

Paradigmatic Chaos as the Godzilla: Analysis of Methodological Problems faced by Novice Qualitative Researchers in Theoretical Frameworks and Research Performances

Beata Borowska-Beszta

Faculty of Education Sciences, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Torun, POLAND

*borbesz@umk.pl, borbesz@wp.pl

Abstract

In this article I analyze the problem of paradigmatic chaos and the role of research paradigms in qualitative research projects. I use in the title of the paper the metaphor of Godzilla (Gojira) from Japanese culture to illustrate the vastness and depth of the issues. Particular attention I dedicate to problems arising from reducing the role of research paradigms (philosophical assumptions) and manifested errors on the plan of research design and its implementation by novice researchers, undergraduate and graduate students of the disability fields and vulnerable groups noticed by qualitative methodology teacher.

Keywords: Research paradigms, social sciences, chaos, novice researchers, teaching issues, qualitative methodology, disability fields.

Introduction

Content of Manuals for Qualitative Methodology: Curricula of qualitative methodology in the social sciences scientific world and academic levels are generally indicated in the academic syllabuses. The contents of currently read methodological manuals, among others are written by Creswell⁶, Flick⁸, Angrosino¹, Ritchie and Lewis²¹, Hammersley and Atkinson¹¹ and Silverman^{23,24}. In Polish ground there were also published qualitative research manuals by S. Palka^{18,19}, Borowska-Beszta^{3,4}, Urbaniak-Zajac and Kos²⁸, Jamielniak¹², Kubinowski^{15,16} and Juszczyk¹³ and others. Generally speaking manuals are different in styles of narratives; however there appear solid and similar elements in them. They are mainly connected with the theoretical conceptualization of research and its application. Besides, many textbooks deeply describe the problems associated with the philosophical assumptions of research as: ontology, epistemology, methodology and axiology. Some depicted books also refer to the layer of language programs and rhetoric of the research projects.

For an experienced university teacher, theorist and practitioner in qualitative research studies rhetoric becomes an additional, clear source of information about the correctness of analyzed, evaluated, reviewed projects. Ways of thinking by above mentioned textbook authors about

qualitative methodology, show a wide spectrum of problems, both referenced to the conceptual framework of the researchers and application of qualitative research strategies. There are also matters of conceptual works, in terms of recognition by novice researcher him/herself within the tradition of philosophical assumptions of the research (research paradigms) and problems of qualitative thinking.

In addition, authors as Hammersley¹⁰, Kubinowski^{15,16} mention that researchers should involve reflectivity of thinking and as Spradley^{26,27} proposed - emic attitude. The aspects of the application of qualitative research strategies are associated in textbooks with common problems in establishing and naming own research position, negotiations on the ground and developing relationships in addition to collecting a variety of data and problems of ethics. Methodological manuals include also issues of data analysis, reliability of studies, writing reports of field work, recognizing the limitations of own research and suggestions for further research. Each of these problems is appropriately and variously deeply analyzed by the authors of textbooks. Some manuals e.g. by Hammersley and Atkinson¹¹, Angrosino¹ give more references or examples of specific qualitative projects, which due to the advantages or unacceptable errors should also be kept in mind by those aspiring to become qualitative researchers.

Planned optimal teaching of qualitative methodology in undergraduate, graduate seminars, or while bachelor's, master's or doctoral thesis will be a gradual process, integrating both the content of philosophical assumptions, with highlights to their value, up to theoretical framework and application of procedural qualitative methodology. Teaching is desirable especially when the students learn not only the procedures for the execution of qualitative research but will launch their capability for emic attitudes and reflectivity which is not always successfully obtained in the work with undergraduate seminarians.

Research Paradigms in Social Sciences- Philosophical Assumptions of Research: An experienced researcher and academic teacher cannot imagine omissions in taught or recommended readings philosophical assumptions or paradigms of social sciences, corresponding to the created qualitative projects. Philosophical assumptions are sometimes equated with "philosophical worldviews"

(Creswell⁶), "paradigms" (Guba and Lincoln⁹), "epistemologies and ontologies" (Crotty⁷). The issue has key importance in the qualitative projects. Creswell⁶ says that "the belief in my understanding of general, researcher should look at the world and the nature of scientific research".

For Scotland²², "paradigm consists of the following components: ontology, epistemology, methodology and methods. Between them there are relationships and dependencies". I would add to this set of paradigm rhetoric or language, as a conceptual apparatus associated with the selected paradigm e.g. constructivist, which shall also be a useful medium to observe the problems relating to student learning and understanding the qualitative methodology.

Among the philosophical assumptions necessary by considerations to take a research position are: ontology, epistemology, methodology and method indicated by Scotland²². Crotty⁷ writes that "ontology refers to questions about the nature of phenomena. The author continues that the "ontological assumptions relate to what constitutes reality and what is it? The researchers, according to Scotland²² "should respond in addition to their own perception of what things are and how they are manifested?"

