



# Implications and Critiques of Quantitative Research: A Systematic Review

Mahendra Sapkota<sup>1ABCD</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Tribhuvan University

Authors' Contribution: A – Study design; B – Data collection; C – Statistical analysis; D – Manuscript Preparation; E – Funds Collection

DOI: 10.17309/jltm.2024.5.3.09

## Abstract

**Objectives.** The study aimed to critically examine challenging notions and attributes embedded with quantitative research from a social science perspective.

**Materials and methods.** Following a systematic review, this study assessed key gaps and contestations revealed in scientific readings published by highly indexed journals and more cited referred texts. The primary analytical question included conceptualizing quantitative methods and highlighting different dimensions of ontology, validity, reliability, generalizability, and ethical implications.

**Results.** The quantitative method is widely used in most scientific fields, translating the research findings into strategic analysis through statistical and experimental frameworks. Despite this scope, the results of this study indicate that the quantitative method has some limitations and dilemmas, which could limit our appreciation and understanding of human behaviour and social phenomena in the subjective world. While adding to the base of empirical knowledge, quantitative research has been criticized for an inadequate approach to capturing complex social phenomena, dependence on rigid assumptions, and vulnerability to contextual factors. Reflecting on these limitations of current quantitative methods informs both directions for advancing existing measurement approaches and integrating alternative strategies.

**Conclusions.** This study concludes that the quantitative method's implications are rational, though not universal. The deterministic approach of quantitative methodology can dilute the understanding of the subjective world due to its inclination towards absolute realities. Therefore, the study underscores the need for methodological pluralism, encouraging scholars, researchers, and students in social sciences and related fields to be open-minded and receptive to alternative research approaches and multi-method strategies for a more comprehensive understanding of human behaviour and social phenomena.

**Keywords:** research, quantitative methodology, positivism, critique and implications.

## Introduction

Quantitative research, with its systematic approach, investigates a particular research problem by collecting quantifiable data and employing statistical, mathematical, or computational techniques. This method is rooted in a positivist approach to knowledge dissemination offering a hallmark of different tools and techniques with scientific scales of measurement (Jamieson et al., 2023; Sapkota, 2024). The quantitative techniques excel in empirical inquiry based on numerical data and statistical tests, making them a reliable choice in all fields. Their strength lies in establishing cause and effect, patterns and forecasting, making them optimal for psychology, economics, public health and education. The capacity to generate numbers has elevated quantitative methods to

a standard status, widely accepted in various academic and professional fields-especially in evidence-based policy-making and practice. Therefore, a scientific definition of quantitative methodology can be confidently asserted as:

“any methodological approach or methods that rely on using some structured instrument, like a survey or an experiment in which the researcher can collect big datasets so they can have quantification of data to analyze the objective world – and provide results that will broadly generalize the research findings or conclusions with deductive reasons.”

Nevertheless, despite how effective these methods can be, quantitative research methods come with glaring criticisms. This approach has been criticized by scholars and practitioners alike for restricting the range of research findings and oversimplifying complex social phenomena. This

© Sapkota, M., 2024.

overconfidence in transforming methodological positivism is a belief that the only authentic knowledge is scientific and that such knowledge can only come from the positive affirmation of theories through strict scientific methods and guidelines. It is based on the widespread objectivity of numeric data, which needs valid support and exploration of the supposed reality and empirical irreducibility to human experience or social context in the making. Critics further note that this type of research cultivates a severance from the lived experiences of people and communities, resulting in shallow findings and often disconnected from the complexities of human behaviour and social interaction (Rudd et al., 2021). This detachment invites doubt over the rigour and relevance of many quantitative findings, mainly where broader issues such as public policy, community sentiments, collective behaviour and intrinsic human values include subjective experiences and contextual factors.

