

Editorial

Evolving Challenges in Modern Qualitative Research

Snur Othman* *Scientific Affairs Department, Smart Health Tower, Madam Mitterrand Street, Sulaymaniyah, Iraq*** Corresponding author: snurothmamns@gmail.com (S. Othman). Doctor City, Building 11, Apartment 50, Zip code: 46001, Sulaymaniyah, Iraq*

Received: October 1, 2025
Revised: October 7, 2025
Accepted: October 15, 2025
First Published: October 20, 2025

Copyright: © 2025 Othman. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Citation: Othman S. Evolving Challenges in Modern Qualitative Research. Barw Medical Journal. 2026;4(1):1-2.
<https://doi.org/10.58742/bmj.v4i1.210>

Qualitative research works at revealing the depth of human experiences, cultural nuances, and complex social dynamics, yet it confronts formidable challenges including pervasive researcher subjectivity, methodological inconsistencies, ethical intricacies, resource burdens, data management overload, and struggles with establishing rigor and transferability that often invite skepticism from quantitative paradigms. These obstacles not only complicate the research process but also threaten the perceived validity and broader applicability of findings in fields like health, education, and social sciences. Addressing them requires deliberate strategies to fortify qualitative inquiry's contributions to knowledge [1].

Subjectivity and Researcher Bias

The interpretive essence of qualitative research inherently invites researcher bias, as personal worldviews, cultural backgrounds, and preconceptions influence every stage from question formulation to data interpretation. For example, during thematic analysis of interviews, a researcher's emphasis on certain participant quotes might overlook contradictory evidence, leading to unbalanced narratives. Mitigation strategies like reflexivity where researchers explicitly document their influences and triangulation, cross-verifying data from multiple sources, prove essential, though full elimination of subjectivity remains impractical in this paradigm [2].

Methodological Design and Rigor Hurdles

Crafting a robust qualitative design demands precise alignment between philosophical underpinnings, research questions, and methods such as phenomenology, grounded theory, or discourse analysis, yet mismatches frequently occur due to insufficient expertise. Determining data saturation when new data yields no fresh insights relies on subjective judgment, complicating claims of completeness, while ensuring transferability to other contexts necessitates detailed "thick descriptions" of participants and settings. In health research, these issues amplify without clear audit trails, prompting calls for standardized rigor criteria akin to quantitative benchmarks [3].

Data Collection and Management Complexities

Gathering qualitative data through prolonged interviews, focus groups, or ethnographies generates vast, unstructured volumes of transcripts, field notes, and multimedia that overwhelm storage, organization, and preliminary sorting. Logistical barriers, like recruiting hard-to-reach participants or adapting to virtual formats, further delay progress, while ensuring consistency across sessions proves elusive without rigid protocols. Digital tools offer relief for transcription and initial coding, but they demand technical proficiency and risk diluting contextual richness if misapplied [1-4].

Analysis and Interpretation Demands

Transforming raw qualitative data into coherent themes involves iterative coding, pattern identification, and narrative synthesis, a labor-intensive process prone to interpretive drift among team members. Balancing depth with transparency challenges researchers, especially when handling ambiguous or contradictory data, and emerging AI aids accelerate this but introduce concerns over algorithmic bias eroding human insight. Peer debriefing, inter-coder reliability checks, and software like NVivo enhance trustworthiness, yet the time investment often months strains projects and underscores the need for advanced training [4].

Ethical, Practical, and Interdisciplinary Tensions

Ethical navigation intensifies in qualitative work due to intimate participant interactions, raising issues like securing ongoing consent, safeguarding anonymity in sensitive topics, and managing power imbalances with vulnerable groups. Practical constraints, including high costs for fieldwork and participant fatigue, compound these, while interdisciplinary skepticism particularly from STEM fields questions replicability and generalizability. Mixed-methods integration and decolonial approaches that center marginalized voices offer bridges, but they require institutional support and evolved review board processes [5].

Emerging Trends and Solutions

Technological innovations like AI-driven analysis and big data integration promise efficiency, yet they challenge traditional methodological purity and amplify ethical risks around data privacy. Postqualitative and indigenous methodologies push boundaries by rejecting linear processes, fostering inclusivity amid globalization. Researchers advance by prioritizing comprehensive training, open-access protocols for auditability, and collaborative networks to elevate qualitative work's stature and impact.

Conflicts of interest: The author has no conflicts of interest to disclose.

References

1. Stewart-Withers, R., Banks, G., McGregor, A., & Meo-Sewabu, L. (2014). Qualitative research. In R. Scheyvens (Ed.) *Qualitative research* (pp. 59-80). SAGE Publications, Ltd, [doi:10.4135/9781473921801.n4](https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473921801.n4)
2. Mruck K, Breuer F. Subjectivity and reflexivity in qualitative research—A new FQS issue. *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung*. 2003;189-212. [doi:stable/20758011](https://doi.org/stable/20758011)
3. Khankeh Hamidreza, Ranjbar Maryam, Khorasani-Zavareh Davoud, Zargham-Boroujeni Ali, Johansson Eva. Challenges in conducting qualitative research in health: A conceptual paper. *Iranian Journal of Nursing and Midwifery Research* 20(6):p 635-641, 2015. [doi:10.4103/1735-9066.170010](https://doi.org/10.4103/1735-9066.170010)
4. Malterud K. Qualitative research: standards, challenges, and guidelines. *The lancet*. 2001;358(9280):483-8. [doi:10.1016/S0140-6736\(01\)05627-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(01)05627-6)
5. Dickson-Swift V, James EL, Kippen S, Liamputtong P. Doing sensitive research: what challenges do qualitative researchers face?. *Qualitative research*. 2007;7(3):327-53 [doi:10.1177/1468794107078515](https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794107078515)