

Paradigm Shift and Diversity in Finance

Fatima Sultana¹, Anwar Hussain²

Lecturer, Lahore Business School, The University of Lahore, Sargodha Campus¹, Assistant Professor, Lahore Business School, The University of Lahore, Sargodha Campus²

Corresponding Author Email: fatima2135@gmail.com¹

Cite this paper: Sultana, F., & Hussain, F. (2019). Paradigm shift and diversity in finance. *Paradigms*, 13(2), 106-113.

The basic purpose of the current paper is to provide an overview about the paradigms and to highlight the paradigm to which finance belongs. It discusses four paradigms i.e. functionalist or positivist, post-positivist, interpretive and pragmatic paradigm in detail and differences that exists between all paradigms on the basis of their ontology (nature of reality), epistemology (view about knowledge), axiology (researcher's value addition) and research methodology (research methods). The purpose of this paper is not to create a new paradigm rather it explains the role of other paradigms along with the positivist paradigm in Finance. Furthermore, it discusses the merits and weaknesses of all paradigms. It concludes that positivist paradigm must adopt the tools of other paradigms to gain more and to enhance its ability to contribute more to the world knowledge. This study will be helpful contribution for the finance researcher to follow the other approaches of other paradigms as well along with positivism paradigm and to use multi method research designs.

Keywords: Research paradigms, Finance, Paradigm diversity, Multi method research design

INTRODUCTION

Finance is considered an important discipline for policy makers as well as for academia. Most of the researches conducted in the field of finance follow the quantitative approach (Shah, Butt & Hasan, 2009; Nikoomaram, Banimahd & Shokri, 2012; (Linnenluecke, Chen, Ling, Smith, & Zhu, 2017). It means that these researches are based on some measurements and observations and these studies highlight the cause and effect relationship.

Based on the conclusion of Linnenluecke et al. (2017) it can be said that most of the researches carried out in finance are based on mathematical modeling and follow positivism paradigm. This paradigm is used to identify the causes of different financial problems that are being faced around the world. But there are number of problems that cannot be solved with the help of positivism paradigm (for example, principle agent conflict, dividend, profitability, investment policy, capital structure, behavioral finance and rationality concept) that somehow include the human nature for final decisions. So, there is need to move a step ahead from positivist paradigm to paradigm diversity (Shannon-Baker, 2016).

This study starts with an overview about four major paradigms i.e. functionalist or positivist, post-positivist, interpretive and pragmatic paradigm and differences that exists between all paradigms on the basis of their ontology (nature of reality), epistemology (view about knowledge), axiology (researcher's value) and research methodology (research methods).

Paradigm can be explained by number of ways. It is a world view approach and system of thinking which includes basic assumptions, grand challenges to be answered and different research techniques (Neuman, 2011). It provides a map or guidelines for solving research puzzles. It can be defined as set of fundamental beliefs and assumptions which builds a thinking framework for researchers which ultimately guides the researcher's behavior as it is the way of seeing reality (Ardalan,

2003) and creates knowledge (Morgan, 2007). It can also be considered as a tool that is used for research process. Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009) claimed that all paradigm can be differentiated based on two fundamental philosophies i.e. ontology and epistemology. Ontology is nature of reality way of seeing reality and epistemology can be defined as nature of knowledge or view about knowledge acceptance. Later on it was discovered that paradigms can also be differentiated on the basis of axiology and research methodology (Saunders et al., 2009; Wahyuni, 2012). Axiology discusses about research ethics highlighting whether the value of the researcher can be incorporated in the research or not. Methodology explains the model to be incorporate in the research.

This paper presents a brief overview about fundamental beliefs of each paradigm followed by the strengths and weaknesses of each paradigm. Next, it presents the paradigm shift and dominant paradigm in finance followed by paradigm diversity in finance. The paper ends with the conclusion.

Research Paradigms

It is important to understand the basic assumptions of each paradigm because without understanding the basics it would be difficult to relate each with financial theories. The assumptions of four basic paradigm i.e. positivism, post positivism, interpretivism and pragmatism are presented below. Each of the paradigms differs from other on the basis of some dimensions like objective and subjective dimension or on the basis of some basic assumptions like assumptions about nature of society (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Ardalan, 2019). In short, it can be concluded that every paradigm is different from other paradigm based on its ontology, epistemology, axiology and methodology. Each paradigm has some dominant assumption about reality, nature of knowledge and research methodology (Meer-Kooistra & Vosselman, 2012).

