

第2部：パネル・ディスカッション

Part II: Panel Discussion

Dr. Hisako Kakai :

Ladies and gentleman, it's time for us to start the panel discussion.

Thank you. I'd like to ask Dr. Mike Fetters to act as a moderator for the panel discussion and to facilitate the discussion session. We have received some questions from the audience in advance and I have selected five questions that I thought are related to many people. We would like to deal with the questions one by one. Dr. Fetters.

Dr. Mike Fetters :

Thank you Dr. Kakai. And actually before I forget, I think we should all thank our interpreters because they have been doing a wonderful job today.

Thank you very much, thank you.

Dr. Mike Fetters :

As you have noticed a lot of this terminology is very difficult and these are some complex concepts and I think they've been doing a remarkable job, so we are very appreciative of them. And we would also like to thank you as the panelists for your participation today as well. So let's go into the panel discussion as Dr. Kakai mentioned our questions that you submitted prior to coming to the meeting. So the first one is "Is it all right to produce three different papers of quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods research out of one project and publish them?" Now, Dr. Creswell actually gave an example of that, but I think we would actually like to start with Professor Bazeley and her perspective on this.

Dr. Pat Bazeley :

Thank you very much. My perspective is that if you are writing a substantive paper, in other words, a paper around the topic of your research then the methods that you have used should be integrated in the writing of that paper. That's not to say that it is not possible to write three separate papers. Whether you can or not will depend to some extent on whether the different components of the study will stand

on their own. And sometimes the qualitative data for instance is purely supplementary to the quantitative data and in that case, it will be hard to push to write a qualitative paper. But the problem that I see is that if you focus on the method, you lose the sense of the whole. The point of your study was the topic and that should be then the focus of your writing. There are always possibilities for writing a separate methodological paper, as John raised as the fourth paper. And there are circumstances where you will write separate papers on just some elements and I give examples in the chapter that I wrote that was published recently of a study that had several papers, some of which were more quantitatively oriented, some of which were more qualitatively oriented, but the study as a whole was written up as a whole.

Dr. Mike Fetters :

Dr. Creswell, would you like to add anything to that?

Dr. John Creswell :

はい。 Stop practicing my Japanese. So, I think it's interesting isn't it that those two are at that table and two of us are at this table. Did you figure out that there is a difference in perspective on mixed methods? What would you say ours was?

More of a methods orientation. Methods orientation.

And their perspective would be more...and I might be wrong in this...I am going to venture that theirs is more the multiple perspectives view which moves more at, to me, I could be wrong, but to me it's more at a philosophical level and ours is more at a practical level. Why is that?

Well in the point of my presentation was there are differences between the social sciences and the health sciences. There are differences between U.S. perspective at times and an Australian perspective. And I think those differences, there are differences between different disciplines, how physiologists view mixed methods, and how somebody in family medicine views mixed methods. And I think all I was trying to say in my presentation was "Be sensitive to what those differences are." And mixed methods now comes in to Japan, I am going to be very curious as to how you adopt it to Japanese cultural ways of doing research. Whether the Japanese cultural ways embrace multiple papers from one project or maybe just... and my multiple



papers are based on methods or more of working from a topic and what make sense, it will be interesting to see how that plays out. But I think there will be cultural factors that will influence how you begin to embrace and use mixed methods research.

Dr. Mike Fetters :

So what we are hearing so far is that you could publish just a qualitative on a quantitative in the mixed methods or series of integrated mixed methods paper, so certainly you can have multiple papers, and both of those are possibilities. And separate from that you also have the option of publishing methodological papers, so *the Journal of Mixed Methods Research* is the methodology journal and there needs to be a methodology point that you are making. So we are interested in publishing unique methodology as it's evolving. Dr. Johnson did you…?

Dr. John Creswell :

Let me add one more thing.

Dr. Mike Fetters :

You want to add one more…

Dr. John Creswell :

And also the point I was making was in some fields like medicine, they require very short articles. And a mixed methods article in the social sciences might be 10000 – 12000 words, very long. And so the field that we are in shapes how we use and publish and write mixed methods research.

