Foundations of Academic Philosophy for Researchers

Michael Neubert, EIM – European Institute of Management, Valletta, Malta

Abstract

This paper comprehensively explores the foundations of academic philosophy and their direct relevance to scholarly inquiry. It clarifies how core concepts such as ontology (the nature of reality), epistemology (the nature of knowledge), axiology (values), and methodology, form the foundation of research design and knowledge production. The paper traces the historical evolution of philosophical thought and outlines major research paradigms (positivist, constructivist/interpretivist, critical/transformative, pragmatic) along with key reasoning approaches (deductive, inductive, abductive, etc.). Key insights highlight that each paradigm has distinct strengths and is suited to particular questions; understanding these differences is essential for aligning research questions with appropriate methods and for ensuring theoretical and methodological coherence. The analysis emphasizes that philosophical literacy enhances research rigor, ethical reflexivity, and interdisciplinary collaboration. For academic research, for example in healthcare and management, actionable recommendations are provided: explicitly identify and articulate your philosophical stance in proposals and dissertations; ensure your chosen methods align with your paradigm and research objectives; remain conscious of the values and ethical implications (axiology) inherent in your work; and be open to integrating diverse paradigmatic perspectives to address complex practical problems. By building this philosophical fluency, emerging scholars can strengthen their research's credibility, relevance, and impact.

#Keywords

philosophical foundations, epistemology, ontology, axiology, methodology, research paradigms, positivism, constructivism, pragmatism, academic reasoning, deductive, inductive, abductive, doctoral research, healthcare research, management research.

doi:10.2440/018-0009

Grundlagen der akademischen Philosophie für Forschende

Diese Arbeit untersucht umfassend die Grundlagen der akademischen Philosophie und deren direkte Relevanz für wissenschaftliche Forschung. Sie erläutert, wie zentrale Konzepte wie Ontologie (die Natur der Realität), Epistemologie (die Natur des Wissens), Axiologie (Werte) und Methodologie das Fundament von Forschungsdesigns und Wissensproduktion bilden. Die Arbeit zeichnet die historische Entwicklung philosophischen Denkens nach und skizziert zentrale Forschungsparadigmen – darunter den Positivismus, den Konstruktivismus/Interpretivismus, das kritisch-transformative Paradigma sowie den Pragmatismus – sowie zentrale Argumentationsansätze wie deduktive, induktive und abduktive Argumentation. Zentrale Erkenntnisse zeigen, dass jedes Paradigma über spezifische Stärken verfügt und sich für bestimmte Fragestellungen besonders eignet; das Verständnis dieser Unterschiede ist essenziell, um Forschungsfragen mit geeigneten Methoden in Einklang zu bringen und theoretische wie methodologische Kohärenz zu gewährleisten. Die Analyse betont, dass philosophische Bildung die wissenschaftliche Strenge, ethische Reflexivität und interdisziplinäre Zusammenarbeit stärkt. Für die akademische Forschung, etwa im Gesundheitswesen oder Management, werden konkrete Handlungsempfehlungen formuliert: Forscher sollten ihre philosophische Position in Projektanträgen und Dissertationen explizit benennen und reflektieren; sie sollten sicherstellen, dass die gewählten Methoden mit dem zugrunde liegenden Paradigma und den Forschungszielen übereinstimmen; sie sollten sich der inhaltlichen Werte und ethi-

schen Implikationen (Axiologie) ihrer Arbeit bewusst sein; und sie sollten Offenheit gegenüber der Integration verschiedener paradigmenbezogener Perspektiven zeigen, um komplexe praktische Probleme adäquat adressieren zu können. Durch den Aufbau philosophischer Sprach- und Handlungskompetenz können Nachwuchswissenschaftler die Glaubwürdigkeit, Relevanz und Wirkung ihrer Forschung substanziell erhöhen.

学术哲学基础：研究人员指南

本文全面探讨了学术哲学的基础及其与学术研究之间的直接关联。文章阐明了本体论（关于现实的本质）、认识论（关于知识的本质）、价值论（关于价值的探讨）与方法论等核心概念如何构成研究设计与知识生产的基础。文章回顾了哲学思想的历史演变，并梳理了主要研究范式（实证主义、建构主义/解释主义、批判性/变革性、实用主义）及其核心推理方式（演绎、归纳、溯因等）。研究指出，每一种范式都有其独特优势，适用于不同类型的研究问题；理解这些差异对于实现研究问题与方法之间的匹配，以及确保理论与方法的一致性至关重要。分析强调，哲学素养有助于提升研究的严谨性、伦理反思能力与跨学科协作水平。针对学术研究，尤其是医疗与管理等领域，本文提出了可操作的建议：在研究计划和学位论文中明确阐述个人的哲学立场；确保所选方法与研究范式及目标保持一致；关注研究中的价值取向与伦理意义（即价值论）；并鼓励开放接纳多种范式视角，以应对复杂的实际问题。通过建立哲学流利性，新兴学者能够提升其研究的可信度、相关性与影响力。

Introduction

Academic inquiry is underpinned by a constellation of philosophical foundations that shape how knowledge is defined, pursued, and justified in research. These foundations include assumptions about reality, knowledge, values, and methodology, which collectively influence how researchers design studies and interpret findings (Crotty, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2015). Engaging explicitly with such assumptions is increasingly seen as a marker of scholarly rigor. For instance, recent literature in education and healthcare research argues that strong theoretical frameworks and clarity about the nature of knowledge are required to achieve "academic legitimacy" in research (Brown & Dueñas, 2020; Creswell & Creswell, 2022; Patton, 2015). In other words, clearly articulated philosophical principles help others understand and evaluate a study's approach (Brown & Dueñas, 2020; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Venkatesh et al., 2023). Concepts such as ontology (the nature of reality), epistemology (the nature of knowledge), axiology (the role of values), and methodology (the approach to inquiry) form the structural foundation upon which academic research is built (Crotty, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Additionally, reasoning processes and overarching research paradigms align a scholar's philosophical stance with their investigative goals (Biesta, 2010; Mertens, 2007; Patton, 2015). This paper provides a comprehensive overview of these interrelated philosophical concepts, demonstrating their integral role in shaping academic knowledge. The discussion is tailored for doctoral researchers, mainly in healthcare and management, illustrating how philosophical fluency equips them with the intellectual tools necessary for high-level inquiry and methodological coherence.

Historical Development of Academic Philosophy

The intellectual roots of academic philosophy extend back to antiquity. In ancient Greece, thinkers such as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle pioneered systematic inquiry into knowledge, reality, and ethics, laying the groundwork for logic, metaphysics, and epistemology. For example, Aristotle's development of formal logic and Plato's debates on the nature of truth were early efforts to understand how we can reason about the world. Classical Greek philosophy intermingled with religious doctrine throughout the medieval period—figures like Augustine and Thomas Aquinas attempted to reconcile faith with reason, embedding philosophical questions within a theological framework (Audi, 2015). The Enlightenment of the 17th–18th centuries marked a turning point that elevated reason and empirical evidence as primary sources of knowledge. Philosophers such as René Descartes, John Locke, Immanuel Kant, and David Hume redefined modern epistemology and metaphysics by examining the nature of knowledge, the self, and the limits of human reason.

By the 19th and 20th centuries, academic philosophy diversified into many schools of thought. Logical positivism (e.g., Carnap) championed verification through empirical science and precise language. Phenomenology (Husserl, Heidegger) and existentialism (Sartre, de Beauvoir) shifted focus to lived experience, consciousness, and human freedom. Critical theory emerged via the Frankfurt School (Horkheimer, 1972), which critiqued ideology and power structures in society. American pragmatism (Peirce, James, Dewey) introduced the idea that truth is not absolute but "what works" through practical consequences and problem-solving. These developments expanded the philosophical landscape, moving beyond a single "correct" way of knowing to a pluralistic view. By the late 20th century, Thomas Kuhn's influential work The Structure of Scientific Revolutions popularized the concept of paradigms—worldviews or models of inquiry that guide scientific research communities (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017; Kuhn, 1962). Kuhn showed that science goes through revolutions where one paradigm replaces another, underscoring that even fundamental concepts of truth and method are historically situated (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017; Kuhn, 1962). In contemporary scholarship, philosophy continues to evolve with interdisciplinary approaches and applications in fields like ethics, education, healthcare, and management. Researchers today draw from this rich history to inform their assumptions about what constitutes valid knowledge and inquiry in their respective domains.

What Is Knowledge?

Knowledge is classically defined as justified true belief, a formulation often attributed to Plato's dialogues (Ichikawa & Steup, 2024). Under this tripartite definition, for someone to know a proposition, three criteria must be met: (1) the proposition must be true, (2) the person believes the proposition, and (3) the person has justification (evidence or reasons) for that belief (Ichikawa & Steup, 2024). Simply, knowledge entails a belief that aligns with reality and is backed by sound reasoning or evidence. For example, a doctoral student in healthcare management may believe that reducing patient wait times improves satisfaction. This belief becomes knowledge if it is true (perhaps supported by hospital data). The student can justify it with empirical research and theory (e.g., queuing theory or service quality frameworks). In research practice, the emphasis on justification means that knowledge claims must be supported by evidence and logical argumentation, distinguishing them from mere assumptions or opinions.

