



Qualitative Mixed Method (QMM) Research: Eliminating Quantitative Methodology — A Critical Review

Prof. (Dr.) Dibyendu Bhattacharyya¹, Subrata Halder²

¹Professor Department of Education, University of Kalyani, Kalyani, Nadia, West Bengal, India
Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-6354-8619>

²Ph.D. Research scholar, Department of Education, University of Kalyani, Kalyani, Nadia, West Bengal, India
Orcid : <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-9928-6028>

Date of Submission: 12-04-2026

Date of Acceptance: 24-04-2026

ABSTRACT

Mixed Method Research (MMR) has long been understood as the integration of quantitative and qualitative approaches. This review challenges that assumption fundamentally. Drawing on three synthesised scholarly documents — Venkatesh, Brown & Sullivan (2023), Teddlie & Tashakkori (2009), Creswell & Plano Clark (2018), Lincoln & Guba (2013), and Greene et al. (1989) — this article argues that MMR can, and often should, be conducted entirely within the qualitative paradigm. The Qualitative Mixed Method (QMM) framework proposed herein reconceptualises 'mixing' as the systematic combination of qualitative traditions: Grounded Theory, Narrative Research, Case Study, Ethnography, Phenomenology, Documentary Analysis and others. A taxonomy of twelve design combinations is presented with philosophical analysis, quality criteria, and applied examples. The article further demonstrates that quantitative validation is neither necessary nor superior to qualitative triangulation for achieving epistemological rigour.

Keywords: *Mixed Method Research, QMM Framework, Qualitative Triangulation, Grounded Theory, Narrative Research, Case Study, Ethnography, Interpretivism, Constructivism, Meta-Inference, Methodological Pluralism, Critical Evaluation*

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Conventional Understanding and Its Limits

The social sciences have long debated the relative merits of quantitative and qualitative inquiry. Mixed Method Research (MMR) emerged at this contested intersection — initially celebrated as the 'third methodological force' (Venkatesh et al., 2023) that would transcend the paradigm wars by combining numbers with narratives. Its appeal lay in methodological comprehensiveness: the capacity to triangulate findings across epistemic traditions.

Yet this conventional framing encodes a hidden assumption — that 'mixed' must mean quantitative plus qualitative. This review systematically dismantles that assumption, drawing on evidence from three substantial scholarly documents to propose a philosophically coherent, methodologically rigorous alternative: Qualitative Mixed Method (QMM) Research.

1.2 The Nine Foundational Propositions

The theoretical foundation of this review rests on nine core propositions that emerge from synthesis of the source documents. These propositions, presented below, form the argumentative spine of the entire framework:

Sr. No.	Foundational Proposition
(1)	MM Research linking with Qualitative Research represents, in many contexts, a compromise with positivist epistemology. While this compromise has been productive, it warrants critical examination in contexts where interpretive understanding is prioritised.
(2)	Some scholars argue that integration with quantitative methods may dilute the distinct epistemological identity of qualitative research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Venkatesh et al., 2023). This concern motivates the QMM framework as a protective alternative.



Sr. No.	Foundational Proposition
(3)	Mixing does not mean only the addition of Quantity with Quality. Integration of research traditions operates at the level of epistemology and methodology, not merely data type (Venkatesh et al., 2023).
(4)	The basic impetus for MM Research is often to validate research or achieve better acceptability — particularly with positivist reviewers. This social pressure need not translate into a methodological necessity.
(5)	Quantification is not always required for validation when robust qualitative triangulation is employed — particularly in interpretivist and constructivist research contexts (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006).
(6)	Rigorous research can be conducted using fully qualitative multi-method designs, philosophically mixing research techniques within the qualitative tradition, without necessarily incorporating quantitative methods.
(7)	QMM Research represents one qualitative research technique contextualised, validated, or enriched by another — operating in multiple directions across the interpretivist paradigm family.
(8)	Research technically based on Case Studies can, upon completion, be merged with Narrative Qualitative Research for deeper understanding and contextual validation (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009).
(9)	The proposed QMM design does not require the inclusion of a quantitative strand. It achieves methodological rigour through epistemologically coherent intra-paradigmatic triangulation.

