

Schrauf, R. W. (2016). Mixed Methods: Interviews, Surveys, and Cross-Cultural Comparison. Cambridge University Press (Media Review)

Author

Li, Zongqiang, Liu, Honggang

Published

2020

Journal Title

Journal of Mixed Methods Research

Version

Accepted Manuscript (AM)

DOI

[10.1177/1558689820950858](https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689820950858)

Rights statement

Li, Z; Liu, H, Mixed Methods: Interviews, Schrauf, R. W. (2016). Mixed Methods: Interviews, Surveys, and Cross-Cultural Comparison. Cambridge University Press (Media Review), Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 2020. Copyright 2020. The Authors. Reprinted by permission of SAGE Publications.

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/398627>

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

Media Review

Schrauf, R. W. (2016). *Mixed Methods: Interviews, Surveys, and Cross-Cultural Comparison*. Cambridge University Press.

Reviewed by: Zongqiang Li, Griffith University, Australia; Honggang Liu, Northeast Normal University, China

In this globalized era, mixed-methods research (MMR) is widely utilized in various social and cultural research fields. However, integrating the qualitative and quantitative data rather than combining findings from both approaches remains a challenge for many researchers. To meet this challenge, Schrauf's book is timely, as it proposes a new discourse-centered framework (DCF) to combine both types of data effectively.

The book comprises three parts. The first part (Chapters 1–2) introduces the DCF and elaborates on the feasibility and necessity of applying it to MMR. Chapter 1 examines the DCF in terms of its concepts and components, highlighting that the DCF does not prohibit utilizing numerical data for the quantitative part of MMR. Instead, it targets the invisible discourse in quantitative data collection and processing; Schrauf highlights, for example, how surveys can provide various types of invisible discourse, ranging from actual conversation recorded in paper-and-pencil to virtual conversation online. Following this theoretical introduction to the DCF, Chapter 2 provides examples of the framework in MMR in various cross-cultural backgrounds, reinforcing its ability to enhance the validity, reliability, and quality of MMR by considering the data from discursive perspectives.

The second part (Chapters 3–5) mainly employs theories of linguistics, intercultural communication, and pragmatics to underscore the linguistic features of the DCF in MMR. Chapter 3 concentrates on the five linguistic constitutive features of interactional data in the DCF and

showcases how these features are applied in the whole mixed-methods process. Chapter 4 demonstrates how to reveal interactional data in questionnaires through the lens of the DCF and how these data are transformed into the constitutive features, namely, the fundamental principles of cultural meaning-making identified in Chapter 3. In addition, this chapter illustrates how interlocutors use qualitative data by interactional transcription to reveal discursive, narrative, and linguistic means for generating information and cultural behaviors. Chapter 5 concerns cross-linguistic translation in MMR, redefining the nature of translation as the search for meaning equivalence. The translated meaning is mediated in alternative natural languages through the translator. The author characterizes translation as an ongoing, cyclic, multilayered process covering the whole MMR and proposes sequence affordances of translation, transcription, and coding.

The third part (Chapters 6–11) uses a mixed-methods study about beliefs regarding Alzheimer disease to demonstrate how the authors used the DCF to analyze MMR data collected from participants in various cultural contexts (e.g., Mexican-Americans, African-Americans, and refugees/immigrants from the former Soviet Union). Chapter 6 sets its focus on the general design of these Alzheimer studies under the DCF. Chapters 7–10 serve as a guide to the DCF-based analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data in these studies. In Chapters 7–8, the authors employed statistical techniques to compare participants' stances from the questionnaire to map the distribution of the discourse and to integrate these findings with discursive analysis of qualitative data from interviews in Chapters 9–10. Chapter 11 makes a summary of using DCF to bring together the two levels of discourse for cross-cultural comparisons.

The principal takeaway offered by the author and the central theoretical and practical concern of the book is the use of DCF as the framework for integrating quantitative and qualitative data. With

the discourse turn in the philosophical field, discourse has become “a fundamental form of cultural life” (Weatherall, 2002, p. 219). Therefore, this book shows that the quantitative and qualitative data are integrated and analyzed based on interwoven discourses as interactional meaning-making and as distributed through a group. In addition to these theoretical contributions, the author shares with readers how to put the DCF into practice by producing discursive maps, a form of consensus analysis used for “examining patterns of alignment between survey participants” (p. 138). Another strength of the book is that the published studies on Alzheimer’s beliefs run through all the chapters as examples and case studies, which improves cohesion between individual chapters and therefore facilitates the reader’s understanding of the MMR. It is also refreshing to find that the chapter on language(s), translation(s), and bilingual(s) appears before the quantitative and qualitative data analysis chapters because the subsequent chapters on data analysis dispense with lengthy language issues, which is often neglected in many MMR methodology books. This chapter successfully demonstrates how it is possible to perform cross-cultural studies when the data are collected in different linguistic contexts.

The author’s argument about DCF is innovative, as mentioned, yet the book also contains limitations. For instance, the question items of surveys are very important to the quantitative method because they act as stance markers to signal the stance that a person takes toward the statement of belief. However, only one survey item example, “Memory loss is normal in old age,” is listed as a stance object. A deficiency of examples makes it hard to judge whether the stance-taking method and consensus analysis could be transferred to studies other than cross-cultural comparisons.

Those who take an interest in MMR are likely to benefit from reading this book, which captures the entire panorama of MMR, from data collection to analysis and publication. Through its tracing of the published Alzheimer’s belief studies, the design of this book allows the undergraduate or

postgraduate students, and the novice researchers, to gain a comprehensive understanding of how to carry out an empirical study using mixed methods and to publish the results in academic journals. Veteran researchers likewise can expand their knowledge, applying the discourse-based approach when performing MMR.

This book modifies our understanding of MMR by introducing a new analytical framework, the DCF, which future research should continue to validate and extend. We hope to see more innovative findings to move MMR forward.

References

Weatherall, A. (2002). *Gender, language and discourse*. Psychology Press.