IJMR E-ISSN: 3109-9777
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEACH

INTEGRATING QUALITATIVE INQUIRY AND SURVEY RESEARCH IN SOCIAL SCIENCES: A DESCRIPTIVE AND ANALYTICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

Rahmat Abd Fatah*
* Department of Sociology, Universitas Muhammadiyah Maluku Utara, Indonesia
Email :rahmatabdfatah@gmail.com

E-ISSN : 3109-9777		
Received: Desember 2025	Accepted: Desember 2025	Published: Desember 2025

Abstract :

Recent developments in contemporary social sciences indicate a growing need for methodological approaches capable of explaining the complexity of social reality in a manner that is both in-depth and representative. The longstanding tension between the depth of meaning offered by qualitative research and the breadth of generalization associated with survey research has driven the advancement of mixed methods as an integrative research strategy. This article aims to map and analyze global trends in the integration of qualitative and survey methods in social science research through a descriptive and analytical literature review approach. The literature search was conducted using reputable international databases, namely Scopus and Web of Science, supplemented by Google Scholar, covering publications from 2000 to 2024. The selected articles consist of peer-reviewed publications that explicitly discuss or apply the integration of qualitative and survey approaches. The analysis employs thematic and conceptual synthesis to identify epistemological rationales, dominant methodological design patterns, the strategic role of surveys, and levels of methodological integration in social research practice. The findings indicate that pragmatism constitutes the dominant epistemological foundation, accompanied by hybrid practices that combine interpretivist and post-positivist logics. Sequential designs, particularly the sequential exploratory design, emerge as the most globally prevalent pattern, while surveys play a strategic role not only as instruments of quantification but also as mechanisms for generalizing qualitative findings, validating constructs, and constructing social typologies. The findings further reveal that methodological integration most frequently occurs at the design and interpretation stages, whereas integration at the analytical stage remains limited. This article contributes to methodological reflection by emphasizing the importance of coherence in integration logic as a fundamental prerequisite for meaningful and scientifically accountable mixed methods practice in social science research.

Keywords : *mixed methods research; qualitative inquiry; survey research; methodological integration; social science research*

INTRODUCTION

Developments in social science research over the past two decades indicate a growing awareness of the limitations of relying on a single methodological approach to understand social realities that are increasingly complex, dynamic, and layered (Azabar & Thijssen, 2025; Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Creswell & Inoue, 2025; Kittel, 2006). Qualitative and survey research methods have long constituted the two main approaches shaping the global tradition of social research. Qualitative approaches excel in exploring subjective meanings, social processes, and the historical and cultural contexts surrounding social action; however, they are often questioned in terms of generalizability and

the replicability of findings. Conversely, survey methods offer strengths in systematic measurement, representativeness, and the capacity for generalization, yet they are frequently criticized for reductionism and their limitations in capturing the complexity of social meanings (Creswell & Inoue, 2025).. This methodological tension between depth of meaning and breadth of generalization remains a classic problem that continues to shape epistemological debates in contemporary social research.

In response to these limitations, the use of mixed methods research, particularly the integration of qualitative and survey approaches, has developed significantly across various social science disciplines. A number of studies in North America and Europe demonstrate that combining in-depth interviews, observation, and surveys enables researchers not only to understand how social phenomena occur but also to assess the extent to which such phenomena are distributed across broader populations (Fetters & Molina-Azorin, 2017). In Asia, Africa, and Latin America, this approach has been widely applied in studies of development, public policy, education, and public health to bridge the need for contextualized data with the demand for quantitative evidence in decision-making processes (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007). Moreover, the growing use of sequential and convergent designs has positioned surveys not merely as data collection instruments but as tools for construct validation, testing social typologies, and extending qualitative findings (Fetters & Molina-Azorin, 2017; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010b; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2008, 2011). Nevertheless, most of these studies remain focused on empirical applications within specific national or sectoral contexts, thereby failing to provide a comprehensive picture of global patterns and trajectories in methodological development.

