CONTEXTS OF OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS IN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDIES

Teaching and Learning Qualitative Methodologies in the Context of Developing Doctoral Education in Lithuania

Audra Skukauskaitė

Saybrook University, Oakland, CA, US,
academicconsulting@yahoo.com

Liudmila Rupšienė

Klaipėda University,
Faculty of Humanities and Education Sciences,
liudarupsiene@rupeksa.com

Abstract. *With the expansion of available research methodologies, particularly those in qualitative research, scholars began examining the various aspects of doctoral programs, including program design, student experiences and research writing. Recently, more researchers also started investigating research learning and teaching within doctoral programs. However, most of the literature on doctoral preparation is derived from the English-speaking world and research learning in non-English speaking countries remains invisible. To address this inequity, in this study, we examine the teaching and learning of qualitative research within a doctoral qualitative research methods class in Lithuania. In the article, we provide a historical context and present analyses from interviews with one doctoral student and two professors who taught the class. The study demonstrates a strong potential of Lithuanian scholars to teach, learn and contribute to qualitative research internationally.*

Keywords: *doctoral education, qualitative research, Lithuanian higher education, ethnographic perspective, research learning, teaching qualitative research.*

Preparing of a new generation of scholars to conduct research is one of the key emphases of doctoral education (Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel & Hutchins 2008). Since the calls to examine researcher preparation (Eisenhart & DeHaan 2005; Pallas 2001; Young 2001), literature on doctoral education has expanded greatly across various disciplines (e.g., Lesko, Simmons, Quarshie & Newton 2008; Millett & Nettles 2006; Roulston, Preissle & Freeman 2013). However, this literature on doctoral education tends to come mostly from English-speaking countries. In an article published in the *International Journal of Doctoral Studies,* Jones (2013) reviewed forty

years' worth of publications on doctoral preparation and estimated that 64.52% of the 995 papers he reviewed came from the US, 11.66% from Australia, 9.65% from the UK, 2.91% from Canada, with other countries constituting 11.26% of publications. The underrepresentation of non-English countries in doctoral education literature creates an incomplete and skewed picture about preparation of researchers globally. The international academic community may benefit from looking at research on doctoral preparation conducted in non-English speaking countries. This research could contribute new understandings about the processes and contextual factors that support and constrain the preparation of researchers in doctoral programs locally and internationally.

The preparation of scholars centers around research learning (Walker et al. 2008), which, to a large extent, is dependent on teaching. However, Jones's (2013) review makes visible that literature on doctoral teaching-learning processes is scarce. The majority of the literature on doctoral preparation Jones reviewed focused on *doctoral program design* (29%) and *doctoral student experience* (26%), with the rest of the articles addressing *student-supervisor relationships* (15%), *writing and research* (14%) and *employment* (13%) issues. The articles he reviewed under the 14% *writing and research* category focused on the pressure to write and publish more and better-quality work and to engage in collaborative scholarship. In the 3% of the studies on *teaching*, the focus was on student opportunities to teach in preparation for academic careers. Jones' synthesis did not address the teaching in

doctoral programs or the ways professors prepare doctoral students for methodological and epistemological diversity. This review made visible that despite a growing body of literature on doctoral education, there is still limited scholarship on how doctoral students learn to become researchers and how they are taught in doctoral programs. To develop a better understanding of how doctoral students learn to become scholars responsive to their local and global communities, more research on doctoral student learning, in the context of teaching, is needed.

Given that learning of research is one of the emphases in doctoral education, it would be prudent to examine how doctoral students develop understandings of the diverse epistemological and methodological research traditions, particularly those of qualitative research. In the 20th century, positivism and post-positivism took root not only in the physical and life sciences but also in the social sciences, including education, sociology and psychology. Worldwide, but particularly in the US and the UK, scholars have responded to the dominance of positivism by developing new, more humanistic approaches to research. Knowledge and practices of qualitative research grew at a rapid pace since the late 19th to early 20th centuries, got suppressed by positivism for a while, but continued developing again since the 1960s. The increasing popularity and diversity of qualitative approaches offered scholars, as well as practitioners, opportunities to examine the complex social worlds in a variety of ways.

