

Exploring Methodological Waters: Mixed Methods in Philippine Applied Linguistics Research

ALEJANDRO S. BERNARDO

Department of English and Research Center for Social Sciences and Education, University of Santo Tomas, Philippines

Author email: alejandrosbernardo@gmail.com

Article information	Abstract
Article history: Received: 26 Jul 2024 Last revised: 18 May 2026 Accepted: 22 May 2026 Available online: 28 May 2026	<i>Drawing on a review of studies published in the Philippine Journal of Linguistics (PJL), one of the country's oldest and most established journals, this paper presents a reflective analysis of how mixed methods research (henceforth MMR) has been applied in linguistics within the Philippine context. Through an examination of methodological approaches, integration techniques, and thematic orientations, the study identifies prevailing trends and emerging patterns in the use of MMR among Filipino applied linguists. While acknowledging the limitations of analyzing a single journal, this exploratory work serves as a preliminary mapping of MMR practices in the field, which provides an empirical basis for future, broader investigations across other reputable journals. Overall, this study contributes to the MMR tradition as it advances the broader discourse on mixed methods investigations by advocating for methodological pluralism and "methodological turn" and by espousing that mixed methods in applied linguistics research in the Philippines may have taken a different form and identity i.e., heterogeneous mixed methods. It also provides practical insights for training researchers at both undergraduate and graduate levels, particularly in disciplines where MMR has not fully gained traction yet.</i>
Keywords: Mixed methods research Applied linguistics research Methodological turn Filipino mixed methods research Heterogeneous mixed methods research	

INTRODUCTION

Applied linguistics research in the Philippines has undergone significant evolution and gained momentum over the years. Borrowing the words of Riaz and Farzana (2024), the volume of applied linguistics studies is "growing at a high rate" (p. 34), with scholars employing diverse methodologies to address complex language-related and language-centered issues. Thus, if there is one social science discipline where mixes of various theoretical, conceptual, and methodological considerations are apparent, it would be applied linguistics.

Language is a multifarious phenomenon that traverses different aspects of human life, including psychology, sociology, education, anthropology, neuroscience, computer science, law, religion, history, and more. As such, applied linguistics benefits greatly from embracing diverse methodologies and perspectives to address complex language-focused issues. Among these methodologies, mixed methods approach seems to have gradually gained traction

and popularity among Filipino applied linguists because of its vigor in providing a better understanding of linguistic phenomena through a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches. However, as Hashemi (2012) lamented, while there has been extensive research on the characteristics and popularity of qualitative and quantitative methods individually, there has been limited exploration of how these two approaches *can be* and *are* integrated, particularly within applied linguistics research. In other words, there is still a lack of research and inadequacy of attempts focusing on how qualitative and quantitative methodologies are effectively combined or used in tandem to provide a more comprehensive understanding of language-related phenomena. In fact, Riazi and Farmani (2024) posited that applied linguistics researchers tend to disfavor ‘pure’ MMR, which involves blending methods at all stages, from forming research questions to drawing conclusions. Instead, they often opt for ‘quasi-mixed’ designs (see Hashemi & Babari, 2013) in which the integration of qualitative and quantitative methods occurs mainly during data collection and analysis. In these designs, the two approaches are scarcely integrated across the research process, from conceptualization and research question formulation to data gathering, analysis, interpretation, and conclusion development (Bergman, 2008; Hashemi, 2012). Put in another way, true or substantial integration is said to be “exercised very rarely” (Niglas, 2004, as cited in Hashemi & Babaii, 2013, p. 841); hence *eclectic* instead of *principled* mixed methods studies are prevalent in applied linguistics research (Riazi, 2016), which “does not take the researcher very far away from the boundaries of the mono-method research” (Afshar & Ranjbar, 2023, p. 68).

Hashemi (2012) earlier remarked that applied linguistics studies, based on the analysis of hundreds of scientific papers published in reputable journals, “had not actually combined qualitative and quantitative methods by any means; rather, one approach influenced the methodology and the components of the other approach (i.e., numbers, statistics, words, and verbal descriptions) were only used as a part of the main method” (p. 3). This observation is corroborated by Afshar and Ranjbar (2023), who argue that mixed methods studies tend to be predominantly quantitative, with occasional qualitative components. They recognized the incoherence in mixed methods studies, which indicates that the quantitative and qualitative elements were hardly effectively or seamlessly integrated to address research objectives optimally, and the mixing of methods was confined to the data collection stage. Moreover, Hashemi and Babaii (2013) expressed that research designs employed within a good number of applied linguistics research diverge from those in the typology purported by Creswell et al. (2008), although analogous combinations are documented in existing literature. This suggests that mixing, in its real sense, and the meta-inferences resulting from data integration rarely occur at various stages in applied linguistics studies. Taken together, these investigations explicate both the promise and the uneven development of MMR in applied linguistics across contexts.

