© 2026 RK Publication | Volume 2, | ISBN-978-81-181100-7-1

RK PUBLICATION
Digital Nursing Book Publisher – A Unit of RK Publications
https://book.rk-publication.com/1

Applied Mixed-Methods Research in Nursing: Measuring Effectiveness, Outcomes, and Quality of Care

MR. ASHISH ANVIKAR

Associate Professor, Department of Child Health Nursing
Bhausaheb Mulak Nursing College, Nagpur, Maharashtra, allananvikar@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION TO MIXED-METHODS RESEARCH

Mixed-methods research is an approach to scientific inquiry that combines both quantitative and qualitative research methods within a single study or a coordinated series of studies. Quantitative research primarily focuses on numerical measurement, objective assessment, relationships between variables, and statistical analysis, whereas qualitative research seeks to understand experiences, perceptions, meanings, attitudes, behaviors, and social processes in their natural context. Mixed-methods research brings these two approaches together to provide a more comprehensive understanding of a research problem than either method could provide independently. In nursing research, this approach is particularly valuable because many healthcare problems involve both measurable clinical outcomes and complex human experiences.

The fundamental principle of mixed-methods research is that quantitative and qualitative data are complementary rather than competing forms of evidence. Quantitative findings may demonstrate the magnitude, frequency, effectiveness, or statistical significance of a phenomenon, while qualitative findings can explain why or how that phenomenon occurs and how it is experienced by patients, families, nurses, or other healthcare professionals. For example, a researcher may quantitatively measure the effectiveness of a nurse-led educational intervention on patients' knowledge scores and simultaneously conduct interviews to explore patients' experiences, perceived usefulness of the education, barriers to learning, and suggestions for improvement. The integration of these findings can provide a deeper understanding of the overall effectiveness of the intervention.

Mixed-methods research has gained importance in nursing because healthcare is a multidimensional field in which biological, psychological, social, cultural, environmental, and behavioral factors interact. A numerical outcome alone may not adequately explain the patient's experience or the contextual factors influencing care. Similarly, qualitative descriptions of patient experiences may provide rich information but may not establish the magnitude of an effect or determine whether an intervention produces statistically significant improvement. By combining both forms of evidence, mixed-methods research allows nurse researchers to examine healthcare problems from multiple perspectives and generate findings that are both measurable and meaningful.

In a mixed-methods study, the researcher deliberately plans the collection, analysis, and integration of quantitative and qualitative data. The two approaches may be implemented simultaneously or sequentially, depending on the purpose of the study. In some studies, quantitative and qualitative data are collected during the same phase and subsequently compared or integrated. In other studies, one method is conducted first and the findings are used to inform the development or implementation of the second method. For instance, a quantitative study may identify a low level of adherence to a treatment regimen, followed by qualitative interviews to explore the reasons for non-adherence. Alternatively, qualitative interviews may initially be conducted to understand patients' concerns and experiences, and the findings may then be used to develop a questionnaire for a larger quantitative

study.

The selection of a mixed-methods approach should be guided by the research problem, objectives, and research questions rather than by the desire to use multiple methods simply for the sake of complexity. The researcher should determine whether combining quantitative and qualitative approaches will provide additional information that cannot be adequately obtained through a single method. A well-designed mixed-methods study requires clear justification for using both approaches, appropriate sampling and data-collection procedures, suitable analytical techniques, and a systematic strategy for integrating the findings.

An important feature of mixed-methods research is **integration**. Integration refers to the process of bringing quantitative and qualitative findings together so that they contribute to a unified interpretation of the research problem. Integration may occur during study design, data collection, analysis, or interpretation. For example, quantitative results may show that a nursing intervention significantly improves patient satisfaction, while qualitative findings may reveal that patients particularly value improved communication and emotional support from nurses. When these findings are integrated, the researcher can explain not only whether the intervention was effective but also how and why it produced the observed outcome.

Mixed-methods research can also strengthen the interpretation and credibility of nursing research findings through triangulation. Triangulation involves examining a research problem from different perspectives or using different sources and methods of evidence. When quantitative and qualitative findings support one another, confidence in the overall interpretation may be increased. However, differences or contradictions between the findings should not simply be ignored. Such discrepancies may identify important factors that require further investigation and may lead to a more sophisticated understanding of the phenomenon being studied.

In nursing practice, mixed-methods research can be applied to evaluate the effectiveness and quality of healthcare interventions, understand patient experiences, assess nursing education programs, investigate healthcare professionals' perspectives, examine barriers to evidence-based practice, and evaluate quality-improvement initiatives. For example, a hospital may introduce a new infection-prevention program. Quantitative data may be used to determine changes in infection rates and compliance with hand-hygiene practices, while qualitative interviews with nurses may explore their perceptions of the program, implementation barriers, workload concerns, and factors that support adherence. Together, these findings provide a more complete evaluation of the program.

Mixed-methods research is particularly useful when the research problem is complex and cannot be adequately explained through numerical measurements alone. It enables researchers to move beyond the question of **"How much?"** or **"How often?"** and investigate questions such as **"Why?"**, **"How?"**, and **"What does this experience mean?"** This combination is highly relevant to nursing, where successful healthcare outcomes depend not only on measurable clinical changes but also on communication, relationships, beliefs, attitudes, satisfaction, cultural factors, and individual experiences.

Despite its advantages, mixed-methods research can be more demanding than using a single research approach. It may require additional time, financial resources, methodological expertise, and careful coordination of different forms of data. Researchers must be competent in both quantitative and qualitative methodologies and must have a clear understanding of how the two datasets will be integrated. Poorly planned studies may collect large amounts of data without achieving meaningful integration. Therefore, careful methodological planning is essential to ensure that the combination of methods contributes directly to answering the research questions.

Overall, mixed-methods research provides a powerful framework for addressing complex questions in nursing and healthcare. By combining numerical evidence with rich descriptions of human experiences, it enables researchers to obtain a broader and deeper understanding of health-related phenomena. When appropriately designed and systematically integrated, mixed-methods research can generate evidence that is clinically relevant, contextually meaningful, and useful for nursing practice, education, administration, and policy development.

TYPES OF MIXED-METHODS RESEARCH DESIGNS

Convergent Parallel Design: Convergent parallel design is a mixed-methods research design in which quantitative and qualitative data are collected during the same phase of the study, analyzed separately using appropriate methods, and then compared or integrated during the interpretation of findings. The purpose of this design is to obtain complementary information about the same research problem and develop a comprehensive understanding by bringing numerical findings and participants' experiences together. For example, a nurse researcher may measure patient satisfaction using a standardized questionnaire while simultaneously conducting interviews to explore patients' experiences with nursing care. The quantitative component may indicate the overall level of satisfaction, whereas the qualitative component may explain the reasons for satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The two sets of findings may confirm each other, provide different perspectives, or reveal discrepancies that require further interpretation. This design is particularly useful when both quantitative and qualitative evidence are considered equally important for answering the research question.

Explanatory Sequential Design: Explanatory sequential design involves collecting and analyzing quantitative data first, followed by qualitative data collection and analysis to explain, clarify, or expand the quantitative findings. This design is especially useful when numerical results require further explanation or when unexpected findings are identified. For example, a researcher may quantitatively evaluate the effectiveness of a nurse-led diabetes education programme and find that some patients demonstrate substantial improvement in self-care practices while others show minimal improvement. The researcher may then conduct interviews with selected participants to explore the reasons for these differences. The qualitative findings may identify factors such as family support, motivation, health literacy, financial limitations, cultural beliefs, or accessibility of healthcare services. Thus, the explanatory sequential design enables the researcher to move from measurable outcomes to a deeper understanding of the reasons and circumstances associated with those outcomes.

Exploratory Sequential Design: Exploratory sequential design begins with qualitative data collection and analysis and is followed by a quantitative phase. It is particularly appropriate when little is known about a phenomenon, when existing theories are inadequate, or when available measurement instruments do not sufficiently represent the experiences of the target population. In nursing research, a researcher may initially conduct interviews with caregivers to explore their experiences of caring for children with chronic illness. The themes identified from the interviews may then be used to develop a structured questionnaire that measures caregiver burden or specific caregiving challenges. The newly developed instrument can subsequently be administered to a larger sample to determine the prevalence and magnitude of the identified problems. This design therefore provides a systematic pathway from exploration and understanding to measurement and generalization.

Embedded Design: Embedded design is a mixed-methods approach in which one type of research method is incorporated within a larger study based primarily on another method. The main method provides the principal source of evidence, while the secondary method contributes additional information that helps explain, support, or enrich the primary findings. For example, a quantitative quasi-experimental study may be conducted to determine the effectiveness of a nurse-led intervention on patient recovery, while qualitative interviews are embedded within the study to understand patients' experiences of receiving the intervention. The quantitative findings may demonstrate whether measurable improvement occurred, whereas the qualitative findings may explain acceptability, perceived benefits, barriers, and practical experiences. Embedded designs are useful when researchers require additional contextual information without giving equal priority to both methodological approaches.

Multiphase Design: Multiphase mixed-methods design involves several interconnected research phases conducted over a period of time, with each phase contributing to the objectives of a larger research programme. Different quantitative and qualitative methods may be used at different stages, and findings from one phase may influence the design or implementation of subsequent phases. For example, researchers may first conduct qualitative interviews to identify barriers to medication adherence, use the findings to develop a nursing intervention, quantitatively evaluate the intervention

in a larger population, and subsequently conduct qualitative interviews to understand participants' experiences and factors influencing implementation. Multiphase designs are particularly useful for complex healthcare interventions, programme development, quality-improvement initiatives, policy evaluation, and long-term nursing research because they allow researchers to examine a problem from its initial exploration through implementation and evaluation.