Dr. Burke Johnson :

My quick thought is I am going to use that “both and” strategy. Remember that from earlier? And I think that there are multiple ways that we can publish and there is not, we don’t have to decide if one way is better than the other. And as John is saying it can be discipline specific and national specific and so forth. The goal is to produce good knowledge and spread it across the world. So look to see what the journals are doing, but at the same time you also want to be innovators and try to push for new and additional ways. So, do both of those. That’s my thought.

Dr. Mike Fetters :

Okay, John kind of got his word in about his take on the overall presentations. Maybe you will deviate slightly from the schedule here. I think we should give an opportunity if you, do you have any general comment that you want to make? Pat, about all the presentations? No? Burke?

Dr. Burke Johnson :

The only thing I would say is I did give another definition of mixed methods and it’s really inclusive one. I like John’s definition a lot by the way, it’s a fine definition of mixed methods. I don’t really see ours was conflicting at all. For me, I define mixed methods, this is my latest thinking, is that it involves mixing at the level of method, methodology and or paradigm. So it allows a lot and we can be a real big family that way. So that’s how I like to deal with it. It’s a large family.

Dr. John Creswell :

-- These is a lot of perspectives on this question of “Do we have qualitative and quantitative” as working topics. And why is it that in the commonwealth countries like Australia, England, there is a concern about these labels, whereas in the United States there is not, is there? Why is that? Why do we have those cultural differences? I would submit that in the United States, most of our methodology and methods discussion is divided into quantitative and qualitative. We have qualitative courses and we have quantitative courses. Also I think that there is through some of the publishing that goes on. SAGE publication, for example, in the 1970’s had the quantitative green book series. Anyone seen those series, that series? And then in

the 1980's they came out the qualitative blue book series. Anyone seen that? So immediately you have a major publishing house kind of setting some distinctions between quantitative and qualitative. And then when the qualitative researcher started challenging quantitative research in the 1970' and 80's, Lincoln and Goober's handbook, that was called a handbook of qualitative research and so the language started to emerge in the United States, which I don't know that this has been prominent in the commonwealth countries. So there again, there is a cultural difference and how we look at research. Is that a fair assessment, Pat?

Dr. Pat Bazeley :

It is possibly, and I'd argue as that just like we have not gone with your acceptance of letter paper, we use A4, we don't necessarily have to go with your division of qual. and quant.

Dr. John Creswell :

Yes, absolutely.

Dr. Pat Bazeley :

Just because America says so doesn't mean the rest of the world has to do it.

Dr. John Creswell :

Right, and I do think that that's one of the great beauties of mixed methods research is that we are people that think in multiple ways and different ways and we are open to that possibility and in the fact that that table over there comes in from more of a broader...

Dr. Pat Bazeley :

Holistic.

Dr. John Creswell :

...holistic, philosophical level and we are coming in from more of a applied methods level. It's good. I think in this mixed methods filed you can enter at different places and all have a voice and we put our voices together and we get a very well rounded

perspective of what the mixed methods is.

Dr. Pat Bazeley :

You would be one of the first people that's called me less than practical.

Dr. John Creswell :

Yes.

Dr. Mike Feters :

Let's move on then. It's a great segway to actually the next question, which is "I am interested in learning how epistemology is regarded in mixed methods." So I was going to ask Professor Johnson if he could comment on that point for us.

Dr. Burke Johnson :

Okay. At least in the U.S. the ...and, and, maybe I don't know... we talked about the things between ontology and epistemology, axiology or values and methodology, so we kind of talked about that and this question ask specific about epistemology which is perhaps the biggest topic in the discipline of philosophy. My answer is epistemologically speaking mixed methods certainly has an epistemology, I think the dominant epistemology is pragmatism, but there is a lot more we can say about it. First of all, epistemology is the study of knowledge, it's what the knowledge is, what standards we have for knowledge, when do we know we have knowledge, how do we get knowledge, that's the epistemology. So mixed methods research, do we have another one coming up about where did it come from?