In the same vein, Gopalakrishnan et al. (2024) highlighted that despite increasing recognition of the value of methodological pluralism, the adoption of MMR remains constrained by limited researcher training, publication pressures, and disciplinary conventions. Earlier, Babaii et al. (2011) had already identified diverse design typologies in MMR but underlined the need for clearer theoretical grounding and stronger integration strategies. Complementing these perspectives, Harris (2021) underscored how institutional and cultural contexts, particularly

in developing countries, influence how mixed methods are adapted and practiced, suggesting that methodological choices are shaped not only by epistemological commitments but also by local research ecologies. These perceived shortcomings of applied linguistics research that claim to have employed mixed methods approaches, presumed to be evident in the Philippines as well, provide the point of departure for this paper.

Linguistics as a discipline in the Philippines is an interesting tale to tell. Philippine linguistics, according to Quakenbush (2003), “rightfully refers to any research on or about the structure and/or use of languages spoken in the Philippines. Such a definition includes research done inside or outside the Philippines by Filipino scholars or others” (p. 3). This definition suggests that research in Philippine linguistics, whether theoretical or applied, may encompass a wide array of topics related to the structure and use of languages spoken in the Philippines, and these studies are done by both Filipinos and non-Filipinos. No less than the national hero himself, Dr. Jose Rizal, is regarded as the first Filipino linguist (Quakenbush, 2003). Rizal’s published work in linguistics constitutes only a small part of his overall body of writings (Kelly, 2014). Therefore, to say that Rizal used MMR during his time is an investigation worthy of pursuing but, unfortunately, is beyond the scope of this study.

What is important to underscore at this point is that linguistic research, be it theoretical or applied, is very much alive in multilingual Philippines, and linguistic phenomena are studied from various lenses and methodologies by a “steady stream of scholars” (Gonzalez, 1998, p. 141). The questions, however, in this paper are: Do Filipino linguists, specifically applied linguists, use MMR in research? If they do, is it MMR in its real sense? If not, what MMR is it? Is there a Filipino mixed methods approach in the context of applied linguistics research? Put declaratively, this study aims to investigate how MMR is employed in applied linguistics studies in the Philippines, specifically whether Filipino applied linguists adopt mixed methods designs consistent with established frameworks or whether their methodological practices reflect a localized or distinctly Filipino approach to MMR.

METHOD

The method employed in this study is relatively simple and straightforward. Studies published in the Philippine Journal of Linguistics (henceforth PJJ) served as the dataset to address the research questions. PJJ is a 54-year-old refereed journal published by the country’s most prestigious organization of linguists, language researchers, and language enthusiasts, the Linguistic Society of the Philippines (LSP). One of the Philippines’ oldest linguistics journals with the most regular publication since its inception in 1970, the PJJ has since been a significant platform for scholarly research and discourse in linguistics within the country, featuring studies in descriptive, comparative, historical, areal, and now, applied linguistics. It has published close to 500 articles since its maiden issue in 1970. Focusing singly on PJJ is warranted, as the journal seems to have evolved in tandem with the further growth of linguistics research in the Philippines. This relationship provides a unique lens through which to examine the country’s linguistic scholarship trajectory. The publication of PJJ coincided with the significant development in linguistics in the Philippines, which makes it a repository

of knowledge and a driving force for academic inquiry and dialogue among linguists in or outside the Philippines.

It should be noted that the articles in PJL were simply subjected to a manual review. The manual review involved scanning the PJL database and examining each article in every volume and issue individually to detect the use of MMR in addressing the study objectives. Attention was paid to the method section, which usually indicates the research approach, data collection procedures, types of data collected, and data analysis. If a mixed methods design is explicitly mentioned in a study, that study is automatically included in the pool of research articles for further analysis. Conversely, if the term “mixed methods” is not mentioned at all in the papers, they are still reviewed, as MMR may have been used implicitly. It is important to note that the selection process relied on the author’s judgment to identify published works that employed mixed methods approaches in the PJL.

