Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

Mixed Methods Research Design: Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches in Social Science Inquiry

[1]Dr. Syed Usman Shahid
[2]Dr. Taha Shabbir
[3]Meritorious Prof. (Retd) Dr. Nasreen Aslam Shah
[*1]PhD Scholar, Hamdard University Karachi
[2]Associate Professor, Hamdard University Karachi
[3]Department of Social Work, Ex-Dean Faculty of Arts and Social Science, Ex-Director Centre of Excellence For Women Studies, University of Karachi

Article Details:`

Received on 18 May, 2026
Accepted on 18 June, 2026
Published on 20 June, 2026

Corresponding Authors*:

Abstract

Mixed methods research (MMR) has emerged over the past four decades as a distinct and increasingly influential methodological paradigm in the social, health, educational, and applied sciences, offering researchers a systematic framework for integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches within a single study or coordinated program of inquiry. This paper provides a comprehensive, critically informed, and practically oriented methodological review of mixed methods research design, tracing its intellectual development from Campbell and Fiske's (1959) multi-trait multi-method matrix and Denzin's (1978) triangulation typology through the paradigm debates of the 1980s, the emergence of formal design typologies in the 1990s, and the consolidation of MMR as a third methodological paradigm by Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) and Creswell and Plano Clark (2007, 2018). The paper systematically addresses the philosophical foundations of MMR across pragmatism, dialectical pluralism, transformative, and critical realist positions; a comprehensive typology of six major designs explanatory sequential, exploratory sequential, convergent parallel, embedded, transformative, and multiphase with their notation conventions, priority structures, and appropriate research contexts; the critical concept of integration and its four principal strategies; quality criteria specific to mixed methods including legitimation, inference quality, and integration rigour; ethical challenges involving dual-consent, community participation, and reporting obligations; disciplinary applications across health, education, policy, and media research; and a systematic comparison with mono-method qualitative and quantitative approaches. Six structured tables consolidate historical, typological, procedural, philosophical, comparative, and quality information. Recent developments including complexity-adaptive designs, participatory MMR, the use of natural language processing and machine learning as analytical strands within mixed methods frameworks, and the emerging field of mixed methods synthesis are addressed critically. The paper argues that MMR's most important contribution to social science inquiry is not the mere combination of data types but the capacity for meta-inference: the production of conclusions that transcend what either strand alone could produce and that are grounded simultaneously in the breadth of quantitative evidence and the depth of qualitative understanding.

Keywords: Mixed methods research, research design, qualitative research, quantitative research, triangulation, integration, pragmatism, sequential design, convergent design, meta-inference

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

Introduction

Research questions in the social sciences are rarely simple enough to be fully answered by a single method. A survey can tell us how many people hold a particular attitude, how that attitude varies across demographic groups, and how strongly it predicts a particular behaviour but it cannot tell us why they hold it, how they understand it in the context of their own lives, or what it means to them in ways they would not reduce to a five-point scale. A qualitative interview can illuminate those meanings with extraordinary depth and specificity but it cannot tell us how widely they are distributed, whether they predict outcomes of practical importance, or whether the patterns identified in a small purposive sample hold across a diverse population. Mixed methods research (MMR) exists precisely to bridge this explanatory gap: to produce knowledge that is simultaneously broad and deep, statistically grounded and interpretively rich, generalisable in principle and contextually specific in practice.

This ambition is not new. Social scientists have combined qualitative and quantitative data since the early days of empirical inquiry, and the practice of using one method to check, extend, or contextualize another has been a feature of the most influential social science research throughout the twentieth century. What is relatively new is the formalization of MMR as a distinct methodological paradigm with its own design logic, philosophical foundations, quality criteria, and reporting standards a development that began in earnest with the paradigm debates of the 1980s and was consolidated by the landmark handbooks of Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) and Creswell and Plano Clark (2007, 2018).

This paper aims to provide a comprehensive methodological review of mixed methods research design that serves both researchers planning their first MMR study and experienced methodologists seeking a systematic synthesis of the current state of the art. It traces the method's intellectual history, examines all major design variants and their philosophical underpinnings, provides detailed guidance on the critical challenge of integration, addresses quality criteria and common design errors, reviews disciplinary applications, and assesses the most significant recent developments including participatory and complexity-adaptive designs, the integration of NLP and machine learning as quantitative strands, and the emerging literature on mixed methods research synthesis.

Historical Background and Intellectual Development

The intellectual history of mixed methods research is most accurately characterized as a series of paradigmatic shifts driven by the perceived inadequacy of purely monomethod approaches to the complexity of social phenomena. Understanding this history matters for contemporary MMR practice because many of the design choices researchers face today about priority, sequence, integration, and philosophical grounding were first framed and debated in the foundational literature of the 1970s through the 1990s.

The Triangulation Origins: Campbell, Fiske, and Denzin

The conceptual ancestor of contemporary MMR is the multi-trait multi-method (MTMM) matrix proposed by Campbell and Fiske (1959) in the context of psychological measurement validity. Their argument was methodological rather than philosophical: that the validity of a psychological construct could only be established if the same construct, measured by different methods, produced convergent results and if different constructs, measured by the same method, produced discriminant results. This introduced the logic of

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

methodological triangulation using multiple methods to converge on a more reliable estimate of reality into the social science vocabulary, though Campbell and Fiske's application was entirely within the quantitative tradition.