Dr. Mike Feters :

Dr. Burke Johnson :

Okay, I am going to hold off on that because I am going back to ancient times, but another quick thought about epistemology would be that, another way to think about mixed methods research would be qualitatively driven mixed methods research that I think both you guys talked about or Mike did.

Yes, and quantitatively driven if you are more of a quantitative researcher, more of quantitative epistemology, then that's the style you will do, and then there is no epistemology war because you work within one, for quantitatively driven would be typically post-positivism, qualitatively driven would be typically constructivism, whereas in mixed methods research if we named one epistemology would probably pragmatism, but I've gone beyond that with something I call "Dialectical Pluralism" and that is an approach then it enables us to engage with different epistemologies. And we can do that on a project by project basis and we can do it within a research team that I think everyone mentioned today. So we can have a team composed of different epistemologies. So we don't have to have one which the question sort of suggested what was the one and in a sense we have a primary one perhaps but on another sense we very much like to engage with different epistemologies.

Dr. Mike Feters :

Okay, go ahead. ---.

Dr. John Creswell :

I think it needs to be said that Burke is one of the leading world philosophers in the mixed methods movement and he's come up with this Dialectic Pluralism which is really emphasizing those principles you shared, right? Burke? Those principles are very consistent with your philosophy and pragmatism is an American philosophy going back to Pat's idea, it doesn't play well around the world right now. People have told me this we can't embrace pragmatism as a philosophy for a mixed methods research because it's an American one. And I think it makes sense, there needs to be something more culturally specific but I've got to say something about philosophy and epistemology and Burke is a great friend and so he won't be offended when I say this, but I often make this comment. I've worked on dozens and dozens of projects especially in the health sciences now, where the word "epistemology" is never mentioned or written about. And I take these great family medicine doctors I've been working with, you know they want to move right to the applied "Will this work in our practice?" They are not going to sit there and talk about philosophy. So I say "I've never been in the conversation in the health sciences, where we've talked about the epistemology or some of the broader philosophy" ...that doesn't mean they are not

important or they don't operate. They do. But it's just that there is not that conversation looking at those areas. How do you respond to that? Do you think that's true?

Dr. Mike Feters :

So the question was whether or not I feel in health sciences that epistemology is the topic of discussion and I think broadly the answer is "No." I think the biggest reason for that is because there is a broadly shared culture about what everyone is doing, what they are expecting in terms of outcomes for this specific type of research that they are doing, and so in a very tight 2500 word paper or 2000 word paper, there is no room to spend 2000 words talking about your perspective.

Dr. John Creswell :

Have I been in a social science team or the conference where social science mixed methods paper's been presented, do they discuss epistemology? The answer would be "Yes." So over the social sciences, this is more, I think more emphasis is given to those broader philosophical ideas behind our research.

Dr. Pat Bazeley :

As a social scientist, I would like to just point out that there are several leading social scientists who have said that we did good research for a long time before we even thought about the question of epistemology and that good research does not necessarily depend on having sat down and worked out your epistemological position. And that's much of my own experience as well, I did what I considered to be good research for many many years before I was faced with this question and really I became faced with it when I met mixed methods literature and that was in the late 1990's. So the other comment I'd make is that there are very many disciplines where the topic is not raised at all. Business is another one where I have reviewed a large number of business articles and word is not used: paradigm, epistemology, none of it is mentioned. Again I think it's because there is a shared value system. The thing that concerns me is when people feel they have to do duty to epistemology and they write a statement at the beginning of an article to get that out of the way and then the rest of the article may in fact even be in conflict with what they've stated.

Certainly it doesn't inform in any way what they've done. So it's a duty statement at the beginning and I think that is pretty much waste of time. So there is a...

Dr. Mike Fetters :

Okay, well we are going to move on to the next question. The question was Question 3, "I am wondering why mixed methods research emerged from historical view point and what are strength and limitations of this research method?" Dr. Creswell, would you like to speak on that issue?

