International Journal of Middle Eastern Research
ISSN: 2976-5455
DOI: 10.32996/ijmer
Journal Homepage: www.al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/ijmer

IJMER
AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Balancing Depth and Insight in Organizational Studies by Deconstructing Corporate Ecosystems through Qualitative Research Methods and Triangulation

Mustafa M. Bodrick [1, 2, 3], Mohammed I. Alassaf [1], Mohammed I. Alsuhaim [1], Mutlaq B. Almutairi [4, 5], Saleh A. Aljurbua [1], Mohammed Y. Alrasi [1], Abdullah A. Alhawas [1], Aws A. Obaid [1], Saad S. Alhazaa [1], Faisal A. Qasem [1]

[1] *Saudi Commission for Health Specialties, Saudi Arabia*
[2] *MAHSA University, Malaysia*
[3] *Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA*
[4] *King Fahad Medical City, MOH, Riyadh*
[5] *Doctoral Program, University of Johannesburg, South Africa*
Corresponding Author: Mustafa M. Bodrick, **E-mail**: mustafabodrick@gmail.com

| ABSTRACT

Systematic research investigations into corporate ecosystems rely heavily on established qualitative research methods, particularly in complexity. These include document analysis, qualitative case studies, and corporate leadership focus groups. While highly resilient, each qualitative approach encounters inherent limitations. Document analysis may overlook informal cultural dynamics, case studies may lack comprehension of ecosystem complexity, and focus groups could fall prey to social desirability bias, and/or susceptibility. Relying on these foundational techniques in isolation potentially compromises the rigor and authenticity of objective institutional inquiry. Implementing qualitative research methods and triangulation addresses individual vulnerabilities, creates a robust analytical framework that minimizes subjective bias and enhances trustworthiness of empirical findings. However, synthesizing these multilayered data streams places the onus on researchers to persistently navigate the tension between systemic complexity and reporting transparency. This study review evaluates how deconstructing corporate ecosystems through these time-tested approaches serves the goal of objective inquiry, identifies essential operational gaps, and underscores a critical need for more rigorous, standardized reporting frameworks to successfully balance deep qualitative insight with analytical depth in modern organizational studies.

| KEYWORDS

Organizational studies, qualitative research methods, triangulation, corporate ecosystems, objective inquiry, qualitative case studies, corporate leadership focus groups, reporting frameworks.

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 05 June 2026 **PUBLISHED:** 26 August 2026 **DOI:** 10.32996/ijmer.2026.5.3.2

Introductory Overview

Researchers need to leverage effective research methods to understand sophisticated organizational systems, finding meaningful insights amid the data overload that is prevalent in modern organizations. Important factors such as high-stakes decision-making, complex organizational frameworks, and regulatory accountability necessitate employing effective research methods in internal audit processes and procedures, and strategic and project management at the leadership levels. This review examines the traditional research methods of document analysis, case studies, and corporate leadership focus groups and their integration through methodological and analytical triangulation approaches. Triangulation as the unifying framework strengthens validity and connects the document analysis, case studies, and corporate leadership focus group methods to reflect complex realities in strategic and project leadership, auditing, and regulatory organizational research.

RESEARCH METHODS

Document Analysis

Prior studies have shown that document analysis has become an important tool for investigating organizational processes in internal audits and strategic decision-making. Cardno (2018) describes document analysis as a methodical research approach employed to assess and derive meaning from organizational records, policies, and communications to reveal patterns, practices, and compliance within institutional contexts. Morgan (2022) contends that the document analysis methodology examines executive communications, audit reports, and policies to identify compliance patterns and governance structures. These key insights and patterns from the data collected are in turn used to inform strategic leadership decision-making to address problems such as low productivity. In a study, Almasria (2022) discovered that the document analysis approach is preferred in organizational studies on the premise that it follows regulatory compliance through procedural manuals and meeting minutes to guarantee a non-intrusive method for assessing behavior. Despite its compliance with regulatory standards, Armstrong (2021) argues that document analysis alone may fail to account for the informal factors that influence audit results. The evidence shows a knowledge gap regarding how document analysis can organize data and incorporate other methods to capture the complexity of organizational protocols.

