METODY ZBIERANIA
I ANALIZY DANYCH
W BADANIACH
EDUKACYJNYCH

Magdalena Ciechowska

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6811-482X

Jesuit University Ignatianum, Cracow, Poland, e-mail: magdalena.ciechowska@ignatianum.edu.pl

Qualitative Research as an Area to Co-existence and Co-creation of the Subjects of Research – Pupils and Teachers. From a Teacher Filled with the Spirit of Research Through Living Laboratories to the Creative Research and the Research that Creates

Abstract

These aspects are not widely discussed in the methodological literature, meanwhile they are important for the emergence of synergy – a characteristic feature of qualitative research. The article also points to concepts that are important for the co-existence and co-creation of the research subjects – concepts of John McKernan that concern the teaching research in action and *Living Laboratories,* and creative research. The author's concept is also presented – research that creates, whose special feature is the co-existence and co-creation of research subjects. Those aspects of qualitative research should be highlighted in wide seeing at teacher research in their own daily practice. In this job, all is the research – meeting the student, evaluation, improving teaching methods, etc.

Keywords: qualitative research, subject of research, co-existence, co-creation.

Introduction

Can conditions that give space for discovering one another, for understanding one's sensitivity and for constructing one's own identity be created in the course

of scientific research? Can research in education be a mutual adventure – for a student and for a teacher (a researcher and a respondent), or should they only be an element of evaluation of didactic and educational work? These questions will be the guiding principles for this article.

Qualitative research has permanently entered the research arena in the area of education. However, its results do not always meet with the approval of hard results of quantitative research. Meanwhile, some of the contemporary, dynamic social, demographic, and legal changes because of the humanistic nature of the phenomenon and its idiomaticity (Kubinowski, 2013) (including multiculturalism, ethnic minorities, migrations but also changes in the scope of legal regulations concerning education) require the use of qualitative research and the implementation of its results (Hatch, 1995; Jarvie, 2012, p. 35). The awareness of methodological differences in the quantitative and qualitative research process is very important. Particularly, these differences will be shown in the paradigm of research conduct, selection of the research sample, data collection methods (research techniques), scheme of research (research methods), and methods of data analysis. What is more, I will focus on specific elements of the qualitative research process, which can be seen as a space for the mutual growth of research entities in both knowledge and experience. Writing here about the qualitative research process I mean the research, which requires direct interactions between a researcher and a respondent (so I skip here the analysis of literature, documents). Here, I am aware that aspects which are described (coexistence and co-creation) can be used by a researcher in a mixed method research. Although some important methodology conceptions indicate an artificial division of research strategy into the qualitative, quantitative or MMR one, they show only one strategy, which focuses on the researcher's choice of the scheme of activity, eg. case study scheme, ethnographic scheme or experiment scheme (Rubacha, 2011; Pasikowski, 2017). The researcher decides what methods of data should be used in the scheme in order to recognize a research problem as the best one. I think it should be added to deep inquiry about coexistence and co-creation aspects.

The term *coexistence* used in the title covers "all interpersonal spaces. It is the mutual sharing of the resources of the heart, mind and spirit by people who meet in a subject dialogue (intellectual closeness), personal (mental closeness, worldview) and existential (spiritual community)". It is always more than just real cooperation (Dymara, 2014, p. 35).

Co-creation can relate to many aspects of life. With regard to qualitative research, the term of *co-creation* is already present in relation to marketing

research, in which clients (of the research) are asked to actively participate in various steps of the research process – from the idea to the research analysis (O'Hern & Rindfleisch, 2010). This co-creation is the foundation for the increasingly popular Living Laboratories research, which will be presented further in the article (Beutel et al., 2017, pp. 1453–1464). This article aims to show one more aspect of co-creation through qualitative research – co-creation of each other (researcher, respondent), thanks to the interactions that occur between them in the course of qualitative research.

The term of co-existence should be looked at in relation to other terms related to it, such as: self-creation (self-realization), in other words a process in which a man realizes himself, creates himself (existential understanding); the process of using own talents, abilities and the process of realizing a specific idea of oneself (Czarnik, 1995, pp. 25–26). Self-realization, however, does not depend only on the subject to whom it applies (Jaśtal, 1995, p. 33). There is also the concept of *being created* – by natural processes and influences of a human being, and *co-creation* taking place during each encounter with another human being (Ostasz, 1995, p. 20–21; Kopińska, 2012, p. 133).

Qualitative research is used for such a meeting with another human being – in which he/she has the space for co-creation and co-existence. What is more, deploying the most of the research methods, the researcher's meeting with the subject is the sine qua non of this research, and hence the dialogue of the researcher with the respondents and himself is necessary (Patton, 1990, p. 72).

Features of qualitative research being the basis for the co-existence and co-creation of research subjects

Among the constitutive features of qualitative research, in the context of the subject of this article, it is worth quoting personalistic, interactive, discursive, holistic perspective (Kubinowski, 2010), idiomatic aspects, synergy, emergence (Kubinowski, 2013; 2018), and contextualism (Ciechowska, 2018c). The first three characteristics clearly indicate the research through personal contact (personalistic and interactive aspects), in which there is room for combining many interpretative perspectives – the researcher, the respondents and future recipients. No voice should be omitted, because it can bring something new to understanding of the studied phenomenon and its presentation in the report (Kubinowski, 2010, p. 71; Jagieła, 2015, p. 82) (of course, this is applied only to a research group, without any possibility for generalizing results). Such sensitivity to the subject's individuality is particularly desirable in the study

of delicate topics, such as experience of violence, a way of dealing with tragic experience (e.g. death of a loved person), or studies of some people exposure to any exclusion.