The paper aims to systematically review the critical criticisms made of quantitative research for gaps and shortcomings in methodology and assumptions. The study aims to respond to these critiques and clarify their implications for research findings whilst reviewing literature across social sciences, health sciences and educational research. Additionally, this paper will eventually contribute to the ongoing debate on methodological improvement in quantitative research and the positivism paradigm. It advocates for a more integrative view that combines quantitative granular insights with complementary qualitative approaches, inspiring a new perspective. This integrative view offers hope for the future of research, leading to more nuanced insights that are less disconnected from practice and policy.

## Materials and Methods

This systematic review adopts a qualitative design using secondary sources, appraising academic papers, critiques and research disputation on quantitative methods. Studies were included according to selection criteria that demanded an explicit critique of quantitative methodologies centring on validity, reliability and generalizability issues, reductionism, and ethical considerations. The review was enriched by a thorough search of scientific readings and studies from JSTOR, PubMed, and Google Scholar, covering literature published between 2000 and 2023.

The publications, drawn from a diverse range of disciplines including psychology, sociology, economics, development studies, public health, and education, foster an interdisciplinary dialogue on the implications and criticisms of quantitative research. A critical analysis of articles was vetoed, and themed criteria were coalesced into categories. Through consideration of prominent theoretical traditions, including those offered by Lincoln and Guba (1985), Sardana et al. (2023) and Strunk (2023), this critique suggests that the limitations of quantitative methodologies may result in particular difficulties in capturing complex social phenomena.

## Results

### *Conceptualization of the quantitative research*

Quantitative research is a precise tool for exploring and assessing objective realities that can be measured. This precision enables us to establish patterns, cause and effect rela-

tionships, and predict outcomes. The method, which typically utilizes formal techniques such as surveys, experiments, and observational studies, gathers data that can be statistically assessed (Fischer et al., 2023). The goal is to maintain objectivity and generalizability, allowing researchers to make inferences that can be applied across other settings and populations. Quantitative research aims to reduce biases, ensuring replicable and valid findings by using standardized measures in terms of pre-defined variables and indicators, structured questionnaires and a deduction-oriented reasoning approach.

Quantitative research, however, is guided by certain assumptions that heavily influence its design and interpretation. A major assumption is that the phenomenon can be measured and quantified, projecting the non-numeric abstract world into a numeric and quantified world of simple numbers. Furthermore, quantitative research assumes objectivity, allowing researchers to remain neutral when gathering and analyzing data. This scientific rigour is essential in ensuring that the research process does not contaminate the results and that the results are still meaningful. Moreover, quantitative researchers broadly assume that relationships between variables can be revealed through systematic inquiry and statistical methods, resting on the belief in stable patterns.

The second assumption taken for granted in quantitative research is the determinism of methodological instruments; that is, some factors are thought to affect, condition and orient the outcomes predictably. It is this assumption that underlies the use of causal-comparative and experimental designs, which are research designs that allow researchers to establish cause-and-effect relationships. In these designs, the independent (treatment, intervention) variables are manipulated by researchers so that they can assess their impact on dependent (outcome) variables. These kinds of causal designs rest on the assumption that knowledge of these is helpful for the prediction of future behaviour or outcomes. However, this assumption has been criticized for oversimplifying different and complex social scenarios and human behaviour. Critics of the quantitative paradigm in social science research, as discussed by Saldaña (2021), state that this focus on causality can neglect the role of external factors and other social dynamics that interact with one another to affect each other. Eventually, it renders the complete story absent from models testing a specific variable relationship between independent and dependent variables, wherein adding every conceivable factor is not feasible. Therefore, it is critical to remember that conceptualizations and assumptions found in quantitative research, while deeply theoretically grounded, may need to be taken a critical eye before being forcefully used as the basis for some phenomena or relationships.