Literary evidence demonstrates that the process of document analysis adheres to a stringent four-stage approach to ensure reliability. Based on Carcary's (2020) study, researchers begin the document analysis process by defining the scope of their study as they identify pertinent data sources such as internal emails, policy drafts, and audit trails. The data gathered from these sources is used to answer the research question. The next phase is a systematic collection of data from regulatory databases or organizational archives to ensure that comprehensive insights are gathered (Morgan, 2022). These databases or archives often consist of board-level review summaries, risk registers, compliance logs, and internal audit checklists, all of which are essential components of strategic governance. Researchers subsequently identify data patterns and categories using a thematic analysis protocol via NVivo (Wæraas, 2022). The patterns established are useful to contextualize a particular organizational study that directly answers audit queries or mitigates project scheduling problems. Finally, researchers engage in triangulation, which involves interviews or observations to enhance the validity of the findings (Wæraas, 2022). Despite this organized approach, Almasria (2022) established the possibility of selection bias in archived documents and the risk of mistaking official records for the objective truth (Almasria, 2022). The analysis shows that document analysis is methodologically sound but needs to be understood in the context of larger organizational realities and augmented to prevent biased conclusions.

Researchers emphasize both the progress and ongoing shortcomings of document analysis as a method for conducting organizational research. Heller (2023) starts by affirming the application of the approach in scaling and analyzing big document sets in audit research via text mining aided by artificial intelligence. However, Morgan (2022) argues against the usefulness of the scalability trait by claiming that restrictions in accessing large data sets expose researchers to the risk of recording implicit knowledge. Carcary (2020) also reports that there is a dearth of research on the use of document analysis in making real-time strategic decisions, which creates a knowledge gap in how changing policies are discussed at the leadership level. Consequently, future research should explore document analysis's generation of static conclusions that ignore the dynamic character of governance and strategy.

Qualitative Case Studies

Qualitative case studies are a fundamental approach for studying intricate organizational phenomena in strategic project management and leadership decision-making. Rashid et al. (2019) contend that the qualitative case study using interviews, observation, and documents is an intensive research methodology applied to explore intricate organizational phenomena that provides profound, contextual insights. Eom and Lee (2022) established that case studies have helped assess how corporate leadership executives respond to regulatory reforms and organizational changes during crises. However, while Emon's (2024) study found that cases are a good means for studying organizational changes during crises, it mentions that the results from this method have low generalizability. As a result, even though case studies discover subtle leadership dynamics that might otherwise go unnoticed in quantitative methods, the findings have limited generalizability in diverse settings.

The case study research technique uses a rigorous and multi-phase approach to ensure the accuracy and completeness of data and findings. Accordingly, Taherdoost (2022) states that case studies start with the purposeful selection of data-rich scenarios, such as audit adjustments or firms undergoing significant strategy shifts. Common case study scenarios include leadership changes after strategy pivots, internal audit enhancements after fraud findings, and corporate restructuring after financial restatements. As per Taherdoost (2021), researchers then employ data-collecting methods, such as interviews, observations, and document analysis, to acquire a full understanding of a specific phenomenon. The analysis step is also part of the process of deploying case studies and envisages a thorough cross-case comparison to uncover trends and outliers in the data sets

(Taherdoost, 2022). Thus, although the case study deployment process is time-consuming, it provides unsurpassed insight into the complexity of organizational processes and leadership challenges.

Gaps in knowledge exist though, in as far as qualitative case studies can potentially offer generalized findings and insight into organizational and leadership problems. The value of a case study becomes prohibitive for large-scale research, thereby limiting diversity in the organizational sampling frame (Takahashi & Araujo, 2020). Furthermore, the cost of conducting broad contextual analyses appears unjustified when such work serves as a supplementary component of another research project (Takahashi & Araujo, 2020). The cost concerns also raise questions regarding the transfer of findings to other organizational settings (Rokade, 2024). Hence, there is a need for future inquiries to investigate suitable case selection criteria and the scope for hybridization to allow for more in-depth organizational research.