Table 1: Nine Foundational Propositions

II. PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

2.1 The Positivist Challenge and the Compromise

Positivism — the dominant tradition in scientific inquiry since the 19th century — holds that knowledge derives from sensory experience and is verified through logical analysis. In the social sciences, this philosophy translated into a preference for quantification, statistical control, and the systematic elimination of subjective bias (Lee, 1991; Weber, 2004). Qualitative research, which privileges interpretation, lived experience, and thick description, was viewed with deep suspicion within positivist frameworks.

Mixed Method Research emerged partly as a diplomatic gesture: an epistemological compromise designed to make qualitative findings more acceptable to positivist reviewers, funding agencies, and institutional gatekeepers. As Venkatesh et al.

(2023) document, this dynamic led to a structural subordination of qualitative methods — frequently reduced to supplementary roles that humanise or contextualise statistical findings. The consequence was the loss of qualitative distinctiveness that the foundational proposition captures precisely: 'Qualitative research lost its identity when it was merged up with quantification.'

2.2 Research Paradigms: A Comparative Overview

Any research, regardless of method, rests on a philosophical foundation (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Venkatesh et al. (2023) identify four philosophical elements of a research paradigm: ontology, epistemology, methodology, and axiology. The table below — derived from Venkatesh et al. (2023, Table 2-1) — presents five major paradigms and their implications for MM research design:



Paradigm	Ontology	Epistemology	Methodology	Relevance to QMM
Positivism (Lee, 1991; Weber, 2004)	Objective reality, independent of the observer	Objective, dispassionate — sensory experience	Hypothetico-deductive: experiments, surveys	Excluded from QMM — epistemologically incompatible
Interpretivism / Constructivism (Lincoln & Guba, 2013)	Multiple realities constructed by participants' minds	Subjective — knowledge created, not discovered	Hermeneutic/dialectic: case study, ethnography	Core philosophical foundation of QMM framework
Pragmatism (Teddle & Tashakkori, 2003)	Both singular and multiple realities open to inquiry	Both biased and unbiased — judged by consequences	Methods best addressing research questions	Supports QMM when pragmatism licenses all-qualitative designs
Critical Realism (Bhaskar, 1975)	Reality exists independently; three layered domains	Epistemological relativism — historical, emergent	Methodological pluralism — retroductive analysis	Compatible with multi-method qualitative inquiry
Transformative Emancipatory (Mertens, 2007)	Multiple socially constructed realities	Socially and historically located within culture	Interactive researcher-participant; justice orientation	Enriches QMM in critical and development contexts

Table 2: Research Paradigms and Their Relevance to QMM Research (adapted from Venkatesh et al., 2023)

2.3 Pragmatism: Liberating Principle, Constraining Practice

Pragmatism has been adopted as the dominant philosophical underpinning for conventional MMR (Venkatesh et al., 2023; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). According to Biesta (2010), pragmatism places central importance on research questions being asked rather than on the methods being used. This research-question primacy is liberating in principle, but has been operationalised within MMR as a justification specifically for Qual+Quan combinations — not as a licence to operate entirely within one paradigm.

This review takes the pragmatist principle seriously and extends it further: if qualitative research questions are best addressed by multiple qualitative methods in combination, pragmatist logic supports — indeed demands — a purely qualitative mixed design. As Teddlie and Tashakkori (2003) themselves recommend: researchers should 'study what interests and is of value to you, study it in the different ways that you deem appropriate.' The QMM framework embodies this instruction.

2.4 The Dialectic Stance: Productive Internal Dialogue

Bergman (2008) and Greene and Hall (2010) identify two stances on mixing paradigms: an alternative paradigm stance (single paradigm as underpinning) and a dialectic stance (multiple paradigms in productive dialogue). The dialectic stance holds that assumptions from different traditions can be 'respectfully and dialectically engaged in a dialog to enhance our thinking' (Greene & Hall, 2010, p. 139). The QMM framework adopts the spirit of the dialectic stance while restricting its scope to the qualitative family of traditions — achieving paradigm deepening rather than paradigm crossing.