### *Ontological and epistemological critique*

Ontological and epistemological critiques against quantitative methodology have gained increasing attention in paradigmatic debates. For example, quantitative research is generally based on a realist ontology, a philosophical position that posits the existence of an objective reality independent of human perception, which assumes that social phenomena are objective and external to us and can be measured by others in exact terms. The quantitative research paradigm

holds the ontology of positivism, which is that generalization and replication of objective realities are expected to be commonalities (Zyphur & Pierides, 2020b). Instead, qualitative researchers and constructivists tend to explore differences in the realities of the subjective world. Thus, the quantitative perspective presumes a distinction between the observer and the observed, ignoring that human experience and social reality are subjective. It has been said that this method oversimplifies the complexity of social phenomena and turns them into zeroes and ones, disregarding cultural context and social science at large (Tabron & Thomas, 2023). This has led the ontological stance of quantitative research to come under attack for ignoring the interpretive components essential to comprehending social contexts, cultural constructs and perceptions of people.

For instance, in terms of epistemology-quantitative methods, because they come from social statistics, privilege objective knowledge but have deep-seated trouble accepting subjective contexts or descriptions of the society where we live and interact. This also aligns with a positively oriented framework of establishing universal laws and generalizable findings through empirical measurement. However, opponents argue that this dependence on statistics can create superficial views of social phenomena, as it does not account for the context-sensitive socio-structural factors that inform individual and collective action. That is why a quantitative analysis might only be able to show some patterns of educational success and failure from year to year by demographic group. In contrast, a qualitative study, with its unique ability to analyze the socio-cultural and economic dynamics behind the trends, is invaluable in understanding the full complexity of social issues. The epistemological critique thus reveals the shortcomings of quantitative research in dealing with human behaviour and social complexity, calling for a pluralistic perspective that values qualitative insights and situational specificity in creating knowledge. Combining several epistemologies within these approaches can provide nuanced details of the complexities of social issues that will contribute significantly to a particular field of inquiry.

#### *Limitations in validity and reliability*

Validity and reliability are central measures of methodological rigour for quantitative research (Duckett, 2021; Sürücü & Maslakci, 2020). However, critics have suggested that adherence to these principles leads such research too often toward narrowly focused interpretations (Maxwell, 2016). Positivist approach, an epistemological basis of most quantitative research methods, denies interpreting human experiences as understood in qualitative terms (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Consider the following – emotionally complex states, the nuances in different cultures geographically stretched apart and social contexts behind how human beings behave and are inclined to think and feel are often simplified and quantified. In this way, reductionism might yield statistically valid findings that are nevertheless not grounded in the lived experiences of participants. Additionally, the focus on reliability may also result in researchers compromising richness – or paying insufficient attention to the meaningful aspects of data in favour of finding consistent answers through methods of consistency (argument). Thus, if the nuances of human

behaviour become less critical because they are not statistically significant, quantitative studies may be valid but will always lack much of what makes them attractive – so long as we ignore the idea that a specific number or magnitude can theoretically represent every human experience.

Furthermore, depending on controlled variables and statistical methods, it creates an illusion of objectivity without considering contextual factors that influence the behaviour of humans. Some critics point out that the quantitative approach focuses on controlling and isolating variables in experimental settings – a process that ignores how socialization works through ongoing participation (by humans with agency) embedded in multilayered contexts. This disconnects the perceived realities and actual realities; which one is valid is always contested, though. Nevertheless, the observers (including researchers) cannot change the ‘independent existence’ of the reality embedded with the phenomenon we investigate. For example, the results of an experiment could provide insights into issues in various social contexts or populations but then differ significantly when attempts are made to apply them. In addition, the quantitative hypothesis testing model may hinder researchers from pursuing emergent themes or unexpected findings that do not fit predetermined parameters. Consequently, the definition of social phenomena is sometimes unwittingly restricted by the rigid definitions required in quantitative research-suggesting a greater need for integrated approaches (one combining rigorous quantitative analysis with qualitative understanding) to tap into such complex human and socially situated behaviours effectively.

#### *Reductionism and contextual oversights*

Some critics suggest that quantitative research is reductionist, taking substantial social complexities and rendering them into un-hierarchic variables. Critics like Hodge (2020) and Sapkota (2024) and Verschuren (2001) argue that this reductionism has the adverse consequence of decontextualizing phenomena, constraining generalizability and robustness of findings. For example, a typical quantitative public health study that reports the incidence of a particular disease may not capture other factors, such as poverty and cultural beliefs directly linked to it. This narrow approach can produce results from researchers who must reflect the realities of those suffering and create a gap in understanding. If interpreted as the work of a few individuals doing well, the consequence will be inappropriate policies with likely damaging effects designed to minimize incentives and competition rather than structural reasons behind these high-impact health inequalities.