Transformative Mixed-Methods Design: Transformative mixed-methods design is guided by a theoretical or philosophical framework that emphasizes social justice, equality, empowerment, and improvement of conditions for individuals or groups who may experience disadvantage or marginalization. This approach combines quantitative and qualitative methods while giving particular attention to social, cultural, economic, and structural factors that influence health and healthcare outcomes. In nursing research, transformative mixed-methods studies may examine healthcare access among vulnerable populations, health disparities, disability, gender-related healthcare concerns, cultural barriers, or inequities in healthcare delivery. Quantitative data may identify the extent of an inequality, while qualitative data may explore how individuals experience that inequality in their everyday lives. The findings can then be used not only to understand the problem but also to develop recommendations and interventions aimed at improving equity and healthcare outcomes.

PLANNING A MIXED-METHODS NURSING STUDY

Identifying the Research Problem: Identifying the research problem is the first and most important step in planning a mixed-methods nursing study. The researcher should identify a problem that is relevant to nursing practice, education, administration, research, or patient care and determine whether the problem requires both numerical measurement and exploration of experiences or contextual factors. A suitable mixed-methods problem is usually complex and cannot be adequately understood through a single research approach. For example, a researcher may want to evaluate the effectiveness of a patient-education programme by measuring changes in knowledge and self-care behavior while also exploring patients' experiences, perceived usefulness, and barriers to applying the information in daily life. The researcher should clearly define the population, setting, variables or phenomena of interest, and the specific gap in existing knowledge. A well-defined research problem provides the foundation for developing research questions, selecting an appropriate design, determining sampling procedures, and planning data collection and analysis.

Research Questions and Objectives: Research questions and objectives provide direction for all stages of a mixed-methods study and should clearly reflect the quantitative, qualitative, and integrated components of the research. Quantitative questions generally focus on measurement, differences, relationships, associations, or effectiveness, whereas qualitative questions explore experiences, perceptions, beliefs, meanings, barriers, facilitators, or social processes. The study may also include an overarching mixed-methods question that explains how the quantitative and qualitative findings will be brought together to provide a comprehensive answer. Objectives should be specific, measurable, realistic, and directly related to the research problem. For example, a study may aim to determine the effectiveness of a nurse-led educational intervention on patients' knowledge and self-care practices and explore patients' experiences regarding the intervention. Clearly formulated questions and objectives help the researcher determine the type of data required and ensure that both components contribute meaningfully to the overall purpose of the study.

Selection of Mixed-Methods Design: Selection of an appropriate mixed-methods design should be based on the research problem, objectives, research questions, timing of data collection, importance of each methodological component, and expected relationship between quantitative and qualitative findings. The researcher should determine whether both forms of data need to be collected simultaneously or sequentially and whether one method should have greater priority. A convergent design may be appropriate when quantitative and qualitative data are required during the same stage, whereas an explanatory sequential design may be preferred when qualitative findings are needed to explain quantitative results. An exploratory sequential design may be suitable when qualitative exploration is necessary before developing a measurement instrument or intervention. The selected design should be clearly justified in the research protocol, and the researcher should identify in advance

how the two forms of data will eventually be integrated.

Sampling Strategies: Sampling strategies in mixed-methods research should be selected according to the requirements of both quantitative and qualitative components. Quantitative research generally requires a sample that is sufficiently large to estimate characteristics, examine relationships, or compare groups, whereas qualitative research generally uses smaller and purposively selected samples to obtain detailed information about participants' experiences. Probability sampling methods such as simple random, systematic, stratified, or cluster sampling may be used for the quantitative component, while purposive, criterion, maximum variation, or other appropriate qualitative sampling methods may be used for the qualitative component. The researcher should decide whether the same participants will participate in both phases or whether different samples will be selected. In an explanatory sequential study, for example, participants for the qualitative phase may be selected based on their quantitative results so that individuals with particularly high, low, or unexpected scores can provide explanations for the observed findings.

Integration Planning: Integration planning is a fundamental part of mixed-methods research because the value of the approach depends not simply on collecting two types of data but on bringing them together meaningfully. The researcher should decide at the planning stage how the quantitative and qualitative datasets will be connected, compared, merged, or embedded. Integration may occur during sampling, data collection, analysis, or interpretation. For example, quantitative findings may be used to select participants for qualitative interviews, qualitative findings may be used to explain quantitative results, or both datasets may be compared through a joint display. The researcher should examine whether the findings support one another, complement each other, or reveal contradictions. Proper integration produces a more comprehensive interpretation of the research problem and prevents the quantitative and qualitative components from becoming two separate studies that have little relationship with each other.

Ethical Considerations: Ethical considerations are essential throughout the planning and conduct of mixed-methods nursing research. Participants should receive clear information regarding the purpose of the study, procedures involved, potential benefits and risks, confidentiality measures, and their right to refuse or withdraw from participation without penalty. Informed consent should be obtained before data collection, and appropriate approval should be obtained from the institutional ethics committee or other relevant review authority. Particular care is required when collecting sensitive information through interviews, focus groups, observations, or clinical records. Participant identities should be protected through appropriate coding, secure data storage, restricted access, and careful reporting. Researchers should also ensure that qualitative narratives are presented respectfully and that quantitative and qualitative findings are not misrepresented. Ethical practice is essential for protecting participants and maintaining the credibility and integrity of nursing research.

MEASURING NURSING EFFECTIVENESS

Definition and Dimensions of Effectiveness: Nursing effectiveness refers to the extent to which nursing interventions, services, practices, or programmes achieve their intended outcomes for patients, families, communities, or healthcare organizations. Effectiveness can be assessed through multiple dimensions, including clinical improvement, patient safety, functional ability, knowledge, self-care, psychological well-being, satisfaction, quality of life, and prevention of complications. Because nursing care addresses physical, psychological, social, educational, and functional needs, effectiveness cannot always be represented by a single outcome. A nursing intervention may be considered effective when it produces meaningful improvement in the health status or experience of patients and achieves the objectives established before implementation. In mixed-methods research, quantitative measurements can demonstrate the extent of improvement, while qualitative evidence can explain how participants experienced the intervention and which contextual factors influenced its effectiveness.

Effectiveness of Nursing Interventions: Nursing interventions include a wide range of activities such as health education, counselling, therapeutic communication, symptom management, behavioural interventions, patient monitoring, care coordination, rehabilitation, and health-promotion programmes. The effectiveness of an intervention should be evaluated against clearly defined objectives and

appropriate outcome measures. Baseline information is usually collected before implementation, followed by assessment after the intervention to determine whether meaningful changes have occurred. Quantitative measures may demonstrate improvement in knowledge, symptoms, physiological parameters, adherence, or functional status, while qualitative interviews may reveal participants' perceptions regarding the usefulness, acceptability, difficulties, and benefits of the intervention. Combining these forms of evidence enables researchers to determine not only whether an intervention produced an effect but also how participants experienced the intervention and what factors contributed to its success or limited its effectiveness.

Patient Outcomes: Patient outcomes are measurable changes in a patient's health status, functioning, behavior, experience, or well-being that occur following healthcare or nursing interventions. They may include mortality, morbidity, symptom severity, functional status, complications, treatment adherence, satisfaction, psychological well-being, and quality of life. The selection of outcomes should be based on the nature of the intervention, characteristics of the population, clinical condition, and objectives of the study. Outcomes may be measured immediately after an intervention or during longer follow-up periods to determine whether improvements are sustained. In mixed-methods research, objective outcome measures can be combined with qualitative accounts of patient experiences to provide a broader understanding of the effects of nursing care.

Clinical Indicators: Clinical indicators are measurable variables used to assess the quality, safety, effectiveness, and performance of healthcare services. In nursing research, commonly used clinical indicators include rates of falls, pressure injuries, medication errors, healthcare-associated infections, pain levels, readmissions, length of hospital stay, complications, and adherence to clinical protocols. These indicators provide objective information that can be monitored over time and compared between groups or periods. When clinical indicators demonstrate improvement or deterioration, qualitative methods can be used to explore the reasons behind the observed changes. For example, a reduction in infection rates may be quantitatively demonstrated, while interviews with nurses may identify improved staff education, better availability of supplies, stronger teamwork, or improved adherence to infection-prevention practices as contributing factors.

Pre-Test and Post-Test Measurement: Pre-test and post-test measurement is a commonly used method for evaluating changes associated with nursing interventions. In this approach, the outcome variable is measured before the intervention to establish a baseline and measured again after the intervention to determine whether a change has occurred. The difference between pre-test and post-test scores provides information about the direction and magnitude of change. A comparison group may be included to strengthen the interpretation of findings and reduce the possibility that changes are caused by factors unrelated to the intervention. Researchers should use reliable and valid measurement instruments and maintain consistency in the timing and conditions of assessment. In mixed-methods research, qualitative data can be collected alongside the pre-test and post-test assessments to provide explanations for the changes observed.

