

<https://doi.org/10.23913/ricsh.v10i19.240>

Artículos Científicos

Filosofía y conductismo. Una relación lógica, ontológica, epistemológica y existencial

*Philosophy and behaviorism. A logical, ontological, epistemological and
existential relationship*

*Filosofia e behaviorismo. Uma relação lógica, ontológica, epistemológica e
existencial*

José Nava Bedolla

Instituto Superior de Ciencias de la Educación del Estado de México, México

nava5812@yahoo.com.mx

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4378-9673>

Resumen

El objetivo central de la presente investigación consistió en analizar el tipo de relaciones que se pueden establecer entre la filosofía y la teoría conductista aplicada a la educación. Se partió del supuesto de que las mentadas relaciones se establecen en el sentido de que el motor que promueve los principios de la ciencia o del conocimiento que se utilizan para elaborar los discursos de la teoría conductista son las necesidades existenciales, epistemológicas, ontológicas y lógicas del sujeto cognoscente dependiendo de circunstancias de modo, tiempo y lugar.

Se trató de un estudio de tipo metacientífico, es decir, epistemológico. Se pretendió hacer ciencia de la ciencia o, lo que es lo mismo, conocimiento del conocimiento para apreciar los alcances y limitaciones de la teoría conductista aplicada a la educación en relación con la idea de filosofía. En un primer movimiento, se reelaboró la “definición” de la categoría denominada con la palabra *filosofía*. En segundo lugar, se reconstruyó el mapeo de la idea enunciada con el término *teoría conductista*. Finalmente, se establecieron las *relaciones* entre la filosofía y la teoría conductista, a partir de las necesidades existenciales del sujeto cognoscente.



Los resultados revelan la existencia de una relación o correspondencia entre la filosofía y la teoría conductista aplicada a la educación en términos de necesidades existenciales, epistemológicas, ontológicas y lógicas del sujeto cognoscente. Lo anterior permite concluir, entre otras cosas, que el mapeo del concepto mencionado con la voz *conductismo* se establece en términos de alguna definición de la noción mentada con la voz *filosofía* que determina la utilización de ciertos principios del conocimiento o de la ciencia dependiendo de las necesidades lógicas, ontológicas, epistemológicas y existenciales del sujeto cognoscente de la teoría conductista. Así, es posible sospechar que toda teoría, además de no ser neutral, está determinada por las necesidades mencionadas.

Palabras clave: conductismo, epistemológicas, filosofía, necesidades existenciales, ontológicas y lógicas, principios de la ciencia o del conocimiento.

Abstract

The main objective of this research was to analyze the type of relationships that can be established between philosophy and behavioral theory applied to education.

It was started from the assumption that the aforementioned relationships are established in the sense that the engine that promotes the principles of science or knowledge that are used to elaborate the discourses of behaviorist theory are the existential, epistemological, ontological and logical needs of the knowing subject depending on circumstances of mode, time and place.

It was a meta-scientific study, that is, epistemological. It was intended to make science of science, or what is the same, knowledge of knowledge; to appreciate the scope and limitations of the behavioral theory applied to education in relation to the idea of philosophy.

In a first movement, the definition of the category named with the word << philosophy >> is reworked.

Second, the mapping of the stated idea is reconstructed with the term "behaviorist theory".

Finally, the <<relations>> between philosophy and behaviorist theory are established, based on the existential needs of the knowing subject.

The results reveal the existence of a relationship or correspondence between philosophy and behaviorist theory applied to education in terms of existential, epistemological, ontological and logical needs of the knowing subject.



The above allows to conclude, among other things, that the mapping of the concept mentioned with the voice <<behaviorism>> is established in terms of some definition of the notion mentioned with the voice << philosophy >> that determines the use of certain principles of knowledge or science depending on the logical, ontological, epistemological and existential needs of the knowing subject of the behaviorist theory.

Then then, it is possible to suspect that every theory, in addition to being neutral, is determined by the needs mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

Keywords: behaviorism, epistemological, philosophy, existential, ontological and logical needs, principles of science or knowledge.

Resumo

O objetivo principal desta pesquisa foi analisar o tipo de relações que podem ser estabelecidas entre a filosofia e a teoria comportamental aplicada à educação.

Partiu-se do pressuposto de que as referidas relações se estabelecem no sentido de que o motor que promove os princípios da ciência ou do conhecimento que se utilizam para elaborar os discursos da teoria behaviorista são as necessidades existenciais, epistemológicas, ontológicas e lógicas dos conhecer o assunto dependendo das circunstâncias do modo, hora e lugar.

Foi um estudo meta-científico, ou seja, epistemológico. Pretendia-se fazer ciência da ciência, ou seja, conhecimento do conhecimento; apreciar o alcance e as limitações da teoria comportamental aplicada à educação em relação à ideia de filosofia.

Em um primeiro movimento, a definição da categoria nomeada com a palavra << filosofia >> é retrabalhada.

Em segundo lugar, o mapeamento da ideia declarada é reconstruído com o termo "teoria behaviorista".

Finalmente, as <<relações>> entre filosofia e teoria behaviorista são estabelecidas, a partir das necessidades existenciais do sujeito cognoscente.

Os resultados revelam a existência de uma relação ou correspondência entre filosofia e teoria behaviorista aplicada à educação em termos de necessidades existenciais, epistemológicas, ontológicas e lógicas do sujeito que conhece.

O exposto permite concluir, entre outras coisas, que o mapeamento do conceito mencionado com a voz <<behaviorismo>> é estabelecido em termos de alguma definição da noção



mencionada com a voz << filosofia >> que determina o uso de certos princípios da conhecimento ou ciência dependendo das necessidades lógicas, ontológicas, epistemológicas e existenciais do sujeito cognoscente da teoria behaviorista.

Então, é possível suspeitar que toda teoria, além de neutra, é determinada pelas necessidades mencionadas no parágrafo anterior.

Palavras-chave: behaviorismo, epistemológicas, filosofia, necessidades existenciais, ontológicas e lógicas, princípios da ciência ou do conhecimento.

Fecha Recepción: mayo 2020

Fecha Aceptación: diciembre 2020

Introduction

It is said that the theory is not neutral, because it obeys certain subjective or group interests of those who construct the ideas, and behaviorism - as a great theory that can be applied to education - does not escape such judgments. In fact, it is also argued that theory depends on philosophy, but how can this idea be interpreted. Taking this into account, the research question that gave rise to this work was formulated as follows: what are the relationships that can be established between philosophy and behavioral theory applied to education? The tentative answer could be that a series of relationships can be established between philosophy and theory: the main one would be that the second depends on the first, that is, between philosophy and theory a dependency relationship can be established. the second with respect to the first. Derived from the previous association, other links were proposed, such as that between philosophy and theory logical, ontological, epistemological and existential relationships can be observed.

In order to demonstrate the previous hypotheses, a definition of the concept of philosophy was reconstructed — first of all — for which some of the most important ones developed throughout history were taken. The methodology used was as follows: some definitions were enunciated; then it was tried to explore, describe, explain, interpret and understand their meanings and meanings; later a position was adopted in front of them; then it was justified in existential, epistemological, ontological and logical terms; the term was then clarified; it was subsequently justified, and finally analyzed and synthesized.

In a second moment, the mapping of the behaviorism concept was reconstructed through the following procedure: the existential, epistemological, ontological and logical needs of the knowing subject of the behaviorist theory were determined, and the principles



of knowledge from which it is attempted were established. do behavioral science from behaviorism applied to education.

Finally, the logical, epistemological, ontological and existential "relationships" between philosophy and behaviorist theory applied to education were established in the following way: the main philosophical problems of the knowledge of human behavior were established, the cognitive faculties were determined with which the knowing subject tries to solve the great philosophical problems of the knowledge of human behavior in behaviorism, its existential and ontological needs were established, the principles of science from which it starts to generate knowledge were clarified and the philosophical assumptions were determined in which, in an irremediable way, it is located when pretending to do behavioral science.