It is important to note that the definition of knowledge as "justified true belief" has been debated by philosophers (e.g., the famous Gettier problem). Still, it remains a helpful starting point in academic contexts (Ichikawa & Steup, 2024). This definition highlights that knowledge is not simply any true belief—we require that the belief be acquired in a reliable or defensible way. In scientific research, justification typically comes from systematic inquiry: observati-

 DOI:10.2440/018-0009

ons, experiments, logical inference, and scholarly dialogue. Doctoral research aims to generate new knowledge, which means researchers must demonstrate that their findings are true (valid and credible) and justified (grounded in methodology and theory). Indeed, a key criterion for evaluating doctoral work is its contribution to knowledge, underscoring why clarity about what counts as knowledge is crucial (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017). Understanding the nature of knowledge thus leads directly into foundational questions of ontology and epistemology—What is the nature of reality that we seek to know? And how can we know anything about that reality?

Before delving into those pillars, it is also helpful to distinguish academic knowledge from other forms of belief. Unlike personal belief or opinion, academic knowledge is collectively vetted and built: it is developed through critical inquiry, peer review, and evidence, within a community of scholars. This distinguishes it from ideology or dogma, where beliefs might be held rigidly without openness to evidence or revision. Academic knowledge is inherently provisional—new evidence can refine or overturn what is considered true. This self-correcting nature of scientific knowledge aligns with the fallibilist view that all claims are subject to re-examination. For doctoral students, adopting a critical stance toward knowledge (acknowledging what is known, unknown, and uncertain) is part of the transition from being a consumer of knowledge to a producer of knowledge.

Academic Philosophy vs. Religious Philosophy vs. Ideology

It is essential to differentiate academic philosophy from religious philosophy and ideology, as these orientations approach knowledge and truth differently. Academic philosophy (and by extension, scientific research) is grounded in critical reasoning, empirical evidence, and openness to questioning. The aim is to move from belief to knowledge – i.e., to convert ideas into justified, testable claims – and to remain open to refutation if new evidence contradicts current understanding. Academic inquiry demands that assumptions be made explicit and conclusions be supported by logic or data, thereby allowing peer scrutiny. In contrast, religious philosophy often begins with faith-based premises or doctrinal truths and seeks understanding within that framework. Its epistemology relies on revelation, authority, or spiritual insight rather than empirical falsification. Thus, religious philosophical claims may be less contestable within their system (one does not test a core article of faith like one would test a scientific hypothesis). While religious thought can be intellectually rigorous, its justifications are usually grounded in theology or sacred texts and aimed at deepening belief, not challenging it through systematic doubt.

Conversely, ideology refers to a set of normative beliefs or values, often political, moral, or cultural, that shape one's interpretation of the world. Ideologies (for example, capitalism, Marxism, feminism, etc.) provide frameworks for social action and identity, and they often carry implicit assumptions about what is true or important. Unlike academic theories, ideologies are typically evaluated by their coherence and usefulness to a group rather than by empirical validation. An ideological stance may selectively accept evidence that fits its narrative and dismiss or reinterpret evidence that contradicts it. As a result, ideologies can resist change or contradiction, prioritizing consistency with core values over open-ended inquiry. For instance, a political ideology might persist in its economic prescriptions even in the face of contrary data, because those prescriptions align with deeper values or goals.

In summary, academic philosophy strives for intersubjective truth (knowledge that holds regardless of individual belief, subject to verification by anyone). In contrast, religious philosophy strives for faithful insight (understanding grounded in spiritual truth), and ideology strives for value-laden coherence (ideas that support a desired so-

cial or moral order). Academic research distinguishes itself by its commitment to skepticism, evidence, and revision. It is "open to critique, revision, and disconfirmation" in ways that dogmatic belief systems typically are not. This does not mean that scholars are free of bias or preconceptions (indeed, the choice of research topic can be value-driven). Still, the academic ethos requires transparency and critical engagement with one's assumptions. Doctoral students in healthcare and management must meticulously recognize when a viewpoint is rooted in empirical evidence versus when ideological or faith-based commitments influence it. Maintaining this distinction helps ensure that research conclusions remain credible and are taken seriously in academic and professional arenas.

Core Philosophical Assumptions in Research

Foundational to any research effort are a set of philosophical assumptions about reality, knowledge, values, and how to systematically investigate phenomena. These assumptions are often categorized under ontology, epistemology, axiology, and methodology (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017; Venkatesh et al., 2023). They form a coherent worldview or paradigm that guides how a researcher formulates questions, chooses methods, and interprets results (Creswell & Creswell, 2022; Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017; Patton, 2015). Table 1 summarizes these core concepts, including their definitions and the key questions they address.

Table 1: *Core Philosophical Assumptions in Research*

Philosophical Concept	*Definition (Key Question)*	*Typical Positions*
Ontology	The study of being and the nature of reality (What is reality? What exists?). It involves assumptions about what entities make up the world and whether reality is objective or constructed.	Realism: a real world exists independent of our perceptions; Relativism: multiple realities exist as constructs of the mind or society; Critical realism: reality exists but is only imperfectly knowable due to human limitations.
Epistemology	The study of knowledge is how we know what we know (What counts as knowledge? How is knowledge acquired?). It deals with the relationship between the knower and what can be known and the criteria for truth and justification.	Objectivism: knowledge is objective, discovered by the knower without personal bias (aligned with empiricism/rationalism); Subjectivism/ Constructivism: knowledge is created by the subject's interactions with the world (it is mind-dependent or socially constructed); Pragmatism: knowledge is judged by its practical utility ("what works").
Axiology	The study of values – the role of ethics and values in research (What is the role of the researcher's values? What is worth knowing?). Axiology informs priorities, ethical considerations, and what the research aims to achieve.	Value-neutrality: researchers should eliminate or minimize personal values influencing research (often associated with (post-) positivism); Value-bound/conscious: researchers recognize that values influence inquiry and may explicitly include their value stance (common in constructivism and pragmatism); Critical axiology: research is an moral–political act, values of social justice guide the inquiry (value-driven - transformative paradigm).
Methodology	The study of methodical approach – the rationale and strategy for conducting research (How should we inquire into reality?). It justifies the selection of specific methods and designs, aligning with ontological and epistemological assumptions.	Quantitative methodology emphasizes measurement, hypothesis testing, and experimental design (aligned with objectivist epistemology). Qualitative methodology emphasizes understanding meanings, context, and experiences through interviews, observations, etc. (aligned with constructivist epistemology). Mixed-methods methodology combines quantitative and qualitative approaches, often aligned with pragmatic philosophy.

Ontology is often considered the starting point: it concerns what exists and is real (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Venkatesh et al., 2023). In research terms, ontological assumptions shape whether a phenomenon is seen as independent of observers or as dependent on social or personal perception. For example, a healthcare researcher with a realist ontology might assume diseases exist as real biological entities in patients regardless of what anyone believes. In contrast, a researcher with a relativist or constructivist ontology might view "illness experience" as something that is co-constructed by patient and societal interpretations. Thus, multiple realities of illness (biological, psychological, social) exist depending on context (Brown & Dueñas, 2020). Ontology asks questions like: "Is there a single reality 'out there', or do multiple realities exist?" (Brown & Dueñas, 2020). Answering this is critical because it influences what kind of knowledge one seeks. If one believes in one objective reality, research will aim to measure or capture that reality. If one believes in many constructed realities, research will aim to interpret or map those subjective experiences.

Epistemology follows by asking: "How can we know reality (or realities) and what counts as legitimate knowledge about it?" (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017; Venkatesh et al., 2023). Epistemology is rooted in the Greek word episteme (knowledge), which deals with the nature and sources of knowledge. It examines the relationship between the knower (the researcher or observer) and the would-be known (the object of study) (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017). Key epistemological questions include whether knowledge is something discovered externally (as in objective facts) or constructed internally (as in personal meaning). For instance, objectivist epistemology holds that researchers can observe reality as it is, using the correct methods to remove bias – knowledge is out there waiting to be discovered. This is common in quantitative research, where the investigator strives to remain independent and neutral (e.g., using standardized instruments to gather data that any other researcher would obtain). On the other hand, constructivist epistemology posits that researchers and participants co-create understanding; knowledge arises from interaction and interpretation (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017). A simple example: in management research, an objectivist might distribute a survey to measure leadership quality as a tangible property, whereas a constructivist might conduct interviews to understand how different people perceive and define effective leadership in their context. Each approach yields "knowledge," but of different kinds – one oriented to objective measurement, the other to subjective insight. Epistemology also involves considering what evidence is credible. Some traditions emphasize empirical evidence (observable via senses or instruments), others stress logical reasoning, and others may even include intuition or authority as knowledge sources (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017). In practice, researchers draw from multiple sources of knowledge – for example, combining empirical data with expert insight – but one's epistemological stance will influence which sources are given priority. Ultimately, epistemology is crucial because it underpins the research design: it "helps establish the faith you put in your data" and how you go about uncovering knowledge in your field (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017).