"Epistemology concerns the nature and forms of knowledge" as per Cohen et al.⁵ Authors continue that "epistemological assumptions relate to the way in which knowledge is created acquired and communicated. In other words, what does it mean to know?" Scotland²² believes that "each paradigm has its own epistemological and ontological assumptions, which will be reflected in the methodologies and methods". This author writes after Crotty⁷ that "the methodology is a strategy or action plan, which underlies the choice of methods". Crotty⁷ continues that "the methodology is associated with the response to the question why? what? where? when? and how? data are collected and analyzed. Guba and Lincoln⁹ explain that "the methodology puts the question of how a researcher can know what he thinks, that something should be known?"

Methods, according to Crotty⁷, however, are the "specific procedures for data collection and analysis". The need is to consider the role of paradigms in the field of consciousness researcher substantiating Slife and Williams²⁵. The authors write, "even though the philosophical assumptions remain largely hidden in the study, all the time affect the practice of research studies and in need of identification."

I agree with the above statement seeing the problems faced by the students, whose projects I analyzed as a promoter or reviewer. Students create confusion and chaos on the level of research paradigms of social sciences. The lack of analysis of the problems and the lack of adjustments made at the right time implies a chain reaction of errors they make. Usually the first capture of errors I make after the

analysis and correction of the first chapters, which in qualitative research projects are entitled "The guidelines for the research project."

The Strength and Inevitability of Research Paradigms: Scotland²² writes about the teaching methodology that "teachers should be able to recognize how the philosophical assumptions exist in relation to the chosen methodology and methods and how philosophical assumptions are related to the results presented in articles". This means that even teachers are not always able to know if the author used the conditional mood - "should". Scotland²² believes that the recognition and knowledge of the philosophical assumptions of research projects will increase the level of understanding the study, the application of theory in practice of teaching, commitment to academic debates and while presenting their findings in research".

Crotty⁷ suggested the opposite induction in the order of deliberations in the area of philosophical assumptions. According to the author, novice researchers guided by a teacher, should answer the four questions. First the method which is proposed to carry out research? Secondly, what methodology (qualitative, quantitative) governs a particular method? Thirdly, what theoretical perspective (ontology) is the basis of the selected methodology? Fourth, what epistemology is indicated by a particular theoretical perspective (ontology)?" Creswell⁶ believes that "students' worldview is shaped by scientific discipline which they study, beliefs of mentors and tutors and previous research experience. From such beliefs often it depends on their choice of a qualitative approach, quantitative or mixed".

Methodological Problems faced by Novice Researchers: In mode of undergraduate and graduate academic study in special education, qualitative research has a specific role although, I have no doubt that special education, special andragogy, special studies on disability need a research in a variety of traditions and research policies, therefore both qualitative as well as quantitative paradigm are important and worthy. The unique values of qualitative research studies of vulnerable groups, disability cultures are associated with the epistemological program which assumes, among others, producing emic knowledge, participation and involvement of the researcher in the field (Flick⁸, Angrosino¹) and the capacity to avoid instrumentalism in the research. They allow to understand the vulnerable groups (Borowska-Beszta^{3,4}, Angrosino¹, Flick⁸).

Not surprisingly, the qualitative researches will sometimes fulfill the role of advocate the rights of people with disabilities if they are conducted as action research. The fact that qualitative studies are suitable for the personal learning, researching differences in general, otherness, strangeness cultural and psychosomatic diversities with due reverence, convince us assumptions of qualitative research made by Jamielniak¹², Flick⁸, Creswell⁶, Angrosino¹ and

anthropological roots of qualitative research, to the famous principle of cultural relativism initiated by Boas². Franz Boas published his views on the comparative method in 1896. The article titled "The Limitations of the Comparative Method of Anthropology" pointed out the boundaries of knowledge and of anthropological understanding.

Steps in Teaching: Since the beginning of the diploma seminar teaching, the syllabus point to the novice researchers, research literature and clear written structure with topics, including the problems of philosophical assumptions and implementation of research. Besides the theoretical ground of qualitative methodology and its' application capabilities should be considered. Among the theoretical problems are introduced epistemological programs, mainly constructivist paradigm and the consequences of grounding and working in this paradigm. While working on diploma seminar there is also analyzed the formation of a research project as a whole, consisting of: formulating research problems in the form of questions, the selection of research methods, data collection techniques, creating a matrix of interviews and data analysis. I draw attention to the role of the researcher and the acceptance of the attitude of the research data and the consequences of choices. In addition, as a teacher I pay attention to content of meeting the validity criteria for qualitative research projects, relating the results to the appropriate level of generalization and perceive students' own limitations and reflexivity suggestions for further research.