In turn, the idiomatic aspect and emergence require from the researcher the ability to adopt a specific way of proceeding. In the case of the idiomatic aspect, it is required to use methods adequate to recognize the studied phenomena, to match their idioms, i.e. those properties that determine their character (Kubinowski, 2013, p. 83). This selection must involve, above all, the well-being of respondents. The previously mentioned features – interactions and personalism, require that the well-being of the subject be the utmost well-being, while the success of the research project comes second. In qualitative research, the openness of the research to new and important aspects of the studied phenomenon is also important, which determines the subsequent steps of research. This feature in a particular manner teaches the qualitative researchers humility and is referred to as the emergence (Kubinowski, 2013; 2018). It requires constant review of the research situation, well-being of the respondents and their own attitude towards people who are our informers. I am conscious of the use of terms used in the steps of research and their meaning in qualitative research. Among them one should mention flexibility. A researcher who projects a research of his/ her professional competence, permanent personality orders, situationally formed attributes and constituting a relationship with a respondent are important for understanding the term "steps" of research, because „they enter into relationship in technical trajectory and produce dynamical structure „reflexion-in-action" (Usher et al., 2001, p. 17). R. Chenail proposes ten steps for curious, but transparent and coherent manner of planning and conducting qualitative research, which match greatly with co-existence and co-creation of the research subjects: Reflect on What Interests You; Step Two: Draft a Statement Identifying your Preliminary Area of Interest and Justifying Its Scholarly and/or Practical Importance; Hone your Topic Focus (deliberating on the following questions: who, what, when, where, why, how); Compose your Initial Research Question or Hypothesis; Define your Goals and Objectives; Conduct a Review of the Literature; Develop your Research Design (design concepts, participants, research methodology, research procedures, quality control); Conduct a Self-assessment in Order to Determine What Strengths You Have That Will Be Useful in your Study and What Skills You Will Need to Develop in Order to Complete your Study; Plan, Conduct, and Manage the Study; Compose and Submit your Report (Chenail, 2011).

Research paradigm as a perspective of research planning and research conduct taking into account the co-existence and co-creation of research subjects

The first element of research design is the researcher's awareness of his/her own perspective on the world, which is the research paradigm, also referred to as the philosophical worldview (Creswell, 2014), that is the set of basic beliefs guiding the conduct (Guba, 1990, p. 17). I draw this meaning of paradigm from Khun's understanding of paradigm as a "scientific community" (Khun, 2001, p. 311), that is aligned with it, what is jointly recognized as scientists' beliefs, sometimes interpreted as a way of perceiving the research phenomenon. (Khun, 2003, p. 204). In literature, the role of adopting an appropriate paradigm into research is rarely highlighted, despite its importance for the properly conducted research, especially in the qualitative strategy, peculiarly, in education of young researchers (Ciechowska, 2018b, pp. 28–31). What is more, a frequent mistake of young researchers (own experience coming from the consultation of diploma and doctoral theses) involves adding the *ex post* paradigm, which seems *the most suitable* for the conducted research. Meanwhile, the road should be completely different – the principles that guide the ethical conduct of the researcher, the principles of including respondents in the research process, etc. come from the philosophical assumptions. When selecting a paradigm, the researcher becomes aware of the object of the phenomenon being examined and the rules of acting with the subjects appearing in it. And so, qualitative pedagogical research is usually conducted on the basis of these paradigms, which "bend down" towards the respondents, or give them a privileged role in the research. In the classification by Yvonna S. Lincoln and Egon G. Guba (Lincoln & Guba, 2005), this is a critical theory, constructivism and participation. In turn, according to Gibson Burrell and Gareth Morgan (Burrell & Morgan, 1979), it will be radical humanism and interpretivism, and for John W. Creswell (Creswell, 2014) constructivism, activism and pragmatism (the latter, however, is typical for mixed-methods research). It is also worth considering the new paradigms that emphasize the subjectivity of the researcher and the respondent, such as the synergy-participatory paradigm (Kubinowski, 2010, p. 46) and subject-participatory paradigm (Szymańska, 2018, p. 42). It is also worth pointing out that the post-colonial and autochthonic paradigm (Chilisa, 2012; Kubinowski, 2015), which is the resultant of critical theory, constructivism and participation, emphasizes research conducted in local communities, in which indigenous knowledge is a way of reaching the respondents and their understanding.

In the first one, the emphasis is laid on participation understood in two dimensions: the researcher participation in the life of the respondent, and the respondent participation in the research. Synergy is a derivative of such a proceeding, i.e. cooperation of research subjects giving a new quality in research. In the subject-participatory paradigm, the subjective treatment of the subject and participation in two dimensions mentioned above is the starting point for the researcher. It is worth mentioning the principles of *participatory research* distinguished by Jarg Bergold and Stefan Thomas: the principle of democracy, the *safe-space* principle and the principle of determining the degree of participation of the community of the research participants. What is more, these paradigms assume that the respondent will be included in the research process at every stage – from research planning, data collection, to the process of analysis and the opportunity to use the communication validation technique (Szmidt & Modrzejewska-Świgulska, 2014, pp. 235–256). Thanks to such a vision of the studied phenomenon, research subjects coexist in the examined reality and should be treated equally with the researcher.

