www.etimm.ase.ro

Transparency and Complexity: Comparative Critical Review of Mixed Methods Approaches in Marketing Research

Haekal Adha AL-GIFFARI
International Islamic University Malaysia
haekal.al@live.iium.edu.my

Nafisa MAYUKH
International Islamic University Malaysia
nafmayukh@gmail.com

Article history
Received 13 August 2023 | Accepted 22 January 2024 | Published online 23 January 2024.

Abstract
Mixed methods enable researchers to yield credible information, data, and results in marketing research. However, the challenge lies in maintaining transparency and comprehensiveness in reporting due to complexities in the process. The objective of this paper is to provide a comparative critical review of three high-quality papers, emphasizing marketing research through a mixed methods approach. A review of mixed methods is explained, followed by the implementation of a comparative critical analysis for three selected journal articles. The first paper (P1) delves into the impact of e-CRM on the performance of SMEs in the UK, while the second (P2) investigates the driving forces behind the adoption of mobile ad blockers. The third paper (P3) analyses the intricate relationship between marketing innovation, R&D investment, and new product performance. Although each paper has a different emphasis on marketing (CRM, mobile ad blockers, and innovation), several similarities are discovered. First, most of the papers' references were connected to their similar earlier paper, focusing on marketing innovation. Second, they shared similar significance for marketers or C-level management in understanding the scientific process of establishing marketing innovation, especially using a digital approach. Third, the sampling procedure is not disclosed which might affect the representativeness. This article helps in understanding the mixed methods approach and assists in developing a more transparent mixed methods approach in marketing research. In conclusion, reviewing, analyzing, and comparing journal articles with similar focus and methods might add methodological and substantial insights in marketing research.

Keywords: Marketing, innovation, mixed methods, critical review.

JEL classification: M31.

1. Introduction

Quantitative and qualitative designs have been employed as the primary research design for centuries, exploring and explaining their own dimension of phenomena. Given the limitations in methodologies and design developments, single-method approaches cannot provide a comprehensive and holistic understanding of phenomena. In response to these limitations, mixed-method emerges as a solution, combining quantitative numerical data with rich qualitative insights (Doyle et al., 2009). Whereby, inferences are obtained in a single study using both qualitative and quantitative approaches (Tashakkori and Creswell, 2007). Data collection and analysis align with the hypothesis and research questions, integrating both qualitative and quantitative methods to provide comprehensive answers (Creswell and Clark, 2018, p.41). Mixed methods bring further diversity in the availability of methods, dealing with various phenomena. It is deemed that mixed methods are more practical in attracting funding for research projects (Giddings, 2006). However, challenges in applying mixed methods are apparent, such as adequate resources, time, and researcher capability (Creswell and Clark, 2018, p.57). This is given that research ethics and transparency are necessary to be fulfilled for research credibility and integrity. Prior research analyzed multi-method and mixed method (Vivek and Nanthagopan, 2021), criticizing mixed methods design (Fàbregues et al., 2021) and critical review of mixed methods approach in tourism and hospitality (Azer et al., 2022). Understanding that marketing is a huge spectrum and mixed methods are considered a more advanced design compared to merely qualitative or quantitative. Thus, the objective of this paper is to provide a comparative critical review of three distinguished papers in the field of marketing research, focusing on their utilization of a mixed methods approach. A meticulous comparative analysis is employed delving into methodologically selected marketing journal articles, exploring and addressing the diverse spectrum of methodologies within the realm of mixed methods research.

2. The purpose of mixed methods design

Examining mixed methods research design, Schoonenboom and Johnson (2017) explained seven primary dimensions of design which consist of purpose, theoretical drive, timing, integration point, typological and interactive design, planned and emergent design, and design complexity. This article will expound on the first four dimensions as the rest are more complex and suitable for expert mixed methods researchers. Some study examples elaborated on understanding the design of mixed methods. The study might begin with a qualitative needs assessment to identify key questions for investigation. Subsequently, an instrument is designed to measure the program's impact, comparing outcomes before and after implementation. Based on this comparison, follow-up interviews are conducted to gain insights into the reasons behind the program's success or failure (Farmer and Knapp, 2008). Another study started using surveys to gather the data and employed interviews with those who fulfilled the questionnaire, delving into the explanation beyond the quantitative findings (Jellesmark et al., 2012).

