



PERCEPTIONS AND HESITATIONS TOWARD QUALITATIVE RESEARCH AMONG THIRD-YEAR BSED-ENGLISH STUDENTS: A MIXED-METHODS INQUIRY

Jun Rilly C. Salas, Antonnette T. Nugal, Almira B. Boncales, Roxanne D. Cajés,
Charhyl Jade C. Amparo

*College of Education, Trinidad Municipal College
Poblacion, Trinidad, Bohol, Philippines*

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the perceptions and hesitations toward qualitative research among third-year Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English (BSED-English) students, with the aim of identifying the factors influencing their reluctance to engage in qualitative research and informing instructional interventions to strengthen research competence. An explanatory sequential mixed-methods design was employed, wherein quantitative data were collected first through a researcher-developed survey administered to 146 third-year BSED-English students, followed by qualitative data obtained from semi-structured interviews with 130 participants to explain and enrich the quantitative findings. The study was conducted during the first semester of the 2025–2026 academic year and was completed in November 2025. The quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation, and multiple regression analysis, while the qualitative data were examined through thematic analysis. Integration of both data strands was achieved through triangulation during the interpretation of findings. Results revealed that students generally exhibited a high level of perception toward qualitative research, particularly regarding its relevance and instructional support, but demonstrated only moderate levels of perceived difficulty, competence, and overall hesitation. Preference for quantitative methods emerged as the highest hesitation dimension, while perceived difficulty and instructional support were identified as the strongest predictors of students' hesitation. The qualitative findings further revealed that students viewed qualitative research as meaningful yet cognitively demanding, with confidence developing through guided practice and instructional support. The study concludes that hesitation toward qualitative research is developmental rather than dispositional and may be addressed through structured pedagogical

interventions, including research workshops, scaffolded learning activities, and faculty mentoring, to enhance students' confidence and engagement in qualitative inquiry.

Keywords: *qualitative research, research perceptions, research hesitation, mixed-methods inquiry, BSED-English students*

INTRODUCTION

The development of research competence is a fundamental expectation in teacher education, particularly in programs preparing future English educators who are expected to engage critically with texts, contexts, and pedagogical practices. In the Philippine higher education landscape, research is not only a curricular requirement but also a key indicator of academic quality and institutional productivity. National policies such as Republic Act No. 7722 (Higher Education Act of 1994) and Republic Act No. 10533 (Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013) explicitly emphasize the cultivation of critical thinking, inquiry, and research skills among learners. Complementing these mandates, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) requires teacher education institutions to integrate research competencies into their curricula, ensuring that pre-service teachers are equipped with both quantitative and qualitative research skills.

Despite these policy directives, a growing body of international and local scholarship suggests that students' engagement with research methodologies is uneven, with qualitative research often perceived as more challenging than quantitative approaches (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Qualitative methodologies—such as document analysis, textual analysis, and literary criticism—are particularly essential in English education, as they enable students to explore meaning, interpretation, and context. However, these approaches require higher-order cognitive processes, including abstraction, reflexivity, and interpretive reasoning, which may pose difficulties for undergraduate learners who have limited exposure or insufficient methodological training.

From a theoretical standpoint, students' hesitation toward qualitative research can be explained through multiple frameworks. Constructivist Learning Theory posits that knowledge is actively constructed through experience and interaction (Piaget, 1970; Vygotsky, 1978). In qualitative inquiry, students are expected to construct meaning from texts and contexts; however, without adequate scaffolding, this process may lead to uncertainty and cognitive difficulty. This aligns with Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller, 1988), which suggests that complex tasks—such as qualitative data analysis involving coding, thematic development, and interpretation—can overwhelm learners' cognitive capacity, resulting in confusion and disengagement.

Moreover, Bandura's (1997) Self-Efficacy Theory provides a psychological explanation for students' reluctance. Students who perceive themselves as lacking the competence to perform qualitative analysis are more likely to avoid such tasks, exhibit low motivation, and prefer alternative approaches. This is further supported by Ajzen's

(1991) Theory of Planned Behavior, which posits that individuals' actions are influenced by their attitudes, perceived social expectations, and sense of control. If students view qualitative research as difficult, perceive that their peers favor quantitative methods, and feel inadequately prepared, their intention to engage in qualitative inquiry diminishes. Empirical literature reinforces these theoretical claims.