The selected methods of qualitative research as a space for the co-existence and co-creation of research subjects

A specific feature of qualitative research, apart from those which have been indicated so far, is the creation of new methods enabling to know the surrounding phenomenon. Owing to the fact that it is changing dynamically, it is also necessary to adapt the cognitive methods to it. The vast array of methods also includes those which, regardless of the dynamics of change, remain valid due to their universality. This will certainly comprise a case study and ethnography. The case study and the requirements of its correct application in a research give the space in which the researcher focuses on the subject and their situation. The cognitive subject is never just a source of information here. It is particularly worth pointing out another aspect of qualitative research that is extremely important for setting the researcher towards the subject. We are talking here about the identity, or rather the identities of the researcher. Research identity can never conflict with a professional identity, for example, a teacher. The teacher as a *people-oriented* professional has to develop strategies of acting, in which the ethics of the researcher does not exclude the teacher's ethics (e.g. the issue of research anonymization, informing parents, etc.) (Ciechowska, 2018b, pp. 66–79). In this place I want to indicate the importance of understanding the roles of a researcher and a teacher. According to the concept by McKernan (described

further in this article), a teacher and a researcher do not perform occasional roles, but constantly interpenetrate in didactic and educational process.

Ethnography as a method that allows to get to know the culture is a kind of platform for co-existence and co-creation, which *per se* are the elements of the field ethnography. *Being-in-the-world* of the respondents is a special feature of ethnography, which gives possibilities for the use of specific techniques, such as the ethnographic interview or participatory observation. Thanks to the ethnographic study, it is possible to familiarize the reader with the so-called hidden knowledge, access to which was obtained by the researcher during the co-existence with the respondents, however, such knowledge can be conveyed only due to a dense description, and sometimes only through performance (Turner, 2005; Krzyworzeka & Krzyworzeka, 2012).

In turn, research in action is a specific process that makes it possible to get to know own research practice, including the teaching one (Pine, 2009). What is more, thanks to the specific way of learning and analysing – a kind of research loop in action – the teacher respects data obtained from students at each step, hence, the name *democracy in action*, because no voice can be omitted or diminished here. In Polish literature, the western type of teacher action research is rarely presented, which may include an educational project – designed by the researcher, but taking into account the specific role of the respondents at each step (Szymańska et al., 2018).

Due to the dynamically changing ways of learning about the surrounding phenomena, ethnography has become the starting point for virtual, visual and auto-ethnography. Virtual reality (VR) and Augmented reality (AR) (Fiore et al., 2014; Wei et al., 2014) are new fields for research. This gives the researcher the opportunity to get to know the virtual culture and the phenomenon of the student identity multiplication (Branicki, 2009), which are accompanied by the creation of their own behaviours on the Internet. The researcher may conduct research in one or two aspects. Three basic types of research are indicated here, in which the location of the research subject and scope to which the inference relates are the differentiating criterion: research on-line space only, research on-line and off-line parallel and both of the space in other time (Cichocki et al., 2012). New research opportunities also include new ethical challenges for the researcher, in this case especially the issues of revealing oneself online. However, when it comes to the co-existence and co-creation of subjects of the study, it will always be an open study. The co-existence in the online world and deriving from this state of scientific knowledge gives a wide range of opportunities to use this aspect for the construction of pedagogical knowledge (Kubinowski, 2017).

The next method, visual ethnography, assumes a special role of images in the process of cognition – both types: those made by the researcher and those being the work of the subjects. This is what gives the opportunity to jointly conduct a research, where the researcher is offered many places to collect information about his/her own world in the form of images, so valued and precious today. This method, thanks to the use of innovative techniques e.g. tourist guide technique (Szabó, 2015), walking tour methodology (Garvin, 2010) or drawings (recording practices in private spheres (Storm-Mathisen, 2018), can be used in the *understanding* of the place where the researcher and the respondent is located. Thanks to the tangible proof, i.e. photography, the researcher can see the point of view of the respondent, the subject and the situation. Sarah Pink pointed to the roles of visual ethnography in creating space and imagination (Pink, 2008). In addition, equipping students with a tool such as a camera (today easily available on mobile phones) gives them conditions to participate in research – providing research materials and then discussing the captured phenomena with the researcher during the interview with the interpretation of photograms (Nowotniak, 2012).

Autoethnography is the most specific method in relations to the *co-existence* and *co-operation* of research subjects, in which the researcher is also a subject. However, it does not exclude the participation of other respondents in such a process. An example is a research, in which the teacher examines himself or herself, e.g. an image of himself or herself as a teacher. It is impossible to omit the students' statements here. However, these will not be normal statements. The autoethnography, as no other method does, relies on emotions and personal experiences of the subjects. Subjectivism, sometimes understood as empowerment is not an obstacle here, but a new aspect of research. (in case of qualitative research in objective issue, it is indicated that one characteristic of them is intersubjectivism (Kubinowski, 2013). An in-depth cognition of oneself is possible thanks to many types of autoethnography (evocative, emotional, performative, visual). As already mentioned – new research opportunities are new ethical challenges. Special in this case, because autoethnographic research often relates to difficult personal situations in which the persons closest to the researcher are involved, and what is related to this – obtaining the consent of these people to be placed in the report (Ciechowska, 2018a). Autoethnography offers special opportunities for use in educational research, especially due to its intra-active and intra-personal character (Ciechowska et al., 2019).