Axiology addresses the question of values in research. Every researcher brings specific values to a study – beliefs about what is important, ethical commitments, and motivations for the research topic (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Venkatesh et al., 2023). Axiology asks: "What is the role of my values in this inquiry? Should research be value-free, value-neutral, or value-driven?" (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017). In a positivist tradition, there is an emphasis on value-neutrality: the idea that research should be conducted objectively, free from the researcher's biases or personal values. The researcher aims to be a detached obser-

ver, and any intrusion of values is considered a threat to validity. In contrast, interpretivist and critical traditions assert that complete value-neutrality is impossible (or even undesirable) because the choice of what to study, how to study it, and how to interpret it is inherently influenced by human values. Thus, they advocate reflexivity – explicitly acknowledging one's values and how those might affect the research. For example, a critical healthcare researcher might value equity and therefore choose research questions about healthcare disparities; this value orientation is not a bias to be eliminated but a driving force for socially relevant research. In the transformative (critical) paradigm, axiology is foregrounded: research is expected to advance social justice, giving voice to marginalized perspectives (Mertens, 2007). Here, values such as empathy, fairness, and empowerment guide the inquiry. Ethical considerations (often formalized in research ethics principles like beneficence, respect, and justice) are also part of axiology (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017). For doctoral students, being clear about axiology means being aware of why the research matters and to whom, and ensuring ethical integrity throughout the study. In fields like healthcare, axiology is critical – researchers must consider patient welfare, consent, and implications of their findings on people's lives. In management, values might concern organizational responsibility, stakeholder interests, or ethical business practices. A transparent axiological stance helps audiences trust that the research is conducted responsibly and that the interpretations are made with an awareness of potential biases or objectives.

Methodology refers to the overall approach and strategy of research – essentially, the rationale behind the research design and the choice of specific methods (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017; Venkatesh et al., 2023). It flows naturally from ontology, epistemology, and axiology. If ontology is what you believe exists, and epistemology is how you believe you can know it, then methodology is how you plan to systematically acquire that knowledge (Halkias et al., 2022). It encompasses decisions about whether to use experiments, surveys, case studies, interviews, observations, etc., and – importantly – why those methods are appropriate given the researcher's philosophical stance. For example, a researcher with a postpositivist ontology (believing in an objective reality but acknowledging imperfect knowledge) and objectivist epistemology will likely choose a quantitative methodology – perhaps a controlled experiment or a survey with statistical analysis – because those methods align with trying to measure an objective reality while controlling for errors. Conversely, a researcher with a relativist ontology and constructivist epistemology will lean toward qualitative methodologies like multiple case study or phenomenology, emphasizing rich contextual understanding and participant meanings (Halkias & Neubert, 2020; Neubert, 2024). Methodology also includes the logic of inquiry (inductive, deductive, etc., which we discuss in the next section) and the procedures for ensuring data reliability, validity, or trustworthiness. It addresses practical questions like: "How will I obtain the data I need to answer my research question? Why is this approach the best way to do so given what I believe about the world? How will I analyze the data and draw conclusions?". While methods are the specific tools or instruments (e.g., a questionnaire, an interview guide, a software for analysis), methodology is the justification for coherently using those tools (Halkias et al., 2023; Neubert, 2023). For instance, in a study on hospital leadership, choosing a case study methodology might be driven by the belief that leadership is context-dependent (ontology) and that in-depth, qualitative insight is needed (epistemology), with an axiology that values practical learning for that organization. The methods could include interviews, observation, and document analysis within that case study. A different researcher might choose a survey methodology for the same topic if they assume leadership effecti-

veness can be objectively measured and compared across many hospitals, aligning with a more positivist stance. In sum, methodology is where philosophical assumptions meet action: it translates ideas about reality and knowledge into a plan for inquiry. A well-articulated methodology is crucial in scholarly work because it allows others to evaluate the appropriateness of the research design and to repeat or build upon the study.

As these four concepts (ontology, epistemology, axiology, methodology) illustrate, philosophical assumptions are deeply interlinked. Together, they form a philosophical profile for a research project. When aligned consistently, this profile ensures coherence; if misaligned, the research may suffer (for example, trying to statistically measure a phenomenon that one's paradigm considers socially constructed could produce confusing or superficial results). Doctoral students are expected to understand and communicate these assumptions in their dissertations or proposals. Doing so demonstrates that they have engaged with the "basic assumptions, beliefs, norms, and values" of their chosen research approach (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017) and can defend their study's design as philosophically sound. It is often said that "a paradigm guides every study" – we turn next to what those paradigms are and how these assumptions play out in some major research paradigms.

Reasoning Approaches in Research

Rigorous research relies on logical reasoning to move from questions to answers. Researchers employ several types of reasoning to connect theory and data, each serving a different purpose in the knowledge-building process. The most commonly discussed forms are deductive and inductive reasoning, but scholarly inquiry also uses abductive, retroductive, analogical, and dialectical reasoning. Table 2 summarizes these modes of reasoning, including how they operate and examples of their use in research.

Table 2:
Modes of Reasoning

Type of Reasoning	*Description*	*Example Use in Research*
Deductive reasoning	A logical process that moves from general principles or theories to specific cases. Often called a "top-down" approach, it starts with a hypothesis derived from theory and then tests it against empirical data. The conclusion must be true if the premises are true and the reasoning is valid. In research, it tests hypotheses and verifies theories by collecting data to see if it confirms the expected pattern.	A management scholar starts with a theory that employee autonomy increases job satisfaction. They deduce that "if the theory is correct, then in a sample of companies, teams with more autonomy will report higher satisfaction." They design a survey or experiment to gather data and statistically test this prediction. A significant result supporting the hypothesis strengthens confidence in the theory.
Inductive reasoning	A logical process that moves from specific observations to broader generalizations or theories. A "bottom-up" approach: one gathers data, looks for patterns, and infers a general rule or theory. Conclusions are probabilistic – they offer plausible explanations but are not certain truth (future observations might contradict them).	A healthcare researcher observes that teams implementing a new protocol have improved patient outcomes in several hospitals. From multiple case observations, they inductively infer a general principle that "collaborative protocols improve patient care." This inductive conclusion can lead to proposing a new theory or a hypothesis to test more formally. Qualitative research often uses induction, e.g., grounded theory, where themes emerge from interview data to form a new conceptual framework.

Type of Reasoning	*Description*	*Example Use in Research*
Abductive reasoning	Often described as "inference to the best explanation." It starts with an observation (often puzzling or unexpected) and works backward to hypothesize the most likely cause or explanation. Abduction is neither purely deductive nor purely inductive; it is a creative leap to form a plausible theory that can then be tested. It accepts that the explanation is a hypothesis to be further scrutinized.	A public health researcher finds that a specific community has much lower infection rates than neighboring areas, which is unexpected. Using abductive reasoning, they propose the best explanation – perhaps a unique community health program or herd immunity – as the cause. This hypothesis (arrived at abductively) can then be examined with further data. Grounded theory methodology explicitly uses abduction: as data are collected, the researcher proposes theoretical explanations for what is observed, and then checks those against new data (a back-and-forth process).
Retroductive reasoning	A form of reasoning used to identify underlying causal mechanisms that are not directly observable. Common in critical realism, retroduction asks: "What must be true (which hidden structure or mechanism) for this observed pattern to occur?". It often involves imagining a model of reality and deducing what unseen factors could produce the outcomes we see, then seeking evidence for those factors.	In organizational research, we observe that several firms spontaneously adopted a similar innovation around the same time and achieved success. Retroductive reasoning might lead us to posit an underlying mechanism (e.g., a shift in market logic or an unspoken industry norm) that drove this convergence. The researcher then investigates historical data, interviews, or theory to uncover that mechanism. Retroduction is especially useful when dealing with complex systems – e.g., a critical realist studying healthcare might look beyond surface variables (like staffing levels) to deeper structures (like institutional culture or power dynamics) that explain why specific interventions succeed or fail.
Analogical reasoning	Reasoning by analogy involves comparing similar cases and inferring that what is true for one case may be true for the analogous case. It relies on similarity in structure or context between the known (source) and the unknown (target) to transfer insights. While not formally rigorous (analogies can be imprecise), it is a heuristic often used for hypothesis generation or illustrative explanation.	A management researcher studying a hospital's response to a crisis might use an analogy to how an airline handles safety incidents, given structural similarities in high-risk industries. By analogical reasoning, practices that improved airline safety culture might be expected to work in healthcare. This can generate hypotheses (e.g., "crew resource management training might improve teamwork in surgery, by analogy to aviation"). In case study research, analogies help in theoretical generalization: lessons from one case are carefully applied to another, with justified comparison of contexts.
Dialectical reasoning	Dialectical reasoning is a form of reasoning that seeks truth through the resolution of contradictions. Originating from Hegelian and Marxian thought, dialectical reasoning involves the interplay of a thesis (an initial idea), its antithesis (a conflicting idea), and an eventual synthesis that reconciles the two at a higher level. It is a process of iterative argumentation and integration. In research, this often appears in critical and conceptual scholarship that tackles paradoxes or conflicting findings by transcending them with a new framework.	In social science, a dialectical approach might examine the tension between individual agency and structural constraints. A researcher notices a debate: one theory says individual leaders shape organizational culture (thesis), another says culture is determined by institutional structures (antithesis). The researcher proposes a synthesis through dialectical analysis, for example, a new model where leaders and structures co-evolve through dynamic interaction. Critical theorists use dialectics to challenge the status quo: e.g., analyzing the contradictions in a healthcare policy (equity vs. cost efficiency) and formulating a more integrative solution. Dialectical reasoning is evident in literature reviews or theoretical papers that pit opposing viewpoints against each other and derive a novel insight or theory that resolves the tension.