One acknowledged limitation of this study is the absence of independent inter-raters in the analysis process. Nonetheless, objectivity was maintained through systematic and repeated reference to established frameworks and foundational concepts in MMR. This constant alignment with theoretical and methodological standards served as an internal mechanism of validation, which ensures that the evaluation of each study was guided by acknowledged principles of what constitutes authentic MMR rather than by subjective interpretation. In the end, only seven studies were selected (see Table 1 below), and each of these articles will be examined in the succeeding section to explain why they are considered to have a mixed methods orientation.

Table 1
PJL articles that employ mixed methods design

Paper	Bibliographic Details
Paper 1	Dyen, I. (1970). Qualitative confirmation of a subgrouping hypothesis. <i>Philippine Journal of Linguistics</i> , 1(1), 1–11.
Paper 2	Cruz, C. A. (1980). Sociolinguistic features of a selected Manila community. <i>Philippine Journal of Linguistics</i> , 11(2), 64–74.
Paper 3	Galang, R. (1982). The acquisition of Tagalog verb morphology: Linguistic and cognitive factors. <i>Philippine Journal of Linguistics</i> , 2(13), 1–16.
Paper 4	Fabregas, R. (1983). Language use, needs, and attitudes of people of certain occupations in a Pangasinan setting. <i>Philippine Journal of Linguistics</i> , 14(1), 61–66.
Paper 5	Villanueva, V., & Madrunio, M. (2016). Examining the language in the courtroom interrogation of vulnerable and non-vulnerable witnesses. <i>Philippine Journal of Linguistics</i> , 47, 28–45.
Paper 6	De Castro, G. (2018). The role of second person pronouns in expressing social behavior: An undocumented case in Zamboanga Chavacano. <i>Philippine Journal of Linguistics</i> , 49, 26–40.
Paper 7	Umila, K. J. B. (2018). Linguistic politeness strategies in classroom interactions: An exploratory mixed methods study. <i>Philippine Journal of Linguistics</i> , 49, 41–67.

All research articles published in the PJL from its first volume were examined for inclusion in the study. The focus was limited to papers situated within applied linguistics, particularly those addressing issues related to language learning and teaching, language use, or language policy and planning. As mentioned, the selection process involved a manual review of each

article in the PJJ database to identify studies employing MMR. Articles were automatically included if the term “mixed methods” or an equivalent label (e.g., “quantitative–qualitative approach”) was explicitly indicated in the methodology section. However, articles that did not explicitly use the term were still reviewed to detect implicit use of mixed methods approaches, specifically, those demonstrating the collection and integration of both qualitative and quantitative data. To ensure methodological clarity, only articles with sufficiently detailed descriptions of research design, data collection, and data analysis procedures were retained for analysis. Editorial notes, book reviews, theoretical essays, and purely conceptual papers were excluded, as they did not provide analyzable methodological content.

Mixed methods research in applied linguistics studies published in the Philippine Journal of Linguistics

Reid (1981, p. 232) claims that:

The first issue of the Philippine Journal of Linguistics contained an article by Dyen (1970) demonstrating the value of using qualitative evidence (innovations in phonology, morphology, and syntax) to substantiate a subgrouping hypothesis formulated based on quantitative evidence such as lexicostatistical percentages.... Subsequent studies have shown a judicious mix of quantitative and qualitative evidence, with the former being treated with the caution it deserves.

The said study titled “Maranao and Tagalic: Qualitative confirmation of a subgrouping hypothesis” is presented in the 1970 issue of PJJ merely as a synopsis. Thus, it was difficult to ascertain how the quantitative-qualitative approach was applied in generating the findings. It should be noted that the proponent is a non-Filipino linguist who published his work on Maranao.

The second instance where MMR appears to have been used in a PJJ paper, though there was no explicit mention of the term ‘mixed methods,’ is the study of Cruz (1980) titled “Sociolinguistic features of a selected Manila community.” The said community is the speech community of Manuguit in Tondo Manila. This research employed three types of surveys and two measures to assess attitudes. Comparative statistical analyses were conducted across age groups and language backgrounds. The 500 participants with varying levels of education (elementary, high school, and college) provided responses, which were quantified as percentages. A follow-up interview was conducted with 120 individuals after eight to ten weeks. The reliability of the survey was evaluated through correlational analysis. Community observations and field interviews followed instrument validation and initial surveys.

The description provided above suggests that MMR was employed in this study. The use of naturally observed occurrences, direct monitoring of daily interactions, and survey responses indicate a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches. The subsequent phase aimed to provide empirical evidence, which suggests a quantitative component to validate qualitative observations. Therefore, it is possible that the study indeed involves both qualitative and quantitative methods, which is characteristic of MMR.