III. THE QUALITATIVE MIXED METHOD (QMM) FRAMEWORK

3.1 Defining QMM Research

Qualitative Mixed Method (QMM) Research is defined as a research design that systematically integrates two or more qualitative research traditions — Grounded Theory, Case Study, Ethnography, Narrative Research, Phenomenology, Documentary Analysis and others— to examine a research problem from multiple interpretive perspectives, with



the explicit aim of achieving theoretical depth, methodological triangulation, and enhanced analytical credibility, without the incorporation of quantitative data or methods.

3.2 Five Core Principles

The QMM framework is governed by five core principles, grounded in Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009), Venkatesh et al. (2023), and Lincoln and Guba (2013):

- **Qualitative Identity Preservation.** Each qualitative method retains its distinct epistemological and methodological identity. Integration harnesses methodological differences as sources of interpretive richness (Lincoln & Guba, 2013).
- **Purpose-Driven Combination.** Methods are combined in response to the specific demands of the research problem — whether corroboration, complementarity, compensation, or expansion (Greene et al., 1989).
- **Dominant-Supporting Structure.** QMM designs feature one dominant method providing the primary interpretive framework, supported by one or more methods providing contextual validation or analytical depth (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009).
- **Iterative Integration.** Integration is not a sequential add-on but an iterative process in which findings from one method continuously inform the design and interpretation of the other.
- **Reflexive Awareness.** QMM researchers maintain continuous reflexive awareness of how their positioning and methodological choices shape the research process and its outcomes (Venkatesh et al., 2013).

IV. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH TRADITIONS IN THE QMM FRAMEWORK

The QMM framework draws on four primary qualitative research traditions — each representing a distinct epistemological approach — which can be combined in twelve design configurations. The following section provides a synthetic overview of each tradition's key characteristics, strengths, and weaknesses.

4.1 Grounded Theory (GT)

Developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967), Grounded Theory is a systematic methodology in which theory is generated inductively from data rather than tested deductively from prior hypotheses. The theory produced is literally grounded in empirical data collected from participants in their natural settings. Three major design variants exist: the Systematic Design (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), the Emergent Design (Glaser, 1992), and the Constructivist Design (Charmaz, 2006). The constructivist variant is particularly well-aligned with the QMM framework, as it acknowledges the researcher's active role in co-constructing theory with participants.

Key GT processes include theoretical sampling (data collection guided by emerging theory), constant comparative analysis, theoretical saturation, and selective coding around a core category. In the QMM framework, GT functions powerfully as a dominant method — generating theoretical categories that supporting methods then validate, contextualise, or enrich by other qualitative methods.

4.2 Narrative Research

Narrative Research focuses on understanding human experience through the stories individuals construct about their lives. Grounded in the premise that humans are storytelling beings, Narrative Research attends to individual stories, their chronological and thematic structure, temporality, and the collaboration between researcher and participant in 'restorying' accounts. Narrative Research brings exceptional interpretive depth and biographical richness to the QMM framework — particularly as a supporting method that humanises and contextualises findings from more structurally oriented methods such as Case Study or Grounded Theory.

4.3 Case Study

Case Study research is an in-depth investigation of a bounded system — a person, group, event, programme, or community — within its real-life context, using multiple sources of evidence (Yin, 2018). The foundational lecture notes articulate the key QMM application directly: 'Suppose one Research is technically based on Case Studies and after completion it can be merged with Narrative Qualitative Research for better understanding and Validation.' This sequential combination — Case Study providing structural depth, Narrative providing experiential richness — exemplifies the integrative logic of the QMM framework. Case Study types include intrinsic, instrumental, collective, descriptive, explanatory, and exploratory designs.