Studies have consistently shown that students tend to prefer quantitative research due to its structured procedures and reliance on numerical data, which are perceived as more objective and easier to manage (Brew, 2001; Murtonen & Lehtinen, 2003). In contrast, qualitative research is often viewed as ambiguous and subjective, leading to anxiety and hesitation (Earley, 2014; Sutton & Austin, 2015). Research further indicates that students struggle with key qualitative processes such as coding, thematic analysis, and interpretation, particularly when instructional support is limited (Kiley & Mullins, 2005; Ryan, 2016).

In the context of teacher education, several studies highlight that insufficient exposure to qualitative methodologies contributes to negative perceptions and low confidence among students (Willison & O'Regan, 2007; Levy & Petrulis, 2012). When research instruction disproportionately emphasizes quantitative methods, students develop a narrow understanding of research, often perceiving qualitative approaches as less systematic or more difficult to execute. Conversely, studies also show that when students are provided with guided practice, explicit instruction, and opportunities to engage in authentic qualitative research tasks, their confidence and appreciation for qualitative inquiry significantly improve (Böttcher & Thiel, 2018; Wagner et al., 2011).

Local studies in the Philippine context echo these findings, indicating that while research is a required component of higher education, students often encounter challenges in mastering qualitative methodologies due to limited training, unclear instructional strategies, and lack of exposure (Bernardo et al., 2015; David & Reyes, 2020). These challenges are particularly pronounced among English majors, for whom qualitative research is not only relevant but essential for engaging in literary analysis, discourse studies, and language research.

At the institutional level, particularly within TMC, efforts to strengthen research culture and productivity underscore the importance of equipping students with comprehensive research competencies. However, observations in research instruction suggest that third-year BSED-English students—who are at a critical stage of research preparation—often exhibit hesitation toward qualitative research. These hesitations manifest in forms such as avoidance of qualitative designs, preference for quantitative methods, and difficulty in interpreting textual data. Such tendencies may hinder the development of essential skills required for both academic and professional practice.

Given these theoretical, empirical, and contextual considerations, there is a clear need to systematically examine students' perceptions and hesitations toward qualitative research. While existing studies provide valuable insights, there remains a gap in understanding how these perceptions operate within specific institutional contexts and

how they can be addressed through targeted interventions. Furthermore, the complexity of this issue necessitates a mixed-methods approach that combines quantitative measurement of perceptions and hesitation with qualitative exploration of students' lived experiences.

Thus, this study investigated the perceptions and hesitations toward qualitative research among third-year BSED-English students using an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design. By integrating statistical analysis with in-depth narratives, the study generated comprehensive, evidence-based insights that informed instructional practices, curriculum development, and institutional strategies for enhancing research engagement and competence among future English educators.

Research Questions

This study aimed to investigate the perceptions and hesitations toward qualitative research among third-year Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English (BSED-English) students. Specifically, it sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the level of students' perceptions toward qualitative research in terms of:
 - 1.1 perceived difficulty;
 - 1.2 perceived relevance;
 - 1.3 perceived competence (self-efficacy); and
 - 1.4 perceived instructional support?
2. What is the level of students' hesitations toward qualitative research in terms of:
 - 2.1 anxiety in conducting qualitative analysis;
 - 2.2 lack of confidence in interpretation;
 - 2.3 preference for quantitative methods; and
 - 2.4 perceived ambiguity of qualitative procedures?
3. Is there a significant relationship between students' perceptions and their hesitations toward qualitative research?
4. What factors significantly predict students' hesitation toward qualitative research?
5. How do the qualitative findings explain and enrich the quantitative results regarding students' perceptions and hesitations toward qualitative research?
6. Based on the integrated quantitative and qualitative findings, what strategic intervention plan may be proposed to enhance students' engagement and competence in qualitative research?