The results show that a relationship or correspondence between philosophy and behaviorist theory can be suggested in terms of existential, epistemological, ontological and logical needs of the knowing subject in a given time, place and circumstances.

It is interesting to note, derived from the conclusions of the research, that —with knowledge or not of the fact— all theoretical discourse —and, in this case, behaviorism applied to education does not escape it— is due to certain existential, ontological needs, , logical and epistemological of the knowing subject that tries to construct knowledge. This implies, among other things, that science is not neutral and that our future researchers, who are currently studying postgraduate degrees in epistemology, must be prepared so that they do not go "blindly" in the construction of their objects of study.

The definition of the concept called with the term philosophy Enunciación of some "definitions" of the determined idea with the expression philosophy

The concept called with the expression philosophy has been "defined" by different thinkers, intellectuals or philosophers of different times and contexts, hence it has been given multiple meanings, such as 'love of wisdom ', 'knowledge obtained through illumination or rational closeness with God ', 'self-reflection of the human spirit through the supreme theoretical and practical values to arrive at the conception of the universe 'or' science of all things by their ultimate causes', to name a few.



Some thinkers understand the word philosophy as follows: "the theoretical science of first principles and first causes" (Aristotle, 1992, p. 8); "It is its essence, whatever the immediate object of its efforts, to keep to pure observation and investigation, but not to give rules" (Schopenhauer, 1997, p. 215); "It is more like an organism than a set, and it is also more appropriate to refer to evolution than composition" (Bergson, 1986, p. 33); "Fundamental science (...), the science that has to ensure the unity of human knowledge by demonstrating a last common foundation" (Natorp, 1987, p. 7); "Attempt of the human spirit to arrive at a conception of the universe through self-reflection on its evaluative, theoretical and practical functions" (Hessen, 2009, p. 9); "A correspondence that translates into language the call of the being of the entity" (Heidegger, 2006, p. 66); "Knowledge of the universe or everything there is, but when we leave, we don't even know what there is, or if what there is forms a universe or a multiverse, nor if a universe or a multiverse will be knowable" (Ortega y Gasset 1998, p. 40).

Exploration, description, explanation, interpretation and understanding of the "definitions" of the notion designated by the word philosophy

If the coincidences are added and multiplied and the divergences between the commented authors are subtracted and divided around the definition of the concept named with the term philosophy, it is possible to analyze and synthesize the aforementioned delimitation from different senses and meanings through a series of inductions and deductions, comparisons and classifications that can refer to a "definition" that allows arriving at a position. It has been understood in terms of "a coherent system of points of view about the world (that is: nature, society and thought) that fundamentally influences the activity of man" (Hessen, 2009, p. 9); as the correspondence that can be established between being and being through language (Heidegger, 2006, p. 66); also in the sense of the first principles and the first causes of science, understanding by "principle ..., in the first place, the starting point of the thing" (Aristotle, 1992, p. 75), "that by which it can be done better a thing, for example, the beginning of a science" (Aristotle, 1992, p. 75), "the essential and first part from which a thing comes" (Aristotle, 1992, p. 75) and, on the other hand, "It is called cause (Aristotle, 1992, p. 76), and the matter of which a thing is made", "first principle of change or rest" (Aristotle, 1992, p. 76), "what is done is the cause of what is done, and what the change prints is what the change experiences" (Aristotle, 1992, p. 76), "all the



intermediates between the motor and the object "(Aristotle 1992, p. 76); therefore, "philosophy cannot do anything other than interpret and explain what exists" (Schopenhauer, 1997, p. 215), in its voluntary determination in an autonomous way because "the conduct of man and the world itself are will, only in this case it is truly autonomous (Schopenhauer, 1997, p. 216); It is also understood as "the science that tries to dispense with symbols" (Bergson, 1986, p. 7), and that "is more similar to an organism than to a set, and it is also more appropriate to refer to evolution than to composition" (Bergson, 1986, p. 33); on the other hand it is "knowledge by principles, but it is not directed to objects but to the unity of knowledge itself" (Natorp, 1987, p. XIV), because "the objects of knowledge are inexhaustible and the wise approach them, but it never fully achieves them "(Natorp, 1987, p. XIV), furthermore" although it is an infinite process, knowledge is not deprived of law or direction, only thanks to the method does science advance "(Natorp, 1987, p. XIV), therefore, "being is the eternal unknown, which step by step knowledge determines better, but the value of determination depends exclusively on the method of knowledge, its procedure, therefore, philosophy itself is method "(Natorp, 1987, p. XIV), then then" it will be the 'true philosophy' that, on the one hand, can be considered as the ultimate basis of all knowledge, on the other, that its scope is broad enough to that is enough for all the objects that fall into the realm of all knowledge "(Natorp, 1987, p. 7), to meet the first requirement (be the ultimate basis of all knowledge), according to Natorp (1987, p. 7), philosophy must be a science (formal criterion) and, for the second requirement (cover the totality of objects that can be known), philosophy needs to limit the different interests of knowledge (material criterion) because "every idea is thought and every painting is painted from certain assumptions or conventions so basic, so nail-biting for the one who thought the idea or painted the picture, which does not even notice them and therefore does not introduce them into his idea or his painting" (Ortega y Gasset, 1998, p. 21).



Taking sides on the "definitions" of the concept named with the word philosophy

From the "definition" of the concept of philosophy elaborated by Hessen (2009, p. 9), it is convenient to recover the ideas about the "evaluative, theoretical and practical functions of the human soul", that is, the needs that the reason of the knowing subject satisfies in a relationship of knowledge with its object of study, they are knowledge of reality (theoretical function), of the stability, permanence or persistence of the human being in it (practical functions) and of the way to assess the decisions made about the previous two (evaluative functions). In Heidegger (2006, p. 66), the ideas of being must be considered, in their sense of "reality" or "thing", of being in their conception of manifestation of "being" or "thing" in existence, and of "Correspondence" between the entity (reality or thing) and the being (manifestation of the existence of the entity, reality or thing) through language, that is, the problems of knowledge are due to the fact that the subject-object relationship of knowledge is not it can establish essentially, if not only, through language as an intermediary: it is a logical relationship. With Aristotle (1992, p. 8) it is good to admit the concept of science, the category of theory, the notion of first principles (Aristotle, 1992, p. 75), and it is also necessary to reflect on the idea of first causes (Aristotle, 1992, p. 76). From Schopenhauer (1997, pp. 215-216) the statements of interpretation, explanation, existence, feeling, intuition, conception, abstraction, points of view, etc. can be highlighted. With Bergson (1986, p. 7) one must recover the ideas of science, the notions of absolute possession of reality, placing the knowing subject in reality, having the intuition of reality, apprehending reality outside of all expression, translation or symbolic representation, etc., as well as the categories of totality and evolution (Bergson, 1986, p. 33). In Natorp (1987, p. XIV) the ideas of knowledge can be recovered by principles and unity of knowledge; the notions of incomplete science and the impossibility of knowing the essence of reality (Natorp, 1987, p. XIV), as well as the concept of method (Natorp, 1987, p. XIV) and of totality (Natorp, 1987, p. 7). With Ortega y Gasset (1998, p. 21) it can be affirmed that the idea of philosophy is very fortunate, understood as thinking about ideas from certain "assumptions" or "conventions"; The idea that concepts, ideas, categories or notions are only theories, hypotheses, assumptions, presumptions, propositions or assumptions about reality should also be considered, since they are only spectra, visions, appearances or ghosts of it (Ortega y Gasset, 1998, p. 55).



Existential, epistemological, ontological and logical justification of taking sides on the "definitions" of the category designated with the expression philosophy

The "definitions" of the idea expressed with the word philosophy - elaborated by each and every one of the commented authors - are considered to be relevant in existential, ontological and epistemological terms.

