**IRSTI 14.35.01**
**UDC 378** **DOI 10.70239/arsu.2026.t84.n2.20**

# FUNDAMENTALS OF MIXED-METHODS RESEARCH DESIGN: ANALYSIS OF MASTER'S STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF METHODOLOGICAL TRAINING (BASED ON THE PROCEEDINGS OF A WORKSHOP AT ZHUBANOV UNIVERSITY)

**UPADHYAY B.[1*], SADYKOVA S.A.[2]**

[*]**Upadhyay Bhaskar[1]** – PhD, professor, Department of organizational leadership, policy and development in education, college of education and human development, University of Minnesota (Twin Cities Campus), Minneapolis, USA.
**E-mail:** bhaskar@umn.edu, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5141-3778
**Sadykova Saule Altybaevna[2]** – PhD, associate professor of department of foreign philology and translation studies, K. Zhubanov Aktobe regional university, Aktobe, Kazakhstan
**E-mail:** ssadykova@zhubanov.edu.kz, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3825-7680

**Abstract.** The article presents the experiences of organizing and conducting a scientific and practical workshop on «Basics of Mixed Methods Research Design», which took place on October 14-15 at K. Zhubanov Aktobe Regional University as part of post «Bolashaq» («500 Scholars») program. The goal of the workshop was to improve the methodological competence of graduate students in the field of mixed methods research and building awareness as well as developing ethical research skills. To assess the effectiveness of the workshop and identify current student needs, semi-structured interviews were conducted with five graduate students from various educational programs. A thematic analysis of the interviews showed that graduates have a basic understanding of mixed methods as a combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches but experience difficulties with practical applications (e.g. design, sampling, data integration, analysis, and research ethics). Participants showed a need for practice-oriented skills building, including examples of case studies, tool development training, and on-going mentoring supports. Finally, the analysis showed that there is a greater need for students to learn about mixed methods as a part of the mandatory graduate level methodological courses. In addition, students need greater encouragement to learn and pursue mixed methods research through interdisciplinary projects. Furthermore, a continuous focus on research ethics needs to be part of graduate students' educational and research practices.

**Key words:** mixed methods research, research design, graduate students, Bolashak program, methodological training, thematic analysis, research ethics.

## Introduction

In the contemporary academic environment, mixed methods research is gaining an increasingly strong position as an independent methodological paradigm, allowing for the combination of the strengths of quantitative and qualitative approaches [1; 2]. For graduate students, especially in the humanities and social sciences, mastery of mixed methods design is becoming an important competency for conducting high-quality dissertation research and subsequent professional activities.

Kazakhstan's higher education system is undergoing many curricular changes aimed at improving scholarly and research skills of graduate students so the graduates can effectively contribute to both in the realm of knowledge production and are able to participate into the global academic community. The Bolashak program, particularly the «500 Scholars» program, plays a key role in enhancing the qualifications of Kazakhstani professors, administrators, and researchers through internships at leading international universities. Since mixed methods research designs capture many key and important features of qualitative and quantitative research traditions as well as their versatility, many graduate students and scholars have a highly positive view of mixed methods approach to research.

**The relevance** of this study stems from the need to support graduate students at a regional university to build their research capacity and skills. Additionally, mixed methods research tradition allows is to assess the current level of methodological understanding and views of the graduate students and potentially identify gaps in research methods skills and practices among the students. Thus, this two-day workshop could provide a targeted educational intervention opportunity. While many studies have actively discussed the advantages of mixed methods research [3; 4], in the Kazakhstani context, systematic studies of understanding graduate students' perceptions of these

methods are few and far between; therefore, has an urgent and critical need to further exploration.

**The aim of this article** is to document and understand the experiences of students who participated in a two-day mixed methods research workshop. We further analyze the post-workshop interviews to capture their understanding, difficulties and needs for mixed methods workshops and other methodological education to enhance their research skills.

**Research objectives:**

1. Describe the content and format of the workshop.
2. To present the results of a thematic analysis of interviews with graduate students.
3. To discuss the identified patterns in the context of improving research skills and need for methodological training in graduate students' education.

