The Bioscan AN INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF LIFE SCIENCES
20(1) 785-804, 2025 www.thebioscan.com

MANAGING SUBJECTIVITY AND OBJECTIVITY IN BUSINESS RESEARCH: A METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR INTEGRATING QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE APPROACHES

Dr.P.Vijaya Vani
Faculty, International Business Studies, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur, AP India
vijayavanipachala@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.63001/tbs.2025.v20.i01.pp794-804

KEYWORDS

[*qualitative research,*
quantitative research,
subjectivity, objectivity,
mixed methods,
business research methodology,
reflexivity,
triangulation,
Dual-Lens Integration Framework

Received on:30-01-2025

Accepted on: 19-03-2025

Published on: 29-03-2025

Abstract

Business research increasingly demands methodological pluralism. Yet the field lacks a unified framework that explicitly addresses how researchers can navigate the epistemological tension between subjective interpretation and objective measurement across the full research lifecycle. This paper proposes the Dual-Lens Integration Framework (DLIF), a structured methodology for managing subjectivity and objectivity in business research through six operationalised strategies: reflexivity auditing, systematic triangulation, structured peer debriefing, member validation protocols, bias taxonomy mapping, and transparent reporting standards. Drawing on a synthesis of empirical literature spanning policy research, education, market analysis, and healthcare, this paper argues that the qualitative–quantitative binary is a false dichotomy; rigor is achieved not by choosing one paradigm, but by consciously governing the interplay between them. Implications for managerial decision-making, strategic planning, customer experience design, and risk management are discussed. The DLIF offers both researchers and practitioners a replicable, discipline-agnostic tool for producing credible, actionable business intelligence.

1. Introduction:

Contemporary business environments are characterised by rapid structural change, complex stakeholder ecosystems, and high informational uncertainty. To navigate this landscape, organisations rely on research that is simultaneously rich in contextual depth and statistically robust — capacities that have historically been associated with qualitative and quantitative methodologies respectively. Yet despite decades of methodological debate, a persistent gap remains in the business research literature: researchers routinely choose between paradigms rather than architecting principled frameworks for their integration.

This paper addresses that gap directly. Rather than rehearsing the comparative merits of qualitative versus quantitative approaches — a well-trodden debate — we focus on the underexplored challenge of governing the researcher's epistemic position throughout the research process. Specifically, we examine how subjectivity (the influence of the researcher's perspective, values, and social location on knowledge production) and objectivity (the aspiration toward bias-free, reproducible inquiry) can be managed concurrently, rather than traded off against each other.

We make three contributions. First, we synthesise a cross-disciplinary body of empirical and theoretical literature spanning applied policy research, educational inquiry, market analysis, organisational communication, and healthcare to produce an integrated account of epistemological management in business research. Second, we identify six operationalised strategies — constituting what we call the Dual-Lens Integration Framework (DLIF) — through which researchers can actively govern subjectivity and objectivity across the research lifecycle. Third, we examine the implications of the DLIF for four areas of business practice: informed decision-making, strategic planning, customer experience enhancement, and risk management.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews qualitative research, its definitions, methodological principles, and application across business-adjacent domains. Section 3 examines quantitative research, its epistemological foundations, and its role in business intelligence. Section 4 analyses subjectivity and the research literature on its management. Section 5 examines objectivity and its limits. Section 6 presents the DLIF. Section 7 discusses implications for business practice. Section 8 addresses common debates. Section 9 concludes.

2. Qualitative Research: Principles and Application in Business

2.1 Definitions and Epistemological Foundations : Qualitative research is broadly defined as the naturalistic study of social meanings and processes, employing interviews, observations, and the analysis of texts and images to understand how and why groups think and act in particular ways (Stanford Libraries, 2024). Crucially, this methodology does not merely describe social behaviour — it seeks to illuminate the mechanisms and meanings that structure it.

Hecker and Kalpokas (2024) extend this definition to emphasise the non-numerical nature of qualitative data: words, images, and behaviours constitute the primary analytical material, and the aim is to generate contextualised, in-depth insight rather than statistically generalisable findings. This epistemological orientation — broadly interpretive — positions qualitative research as especially suited to phenomena where the meaning of an experience to the actor is itself the phenomenon of interest.

