



## The Getting To Know The Various Schools Of Philosophical Thinking Methods in The Implementation Of Management

Ivan Widjaja<sup>1\*</sup>, Adi Hermawansyah<sup>2</sup>, Agung Winarno<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1-3</sup>Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia,

[ivan.widjaja.2404139@students.um.ac.id](mailto:ivan.widjaja.2404139@students.um.ac.id)<sup>1\*</sup>, [adi.hermawansyah.2404139@students.um.ac.id](mailto:adi.hermawansyah.2404139@students.um.ac.id)<sup>2</sup>  
[agung.winarno.fe@um.ac.id](mailto:agung.winarno.fe@um.ac.id)<sup>3</sup>

Author Correspondence: [ivan.widjaja.2404139@students.um.ac.id](mailto:ivan.widjaja.2404139@students.um.ac.id)\*

**Abstract.** This article discusses various philosophical thinking methods that have significantly impacted the implementation of management science. Philosophical schools such as rationalism, empiricism, skepticism, idealism, and pragmatism offer unique perspectives on understanding reality and knowledge and how these can be applied in management practice. This research aims to identify philosophical paradigms that can help mitigate risks in management and comprehensively apply the fundamentals of social science. Through a literature review approach, the results show that philosophical thinking methods enhance managerial flexibility and open space for systematic thinking in decision-making.

**Keywords:** Philosophy, Management, Epistemology, Ontology

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Philosophy begins with the need for humans to answer fundamental questions about the world, existence, and life. Before the development of modern science, humans tried to understand natural phenomena, reality, and morality through myths and religion. However, a new, more structured, and systematic way of thinking emerged as philosophy as time went on. This thinking relies on reason, logic, and critical reasoning rather than simply accepting beliefs or traditions. Thus, philosophy was born as an effort to seek truth rationally and critically. The schools of thinking methods in philosophy have contributed significantly to how man understands the world and himself. From rationalism, which puts reason first, to existentialism, which emphasizes individual freedom, each school provides a unique perspective that enriches human insight into reality. Although different in approach, each school of philosophy teaches the importance of reflection, dialogue, and exploration in the search for truth and meaning in life. These diverse philosophical thinking methods help humans to face intellectual and existential challenges in their lives. The discipline has developed since thousands of years ago and has always tried to answer fundamental questions about existence, knowledge, ethics, and life. Philosophy schools are diverse and influenced by various historical, cultural, and social contexts. One way to understand philosophy is to study the thinking methods used by philosophers in answering big questions. In this paper, we will discuss several significant schools of philosophical thinking methods and their impact on the

Received: October 17, 2024; Revised: October 31, 2024; Accepted: November 06, 2024 Online Available: November 08, 2024;

\*Ivan Widjaja, [ivan.Widjaja.2404139@Students.Um.Ac.Id](mailto:ivan.Widjaja.2404139@Students.Um.Ac.Id)

development of human thought related to the philosophy of social sciences in implementing implementation-based management science.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

Modern science, especially in physics, biology, and psychology, has also enriched philosophy with analytical and experimental methods, which makes philosophy more interdisciplinary and connected with other fields of science. Let's take a look at some schools of philosophical thinking methods in general that have become disciplines

### **1. Rationalism**

Rationalism is a school of philosophy emphasizing reason as the primary source of knowledge. Rationalist philosophers believe truth can be achieved through reason, regardless of sensory experience. The central figure of rationalism is René Descartes, famous for his phrase "Cogito, ergo sum" (I think, then I am). Rationalism tends to be skeptical of sensory data because the senses are considered deceptive. Rationalism emphasizes logical and mathematical principles that are universal and unaffected by empirical variables. In the view of rationalism, reality has a structure that can be understood and elaborated through rational analysis.