**Materials and methods of research**

**Research Design.** The study was carrioed out in a qualitative paradigm, using elements of a mixed-methods design at the data collection level (interviews and document analysis). The study was an exploratory case study aimed at documenting and understanding participants' perceptions of mixed-methods research, various aspects of its design, broad ideas of research ethics as well as specific to mixed methods design, and a general process of analyzing data from mixed methods research.

In this paper we specifically focus on graduate students' perceptions of learning about mixed methods design and research ethics because in most studies on research design and ethics, students' voices are either left out or muted [5]. Since this is the first-time mixed methods workshop participants were graduate students, we wanted to understand what their experiences were like and what ideas and issues related to mixed methods design and ethics they found valuable and challenging. Therefore, exploratory qualitative design seemed the most appropriate methodological choice.

**Study Participants.** The study participants were those who attended the two days long seminar with interactive activities on mixed methods design. Out of approximately 30 students who participated in the workshop, five graduate students (all female, aged 22–25) agreed to share their experiences for the study. All students were from K. Zhubanov Aktobe Regional University. The two-day seminar covered basics of mixed methods research design as well as some discussions on research ethics. Participant selection criteria included voluntary consent to be interviewed, full participation in the workshop, and being at least in their first year of master's program. In order to ensure anonymity, participants were assigned codes P1–P5.

**Workshop Description/Context.** The workshop was held on October 14 and 15 in 2024 in a hybrid format (in-person with the option of online participation). The program included the following modules, which are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The program of workshop

| Module | Content |
|---|---|
| 1. Introduction to Mixed Methods | Definition, history, paradigmatic foundations [6]. |
| 2. Types of mixed methods designs | Convergent, sequential (exploratory, explanatory) |
| 3. Data integration procedures | Comparison, transformation, joint representation (joint display) |
| 4. Ethical aspects | IRB procedures, informed consent, and confidentiality in mixed methods |
| 5. Practical workshop | Development of a research protocol, pilot interviews, and questionnaires |

The workshop was conducted by Dr. Saule Sadykova (K. Zhubanov ARU) and Dr. Bhaskar Upadhyay (University of Minnesota). The workshop was attended by 12 graduate students and six university faculty members.

**Data collection.** Interview was the major method of data collection to better understand students' more nuanced perceptions and views about mixed methods research design. Two weeks after the workshop, semi-structured interviews were conducted with five graduates. The interview questions were focused on knowing what students understood about the mixed methods research, designing a mixed methods research design, challenges and usefulness of this research method and what they learned and would remain unclear. The interview protocol can be found in the appendix.

Interviews were conducted in Russian or Kazakh, lasted 25–40 minutes, were audio-recorded with the consent of the participants, and were transcribed verbatim.

**Data analysis.** We utilized the transcript analysis method [7] that is more appropriate in small samples. We first read the transcripts to make sense of the data. After that we carried out an open coding method to generate codes that were related to students' views, perceptions, challenges, usefulness, and future value of mixed methods research design in their own research studies. We generated more than 20 open codes which were then coalesced into larger codes through axial coding method. Axial coding allowed us to reduce the open codes into seven codes. Finally, we grouped seven codes into appropriate themes or findings of this study. We revised and refined the themes into more appropriate and representative six themes as findings. Thus, providing us with robust interpretation of our data. We carried out the analysis manually using color highlighting.

**Ethical principles.** The study was carried out based on the approved exempted IRB protocol from the University of Minnesota. The Human Subject Determination was that the study did not include vulnerable groups and did not involve undue burden on the adult participants and intervention. Participants provided informed consent and we anonymized the data to mask the identities of the participants.

**Results and its discussion**

On analyzing the data from five master's students, we found six major themes. To assess the relative importance of each theme, frequency counts were used—not in a strictly statistical sense, but as an indicator of the dominance of certain semantic clusters in the responses. We present the six themes below. We provide representative quotes from participants as evidence and where necessary, we indicate the number of participants who agree with the central idea of the themes.