In Hessen (2009) it is about "an attempt by the human spirit to arrive at a conception of the universe through self-reflection on its evaluative, theoretical and practical functions" (p. 9), human beings reflect on reality from our own existential needs and, in this case, it is said that philosophy can satisfy needs for knowledge of reality (theoretical function), awareness of the consequences of our actions (evaluative function) and decision-making about our behavior in the world (practical function); the intention of the knowing subject is to determine the object to be known, that is, to know reality in order to be aware of the consequences of their actions on it and, consequently, to be able to make reasoned decisions about his behavior in the world; For this reason, it is possible to estimate that the "definition" of the idea expressed with the term philosophy that is discussed is of a "rational" type; the human soul intends to bring order into reality to satisfy its needs for knowledge, awareness and decision making.

With Heidegger (2006) we understand it as "a correspondence that translates into language the call of the being of the entity" (p. 66); all human beings feel and think differently. Then, then, we must settle for translating into language the call of the being of the entity, that is to say, in the knowledge reality itself is not present, but only a discourse on it elaborated by the knowing subject. This allows us to establish that the "definition" of the concept named with the word philosophy —constructed by Heidegger— is also "rational" because it addresses the logical relationship between the knowing subject and the object to be known when it establishes that it is reduced to language.

From Aristotle (1992) it can be said that philosophy is "the theoretical science of first principles and first causes", because he supposes that reason reads the impressions of the senses using, as a magnifying glass, these principles:



The vegetative soul and the animal soul constitute only in man the matter of the realization of his own form: reason (Nous-dianoeísthay). By virtue of this, the impulse (orexis) is converted into will (boulesis) and representation into knowledge (episteme). This adds, as it were, as something new and higher to all psychic activities that derive from perception (and in which only animals participate), but it can only be carried out in man. (p. 8).

It is possible to estimate that the "definition" of the concept named with the term philosophy - constructed by Aristotle - is of the "intellectual" type (read inside). It is assumed that knowledge has its origin first in the perceptions of the senses and then in the "reading" that the spirit makes of them using certain "principles" with which it seeks to extract the essence of reality to achieve certain ends. For an intellectualist like Aristotle "knowledge, as such, is an act, and, at least, that act is an operation: an 'object' corresponds to the operation", "the operation supposes a faculty" (Polo, 2006, p. fifteen).

For Schopenhauer (1997), philosophy is an "interpreting and explaining what exists, the essence of the world, which is inconcrete, that is, as a feeling, intuitively reveals itself to each one of us; present it in abstract and precise concepts, and this under all possible aspects and from all points of view "(p. 215), for which it is estimated that the definition of the concept expressed through the term philosophy - elaborated by Schopenhauer - is of "sensual" type; the reality, according to this author, is apprehended only with the senses, in an empirical way. It is the lived experiences that allow us to know the essence of the phenomena.

In Bergson (1986) it is defined as "the science that tries to dispense with symbols" (p. 7). Like Schopenhauer, philosophy is understood as a science that does not need symbols, but rather realities, lived experiences; It is to be appreciated that the definition of the concept expressed with the voice philosophy for this author is of a "sensual" type. The reality is not known, it is lived.

With Natorp (1987) it is understood as "knowledge by principles, but it is not directed to objects but to the unity of knowledge itself" (p. XIV); It is of the "rational" type, that is, said discourse is elaborated from reason and the spirit of the author tries to put order in knowledge by means of rationalist principles, postulates, axioms or maxims.



In Ortega y Gasset (1998) it is interpreted in this way:

Every idea is thought out and every painting is painted from certain assumptions or conventions that are so basic, so past nail for the one who thought the idea or painted the painting, that he does not even notice them and therefore does not introduce them into his idea or into his painting, we do not find them placed there but precisely supposed and as if left behind. That is why, sometimes, we do not understand an idea or a painting: we lack the word enigma, the key to the secret conviction (p. 21).

This means that it is considered a "rational" type. All construction of knowledge, with or without the knowledge of the person who elaborates it, starts from certain assumptions or conventions that the knowing subject should know in order to better understand reality.

Clarification of the "definition" of the idea named with the term philosophy

If we recover some of the main ideas of the commented authors, it is possible to elaborate a definition that tries to cover all the positions analyzed, in the following terms: the definition of the term designated with the expression philosophy can be understood as an intention of the human soul of explore, describe, explain, interpret or understand reality from certain principles that must be assumed to solve the great problems of knowledge, depending on the cognitive faculties that the knowing subject uses to do so, based on their existential, epistemological needs, ontological and logical at a certain time, place and circumstances.

As:

- The word principles should be understood as logical, ontological, epistemological and existential, the study of which will be addressed in the next section.
- By the word assumptions it is necessary to understand the terms, words or voices with which the principles that indicate movement and / or stillness have been designated (skepticism, subjectivism, relativism, pragmatism, dogmatism and criticism), order and / or disorder (rationalism , empiricism, intellectualism and apriorism), determinism and / or indeterminism (objectivism, subjectivism and dialectic), existence and / or nonexistence (realism, idealism and phenomenism), duality, unity or diversity (dualism, monism and pluralism) that allow to build a knowledge of reality of a rational and / or sensual type with concepts and criteria of immanent and



/ or transcendent truth and with which it is tried to solve the great problems of knowledge.

- By the statement problems of knowledge it is necessary to understand the great unknowns that throughout the history of philosophy have tried to solve from different assumptions, depending on the cognitive faculty or faculties that the knowing subject uses for it, on the possibility, the origin, the essence, the classification and the concepts and criteria of truth of knowledge, among others.
- Because of what has been exposed as cognitive faculties, reason and / or the senses must be imagined that —more than clarifying the great problems of knowledge— allow us to straighten out existential, epistemological, ontological and logical needs.
- Due to what is expressed as existential needs, those that every knowing subject has to survive in this world must be conceived, such as food, clothing, room, education, recreation, and so on.
- By the expression epistemological needs one must understand the need to know the reality that every knowing subject has in order to be aware of its scope and limitations on it and make the most appropriate decision to solve their existential needs.
- For what is expressed as ontological needs, the same principles, postulates, axioms, assumptions, propositions or premises that indicate movement and / or stillness, order and / or chaos, determinism and / or indeterminism, existence and / or nonexistence, unity must be understood , duality and / or plurality, rational and / or sensual, transcendence and / or immanence.
- Logical needs include all those that refer to correct thinking.

Existential, epistemological, ontological and logical justification of the "definition" of the notion designated with the expression philosophy

The definition of the idea alluded to with the expression philosophy (understood as an intention of the human soul to explore, describe, explain, interpret or understand reality using certain principles that must be assumed to solve the great problems of knowledge, depending on the cognitive faculties that the knowing subject uses for this, based on existential, epistemological, ontological and logical needs) seems to be pertinent because it encompasses any intention of knowledge that any knowing subject has to know any reality.



Analysis and synthesis of the definition of the category named with the word philosophy

If the "definition" of the idea that is intended to be expressed with the word philosophy is "decomposed" into the parts that form it, the following is obtained:

- Human beings have needs for food, shelter, clothing, recreation, education, fulfillment and many more to survive in this world. These deficiencies can be called existential needs.
- To satisfy their existential needs, human beings need to know reality. These insufficiencies can be designated as epistemological needs.
- To know reality, human beings have the need to start from certain principles of knowledge or science. These deprivations can be distinguished as ontological needs.
- Finally, ontological needs are related to other logical deficiencies; that is to say, the former refer to the entity, the latter to its manifestation in experience through language. The latter type of needs can be designated as logical needs.
- Similarly, to satisfy their existential needs, human beings have two cognitive faculties: their reason and their senses.
- Reason and / or the senses are used by human beings as "cognitive faculties" (theoretical function), as faculties of awareness about the consequences of their actions (evaluative function) and as decision-making faculties about their behavior in the world (practical function).
- It also happens that, to solve their existential problems, human beings need to know reality (theoretical function) and be aware of the consequences of their actions (evaluative function) to make decisions about their behavior in the world (practical function).
- To know reality, human beings have to face the problems of knowledge by virtue of the fact that it has been shown that reality cannot be known in essence. We can mention some great unknowns to which it has not been possible to give a definitive solution: the possibility, origin, essence, classification and concept, and criterion of truth of knowledge, among others.
- The aforementioned knowledge problems have been tried to solve in four different ways, depending on the cognitive faculties used for it: reason and / or the senses. Such solutions are not essential, they are just assumed.



