Article 1 : Data Analysis Strategies for Mixed-Method Evaluation Designs

The article begins by acknowledging the increasing recognition, since 1984, of the importance of using multiple methods in program evaluation. It notes the gap between the calls for utilizing multiple methods and actual successful examples of doing so. Despite this, the shift in thinking towards embracing multiple methods is seen as essential for the development of new evaluation models.

Over time, a significant body of literature has emerged focusing on various issues related to the use of multiple methods in evaluation and applied research. This includes discussions on triangulation, multiplism, mixing methods and paradigms, and mixed-method typologies. These discussions build upon classic theoretical literature, laying the groundwork for exploring different research strategies.

The article then introduces the concept of mixed-method evaluation designs, which involve integrating both quantitative and qualitative methods in program evaluation. Greene, Caracelli, and Graham (1989) provide a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs, identifying five main purposes for combining qualitative and quantitative methods: triangulation, complementarity, development, initiation, and expansion.

Each purpose serves a distinct function in the evaluation process, from seeking convergence and corroboration of results to extending the breadth and range of inquiry. The article discusses how these purposes are grounded in both theoretical literature and empirical evaluation studies.

Furthermore, Greene et al. (1989) identify seven design elements relevant to mixed methodology, which encompass characteristics of methods, phenomena under investigation, paradigms, and criteria for implementation. These elements are crucial for effectively integrating qualitative and quantitative methods in evaluation designs.

The article also explores different approaches to data analysis and interpretation/reporting in mixed-method evaluations. It categorizes these approaches into four main strategies: no integration, partial integration during interpretation, integration during both analysis and interpretation, and unreported analysis procedures. The findings indicate a paucity of instances where qualitative and quantitative data are meaningfully integrated during the analysis stage, despite intentional mixed-method designs.

To address this gap, the article discusses integrative strategies for mixed-method data analysis. These include data transformation, typology development, extreme case analysis, and data consolidation/merging. These strategies facilitate the integration of qualitative and quantitative data, providing comprehensive insights into program evaluation

Overall, the article underscores the importance of thoughtful planning, careful execution, and innovative analytical approaches in mixed-method evaluation designs. It highlights the need for further exploration and refinement of mixed-method approaches to enhance the effectiveness and validity of program evaluation efforts.