In business research specifically, this translates to a capacity to reveal the lived experience of employees, the tacit motivations of consumers, the informal dynamics of organisational culture, and the contextual factors that determine whether a strategy succeeds or fails in practice (Gephart & Saylors, 2020).

2.2 Methodological Approaches

Four methodological traditions are particularly relevant to business research. Srivastava and Thomson (2009) demonstrate how a policy-oriented qualitative methodology — combining interviews, focus groups, and documentary analysis with iterative refinement of research questions — can generate insights that are both theoretically grounded and practically actionable. Their framework illustrates the importance of aligning method selection with the dual demands of academic rigour and real-world policy utility.

Baskarada (2014) provides complementary guidance through qualitative case study methodology, emphasising the selection of theoretically appropriate cases, the

triangulation of data sources, and the maintenance of an audit trail to ensure transparency. This approach is particularly well-suited to the single-organisation or bounded-system analyses common in management research.

Lowhorn (2007) contributes a decision-theoretic perspective, arguing that the choice of qualitative methodology should be driven by the nature of the research question rather than disciplinary convention. Complex, multi-causal phenomena — such as why an organisational change initiative fails — are better served by qualitative approaches; phenomena amenable to operationalisation and hypothesis testing are better served by quantitative ones.

Fossey et al. (2016) provide a quality-assurance framework for evaluating qualitative research, articulating criteria for trustworthiness that include credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Their synthesis of interpretive and critical research paradigms is especially relevant to business researchers who must communicate findings to sceptical, quantitatively-oriented audiences.

3. Quantitative Research: Principles and Application in Business

3.1 Definitions and Epistemological Foundations : Quantitative research deals in numbers, logic, and an objective analytical stance (USC Libraries, 2024). It focuses on numeric data, structured collection methods, and the application of statistical techniques to identify patterns, test hypotheses, and generalise findings to broader populations. In the formulation of Bhandari (2023), quantitative research is the process of collecting and analysing numerical data to find patterns and averages, make predictions, test causal relationships, and generalise results.

Epistemologically, quantitative research typically aligns with positivism — the view that reality is mind-independent, measurable, and governed by discoverable regularities. Basias and Pollalis (2018) situate this within a scientific method framework: hypotheses are stated before data collection, empirical evidence is gathered through instruments designed to minimise researcher influence, and statistical analysis determines whether hypotheses are supported. The processual link between empirical observation and mathematical expression is, in their account, what distinguishes quantitative research from informal inference.

3.2 Application Domains in Business Research

Siripipatthanakul et al. (2023) provide a comprehensive overview of quantitative methods in educational settings — a domain with close parallels to organisational research. They outline a seven-step process: problem identification, research question formulation, proposal development, research design, instrument development and pilot testing, data collection (via surveys), and data analysis using both probability and non-probability sampling techniques. This procedural clarity is a hallmark of quantitative research and contributes to its replicability.

In market research, QuestionPro (2024) documents the application of quantitative methods — including surveys, polls, and questionnaires — to measure consumer preferences, evaluate product-market fit, and segment target audiences. Crucially, this requires large, statistically representative samples, and the analysis employs descriptive statistics, inferential statistics, and

multivariate techniques to produce actionable intelligence for business strategy.

Valdez (2019) extends the analysis to healthcare — a domain that exemplifies both the strengths and responsibilities of quantitative research — demonstrating how statistical methods enable objective, generalisable evaluation of treatment efficacy. The translation to business is direct: quantitative research enables organisations to evaluate interventions (product launches, training programmes, marketing campaigns) with a rigour that qualitative methods alone cannot provide.

Ali et al. (2021) offer a particularly relevant demonstration in the context of internal organisational communication, showing how quantitative methods — surveys, questionnaires, and statistical analysis of communication metrics — enable organisations to measure employee satisfaction, identify communication bottlenecks, and evaluate the effectiveness of different information channels.