Denzin (1978) radically extended this logic in Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook, identifying four types of triangulation data triangulation (multiple data sources), investigator triangulation (multiple researchers), theory triangulation (multiple theoretical frameworks), and methodological triangulation (multiple methods). Methodological triangulation, in Denzin's formulation, could combine multiple qualitative methods, multiple quantitative methods, or qualitative and quantitative methods, and its purpose was not merely validation but completeness: each method illuminates a different facet of the phenomenon under study, and their combination produces a more comprehensive account than any single method could achieve alone.

The Paradigm Wars and the Pragmatist Resolution

The 1980s brought a methodological crisis that would prove productive for the development of MMR: the paradigm wars between quantitative and qualitative traditions. The incompatibility thesis, most forcefully stated by Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Guba and Lincoln (1994), held that qualitative and quantitative methods were founded on irreconcilably different ontological and epistemological assumptions that a researcher who believed in multiple constructed realities (the constructivist position) could not consistently use methods premised on a single, measurable, external reality (the positivist position) and that therefore mixing them within a single study was logically incoherent.

The pragmatist response to this challenge, developed most influentially by Howe (1988), Rossman and Wilson (1985), and later by Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998), argued that the incompatibility thesis was philosophically mistaken and practically counterproductive. Drawing on the pragmatist tradition in American philosophy Dewey, James, Peirce they argued that methods should be evaluated by their fitness for purpose rather than their paradigmatic purity, that epistemological questions and methodological questions could be kept separate, and that the practical research benefits of combining methods outweighed whatever philosophical tensions the combination involved. This pragmatist resolution became the dominant philosophical position in the MMR literature and enabled the formalisation of mixed methods designs in the 1990s and 2000s.

Formalisation and the Emergence of Design Typologies

The formalisation of MMR as a distinct methodological paradigm occurred through a series of landmark publications that established the design vocabulary, typological frameworks, and quality standards that the field now relies on. Greene, Caracelli, and Graham's (1989) seminal paper analysed 57 mixed methods evaluation studies and identified five purposes for mixing methods: triangulation, complementarity, development, initiation, and expansion a typology that remains analytically useful today. Morse (1991) introduced the notation conventions (upper case for dominant strand, lower case for secondary; arrows for sequential, plus signs for simultaneous) that have become the standard graphic language of MMR design. Creswell and Plano Clark's (2007) Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research provided the most accessible and comprehensive design framework, identifying six major designs with explicit notation, decision criteria, and procedural guidance. Table 1 provides a systematic timeline of this development.

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

Table 1: ***Historical Development of Mixed Methods Research***

Note. Compiled from Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003), Greene et al. (1989), and Denzin (1978).

Era	Key Development	Significance	Key Scholars
1950s–1960s	Campbell & Fiske's multi-trait multi-method (MTMM) matrix	First systematic use of multiple methods for validation; coined 'triangulation' in social science	Campbell & Fiske (1959)
1970s	Denzin's triangulation framework	Extended triangulation to data, investigator, theory, and methodological types; bridged qualitative and quantitative	Denzin (1978)
1980s	Paradigm debates	Qualitative-quantitative 'war'; incompatibility thesis challenged; pragmatist response emerges	Lincoln & Guba; Howe; Rossman & Wilson
1988–1995	Early mixed-methods typologies	Sequential and concurrent designs formally typologised; integration strategies identified	Greene et al. (1989); Morse (1991)
2003	Tashakkori & Teddlie's Handbook (1st ed.)	Mixed methods established as a third methodological paradigm; procedures codified	Tashakkori & Teddlie (2003)
2007–2010	Creswell & Plano Clark's design framework	Six-design typology widely adopted; mixed methods positioned within pragmatist epistemology	Creswell & Plano Clark (2007, 2011)
2010s	Quality criteria development	Legitimation, inference quality, and integration-specific rigour criteria proposed	Onwuegbuzie & Johnson; Creswell; Teddlie & Tashakkori
2018–2026	Complex, emergent, and AI-assisted designs	Intervention, case study, and participatory hybrid designs; NLP and ML in mixed methods	Creswell & Plano Clark (2018); Fetters et al.

Definition and Conceptual Framework

Creswell and Plano Clark (2018) define mixed methods research as 'an approach to inquiry involving collecting both quantitative and qualitative data, integrating the two forms of data, and using distinct designs that may involve philosophical assumptions and theoretical frameworks' (p. 5). This definition foregrounds three features that are definitionally essential to MMR: the collection of both data types, the integration of the two strands, and the explicit design framework that governs the relationship between them. The third feature is the most methodologically consequential and the most frequently neglected in practice: mixing methods without a clear design logic without specifying priority, sequence, integration point, and purpose produces not mixed methods research

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

but multimethod research, in which multiple methods are applied to the same question without systematic connection.

Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, and Turner (2007), in a landmark conceptual paper, synthesised 19 definitions of MMR and proposed the following integrative definition: 'Mixed methods research is the type of research in which a researcher or team of researchers combines elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches (e.g., use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, data collection, analysis, inference techniques) for the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration' (p. 123). The reference to 'breadth and depth' is particularly important because it captures the epistemological logic of MMR: qualitative approaches provide depth of understanding of specific cases, contexts, and meanings; quantitative approaches provide breadth of coverage across larger and more representative samples; and their integration produces both simultaneously.

The concept of meta-inference introduced by Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) is the most important theoretical contribution to the MMR framework and deserves extended discussion. A meta-inference is a conclusion drawn from the integration of qualitative and quantitative inferences that cannot be produced by either strand alone. It is not a summary of the qualitative findings plus a summary of the quantitative findings but a genuinely integrated interpretive claim about what both strands together reveal about the research question. The production of meta-inferences is the criterion by which genuine MMR is distinguished from the mere presentation of two separate monomethod studies in a single paper, and it is the benchmark against which the quality of integration should be evaluated.

