

Methodological Pluralism in Political Science: Causes and Levels

Khelalfa Hadjer¹

Abbes Laghrour Khenchela University (Algeria)
hadjer.khelalfa@univ-khenchela.dz

Idri Safia²

Larbi Ben M'hidi University - Oum El Bouaghi (Algeria)
idri.safia@univ-ueb.dz

Received: 21.02.2023

Accepted: 19.06.2023

Published: 01.07.2023

Abstract:

A substantial body of scholarship contends that the social sciences have not attained the same level of scientific rigor as the natural sciences, nor have they fully achieved the fundamental purpose of science, producing certain and verifiable knowledge, in the same manner. This remains true despite the increasing orientation of the social sciences, including political science, toward scientific methodologies. This gap is largely attributed to the proliferation of methodologies, theoretical perspectives, sources of information, and analytical tools employed in the study of political phenomena.

Accordingly, the issue of methodological pluralism in political science intersects with several core domains of the discipline. It emerges prominently within political research methodology, which focuses on the diverse approaches used to analyse political phenomena, and extends across various subfields of international relations such as comparative politics, security studies, and strategic studies.

Keywords: methodological pluralism; methodologies; theories; research methodology; methodological integration.

Introduction

A wide range of scholars and theorists assert that the social sciences do not enjoy the same scientific standing as the natural sciences, nor have they successfully achieved the essential goal of scientific inquiry—namely, the production of certain and validated

knowledge—to the same degree. This limitation persists despite the orientation of the social sciences, including political science, toward adopting scientific methods. The root of this challenge lies in the multiplicity of methodologies, theoretical frameworks, information sources, and analytical techniques used in the investigation of political phenomena.

The question of methodological pluralism in political science thus spans several major areas within the field. It arises first within political research methodology, which is primarily concerned with the study and evaluation of the various methodological approaches used to investigate political issues. It also permeates multiple subfields of international relations, particularly comparative politics, security studies, and strategic studies, among others.

1. Topic Importance

The scholarly importance of this topic stems from the need to understand how methodological pluralism can be effectively employed in the study of political phenomena. Given the persistent crisis concerning the identification of appropriate methodological frameworks for analysing political issues, it becomes crucial to examine how pluralism may address this challenge. Ultimately, the objective is to achieve what is termed *methodological integration* in political science—an integrative approach that itself emerges as a direct outcome of methodological pluralism.

2. Problem Statement

The diversity of methodologies, theoretical perspectives, and research tools applied to political phenomena has resulted in a methodological dilemma encapsulated in the dual question: “*How do we study, and with what means?*” Consequently, methodological pluralism has produced a genuine crisis within social research generally, and political research specifically. This study seeks to address the following central question:

“How can methodological pluralism be effectively employed in political science, and in what ways can it be beneficial?”

3. Hypotheses

1. The greater the researcher’s reliance on multiple methodologies when investigating a specific topic, the more likely it becomes to reach conclusions that are relatively certain and empirically supported.
2. The more complex the political phenomenon under study, the stronger the need for methodological pluralism as an analytical approach.

4. Study Structure

This article is structured around three major axes:

The first axis presents the conceptual framework of the study, examining the notions of *methodology*, *method*, and *theory*, since these three concepts constitute the fundamental analytical tools of political research.

The second axis explores the levels of methodological pluralism in political science by analysing, first, the underlying causes of pluralism in the field, and second, its various levels. It concludes by clarifying the relationships among these levels.

The third axis assesses the extent to which methodological pluralism is applied in contemporary research, highlighting both the perspectives that remain hesitant or critical of pluralism and those that consider it an indispensable necessity.

The article concludes with a synthesis of the major arguments presented and the most significant findings reached, while revisiting the central research question raised in the introduction.

I- Conceptual Framework:

When conducting research, it is necessary to begin by identifying the main concepts that will be used, defining them, eliminating any ambiguity surrounding them, and clarifying how each concept has developed. Concepts function as analytical keys that enable the researcher to examine the subject under investigation. This will be carried out through a discussion of three essential concepts: the concept of methodology, the concept of method, and the concept of theory.

1- The Concept of Methodology

Many researchers in the social sciences tend to confuse the concept of methodology with that of method, and some even consider the two synonymous, assuming they refer to the same meaning. However, the concept of methodology is entirely distinct from the concept of method, and the reverse is also true. This distinction is the focus of the following clarification concerning the meaning of methodology.