Another study in the PJL that seems to have employed MMR is the work of Galang in 1982, “The acquisition of Tagalog verb morphology: Linguistic and cognitive factors.” In this investigation, children across four different age brackets engaged in tasks involving comprehension and production of focus and aspect. To broaden the applicability of findings, the experimental data were juxtaposed with children’s spontaneous speech. However, based on the writer’s narration, it appears that MMR might not have been explicitly employed in this study. The description mentions tasks involving comprehension and production of focus and aspect for children across different age brackets. This suggests a primarily qualitative approach focused on observing and analyzing children’s performance. The comparison of experimental data with children’s spontaneous speech could have enhanced the validity and applicability of the findings. However, it did not necessarily indicate the use of a mixed methods approach, but additional quantitative data collection or analysis methods were employed alongside the qualitative observations.

In the 1983 study of Fabregas titled “Language use, needs, and attitudes of people of certain occupations in a Pangasinan setting,” the two tools utilized were a questionnaire focusing on language background and a structured interview. Additionally, observation was employed to study verbal interactions among the initial 15 respondents in diverse work settings. Both interviews and observations were recorded. Texts were scrutinized to verify reported language usage, and representative utterances or conversational excerpts were identified. Based on the description provided, it seems that MMR was employed in this investigation. The qualitative methods include observation of verbal interactions among the respondents in various work settings, scrutinizing texts to verify reported language usage, and identifying representative utterances or conversational excerpts. The quantitative methods refer to the use of a questionnaire focusing on language background.

The very first investigation in PJL to explicitly indicate the use of MMR was the study conducted by Villanueva and Madrunio in 2016. The study titled “Examining the language in the courtroom interrogation of vulnerable and non-vulnerable witnesses” employed MMR as it undertakes qualitative and quantitative analysis of the corpus made up of 1,866 questions and 1,811 replies in the transcript of stenographic notes. The researchers utilized semi-structured interviews to delve into lawyers’ and witnesses’ preparation and experience during cross-examination. Similarly, they employed this method to interview two rape victims, alongside a child psychologist, about their cross-examination experiences. However, in this study, it seems unclear how the findings from quantitative analysis of the stenographic notes were compared with qualitative insights from the interviews to validate or expand upon each other’s results. The qualitative findings from the interviews appear to be hardly utilized to provide context or explanations for quantitative patterns observed in the stenographic notes that could have heightened the overall grasp of the phenomena under investigation. Finally, it seems unclear if both data types were analyzed separately at first and were followed by integration during the interpretation phase to generate a thorough understanding of the research topic.

In the study by Castro (2018) titled “The role of second-person pronouns in expressing social behavior: An undocumented case in Zamboanga Chavacano,” MMR was employed.

The data comprised naturally observed occurrences, direct monitoring of daily interactions, and survey inputs from 106 individuals proficient in Chavacano. The subsequent stage aimed to empirically substantiate the observed influence of the second person singular (2SG) on portraying emotions and various social behaviors. However, it is unclear if the subsequent stage of the study aims to substantiate empirically the observed influence of the 2SG on the portrayal of emotions and various social behaviors and if the integration of qualitative observations with quantitative analysis indeed validated and provided evidence for the observed phenomena.

Interestingly, a more recent study by Umila in 2018 titled “Linguistic politeness strategies in classroom interactions: An exploratory mixed methods study” appears to be mixed methods research in orientation, from the research question formulation to the data collection and analysis. The said study indicates:

This mixed methods study aimed to explore teachers’ politeness strategies in classroom interactions in light of Brown and Levinson’s theory. Specifically, the qualitative phase (Phase 1) of this study included the following questions: 1. What politeness strategies are used by teachers in motivating, instructing, managing the class, and giving feedback/evaluation? Quantitative phase (Phase 2) included the question: 2. How effective is the use of politeness strategies by the teachers in classroom interaction as assessed by students along (a) motivation, (b) instruction, (c) classroom management, and (d) evaluation? 3. Based on the qualitative findings and quantitative results, what model can be developed to effectively use politeness strategies in classroom interaction? (p. 43)