Corporate Leadership Focus Groups

A vital research technique to study the opinions and decision-making processes of corporate leadership executives is focus groups. Denny and Weckesser (2022) maintain that a focus group is a qualitative research method using guided discussions among two or more individuals to collect data. Researchers can study group dynamics, opinions, and decision-making processes using this research methodology. Tomaszewski et al. (2020) undertook research which noted that the focus group methodology has been used to evaluate executive differences in investment decisions and to examine the way whistleblower disclosures are treated by audit boards. Moreover, Van der Merwe et al. (2019) find that a focus group unearths interactions and group sensemaking among prominent leaders, a type of evidence often lost in one-to-one interviews. Indeed, existing research denotes the value of employing corporate leadership focus groups to collect genuine opinions in contemporary complex work environments.

Academic research substantiates the fact that obtaining superior executive focus group outcomes necessitates a meticulous process. According to Negrin et al. (2022), the initial process of the focus group roll-out is recruitment using advanced interviewing or snowball sampling to overcome access issues. The second process involves flexible expert moderation sessions to permit the subjects to receive an introduction to the issues under examination (Negrin et al., 2022). The third process is extensive transcription coding, which exposes overarching narratives and subtle power structures using qualitative methods like MAXQDA (Bryda & Costa, 2023). The literary evidence highlights the reality that corporate leadership focus groups are a pragmatic means of obtaining precise and in-depth insights into leadership dynamics.

Prior academic studies have focused on the benefits and limitations of using corporate leadership focus groups as a research technique. A study by Busetto et al. (2020) cautions against social desirability bias, which could compromise the study's validity regarding audit queries, even though focus groups are useful for sharing opinions on collective leadership. In another study, Bryda and Costa (2023) attest that focus groups have considerably varied effectiveness depending on cultural setting and organizational structure. Flatter organizations are likely to yield more authentic findings (Bryda & Costa, 2023). Therefore, variations as they pertain to organizational structures pose challenges to the applicability of findings across settings and different hierarchies. There exists a gap in understanding how to best integrate corporate leadership focus groups and passive data collection or experiments through triangulation to allow researchers to capture multidimensional leadership dynamics in corporate leadership environments.

Triangulation of Research Methods and Data Analysis, and Reporting in Organizational Research

Triangulation of research methods has evolved as a pillar of rigorous and credible organizational research since it offers the means for enhancing validity, reducing bias, and revealing underpinning relationships within complex institutional environments. Donkoh and Mensah (2023) characterize triangulation as the systematic combination of numerous techniques, sources of data, or theoretical perspectives into one study. Donkoh and Mensah (2023) further assert that the integration enables scholars to cross-check effects and unearth more nuanced insights. The triangulation strategy has been widely embraced within high-stakes industries, covering internal audits, strategic planning, and regulatory compliance. Researchers are now cognizant that sole-method studies often omit the complex nature of organizational reality, and thus triangulation has been a preferred method and a requirement for effective and impactful research (Hanson-DeFusco, 2023). Triangulation is a methodological option and an important criterion for creating reliable, multi-dimensional, and practical research as organizational environments become complex.

Triangulation of Research Methods

Triangulation of research techniques has emerged as a gold standard for organizational studies of high-stakes topics like internal auditing, strategic management, and compliance. Recent studies suggest combining document analysis with interviews and case study data to significantly enhance the validity of audit compliance findings (Sykes et al., 202). For instance, when conducting a fraud detection study, Almalki (2022) triangulated forensic accounting data against whistleblower interviews and worker questionnaires and found discrepancies that one research method missed. Likewise, strategic management scholars now integrate social network studies and case studies to map decision paths in mergers and acquisitions (Eveborn et al., 2024). As evidenced by the limitations of document analysis, which frequently fails to discover contingent norms, hybrid studies address the shortcomings inherent in single-method approaches. Vivek (2023) warns, however, that poorly integrated triangulation may lead to contradictory findings, perpetuating, instead of eliminating, research uncertainty. From the literary review, it is apparent that triangulation enhances methodological robustness, but must be well integrated to avoid compounding uncertainty.