From the concept of a teacher *filled with the spirit of research to living laboratories*

James McKernan pointed out that the teacher during the studies should be „filled with the spirit of research" in such a way that he/she would effectively use his/her research competences in his/her professional work and thus become a reflective practitioner (McKernan, 1996). What is more, thanks to such an action, he/she would have constant insight into the teaching and education process of the pupils who would also actively participate in the research. Such a concept would be realized through the use of research in action in educational practice. McKernan promotes research in action as the kind of research which gives the opportunity to go beyond the vision of school as a place of knowledge distribution, to the place of experiencing it, both by the student and teacher, who "must play the role of a competent participant observer. (…) If a person teaching wants to be called a teacher, he/she must participate in the teaching and educational process, and more specifically, he/she should experience the participant observation. He/she must realize that he/she is rather a "seeker" than a "person knowing". (…) The teaching plan cannot be treated as a finite, once approved quality" (McKernan, 1996, p. 38). Research in action gives opportunities to acquire new experiences and a new type of knowledge not only for the teacher, but also for the student. The idea of a student as a researcher "requires broadening the definition of a 'student' with his/her activity regarding the extraction of his/her own experiences and integrating them during reflection and reading their meaning. Such integrating procedures result in the increased human awareness" (Jodłowska, 2012, p. 221).

Referring to the main ideas of McKernan (1996) presented above, one can move forward and say that school can become a kind of *Living Labs*. Although the name itself is not too accurate with regard to the concept itself, or its allocation to the school, the assumptions are an interesting opportunity to present co-creation and co-operation of research entities in the space of qualitative research (not only in the research in action). Below I will try to present the most important assumptions of this concept.

Living Labs were created as a place to implement the demanded approach to innovation, combining business, science, administration and civil society (Macełko & Mendel, 2011). The active role of users in LLs means a new place of value creation that arises thanks to the interaction and experience of various entities (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004).

In the literature describing LLs, the co-creation is defined as active, creative and social cooperation involving the creation process between producers

and clients (users) (Beutel et al., 2017). The basic aspect of co-creation is the involvement of users, which is expressed in their impact on the idea, development process and launch in the NPSD system (New Products and Service Development) (Jaspersen, 2010). It is emphasized that the special strength of LLs lies in setting work to the offline system. Thanks to this, obstacles in transferring knowledge in relation to *sticky information*[1] and hidden knowledge are overcome. Among other things, this is why the LLs concept is considered a "user-oriented research methodology for detection, prototyping, validation and refinement of complex solutions in various and changing real life contexts" (Eriksson et al., 2005).

The LLs methodology uses co-creation techniques as well as traditional research methods used in marketing innovation, such as surveys, in-depth interviews or focus groups (Witell et al., 2011). In addition, the methods used in LL should be adapted to the clear advantages of interactivity and the reality of the living environment, and therefore should go beyond the traditional methods of innovative research (Almirall & Wareham, 2008).

Translating these assumptions into the language of the methodology of qualitative pedagogical research, I notice convergent points strengthening the thesis about the co-existence and co-creation of research subjects, they also provide the foundations for the concept of creative research, which will be presented in the next part of the article.

From LLs to Creative Research and Research that Creates

The phenomenon of co-existence and co-operation of research entities in qualitative research requires the integration of all elements of this process. Such integrity results in a platform for *being together* (researcher and respondent) during the study. It is worth paying attention to the nomenclature of qualitative research – these are research with children, research with teachers, parents – while not research on children or in people, which happens in the literature (Komisja do spraw etyki w nauce [The Code of Ethics for Research Workers], 2017), but it is the evident linguistic imperfection.

---

[1] *Sticky information* – in management, it means information is expensive to be purchased, "glued" to a place, difficult to transfer and apply in a new location. Eric von Hippel argues that in certain circumstances, innovation will be the work of end users, and not experts (von Hippel, 1994).

This integrity in the qualitative pedagogical research can contribute to the greater authenticity of the cognitive process, which at the same time has the power to indicate, and at a later step to implement the pedagogical implications for co-existence and co-operation of research subjects[2]. This is because the participant of the research is involved in all steps of the research process, which allows enhancing greater creativity (not so much of the researcher, as the research). Creative research constitutes a synergy of the researcher's and respondent's creativity. The word synergy means joint action (from Greek *sin* – common and *ergos* – action). It forms the "added value" that is not created explicitly, but is revealed as an additional element of interaction or cooperation of two or more distinguished factors (Walulik, 2018). The researcher should pay attention to possible disorders and distortions of data co-generated by respondents, which may be object to different process e.g. cognitive automatism (Lazaric, 2012), tendentious information processing (Schultze et al., 2012) or totalitarian ego (Greenwald, 1980).

The term *creative research* in Polish methodological literature does not seem to be too popular, although the idea has been emphasized by Dariusz Kubinowski (2010). Meanwhile, in English-language literature, it was published in a textbook study: *Creative research: the theory and practice of research for the creative industries* (Collins, 2018). Hilary Collins emphasizes that creative research requires a new, interdisciplinary and non-linear, but circular view of the research process. Due to the user-oriented character of the design process, it is possible to adopt an inclusive rather than exclusive approach to the creative research process in a way that is invaluable as a method of research focused on individuals (Collins, 2018). *Person-sensitive methodology* (Ciechowska & Walulik, 2018) emphasizes the person as a research centre – its well-being, its development thanks to research, but also *through* research – such research can be referred to as "research that creates".

What can be created by research? Looking through the prism of earlier considerations, it seems that any element of research and phenomena in which it is conducted can be created. Of course, there is no way to create something from scratch, but thanks to a different view of the research subjects and the possibilities offered by the qualitative research methodology, we can create a new quality of research relationships and then personal relations (especially

---

[2] The authenticity lies on i.a. on researching what's most important according to respondents, on designing the research cooperatively without the risk of using respondents as „information providers", on opportunity to help and giving them a voice in a report.

when the researcher remains in the studied environment), new teaching quality (particularly, thanks to the teacher action research), new quality of cooperation with a student, a parent, other teachers or other research subjects. During the research, the researcher is never static. Especially, in terms of personality traits, which in the course of the relationship, on which the qualitative research is based, may be object to change. Such relationships, can have an interpersonal aspect – the most common and involving contacts with other people, but the second aspect is intra-personal, which runs inside a person and can affect his/her perception of phenomenon and himself/herself in relations with others (Ciechowska et al., 2019). It is a kind of self-creation – it allows noticing from a perspective and internalizing the current history of life, worldview, values or tastes shaped in your life. Acceptance of self, as is the case here, but also the desire to change, to dynamize one's own way leads to constructive creation of one's own *self.* A special role in this process is played by autoethnography, but also other methods that provide space for mutual co-creation of research subjects – thanks to the meeting of a researcher and a respondent, their mutual attitude, contacts marked by an understanding attitude.