While developments in the "quantitative" research have been more stable and

gradual over the past century, "qualitative" research approaches have expanded exponentially and keep growing, along with continuing debates and discussions about the new methodologies. This unceasing growth, debates and the expansion of qualitative perspectives has become a challenge in doctoral education. To prepare scholars to conduct qualitative research, not only students but also their professors have to read, learn and select from a vast amount of information. In countries such as the US, UK, Australia, Canada and other nations with strong academic traditions and libraries, researchers usually have good access not only to scholarly databases but also to qualitative research communities and conferences. Moreover, faculty who teach qualitative research often have received training and/or have seen the developments of the qualitative fields firsthand. These experiences and access to resources enable the professors and their students to meet the challenges of teaching and learning the diverse epistemological foundations and methodological approaches of qualitative research.

The situation of learning qualitative research is more complex in developing and non-English speaking countries. In countries where access to international methodological literature was limited due to political and economic constraints, the exposure to new possibilities presents new challenges of finding, selecting and learning from the extensive information that has been generated worldwide. Scholars from such countries often struggle with entering, contributing and integrating into the worldwide scholarly community. Yet, their histories, challenges and pathways to pre-

pare qualitative researchers often remain invisible.

Building on the arguments presented above, in this paper, we examine the accounts of the doctoral faculty and students about the teaching and learning of qualitative research. We focus on student and professor practices in learning qualitative research in a doctoral course on qualitative research methodologies. Our research participants are doctoral students and professors in Lithuania. Lithuania is one of the non-English countries whose experiences in preparing researchers in doctoral programs is rarely examined or presented to the international research community. Given Lithuania's history of Soviet occupation and limited access to international literature and communities, studying teaching and learning of qualitative research in Lithuanian doctoral programs presents an opportunity to understand the challenges and contextual factors that support or constrain the preparation of scholars. A study of the doctoral preparation of scholars in Lithuania enables us to examine what became possible to teach, learn, and do in the area of qualitative research when access to international literature and opportunities for international scholarly participation opened up in the past three decades since Lithuania regained independence in 1990.

In this article, we first present the context for teaching and learning qualitative research in Lithuania and then provide a brief overview of our larger program of research on which this study is based. In the third section, we analyze opportunities for learning qualitative research in the context of tasks designed for a qualitative research methods course. In the discussion, we pro-

vide an overview of student and professor practices that made possible the learning of qualitative research in a doctoral course. We end the paper by making visible the importance of context and history in understanding teaching and learning in doctoral education.

Historical Contexts for the Doctoral Preparation of Researchers in Lithuania

Research teaching and learning in doctoral programs has a long history that began with the establishment of universities in Paris and Bologna in the 11th century and the preparation of doctoral scholars at those universities (Kurtz-Costes, Helmke & Ulku-Steiner 2006). The first university in Lithuania, Vilnius University, was established in 1579 (Bumblauskas, Butkevičienė, Jegelevičius, Manusadžianas, Pšibilskis, Raila & Vitkauskaitė 2004), while the second university, Vytautas Magnus University (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas), opened its doors in Kaunas in 1922 (Janužytė 2013). After 1950, only Vilnius University had remained (Zulumskytė 2014). However, other institutions of higher education, as well as certain research centers, started appearing since the 1930s, e.g., Kaunas Vytautas Magnus Military College, Klaipėda Trade Institute, the State Pedagogical Institute and others (Janužytė 2013). After regaining independence, Lithuania witnessed the so-called "universitatization" (*universitetizavimas*), when former non-university institutes of higher learning transformed into universities (Želvys 2005). At this time, Lithuania has 14 state universities (www.lamabpo.lt/turinys/aukstosios-mokyklos/universitetai), though, in the past few years, there have been persistent efforts to reduce this number.

Since their founding, the Vilnius and Vytautas Magnus universities have prepared doctoral research scholars (Bumblauskas et al. 2004). However, after Lithuania lost its statehood in 1940 and the Soviet model of science and studies was imposed, the internationally common model of doctoral education was replaced. Instead, the Soviet model included two levels of degrees: the lower, candidate level and the higher, doctoral level. The latter was given for significant scientific contributions (Zickel 1989) and is not directly comparable to the Western model of the doctoral degree.