Theme 1: Understanding Mixed Methods – from Intuitive to Structured

All five participants demonstrated the ability to provide a general definition of mixed methods, but the depth of understanding varied significantly. Three of the five respondents held a so-called «naive» definition of the mixed methods research, describing mixed methods as a simple combination of surveys and interviews. A participant noted that mixed methods research is «when we use both surveys and interviews to get both numbers and people's opinions» (P2). Similarly, a student stated that, «It's [mixed methods] a combination of quantitative and qualitative data to more fully answer the research question» (P5). However, some participants who had experience learning about survey research in their writing coursework (P1, P4) demonstrated a more nuanced understanding: «I realized that simply adding interviews to a questionnaire isn't a mixed-methods design. You need to think about how to combine this data, and at what stage» (P4). They showed some complexities about mixed methods research design.

After the workshop, three participants (P1, P3, and P5) were able to not only state the definition but also successfully named specific design types. Additionally, they specifically mentioned that they primarily found «sequential explanatory designs most applicable» to their thesis topics. However, only one participant (P5) demonstrated an understanding of «data integration procedures», the most challenging aspect of mixed methods. Four of the five respondents expressed some form of difficulty regarding how exactly quantitative and qualitative data should be compared. This indicates that even after the workshop, the concept of integration remains an epistemological challenge for most graduate students.

None of the participants were familiar with Creswell's classification of mixed methods design such as convergent, sequential, exploratory, explanatory before the workshop. After the workshop, a participants noted, «I found the sequential explanatory design clear: first a survey, then an interview to explain the numbers. This fits my topic of the effectiveness of pedagogical strategies»

(P3).

Theme 2: Ethical aspects of mixed methods – an underestimated component

In the participants' responses, ethical issues arose spontaneously, without direct prompting from the interviewer, which could likely be because of the emphasis on the value and need for IRB procedures during the workshop. Four of the five participants mentioned the need to obtain informed consent when working with their research participants, but only two (P1 and P5) addressed the specific ethical risk of mixed-method designs: “the possibility of inadvertent identification of participants when comparing quantitative and qualitative data”. The remaining respondents considered the ethical concerns raised in the mixed method design as the sum of qualitative and quantitative designs. They felt that qualitative and quantitative methods required separate ethical consideration and they were additive in nature. They showed lack of awarness that in a mixed methods design, the risks are not summative but rather they are multiplicative. This gap is particularly significant, as it highlights the lack of a systematic discussion of the ethics of mixed methods research within the existing curriculum. The responses from P1 and P2 show their ethical awareness in research, specifically mixed methods design.

> P1:When we interview people, we always have to ask permission, and in mixed methods, this is doubly important because we collect both personal stories and anonymized data, but they can be compared.
> P5: I learned that even if a study doesn't require a full IRB protocol, we still have no right to violate confidentiality.

At the same time, one participant (P3) admitted that the ethical standards of mixed methods remained «vague» for her: «I know consent is required, but I don't understand how to formalize it if I'm using pre-existing questionnaires and interviews with translators simultaneously». This suggests the need for a more nuanced and focused education on research ethics as well as some kind of practical engagement. Furthermore, students like P3 is in need of more practical review of research ethics related documents and procedure at their university.

Theme 3. Difficulties in applying mixed methods

Participants identified four categories of barriers in utilizing mixed methods design in their potential research. We counted how the number of times students mentioned different barriers to using mixed methods in their studies. The most common challenge, noted by four out of five graduate students, was a lack of time due to the need to collect two types of data in parallel with their main course load. Three participants identified the difficulty of data integration as a major conceptual barrier. Exactly the same number of respondents (three) admitted to a lack of analysis skills in using qualitative and quantitative softwares such as the SPSS or Nvivo. They felt that this was a major limitation their ability to process mixed method data. Two participants felt that a big challenge was recruiting participants for a mixed method study because potential respondents often declined to participate in a study involving two stages of data collection. More senior students (P1, P3, P5), who had already started their research (thesis or dissertation) and had already completed some parts of their research work wanted asked specific and situational questions about overcoming some of the barriers mentioned earlier whereas first-year students (P2 and P4) wondered about the barriers in a more general sense. The table below shows some of the key barriers that students identified during the interviews (Table 2).