Positivism and post positivism paradigm

Both paradigms are similar in some context but there exists some differences as well (Porta & Keating, 2008). Positivism paradigm follows the rules of natural sciences (Neuman, 2011). Ontological view of this paradigm is that there exists a single and concrete reality (Ardalan, 2019). For positivist paradigm $2+2$ will always equal to 4 as there is only one possible answer or a single reality for this case. The reality is external, physical and objective in nature. Epistemologically, they support the knowledge which is numeric based or the knowledge which can be generalized (belief on law like generalizations), re-produced and captured easily (Porta & Keating, 2008; Ardalan, 2019). Positivists are individualists, which mean that properties of an aggregate are determined based on properties and characteristics of a unit. Axiologically, researchers cannot add value to the phenomena being observed. They observe “what is” without adding value to it (Ardalan, 2003; 2019; Neuman, 2011). They only state the results which they observe. In other words, the researchers and the phenomena under observation are totally independent of each other. They follow the etic approach which is also known as outsider approach. Positivist paradigm discover causal laws and use the quantitative approach as they deal with the testing a theory by developing different hypothesis and use statistical tests and technique to find the answer and carrying the research process (Porta & Keating, 2008; Neuman, 2011; Wahyuni, 2012). Post positivism also follows the same ontology in which reality is single, concrete, external, observable and objective in nature. But they challenge the belief of their ontology as interpretation involves human aspect to it. So, this paradigm is sometimes termed as critical realism (Wahyuni, 2012). This paradigm follows deductive procedures. The reality is known but it cannot be captured easily. The knowledge in case of post modernism paradigm is in form of probabilistic laws (Porta & Keating, 2008).

Interpretivism paradigm

Interpretivism paradigm, which is also known as constructivism, talks about multiple realities (Ardalan, 2019). Researcher also talked about the ontology, epistemology, axiology and methodology of this paradigm. Ontologically, truth is socially constructed i.e. based on human’s perceptions and beliefs. The perceptions and beliefs are subjective and may vary from individual to individual so cannot be generalized (Saunders et al., 2009; Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013; Ardalan, 2019), reproduced or replicate (Wahyuni, 2012). Similar arguments were developed by Ardalan (2005; 2019) saying that reality varies from individual to individual because it is subjective in nature. Epistemological view is that knowledge is created through interpretations, subjective meanings and social phenomena. Knowledge is acceptable if it is based on detailed solution and reality. Humans in these paradigms are perceived as free. Axiologically, researchers and the phenomena under observation are dependent to each other. They cannot be separated from one another. Researchers can add value to the research, so they take stance of emic or insider approach. Researcher’s value matters a lot in data collection and interpretation process (Saunders et al., 2009; Wahyuni, 2012). As far as methodology is concerned this paradigm use qualitative approach. Some researchers argue that

interpretive approach is the systematic analysis in which the meaningful actions of people are directly and deeply observed. The purpose of such observation is to get an idea that how people interact and maintain the social worlds (Neuman, 2011; Ardalan, 2019).

Pragmatism paradigm

Pragmatism is one of the paradigms which follow the mixed ontology, epistemology, axiology and methodology. Ontology and epistemology are chosen based on research question to be answered. Ontology for this paradigm can be objective and subjective as they follow the characteristics of both positivism and interpretivism paradigm. For them reality can be singular as well as multiple depending upon the situation and research question. They preferred the mixture of both paradigms i.e. positivism and interpretivism. Axiology is etic-emic which means that researcher can have inside as well as outside perspective. While choosing methodology, emphasis is on what works best to solve the research question. A mixture of qualitative and quantitative approach is the best solution and is preferred too (Wahyuni, 2012). Four fundamental beliefs (i.e. ontology, epistemology, axiology and methodology) for four different paradigms (functionalist or positivist, post-positivist, interpretive and pragmatic paradigm) are presented in Table 1 based on Saunders et al. (2009).