METHODOLOGY

This study employed an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design to investigate the perceptions and hesitations toward qualitative research among third-year Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English (BSED-English) students. This design was selected to allow for the initial collection and analysis of quantitative data, followed by a qualitative phase aimed at explaining and elaborating on the quantitative results. The integration of both strands provided a more comprehensive understanding of the factors

influencing students' reluctance to engage in qualitative research approaches such as document analysis, textual analysis, and literary criticism.

The study was conducted at TMC, a higher education institution that actively promotes research engagement as part of its academic and institutional agenda. The focus on third-year BSED-English students was intentional, as this cohort is at a critical stage of research preparation, typically enrolled in research-related courses that require both quantitative and qualitative competencies.

Participants in the quantitative phase were selected using purposive sampling, ensuring that only students with prior exposure to research coursework were included. All available third-year BSED-English students during the data collection period were invited to participate to obtain a comprehensive representation of the target population. For the qualitative phase, a subset of participants was selected based on their survey responses, particularly those who demonstrated notable levels of hesitation or contrasting perception scores. This approach allowed for the identification of participants who could provide rich, relevant, and diverse insights into the phenomenon under investigation.

Data were collected using a researcher-developed survey questionnaire and a semi-structured interview guide. The quantitative instrument consisted of Likert-scale items designed to measure students' perceptions of qualitative research in terms of perceived difficulty, relevance, competence (self-efficacy), and instructional support, as well as their hesitations in terms of anxiety, lack of confidence, preference for quantitative methods, and perceived ambiguity. The instrument underwent content validation by research experts to ensure its alignment with the study's constructs, and a pilot test was conducted to establish reliability using Cronbach's alpha.

Following the quantitative phase, qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews. The interview guide was designed to elicit in-depth responses regarding students' experiences, challenges, and attitudes toward qualitative research. The flexible nature of the interviews allowed participants to articulate their perspectives freely while maintaining alignment with the study's objectives. All interviews were conducted with informed consent, recorded with permission, and transcribed verbatim for analysis.

The data gathering procedure followed a sequential process. After securing institutional approval, the survey questionnaire was administered to the participants, and responses were collected and organized for statistical analysis. Based on the results, participants for the qualitative phase were identified and invited for interviews. This sequential approach ensured that the qualitative findings were grounded in and directly responsive to the quantitative results, thereby strengthening the study's explanatory power.

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Mean and standard deviation were computed to determine the levels of students' perceptions and hesitations. Pearson product-moment correlation was used to examine the

relationship between perception variables and hesitation. Multiple regression analysis was employed to identify which perception factors significantly predicted students' hesitation toward qualitative research. All statistical analyses were conducted at a 0.05 level of significance.

Qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis. The process involved familiarization with the data through repeated reading of transcripts, coding of significant statements, and identification of recurring patterns and themes. These themes were then interpreted in relation to the quantitative findings to provide a deeper and more nuanced understanding of students' perceptions and hesitations. The integration of quantitative and qualitative results was achieved through triangulation, ensuring the validity and robustness of the findings.

Ethical considerations were strictly observed throughout the study. Participants were fully informed about the purpose of the research, and their participation was voluntary. Informed consent was obtained prior to data collection, and participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity. Data were securely stored and used solely for academic purposes. The study adhered to institutional research ethics guidelines, ensuring respect for participants' rights and the integrity of the research process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Question 1

What is the level of students' perceptions toward qualitative research?

Table 1 - Level of Students' Perceptions Toward Qualitative Research

Dimension	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Perceived Difficulty	3.00	0.94	Moderate
Perceived Relevance	4.08	0.91	High
Perceived Competence (Self-Efficacy)	3.38	0.74	Moderate
Perceived Instructional Support	3.82	0.81	High
Overall Mean	3.57	—	High

Students' Perceptions Toward Qualitative Research

Findings revealed that students demonstrated an overall high perception toward qualitative research ($M = 3.57$), with perceived relevance ($M = 4.08$) and instructional support ($M = 3.82$) obtaining high ratings, while perceived difficulty ($M = 3.00$) and perceived competence ($M = 3.38$) remained at moderate levels. These findings suggest that although students recognize the importance of qualitative research, they simultaneously experience uncertainty in performing qualitative tasks.