The term “methodology” in Arabic corresponds to *Méthodologie* in French, and the concept is composed of two elements: *Méthode*, meaning method, and *Logie*, meaning science.

¹Scruton, Roger, *A Dictionary of Political Thought*, The Macmillan Press, London, 1982, p. 297.

Accordingly, when the two terms are combined, methodology in its terminological sense refers to the science that takes the method itself as the object of study; it is, in essence, the science of methods. Thus, methodology represents the whole, which is broader and more comprehensive than the method, which constitutes only a part of the larger whole—namely, methodology.

This definition corresponds to the terminological dimension of methodology. As for its substantive meaning, it has generated disagreement: some consider methodology an art, whereas others view it as a science.²

Methodology as an art:

The idea of considering methodology an art emerges from approaching it as an organized and refined manner of presenting and arranging information in a way that renders it coherent and simple, thereby conveying the intended meaning clearly to the reader.

Methodology as a science:

Viewing methodology as a science becomes explicit in its very definition, which states that methodology is the science concerned with the study of methods. Moreover, attributing scientific character to any field requires the presence of both a method and a subject matter—conditions that are met in methodology as the science that studies methods. It thus encompasses both the method and the phenomena to which that method is applied.

Based on this clarification, methodology appears simultaneously as a science and an art. It consists of the set of methods and techniques that guide the preparation of research and direct it toward scientific procedure.³

2- The Concept of Method

The scientific method is the tool or procedure used by the researcher to study a particular phenomenon or to address a specific topic, with the primary aim of attaining certain scientific knowledge.

The concept of method has undergone considerable development across different historical periods, evolving notably with:

²Djendli, Abdel Nasser, *Techniques and Methods of Scientific Research in Political and Social Sciences*, University Publications Office, Algeria, 2010, 3rd ed., pp. 16–18.

³Maurice Angers, *Methodology of Scientific Research in the Humanities: Practical Exercises*, trans. Bouzid Sahraoui et al., Dar Al-Qasba Publishing, Algeria, 2006, 2nd ed., p. 98.

The Greeks:

The Greeks were the first to employ the term “method.” Its earliest use appears with Plato (427–347 BC), who defined it as synonymous with inquiry and as the knowledge attained by humans through their interaction with reality. Aristotle (384–322 BC), however, defined method as inquiry itself.

The Middle Ages:

Among the most prominent scholars who addressed the concept of method during this period were Ibn Khaldun (1332–1406), author of *Al-Muqaddimah*, and Ibn Taymiyyah, author of *Refutation of Logic*. During this era, the method was defined as: “a set of formulated rules upon which the researcher relies in order to reach scientific truth regarding a phenomenon.”⁴

The Modern Era:

The scientific method in its contemporary form emerged in the 17th century with the rise of modern science through notable thinkers such as Descartes, Bacon, William James, Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim, and Galileo (1564–1642), who is considered the first to propose hypotheses and subject them to experimentation. It was at this stage that the scientific method took its developed form.

One of the most significant modern definitions of method is that proposed by the philosophers of the “Bourbaki logic school,”⁵ who described it as: “the art of correctly organizing a sequence of numerous ideas in order to uncover the truth when we are ignorant of it, or to demonstrate it to others when we already know it.”⁶

Hamed Rabie defines method as: “the path of approaching the phenomenon, the course followed to reach a predetermined objective.”⁷

Professor Amer Qandilji similarly states: “The scientific method is the path leading to the discovery of truth in the various sciences through a set of general rules that govern the

⁴Djendli, Abdel Nasser, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

⁵Larami, A. & Fali, B., *Research in Communication: Methodological Elements*, translated by a group of professors, revised by Foudhil Deliou, Laboratory of Sociology of Communication, Algeria, 2009, p. 50.

⁶Jandali, Abdel Nasser, *ibid.*, p. 13.

⁷Shalabi, Mohammed, *Methodology in Political Analysis: Concepts, Methods, Approaches, and Tools*, Dar Houma, Algeria, 2007, 5th ed., p. 12.

course of reasoning and guide it practically until it reaches an acceptable and known result.”⁸

From the above, an operational definition of method may be derived as the scientific procedure adopted by the researcher in studying a particular phenomenon through defined steps aimed at attaining certain knowledge.