First, the main purpose of mixed methods is to strengthen and extend the study using the combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches in answering research questions. The use of mixed methods can be optimized in evaluating at least one research question to understand phenomena in multiple dimensions or several research questions can be applied provided it is related to each other, hence quantitative and qualitative approach could fit with the research question design. Second, theoretical drive. The driving theory of whether they are qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods researchers will determine the mixed methods design. Quantitative dominance in mixed methods depends on the positivistic view and adds a qualitative approach to complementing the research, while qualitative dominance implements otherwise, relying on interpretive views and recognizing the quantitative data. However, the pure mixed methods researcher position their equal status as they put their mixed methods philosophy as the foundation and believe the qualitative and quantitative approaches will enrich the findings equally (Johnson, et al., 2007). Third, timing consists of simultaneity and dependence (Guest, 2013). Guest (2013) explained that simultaneity classifies parallel and sequential mixed methods designs. Parallel or concurrent design happens when quantitative and qualitative elements are executed simultaneously, while sequential design is when the execution of quantitative elements precedes the qualitative elements or otherwise. Dependence means when the execution of one component depends on the results of other elements' data analysis results. For instance, the quantitative approach cannot be implemented unless the data analysis of the qualitative approach is executed (Toyon, 2021). Fourth, is the point of integration. Mixed methods are not only mixing the results but also integrating them. How and where integration is the essence of this research design. There are two points of integration, the result point of integration and the analytical point of integration (Morse, 2016). The resulting point of integration wrote the findings of the first element and integrated it with the second element. The portrayal of findings from quantitative and qualitative approaches will be displayed as well as its integrative statement. Next, the analytical point of integration involves two analytical stages. In the first phase, qualitative data is used to identify the topics. In the second phase, those topics are quantified, becoming quantitative data. Fifth, typology utilization design. Typology utilization designs the major construction of mixed methods body which can be used to apply the research. One of the most well-known mixed methods typological designs is introduced by Creswell and Clark (2018) which are convergent, explanatory, and exploratory (p.123). Convergent designs exhibit the results of both components merged and compared, while the explanatory sequential design shows that quantitative components are explained by qualitative components. In addition, the exploratory sequential design gathers qualitative data first and its results to build quantitative measurement (Creswell and Clark, 2018, p. 123).

3. Methodology

A Comparative Critical Analysis has been conducted in this study to analyze the similarities, differences, advantages, and challenges addressing the mixed method approach in marketing research (Coccia and Benati, 2018). Three selected journal articles will be reviewed respectively. The three papers were selected due to the similarities in their research design, addressing a similar phenomenon in marketing. However, different mixed-method approaches and different scopes of marketing are identified. Based on the publication level, citation, and methodological framework, selected journal articles are considered at the same scientific level. To ease the identification within the paper, each paper is assigned P1, P2, and P3, respectively. The first paper titled 'Exploring and Explaining SME Marketing: Investigating E-CRM using A Mixed Methods Approach' (Harrigan et al., 2012) is assigned as P1 followed by 'The Curse of Mobile Marketing: A Mixed Methods Study on Individuals' Switch to Mobile Ad Blockers' (Müller et al., 2017) as P2 and lastly, 'R&D, Marketing Innovation, and New Product Performance: A Mixed Methods Study' (Grimpe et al., 2017) assigned P3. Each paper is reviewed critically based on its objective, significance, methodology, theory, and findings. In every segment, comments are identified for the article's understanding and improvement. Next, comparative analysis is conducted to investigate the similarities and differences among selected journal articles, referring to the results of critical analysis. Comments are made in the comparison section as well.

