, and critical realism), each with distinct perspectives on the nature of reality, knowledge, and values in research. By introducing these paradigms in an accessible way, this article aims to assist researchers in identifying the paradigm that best aligns with their worldview and research objectives. Understanding these foundational concepts is a crucial first step in designing methodologically sound and philosophically coherent studies.

One significant limitation of this article is that it only offers an introductory exploration of each paradigm, which does not capture the full depth and complexity of the philosophical debates and nuances underlying these perspectives. As a result, this article may oversimplify certain aspects of these paradigms to make the concepts accessible, potentially limiting the depth of understanding for advanced researchers or those well-versed in philosophical inquiry. Consequently, once a researcher has identified which paradigm resonates most with their view of the world and their research goals, it is essential to further explore the complexities of that

paradigm. Each paradigm brings with it a rich tradition of philosophical thought, ethical considerations, and methodological implications that need to be carefully explored to ensure rigour and coherence in research.

By consciously selecting and clearly articulating their research paradigm, researchers not only enhance the integrity and rigour of their own studies but also contribute to the ongoing disciplinary dialogue about the nature of reality and knowledge construction. Researchers must remain reflexive, continually reassessing their paradigmatic choices considering new theoretical developments and societal changes. This reflexive practice encourages the academic community to critically engage with and expand upon existing paradigms, ultimately leading to the advancement of knowledge across disciplines. In this way, research paradigms serve as a crucial bridge between the philosophical foundations of a study and its practical execution, ensuring that research is both meaningful and impactful.

References

- Archer, M., Bhaskar, R., Collier, A., Lawson, T., & Norrie, A. (1998). *Critical realism: Essential readings*. Routledge.
- Bhaskar, R. (2008). *A realist theory of science*. Routledge.
- Bhaskar, R., & Hartwig, M. (2016). *Enlightened common sense: The philosophy of critical realism*. Routledge.
- Biesta, G. (2010). Pragmatism and the philosophical foundations of mixed methods research. A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods research for the social & behavioral sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 95-118). Sage.
- Biesta, G. J. J., & Burbules, N. C. (2003). *Pragmatism and educational research*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. Sage.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Burr, V. (2015). *Social constructionism* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Cersosimo, G. (2022). Pragmatism. In P. Atkinson, S. Delamont, A. Cernat, J. W. Sakshaug, & R. A. Williams (Eds.), *SAGE research methods foundations*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036837556>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *Foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Routledge.
- Danermark, B., Ekstrom, M., Jakobsen, L., & Karlsson, J. C. (2001). *Explaining society: An introduction to critical realism in the social sciences*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203996249>
- Denicolo, P., Long, T., & Bradley-Cole, K. (2016). *Constructivist approaches and research methods*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526402660>
- Dombrowski, P. M. (2020). Social constructionism. In P. M. Dombrowski (Ed.), *Humanistic aspects of technical communication* (pp. 81-96). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315231433-5>
- Elder-Vass, D. (2022). Critical realism. In G. Delanty & S. P. Turner (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of contemporary social and political theory* (pp. 241-249). Routledge.
- Fosnot, C. T. (2005). *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Gergen, K. J. (2015). *An invitation to social construction* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Henderson, K. A. (2011). Post-positivism and the pragmatics of leisure research. *Leisure Sciences*, 33(4), 341-346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2011.583166>
- Karupiah, P. (2022). Positivism. In M. R. Islam, N. A. Khan, & R. Baikady (Eds.), *Principles of social research methodology* (pp. 73-82). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5441-2_6
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2016). *The constructivist credo*. Routledge.
- Little, D. (2019). Postpositivism. In P. Atkinson, S. Delamont, A. Cernat, J. W. Sakshaug, & R. A. Williams (Eds.), *SAGE research methods foundations*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036837553>
- McNamee, S., & Hosking, D. M. (2012). *Research and social change: A relational constructionist approach*. Routledge.
- Morgan, D. L. (2013). *Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods: A pragmatic approach*. Sage.