Intervention Effectiveness Studies: Intervention effectiveness studies are designed to determine whether a specific nursing intervention produces the intended outcomes in a defined population and setting. These studies may use experimental, quasi-experimental, or mixed-methods approaches depending on the research question and practical circumstances. The researcher should clearly describe the intervention, target population, setting, duration, implementation procedures, comparison conditions, and outcome measures. Quantitative findings can establish whether statistically or clinically meaningful changes occurred, while qualitative findings can explore participants' experiences, perceived benefits, barriers, acceptability, and factors influencing implementation. Mixed-methods effectiveness studies are therefore valuable because they address both the measurable impact of an intervention and the contextual factors that explain its success or limitations.

MEASURING PATIENT AND NURSING OUTCOMES

Patient Safety Outcomes: Patient safety outcomes represent the extent to which healthcare services prevent avoidable harm and protect patients during the delivery of care. Common patient safety outcomes include falls, medication errors, healthcare-associated infections, pressure injuries, adverse

events, wrong-site procedures, and preventable complications. Nurses play a major role in patient safety because they continuously assess patients, administer medications, monitor changes in health status, communicate with healthcare professionals, and implement preventive measures. Quantitative methods can determine the frequency, rate, or severity of safety events, while qualitative methods can explore nurses' and patients' experiences and identify organizational, environmental, communication, or human factors contributing to safety problems. Combining both forms of evidence provides a more complete understanding of patient safety and supports the development of effective preventive strategies.

Clinical Outcomes: Clinical outcomes refer to measurable changes in a patient's physical or psychological health condition following illness, treatment, or nursing care. Examples include improvement in symptoms, wound healing, blood pressure control, glycaemic control, respiratory function, infection resolution, pain reduction, reduction in complications, and recovery time. Clinical outcomes should be selected according to the characteristics of the population and the objectives of the intervention. Objective clinical measures provide important evidence regarding the effectiveness of care, but they may not fully represent the patient's experience. Therefore, mixed-methods research may combine clinical measurements with patient interviews to understand how patients perceive their health changes and whether clinical improvement has resulted in meaningful improvements in daily life.

Functional Outcomes: Functional outcomes refer to changes in an individual's ability to perform activities necessary for independent living and participation in daily life. These outcomes may include mobility, self-care, communication, cognitive functioning, social participation, occupational functioning, and independence in activities of daily living. Functional outcomes are particularly important in rehabilitation, geriatric, neurological, chronic illness, and community health nursing. Standardized functional assessment tools can provide numerical measurements of changes, while qualitative interviews can explore how patients experience their recovery and adaptation. This combination can reveal differences between objectively measured functional improvement and the patient's personal perception of recovery.

Patient Satisfaction: Patient satisfaction refers to the extent to which patients perceive that healthcare services meet their needs, expectations, preferences, and standards. Satisfaction may be influenced by communication, responsiveness, respect, accessibility, technical competence, emotional support, privacy, waiting time, involvement in decision-making, and continuity of care. Standardized questionnaires and rating scales can be used to quantify satisfaction across large groups of patients. However, numerical scores may not explain the specific experiences that influence satisfaction. Interviews and focus group discussions can provide detailed information about positive and negative experiences and identify specific areas requiring improvement. Mixed-methods research therefore allows researchers to measure the overall level of satisfaction while also understanding the reasons underlying patients' perceptions.

Quality of Life: Quality of life is a multidimensional concept that includes physical health, psychological well-being, social relationships, independence, environmental conditions, and an individual's overall perception of life. Nursing interventions may improve quality of life even when changes in conventional clinical indicators are relatively small. Standardized quality-of-life instruments can be used to measure changes across different domains, while qualitative methods can explore what quality of life means to patients in the context of their illness and circumstances. This combination is particularly valuable in chronic illness, cancer, palliative care, rehabilitation, disability, and long-term nursing care, where individual preferences, values, and experiences strongly influence perceived well-being.

Nursing-Sensitive Outcomes: Nursing-sensitive outcomes are patient outcomes that are significantly influenced by the quantity, quality, and effectiveness of nursing care. Examples include falls, pressure injuries, pain management, patient education, medication-related errors, infection prevention, patient satisfaction, and aspects of functional status. These outcomes are important because they help demonstrate the contribution of nursing care to patient safety, recovery, and quality of life. Monitoring nursing-sensitive outcomes can support evidence-based practice, quality improvement, staffing decisions, professional accountability, and healthcare planning. Mixed-methods research can

strengthen evaluation by combining numerical measurement of nursing-sensitive indicators with qualitative exploration of nurses' practices and patients' experiences.

Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs): Patient-reported outcome measures are standardized instruments completed directly by patients to provide information about their symptoms, functioning, health status, quality of life, or perceptions of treatment outcomes. PROMs are important because some aspects of health cannot be adequately assessed through clinical observations or laboratory investigations. They allow patients to report how they feel and function from their own perspective and therefore support patient-centered evaluation of healthcare. PROMs can be administered before and after an intervention to measure changes over time. In mixed-methods research, PROM findings can be supplemented by qualitative interviews that explore experiences not fully captured by standardized questions, thereby providing a richer understanding of patient outcomes.

MEASURING QUALITY OF NURSING CARE

Concept and Dimensions of Quality: Quality of nursing care refers to the extent to which nursing services are safe, effective, timely, efficient, equitable, patient-centered, and consistent with professional standards and evidence-based practice. Quality is a multidimensional concept that includes clinical competence, communication, responsiveness, continuity of care, patient safety, ethical practice, respect for individual preferences, and achievement of desired outcomes. Because quality cannot be adequately represented by a single measurement, researchers use a combination of indicators and assessment methods. Quantitative methods can measure performance and outcomes, while qualitative approaches can explore patients' and nurses' perceptions of care quality and identify contextual factors that influence the delivery of high-quality nursing services.

Structure, Process, and Outcome Approach: The structure, process, and outcome approach provides a systematic framework for evaluating healthcare quality. Structure refers to the resources and organizational conditions available for providing care, including staffing, infrastructure, equipment, policies, facilities, and professional qualifications. Process refers to the activities performed during the delivery of care, such as patient assessment, medication administration, communication, documentation, health education, infection prevention, and implementation of clinical guidelines. Outcome refers to the effects of care on patients, including clinical improvement, safety, satisfaction, functional status, and quality of life. This framework allows researchers to examine whether adequate resources are available, whether care is delivered appropriately, and whether the care produces desirable outcomes. Mixed-methods research can strengthen this assessment by combining objective indicators with observations and interviews.

Quality Indicators: Quality indicators are measurable variables used to monitor and evaluate the performance and quality of healthcare services. Nursing-related quality indicators may include fall rates, pressure injury rates, healthcare-associated infection rates, medication errors, patient satisfaction, documentation compliance, staffing indicators, and adherence to clinical standards. Effective indicators should be clearly defined, reliable, relevant, measurable, and sensitive to meaningful changes in care. Regular monitoring allows healthcare organizations to identify strengths and weaknesses and evaluate the impact of quality-improvement interventions. Qualitative inquiry can complement indicator data by exploring why a particular indicator has improved or deteriorated and identifying organizational or human factors influencing the observed performance.

Standards of Nursing Care: Standards of nursing care describe the expected level of professional performance and provide a basis for evaluating the quality and safety of nursing practice. Standards may be established by professional organizations, regulatory authorities, healthcare institutions, clinical guidelines, evidence-based recommendations, and legal or ethical requirements. They promote consistency, accountability, professional competence, and patient safety. Compliance with nursing standards can be evaluated through clinical audits, documentation review, direct observation, competency assessment, patient feedback, and outcome measurement. Qualitative methods can further identify practical barriers experienced by nurses when attempting to follow established standards, including workload, staffing limitations, inadequate resources, communication problems, and organizational constraints.

Quality Assurance and Quality Improvement: Quality assurance focuses on maintaining predetermined standards of care, whereas quality improvement involves continuous efforts to enhance healthcare processes, patient experiences, and outcomes. Quality improvement generally involves identifying a problem, analyzing contributing factors, implementing a change, monitoring the results, and modifying the intervention when necessary. Nursing researchers can use mixed-methods approaches to evaluate quality-improvement programmes by measuring changes in quantitative indicators and exploring the experiences of nurses, patients, and other stakeholders. This combination can determine whether improvement occurred and provide insight into the factors that supported or hindered successful implementation and sustainability.

Patient-Centered Care: Patient-centered care places the individual patient's preferences, values, needs, beliefs, and goals at the center of healthcare decision-making and service delivery. It involves respectful communication, shared decision-making, individualized care, emotional support, cultural sensitivity, privacy, and involvement of patients and families in appropriate aspects of care. Measuring patient-centered care requires assessment of both observable care processes and subjective patient experiences. Questionnaires may assess communication, involvement, respect, and satisfaction, while interviews can explore whether patients felt listened to, respected, informed, and involved in decisions. Mixed-methods research is therefore particularly valuable for evaluating patient-centered nursing care because it combines measurable indicators with the patient's own voice and experience.

QUANTITATIVE METHODS FOR MEASURING OUTCOMES

Questionnaires and Rating Scales: Questionnaires and rating scales are widely used quantitative methods for collecting standardized information from nursing research participants. They may be used to measure knowledge, attitudes, satisfaction, anxiety, stress, pain, quality of life, self-care practices, health behaviors, or perceptions of healthcare. Questionnaires may contain closed-ended questions with predetermined response options that can be assigned numerical values and analyzed statistically. Rating scales allow researchers to measure the intensity or frequency of a particular characteristic or response. Researchers should select instruments that are appropriate for the study population and research objectives and should establish or verify their reliability and validity before using them for outcome measurement.