Methodological triangulation has been critical to internal auditing for dealing with complex regulatory circumstances. Arthur and Owen's (2019) research on governance, ethics, and organisational patterns within the financial industry employed policy documents, regulatory interviews, and participant observation to illustrate the ways in which compliance staff interpret ambiguous rules. This method identified a decoupling effect, whereby official audit documents adhered to guidelines but masked noncompliant daily operations. In like manner, Almodaw (2024) employed sequential triangulation that involved reviewing audit documents and interviewing auditors to establish systematic flaws within the risk appraisal procedures. This research highlights triangulation's ability to reveal concealed organizational risks but also outlines logistical challenges such as recruiting time-constrained individuals for multimethod studies which remains a major impediment (Almodaw, 2024). Thus, these findings show that despite improving validity, there remains a knowledge gap on how to appropriately conduct participant sampling and stagger data acquisition.

Strategic management research has taken triangulation a step further by incorporating real-time techniques into conventional structures. Thille et al.'s (2022) research on company pivots combined qualitative case studies with weekly executive diaries and email network analysis to capture both planned tactics and emergent adaptations. Klumpes (2025) used risk registers, wargaming simulations, and post-crisis focus groups in crisis management to demonstrate how cognitive biases influence strategic responses. As seen in the critique of case studies for their limited generalizability, these scholarly research breakthroughs address this concern by grounding narratives in behavioral and network data (Paparini et al., 2021). However, challenges remain, with a significant portion of strategic management research examined by Drnevich et al. (2020) exhibiting the possibility of cherry-picked conclusions. The findings imply that strategic management requires standardized methods for integrating and weighing triangulated data.

Regulatory contexts necessitate complex triangulation to balance policy analysis with ground-level effects. Chua et al.'s (2024) study of the accounting-state-market dynamic in China combined legislative text analysis, regulator focus groups, and organizational ethnographies to reveal enforcement discrepancies across industries. Similarly, Michaels (2018) connected Occupational Safety and Health Administration violation records with inspector interviews, testimonies, and firm site visits to demonstrate how resource limitations limit regulatory effectiveness. Such research exemplifies contextual triangulation, which involves adapting methods to institutional power dynamics such as combining anonymous employee surveys with public documents to avoid retaliation concerns (Michaels, 2018). Nevertheless, there are still knowledge gaps about how ethical problems are encountered when researchers inadvertently expose whistleblowers during data reconciliation (Chua et al., 2024). In future studies, ethical protocols related to the triangulation of sensitive regulatory environments will have to be devised while maintaining methodological correctness.

Data Analysis and Reporting

Past studies show that the triangulation of data analysis approaches is crucial for extracting usable insights from complex organizational data. Internal audit researchers routinely cross-validate statistical abnormalities in audit trails with qualitative process tracing as a means of distinguishing between intentional fraud and procedural errors (Westbrook, 2024). Likewise, Fasey et al. (2020) used a long-term study of audit statistics with event-related interviews to investigate the influence of temporal pressure on risk assessment. These analytical hybrids help to mitigate the drawbacks of solely quantitative audits by ignoring contextual red flags or sampling bias. Even while analytical triangulation is becoming increasingly popular, there is still a knowledge gap regarding how established procedures can direct the integration of various data types. In the absence of such frameworks, researchers run the risk of weakening the validity that triangulation aims to improve (Westbrook, 2024). Future studies should investigate how to develop clear and repeatable triangulation rules to guarantee that results are reliable and accurately represent institutional reality.

Strategic management researchers continue to pioneer multilevel analytical triangulation to bridge micro- and macro-level research divides. Enang et al. (2024) used narrative coding and semantic network analysis to study strategic plans to demonstrate how CEO rhetoric influences middle management execution. Drawing from the critiques of corporate leadership focus groups, specifically their inclination to favor anecdotal evidence over empirical data, George (2024) enhanced the discussion by correlating executive feedback with real-time performance dashboards, quantifying the impact of leadership behavior throughout organizations. However, these resource-intensive designs frequently lack reproducibility because only a few studies in Enang et al.'s (2024) evaluation offered sufficient data for replication. Despite its analytical complexity, this transparency gap jeopardizes strategic management's credibility.