4. Subjectivity in Business Research

4.1 Conceptualisation : Subjectivity is the claim that perception emerges from a subject's point of view, shaped by social location — including class, gender, ethnicity, and professional identity — and by accumulated experience (Sharp, 2020). In business research, subjectivity operates at multiple levels: it shapes what phenomena researchers choose to study, what questions they ask, how they interpret responses, and what they report. Critically, as Sharp notes, acknowledging subjectivity does not negate the validity of the knowledge produced; rather, failing to acknowledge it risks systematic error.

Pope's (n.d.) analysis of subjectivity in educational research — closely analogous to business research in its reliance on interpretive, participant-centred methods — demonstrates that researcher subjectivity, when surfaced and managed, becomes an asset rather than a liability. Reflexivity, the practice of critical self-examination, transforms the researcher's perspective from a source of bias into a resource for generating nuanced, empathetic understanding.

4.2 Strategies for Managing Subjectivity : Six strategies for managing subjectivity are identified in the literature. Together, these form the subjectivity management component of the DLIF.

- Reflexivity: Continuous self-examination of the researcher's assumptions, values, and social position throughout data collection, analysis, and reporting (Dixon, 2018). Reflexivity does not eliminate subjectivity but makes it visible and manageable.
- Triangulation: The use of multiple methods, data sources, or theoretical lenses to cross-validate findings and compensate for the limitations of any single approach (Noble & Heale, 2019).
- Peer debriefing: Consultation with independent colleagues who probe the researcher's interpretive choices, helping to surface unacknowledged assumptions and detect confirmation bias (Delve et al., 2021).
- Member checking (respondent validation): Collaborative verification of data interpretations with research participants, ensuring that researcher representations align with participants' intended meanings (Delve et al., 2023).
- Transparency: Full disclosure of methodological choices, data collection procedures, analytical decisions, and

potential conflicts of interest, enabling readers to assess the credibility of findings independently.

- Collaborative approaches: Involving researchers from diverse disciplinary, institutional, and cultural backgrounds to counterbalance individual perspective, particularly valuable in cross-sector or international business research.

5. Objectivity in Business Research: Limits and Governance

5.1 The Classical Model and Its Limits : In its classical formulation, objectivity assumes that a truth or independent reality exists outside any investigation, and that the researcher's task is to uncover it without contamination (AQR, 2013). This model — associated with positivism and the natural sciences — underpins the epistemological ambition of quantitative research. Yet, as both Niaz (2017) and Panhwar and Khatwani (2020) demonstrate, complete objectivity is neither achievable nor, arguably, desirable.

Niaz's (2017) examination of scientific research published in Science & Education reveals that even in the natural sciences — the domain most associated with objective inquiry — researcher biases, theoretical commitments, and methodological choices shape findings in non-trivial ways. The appropriate response is not to abandon the aspiration for objectivity but to supplement it with transparency and reflexivity.

Panhwar and Khatwani (2020) extend this argument to social research, where the inherent subjectivity of human experience makes the classical objectivity model particularly strained. They advocate for a reflexive objectivity — an orientation that acknowledges the researcher's influence while systematically working to minimise its distorting effects.

5.2 Bias in Quantitative Research: A Taxonomy : A critical implication of the objectivity literature is that quantitative research is not inherently bias-free. Chipeta (2020) identifies six systematic biases that threaten the validity of survey-based quantitative research — the dominant method in business studies:

Bias Type	Mechanism	Mitigation Strategy
Acquiescence bias	Respondents systematically agree with statements regardless of content	Balanced scale design; reverse-coded items
Social desirability bias	Respondents select socially acceptable answers over truthful ones	Anonymous surveys; indirect questioning techniques
Habituation bias	Repetitive questions cause respondents to answer by prior pattern	Question randomisation; concise instruments
Confirmation bias	Researcher designs questions that prime expected answers	Blind coding; pre-registration of hypotheses
Extreme response bias	Respondents systematically choose extreme scale endpoints	Midpoint anchoring; cognitive interviewing during piloting
Non-response bias	Non-participants differ systematically from respondents	Follow-up protocols; weighting adjustments

This taxonomy has direct implications for business research practice. Recognising that quantitative instruments are not passively neutral — but are themselves artefacts shaped by researcher decisions — underscores the importance of bias-management protocols even within positivist methodologies.