Clinical Assessment Tools: Clinical assessment tools are standardized instruments used by nurses to assess patient conditions, risks, symptoms, functional abilities, and healthcare needs. Examples include pain assessment scales, fall-risk assessment tools, pressure injury risk assessment instruments, nutritional assessment tools, and functional assessment scales. The use of standardized tools improves consistency between assessments and allows researchers to compare patient outcomes across time and groups. Researchers should ensure that the selected tool is suitable for the target population, clinically relevant, reliable, and valid. Training may be required when assessment involves professional judgment or when multiple assessors are involved in data collection.

Observational Checklists: Observational checklists are structured instruments used to record whether specific behaviors, procedures, activities, or clinical practices occur according to predetermined criteria. They are commonly used in nursing research to assess hand hygiene, infection-control practices, medication administration, communication behaviors, clinical skills, documentation, and compliance with protocols. Observational methods provide information about actual practice rather than relying solely on self-reported behavior. However, researchers should consider observer bias and the possibility that participants may modify their behavior because they know they are being observed. Standardized training and clear operational definitions can improve the reliability of observational measurements.

Physiological Measurements: Physiological measurements provide objective information regarding a patient's physical condition and are commonly used as outcomes in nursing research. Examples include blood pressure, pulse rate, respiratory rate, body temperature, oxygen saturation, blood glucose, body mass index, laboratory values, and other clinically relevant physiological parameters. These measurements can be used to evaluate disease progression, treatment response, and effectiveness of nursing interventions. Accurate measurement requires standardized procedures, appropriate equipment, trained personnel, and consistent measurement conditions. Researchers should carefully

document the timing and method of measurement and ensure that equipment is functioning correctly and appropriately calibrated.

Reliability and Validity: Reliability refers to the degree to which a measurement instrument produces consistent and stable results, whereas validity refers to the extent to which the instrument accurately measures the construct it is intended to measure. Reliability may be evaluated through methods such as test-retest reliability, inter-rater reliability, and internal consistency, while validity may involve content, construct, criterion-related, and other forms of evidence. Reliable and valid instruments are essential for producing trustworthy quantitative findings. If a tool is unreliable, repeated measurements may vary considerably, whereas a tool lacking validity may consistently measure the wrong construct. Researchers should therefore use established instruments whenever appropriate or conduct systematic procedures for developing and validating new tools.

Statistical Analysis of Outcomes: Statistical analysis is used to organize, summarize, compare, and interpret quantitative data collected during nursing research. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, mean, median, standard deviation, and range can describe participant characteristics and outcome distributions. Inferential statistics such as t-tests, chi-square tests, analysis of variance, correlation, regression, and other appropriate techniques can be used to examine differences, relationships, associations, or effects. The choice of statistical test should depend on the research design, research question, type and distribution of data, sample characteristics, and assumptions of the statistical procedure. In mixed-methods research, quantitative findings should ultimately be interpreted alongside qualitative findings so that statistical results can be understood in their clinical and contextual context.

QUALITATIVE METHODS FOR UNDERSTANDING OUTCOMES

Interviews: Interviews are an important qualitative method used to explore participants' experiences, perceptions, beliefs, attitudes, feelings, and interpretations of health and healthcare. Interviews may be structured, semi-structured, or unstructured, with semi-structured interviews being particularly common in nursing research because they provide predetermined areas of inquiry while allowing participants to describe their experiences freely. Interviews can be used to explore patient experiences of illness, perceptions of nursing care, barriers to treatment adherence, responses to nursing interventions, and nurses' experiences of clinical practice. The researcher should establish a respectful and supportive environment that encourages participants to provide detailed and honest information. Interview data are usually recorded, transcribed, coded, and analyzed systematically to identify meaningful patterns and themes.

Focus Group Discussions: Focus group discussions involve a small group of participants who discuss a specific topic under the guidance of a facilitator. The interaction between participants can generate diverse opinions, shared experiences, differences in viewpoints, and new ideas that may not emerge during individual interviews. Focus groups are useful for exploring patient experiences, community beliefs, nursing professionals' perceptions, educational needs, healthcare barriers, and attitudes toward health programmes. The facilitator should maintain a supportive environment, encourage balanced participation, and prevent one participant from dominating the discussion. Confidentiality should be addressed before the discussion, although participants should be informed that complete confidentiality within a group cannot be guaranteed.

Observation: Observation involves systematically watching and recording behaviors, interactions, clinical procedures, environmental conditions, or social processes. It is useful when researchers need to understand what actually happens in practice rather than relying only on participants' descriptions. Nursing researchers may use observation to study nurse-patient communication, clinical procedures, infection-control practices, medication administration, patient behavior, or workplace interactions. Observation may be structured or unstructured and may involve participant or non-participant observation. Researchers should establish clear observation procedures, maintain ethical standards, protect privacy, and minimize their influence on participants' behavior.

Case Studies: A case study involves an in-depth investigation of an individual, family, group,

organization, programme, event, or clinical situation within its real-life context. Case studies are particularly useful for examining complex phenomena that cannot be separated easily from the environment in which they occur. Nursing researchers may use case studies to examine complex patient-care situations, unusual clinical experiences, implementation of nursing programmes, organizational changes, or healthcare innovations. Multiple sources of evidence, such as interviews, observations, clinical records, documents, and reports, may be used to develop a detailed understanding of the case. Case studies provide contextual depth and may generate insights that can inform practice and future research.

Narrative Methods: Narrative methods focus on the stories that individuals tell about their lives, health conditions, relationships, experiences, and responses to significant events. Narratives provide insight into how people construct meaning and understand their experiences over time. In nursing research, narrative methods may be used to explore chronic illness, childbirth, cancer experiences, caregiving, disability, rehabilitation, bereavement, and adaptation to changes in health. The researcher considers the content, sequence, context, language, and meaning of participants' stories. Narrative approaches recognize that healthcare experiences are personal and cannot always be adequately represented through numerical scores or standardized categories.

Thematic Analysis: Thematic analysis is a widely used qualitative data-analysis method for identifying, organizing, describing, and interpreting patterns of meaning within qualitative data. The researcher begins by becoming familiar with the collected data, develops initial codes, examines relationships among codes, identifies potential themes, reviews and refines the themes, and develops an interpretation that addresses the research questions. The analysis should be systematic and transparent, with themes supported by relevant evidence from the dataset. In mixed-methods research, themes identified through qualitative analysis may be compared with quantitative findings to explain, complement, or challenge numerical results. Proper thematic analysis helps transform large amounts of qualitative information into meaningful findings that can inform nursing practice.

Understanding Patient and Nurse Experiences: Understanding patient and nurse experiences is an important purpose of qualitative research because healthcare outcomes are influenced by communication, relationships, emotions, beliefs, expectations, organizational culture, workload, resources, and social and cultural circumstances. Quantitative data may demonstrate that a nursing intervention improved a particular outcome, but qualitative evidence can explain how patients experienced the intervention, why they found it useful or difficult, and which factors influenced their response. For example, a quantitative study may demonstrate improved adherence following a nurse-led counselling programme, while interviews may reveal that individualized education, family support, regular follow-up, and simplified instructions contributed to successful adherence. Patients may also describe barriers such as financial difficulties, cultural beliefs, lack of support, transportation problems, or limited access to healthcare. Similarly, nurses may identify staffing shortages, workload, inadequate training, communication difficulties, resource limitations, or organizational policies as factors influencing implementation. Integrating these experiences with quantitative outcome data enables researchers to understand not only whether an intervention was effective but also how, why, and under what circumstances it produced the observed outcomes. Qualitative understanding therefore adds depth and context to nursing research and supports the development of evidence-based, patient-centered, and practically relevant nursing interventions.

INTEGRATION OF QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

Meaning of Integration: Integration is the central characteristic of mixed-methods research and refers to the deliberate process of bringing quantitative and qualitative evidence together to develop a comprehensive understanding of the research problem. Simply collecting quantitative and qualitative data in the same study does not constitute effective mixed-methods research unless the findings are meaningfully connected. Integration may occur at different stages, including research design, sampling, data collection, analysis, and interpretation. The purpose of integration is to determine how the two forms of evidence relate to each other and whether they provide convergent, complementary, or contradictory information. In nursing research, integration can help explain not only whether a nursing

intervention produced a measurable outcome but also how patients and healthcare professionals experienced the intervention and which contextual factors influenced its effectiveness.

Connecting Datasets: Connecting datasets refers to the process of establishing a deliberate relationship between quantitative and qualitative data collected during different phases of a mixed-methods study. This connection may occur when the results of one phase are used to determine the participants, questions, or procedures of another phase. For example, in an explanatory sequential study, quantitative results may be used to identify participants for qualitative interviews. Patients with particularly high, low, or unexpected outcome scores may be selected for interviews to understand the reasons for their results. Similarly, findings from qualitative research may be used to develop variables, measurement tools, or intervention components for a subsequent quantitative phase. Connecting datasets therefore creates a logical pathway between different components of the research and strengthens the overall coherence of the study.