Table 2. The graduate student identified barriers to mixed methods research.

| **Barrier type** | **Examples of statements** | **Number of students** |
|---|---|---|
| Lack of time to collect two types of data | «It’s very difficult to manage both collecting questionnaires and conducting interviews - this is a double job». (P2) | 4 |
| The complexity of data | «It’s unclear how to compare statistics from the | 3 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| integration | survey and quotes from the interview». (P4) | |
| Lack of skills in working with programs | «I don't know how to use SPSS, only Excel. And for the mixed methods, you also need NVivo, as we were shown». (P1) | 3 |
| Difficulty accessing participants | «The big challenge is finding respondents who will agree to both a survey and an interview. Many refuse». (P5) | 2 |

The barrier associated with institutional pressure and deadlines deserves special attention. P4 noted, «Our research thesis is written in parallel with our studies. There's no separate semester just for research. That's why, many people give up the mixed design and choose something simpler». Thus, pointing out why mixed methods design has lesser opportunity to be utilized in research anytime soon.

Theme 4. Workshop Evaluation and Requests for Further Training

Without exception, all participants rated the practical value of the workshop. They also mentioned the usefulness of the activity in the workshop during which they independently got to develop a draft of a research protocol. Four respondents highly valued the analysis of real projects shared by the workshop presenters, which, according to them, allowed them to «see how everything works in practice». However, two participants expressed a wish for handouts, namely, informed consent templates, study design checklists, and examples of joint data display. This indicates that, despite the value of interactive formats, graduate students feel a need for cognitive reference points that can be used while they are carrying out their independent research work.

All participants highly appreciated the practical focus of the workshop. P1 mentioned, «The workshop, where we wrote the research protocol ourselves, was very helpful. Before that, it was all theory». Similarly, P3 stated that «Professor Upadhyay's examples from real projects were very helpful; it was immediately clear how everything works».

When asked what else they needed to get a better understanding about mixed methods design, the participants answered with responses in the following manned:

More practical sessions with case studies (5 out of 5). P2 stated, «I'd like for each session to focus on someone else's design what's good about it, what's bad about it, and how to improve it».

Individual mentoring (4 out of 5). P5: «It's best when each graduate student has an additional mentoring assistance, except your supervisor, who reviews your design and offers advice».

Mixed Methods Software Course (3 out of 5). P4: «Teach us how to use NVivo and SPSS not just in practice, but with real data».

Templates and checklists (2 of 5). P1: «A collection of templates would be nice: consent form, interview protocol, integration plan».

These representative statements indicate that students would want to learn and utilize mixed methods design. They just need greater skills enhancing learning opportunities.

Theme 5: The Impact of Personal Experience and Motivation

Three participants linked their understanding of mixed methods to their coursework experience, where they had already used survey or interview elements but had not recognized this as part of a mixed-methods design. For example, P4 noted, «I've done surveys before, but I didn't know it was part of a mixed-methods design». Two respondents cited their supervisors as a source of methodological advice, but in both cases, this was merely advice to add interviews to the survey, without explaining the integration procedures. Thus, current dissertation supervision practices appear to fail to provide systematic training in mixed methods.

Theme 6: Suggestions for improving methodological training

An analysis of the participants' proposals revealed a consensus request for practice-oriented and skills focused workshops and other opportunities. All five graduate students preferred incorporating real-world case studies into the curriculum, preferably in every class. Four participants supported the idea of individual mentoring, whereby each master's and doctoral student is assigned an experienced researcher who reviews the design and provides feedback. Three

respondents considered it necessary to introduce a separate course or module on working with mixed-methods studies to learn various analysis software tools. Finally, two participants expressed a desire to create a collection of standard templates and documentation, demonstrating a demand for standardized procedures.

The workshop exposed a gap between theoretical knowledge of mixed methods and the practical ability to apply them. This gap is characteristic not only of Kazakhstani but also of other international master's degree training practices [8; 9]. Participants demonstrated motivation to master mixed methods design but encountered objective limitations: time, resources, and tools.

An important outcome is the graduate students' awareness of the ethical implications of mixed methods design. Unlike single-methods designs, students needed to be more cognizant research ethics appropriate for mixed methods design. They also seemed to be aware of additional ethical risks associated with participant identification when comparing qualitative and quantitative data [10]. Participants expressed a willingness to adhere to ethical standards but they need practical tools (consent templates, de-identification procedures) to help them guide in building a more robust research ethics practices.