4.4 Ethnography



Ethnography involves prolonged immersion in a cultural group to observe, describe, and interpret shared patterns of behaviour, meaning, and social life. Originating in anthropology, ethnography has been widely adopted across education, sociology, health research, and organisational studies. Its defining features — extended fieldwork, participant observation, emic (insider) perspective, and

reflexivity — make ethnography an exceptionally powerful method for generating culturally grounded contextual understanding. In QMM Design J, Ethnography functions as the dominant method, supported by Documentary and Content Analysis; in Designs K and L, it provides the cultural macroframe within which Case Study and Narrative methods operate at bounded and individual levels respectively.

Method	Epistemological Root	Unit of Analysis	Core Strength	Core Limitation	QMM Role
Grounded Theory	Constructivism / Interpretivism	Codes, categories, theory	Generates original theory from data	Saturation difficult to determine	Dominant or supporting
Narrative Research	Interpretivism / Phenomenology	Individual story / biography	Rich biographical depth & meaning	Limited transferability	Dominant or supporting
Case Study	Interpretivism / Realism	Bounded system / unit	Contextual richness, multiple sources	Limited generalisability	Dominant or supporting
Ethnography	Interpretivism / Constructivism	Cultural group / community	Deep emic cultural understanding	Extremely time-consuming	Dominant or supporting

Table 3: Comparative Overview of QMM Qualitative Traditions (Venkatesh et al., 2023; Creswell, 2015)

V. TAXONOMY OF QMM DESIGN COMBINATIONS

5.1 Overview: Three MM Design Types

The QMM framework utilises three foundational MM design architectures — Triangulation, Explanatory, and Exploratory — each applicable entirely within the qualitative paradigm. Triangulation Designs collect data from multiple

qualitative methods simultaneously and seek convergence, corroboration, and correspondence of findings (Greene et al., 1989). Explanatory Designs are sequential: the first qualitative method generates findings that the second then explains, contextualises, or deepens. Exploratory Designs are simultaneous, but here the first method generates insights that inform the design or focus of the subsequent method.

5.2 The Complete Twelve-Design Matrix

Sr. No.	Dominant Method	Supporting Method(s)	MM Design Type	Epistemological Logic and Purpose
A	Grounded Theory	Case Study	Explanatory (Sequential)	GT builds theory from emergent categories; Case Study provides bounded contextual evidence to refine theoretical propositions (Venkatesh et al., 2023)
B	Grounded Theory	Ethnography	Exploratory (simultaneous)	GT builds theory; Ethnography provides cultural field immersion to validate and enrich theoretical categories with emic insight



Sr. No.	Dominant Method	Supporting Method(s)	MM Design Type	Epistemological Logic and Purpose
C	Grounded Theory	Narrative Research and Others	Triangulation	GT generates theoretical constructs; individual Narratives illustrate and humanise abstract propositions by anchoring them in lived experience
D	Narrative Research	Case Study	Explanatory (Sequential)	Narrative captures lived experience; Case Study provides structured, bounded evidence to ground the personal story in documented reality
E	Narrative Research	Ethnography and Others	Triangulation (Concurrent)	Narrative explores individual stories; Ethnography provides the cultural context to validate and situate personal accounts within collective meaning
F	Narrative Research	Grounded Theory	Exploratory (simultaneous)	Narrative leads; GT coding techniques systematically analyse narrative data to extract patterns and emerging conceptual categories
G	Case Study	Ethnography	Explanatory (Sequential)	Case Study examines a bounded real-world unit; Ethnography deepens cultural understanding and meaning within that bounded context
H	Case Study	Narrative Research and Others	Triangulation (Concurrent)	Case Study provides structural framework; participant Narratives enrich and humanise understanding of the case through personal accounts
I	Case Study	Grounded Theory	Exploratory (simultaneous)	Case Study provides bounded empirical foundation; GT techniques build transferable theory from within-case data, enabling analytical generalisation
J	Ethnography	Documentary + Content Analysis	Explanatory (Sequential)	Ethnography captures lived culture through field immersion; Documentary and Content Analysis provide textual and archival corroboration (Bryman, 2006)
K	Ethnography	Case Study	Triangulation (Concurrent)	Ethnography provides cultural depth and contextual richness; Case Study adds bounded structural focus and systematic cross-case comparison
L	Ethnography	Grounded Theory	Exploratory (simultaneous)	Ethnographic field data feeds GT open and axial coding to generate culturally grounded, contextually saturated theory