6. The Dual-Lens Integration Framework (DLIF) : The foregoing review reveals a consistent pattern across disciplines: neither qualitative nor quantitative research, on its own, fully satisfies the epistemological demands of rigorous business inquiry. Qualitative research offers depth without breadth; quantitative research offers breadth without depth. Subjectivity without management produces idiosyncratic, non-transferable findings; the aspiration to objectivity without acknowledgement of its limits produces spuriously confident conclusions.

The Dual-Lens Integration Framework (DLIF), proposed here, operationalises the integration of both paradigms and the governance of both epistemic orientations across the five stages of the research lifecycle. The framework is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: The Dual-Lens Integration Framework (DLIF)

Research Stage	Qualitative Lens	Quantitative Lens	Governance Mechanism
1. Problem Framing	Exploratory interviews; literature gap identification	Descriptive statistics on existing datasets	Reflexivity audit; pre-registration of research questions
2. Design	Case selection; purposive sampling	Hypothesis formulation; power analysis	Peer debriefing; ethics review
3. Data Collection	Interviews; focus groups; ethnography	Surveys; experiments; secondary data	Member checking; bias taxonomy screening
4. Analysis	Thematic coding; narrative analysis	Statistical modelling; regression; ANOVA	Triangulation; inter-rater reliability testing
5. Reporting	Thick description; case narratives	Statistical tables; effect sizes; confidence intervals	Transparent reporting standards; confirmability statement

Several design principles underpin the DLIF. First, integration is sequential, not additive — qualitative insights inform quantitative instrument design, and quantitative findings generate hypotheses for qualitative exploration. This recursive relationship prevents the two methodologies from being conducted in parallel isolation. Second, governance mechanisms are stage-specific: different risks to validity are salient at different points in the research process, and the DLIF assigns appropriate management strategies accordingly. Third, the framework is transparent by design — every methodological decision is documented and available for scrutiny, satisfying both academic and practitioner expectations for accountability.

The DLIF is consistent with the broader mixed-methods literature (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018) but extends it by making the

epistemological governance function explicit and operationalised. It provides researchers with not merely a mandate to mix methods, but a structured protocol for doing so responsibly.

7. Implications for Business Practice

7.1 Informed Decision-Making : The integration of qualitative and quantitative research, governed by the DLIF, produces a more holistic information base for organisational decision-making. Qualitative research reveals the motivations, concerns, and informal logics that shape stakeholder behaviour — information that statistical analysis cannot surface. Quantitative research provides the confirmatory evidence and predictive power needed to commit resources with confidence. Used together, they reduce both Type I errors (acting on spurious patterns) and Type II errors (failing to act on real but statistically undetected effects).

7.2 Strategic Planning

Strategic planning in volatile markets requires organisations to anticipate change, not merely respond to it. Qualitative research — through trend immersion, expert interviews, and ethnographic observation — enables organisations to detect weak signals and emerging narratives before they are quantifiable. Quantitative research then provides the statistical validation and scenario modelling needed to translate qualitative insight into resource allocation decisions. The DLIF formalises this complementarity, ensuring that strategic planning is neither purely data-driven (and thus blind to unarticulated market shifts) nor purely intuitive (and thus ungrounded in empirical evidence).

7.3 Customer Experience Enhancement

Customer experience is irreducibly subjective — it is constituted by meaning, interpretation, and affect, not merely behaviour. Qualitative methods — focus groups, depth interviews, diaries, and observational studies — are the appropriate primary tool for understanding experience. However, they cannot on their own identify which improvements produce statistically significant shifts in loyalty, satisfaction, or lifetime value. The DLIF enables organisations to use qualitative insight to generate hypotheses and design experience-improvement interventions, and quantitative methods to evaluate their impact at scale.

7.4 Risk Management : Effective risk management requires both the identification of risks (a qualitative task, dependent on stakeholder engagement, narrative analysis, and contextual judgment) and the quantification of their likelihood and impact (a quantitative task, dependent on historical data, statistical modelling, and scenario analysis). The DLIF enables organisations to conduct both systematically, integrating qualitative risk sensing with quantitative risk modelling to produce comprehensive, evidence-based risk registers and mitigation strategies.