The limitations of previous studies become increasingly evident when examined from a meta-methodological perspective. The literature on mixed methods research generally emphasizes research design, data collection techniques, or analytical procedures; however, relatively few studies systematically map long-term global trends in the use of qualitative and survey methods (Curry, Nembhard, & Bradley, 2009; Migiro & Magangi, 2011; Turner, Cardinal, & Burton, 2017).. As a result, understanding of how the logic of methodological integration has evolved, which epistemological paradigms underpin it, and how the positions of survey and qualitative approaches have shifted within the international social research landscape remains fragmented. To date, only limited research has analytically examined these developments by utilizing reputable international publication databases to reveal patterns of collaboration, the dominance of particular research designs, or shifts in methodological focus across time and regions. The absence of such global mapping has created a significant research gap, particularly for scholars seeking to situate the methodological positioning of their research within the broader context of global knowledge production (Snyder, 2019),(Fatah, 2024).

Based on this research gap, this article offers a clear contribution by adopting a descriptive and analytical literature review approach to map the global

landscape of qualitative and survey research methods in the social sciences. Unlike conventional literature reviews that are primarily narrative or normative, this study combines systematic description with conceptual analysis to uncover dominant methodological patterns, epistemological rationales, and prevailing practices of methodological integration in international publications. This approach enables the identification of research design trends, the strategic role of surveys within mixed methods frameworks, and recurring methodological challenges documented in the literature. Accordingly, this article addresses not only questions of "what" is studied and "which" methods are employed, but also "why" particular methods are selected and "how" qualitative–survey integration is epistemologically justified (Fetters, Curry, & Creswell, 2013).

In line with these objectives, this article seeks to map and analyze global trends in the use of qualitative and survey research methods in social science research through a descriptive and analytical literature review. The main research questions include: (1) how international publications integrating qualitative and survey methods in the social sciences have developed and are distributed; (2) which methodological designs and integration logics are most dominantly employed; and (3) how survey and qualitative approaches are positioned within mixed methods epistemological frameworks. To address these questions, the study employs a systematic literature search strategy using reputable international databases such as Scopus and Web of Science, supplemented by Google Scholar, covering publications from 2000 to 2024. The analysis is conducted through thematic and conceptual synthesis to generate a comprehensive and reflective methodological map. Through this approach, the article is expected to contribute both theoretically and methodologically to the development of social research that is more coherent, reflexive, and grounded in meaningful methodological integration.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a descriptive and analytical literature review approach to map and analyze global trends in the use of qualitative and survey research methods in the social sciences. This approach is selected because it enables conceptual and reflective synthesis of methodological developments without the intention of testing hypotheses or calculating statistical effect sizes (Snyder, 2019). The literature search was conducted using the Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar databases, employing keywords related to mixed methods research, qualitative inquiry, and survey research, and was limited to publications from 2000 to 2024.

The selected articles consist of peer-reviewed publications in the social sciences that explicitly discuss or apply the integration of qualitative and survey methods. The selection process was carried out in stages through screening of titles, abstracts, and full texts. The analysis was conducted through thematic and conceptual synthesis to identify mixed methods design patterns, epistemological rationales, and the strategic role of surveys in mixed methods research, with an emphasis on methodological transparency and analytical rigor as recommended

in the mixed methods methodology literature (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Fetters & Molina-Azorin, 2017; Huang, Zan, Lv, & Zhao, 2025)

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Epistemological Rationale of Mixed Methods

International literature indicates that the integration of qualitative and survey methods is primarily grounded in pragmatism as the dominant epistemological foundation. Pragmatism views methods as tools for addressing research questions rather than as dogmatic commitments to a particular paradigm (Biddle & Schafft, 2015; Morgan, 2007, 2014; Yvonne Feilzer, 2010).. However, in practice, this approach is not purely pragmatic. Many studies draw on interpretivist logic during the stage of meaning exploration (through interviews or observation) and subsequently shift to post-positivist assumptions when conducting measurement and generalization through surveys. This hybrid pattern demonstrates that mixed methods function as an epistemological bridge connecting the understanding of meaning with the testing of empirical patterns, although this rationale is often not made explicit in research reports (Amadi, 2023; Jones, 2017; Riazi, 2016; Sommer Harrits, 2011). Table 1 presents an overview of the epistemological rationale underlying mixed methods.