In the teaching of the application layer or the practice of research and field work the students face problems of specifics dealing with data collection in socially vulnerable groups, consensus-building in the field, foundation of recruiting participants for research, ethics of data collection, issues of practice of sequential data collection and analysis. However, all these listed problem areas of regular teaching qualitative methodology overlap different, previous experience gained under the way of academic learning different methodologies of educational research on previous years of study, conducted by various academics working in scientific research in different, sometimes antagonistic traditions to qualitative research.

All of the shown above elements are the methodological content and context of teaching on diploma seminar. This is related to individual desire of learning methodological issues by the students and their former methodological knowledge obtained from various academic teachers (even pure positivists). Such landscape contains also ongoing seminar methodological support and construct finally a kind of collage of determinants illustrating problems, dilemmas and failures faced by novice researchers and noticed by teacher of qualitative methodology.

Sources of Problems: The teaching of qualitative

methodology in the social sciences (education, special education) and its' key aspects, objectives, dilemmas is broadly supported formerly and currently by the world's methodological publications. The authors Mulvihill, Swaminatha and Bailey¹⁵ believe that "dry in a historical moment, it is important for students' to be aware and equipped to engage not only with the methodological tools to pursue their research but that is understand how one conceptualizes, approaches and of believes they should engage in the research process is also part of the politics of knowledge construction".

Continuum and Structure of Problems: I turn now to the analysis of the category that I call determinants of the problems, dilemmas and failures in teaching qualitative methodology. Initially in the broadest context of these considerations I put on a continuum in which one area will be problems of (I) qualitative methodology teacher and in (II) with the students. Those problems that are associated with academic methodology teachers underwent in Poland the influence of cultural and political changes. I do not give this category of problems much attention in this article because issues are so extensive that they require a separate discussion in a separate paper, as I already mentioned. I call these problems generally the circumstances related to the universalization of competence of methodology teachers.

I follow now to discuss the observed errors or dilemmas in relation to student reports of qualitative research, which I reviewed. I generated continuum of conditions of the problems in teaching qualitative methodology attributable to the teachers and students. These remarks raise the general question: If any social science methodologist should teach qualitative methodology? The second is how to raise students' desire to reading methodological publications?

I. On the Side of Teacher-Examples:

- Strong grounding in antagonistic paradigm - positivist / post-positivist and/or open devaluation of constructivist/interpretivist paradigms (Active participation in so called "paradigm wars").
- Lack of own research conducted in constructivist paradigm associated with teaching such way of research
- Treating qualitative methodology as a set of independent techniques and tools.
- Using the concepts of scientific language and rhetoric apparatus from the antagonistic paradigm (positivistic/post-positivistic) towards constructivism.

II. On the Side of Student- Examples:

- Prior or present experiences associated with learning qualitative methodology (e.g. teachers did not conduct any research in constructivist paradigm, were strongly grounded in an antagonistic, positivist paradigm or devaluating constructivist paradigm).
- Errors in analytical reading of methodological textbooks in social sciences and mixing antagonistic paradigms rules.

- Errors in the design of the theoretical assumptions of qualitative research projects.
- Errors in the implementation of research in the field.

Among detailed examples as simple model of the gradual process of constructing errors in qualitative research projects, on the side of a student in my opinion are:

I. Incorrect Analysis of Qualitative Methodology Manuals Content- Examples:

- Random analysis, taking into account only the exclusion of procedures and strategies for the application of qualitative research and omitting the philosophical assumptions.
- Lack of a comprehensive approach to the content of the research paradigms taking into account the role and need to identify themselves with them.
- Analysis of textbooks of social research methodology and chapters on qualitative research written in the canon and from the perspective of an antagonistic paradigm (positivistic/post-positivistic).
- Lack of ability to distinguish the role of paradigms and their role in the entire research project.

II. Paradigmatic Chaos in Theoretical Framework of Research Project- Examples:

- Faulty design a qualitative research project.
- Errors in assumptions of conceptualizing possible use of mixed methods.
- Errors in defining the role and attitude of the researcher.
- Faulty designed research purposes, research questions.
- Faulty designed tools.
- Ethical relativism.
- Rhetorical relativism.

III. Paradigmatic Chaos in Performance of Research. Examples:

- Errors in building ties and rapport in the field (manifested in the rhetoric areas, research ethics, conducted interviews, observations).
- Random data collection, chaotic excluding cognition of cultural scene without in the context of the research questions.
- Defeats in data collection.
- Prejudices.
- Defeats in research work.
- Errors in narratives of projects and defectively designed research reports.

I. Incorrect Analysis of Qualitative Methodology- Manuals Content:

It is not irrelevant question of how the student should reach key issues in the handbook and what publications students should read while preparing for the implementation of a qualitative research projects. Among the main problems I would depict, as first: reading and the reluctance to notice the relationship between the future exploration and learning the content of theoretical issues of qualitative methodology of their research project.