Dr. John Creswell :

In my thinking, and I could be wrong, mixed methods emerged, as we know it today, during the time period of 1985 to 1990. There were about 8 people working on the idea of combining quantitative and qualitative research in the project. That doesn't mean there weren't researchers that have been doing that in the past, but in terms of actually thinking about a methodology, there were about 8 people. None of these individuals were in touch with each other, they were from different disciplines, and they were from different countries. Jennifer Green in evaluation, Alan Briman in management, Hunter and Brewer in sociology, Ben Crabtree in family medicine, Jane Morse in nursing, and I suppose I can add John Creswell in there in education/social sciences. But none of us knew what other people were doing. We had all come to the point where we thought that I believe qualitative research was now becoming accepted and that there would be some added value, one plus one equals three, to bringing these two approaches to research together. There was more interdisciplinary work being developed that brought people from different approaches to research together on a team. Federal agencies were beginning to emphasize more team research in the United States and we felt that a new methodology was being born. And none of us knew where it would go or how popular it would become in the world. And we all had that hope that there would be a coming together of a world community some day that will bring together the quantitative and qualitative people to work together in hand. So the Mixed Methods Association I think has done that. New methodologies, new approaches to research evolve and change over the years. Prior to 1990, we didn't really know much about structural equation modeling. We didn't know much about participatory research. We really didn't know a lot about

outside of a small group what grounded theory meant. And so this methodology arose that could give us more insight when we had both, in my opinion, both databases available to help us understand our research problems.

Dr. Mike Fetters :

Burke did you want to add to that?

Dr. Burke Johnson :

Why did mixed methods research emerge? Because it's a good idea. It's an idea that its time came as John just described and let's just say hypothetically went a way for a while. I promise it will come back. Why? Because it's a good idea. We need to look at the world qualitatively and quantitatively, that's an defensible position, so it's difficult for this idea to go away but it's possible it will. So I fully agree with everything John just said and also what this new group is doing is we are systematically articulating it, that's what we are doing. We are trying to show how to do it. But now the only other thought I will add real fast is it's also very old. We are articulating all the new ideas about it, writing books about it and so but it's also a very old idea and it goes, it's a part of a knowledge difference, in views of knowledge that goes back to the ancient Greek, it goes back to ancient Japanese, ancient Chinese and ancient Indians and the idea of quality and quantity, that idea goes far back. Aristotle talked about it for example. Aristotle talked about the principle of balance. So I have a chapter in the second edition of *the Handbook of Mixed Methods Research* where talk about the intellectual history, so if you want to look at it from a really long historical perspective, you can read that. But in terms of its modern inception that we are in right now, it's exactly what John was describing.

Dr. John Creswell :

We could give you a long list of the ways and which this methodology is moving around the world right now and moving through the disciplines. We are estimating that there are something like 30 to 40 books on mixed methods research right now. I think one reason that has promoted mixed methods is, it's a very natural and intuitive way of doing research because in our ordinary life, we collect evidence to understand problems, and sometimes that evidence is based upon numbers or facts, and

sometimes that evidence is based upon personal stories. Think about your television broadcast of the news. They are talking about the Tsunami in Thailand and they are giving the statistics of how many people are killed and how many people are displaced, and then they are interviewing people to tell the personal stories. They are doing a mixed methods broadcast. Think about going into your doctor's office. This doctor is going to come up with your test scores for your, the check for your cholesterol, the lipids and then this doctor is going to ask you "Tell me the history, tell me your story of your illness and how you've been feeling lately". That doctor is putting together the numbers and the stories. So mixed methods is very intuitive. I use all kinds of examples, soccer matches, football matches, incidents that have happened around the world, the green, ideas about the environmental greening that's occurring and environmental issues, these are all illustrations of bringing stories and numbers together. It's very intuitive. That's why people can understand it.

Dr. Mike Feters :

And actually that leads us to our next question which is "How do you integrate these together in case studies?" And I think did you want to take that or no? Burke? Did you want to take that? Go ahead Burke.

Dr. Burke Johnson :

I'll start real fast. Remember how it's talking about my definition of mixed methods research. I think one of the interesting areas today is the idea of creating mixed methodologies and case study is one methodology that can be turned into mixed methods research. I think it's very easy to conduct a case study that collects multiple data, collects quantitative and qualitative data that meets the pieces of John's definition. We can do that type of case study and so I think we could call that a mixed methods case study if we want to or we can just not worry about what we call it. But I think case study very easily falls in, it can be done through mixed methods research.