Doctoral education in Lithuania has deep roots and varied experiences that laid the foundation for current opportunities to research teaching and learning. The newest phase of doctoral education in Lithuania began after Lithuania regained independence in 1990. The 1991 Lithuanian Republic Law of Science and Studies *(Lietuvos Respublikos mokslo ir studijų įstatymas)* already created a new doctoral education model, which continued changing so as to address the European Union's higher education policies as well as the Lithuanian opportunities to implement those policies. However, despite the changes, since the beginning, doctoral programs were tasked with preparing scholars who would be able to conduct research studies – researchers, in other words.

In accordance with the policies governing doctoral studies, the Lithuanian Research Council carries the responsibility to approve, monitor, control and evaluate

doctoral programs. However, no document governing doctoral education provides detailed guidelines for teaching and learning of research. The newest Provisions for the Research Doctorate (*Mokslo doktorantūros nuostatai* 2017) recommend that doctoral studies contain at least three study subjects and that doctoral supervisors guide student studies and research. As a result, universities with doctoral programs have had extensive freedom in planning how to prepare students for research. Doctoral supervisors carry the greatest responsibility for teaching their students how to conduct research. However, it is not clear how this preparation takes place, as there are no guidelines for how supervisors are to teach their students or how the students are to learn from their supervisors.

Moreover, there are no regulations relating to research methodologies, but universities have the right to introduce compulsory and elective research classes. For example, a joint PhD program in Education, run by a consortium of four universities (the Vilnius, Vytautas Magnus, Klaipėda and Mykolas Romeris universities), requires one 5-credit course in "Research Methodology in the Social Sciences" and two elective 5-credit courses in "Qualitative Research Methodology in the Education Sciences" and "Quantitative Research Methodology in the Education Sciences" (http://www.edukologijos-doktorantura.lt/). Other universities and programs of studies offer other solutions. For example, in the second PhD program in education (jointly offered by the Lithuanian University of Education Sciences, as well as the Kaunas Technological, Šiauliai and Lithuanian Sports universities), all ed-ucation doctoral students take an 8-credit course in "Epistemology of Education Sciences and Research Methodology." The course is taught by two professors, one of whom has expertise in quantitative and the other in qualitative research. Lithuanian universities that include methodology courses provide opportunities similar to most international universities, which include at least one research course in their doctoral programs, with many, particularly research universities in the US, offering two or more courses that introduce students to varied research approaches and epistemologies often labeled as qualitative and quantitative. However, not all universities and not all doctoral programs in Lithuania offer such opportunities.

While researcher preparation in Lithuanian doctoral education is formally comparable to that of other countries known for scholarly achievement, there are deeper contextual factors that impact research and qualitative research teaching and learning in Lithuanian universities. These contextual factors relate to the growth of research methodology internationally during the time when Lithuania, along with the other former republics of the Soviet Union, was separated from the rest of the world for 50 years (1940–1990). Researcher visits to or from the Soviet Union were nearly impossible; few researchers knew English or other foreign languages, which prevented idea migration. Scientific literature published outside the Soviet Union was available only in select central libraries and this literature was limited in scope. Some books were translated into Russian, which became a required language for all Lithuanian researchers. While the Russian books offered

some new scientific information, the general isolation from the worldwide research community significantly impacted the quality of research publications in Lithuania. Because Lithuanian scholars had no access to current and relevant international literature, many researchers wrote dissertations without referencing the newest knowledge or developments in their fields.

The situation continued even after the Soviet collapse and Lithuanian independence. While international borders opened quickly, access to international research knowledge has been very slow. To this day, Lithuanian scholars can only dream about the access to databases that is available for university professors and students in the US or about receiving the funding for research studies and conferences comparable to that of their colleagues in other more developed nations. This situation signals that Lithuanian researchers, especially those in education and other social sciences, have not yet overcome their scientific isolation and do not have equitable access to international scientific resources, including resources about research methodology.