The findings align with Creswell's [1] conclusions regarding the need to teach mixed methods not as a separate discipline, but as a cross-cutting competency integrated into research practice. The workshop, held at Zhubanov University, was the first step in this direction.

**Comparative analysis of the participants.** When comparing the responses of individual respondents, a clear connection emerges between the initial level of preparation and the progress achieved during the workshop. P1 and P5, participants with practical experience in research seemed to demonstrate greater understanding about mixed methods and related research. Since both already had approved dissertation topics by the time of the workshop, which likely created an additional motivational basis for mastering mixed methods designs. In contrast, P2 and P4 (first-year students with no research experience yet and no approved topic for research) seemed to retain a disjointed view and understanding of mixed methods research after the workshop. They knew that qualitative and quantitative designs were being mixed, but they seemed to have challenge in identifying various kinds of mixed methods designs and their purposes. P3, who had done some research, seemed to demonstrate confidence in mixed methods ideas, but was unable to provide an independent example of applying a mixed design to her topic. These differences suggest that the effectiveness of mixed methods workshop to build research skills seemed to help enhanced students’ knowledge and understanding on the topic. However, they all seemed to indicate that they learned the most when the theories of mixed methods were aligned with appropriate activities and opportunities to connect with one's own research project.

**Frequency analysis as an indicator of priorities.** We wanted to understand which research related priorities students felt most valuable in building their research capacity and understanding in relation to ethics and mixed methods design. The total number of mentions for each topic (without duplication within a single interview) was distributed as follows. The largest number of statements-fourteen - was related to suggestions for improvement in learning about research methods in general, which seemed to demonstrate students' dissatisfaction with the existing system of teaching and learning methodological courses or focused training on those topics. Almost as many – twelve – mentions were related to understanding mixed methods and the difficulties of their application, reflecting both aroused interest and an awareness of obstacles. Eleven mentions were related to the topic of seminar evaluation, all of which were positive, citing specific deficiencies in their regular university education connected to research methods and ethics. Nine mentions were related to ethical aspects, which, on the one hand, speaks to a developed sensitivity to ethical issues, but also points to insufficient consideration of the specific ethical concerns of mixed designs. Finally, the fewest mentions – five – were related to the influence of personal experiences in research and research ethics, which seemed to be about the lack of critical reflections on their individual educational trajectory in the context of mastering research methodologies and skills associated with them.

The findings fit within the broader context of international research on mixed methods

teaching. As Creswell [1] has shown, short-term workshops are effective in raising awareness but insufficient for developing full-fledged mixed methods design competence. Our results confirm this: after a two-day workshop, participants learned to recognize and name design types, but stated some difficulties they would encounter while applying this knowledge to their own projects, particularly in terms of data integration and software use to analyze the data.

The ethical dimension of mixed methods deserves special attention. The literature has repeatedly emphasized that mixed methods designs pose specific ethical risks associated with the de-anonymization of participants when comparing quantitative and qualitative data. The fact that only two of the five participants were able to verbalize this risk even after the workshop indicates that this topic is insufficiently addressed in the existing curriculum. It is recommended not only to include the ethics of mixed methods in lecture courses but also to explore specific case studies demonstrating the mechanisms of de-anonymization.

Case studies, individual mentoring, practical workshops, and provision of documentation templates were all cited as priorities by participants, and all are included in international guidelines as best practices for blended methods teaching. Thus, the needs of Kazakhstani master's students are not specific to their local context but rather reflect the universal needs of early-career researchers.

**Limitations and directions for further research.** Before moving on to recommendations, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of the study. The small sample (five participants) precludes statistical generalizations, but the depth of the qualitative analysis compensates for this. The study was conducted at a single university, focusing on a single major, which limits the generalizability of the results to other disciplines, universities, and contexts. The homogeneity of the sample by gender (all women) reflects the actual gender composition but does not account for possible gender differences in perceptions of methodological training. However, we do not believe that there will be any gender difference in the perceptions of methodological training. Finally, interviews were conducted two weeks after the seminar, so long-term knowledge retention was beyond the scope of the study. A promising direction would be a longitudinal study in which the same group of master's students would be interviewed six months later, at the stage of completing their dissertations.