Regulatory research has used discourse network analysis to triangulate policy implementation across data types. Lainez and Gardner (2023) used lexical analysis of emails, meeting minutes, and enforcement orders to map regulator-industry communications to depict how soft law emerges from informal negotiations. Burdon and Sorour (2020) equally used institutional logics of policy texts and sanction patterns to demonstrate how cultural standards supersede formal rules. These approaches excel at capturing regulatory gray areas, but they have unique epistemological tensions, with Johnson et al. (2020) discovering that positivist text analytics tools frequently conflict with interpretive policy studies, which requires researchers to constantly recalibrate. These tensions indicate the need for bilingual analysts who are familiar with both computational and critical data analysis methods.

Emerging standards for reporting aim to enhance triangulation transparency without reducing complexity. Coker (2023) suggests integrated displays that visually link audit statistics and anonymized interview quotes to enhance stakeholder trust over outcomes. McClure and Hons (2022) document interactive digital supplements that enable users to navigate triangulated data layers relative to institutional logics' impact in an organisational female career advancement case study. However, the digital interactive supplements tend to overwhelm non-academic audiences. Reflexivity is another frontier to enhance transparency reporting, with Bukamal (2022) finding that researchers' backgrounds affected analytical decisions during triangulation. These adjustments cumulatively shift organizational research practice toward abductive rigor that pedagogically cycles through data types and stays receptive to serendipitous findings. Nonetheless, there is scarce research on how rigorous reporting systems can achieve a balance between analytical depth and user insight. Future research must focus on creating standardized, user-centered triangulation reporting systems that retain methodological rigor while enhancing transparency and user involvement among diverse academic and practitioner audiences.

Conclusion

Document analysis, case studies using a qualitative approach, and corporate leadership focus groups have been identified in this literature review as essential tools to uncover underpinning dynamics and enhance strategic insights in organizations. However, the standalone application of these methods often results in methodological blind spots. Triangulation emerges as a methodological enhancement and a strategic necessity in capturing the layered complexities of project and strategic leadership, auditing, and regulatory transformation. As such, the review indicated that document analysis offers structured insights into internal audits but must be complemented by other methods to capture tacit processes. Further, critical analysis indicated that case studies using a qualitative methodology are still the best way to deconstruct complicated strategic decisions. However, these cases need to be carefully designed through clearly defined objectives, rigorous data collection, and diverse participant inclusion to ensure credibility. Meanwhile, even though still underutilized, corporate leadership focus groups provide a unique opportunity to access executive cognition and collective strategy formulation. This literature review emphasizes the value of method and analytical triangulation for gaining reliable and context-rich organizational insights. Importantly, this review recommends that future research investigate hybrid approaches that combine traditional rigor with digital agility through advanced triangulation frameworks when studying leadership-level dynamics in contemporary organizations.

Disclaimer:

The views expressed are entirely those of the coauthors, and therefore are not necessarily perspectives of the institutions associated with the coauthors. It is declared that there are no conflicts of interest. Furthermore, the coauthors are not responsible for any errors or omissions, and/or for the results obtained from the sources used to generate this review publication. The coauthors therefore bear no liability to any person for any loss or damage arising out of the inaccurate use of the information provided in the review.

References

Almalki, K. (2022). *Factors engendering corporate fraud and mechanisms for enhancing the detection and prevention of fraudulent financial practices in the UK retail industry* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield). https://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/32066/1/Final%20Thesis%20with%20Comments%20Addressed.pdf

Almasria, N. A. (2022). Corporate governance and the quality of audit process: An exploratory analysis considering internal audit, audit committee and board of directors. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, *7*(1), 78–99. https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2022.7.1.1210 https://ejbmr.org/index.php/ejbmr/article/download/1210/658