8. Discussion: Resolving the False Dichotomies

8.1 Qualitative versus Quantitative Research : The question of whether qualitative or quantitative research is superior is, in the context of the DLIF, a category error. The appropriate question is: which methodology, or which combination of methodologies, is best suited to the research question at hand? Lowhorn (2007) provides the relevant criterion: qualitative methods are suited to understanding complex phenomena and generating in-depth insight; quantitative methods are suited to testing hypotheses and generalising to larger populations. These are

not competing functions — they are complementary ones.

Troy (2023) usefully documents the limitations of each approach: quantitative research is time-consuming, requires extensive statistical expertise, and can produce findings that are precise but shallow; qualitative research requires substantial planning, is difficult to replicate, and can produce findings that are rich but idiosyncratic. The DLIF is designed precisely to exploit the strengths of each while compensating for these respective limitations.

8.2 Subjectivity versus Objectivity

The apparent opposition between subjectivity and objectivity dissolves under careful examination. Objectivity is not a condition that researchers achieve or fail to achieve; it is a regulative ideal that orients research practice. Subjectivity is not a contamination to be eliminated but a constitutive feature of all knowledge production — including quantitative research, as the bias taxonomy in Section 5.2 demonstrates. The Content Authority (2023) correctly observes that the choice between subjective and objective orientations depends on context; we add that in most business research contexts, both orientations are simultaneously operative and must be governed jointly.

The DLIF operationalises this joint governance, embedding both subjectivity management strategies (reflexivity, member checking, peer debriefing) and objectivity governance mechanisms (pre-registration, bias screening, transparent reporting) within a single, unified research protocol.

9. Conclusion : This paper has proposed the Dual-Lens Integration Framework (DLIF) as a methodological response to the epistemological challenges facing business researchers. By synthesising a cross-disciplinary literature on qualitative research, quantitative research, subjectivity, and objectivity, we have demonstrated that rigorous business research is not achieved by selecting one paradigm over the other, but by governing the interplay between them through explicit, stage-specific management strategies.

The DLIF contributes to business research methodology in three ways: it provides a unified vocabulary for discussing epistemological governance; it maps management strategies to specific stages of the research lifecycle; and it connects methodological rigour to concrete business outcomes in decision-making, strategy, customer experience, and risk management.

Future research should validate the DLIF through application in specific organisational contexts, examining how the framework performs across different industries, cultural settings, and research scales. Particular attention should be paid to the challenges of implementing the framework in applied research settings where time and resource constraints limit methodological ambition. The development of practitioner-oriented DLIF toolkits — including reflexivity audit templates, bias screening checklists, and transparent reporting standards — represents a productive area for future methodological work.

Ultimately, the case made here is not merely methodological but epistemological: the most important questions in business — about why organisations succeed or fail, how consumers construct value, and what futures organisations might inhabit — demand a research practice that is simultaneously rich in interpretation and robust in evidence. The

DLIF is offered as a structured means of achieving that ambition.