Furthermore, the focus on data generalization in quantitative research often leads to the unintentional perpetuation of biases and stereotypes. Outliers or exceptional cases, such as smaller groups or nonstandard experiences, may be effectively ignored in larger datasets. For instance, in educational research, the averages generated by quantitative methods might obscure the unique stories of students with disabilities or those who are members of a nontraditional group. When researchers anchor their work in statistical averages, they may inadvertently reinforce the biases and stereotypes they aim to counteract, masking individual experiences under the broad brush of flawed and limiting quantitative data. These imbalances, however, perpetuate inequities, as schools use

group data to direct their services to an entire population instead of tailoring them to the unique needs of each student. Thus, quantitative research, by reducing understanding to a shallow level of detail, can perpetuate society's systemic injustices due to its inability to derive meaning from context.

### *Generalizability and sample limitations*

Quantitative research is frequently highly generalizable, aspiring to make inferences on larger populations of individuals in different circumstances. Quantitative generalization depends on sampling methods and research design in use (Keysers et al., 2019). However, critics such as Bryman (2012) point out that problematic generalizations can occur when studies relate to samples that are biased or not representative of the wider population. For example, in education, studies that relied on survey responses may inadvertently attract certain demographic groups more than others, skewing the representation from some socio-economic or cultural backgrounds. They are raw from a specific school district, which might not reflect the diversity of the population or the survey will have some bias towards students with better academics, and therefore, results will be skewed. Therefore, results stemming from these samples must be more generalizable to the broader population.

These critics say that quantitative research lacks external validity due to specific methodological issues such as biased sampling, inadequate sample size, or flawed research design, which make the findings unable to inform policy or practice effectively (Queirós et al., 2017). Research that does not accurately reflect the diversity of a population can lead to misleading assumptions and, ultimately, solutions that only help part of a population by leaving parts out. For instance, we might run a program to educate practitioners based on findings from a non-diverse sample and cite these results as the reason that pupils from underrepresented communities are not gaining experience with work-related learning; our intervention may address one population only — depriving an essential diversity of its students who go into gainful employment of the skills they need — and effectively widen inequality rather than lessen it. Furthermore, when policymakers use these generalized findings to implement decisions, there is a potential risk that such policies will not fit all and may lead to moving multiple levers with solutions dealing with all stakeholders involved. Therefore, quantitative methods often have minimal utility in the real-world context without appropriate research design and representative sampling.

### *Ethical concerns and participant detachment*

Ethical issues in quantitative research may be played down because of the dominant nature of quantified (i.e. number-based) output and statistical significance. It can lead researchers to prioritize data collection and analysis at the expense of understanding participants' lived experiences, a crucial aspect that should not be overlooked (Zyphur & Pierides, 2017). In areas like psychology and health, where quantitative approaches often dominate, the standardization implicit in these procedures and protocols can also lead to an insensitivity toward the specific situation of each participant. Institutional review boards (IRBs) protect study participants'

rights and ensure they provide informed consent but often do not consider the ethical implications of data collection more generally. The downside is that researchers treat users as mere statistics rather than individual users with special needs and experiences.

According to Guba and Lincoln (1994), participatory ethics is often forgotten in quantitative studies, as the more formalized structure of quantitative research creates a barrier between researchers and the people whose lives they are trying to study. Such shelving of the deeper truths of participants can have a probability impact by focusing on outcomes, treating research like an equation, and avoiding nuance about how lives have been affected. In one instance, a study that evaluated the effects of a novel health intervention reported statistically significant benefits in numeric outcomes but did not capture any participant's hurdles or motivations nor the community contextual factors that would aid readers in interpreting this particular data — each participant's whole person experience with the behaviour being studied. This lack of nuance in the results hinders their interpretation and application in practice, leading to perceived successes of dubious validity. Therefore, a more nuanced approach, incorporating qualitative components or participatory methods, is needed to guide the ethical consciousness of more sensical quantitative research and improve sensitivity and contextual relevance. This approach could deepen our understanding of what research results can mean for people and communities.

