MESSAGE FROM THE RECTOR OF YOGYAKARTA STATE UNIVERSITY

Welcome to Yogyakarta, Indonesia!

It is a great honor and pleasure for me to welcome you all to the 3rd International Conference on Educational Research and Innovation held in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. On behalf of Yogyakarta State University and the committee, let me extend my warmest greetings and appreciation to all speakers and participants who have travelled hundreds or even thousands of miles by various transportation means to come to Yogyakarta to attend this conference. It is my strong belief that your safe journey has been due to the blessings granted by God the Almighty and the Most Merciful to Whom we without any further due have to express our gratitude and praise.

It is indeed a privilege for Yogyakarta State University to have the opportunity to organise this very important conference in which educational researchers and practitioners get together to share ideas, experiences, expectations, and research findings. This conference is held as one of the agendas of Yogyakarta State University to celebrate its 51st anniversary. The theme of this year’s conference is “Ethics in High-Quality Research”.

Research is one of the activities among the academic members of a university. It is a systematic effort to solve the problems or answer the questions by collecting data, formulating the generalities based on the data, then finding and developing organized knowledge by scientific method. It is expected that from research activities valuable empirical facts can be obtained to improve and develop the theory and practice to bring a better quality of education.

Unfortunately, currently issues on ethics are regaining their popularity in various practices of research, such as inaccurate data analyses, data manipulations, and plagiarism. In response to this, in this year to support the roles of the Institute of Research and Community Services of Yogyakarta State University in encouraging researchers to conduct high-quality researches, an International Conference on Educational Research and Innovation (ICERI) is held under the umbrella theme of Ethics in High-Quality Research. It provides teachers/lecturers, education practitioners, college students, and policy makers the opportunity to share their knowledge, experiences, and research findings which are innovative and relevant to develop the educational practices focusing on the process and product.
This third conference is aimed at discussing the papers on the research findings related to research ethics, and researches on character education, teaching innovations, as well as educational policies. It is expected that this conference will reach its declared objectives successfully as a strategic forum to yield recommendations on the importance of ethics in the research to produce high-quality research for the benefits of the human’s welfare.

To conclude, let me wish you a fruitful discussion during the conference and an enjoyable stay in Yogyakarta. And finally, hopefully all materials in this conference compiled into a proceeding are useful for us to improve the quality of education and educational research.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Wassalamu’ alaikum warrahmatullah wabarakatuh.
May peace and God’s blessings be upon you all

Yogyakarta, 6 May 2015
Rector,

Prof. Dr. Rochmat Wahab, M.Pd., M.A.
MESSAGE FROM THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

His Excellency Minister of Research and Technology and Higher Education, Vice Rectors and Deans of all faculties, Honourable Heads of Institutes of Research of the surrounding universities, Distinguished all invited speakers and all other speakers, Distinguished guests, All participants, Ladies and gentlemen,

Assalamu’ alaikum warraḥmatullah wabarakatuh
May peace and God’s blessings be upon you all
Good morning

First of all allow me to extend my warmest greetings and welcome to you all to the 3rd International Conference on Educational Research and Innovation, held by Yogyakarta State to celebrate its 51st anniversary.

Raising the theme – Ethics in High-Quality Research - this conference is designed to discuss the papers on the research findings related to research ethics, and researches on character education, teaching innovations, as well as educational policies. Hopefully, all discussions in this conference can be inspiring and useful for us to improve the quality of education and educational research.

Ladies and gentlemen

For your information, we will proudly present one keynote speech, four plenary presentation sessions and four parallel presentation sessions. Four outstanding speakers in the field of character education and educational research have been invited. They are Christopher Drake from Association for Living Values Education, Hong Kong, Dr. Elizabeth Hartnell-Young from Australian Council of Educational Research, Dr. Mohamed Bahaaeldin from Faculty of Education, Technische Universitat Dresden, Germany, and Dr. Nurul Taufiqurahman, Head of Innovation Center of the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI), Indonesia.

Ladies and gentlemen

We have done our best to prepare for this conference. So, my highest appreciation and heartfelt thanks to all committee members. As to err is human, shortcomings may
occur here and there. On behalf of the committee, I would therefore like you all to accept our apologies.

At the end of my speech I would like to kindly request the Rector of Yogyakarta State University to officially open the conference.

To conclude, let me wish you a productive discussion and a fruitful conference. Thank you very much for your attention.