### **2. Empiricism**

In contrast to rationalism, empiricism emphasizes sensory experience as the primary source of knowledge. Empirical philosophers such as John Locke, George Berkeley, and David Hume argue that human knowledge comes from experience gained through the five senses. Locke, for example, introduced the concept of the "tabula rasa," in which the human mind is initially a "blank sheet" filled with experience. Empiricism emphasizes that all valid knowledge must be based on observation and experimentation. In this context, this school of thought heavily influences the modern scientific method due to its focus on collecting empirical data and testing hypotheses through experiments.

### **3. Skepticism**

Skepticism is an approach that casts doubt on claims of knowledge and truth. Scepticisms radically questions whether humans can know something for sure. Pyro of Elis was one of the earliest figures to develop scepticism as a method of philosophy. Scepticism teaches that, in most cases, human knowledge is relative and limited, so no claim of expertise

can be considered absolutely genuine. Scepticism has made an essential contribution to stimulating philosophical dialogue and the development of critical thinking.

#### **4. Idealism**

Idealism is a school that emphasizes that reality depends on thoughts or ideas. Philosophers such as Immanuel Kant and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel were the leading exponents of idealism. Kant introduced the concept that the actual reality of the world (noumenon) cannot be known directly by humans; What we can know is a mental representation of the outside world (phenomenon). Hegel developed idealism with his theory of "dialectic," in which he explained that the development of ideas and reality occurs through thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. In this context, reality is considered something that continues to evolve through the opposition and union of ideas.

#### **5. Positivism**

Positivism is a school of philosophy that emphasizes that authentic knowledge can only be obtained through the scientific method. An essential figure of this school was Auguste Comte, who introduced the hierarchy of science and claimed that philosophy should strive to be "the science of science." Positivism rejects metaphysical and theological speculation as a source of knowledge and only recognizes empirical observations and testable facts. In its development, positivism became the basis of the philosophy of science and the development of structured scientific research methods in which observation, measurement, and experimentation played an important role.

#### **6. Pragmatism**

Pragmatism is a school that emphasizes practical actions and consequences as the main criteria for assessing the correctness of an idea. Pragmatists such as Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and John Dewey emphasized that the meaning of an idea must be seen from how it works in practice and the real impact it produces. In the pragmatic view, truth is not seen as something absolute or universal but rather as something that is constantly tested by actual results and consequences. It places pragmatism as a philosophy that is very contextual and flexible.

## **7. Existentialism**

Existentialism is a school of philosophy that focuses on individual freedom, responsibility, and the search for meaning in life amidst the absurdity of the world. Figures such as Søren Kierkegaard, Friedrich Nietzsche, Jean-Paul Sartre, and Albert Camus emphasized the importance of individual freedom in determining their own life path. Existentialism rejects universal ideas that are deterministic or normative and instead emphasizes that human beings are creatures besieged by free choices that often bring anxiety. In this philosophy, humans are considered to have to create the meaning of their own life in a world that does not give an innate meaning.

## **3. METHODS**

The method used is a literature review directly related to the material raised is whether this philosophy can be applied in management practice, can be expressed at a practical level are as identifying a philosophical paradigm in contemporary management, articulate and mitigate risks in the context of implementing management at a practical level, and applying the basics of social science in comprehensive management

## **4. RESULTS**

### **Implications in Management**

In management, philosophy has a role in developing management theory, such as the role of epistemology (theory of knowledge) and ontology (the study of existence). The Ontology is The approach that believes that the social world can be understood as something objective and consists of fixed structures. This structure directs individual behavior through specific agents. Epistemology is a naturalistic perspective; this approach believes that the social world can be known through scientific methods since existing structures can provide predictions of human behavior.