4. Critical review of selected journal articles

P1 focuses on exploring the use of Internet-Based Technologies (IBTs) by small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in enhancing their Customer Relationship Management (CRM) process (Harrigan et al., 2012). The approach taken by SME entrepreneurs or owner-managers in implementing their marketing is examined as well. However, the research questions, research objectives, and hypothesis are not clearly stated, and the significance of the paper is not explicitly explained. Nonetheless, the findings bring practical and managerial significance as they provide guidelines for SMEs in enhancing their customer-oriented marketing as well as a framework for SME managers to integrate IBTs with their CRM. Additionally, the study does not explicitly mention a specific theory, framework, or model, which can make it difficult to understand the research direction.

Alternatively, a sequential approach to mixed methods research was described, where a qualitative phase was preceded by a single quantitative. This approach to research design enables exploration followed by deeper elaboration of e-CRM (Electronic customer relationship management) in SMEs, whereby the combination of web channels with the overall enterprise CRM strategy ensures consistency in sales, customer service and support, and marketing across all channels. Hence, giving both breadth and depth to the research. The quantitative and qualitative methods are mixed to the extent that quantitative data leads directly to qualitative investigation and subsequent data. More specifically, the qualitative phase served to elucidate and provide more depth to the questionnaire responses. A questionnaire was distributed to SMEs in the UK to gather the nature of CRM in SMEs, including its potential benefits and challenges of e-CRM with a total of 200 responses. Next, semi-structured interviews with entrepreneurs or owner-managers about the marketing approach were conducted with 20 informants. Gaining insights from the management draws the phenomena better as they were strongly involved with the practical implementation. P1 attempted to gather the major perception about the potential benefits and challenges of CRM in SMEs and complement those data with insights from the C-level management or top management, in relation to the marketing approach. Regression analysis was implemented to examine the relationship between e-CRM and business performance in SMEs. Thematic analysis was used to analyze qualitative data. Also, the independent variable is the use of e-CRM in SMEs and the dependent variable is the potential benefits and challenges of e-CRM in SMEs. The combination of the quantitative and qualitative data provides broader and deeper insights, although P1 did not clearly define the sample demographics that the questionnaire was distributed to, making it difficult to assess the generalizability of the research findings.

The findings indicated a positive and significant impact of e-CRM on the performance of SMEs. The study identifies key dimensions of e-CRM in SMEs, including customer knowledge management, customer interaction management, and customer service management. It's important to note that the study has certain limitations, such as its exclusive focus on UK service-sector SMEs. This limits the generalizability of the findings to other countries. Additionally, a sequential mixed methods approach was employed, with the qualitative phase complementing the quantitative results. This suggests that while the qualitative data may not be as comprehensive as in a standalone qualitative study, it enhances the overall understanding when combined with quantitative findings.

P2 questions the factors that influence individuals' decision to switch to using mobile ad blockers and the configurations of influencing factors that result in individuals' switching to using mobile ad blockers (Müller et al., 2017). The practical significance of this study is that it provides valuable implications for advertisers facing the challenge of rising mobile ad blocker use. By understanding the factors that influence individuals to switch to using mobile ad blockers, advertisers can take steps to address these factors and reduce the use of ad blockers. The pull-push-mooring model was used in this paper to evaluate the factors that influence individuals to switch to using mobile ad blockers. The PPM model is a framework used to explain migration patterns by considering factors that "push" people out of their current situation, factors that "pull" them toward a new situation, and factors that "moor" them in their current situation. This model identifies the configurations of pull, push, and mooring factors that result in individuals' intention to switch. The paper employs exploratory sequential design as it applies a qualitative approach to construct quantitative components. The study aims to address two research questions (RQs) related to individuals switching to using mobile ad blockers. The first RQ addresses the influencing factors of individuals' switching to using mobile ad blockers. A qualitative characterization and methodology were utilized through 42 semi-structured interviews that were recorded anonymously and were then analyzed using descriptive/interpretative coding. The second RQ is about the configurations of influencing factors resulting in individuals switching to using mobile ad blockers. The study used quantitative characterization and methodology through qualitative comparative analysis (QCA). QCA is a research method used in social sciences to analyze complex relationships among variables. It combines qualitative and set-theoretical approaches to identify necessary and sufficient conditions for an outcome. Adding more respondents to the survey brings more comprehensive data as it elaborates the phenomena better, especially since the mobile ad practice will involve numerous people due to the massive use of smartphones and the internet. Analysis was done through fuzzy set QCA. Fuzzy set QCA is an extension of QCA that allows for degrees of membership in sets rather than binary distinctions. It deals with uncertainty and imprecision in data. It is identified that the independent variables are push, pull, and mooring while the dependent variable is the intention to use mobile ad block.