Strengths and Weaknesses of Paradigms

Each paradigm has some strength as well as limitations. Major strength of the positivism approach that data is gathered through hit and trial methods, but data gathered is accurate and law like generalizations can be made from the results as these results are based on scientific techniques (Ardalan, 2019). If theory is presented in a wrong way it will not have any impact on the nature. For example, initial prediction was that Sun revolves around the Earth. Later, it was explored that Earth revolves around the Sun. Belief on wrong knowledge had no effect on the nature. The major limitation of this approach is that it cannot capture the social phenomena (Ardalan, 2003) and it is impossible to study human beings by using methods of natural sciences (Ardalan, 2019). Post positivism approach also uses objective and accurate data but explains phenomena critically which results in deep investigation of the phenomena. Each phenomenon is explained through critical lens and social conditioning (Wahyuni, 2012). The weak point of this paradigm is that there is no specificity of the results. The researcher can be biased by incorporating his experience. Interpretivism paradigm believes on multiple realities so each researcher can interpret the result by his own way depending on the given detail. This can also be one of the biggest weaknesses of this paradigm. As complete information might not be available in all situations and law like generalizations cannot be made. The strength of pragmatism is the use of multi method approach. One method can cover the weaknesses of other while working on the research model. Mix method approach helps to understand the clear picture of the phenomena. Furthermore, actual research problem can be recognized in a better way. It also highlights those hidden facts which cannot be seen by using single method approach (Creswell, 2014). This paradigm depends on framing effect

which can be the strength as well as the limitation (Porta & Keating, 2008). Researcher is value bound so biasness can also affect the results of the research. Table 2 provides a clear picture of the strength and weakness of each paradigm.

Table 2: Strengths and Weaknesses of Paradigms

Paradigms	Strength	Limitation
Positivism	Accurate prediction Law like generalization	No focus on social aspects
Post positivism	Accurate prediction Critical evaluation	Content validity bias
Interpretivism	Cater social phenomena Evaluation on the basis of reality information	No generalizability Non availability to accurate information
Pragmatism	Multi method design Framing effect	Researcher's bias

Paradigm Shift in Finance

Dominant Paradigm in Finance

It has been proved by number of researchers that the dominant paradigm in finance is positivism paradigm and many financial theories follow positivism paradigm (Ardalan, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007a, 2007b; Neuman, 2011; Rao, 2019). The word finance is associated with concrete reality and causes and effects. Different theories of finance that are presented since 1970s believed on the characteristics matched with the positivist paradigm. Some of the major theories of finance are agency theory (Ross, 1973; Mitnick, 1975), theory of dividend policy (Miller & Modigliani, 1961; Black, 1976), theory of capital budgeting, theory of capital structure (Modigliani & Miller, 1958; Myers & Majluf, 1984) etc.

To identify the objectivity or subjectivity of social science research four factors should be discussed i.e. ontology, epistemology, axiology and methodology so that better information can be gathered about nature of social science research and nature of society (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). Based on Burrell and Morgan (1979) work, researchers identify that financial researches are objective in nature. As most of the researches in the field of finance follow cause and effect mechanism (ontology), follow law like generalizations and have nomological connections (epistemology), interaction of human beings is natural (human nature) and all follow quantitative methods i.e. information is obtained through observations and measurements without adding value to it (methodology) (Bettner, Robinson, & McGoun, 1994). Other researches also proved that these characteristics are same as of positivism paradigm (Ardalan, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007a, 2007b; Rao, 2019). So, it can be concluded that mostly financial researches and financial theories lies in positivist paradigm.

Paradigm Shift

The debate about multiplicity of paradigm was started by Burrell & Morgan (1979). Most of the researches carried out in the field of finance are based on mathematical models and these models are empirically tested (Linnenluecke et al., 2017). Frankfurter and Lane (1992) claimed that financial work is nothing more than empirical testing. As, in most of the researches, existing theories are tested. It does not explain new phenomena. So it is said that it's explanatory power is zero as compare to social and natural sciences. The reason behind is that it follows a specific paradigm i.e. positivism. Almost all the

researchers conducted are related to this particular paradigm and there is no focus toward other paradigms (Jensen & Smith, 1984).

Positivist paradigm is not the only source of financial knowledge. The only way to enlarge research scope is a step towards paradigm diversity as each paradigm has some strengths as well as weaknesses (Rahman, 2017). This paradigm must be combined with other paradigms i.e. post positivist, interpretivism and pragmatic paradigm for getting idea about the basic assumptions of the financial theories (Creswell & Clark, 2011). Brand (2009) also confirms that researchers should decrease their reliance on the positivism paradigm and should move towards integration with other paradigms. Each paradigm has some strength over other and each has scope which motivates researchers to use all paradigms while conducting financial research.