Despite the historical and economic challenges, Lithuania has continued to prepare doctoral scholars for research. Until about a decade ago, most social science and education researchers relied on quantitative methodologies. Knowledge of quantitative methodologies was available from translated textbooks on statistics (Kendall 1960) and multivariate statistical analysis (Anderson 1963), translated into Russian as well through the efforts of a Lithuanian mathematician and educator Bronislavas Bitinas. Bitinas's book on *Multivariate Analysis in Pedagogy and Psychology*,

published in Russian in 1971, became the most influential research methodology guide. His subsequent work, the development of a statistical analysis program, and his mentoring of multiple generations of researchers established a post-positivist research tradition that was also represented in other research methodology textbooks, such as those by Kardelis (1997; 2002) and Tidikis (2003).

While the teaching and learning of quantitative methodologies in Lithuanian doctoral education had a strong foundation, qualitative research was mostly unknown. Methodological literature on qualitative and ethnographic research developed over the past six decades mostly in the US and UK (Gobo 2005; Skukauskaite, Rangel, Rodriguez & Ramon 2015). For decades, international scholars have had access to a multitude of approaches, each with their own histories, traditions, disciplinary bases, research practices and networks of researchers. A 50-year scientific isolation, as well as a long-standing positivistic view of science, prevented Lithuanian scholars from accessing and learning about qualitative research approaches. The first Lithuanian textbook on qualitative research was published in 2008 (Bitinas, Rupšienė, Žydžiūnaitė), with a few texts on qualitative research practices such as collecting qualitative data (Rupšienė 2007) and interviewing (Girdzijauskienė 2006) appearing a few years earlier. Some doctoral programs started offering courses on qualitative research methodologies and students began writing qualitative doctoral dissertations. However, given the historical context and the fact that many professors currently responsible for teaching

and supervising student research hadn't had any opportunities to learn qualitative research themselves, we designed a program of research that examines the teaching and learning of qualitative research in Lithuania. We seek to understand what opportunities and constrains students and faculty encounter as they teach and learn qualitative research in Lithuania. For this paper, we have chosen to focus on doctoral student learning in a Qualitative Research Methodologies in Education class.

Research design

This paper is part of a larger program of research in which we explore student and faculty perspectives as well as contexts for teaching and learning research in Lithuania. The program of research focuses on the learning of qualitative and ethnographic research, though it also embraces participant choice to describe their learning experiences more generally. Open-ended interview conversations are the primary data collection method, with document analyses, formal and informal observations, participant reflexive accounts and other sources of information providing contextual and contrastive resources for multilayered analysis.

This program of research adopts an interactional ethnographic perspective in order to explore participant discourses, sociocultural and historical contexts and other information from multiple points of view within a participant-focused cultural relevance framework. In designing, conducting and analyzing records for this study, we draw on four principles of the interactional ethnographic perspective (Green,

Skukauskaite & Baker 2012) to locate participant perspectives within the temporal, social, political and international contexts that participants mark as relevant (Bloome & Egan-Robertson 1993) through their discursive choices in research interactions. The principle of *nonlinearity* of ethnography enables us to focus on particular rich points (Agar 2006), which serve as anchors for uncovering layers of information inscribed within and beyond the interview-conversation. The principle of *leaving aside ethnocentrism* guides our focus on participant emic perspectives, requiring us to be reflexive on the one hand and participant-focused on the other. The principle of *identifying boundaries* enables us to follow participant discourse to identify boundaries of events, ideas and/or activities they mark as important. The principle of *making connections* guides our analyses within and across interviews to uncover common and diverging aspects of qualitative research teaching and learning; this principle also guides our search for documentary and other evidence to explore relationships between participant discourse and broader sociohistorical contexts.

Research participants include Lithuanian faculty and graduate students who have engaged in teaching, learning and/or doing qualitative research. Our focus rests on scholars in education and the social sciences. To date, we have conducted sixteen conversational interviews that lasted from 50 minutes to 2 hours, with 75 minutes being the average length. All interviews were recorded on a digital audio recorder, which allowed microphone sensitivity adjustments depending on the ambient noise in the interview setting. Participants se-

lected the interview locations; the settings included cafes, university hallways or offices and participant homes.