Research that creates (e.g. action research) is changing environment. This is unacceptable in the quantitive strategy (the exception is a variation of the experimental scheme, in which the impact of a given factor is examined). Meanwhile, qualitative research, especially carried out in the paradigm of activism, critical theory, or subject-participatory theory, is carried out not only to learn about the phenomena, but its second goal, which derives from the adopted philosophical worldview (Creswell, 2014) of phenomenon, is the change – change of narrative, change of perception, etc.

The mere *writing* of a report on qualitative research carries with it a change through *how* and *what* language is used – "the individual constructs its identity and subjectivity through language. Perceiving language as constructing discourses – ways of giving meaning to organizing the world – makes it an area of struggle and exploration" (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005, p. 964). One of the ways showing the possibility of combining creation and research analysis is the CAP ethnography (the acronym from c*reative analytical practices)*, i.e. research taking into account the author's individual situation (e.g. in autoethnographic or traditional ethnographic text) and passing it to the readers. "Thanks to the use of CAP, ethnographers learn a lot about problems and about themselves, which was impossible and unimaginable when they acted in accordance with conventional analytical procedures" (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005, p. 964).

Research that creates can also affect the space in which it is conducted, especially when these are very difficult conditions, in which it is impossible to separate research from helping and striving to change conditions or the issue of help is included in the research program (Bunch et al., 2005). The foundations of many studies include the creation and coexistence of subjects of research or the surrounding space as in the case of the post-colonial-autochthonic paradigm (but also, e.g., in a critical theory), which "assumes the synergy of learning and changing social phenomena. Thus, the research is at the same time an impulse for a positive change, understood as strengthening the subjectivity and indigenous social identity in the context of the new post-colonial order, but taking into account the current global cultural situation and the inevitable civilizational changes (Kubinowski, 2015, p. 202).

Creative research and research that creates as a space for co-existence and co-operation of research subjects – practical implications

This study does not exhaust the topic, but it only indicates how research that creates can contribute to changes in the phenomena and how it can be used. An example may be the world closest to the pedagogues – the reality of a student and a teacher.

A student feels appreciated, important through inclusion in the research process and subjective treatment; he/she knows that their opinion matters and influences the change of shaping the sense of acting and raising self-esteem, which is particularly evident in the case of teacher action research. In addition, also including him/her into the process of analysis and interpretation teaches them responsibility for their own behaviour – the student sees that their actions and words remain and have a meaning. Co-existence and co-creation with the teacher, which take place in a qualitative research process, give the student the feeling that they can count on the teacher. It supports his/her openness and courage towards the researcher – pedagogue.

In turn, the teacher tries seeing the student not only as the subject of his own didactic and pedagogical interactions, but also as a research object. Never as an area of research! He/she should always be treated as an equal participant in the studied phenomena. Here, the teacher learns to be with the student, to listen and open to non-specific signals relevant to the research process (in accordance with the principle of emergence). He acts with tolerance towards the student's individual identity. In addition, he gains new opportunities to revise

his own research practice, conducted taking into account the student, for the student, but also for himself, which takes place primarily thanks to autoethnographic research. Personal qualities of a qualitative researcher – teacher – (such as openness, empathy, respect, innovation, readiness to change) harmonize with the desirable characteristics of a pedagogue sensitive to the well-being of a child in the process of learning about social phenomena.

The teacher (researcher) should remember about difficulties coming from co-existence and co-creation implementation to a research process. Furthermore, he/she should take into consideration the distortions mentioned above, that can take place while generating data by the respondents. Another thing worth emphasizing is that the subjects taking part in the research can have different feelings and emotions. Moreover, the contacts between the research subjects feature with the continuum of social relations. One should notice that the extreme aspects of these relations can't help achieving research success. They include: exclusion of excessive confidentiality, and even too intimate relationship (Lofland et al., 2006). Difficulties can happen during research that can last too long in accordance with the necessery focus on individual ideas of respondent and *sharing power in relations* resulting from democratizing the research process (Karanieli-Miller et al., 2008) through implementation of co-existence and co-creation aspects.

It seems, though, that the awareness of such difficulties can help to avoid them create opportunities for implementation of co-existence and co-creation in the research process, and enrich it on all its stages.

The above considerations have brought me to the conclusion that qualitative research as a specific form of meeting and dialogue, conducted in a specific methodological framework (mentioned elements of qualitative research such as features of qualitative research, paradigm or some methods) lead to a new quality of relationship between the student and the teacher, building a specific familiarity on a different, new line – researcher-respondent.

Summary

People get involved in qualitative research for a variety of reasons. Tom Clark indicates that motivation at the individual level includes subjective, introspective and therapeutic interest, joy, curiosity, social comparison, economic significance and material interest. On the other hand, at the collective level, the motivation concerns representation, strengthening the political position and informing about "change" (Clark, 2010). In the light of the above considerations,

co-existence and co-creation fit into the individual motivation, which is the desire to get to know oneself and the possible change of one's personality and to experience such research as an adventure that brings joy and arouses curiosity.