Almodawi, A. A. M. (2024). *Impact of the audit committee's characteristics on enterprise risk management, internal audit, external audit and firm performance in Saudi Arabia* (Doctoral dissertation, RMIT University Australia). https://research-repository.rmit.edu.au/articles/thesis/Impact_of_the_Audit_Committee_s_Characteristics_on_Enterprise_Risk_Management_Internal_Audit_External_Audit_and_Firm_Performance_in_Saudi_Arabia/26012953/1/files/46975645.pdf

Arias Valencia, M. M. (2022). Principles, scope, and limitations of the methodological triangulation. *Investigacion y Educacion en Enfermeria*, *40*(2). https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.iee.v40n2e03 http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?pid=S0120-53072022000200003&script=sci_arttext

Armstrong, C. (2021). Key methods used in qualitative document analysis. *OSF Preprints*, *1*(9). https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm?abstractid=3996213

Arthur, K. N. A., & Owen, R. (2019). A micro-ethnographic study of big data-based innovation in the financial services sector: Governance, ethics and organisational practices. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 160, 363–375. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04203-x https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s10551-019-04203-x.pdf

Bryda, G., & Costa, A. P. (2023). Qualitative research in digital era: Innovations, methodologies and collaborations. *Social Sciences*, *12*(10), 570. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12100570 https://www.mdpi.com/2076-0760/12/10/570

Bukamal, H. (2022). Deconstructing insider–outsider researcher positionality. *British Journal of Special Education*, *49*(3), 327-349. https://nasenjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1467-8578.12426 https://pure-oai.bham.ac.uk/ws/files/175026688/British_J_Special_Edu_2022_Bukamal_Deconstructing_insider_outsider_researcher_positionality.pdf

Burdon, W. M., & Sorour, M. K. (2020). Institutional theory and evolution of 'a legitimate' compliance culture: The case of the UK financial service sector. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *162*, 47-80. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3981-4 https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s10551-018-3981-4.pdf

Busetto, L., Wick, W., & Gumbinger, C. (2020). How to use and assess qualitative research methods. *Neurological Research and Practice*, *2*(1), 14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42466-020-00059-z https://search.proquest.com/openview/71bf947a86013de402722031be1cb441/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=4406322

Carcary, M. (2020). The research audit trail: Methodological guidance for application in practice. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, *18*(2), 166–177. https://doi.org/10.34190/JBRM.18.2.008 https://academic-publishing.org/index.php/ejbrm/article/download/2033/1940

Cardno, C. (2018). Policy document analysis: A practical educational leadership tool and a qualitative research method. *Educational Administration: Theory & Practice*, *24*(4), 623–640.
https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1305631.pdf
https://www.researchbank.ac.nz/bitstreams/d7e36975-d98c-42a2-8f9d-48b6b5323cd0/download

Chua, W. F., Dai, N. T., Tan, Z. S., & Yu, L. (2024). Researching the accounting-state-market dynamic in China: A literature review and research agenda. *The British Accounting Review*, 101444.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2024.101444
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0890838924002087

Coker, D. C. (2023). An integrative qualitative framework: Improving research through strategic mapping. *Online Submission*, *11*(1), 66-109.
https://doi.org/10.5296/ire.v11i1.20921
https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED633598.pdf

Denny, E., & Weckesser, A. (2022). How to do qualitative research? Qualitative research methods. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology*, *129*(7), 1166–1167.
https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0528.17150
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9322519/

Donkoh, S., & Mensah, J. (2023). Application of triangulation in qualitative research. *Journal of Applied Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, *10*(1), 6-9.
https://www.academia.edu/download/98007485/JABB_10_00319.pdf
https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Application-of-triangulation-in-qualitative-Donkoh/a70f29295739a9b4a7eedbbdeb47bf246391a4f0

Drnevich, P. L., Mahoney, J. T., & Schendel, D. (2020). Has strategic management research lost its way? *Strategic Management Review*, *1*(1), 35-73.
https://josephmahoney.web.illinois.edu/BADM504_Fall%202019/Drnevich%20Mahoney%20Schendel%20SMR%202020.pdf
https://strategicmanagementreview.net/assets/articles/Drnevich,%20Mahoney,%20and%20Schendel.pdf