**Recommendations.** Based on the analysis, several recommendations can be formulated. First, it would be advisable to include a separate module on mixed methods research in the curricula of master's programs, comprising at least three credits (120 academic hours), with an emphasis on practical design and development, integration of methods and data collection procedures, and research ethics. Second, it is necessary to create a teaching and methodological kit that includes not only theoretical materials but also research protocol templates, design checklists, and examples of joint data display adapted to the context of Translation Studies or any other program. Third, organizing a series of workshops on working with mixed methods skills development (data analysis tools and processes) would support students' research capacity. A preference for free and accessible tools would be worthwhile because of the cost associated with many data management and analysis tools such as JASP, R, and basic NVivo. Fourth, a system of individual mentoring program would help master's students receives support from an experienced in mixed methods researcher during the design planning stage. Finally, it is necessary to regularly hold open workshops or webinars and discussions on the ethical dilemmas of mixed methods research, with analysis of specific cases from the field of intercultural communication, translation, and other social science areas.

These measures will not only enhance the methodological competence of master's students but also develop a strong ethical practices, which is especially important for specialties that involve working with people, texts, and cultural meanings.

**Conclusion**

The workshop, «Basics of Mixed Methods Research Design» program allowed us to document and understand the following key experiences and concerns of students:

1. The students had an intuitive understanding of combining methods but lacked a systematic understanding of design types and data integration procedures.

2. The students seemed to identify key challenges in using mixed methods: time costs,

integration complexity, lack of skills in working with specialized software, and ethical dilemmas.

3. The students sought and valued practice-oriented training that was hands-on.

4. The study showed master's degree students needed methods related training to build their research skills.

5. The study seemed to point that the «Mixed Methods Research Design» needs to be part of the graduate student course work and research education.

6. A regular methodological workshop at the university in partnership with the international experts could be beneficial to students and others.

7. An easily accessible templates and checklists on ethics and methodological choices adapted to Kazakhstani conditions would be of value to the students in providing guidance and support.

8. A researcher-graduate student mentoring system to provide individualized support for research design would be of value to students.

9. To demonstrate the effectiveness of international cooperation within the framework of the Bolashaq program for the transfer of advanced methodological standards.

Future research opportunities could include developing and testing a modular mixed-methods program for master's students, as well as conducting a longitudinal study to track the impact of such seminars on the quality of dissertations at the doctoral level education.

## References

1. Creswell J.W. Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (3rd ed.). – Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2009. – 260 p.

2. Tashakkori A., Teddlie C. SAGE Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research (2nd ed.). – Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2010. – 912 p.

3. Fetters M.D., Curry L.A., Creswell J.W. Achieving Integration in Mixed Methods Designs—Principles and Practices. Health Services Research, 2013. Volume 48. Issue 6 (Pt 2), 2134–2156. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117

4. Plano Clark V.L., Ivankova N.V. Mixed Methods Research: A Guide to the Field. – Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2017. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483398341

5. Droog A., Weaver K.D., Brady F. Along for the Journey: Graduate Student Perceptions of Research. College & Research Libraries, 2024. Volume 85. Issue 6. 804–825. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.85.6.826

6. Creswell J.W., Plano Clark V.L. Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research. – Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2010. – 488 p.

7. Braun V., Clarke V. Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 2006. Volume 3. Issue 2. 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

8. Earley M.A. A Synthesis of the Literature on Research Methods Education. Teaching in Higher Education, 2014. Volume 19. Issue 3. 242–253. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2013.860105

9. Stern C., Lizarondo L., Carrier J., Godfrey C., Rieger K., Salmond S., Apóstolo J., Kirkpatrick P., Loveday H. Methodological Guidance for the Conduct of Mixed Methods Systematic Reviews. JBI Evidence Synthesis, 2020. Volume 18. Issue 10. 2108–2118. https://doi.org/10.11124/JBISRIR-D-19-00169

10. Iphofen R., Tolich M. (Eds.). The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research Ethics. – London: SAGE Publications Ltd., 2018. – 664 p.