Umila (2018) explains that data collection and analysis followed a mixed methods approach, specifically an exploratory sequential mixed methods design. Given the use of a second language in the participants’ interactions, it was considered suitable to employ both quantitative and qualitative methods as complementary strategies for investigation. A mixed methods design was chosen as neither purely quantitative nor purely qualitative approaches were adequate to grasp and address the research problem completely. Careful consideration was given to the principles guiding mixed methods approach selection, emphasizing interaction, priority, timing, and data integration. The exploratory sequential mixed methods design allowed the proponent to investigate the politeness strategies employed by teachers and students’ perceptions of their effectiveness in classroom interactions. The initial qualitative phase involved gathering observation and interview data to explore politeness strategies in classroom settings. The qualitative findings guided the creation of a survey instrument for gathering data from a broader group of Ifugao State University (IFSU) students. This constituted the study’s second phase, where teachers’ perceived effectiveness of politeness strategies was quantitatively described, building upon insights from the initial qualitative phase. Combining data from both phases enhanced the analysis, which provides a comprehensive overview of the third research question. Subsequently, a questionnaire for assessing politeness strategies was devised using these findings and employed in the quantitative phase of the study.

This preliminary analysis of published (applied) linguistics research in PJL is telling that foremost, there is a relatively small number of mixed-methods-grounded applied linguistics

studies in the Philippines at the moment. While acknowledging the constraint of analyzing data from a single journal within the Philippines, the identification of merely seven studies out of approximately 500 in the PJJ underscores the relatively modest adoption of MMR within applied linguistics research in the country. Moreover, the observed limitations in the integration of quantitative and qualitative designs within the said studies suggest a partial realization of mixed methods approaches, characterized by a form of quasi-mixing, in which “mixing is often used only at the stages of data collection and analysis” (Hashemi, 2012, p. 5).

In addition, applied linguistics in the Philippines seems to be associated mainly with qualitative studies and tends to be stereotyped as quantitative-averse. One reason for the association with qualitative study is the complex and multifaceted nature of language-related phenomena. Qualitative methods, for instance, interviews, observations, and discourse analysis, are well-matched for exploring the intricacies of language use in context, which allows researchers to capture rich, nuanced data that quantitative methods might overlook. Moreover, qualitative approaches are often preferred when investigating subjective experiences, perceptions, and social constructs related to language. However, it is essential to note that this association hardly suggests an aversion to quantitative methods.

The foregoing likewise intimates that there has been an increasing appreciation of integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches in applied linguistics research. Applied linguists seem to be more cognizant of the usefulness of both qualitative and quantitative methods and they now advocate for methodological pluralism. However, that said, it is essential to raise these questions: Do applied linguistics researchers in the Philippines employ “true” mixed methods approaches or “pure” mixed designs (Hanson et al., 2005), and do they employ integration in “conceptualization and execution” (Bergman, 2008, p. 2) in all phases of an empirical investigation? If not, should the mixed methods approach of Filipino applied linguists be regarded as an “untrue mixed method” or an “impure mixed method”?

Like the observation of Hashemi and Babaii (2013) more than a decade ago, it appears that several research designs utilized by applied linguistics researchers were absent from the classification proposed by Creswell et al. (2008). Further, the observations of Lovitos and Parohinog (2021) in their study, which suggest that Filipino authors tend to favor a ‘sequential quantitative first’ approach in applied linguistics research, appear to be substantiated by the findings of this investigation. Acosta and Acosta (2017) illustrate this approach in two major phases: (1) quantitative data collection, e.g., survey questionnaire, quantitative analysis, e.g., Pearson correlation; and quantitative results, e.g., descriptive statistics, where phase 1 leads to purposively selecting interview participants; (2) qualitative data collection, e.g., individual in-depth interviews, qualitative data analysis, e.g., identifying themes, and qualitative results, e.g., text data, which leads to integrating quantitative and qualitative results, interpretation and explanation of the quantitative and qualitative results. The implementation of these two data collection methods “points back to the complementarity of numerical and textual data” (Lovitos & Parohinog, 2021, p. 220).

Towards a distinct mixed methods approach and methodological pluralism in applied linguistics

While this paper may not significantly advance the sophistication of mixed methods designs in applied linguistics research, it provides a theoretical perspective that encourages researchers to reconsider established paradigms. This reflection challenges the conventional understanding of MMR and suggests the possibility of developing a distinct approach to mixed methods. MMR in applied linguistics within the Philippines may have developed unique characteristics that diverge from established global norms, and the analysis of the studies cited in this paper sheds light on how MMR is implemented in the Philippine context. Initiating a dialogue about these distinctive practices is essential, as it could lead to the development of a tailored framework for understanding MMR in applied linguistics in the Philippines. This conversation could eventually contribute to a more nuanced and contextually relevant understanding of MMR in the country.