Wassalamu’ alaikum warrahmatullah wabarakatuh.
May peace and God’s blessings be upon you all

Yogyakarta, 6 May, 2015
Head of Research Institute and Community Service of Yogyakarta State University

Prof. Dr. Anik Ghufron, M.Pd.
FOREWORDS FROM THE HEAD OF COMMITTEE

Assalamu’alaikum wa Rahmatullohi wa Barokatuh
May peace and God’s blessings be upon us all

Your Excellency The President of Yogyakarta State University Prof. Dr. Rochmat Wahab, M.Pd, M.A, ladies and gentlemen, good morning and welcome to Yogyakarta State University.

The seminar entitle International Conference on Educational Research and Innovation (ICERI) is held under the umbrella theme of Ethics in High-Quality Research. The seminar is organized by Institute of Research and Community Services, Yogyakarta State University, working together with ACER, LIPI, and University of Dresden. This seminar also dedicated to celebrate the 51st Commemoration of Yogyakarta state university.

Ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the committe of this conference, I would like to express highest appreciation and gratitude to the keynote speakers Prof. Drs. Muhammad Nasir, Akt, M.Si, Ph.D (Minister of Research, Technology and Higher Education) and four invited speaker:

- Christopher Drake
  (Association for Living Values Education, Hong Kong)
- Dr. Elizabeth Hatnell-Young
  (Australian Council for Educational Research, Australia)
- Dr. Bahaaidin Mohamed
  (Faculty of Education, Technische Universitat Dresden, Germany)
- Dr. Nurul Taufiqu Rahman, M.Eng.
  (Head of Innovation Center, Indonesian Institute Sciences (LIPI), Indonesia)

The conference is around 200 participant with 121 orally presented article from lecture, researcher, teacher, and student from about 45 universities. The conference is aimed at discussing the papers on the research findings related to research ethics, and researches on character education, teaching innovations, as well as educational policies. It is expected that this conference yields recommendations on the importance of ethics in the research to produce high-quality research for the benefits of the human’s welfare.
This conference will be far from succes and we could not accomplish what we do without the support from various parties. So let me extend my deepest gratitude and highest appreciation to all committee members. I would also like to thank each of participants for attending our conference and bringing your expertise to our gathering. Should you find any inconveniences and shortcomings, please accept my sincere apologies. In conclusion, I hope that your discussions produce something useful and very pleasant stay in Yogyakarta.

Wassalamu’ alaikum wa Rahmatullohi wa Barokatuh
Thank you

Por. Dr. Sri Atun
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Abstract

This particular study is intended to discuss the question of positivistic hegemony in the practice of social and humanities sciences in Indonesia. It is widely believed that the positivistic approach in its early history was an approach particularly used in conducting researces of natural sciences. However, in later development, this approach has been used and even became the most important approach in conducting any kinds of studies not only those of natural sciences but also the ones of social and humanities sciences. In fact, the two disciplines have philosophical differences. One of the fundamental differences is the fact that natural sciences believe in the idea of correctness while social and humanities sciences believe in the idea of appropriateness. Consequently these two areas of studies need to be treated differently unless various achievement and development of sciences will not play their significant roles as the catharsis and enlightenment for various problems of culture and humanity. In turn, sciences will not be a blessing but rather a curse. In relation to this phenomenon, this particular study tries to discuss the notion of approaches in sciences, their fundamental differences, not to mention the implications that need to be specifically treated in relation to the social and humanity disciplines.

Key words: hegemony, positivistic approach, social and humanity sciences.

Introduction

One of the biggest criticisms to the educational field particularly addressed to science institutions is their failure in becoming one of the best elements of the enlightenment processes of various cultural and humanities matters. The development of modern or even postmodern sciences that tends to be really revolutionary is not equal to the complexity of various cultural and humanity problems.

It is commonly believed that the complexity of the contemporary civilization problems is the result of the science development. The advancement of science and technology that initially aimed at simplifying humans’ work has resulted in anxiety and fear to humans’ life. Various achievements in the advancement of science that are supposed to bring more enlightenment and happiness to humans’ life, on the contrary, in many cases tend to put and trap human beings in a deep immeasurable hole.