3- The Concept of Theory

Theory is one of the most intricate and complex concepts. In French, it refers to *La Vision*, and in English, it corresponds to *The Sight*. The definitions provided for theory vary according to scholars’ perspectives and orientations. Some relate theory to the functions it performs in studying a particular subject, while others restrict it to a tool that organizes concepts and information for the purpose of analysing a given phenomenon. ⁹Several notable definitions include the following:

Zetterberg defines theory as “a set of hypotheses resembling laws and interconnected in an organized manner.”¹⁰ Monte Palmer states: “If a hypothesis is an unverified assertion about the existence of a relationship between two or more variables, then a theory is a verified empirical assertion of such a relationship. The moment a theory becomes empirically testable, several assumptions can be derived from it.”¹¹ Graham C. Kinloch defines it as “a set of abstract assumptions and logical relationships that attempt to explain and interpret how a particular phenomenon occurs.”¹²

Fillipe Braillard, in his book *Théories des relations internationales*, defines theory as “a conceptual framework that enables the organization of research and the formulation of hypotheses that clarify the studied phenomena.”¹³

⁸Qandilji, Amer, *Scientific Research and the Use of Traditional and Electronic Sources of Information*, Al-Yazouri Scientific Publishing, Jordan, 2008, 1st ed., p. 40.

⁹Djendli, Abdel Nasser, *Theorizing in International Relations Between Interpretive Approaches and Constructive Theories*, Al-Khuldounia Publishing, Algeria, 2007, 1st ed., p. 17.

¹⁰Aref, Nasr Mohammed, *Epistemology of Comparative Politics: The Cognitive Model, Theory, Method*, Majd University Foundation, Lebanon, 2002, p. 72.

¹¹Shalabi, Mohammed, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

¹²Kinloch, Graham C., *Sociological Theory: Its Development and Major Paradigms*, Hill Book Company, New York, 1977, p. 4.

¹³Jandali, Abdel Nasser, *Theorizing in International Relations...*, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

Despite the diversity of definitions and perspectives concerning theory, the following operational definition may be formulated: theory is a conceptual framework that directs research toward more productive fields and enables explanation within a broader and clearer context.

After establishing the relationship between methodology and method—where it was concluded that the relationship is one of whole to part, meaning that methodology is the whole that studies its part, the method—the relationship between method and theory may now be identified.

Both method and theory serve to organize information. If theory functions as a guiding framework for method, then method contributes to the development of theory, the verification of its validity, or its reformulation to correspond to new realities and to become more capable of explanation, interpretation, and prediction.

II- Levels of Methodological Pluralism in Political Science

The issue of methodological pluralism (The Methodology of Triangulation) in the social sciences in general, and political science in particular, emerged in Western societies during the 1970s as a result of the nature of the social phenomenon in general—and the political phenomenon in particular—as constantly changing and highly complex. Methodological pluralism is grounded in a philosophy inspired by the well-known Western saying: “No one of us is as strong as all of us.” In the social sciences, it consists of five basic types:

- 1- Multiplicity of methods.
- 2- Multiplicity of theories.
- 3- Multiplicity of observers.
- 4- Multiplicity of data collection tools.
- 5- Multiplicity of data sources.

In this research, the focus is placed on two main levels of methodological pluralism: pluralism at the level of methods, and pluralism at the level of theories. As for the remaining levels, they may be summarized as follows:¹⁴

Plurality of observers as a level of methodological pluralism:

¹⁴Al-Damigh, Sami ben Abdulaziz, "Methodological Pluralism: Its Types and Suitability for the Social Sciences", King Saud University. Accessed 14/11/2020 from: www.forum.stop55.com/302610.html

This level is based on the assumption that relying on a single observer to observe a phenomenon or behaviour—or to live within and observe a particular society—renders the process more prone to error and bias than relying on a group of observers. The multiplicity of observers provides greater credibility and reduces errors in the collected data, ultimately producing knowledge of social reality that is more precise, more accurate, and more reflective of actual conditions.

Plurality of data collection tools as a level of methodological pluralism:

This type takes two main forms:

A—Plurality of data collection tools:

Plurality in the use of more than one tool for data collection appears, for example, when the researcher employs observation and a questionnaire, or observation and interviews, and similar combinations. This type of methodological pluralism is based on the assumption that the weaknesses of one tool constitute the strengths of another. Accordingly, using multiple tools in research helps overcome the limitations inherent in each individual tool.