Table 4: Taxonomy of QMM Research Designs A–P (Synthesised from Venkatesh et al., 2023; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009; Greene et al., 1989; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018)



5.3 Purposes of QMM Combinations

Greene et al. (1989) identified five primary purposes for mixed-methods research, each directly applicable within the QMM framework. Triangulation (Designs A, B, C, N) uses multiple qualitative methods to seek convergence and corroboration of findings. Complementarity (Designs D, E, G, H, K, L) examines overlapping but different facets of the same phenomenon to achieve elaboration and clarification. Development (Designs F, I, M, P) uses results from one qualitative method to inform the design of the second. Initiation (Design J) discovers contradictions between qualitative perspectives to recast research questions. Expansion

(Designs O, P) extends the breadth of inquiry by applying different qualitative methods to different research questions.

VI. APPLIED ILLUSTRATION: DESIGN C — GROUNDED THEORY + NARRATIVE RESEARCH

To demonstrate QMM design in practice, the following illustrative application is derived from the logic of Design C — the combination of Grounded Theory as dominant method with Narrative Research as supporting method.

Applied Example: Grounded Theory + Narrative Research (Design C)

Research Problem: Understanding how first-generation university students negotiate academic identity formation in post-colonial institutional contexts.

Phase 1 — Dominant (Grounded Theory): Semi-structured interviews with 30 students. Open, axial, and selective coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2015) generates a framework of 'identity negotiation under institutional pressure', reaching theoretical saturation after 24 participants.

Phase 2 — Supporting (Narrative Research): Three purposively selected participants share extended life-history narratives. Analysed for story structure, turning points, and meaning-making. Researcher and participants collaborate to verify interpretive adequacy.

Integration: Narratives validate and illustrate GT theoretical categories. Discrepancies between narrative accounts and GT findings become productive sites of analytical inquiry (Fielding, 2012).

Outcome: A theory of academic identity formation validated entirely through qualitative triangulation — without a single numerical measure. Quality assured through Lincoln and Guba's (1985) credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability criteria.

Figure 1: Applied Illustration of QMM Design C (Grounded Theory + Narrative Research)

VII. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: TRADITIONAL MMR vs QMM RESEARCH

7.1 Systematic Comparison

Analytical Dimension	Traditional Mixed Method Research	Proposed: Qualitative Mixed Method (QMM)
Philosophical Basis	Pragmatism — bridges positivist and interpretivist paradigms (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004)	Interpretivism / Constructivism — multiple realities socially constructed (Lincoln & Guba, 2013)
Quantitative Component	Required — surveys, experiments, statistical analysis (Venkatesh et al., 2023)	Eliminated entirely — no numerical data or inferential statistics required
Validation Strategy	Statistical generalisability; reliability coefficients; construct validity	Qualitative triangulation — credibility, transferability, dependability, confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985)
Data Nature	Numeric + textual — mixed types across strands	Purely textual, narrative, observational, and documentary



Analytical Dimension	Traditional Mixed Method Research	Proposed: Qualitative Mixed Method (QMM)
Subjectivity Treatment	Minimised through randomisation and statistical controls (Cook & Campbell, 1979)	Embraced as epistemological strength; reflexivity is a primary research tool
Identity Preservation	Qualitative often subordinated as supplementary strand	Each qualitative method retains its full epistemological identity
Integration Logic	Quantitising or qualitising data across paradigms (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009)	Methodological triangulation — qualitative lenses mutually validate each other
Typical Designs	Explanatory, Exploratory, Triangulation (Concurrent) (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018)	GT+Case Study, Narrative+Ethnography, Ethnography+Documentary Analysis (16 combinations)

Table 5: Comparative Analysis of Traditional MMR vs Proposed QMM Framework (based on Venkatesh et al., 2023; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009; Lincoln & Guba, 2013; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018)