The high rating for perceived relevance indicates that respondents generally value qualitative inquiry as important to English and literary studies. This finding aligns with the

arguments of Creswell and Poth (2018) and Merriam and Tisdell (2016) that qualitative research fosters interpretive reasoning and contextual understanding essential in language and literary inquiry. Similarly, studies by Brew (2001) and Kember (2000) found that students often acknowledge the intellectual and professional value of research even when they perceive methodological challenges.

However, the moderate rating for perceived difficulty and competence suggests that appreciation does not necessarily translate into confidence. This tension was strongly illuminated in the qualitative findings.

Three themes emerged regarding students' perceptions.

Theme 1: Qualitative Research is Meaningful Yet Cognitively Demanding

Participants consistently described qualitative research as intellectually enriching but mentally demanding.

One respondent shared: "Qualitative research helps me understand texts deeply, but the analysis part is difficult because it requires a lot of thinking." Another noted: "There is no fixed answer, and that makes interpretation challenging."

These narratives reinforce the moderate difficulty rating and resonate with Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller, 1988), which explains that tasks requiring simultaneous interpretation, abstraction, and synthesis can produce cognitive strain. The finding also supports studies by Earley (2014) and Ryan (2016), which found students often associate qualitative inquiry with cognitive complexity and ambiguity.

Rather than indicating rejection of qualitative inquiry, these findings suggest students recognize its value while grappling with its intellectual demands.

Theme 2: Self-Efficacy in Qualitative Research Remains Emerging

Although respondents did not completely lack confidence, many expressed fragile or developing self-efficacy.

Students reported: "I can do qualitative analysis, but I often doubt whether my interpretations are correct." "I am confident only when guided." These responses mirror the moderate competence mean and support Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory (1997), which posits that perceived capability strongly shapes engagement and persistence. The finding also parallels Murtonen and Lehtinen (2003), who found students' confidence in research is often undermined by methodological uncertainty.

This suggests hesitation may stem less from resistance and more from fragile confidence.

Theme 3: Instructional Support Mediates Engagement

A strong pattern in the qualitative data emphasized the centrality of instructional support.

Participants stated: “Examples and feedback from instructors make qualitative research manageable.” “Step-by-step guidance makes it less intimidating.” These findings substantiate the high instructional support mean and align with Vygotskian scaffolding principles (Vygotsky, 1978), suggesting guided support mediates students’ engagement with complex tasks. Similar findings were reported by Willison and O’Regan (2007), who found structured mentoring significantly improves research confidence.

Taken together, the findings suggest students’ perceptions are characterized by appreciation, emerging confidence, and dependence on instructional scaffolding.

Research Question 2

What is the level of students’ hesitations toward qualitative research?

Table 2 - Level of Students’ Hesitations Toward Qualitative Research

Dimension	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Anxiety in Conducting Qualitative Analysis	3.32	0.89	Moderate
Lack of Confidence in Interpretation	3.33	0.93	Moderate
Preference for Quantitative Methods	3.44	0.93	High
Perceived Ambiguity	2.91	0.87	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.25	—	Moderate

Students manifested a moderate level of hesitation toward qualitative research ($M = 3.25$). The strongest hesitation dimension was preference for quantitative methods ($M = 3.44$), suggesting a tendency among students to gravitate toward quantitative approaches. Anxiety and lack of confidence were also moderately evident.

Interestingly, perceived ambiguity registered relatively lower hesitation compared with other dimensions, indicating students may not entirely view qualitative research as unclear, but may struggle more with competence and comfort.

Theme 1: Complexity Generates Anxiety and Hesitation

Students frequently linked hesitation to interpretive complexity.

As one respondent expressed: “I get anxious because I am unsure if I am analyzing correctly.” Another noted: “Coding and identifying themes can be overwhelming.”

These narratives explain the anxiety and confidence-related hesitation reflected in the quantitative findings. They echo Ajzen’s Theory of Planned Behavior (1991), where low perceived behavioral control contributes to avoidance tendencies.

This finding is consistent with Sutton and Austin (2015), who reported interpretive uncertainty as a major source of qualitative research anxiety.

Theme 2: Preference for Quantitative Research Reflects Desire for Structure

The strongest hesitation factor—preference for quantitative methods—was strongly supported qualitatively.