Emon, M. M. H. (2024). Research approach: A comparative analysis of quantitative and qualitative methodologies in social science research.
https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202412.1128/download/final_file
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387149450_Research_Approach_A_Comparative_Analysis_of_Quantitative_and_Qualitative_Methodologies_in_Social_Science_Research

Enang, E. S., Zhang, Y., & Sminia, H. (2024). How stories make strategy: Top management and middle managers' storytelling performances. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2024, No. 1). Academy of Management.
https://livrepository.liverpool.ac.uk/3183750/1/12010.pdf
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382783313_How_Stories_Make_Strategy_Top_Management_and_Middle_Managers'_Storytelling_Performances

Eom, S. J., & Lee, J. (2022). Digital government transformation in turbulent times: Responses, challenges, and future direction. *Government Information Quarterly*, *39*(2), 101690.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2022.101690
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8914696/pdf/main.pdf

Eveborn, M., Rejare, M., & Svensson, A. (2024). *Evaluating the impact of M&A capabilities on strategic decision-making for internationalization: a case study of a Swedish SaaS platform firm*. Lund University Libraries.
https://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId=9159598&fileOId=9159600

Fasey, K. J., Sarkar, M., Wagstaff, C. R., & Johnston, J. (2022). Understanding organizational resilience in elite sport: An exploration of psychosocial processes. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *62*, 102236. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2022.102236
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1469029222001042

George, A. S. (2024). The symbiotic relationship between visionary and pragmatic leadership in propelling organizational success. *Partners Universal International Innovation Journal*, *2*(3), 57-79.
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11411388
https://puiij.com/index.php/research/article/download/139/110

Hanson-DeFusco, J. (2023). What data counts in policymaking and programming evaluation–Relevant data sources for triangulation according to main epistemologies and philosophies within social science. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *97*, 102238.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2023.102238
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0149718923000150

Heller, M. (2023). Rethinking historical methods in organization studies: Organizational source criticism. *Organization Studies*, *44*(6), 987–1002. https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406231156978
https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/01708406231156978

Johnson, J. L., Adkins, D., & Chauvin, S. (2020). A review of the quality indicators of rigor in qualitative research. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *84*(1), 7120.
https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7120
https://www.ajpe.org/article/S0002-9459(23)01606-6/fulltext

Klumpes, P. J. M. (2025). Enterprise risk management adoption practices by US and European multinationals. *Accounting and Auditing*, *1*(1), 5.
https://doi.org/10.3390/accountaudit1010005
https://www.mdpi.com/3042-6618/1/1/5

Lainez, N., & Gardner, J. (2023). Algorithmic credit scoring in Vietnam: A legal proposal for maximizing benefits and minimizing risks. *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, *10*(3), 401-432.
http://doi:10.1017/als.2023.6
https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/332A14670E7C75746E1A3F9B6AD09E4F/S2052901523000062a.pdf/algorithmic-credit-scoring-in-vietnam-a-legal-proposal-for-maximizing-benefits-and-minimizing-risks.pdf

McClure, S., & Hons, B. A. (2022). *Institutional logics influence on organisational female career progression: A study of the British and German public sector* (Doctoral dissertation, Queen's University Belfast).
https://pureadmin.qub.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/289809200/McClure_PhD_Final.pdf

Michaels, D. (2018). A more effective and collaborative OSHA: A view from stakeholders. Retrieved from
https://democrats-edworkforce.house.gov/imo/media/doc/DMichaels%20Testimony_w.attachments2%2027%202018.pdf

Morgan, H. (2022). Conducting a qualitative document analysis. *The Qualitative Report, 27(*1), 64–77.
https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5044
http://hanimorgan.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Hani-Morgan-Conducting-a-Qualitative-Document-Analysis-1.pdf

Negrin, K. A., Slaughter, S. E., Dahlke, S., & Olson, J. (2022). Successful recruitment to qualitative research: A critical reflection. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *21*, 16094069221119576.
https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069221119576
https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/16094069221119576