ASPECT	CORE MEANING	APPLICATION IN RESEARCH
PRAGMATISM	Methods are selected based on their usefulness in answering research questions	Combining qualitative and survey methods according to analytical needs
INTERPRETIVISM	Focus on meaning and social context	Interviews or observation to understand actors' experiences
POST-POSITIVISM	Focus on measurement and general patterns	Surveys to test and generalize findings
HYBRID LOGIC	Integration of two approaches	Qualitative research followed by surveys (sequential exploratory)
EPISTEMOLOGICAL BRIDGE	Linking meaning and patterns	Integrating qualitative and survey findings during analysis
METHODOLOGICAL COHERENCE	Consistency among research objectives, methods, and analysis	Clear explanation of the rationale for methodological integration

Table 1. Operationalization of the Epistemological Rationale of Mixed Methods

This table explains the epistemological rationale for the use of mixed methods as a research approach that integrates qualitative and survey methods within a single analytical framework. Pragmatism serves as the primary foundation, allowing researchers to select and combine methods based on their usefulness in addressing research questions. In practice, interpretivist approaches are employed to explore meaning and social context through qualitative methods, while post-positivism is applied at the stage of measurement and pattern testing through surveys. These two approaches are connected through a hybrid logic that enables a transition from the exploration of meaning to empirical testing. The integration of qualitative and survey findings functions as an epistemological bridge that brings together depth of understanding and breadth of generalization. This entire process emphasizes the importance of methodological coherence, namely the alignment between research objectives, epistemological approaches, and methodological strategies that are explicitly articulated in research reports.

2. Patterns of Qualitative–Survey Integration Designs

Thematic synthesis identifies three research designs as the most globally dominant. The sequential explanatory design (survey–qualitative) is commonly used in policy studies and program evaluations, where survey results guide in-depth qualitative exploration of ambiguous or unexpected findings. The convergent design is used more sparingly because it requires a high level of integrative capacity; however, it offers strong triangulation when qualitative and survey data are analyzed in parallel (Plano Clark, 2017; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010a; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2012).Globally, sequential designs—particularly the sequential exploratory design (qualitative–survey) are the most dominant. This design is widely employed when constructs are not yet well established, as qualitative findings are used to develop survey instruments and to test the distribution of these findings across broader populations. Sequential exploratory designs are considered the most operationally and epistemologically "safe" approach, especially in complex social research contexts. Table 2 presents an overview of these dominant integration design patterns.

MIXED METHODS DESIGN	METHOD SEQUENCE	RIMARY PURPOSE	COMMON CONTEXT OF USE	EPISTEMOLOGICAL NOTE
SEQUENTIAL EXPLORATORY	Qualitative-Survey	Developing constructs and survey instruments based on qualitative findings	When concepts or phenomena are not yet theoretically well establishe	Most globally dominant; considered operationally and epistemologically safe

			d	
SEQUENTIAL EXPLANATORY	Survey-Qualitative	Explaining or deepening ambiguous or unexpected survey results	Public policy studies and program evaluations	Surveys serve as triggers for qualitative meaning exploration
CONVERGENT DESIGN	Qualitative - Survey (parallel)	Triangulation and cross-validation between two types of data	Studies requiring high analytical capacity	Strong integration but demands high methodological competence

Table 2. *Qualitative–Survey Integration Designs in Mixed Methods Research*

Explanation of the Three Mixed Methods Designs

a. Sequential Exploratory Design (Qualitative-survey)

This approach begins with qualitative research and is followed by a survey. It is particularly suitable when the research topic is relatively new or when key concepts have not yet been clearly defined. In practice, researchers first conduct interviews or observations to gain an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon under study. From these qualitative data, key themes or categories are identified and subsequently used as the basis for constructing survey questions.

For example, in a study on community participation in village governance, initial interviews may identify three forms of participation: active, limited, and symbolic. These categories are then translated into survey items and distributed to a larger group of residents. The final outcome allows researchers not only to understand how participation is perceived by community members, but also to determine the extent to which each form of participation is distributed within the population, for instance, 45% active, 35% limited, and 20% symbolic. This design is the most widely used because its procedural flow is clear and it is considered relatively safe for researchers.

b. Sequential Explanatory Design (Survey- Qualitative)

This approach starts with a survey and is followed by qualitative research to explain survey findings that are unclear, ambiguous, or unexpected. It is commonly used in policy studies and program evaluations. In practice, researchers first administer a survey to identify general patterns. Once the survey results are obtained, selected findings that appear particularly interesting or contradictory are explored further through in-depth interviews.