Philosophical Foundations of Mixed Methods Research

The question of what philosophical position warrants the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods what epistemological stance allows a researcher to hold simultaneously the interpretivist commitment to multiple constructed realities and the post-positivist commitment to a single, approximately knowable external reality is the deepest and most contested theoretical issue in the MMR literature. Four major philosophical positions have been proposed, each with different implications for design practice. Table 4 presents these positions systematically.

Pragmatism

Pragmatism, in its various forms (Deweyan instrumentalism, Jamesian radical empiricism, Peircean fallibilism), is the dominant philosophical home of MMR. Its core claim, for methodological purposes, is that research questions rather than philosophical commitments should determine method selection, and that methods should be evaluated by the quality of the knowledge they produce rather than their conformity to a paradigmatic tradition. Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) adopted pragmatism as the philosophical foundation of MMR on the grounds that it dissolves the incompatibility thesis by denying that epistemological positions and methodological choices are logically connected in the way the incompatibility argument assumes: a researcher can use surveys and interviews within the same study without committing to incoherent metaphysical positions, because the epistemological questions and the methodological questions are answerable independently.

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

Dialectical Pluralism and the Transformative Paradigm

Greene's (2007) dialectical pluralism offers a more philosophically sophisticated alternative to the pragmatist position. Rather than dissolving paradigmatic tensions by declaring them practically irrelevant, dialectical pluralism embraces them as a source of generative insight: different paradigms ask different questions, attend to different features of social reality, and produce different kinds of knowledge, and their juxtaposition within a single study produces analytical friction that illuminates aspects of the phenomenon that neither alone would reveal. On this account, integration is not the merging of two strands into a single coherent narrative but the productive confrontation of different epistemic perspectives.

Mertens's (2009, 2015) transformative paradigm locates MMR within a social justice framework, arguing that the purpose of research and therefore the criterion by which methods should be selected and integrated is the promotion of equity, the amplification of marginalised voices, and the challenge of structural inequality. This position has been particularly influential in community-based participatory research, disability studies, critical race theory, and feminist research, where the ethical and political dimensions of method choice are as consequential as the epistemological ones.

Critical Realism

Critical realism, associated with Roy Bhaskar's (1978) philosophical work and applied to social science methodology by Maxwell and Mittapalli (2010) and others, offers a third alternative grounded in a stratified ontology: there is a real world that exists independently of our knowledge of it, but that world operates at multiple levels the empirical (what we observe), the actual (what events occur), and the real (the generative mechanisms that produce those events) and our access to it is theory-laden, fallible, and partial. MMR, on a critical realist account, is justified not by pragmatist utility but by ontological necessity: complex social phenomena are constituted by mechanisms operating at multiple levels that require both quantitative methods (to identify patterns at the empirical level) and qualitative methods (to identify mechanisms at the real level) for adequate explanation. This retroductive reasoning moving from observed patterns through contextual understanding to theoretical mechanisms is particularly well-suited to the explanatory sequential design.

Table 4: ***Philosophical Foundations of Mixed Methods Research***

Note. Compiled from Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), Greene (2007), Mertens (2015), and Maxwell and Mittapalli (2010).

Philosophical Position	Core Assumptions	Implications for Mixed Methods	Key Proponents
Pragmatism	Truth is what works; knowledge is evaluated by practical consequences; both objectivist and subjectivist stances can be held simultaneously without contradiction	The dominant philosophical home of MMR: method selection is driven by fitness for purpose, not paradigmatic loyalty; both strands are equally legitimate tools	Dewey, James, Creswell & Plano Clark, Tashakkori & Teddlie
Dialectical Pluralism	Multiple paradigms produce different but complementary insights;	Both strands are conducted from within their own paradigmatic	Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, Greene (2007)

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

	paradigmatic diversity is a resource rather than a problem to be resolved	tradition; integration occurs at the level of interpretation without forcing epistemological synthesis	
Transformative Paradigm	Research is inherently political; the purpose of MMR is social justice and the amplification of marginalised voices; methods are evaluated by their emancipatory potential	Methods selected and integrated to serve advocacy goals; community participatory designs; critical race, feminist, and disability frameworks	Mertens (2009, 2015)
Critical Realism	There is a real world that exists independently of our knowledge of it, but our access to it is theory-laden and fallible; mechanisms operate at multiple levels	Both strands contribute to understanding causal mechanisms and their contexts; retroductive reasoning integrates qualitative and quantitative evidence	Bhaskar, Maxwell & Mittapalli, Creswell

Typology of Mixed Methods Research Designs

The design typology developed by Creswell and Plano Clark (2007, 2018) identifies six major MMR designs, each with a distinct logic, notation convention, priority structure, and appropriate research context. These designs are not rigid templates but starting points for design decisions that must be adapted to the specific requirements of the research question, the available resources, and the epistemological position of the researcher. Table 2 presents the full typology; each design is described below.

Explanatory Sequential Design

The explanatory sequential design (QUAN → qual) collects and analyses quantitative data first, then uses qualitative data to explain, interpret, or contextualise the quantitative findings. It gives priority to the quantitative strand, and the qualitative component is explicitly designed to address questions raised by the quantitative analysis to explain unexpected results, to contextualise patterns that the statistical analysis identified but could not account for, or to give voice to the experiences and meanings behind numerical patterns. The design is particularly well-suited to research contexts where a large quantitative dataset exists or can be efficiently collected and where the researcher wants to understand the mechanisms or processes that explain the quantitative patterns observed. A typical application might collect survey data on digital media use and political polarisation across a national sample, then conduct in-depth interviews with subgroups identified by the survey analysis as displaying distinctive patterns.

