

## The Divergence between Qualitative And Quantative Research

Jarigbe Egbede Agom

Department of international relations and diplomacy

Baze university

Phone: +234 703521 6753

### Abstract

*The divergence between quantitative and qualitative research represents one of the most enduring and consequential methodological debates within the social sciences, fundamentally shaping knowledge production in International Relations and Diplomacy. This paper contends that this division is not merely a technical disagreement over tools but a reflection of profound philosophical, epistemological, and ontological commitments that inform how scholars conceptualize reality, generate evidence, and validate truth claims. Quantitative research, anchored in positivist and post-positivist traditions, prioritizes numerical measurement, statistical analysis, causal inference, and the quest for generalizable laws. In contrast, qualitative research, rooted in interpretivist, constructivist, and critical traditions, emphasizes contextual understanding, the interpretation of meaning, processual analysis, and the exploration of subjective lived experiences. This methodological schism has mirrored and reinforced theoretical and paradigmatic divides. Realist and liberal institutionalist scholars have traditionally leveraged quantitative methods to analyze patterns of war, trade, and alliance behavior, while constructivist, critical, feminist, and post-structuralist scholars have employed qualitative methods to investigate the formation of identities, the power of norms, the intricacies of diplomatic practice, and the structures of discourse. This paper critically examines this divergence by tracing its philosophical roots, analyzing its manifestation in International Relations theory and practice, and evaluating the methodological trade-offs each approach entails. It argues that while the epistemological foundations of each tradition create a persistent and meaningful divide, a reflexive, problem-driven scholarly practice—supplemented by deliberate mixed-methods designs—offers the most productive path forward for a discipline grappling with complex global phenomena. The paper concludes that methodological pluralism, grounded in an understanding of the strengths and limitations of each approach, is essential for the intellectual rigor and policy relevance of International Relations.*

---

**Keywords:** Methodology; quantitative Research; Qualitativaive Research; Divergence; Scientific Research.

### 1.0 Introduction

Research methodology constitutes the foundational architecture of scholarly inquiry, determining not only how knowledge is gathered and analyzed but also what counts as valid knowledge in the first place. In the disciplines of International Relations and Diplomacy, methodological choices are far from neutral; they actively shape explanations of war and peace, state behavior, diplomatic negotiation, global governance, and transnational identity formation. Among the most persistent and defining methodological fissures is the divergence between quantitative and qualitative research approaches. This divide extends beyond a simple preference for numbers versus words, representing instead a deeper clash over the nature of social reality (ontology), how we can know that reality (epistemology), and the ultimate purpose of scholarly investigation.

Quantitative research is conventionally associated with a positivist ethos, valuing objectivity, hypothesis-testing, variable measurement, and statistical generalization. It seeks to emulate the natural sciences by identifying law-like causal relationships that can predict patterns of international behavior. Conversely, qualitative research is often linked to interpretivist or post-positivist philosophies, prioritizing depth, context, narrative, and the interpretation of meaning. It contends that the social world, constituted by human consciousness, language, and intersubjective understandings, requires methods sensitive to complexity and specificity, such as case studies, process tracing, interviews, and discourse analysis (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

In IR, this methodological divergence has been particularly pronounced, often aligning with theoretical and even ideological camps. The behavioral revolution of the 1950s and 60s cemented the position of quantitative analysis in the study of interstate conflict and cooperation. In response, subsequent waves of scholarship—including the reflectivist and constructivist turns—challenged the hegemony of positivist methods, advocating for qualitative approaches that could capture the role of ideas, norms, and identity (Jackson, 2016). This debate, a core facet of the discipline's "Third Debate" between positivism and post-positivism, continues to influence training, publishing, and research funding.

This paper seeks to provide a comprehensive analysis of this methodological divergence. It is guided by the following research questions:

1. What philosophical and epistemological foundations account for the fundamental divergence between quantitative and qualitative research?
2. How have these methodological approaches become embedded within, and reflective of, major theoretical traditions in International Relations?
3. What are the practical methodological implications—in terms of design, data collection, and analysis—of choosing one path over the other?
4. How can scholars navigate this divide to produce rigorous, insightful research, and what is the potential and limitation of mixed-methods integration?

Addressing these questions is crucial for PhD scholars and researchers, who must not only select a methodological approach but also articulate a defensible philosophical justification for that choice, demonstrating an awareness of its capacities and constraints.

## 2.0 Literature Review

The literature on methodological divergence is vast and interdisciplinary, originating in philosophy of science and sociology before becoming a central concern in political science and International Relations.