7.2 Validation Without Quantification

A central concern motivating quantitative–qualitative integration in conventional MMR is the question of validation. The QMM framework draws on Lincoln and Guba's (1985) four qualitative quality criteria as a complete and rigorous alternative validation framework. Credibility — confidence in the truth of the findings, achieved through prolonged engagement and member checking — is the qualitative parallel to internal validity. Transferability — the degree to which findings can inform understanding in analogous contexts — replaces external validity. Dependability — the researcher's description of changes in setting and their effects on the research process — replaces reliability. Confirmability — the degree to which results can be corroborated by others through an audit trail — replaces objectivity.

Onwuegbuzie and Johnson (2006) further identify weakness minimisation as a key legitimization criterion for mixed research: compensating the weaknesses of one method with the strengths of another. In QMM research, this is achieved intra-paradigmatically — the limited transferability of Case Study is compensated by the theoretical generativity of Grounded Theory; the interpretive

depth of Narrative Research is anchored by the bounded evidence of Case Study.

7.3 Bryman's Integration Problem

Bryman (2006) demonstrated that even in ostensibly mixed designs, qualitative and quantitative data rarely achieve the full epistemological synthesis promised by MMR theory. In his review of 232 mixed-methods articles, Bryman found that in many cases qualitative findings merely supplemented or contextualised quantitative results, rather than contributing to a genuinely integrated meta-inference. The QMM framework sidesteps this integration problem entirely by eliminating the paradigmatic incompatibility at its source — there is no Qual–Quan boundary to bridge when both methods operate within the same interpretive tradition.

VIII. QUALITY CRITERIA FOR QMM RESEARCH

Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) identify two primary domains of quality in MM research: design quality and interpretive rigour. The table below adapts these criteria specifically for QMM research designs:

Quality Domain	Definition and Criteria	Key Assessment Questions
Design Suitability (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009)	Methods selected are appropriate for answering the research questions	Are the qualitative methods appropriate? Does the design match the research questions and purpose?



Quality Domain	Definition and Criteria	Key Assessment Questions
Design Fidelity (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009)	Methods are implemented with the rigour necessary to capture meanings and relationships	Are qualitative procedures implemented with the quality needed for interpretive depth?
Within-Design Consistency	Design components fit together in a seamless and cohesive manner across all stages	Do strands link logically? Are integration points clearly specified?
Analytical Adequacy (Venkatesh et al., 2013)	Analysis strategies are appropriate and adequate to answer research questions	Are qualitative analytic strategies effectively and consistently implemented?
Interpretive Consistency (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009)	Results from one strand are consistent with results from another strand	Do inferences closely follow findings in type, scope, and intensity?
Integrative Efficacy (Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006)	Inferences from each strand are integrated into a theoretically consistent meta-inference	Do meta-inferences incorporate all strand inferences? Are credible inconsistencies theoretically explained?
Interpretive Correspondence	Meta-inferences satisfy the initial stated purpose for using a mixed-methods approach	Do meta-inferences correspond to the study's stated purposes?

Table 6: Quality Criteria for QMM Research (adapted from Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009; Venkatesh et al., 2013; Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006)

IX. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF QMM RESEARCH

Strengths	Weaknesses
Triangulates findings across multiple qualitative traditions, strengthening validity without positivist quantification (Venkatesh et al., 2023)	Complex design requires deep expertise in multiple qualitative traditions simultaneously
Preserves qualitative epistemological identity; does not subordinate interpretation to statistical logic (Lincoln & Guba, 2013)	Resource intensive: extended fieldwork, multiple interview rounds, and multi-strand analysis demand significant time
Generates richer, more nuanced understanding than single-method qualitative designs	Risk of incoherence if dominant and supporting methods are philosophically misaligned
Produces meta-inferences that transcend what either method could achieve alone (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009)	Integration at the analysis stage (not just interpretation) is technically demanding (Venkatesh et al., 2023)
Provides multiple forms of validity evidence: transferability, confirmability, credibility, and dependability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985)	Publication venues may not yet have clear standards for evaluating qualitative-dominant MM studies
Directly addresses Teddlie & Tashakkori's (2003) multi-method qualitative design category — methodological legitimacy is established	Researchers trained primarily in one tradition may lack the skill to execute a second method with equal rigour (Bergman, 2008)