Dr. Mike Feters :

I would concur with that, I mean it's actually very common to ask most classic case report in medicine or nursing talks about the patient and they give numbers, the

results from their test exactly what the Dr. Creswell's speaking to and also tells a story of the patients, so these are case reports, case series, it's very natural approach, actually one of probably the oldest approaches that we have in our scientific thinking. It does leads us to our last question about "How can we overcome prejudice against qualitative research methods in Japanese research societies here in Japan and Dr. Bazeley we would like for you to weigh it on that.

Dr. Pat Bazeley :

A part of the problem, as I see it, about why the qualitative methods haven't been accepted is to do with the rigor with which the qualitative studies have been undertaken or presented, and so I'd like to suggest that if you are doing a qualitative study, what you need to do is do more than simply report some themes, which are usually categories rather than themes, with a few quotes. You need to go beyond that. And then you have more hope of your work being accepted. So do you want to add to that?

Dr. Mike Fetters

So actually I would like to add to that, I think the other issue is also bringing good qualitative research into quantitative research and doing mixed methods studies that are very compelling. Good researcher should know that the methods that they apply have limitations. So if you are doing surveys you know if you've done a quantitative oriented survey, you are not going to have stories generated by that. And if you can find research or do research that is really compelling by integrating stories with these numbers that you get back, I think that is what is most compelling. So doing good mixed methods research that putting qualitative into studies, I think we will actually also be a bridge for understanding better the qualitative side of things as well.

Dr. Pat Bazeley :

Which is why you don't publish them separately.

Dr. John Creswell :

So the larger question for me is "Why is qualitative research not part of the

orientation towards research here in Japan?” I can take Thailand for example and tell you why, why they are very quantitatively oriented and why before everyone of my workshops in Thailand I would give a short course on qualitative research and the value of qualitative research. If you look at their senior scientists, they were trained, many of them in the States, and the United States had a very strong quantitative orientation. It's my understanding that one of your leading measurement specialists here in Japan was trained in Princeton. So they began picking up that strong quantitative orientation. If you take South Africa for example, they have a very strong qualitative orientation. I've actually presented in Johannesburg, South Africa, and someone raised their hand and they said there is no... John could you help us out in statistics because there is no one in this room that really knows how to do quantitative research. And yet you are asking us to know both quantitative and qualitative to do mixed methods research. So I think you can look a little bit at the senior scientists where they were trained and in South Africa they all went to England, many of them went to England or they went to Bergen or some of the Northern European countries for their doctoral training as researchers and those countries emphasized qualitative research. Did you know in Great Britain right now there is a great concern about the lack of qualified quantitative researchers, did you know that? So there is kind of a cultural country orientation and the question for Japan would be “How are you going to do mixed methods if you don't have a solid grounding in qualitative research?”

Dr. Mike Fetters :

So, as the moderator of the session I apologize for not keeping these very interesting special guests contained on track shall we say, but we did want to open up to any general questions.

Dr. Hisako Kakai :

So, we still have 6 minutes left. If anyone has a question, please.

Female Speaker :

Could you just clarify what you just said, Europe has a qualitative emphasis, does that mean that America has a quantitative one, or does it depend on the university or

the state or what's America's focus on...in your own university, you said it went from this university to this one and it didn't mean anything to me at all, not being from America, what is the American take on this?

Dr. John Creswell :

I would say that and Burke can reflect on this, too, but I would say that, Mike, I would say the dominant methodology in the United States has been quantitative. It started with the survey research that was done during the first and second world war, it was emphasized by strong experimental researchers like B.F. Skinner and it wasn't until I think in 1970's or early 80's that the qualitative researchers started forming and challenging the dominant quantitative approach. It wasn't until 1985 – 90 where mixed methods now could be launched as a new methodology. Is that, would you agree with that Burke?

Dr. Burke Johnson :

I fully agree.