Deductive and inductive reasoning are often presented as the two core approaches in science. In practice, most research projects utilize both to some degree. A deductive approach is powerful for testing hypotheses and confirming (or falsifying) existing theories. For example, in epidemiology, one might deduce from theory that "if a vaccine is effective, infection rates in a vaccinated group will be significantly lower than in an unvaccinated group." The study is then structured to see if that prediction holds, thereby strengthening or weakening the theory. Deduction yields strong logical inferences – a well-designed experiment can provide compelling evidence against a hypothesis if the predicted outcome does not occur (following the falsificationist principle of Karl Popper). However, deduction relies on the quality of the initial theory and premises; it does not generate new theory; it tests what is already assumed. This is where induction complements the process. Inductive reasoning allows researchers to discover new patterns and build theories from the ground up. Induction enables insights to emerge from data, especially in exploratory phases or new problem areas where established theory is thin. For instance, if management scholars interview dozens of successful entrepreneurs and consistently find they mention learning from failure as key to their success, an inductive generalization might be that "learning orientation is a critical factor for entrepreneurial success." This new hypothesis can later be tested deductively on a larger scale, showing the iterative nature of research logic. In fact, many research methodologies explicitly encourage an iterative cycle of deduction and induction – one deduces hypotheses, tests them, observes anomalies, then inductively updates the theory, and so on.

Moving beyond the basic pair, abductive reasoning has gained prominence, particularly in qualitative and mixed-methods research (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Venkatesh et al., 2023). Abduction is what you use when you encounter something in your data that existing theories cannot explain – a sort of intellectual creativity to propose a novel explanation. It is considered the cornerstone of grounded theory methodology, where researchers constantly alternate between data and theory, guessing at explanations and then checking them. For example, in healthcare research, unexpected patient behaviors or outcomes might prompt a clinician-researcher to formulate a new explanation (perhaps involving a previously unconsidered cultural factor) that better fits the observations than any current model. This abductive leap can later be examined with more structured research, but it often is the source of new theoretical ideas.

Retroductive reasoning is particularly associated with critical realist philosophy (Bhaskar, 1975). Realists argue that what we observe (the empirical) is driven by deeper mechanisms (the real), which we cannot see directly. Retroduction is the process of reasoning backward from observations to hypothesize those hidden mechanisms (Saxena, 2019). For example, suppose a hospital's infection rates drop dramatically after a specific administrative change. In that case, retroduction might lead us to posit that the change altered an underlying social mechanism (like communication flow or accountability structure), which in turn caused better adherence to hygiene protocols. The researcher would then investigate evidence for that mechanism, perhaps through interviews or process tracing. In mixed-methods studies, one might use quantitative data to identify a pattern and then qualitative approaches to retroductively explore what underlying process produced that pattern (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Venkatesh et al., 2023).

Analogical reasoning is frequently employed in fields like strategic management, education, or policy studies, where direct experimentation is difficult and researchers look to lessons from other domains. While analogy can be a weaker form of evidence (because two situati-

ons are never identical in all respects), it is invaluable for theory transfer and for building frameworks. For example, the famous concept of "ecosystem" in business (companies interacting like species in a biological ecosystem) is an analogy borrowed from ecology to explain complex inter-firm relationships. This analogy sparked new theoretical developments in management science. Researchers must use analogies carefully to identify key similarities and acknowledge differences to make the comparison meaningful.

Dialectical reasoning, finally, is at the heart of critical analysis and theoretical discourse. In fields concerned with social change (like critical management studies or public health policy), scholars often find that contradictions in society (e.g., between profit and public good in healthcare) drive the dynamics of problems. A dialectical approach does not accept these contradictions at face value but uses them to propel deeper understanding. For instance, a dialectical study of healthcare might look at the opposing forces of standardization (protocols that make care efficient and consistent) vs. personalization (tailoring care to individual patient needs). Each has evidence and arguments in its favor; a dialectical analysis would explore this tension and seek a higher-order resolution (perhaps a new model of care that integrates standardized practices with flexible, patient-centered provisions). The outcome could be a synthesized framework that informs policy, arguably more robust because it consciously addresses conflicting priorities. Dialectics also underlie the peer review and academic debate process: researchers put forward a thesis (their findings or theory), colleagues may present antitheses (critiques, alternative interpretations), and over time, the field moves toward a refined consensus or new theory that synthesizes the insights.

In sum, high-quality research in doctoral studies leverages these reasoning approaches thoughtfully. Quantitative studies may lean heavily on deduction (with a complement of induction when interpreting unexpected findings), whereas qualitative studies often emphasize induction and abduction. Mixed-methods designs explicitly use both: for example, an exploratory qualitative phase (inductive/abductive) to generate hypotheses, followed by a quantitative phase (deductive) to test them, or vice versa (deductively testing, then inductively explaining outliers) (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Venkatesh et al., 2023). A reflexive researcher remains aware of which mode of reasoning they are using at different stages, and they align it with their overall methodological approach. By combining these reasoning tools, doctoral researchers can enhance the robustness of their inquiry – using deduction for precision and validation, induction for discovery, abduction for innovation, and dialectics for critical depth. The result is a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon under study.

Major Research Paradigms

A research paradigm is a coherent worldview or belief system that guides how research is conducted, integrating the ontological, epistemological, axiological, and methodological assumptions discussed above (Brown & Dueñas, 2020; Creswell & Creswell, 2022; Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017). Paradigms can be considered overarching frameworks that dictate what questions are asked, how data are collected and interpreted, and how quality is judged (Creswell & Creswell, 2022). Several paradigms have achieved prominence in academic research, especially in social sciences. Each represents a distinct philosophy of inquiry:

- Positivism (and its nuanced successor, Post-positivism),
- Constructivism/Interpretivism,
- Transformative/Critical (e.g., critical theory, feminist, transformative-emancipatory paradigm),
- Pragmatism.

 DOI:10.2440/018-0009

These paradigms are often compared in terms of their ontology, epistemology, axiology, and preferred methodologies. Table 3 provides a comparative summary of key assumptions in major paradigms as applied in fields like healthcare and management research.

Paradigm	Ontology (Nature of Reality)	Epistemology (Nature of Knowledge)	Axiology (Role of Values)	Methodological Preference
Positivism	Realist – a single, objective reality exists "out there" independent of observers. Reality is ordered and governed by natural laws; it can be objectively known using correct methods.	Objectivist: The researcher can observe reality without influencing it, aiming for objective knowledge. Knowledge is valid if it corresponds to reality and is verified through empirical observation and logical analysis. Truth is context-independent and generalizable.	Value-neutral – research should be free of the researcher's values or biases. The investigator and subject are independent (dualism). Inquiry is considered objective when it eliminates subjective influence; values are seen as irrelevant to scientific outcomes.	Quantitative, experimental, and survey methods. Emphasis on measurement, hypothesis testing, and statistical analysis. Seeks causal explanation and prediction. Large samples and reproducibility are favored for generalization. Laboratory experiments or clinical trials in healthcare are classic positivist approaches.
Post-positivism	Realist (critical realist flavor) – a single reality exists but can only be known imperfectly. Observations are theory-laden and subject to error, so reality is approximate. Embraces a critical realism: objective reality is assumed but only partially apprehendable due to human fallibility.	Modified objectivist – strives for objectivity but recognizes all measurements as uncertain. Knowledge is probabilistic and subject to revision. Uses falsification rather than verification: hypotheses can be rejected, but not proven true. The knower seeks to be objective, yet absolute certainty is unattainable.	Values are controlled but acknowledged – researchers try to minimize bias, yet openly account for how values or theoretical perspectives may have influenced the inquiry. Complete neutrality is an ideal; in practice, critical self-reflection is used to reduce bias.	Quantitative and experimental methods remain primary, but with methodological rigor to address errors (e.g., using triangulation, statistics that account for uncertainty, replication studies). Often includes mixed methods or qualitative data to contextualize findings. For example, a post-positivist study in management might include a survey (with statistical hypothesis testing) followed by some interviews to help explain unexpected results.
Constructivism / Interpretivism	Relativist – multiple realities exist, as reality is socially or experientially constructed. What is real depends on context, perspective, and interaction. There is no single truth, only local and specific constructions of reality (e.g., each patient's experience of illness is a different reality).	Subjectivist: Knowledge is co-created between the researcher and participants. The investigator cannot be truly separate from what is being studied, especially in social realms. Truth is plural and subjective; understanding is gained by interpreting meanings (Verstehen). The goal is to understand how people construct meaning in their contexts rather than to discover universal laws.	Value-bound – researchers' and participants' values are integral to the research process. Instead of trying to eliminate influence, interpretivist researchers often embrace reflexivity, making their positionality clear. They value the subjective connection as a source of insight. The inquiry is often driven by appreciating participants' perspectives and needs.	Qualitative, naturalistic methods (e.g., ethnography, case study, phenomenology, grounded theory). Methods involve close interaction: interviews, observations, focus groups, and narrative analysis. The aim is a rich, contextualized understanding rather than generalization. For example, an interpretivist study might explore patients' lived experiences of managing a chronic illness through in-depth interviews, yielding themes illuminating how different individuals understand their condition.