For instance, the interview is a data collection tool that enables the researcher to obtain precise information about the phenomenon under examination. However, its disadvantages include the absence of anonymity and confidentiality for the researcher, the potential for bias, and the possibility that certain topics may cause embarrassment for the researcher.

B—Plurality within the tool itself:

This refers to the use of more than one measure within the same tool. For example, the researcher may incorporate three different scales into a single questionnaire, particularly when the phenomenon under study is multidimensional.

Plurality of data sources as a level of methodological pluralism:

This type is based on the idea that relying on only one data source significantly restricts the researcher and results in findings of limited credibility. In contrast, using multiple sources produces more credible results. Moreover, avoiding reliance on a single source enables access to multiple components of the truth related to the studied phenomenon.

This is a brief presentation of the remaining three levels of methodological pluralism. What follows is an emphasis on the reasons that led to the emergence of this pluralism, along with clarification and analysis of the level of methods and the level of theories in methodological pluralism.

1- Reasons for Methodological Pluralism

The issue of methodological pluralism in political science has generated a major crisis in the social sciences in general and political science in particular. This pluralism may be attributed to several reasons summarized as follows:

A—The complexity of research topics in the social sciences:

Producing generalizations in the social sciences is extremely difficult—unlike in the natural sciences—due to the interaction of numerous factors and variables that cannot be isolated from one another when explaining social and human phenomena. This makes reaching generalized conclusions a challenging task.

B—The loss of objective scientific spirit:¹⁵

Every researcher must approach their subject with objectivity. However, achieving this is highly difficult because the researcher is part of the phenomenon being studied in political science. This contrasts with the natural sciences, where the researcher is entirely independent from the phenomenon under examination.

To address this problem, the French sociologist Émile Durkheim proposed studying the social phenomenon as if it were a material object—what he referred to as “social facts” or *la chose sociale*.

C—The scientific method itself:

Each method is the product of a particular historical era and intellectual context. What applied to the Greeks did not necessarily apply to the Romans, and so forth.

D—Interaction between the observing researcher and individuals in the study of the phenomenon:¹⁶

The presence of the researcher may influence the behaviour of the subjects being studied. This may occur due to trust, familiarity, or even friendship between the researcher and the participants, resulting in information that reflects the researcher’s orientation rather than that of the phenomenon under examination.

E—The diversification of political science subfields:¹⁷

¹⁵Djendli, Abdel Nasser, *Techniques and Methods...*, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

¹⁶Al-Hamadani, Mowaffaq et al., *Scientific Research Methods: Fundamentals of Scientific Research*, supervised by Saeed Al-Tell, Al-Warrak Publishing, Jordan, 2006, 1st ed., p. 42.

Political science encompasses a wide range of areas, including political history, geopolitics, political economy, international law, and others. This diversity necessitates the use of multiple methods. For example, international law requires the legal method, political history demands the historical method, and political economy relies on the Marxist method, among others.

F—The multiplicity of social science branches:

The social sciences encompass many disciplines—political science, history, economics, sociology, and others. Despite their shared social nature, each discipline is characterized by one or more specific methodologies that distinguish it from the others.

G—Measurement problems and difficulties in control:¹⁸

Measurement tools in the social sciences are less precise than those used for natural phenomena. The complexity of social phenomena also makes it difficult for the researcher to control or manipulate the influencing variables.

H—The multiplicity of aspects of political and social phenomena:¹⁹

The multidimensional nature of the phenomenon obliges the researcher to rely on a combination of methods within what is known as methodological integration.

For example, studying elections requires the use of several methods:

- the inductive method to examine candidates in the electoral process,
- the historical method to understand previous electoral outcomes,
- the comparative method to compare the past and present of the electoral process in order to predict its future,
- and the statistical method to measure public opinion trends, political participation, and electoral results.

By relying on these four methods together, methodological integration is achieved.

2- Method as a Level of Methodological Pluralism

¹⁷Djendli, Abdel Nasser, *ibid.*, p. 125.

¹⁸Al-Hamadani, Mowaffaq et al., *op. cit.*, pp. 42–43.

¹⁹Djendli, Abdel Nasser, *Techniques and Methods...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 126–127.