Research that creates seems to be part of the future of qualitative research that Yvonna S. Lincoln and Norman K. Denzin foresee for it. They write that social research should show an interventionist character. In addition, they predict that "in the ninth phase, the world of methods will enter the period called the *breakthrough future,* in which – if there is no intervention, currently difficult to imagine – methodologists will find themselves on two opposite sides of great division. Random attempts presented as the "golden standard" in social research will occupy time of one group of researchers, while conducting socially and culturally sensitive, community-oriented research focused on supporting social justice will concern the minds of the second group (Lincoln & Denzin, 2005, p. 1125). Research that creates is research sensitive culturally, socially, in terms of identity. It does not aim to create a new world, in accordance with any rules, but it helps to create oneself and co-creation of others for what they have always wanted to be – aware of themselves, their own limitations and capabilities in changing themselves and the world.

References

Almirall, E., & Wareham, J. (2008). Living Labs and open innovation: roles and applicability. *The Electronic Journal for Virtual Organizations and Networks,* 10, 21–46,

Beutel, T., Jonas, J.M., & Moeslein, K.M. (2017). Co-creation and User Involvement in a Living Lab: An Evaluation of Applied Methods in Leimeister. In: J.M. Brenner (Ed.), *Proceedings der 13 Internationalen Tagung Wirtschaftsinformatik* (pp. 1453–1464). St. Gallen.

Branicki, W. (2009). *Tożsamość a wirtualność* [*Identity and Virtuality*]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo NOMOS.

Bunch, M.J., Franklin, B., Morley, D., Vasantha Kumaran, T., & Madha Suresh, V. (2005). Research in Turbulent Environments: Slums in Chennai, India and the Impact of the December 2004 Tsunami on an Ecohealth Project. *EcoHealth*, 2(2), 150–154.

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Chenail, R.J. (2011). Ten Steps for Conceptualizing and Conducting Qualitative Research Studies in a Pragmatically Curious Manner. *The Qualitative Report*, 16(6), 1715–1732.

Chilisa, B. (2012). *Indigenous Research Methodologies*. Los Angeles – London – New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Cichocki, P., Jędrkiewicz, T., & Zydel, R. (2012). Etnografia wirtualna [Virtual Etnography]. In: D. Jemielniak (Ed.), *Badania jakościowe* [*Qualitative Research*], v. 2, (pp. 203–220). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Ciechowska, M. (2018a). Autoetnografia w badaniach pedagogicznych [Autoethnography in Pedagogical Research]. In: M. Ciechowska, & M. Szymańska, *Wybrane metody jakościowe w badaniach pedagogicznych* [Selected Methods in Qualitative Pedagogical Research], (pp. 197–226). Kraków: Wydawnictwo AIK.

Ciechowska, M. (2018b). Etyczne aspekty jakościowych badań pedagogicznych [Ethical Aspect in Qualitative Pedagogical Research]. In: M. Ciechowska, & M. Szymańska, *Wybrane metody jakościowe w badaniach pedagogicznych* [Selected Methods in Qualitative Pedagogical Research], (pp. 66–79). Kraków: Wydawnictwo AIK.

Ciechowska, M. (2018c). Konstytutywne cechy badań jakościowych [Constitutive Features of Qualitative Research]. In: M. Ciechowska, & M. Szymańska, *Wybrane metody jakościowe w badaniach pedagogicznych* [Selected Qualitative Methods in Pedagogical Research], (pp. 51–65). Kraków: Wydawnictwo AIK.

Ciechowska, M., Kusztal, J., & Szymańska, M. (2019). Autoethnography in Intrapersonal and Intra-active Training of Pedagogues. Selected Aspect and Possibility of Using. *Przegląd Badań Edukacyjnych*, 28(1), 177–192, doi: 10.12775/PBE.2019.010.

Ciechowska, M., & Walulik, A. (2018). Integral Upbringing in the Perspective of Pedagogical Qualitative Research. *Paedagogia Christiana*, 2(42), 87–100, doi: 10.12775/PCh.2018.017.

Clark, T. (2010). On 'Being Researched': Why do People Engage with Qualitative Research? *Qualitative Research*, 10(4), 399–419, doi: 10.1177/1468794110366796.

Collins, H. (2018). *Creative research: the theory and practice of research for the creative industries,* 2th ed. London, New York, Oxford, New Delhi, Sydney: Bloomsbury Visual Arts.

Creswell J.W. (2014). *Research design. Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches,* 4th ed. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: SAGE Publications.

Czarnik, T. (1995). Podstawowe znaczenia terminu samorealizacja [Basic Meanings of the Term Self-realization]. In: J. Pawlica (Ed.), *Autokreacja człowieka – między wolnością a zniewoleniem. Materiały VI Jagiellońskiego Sympozjum Etycznego, 5–6 czerwca 1995* [Human Autocreation – Between Freedom and Slavery. Materials of the Sixth Jagiellonian Ethical Symposium, June 5–6, 1995], (pp.25–28). Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ.

Dymara, B. (2014). Źródła, cechy i perspektywy pedagogiki współbycia [Sources, Pedagogy of Intercourse Pedagogy]. In: U. Szuścik, & B. Oelszlaeger-Kosturek (Eds.), *Dziecko w świecie innowacyjnej edukacji, współdziałania i wartości* [A Child in the World of Innovative Education, Cooperation and Values], v. 1 (pp.29–47). Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Eriksson, M., Niitamo, V.-P., & Kulkki, S. (2005). *State-of-the-Art in Utilizing Living Labs Approach to User-centric ICT Innovation – a European Approach*. Lulea: Centre for Distance-Spanning Technology at Luleå University of Technology.