Excellency in learning the methodology, although no guarantees of success but at least conducive compensates for errors. The problem is not specific for my experiences, because exchanging views with colleagues; I notice that they share my view. It seems in some cases that it matters a little that there are in the market doing a lot of good publishing concerning the qualitative methodology.

Besides seminar, students have the details of the syllabus and are encouraged to explore the methodological problems and then consult them with me. The reluctance to explore by the qualitative methodology is seen in feedback and I can watch it directly on the questions that students ask me when conducting their projects. It happens very rarely (but sometimes is does) that undergraduate students are asking me questions reflecting their reflectivity and creativity.

There are students who quickly understand that a good knowledge of the philosophical assumptions and practical implementation of research will affect the quality of the project and constructed cultural knowledge. But there are those who want to "quickly wade" through the troubles of the first chapter, or design their own research and seek to implement them in a minimalist way.

With all the respect to the students, it happened, I read the research projects of novice researchers, where the first chapters or theoretical framework of their research projects were a strange chaos and collage of clumps definitions, descriptions of methods, techniques from various, even antagonistic paradigms, not far from aspiring to mixed methods because the methodological manual with which students used to prepare their qualitative projects was generally entitled "methodology" or "methods of educational research". Students felt not the contradictions of using the content describing: testing strategies, experiments conducted in antagonistic paradigm.

II. Paradigmatic Chaos in Theoretical Framework of Research Project:

Procedural problems encountered in academic practice are many. The first is the most serious error at the level of the selection of the research paradigms in the social sciences or their free and defective mixing, not having anything in common with the procedures of mixed methods e.g. sequential, parallel or transformative as indicated by Creswell⁶. Below I want to indicate the following example the problem of chaos in the philosophical assumptions of qualitative research project concerning the paradigms of the social sciences, their faulty and incomplete understanding. The following example of errors refers to the application of students research activities and obtaining the results in the form of a chain reaction of procedural and ethical errors.

Example 1: Unethical Research with Paradigmatic Errors in Theoretical Framework: I refer to the research report presented on May 21-22th, 2013 at International Workshop on Research in the Faculty of Education

Sciences, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Torun. The report was carried out by two Polish students graduating II degree in education, at university (coded by me as University "X") who decided to conduct research embedded in the area of social rehabilitation and prostitution of underage girls. Objective of the project was aimed at getting to know: who? how? and under what conditions? makes contact online and then arrange dates with underage girls for sexual encounter. The authors were interested in knowing the problem of prostitution of underage girls through collecting data with their clients.

The two young female researchers have provided qualitative objectives of the project and indicated the way in which they implemented data collection online. Data collection was however surprising. These two female students entered the chat on sexual portals where took place a kind of sexual recruitment of girls and using many different "nicks" pretended to be different adolescent girls. Gradually they alluded open but brief conversations with approximately 40 men, potential sex business customers.

The result of their research and cognitive activities online gave huge data about clients, males looking for sexual contacts with underage girls. The students presented on workshop lot of verbatim data from online collection: as "nicks" of men with whom they talked, agreed concrete brief descriptions of sexual services, prices ranging from a few hundred PLN and reaching up to 4,000 PLN and they established meeting places. (I want to add that assistant professor's monthly salary in public university in Poland is lower than 4,000 PLN). Among men hungry for sex with underage girls was also a policeman, as he assured two young researchers. This however was not proved. It is important apposition that recruited potential customers, the men with whom researchers talked did not know that their interviewers are not teenagers but female, adult students doing the research. They did not know that the students repeatedly falsified own identities. Finally the students established particular places for meetings with "clients" because they wanted to check whether a client will come to the house in a designated place.

Already during the presentation of the report of their research, I turned attention to the fact that there has been a confusion of objectives of the project at the level of the research paradigm and they have moved experiment model to the qualitative research, what is still disputed. Besides, in my opinion research was conducted without transparency and formal consent of the interviewees. I pointed out that their project even though it was very interesting as well as strongly unethical and risky for young female researchers. I want to add that verbatim data obtained by the researchers while chat with men, negotiating services and prices, surprised more than one person in the room, but at the same time the data raised voices that justified such action of novice researchers indicating that they would not collect such rare and reliable data if they introduced themselves as

researchers.

I want to add that at the beginning of the final discussion during the workshop it was not easy, because female students did not understand where the mistake in qualitative research design was. After all, one may think of those female students as of brave young researchers who made fools of men with evil intentions. Critically analyzing this design I want to say that both young researchers deceived approx. 40 men about own purposes. Errors and shortcomings were unnoticed by students who created unintentionally paradigmatic chaos and transfer model of quasi experiment (from antagonistic paradigm) to the qualitative research in constructivist paradigm. Creswell⁶ defines an experimental study as follows: "it is intended to ascertain whether the operation has a specific effect. You can check this by treating one group of influence of a particular factor and the other leaving no intervention and then comparing the results. There are real experiments, the random assignment of experimental conditions and the quasi-experiments which use patterns without a randomization¹⁴.