For example, a survey on public satisfaction with public services may reveal high levels of satisfaction alongside low levels of trust in government institutions. To understand this apparent contradiction, researchers then conduct interviews with respondents. The qualitative findings may reveal that while citizens are satisfied with technical service delivery, they remain skeptical about government transparency and intentions. Through this design, survey statistics become more meaningful as they are interpreted in light of respondents' experiences and perceptions.

c. Convergent Design (Qualitative and Survey Conducted Simultaneously)

This approach involves collecting qualitative and survey data at the same time and integrating them during the analysis phase. It is best suited for researchers with a relatively strong level of methodological experience. In practice, interviews and surveys are conducted in parallel with the same or comparable groups of participants. After data collection, qualitative and survey findings are compared and integrated.

For example, in a study of organizational work culture, interviews may indicate a strong value of collegiality, while survey results show high scores on teamwork indicators. The integration of these findings allows for triangulation, enabling researchers to conclude that a culture of togetherness is not only subjectively perceived but also reflected in measurable behavioral patterns. Despite its analytical strength, this design demands a higher level of analytical skill because integration occurs directly at the analysis stage.

3. The Strategic Role of Surveys in Mixed Methods

Contrary to the assumption that surveys serve merely as instruments of quantification, recent literature highlights a more strategic role for surveys within mixed methods research. First, surveys function to generalize qualitative findings, extending meanings derived from limited contexts to broader populations. Second, surveys are employed for construct validation, testing the stability of categories and typologies generated through qualitative analysis. Third, surveys serve as tools for testing social typologies, enabling the segmentation of actors based on patterns of meaning and practice that were previously identified qualitatively (Gierus et al., 2025; Ngulube & Ukwoma, 2022). This shift marks a transformation of surveys from purely technical instruments into integral components of knowledge production strategies within mixed methods research.

ROLE OF SURVEYS	ANALYTICAL PURPOSE	OPERATIONAL STEPS	EXPECTED OUTCOMES
GENERALIZATION OF QUALITATIVE FINDINGS	Extending meanings from limited contexts to broader populations	Developing survey items based on themes and categories derived from interviews or observations	Qualitative findings can be tested for their distribution and tendencies within the population

CONSTRUCT VALIDATION	Testing the stability of qualitative categories and typologies	Converting qualitative concepts into measurable indicators and scales	Qualitative constructs are confirmed or revised based on survey data
TESTING SOCIAL TYPOLOGIES	Grouping actors based on patterns of meaning and practice	Applying descriptive or cluster analysis to survey data	Social segmentation based on meanings and behaviors is established

Table 3. *Understanding Surveys in Mixed Methods Research*

Operational Explanation

Within the mixed methods framework, surveys are no longer understood as standalone measurement instruments, but rather as strategic components of a research process that is integrated with qualitative approaches. In practice, this process generally begins with the use of qualitative findings as the conceptual foundation for the survey. For example, in a study on citizen participation in village development, in-depth interviews are first conducted to explore how residents interpret participation. These interviews may generate categories such as active participation (attending meetings and engaging in collective work), limited participation (occasional attendance), and symbolic participation (moral support without direct involvement). These categories are then operationalized into survey indicators and questions, such as the frequency of attendance at village meetings or involvement in collective activities.

The survey is subsequently administered to a larger number of respondents to assess the extent to which each form of participation is distributed across the population. Survey results may indicate, for instance, that 45% of residents fall into the category of active participation, 35% into limited participation, and 20% into symbolic participation. At the integration stage, these data are combined with qualitative findings to explain that the dominance of active participation is closely related to strong values of collectivism and social responsibility, whereas limited participation emerges because residents perceive village activities as more administrative than substantive. In this way, surveys simultaneously serve to generalize qualitative findings, validate established categories, and construct more stable social typologies, ensuring that research outcomes are not only rich in meaning but also empirically robust and scientifically accountable.

4. Forms and Levels of Methodological Integration

Cross-study synthesis reveals significant variation in the levels of methodological integration. Integration most frequently occurs at the design level (method sequencing) and the interpretation level (integration of findings),

while integration at the analytical level remains relatively rare and challenging. The use of joint displays-tables or visual representations that combine qualitative and survey data-has begun to increase as a best practice for enhancing transparency in integration, although it has not yet become a standard practice (Clark & Sanders, 2015; Fetters & Tajima, 2022; Guetterman et al., 2015; R. E. Johnson et al., 2019; Nessle et al., 2023; Verdinelli & Scagnoli, 2013). Overall, the primary challenge lies not in the availability of techniques, but in the coherence of the integration logic connecting research objectives, methodological design, and interpretation. Table 4 presents an overview of the forms and levels of methodological integration.