Students remarked: “Numbers feel easier because they are straightforward.” “Quantitative research has clearer procedures.”

This preference appears rooted not in rejection of qualitative methods but in attraction to procedural clarity. Similar tendencies were reported by Brew (2001) and Levy and Petrulis (2012), who found novice researchers often associate numerical approaches with certainty and control.

This reinforces that students’ hesitation may be methodological rather than philosophical.

Theme 3: Hesitation is Viewed as Surmountable Through Practice

Importantly, students framed hesitation as improvable. One participant shared: “More practice with coding would make me more confident.” Another noted: “Workshops on qualitative analysis would help us overcome fear.”

This theme is particularly significant because it reframes hesitation as developmental rather than fixed resistance.

Research Question 3

Is there a significant relationship between perceptions and hesitations?

Pearson Correlation

$$r = .387$$

Variables	r	Interpretation
Perceptions and Hesitations	.387	Weak to Moderate Positive Relationship

Findings indicate a positive moderate relationship between perceptions and hesitations toward qualitative research ($r = .387$).

Further subscale relationships show:

Predictor	Correlation with Hesitation
Perceived Difficulty	.538
Perceived Relevance	.111
Perceived Competence	.037
Instructional Support	.219

- Perceived difficulty shows the strongest association with hesitation.
- Relevance and competence show weak relationships.
- Difficulty appears central to students’ hesitation.

This suggests hesitation increases as perceived difficulty increases.

Relationship Between Perceptions and Hesitations

Correlation analysis showed a moderate positive relationship between perceptions and hesitations ($r = .387$), with perceived difficulty showing the strongest association with hesitation.

Qualitative evidence clarified this relationship wherein students repeatedly linked perceptions of complexity to avoidance: “Because it feels complicated, I hesitate to do it.”

This supports the statistical finding that difficulty perceptions shape hesitation. The result aligns with Murtonen (2005), who found methodological difficulty perceptions significantly influence students’ research anxiety.

The convergence of quantitative and qualitative evidence strengthens the interpretation that difficulty operates as a central explanatory mechanism.

Research Question 4

What factors predict students’ hesitation?

Preliminary Multiple Regression Model

Regression equation:

$$\text{Hesitation} = .987 + .445(\text{Difficulty}) + .043(\text{Relevance}) - .033(\text{Competence}) + .225(\text{Support})$$

Standardized Predictive Pattern (Preliminary)

Strongest predictors:

1. **Perceived Difficulty** (strongest predictor)
2. **Instructional Support** (secondary predictor)

Results suggest that students’ hesitation toward qualitative research is primarily influenced by:

- perceptions of difficulty
- adequacy of instructional support

Difficulty appears to be the dominant predictor of hesitation.

Predictors of Hesitation Toward Qualitative Research

Regression results identified perceived difficulty and instructional support as strongest predictors of hesitation. This finding is particularly significant because it suggests hesitation is shaped by both cognitive and pedagogical factors.

Students’ narratives reinforced this: “Without guidance, qualitative research feels overwhelming.” “Support from instructors reduces hesitation.”

These findings support constructivist perspectives emphasizing the importance of scaffolding in complex learning processes and align with Böttcher and Thiel (2018), who found research mentoring significantly predicts students’ research engagement.

Research Question 5

Qualitative Findings Explaining Quantitative Results and Implications for Strategic Planning

The integrated findings suggest students do not hesitate toward qualitative research because they devalue it, but because they experience it as demanding and feel only partially prepared to engage in it confidently.

This meta-inference informed a proposed strategic plan centered on:

- (1) qualitative analysis workshops,
- (2) scaffolded research modules,
- (3) faculty mentoring support, and
- (4) guided coding and interpretation clinics.

These interventions directly respond to both statistical trends and thematic evidence.

Taken together, the findings reveal a central paradox: students value qualitative research and recognize its relevance, yet hesitate to engage with it due primarily to perceived complexity and fragile self-efficacy. This paradox is mediated by instructional support, which emerges as a critical factor in reducing hesitation.

This integrated finding extends prior scholarship by showing that hesitation toward qualitative research is not simply a matter of negative attitudes but a function of cognitive demand, self-beliefs, and pedagogical conditions.