Dr. Mike Feters :

And I would also add in the United States the National Institutes of Health, it's a very large organization funding scientific studies and the world of medicine and health sciences, that organization has been very quantitatively oriented with the randomized control trial being considered the gold standard for research, very quantitatively oriented. There is an interest, Dr. Creswell actually led the development of a best practices in mixed methods research guideline that was put forth by the NIH and he's mentioned on numerous occasions that in the first 3 weeks that was posted online and it had over 19,000 hits, so this is a website with 19,000 hits in the first 3 weeks published by the National Institutes of Health. So there is this really burgeoning interest but the point I wanted to make was that a very huge funding organization I think drove a very quantitatively driven agenda in the United States.

Female Speaker :

All I must say is it's been extremely interesting having the two perspectives,

having my research methodology learnt in New Zealand, I found this side very interesting because I kind of knew what this side was already saying. And my friend having studied in the States was the other way around. She said what I know these things, so this was really interesting to me, so was extremely beneficial to have the different perspectives. Thank you very much.

Dr. Hisako Kakai :

Thank you. Anyone else?

Dr. John Creswell :

A larger message I was trying to make in my presentation was “Let’s be sensitive to those differences and try to understand them.”

Female Speaker2 :

My question is to Dr. Fetters. You mentioned that in your medical field, you wouldn’t have epistemology, you didn’t have a discussion about epistemology, however, what I think is that since the science itself, I mean the age itself is governed by what the epistemology is… I mean the medicine itself is contextualized in this age, the medicine 100 years ago, 200 years ago, now are pretty much different. Let’s say now it’s so much industrial governed and so forth. So the if… then also that budget and distribution in science is governed by epistemology, too. So I wonder why, if you don’t do the epistemology examination, who could be a possibility to do, to comprehend the context of medicine in terms of epistemology?

Dr. Mike Fetters :

The answer is “Yes” and I agree with you. I think it’s really important to say that, first of all I am not saying that there is no epistemology, I think it’s really important and it is there, I think the other question is what is your question meaning who is the person asking the question. So if you are thinking about policy and where is science in the United States and what is policy about science and what is policy around priorities for funding, that’s a different type of question than what treatment should I use for my patient when I am making a decision at the bedside. That kind of question is very applied and the epistemology argument when I am trying to choose between

Drug A or Drug B or behavior intervention or drug intervention or to stop doing something that I've been doing for a long time because the evidence now says it's not working, that's a different type of question that's being asked there. So I think the point is that both are important and I would not deny the importance of epistemology at all, in fact I think it's really important. But I think that's a different type of thinking what type of questions being asked and in what context.

Dr. Hisako Kakai :

Any other questions?

Male Speaker :

The first of all, I would like to express my appreciation for all the speakers. I used to teach in Kazakhstan, which you may not be familiar with, but many of the young researchers are very into your book, I mean Creswell's, you are a kind of superstar among those young people in Kazakhstan, and I was very impressed by your voice today.

Here is my question. How are you going to train young researchers? Dr. Fetters says communication and teamwork will become more important in the future. I think they are very important, too. But does it mean that researchers who have very good experiences in certain discipline can cooperate with each other very well? When we talk about the training of young researchers, do you think that we have to teach both qualitative and quantitative methods at the same time? So, according to the books on mixed methods research, it is said that we have to train the new generation of researchers to become familiar with both qualitative and quantitative methods, but in Japan especially, it has always been either or, qualitative or quantitative. So, do you know some universities or institutions that train students in both qualitative and quantitative methods simultaneously?

Dr. John Creswell :

So, at the University of Nebraska, we have a doctoral program in research methodology where students are required to take both quantitative, statistics courses and qualitative courses, and then the final course is the mixed methods course that bridges both of them. Because we feel just like what Dr. Fetters was saying in his

presentation we feel that you need both skill sets or you need to join a team that has individuals who have different skill sets. I was on a project in Boston, it was a national science foundation project, and on the left side of the table sat all of the quantitative researchers, on the right side sat the qualitative researchers. Do you know where I sat?

Male Speaker :

In the middle.