Quasi experiments include diagrams with a single entity". If someone wanted to analyze the real intentions of the young researchers from the perspective of experimental research, I believe that the females applied the most likely model of experiment. If one wanted to see the possibility of attempts to create a mixed-method research by them, this either cannot be found because no clear patterns of such were given as e.g. sequential, parallel or transformative by Creswell⁶.

Qualitative research does not apply to experiment on humans but rather they meet and try to understand from the emic perspective studied problems, what is highlighted by cultural anthropologists e.g. Spradley²⁶. The use of experiments in qualitative research is still criticized. Analyzing the case of a research project from the perspective of the accuracy of qualitative research studies or even mixed-methods, I want to note serious shortcomings. The young authors addressed cognitive curiosity applied what looks like a provocation and manipulation of the informants. There is therefore a package of ethical errors in data collection and general ethics considerations in quoted student project.

Ethical shortcoming in discussed qualitative research was seen from the beginning of theoretical framework design as the lack of transparency of the research paradigm employed, besides role of the researcher, moreover, lack of informed consent of informants supported by a signed consent. In addition, female students introduced confusion and falsified own identities in order to create a situation and obtain research objectives. Their explanations to the workshop participants that with informed consent and clearly announced own goals and roles they would not have gathered as reliable data without falsifying their identity

and role, is in fact not satisfying.

Such statements do not convince experienced researchers, because every experienced qualitative researcher knows that field research requires a longer stay in the field and building a rapport that evolves from establishing ties towards participation. Building relationships is a conscious time for needed negotiations made by researcher negotiating conditions of stay in the field research, gaining the trust of the studied culture. Therefore crucial in qualitative research is voluntary and aware participation of research participants with real goals and intentions expressed by explicit researchers. The mistakes of students were therefore oversight at the level of confusion and chaos on research paradigms levels and then ethics of data collection.

Faulty Construction of Purposes, Tasks and Research Questions:

The practice of teaching of seminar students in the direction of constructivism faces many obstacles along the way. One of them is the lack of recognition by student's cause-effect process of identifying the choice of a research paradigm and then designing and undertaking entire projects. Constructivist paradigm requires the detailed and specific actions on the set of epistemological, axiological, rhetoric and methodological fields. Reading and assessing students written proposals especially on undergraduate level meant as the first chapters and foundation of research projects, I often encounter in the text implementation of the explanations in which research paradigm project is located, then it happened that the creation for research purposes is designed which is directly contradiction to this.

Errors appear also on the set of rhetoric research project. An example would be the creation for qualitative research purposes associated with words "verifying", "checking", "proving" with intention of testing the reality. The problems manifest misunderstanding on the set of conceptual apparatus, which use the students.

Example 2: Paradigmatic Chaos on Rhetoric Level

1. "The aim of the research is the desire to check"
2. "The aim of the study is to prove that it is worth to be a special education teacher ..."
3. "The aim of my research is to verify the organizational culture of rehabilitation camps."

This method of determining the quality of students' purpose of the research project invariably reminds positivist tradition and such attitude towards studies in which the essence is to verify the phenomena proving diagnosis and not understanding and knowledge of phenomenological way in emic perspective. Errors within the meaning of the consequences that selects the paradigm of research by students can be seen on the set of the language they use.

The negative effects of the implementation of such a chaotic construction of a research project may arise after

the date of entry into the area. The first problem may be seen as the inability to reach an agreement in the field and subsequently establishing ties or in completion of research techniques and data gathering. The second mistake is characterized by the low quality of the created imperfectly misshapen cultural knowledge. The chaos occurred as chain reactions and effects of errors on paradigmatic level. Although in the qualitative methodology can be found attempts of creating cultural knowledge concerning different percentage distribution of voices from the field, giving attitude etic or emic (Spradley^{26,27}), qualitative research cannot in any way eliminate the voices of the participants from cultural scene.

Paradigmatic chaoses embodied in a layer of qualitative language are also derivative of the relatively low knowledge of students about the consequences of their choices, of methodological literature. They often choose by themselves methodological literature which is in particular moment accessible in libraries. The recommended methodological literature to conduct qualitative research projects I usually place in the syllabus, correspondence with students, as optimal to cover the research objectives and plans of individual project.

The common mistakes I can easily see in chapter 1 are concerned with theoretical framework of the research project related to reading accidental epistemologies and methodologies. It happens that in the paragraphs concerning the issues of choosing own epistemological program in the projects that will be optimal, there are extensive descriptions of scientific knowledge, characteristic of the positivist paradigm/post-positivist from textbook scholar X which was accessible in libraries, who wrote also single chapter on qualitative research in his/her methodology book.