- Morgan, D. L. (2014). Pragmatism as a paradigm for social research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(8), 1045-1053. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800413513733>
- Paley, J. (2024). *Constructivism and the metaphysics of qualitative research*. Routledge.
- Panhwar, A. H., Ansari, S., & Shah, A. A. (2017). Post-positivism: An effective paradigm for social and educational research. *International Research Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 45(45), 253-259. <https://sujo.usindh.edu.pk/index.php/IRJAH/article/view/927>
- Park, Y. S., Konge, L., & Artino, A. R. (2020). The positivism paradigm of research. *Academic Medicine*, 95(5), 690-694. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000003093>
- Phillips, M. J. (2023). Towards a social constructionist, criticalist, Foucauldian-informed qualitative research approach: Opportunities and challenges. *SN Social Sciences*, 3, 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-023-00774-9>
- Phillips, D. C., & Burbules, N. C. (2000). *Postpositivism and educational research*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Popper, K., & Bartley, W. W. (1985). *Realism and the aim of science: From the postscript to the logic of scientific discovery*. Routledge.
- Ryan, G. (2018). Introduction to positivism, interpretivism and critical theory. *Nurse Researcher*, 25(4), 14-20. <https://doi.org/10.7748/nr.2018.e1466>
- Schrag, F. (1992). In defense of positivist research paradigms. *Educational Researcher*, 21(5), 5-8. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X021005005>
- Schwartz-Shea, P., & Yanow, D. (2020). Interpretivism. In P. Atkinson, S. Delamont, A. Cernat, J. W. Sakshaug, & R. A. Williams (Eds.), *SAGE research methods foundations*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036915455>
- Steffe, L. P., & Gale, J. (1995). *Constructivism in education*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- van Manen, M. (2016). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315421056>
- Yanow, D., & Schwartz-Shea, P. (2015). *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*. Routledge.

Author Note

Dr. Lynette Pretorius is an award-winning educator and researcher in the fields of academic language, literacy, research skills, and research methodologies. She has experience teaching undergraduate, postgraduate, and graduate research students, including supervising Ph.D. students. Lynette is the author of multiple journal articles, and two academic books focused on the experiences of graduate research students in academia. She has qualifications in Medicine, Science, Education, as well as Counselling, and her research interests include doctoral education, academic identity, student wellbeing, AI literacy, and autoethnography. Lynette is a Senior Fellow of the Higher Education Academy – an international honour awarded to educators who demonstrate a thorough understanding of, and a strong commitment to, teaching and learning approaches which foster high-quality student learning. Please direct correspondence to lynette.pretorius@monash.edu

Author Contribution: Dr. Lynette Pretorius contributed to the conceptualisation, investigation, project administration, resources, and writing (both draft and final version) of this study.

Acknowledgements: I did not receive any specific grants from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors for the preparation or publication of this manuscript. I disclose that I earn a small income from my YouTube channel, where I have

previously posted videos discussing the topics covered in this manuscript. This manuscript is exempt from ethical approval as it does not include any data collected through research. This manuscript was previously made available via pre-print on Monash University's institutional research repository. The pre-print can be accessed here: <https://doi.org/10.26180/27013843> It is also important to note that this manuscript is an academic version of a blog post that I wrote for my website in February 2024. In recognition of the numerous requests for an academic source that could be referenced in articles, books, and theses, I decided to convert it into this short article. The original blog post can be found here: https://www.lynettepretorius.com/the_scholars_way_blog/demystifying-research-paradigms/ I acknowledge that I used a customised version of ChatGPT 4 (OpenAI, <https://chat.openai.com/>) to help me refine my phrasing during the preparation of both the original blog post and this manuscript. The output from ChatGPT 4 was adapted to reflect my own style and voice, as well as during the peer review process. I take full responsibility for the final content of this manuscript.

Copyright 2024: Lynette Pretorius and Nova Southeastern University.

Article Citation

Pretorius, L. (2024). Demystifying research paradigms: Navigating ontology, epistemology, and axiology in research. *The Qualitative Report*, 29(10), 2698-2715. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2024.7632>