## 2.1 The Rise of Positivism and Quantitative Dominance

The early methodological landscape was heavily influenced by positivism, pioneered by Auguste Comte (1853), which asserted that only knowledge derived from empirical observation constituted valid science. This philosophy advocated for the unity of scientific method across natural and social worlds. In political science and IR, this impulse culminated in the behavioral revolution. Scholars like J. David Singer (1961), with the Correlates of War project, and Karl Deutsch (1968) argued for the systematic collection of numerical data and the application of statistical techniques to uncover general laws of international politics. This period established large-N statistical analysis as the gold standard for "scientific" rigor, focusing on measurable variables like military capabilities, alliance ties, and trade volumes.

## 2.2 The Interpretivist and Post-Positivist Challenge

Concurrently, a robust intellectual challenge emerged from interpretivist and phenomenological traditions. Alfred Schutz (1967) argued that social reality (*Lebenswelt*) is fundamentally different from natural reality, as it is pre-interpreted by the actors within it. Therefore, understanding (*verstehen*)—grasping the subjective meanings that guide action—must be the primary goal of social science. This philosophical stance provided a foundation for qualitative methodologies. In IR, the end of the Cold War and the inadequacy of purely materialist models created an opening for constructivist scholars like Alexander Wendt (1999). By arguing that "anarchy is what states make of it," Wendt shifted focus to intersubjective structures—norms, identities, and cultures—which demanded interpretive, qualitative methods for their analysis.

## 2.3 The Critical and Reflexive Turn

Further divergence was fueled by critical theory, feminism, and post-structuralism. Scholars such as Robert Cox (1981) distinguished between "problem-solving theory" (which takes the world as given and uses positivist methods) and "critical theory" (which questions the very structures of that world). Feminist theorists like J. Ann Tickner (2001) argued that mainstream, often quantitative, IR was gendered, marginalizing women's experiences and perspectives. These approaches emphasized reflexivity, the critique of power/knowledge nexuses, and the use of qualitative methods like discourse analysis and ethnography to deconstruct dominant narratives and give voice to the marginalized.

## 2.4 The "Unity of Science" Debate and Mixed Methods

A pivotal moment in the literature was the publication of *Designing Social Inquiry* by King, Keohane, and Verba (1994). KKV argued that the logic of inference—making descriptive and causal claims about the world—is universal. They proposed that qualitative research could and

should be systematized to adhere to the same principles of valid inference that govern quantitative work. This provoked a fierce counter-response from qualitative methodologies (e.g., Brady & Collier, 2004), who argued that KKV's template was inherently quantitative, undervaluing the unique strengths of qualitative inquiry, such as concept formation, within-case causal process tracing, and the handling of complex causality.

This debate has given rise to a growing literature on mixed-methods research (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018), which seeks pragmatic integration. However, a significant strand of literature warns of epistemological incommensurability, suggesting that methods rooted in incompatible views of reality cannot be seamlessly combined without philosophical contradiction (Smith, 1983). The contemporary literature thus reflects a tension between the push for integration and the recognition of enduring, philosophically grounded divergence.

### **3.0 Theoretical Framework: Epistemological and Ontological Foundations**

The core divergence stems from incompatible starting points regarding the nature of reality and how we know it.

#### **3.1 The Quantitative-Positivist Nexus**

Quantitative research is primarily allied with positivism and its successor, post-positivism (or critical realism). The ontological assumption is realism: a single, objective reality exists independently of the observer's beliefs. The epistemological stance is objectivism: the researcher can, with proper methods, measure and apprehend this reality neutrally. The goal is to explain and predict by discovering generalizable causal laws, minimizing bias through controlled design, operationalization, and statistical testing (Neuman, 2014).

In IR theory, this aligns seamlessly with (neo)realism and (neo)liberalism. Realism's focus on material power, the security dilemma, and systemic constraints yields variables (e.g., GDP, military expenditure, polarity) readily suited to quantification. Liberal institutionalism's interest in interdependence, institutions, and regime type similarly employs quantitative indicators (trade flows, IGO memberships, democracy scores) to test hypotheses about cooperation (Keohane, 1984).

#### **3.2 The Qualitative-Interpretivist Nexus**

Qualitative research is anchored in interpretivism (including constructivism and hermeneutics). Its ontology is one of relativism or social constructionism: realities are multiple, mentally constructed, and shaped by social, historical, and cultural contexts. Epistemologically, it embraces subjectivism or intersubjectivism: knowledge is created through interaction between the researcher and participants, and understanding is always mediated by interpretation. The goal is not prediction but understanding (*verstehen*)—to reconstruct the meanings, beliefs, and intentions that constitute social action.

In IR, social constructivism is the paradigmatic example. By focusing on how shared ideas, norms, and identities (e.g., "sovereignty," "human rights," "a European identity") constitute interests and shape behavior, constructivism deals with phenomena irreducible to numbers. Similarly, critical theories, feminist IR, and post-structuralism employ qualitative methods to interrogate how power operates through discourse, to reveal silences, and to explore the lived experiences of individuals and groups in the international system (Tickner, 2001).