Chaos and paradigmatic errors are also evident on the plans of formulating research problems in the form of research questions. During my teaching practice, I note that there is widespread confusion of research questions with questions created in matrices of interviews. The problem of inconsistencies is usually revealed during the conceptual work before entering the study cultural scene. This is an amazing phenomenon, illustrating sometimes relatively poor control over the students' own ideas constituting confusion between research questions with questions for the interview.

Designing qualitative research, which I coordinate assumes the existence of a clear division in the construction of the project into three sections: the first chapter is the establishment of a research projects' framework, the second chapter is a review of literature and ontological issues and the third chapter is meant as own research performance. In addition, other projects' features include all necessary standard components of bachelor's or master's thesis. In the first chapter, students formulate theoretical assumptions of

projects, precise research objectives and research problems in the form of questions.

The practice of conducting students and their works to date has indicated the existence of various problems related to the construction of research questions. Among the major mistakes I can distinguish: research questions which were created without regard to the objectives of the research. In addition, the research questions were sometimes developed in the wrong way, when it comes to the structure of the questions. Typically, the most serious mistake is the creation of verification questions of narrow range, starting with the word "if" and implying a simple answer: yes or no. Another problem associated with the mistaken design of the research questions is that the research questions sometimes tend to be completely separated "mentally", "logically" and "semantically" of questions created by students within the interview matrix.

As a result, students learn not what is actually indicated for the purposes of research or without proper adjustments they will possibly recognize some phenomena as incomplete. Of course, qualitative studies are inherently developmental with the possibility of evolution and changes made in the direction of questions, but I mean the questions that they are designing are not entirely related to the research questions of the projects.

Another mistake is putting research questions impossible to achieve in the desired tradition of qualitative research. A special case is the creation of research questions with the desire to know the "influence", not "phenomena". Unfortunately, the "influence" can be known in studies in the positivist, post-positivist traditions. I think that special attention should be given while teaching the moment of the correct explanation to the student of how to create research questions and questions for the interview with consistency to entire project.

In other case it can happen that interview questions will be insignificant, irrelevant with the objectives of the project or even exploiting the informants. The research questions shared below are the main example. Too narrow range, in addition formulated as verification questions, beginning with "if" or looking to investigate category called "influence" in small purposive samples.

Example 3: Errors in Construction of Research Questions

1. General research question: Do fairy tales influence the development of children with intellectual disabilities?

III. Paradigmatic Chaos in Performance of Research:

Defeats in Building Rapport in the Field: Despite the knowledge of methods and procedures and after consultation with me as promoter in diploma seminar, it happened that one student proposed a draft and qualitative data collection in the field as verbal technique. Student

recounted to me on 23th November 2015 interview with the father of two adult children with multiple, severe disabilities. The biggest disappointment that female, graduate student confronted, was external image of a great husband and father of adult children with severe disabilities, with an informant, a man who during the interview was several times verbally aggressive, arrogant and even insulting student.

The problem of the failure while building relationships in the field in my opinion was also linked with the attitude of excessive emotional detachment of female student when collecting data and lack of personalizing the form of questions, posed in the interview. The informant was unintentionally asked to answer too general issues not related to his own parenthood, what in fact makes him angry and arrogant. A student took a position of almost positivistic not involved interviewer, which I could read from the transcript of the interview. Student did not notice, even generally good prepared to fieldwork that her gathering data in a families of persons with severe disabilities constructed while collecting the data additional tension in the area.

Prejudices in Fieldwork: It is essentially difficult for students researchers agree to this statement and understand that qualitative research is subjectivist in nature. One should know that researcher brings to the research his/her own values but also prejudices. These threads usually require multiple translations, but nevertheless, reveal errors in students' writing, already at the stage of formulating the assumptions of the research project and its objectives. Interesting are the biases in the construction of qualitative projects. Prejudices which I noticed in proposals of special education seminar students during my experiences in teaching are generally not indexed semantically negatively by students at the bachelor level. I would say that they thematically express ones identification with humanity standards and "underdog" position as content of bias. They are expressed as explicit solidarity with the hypothetical or real "victims" of social oppression. Prejudices are expressed below in example 4 as research purposes.

Example 4: Prejudices

Students write as objectives:

1. "I want to explore the sexuality of people with intellectual disabilities in Poland because they have a sexuality like everyone else." Prejudice, with whom I came into contact in the course of teaching qualitative methodology during undergraduate seminars is also often linked to excessive valorization of the role, potential and students' positive attitudes towards the subjects of study. It is therefore difficult, in my opinion, to keep by students the disciplined knowledge acquisition in phenomenological way meant as "bracketing technique". The second problem is developing by students own prejudices towards phenomena in the culture being studied or inability to distancing themselves from the field (temporary mental and

physical marginalization issue) in purpose to create qualitative research of better quality. At the level of graduate seminar students' these problems occur sporadically but already occur in research works of students from undergraduate level.