Building Findings: Building findings refers to the process in which findings from one methodological component contribute to the development or interpretation of findings from another component. This approach is particularly common in sequential mixed-methods designs. Qualitative findings may help researchers identify important concepts that are later measured quantitatively, while quantitative findings may identify patterns requiring further qualitative explanation. For example, interviews with nurses may identify barriers to effective pain management, which can subsequently be converted into measurable variables and assessed in a larger nursing population. The process of building findings allows researchers to progressively develop knowledge and provides a logical relationship between different phases of a study.

Merging Quantitative and Qualitative Results: Merging involves bringing quantitative and qualitative results together during analysis or interpretation so that they can be directly compared and understood in relation to each other. The researcher may compare numerical results with qualitative themes to determine whether they support, complement, or contradict each other. For example, quantitative findings may demonstrate high patient satisfaction with a nursing service, while qualitative interviews may reveal concerns about waiting time and communication. Such differences should not automatically be considered methodological failure; instead, they may provide important information about different dimensions of the patient experience. Merging findings enables researchers to move beyond separate reporting of results and develop a more complete explanation of the research problem.

Joint Displays: Joint displays are visual or tabular methods used to present quantitative and qualitative findings together in an organized format. A joint display may place statistical results alongside qualitative themes, participant characteristics, quotations, or interpretations. It allows researchers and readers to identify relationships, similarities, differences, and patterns across the two forms of evidence. For example, a table may present changes in patient knowledge scores alongside qualitative themes describing patients' perceptions of an educational programme. Joint displays can make complex mixed-methods findings easier to understand and can support systematic interpretation. They are particularly useful when a large amount of quantitative and qualitative information needs to be integrated clearly.

Triangulation: Triangulation involves examining a research problem using multiple sources, methods, perspectives, or types of evidence to increase the depth and credibility of the findings. In mixed-methods research, methodological triangulation may involve comparing quantitative measurements with qualitative accounts of the same phenomenon. If both approaches produce similar findings, confidence in the interpretation may be strengthened. However, triangulation does not require the findings to be identical. Differences may reveal aspects of the phenomenon that would remain hidden if only one method were used. In nursing research, triangulation can be used to compare patient questionnaires, nurse interviews, clinical observations, and clinical outcome data to obtain a broader understanding of healthcare quality.

Interpretation of Integrated Findings: Interpretation of integrated findings involves explaining the meaning of the combined quantitative and qualitative evidence in relation to the research questions, theoretical framework, existing literature, and nursing practice. The researcher should identify areas of agreement, complementarity, and disagreement between the datasets and provide reasonable

explanations for these patterns. Statistical significance should be considered together with practical and clinical meaning, while qualitative themes should be interpreted in relation to measurable outcomes. The final interpretation should demonstrate what was learned through the combination of methods that could not have been adequately understood through either approach alone. Effective interpretation can provide stronger evidence for clinical decision-making, nursing interventions, healthcare policy, and future research.

EVALUATING NURSING INTERVENTIONS USING MIXED METHODS

Intervention Development: Intervention development is the systematic process of designing a nursing intervention based on identified needs, theoretical principles, existing evidence, clinical expertise, and patient or stakeholder perspectives. Mixed-methods research can contribute to intervention development by combining qualitative exploration of patient and provider needs with quantitative evidence regarding the prevalence and severity of the identified problem. For example, interviews with patients may identify difficulties related to medication adherence, while quantitative assessment may establish the extent of non-adherence in the target population. These findings can be integrated to develop an intervention that is evidence-based, culturally appropriate, clinically relevant, and acceptable to patients and healthcare professionals.

Baseline Assessment: Baseline assessment involves measuring relevant patient, provider, or organizational characteristics before implementation of a nursing intervention. Baseline data provide a reference point against which subsequent changes can be evaluated. Quantitative baseline measures may include knowledge scores, clinical indicators, symptom severity, quality-of-life scores, adherence rates, or patient satisfaction, while qualitative baseline information may describe existing experiences, beliefs, practices, barriers, and expectations. Establishing a clear baseline is essential because it enables researchers to determine the magnitude and direction of change following the intervention and helps identify factors that may influence implementation and outcomes.

Implementation: Implementation refers to the process of delivering the planned nursing intervention to the intended population according to predefined procedures. Effective implementation requires appropriate training, resources, communication, supervision, monitoring, and adherence to the intervention protocol. Quantitative data may be used to monitor participation, attendance, compliance, intervention dose, and completion rates, while qualitative methods may explore how patients and healthcare providers perceive the intervention and what difficulties they encounter during implementation. Understanding both measurable implementation indicators and participant experiences helps researchers identify deviations from the planned intervention and determine whether contextual factors influenced its delivery.

Outcome Measurement: Outcome measurement is the systematic assessment of changes resulting from a nursing intervention. Outcomes may include clinical status, knowledge, behavior, symptoms, functional ability, patient safety, satisfaction, quality of life, or other variables relevant to the intervention. Quantitative outcome measures allow researchers to determine whether statistically or clinically meaningful changes occurred, while qualitative information can explain how participants experienced those changes. For example, a nursing education programme may produce a significant increase in knowledge scores, while interviews may reveal that participants gained confidence in self-care and felt better prepared to manage their condition. Combining both forms of evidence provides a more complete evaluation of intervention effectiveness.

Patient and Provider Perspectives: Patient and provider perspectives are important because the success of a nursing intervention depends not only on measurable outcomes but also on acceptability, feasibility, satisfaction, and the experiences of those involved in delivering and receiving care. Patients can provide information about whether the intervention was understandable, convenient, culturally appropriate, acceptable, and beneficial, while nurses and other healthcare providers can describe practical challenges, resource requirements, workload, training needs, and organizational support. Qualitative interviews or focus groups can provide detailed information about these perspectives, while quantitative satisfaction or acceptability scales can provide measurable estimates. Integrating both perspectives helps researchers develop interventions that are clinically effective and practically feasible.

Process Evaluation: Process evaluation examines how an intervention was implemented rather than focusing only on its final outcomes. It may assess whether the intervention was delivered as planned, whether participants received an adequate dose, whether healthcare professionals followed the protocol, and what contextual factors affected implementation. Quantitative process indicators may include attendance, completion rates, adherence, duration, and frequency of intervention delivery, whereas qualitative methods may identify barriers, facilitators, communication issues, and participant perceptions. Process evaluation is particularly important when an intervention does not produce the expected outcome because it helps determine whether the intervention itself was ineffective or whether problems in implementation influenced the result.

Follow-Up Assessment: Follow-up assessment involves evaluating participants after an intervention to determine whether observed changes are maintained over time. Follow-up may occur at one or several predetermined intervals depending on the nature of the intervention and expected outcomes. Quantitative follow-up measures can identify whether improvements in clinical, behavioral, functional, or psychological outcomes are sustained, while qualitative interviews can explore participants' long-term experiences and factors influencing continued adherence. Follow-up assessment is important because an intervention may produce short-term improvement without resulting in lasting change. Mixed-methods follow-up therefore provides information about both the durability of outcomes and the experiences that influence long-term maintenance.

MIXED METHODS FOR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT IN NURSING

Identifying Quality Gaps: Identifying quality gaps involves determining differences between the current level of healthcare performance and the desired or established standard of care. Quality gaps may involve patient safety, infection prevention, medication administration, documentation, communication, staffing, patient satisfaction, or clinical outcomes. Quantitative data such as incident rates, audit results, clinical indicators, and patient satisfaction scores can identify the magnitude of the gap, while qualitative interviews and observations can explore why the gap exists. A mixed-methods approach provides both measurable evidence of the problem and contextual information needed to understand its causes and develop appropriate improvement strategies.

Root-Cause Analysis: Root-cause analysis is a systematic process used to identify the underlying factors contributing to a quality or safety problem rather than focusing only on the immediate event. In nursing, root-cause analysis may be applied to medication errors, patient falls, healthcare-associated infections, pressure injuries, delayed treatment, or communication failures. Quantitative information can identify patterns and frequencies of adverse events, while qualitative information from nurses, patients, and other healthcare professionals can identify workflow problems, communication barriers, staffing issues, training deficiencies, environmental factors, and organizational weaknesses. The integration of these findings helps healthcare teams develop interventions that address underlying causes rather than simply treating symptoms of the problem.

Plan–Do–Study–Act (PDSA): Plan–Do–Study–Act is a commonly used quality-improvement framework involving four interconnected stages. During the planning stage, the problem is identified, objectives are established, and a proposed change is developed. During the doing stage, the change is implemented on a small or manageable scale. The study stage involves collecting and analyzing data to determine whether the change produced the expected improvement, while the act stage involves adopting, modifying, or abandoning the change based on the findings. Mixed-methods approaches can strengthen PDSA cycles by combining quantitative measures of improvement with qualitative information about staff and patient experiences. This provides a more complete understanding of whether the change was effective and why it succeeded or failed.

Evidence-Based Quality Improvement: Evidence-based quality improvement involves using the best available research evidence, clinical expertise, patient preferences, and local healthcare data to improve nursing practice and patient outcomes. Researchers and quality-improvement teams should identify relevant evidence, assess its applicability, and adapt it to the local context. Quantitative evidence can demonstrate the effectiveness of proposed practices, while qualitative evidence can provide information about acceptability, feasibility, cultural relevance, and contextual barriers. Mixed-methods

approaches therefore support quality improvement by combining scientific evidence with practical and experiential knowledge.