It is undeniable that modern world that is easily identified by the advancements of sciences with their spectacular discoveries, has brought many blessings in the form of simplicities for human beings to run their lives. On the other hand, it is also undeniable that the advancement of sciences also has the negative impacts on humans’ life. One of them that can be said to be the most crucial is the appearance of what so called the crisis...
of consciousness and the existence of values (Komarudin Hidayat & Wahyu Nafis, 2003). In line with this, Simmel (1980:41) states that "The crisis of culture is a crisis of the spirit of modern man, a crisis of conscience. ...an interpretation of the sociopsychological correlates or manifestations of this crisis in the mentality of the native of the modern culture".

Various crises of existence and values that typically happen in modern culture as mentioned earlier, at a particular point, are the results of the fallacy in the practical awareness of science tradition, particularly, in relation to the current practices of socio-humanistic sciences. The fallacy is initiated by the use of positivistic paradigm that seems to be a strong hegemony. This paradigm is commonly believed to be the one typically used in the practice of natural sciences. However, this paradigm in turn has become a strong hegemony for every kind of sciences, not only those belonging to natural sciences but also those of social and humanities sciences. One thing to be noted is the fact that philosophically each group of sciences has each own paradigm. One of the most fundamental differences between the two is the fact that natural sciences put their focus on the idea of correctness, whereas social and humanities put emphasize on the idea of appropriateness. This phenomenon very often results in the failure of the various advancement of sciences to play their best roles as the catharsis and enlightenment agents of various problems related to culture and humanity. Sciences, then can be a good blessings but rather curses to humans’ life.

This crucial problem has become a deep concern for many years. The great philosopher of the 21st century, Albert Einstein in one part of his speech in front of the students of California University in 1938, as adapted by Suriasumantri (2006:248-249) has mentioned the following.

It is not enough for you to understand sciences to facilitate your works to be humans’ blessing. It is the attention to human beings and their destiny that always need to be the main concern of all technical efforts, of all attentions to the big problems that remain unsolvable of working arrangement and the equalization of things- to make the results of our thinking become blessing rather than curses to humanity. Don’t forget this in the middle of various diagrams and equations.

**Method**

It is necessary to state that this piece of writing is merely the result of a study of the phenomenon or the development of ideas rather than the result of a particular research. The ideas mentioned in this particular writing can be said to be the results of critical reflections of various phenomena closely related to the practice of positivistic hegemony of science tradition commonly found in our society. In practical, these critical reflections are discussed dialectically with various related concepts or theories that can be used to make analysis and synthesis and in turn result in a narrative writing.

**Discussion**

**The Paradigm in Science Construction and The Nature of Difference of Science Groups**

In science perspective, the term ‘paradigm’ has a significant role, as the result of its function and fundamental existence, that is as the basic framework directing to which direction a particular science needs to be used. Even when its discursive discussion is more widely stretched, the position and important role of each science paradigm can be practically used in daily life contexts of culture and humans’ life. With absence of a guiding paradigm, it will be impossible to discuss and develop cultural phenomena.

The term ‘paradigm’ was firstly used by Thomas Khun (1962) in his monumental book entitled *The Structure of Scientific Revolution* then followed by Robert Winslow Friedrichs (1970) in his book *A Sociology of Sociology.* Thomas Kuhn (1962) in his book—that has been newly published in 2012- defines the term paradigm as a set of fundamental beliefs guiding our actions, either those of daily actions or scientific ones. In line with Khun, Friedrichs (in Lundberg & Young, 2005:47) defines paradigm as “A fundamental image a discipline has of its subject matter”. Meanwhile, Denzin & Lincoln (1994:105) define paradigm as: “Basic belief system or worldview that guides the investigator, not only in choices of method but in ontologically and epistemologically fundamental ways”. From those definitions, it can be said that paradigm is a system of fundamental beliefs or ways of looking at the world that provide guidances for researchers not only in choosing the methods but also in using the fundamental ways of conducting their researches.