The study found that individuals switch to using mobile ad blockers due to negative experiences with mobile ads such as intrusiveness, annoyance, and irrelevance. Individuals who use mobile ad blockers tend to be more privacy-conscious and have a higher level of digital literacy. The study also found that the pull, push, and mooring factors have a significant effect on individuals' intention to switch to using mobile ad blockers. Four distinct configurations of influencing factors were identified resulting in the intention to switch: (1) push and mooring factors, (2) pull and mooring factors, (3) push factors only, and (4) pull factors only. The pull factors were found to have the strongest effect on individuals' intention to switch to using mobile ad blockers. The study used the push-pull-mooring (PPM) model to explain a switch of behavior, which is typically used to explain a switch of technologies. However, this is a limitation because the model may not fully capture the complexity of the decision-making process involved in switching to using mobile ad blockers. Additionally, the model may not account for other factors that may influence individuals' decision to switch, such as social norms or personal values.

P3 investigates the role of R&D and marketing innovation in achieving new product performance (Grimpe et al., 2017). The study has three hypotheses. The first hypothesis (H1) is that there is a dis-synergistic effect between investments into technological and marketing innovation on new product performance. The second hypothesis (H2) is that there is a dis-synergistic effect between investments into technological and marketing innovation on new product performance and this effect will be stronger for small firms compared to large firms. The third hypothesis (H3) is that there is a dis-synergistic effect between investments into technological and marketing innovation on new product performance and this effect will be stronger for firms in high-tech industries compared to firms in low-tech industries. A dis-synergistic effect refers to a situation where the combined effect of two or more factors or actions is less than what would be expected if their individual effects were simply added together. It represents a negative interaction. The study's practical significance suggests that firms should carefully consider the trade-offs between investing in marketing innovation and R&D and that pursuing a dual strategy may not always be the best approach. Competence Development and Innovation Diffusion are used as the framework in this paper to examine the people's efforts in either marketing or research and development division for creating product innovation. Competence development refers to the process of acquiring skills and knowledge, often related to technology or innovation diffusion, which is the spread of new ideas, practices, or technologies through a population or organization. The authors argue that pursuing a dual strategy of investing in both marketing innovation and R&D at the same time may increase the complexity of the innovation process, which in turn may lower new product performance. Convergent mixed methods were implemented in this paper as the primary design as qualitative and quantitative approaches were implemented separately without dependency. The qualitative part of the research involves semi-structured interviews with the Manager of Business Development, Manager of Business Intelligence, Marketing Manager, R&D Director, and CEO to answer H2 and H3. The quantitative part involves CIS surveys that target the decision-makers for a firm's innovation activities. CIS stands for Community Innovation Survey, which is a type of survey used to gather data on innovation activities and strategies within businesses and organizations. Typical respondents are CEOs, heads of innovation management units, or R&D departments. Regression analysis was used to test the relationship between marketing innovation, R&D investment, complexity, and new product performance. Thematic analysis was used to analyze the interview results. The dependent variable (DV) is New Product

Performance while the independent variable (IV) or factor variable (FV) is Investment in marketing and Investment in Product. The mediated variable is Complexity. However, the paper does not mention the total number of respondents and informants.