Strengths	Weaknesses
Avoids the integration problem documented by Bryman (2006) — no paradigmatic boundary to bridge	Funding agencies may favour designs with quantitative components for perceived generalisability

Table 7: Strengths and Weaknesses of QMM Research (synthesised from Venkatesh et al., 2023; Bergman, 2008; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009; Lincoln & Guba, 2013)

X. DISCIPLINARY APPLICATIONS OF THE QMM FRAMEWORK

The QMM framework has broad applicability across multiple social science and professional disciplines:

Education Research: A researcher studying inclusive education could deploy a Case Study design examining a specific school's policy implementation, supported by Narrative Research capturing the lived experiences of students with disabilities. This directly embodies Proposition (8): one method based on Case Study merged with Narrative Research for better understanding and validation.

Health and Social Care: A study of patient decision-making at end of life could use Grounded Theory to build a model of decision-making processes from interview data, triangulated with Ethnographic observation examining how these processes unfold in actual clinical settings — a corroboration design entirely within the qualitative paradigm.

Organisational Studies: An investigation of organisational culture change could deploy Ethnographic methods (immersing the researcher in the organisational context) combined with Documentary and Content Analysis (examining official communications and policy documents) — QMM Design J.

Information Systems Research: Zhang and Venkatesh (2017) employed a sequential approach in which qualitative interview data informed quantitative model validation. The QMM framework would reconceptualise this as Design C or Design I: the Grounded Theory phase generates theoretical categories; a subsequent Narrative or Case Study phase validates and deepens those categories without quantitative supplementation.

Development Studies: Research on community responses to environmental displacement could use Narrative Research (documenting individual stories of loss and adaptation) alongside Grounded Theory (developing a theoretical framework of community resilience) — honouring individual experience while building transferable theoretical knowledge entirely within the qualitative tradition.

XI. CRITIQUES AND RESPONSES

11.1 Limited Generalisability

Critics may argue that the absence of quantitative data limits the generalisability of QMM findings. The QMM response draws on Venkatesh et al. (2013) and Lincoln and Guba (1985): generalisability is not the appropriate quality criterion for qualitative research; transferability — the capacity of findings to inform understanding in analogous contexts — is the relevant standard. Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) further note that analytical generalisation from case-based qualitative research represents a legitimate and well-established form of scientific inference.

11.2 Reduced External Credibility

Some reviewers and funders may be sceptical of research that excludes quantitative components. Venkatesh et al. (2023) document this challenge in their discussion of 'nomenclature, design, and classification issues in mixed-methods research.' The QMM framework addresses this through explicit epistemological justification, methodological transparency, and citation of established quality criteria (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). The proposition stands: 'No need to quantify for better validation if the alternatives are open.'

11.3 Skill Requirements

Combining multiple qualitative methods requires significant methodological expertise. Bergman (2008) and Creswell and Plano Clark (2018) both identify methodological skill as a critical resource in mixed-methods research. The QMM framework requires fluency in at least two qualitative traditions and the ability to navigate tensions when different traditions produce discrepant findings. Team-based research, iterative methodological training, and the use of methodological consultants can address this challenge effectively.