The thesis of a single-method approach has been subjected to extensive criticism, particularly by the philosopher and researcher Feyerabend, who emphasized that science has not been—and will never be—governed by a rigid system of absolute principles. History provides numerous examples: the most successful scientific discoveries were not the result of a single method, and had the dominant scientific rules of the time been strictly applied, none of the major scientific revolutions would have occurred. Science would have remained stagnant at a fixed point.²⁰

Analysis at the level of method leads to the examination of two types of methods: the ideal philosophical method and the scientific empirical method.

A—The Philosophical Speculative Method

This method is based on examining the phenomenon from the perspective of what ought to be, rather than what exists in reality. It relies on ideas and beliefs formulated as axioms and assumptions to derive what is considered the best possible organization of life in society. This method was used by many thinkers from the Greeks to the Middle Ages as follows:²¹

In the Greek era, it was employed by both Plato and Aristotle. Plato presented the best conception of life in the city-state through the deductive method in his writings. Aristotle attempted to apply his inductive method—based on sensory perception and observation—to the city-state and its system of governance, yet ultimately fell into the trap of excessive philosophical abstraction.

In the Roman era, Marcus Tullius Cicero adopted the same approach as the Greeks. His contribution lay in his ability to analyze the ideas of Plato and Aristotle and, most importantly, in emphasizing the role of law in defining the state. For Cicero, the state is the legal organization of the political community.

Saint Augustine is considered the most influential thinker of the Middle Ages to adopt the philosophical method. Influenced by Plato's deductive approach, Augustine's ideas are clearly reflected in his work *The City of God*, where he argued that the ideal state can only be realized through a Christian state governed by the teachings of the Church—not through the application of law or constitutional provisions. For Augustine, the state is a moral instrument intended to restrain the wicked.

²⁰Aref, Nasr Mohammed, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

²¹Djendli, Abdel Nasser, *Techniques and Methods...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 127–129.

The influence of the ideal philosophical method continued into the modern era, particularly in the 19th century with the German thinker Hegel in his studies on the state, freedom, and dialectics.

The continuity of the speculative method until modern times can be explained by the fact that all sciences were taught within the framework of philosophy—then known as the “mother of sciences”—which represented the essence of scientific inquiry.²² The philosophical ideal method includes the following: the deductive method, the inductive method, the historical method, the legal method, and the descriptive method.

B- The Scientific Realist Method²³

The scientific empirical method emerged in the Middle Ages with Ibn Khaldun, author of *Al-Muqaddimah*, and Ibn Taymiyyah, author of *Refutation of Logic*. They laid the foundations for the experimental revolution in the social sciences, which later materialized through the work of scholars such as Niccolò Machiavelli, who emphasized empirical induction in studying the absolute power of the king in relation to the Church. Jean Bodin likewise relied on the empirical method in his various analyses.

Francis Bacon authored *Novum Organum* in 1620, through which he attempted to identify the characteristics of the scientific method—specifically the inductive experimental method—and the way it may be applied to political phenomena. The use of the empirical method reached its peak with Montesquieu in *The Spirit of the Laws* (1734), where he examined the principle of the separation of powers as implemented in the French system.

The method gained even broader application with Karl Marx in the second half of the 19th century, as he focused on material reality and developed a dialectical scientific approach grounded in dialectical materialism and historical materialism. The scientific empirical method includes many sub-methods, such as the comparative method, the Marxist method, the statistical method, the functional method, and the experimental method.

3- Theory as a Level of Methodological Pluralism

The social sciences in general, and political science in particular, encompass a wide range of theories that differ in their focus, their method of construction (whether inductive or

²²Djendli, Abdel Nasser, *ibid.*, p. 133.

²³Djendli, Abdel Nasser, *ibid.*, pp. 129–132.

deductive), and the degree to which their hypotheses are empirically verified. Despite this broad array of theories, there is no single theory universally accepted by all specialists in any branch of political science. Each theory approaches the phenomenon from a specific perspective linked to its own analytical framework. Consequently, relying on one particular theory to explain a phenomenon significantly restricts the researcher's perspective and reduces the credibility of the explanation, while also generating doubt regarding the results reached.²⁴

For example, in the field of international relations, when studying security, the researcher encounters multiple theories—each addressing security from a perspective consistent with its assumptions and foundations. In international relations, three major theories compete: realism, idealism, and behavioralism.