Based on the quantitative analysis, the paper found that investing in marketing innovation is positively related to new product performance, and investing in R&D is positively related to new product performance. However, when firms pursue a dual strategy of investing in both simultaneously, it negatively impacts new product performance due to increased innovation process complexity. Based on the qualitative analysis of interviews with managers and executives, the paper finds that pursuing a dual strategy of investing in both marketing innovation and R&D is challenging due to the need to balance resources and managerial attention. Firms in high-tech industries or large firms are more likely to have higher innovation performance than firms in low-tech industries or small firms. Marketing innovation is a key source of competitive advantage, particularly in industries where technological innovation is difficult or costly. The study has some limitations. It is based on a sample of firms from Germany, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other countries or regions. The study focuses on a narrow definition of marketing innovation, which may not capture the full range of innovative marketing practices that firms use. The study does not provide detailed insights into how firms successfully introduce marketing innovations, how they may be effectively protected against imitation, and at which point in the life cycle of the firm's product portfolio they should be introduced. The study does not examine the role of other factors, such as organizational culture or external market conditions, that may influence the relationship between marketing innovation, R&D investment, and new product performance. Finally, it is a cross-sectional study and cannot draw causal relationships. A cross-sectional study is a type of research design where data is collected from a group of individuals or entities at a single point in time. It provides a snapshot of a population at that moment.

5. Comparative analysis

In this section, some categories are analyzed in terms of their similarities and differences, such as connected studies, significance, theoretical frameworks, methods, and findings. It helps to discover the nuances of mixed methods research in the marketing spectrum.

5.1. Connected studies

The selected papers were strongly involved with marketing concepts and innovation. Although it is not cited directly, most of the papers' references were connected to their similar earlier paper. The early paper revolves around the early establishment of the concept of innovation diffusion as the theory was about how the product gains the momentum to be disseminated for a specific community, the work was published for the first time in 1962 (Rogers, 1995). In 2004, the early study of the concept, implementation, and measurement of CRM was established and conceptualized as a marketing effort (Reinartz, Krafft and Hoyer, 2004). In 2011, a study about the integration of marketing, entrepreneurship process, and institutional theory was developed (Webb et al., 2011). However, the paper that relates to data-driven marketing was limited as most of the connected studies were about the marketing strategy with less explanation about the data-driven approach. Adding literature related to data-driven marketing provides more spectrum on how the market moves in a specific way and gives insights to the practitioners of whether the strategy was successful with certain measurements.

5.2. Significance of the study

From all selected papers, marketers or C-level management can benefit from understanding the scientific process of establishing marketing innovation, especially using a digital approach. P1 and P3 emphasize CRM and marketing innovation, a digital shift from product-oriented to market-oriented brought a broader strategy for implementing and measuring the results. P2 assesses the users' behavior toward mobile ads helping practitioners in developing better mobile ad. Using a mixed method, those studies discovered richer phenomena of marketing and innovation as both sides of the school of thought were implemented. Furthermore, the government or authority may use the findings in developing better regulation for marketing, ads, and social media to ensure it is not misused and provides mutual benefits for the company and stakeholders. In addition, academics can benefit in understanding deeper and broader the literature related to marketing innovation, and market behavior. However, the detail and step-by-step detail implications were less explained in benefiting the findings which might be a challenge for the readers and target audience. Additionally, the study would benefit from a more detailed explanation of the implications of the findings, as well as a discussion of how the results may differ in other countries with different business landscapes and ecosystems. This would make the findings more accessible and actionable for a wider audience.

5.3. Theoretical framework

P1, P2, and P3 each employed distinct frameworks centered around marketing and audience analysis. Notably, P2's framework, utilizing the Pull-Push-Mooring (PPM) model, stands out for its clarity and thorough elaboration. The Pull-Push-Mooring model is used to explain a variety of behaviors, including migration, consumer switching, and employee turnover patterns by considering factors that "push" people out of their current situation, factors that "pull" them toward a new situation, and factors that "moor" them in their current situation (Bansal, 2005; Zanabazar et al., 2021). This model comprehensively examines the factors influencing individuals to switch to mobile ad blockers, taking into account user responses of rejection, acceptance, or promotion. Considering the PPM framework's origin in migration studies, integrating specific behavioral theories like the Theory of Planned Behavior or the Technology Acceptance Model could enhance the depth of the study. The Theory of Planned Behavior, rooted in psychology, explains human behavior through attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. Meanwhile, the Technology Acceptance Model focuses on technology adoption, considering factors such as perceived usefulness and ease of use. In contrast, P1 and P3 center around CRM and innovation diffusion theories to explore e-CRM implementation, though with less detailed explanation. Providing a more thorough discussion of the chosen theories and their application in the study would enhance the reader's understanding of the paper's context and direction.