### *Challenges in adapting to contemporary issues*

Over the past few years, scholars have raised significant questions about the suitability of quantitative research for addressing complex, modern problems. Critics argue that the more traditional methods of quantitative studies need help to capture the complexity of these global challenges. Quantitative research, for example, isolates variables via numbers, which can obscure the complex web of social/economic/environmental interrelation. Consequently, these types of studies could deliver a reductive perspective on topics such as climate change, which requires an integrated understanding of both terrestrial and ecological systems with human behaviour. There are many ways this limitation manifests itself; one such way is through public health studies, as a close-knit focus on specific indicators of health can shift attention away from social determinants that may play the most significant role in an outcome (e.g., access to healthcare, the culture surrounding illness and illness behaviour, community resilience).

Scholars such as Creswell (2014) and Morse (2016), who specialize in qualitative methodology, recommend combining qualitative and quantitative approaches to gain a deeper depth and richness of data collection within these contexts. Integrating both methodologies allows researchers to obtain the complexities of models or phenomena associated with contemporary issues, thus providing a much better holistic understanding of the variables under investigation. Qualitative methods, including interviews or participatory action research, can add specific colour to the stories of those facing environmental or social challenges with meaning beyond numbers. Some criticize quantitative research as making it particularly difficult to address 21st-century global problems that transcend national borders and would benefit from sen-

sitive, flexible, adaptable approaches. In response, researchers need to adopt a broader integrative approach. This approach values the variety of perspectives and methods at all levels, encouraging collaboration and interdisciplinary research. It also involves moving towards a more granular understanding of the complexity of human experience and social change, recognizing that these issues are not easily quantifiable and require a nuanced, context-specific approach.

## Discussion

### *Defensive nature of quantitative research*

A defensive stance has become entrenched in dealing with critiques, particularly those targeting the often reductionist and decontextualized quantitative research methodologies. Advocates of quantitative approaches frequently stress their accuracy and interpretation in the form of statistical analysis, which is deemed crucial for locating correlations and determining causality. Such findings are frequently heralded as evidence-informed policy and practice support, purporting to offer insight and direction towards effective solution strategies across domains, from public health to education to social policy (Park et al., 2020; Şahin & Ozturk, 2019; Zyphur & Pierides, 2020a). However, this defensive position is regularly countered by academics asserting a weaker claim on quantitative research: data can only be generalized so that potential outliers and anomalies have been accounted for in the contexts where the data was scrubbed. According to Schreier (2018), these generalizations can result in inaccurate conclusions since they need to highlight the nuance and variability of reality. This persistent conflict demonstrates an essential challenge faced by those working in quantitative research: how to render their method as both relevant and scientific amid increasing desires for nuanced yet adaptable representations of the social world.

Quantitative research is often defensively portrayed to claim the absolute realities of the objective world. It is less answered what to be done to assess the multi-realism in the advent of diverse and contrasting claims and counterclaims in theorizing the reality of the single phenomena. In the current landscape, where there is a heightened interest in socio-cultural context, qualitative detail, and participants' voices among social scientists, the quantitative researcher might find herself in a methodological dance-off. This defensive posture can take the form of refusal to engage with criticism and even consider combining alternative methods to enrich their findings. However, it is crucial to recognize that accurate understanding cannot be achieved without something more than the shallow end of analysis always undertaken by quantitative scholars. They need to learn to swim in deeper waters by learning from qualitative researchers caught up in ossified methodological camps. Embracing such dialogue and integrating qualitative methods could lead to a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the social world, increasing the external validity and verifiability of quantitative results.