With the changing issues in finance, its research methodology is also changing. Rahman (2017) also talked about the change in research methodology. Earlier researches of finance are part of positivism paradigm (Kao & Wu, 1994; Evans, 1998; Rahman, 2017) but now many researchers are adopting paradigms other than positivism paradigm and are moving towards clinical methodology. Clinical methodology is different from positivist paradigm. It starts with inner learning, observation and action within phenomena. Practically, researcher visit, observe, listen and interacts about the people that he/ she observes in surroundings. The methodology traditionally used by researchers was the scientific research methodology and shift is from quantitative approach to qualitative approach (Paudel, 2005; Parker, 2012). These researchers further explained about the popularity of qualitative research method in the field of accounting and finance and explored that qualitative research can make a significant contribution in solving grand puzzles and challenges that are still unsolved because of following only one paradigm i.e. positivist paradigm. Qualitative researchers use case studies, observation and interviews etc while deciding about their research methods. A study conducted by Lahmann, Stranz & Velamuri (2017) used case study in their research to determine the private firm's value creation which tells that financial researches are moving towards qualitative approach.

According to Morgan (1983), as cited in Paudel (2005), scientific research methodology consists of five stages i.e. observation, building a theory, developing hypotheses, designing framework and hypothesis testing to accept or reject the theory. Whereas, clinical methodology follows a bit different steps i.e. understanding phenomena from inside, adopting learner's role, providing symbols along with the meaning to a particular system, identifying and explaining them and testing the opinion to accept or reject. In order to find about the agency issues or agency conflicts, deep understanding of the phenomena is very important. After that, researchers can give different meanings and interpretation to that phenomena on the basis of understanding. At the end, the opinion of the researchers can be accepted or rejected. Simple observation may not lead us to the true picture but deep understanding and explanation will help to

solve many issues. As in the later case the interpretation can be different at different situations.

PARADIGM DIVERSITY

Most of the researches in finance carried out around the globe and especially in Pakistan are based on positivist paradigm (Weir, 2013; Rao, 2019). Common practice in the field of finance is that after data collection process some mathematical model is tested by using collected data. After that results are interpreted. This approach is not broad as it sometimes fails to find solutions to the existing problems and does not explain the nature. It is not impossible to reach the hidden reality by applying positivist paradigm. For example, firms pay dividend to the shareholder in order to maximize the shareholder's wealth. Wealth maximization is somehow related to inner satisfaction. But the problem faced in this case is that the satisfaction level of the investor cannot be measured. Such situations might lead towards agency conflicts which cannot be solved without involving human aspect in it so hidden reality i.e. actual conflict or cause of conflicts cannot be determined by numbers only. The firms whose major assets are humans rather than capital cannot use the assumptions of positivist paradigm only. The knowledge-based firms have different characteristics. For example, these firms try to involve human elements in their decision making or in their daily operations so the paradigm used for such firms will also be different (Brennan, 1995). Some of the scholars also discuss the limitations of the dominant paradigm i.e. positivist paradigm (Gouws & Rehwinkel, 2004; Hardy & Ballis, 2005; Rahman, 2017).

To avoid this limitations researcher must adopt paradigm diversity as it is the only solution to all problem. Paradigm diversity is the integration of different paradigms to answer one or more research questions. In this process more than one theoretical construction is applied on given data (Ardalan, 2000). There are some studies which has discussed about the paradigm diversity in finance. Bettner et al. (1994) examined the narrowness of current paradigm used for conducting the study on capital markets and explored the influence of qualitative research on capital markets. A study conducted by Ardalan (2003) emphasized on paradigmatic context and financial theories. This paper concluded that financial theories are based on positivism and suggested that finance should adopt the tools and characteristics of other paradigms as well. Ardalan (2007a) presented paradigmatic view of corporate governance and argued that all paradigms have unique characteristics and their tools and methods are of equal importance. Furthermore, researcher argued that these paradigms must be adopted by all fields. Similar study was conducted by Ardalan (2010) to identify the paradigmatic view of globalization in the field of finance. It is explored that in order to understand about the concept or a phenomena in detail, integration of different paradigm should be used. Furthermore, it was concluded that social researchers can gain much by using multiple paradigm while researching a phenomena. Bogt & Helden (2014) also discussed the ways to reduce this research gaps in the fields that use positivism paradigm as a dominant paradigm. Other studies

also confirm the concept of paradigm diversity (Ardalan, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007b; Rahman, 2017).

This paper discusses the paradigm shift and some of the questions in the field of finance that cannot be answered by positivism paradigm. Number of studies confirm that leading and dominant paradigm in finance is positivism (Ardalan, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007a, 2007b; Neuman, 2011; Rahman, 2017) but there are few gaps and limitations in this particular paradigm. In order to fill these gaps researchers can take help of other paradigms as well. Some of the cases are discussed below.