Ethical Relativism: Although written consent to participate in qualitative research is still respected by seminar students both levels in a form to provide ethical data collection, some errors can also be seen in students' proposals of such forms. Good examples of consents are available in the textbooks of qualitative research written by Rapley²⁰, Angrosino¹ or Jamielniak¹². However designing optimal written consent form still causes problems to students.

Analyses of prepared by the student's consents forms lead me to the following reflections.

(1) First, unfortunately, they tend not to read the recommendations and adapt forms to their research needs and requirements of own research projects.

(2) Those that perform only e.g. individual interviews are asking in the second paragraph of the agreement to participate in "the group interviews."

(3) In addition, those who carry out such an individual interview are asking for something what not fit to the planned research needs.

(4) Some problems cause level of anonymization and issues of payment to the informants. Anonymization is rather regularly discussed on seminars condition of an agreement but its level is raising concerns. To what extent one should code the personal data? The answer is associated with the psychological wellbeing of the informant. Speaking of payments I noticed that participation in research meant as free of costs interview, should be clearly described in the beginning if one is looking for comfort while research.

If students will forget about it, they should not be surprised that in the explored cultural scene, someone will expect some sort of payment. I am thinking in particular of people from vulnerable groups, which e.g. because of their intellectual potential can understand the intentions of the researcher otherwise. This situation is known to me personally in the field research because an adult member of day care facility with intellectual disability asked me once for payment for the interview to the research because the "interview to the newspaper is paid" and he also should be paid.

(5) Another error in the creation of a consent form by students is placing there (inadvertently) incomplete or conflicting data. E.g. students do not indicate what will happen with the audio data after the meeting. Where and how will data be stored or destroyed?

(6) In addition, there is the lack of information sometimes about who will have access to audio and transcribed data?

(7) One of the biggest drawbacks with consent form is forgetting by the students about the agreements in the form as request for permission to publish encoded, anonymized

and transcribed interviews in a Bachelor's or Master's thesis. Without the consent of the interview transcripts cannot fit and they are proof of being a researcher in the field, enhancing the credibility of the research project. In such situations, they do not have time to catch errors during the first adjustment. It is necessary to prepare annex to the consent form.

(8) Among other errors associated with creating forms are those that are missing parts, e.g. a statement that the person may, without giving any reason to withdraw at any time from participation in the study.

(9) Subsequent failures and relatively low care of some students.

Example 5: Ethical Relativism

One of my former undergraduate seminar students rarely participating in seminar meetings and consultations due to work and having individual organization of study, asked once for anonymity 6 informants and then posted in completed thesis all the signed formal consents and brought me bound thesis for final approval. She even said that "the inclusion of signed consent forms seemed to her more exacerbating the participation of research participants, residents of Stationary Care Facility." I explained once again the huge error and retreated to her this thesis to improvement.

Rhetorical Relativism Difficulties in Writing of Reports:

Writing is an essential and fundamental element of qualitative research. It is hard to think about the implementation of a Bachelor's or Master's thesis in the framework of a qualitative research project without a good knowledge of the rules of writing correctly in Polish language. However knowing correct Polish language is actually not enough for writing a scientific research report. Among the problems that students experience, the most troubled are those associated with the rhetorical questions arising from the constructivist paradigm. On the set of the practice of writing errors they involve the use by students in the impersonal mode of grammatical forms in analysis and reviews of the literature, when they should clearly indicate own voice, written in the first person or clearly isolated voice of the cited authors.

Mannerism of Understatements and Poor Specification of Writing Drafts and Reports:

Mannerism of understatements and poorly specified descriptions of problems is another difficult pattern of writing by novice researchers their research drafts and reports. I would divide problems in this area in three dimensions as: personal, temporal and geographical understatements. Phenomena appear mainly as lack of precision in depiction of particular scholars, researchers' names which should be written in theoretical frameworks. Students often write "many researchers share such idea" or "some academics found". Similar situation of understatements appear while writing about reviewed time of analyzed researches or places, in fact reduced mainly to local Polish ground.

It happened that novice researchers and seminar students write “for many years researchers...” or “there is no evidence of the research on such subject” without deepened search in foreign scientific data bases. After years of teaching experience I notice that in this area students need more help and advices. It is obvious that above examples of errors can be reduced by constant practice of academic writing in the context of the knowledge and respect to the rules of academic writing e.g. APA style etc. I would say, that constant contact with visual presentations as teaching medium, during undergraduate and graduate studies, decreases the rate of written assignments which is slightly reducing potential and quality of the future students’ written research reports.

Conclusion

Summary dilemmas and problems faced by novice researchers while preparation of own research projects are also problems noticeable by teacher in teaching qualitative methodology. The multitude of procedural problems in the correct planning and implementation of qualitative projects seems overwhelming, even though projects are gaining the quality in direct proportion to the use of seminar consultations during the seminars and comprehensive reading proper methodological literature. In this paper I concentrated mainly on problems experienced by students of undergraduate and graduate levels which were noticed by me as a qualitative methodology teacher.