Exploratory Sequential Design

The exploratory sequential design (qual → QUAN) reverses the priority, beginning with qualitative data collection to explore the phenomenon, develop constructs and hypotheses, and build the theoretical foundation for a subsequent quantitative phase. Its most common application is instrument development: qualitative methods generate the conceptual categories, vocabulary, and items that are then operationalised in a survey or

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

scale that is administered to a larger quantitative sample. This design is appropriate when the researcher lacks a theoretical framework adequate to the research question when the existing literature is insufficient to support a quantitative study without qualitative foundation-building and when the goal is generalisation of qualitatively developed insights across a broader population.

Convergent Parallel Design

The convergent parallel design (QUAN + qual) collects and analyses both strands simultaneously, giving them roughly equal priority, and integrates their findings at the interpretation phase to produce a more complete understanding of the research question than either strand alone could achieve. Integration typically involves merging the findings comparing, corroborating, and expanding each strand's results with the other and can be facilitated by data transformation (converting qualitative themes to quantitative codes for statistical comparison) or by a side-by-side narrative comparison in the discussion section. This design is most appropriate when the researcher wants to validate or triangulate qualitative findings with quantitative data, or when the research question has both experiential/meaning dimensions and distributional/frequency dimensions that are of equal analytical interest.

Embedded, Transformative, and Multiphase Designs

The embedded design nests one strand within another most commonly, a qualitative component within a quantitative experimental or survey design to address a specific sub-question that the primary design cannot answer. Its most important application is the randomised controlled trial (RCT) with embedded qualitative process evaluation: the RCT addresses efficacy (did the intervention produce the intended outcomes?), while the embedded qualitative strand addresses mechanism and context (how and why did it produce those outcomes, and for whom?). This design has become standard in implementation science and health services research. The transformative design applies a social justice framework to drive design decisions, ensuring that both strands serve advocacy and empowerment goals. The multiphase design involves multiple sequential or concurrent studies, each building on the previous, to address a complex research programme that evolves over time most commonly in large evaluation studies or federally funded research programmes.

Table 2: ***Typology of Major Mixed Methods Research Designs***

Note. Compiled from Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), Morse (1991), and Creswell et al. (2011).

Design	Priority	Sequence	Core Purpose	Best Suited For
Explanatory Sequential (QUAN → qual)	Quantitative	Quantitative first, then qualitative to explain	Use qualitative to explain, interpret, or contextualise quantitative results	Exploring surprising, anomalous, or poorly understood quantitative findings
Exploratory Sequential (qual → QUAN)	Qualitative	Qualitative first, then quantitative to test or generalise	Develop instruments, variables, or hypotheses from	Building surveys, scales, or experimental interventions

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

			qualitative; test quantitatively	from qualitative foundations
Convergent Parallel (QUAN + qual)	Equal	Both strands simultaneously; integrate at interpretation	Compare, corroborate, or expand understanding by merging both strands	Validating findings, presenting fuller picture than either strand alone
Embedded (QUAL + quan or QUAN + qual)	One dominant	One strand embedded within the other (e.g., qualitative within an RCT)	Augment a primary method with a secondary strand for a specific sub-question	Clinical trials, programme evaluations, experiments requiring contextual data
Transformative	Advocacy-driven	Either sequential or concurrent; driven by social justice framework	Promote social change; amplify marginalised voices; challenge structural inequality	Community-based participatory research; disability, gender, or race studies
Multiphase	Variable	Multiple sequential or concurrent phases over time	Address complex research programmes with evolving questions across multiple studies	Large evaluation studies, longitudinal programme research, multi-site studies

Integration: The Defining Methodological Challenge of Mixed Methods Research

Integration the active, systematic connection of qualitative and quantitative strands to produce findings that transcend either strand alone is the defining methodological challenge of MMR and the criterion by which genuine mixed methods research is distinguished from multimethod research. Fetters, Curry, and Creswell (2013) provide the most influential framework for understanding integration, identifying three principal integration strategies: merging (bringing the two datasets together, either by transforming one into the form of the other or by comparing them in the discussion), connecting (the outputs of one strand connect to and inform the inputs or design of the next strand, as in sequential designs), and embedding (one strand is nested within the other and plays a supporting role throughout the primary design).

The timing of integration is as important as its form. Yin (2006) distinguishes between integration at the design phase (where the relationship between strands is built into the research questions and data collection instruments), at the analysis phase (where data from both strands are analysed together or in parallel), and at the interpretation phase (where findings from both strands are discussed in relation to each other). Premature integration designing the qualitative strand to simply confirm quantitative findings before the quantitative analysis has been completed compromises the independence of the qualitative strand and defeats the purpose of mixing. Delayed integration publishing the

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

two strands in separate papers and calling the combination a mixed methods study produces what Creswell and Plano Clark (2018) call 'side-by-side' rather than 'integrated' mixed methods research.

The most challenging form of integration is the production of meta-inferences genuinely integrated conclusions that would not be possible without both strands. A study that finds, in the quantitative strand, that digital media use is negatively associated with political trust across a national survey sample, and finds, in the qualitative strand, that participants explain this relationship through narratives of media manipulation and algorithmic capture, produces a meta-inference when it argues that the quantitative pattern is produced by a specific mechanism the algorithmically amplified perception of media dishonesty that was only identifiable through the qualitative strand and that, in turn, provides a theoretically grounded explanation for why the quantitative association holds. This kind of integrative reasoning is the methodological goal of MMR and the justification for the additional complexity and resource investment it requires.