Fiore, A., Mainetti, L., Manco, L., & Marra, P. (2014). Augmented Reality for Allowing Time Navigation in Cultural Tourism Experience: A Case Study. *Augmented and Virtual Reality*, 8853, (Lecture Notes in Computer Science), 296–301, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-13969-2_22.

Garvin, R. (2010). Responses to the Linguistic Landscape in Memphis, Tennessee: An Arban Apace in Transition. In: E. Shohamy, E. Ben-Rafael, & M. Barni (Eds.), *Linguistic Landscape in the City* (pp. 252–271). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Greenwald, A.G. (1980). The Totalitarian Ego. Fabrication and Revision of Personal Story. *American Psychologist*, 35(7), 603–618.

Guba, E. (1990). The Alternative Paradigm Dialog. In: E. Guba (Ed.), *The Paradigm Dialog* (pp.17–27). Newbury Park: International Educational and Professional Publisher Sage.

Hatch, J.A. (Ed.) (1995). *Qualitative Research in Early School Settings*. Westport, Connecticut, London: PRAGER.

Jagieła, J. (2015). *Słownik terminów i pojęć badań jakościowych nad edukacją* [*Dictionary of Terms and Concepts of Qualitative Research on Education*]. Częstochowa: Wydawnictwo im. S. Podobińskiego Akademii im. Jana Długosza.

Jarvie, K.W. (2012). Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education and Care Implementation. *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy*, 2(6), 35–43.

Jaspersen, K.R. (2010). User-involvement and Open Innovation: the Case of Decision-Maker Openness. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 14, 471–489, doi: 10.1142/S136391961000274X.

Jaśtal, J. (1995). O złudzeniach samorozwoju [About Self-development Delusions]. In: J. Pawlica (Ed.), *Autokreacja człowieka – między wolnością a zniewoleniem. Materiały VI Jagiellońskiego Sympozjum Etycznego, 5–6 czerwca 1995* [Human Autocreation – Between Freedom and Slavery. Materials of the Sixth Jagiellonian Ethical Symposium, June 5–6, 1995], (pp.33–39). Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ.

Jodłowska, B. (2012). *Pedagogika sokratejska* [*Socratic Pedagogy*]. Kraków: Impuls.

Karanieli-Miller, O., Sterier, R., & Pessach, L. (2008). Power Relations in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(2), 279–289, doi: 10.1177/1049732308329306.

Khun, T.S. (2001). *Struktura rewolucji naukowych* [*Structure of Scientific Revolutions*]. Warszawa: Fundacja Aletheia.

Khun, T.S. (2003). *Droga po strukturze. Eseje filozoficzne z lat 1970–1993 i wywiad – rzeka z autorem słynnej „Struktury rewolucji naukowych"* [*Structure Route. Philosophical Essays from 1970–1993 and Interview – River with the Author of the Famous „Structures of Scientific Revolutions"*]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sic!

Komisja do spraw etyki w nauce [The Code of Ethics for Research Workers]. (2017). Retrieved 09 November 2019 from https://instytucja.pan.pl/index.php/kodeks-etyki-pracownika-naukowego.

Kopińska, V. (2012). Pojęcie wolności i jego teoretyczne konotacje [The Use of the Term "Freedom" and its Theoretical Connotations]. *Kultura – Społeczeństwo – Edukacja,* 1, 121–139.

Krzyworzeka, A., & Krzyworzeka, P. (2012). Etnografia w badaniu wiedzy ukrytej [Ethnography in the Study of Hidden Knowledge]. *E-mentor*, 1(43). Retrieved 9 November 2019 from http://www.e-mentor.edu.pl/artykul/index/numer/43/id/906.

Kubinowski, D. (2010). *Jakościowe badania pedagogiczne. Filozofia-Metodyka-Ewaluacja* [*Qualitative Pedagogical Research. Philosophy-Methodology-Evaluation*]. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Kubinowski, D. (2013). *Idiomatyczność, synergia, emergencja. Rozwój badań jakościowych w pedagogice polskiej na przełomie XX i XXI wieku* [*Idiomaticity, Synergy, Emergence. The Development of Qualitative Research in Polish Pedagogy at the Turn of the 20th and 21st Centuries*]. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Makmed.

Kubinowski, D. (2015). Postkolonialno-autochtoniczny paradygmat badań społecznych nad wielokulturowością w perspektywie pedagogicznej [Postcolonial Indigenous Paradigm of Social Research on Multiculturality in a Pedagogical Perspective]. *Pogranicze. Studia Społeczne*, XXV, 197–208.

Kubinowski, D. (2017). Możliwości zastosowania społecznych badań internetowych w konstruowaniu wiedzy pedagogicznej [Possibilities of Using Social Internet Research in Constructing Educational Knowledge]. *Przegląd Badań Edukacyjnych,* 2(25), 333–343, doi: 10.12775/PBE.2017.033.

Kubinowski, D. (2018). Badanie jakościowe jako poznanie idiomatyczne [Qualitative Research as Idiomatic Knowledge]. *Jakościowe Badania Pedagogiczne*, II (2), 65–78, doi: 10.18276/jbp.2017.2.2-05.

Lazaric, N. (2012). *Cognitive Automatisms and Routinized Learning*. In: N.M. Seel

(Ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Sciences of Learning*. Boston: Springer (p. 30), doi: 10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6_4049.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Denzin, N.K. (2005). Epilogue: The Eighth and Ninth Moments – Qualitative Research in/and the Fractured Future. In: N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3th ed. (pp. 1115–1126). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (2005). Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences. In: N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3th ed. (pp. 191–216). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Lofland, J., Snow, D., Anderson, L., & Lofland, L.H. (2006). *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thomson.