Principle-agent conflict

Agency theory best explains the principle-agent relationship and their conflicts. Further, it suggests ways for solving these conflicts. In this relationship one party (principal) engage other party (agent) to perform certain functions for them as first party has control and authority over other. Most common agency relationships are of employer and employee, state and ambassador and shareholder and CEO. Ardalan (2002, 2003, 2005, 2007a, 2007b) argued that this theory uses the positivist paradigm to solve the agency problems. Agency problems/conflicts arises because of information asymmetry, unaligned goals and divergent interests. Agency theory might not solve all of the conflicts by using only positivist approach as it involves human beings, their divergent interests and goals. Neither information nor interests can be measured physically or in term of numbers. Using positivist paradigm alone is not sufficient to identify the interests of both parties and the availability of information. For these types of measures qualitative survey is useful (Saunders et al., 2009). Bochantin and Cowan (2016) also reported that interests cannot be measured through positivist paradigm so there is need to expand the ontology, epistemology and methodology of research. So, for such cases interpretivist and pragmatic paradigm are suitable as both involve social phenomena. The reason behind suggesting interpretivism is that qualitative approach helps to identify the main causes of the conflicts. After identifying such conflicts, possible solution can be decided. Secondly, it helps to find out the reasons of non-availability of information. Hence, possible solution can be suggested to spread equal information to all. The reason behind suggesting pragmatic approach is that sometimes these conflicts are removed by providing bonuses and compensations to the managers. These benefits can be measured objectively as well as subjectively or by using multimethod approach and pragmatic approach is the appropriate paradigm for it (Wahyuni, 2012). If quantitative method is used alone, it will be difficult to find the actual causes of the conflicts and causes will remain unsolved.

Dividend policy

Dividend is the expected financial return to the shareholders over a given time period as a result of an investment. This return can be used in form of cash payments, stock or share repurchase (Baker & Weigand, 2015). Financial theory states that one of the major goals of management is to create value for shareholders. Their goal is to maximize the shareholder wealth. This goal can be achieved by paying dividends to the shareholders of the firms (Jensen, 2001). Mostly firms pay dividends to attract investors

and to fulfill shareholder's needs. This goal is particularly related to the shareholder's wealth to satisfy them. The satisfaction level can never be measured in terms of numbers or by using positivist paradigm (Bochantin & Cowan, 2016). For measuring satisfaction one can choose interpretivism paradigm in which we can measure the satisfaction of the shareholder by using questionnaires or through interviews. As for measuring satisfaction qualitative method approach is suitable. Sometimes firms pay dividend not to increase the shareholder's wealth, but they want to save themselves from taxes or their main purpose behind dividend distribution is to create positive signal in the market. Tax aversion or signaling effect is dependent on the individual/ group behavior (behavior of the investors) which is impossible to measure objectively. It might have positive impact on some investor or might not have any impact on others. If more investors take/ consider that signal a positive then it will create positive signal in the market otherwise negative market signal will be created (Brealey, Myers, & Allen, 2011). The behavior is something that does not remain constant. It changes with the time so ontologically positivist paradigm fails to measure it. Again, Interpretivist paradigm is the best to measure such types of behaviors as it provides context-based knowledge (Lincoln & Guba, 2005; Wahyuni, 2012).

Profitability

In the field of finance profitability is widely used concept. It is measured in terms of sales, reduction in cash conversion cycle or the waste reduction. Some firms focus too much on earning profits and in doing so they exceed their limits which results in liquidity problems (Sultana, Rahman, & Sohail, 2019). Sometimes, firms report those profits as well which are not yet received in order to attract more investments or they are motivated towards earnings management (Rani, Hussain, & Chand, 2013). So, measuring firm's profitability by facts and figure and in form of number will be misleading. It is suggested that firms must set an optimal level between profitability and liquidity (Bolek, 2013; Pike & Pass, 1987). The question arises that how firm should choose the optimal level? It cannot be selected by using a single paradigm and there is no fix amount for the profits to be earned. In other words, there is no law like generalization for earning profits. Rather, limit is set on the basis of judgement and past experiences. Positivism paradigm does not allow researchers to add values in the research. So, there must be some other paradigm along with positivist paradigm. And in this particular situation, post positivist paradigm is suitable. As axiologically researchers can add values on the basis of their experience (Saunders et al., 2009; Wahyuni, 2012).