- Knowledge problems are intended to be solved with certain principles that must be assumed and that derive from the cognitive faculties used for this.
- Each and every one of the principles is related to each and every one of the five main problems of human knowledge.
- Each and every one of the principles establishes one and only one assumption with which it is intended to solve the philosophical problems of human knowledge, depending on the cognitive faculty used for it.

If the parts that make up the definition of the concept called with the word philosophy are put together again in a whole, the following is obtained: philosophy is the purpose of the human spirit to understand reality from certain assumptions that are derived from certain principles born of the cognitive faculties of the knowing subject, trying to solve with them the problems of knowledge, depending on their existential, epistemological, ontological and logical needs at a certain time, place and circumstances.

Behaviorism. A mapping of the concept

Existential, epistemological, ontological and logical needs of the knowing subject in behaviorist theory

It has already been commented that human beings have needs for food, shelter, clothing, recreation, education, fulfillment and many more to survive in this world. These deficiencies can be called existential needs. In this regard, Skinner (1994) asks:

Is science really possible? Can it explain any aspect of human behavior? What methods can it use? Are its laws as valid as those of physics and biology? If so, what role will it play in human affairs? (...) to what extent is what has been said worth anything? (p. 7).

Faced with these questions, it is possible to appreciate that the epistemological need arises of how to explain behavior due to an existential need to solve human affairs. This existential necessity goes beyond the mere explanation of human behavior (epistemological necessity); At a higher level, the point is to be able to predict it (another epistemological need) in order to control it (another existential need): "Why do people behave the way they do? (...) how could a person anticipate and thus prepare for what someone else was going to do? (...) how could a person be induced to behave in a certain way? " (Skinner, 1994, p. 12). To solve their existential problems, human beings need to know reality (theoretical function



of the spirit) and be aware of the consequences of their actions (evaluative function of reason) to make decisions about their behavior in the world (practical function of the will) . According to Skinner (1994), "If we want to predict what a person will do, how can we discover the mental causes of their behavior? And how can we produce the feelings and states of mind that will induce it to behave in a certain way? " (p. 13). The idea is to know human behavior to predict it; predict it to control it, and control it to solve human issues related to behavior.

Principles of knowledge from which the knowing subject intends to do behavioral science

Seeking to understand the principles of science, in general, this definition of the concept of philosophy by Aristotle (1992) was found: "Theoretical science of first principles and first causes" (p. 8). Following Aristotle (1992), the concept expressed with the voice of first principles is understood, at first, as the "starting point of the thing" (p. 75); in a second moment, as "that by which a thing can be done better; for example, the beginning of a science" (p. 75), and, in a third moment, as "the essential and first part from which a thing comes" (p. 75).

The first principles are supposed to be valid for any science: "A 'principle' is a true, absolutely evident, universal and necessary proposition. Therefore, it does not need a demonstration, but, on the contrary, it is assumed in any demonstration" (Gutiérrez, 2005, p. 157).

Saint Thomas Aquinas, following Aristotle, proposes three essential characteristics of every first principle:

Conditions that the most certain principle must carry out... 1. It must be a principle on which all error is impossible, since one is deceived about the things one does not know; 2. It must not suppose any previous truth, since it is necessary to know anything; 3. It must be in us naturally, prior to any investigation of the spirit, since this investigation supposes it (Garrigou-Lagrange, 1980, p. 203).

Every principle refers to being and what is predicated of being:

The analysis of our ideas shows in an indisputable way that the entirely first idea implicit in all the others is the idea of being; From this it legitimately follows that the judgment entirely must first have being as its subject and as a predicate what is first convenient to be. (Garrigou-Lagrange, 1980, p. 203).

What is it that is primarily convenient to being? What is it that fits primarily with science? The first principles, that is, what is first convenient for everyone to be, can be logical (discursive), ontological (action, passion or state in which the being of the entity is in a certain place, time and circumstances), epistemological (theories knowledge or science) and existential. That is, it is assumed that the being of the entity manifests itself in existence through language. To accept this, it is necessary to resort to the definition of the concept expressed with the term philosophy elaborated by Heidegger (2006) as “a correspondence that translates into language the call of the being of the entity” (p. 66).

If by the expression entity we mean every being, thing or object that has its own and independent existence in reality, then the enunciation of the category named with the expression philosophy by Heidegger can be interpreted as the correspondence that can be established between the entity (as a possibility of existence) and being (as experience) through language; that is, as the manifestation of the being of the entity through expressions, phrases, words, phrases or voices; that is, any entity or thing manifests itself in existence through communication through language.

Some first logical, ontological, epistemological and existential principles that are supposed to "suit" all science or knowledge, are the following:

- *Logical principle of non-contradiction*: “It is impossible to affirm and deny the same predicate to the same subject at the same time and under the same aspect” (Gutiérrez, 2005, p. 158). It can also be formulated like this: "Two contradictory propositions cannot be true at the same time" (Gutiérrez, 2005, p. 158) and their corresponding ontological principle of stillness:

Only being is, non-being cannot be (...), being is equal to matter, full space, non-being is empty space. Therefore, there can be no empty space and therefore no movement, since this means that material things change places through empty space; and since the whole being is everywhere, there can be no change; matter remains matter in all circumstances, and all becoming and passing is deceptive appearance (Simmel, 1946, pp. 56-58).



And epistemological and existential prediction. To say of Skinner (1994):

There is a kind of prediction possible on the <<principle>> that people are likely to do again what they have done frequently; people follow customs because it is customary to do so ... The discovery of <<principles>> of organization in the structure of behavior ... can make possible the prediction of cases of behavior that have not previously occurred (p. 14).

This allows us to suppose that in order to know human behavior and be able to predict it in order to control it, it is necessary to start from certain principles of knowledge; in this case, the principle that “people are likely to do again what they have done frequently”, that is, customs or habits that are derived from other higher principles of a logical order and that can be expressed as “is impossible to affirm and deny the same predicate to the same subject at the same time and under the same aspect ”or as“ two contradictory propositions cannot be at the same time true ”which, in turn, are related to ontological principles of rest or stillness.

For behaviorism "education is one of the procedures that society uses to 'control' people's behavior" (Guzmán and Hernández Rojas, 1993, p. 14). Possibly the foregoing is due to the assumption that the behavioral objectives do not move, that is, that they always remain still because to establish the judgments about the aims of education, in this case, the behaviorist starts from logical principles of non-contradiction, ontological of rest or stillness and epistemological and existential of prediction. In that understanding, it is possible to presume that human behavior can be known, predicted and controlled.

- *Logical principle of identity*: “A is necessarily A” (Gutiérrez, 2005, p. 159) and its corresponding ontological principle of determinism: “Being is; not being is not” (Gutiérrez, 2005, p. 159). "The same being cannot be and not be at the same time and under the same relationship" (Garrigou-Lagrange, 1980, p. 204). It would not be correct to affirm that a thing is and, at the same time and under the same aspect, to deny that it is. It is another way of stating the principle of non-contradiction. "Aristotle says, from the logical point of view: 'it is impossible that the same attribute belongs and does not belong to the same subject, at the same time and under the same relationship'" (Garrigou-Lagrange, 1980, p. 204). What is first convenient for the being (subject) is that the reasons on which the judgments about its substance and its accidents (predicate) are based only belong to him and, not that they belong to him and, at the same time and under the same relationship, do not belong to him. belong.