Discussing the nature of sciences, it can simply said that there are two big groups of sciences, namely, natural sciences and the other one is the one related to socio cultural life, which is commonly called social and humanities sciences. The first groups of science, that is natural sciences is the term used to refer to sciences whose objects are natural things having the exact and general rules/laws that can be used in limited time, in any places and it can be said that they tend to be ‘objective’ (Buckley, 1992:10). It is based on its objectivity that natural sciences are also called exact sciences. Other objects beyond human observation can be included in the study of natural
and humanities sciences is called ‘truth’. In other words, the paradigm used in social natural sciences’ positivistic tradition in finding the causality of an event as commonly happens in to find what so called ‘truth’ rather than explaining (Hammersley, 1993:16). Therefore, the approach emphasize on the qualitative analysis rather than ‘objective’ facts (Buckley, 1992:10); with its tend to have focus on ‘subjective’ facts rather on universal facts taken from external observation but empirical experiences with its main way of external distant observation. The main thesis of positivistic approach is that the valid knowledge is merely the one based on facts. In this sense, positivism denies the existence of every power or subject behind the fact. It also denies the use of various methods unless those commonly used to analyze facts (Muhadjir, 1998). In this context, asset of results of scientific processes then need to be made in a correct and incorrect format that has nearly absolute meaning and even tend to be universal.

On the other hand, the basic spirit of social and humanities sciences is not put upon the obsession of getting objective facts, not even universal facts taken from external observation but rather on the subjective facts that closely related to humans’ nature and humanity not to mention its contextual cultural settings as the main concern. Gilje & Skirbekk (2013:197) states that:

The difference between the humanities and the natural science, concern not only two different methods, but also different relationships between the subject of cognition and the object of cognition in the two types of disciplines. Society, culture, and history are produces of the human spirit. Therefore, in the 'new science', the researcher seeks to understand society and culture as expressions of human intentions, desires, and motives. In the humanities we are not concerned with the Cartesian distinction between subject and object. Here the object of cognition is itself a subject (human beings and the societies they create). In te humanities the researcher is, in a certain sense, personally

Meanwhile, the second group, the social and humanities sciences are the branches of sciences that try to understand the meaning of humans’ life and existence. In Oxford English Dictionary (2003), it is stated that, “The humanities are academic disciplines that study human culture. The humanities use methods that are primarily critical, or speculative, and have a significant historical element—as distinguished from the mainly empirical approaches of the natural sciences”. In line with this definition, Belfiore & Upchurch (2013:8) claim that, “The humanity as ‘the branch of learning concerned with human culture; the academic subject collectively comprising this branch of learning, as history, literature, ancient and modern languages, law, philosophy, art, and music’.

Unlike natural sciences, this type of sciences tend to have focus on ‘subjective’ facts rather on ‘objective’ facts (Buckley, 1992:10); with its emphasize on the qualitative analysis rather than quantitative and tend to be naturalistic (Hammersley, 1993:16). Therefore, the approach underlying social and humanities sciences puts in main focus on naturalistic meaning understanding to find what so called ‘truth’ rather than explaining the causality of an event as commonly happens in natural sciences’ positivistic tradition in finding ‘truth’. In other words, the paradigm used in social and humanities sciences is called verstehen-ideographic, while the natural sciences are erklaren-nomotetik. Verstehen is a modification way of interpreting texts, while erklaren is an explanation of social symptom by looking at its causality. Nomothetic refers to knowledge to find regularity while ideographic is a knowledge that focuses on individual and historical symptom. In relation to that, Knierimen & Roege (2010) mention the following.

What distinguishes the humanities from the natural sciences is not a certain subject matter, but instead the method of approach to any question. The humanities probe intangibles such as purpose, meaning, and judgment – all adding up to the capacity for self-reflection, abstract thought, and creativity. The humanities focuses on understanding meaning, purpose, and goals and furthers the appreciation of singular historical or social events – an interpretive method of finding “truth” – rather than explaining the causality of events or uncovering the truth of the natural world.

Consequently, when we explore what it means to be human, we need more than neat categories and a perfect definition. There is something about us that we cannot mention, that deny clear labels, yet challenges us to try to figure it out. Underlying our thought is the assumption of a human nature, a sense of what identifies us as a species. If the humanities explore the intangibles, then arts, for example and its relevance for students today need to be put within the domain of humanities.

The existence of the fundamental difference between natural sciences and social and humanities sciences, leads to the differences in the paradigmatic level. The most prominent paradigmatic focus of natural sciences is its main approach that relies on the objective facts based on empirical experiences with its main way of external distant observation. The main thesis of positivistic approach is that the valid knowledge is merely the one based on facts. In this sense, positivism denies the existence of every power or subject behind the fact. It also denies the use of various methods unless those commonly used to analyze facts (Muhadjir, 1998). In this context, asset of results of scientific processes then need to be made in a correct and incorrect format that has nearly absolute meaning and even tend to be universal.