Investment policy

Firm's investment policy is linked with the firm's profitability as it invest for increasing profits and enhancing value. Investment in a particular project is based on the individual's personality. Some individuals are risk takers so they will be ready to invest in risky projects but those who are risk averse will choose only those projects which are less risky (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979). Similarly, investors can also be risk takers or risk averse. Investor who is also the employee in particular firm will have different attitude and investment behavior as compare

to the investor who is not the employee (Shafi et al., 2011). For measuring the individual's personality or investor's behavior interpretivist paradigm is more appropriate. As far as positivism is concerned, it believes on law like generalizations and a singular reality. There is no room for multiple realities (Ardalan, 2019). But personality varies from individual to individual and also behavior of one firm is different from other. Kordeš (2009) explored that decision making is based on judgement and experience. Decisions are not based on the just external reality. So individuals are not objective but they make subjective decisions.

Theory of capital structure

Capital structure is the relative mix of firm's debt and equity which has an impact on the firm's structure in long run. It is related to the behavioral perspective. Individual who is more confident (or over confident) will tend towards more debt ratio and will choose highly levered financing structures (Barros & Silveira, 2007). Similarly, managerial optimism and risk tolerance can impact the capital structure ratio in a positive way (Abdeldayem & Sedeek, 2018). Such type of behavior cannot be pointed out through positivist paradigm rather interpretivist paradigm best explains it (Ardalan, 2005). Confidence can be observed or measured using interviews but it cannot be measured by using numbers. So it can be said that confidence of an individual cannot be tapped through quantitative method but it is possible to tap through qualitative methods.

Behavioral finance and concept of rationality

Behavioral finance which is also known as open mind finance is the most controversial area in the field of finance (Ardalan, 2003). Traditional view of finance states that economic agents expect maximum utility and they are rational whereas behavioral finance states that market behavior is totally dependent on the behavior of people. Again, positivism paradigm fails to deal this situation as behavior cannot be tapped by numbers but interviews are the most appropriate way to measure the behaviors. So, for dealing the behavior of people interpretivism paradigm is suitable and appropriate as it incorporates human element to it (Saunders et al., 2009).

Finance follows positivist paradigm which says that researchers should be value free (Ardalan, 2019). They must not include anything from their side in the research (Ardalan, 2003). They should only report what is observed and not what they think or have experienced about the phenomena. But in actual situations it is not possible for researchers to be value free and etc. Researcher's bias is always there in reality (Wahyuni, 2012). So, exploring absolute reality is not possible even when dealing with numbers or based on facts and figures. The shift towards other paradigms is beneficial as it reduces limitation of positivist paradigm and helps to solve number of questions that are still unanswered through positivist paradigm.

CONCLUSION

This paper highlights that dominant paradigm used in finance is positivist paradigm (Neuman, 2011; Rao, 2019). It also concludes that combination of other three paradigms (i.e. post positivism, interpretivism and pragmatic paradigm) along with the positivist paradigm will help to solve most of the financial

problems (Wahyuni, 2012). Most of the financial theories like agency theory, capital structure theory and dividend payout policy cannot be tapped through positivist paradigms alone but integration with other paradigms will provide the best way to understand these theories well. Paradigm diversity will reduce the difference between literature of academic finance and philosophy of social sciences. Its inferences will be conclusive if it decreases its dependence on the positivism paradigm and adopts the methodology and characteristics of other paradigms. It is the fact that if one task is repeated and again with no addition in it, no value can be created. Addition of other paradigms will ultimately increase the efficiency of financial research. It removes most of the problems and limitations as it is a tool for knowledge creation.

The interpretivism paradigm can solve the limitations of positivist paradigm (Wahyuni, 2012). The reason behind is that it deals with human element (Ardalan, 2003, 2005, 2007a, 2007b, 2010, 2019) and most of the financial theories are also related to human's relationships and their conflicts (agency theory), their perception and decision making (dividend and investment decisions). Human element is not involved in positivist paradigm because human's interests, their behavior and confidence cannot be measured by numbers only so most of the times it requires help of other paradigms.