Table 1: Foundational Divergence Between Research Approaches

Aspect	Quantitative (Positivist/Post-Positivist)	Qualitative (Interpretivist/Constructivist)
Ontology (Nature of Reality)	Singular, objective, independent of observer.	Multiple, socially constructed, subjective.
Epistemology (Nature of Knowledge)	Objective, discoverable through measurement; researcher is detached.	Subjective/intersubjective, co-created through interpretation; researcher is engaged.
Axiology (Role of Values)	Values are to be minimized; science is value-free.	Values are inherent; reflexivity about bias is essential.
Purpose of Research	Explain, predict, generalize, test theory.	Understand, interpret, contextualize, generate theory.
Typical IR Theories	Realism, Liberal Institutionalism.	Constructivism, Critical Theory, Feminism, Post-structuralism.

#### **4.0 Methodology: Practical Divergence in Design and Execution**

The philosophical divide manifests concretely in research design, data collection, and analytical techniques.

##### **4.1 Quantitative Methodology: Measurement and Modeling**

**Research Design:** Often deductive, beginning with a theory from which testable hypotheses are derived. Designs include experiments, large-N observational studies, and formal models.

**Data Collection:** Relies on standardized instruments to generate numerical data: structured surveys, existing datasets (e.g., Polity IV, COW), content analysis with coding schemes, and experimental results.

**Data Analysis:** Employs statistical techniques (e.g., regression analysis, factor analysis, time-series) to quantify relationships between variables, test for significance, and control for confounding factors. The goal is to make probabilistic causal claims and estimate effects (Bryman, 2016).

**Criteria for Quality:** Validity (are we measuring what we intend?), reliability (would the measure yield consistent results?), replicability (could another scholar reproduce the analysis?), and generalizability (do the findings apply beyond the studied sample?).

**Strengths & Limitations:** Its strength lies in precision, replicability, and the ability to identify broad patterns and correlations across many cases. Its primary limitation is reductionism: complex social processes may be lost when reduced to measurable variables, risking an "ecological fallacy" where group-level data misrepresents individual-level mechanisms.

##### **4.2 Qualitative Methodology: Interpretation and Context**

**Research Design:** Often inductive or abductive, aiming to build theory from grounded observation or to diagnose puzzling outcomes. Common designs include single or comparative case studies, ethnography, and process tracing.

**Data Collection:** Gathers non-numerical, rich data: in-depth interviews, focus groups, participant observation, historical archives, diplomatic cables, public speeches, and visual materials.

**Data Analysis:** Involves interpretive techniques: thematic analysis, narrative analysis, discourse analysis, and, crucially, process tracing—the systematic examination of diagnostic evidence within a case to test conjectures about causal mechanisms linking causes to outcomes (George & Bennett, 2005).

**Criteria for Quality:** Credibility (accuracy of the interpretation), transferability (contextual applicability, not statistical generalization), dependability (consistency of the process), and confirmability (neutrality, achieved through reflexivity and audit trails).



Strengths & Limitations: Its strength is depth and validity, offering nuanced insight into causal processes, meanings, and context. It is indispensable for studying rare events, path dependence, and the "how" and "why" questions. Its main limitations are concerns about subjectivity, potential lack of transparency, and limited external validity (case-specific findings).

#### 4.3 The Mixed-Methods Terrain and Its Discontents

In response to these trade-offs, mixed-methods designs have proliferated. A common approach in IR is a sequential design, such as:

1. Qual → Quant: Using qualitative exploration to identify variables, mechanisms, or theoretical concepts later tested quantitatively across a larger sample.
2. Quant → Qual: Using quantitative analysis to identify a broad correlation or an outlier case ("deviant case") that is then explored in depth qualitatively to uncover the underlying mechanism.

However, this integration is philosophically fraught. Combining methods from incommensurate paradigms requires careful philosophical bracketing or a pragmatic, problem-driven approach that prioritizes the research question over paradigmatic purity. True integration is challenging and demands methodological sophistication to avoid simply performing two separate studies in one paper.

### 5.0 Objectives and Impact on Knowledge and Policy

The divergent objectives of each approach shape the kind of knowledge produced and its relevance to policymakers.

Quantitative research aims for explanation, prediction, and generalization. Its knowledge product is often a model or a statistically significant relationship (e.g., "joint democracy reduces the probability of militarized dispute onset by X%"). This form of knowledge is highly valued in policy circles for its apparent certainty and predictive power, feeding into risk assessments, resource allocation, and broad strategic planning. For instance, quantitative findings on the "democratic peace" have influenced decades of Western foreign policy rhetoric and democracy promotion agendas.