On the other hand, the basic spirit of social and humanities sciences is not put upon the obsession of getting objective facts, not even universal facts taken from external observation but rather on the subjective facts that closely related to humans’ nature and humanity not to mention its contextual cultural settings as the main concern.
When Positivistic Paradigm Takes The Most Important Role in Social and Humanities Sciences

As mentioned earlier, each of the group of sciences needs to use different paradigm. The problem is they don’t do that. A series of historical notes show that for a long time up to the current time, both groups of sciences tend to use one paradigm, that is the paradigm of natural sciences as their means of analysis (Sriraman & Goodchild, 2009:85). It can be said that positivistic paradigm has been becoming a strong hegemony over both groups of sciences. This hegemony has resulted in the facts that a series of scientific processes, either those belong to natural sciences or social and humanities sciences cannot be easily differentiated. As the main observable principles are empirical, objective and universal.

Talking about the use of positivistic paradigm of natural sciences in social and humanities sciences, it cannot be separated to the person who initiated this phenomenon. It was August Comte (1789-1857), a French man who is considered as the one who put the foundation of modern sociology. He introduced ‘three steps-law’ in humans intellectual development, namely, theological, metaphysics, and positivistic step. These three steps can be easily recognized in the way humans explain a variety of social-economical phenomenon. In the first step, humans tend to refer to any supernatural things; in the second step humans tend to refer to any kinds of metaphysical powers, and in the third step, humans tend to refer to the scientific description and rules. Positivism does not have much concern or even ignores anything outside humans’ empirical-sensation knowledge. This idea is in line with the term ‘positivism’ inherited from the word ‘positive’ (the opponet of negative), having the meaning of strict, definite/fixed, and convincing (Echols, 1982:439). In philosophy, the term positivism refers to an idea based on something which is fixed/ precise/exact, factual, and real of a certain phenomenon that is known and based on empirical data.

In line with this principle, then, positivism put its emphasize on the idea that the observed object must be in the form facts, and the study must lead to something fixed and carefully observed. According to Comte, the means that can be used to conduct scientific studies are: observation, comparison, experiments, and historical method (Splichal, 1999:229). The passion of the objectivity, in turn, makes a scientist tend to separate between ‘a subject who conduct the research’ and ‘an object being studied’ in order to get neutral and avoid judgement as well as mere opinion. This may result in the scientist gets detached or having a particular distance from the real social life.

As the one who initiated the positivism paradigm, Comte has got much influence from Descartes, who said that sciences underlying any kinds of sciences are mathematics-astronomy-chemistry-physics-and biology and the top of them is sociology physics. Comte states that it is not until humans do scientific investigations, that they will get useful findings. The non-natural sciences will find difficulties to get legitimatization as they need to deal with some difficulties. The difficulties are closely related to non-exact assumptions that they cannot provide advantages/benefits to modern human beings (Listiyono, 2006:150).

Positivistic Paradigm Hegemony in Humanities Sciences and Its Various Impacts

As Comte’s philosophical positivism became the foundation of education, it can be said that education as one kind of humanities sciences is merely conducted on the basis of empiricism, materialism, and rationalism. According to the positivism philosophy, an educational institution having this philosophy as the main basis claims that humans’ knowledge development need to follow the three steps of developments. First, the theological steps, in which humans believe that there is always a supernatural power underlying every single natural symptom. It is that supernatural power managing the function and movement of that symptom. The theological step can be divided into three periods, namely, animism, polytheism, and monotheism. The second step is the metaphysics step, in which, the supernatural powers are replaced by some abstract concepts and principles, such as God’s will, destiny, etc. In short, it can be said that metaphysics is highlighted in this step. The third step is the positive step in which humans no longer look for something behind facts. Based on observation and ratio, human beings try to identify the similar relationship of facts.

Thus, it can be considered that positivism is a stream in scientific tradition aims at separating knowledge from the initial goal of achieving it, that is to get knowledge for the sake of knowledge that theories need to be separated from humans’ life. This paradigm considers the knowledge of objective facts as the right knowledge. Knowledge,
accordig positivism, must be neutral, free from any kinds of interest.