Table 3: *Comparative summary of key assumptions in major paradigms*

Paradigm	Ontology (Nature of Reality)	Epistemology (Nature of Knowledge)	Axiology (Role of Values)	Methodological Preference
Transformative / Critical (e.g., critical theory, feminist, transformative-emancipatory)	Relativist with a critical realist nuance, multiple realities exist, shaped by social, political, cultural, economic, gender, and power dynamics. What is considered "real" or "true" is often defined by those in power. Thus, marginalized groups' realities may be different, systematically distorted, or ignored under dominant paradigms.	Subjectivist (informed by critical theory): Knowledge is seen as structurally influenced and interest-bound. All knowledge reflects power relationships. Researchers in this paradigm seek to uncover hidden structures (ideologies, hegemonies) that shape perceptions of reality. The inquirer often adopts the standpoint of marginalized communities to generate knowledge that challenges the status quo. Knowledge is valid if it helps to empower and transform society toward greater justice.	Value-driven – explicitly and unavoidably political. Advocacy for specific values (equity, inclusivity, liberation) is a core part of the research. Instead of shunning bias, the researcher openly aligns with the oppressed or disadvantaged. Ethical commitment to social change is paramount. Mertens (2007) notes that the transformative paradigm's axiological assumption prioritizes research addressing inequality and injustice.	Participatory, dialogic, and mixed methods. Methods often involve collaboration with participants (e.g., Participatory Action Research), so those being studied are co-researchers in knowledge production. Qualitative methods (interviews, narratives) are used to surface unheard voices, and quantitative data may be used to expose systemic inequities. For example, a transformative study in healthcare might work with a community to document and address environmental health injustices, using surveys to quantify the problem and community meetings to mobilize action. The research process itself is interventionist, aiming for empowerment.
Pragmatism	Pluralist – reality is both objective and subjective. Pragmatists sidestep the metaphysical debate by asserting that the reality that matters is the one that helps solve the problem at hand. They focus on practical reality: whatever is useful or successful in predicting and controlling phenomena. Some pragmatists see reality as dynamic and continually renegotiated.	"Knowledge is what works." Pragmatist epistemology is functional: truth is judged by the practical consequences of believing or using an idea. There is no strict loyalty to any single notion of truth; theories are tools, not mirrors of reality. The researcher can combine subjective and objective viewpoints as needed. In practice, this often means integrating insights from different disciplines or methods to understand a problem better. Epistemologically, pragmatism is comfortable with both quantitative and qualitative evidence – the criterion is usefulness and explanatory power rather than fidelity to an abstract ideal of Truth.	Value-conscious—Pragmatists acknowledge that research is value-laden in choosing problems of interest (often those with practical social importance). However, once the problem is chosen, the guiding value is effectiveness: finding solutions that work. They tend to prioritize outcomes (e.g., improving patient care or organizational performance) over adherence to any ideological stance. In essence, the "good" is what produces desirable results for stakeholders. This stance encourages collaboration with practitioners and stakeholders to define what outcomes are valuable.	Mixed-Methods & Flexible Design. Pragmatism is the philosophical backbone of the mixed methods movement (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010; Biesta, 2010). Pragmatic researchers feel free to use any method – quantitative, qualitative, or a combination – that helps answer their research question. They often design studies in phases, using qualitative exploration to inform quantitative measures or vice versa, as needed. The emphasis is on the solution of problems and the application of research to real-world issues. For instance, a pragmatic study in management might include qualitative interviews to identify key organizational challenges, followed by a quantitative intervention study to test which solution best addresses those challenges. The success of the research is measured by its practical impact and explanatory capacity, not by its purity to a single methodology.

Positivism is historically the oldest of these paradigms in scientific research, originating from Auguste Comte and others in the 19th century (Venkatesh et al., 2023). It profoundly influenced fields like biomedicine and economics, where the ideal is to discover general laws (analogous to physics) through objective observation and measurement. In medical and health sciences, positivism (and post-positivism) has been dominant, which is evident in the emphasis on randomized controlled trials, blinding, and statistical significance – all efforts to isolate an objective signal in the data (Brown & Dueñas, 2020). The ontology is that illnesses, treatments, and outcomes exist as objective reality (e.g., a drug's effect exists whether we measure it or not). Epistemology is when, through careful experimentation and observation, we can know that reality (e.g., the actual effect size of the drug). Axiologically, any influence of values (say, a physician's hope that the drug works) is carefully filtered out through methodological controls and bias checks. Methodologically, standardization and replication are key; a study should yield the same results regardless of who conducts it, reflecting the singular truth of the matter (Park et al., 2020). The post-positivist paradigm modifies this stance by acknowledging that absolute objectivity is an ideal asymptote – researchers are human, measurements have error, and complex phenomena may never be fully controllable. Post-positivists, therefore, use strategies like triangulation (multiple methods/measures) and statistical modeling to estimate truth with known uncertainty (for example, using confidence intervals to express that our knowledge is always probabilistic). They remain within a primarily quantitative frame but invite methodological pluralism when needed to get a better handle on a problem (Venkatesh et al., 2023).

The interpretivism/Constructivism paradigm gained momentum as sociology, anthropology, and later healthcare and management scholars realized that human phenomena cannot be meaningfully reduced to numbers without losing the essence of what is being studied (Venkatesh et al., 2023). Max Weber argued for verstehen (understanding) of social action by grasping subjective meaning, which is a foundation of interpretivist epistemology. In education and management research, this paradigm manifests in studies that explore organizational culture or patient satisfaction not as objective quantities but as meanings and narratives constructed by people. An interpretivist management researcher might examine how employees in a company perceive a new policy and its symbolic significance for them, using methods like participant observation or open-ended interviews. The knowledge produced is an interpretation grounded in those particular people's perspectives. Such knowledge might not be generalizable statistically, but it provides deep insights into process and context. Validity in this paradigm is assessed by criteria like credibility, transferability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) rather than positivist criteria of internal/external validity and reliability. In healthcare, interpretivism is evident in qualitative studies of patient experiences, where the goal is to understand the patient's story and use that insight to improve care holistically.

The Transformative/Critical paradigm arose from recognizing that research is not neutral and that traditional paradigms often ignore power imbalances (Venkatesh et al., 2023). Influenced by critical theorists (e.g., the Frankfurt School) and later by feminist and critical race scholars, this paradigm posits that all knowledge is intertwined with power and politics. A classic example is in international development research: A positivist might measure whether an intervention increased crop yields; a transformative researcher would also ask who benefits from the increased yields?, who has a voice in the community's agricultural decisions?, and does the intervention reinforce or reduce inequalities?. In health research, a transformative para-

digm could lead to studies that center on marginalized populations (people with disabilities, racial minorities, etc.) and involve them actively in the research process to ensure the knowledge produced is grounded in their reality and useful for improving their situation. Donna M. Mertens, a key proponent of the transformative paradigm in mixed methods, emphasizes incorporating social justice directly into research design and execution (Mertens, 2007). Ontologically, this paradigm often overlaps with constructivism (multiple realities), but it adds a dimension: recognizing that some realities are suppressed or distorted by domination. Epistemologically, it favors an approach where knowledge comes through dialogue and reflection in a community. It often uses methods like dialogical interviews, photovoice, or community forums, which blur the line between researchers and researched. The success of a transformative study is measured not just by publications, but by empowerment outcomes: Did the community gain from the research? Was awareness raised? Did it prompt policy changes or action? For doctoral students adopting this paradigm, ethical considerations are integrated throughout: one must navigate the dual role of scholar and advocate carefully (maintaining rigor while pursuing change).

Pragmatism as a paradigm is sometimes positioned as a middle ground that emerged to bridge the "paradigm wars" between positivists and constructivists (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017). Pragmatists argue that the debate over which paradigm is "right" is less productive than focusing on what works best for investigating a particular problem. The American philosophers William James and John Dewey advanced the idea that truth is not an absolute correspondence with reality but is instead verified by the practical consequences of believing something (Nowell, 2015). In the context of research, this translates to flexibility in choosing methods: the researcher might combine numerical data and narrative data, and if doing so, it provides a more complete answer (Venkatesh et al., 2023). For example, in a healthcare management PhD project on improving patient satisfaction, a pragmatist might use surveys to quantify satisfaction levels and identify patterns, and conduct focus groups with patients and staff to understand the reasons behind those patterns, then integrate the findings to develop an intervention. The paradigm wars of the 1980s (debates pitting quantitative vs. qualitative, objectivist vs. subjectivist) have given way to more pluralistic approaches in many fields, and pragmatism has been key in this shift (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017). It is worth noting that pragmatism is not "anything goes" – it still demands careful justification and integration of methods, but the justification is contextual and consequence-oriented rather than ideological. The mantra "whatever works" is sometimes misunderstood; in research, it means whatever combination of theories and methods provides answers that solve the problem or advance understanding in a useful way (Nowell, 2015). This is particularly appealing in applied fields (business, education, nursing, etc.) where the value of research is measured by its impact on practice.

In many cases, researchers combine elements of paradigms or operate at the intersections. For instance, post-positivism itself was a response to incorporate a bit of interpretivist humility (recognition of theory-ladenness) into positivism. Critical realism (associated with philosopher Roy Bhaskar) can be seen as blending positivist ontology (realist) with a constructivist epistemology (our knowledge of reality is always socially situated) – it often aligns with a retroduction mode of reasoning. Mixed methods research explicitly tries to draw from both positivist/post-positivist and constructivist camps, often under a pragmatist or transformative umbrella (depending on whether the goal is practical problem solving or social justice) (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Venkatesh et al., 2023).