A—Realist Theory:

Realism assigns a material, power-centered character to international relations. It views international relations as a struggle for power and considers the survival of the state as its highest interest. This is highlighted by leading proponents of realism, foremost among them Hans Morgenthau. Realism emerged as a reaction to the optimistic idealist approach represented by idealist theory.²⁵

B—Idealist Theory:

Known as the optimistic school in international relations, idealism views international relations positively, asserting that peace is attainable despite the anarchic nature of the international system. Thinkers such as Emmanuel Kant and Jeremy Bentham were leading figures of this school. Both rejected the brutality of international relations—what Kant termed “the state of savagery,” which lacks any legal order—and called for the establishment of a global government governed by the rules of international law.²⁶ For this reason, idealist theory relied on the legal method in analysing and understanding international reality.

C—Behavioral Theory:

²⁴Al-Damigh, Sami ben Abdulaziz, *op. cit.*

²⁵Djendli, Abdel Nasser, *Techniques and Methods...*, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

²⁶Baylis, John & Smith, Steve, *The Globalization of World Politics*, trans. Gulf Research Center, UAE, 2004, 1st ed., p. 321.

Behavioralism emerged as a direct result of the modern scientific and technological revolution. Its early foundations are associated with Graham Wallace in his book *Human Nature in Politics*, where he examined the deficiencies of politics in human nature. Arthur Bentley also contributed through *The Process of Government*, which addressed how governance is conducted through the environmental interaction of internal variables and their effects on external variables and on the psychological environment of decision-making units.

Behavioralism developed further with the American school, particularly through Charles Merriam in his 1925 book *New Aspects of Politics*, where he called for establishing a psychological perspective centered on the human being. Thus, behavioralism emphasized the importance of the individual, the role of psychological factors, and relied on statistical and quantitative methods using newly developed tools and approaches in political analysis.²⁷

From the discussion of the levels of methodological pluralism in political science, it becomes clear that methodological pluralism at both the level of method and the level of theory constitutes two essential entry points for understanding the issue of methodological pluralism.

III- Methodological Pluralism Between Reality and Abstraction

Methodological pluralism has become an established reality in many sciences. However, despite its recognition throughout much of the literature, certain researchers still avoid or limit its use in their studies, forming the first trend that calls for restricting the use of multiple methods or theories due to what they describe as the disadvantages of methodological pluralism.

In contrast, the second trend—completely opposite to the first—argues that employing methodological pluralism in studies and research greatly benefits both the research and the researcher.

1- Advantages of Employing Methodological Pluralism

Many researchers consider the use of methodological pluralism in studies and research to be beneficial for several reasons:

- _ Methodological pluralism reduces the likelihood of error when conducting any research.

²⁷Djendli, Abdel Nasser, *Theorizing in International Relations...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 275–277.

- _ It increases the credibility of the results reached due to relying on more than one observer, which prevents bias or the emergence of uncertain findings.
- _ It achieves objectivity, which is the primary aim sought by the social sciences.
- _ Interpreting and explaining data through more than one theory enhances the accuracy and soundness of research findings.²⁸
- _ Methodological pluralism helps overcome the shortcomings inherent in each method or theory, as every method possesses strengths and weaknesses.
- _ It is a methodological necessity for achieving methodological integration by combining quantitative and qualitative approaches.²⁹
- _ It assists in understanding a specific topic by examining it from different angles and perspectives. For example, understanding security may require analysing it through both realist and liberal theories.

From the above, methodological pluralism appears as a methodological necessity that helps overcome the crisis of determining the most appropriate method to follow in order to reach more reliable results.

2- Disadvantages of Employing Methodological Pluralism

Other researchers consider methodological pluralism more of a burden than a benefit. They therefore refrain from using it in their studies for the following reasons:

- _ Relying on more than one method to study a specific phenomenon may lead to difficulties in controlling the subject and forming an integrated picture of the phenomenon, and may even result in contradictory findings.³⁰
- _ Employing methodological pluralism requires significant time and effort, making it unsuitable for all researchers. Its application remains dependent on the researcher's willingness to reach precise and realistic results.
- _ Methodological pluralism necessitates the use of methods, theories, and analytical tools, which requires financial resources. This is often incompatible with studies that have limited budgets, particularly in developing and Arab countries, unlike developed countries such as the United States, Britain, and Germany, where scientific research receives substantial financial support.

²⁸Al-Damigh, Sami ben Abdulaziz, *ibid*.