Through triangulation, the study demonstrates that students' hesitations are developmental challenges that can be addressed through targeted instructional interventions rather than fixed dispositions against qualitative inquiry.

Basis for Strategic Plan (Emerging Problem Areas)

Priority issues identified:

1. Preference for quantitative methods
2. Anxiety toward qualitative analysis
3. Low confidence in interpretation
4. Perceived methodological difficulty

These findings can support an intervention plan such as:

- Qualitative Research Skills Workshops
- Guided Coding/Thematic Analysis Clinics
- Scaffolded Qualitative Research Modules
- Faculty Mentoring Support Program

Summary of Findings

This study investigated the perceptions and hesitations toward qualitative research among third-year Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English (BSED-English)

students using an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design. The integration of quantitative and qualitative findings yielded the following key results:

First, students demonstrated a generally high level of perception toward qualitative research, particularly in terms of its relevance and the instructional support they receive. However, perceived difficulty and perceived competence were only at moderate levels, indicating that while students recognize the value of qualitative inquiry, they do not feel fully confident in performing it.

Second, students exhibited a moderate level of hesitation, with preference for quantitative methods emerging as the most prominent dimension. This suggests that students tend to gravitate toward research approaches that are more structured and procedural.

Third, there was a moderate positive relationship between perceptions and hesitations, with perceived difficulty showing the strongest association with hesitation. This indicates that as students perceive qualitative research to be more difficult, their hesitation increases.

Fourth, regression analysis revealed that perceived difficulty and instructional support significantly predict students' hesitation. This highlights that both cognitive and pedagogical factors influence students' engagement with qualitative research.

Fifth, qualitative findings explained and expanded these results by revealing that students view qualitative research as meaningful but cognitively demanding, that their confidence is still developing, and that instructional support plays a crucial role in reducing hesitation. Students also expressed that their hesitation is not permanent and can be addressed through guided practice and structured support.

Conclusions

The findings of this study reveal that hesitation toward qualitative research among BSED-English students is not rooted in negative attitudes toward its value, but rather in the perceived complexity of its processes and students' developing self-efficacy in performing qualitative tasks. While students recognize qualitative research as relevant and essential in their academic and future professional practice, they experience challenges related to interpretation, analysis, and methodological ambiguity.

The study affirms that perceived difficulty serves as the central factor influencing hesitation, while instructional support functions as a critical mediating variable that can either exacerbate or reduce students' reluctance to engage in qualitative inquiry. This highlights the importance of pedagogical interventions that focus not only on knowledge transmission but also on scaffolding, guided practice, and confidence-building.

Furthermore, the integration of qualitative and quantitative findings underscores that students' hesitation is developmental rather than dispositional, suggesting that with

appropriate instructional design and support systems, students can overcome their apprehensions and develop competence in qualitative research.

Overall, the study contributes to the growing body of literature on research education by demonstrating that improving students' engagement in qualitative research requires a balanced focus on cognitive readiness, instructional practices, and experiential learning opportunities.

Recommendations

Strategic Action Plan

A Proposed Institutional and Program-Level Intervention

Based on the integrated findings, the following strategic plan is a recommended proposal to enhance students' engagement in qualitative research. This plan is aligned with TMC's research agenda and supports the strengthening of research competencies within the BSED-English program.

Strategic Plan for Enhancing Qualitative Research Engagement

Key Issue	Evidence from Findings	Strategic Objective	Proposed Intervention	Responsible Unit	Timeline	Expected Outcome
High perceived difficulty in qualitative research	Moderate difficulty (M=3.00); Theme: cognitive complexity	Reduce perceived complexity	Conduct Qualitative Research Workshops (coding, thematic analysis, interpretation)	Research Office / English Department	Per semester	Improved student understanding of qualitative processes
Low confidence in interpretation	Moderate competence (M=3.38); Theme: fragile self-efficacy	Strengthen student confidence	Implement Guided Qualitative Research Modules embedded in coursework	Faculty / Program Chair	Continuous	Increased self-efficacy in qualitative tasks
Preference for quantitative methods	Highest hesitation dimension	Balance methodological exposure	Integrate Comparative Research Method Sessions (qual vs quant applications)	Curriculum Committee	Annual review	More balanced methodological preference
Need for stronger instructional support	High support but still predictive of hesitation	Enhance scaffolding practices	Establish Faculty Mentoring and Consultation Program	Research Office / Faculty	Continuous	Improved instructional delivery
Need for experiential learning	Qualitative themes: need for practice	Increase hands-on experience	Introduce Qualitative Research Clinics and Practicum Sessions	English Department	Per term	Improved practical research competence