5.4. Comparative procedure

This section will address and compare the three papers altogether to expand the understanding. All three selected papers use mixed methods to address various issues in marketing as P1 focuses on e-CRM and marketing, P2 emphasizes switching behavior to mobile ad blocks, and P3 specifies creating product innovation using R&D and marketing investment. P1 and P3 are more likely to enhance marketing implementation while P2 anticipates the behavior that might hinder marketing goals. Furthermore, all papers' primary audience is marketing practitioners, particularly managers or directors. It makes the papers worth reading for the audience, providing a better and deeper understanding related to the topic. Next, all papers have different designs of mixed methods which are suitable based on their data collection and analysis. However, the sampling procedure is the issue in most papers as they do not disclose their sampling technique, and even P3 does not mention the total numbers of their respondents and informants. It will be difficult to understand the representativeness and data integrity. Mentioning the details in methodology systematically will help the readers to understand the flow and integrity of research papers. In addition, P1 and P3 conducted a study in Europe, while P2 did not specify the locations of the study. The generalizability of each paper is limited as the results in developed countries may be different than in developing countries, thus conducting a similar study in the developing countries or Asian countries will enrich the study.

5.5. Findings

All three papers address different aspects of marketing and innovation. P1 emphasizes e-CRM and its impact on business performance in SMEs in the UK, while P2 investigates the reasons individuals switch to using mobile ad blockers. P3 examines the relationship between marketing innovation, R&D investment, and new product performance, specifically looking at the implications of a dual strategy. P1 and P3 both find positive findings for their respective factors (e-CRM and marketing innovation, R&D investment) and business performance. On the other hand, P3 identifies a negative relationship between pursuing a dual strategy of investing in both marketing innovation and R&D simultaneously and new product performance. This suggests that while individual investments in e-CRM or R&D can lead to improved business performance, combining the two may introduce complexities that hinder new product performance. P2 explores the motivation of mobile ad blocker usage, identifying negative experiences, privacy consciousness, and digital literacy as influencing factors. While the research doesn't directly relate to business performance, it provides valuable insights for marketers and advertisers on how to improve mobile ad effectiveness and reach their target audience more efficiently. While the three papers present valuable insights, it's worth noting that the cross-sectional designs employed limit the establishment of causality. To enhance the strength of evidence regarding the relationships between the variables under study, future research might consider adopting longitudinal or experimental approaches. This strategic shift could potentially yield more robust findings, enhancing the generalizability of study outcomes and contributing to the advancement of knowledge in the field.

6. Advantages, challenges, and criticisms of the research design

This section will address the advantages, challenges, and criticisms of mixed methods design. As elaborated by Creswell and Clark (2018) mixed methods provide the bridge between two adversarial research paradigms, quantitative and qualitative as the former is more likely to be positivistic while the latter is interpretive (p. 53–54). It answers research questions with more extensive evidence and analysis, contributing to the study and literature expansion. Also, practically, mixed methods help scholars to produce multiple writings from a single study as well as attract more funding opportunities (Giddings, 2006). However, its challenges are prominent as it leads to criticism against mixed methods overall. First, analyzing data using a mixed-method approach might be a lengthy and complicated process. Second, integrating data and methods will be very challenging for some researchers as they need to ensure the right process and time to collect, analyze, and integrate the data. Third, quantitative and qualitative are constructed by different philosophical and epistemological frameworks, hence it will be difficult to combine. Fourth, selecting the most appropriate mixed methods design for a specific study, including maintaining data quality and integrity is not an easy task. When researchers can't handle challenges effectively, the methods may lack credibility and in turn, face criticism. Dawadi et al. (2021) enunciated that data collection and analysis are not sufficient to establish quality conclusions due to their lack of focus, on apprehending the two different philosophical paradigms.