The paradigms also have areas of tension: A positivist might critique interpretive research as lacking objectivity or generalizability ("it is just anecdotal or subjective"). An interpretivist might counter that positivist work ignores the richness of human experience and imposes an artificial detachment that misses the point ("people are not numbers, and context is everything"). A transformative researcher might critique both for being apolitical, arguing that positivist "neutrality" often reinforces the status quo and that even interpretivists sometimes fail to translate understanding into change. Others might critique pragmatists as having "no stance" or being too quick to instrumentalize research without philosophical depth (Hampson & McKinley, 2023). Indeed, some scholars caution that if pragmatism is used superficially, one might ignore important philosophical inconsistencies or ethical considerations in the name of expediency (Hampson & McKinley, 2023). However, advocates of pragmatism (and mixed methods) respond that their approach is itself principled – the principle being that research should be judged by its problem-solving capacity and its usefulness to stakeholders (patients, managers, policy makers, etc.), which is a valid philosophical position (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Venkatesh et al., 2023).

Understanding these paradigm differences is not just an abstract exercise; it has practical implications for doctoral researchers. The paradigm influences how you formulate your research question (e.g., a "what is the effect of X on Y" question is framed in a post-positivist way, whereas "how do participants experience Z" is framed in an interpretivist way). It guides method selection (survey vs. interviews vs. mixed) and even writing style (passive third person vs. active first person; reporting counts vs. telling stories). It also shapes evaluation criteria: a positivist dissertation might be judged on internal/external validity and replicability, an interpretivist one on depth of insight and trustworthiness of interpretation, a critical one on its reflexivity and transformative potential, and a pragmatic one on the coherence of integrating methods and the tangible outcomes or recommendations it produces.

In summary, no paradigm is "the best" universally; each is suited to different research questions and worldviews. Modern scholarship encourages paradigm awareness: researchers should be able to articulate their philosophical stance, be aware of its strengths and limitations, and possibly even borrow strategies from other paradigms when appropriate (with careful justification). Table 3's comparisons highlight how, for example, ontology ranges from belief in one reality to many, epistemology from objective discovery to subjective co-creation, axiology from neutrality to overt advocacy, and methodology from tightly controlled trials to participatory action. Doctoral students in healthcare and management often operate in interdisciplinary environments – e.g., a health services study might involve biomedical (positivist) and social science (interpretivist) components in the same project. Being fluent in paradigm differences enables effective collaboration (you can communicate with and justify your approach to colleagues of different philosophical leanings) and innovation (you might design novel studies that bridge paradigms, such as a randomized trial plus qualitative interviews to understand why an intervention worked or not).

Philosophical Differences and Tensions

Because paradigms are based on fundamentally different assumptions, tensions inevitably arise in the research community, sometimes called the "paradigm wars" (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017). In the late 20th century, these debates were especially heated between proponents of quantitative (often positivist/post-positivist) and qualitative (interpretivist) research, each camp defending the legitimacy of its approaches. Positivists argued that interpretivists lacked objec-

tivity and produced context-bound results that could not be generalized. Interpretivists argued that positivists were naïvely reductionist, stripping away context and meaning in pursuit of shallow regularities. This led to a period where, in some fields, qualitative research had to fight for acceptance as "real science." Paradigm tensions were also evident in mixed-methods discussions. Some purists claimed you cannot coherently mix paradigms because their assumptions are incommensurable, whereas pragmatists and others argued that multiple paradigms can be complementary. For example, Guba and Lincoln in the 1980s initially took a hard stance that paradigms are mutually exclusive, but by the 2000s, there was more acceptance of dialogue across paradigms (Lincoln & Guba, 2000; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009).

One effect of the paradigm wars was greater clarity about each paradigm's assumptions and a more thoughtful approach to training researchers. Doctoral programs explicitly began teaching the philosophical foundations so students could justify why they chose a qualitative vs. quantitative approach, beyond methodological convenience. This, in turn, has improved the sophistication of research designs. For instance, an informed researcher might preempt criticism by addressing paradigm-specific quality criteria: a qualitative study might use strategies like member-checking or thick description to enhance trustworthiness, anticipating positivist-leaning reviewers' concerns about "subjectivity." Conversely, quantitative researchers started acknowledging and discussing the theoretical lens behind their models, rather than pretending they were theory-free. One observer noted that "the power of an experiment is only as strong as the clarity of the basic assumptions which underlie it" (Brown & Dueñas, 2020). In other words, explicitly making paradigmatic assumptions strengthens research by highlighting its foundation. Mitroff and Bonoma (1978) famously argued that unspoken paradigms can limit and bias research; when assumptions are clear, scholars can debate and refine those assumptions or even combine them creatively (Brown & Dueñas, 2020).

Many scholars today advocate methodological or paradigm pluralism, especially in applied fields. The recognition is that complex problems (like improving healthcare systems or managing global supply chains) often benefit from multiple lenses. A hospital, for example, is simultaneously a biomedical system (amenable to positivist study for clinical outcomes), a social organization (fit for interpretive study about culture), and part of a societal power structure (open to critical analysis about healthcare equity). Embracing this complexity can lead to richer insights. That said, tensions persist. Reviewers or stakeholders sometimes have implicit biases – e.g., a hospital CEO might instinctively trust quantitative data over qualitative, or a community group might mistrust statistics that do not capture their lived experience. Researchers often need to justify their paradigm to audiences from another paradigm. A constructive way to handle these tensions is through bridging narratives: explaining one's results in multiple ways. For instance, if a mixed-methods study finds that a new clinic process improved patient satisfaction (quantitative finding) and the interviews reveal staff felt more empowered (qualitative finding), the researcher might present a synthesized narrative that speaks to both outcome effectiveness and human factors, appealing across paradigms.

In academic publishing, some journals historically aligned with certain paradigms (e.g., Postivist Economics vs. Interpretive Anthropology journals), but interdisciplinary journals now explicitly welcome varied approaches as long as standards of that approach are met. The key for researchers is to maintain respectful dialogue: understanding that questions like "is this statistically significant?" and "is this meaningfully significant to participants?" are valid but dif-

 DOI:10.2440/018-0009

ferent inquiries. It is encouraging that newer generations of scholars are often "bilingual" or "trilingual" in paradigms, comfortable with reading and valuing research coming from different philosophical traditions. This openness fosters scholarly dialogue where, for example, a positivist and a constructivist can collaborate on a healthcare issue, each contributing strengths (one brings rigor in measurement, the other brings depth of understanding).

Another area of tension is ethical and political: critical paradigm researchers sometimes argue that positivist research, by claiming neutrality, inadvertently supports harmful power structures (for instance, by not questioning pharmaceutical industry agendas or by ignoring minority voices in data). Positivist researchers may respond that their methods are tools that can be used for any agenda and that rigor is separate from ideology. This debate touches on the axiological dimension: can/should science ever be truly apolitical? While a full resolution is beyond our scope, a pragmatic stance is emerging: many researchers see value in rigor and relevance – doing solid research that addresses pressing social needs. Funding bodies are increasingly asking for impact statements (how will this research benefit society?) even for basic science projects, indicating a shift toward expecting researchers to connect their work with values and applications.

In sum, when unmanaged, philosophical tensions in academia can lead to fragmentation and misunderstanding, but when recognized, they can be productive, driving reflexivity and innovation. A doctoral researcher can navigate critiques more effectively by understanding the philosophical differences. Rather than seeing an alternative paradigm critique as an attack, one can see it as an invitation to strengthen one's approach or even to incorporate multiple approaches. The trend in healthcare and management sciences is toward integration and complementarity: leveraging quantitative data for breadth and qualitative data for depth, evidence-based research combined with human-centered design principles, etc. This pluralistic approach, however, demands that researchers be well-versed in philosophy of science fundamentals, so they can ensure coherence when mixing methods and be clear about what claims they are (or are not) making. The foundation in academic philosophy thus becomes extremely practical – it helps researchers defend their methodological choices, make sense of interdisciplinary teamwork, and critically evaluate research literature regardless of its paradigm.

Role of Philosophical Foundations in Doctoral Research

For doctoral students and emerging scholars, philosophical competence underpins true research expertise, particularly in applied fields like healthcare and management. Doctoral training is not just about learning techniques like how to run a regression or conduct an interview; it is about understanding why and when to use those techniques, which is a philosophical question. A clear grasp of foundational assumptions enhances every aspect of research design and execution. When a doctoral student formulates a research question, knowing the philosophical underpinnings helps ensure the question is answerable and aligned with an appropriate paradigm. For example, asking "What is the effect of leadership style on nurse retention rates?" implies a post-positivist, quantitative approach (measuring defined variables and causal inference). Alternatively, asking "How do nurses in different hospital units experience leadership and how does it influence their decision to stay or leave?" signals an interpretivist, qualitative approach. Both questions are valid but will lead to very different study designs and knowledge outcomes. An astute researcher chooses and refines the question in light of a paradigm that fits the problem and their worldview, or even combines questions in a complementary way if using mixed methods (see Table 4 and Table 3 for further explanations.