In behaviorism, these two principles allow us to arrive at a third: the epistemological and existential principle of being able to treat students as objects of the educational act. In this psychological theory applied to education, the definition of the category expressed with the word student is understood as “the object of the educational act, as the receiver of the entire instructional process designed by the teacher” (Guzmán and Hernández Rojas, 1993, p. 16). That is, after being subjected to learning processes (study objects), students (cognitive subjects) will be determined or indeterminate by the contents; that is, passed or failed.

It is probable that this happens because the behaviorist considers that the knowing subject (student) can be determined by the object of knowledge (the contents of the teaching) because, to elaborate the judgments about the definition of the concept expressed with the term student, the behaviorist starts from logical principles of identity, ontological determinism and epistemological and existential to think of the student as the object of the educational act, whose behavior can be modified by the behavioral contents.

- *Logical principle of excluded third party*: “There is no middle between two contradictory propositions” (Gutiérrez, 2005, p. 159) and their corresponding ontological principles: “Anything is or is not, there is no middle ground” (Gutiérrez, 2005, p 159) and exclusion, and epistemological and existential control. What is first convenient for being, being, thing or subject is that what is predicated on it is true or false (exclusion), but not both qualities at the same time and under the same relationship.

For behaviorism, evaluation “plays a crucial role in improving teaching, since continuously checking it allows us to quickly detect its successes and errors. It is essential to use objective instruments to verify the achievement of behavioral objectives” (Guzmán and Hernández Rojas, 1993, p. 18). That is, it is about excluding (through behavioral objectives tests) and discarding, that is, separating, students who do not allow themselves to be determined by the behavioral objectives, that is, to control them.

Possibly the foregoing is due to the fact that it is assumed that the behavior of the students can be known and, therefore, predicted and controlled because in order to elaborate the definition of the concept expressed with the evaluation voice, the behaviorist starts from logical principles of excluded third parties, ontological of exclusion and epistemological and existential control of human behavior.



The two principles that follow only refer to the ontological. In logical terms, they agree in everything with the principles mentioned above.

- *Ontological principle of sufficient reason*: “Every entity has a sufficient reason for its existence. Or: Every being has a sufficient reason for being”(Gutiérrez, 2005, p. 159). It can also be interpreted in terms of order. If this first ontological principle is carefully considered, it will be seen that it refers to being. Every phenomenon needs an explanation, a reason for being:

Everything that is has its reason for being, and consequently everything is intelligible; and no: everything is intelligible, therefore everything must have a reason for being for us. Just as intelligence knows being before knowing itself and is not intelligible by itself but in function of being (as a living relation to being), while being is intelligible by itself; thus also she discovers the first principles in being, as laws of being, before discovering them as laws of thought; and these principles are not laws of thought (essentially relative to being), but because they are primarily laws of being (Garrigou-Lagrange, 1980, pp. 217-218).

And its corresponding epistemological and existential principle of solving human problems related to education, in relation to the behavioral theory of learning. It is, as has already been established, to know human behavior in order to predict and control it. "For behaviorists, learning is a relatively permanent modification of the observable behavior of organisms as a result of experience" (Guzmán and Hernández Rojas, 1993, p. 15). It is human reason that has the need to put order in the behavior of students in order to solve the existential problems of education.

It is likely that the above happens because behaviorists consider that human behavior is modifiable because to elaborate the definition of the idea mentioned with the expression learning, it is based on rational ontological principles, that is, the human soul tries to put order in the learning and epistemological and existential solutions to the learning problem.

The ontological principle of sufficient reason is analogous to the ontological-rational principle of causality:



- *Ontological principle of causality*: "Everything that exists has a cause of its existence (...) even when the causes are denied, in any case, there remains the need for a reason to explain the being of things" (Gutiérrez, 2005, p. 160) and its corresponding epistemological and existential principle of direction and control of the learning process. According to deductive logic, which is the logic of every rationalist, there are two modes that are directly appropriate to the being of entities, one positive and the other negative. The positive way consists in affirming that the being of entities is determined, its determined nature constitutes it properly, that is, it is convenient for it:

We find two modes that suit every being considered in itself: one positive and the other negative (Garrigou-Lagrange, 1980, p. 206).

The positive way is that each being is a determined thing ... The supreme judgment that must affirm what is firstly appropriate to being has, then, as a formula: "Every being is a determined thing, a determined nature that properly constitutes it." It is in this way that it is said without tautology: God is God ... A is A. If being is given to the proposition as subject, in the predicate it is necessary to express the nature of being, what defines it, and say no "the being is being" but "being is what it is or can be". And since it is evident that this first predicate is suitable for the first subject by itself, the formula can be specified and said: "Every being is and is by itself a determined nature that properly constitutes it." This formula is no longer a tautology; There is even a philosophy that denies its truth: the philosophy of becoming, captivated by sensible appearances, that denies that there are things to admit only actions, that defines the real not by what it is, but by what is done and changes without cease, who therefore refuses to see real distinctions (Garrigou-Lagrange, 1980, p. 207).

The negative mode that is supposed to be appropriate to every being in itself considered, that is, to every being of the entity, is unity:

As for the negative mode that is appropriate for every being considered in itself, it is unity, which is opposed to multiplicity, like identity that is opposed to diversity ... If every being is a certain nature, which properly constitutes it, follow that as such it is not divided; if it were divided it would be and would



not be under the same aspect what properly constitutes it. If it is simple, it is not only individual but indivisible; if it is composed, it ceases to be when it is divided ... Unity, being a property of being, varies with it. Indeed, being is said first of the substance, then of the quantity, of the quality, etc., of the different accidents that are certainly something real; in the same way, the unit has the corresponding multiple meanings: identity is the unit of essence or substance, equality is the unit of quantity, similarity is the unit of quality. What then expresses the principle "all being is one and the same" is the functional identity of every being with itself. (Garrigou-Lagrange, 1980, p. 208).

Unity is supposed to be opposed to multiplicity, identity to diversity, determinism to indeterminism, indivisibility to divisibility, the whole to the parts, the simple to the complex, the compound to the divided, etc. In the behaviorist theory, the control and direction of the learning process in the teacher is privileged: "This position assigns the teacher a directing and controlling role of the learning process; he is defined as a 'behavioral engineer' who shapes behaviors positively valued by the school "(Guzmán and Hernández Rojas, 1993, p. 16).

Possibly the above is due to the fact that it is assumed that the behavior of the students can be known and, therefore, predicted and controlled because to elaborate the definition of the statement expressed with the statement, the role of the teacher the behaviorist starts from logical principles of not contradiction, identity, excluded third party, sufficient reason and causality; of ontological principles of stillness, order, determinism, dualism, etc .; and of epistemological and existential principles of direction and control of the learning process.

Behaviorism and philosophy. A logical, ontological, epistemological and existential relationship

For the purposes of establishing the logical, ontological, epistemological and existential relationships between philosophy and the psychological theory of behaviorism, it is pertinent to consider the definition of the concept expressed with the term philosophy, elaborated in the first section of this work, as the purpose of the human spirit of understanding reality from certain assumptions that are derived from certain principles born from the cognitive faculties of the knowing subject, trying to solve with them the problems of



knowledge, depending on their existential, epistemological, ontological and logical needs at a given moment, place and circumstances.

Philosophy provides the assumptions to solve the problems of knowledge. The assumptions depend on the cognitive faculties that the knowing subject uses to solve the problems of knowledge. The cognitive faculties with which it is intended to solve the problems of knowledge through certain assumptions will depend on the needs of the knowing subject in a certain time, place and circumstances, which will force him to use certain principles of a logical, ontological, epistemological and existential order in the construction of behaviorist discourses.

What are the main problems of knowledge of human behavior?

It was already observed, in the second part of this work, that Skinner (1994) specifies the problems of knowledge of human behavior in a very illuminating way:

Is science really possible? Can you explain any aspect of human behavior? What methods can you use? Are its laws as valid as those of physics and biology? Will it lead to a technology, and if so, what role will it play in human affairs? ... To what extent is what has been said worth anything? (p. 7).