Monitoring Quality Indicators: Monitoring quality indicators involves the regular collection and analysis of measurable variables that reflect healthcare performance and patient outcomes. Nursing quality indicators may include fall rates, pressure injury rates, infection rates, medication errors, patient satisfaction, response times, documentation compliance, and adherence to clinical protocols. Trends in indicators can be monitored before, during, and after implementation of quality-improvement interventions. Qualitative information from nurses and patients can supplement indicator data by explaining changes in performance and identifying factors that may not be visible in numerical records. Continuous monitoring allows organizations to identify emerging problems and evaluate whether improvements are sustained.

Evaluating Improvement Initiatives: Evaluation of quality-improvement initiatives involves determining whether a planned change has achieved its intended objectives and produced meaningful improvement in care. Quantitative evaluation may compare quality indicators before and after implementation, while qualitative evaluation may explore the experiences of patients, nurses, managers, and other stakeholders. The researcher should consider both statistical and practical significance and examine whether improvements are sustainable. Mixed-methods evaluation can also identify unintended consequences, implementation barriers, and opportunities for further improvement. The findings can be used to refine existing interventions and guide future quality-improvement activities.

DATA ANALYSIS IN MIXED-METHODS RESEARCH

Quantitative Data Analysis: Quantitative data analysis involves organizing, cleaning, summarizing, and statistically analyzing numerical information collected during the study. The researcher begins by checking the completeness and accuracy of the dataset and identifying missing or inconsistent observations. Descriptive statistics can summarize participant characteristics and outcome variables, while inferential statistics can be used to examine differences, relationships, associations, or intervention effects. The statistical procedures selected should be appropriate to the research design, measurement level, sample size, distribution of data, and assumptions of the statistical test. In mixed-methods research, quantitative analysis should be completed carefully before the results are integrated with qualitative findings.

Qualitative Data Analysis: Qualitative data analysis involves systematically examining non-numerical information such as interview transcripts, focus group discussions, observation notes, narratives, and documents to identify meaningful patterns and themes. The process generally includes data familiarization, coding, categorization, theme development, interpretation, and verification. Researchers may use manual coding or appropriate qualitative data-analysis software. The analysis should remain closely connected to the research questions and should accurately represent participants' perspectives. In mixed-methods research, qualitative analysis provides contextual and experiential information that can explain, complement, or challenge quantitative findings.

Descriptive and Inferential Statistics: Descriptive statistics summarize the characteristics and distribution of collected quantitative data using measures such as frequency, percentage, mean, median, mode, range, variance, and standard deviation. Inferential statistics are used to draw conclusions about relationships, differences, or effects beyond the observed sample. Depending on the research question and design, researchers may use t-tests, chi-square tests, analysis of variance, correlation, regression, or other appropriate statistical procedures. The researcher should consider assumptions, effect size, confidence intervals, and practical significance rather than relying exclusively on statistical significance. In mixed-methods research, statistical results should be interpreted alongside qualitative findings to provide a more meaningful understanding of the results.

Coding and Categorization: Coding is the process of assigning labels to meaningful segments of qualitative data, while categorization involves grouping related codes into broader concepts. During qualitative analysis, researchers may identify words, statements, experiences, behaviors, or ideas that are relevant to the research questions and assign codes to them. Related codes can then be organized

into categories and eventually developed into broader themes. Coding should be systematic and transparent, and researchers should maintain records of analytical decisions. In mixed-methods studies, qualitative categories may also be compared with quantitative variables to identify relationships between numerical outcomes and participants' experiences.

Integration of Datasets: Integration of datasets involves systematically bringing quantitative and qualitative findings together to develop an overall interpretation. Researchers may connect the datasets during sampling, merge them during analysis, or compare them during interpretation. Quantitative findings may be used to select qualitative participants, while qualitative findings may explain unexpected statistical results. Joint displays and side-by-side comparisons can help identify areas of convergence, complementarity, and discrepancy. Successful integration ensures that both forms of evidence contribute to answering the overall research question and produces conclusions that are stronger and more comprehensive than separate analyses alone.

Interpretation of Mixed-Methods Results: Interpretation of mixed-methods results involves explaining the meaning and significance of the combined quantitative and qualitative findings. Researchers should examine whether the results confirm one another, provide complementary information, or demonstrate contradictions. Unexpected findings should be carefully explored rather than ignored, as they may reveal important contextual or theoretical factors. The final interpretation should relate the findings to the research questions, theoretical framework, existing evidence, and implications for nursing practice. The researcher should clearly distinguish between what is directly supported by the data and what represents interpretation or inference.

VALIDITY, RELIABILITY, AND TRUSTWORTHINESS

Internal and External Validity: Internal validity refers to the degree to which the findings of a quantitative study accurately reflect the effects or relationships investigated within the study and are not substantially influenced by uncontrolled factors, bias, or confounding variables. External validity refers to the extent to which findings can reasonably be applied or generalized to other populations, settings, or situations. In nursing research, researchers can strengthen internal validity through appropriate study design, control of confounding factors, reliable measurement, and standardized procedures. External validity can be supported through appropriate sampling, clear description of participants and settings, and replication in different populations. In mixed-methods research, both forms of validity should be considered alongside the quality of the qualitative component and the appropriateness of integration.

Reliability of Quantitative Tools: Reliability refers to the consistency, stability, and dependability of quantitative measurement instruments. A reliable tool should produce reasonably consistent results when used under similar conditions. Reliability can be assessed through test-retest methods, internal consistency, inter-rater reliability, or other appropriate procedures. For example, a nursing questionnaire designed to measure patient satisfaction should provide consistent measurements when administered under comparable conditions. Researchers should report relevant reliability evidence and ensure that the instrument is appropriate for the population and context in which it is used.

Credibility: Credibility refers to confidence that qualitative findings accurately represent participants' experiences and perspectives. It is broadly comparable to internal validity in quantitative research but is addressed through different methodological strategies. Credibility may be strengthened through prolonged engagement, appropriate sampling, member checking where suitable, triangulation, peer review, careful interviewing, and systematic analysis. In nursing research, credibility is particularly important when findings are used to understand sensitive patient experiences or develop interventions based on participants' perspectives.

Dependability: Dependability refers to the consistency and stability of the qualitative research process and the extent to which the research procedures are clearly documented and logically followed. Researchers can strengthen dependability by maintaining detailed records of data collection, coding decisions, analytical procedures, methodological changes, and research decisions. An audit trail allows others to understand how the researcher moved from raw data to categories, themes, and conclusions.

Clear documentation improves transparency and strengthens confidence in the qualitative component of a mixed-methods study.

Confirmability: Confirmability refers to the extent to which qualitative findings are grounded in the participants' data rather than being primarily influenced by the researcher's personal assumptions, preferences, or biases. Researchers should acknowledge their own position and consider how it may influence data collection and interpretation. Strategies such as maintaining reflexive notes, using an audit trail, discussing interpretations with research colleagues, and supporting themes with appropriate evidence can strengthen confirmability. The objective is not to eliminate researcher interpretation but to demonstrate that interpretations are logically supported by the data.

Transferability: Transferability refers to the extent to which qualitative findings may be relevant or applicable to other settings, populations, or contexts. Unlike statistical generalization, transferability depends on the reader or researcher determining whether the context and characteristics of the original study are sufficiently similar to another setting. Researchers can support transferability by providing detailed descriptions of participants, settings, healthcare environments, sampling procedures, and contextual factors. Such descriptions allow readers to judge whether the findings may be meaningful in their own practice or research environment.

Mixed-Methods Validity: Mixed-methods validity refers to the overall quality and appropriateness of the quantitative, qualitative, and integration components of a mixed-methods study. A study may have strong quantitative and qualitative methods but still have weak mixed-methods validity if the two components are poorly connected or if the integration does not appropriately address the research questions. Researchers should therefore consider the quality of each methodological component as well as the rationale for combining them, the adequacy of integration, the consistency between research questions and methods, and the credibility of the overall interpretation. Strong mixed-methods validity results when both forms of evidence are appropriately collected, analyzed, integrated, and interpreted.

REPORTING MIXED-METHODS RESEARCH

Structure of a Mixed-Methods Research Report: A mixed-methods research report should present the study in a logical and transparent manner so that readers can understand the research problem, methodology, findings, integration process, and implications. The report generally includes an introduction, review of relevant literature, research questions and objectives, methodology, results, integration of findings, discussion, conclusions, limitations, recommendations, and implications. The researcher should clearly explain why mixed methods were selected and identify the specific design used. The relationship between the quantitative and qualitative components should be described throughout the report, including how participants were selected, how data were collected, how datasets were analyzed, and where integration occurred.

Presentation of Quantitative Findings: Quantitative findings should be presented clearly using appropriate text, tables, figures, graphs, and statistical summaries. Participant characteristics should be described, followed by the results corresponding to each quantitative research question or objective. Statistical tests should be reported accurately, including relevant measures of central tendency, variability, significance, effect size, or confidence intervals where appropriate. Tables and figures should be clearly labeled and should not duplicate information unnecessarily. The researcher should distinguish between statistically significant findings and clinically or practically meaningful findings and avoid making conclusions that are not supported by the data.

Presentation of Qualitative Findings: Qualitative findings should be presented through clearly defined categories, themes, subthemes where appropriate, and explanatory descriptions. Researchers may use carefully selected participant quotations to illustrate important themes and demonstrate how interpretations are grounded in the data. Quotations should be presented without revealing participants' identities or confidential information. The findings should focus on patterns and meanings rather than simply reproducing large amounts of interview data. The researcher should clearly explain how themes were developed and how they relate to the research questions.