Table 4: *Examples of philosophical paradigms and reasoning alignment with research design.*

Component	Quantitative	Qualitative	Mixed-Method
Research Question	Tests the effect of leadership training on employee outcomes using measurable indicators.	Explores caregivers' perceptions to understand how they navigate caregiving and personal responsibilities.	Combines patient perspectives and outcome data to evaluate a tailored adherence intervention.
Paradigm	Positivism	Constructivism	Pragmatism
Ontology	Realism	Relativism	Pluralism
Epistemology	Objectivism	Subjectivism	Pragmatism
Axiology	Value-neutral	Value-bound	Value-conscious
Methodology	Quasi-Experimental	Multiple Case Study	Explanatory Sequential
Methods	Surveys, inferential statistics	Semi-structured interviews, thematic analysis	Focus groups, surveys, PLS-SEM, replication logic
Reasoning	Deductive	Inductive	Deductive / Inductive

Ethical awareness is another area strengthened by philosophical foundations. Axiology reminds researchers to consider: Who benefits from this research? What values am I upholding? In healthcare, this is tied to the imperative "do no harm" and striving for equity in health outcomes. In management, it might relate to social responsibility and ethical leadership. A researcher grounded in philosophy will be better at identifying potential ethical dilemmas (e.g., power imbalances in interview settings, implications of data privacy, etc.) and addressing them proactively. Moreover, understanding that all knowledge is situated (even lab experiments occur within social contexts) can instill humility and ethical caution in interpreting and applying findings. For instance, a positivist-trained data scientist working in public health who appreciates constructivist insights may be more careful in communicating algorithm results, acknowledging community context rather than presenting them as universal truths.

From a pragmatic standpoint, being philosophically informed empowers researchers to defend their work. In a dissertation defense or peer review, one might be asked: "Why did you choose a qualitative approach for this question? Would a randomized trial be better?" Without philosophical backing, a student might falter. Still, one versed in paradigms can cogently argue how their constructivist epistemology necessitated a qualitative design to capture the meaning-rich aspects of the problem, and why a trial (though useful for other questions) would miss the point here. This turns critiques into opportunities to demonstrate scholarly maturity. It also helps in situating research in broader debates. For example, a management PhD who knows the history of positivist vs. interpretivist debates in organizational studies can position their research as contributing to a particular side or bridging the divide, making their theoretical contribution clearer.

A coherent doctoral research process is built on a structured philosophical sequence (see table 5) that ensures methodological alignment and ethical integrity. The process begins with the researcher's worldview or paradigm, which shapes assumptions about ontology (reality), epistemology (knowledge), and axiology (values). These foundations

 DOI:10.2440/018-0009

guide the choice of methodology and corresponding research design, which structures the inquiry. The researcher then identifies the form of reasoning (e.g., deductive, inductive) and selects appropriate data collection and analysis methods. Ethical reflexivity is essential throughout this process, requiring researchers to critically assess their positionality, assumptions, and influence on the research. Following this logical sequence ensures that each element supports the next, maintaining internal coherence. Ethical reflexivity justifies the researcher's presence in the study and promotes transparency, trustworthiness, and accountability, which are particularly crucial in sensitive or complex research contexts. Mastering this philosophical alignment for doctoral students enhances their work's quality, credibility, and scholarly defensibility.

Table 5: *Sequence for Philosophical Research Alignment*

Step	Component	Explanation	Example
1	Paradigm	Identify your fundamental beliefs about reality and knowledge	Positivist, Constructivist, Pragmatist, Transformative
2	Ontology	Define your assumptions about the nature of reality	Is there one objective reality or multiple subjective realities?
3	Epistemology	Determine how you believe knowledge can be known	Is knowledge discovered objectively or constructed subjectively?
4	Axiology	Reflect on the role of values in your research	Are you aiming for neutrality or consciousness?
5	Methodology	Choose your overall strategy for inquiry	Qualitative, Quantitative, or Mixed Methods
6	Design	Choose your research design	Case study, longitudinal, Delphi
7	Reasoning	Decide on your logical structure	Deductive, Inductive, Abductive
8	Methods	Select tools and procedures for collecting/analyzing data	Interviews, Surveys, Thematic Analysis
9	Ethical Reflexivity & Justification	Consider your positionality, context, and justify your philosophical alignment	Why this paradigm for this question in this context?

Philosophical foundations also facilitate interdisciplinary communication. A healthcare administrator with training in quantitative epidemiology might find themselves collaborating with a medical anthropologist on a community health project. If both understand terms like ontology and epistemology, they can explicitly map out where their approaches differ and find common ground. For instance, they might agree on a critical realist stance to use both epidemiological data and ethnographic insight. This mutual understanding is increasingly important as complex problems require teamwork across disciplines.

Finally, the ultimate goal of doctoral research is often described as contributing new knowledge. However, in light of our earlier discussion, we can appreciate that "knowledge" is paradigm-dependent. Thus, philosophical fluency allows scholars to articulate what kind of knowledge they are contributing. Is it a causal explanation, a rich description, a theoretical model, a meta-critical insight, or a practical solution? Each of these aligns with different philosophical expectations. Communicating this clearly in a thesis or journal article means the right audience can appreciate the contribution. A common pitfall is when researchers use methods from one paradigm

but overclaim in terms of another – for example, making broad generalizations from a small qualitative study (which invites positivist criticism), or conversely dismissing statistical correlations as meaningless without considering their practical implications (which might miss opportunities for pragmatic action). Knowing the strengths and limits of one's approach leads to appropriately scoped conclusions and suggestions for future research. It also encourages cumulative knowledge growth: researchers can see how their work connects to others'. A well-founded study will explicitly state its paradigm and assumptions, making it easier for future scholars to build on it (perhaps by testing the qualitative insights quantitatively, or applying a theory in a new context, etc., in a complementary paradigm).

In essence, philosophical foundations are not an "extra" or a formality in doctoral research – they are the backbone of scholarly inquiry. Mastery of these concepts differentiates the doctoral-level researcher from the technician. It enables creativity (by allowing one to reconceptualize problems), rigor (by ensuring internal consistency), and impact (by connecting research to real-world contexts and values). A strong philosophical grounding is indispensable, especially in healthcare and management, where human factors and ethics are deeply entwined with technical and empirical issues. It ensures that, as new doctors of philosophy (Ph.D.), graduates live up to the title: not just doing research, but understanding the foundations of knowledge and inquiry deeply enough to advance them.

Conclusion

Academic philosophy provides a coherent framework for conceptualizing, conducting, and evaluating scholarly research. Its foundational pillars—ontology, epistemology, axiology, and methodology—define how scholars view reality, what they accept as knowledge, how values interface with inquiry, and why they choose certain research strategies. These philosophical underpinnings, paired with various modes of reasoning and paradigm worldviews, shape how we construct knowledge and make ethical and methodological decisions in our studies. By differentiating academic inquiry from belief-based or ideological approaches, researchers safeguard the integrity of their work, remaining open to critique and revision rather than clinging to dogma. For doctoral researchers in healthcare and management, fluency in these philosophical foundations is not optional but a prerequisite for meaningful, credible, and impactful inquiry. Embracing this "mapping of the terrain of knowledge and inquiry" means that new scholars can thoughtfully align their research questions with appropriate methods, critically engage with literature and data, and effectively communicate the significance of their findings. In doing so, they produce robust dissertations and contribute to the broader scholarly dialogue, helping to advance the collective understanding in their fields. Ultimately, a well-founded philosophical stance empowers researchers to navigate the complexities of real-world problems with both rigor and imagination, ensuring that their academic contributions are scientifically sound and practically relevant.

 DOI:10.2440/018-0009

Glossary

Abductive reasoning: A logical reasoning process where an observed surprising fact is explained by hypothesizing the most likely cause or explanation. It is an "inference to the best explanation," forming a plausible theory that can be tested, even though the explanation is not guaranteed to be true.

Analogical reasoning: A reasoning approach that draws comparisons between similar cases. Insights or solutions from a known situation (the source) are applied to a new situation (the target) under the assumption that the two share significant similarities, meaning what holds true in one may hold in the other.

Axiology: The branch of philosophy dealing with values, including ethics and aesthetics. In a research context, axiology concerns the role of the researcher's values and ethics in shaping the research process, influencing what is studied, how it is studied, and how findings are interpreted.

Constructivism (Interpretivism): A research paradigm positing that reality is socially constructed and multiple. Knowledge is co-created by researchers and participants, reflecting subjective experiences and contexts. Constructivist (interpretivist) research prioritizes understanding meaning and perspective, often using qualitative methods to explore how people make sense of their world.

Critical realism: A philosophical approach that combines a realist ontology with recognizing epistemological limitations. It holds that a reality exists independently of our perceptions, but our understanding of it is inherently imperfect. Researchers using critical realism seek to uncover underlying structures or mechanisms that explain observable phenomena.

Deductive reasoning: A "top-down" logical process that starts with general principles or theories and applies them to specific cases. If the general premise is true and reasoning is valid, then the conclusion about the particular case must also be true. Deduction is often used to test hypotheses.

Dialectical reasoning: A form of reasoning that resolves contradictions by examining opposing ideas (thesis and antithesis) and integrating them into a higher-level understanding (synthesis). It involves iterative dialogue between conflicting viewpoints, aiming to produce a new idea or framework that reconciles and transcends the initial opposition.

Epistemology: The branch of philosophy concerned with knowledge – its nature, sources, and limits. Epistemology explores how we know what we know, including the relationship between the knower and the known, what counts as valid knowledge, and the criteria for truth and justification.