If the aforementioned problems are translated - in terms of the theory of science - it can be established that the cited author refers to the possibility, origin, essence, composition and concepts, and truth criteria of human knowledge, in terms of Hessen (2009).

Table 1 of this study shows the main problems that, like any other psychological or sociological theory of human behavior, behaviorism aims to solve:

Tabla 1. Los problemas filosóficos del conocimiento de la conducta humana

N.º	PREGUNTA	TEMA
1	¿Es posible conocer la conducta humana?	El problema de la posibilidad del conocimiento de la conducta humana
2	¿Cuál es la fuente del conocimiento de la conducta humana?	El problema del origen del conocimiento de la conducta humana
3	¿Cuál es la esencia del conocimiento de la conducta humana?	El problema de la esencia del conocimiento de la conducta humana
3.1	El problema de la relación de conocimiento: ¿quién determina a quién en una relación de conocimiento de la conducta humana: ¿el sujeto al objeto, el objeto al sujeto o ambos se determinan recíprocamente?	
3.2	El problema de la existencia de la conducta humana: ¿puede existir la conducta humana con independencia del sujeto cognoscente?	
3.3	El problema de la composición de la conducta humana: ¿la conducta humana es única, dual o múltiple?	
4	¿Cómo se tipifica la conducta humana?	El problema de la clasificación de la conducta humana
5	¿Cuáles son los criterios y conceptos de verdad que nos permiten aceptar un conocimiento de la conducta humana como verdadero o rechazarlo por falso?	El problema de la verdad del conocimiento de la conducta humana

Fuente: Elaboración propia

With what faculty or cognitive faculties do you intend to solve the problems of knowledge of human behavior?

When Skinner (1986) says that “when trying to solve the problems that affect us in our current world, we spontaneously make use of what we are capable of doing better. We seek security, and our security is science and technology ”(p. 5), it is possible to observe that it tries to solve the problem of the origin of knowledge in a rational way, that is, using only its reason as a cognitive faculty and, therefore, supposes that there is an order or, possibly, he is looking for it, duly established, that is manifested in science and technology and that will give him security to solve the behavioral problems of humanity. It is the soul or reason of the cited author in search of order to ensure the solution of the behavioral problems that affect the world, through established science and technology, which will give him the security to know, predict and control human behavior.

Thus, Skinner (1986) expresses himself as follows on how to solve global behavioral problems: “What we need is a behavioral technology (...). We could solve our problems quickly enough if we could adjust, for example, world population growth with the same precision with which we determine the course of an aircraft ”(p. 5). That is, the problem of the subject-object of knowledge relationship is intended to be solved with reason, in such a way that the object of knowledge (the technology of human behavior) determines the knowing subject (humanity) in the understanding that it applies to modify your behaviors in accordance with such technology.

Behavioral technology targets all humans to convince them - through conditioned reinforcers or otherwise - to adjust their behavior to certain guidelines, but if some are not convinced, Skinner's reason or intelligence will divide reality in two opposite and irreconcilable poles (readiness-reluctance, punishments-rewards, development-underdevelopment) to justify the exclusion of them in a rational way:

The child who needs to be spurred on and scolded is something less than a fully developed human being. We long to see him rush to his duties not because every step that occurs is in response to his mother's verbal reprimands, but because certain temporary contingencies, including reluctance and promptitude reinforced, have acted to make a change in your behavior. Call this better organization, more sensitivity or reality or whatever you want. The simple fact is that the child has gone from a temporary verbal control exercised



by her parents to being controlled by certain inexorable facets of the environment. (Skinner, 1985, p. 240).

This is due to the fact that the commented author tries to solve the problem of the composition of reality in a rational way. Despite the fact that a whole technology is proposed to modify the behavior of human beings based on certain guidelines and with certain conditioned reinforcers or not, the truth is that he is inventing all this (and not discovering, as he pretends to show) the reason or spirit of the commented author; In other words, the problem of the existence of reality is intended to be solved in a rational way with ideas that have nothing to do with reality, that is, invented by the author's intelligence:

Even if it is not the therapist who chooses, even if he recommends “self-realization,” the control he exercises has not ceased and he remains ready to intervene as soon as circumstances demand, when, for example, the client chooses to improve further in the process. art of lying or when you decide to assassinate your boss (Skinner, 1985, p. 239).

It is assumed that if this control of rational or mental origin determines humanity to behave as established by behaviorism, the behavioral problems of humanity will be solved and that this may be possible through the use of behavioral technologies; one of them would be, for example, admiration for the behavior of the other: “The practice of admiration represents an important part of culture; because behavior, which would otherwise be weakened, thanks to its help is fixed and maintained ”(Skinner, 1985, p. 229). This is due to the fact that the aforementioned author tries to solve the problem of the possibility of knowledge in a rational way, assuming that it is possible to know, predict and control human behavior, by virtue of the fact that he considers, in the same way, that the behavioral reality does not change , while reinforcing:

Every enumeration of values is an enumeration of reinforcers, whether conditional or otherwise. We are constituted in such a way that, under certain circumstances, food, water, sexual contact and other things will make it more likely that whatever the behavior that originates them will occur again (...). An organism can be reinforced - induced to "choose" - by almost anything. (Skinner, 1985, p. 238).

In closing, with or without knowledge of the fact, the behaviorist tries to know human behavior using his soul or reason as a cognitive faculty, trying to solve with it the main



philosophical problems of knowledge (possibility, origin, essence - subject-object relationship-, existence and composition of reality) due to the existential need to predict and control it; that is, to put order in human behavior.

What are the philosophical assumptions with which the knowing subject of the behaviorist theory tries to solve the problems of knowledge?

A necessary consequence of pretending to know the behavior of humanity by solving the philosophical problems of knowledge with reason, as already observed in the previous section, is that the behaviorist is located, also with knowledge or not of the fact, in rational philosophical assumptions. When Skinner (1985) says: "If we value the achievements and objectives of democracy, we must not refuse to apply science to the planning and construction of cultural patterns, even though we are then in a certain sense also in the position of controllers" (p. 241), can be interpreted in the sense that the purpose of controlling human behavior is synonymous with inspecting, monitoring, intervening, registering and supervising it; that is, determine humanity to behave according to certain models, schemes, guidelines, standards or cultural molds.

In this understanding, it is possible to estimate that it is intended to know, predict and control human behavior by trying to solve the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge objectively (it is assumed that, in a relationship of knowledge, the object determines the subject) , because the cognitive faculty that is being used for it is the reason or human soul.

It is estimated that, if this control of rational or spiritual origin is not accepted by all the human beings to whom it is directed, the soul of the commented author will divide the behavior in two to justify the exclusion of those who do not allow themselves to be determined by the order settled down. Thus the following can be said with the author commented:

Individuals who live within certain groups exercise mutual control according to a technique that not without reason adopts the name of "ethics." When an individual behaves in an acceptable way in the eyes of the group, he receives admiration, approval, affection, and many other reinforcements that increase the probability that that individual will continue to behave in the same way. When his behavior is not acceptable, he is criticized, censured, hurt or, in



certain cases, punished. In the first case, the group qualifies the individual as "good"; in the second, of "bad". This practice is so deeply ingrained in our culture that we often do not admit that it is a control technique. And yet we are almost always involved in such control, despite the fact that both the reinforcements and the penalties imposed tend to be subtle. (Skinner, 1985, p. 229).

It can be seen that this is due to the fact that the commented author intends to know, predict and control human behavior, trying to solve the problem of the composition of reality in a rational or intellectual way, and thus placing himself on the philosophical assumption that Hessen (2009) calls dualism, because it is estimated or assumed that human behavior is divided into two opposite poles, contradictory and irreconcilable to each other: good and bad behavior, admirable behavior and reprehensible behavior, etc. In that same vein he says the following:

Science is dramatically increasing our ability to influence, change, shape — in a word — control human behavior (...). He has also identified certain conditions or variables that can be used to predict and control behavior according to a new and increasingly rigorous technology (...). The experimental study of behavior takes us beyond complex or inaccessible "principles", "factors", etc., to some variables that can be directly manipulated (Skinner, 1985, p. 227).