References

1. Ali, B. J., Anwar, G., Gardi, B., Othman, B. J., Aziz, H. M., Ahmed, S. A., ... & Sabir, B. Y. (2021). Business communication strategies: Analysis of internal communication processes. Journal of Humanities and Education Development, 3(3), 16–38.
2. Antwi, S. K., & Hamza, K. (2015). Qualitative and quantitative research paradigms in business research: A philosophical reflection. European Journal of Business and Management, 7(3), 217–225.
3. Association for Qualitative Research (AQR). (2013). Objectivity. Retrieved from https://www.aqr.org.uk/glossary/objectivity
4. Basias, N., & Pollalis, Y. (2018). Quantitative and qualitative research in business & technology: Justifying a suitable research methodology. Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research, 7, 91–105.
5. Baskarada, S. (2014). Qualitative case study guidelines. The Qualitative Report, 19(40), 1–25.
6. Bhandari, P. (2023). What is quantitative research? Definition, uses & methods. Scribbr. Retrieved from https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/quantitative-research/
7. Chipeta, C. (2020). How to avoid respondent bias in quantitative research. Conjointly. Retrieved from https://conjointly.com/blog/how-to-avoid-respondent-bias/
8. Content Authority, The. (2023). Objectivity and subjectivity: Meaning and differences. Retrieved from https://thecontentauthority.com/blog/objectivity-vs-subjectivity
9. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). SAGE.
10. Delve, Ho, L., & Limpaecher, A. (2021). What is peer debriefing in qualitative research? Delve. Retrieved from https://delvetool.com/blog/peerdebriefing
11. Delve, Ho, L., & Limpaecher, A. (2023). Member check and respondent validation in qualitative research. Delve. Retrieved from https://delvetool.com/blog/memberchec k
12. Dixon, T. (2018). What is reflexivity? The Mantic Education. Retrieved from https://www.themantic-education.com/ibpsych/2018/03/16/what-is-reflexivity/
13. Fossey, E., Harvey, C., McDermott, F., & Davidson, L. (2002). Understanding and evaluating qualitative research. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 36(6), 717–732.
14. Gephart, R. P., & Saylors, R. (2020). Qualitative designs and methodologies for business, management, and organizational research. Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Business and Management.
15. Hecker, J., & Kalpokas, N. (2024). The ultimate guide to qualitative research – Part 1: The basics. ATLAS.ti. Retrieved from https://atlasti.com/guides/qualitative-research-guide-part-1/qualitative-research
16. Longe, B. (2024). 15 reasons to choose quantitative over qualitative research. Formplus. Retrieved from https://www.formpl.us/blog/quantitative-qualitative-research

17. Lowhorn, G. L. (2007). Qualitative and quantitative research: How to choose the best design. Academic Business World International Conference Proceedings.
18. Niaz, M. (2017). Understanding objectivity in research reported in the Journal Science & Education. Science & Education, 26(3–4), 229–248.
19. Noble, H., & Heale, R. (2019). Triangulation in research, with examples. Evidence-Based Nursing, 22(3), 67–68.
20. Oyakshire, A. V. (2020). Forensic accounting investigation: A panacea for fraud and corruption detection in Nigeria. ResearchGate. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344291578
21. Panhwar, F., & Khatwani, M. K. (2020). Objectivity in social research: A critical analysis. International Research Journal of Arts & Humanities, 48(48), 53–64.
22. Pope, E. M. (n.d.). Subjectivity in educational research. University of West Georgia. Retrieved from https://www.westga.edu/academics/research/vrc/assets/docs/subjectivity-reflexivity-notes.pdf
23. QuestionPro. (2024). Quantitative market research: The complete guide. Retrieved from https://www.questionpro.com/blog/quantitative-market-research/
24. Sharp, J. (2020). Subjectivity. In International Encyclopaedia of Human Geography (2nd ed.). Elsevier. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/subjectivity
25. Siripipatthanakul, S., Muthmainnah, Asrifan, A., Siripipattanakul, S., Kaewpuang, P., Sriboonruang, P., ... & Sitthipon, T. (2023). Quantitative research in education. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 6(1), 1–22.
26. Srivastava, A., & Thomson, S. B. (2009). Framework analysis: A qualitative methodology for applied policy research. Journal of Administration and Governance, 4(2), 72–79.
27. Stanford Libraries. (2024). Qualitative research. Retrieved from https://guides.library.stanford.edu/qualitative_research
28. Troy, C. (2023). Qualitative vs quantitative research – A comprehensive guide. Research Prospect. Retrieved from https://www.researchprospect.com/quantitative-vs-qualitative-research/
29. Turner, D., Ting, H., Wong, M. W., Lim, T. Y., & Tan, K. L. (2021). Applying qualitative approach in business research. Asian Journal of Business Research, 11(3), 1–13.
30. USC Libraries. (2024). Organizing your social sciences research paper: Types of research designs. Retrieved from https://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide
31. Valdez, A. (2019). What are the benefits of quantitative research in health care? Career Trend. Retrieved from https://careertrend.com/what-are-the-benefits-of-quantitative-research-in-health-care-13657338.html