REFERENCES

- Abdeldayem, M. M., & Sedeek, D. S. (2018). Managerial Behavior and Capital Structure Decisions; Do Overconfidence, Optimism and Risk Aversion Matter? *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 8(7), 925-945.
- Ardalan, K. (2007a). Corporate governance: a paradigmatic look. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 34 (8), 506-524.
- Ardalan, K. (2010). Economic Dimension of Globalization. *Journal of Globalization Studies*, 1 (2), 41-67.
- Ardalan, K. (2007b). Markets: a paradigmatic look. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 34 (12), 943-960.
- Ardalan, K. (2005). Mathematics and academic finance: the role of paradigms. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 32 (4), 276-290.
- Ardalan, K. (2003). Money and academic finance: the role of paradigms. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30 (6), 720-740.
- Ardalan, K. (2000). The Academic Field of Finance and Paradigm Diversity. *Southern Business Review*, 21-31.
- Ardalan, K. (2002). The mathematical language of academic finance: a paradigmatic look. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 29 (3), 187-204.
- Ardalan, K. (2003). Theories and controversies in finance: a paradigmatic overview. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30 (1/2), 199-209.
- Ardalan, K. (2019). Ideology: A Multiparadigmatic Approach. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Economics*, 31(2), 124-142.
- Baker, H. K., & Weigand, R. (2015). Corporate dividend policy revisited. *Managerial Finance*, 41 (2), 126-144.
- Barros, L. A., & Silveira, A. D. (2007). Overconfidence, Managerial Optimism and the Determinants of Capital Structure. Working paper, 1-33.
- Bettner, M., Robinson, C., & McGoun, E. (1994). The case for qualitative research in finance. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 1-18.
- Black, F. (1976). The dividend puzzle. *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 2 (2), 5-8.
- Bochantin, J. E., & Cowan, R. L. (2016). Focusing on Emotion and Work-Family Conflict Research: An Exploration Through the Paradigms. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 1-15.
- Bogt, H. J., & Helden, G. J. (2014). A pragmatic view on engaged scholarship in accounting research. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, 11 (1), 40-50.
- Bolek, M. (2013). Profitability as a Liquidity and Risk Function Basing on the New Connect Market in Poland. *European Scientific Journal*, 1-15.
- Brand, V. (2009). Empirical Business Ethics Research and Paradigm Analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 86, 429-449.
- Brealey, R. A., Myers, S. C., & Allen, F. (2011). *Principles of Corporate Finance*. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Brennan, M. J. (1995). Corporate finance over the past 25 years. *Financial Management*, 24 (2), 9-22.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*. Hants, England: Gower Publishing Company Limited.
- Creswell, J. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4 ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Evans, M. D. (1998). Dividend Variability and Stock Market Swings. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 65 (4), 711-740.
- Frankfurter, G. M., & Lane, W. R. (1992). The Rationality of Dividends. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 115-129.
- Gouws, D., & Rehwinkel, A. (2004). Financial accounting and reporting: Sustaining relevance in the present time paradigm. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 12 (1), 77-99.
- Hardy, L., & Ballis, H. (2005). Does one size fit all? The sacred and secular divide revisited with insights from Niebuhr's typology of social action. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 18 (2), 238-254.
- Hatch, M. J., & Cunliffe, A. L. (2013). *Organization Theory: Modern, Symbolic, and Postmodern Perspectives* (3 ed.). United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Jensen, M. (2001). Value maximization, stakeholder theory, and the corporate objective function. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 14 (2), 8-21.
- Jensen, M., & Smith, J. C. (1984). *Introduction in Modern Theory of Corporate Finance*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision Making Under Risk. *Econometrica*, 263-291.