Paparini, S., Papoutsi, C., Murdoch, J., Green, J., Petticrew, M., Greenhalgh, T., & Shaw, S. E. (2021). Evaluating complex interventions in context: Systematic, meta-narrative review of case study approaches. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *21*, 1-22.
https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-021-01418-3
https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1186/s12874-021-01418-3.pdf

Rashid, Y., Rashid, A., Warraich, M. A., Sabir, S. S., & Waseem, A. (2019). Case study method: A step-by-step guide for business researchers. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *18*, 1609406919862424.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919862424
https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1609406919862424

Rokade, V. (2024). Innovative strategies and applications in case study methodology-A Review. *AG Volumes*, 124–136.
https://agvolumes.com/Books-AG/index.php/AGvolumes/article/download/31/31

Sykes, M., Thomson, R., Kolehmainen, N., Allan, L., & Finch, T. (2021). Opportunities to enhance ward audit: A multi-site qualitative study. *BMC Health Services Research*, *21*, 1-12.
https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-06239-0
https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1186/s12913-021-06239-0.pdf

Taherdoost, H. (2021). Data collection methods and tools for research; a step-by-step guide to choose data collection technique for academic and business research projects. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management (IJARM)*, *10*(1), 10-38.
https://hal.science/hal-03741847v1/file/Data%20Collection%20Methods%20and%20Tools%20for%20Research%20.pdf
https://elvedit.com/journals/IJARM/wp-content/uploads/Data-Collection-Methods-and-Tools-for-Research.pdf

Taherdoost, H. (2022). What are different research approaches? Comprehensive review of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method research, their applications, types, and limitations. *Journal of Management Science & Engineering Research*, *5*(1), 53-63.
https://hal.science/hal-03741840/document
https://www.academia.edu/download/110534742/What_are_Different_Research_Approa.pdf

Takahashi, A. R. W., & Araujo, L. (2020). Case study research: Opening up research opportunities. *RAUSP Management Journal*, *55*, 100-111.
https://doi.org/10.1108/RAUSP-05-2019-0109
https://www.scielo.br/j/rmj/a/HsgJqXyP8yYcMnQMCcMb7Xt/

Thille, P., Chartrand, L., & Brown, C. (2022). Diary-interview studies: Longitudinal, flexible qualitative research design. *Family Practice*, *39*(5), 996-999.
https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/cmac039
https://www.academia.edu/download/113858769/cmac039.pdf

Tomaszewski, L. E., Zarestky, J., & Gonzalez, E. (2020). Planning qualitative research: Design and decision making for new researchers. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *19*, 1609406920967174.
https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406920967174
https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1609406920967174

Van der Merwe, S. E., Biggs, R., Preiser, R., Cunningham, C., Snowden, D. J., O'Brien, K., Jenal, M., Vosloo, M., Blignaut, S., & Goh, Z. (2019). Making sense of complexity: Using SenseMaker as a research tool. *Systems*, *7*(2), 25.
https://doi.org/10.3390/systems7020025
https://www.mdpi.com/2079-8954/7/2/25/pdf

Vivek, R. (2023). A comprehensive review of environmental triangulation in qualitative research: Methodologies, applications, and implications. *Journal of European Economy*, *22*(4), 517-532.
https://doi.org/10.35774/jee2023.04.517
http://jeej.wunu.edu.ua/index.php/enjee/article/download/1707/1688

Wæraas, A. (2022). Thematic analysis: Making values emerge from texts. In *Researching values: Methodological approaches for understanding values work in organisations and leadership* (pp. 153–170). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/53343/1/978-3-030-90769-3.pdf#page=163
https://scholar.archive.org/work/ve4dhmkq75bgboaj2f2tjfqw6q/access/wayback/http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/978-3-030-90769-3.pdf#page=163

Westbrook, J. P. (2024). *Queering Futures with Data-Driven Speculation: The design of an expanded mixed methods research framework integrating quantitative, qualitative, and practice-based modes* (Doctoral dissertation, DePaul University).
https://search.proquest.com/openview/2335c996d1afddcecf53d60bf03de176/1.pdf?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y