Conclusion

In conclusion, mixed methods design is considered a more comprehensive research approach compared to the sole application of quantitative or qualitative approaches. However, its implementation is challenging due to the need for sufficient resources, time, and skills. The comparative analysis of the three studies employing mixed methods design provides valuable insights into the strengths and limitations of each paper using this approach. While the papers contribute to the field of marketing by addressing different research topics, there are areas for improvement for all selected papers, such as providing more details on sampling procedures and explicitly stating the frameworks used to enhance its clarity. All papers provide a comprehensive marketing research approach as a mixed-method design employed. In this context, P1, P2, and P3 use different marketing frameworks. P2 stands out for its clear elaboration of the Pull-Push-Mooring model, which it uses to study factors influencing mobile ad blocker adoption, while P1 and P3 provide less explicit explanations of their frameworks. Nonetheless, researchers and practitioners in the field can benefit from this study as it provides insights into the strengths and limitations identified in the analysis of the three examined studies. For researchers, this entails a nuanced understanding of the effective utilization of mixed methods in marketing research and recognizing the intricate interplay between qualitative and quantitative components, enhancing the methodological robustness of their studies. This in turn equips industry practitioners with better academic guidance in mitigating challenges in real-world marketing scenarios.

Limitations and further research directions

This study, while offering insightful findings, acknowledges certain limitations which pave the way for future research opportunities. The comparative analysis was conducted on a select number of articles, providing a focused yet somewhat limited perspective in the vast landscape of mixed methods studies in marketing. Additionally, the scope of marketing concepts addressed was broad, offering a comprehensive overview but potentially needing the nuances of more specific marketing sub-disciplines. To build on this foundational work, future studies are encouraged to expand the selection of articles. Including a larger and more diverse range of papers employing mixed methods will not only enhance the representativeness of the analysis but also provide a more robust understanding of how these methods are applied across various marketing contexts. Moreover, homing in on specific areas within marketing, such as digital marketing, consumer psychology, or sustainable marketing practices, could yield more detailed insights relevant to those subfields. Deepening the level of analysis is another critical avenue for subsequent research. A more thorough examination of the methodological intricacies, such as the integration of qualitative and quantitative data, the theoretical frameworks employed, and the implications of different research designs, would contribute to a richer, more nuanced understanding of mixed methods research in marketing.

Acknowledgment

We extend our heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Norbaiduri Binti Ruslan for her invaluable guidance, support, and feedback in completing this journal article. Our thanks also go to the Department of Communication, KIRKHS, IIUM, for providing an enriching platform for learning and sharing our work.

References

Azer, J., Taheri, B. and Gannon, M., 2022. A Critical View on Mixed-Method Approaches to Tourism and Hospitality Research. In: F. Okumus, S.M. Rasoolimanesh and S. Jahani, eds. *Advanced Research Methods in Hospitality and Tourism*. [online] Emerald Publishing Limited. pp.5–24. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80117-550-020221002.

Bansal, H. S. (2005). "Migrating" to New Service Providers: Toward a Unifying Framework of Consumers' Switching Behaviors. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 33*(1), 96–115. https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070304267928

Coccia, M. and Benati, I., 2018. Comparative Studies. In: A. Farazmand, ed. *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. [online] Cham: Springer International Publishing. pp.1–7. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_1197-1.

Creswell, J.W. and Clark, V.L.P., 2018. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. 3rd ed. SAGE Publications.

Dawadi, S., Shrestha, S. and Giri, R.A., 2021. Mixed-Methods Research: A Discussion on its Types, Challenges, and Criticisms. *Journal of Practical Studies in Education*, [online] 2(2), pp.25–36. https://doi.org/10.46809/jpse.v2i2.20.