- Kao, C., & Wu, C. (1994). Rational Expectations, Information Signalling and Dividend Adjustment to Permanent Earnings. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 76 (3), 490-502.
- Kordeš, U. (2009). The Phenomenology of Decision Making. *Interdisciplinary Description of Complex Systems*, 65-77.
- Lahmann, A. D., Stranz, W., & Velamuri, V. K. (2017). Value creation in SME private equity buy-outs. *Qualitative Research in Financial Markets*, 9 (1), 2-33.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (2005). Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Influences. In E. Guba, & Y. Lincoln, *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Linnenluecke, M. K., Chen, X., Ling, X., Smith, T., & Zhu, Y. (2017). Research in finance: A review of influential publications and a research agenda. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, 43, 188-199.
- Meer-Kooistra, J. v., & Vosselman, E. (2012). Research paradigms, theoretical pluralism and the practical relevance of management accounting knowledge. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, 9 (3), 245-264.
- Miller, M., & Modigliani, F. (1961). Dividend policy, growth, and the valuation of shares. *Journal of Business*, 34 (4), 411-433.
- Mitnick, B. M. (1975). The theory of agency: The policing "paradox" and regulatory behavior. *Public Choice*, 27-42.
- Modigliani, F., & Miller, M. (1958). The Cost of Capital, Corporation Finance, and the Theory of Investment. *American Economic Review*, 58, 261-297.
- Morgan, D. (2007). Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: Methodological implications of combining qualitative and quantitative methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 48-76.
- Morgan, G. (1983). *Beyond Method: Strategies for Social Research*. Beverly Hills: CA: Sage Publications.
- Myers, S., & Majluf, N. (1984). Financing Decisions When Firms Have Information that Investors Do Not Have. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 13, 187-221.
- Neuman, W. (2011). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
- Nikoomaram, H., Banimahd, B., & Shokri, A. (2012). An Empirical Analysis of Earnings Management Motives in Firms Listed on Tehran Stock Exchange. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2 (10), 9990-9993.
- Parker, L. (2012). Qualitative management accounting research: Assessing deliverables and relevance. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 54-70.
- Paudel, R. B. (2005). Clinical Research in Finance. *The Journal of Nepalese Business Studies*, 2 (1), 95-97.
- Pike, R., & Pass, C. (1987). Management of Working Capital: A Neglected Subject. *Management Decision*, 18-24.
- Porta, D. d., & Keating, M. (2008). *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences-A Pluralist Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rahman, M. S. (2017). The Advantages and Disadvantages of Using Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches and Methods in Language "Testing and Assessment" Research: A Literature Review. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 6(1), 102-112.
- Rani, P., Hussain, F. F., & Chand, P. V. (2013). Managerial incentives for earnings management among listed firms: Evidence from Fiji. *Global Journal of Business Research*, 7(1), 21-31.
- Rao, S. (2019). The Philosophical Paradigm of Financial Market Contagion Research. *International Journal of Management Concepts and Philosophy*, 12(3), 278-295.
- Ross, S. A. (1973). The economic theory of agency: The principal's problem. *American Economic Review*, 134-139.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research Methods for Business Students*. London: Pearson Education.
- Shafi, H., Akram, M., Hussain, M., Sajjad, S. I., & Rehman, K. U. (2011). Relationship between Risk Perception and Employee Investment Behavior. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 345-351.
- Shah, S. Z., Butt, S. A., & Hasan, A. (2009). Corporate Governance and Earnings Management an Empirical Evidence Form Pakistani Listed Companies. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 26 (4), 624-638.
- Sultana, F., Raheman, A., & Sohail, M. K. (2019). A Comparative Study on Liquidity Management, Operating Performance and Firm Value. *Pakistan Business Review*, 21(1), 15-26.
- Wahyuni, D. (2012). The Research Design Maze: Understanding Paradigms, Cases, Methods and Methodologies. *Journal of Applied Management Accounting Research*, 69-80.
- Weir, K. (2013). Methodological Dominance in Academic Finance: The Case of Behavioural Finance. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(20), 8-14.

Table 1**Basic and Fundamental Beliefs in Management Science Paradigm**

Paradigms in Management Science				
Fundamental Beliefs	Positivist approach (Naïve realism)	Post positivist approach (Critical Realism)	Interpretivist approach (Constructivism)	Pragmatic approach
Ontology	Belief on single, external or physical reality. Reality is objective in nature and does not depend on social actors	Belief on single and objective reality. It is independent of human thoughts, knowledge and beliefs. But interpreted through social conditioning so called critical realists.	Belief on multiple and subjective reality. It is socially constructed and changes from person to person.	Belief on external and multiple realities. Realities vary depending upon the nature of research question to be answered.
Epistemology	Knowledge is based on the observable phenomena, actual data, and facts and figures. Focus is on causal relationship and law like generalizations.	Knowledge is based on the observable phenomena, actual data, and facts and figures. Focus is on context based explanations.	Knowledge is based on the subjective and social phenomena. Focus is on the detail about situation and reality of that situation.	Knowledge is based on either objective or subjective phenomena or both depending on the research question. Focus is on applied and practical research.
Axiology	Researcher is value-free and etic Researcher is independent of phenomena being observed and does not incorporate anything value in the results and has objective view.	Researcher is value-laden and etic Researcher is biased by cultural experiences and adds value to the phenomena being observed.	Researcher is value-bound and emic Researcher and the phenomena being observed are interrelated. Both cannot be separated from each other and has subjective view.	Researcher is value-bound and etic-emic Values are vital in interpretation of the results. The researcher can adopt objective or subjective view.
Data Collection Techniques	Quantitative approach is followed, sample is large and highly structured.	Both quantitative and qualitative approaches are followed.	Qualitative approach is followed, sample is small.	Mixed or multi method approach is followed depending upon research question.