LEVEL OF INTEGRATION	WHAT IS INTEGRATED	SIMPLE WORKING MECHANISM	PRACTICAL EXAMPLE	KEY NOTES
INTEGRATION AT THE DESIGN LEVEL	Sequence of methods	Determining when qualitative and survey methods are applied	Interviews are conducted first, followed by a survey	Most frequently used and the easiest to implement
INTEGRATION AT THE ANALYSIS LEVEL	Qualitative and survey data	Data are analyzed and directly compared	Interview themes are compared with survey results	Rarely used; requires advanced analytical skills
INTEGRATION AT THE INTERPRETATION LEVEL	Findings from both methods	Interview and survey results are explained jointly	Survey statistics are used to reinforce qualitative meanings	Commonly used and relatively safe
INTEGRATION TOOLS	Techniques for combining results	Presenting data in a single display	Joint displays (integrated tables/graphs)	Enhances clarity and transparency
MAIN CHALLENGE	Logic of integration	Maintaining consistency among objectives, methods, and conclusions	Integration rationale is unclear	The main issue lies in logic rather than technique

Table 4. ***Forms and Levels of Methodological Integration in Mixed Methods Research***

This table demonstrates that, within mixed methods research, methodological integration can occur at multiple levels. The most common and easily implemented forms of integration take place at the design and interpretation stages. Integration at the analysis stage is more challenging, as it requires researchers to process and relate two different types of data simultaneously. Tools such as joint displays help present qualitative and survey findings within a single table or visual representation, making the logic of integration more explicit. The primary challenge lies not in the lack of techniques, but in ensuring that the mode of integration aligns with the research objectives.

Challenges of Integration and Methodological Implications

Despite the availability of various integration techniques and research designs, mixed methods practice in social research continues to face significant methodological challenges. The main challenge does not stem from limitations in instruments or methods, but rather from the coherence of the integration logic connecting research objectives, methodological design, and the interpretation of findings. Many studies successfully combine interviews and surveys at the design stage or in the reporting of results, yet fail to convincingly explain why and how the two methods complement one another. As a result, integration often remains procedural rather than analytical.

Integration at the analysis stage is the least frequently implemented because it demands researchers' ability to simultaneously interpret and relate qualitative and survey data. Without a clear analytical framework, qualitative and survey data tend to proceed in parallel without meaningful interaction. This is where the use of tools such as joint displays becomes particularly important, as they allow researchers to present qualitative and quantitative findings in a single, mutually explanatory format. However, the literature indicates that the use of joint displays remains limited and has not yet become standard practice, especially among novice researchers.

The methodological implication of this condition is the need for researchers to consciously and explicitly design methodological integration from the outset of the study. Integration should not be understood as a technical step applied at the end of the research process, but rather as an epistemological strategy that guides the entire research trajectory. By ensuring that research objectives, design choices, analytical techniques, and interpretive strategies follow a coherent logical sequence, mixed methods research can produce social knowledge that is not only rich in meaning but also empirically robust and scientifically accountable

RESEARCH STAGE	COMMON PROBLEM	SIMPLE EXPLANATION	PRACTICAL SOLUTION
FORMULATION	Misalignment	Interviews and	Formulate a

OF OBJECTIVES	between qualitative and survey objectives	surveys address different questions	single overarching objective that requires both meaning and patterns
RESEARCH DESIGN	Methods combined without a clear rationale	Qualitative and survey methods are used merely by instruction	Decide from the outset which method comes first and for what purpose
DATA COLLECTION	Qualitative and survey data proceed independently	No plan to connect the findings	Identify in advance which components will be integrated
DATA ANALYSIS	Data analyzed separately without comparison	Interview and survey findings do not interact	Compare interview themes with survey results
INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS	Numerical data and narratives are disconnected	Survey results fail to explain meaning	Use survey data to strengthen qualitative narratives
REPORTING	Integration is not explained	Readers do not understand why methods were combined	Explicitly explain the integration logic in the methods and discussion sections

Table 5. Stages of Mixed Methods Research

This table outlines the main stages of mixed methods research and the most common problems encountered by novice researchers, from the formulation of objectives to the reporting of results. Each problem is presented with a simplified explanation and accompanied by practical solutions to help researchers maintain logical coherence between qualitative and survey methods. The core message of the table is that failures in integration often occur not because of a lack of techniques, but because of insufficient planning and inadequate explanation of how qualitative and survey data complement one another. Therefore, the use of simple joint displays for integrating interview and

survey data represents a strategic step for visually and analytically connecting qualitative findings with survey results, making the integration logic explicit, accessible, and scientifically defensible.