Macełko, M., & Mendel, I. (2011). Living Lab – koncepcja popytowego podejścia do innowacji [Living Lab – the User Driver Innovation Conception]. *Organizacja i Zarządzanie: Kwartalnik Naukowy*, 2, 111–125.

McKernan, J. (1996). *Curriculum Action Research: A Handbook of Methods and Resources for the Reflective Practitioner*. Abington, Kogan Page.

Nowotniak, J. (2012). *Etnografia wizualna w badaniach i praktyce pedagogicznej* [*Visual Ethnography in Research and Pedagogical Practice*]. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls".

O'Hern, M., & Rindfleisch, A. (2010). Customer Co-Creation. *Review of Marketing Research*, 6, 84–106, doi: 10.1108/S1548-6435(2009)0000006008.

Ostasz, L. (1995). Autokreacja. Współkreacja. Spotkanie [Autocreation. Co-Creation. Meet]. In: J. Pawlica (Ed.), *Autokreacja człowieka – między wolnością a zniewoleniem. Materiały VI Jagiellońskiego Sympozjum Etycznego, 5–6 czerwca 1995* [Human Autocreation – Between Freedom and Slavery. Materials of the Sixth Jagiellonian Ethical Symposium, June 5–6, 1995], (pp. 27–33). Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ.

Pasikowski, S. (2017). Między swoistością a uniwersalnością w metodologii badań pedagogicznych [Between Specificity and Universality in the Methodology of Pedagogical Research]. In: D. Kubinowski, & M. Chutoriański (Eds.), *Pedagogika jako społeczno-humanistyczna nauka stosowana: konsekwencje metodologiczne* [Pedagogy as a Socio-humanist Applied Science: Methodological Consequences], (pp. 69–82). Kraków: Impuls.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Newbury Park–London–New Delhi: SAGE.

Pine, G.J. (2009). *Teacher Action Research. Building Knowledge Democracies*. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: SAGE.

Pink, S. (2008). Mobilising Visual Ethnography: Making Routes, Making Place and Making Images. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 9(3), Retrieved 19 November 2019 from http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1166/2575

Prahalad, C.K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creation Experiences. The Next Practice in Value Creation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18, 5–14, doi: 10.1002/dir.20015.

Richardson, L., & St. Pierre, E.A. (2005). Writing: A Method of Inquiry. In: N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3th ed. (pp. 959––978). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi, SAGE Publications.

Rubacha, K. (2011). *Metodologia badań nad edukacją* [*Methodology of Educational Research*]. Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza Łośgraf.

Schultze, T., Pfeiffer, F., & Schulz-Hardt, S. (2012). Biased Information Processing in the Escalation Paradigm: Information Search and Information Evaluation as Potential Mediators of Escalating Commitment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 97(1), 16–32, doi: 10.1037/a0024739.

Storm-Mathisen, A. (2018). Visual Methods in Ethnographic Fieldwork – On Learning from Participants Through their Video-accounts. *Forum for Development Studies,* 45(2), 261–286, doi: 10.1080/08039410.2018.1450287.

Szabó, P.T. (2015). The Management of Diversity in Schoolscapes: An Analysis of Hungarian Practices. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 9(1), 23–51.

Szmidt, K.J., & Modrzejewska-Świgulska, M. (2014). Walidacja komunikacyjna w procesie analizy badań pedagogicznych [Communicative Validation in Data Analysis in Educational Research]. *Przegląd Badań Edukacyjnych*, 2(19), doi: 10.12775/PBE.2014.031.

Szymańska, M. (2018). Paradygmat podmiotowo-partycypacyjny [Subjective-participatory Paradigm]. In: M. Ciechowska, & M. Szymańska, *Wybrane metody jakościowe w badaniach pedagogicznych* [Selected Qualitative Methods in Pedagogical Research], (pp. 42–50). Kraków: Wydawnictwo AIK.

Szymańska, M., Ciechowska, M., Pieróg, K., & Gołąb, S. (2018). *Badania w działaniu w praktyce pedagogicznej* [*Action Research in Pedagogical Practice*]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo AIK.

Turner, V. (2005). *Od rytuału do teatru: powaga zabawy* [*From Ritual to Theatre: the Seriousness of Fun*]. Warszawa: Volumen.

Usher, R., Bryant, I., & Johnstone, R. (2001). Podmiot poznający w badaniach edukacyjnych [A Learning Entity in Educational Research]. *Teraźniejszość – Człowiek – Edukacja*, 2(14), 7–28.

Von Hippel, E. (1994). 'Sticky Information' and the Locus Problem Solving: Implications form Innovation. *Management Science*, 40(4), 429–439, doi: 10.1287/mnsc.40.4.429.

Walulik, A. (2018). Pedagodzy – młodzi badacze w przestrzeni podmiotowości, partycypacji i synergii [Educators – Young Researchers in the Area of Subjectivity, Participation and Synergy]. In: M. Ciechowska, & M. Szymańska, *Wybrane metody jakościowe w badaniach pedagogicznych* [Selected Methods in Qualitative Pedagogical Research], (pp. 7–18). Kraków: Wydawnictwo AIK.

Wei, S., Ren, G., & O'Neill, E. (2014). *Haptic and Audio Displays for Augmented Reality Tourism Applications*. IEEE Haptics Symposium (HAPTICS). Bath: University of Bath.

Witell, L., Kristensson, P., Gustafsson, A., & Löfgren, M. (2011). Idea generation. Customer co-creation versus traditional market research techniques. *Journal of Service Management*, 22, 140–159, doi: 10.1108/09564231111124190.