### *Addressing ethical and contextual limitations*

A main criticism of quantitative research is that it neglects ethical issues and the contextual elements of a partici-

pant's life. Many quantitative studies, its critics say, consist of little more than perfunctory interactions with a handful of participants — almost as though those individuals have been reduced to numbers on pages instead of stories and organisms within rich contexts. Such distance leads to ethical failures because the details of participants' lives are sacrificed or compromised for the numbers or quantified facts (Bauer et al., 2021). However, the future looks promising as methodological adaptation is going forward. Participatory approaches in quantitative designs could better understand participants' realities, paving the way toward more meaningful ethical engagement. This shift towards more participatory approaches should inspire optimism, as it promises to bring a more humanistic and ethical dimension to research.

Overcoming ethical issues in conducting quantitative studies benefits not only the research subjects via their engagement but also increases the strength of the entire process. This social responsibility or ethical practice by researchers who not only take care of personal interest but are also interested in hearing the views of their research participants. This behaviour reflects the vital role placed on both ethics and participant experience. It allows for more profound and contextualized results, as the researcher can assess the key contributing factors that may affect participants' shaping behaviours and attitudes. Moreover, engaging participants as full partners in the research process can enable communities to express their concerns and experiences that shape the research findings. In the end, the incorporation of ethical engagement into quantitative research allows for better validity in results while also promoting a culture of ethics within research. This empowerment of researchers to promote ethical engagement is crucial in this day and age where participants are often grouped as mere subjects to study rather than viewers who can trace back through a road of constructivism.

### *Quantitative research in the context of global issues*

In an era of complexity regarding global issues, critiques of quantitative research are particularly salient as these social phenomena cannot be understood in isolation. Bryman (2012), Creswell (2014) and Timans et al. (2019), among others, have argued for methodological pluralism as a response to such complex problems that may require both quantitative and qualitative strategies. Quantitative research may provide valuable information about how widespread a problem is, but only qualitative work can reveal the social determinants and contextual factors of the problem. If both methodologies are integrated, it enables researchers with a more comprehensive view of global challenges, which rarely can be reduced to purely number data, such as climate change, poverty and health disparities.

In addition, qualitative insights combined with quantitative results increase the generalization of research findings. Qualitative research produces context-specific insights that can reveal differences between population segments, making them appropriate for adaptation to different contexts. Such adaptability is essential for social injustices and environmental sustainability, as one-size-fits-all solutions rarely work (Hammersley, 2017). Indeed, acknowledging the limitations of quantitative research enables scholars to contribute to more relevant and improved interventions by directly addressing issues related to inclusivity, complexity and context within a

domain in which these concepts seem particularly pertinent. Thus, quantitative research can change from a defensive posture to an integrated and more holistic relation that helps recognize its weaknesses and use this form's strengths, resulting in excellent yields by addressing contemporary challenges.

## Conclusion

The insights that quantitative methods provide regarding disentangling complex interrelationships among various variables, thanks to their more structured and replicable methodologies, cannot be denied. However, the critiques examined in this review point to some significant limitations of this approach. Reductionism, ethical concerns, and issues with generalizability are all significant obstacles to achieving an adequate understanding of many aspects of the social world. These criticisms underscore the urgent need to rethink quantitative practices, primarily calling for a more interpretive lens that values the context and diversity of human experience. Overcoming these limitations will enable researchers to have greater transferability of their findings and be able to relate them more closely towards real-world problems.

Furthermore, in the face of the multi-faceted nature of global problems today, there is a growing need for adaptable and context-specific research approaches. The integration of qualitative insights into quantitative frameworks presents a promising solution to bridge this gap. By combining rich content knowledge with numerical outputs, this approach can bring new dimensions to understanding complex problems. The adoption of methodological pluralism, which leverages the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative methods to complement each other, promises to yield richer insights and more effective solutions to our most pressing problems. Plural perspective and strategy in methodology can better enhance triangulation, particularly in terms of paradigms, and methods. The multi-method approach, by its very nature, is designed to enhance the credibility of research results and empower researchers to respond more sensitively, inclusively, and effectively to the contemporary challenges of social science research.