Doyle, L., Brady, A.-M. and Byrne, G., 2009. An overview of mixed methods research. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, [online] 14(2), pp.175–185. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987108093962.

Fàbregues, S., Escalante-Barrios, E.L., Molina-Azorin, J.F., Hong, Q.N. and Verd, J.M., 2021. Taking a critical stance towards mixed methods research: A cross-disciplinary qualitative secondary analysis of researchers' views. *PLOS ONE*, [online] 16(7), p.e0252014. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0252014.

Farmer, J. and Knapp, D., 2008. Interpretation Programs at a Historic Preservation Site: A Mixed Methods Study of Long-Term Impact. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, [online] 2(4), pp.340–361. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689808321026.

Giddings, L.S., 2006. Mixed-methods research: Positivism dressed in drag? *Journal of Research in Nursing*, [online] 11(3), pp.195–203. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987106064635.

Grimpe, C., Sofka, W., Bhargava, M. and Chatterjee, R., 2017. R&D, Marketing Innovation, and New Product Performance: A Mixed Methods Study: R&D AND MARKETING INNOVATION. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, [online] 34(3), pp.360–383. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12366.

Guest, G., 2013. Describing Mixed Methods Research: An Alternative to Typologies. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, [online] 7(2), pp.141–151. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689812461179.

Harrigan, P., Ramsey, E. and Ibbotson, P., 2012. Exploring and explaining SME marketing: investigating e-CRM using a mixed methods approach. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, [online] 20(2), pp.127–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2011.606911.

Jellesmark, A., Herling, S.F., Egerod, I. and Beyer, N., 2012. Fear of falling and changed functional ability following hip fracture among community-dwelling elderly people: an explanatory sequential mixed method study. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, [online] 34(25), pp.2124–2131. https://doi.org/10.3109/09638288.2012.673685.

Johnson, R.B., Onwuegbuzie, A.J. and Turner, L.A., 2007. Toward a Definition of Mixed Methods Research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, [online] 1(2), pp.112–133. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689806298224.

Morse, J.M., 2016. *Mixed Method Design*. 0 ed. [online] Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315424538.

Müller, L., Maier, C., Mattke, J. and Weitzel, T., 2017. The Curse of Mobile Marketing: A Mixed Methods Study on Individuals' Switch to Mobile Ad Blockers. Thirty Eighth International Conference on Information Systems. South Korea.

Reinartz, W., Krafft, M. and Hoyer, W.D., 2004. The Customer Relationship Management Process: Its Measurement and Impact on Performance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, [online] 41(3), pp.293–305. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.41.3.293.35991.

Rogers, E.M., 1995. *Diffusion of innovations*. 4th ed ed. New York London Toronto [etc.]: Free press.

Schoonenboom, J. and Johnson, R.B., 2017. How to Construct a Mixed Methods Research Design. *KZfSS Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, [online] 69(S2), pp.107–131. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11577-017-0454-1.

Tashakkori, A. and Creswell, J.W., 2007. Editorial: The New Era of Mixed Methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, [online] 1(1), pp.3–7. https://doi.org/10.1177/2345678906293042.

Toyon, M.A.S., 2021. Explanatory sequential design of mixed methods research: Phases and challenges. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478)*, [online] 10(5), pp.253–260. https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v10i5.1262.

Vivek, R. and Nanthagopan, Y., 2021. Review and Comparison of Multi-Method and Mixed Method Application in Research Studies. *European Journal of Management Issues*, [online] 29(4), pp.200–208. https://doi.org/10.15421/192119.

Webb, J.W., Ireland, R.D., Hitt, M.A., Kistruck, G.M. and Tihanyi, L., 2011. Where is the opportunity without the customer? An integration of marketing activities, the entrepreneurship process, and institutional theory. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, [online] 39(4), pp.537–554. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-010-0237-y.

Zanabazar, A., Kho, N. S., & Jigjiddorj, S. (2021). The Push and Pull Factors Affecting the Migration of Mongolians to the Republic of South Korea. *SHS Web of Conferences*, *90*, 01023. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20219001023