The two philosophical perspectives above in building a management framework produce an intellectual framework, namely:

		Epistemologi	
		Naturalisme	Hermeneutik
Ontologi	Strukturalisme	<p><b>Naturalis Strukturalisme</b>                      Menganggap bahwa dunia sosial yang bersifat objektif dapat diketahui dengan metode ilmiah dimana struktur menjalankan kekuatan melalui agen, sehingga perilaku manusia dapat diprediksi.                      “Manajemen Proses”</p>	<p><b>Hermeneutik Strukturalisme</b>                      Menganggap bahwa dunia sosial yang bersifat subjektif diketahui hanya sebagai bentukan masyarakat dengan melihat perilaku mereka yang dapat diprediksi dan dapat ditentukan.                      “Manajemen Inklusi/keterlibatan”</p>
	Agensi	<p><b>Naturalis Agensi</b>                      Menganggap bahwa dunia sosial yang bersifat objektif dapat diketahui dengan metode ilmiah dimana orang-orang sebagai agen dari tindakan mereka dengan perilaku mereka yang dapat diprediksi dengan tidak membatasi kepentingan mereka.                      “Manajemen Hasil”</p>	<p><b>Hermeneutik Agensi</b>                      Menganggap bahwa dunia sosial yang bersifat subjektif dapat diketahui melalui apa yang orang-orang percaya dengan adanya pembatasan pada persepsi mereka sehingga perilaku mereka dapat diprediksi.                      “Manajemen Keberlangsungan”</p>

(Dixon, J. and Dogan, R., 2003)

**Figure 1. Diagram of Philosophical Prespective**

From diagram above, it can be described as follows:

**Perspectives Naturalis Agency**

Managers tend to use a *naturalist agency* approach in managing an entrepreneur-oriented organization, especially those that focus on the result. This approach was chosen because the organization, in its early stages, has a simple structure, where the final result (output/outcome) is the core of the goal. In addition, organizational structures are usually not complex, less formal, and have not experienced centralization. In the strategic decision-making model developed by Thomson, managers often only judge success based on the value of the result without paying attention to the process that goes through to achieve that result. Managers with a *naturalist agency* approach usually have a developer leadership style, characterized by a consultative management system. In this pattern, relationships between organization members and assignment behaviour are relatively low. Managers only set goal limits, while members of the organization are free to carry out tasks and make decisions. While there is freedom and autonomy in the implementation of duties, there is still accountability for decisions made.

**Perspective Naturalis Structuralist**

Managers who tend to use *the naturalist structuralist style* will manage the organization with a bureaucratic approach, where primary attention is given to inputs and processes in achieving the organization's goals. In contrast to *naturalist agencies*, *the naturalist structuralist* approach emphasizes strict and complex structural mechanisms, high formalities, and strong centralization. From this perspective, managers ensure that the organization is managed centrally, with specific member duties, maintain order, and have good unity and control. The

top-down management approach is very dominant, so members can be directed more quickly toward the organization's goals, and a high level of loyalty is expected. Managers will assess the success of the organization based on the extent to which the process has been carried out in accordance with the established rules, as well as good employee compliance. The administrative process is closely supervised, and the tasks are clearly divided among each member of the organization. This approach assumes that human behavior can be predicted easily if there are restrictive and binding rules.

From this perspective, the leadership style is referred to as the parental leadership style. Parental leadership is fatherly with the following characteristics: (1) managers perceive subordinates as immature individuals or need guidance, (2) managers tend to be overly protective, (3) rarely give subordinates the opportunity to make their own decisions, (4) almost never give room for initiative, (5) rarely provide opportunities for subordinates to develop their creativity and imagination, and (6) managers act as if they always know what to do. That is best and true.

### **Hermeneutic Agency Perspective**

From the perspective of a *hermeneutic agency*, managers will manage the organization by enforcing a strict bureaucratic structure, with a primary focus on input and process (Morgan, 1986). This perspective is characterized by low cooperation among members of the organization and very binding rules. The existing bureaucratic structure allows organizations to be managed with a high level of complexity, formality, and centralization. In this context, managers have a very dominant role because decision-making is generally done without much involvement of members of the organization. The leadership style that is in accordance with the *hermeneutic agency approach* is the driver leadership style, which uses an authoritarian, exploitative management system. This leadership is characterized by low relationships between members of the organization but with a high level of assignment. Managers assign specific tasks to employees with rigorous supervision. The dominance of managers in leadership allows them to manage the organization by emphasizing the power of the position and formal authority to achieve the organization's goals.