The previous quote can be interpreted in the sense that the mind or reason of the commented author tries to put order in the behavior of human beings, looking for reasons to convince his public that it is possible to know it, predict it and control it by establishing certain scenarios, environments, situations, circumstances or contexts. This is due to the fact that, with or without knowledge of the fact, an attempt is made to know human behavior, trying to solve the problem of the origin of knowledge in a rational or mental way, assuming that in human nature there is an order to which the behavior of others. Hessen (2009) calls this philosophical assumption rationalism because it originates in the reason or soul of the knowing subject.

Once the use of behavioral technology is able to convince the majority of human beings to adjust their behavior to certain cultural patterns proposed in a rational or spiritual way, people adapt, conform, accommodate, condition or become acclimate to them:



People behave in ways, we say, that conform to ethical, political or religious guidelines, because they are reinforced to do so. The resulting behavior can have far-reaching consequences for the survival of the pattern to which it conforms. And, like it or not, survival is the ultimate criterion (Skinner, 1985, p. 238).

In other words, the problem of the possibility of knowing the behavior is resolved rationally, assuming that the behavior of others remains fixed or immobile as long as the expected behaviors continue to be reinforced. Hessen (2009) calls this philosophical assumption dogmatism. It is assumed that since behaviors remain unchanged, they can be known and passed on from generation to generation.

Perhaps the last dream of the commented author is to control human behavior in such a way that all humanity is totally determined: “Let us use our power to control, each time increasing, in order to create individuals who do not need and who perhaps do not already respond to control ”(Skinner, 1985, p. 239).

By way of closing - and as already commented in the previous section, with knowledge not in fact - the behaviorist tries to know, predict and control human behavior; trying to solve the main philosophical problems of knowledge (possibility, origin essence-subject-object relationship, existence and composition of reality) in a rational way and the necessary consequence of this fact is that it is located in dogmatic philosophical assumptions (possibility of knowledge), rational (origin of knowledge), objectivists (relation subject-object of knowledge), idealists (existence of reality) and dualists (composition of reality), elaborating ideas, judgments and reasoning of a rational or mental type about human behavior with concepts and criteria of immanent truth. That is to say, due to this lack of order in human behavior, as already mentioned in the closing of the previous section, the knowing subject of the behaviorist theory will have to substitute the certainty that he would have if human behavior could really be known in essence, by an assumption, consideration or estimate made by your soul or reason to bring order to the behavior of humanity.

Discussion

The findings reveal that the ideas, judgments and reasoning that every knowing subject elaborates on any phenomenon, depend - necessarily - on certain philosophical assumptions in which it is located, with or without knowledge of the phenomenon.

The dependency relationship of the behaviorist theory applied to education with respect to philosophy —which was proposed as the general hypothesis of this study— was demonstrated in the sense that the philosophical assumptions on which the theory is located depend, in a necessary way, of certain logical, ontological, epistemological and existential needs of the knowing subject.

This fact has been ignored throughout the history of philosophy, even by epistemologists themselves. More than a century ago, Juan Hessen (1999) warned about the problem of knowledge and the assumptions with which it is intended to be solved, but he completely ignored that they depend on the logical, ontological, epistemological and existential needs of the subject who seeks to know, and He placed his discourse - ignoring this fact - in a dogmatic epistemological position (possibility of knowing), rational (origin of knowledge), objective (subject-object relationship), idealist (existence of reality) and dualist (composition of reality), constructing a Rationalist type epistemology with concepts and criteria immanent of truth, and neglecting the other possibilities that can be obtained using the senses or from a mixture between them and reason. He naively assumed that knowledge is essentially possible, that it is born in reason, that it is neutral, ideal, and dualistic, respectively.

With John Locke (1994) the opposite happened. He maintains a skeptical, subjectivist, relativist and pragmatic epistemology (possibility of knowing), empirical (origin of knowledge), subjective (subject-object relationship), realistic (existence of reality) and monistic (composition of reality), constructing an epistemology of the type sensual with truly transcendent concepts and criteria. He naively assumed that knowledge in essence is not possible, that it is born in the senses, that it is interested, real, and monistic, respectively.

With Verneaux (2011) something similar happened. Following Aristotle's epistemology - which was later recovered by Santo Tomas de Aquino - he constructed an epistemology of a critical type (possibility of knowing), intellectualist (origin of knowledge), dialectic (subject-object relationship), phenomenological (existence of reality) and pluralist (composition of reality) that allows the generation of mixed discourses (sensual-rational)



with mixed concepts and criteria of truth (intuitive-rational) and neglecting the richness of the purely rational, purely empirical and the rational-sensual.

The opposite happened with Polo (2006) as with Verneaux. Following the Kantian tradition, he constructed an epistemology of a critical type (possibility of knowing), a priori (origin of knowledge), dialectic (subject-object relationship), phenomenological (existence of reality) and pluralistic (composition of reality) that allows the generation of mixed discourses (rational-sensual) with mixed concepts and criteria of truth (rational-intuitive) and neglecting the richness of the purely rational, purely empirical and the sensual-rational.

The four previous paragraphs give an idea about the four possibilities that the human being has to suppose that he knows in art, science, religion and the same philosophy: from his reason, his senses, his reason first and then his senses, and your senses first and then your reason. That is, rational, sensual or mixed knowledge (sensitive-rational or rational-sensitive).

In this study it is argued that none of the four is better than the others and that everything depends on the object of study and the logical, ontological, epistemological and existential interests of the knowing subject. Science is not neutral: it obeys personal and / or group interests.

Contemporary authors (Diez and Moulines, s. F.) Have not contributed anything new to the epistemological discussion as understood in this study; what they have done is adhere to one of the four positions mentioned, confronting their ideas with the authors who defend the other positions. This can be seen in the countless congresses that are held worldwide. The fact that knowledge problems do not have a single solution that allows certainty in knowledge has been ignored and that it is substituted in the arguments with certain philosophical assumptions that the mind of the knowing subject elaborates depending on the cognitive faculty with the that seeks to solve the problems of knowledge that, in turn, depends on its logical, epistemological, ontological and existential interests.

It would be good to analyze, in the same terms as this study, the other theories that apply to education, such as psychoanalysis, humanism, cognitiveism, psychogenetics and sociocultural theory, etc., to have a clearer idea of their epistemological, ontological, logical and existential scopes and limitations, and of the relationships between these and philosophy, in the understanding that they differ enormously from each other.



Derived from the previous conclusions, a solid training in epistemology is required during postgraduate courses so that future researchers understand that science obeys interests that relate the philosophical (epistemological, ontological, logical and existential) with the theoretical.

Some lines of research that remain pending for future studies may be the following: the relationship between the philosophical assumptions with which it is intended to solve the problems of knowledge and the problems of knowledge themselves, between the problems of knowledge and cognitive faculties of the knowing subject, between the cognitive faculties of the knowing subject and the principles of science and between the principles of science and the existential, logical, ontological and epistemological needs of the knowing subject, etc.

Conclusions

Between philosophy and behavioral psychological theory applied to education, it is possible to observe a relationship of determination of the first over the second. This dependence of behaviorism on philosophy can be broken down into a series of minor relationships that can be established between the entities mentioned: first, the ideas, judgments and reasoning that the knowing subject of the behaviorist theory elaborates on behavior Human beings depend, in a necessary way, on the philosophical assumptions with which the behavioral knowing subject tries to solve the main problems of knowledge of behavior.