Qualitative research aims for understanding, interpretation, and contextualization. Its knowledge product is a nuanced narrative, a theory of process, or a critical deconstruction (e.g., "how the norm of Responsibility to Protect was negotiated, internalized by state diplomats, and ultimately applied in Libya"). This knowledge is crucial for the *practice* of diplomacy, conflict mediation, intelligence analysis, and understanding the local dynamics of intervention. It helps answer the pivotal question: "How does this work in practice, and what does it mean to the actors involved?"

The two approaches thus offer complementary forms of policy intelligence: quantitative research provides the "big picture" map of trends and probabilities, while qualitative research provides the detailed "ground-level" guide to navigating specific terrains. A diplomat needs both the statistical profile of a region *and* the deep cultural and political understanding of its key actors.

## 6.0 Conclusion

The divergence between quantitative and qualitative research in International Relations is profound, durable, and intellectually productive. It is not a problem to be solved but a fundamental feature of a discipline grappling with a multifaceted social world. This paper has demonstrated that the split originates in irreconcilable philosophical commitments about reality and knowledge (ontology and epistemology), which then cascade into distinct theoretical allegiances, methodological practices, and research objectives.

Quantitative methods, aligned with positivism and theories like realism, offer powerful tools for identifying broad patterns, testing hypotheses, and aspiring to generalizable knowledge. Qualitative methods, aligned with interpretivism and theories like constructivism, offer indispensable tools for uncovering meanings, tracing processes, and building context-rich explanations. The debate between them, exemplified by the KKV controversy, reflects a healthy disciplinary tension over the standards of evidence and the goals of inquiry.

The future of rigorous IR research lies not in the triumph of one approach over the other, but in methodological pluralism and reflexivity. Scholars must be problem-driven, not method-driven, selecting the tool kit most appropriate for their research question while being transparent about the philosophical assumptions and limitations of their choice. Mixed-methods designs offer a promising, if philosophically complex, pathway for leveraging the strengths of both worlds. Ultimately, the complexity of global politics—from nuclear deterrence to climate negotiations to transnational social movements—demands a diverse methodological arsenal. By embracing this diversity with sophistication and reflexivity, the field of International Relations and Diplomacy can produce more robust, comprehensive, and relevant knowledge.

## 7.0 Recommendations

Based on the foregoing analysis, the following recommendations are proposed for the advancement of methodological practice in International Relations and Diplomacy:

1. For PhD Training: Doctoral programs should move beyond teaching methods in isolation. Required coursework should include comparative methodology, explicitly teaching the philosophical foundations of each approach and training students in the art of methodological justification in research design.
2. For Scholarly Practice: Researchers should adopt a stance of methodological reflexivity. Publications and dissertations should include a clear statement of philosophical positioning (e.g., critical realist, constructivist) and explain how this stance informs the choice of methods, rather than presenting methods as atheoretical tools.
3. For Bridging the Divide: Journals and academic associations should actively foster inter-methodological dialogue, through special issues, conference panels, and workshops that pair quantitative and qualitative scholars to address the same substantive puzzle.
4. For Mixed-Methods Research: When employing mixed methods, researchers should consciously articulate their integrative strategy (e.g., triangulation, complementarity, expansion) and address, rather than ignore, potential epistemological tensions in their design.



5. For the Discipline: IR should embrace analytic eclecticism (Sil & Katzenstein, 2010), prioritizing complex, real-world problems over paradigmatic purity, and thereby creating space for pragmatic and innovative methodological combinations that enhance explanatory power.

## References

- Brady, H. E., & Collier, D. (Eds.). (2004). *Rethinking social inquiry: Diverse tools, shared standards*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Comte, A. (1853). *The positive philosophy of Auguste Comte* (H. Martineau, Trans.). Chapman.
- Cox, R. W. (1981). Social forces, states and world orders: Beyond international relations theory. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 10(2), 126–155.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Deutsch, K. W. (1968). *The analysis of international relations*. Prentice-Hall.
- George, A. L., & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case studies and theory development in the social sciences*. MIT Press.
- Jackson, P. T. (2016). *The conduct of inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of science and its implications for the study of world politics* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton University Press.
- King, G., Keohane, R. O., & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton University Press.
- Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th ed.). Pearson.

Schutz, A. (1967). *The phenomenology of the social world* (G. Walsh & F. Lehnert, Trans.). Northwestern University Press.

Sil, R., & Katzenstein, P. J. (2010). *Beyond paradigms: Analytic eclecticism in the study of world politics*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Singer, J. D. (1961). The level-of-analysis problem in international relations. *World Politics*, 14(1), 77–92.

Smith, J. K. (1983). Quantitative versus interpretive: The problem of conducting social inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 12(4), 6–13.

Tickner, J. A. (2001). *Gendering world politics: Issues and approaches in the post-Cold War era*. Columbia University Press.

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics*. Cambridge University Press.