Many problems exist on the side of teachers and generally speaking they are related to long experiences of students learning process of different methodologies through entire academic studies. The desire to penetrate the topics and nuances of qualitative methodology is not as desirably perceived task by undergraduate students, as one may think. They prefer to analyze ontological issues far more with more enthusiasm and involvement. From my experience in teaching, the analysis of methodological problems is sometimes too difficult to undergraduate students and they are "wading" through the methodology, despite the fact that on the Polish publishing market there are publications of contemporary foreign authors who write excellent manuals, understandable and at the same time they possess high scientific level.

References

1. Angrosino M., Doing Ethnographic and Observational Research, Warsaw, PWN (2010)
2. Boas F., Museums of Ethnology and their Classification *Science*, **9 (229)**, 612-614 (1887)
<https://archive.org/stream/jstor1762644/1762644#page/n1/mode/2up>
3. Borowska-Beszta B., Ethnography for Therapists (Special Educators), Methodological Sketches Cracow, Publisher House Impulse (2005)
4. Borowska-Beszta B., The Ethnography of lifestyle of adults

with developmental disabilities, residents in Toruń, Publishing House NCU (2013)

5. Cohen L., Manion L. and Morrison K., Research Methods in Education, 6th Ed., Routledge, London and New York, Taylor & Francis Group (2007)
6. Creswell J., Research Design, Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches, 3rd ed., Cracow, Jagiellonian University Publisher (2013)
7. Crotty M., The Foundations of Social Research, Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process, New Delhi, SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks (1998)
8. Flick U., Designing Qualitative Research, Warsaw, PWN (2010)
9. Guba E.G. and Lincoln Y.S., Competing paradigms in qualitative research, In Denzin N.K. and Lincoln Y.S., Eds., Handbook of qualitative research, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sagepp., <https://www.uncg.edu/hdf/facultystaff/Tudge/Guba%20&%20Lincoln%201994.pdf>, 105-117 (1994)
10. Hammersley M., Teaching Qualitative Method: as craft, profession, or bricolage?, In Gobo G., Gubrium J. and Silverman D., eds., Qualitative Research Practice, London, Sage (2004)
11. Hammersley M. and Atkinson P., Ethnography, Principles in Practice, Poznan, Zyski S-ka (2000)
12. Jamielniak D., Qualitative Researches, Methods and Tools, Warsaw, PWN (2012)
13. Juszczak S., Qualitative Research in Social Sciences, Methodological Sketches, Katowice, Silesia University Publisher (2014)
14. Keppel G., Design and analysis: A researcher’s handbook, 3rd ed., Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall (1991)
15. Kubinowski D., Qualitative educational research, Philosophy, Methodology, Evaluation, Lublin, University of Marie Curie Skłodowska Press (2010)
16. Kubinowski D., Idiomatic - Synergy – Emergence, Development of Qualitative Research in Polish Education at the Turn of the Century, Lublin, Publisher Makmed (2014)
17. Mulvihill T.M., Swaminatha R. and Bailey L.C., Catching the “Tail/Tale” of Teaching Qualitative Inquiry to Novice Researchers, *The Qualitative Report*, **20(9)**, 1490-1498 (2015)
18. Palka S., ed., Orientations in Methodology of Educational Research, Crakow, Jagiellonian University Publisher (1998)
19. Palka S., ed., Basics of Research Methodology in Education, Gdańsk, Gdańsk Psychological Publishing (2010)
20. Rapley T., Conversation, Discourse and Documents Analysis, Warsaw, PWN (2010)
21. Ritchie J. and Lewis J., ed., Qualitative Research Practice. A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers, New Delhi,

SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks (2003)

22. Scotland J., Exploring the Philosophical Underpinnings of Research: Relating Ontology and Epistemology to the Methodology and Methods of the Scientific, Interpretive and Critical Research Paradigms, (In) *English Language Teaching, Canadian Center of Science and Education* 5(9), 9-16 (2012)
<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1080001.pdf>

23. Silverman D., Doing Qualitative Research, Warsaw, PWN (2008)

24. Silverman D., Interpretation of Qualitative Data, Warsaw, PWN (2015)

25. Slife B.D. and Williams R.N., What's behind the research: Discovering hidden assumptions in the behavioral sciences, London, Sage (1995)

26. Spradley J., The Ethnographic Interview, United States, Wadsworth Group, Thomas Learning (1979)

27. Spradley J., Participant Observation, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston (1980)

28. Urbaniak-Zajac D. and Kos E., Qualitative Research in Education, PWN, Warsaw (2013).

(Received 21st April 2016, accepted 28th April 2016)