²⁹Djendli, Abdel Nasser, *Techniques and Methods...*, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

³⁰Al-Damigh, Sami bin Abdulaziz, *ibid*.

- _ Using multiple methods in research may lead to answers to different research questions due to combining quantitative and qualitative methods, which does not always serve the researcher's objectives.³¹
- _ The plurality of observers may result in disagreement among them regarding what they observe, as each observer interacts with the studied phenomenon differently.

From what has been presented, some researchers view methodological pluralism as a methodological necessity that facilitates dealing with the studied phenomenon and increases the credibility of the results obtained. Meanwhile, another group considers methodological pluralism to have more disadvantages than advantages, mainly due to difficulties in controlling the study and the risk of reaching conflicting results.

Conclusion:

After examining the essence of methodological pluralism and discussing the various issues related to it, several conclusions may be drawn:

Employing methodological pluralism eliminates the shortcomings that arise when using only one method or one theory. Using any of them in isolation leads to deficiencies and weaknesses in the overall study and in the results obtained. This is due to the fact that the aim of any researcher in the social sciences in general, and political science in particular, is to reach social truth—what is known as Social Reality.

Furthermore, the multiplicity of methodological levels in political science helps facilitate dealing with the studied phenomenon, making the study more systematic and organized while allowing for a deeper understanding of its various dimensions.

Although some researchers consider methodological pluralism a burden rather than a benefit, their view represents only part of the broader academic perspective, which sees methodological pluralism as a methodological necessity. It is also an advantage that has elevated scientific research in the social sciences to higher levels through the use of new and diverse tools and techniques, enabling researchers to address the social—and particularly political—phenomenon from all its methodological and epistemological dimensions.

It is also important to note that methodological pluralism in political science has become an inevitable necessity, especially given the complexity of contemporary political

³¹Ibid.

phenomena such as irregular migration, securitization, and peacebuilding in post-conflict societies.

Therefore, employing methodological pluralism in studies and research benefits both the research and the researcher. It is the key to achieving methodological integration, which is itself essential for reaching the primary goal: attaining knowledge that is relatively certain.

Finally, some recommendations for the conference may be stated as follows:

- _ Organizing a second international conference on the various methodological issues that characterize the social sciences.
- _ Publishing the conference proceedings in a scientific book so that all may benefit.

References and Sources:

First: In Arabic

1– Books:

- 1- Al-Hamadani, Mowaffaq et al. *Scientific Research Methods: Fundamentals of Scientific Research*, supervised by: Saeed Al-Tell, Al-Warrak Publishing and Distribution, Jordan, 2006, First Edition.
- 2- Angers, Maurice. *Methodology of Scientific Research in the Humanities: Practical Exercises*, translated by: Sahraoui Bouzid et al., Dar Al-Qasba Publishing, Algeria, 2008.
- 3- Aref, Nasr Mohammed. *Epistemology of Comparative Politics: The Cognitive Model, Theory, Method*, Majd University Foundation for Studies, Publishing and Distribution, Lebanon, 2002.
- 4- Baylis, John and Smith, Steve. *The Globalization of World Politics*, translated by: Gulf Research Center, United Arab Emirates: Gulf Research Center, 2004, First Edition.
- 5- C. Kinloch, Graham. *Sociological Theory: Its Development and Major Paradigms*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.
- 6- Djendli, Abdel Nasser. *Theorizing in International Relations Between Interpretive Approaches and Constructive Theories*, Al-Khuldounia Publishing and Distribution, Algeria, 2007, First Edition.
- 7- Larami, A. and Fali, B. *Research in Communication: Methodological Elements*, translated by a group of professors, revised and edited by: Daliou Fadhel,

Laboratory of Sociology of Communication, Mentouri University of Constantine, Algeria, 2009.

- 8- Qandilji, Amer. *Scientific Research and the Use of Traditional and Electronic Information Sources*, Al-Yazouri Scientific Publishing and Distribution, Jordan, 2009.
- 9- Scruton, Roger. *A Dictionary of Political Thought*, London: The Macmillan Press, 1982.
- 10-Shalabi, Mohammed. *Methodology in Political Analysis: Concepts, Methods, Approaches, and Tools*, Dar Houma, Algeria, 2007, Fifth Edition.
- 11-*Techniques and Methods of Scientific Research in Political and Social Sciences*, University Publications Office, Algeria, 2010, Third Edition.