## References

1. Creswell J.W. Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (3rd ed.). – Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2009. – 260 p.

2. Tashakkori A., Teddlie C. SAGE Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research (2nd ed.). – Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2010. – 912 p.

3. Fetters M.D., Curry L.A., Creswell J.W. Achieving Integration in Mixed Methods Designs—Principles and Practices. Health Services Research, 2013. Volume 48. Issue 6 (Pt 2),

2134–2156. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117

4. Plano Clark V.L., Ivankova N.V. Mixed Methods Research: A Guide to the Field. – Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2017. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483398341

5. Droog A., Weaver K.D., Brady F. Along for the Journey: Graduate Student Perceptions of Research. College & Research Libraries, 2024. Volume 85. Issue 6. 804–825. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.85.6.826

6. Creswell J.W., Plano Clark V.L. Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research. – Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2010. – 488 p.

7. Braun V., Clarke V. Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 2006. Volume 3. Issue 2. 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

8. Earley M.A. A Synthesis of the Literature on Research Methods Education. Teaching in Higher Education, 2014. Volume 19. Issue 3. 242–253. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2013.860105

9. Stern C., Lizarondo L., Carrier J., Godfrey C., Rieger K., Salmond S., Apóstolo J., Kirkpatrick P., Loveday H. Methodological Guidance for the Conduct of Mixed Methods Systematic Reviews. JBI Evidence Synthesis, 2020. Volume 18. Issue 10. 2108–2118. https://doi.org/10.11124/JBISRIR-D-19-00169

10. Iphofen R., Tolich M. (Eds.). The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research Ethics. – London: SAGE Publications Ltd., 2018. – 664 p.

# АРАЛАС ЗЕРТТЕУ ӘДІСТЕРІ ДИЗАЙНЫНЫҢ НЕГІЗДЕРІ: МАГИСТРАНТТАРДЫҢ ӘДІСНАМАЛЫҚ ДАЯРЛЫҚ ТУРАЛЫ КӨЗҚАРАСТАРЫН ТАЛДАУ (ЖҰБАНОВ УНИВЕРСИТЕТІНДЕ ӨТКЕН СЕМИНАР МАТЕРИАЛДАРЫ НЕГІЗІНДЕ)

**УПАДХАЙ Б.[1*], САДЫКОВА С.А.[2]**

[*]**Упадхай Бхаскар[1]** – PhD, Білім беру саласындағы ұйымдастырушылық көшбасшылық, саясат және даму кафедрасының профессоры, Білім беру және адами даму колледжі, Миннесота университеті (Twin Cities кампусы), Миннеаполис қ., АҚШ.
**E-mail:** bhaskar@umn.edu, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5141-3778
**Садыкова Сауле Алтыбаевна[2]** – PhD, Шетел филологиясы және аударматану кафедрасының доценті, Қ. Жұбанов атындағы Ақтөбе өңірлік университеті, Ақтөбе қ., Қазақстан
**E-mail:** ssadykova@zhubanov.edu.kz, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3825-7680

**Аңдатпа.** Мақалада «Аралас зерттеу әдістері дизайнының негіздері» тақырыбындағы ғылыми-тәжірибелік воркшопты ұйымдастыру және өткізу тәжірибесі ұсынылған. Аталған воркшоп 14–15 қазанда Қ. Жұбанов атындағы Ақтөбе өңірлік университетінде «Болашақ» бағдарламасының («500 ғалым») аясында өтті. Воркшоптың мақсаты магистранттардың аралас зерттеу әдістері саласындағы әдіснамалық құзыреттілігін жетілдіру, зерттеу туралы хабардарлығын арттыру және зерттеу этикасы дағдыларын дамыту болды.

Воркшоптың тиімділігін бағалау және білім алушылардың өзекті қажеттіліктерін анықтау мақсатында әртүрлі білім беру бағдарламаларында оқитын бес магистрантпен жартылай құрылымданған сұхбат жүргізілді. Сұхбаттардың тақырыптық талдауы магистранттардың аралас зерттеу әдістерін сандық және сапалық тәсілдердің үйлесімі ретінде жалпы түсінетінін, алайда оларды практикалық тұрғыдан қолдануда (мысалы, зерттеу дизайнын құру, іріктеу жүргізу, деректерді интеграциялау, талдау және зерттеу этикасын сақтау мәселелерінде) қиындықтарға тап болатынын көрсетті.