The preceding section leads to a conceptualization of the nature of the mixed methods design Filipino applied linguists employ in their studies. This is where a juxtaposition between a type of mixture, i.e., heterogeneous mixture in chemistry and mixed method designs in applied linguistics research, may be found useful. Regarding the combination of components, both heterogeneous mixtures and MMR involve combining different components or elements. In heterogeneous mixtures, various substances are physically mixed, each retaining its properties. In other words, various substances are physically combined without undergoing chemical reactions that would alter their individual properties. This means that each component of the mixture retains its distinct physical characteristics.

Similarly, in applied linguistics, MMR involves the combination of different research approaches, particularly qualitative and quantitative methods, to address research questions more comprehensively. In many cases, these methods are employed together while still preserving their distinct methodological characteristics, assumptions, and procedures. Rather than fully merging into a single approach, each method contributes its unique strengths to the investigation of a linguistic issue or phenomenon.

In terms of integration, both heterogeneous mixtures and MMR share a comparable characteristic. In heterogeneous mixtures, different substances may be combined or interact to some degree; however, their individual properties remain recognizable and distinguishable. Likewise, in applied linguistics MMR, qualitative and quantitative data, findings, or interpretations are integrated to generate a richer and more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon under investigation. Although the extent of integration may vary and is not always substantial, the process allows researchers to connect insights from both approaches while maintaining their methodological distinctions. As a result, MMR facilitates a more holistic analysis and interpretation of linguistic issues by drawing on the complementary strengths of qualitative depth and quantitative breadth.

Also, the insights derived from the analysis of studies published in the PJJ directly ground the paper's call for the broader and more planned use of mixed methods approaches in applied

linguistics. The restricted yet varied forms of methodological integration seen in the studies examined unveil both the increased attention and the conceptual ambiguities surrounding MMR in the Philippine context. These patterns highlight the need for a more explicit grasp of how mixed methods designs are adapted, localized, and taught in the Philippines. Thus, the advocacy for methodological pluralism and a methodological turn emanates from these empirical insights, i.e., it is a call to polish research training, enhance methodological literacy, and appreciate the heterogeneous ways Filipino scholars employ mixed methods in addressing linguistically and socially grounded research questions.

The heterogeneous nature of the mixed methods design in applied linguistics research in the Philippines allows researchers to triangulate findings, verify findings from various data sources, and achieve a more comprehensive understanding of a linguistic phenomenon. By combining diverse methods, Filipino researchers can leverage the advantages of qualitative and quantitative approaches, which results in a more comprehensive and robust study. However, as Hashemi (2012, p. 6) puts it:

Needless to say, a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of mixing qualitative and quantitative components at different stages of the study would be helpful to researchers. By developing more carefully informed opinions about mixed methods research and creatively using a range of mixed method designs, the quality of research in applied linguistics could be further improved.

There is a need to better prepare and train students, undergraduate and graduate alike, in the use of mixed methods paradigms. The course syllabus in Language Research (Methodology) implemented in the BA in English Language Studies program, for instance, needs to be reviewed and updated to ensure that studies employing MMR are done with much depth and that the students are exposed to pure mixed methods studies in the field. It is essential to ascertain that students are introduced to a comprehensive range of mixed methods studies, including pure mixed methods approaches. An updated syllabus or a reframed curriculum should encompass a balanced blend of theoretical foundations and practical applications of MMR. This could involve introducing students to various mixed methods designs, such as sequential, concurrent, and transformative approaches, and exploring how these designs may be effectively employed in language research.

Moreover, the syllabus in Language Research should incorporate case studies and examples of pure mixed methods studies across different domains of applied linguistics for this provides students with real-world illustrations of the integration of qualitative and quantitative methods. The updated syllabus should emphasize the importance of critical thinking and methodological rigor in conducting mixed methods investigations. Students should be encouraged to evaluate the strengths and limitations of different mixed methods approaches, consider ethical issues in research design and implementation, and develop skills in effectively integrating qualitative and quantitative data.

Similarly, Research Methodology courses in the MA or PhD in English Language Studies program needs rethinking so that the study of research methods in applied linguistics is not

only contextualized but also enhanced to ensure that graduate students are better equipped with mixed methods approaches when they formulate their theses or dissertations. A more rigorous scrutiny of research proposals is needed to establish that studies that use mixed methods designs are indeed, or unquestionably, mixed methods in orientation. Separate evaluation criteria are needed for mixed-methods-grounded theses and dissertations.