Planning and Designing a Mixed Methods Study

The design of a rigorous MMR study requires a series of interconnected decisions that cannot be made independently: each choice about one design element constrains and is constrained by choices about the others. The sequence and priority of the strands determine the integration strategy; the integration strategy determines the sampling requirements; the sampling requirements interact with the philosophical position; and the philosophical position shapes the research questions and the criteria by which quality will be evaluated. Table 3 presents the full decision sequence in a ten-step framework that provides practical guidance for researchers at the design stage.

Establishing the Rationale for Mixing

The first and most fundamental design decision is establishing a clear and compelling rationale for using mixed methods rather than a monomethod approach. Greene et al.'s (1989) five-purpose framework remains the most useful diagnostic tool: triangulation (seeking convergence of results from different methods for the same phenomenon), complementarity (using different methods to elaborate or clarify different facets of the phenomenon), development (using one method to develop instruments or questions for the second), initiation (discovering paradoxes and fresh perspectives through the juxtaposition of findings from different methods), and expansion (extending the breadth of inquiry by using different methods for different components). The choice of rationale should drive every subsequent design decision and should be explicitly stated in the methodology section of the final report.

Sampling in Mixed Methods Research

Mixed methods research confronts a distinctive sampling challenge: the two strands have different and sometimes conflicting sampling logics. Quantitative strands require probability or representative samples large enough to support statistical inference; qualitative strands require purposive samples small enough to support the depth of engagement that interpretive analysis demands. In sequential designs, this tension is managed by sampling the qualitative strand from within the quantitative sample selecting participants for in-depth interviewing on the basis of their quantitative survey responses, for example, which allows the qualitative strand to speak to the same population as the quantitative strand. In convergent designs, separate samples may be drawn for each strand, which requires explicit justification of the relationship between the two samples in the

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

interpretation phase. Teddlie and Yu (2007) provide the most comprehensive framework for mixed methods sampling, identifying four major strategies: basic (independent samples for each strand), sequential (second strand sample drawn from first), concurrent (separate but related samples), and multilevel (different samples from different levels of a hierarchical system).

Table 3: ***Steps in Mixed Methods Research Design and Implementation***

Note. Adapted from Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), Fetters et al. (2013), and Teddlie and Yu (2007).

Step	Phase	Key Activities and Decisions
1	Justify the approach	Establish that neither qualitative nor quantitative alone can answer the research question; specify the rationale (triangulation, complementarity, development, expansion, or initiation)
2	Select the design	Choose from the six major designs based on priority, sequence, integration point, and resource constraints; specify notation (e.g., QUAN → qual)
3	Specify integration strategy	Determine when and how the two strands will be connected: data transformation, following a thread, building or merging; plan the integration point explicitly
4	Address philosophical stance	Specify the epistemological position (pragmatism, dialectical pluralism, transformative) that warrants combining methods; document in methodology section
5	Design qualitative strand	Select qualitative tradition (phenomenological, constructivist, critical); determine sampling strategy and sample size; design data collection instruments
6	Design quantitative strand	Select quantitative design (survey, experiment, correlational); determine sampling frame; power calculations for sample size; instrument validation
7	Obtain ethics approval	Address IRB/ethics requirements for both strands, including dual-consent procedures where participant pools differ between strands
8	Collect data	Implement strands in the specified sequence or simultaneously; maintain rigour standards appropriate to each strand independently
9	Analyse each strand	Conduct within-strand analysis using methods appropriate to each (e.g., thematic analysis + regression); maintain strand independence during analysis
10	Integrate findings	Execute the integration strategy: merge, compare, transform, or embed the findings from both strands; identify convergence, complementarity, and divergence
11	Interpret and report	Discuss integrated findings in relation to the research question; address meta-inferences; report using mixed-methods reporting standards (e.g., GRAMMS)

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

Quality and Rigour in Mixed Methods Research

Establishing the quality of MMR requires a framework that addresses the rigour of each strand within its own methodological tradition and the quality of the integration that connects them. The first requirement means that the qualitative strand is evaluated by qualitative quality criteria credibility, transferability, dependability, confirmability, and reflexivity as specified by Lincoln and Guba (1985) and the quantitative strand is evaluated by quantitative quality criteria internal and external validity, reliability, and statistical conclusion validity. Neither strand's quality can be compensated by the other's strengths: a high-quality qualitative strand cannot rescue a poorly designed quantitative survey, and vice versa.

The quality of integration requires additional, MMR-specific criteria. Onwuegbuzie and Johnson (2006) proposed a framework of nine 'legitimation types' specific to MMR, including sample integration legitimation (the degree to which the relationship between the qualitative and quantitative samples is made explicit and justified), inside-outside legitimation (the degree to which both insider, emic perspectives and outsider, etic perspectives are authentically represented), weakness minimisation legitimation (the degree to which the weaknesses of each strand are compensated by the strengths of the other), and sequential legitimation (the degree to which the findings of the first strand adequately informed the design of the second in sequential designs). Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) proposed inference quality as the overarching MMR quality construct, defined as the degree to which the meta-inferences produced by the study are credible meaning that they are grounded in both strands' findings, coherent across both strands' analytical frameworks, and transferable to other contexts and populations.