Қатысушылар тәжірибеге бағытталған дағдыларды дамытуға, соның ішінде кейстік зерттеулер мысалдарын қарастыруға, зерттеу құралдарын әзірлеу бойынша оқытуға және тұрақты ғылыми жетекшілік қолдауға қажеттілік бар екенін атап өтті. Сонымен қатар, талдау нәтижелері аралас зерттеу әдістерін магистратура деңгейіндегі міндетті әдіснамалық пәндердің құрамына енгізудің маңыздылығын көрсетті. Бұдан бөлек, студенттерді пәнаралық жобалар арқылы аралас зерттеу әдістерін меңгеруге және оларды ғылыми зерттеулерде қолдануға ынталандыру қажет. Сондай-ақ зерттеу этикасына тұрақты назар аудару магистранттардың білім беру және ғылыми-зерттеу тәжірибесінің ажырамас бөлігі болуы тиіс.

**Түйін сөздер:** аралас зерттеу әдістері, зерттеу дизайны, магистранттар, «Болашақ» бағдарламасы, әдіснамалық даярлық, тақырыптық талдау, зерттеу этикасы.

# ОСНОВЫ ДИЗАЙНА ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ СО СМЕШАННЫМИ МЕТОДАМИ: АНАЛИЗ ВОСПРИЯТИЯ МЕТОДОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ ПОДГОТОВКИ МАГИСТРАНТАМИ (НА ОСНОВЕ МАТЕРИАЛОВ СЕМИНАРА В ЖУБАНОВ УНИВЕРСИТЕТЕ)

**УПАДХАЙ Б.[1*], САДЫКОВА С.А.[2]**

[*]**Упадхай Бхаскар**[1] – PhD, профессор кафедры организационного лидерства, политики и развития в сфере образования, Колледжа образования и развития человека, Университета Миннесоты (кампус Twin Cities), г. Миннеаполис, США.
**E-mail:** bhaskar@umn.edu, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5141-3778
**Садыкова Сауле Алтыбаевна**[2] – PhD, доцент кафедры иностранной филологии и переводоведения, Актюбинский региональный университет имени К. Жубанова, г. Актобе, Казахстан
**E-mail:** ssadykova@zhubanov.edu.kz, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3825-7680

**Аннотация.** В статье представлен опыт организации и проведения научно-практического воркшопа на тему «Основы дизайна исследований с использованием смешанных методов» («Basics of Mixed Methods Research Design»), который состоялся 14–15 октября в Актюбинском региональном университете имени К. Жубанова в рамках программы «Болашак» («500 ученых»). Целью воркшопа являлось повышение методологической компетентности магистрантов в области исследований с использованием смешанных методов, расширение их исследовательской осведомленности, а также развитие навыков исследовательской этики.

Для оценки эффективности воркшопа и выявления актуальных потребностей обучающихся были проведены полуструктурированные интервью с пятью магистрантами различных образовательных программ. Тематический анализ интервью показал, что магистранты имеют базовое представление о смешанных методах как о сочетании количественных и качественных подходов, однако испытывают трудности в их практическом применении (в частности, при разработке дизайна исследования, формировании выборки, интеграции данных, анализе и соблюдении принципов исследовательской этики).

Участники отметили необходимость развития практико-ориентированных навыков, включая изучение примеров кейсов, обучение разработке исследовательских инструментов и получение постоянной научно-методической поддержки. Кроме того, результаты анализа показали высокую потребность во включении исследований с использованием смешанных методов в обязательные методологические дисциплины магистратуры. Также необходимо стимулировать студентов к изучению и применению смешанных методов исследования посредством междисциплинарных проектов. Наряду с этим постоянное внимание к вопросам исследовательской этики должно стать неотъемлемой частью образовательной и научно-исследовательской деятельности магистрантов.

**Ключевые слова:** смешанные методы исследования, дизайн исследования, магистранты, программа «Болашак», методологическая подготовка, тематический анализ, исследовательская этика.