The behaviorist tries to know, predict and control human behavior trying to solve the main philosophical problems of knowledge (possibility, origin, essence-subject-object relationship, existence and composition of reality, classification and concept and truth criteria) with knowledge or not of the fact - in a rational way, and the necessary consequence of this event is that it is located - also with knowledge or not of the fact - in dogmatic philosophical assumptions (possibility of knowledge), rational (origin of knowledge), objectivist (subject-object relation of knowledge), idealists (existence of reality) and dualists (composition of reality), elaborating ideas, judgments and reasonings of a rational or mental type about human behavior with concepts and criteria of immanent truth.

Due to this lack of order in human behavior, the knowing subject of the behaviorist theory will have to replace the certainty that he would have if human behavior could really



be known in essence, with an assumption, consideration or estimate made by his soul or reason to put order in the behavior of humanity.

It is possible to affirm that the first aspect of the behaviorist philosophy-theory relationship is established between the ideas, judgments and reasonings that the knowing subject of the behaviorist theory elaborates on human behavior and the philosophical assumptions with which it tries or tries to solve the problems of the knowledge of human behavior.

Second, with knowledge not of the fact, the behaviorist tries to know human behavior using his soul or reason as a cognitive faculty, pretending to solve with it the main philosophical problems of human knowledge (possibility, origin, essence - subject-object relationship, existence and composition of reality - classification and concept and criterion of truth) due to the existential need to predict and control it; that is, to put order in human behavior.

It is presumed that the second aspect of the behaviorist philosophy-theory relationship is indicated among the philosophical assumptions with which the knowing subject of the behaviorist theory tries to solve the problems of knowledge of human behavior and the cognitive faculty that he uses for it: in this case, your reason, soul, mind, spirit, intelligence or whatever you want to call that entity with which we think.

Third, given the impossibility of the knowing subject to know—in essence—human behavior, perhaps due to the fact that he lacks the cognitive faculties to do so; This must be satisfied with assuming it, conjecturing it, presuming it, believing it, suspecting it or admitting it from certain philosophical assumptions with which he tries to solve the philosophical problems of the knowledge of human behavior.

It is estimated that the third aspect of the behaviorist philosophy-theory relationship can be fixed between the philosophical problems of knowledge of human behavior (possibility, origin, essence -relation subject-object of knowledge, existence and composition of behavioral reality-, classification and concept and criterion of truth), and the respective philosophical assumptions (dogmatism, rationalism, objectivism, idealism, dualism, etc.) already mentioned, with which the knowing subject of the behaviorist theory tries to solve them.



Fourth, to elaborate ideas, judgments and reasoning about human behavior, again - with or without knowledge of the fact - the knowing subject of the behaviorist theory starts from certain principles of science that are related to the aforementioned philosophical assumptions, with Those who intend to solve the problems of knowledge of human behavior, using their reason or soul as a cognitive faculty.

The logical principles (non-contradiction, identity, excluded third party, sufficient reason and causality) from which the knowing subject of the behaviorist theory seeks to express the reasons on which reasoning about being is based, that is, about human behavior , are related to the assumptions with which he tries to solve the philosophical problems of knowledge of behavior, using his soul or reason as cognitive faculties.

The ontological principles (rest or stillness, determinism, exclusion, security and determinism, respectively) from which the knowing subject of the behaviorist theory tries to transform the being (the behavior) into being (to know, predict and control the behavior), they are related to the philosophical assumptions with which he tries to solve the philosophical problems of the knowledge of behavior, using his soul or reason as cognitive faculties.

The epistemological or existential principles (prediction, manipulation, control, etc.) from which the knowing subject of the behaviorist theory tries to know, predict and control human behavior, are related to the philosophical assumptions with which it tries to solve problems philosophical knowledge of behavior, using his soul or reason as a cognitive faculty.

It is to be conjectured that the fourth aspect of the behaviorist philosophy-theory relationship can be founded between the philosophical assumptions with which the knowing subject tries to solve the problems of knowledge of human behavior, using his reason or soul as a cognitive faculty, and the principles of science with which it tries to elaborate ideas, judgments and reasoning about human behavior.

Finally, in fifth place, it is to be expected that the principles of science (logical, ontological and epistemological) that the knowing subject uses to elaborate ideas, judgments and reasoning about human behavior, are related to their existential needs (food, house , dress, education, recreation, etc.). This forces him, in a certain sense, to solve the philosophical problems of knowledge using his reason or spirit as a cognitive faculty and



placing himself, with or without knowledge of the fact, in certain philosophical assumptions with which he tries to solve the problems of knowledge.

It is possible to consider that the sixth aspect of the behaviorist philosophy-theory relationship can be established between the principles of science (logical, ontological, epistemological) and the existential needs (food, clothing, room, education, recreation, etc.) of the subject. cognizant of behaviorist theory.

Ultimately, the engine that promotes the principles of science or knowledge that are used to elaborate the discourses of behaviorist theory are the existential, epistemological, ontological and logical needs of the knowing subject depending on circumstances of mode, time and place.

In this understanding, a relationship or correspondence between philosophy and behaviorist theory can be suggested in terms of existential, epistemological, ontological and logical needs of the knowing subject in a given time, place and circumstances.

The foregoing allows us to conclude, among other things, that the mapping of the concept mentioned with the voice behaviorism is established in terms of some definition of the notion mentioned with the voice philosophy that determines the use of certain principles of knowledge or science depending on the logical, ontological, epistemological and existential needs of the knowing subject of behaviorist theory in certain circumstances of mode, time and place.

Future lines of research

The most important aspects of the philosophy-theory relationship that were highlighted in this work, and that are potentially very interesting for later developments, refer to the relationships between existential needs and ontological needs, between ontological needs and knowledge problems, between problems of knowledge. knowledge and philosophical assumptions, between philosophical assumptions and cognitive faculties, between cognitive faculties and principles of science, among other no less important relationships that will be the subject of new research in order to relate them to the other theories that apply to education, such as are psychoanalysis, humanism, cognitivism, psychogenetics and sociocultural theory, etc., to have a clearer idea of their epistemological, ontological, logical and existential scopes and limitations, and of the relationships between these and philosophy, in the understanding that they differ enormously from each other;



investigations, all of them, that would allow the conformation of a book that could be named: “Philosophy and educational theory. An onto-epistemological relationship”.

References

- Aristóteles (1992). *Metafísica*. México: Porrúa.
- Bergson, H. (1986). *Introducción a la metafísica*. México: Porrúa.
- Diez, J. A. y Moulines, U. (s. f.). *Fundamentos de filosofía de la ciencia*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Garrigou-Lagrange, R. (1980). *El sentido común. La filosofía del ser y las formas dogmáticas*. Madrid: Ediciones Palabra.
- Gutiérrez, R. (2005). *Introducción a la lógica*. México: ESFINGE.
- Guzmán, J. C. y Hernández Rojas, G. (1993). *Implicaciones educativas de seis teorías psicológicas*. México: CONALTE.
- Heidegger, M. (2006) *¿Qué es la filosofía?* España: Herder.
- Hessen, J. (2009). *Teoría del conocimiento*. México: Porrúa.
- Locke, J. (1994). *Ensayo sobre el entendimiento humano*. México: GERNIKA.
- Natorp, P. (1987). *Propedéutica filosófica*. México: Porrúa.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1998). *¿Qué es filosofía?* México: Porrúa.
- Polo, L. (2006). *Curso de teoría del conocimiento* (tomo I). Pamplona, España: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, S. A.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1997). *El mundo como voluntad y representación*. México: Porrúa.
- Skinner, B. F. (1985). *Aprendizaje y comportamiento*. España: Ediciones Martínez Roca, S. A.
- Skinner, B. F. (1986). *Más allá de la libertad y la dignidad*. España: Ediciones Martínez Roca, S. A.
- Skinner, B. F. (1994). *Sobre el conductismo*. España: Psico-libro.
- Simmel, G. (1946). *Problemas fundamentales de la filosofía*. Madrid, España: Revista de Occidente.
- Verneaux, R. (2011). *Curso de filosofía tomista. Epistemología general o crítica del conocimiento*. España: Herder.