The most commonly cited quality failure in published MMR is integration weakness the production of what Moran-Ellis et al. (2006) call 'parallel play': the sequential presentation of qualitative and quantitative findings without genuine integration into meta-inferences. Audit trail maintenance, integration memos that document the researcher's reasoning at every integration decision point, and the explicit specification of the meta-inferential claims in the research questions and discussion section are the primary practical mechanisms for demonstrating integration quality.

Advantages and Limitations of Mixed Methods Research

The primary advantage of mixed methods research is its capacity to address the fundamental limitation of every monomethod approach: the inability to produce simultaneously the breadth of quantitative evidence and the depth of qualitative understanding that complex social questions require. This advantage is most tangible in research contexts where the phenomenon is both distributed (varying in frequency, magnitude, and pattern across a large population) and meaningful (understood differently by different people in different contexts) which describes most questions of practical importance in health, education, policy, and social science research. Table 5 presents a systematic comparison of advantages and limitations.

A second major advantage is the credibility enhancement that comes from triangulation: when qualitative and quantitative strands produce convergent findings, researchers and audiences can have greater confidence in the conclusions than either strand alone would warrant. This credibility enhancement is particularly important in applied and policy research contexts, where findings must persuade diverse audiences

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

quantitatively oriented funders and policy makers as well as practice-oriented professionals and where a single-method study is more easily dismissed as methodologically limited.

The principal limitation of MMR is the level of methodological competence it demands. A researcher who is an expert qualitative analyst but who designs and implements a poorly powered or conceptually invalid quantitative strand produces a mixed methods study that is not merely limited but actively misleading, because the quantitative strand confers a credibility it does not deserve. The converse problem a sophisticated quantitative design paired with a superficial qualitative component that functions as illustrative anecdote rather than analytic evidence is equally common in the published literature and equally damaging to the validity of the integrated findings.

Table 5: ***Comparative Overview of Advantages and Limitations of Mixed Methods Research***

Note. Compiled from Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), Greene (2007), and Johnson et al. (2007).

Advantages	Limitations
Addresses complex research questions that neither strand alone can fully answer	Requires competence in both qualitative and quantitative methodology; rare in a single researcher
Triangulation strengthens confidence in findings through methodological convergence	Time and resource intensive: two full studies effectively conducted, analysed, and integrated
Compensates for the weaknesses of each standalone method through complementarity	Risk of integration failure: strands analysed and reported separately without genuine mixing
Greater practical relevance: breadth of survey data combined with depth of qualitative insight	Paradigm tensions: mixing epistemologically incompatible strands without explicit philosophical justification
Supports instrument development, theory building, and hypothesis generation across strands	Sample management complexity: different sampling logics for each strand may be difficult to reconcile
Increases credibility with diverse audiences: quantitative for policy, qualitative for practitioners	Reporting challenges: no single journal format accommodates full mixed-methods reporting requirements
Well-suited to intervention and evaluation research requiring both outcome and process data	Integration timing risk: poorly sequenced designs may compromise the integrity of the second strand
Increasing acceptance and prestige in health, education, and social science journals	Risk of unequal weighting: one strand may dominate, undermining the mixed-methods rationale

Ethical Considerations in Mixed Methods Research

Mixed methods research generates ethical challenges that compound those of its individual strands. The most distinctive ethical challenge is dual consent: in sequential designs where the qualitative sample is drawn from the quantitative sample, participants who consented to survey participation must be separately approached and their consent obtained for qualitative participation. The original survey consent process must therefore either anticipate this possibility or include appropriate language, or the researcher must

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

return to survey participants for a separate consent process a procedure that introduces attrition and potential self-selection bias into the qualitative sample.

Transformative MMR designs raise specific ethical obligations around community participation and power sharing. When MMR is conducted within a community-based participatory research framework, the ethical obligations extend beyond individual consent to include collective consent at the community level, equitable sharing of research benefits, community ownership of the data, and community participation in decisions about publication and dissemination. These obligations are not always compatible with the institutional requirements of academic publication and research ethics review, and researchers working in transformative MMR designs must navigate these tensions explicitly and transparently.

The ethics of reporting in MMR requires specific attention to the communication of integration quality. Researchers who present qualitative and quantitative findings separately without genuine integration are not merely methodologically weak they may be misleading readers about the nature and quality of the evidence, particularly if the separate strands produce divergent findings that are not reported or discussed. The GRAMMS (Good Reporting of a Mixed Methods Study) guidelines and the COREQ reporting standards for qualitative research provide a combined framework for transparent reporting, but their consistent application in peer-reviewed journals remains uneven.

Applications across Disciplines

Mixed methods research has achieved its broadest and deepest penetration in health and clinical research, where the combination of RCT-based outcome data and qualitative process evaluation has become a methodological standard for the evaluation of complex interventions. The Medical Research Council's framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions (Craig et al., 2008; Moore et al., 2015) explicitly specifies MMR as the appropriate design for understanding how, why, and for whom complex interventions work a level of explanatory ambition that RCTs alone cannot achieve. Clinical implementation science has adopted embedded MMR designs as its primary methodological toolkit, generating evidence not only about whether health interventions are effective but about the contextual factors, mechanisms, and implementation processes that determine whether effectiveness generalises from controlled trials to real-world settings.

In educational research, MMR has been extensively applied to program evaluation, curriculum reform, and educational equity studies. The Institute of Education Sciences in the United States has funded numerous MMR evaluation studies of educational interventions, reflecting a consensus that understanding the mechanisms and contextual conditions of educational effectiveness requires both outcome measurement and process understanding. Studies of technology-enhanced learning, where quantitative measures of learning outcomes must be complemented by qualitative understanding of how students engage with digital tools and what pedagogical practices produce effective technology integration, represent a particularly active application domain.