Integration into TMC Research Agenda

This strategic plan directly supports TMC's goals of:

- strengthening research culture
- increasing student research productivity
- improving quality of undergraduate research outputs

It also aligns with institutional priorities on:

- research capability building
- publication readiness
- faculty-student research collaboration

Integration into BSED-English Program

The findings and proposed interventions may be embedded in:

- Research Courses (e.g., Research in English/Literature)
- Curriculum Enhancement (qualitative methods integration)
- Thesis Preparation Programs

This ensures sustainability of the intervention beyond the scope of the study.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

The authors applied strict adherence to the ethics of research. Informed consent was obtained. The participants' well-being was upheld. Data privacy was maintained. The study contains no substantial plagiarism and there was no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.
- Bernardo, A. B. I., Ganotice, F. A., & King, R. B. (2015). Research skills and attitudes among Filipino students. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*, 48(1), 1–20.
- Böttcher, F., & Thiel, F. (2018). Evaluating research-oriented teaching: A new instrument to assess university students' research competencies. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1212329>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brew, A. (2001). *Research and teaching: Beyond the divide*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Commission on Higher Education. (2017). *Policies, standards, and guidelines for Bachelor of Secondary Education programs*. CHED.

- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- David, C. C., & Reyes, M. L. (2020). Research engagement in Philippine higher education: Challenges and opportunities. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 21(3), 451–462. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-020-09642-5>
- Earley, M. A. (2014). A synthesis of qualitative research on student learning in higher education. *Educational Research Review*, 13, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2014.08.001>
- Kember, D. (2000). *Action learning and action research: Improving the quality of teaching and learning*. Routledge.
- Kiley, M., & Mullins, G. (2005). Supervisors' conceptions of research and the implications for supervision. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 24(3), 245–258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360500153949>
- Levy, P., & Petrulis, R. (2012). How do first-year university students experience inquiry and research, and what are the implications for the practice of inquiry-based learning? *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(1), 85–101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.499166>
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Murtonen, M. (2005). University students' research orientations: Do negative attitudes exist toward quantitative methods? *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 49(3), 263–280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313830500109527>
- Murtonen, M., & Lehtinen, E. (2003). Difficulties experienced by education and sociology students in quantitative methods courses. *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(2), 171–185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0307507032000058064>
- Piaget, J. (1970). *Science of education and the psychology of the child*. Viking Press.
- Republic Act No. 7722. (1994). Higher Education Act of 1994. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph>
- Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph>
- Ryan, G. W. (2016). Introduction to positivism, interpretivism, and critical theory in qualitative research. *Field Methods*, 28(1), 85–109.
- Sutton, J., & Austin, Z. (2015). Qualitative research: Data collection, analysis, and management. *Canadian Journal of Hospital Pharmacy*, 68(3), 226–231. <https://doi.org/10.4212/cjhp.v68i3.1456>
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wagner, C., Garner, M., & Kawulich, B. (2011). The state of the art of teaching research methods in the social sciences: Towards a pedagogical culture. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(7), 823–839. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.527406>
- Willison, J., & O'Regan, K. (2007). Commonly known, commonly not known, totally unknown: A framework for students becoming researchers. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26(4), 393–409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360701658609>

APA Citation:

Salas, J. R. C., Nugal, A. T., Boncales, A. B., Cajés, R. D. & Amparo, C. J. C. (2026). PERCEPTIONS AND HESITATIONS TOWARD QUALITATIVE RESEARCH AMONG THIRD-YEAR BSED-ENGLISH STUDENTS: A MIXED-METHODS INQUIRY. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(8), 391–406. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21832076>

Corresponding author: *instructorjunrillysalas@gmail.com*