Joint Presentation of Findings: Joint presentation involves presenting quantitative and qualitative

findings together so that their relationship can be clearly understood. Researchers may use integrated tables, joint displays, matrices, figures, or narrative comparisons to demonstrate areas of agreement, complementarity, and contradiction. For example, quantitative results may demonstrate improvement in patient satisfaction while qualitative themes explain that improved communication and emotional support were important reasons for the improvement. Joint presentation helps readers understand the contribution of each methodological component and demonstrates the added value of using mixed methods.

Discussion and Interpretation: The discussion section should interpret the integrated findings rather than simply repeating the results. Researchers should explain what the findings mean, how they relate to previous research, why quantitative and qualitative findings may agree or differ, and what new insights emerge from their combination. Unexpected or contradictory findings should be explored carefully. The discussion should also consider the theoretical, clinical, educational, organizational, and policy implications of the findings. The researcher should avoid overstating conclusions and should clearly identify limitations that may influence interpretation.

Implications for Nursing Practice: The implications section should explain how the findings may contribute to nursing practice, education, administration, research, and healthcare policy. Mixed-methods findings can identify both measurable improvements and contextual factors that influence implementation. For example, quantitative evidence may demonstrate that a nurse-led intervention improves patient outcomes, while qualitative evidence may identify the training, resources, communication, or organizational support required for successful implementation. Such information can guide evidence-based nursing practice and help healthcare organizations develop interventions that are both effective and feasible.

APPLICATIONS IN NURSING PRACTICE

Medical-Surgical Nursing: Mixed-methods research has important applications in medical-surgical nursing because patients frequently experience complex conditions requiring both measurable clinical management and individualized care. Quantitative methods can assess outcomes such as pain, wound healing, infection rates, length of hospital stay, medication adherence, and complications, while qualitative methods can explore patients' experiences of illness, treatment, communication, and recovery. For example, a study may evaluate the effectiveness of a nurse-led pain-management programme using pain scores while interviewing patients to understand their perceptions of pain relief and barriers to reporting pain. The integration of both types of evidence can support improvements in clinical nursing practice.

Child Health Nursing: In child health nursing, mixed-methods research can be used to evaluate interventions involving children, parents, caregivers, and healthcare professionals. Quantitative measures may assess growth, developmental outcomes, symptom severity, treatment adherence, hospitalization, or knowledge, while qualitative approaches can explore parental experiences, children's perceptions, family concerns, and barriers to healthcare utilization. Mixed methods are particularly useful when studying complex pediatric conditions because outcomes may be influenced by family functioning, communication, developmental level, cultural beliefs, and social circumstances. Integrated findings can guide family-centered and developmentally appropriate nursing care.

Mental Health Nursing: Mental health nursing involves experiences that are often complex and difficult to capture through numerical measures alone. Quantitative methods can measure symptoms, functioning, medication adherence, quality of life, relapse rates, or treatment outcomes, while qualitative methods can explore patients' experiences of stigma, therapeutic relationships, coping, recovery, and mental health services. Mixed-methods research can therefore provide a balanced understanding of both measurable changes and personal experiences. For example, a therapeutic nursing intervention may be evaluated using standardized symptom scales alongside interviews exploring patients' perceptions of the intervention and their relationship with nursing staff.

Community Health Nursing: Community health nursing involves populations and environments in which health outcomes are influenced by social, cultural, economic, environmental, and behavioral factors.

Quantitative methods can assess disease prevalence, immunization coverage, health behaviors, service utilization, maternal and child health indicators, and knowledge levels, while qualitative methods can explore community beliefs, cultural practices, perceived barriers, and experiences with health services. Mixed-methods research can therefore help community health nurses design interventions that are not only statistically effective but also culturally acceptable and responsive to local needs.

Maternal and Newborn Health: Mixed-methods research is highly relevant to maternal and newborn nursing because outcomes are influenced by clinical, psychological, social, cultural, and family-related factors. Quantitative measures may include maternal complications, birth outcomes, breastfeeding rates, neonatal indicators, antenatal care utilization, and postpartum recovery, while qualitative methods can explore women's experiences of pregnancy, childbirth, breastfeeding, healthcare communication, and support. Integrating both forms of evidence can help researchers understand why women use or avoid services and how healthcare experiences influence maternal and newborn outcomes.

Nursing Education: Mixed-methods research can be used extensively to evaluate nursing education programmes, teaching strategies, clinical learning experiences, simulation, technology-assisted learning, and assessment methods. Quantitative measures may assess examination performance, knowledge, clinical competency, skill scores, retention, or academic achievement, while qualitative methods can explore students' perceptions, learning experiences, confidence, stress, motivation, and challenges. Combining these findings can help educators determine whether a teaching strategy produces measurable learning improvements and understand the experiences that contribute to its effectiveness.

Nursing Administration: In nursing administration, mixed-methods research can be used to evaluate staffing, leadership, workload, organizational culture, employee satisfaction, retention, quality improvement, and healthcare service performance. Quantitative data can measure staffing ratios, absenteeism, turnover, patient outcomes, overtime, workload, and satisfaction scores, while qualitative interviews can explore nurses' experiences of leadership, workload, communication, professional relationships, and organizational support. Integrated findings can help nurse administrators develop evidence-based policies and management strategies that improve both staff well-being and patient care.

CHALLENGES AND ETHICAL ISSUES

Complexity of Study Design: Mixed-methods research is generally more complex than studies based on a single methodology because researchers must plan and coordinate quantitative and qualitative components and determine how the findings will be integrated. The researcher must understand different sampling methods, data-collection procedures, analytical techniques, and standards of rigor. Poor planning may result in excessive data collection, unclear research questions, or weak integration. Therefore, researchers should carefully justify the use of mixed methods and establish a clear design before beginning the study.

Time and Resource Requirements: Mixed-methods studies may require more time, personnel, funding, equipment, and organizational support than quantitative or qualitative studies conducted independently. Researchers may need to recruit participants for different phases, conduct interviews, administer questionnaires, analyze different forms of data, and perform integration. Transcription and qualitative analysis can be particularly time-consuming. Adequate planning of resources, staffing, training, and timelines is therefore essential for successful completion of the research.

Sampling Challenges: Sampling can be challenging because quantitative and qualitative components may require different sample sizes and selection strategies. Quantitative research may require a relatively large sample to achieve adequate statistical power, while qualitative research generally requires participants who can provide rich and relevant information. Researchers must decide whether to use the same participants, separate samples, or connected samples for different phases. Appropriate sampling decisions are essential for ensuring that both components adequately address their respective research questions.

Data Integration Difficulties: Integration can be one of the most challenging aspects of mixed-methods research. Researchers may obtain quantitative and qualitative findings that do not easily correspond or

may appear contradictory. Differences can result from variations in samples, measurement methods, timing, contexts, or the different dimensions examined by each method. Researchers should not force the findings to agree but should carefully investigate the reasons for discrepancies. Clear integration planning, appropriate joint displays, and systematic interpretation can help overcome these difficulties.

Researcher Competence: Mixed-methods research requires researchers to have adequate knowledge and skills in both quantitative and qualitative methodologies and in the principles of integration. Researchers should understand statistical analysis, qualitative coding, research design, sampling, measurement, ethics, and interpretation. When individual researchers do not possess expertise in all areas, collaboration among researchers with complementary methodological skills may strengthen the study. Continuing methodological training and consultation can also improve research quality.

Confidentiality and Informed Consent: Confidentiality and informed consent are essential ethical requirements in mixed-methods research. Participants should be informed about the purpose of the study, procedures, potential risks and benefits, confidentiality arrangements, and their right to withdraw. Researchers must ensure that personal information, clinical records, interview transcripts, recordings, and quantitative datasets are securely stored. Special care is required when qualitative quotations may contain information that could indirectly identify participants. Researchers should remove or modify identifying information when reporting findings while preserving the meaning of the data.

Ethical Management of Patient Data: Ethical management of patient data requires careful attention to privacy, confidentiality, data security, informed consent, authorized access, and responsible reporting. Patient information obtained from questionnaires, interviews, electronic records, clinical assessments, or other sources should be collected only for legitimate research purposes and handled according to applicable ethical and institutional requirements. Researchers should use appropriate coding and secure storage systems and should limit access to authorized personnel. When electronic or linked datasets are used, additional safeguards may be required to prevent unauthorized identification. Ethical management of patient data protects participants and maintains public trust in nursing research.

CASE STUDIES AND PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

Mixed-Methods Evaluation of a Nursing Intervention: A mixed-methods evaluation of a nursing intervention can combine quantitative measurement of outcomes with qualitative exploration of patient and provider experiences. For example, a nurse-led self-care education programme for patients with a chronic illness may be evaluated by measuring knowledge and self-care scores before and after the intervention. At the same time, interviews may be conducted with selected patients to explore their experiences, perceived benefits, difficulties, and suggestions. Quantitative results may demonstrate improvement, while qualitative findings may explain which components of the intervention were most useful and what barriers affected implementation. The integrated findings can then guide refinement and wider implementation of the intervention.