Example of a Simple Joint Display for Integrating Interview and Survey Data:

INTERVIEW THEME	QUALITATIVE MEANING (BRIEF)	SURVEY RESULT	INTEGRATED INTERPRETATION
ACTIVE PARTICIPATION	Residents feel involved as a form of social responsibility	45% of respondents frequently attend meetings and collective activities	Shared values of collectivism drive high levels of active participation
LIMITED PARTICIPATION	Involvement is situational and dependent on available time	35% of respondents participate only occasionally	Limited participation is associated with time constraints and competing priorities
SYMBOLIC PARTICIPATION	Support is expressed verbally without direct involvement	20% of respondents are not actively involved	Symbolic participation reflects a gap between expressed support and actual engagement

Table 6. *Example of a Simple Joint Display for Integrating Interview and Survey Data*

Methodological Implications for Novice Researchers and Social Research Practice

The discussion of forms and levels of methodological integration indicates that the success of mixed methods research is largely determined by researchers' ability to maintain logical consistency between research objectives, study design, and interpretive strategies. For novice researchers, the primary challenge lies not in limited analytical techniques or research instruments, but in designing and explaining the relationship between interviews and surveys in a coherent and convincing manner. When integration is not planned from the outset, qualitative and survey data tend to run in parallel without reinforcing one another, thereby limiting the potential of mixed methods to generate comprehensive understanding.

In this context, the use of simple joint displays for integrating interview and survey data has important methodological implications. Such displays

function as thinking tools that encourage researchers to consciously connect meanings derived from interviews with patterns identified through surveys. By placing qualitative themes and survey results within a single display, researchers are compelled to address a critical question: whether quantitative data reinforce, extend, or challenge qualitative findings. This process helps prevent partial conclusions and promotes more reflective interpretation.

Moreover, this approach has practical implications for research reporting. Simple displays facilitate readers-including reviewers and policymakers—in understanding the logic of methodological integration without requiring them to navigate lengthy and highly technical methodological descriptions. Integration thus becomes transparent not only at the level of analysis but also in the presentation of findings. For novice researchers, this strategy offers a realistic middle ground between methodological rigor and limited experience, while maintaining scientific quality.

Overall, these findings and discussions affirm that effective mixed methods research is not determined by the complexity of research designs or the sophistication of analytical techniques, but by the clarity of integration logic. By starting with appropriate research questions, selecting suitable designs, and employing simple yet consistent integration tools, researchers-including those at early stages of their careers-can harness the potential of mixed methods to produce social knowledge that is rich in meaning, empirically strong, and accessible to diverse audiences.

CONCLUSION

This article demonstrates that the mixed methods approach, particularly the integration of qualitative and survey methods, constitutes a relevant methodological response to the complexity of social realities that cannot be adequately explained by a single approach. The literature synthesis indicates that the epistemological rationale of mixed methods is generally grounded in pragmatism, drawing on interpretivist logic to understand social meanings and post-positivist logic to test patterns and distributions of findings through surveys. Nevertheless, the primary challenge in mixed methods practice does not lie in the absence of research designs or techniques, but rather in insufficient explanation of how and why the two methods are coherently integrated.

The findings further confirm that sequential designs-especially the sequential exploratory design-are the most globally dominant choice because they are considered the safest and easiest to implement, particularly for novice researchers. Within this design, surveys play a strategic role as tools for generalizing qualitative findings, validating constructs, and forming more stable social typologies. Consequently, surveys are no longer understood merely as instruments of quantification, but as integral components of knowledge production strategies that connect depth of meaning with the breadth of empirical patterns.