The practice of Comte’s opinion of the importance of positivistic paradigm applied in social and humanistic sciences can be easily identified in Indonesian context not to mention in educational setting. In this particular setting, the hegemony of positivistic awareness phenomenon is clearly seen for instance, in the form of the application of statistics with its various sophisticated quantitative analysis that tend to be considered as the source of every truth. Moreover, statistics has become a prerequisite to enter some post graduate programs. Anyone who will enter the program needs to take it before learning various subjects.

In more operational practice, the scientific paradigm has been used as the main approach in the new curriculum, 2013 Curriculum. It is widely believed that this curriculum offers a new idea in the form of the changing of the paradigm claimed to be a very basic philosophy of learning steps, what so called the scientific approach that is considered to be a better approach compared to other approaches (Permendikbud No. 65 Tahun 2013). In this scientific paradigm, the learning materials are merely based on facts or phenomena that can be explained logically or by using a certain reason. Through this scientific based approach, it is believed that students/learners will be more active in constructing their knowledge and skills. The use of this approach to learning is also believed to be able to facilitate learners to conduct investigations to find facts of a particular phenomenon or event. It implies that during the process of learning, learners learn and become familiar of how to find scientific truths. They are trained to use the logical, well-organized, and systematic ways of thinking by means of what so called as High Order Thinking. The scientific approach in the practice of teaching and learning cover some main components: observing, questioning, experimenting, associating, and communicating. The underlying principle of this approach is believed to be an idea proposed by Roger Crombie White in his book entitled Curriculum Innovation: A Celebration of Classroom Practice (1997). The main thesis proposed in this approach is mainly on the importance of facilitating students with facts. Crombie White claims that ‘nothing is more important than facts.’

Another crucial problem in the educational field related to the strong hegemony of positivistic paradigm is closely related to the idea of universality. This hegemony appears in the form of the strong tendency of considering theories coming from Western countries as the main source of truth in getting any kinds of knowledge. In discussing particular topics related to the spirit of locality, such as the study of character education, we are supposed to use theories coming from Western countries. This phenomenon can be found in many books discussing character education, not to mention the one of Zuchdi (2011) and other books written by Indonesian scholars having this topic. Most of those books adopt the theories of character education proposed by Thomas Lickona, in his popular book entitled Educating for Character: How Our Schools Can Teach Respect and Responsibility (1992). Meanwhile, other resources related to character education based on the Indonesian locality, for example, the ones written by Ki Hadjar Dewantara, Ki Ageng Suryomentaram, Sosrokarlono, and many others are rarely considered as being significant resources and tend to be ignored and perceived as being non-universal.

Finally, it can be said that positivism has been becoming a very effectual poison for experts and individuals working with social and humanities sciences. They always consider the positivist thinking, which put its main concern on objectivity in every scientific activity. In research practices, the practice of positivistic paradigm can be easily recognized by the use of survey and quantitative methods that always result in objective scientific truth. Subjectivity has been familiar among individuals that believe and tend to use the positivistic approach, not to mention those dealing with social and humanities sciences. These people tend to consider subjectivity as something unscientific and could lead to the failure of developing sciences. The objective attitude of social scholars who believe in positivistic paradigm may reduce their being critical towards cultural social phenomena in the society.

This natural sciences hegemony has led to the so called modernism civilization that tend to have various problems as the result of the reduction of the nature and existence of culture and humanity, merely for the sake of fulfilling the positivistic paradigm of natural sciences that has no capability in reaching the source of understanding (Rosenberg, 2013:165). It is from fact that various de-humanistic problems as the negative impacts of modernization and universality could be clearly and significantly defined (Cho, 2013:123).

Starting from this limited definition of factual knowledge that typically used positivistic paradigm as mentioned by Comte, it is necessary to make Sistem Pendidikan Nasional as a starting point to enhance not only students’ knowledge and skills but also as a means of transforming and internalizing various humanistic values, such as faith and belief, and good attitudes.
Conclusion

The hegemony of positivistic paradigm in social and humanities sciences needs to be considered. Unfortunately, until now, it seems that this hegemony remains exist. One of the negative impacts of this phenomenon is many often various advancements of sciences cannot play their best roles as the catharsis and enlightenment of various problems of culture and humanity. Sciences, in turn cannot blessings but rather it they tend to be curses for civilization and humanity. Therefore, various alternative steps are necessary to state the importance of choosing the right paradigm for each group of sciences not to mention the social and humanities sciences that need to have naturalistic paradigm rather than positivistic one.
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