Measuring Patient Satisfaction and Care Quality: Patient satisfaction and quality of nursing care can be evaluated using a combination of standardized satisfaction questionnaires, clinical quality indicators, interviews, and observations. Quantitative data may demonstrate overall satisfaction levels and identify areas with lower scores, while qualitative interviews can provide detailed explanations of patients' experiences regarding communication, responsiveness, privacy, emotional support, and involvement in care decisions. Clinical indicators and observations can provide additional evidence about actual care practices. Integrating these findings allows healthcare organizations to identify specific areas for quality improvement and develop interventions based on both measurable performance and patient perspectives.

Evaluating Nurse-Led Education Programs: Nurse-led education programmes can be evaluated through quantitative measures of knowledge, skills, adherence, self-care practices, or clinical outcomes and qualitative exploration of learners' experiences. For example, a structured education programme for patients newly diagnosed with diabetes may be evaluated using pre-test and post-test knowledge scores and measures of self-care behavior. Interviews may then explore patients' understanding of the

education, confidence in managing their condition, family support, and barriers to following recommendations. The integrated findings can determine whether the programme was effective and identify ways to improve educational content and delivery.

Assessing Medication-Safety Interventions: Medication-safety interventions can be evaluated using quantitative indicators such as medication-error rates, adherence to medication-administration protocols, documentation accuracy, and adverse-event rates. Qualitative interviews and observations can explore nurses' experiences, workflow difficulties, communication issues, interruptions, staffing conditions, and perceptions of medication-safety procedures. For example, a hospital may introduce a medication double-checking protocol and evaluate changes in medication errors before and after implementation. Qualitative evidence can explain whether nurses considered the procedure practical and identify barriers that may affect adherence. Such mixed-methods evaluation provides evidence regarding both effectiveness and feasibility.

Evaluating Infection-Control Programs: Infection-control programmes can be assessed through quantitative measures such as infection rates, hand-hygiene compliance, use of personal protective equipment, and adherence to isolation protocols. Qualitative methods can explore nurses' knowledge, perceptions, attitudes, environmental challenges, availability of supplies, workload, and organizational support. If quantitative findings demonstrate improved compliance but infection rates remain unchanged, qualitative findings may help explain possible reasons, such as environmental contamination, inadequate equipment, or other transmission pathways. Mixed-methods evaluation therefore provides a comprehensive understanding of both implementation and clinical outcomes.

Assessing Patient Experience and Clinical Outcomes: Patient experience and clinical outcomes represent two complementary dimensions of healthcare quality. Quantitative methods can measure outcomes such as symptom reduction, length of stay, complications, functional status, readmission, or quality-of-life scores, while qualitative methods can explore patients' experiences of communication, emotional support, involvement in decisions, continuity of care, and treatment burden. A mixed-methods approach allows researchers to determine whether measurable clinical improvement is accompanied by a positive patient experience. It may also identify situations in which clinical outcomes improve but patients continue to experience distress or dissatisfaction, highlighting areas that require additional nursing attention.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Digital and Technology-Enabled Mixed-Methods Research: Digital technologies are creating new opportunities for mixed-methods nursing research through the collection of large volumes of clinical, behavioral, and patient-generated information. Mobile health applications, wearable devices, telehealth platforms, online questionnaires, digital diaries, and electronic communication systems can provide quantitative information about health behaviors and outcomes while also supporting qualitative collection through digital interviews, open-ended responses, and patient narratives. These technologies can improve the speed and reach of data collection and allow researchers to study health experiences in real-world settings. However, researchers must ensure appropriate data security, participant privacy, accessibility, and ethical management of digital information.

Electronic Health Records: Electronic health records provide an important source of routinely collected healthcare data that can support mixed-methods research. Quantitative information such as diagnoses, laboratory results, medication use, admissions, clinical outcomes, and healthcare utilization can be analyzed to identify patterns and trends. Qualitative methods can then be used to explore patient or provider experiences related to the identified patterns. For example, electronic records may identify high rates of hospital readmission, while interviews with patients and nurses may explore the reasons for readmission, discharge challenges, continuity of care, and barriers to follow-up. Responsible use of electronic health records requires strong attention to privacy, data governance, and ethical approval.

AI-Assisted Data Analysis: Artificial intelligence and machine-learning technologies are increasingly being explored for assisting researchers in managing and analyzing large datasets. AI-assisted tools may help organize large volumes of text, identify potential patterns, classify data, support coding, or detect

relationships within quantitative datasets. In mixed-methods research, such technologies may assist with processing large-scale qualitative and quantitative information. However, AI-generated classifications or interpretations should not replace researcher judgment. Researchers must verify outputs, consider algorithmic bias, protect confidential information, and maintain transparency regarding the methods used. Human oversight remains essential when interpreting complex patient experiences and clinically significant findings.

Patient-Generated Health Data: Patient-generated health data include information produced by individuals through mobile applications, wearable devices, home monitoring systems, symptom diaries, patient portals, and self-reported assessments. Such data provide opportunities to examine health conditions outside traditional healthcare settings and may offer continuous information about symptoms, activity, sleep, physiological measures, medication adherence, and health behaviors. Quantitative patient-generated data can be combined with qualitative narratives to understand how patients interpret and respond to changes in their health. This approach supports patient-centered research and may enable earlier identification of health problems and more individualized nursing interventions.

Big-Data Integration: Big-data integration involves combining information from multiple large and diverse sources, such as electronic health records, clinical databases, patient-generated data, public health databases, registries, and research datasets. Mixed-methods approaches can provide an opportunity to combine large-scale quantitative patterns with qualitative understanding of individual experiences and contextual factors. Big-data research may help identify risk factors, predict outcomes, evaluate healthcare utilization, and improve resource allocation. However, researchers must address challenges related to data quality, interoperability, privacy, cybersecurity, bias, and interpretation. The increasing availability of large datasets makes methodological rigor and ethical data governance increasingly important.

Multidisciplinary Research: Future nursing research is likely to involve greater collaboration among nurses, physicians, psychologists, epidemiologists, statisticians, public health professionals, social scientists, informatics specialists, and other disciplines. Mixed-methods research provides a useful framework for bringing different professional perspectives together because complex healthcare problems often require clinical, behavioral, social, organizational, and technological understanding. Multidisciplinary teams can contribute complementary expertise to study design, data collection, analysis, integration, and implementation. Such collaboration can strengthen the relevance and applicability of research findings and support comprehensive solutions to complex healthcare problems.

Translating Mixed-Methods Evidence into Nursing Practice: The ultimate value of mixed-methods research lies in its ability to generate evidence that can be translated into meaningful improvements in nursing practice. Translation involves moving research findings into clinical protocols, educational programmes, quality-improvement initiatives, policies, and patient-care strategies. Mixed-methods evidence is particularly useful for translation because it can demonstrate measurable effectiveness while also identifying practical, cultural, organizational, and experiential factors that influence implementation. Researchers and healthcare professionals should therefore communicate findings clearly to clinicians, administrators, educators, policymakers, patients, and communities. Effective translation requires collaboration, ongoing evaluation, adaptation to local contexts, and monitoring of outcomes to ensure that evidence-based changes produce sustainable improvements in patient care and nursing practice.

References

1. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2025). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
2. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

3. Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 33*(7), 14–26. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033007014
4. Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1*(2), 112–133. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689806298224
5. Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2010). *SAGE handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
6. O'Cathain, A., Murphy, E., & Nicholl, J. (2010). Three techniques for integrating data in mixed methods studies. *BMJ, 341*, c4587. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.c4587
7. Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2009). A typology of mixed methods research designs. *Quality & Quantity, 43*, 265–275. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-007-9105-3
8. Collins, K. M. T., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Jiao, Q. G. (2007). A mixed methods investigation of mixed methods sampling designs in social and health science research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1*(3), 267–294. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689807299526
9. Creamer, E. G. (2018). *An introduction to fully integrated mixed methods research*. SAGE Publications.
10. Plano Clark, V. L., Anderson, N., Wertz, J. A., Zhou, Y., Schumacher, K., & Miaskowski, C. (2015). Conceptualizing longitudinal mixed methods designs: A methodological review of health sciences research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 9*(4), 297–319. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689814543563
11. Strudsholm, T., Meadows, L. M., Vollman, A. R., Thurston, W. E., & Henderson, R. (2016). Using mixed methods to facilitate complex, multiphased health research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 15*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406915624579
12. Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs—Principles and practices. *Health Services Research, 48*(6, Pt. 2), 2134–2156. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117
13. Harrison, R. L., Reilly, T. M., & Creswell, J. W. (2020). Methodological rigor in mixed methods: An application in management studies. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 14*(4), 473–495. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689819858057
14. Levitt, H. M., Bamberg, M., Creswell, J. W., Frost, D. M., Josselson, R., & Suárez-Orozco, C. (2018). Journal article reporting standards for qualitative primary, qualitative meta-analytic, and mixed methods research in psychology: The APA Publications and Communications Board task force report. *American Psychologist, 73*(1), 26–46. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000151
15. Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2021). *Nursing research: Generating and assessing evidence for nursing practice* (11th ed.). Wolters Kluwer.
16. LoBiondo-Wood, G., & Haber, J. (2022). *Nursing research: Methods and critical appraisal for evidence-based practice* (10th ed.). Elsevier.
17. Grove, S. K., Gray, J. R., & Burns, N. (2015). *Understanding nursing research: Building an evidence-based practice* (6th ed.). Elsevier.
18. Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
19. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE Publications.
20. Donabedian, A. (1988). The quality of care: How can it be assessed? *JAMA, 260*(12), 1743–1748. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.260.12.1743