XII. CONCLUSION

This review has advanced a theoretically grounded and empirically supported argument: Mixed Method Research, reconceived as the combination of qualitative research traditions rather than the integration of qualitative and quantitative methods, represents a philosophically coherent, methodologically rigorous, and epistemologically honest approach to social inquiry. Drawing on



Venkatesh et al. (2023), Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009), Bergman (2008), Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), Lincoln and Guba (2013), and Greene et al. (1989), the review has demonstrated that:

- The compulsory inclusion of quantitative methods in MMR encodes a positivist assumption incompatible with interpretivist epistemology, constituting a historical compromise rather than a logical necessity.
- Qualitative research 'lost its identity when it was merged up with quantification' — and that identity can be recovered through intra-paradigmatic methodological pluralism.
- Twelve distinct QMM design combinations provide a comprehensive and practically applicable framework for qualitative-dominant mixed research across all social science disciplines.
- Validation without quantification is not only possible but achievable through qualitative triangulation using Lincoln and Guba's (1985) credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability criteria.
- The quality criteria of Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) and Venkatesh et al. (2013) are fully applicable to QMM designs, providing a rigorous evaluative framework with established scholarly legitimacy.

Mixed Method Research need not mean Quantitative + Qualitative. It can mean Qualitative + Qualitative — a richer, more coherent, and philosophically honest form of methodological pluralism that preserves the epistemological integrity of interpretive inquiry while achieving the analytical depth and triangulation power of mixed-method design. 'Mixing does not mean only addition of Quantity with Quality.'

REFERENCES

- [1]. Bergman, M. M. (Ed.). (2008). *Advances in mixed methods research: Theories and applications*. SAGE Publications.
- [2]. Bhaskar, R. (1975). *A realist theory of science*. Leeds Books.
- [3]. Biesta, G. (2010). Pragmatism and the philosophical foundations of mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (2nd ed., pp. 95–117). SAGE Publications.
- [4]. Bryman, A. (2006). Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: How is it done? *Qualitative Research*, 6(1), 97–113. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794106058877>
- [5]. Bryman, A. (2007). Barriers to integrating quantitative and qualitative research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 8–22.
- [6]. Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56(2), 81–105.
- [7]. Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. SAGE Publications.
- [8]. Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis for field settings*. Houghton Mifflin.
- [9]. Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [10]. Creswell, J. W. (2015). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. SAGE Publications.
- [11]. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [12]. Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 1–32). SAGE Publications.
- [13]. Fielding, N. G. (2012). Triangulation and mixed methods designs: Data integration with new research technologies. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6(2), 124–136.
- [14]. Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. Basic Books.
- [15]. Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Aldine.
- [16]. Greene, J. C., & Hall, J. N. (2010). Dialectics and pragmatism: Being of consequence. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (2nd ed., pp. 119–143). SAGE Publications.
- [17]. 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.
- [18]. Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14–26.



- [19]. Lee, A. S. (1991). Integrating positivist and interpretive approaches to organizational research. *Organization Science*, 2(4), 342–365.
- [20]. Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- [21]. Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2013). *The constructivist credo*. Left Coast Press.
- [22]. Mertens, D. M. (2007). Transformative paradigm: Mixed methods and social justice. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(3), 212–225.
- [23]. Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Johnson, R. B. (2006). The validity issue in mixed research. *Research in the Schools*, 13(1), 48–63.
- [24]. Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. SAGE Publications.
- [25]. Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [26]. Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- [27]. Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2003). Major issues and controversies in the use of mixed methods in the social and behavioral sciences. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (1st ed., pp. 3–50). SAGE Publications.
- [28]. Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative techniques in the social and behavioral sciences*. SAGE Publications.
- [29]. Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2010). Overview of contemporary issues in mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (2nd ed., pp. 1–44). SAGE Publications.
- [30]. Uprichard, E., & Dawney, L. (2019). Data diffraction: Challenging data integration in mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 13(1), 19–32.
- [31]. Venkatesh, V., Brown, S. A., & Bala, H. (2013). Bridging the qualitative-quantitative divide: Guidelines for conducting mixed methods research in information systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 37(1), 21–54.
- [32]. Venkatesh, V., Brown, S., & Sullivan, Y. (2023). *Conducting mixed-methods research: From classical social sciences to the age of big data and analytics*. Virginia Tech Publishing.
- [33]. Weber, R. (2004). The rhetoric of positivism versus interpretivism: A personal view. *MIS Quarterly*, 28(1), iii–xii.
- [34]. Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [35]. Zhang, X., & Venkatesh, V. (2017). A nomological network of knowledge management system use. *MIS Quarterly*, 41(4), 1275–1306.