Dr. John Creswell :

In the middle, yes. And I was going back and forth and translating actually and bringing them together with the mixed methods perspective. So both skill sets are important I think or to find team members that can complement that and Mike, you spoke about the teams a bit and all of us have really emphasized that. So the question in Japan would be if there is a deficit in qualitative training, how is that going to emerge here? What workshops will be given that emphasize that part, so then people can go on teams and do mixed methods research.

Dr. Mike Fetters :

Did you want to comment, Pat?

Dr. Pat Bazeley :

I think it's important to recognize that a lot of things about good research are common to both qualitative and quantitative methods, and it's possible to teach research methods that emphasize those good research qualities and to illustrate it with both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The other comment I'd make about team work is that team work still relies on the people within the team having sufficient understanding of the other's methods to not create conflict. Of course I had to work on teams and I am sure you have times with team members who have no understanding of the other kinds of methods and who are therefore unreasonable in their expectations of what they can do or how it fits their part of the project. And so having at least some understanding of the other kind of methods is important. Having skill in one is obviously critical. Having skill in both is absolutely desirable. The

minimum would be some understanding of how the other approach works.

Dr. Mike Fetters :

One other thing I would like to add, and I know Dr. Kakai is ready to cut us off but I think it's really important to know that from both perspectives you want rigorous qualitative data collection, you want rigorous quantitative data collection. That means you need someone who spent significant time working on those things and understanding it. If you are really pushing the limits with mixed methods research, we need to be working at the front edge of quantitative and qualitative research in order to bring those things together. So on a team, it's valuable to have someone who is really an expert in a very narrow area for example, adaptive clinical trials, these are a new type of clinical trial that has only been emerging in the last 10 to 15 years where their Bayesian adaptation's been made during the trial. Very new. If you wanted to do a mixed methods project where you are integrating qualitative data into that kind of trial, you want Bayesian experts on the team. The other thing is that I think there are certain people that are just wired to do one thing better than the other and I don't think we should try and force everybody into being a mixed methods researcher. Not everybody should be a qualitative researcher, not everyone should be a quantitative researcher. But I think there is a real critical piece which I think John was speaking too was having someone in the middle who can translate. So I think as teachers our job is to find out what are the aptitudes of these people to give people the opportunity to learn about both methodologies, we need people that can translate between and have that crosswalk between the qualitative and the quantitative. But we don't need everybody to be mixed methods researchers and the other thing is even though most projects I do are mixed methods projects, I sometimes don't do mixed methods projects because it's not appropriate. We need the question to match up again what the problems and the methods to match up to the problems that we are trying to answer.

Dr. John Creswell :

I would like everyone to be mixed methods researcher. I think that if you are doing mixed methods, first of all, you are working with the world's most recent methodology. Secondly you can get out more papers, multiple papers. Third, I think

gathering more evidence, quantitative and qualitative, you can have a better understanding of your research problem. The downside is it takes more time, it takes skills, and it takes people that are beginning to understand mixed methods to publish your work. And that's all emerging, all around the world right now. It's a fascinating... it's been seen as the third methodological movement, hasn't it, Burke? First we had quantitative and we had qualitative and now we have mixed methods and so it is I think the methodology of the future, and I think that many people in the future are going to be doing mixed methods research. That doesn't mean quantitative isn't fine or qualitative. But I think it's an emerging methodology that's worth paying attention to.

Dr. Hisako Kaki :

Thank you very much. I'd love to continue this discussion, however, it's past 5:00, so we need to wrap this up. I'm responsible for this seating arrangement. It just happened that these four people are sitting in these seats. I was not thinking about starting another paradigm war or anything like that, but as you can tell these four people are very diverse in their thinking and yet they are members of one community. That's why I like this community very much. So if you are interested, I hope you will join us in the Mixed Methods International Research Association and the Japan Society for Mixed Methods Research. If you want to continue to listen to the discussion, you can join us at the Osaka Ibaraki campus of Ritsumeikan University. Also as Dr. Johnson said, what we have discussed here will be published in our university's *Aoyama Journal of international Studies*, so look forward to the publication of the journal. Thank you for your participation and see you again.