## Conflicts of Interest

No conflicts of interest exist.

## References

- Jamieson, M. K., Govaart, G. H., & Pownall, M. (2023). Reflexivity in quantitative research: A rationale and beginner's guide. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 17(4), e12735. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12735>
- Sapkota, M. (2024). *Academic writing and scientific publication: Proposal, Thesis and Article* (Masters, MPhil and PhD). New Hira Books, Kathmandu, Nepal. [https://www.academia.edu/125787701/Academic\\_writing\\_and\\_scientific\\_publication\\_Proposal\\_Thesis\\_and\\_Article\\_Masters\\_MPhil\\_and\\_PhD](https://www.academia.edu/125787701/Academic_writing_and_scientific_publication_Proposal_Thesis_and_Article_Masters_MPhil_and_PhD)
- Rudd, G., Meissel, K., & Meyer, F. (2021). Measuring academic resilience in quantitative research: A systematic review of the literature. *Educational Research Review*, 34, 100402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100402>
- Sardana, N., Shekoohi, S., Cornett, E. M., & Kaye, A. D. (2023). *Qualitative and quantitative research methods*. In Substance use and addiction research (pp. 65-69). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-98814-8.00008-1>
- Strunk, K. K. (2023). *Critical approaches to quantitative research: Review, critique, and applications*. Handbook of Critical Education Research, 56-74.
- Fischer, H. E., Boone, W. J., & Neumann, K. (2023). *Quantitative research designs and approaches*. In Handbook of research on science education (pp. 28-59). Routledge.
- Saldaña, J. (2021). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Zyphur, M. J., & Pierides, D. C. (2020). Making quantitative research work: From positivist dogma to actual social scientific inquiry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 167, 49-62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04189-6>
- Zyphur, M. J., & Pierides, D. C. (2020). Statistics and probability have always been value-laden: An historical ontology of quantitative research methods. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 167(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04187-8>
- Tabron, L. A., & Thomas, A. K. (2023). Deeper than wordplay: A systematic review of critical quantitative approaches in education research (2007–2021). *Review of Educational Research*, 93(5), 756-786. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543221130017>
- Duckett, L. J. (2021). Quantitative research excellence: Study design and reliable and valid measurement of variables. *Journal of Human Lactation*, 37(3), 456-463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08903344211019285>
- Sürücü, L., & Maslakci, A. (2020). Validity and reliability in quantitative research. *Business & Management Studies: An International Journal*, 8(3), 2694-2726. <https://doi.org/10.15295/bmij.v8i3.1540>
- Maxwell, J. A. (2016). Expanding the history and range of mixed methods research. *Journal of mixed methods research*, 10(1), 12-27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689815571132>
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). *Competing paradigms in qualitative research*. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 105-117). Sage Publications.
- Hodge, S. R. (2020). *Quantitative research*. In Routledge Handbook of Adapted Physical Education (pp. 147-162). Routledge.
- Verschuren, P. J. (2001). Holism versus reductionism in modern social science research. *Quality and Quantity*, 35, 389-405. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1012242620544>
- Keysers, D., Schärli, N., Scales, N., Buisman, H., Furrer, D., Kashubin, S., ... & Bousquet, O. (2019). Measuring compositional generalization: A comprehensive method on realistic data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.09713*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1912.09713>
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Queirós, A., Faria, D., & Almeida, F. (2017). Strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative research methods. *European journal of education studies*, 3(9). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.887089>
- Zyphur, M. J., & Pierides, D. C. (2017). Is quantitative research ethical? Tools for ethically practicing, evaluating, and using quantitative research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 143, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3549-8>