### **Perspective Hermeneutic Structuralist**

Managers who follow a *hermeneutic structuralist* perspective tend to manage organizations with a missionary-oriented approach, where primary attention is directed to the process of achieving organizational goals. These managers ensure that the organization has a

simple structure with a low level of complexity, formality, and centralization. This allows members of the organization to design their own work according to their respective responsibilities, creating a harmonious work environment and facilitating joint decision-making. In the strategic decision-making model proposed by Thomson, this approach falls under the category of compromise decision-making. Managers assess organizational success from a cause-and-effect relationship, assuming that good results can only be achieved through their active involvement in the achievement process.

Managers also encourage collaboration between members of the organization, as well as with outside parties such as society or other organizations, as they may have either direct or indirect influence on the achievement of organizational goals. The most suitable leadership style for managers with a *hermeneutic structuralist perspective* is the coach leadership style, where the management system is based on group participation. This style is characterized by a strong relationship between managers and members of the organization, although formal task behavior is not strongly emphasized. In this environment, managers act as facilitators who support the joint decision-making process, create close relationships between members, and reduce conflicts within the organization.

## **5. CONCLUSION**

Some of the conclusions from the discussion are as a manager in a philosophical context must be able to think systematically about epistemology and ontology to improve performance. A person's flexibility in applying management opens up space to think comprehensively and structurally about the management application. Open thinking is the most important part of responding to all problems and finding current solutions in the organizational managerial framework.

## **6. LIMITATION**

This research has some limitation of the outlined management perspectives reveal significant challenges in fully capturing the complexity of real-world organizational dynamics. While each approach provides a distinct framework for managing structures and behaviors, they may lack the flexibility needed to adapt to increasingly dynamic environments that require innovation, rapid decision-making, and responsiveness to diverse cultural and social contexts.

The epistemological and ontological perspectives discussed have limitations in producing fully accurate predictions about human behaviour, as human behaviour is influenced by many subjective factors and cannot always be predicted solely through specific structures

or rules. This may reduce the effectiveness of the model in situations where flexibility or creativity is required.

Perspectives such as structuralist naturalism and agency hermeneutics, which emphasise formal rules and centralised control, can be challenging in organisations that require innovation and rapid response to market changes. In fast-changing environments, these limitations can hinder an organisation's ability to innovate and adapt to external conditions. Structuralist approach, tends to ignore changing social and cultural dynamics. In modern organisations, diversity and inclusion are increasingly important, and an overly strict or centralised perspective may fail to accommodate evolving social values in the workplace. whereas the hermeneutic approach may be less suitable in environments with values that favour collaboration and openness.

## **REFERENCES**

- Comte, A. (1975). *The positive philosophy*. AMS Press.
- Descartes, R. (1993). *Meditations on first philosophy* (J. Cottingham, Trans.). Hackett Publishing Company.
- Hutter, M. R. J. H., & Schulte, M. A. M. (2019). *Humanistic management: Social responsibility in the 21st century*. Springer.
- James, W. (1907). *Pragmatism: A new name for some old ways of thinking*. Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Kant, I. (1998). *Critique of pure reason* (P. Guyer & A. W. Wood, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.
- Kaukab, M. E. (2014). Philosophy of management science and implications in practice. *Journal of Business Focus: Media for the Study of Management and Accounting*, 13(1), 12-21.
- Locke, J. (1996). *An essay concerning human understanding*. Wordsworth Editions.
- Please note that for a source like the *Journal of Business Focus*, you'll want to make sure to provide the correct page range, volume, and issue number if they are available.
- Sartre, J.-P. (1946). *Existentialism is a humanism*. Yale University Press.
- Saunders, M. N. K., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.