In political science, communications, and media studies domains directly relevant to the research agenda of digital governance, AI ethics, and disinformation analysis MMR is increasingly used to combine computational analysis of large-scale digital trace data with qualitative analysis of platform governance documents, interviews with practitioners and regulators, and ethnographic observation of newsroom and platform practices. This

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

combination allows researchers to identify patterns in behaviour and content at scale while understanding the institutional logics, professional cultures, and policy frameworks that produce those patterns. The integration of NLP-derived quantitative measures of media framing with qualitative discourse analysis of specific cases represents a particularly promising MMR application for the study of disinformation, algorithmic bias, and AI governance.

In social work, public policy, and development studies, the transformative MMR tradition has been particularly influential, producing research that combines distributional analysis of social inequalities with participatory qualitative research conducted with affected communities. This tradition is important not only methodologically but ethically: it models a relationship between researcher and researched that distributes epistemic authority more equitably and produces knowledge that is more directly actionable by the communities it purports to serve.

Comparison with Monomethod Research Approaches

The comparative positioning of MMR relative to purely qualitative and purely quantitative approaches is most usefully understood not as a competition in which one paradigm 'wins' but as a differentiation of research purposes in which different approaches are optimal for different questions, contexts, and resources. Table 6 provides a systematic comparison across nine dimensions. The most important insight from this comparison is that MMR is not simply 'better' than monomethod research in the abstract but is specifically appropriate for research questions that require both breadth and depth, both measurement and meaning, both statistical evidence and contextual understanding and that such questions are the norm rather than the exception in applied social science.

The convergent parallel design is particularly well-suited to comparison with monomethod approaches: it collects both data types simultaneously and independently, and the comparison of its findings with those of hypothetical monomethod alternatives a survey study or an interview study of the same phenomenon makes visible the additional analytic value that integration provides. Studies that use convergent parallel designs and find convergent results across strands support the conclusion that the phenomenon is robust to methodological variation; studies that find divergent or contradictory results across strands (which Creswell and Plano Clark, 2018, call 'incongruence') generate new questions about the nature of the phenomenon that neither strand alone would have raised a form of analytic insight that justifies the additional investment of MMR even when the results are not neatly confirmatory.

Table 6: ***Comparison of Mixed Methods Research With Monomethod Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches***

Note. Compiled from Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), Johnson et al. (2007), and Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009).

Dimension	**Quantitative Only**	**Qualitative Only**	**Mixed Methods (Convergent)**	**Mixed Methods (Sequential)**
Primary goal	Measurement, prediction, generalisation	Understanding, meaning, context	Corroboration, validation, completeness	Explanation, exploration, development
Epistemological home	Positivism / post-positivism	Interpretivism / constructivism	Pragmatism / dialectical	Pragmatism / critical realism

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

			pluralism	
Sample	Large, probability-based	Small, purposive	Both, at respective sizes	Sequential; second sample derived from first
Data type	Numerical	Textual / visual / observational	Both simultaneously	Both sequentially
Generalisability	Statistical; external validity	Conceptual; transferability	Both: statistical + conceptual	Dependent on sequencing and priority
Depth	Low (surface patterns)	High (interpretive depth)	Moderate across both	High depth possible in primary strand
Integration	Not applicable	Not applicable	At interpretation / analysis phase	At design or interpretation phase
Complexity	Moderate	Moderate	High dual rigour required	Very high two full sequential studies

Recent Trends and Emerging Developments

NLP and Machine Learning as Quantitative Strands in Mixed Methods

The most methodologically significant recent development in the MMR landscape for researchers working at the intersection of social science and computational analysis is the emergence of natural language processing and machine learning as quantitative strands in mixed methods designs. Large-scale text analysis using NLP sentiment analysis, topic modelling, named entity recognition, frame analysis generates quantitative patterns across millions of documents that cannot be analysed by qualitative methods alone, while the interpretive understanding of what those patterns mean, why they exist, and how they are produced requires qualitative methods that NLP cannot replicate. The combination of these approaches within a mixed methods framework with the NLP analysis constituting the quantitative strand and qualitative analysis of selected cases constituting the qualitative strand is a methodologically natural extension of the MMR design logic to a new class of data and methods.

Computational social science more broadly has developed what Salganik (2018) calls 'amplified asking' as a mixed methods paradigm: using surveys or interviews to generate qualitative understanding that guides the design and interpretation of large-scale digital trace data analysis, then using the digital trace analysis to assess the generalisability and scope of the qualitatively derived insights. This represents a computationally enabled version of the exploratory sequential design and has been applied productively in political science (combining survey experiments with Twitter analysis), sociology (combining interview-based grounded theory with large-scale social media corpus analysis), and media studies (combining qualitative frame analysis with automated topic modelling of news archives).

Participatory and Community-Based MMR

Participatory MMR designs in which community members are involved as co-researchers in both the qualitative and quantitative strands has gained significant momentum in

Vol. 4 No. 6 (2026)

Journal of Social Signs Review

Online ISSN 3006-4651

Print ISSN 3006-466X

health equity, global development, and educational research. Israel et al.'s (2013) community-based participatory research framework provides the most comprehensive guidance for integrating community participation into all phases of the research process, including data collection, analysis, and interpretation. The methodological challenges are substantial: community co-researchers require training in both qualitative and quantitative methods; community priorities may diverge from academic research questions; and the time and resource investments of participatory research are considerably greater than those of researcher-led designs. But the epistemological and ethical benefits more contextually valid data, more relevant and actionable findings, and more equitable distribution of the benefits of research make participatory MMR the methodological gold standard for research with marginalised and under-served communities.