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Morse, J. M. (2016). *Mixed method design: Principles and procedures*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315424538>
- Park, Y. S., Konge, L., & Artino Jr, A. R. (2020). The positivism paradigm of research. *Academic medicine*, 95(5), 690-694. [10.1097/ACM.0000000000003093](https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000003093)
- Şahin, M. D., & Ozturk, G. (2019). Mixed method research: Theoretical foundations, designs and its use in educational research. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 6(2), 301-310. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/880619>
- Schreier, M. (2018). *Sampling and generalization*. The SAGE handbook of qualitative data collection, 84-97. <https://www.torrossa.com/gs/resourceProxy?an=5018779&publisher=FZ7200#page=113>
- Bauer, G. R., Churchill, S. M., Mahendran, M., Walwyn, C., Lizotte, D., & Villa-Rueda, A. A. (2021). Intersectionality in quantitative research: A systematic review of its emergence and applications of theory and methods. *SSM-population health*, 14, 100798. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2021.100798>
- Timans, R., Wouters, P., & Heilbron, J. (2019). Mixed methods research: what it is and what it could be. *Theory and society*, 48, 193-216. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-019-09345-5>
- Hammersley, M. (2017). *Deconstructing the qualitative-quantitative divide 1*. In *Mixing methods: Qualitative and quantitative research* (pp. 39-55). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08903344211019285>

## Імплікації та критика кількісних досліджень: Систематичний огляд

Махендра Сапкота<sup>1ABCDA</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Державний університет в Непалі

Авторський вклад: А – дизайн дослідження; В – збір даних; С – статаналіз; D – підготовка рукопису; Е – збір коштів

Реферат. Стаття: 7 с., 28 джерел.

**Мета дослідження.** Мета дослідження полягала у критичному аналізі складних концепцій та характеристик, пов'язаних з кількісними дослідженнями, з точки зору соціальних наук.

**Матеріали та методи.** На основі систематичного огляду в цьому дослідженні проведено оцінку ключових прогалин і суперечностей, виявлених у наукових працях, що були опубліковані в журналах з високим індексом цитування, а також у більш цитованих реферативних текстах. Головне аналітичне питання включало концептуалізацію кількісних методів і висвітлення різних вимірів онтології, валідності, надійності, узагальненості та етичних імплікацій.

**Результати.** Кількісний метод широко використовується в більшості наукових галузей, перетворюючи результати досліджень на стратегічний аналіз через статистичні та експериментальні рамки. Попри таку широку сферу застосування, результати цього дослідження вказують на наявність у кількісного методу певних обмежень і дилем, які можуть обмежити наше сприйняття і розуміння людської поведінки та соціальних явищ у суб'єктивному світі. Сприяючи розширенню бази емпіричних знань, кількісні дослідження піддаються критиці за неадекватний підхід до вивчення складних соціальних явищ, залежність від жорстких припущень і вразливість до контекстуальних чинників. Рефлексія над зазначеними обмеженнями сучасних кількісних методів впливає на визначення напрямів щодо оцінки удосконалення існуючих підходів та інтеграції альтернативних стратегій.

**Висновки.** Проведене дослідження дозволяє зробити висновок, що імплікації кількісного методу є раціональними, однак не мають універсального характеру. Детерміністський підхід кількісної методології може призвести до вихолощення розуміння суб'єктивного світу внаслідок свого тяжіння до абсолютних реалій. Отже, дослідження підкреслює необхідність методологічного плюралізму, заохочуючи науковців, дослідників та студентів соціальних наук та суміжних галузей бути відкритими та сприйнятливими до альтернативних дослідницьких підходів та мультиметодичних стратегій задля більш комплексного розуміння людської поведінки та суспільних явищ.

**Ключові слова:** дослідження, кількісна методологія, позитивізм, критика та імплікації.

### Information about the authors:

**Sapkota, Mahendra:** [sapkota.mahendra27@gmail.com](mailto:sapkota.mahendra27@gmail.com); <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7854-6554>; Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu 46000, Nepal.

**Cite this article as:** Sapkota, M. (2024). Implications and Critiques of Quantitative Research: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Learning Theory and Methodology*, 5(3), 153-159. <https://doi.org/10.17309/jltm.2024.5.3.09>

Received: 25.11.2024. Accepted: 19.12.2024. Published: 30.12.2024

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)