Furthermore, the discussion of forms and levels of methodological integration reveals that integration most frequently occurs at the design and

interpretation stages, while integration at the analysis stage remains relatively rare due to the higher level of methodological capacity it requires. In this context, the use of simple displays for integrating interviews and surveys has proven to be an effective practical solution. Such displays assist researchers in presenting and interpreting the relationship between qualitative findings and survey results in a transparent manner, allowing the logic of integration to be easily understood by readers and reviewers without compromising scientific rigor.

Based on these findings, this article recommends that researchers-particularly those at early stages of their careers-conceptualize mixed methods not as a complex combination of techniques, but as a methodological way of thinking that demands clarity of purpose, consistency in research design, and reflective interpretation. Methodological integration should be planned from the formulation of research questions, explicitly articulated in the methods section, and concretely demonstrated through integrative tools such as tables or joint displays. Through this approach, mixed methods can function as a research strategy that is not only epistemologically robust, but also practical, transparent, and inclusive for researchers with varying levels of experience.

REFERENCES

Amadi, A. (2023). Integration in a mixed-method case study of construction phenomena: From data to theory. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, *30*(1), 210–237.

Azabar, S., & Thijssen, P. (2025). Behind the scenes: a (self) critical reflection on doing mixed methods. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1–19.

Biddle, C., & Schafft, K. A. (2015). Axiology and anomaly in the practice of mixed methods work: Pragmatism, valuation, and the transformative paradigm. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *9*(4), 320–334.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Inoue, M. (2025). A process for conducting mixed methods data analysis. *Journal of General and Family Medicine*, *26*(1), 4–11. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1002/jgf2.736

Curry, L. A., Nembhard, I. M., & Bradley, E. H. (2009). Qualitative and mixed methods provide unique contributions to outcomes research. *Circulation*, *119*(10), 1442–1452.

Fatah, R. A. (2024). Penerapan Metode Penelitian Fenomenologi Pada Hermeneutika Hans George Gadamer. *Jurnal Kolaboratif Sains*, *7*(1), 515–524. https://doi.org/10.56338/jks.v7i1.4901

Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs—principles and practices. *Health Services Research*, *48*(6pt2), 2134–2156. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117

Fetters, M. D., & Molina-Azorin, J. F. (2017). The journal of mixed methods research starts a new decade: The mixed methods research integration trilogy and its dimensions. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, Vol. 11, pp.

291–307. Sage Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689817714066

Huang, L., Zan, J., Lv, K., & Zhao, X. (2025). A systematic review of mixed methods research in tourism and hospitality. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *63*, 163–176. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2025.03.005

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/https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689806298224

Jones, K. (2017). Using a theory of practice to clarify epistemological challenges in mixed methods research: An example of theorizing, modeling, and mapping changing West African seed systems. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *11*(3), 355–373.

Kittel, B. (2006). A crazy methodology? On the limits of macro-quantitative social science research. *International Sociology*, *21*(5), 647–677.

Migiro, S. O., & Magangi, B. A. (2011). Mixed methods: A review of literature and the future of the new research paradigm. *African Journal of Business Management*, *5*(10), 3757–3764.

Morgan, D. L. (2007). Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: Methodological implications of combining qualitative and quantitative methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *1*(1), 48–76.

Morgan, D. L. (2014). Pragmatism as a paradigm for social research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *20*(8), 1045–1053.

Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). Mixed methods research. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *12*(3), 305–306.

Riazi, A. M. (2016). Innovative mixed-methods research: Moving beyond design technicalities to epistemological and methodological realizations. *Applied Linguistics*, *37*(1), 33–49.

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, *104*, 333–339. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Sommer Harrits, G. (2011). More than method?: A discussion of paradigm differences within mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *5*(2), 150–166.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2010a). Putting the human back in '"human research methodology"': The researcher in mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, Vol. 4, pp. 271–277. Sage Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2010b). *Sage handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*. sage.

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2008). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences*. Sage publications.

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2011). Mixed methods research. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, *4*(1), 285–300.

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2012). Common "core" characteristics of mixed methods research: A review of critical issues and call for greater convergence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *56*(6), 774–788.

Turner, S. F., Cardinal, L. B., & Burton, R. M. (2017). Research design for mixed methods: A triangulation-based framework and roadmap. *Organizational Research Methods*, *20*(2), 243–267.

Yvonne Feilzer, M. (2010). Doing mixed methods research pragmatically: Implications for the rediscovery of pragmatism as a research paradigm. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *4*(1), 6–16.