Mixed Methods Research Synthesis

Mixed methods research synthesis the systematic integration of findings from multiple primary MMR studies into a coherent synthetic account is an emerging methodological frontier that addresses a significant gap in the research synthesis literature. Traditional systematic reviews and meta-analyses are designed for quantitative primary studies; traditional qualitative evidence synthesis frameworks (meta-ethnography, thematic synthesis) are designed for qualitative primary studies. Neither is adequate for synthesising the integrated findings of primary MMR studies, because the meta-inferences that MMR produces cannot be reduced to either quantitative effect sizes or qualitative themes without losing the integrative value that MMR was designed to generate. Pearson et al.'s (2015) convergent integrated review approach and the JBI Mixed Methods Systematic Review framework provide methodological guidance for this emerging area, though consensus on standards and procedures is still developing.

Conclusion

Mixed methods research has achieved its current prominence in social science methodology not through methodological fashion but through genuine explanatory necessity. The questions that matter most to researchers, practitioners, and policy makers how do complex social interventions work, for whom, and under what conditions? What do population-level statistical patterns mean to the people whose behavior they describe? How can research produce knowledge that is simultaneously rigorous in its evidentiary standards and relevant to the communities it studies? are questions that no monomethod approach can fully answer. MMR exists to answer them, and when it is designed and implemented with methodological seriousness, it produces a form of knowledge integrative, multi-perspectival, simultaneously broad and deep that is uniquely valuable.

The key methodological insight of this paper is that integration is not the incidental feature of MMR but its defining purpose and its most demanding challenge. Researchers who collect both quantitative and qualitative data but present them in separate sections without genuine connection are not doing mixed methods research they are doing multimethod research with higher costs and the appearance of methodological sophistication. The production of meta-inferences that are grounded in both strands and that could not have been produced by either alone is the criterion by which MMR should be designed, implemented, evaluated, and reported.

As MMR continues to evolve incorporating computational methods as quantitative strands, developing participatory designs that distribute research authority more equitably, and building the synthesis frameworks needed to cumulate integrated evidence across

studies its methodological toolkit will become more diverse and more powerful. But the core logic will remain: that complex social phenomena require both the breadth that quantitative methods provide and the depth that qualitative methods provide, and that the combination, when genuinely integrated, produces understanding that transcends either approach alone.

References

Bhaskar, R. (1978). *A realist theory of science* (2nd ed.). Harvester Press.

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56(2), 81–105. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0046016

Craig, P., Dieppe, P., Macintyre, S., Michie, S., Nazareth, I., & Petticrew, M. (2008). Developing and evaluating complex interventions: The new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*, 337, a1655. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.a1655

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (1st ed.). SAGE.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE.

Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs Principles and practices. *Health Services Research*, 48(6 Pt 2), 2134–2156. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117

Greene, J. C. (2007). *Mixed methods in social inquiry*. Jossey-Bass.

Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V. J., & Graham, W. F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(3), 255–274. https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737011003255

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). SAGE.

Howe, K. R. (1988). Against the quantitative-qualitative incompatibility thesis or dogmas die hard. *Educational Researcher*, 17(8), 10–16. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X017008010

Israel, B. A., Eng, E., Schulz, A. J., & Parker, E. A. (Eds.). (2013). *Methods for community-based participatory research for health* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2), 112–133. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689806298224

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

Maxwell, J. A., & Mittapalli, K. (2010). Realism as a stance for mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *SAGE handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (2nd ed., pp. 145–167). SAGE.

Mertens, D. M. (2009). *Transformative research and evaluation*. Guilford Press.

Mertens, D. M. (2015). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Moore, G. F., Audrey, S., Barker, M., Bond, L., Bonell, C., Hardeman, W., Moore, L., O'Cathain, A., Tinati, T., Wight, D., & Baird, J. (2015). Process evaluation of complex

interventions: Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*, 350, h1258. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.h1258

Moran-Ellis, J., Alexander, V. D., Cronin, A., Dickinson, M., Fielding, J., Sleney, J., & Thomas, H. (2006). Triangulation and integration: Processes, claims and implications. *Qualitative Research*, 6(1), 45–59. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794106058870

Morse, J. M. (1991). Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. *Nursing Research*, 40(2), 120–123. https://doi.org/10.1097/00006199-199103000-00014

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Johnson, R. B. (2006). The validity issue in mixed research. *Research in the Schools*, 13(1), 48–63.

Pearson, A., White, H., Bath-Hextall, F., Apostolo, J., Salmond, S., & Kirkpatrick, P. (2015). A mixed-methods approach to systematic reviews. *International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare*, 13(3), 121–131. https://doi.org/10.1097/XEB.0000000000000052

Rossman, G. B., & Wilson, B. L. (1985). Numbers and words: Combining quantitative and qualitative methods in a single large-scale evaluation study. *Evaluation Review*, 9(5), 627–643. https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X8500900505

Salganik, M. J. (2018). *Bit by bit: Social research in the digital age*. Princeton University Press.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. SAGE.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (1st ed.). SAGE.

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences*. SAGE.

Teddlie, C., & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed methods sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 77–100. https://doi.org/10.1177/2345678906292430

Yin, R. K. (2006). Mixed methods research: Are the methods genuinely integrated or merely parallel? *Research in the Schools*, 13(1), 41–47.