Inductive reasoning: A "bottom-up" reasoning process that draws general conclusions from specific observations. Patterns or regularities observed in individual cases are used to infer broader principles or theories. Inductive conclusions are probabilistic, suggesting plausible generalizations but remaining open to revision if new evidence emerges.

Method: In research, a method is a specific technique or procedure used to collect or analyze data. Examples include experiments, surveys, interviews, and statistical analyses. Methods are the concrete tools applied within a study to gather evidence or to interpret data.

Methodology: The overarching strategy and rationale for a research project. Methodology describes how research should be conducted, including the choice of methods, and is guided by underlying philosophical assumptions (ontological and epistemological). It justifies why certain methods are used to answer a research question.

Objectivism: An epistemological stance asserting that knowledge of reality

can be obtained objectively, independent of the researcher's biases or perspectives. It assumes an external reality that can be observed and measured accurately. Objectivist approaches emphasize neutrality and facts, often aligning with positivist scientific methods.

Ontology: The branch of philosophy dealing with the nature of reality and existence. Ontological assumptions address what entities exist and what is real, for example, whether there is a single objective reality or multiple subjective realities. In research, ontology underpins how we conceptualize the phenomena we study.

Paradigm (research paradigm): A set of shared beliefs, assumptions, and practices that shape how research is conducted. A paradigm encompasses a worldview defining what is considered knowledge (epistemology), what is reality (ontology), what values are embraced (axiology), and how inquiry should proceed (methodology). Examples include positivist, constructivist, critical, and pragmatic paradigms.

Positivism: A research paradigm based on the belief that an objective reality exists and can be known through observation and reason. Positivism emphasizes empirical data, measurement, and hypothesis testing. It values objectivity, reproducibility, and generalizable findings, often employing quantitative methods to uncover laws or patterns in phenomena.

Post-positivism: A refinement of positivist philosophy that accepts that while an objective reality exists, our knowledge of it is imperfect. Post-positivists use empirical observation and logical inference but acknowledge biases and measurement errors. They emphasize falsifiability and probabilistic conclusions, aiming for objectivity while recognizing that absolute certainty is unattainable.

Pragmatism: A research paradigm that focuses on practical solutions and "what works." Pragmatism holds that concepts and theories are true if they are useful in solving problems. It is not committed to a single ontology or epistemology but mixes methods and perspectives to address the research question.

Realism: In philosophy, the view that a reality exists independently of observers or perceptions. In ontology, realism asserts that phenomena have an objective existence (e.g., diseases exist as biological entities regardless of beliefs). This assumption often underlies positivist approaches, which seek to discover truths about the external world.

Relativism: The philosophical view that reality (or truth) is not absolute but depends on perspective or context. In ontology, relativism suggests multiple realities exist, as knowledge and meaning are constructed by individuals or cultures. What is "true" can vary across different frames of reference or social contexts.

Retroductive reasoning: A reasoning method often used in critical realism to infer unseen causes for observed patterns. It asks, "What must be true behind the scenes for this outcome to occur?" Retroduction involves positing underlying mechanisms or structures that, if they existed, would explain the empirical observations.

Subjectivism: An epistemological perspective that holds all knowledge to be subjective, shaped by the experiences, perspectives, or context of the knower. Subjectivism maintains that the researcher and the object of study are intertwined, and that facts cannot be separated from values or interpretation. It contrasts with objectivism and aligns with constructivist paradigms.

Transformative paradigm: A research paradigm rooted in critical theory, focusing on empowering marginalized groups and driving social change. It sees reality as shaped by power dynamics and insists research should not be neutral – values of equity and justice are central. Transformative studies use participatory methods and aim to address inequities.

References

Audi, R. (2015). *The Cambridge dictionary of philosophy (3rd ed.)*. Cambridge University Press.

Bhaskar, R. (1975). *A realist theory of science*. Routledge.

Biesta, G. (2010). *Pragmatism and the philosophical foundations of mixed methods research.* In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), SAGE handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research (2nd ed., pp. 95–118). SAGE.

Brown, M. E., & Dueñas, A. N. (2020). A medical science educator's guide to selecting a research paradigm: building a basis for better research. *Medical Science Educator, 30*(1), 545-553. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40670-019-00898-9

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2022). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed-method research*. SAGE.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process* (3rd ed.). SAGE.

Halkias, D., & Neubert, M. (2020). Extension of theory in management and leadership studies using the multiple case study design. *International Leadership Journal, 12*(2), 48-73.

Halkias, D., Neubert, M., & Harkiolakis, N. (2023). *Multiple Case Study Data Analysis for Doctoral Researchers in Management and Leadership*. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4423757 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4423757

Halkias, D., Neubert, M., Thurman, P. & Harkiolakis, N. (2022). *The multiple case study design: methodology and application for management education*. Routledge.

Hampson, T., & McKinley, J. (2023). Problems posing as solutions: Criticising pragmatism as a paradigm for mixed research. *Research in Education, 116*(1), 124-138. https://doi.org/10.1177/00345237231160085

Horkheimer, M. (1972). *Critical theory: Selected essays*. Herder and Herder.

Ichikawa, J. J. & Steup, M. (2024). *The Analysis of Knowledge*, in The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2024 Edition), Edward N. Zalta & Uri Nodelman (eds.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2024/entries/knowledge-analysis/>.

Kivunja, C., & Kuyini, A. B. (2017). Understanding and applying research paradigms in educational contexts. *International Journal of higher education, 6*(5), 26-41.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.

Kuziaev, T., & Neubert, M. (2024). *Age-Based Adoption of AI-Based Smart Home Technologies Among Chinese Millennials and Gen Z Consumers* (December 01, 2024). Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5199582 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5199582

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Mertens, D. M. (2007). Transformative paradigm: Mixed methods and social justice. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1*(3), 212–225. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689807302811

Mitroff, I. I., & Bonoma, T. V. (1978). Beyond objectivism and relativism: A paradigm for social research. *Human Relations, 31*(3), 219–250.

Declarations

Author Contact Information

Correspondence regarding this article should be directed to M. Neubert at michael.neubert@faculty.eim.education.

Conflict of (Competing) Interest

The author declares that he has no (competing) financial or non-financial interests related to this study.

Funding

The author self-funded the research, and no external funding was obtained for its completion.

Author Contributions (CRediT taxonomy):

Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – Review & Editing: Michael Neubert.

Acknowledgments

None.

Data Availability and Supplementary Material

All data generated and analyzed during this study and supplementary material are available upon reasonable request.

Prior Publication

The author confirms that this research has not been published previously and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere.

Ethics Statement

This study complies with the ethical guidelines of the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity and adheres to the GDPR requirements for data protection. Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of EIM, and informed consent was secured from all participants.

Responsible AI Ethics Statement

This study used artificial intelligence (AI) tools to support tasks such as identifying relevant literature, analyzing datasets, and editing textual content. These tools were employed solely to enhance efficiency, and their outputs were critically reviewed to ensure alignment with research objectives. The use of AI adheres to ethical principles outlined in the EU AI Act, the OECD AI Principles, and the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, emphasizing transparency, fairness, and accountability. The authors made all final decisions and retain full responsibility for this research's integrity, rigor, and conclusions.

Neubert, M. (2023). *Guía breve y sencilla para utilizar el estudio de casos como método de investigación*. BOD GmbH DE.

Neubert, M. (2023). Post Pandemic Internationalization Behavior. *International Business Research, 16*(6), 25-36. https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v16n6p25

Neubert, M. (2023). Market Entry Form Choices of Multi-Sided Platforms in the Travel Booking Sector. *International Journal of Business and Management, 18*(6), 222-233. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v18n6p222

Neubert, M. (2024). *Le design de l'étude de cas comme méthode de recherche: Un guide facile à comprendre et rapide à utiliser pour les professionnels et les étudiants*. BoD-Books on Demand.

Nowell, L. (2015). Pragmatism and integrated knowledge translation: exploring the compatabilities and tensions. *Nursing open, 2*(3), 141–148. https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.30

Park, Y. S., Konge, L., & Artino, A. R. (2020). The positivism paradigm of research. *Academic Medicine, 95*(5), 690–694. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000003093

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Reichertz, J. (2010). Abduction: The logic of discovery of grounded theory. Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/ Forum: *Qualitative Social Research, 11*(1). https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-11.1.1412

Russell, B. (1945). *A history of Western philosophy.* Simon and Schuster.

Saxena, D. (2019). The search for mechanisms in business research: Reflections on retroductive analysis in a multilevel critical realist case study. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods, 17*(1), 17–27.

Scotland, J. (2012). Exploring the philosophical underpinnings of research: Relating ontology and epistemology to methodology and methods of the scientific, interpretive, and critical research paradigms. *English Language Teaching, 5*(9), 9–16. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n9p9

Trochim, W. M. (2020). *Research methods: The essential knowledge base* (2nd ed.). Cengage Learning.

Venkatesh, V., Brown, S., & Sullivan, Y. (2023). *Conducting mixed-methods research: From classical social sciences to the age of big data and analytics*. Virginia Tech Publishing.

Zagzebski, L. T. (1996). *Virtues of the mind: An inquiry into the nature of virtue and the ethical foundations of knowledge*. Cambridge University Press.