In addition, course instructors responsible for teaching research methodology classes must move beyond the oversimplified notion that quantitative design solely revolves around numbers while qualitative design solely focuses on words. This shallow characterization needs to capture the complexity and depth of both approaches. Additionally, it is crucial to dispel the misconception that MMR is synonymous with mere triangulation or multiple methods. While triangulation, a process of corroborating findings from different sources, and multi-method approaches are standard components of MMR, true mixed methods endeavors involve more than just combining quantitative and qualitative data. It requires thoughtful integration of both approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding of the research question or phenomenon under investigation. To address these misconceptions, course facilitators should emphasize the diverse range of techniques and methodologies available within quantitative, qualitative, and MMR. Students can develop the skills needed to design and conduct rigorous studies that effectively address complex research questions by fostering a nuanced understanding of research methodologies.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

What this paper has accomplished so far is a reflection on the nature of applied linguistics mixed methods research completed in the Philippines using the PJJ as a case in point. While done manually, the analysis of the published articles hints at the fact that a heterogeneous mixed methods approach is employed in applied linguistics research in the country. This, however, calls for further introspection to find out if this heterogeneous mixed methods design aligns with the criteria of pure mixed methods research. Pedagogical improvements, particularly in the teaching of research methodology courses in the applied linguistics programs in the Philippines, will also be instrumental in achieving what Brynes (2013, as cited in Riazi & Farsani, 2024, p. 144) calls “methodological turn,” an expert examination of researchers’ methodologies essential to facilitate a discussion that illuminates the interplay between and among theory, practice, and knowledge. In applied linguistics, a methodological turn in the deployment of MMR points to these shifts: from division to integration (not treating quantitative and qualitative data as strictly separate), from isolation to fusion (not using a single approach), from purism to pluralism (accommodating diverse perspectives), and from methods to methodology (focusing on research design, philosophical rationale, and epistemological assumptions that ground a study).

While the present investigation focused on applied linguistics research published in the country’s oldest and most established journal in the field, the findings reveal that mixed methods approach remains relatively underutilized in Philippine applied linguistics. Admittedly, the inclusion of only one journal limits the representativeness of the sample, as very few

identified studies may not fully capture the breadth of research conducted nationwide. Nonetheless, the decision to focus on this journal was intentional; it serves as a credible starting point for mapping trends, given its historical influence and consistent publication of applied linguistics research over the years. This investigation is therefore positioned only as a preliminary study, which paves the way for future analyses that will incorporate additional journals and provide a more comprehensive picture of mixed methods research practices in the Philippines. Despite its scope, the study still offers valuable insights that may inform and inspire subsequent scholarly inquiries in this growing area. Future studies, however, may consider incorporating additional publication platforms to provide a more comprehensive overview of applied linguistic research conducted in the Philippines that may have utilized mixed methods designs. Including unpublished theses and dissertations could also enhance representation and offer valuable insights into this study area.

Finally, the present study recognizes that identifying emerging typologies of MMR in Philippine applied linguistics may be challenging, given that the present analysis draws from a single journal only. The description of such typologies is therefore positioned as exploratory rather than conclusive. To address this limitation, a follow-up investigation should be undertaken, which expands the corpus to include a wider range of reputable journals in the Philippines, both long-established and newly founded, local and international, as well as multidisciplinary and linguistics-focused publications. Subsequent studies are hoped to provide a more comprehensive and representative account of MMR practices in Philippine applied linguistics research.

THE AUTHOR

Alejandro S. Bernardo is a language educator and scholar formerly affiliated with the University of Santo Tomas, Philippines. He previously served as president of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines and vice-chair of the Philippine Social Science Council. He is currently a trainer at the Foundation for the Upgrading of the Standards of Education (FUSE), contributing to teacher development and educational advancement in the Philippines.
alejandrosbernardo@gmail.com

REFERENCES

- Acosta, I. C., & Acosta, A. S. (2017). A mixed methods study on teachers' perceptions of higher education institutions' readiness to implement the K-12 Curriculum. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 5(7), 1215–1232.
- Afshar, H. S., & Ranjbar, N. (2023). Mixed methods research in applied linguistics: The status quo of the current issues and practices. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 11(1), 49–74.
- Babaii, E., Atai, M. R., & Mohammad, S. (2011). Revisiting the dichotomy between qualitative and quantitative research: Mixed method designs in applied linguistics. *Teaching English Language*, 5(2), 125–157. https://www.teljournal.org/article_54930_19bcfc2ec6e32ba0b8effa4ecac8da7e.pdf
- Bergman, M. M. (2008). Introduction: Whither mixed methods? In M. M. Bergman (Ed.), *Advances in mixed methods research* (pp. 1–7). Sage.

- Bryman, A. (2007). Barriers to integrating quantitative and qualitative research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1, 8–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2345678906290531>
- Byrnes, H. (2013). Notes from the editor. *Modern Language Journal*, 97(4), 825–827. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12051.x>
- Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., & Garrett, A. L. (2008). Methodological issues in conducting mixed methods research designs. In M. M. Bergman (Ed.), *Advances in mixed methods research* (pp. 66–83). Sage.
- Cruz, C. A. (1980). Sociolinguistic features of a selected Manila community. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 11(2), 64–74.
- De Castro, G. (2018). The role of second person pronouns in expressing social behavior: An undocumented case in Zamboanga Chavacano. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 49, 26–40.
- Dyen, I. (1970). Qualitative confirmation of a subgrouping hypothesis. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–11.
- Fabregas, R. (1983). Language use, needs, and attitudes of people of certain occupations in a Pangasinan setting. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 14(1), 61–66.
- Hanson, W. E., Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Petska, K. S., & Creswell, J. D. (2005). Mixed methods research designs in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 224–235.
- Harris, J. (2021). Mixed methods research in developing country contexts: Lessons from field research in six countries across Africa and the Caribbean. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 16(2), 165–182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15586898211032825>
- Hashemi, M. R. (2012). Reflections on mixing methods in applied linguistics research. *Applied Linguistics*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams008>.
- Hashemi, M. R., & Babaii, E. (2013). Mixed methods research: Toward new research designs in applied linguistics. *Modern Language Journal*, 97(4), 828–852. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12049.x>
- Galang, R. (1982). The acquisition of Tagalog verb morphology: Linguistic and cognitive factors. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 2(13), 1–16.
- Gonzalez, A. (1998). Linguistics as a discipline in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 29(1–2), 141–142.
- Gopalakrishnan, A., Mathieu, C. S., & LaScotte, D. K. (2024). Investigating mixed methods research in applied linguistics: Methodological avoidance and possible barriers in the field. *Studies in Applied Linguistics and TESOL*, 24(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.52214/salt.v24i1.10190>
- Kelly, P. (2014, April 24). *Dr. Jose Rizal and the making of a modern linguistic messiah*. History and Philosophy of Sciences. <https://hiphilangsci.net/2014/04/23/dr-jose-rizal-and-the-making-of-a-modern-linguistic-messiah/>
- Lovitos, A. H. R., & Parohinog, D. (2021, September 4). *Mixed methods research practices among Filipino and foreign authors* [Paper presentation]. The 4th Doing Research in Applied Linguistics (DRAL4), Bangkok, Thailand.
- Niglas, K. (2004). *The combined use of qualitative and quantitative methods in educational research* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Tallinn Pedagogical University.
- Quakenbush, S. (2003). Philippine linguistics from an SIL perspective—Trends and prospects. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 34(1), 1–25.
- Reid, L. A. (1981). Philippine linguistics: The state of the art: 1970–1980. In D. V. Hart (Ed.), *Philippine studies: Political science, economics and linguistics* (pp. 212–273). Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois University.
- Riazi, A. M. (2016). Innovative mixed-methods research: Moving beyond design technicalities to epistemological and methodological realizations. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(1), 33–49. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv064>

- Riazi, M. A., & Farsani, M. A. (2024). Mixed-methods research in applied linguistics: Charting the progress through the second decade of the twenty-first century. *Language Teaching*, 57(2) 143–182. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000332>
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2008). Quality of inferences in mixed methods research. In M. M. Bergman (Ed.), *Advances in mixed methods research* (pp. 101–119). Sage.
- Umila, K. J. B. (2018). Linguistic politeness strategies in classroom interactions: An exploratory mixed methods study. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 49, 41–67.
- Villanueva, V., & Madrunio, M. (2016). Examining the language in the courtroom interrogation of vulnerable and non-vulnerable witnesses. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 47, 28–45.
- Wilkinson, I. A., & Staley, B. (2019). On the pitfalls and promises of using mixed methods in literacy research: Perceptions of reviewers. *Research Papers in Education*, 34(1), 61–83.