Participants came from different universities across Lithuania. Given the small size of the country and the established networks of professors and doctoral scholars across universities, we started by interviewing professors and students we already knew. We also recruited potential participants at the end of the qualitative research seminars that Skukauskaitė conducted in Lithuania in 2016 and 2017. Rupšienė used her networks as a professor and leader in doctoral consortia to identify and recruit potential participants for the study. Because Rupšienė is one of the primary leaders in qualitative methodology in Lithuania, she was also a participant in this study. In addition to identifying the participants through personal connections and research networks, we also had a number of doctoral students and faculty approach us expressing their desire to participate in the study.

To uncover opportunities for learning and teaching qualitative research within the context of a qualitative research methods class, for this paper, we selected one interview with a doctoral student we will call Daiva. We also interviewed both professors Daiva had referenced in her interview but for the paper, we largely draw on Daiva's accounts of her learning. We selected this particular interview as a representative case, because what Daiva shared about her experiences of learning qualitative research was representative of the accounts of other doctoral students who have taken a qualitative research methods class recently within the doctoral program in education run by a consortium of universities. The faculty, stu-

dents and recent graduates who had completed their programs at an earlier time or with different professors did not have the same opportunities; their perspectives are beyond the scope of this article and will be explored in future publications.

Learning Qualitative Research Within the Context of a Qualitative Research Methods Course

When doctoral students talked about their experiences of learning qualitative research in the doctoral program, they emphasized the opportunities to learn specific qualitative research "strategies" and develop practical skills. The term "strategies" is widely used in Lithuania to refer to qualitative research approaches/methodologies. It comes from Creswell's (2009) book on Research Design, widely used in the Lithuanian doctoral programs. We first explore practices the student and professor construct in the processes of learning the qualitative research "strategies." We then explore opportunities for learning qualitative research through engaging in practical activities of data collection and reflection.

Learning Qualitative Research by Developing Understandings of a Chosen Research Approach

The processes of teaching and learning a particular qualitative research approach (a strategy, in participant terms) involve classroom assignments and interactions that help students develop a deeper understanding of the strategy they might use for their dissertation. Our student interviewee's, Daiva's, account of this teaching-

Table No. 1. *Interview excerpts about learning phenomenology in the context of a doctoral Qualitative Research Methodologies course.*

Line	Interview excerpt	English translation	Focal information on ways of learning qualitative research methodology
1.	*mes turime fenomenologiją, tai mes pirmiausia susipažįstame, kas tai per strategija, kada ji naudojama*	if we study phenomenology, we first learn what kind of strategy it is and when it is used,	Beginning learning of a specific qualitative methodology through an overview
2.	*tada bandome bandome analizuoti kažkokį tekstą, arba filmą*	then we try to analyze some text or a film	Learning through analysis
3.	*mes žiūrėjome filmą ... ir mums reikėjo parašyti refleksiją*	we watched a film... and we had to write a reflection	Learning through reflecting
4.	*... taip pat mes turėjome pasirinkti vieną iš strategijų, kurią naudosime, jeigu kokybinio tyrimo strategiją pasirenkame savo disertacijoje*	we also had to choose one of the strategies we aare going to use if we choose qualitative research for our dissertations	Choosing a relevant approach
5.	*tai turėjome tokią apžvalgą padaryti iš įvairių literatūros šaltinių*	so, we had to create an overview using varied sources of literature	Conducting a review
6.	*apie 20 literatūros šaltinių apie tą strategiją*	about 20 sources about that particular strategy	Using 20 sources of literature
7.	*kad mes turėtume supratimą*	so, we would develop an understanding	Keeping understanding as the goal
8.	*ir visiškai nesinaudojant lietuviška literatūra, ir tiktai angliška ir kitom kalbom parašyta literatūra*	and we could not use Lithuanian literature, only literature written in English or other languages	Using literature in English or other languages, not Lithuanian
9.	*ir tai buvo mums tikrai nemažas darbas*	and that was quite a big task for us	Understanding the scope of work
10.	*reikalavimas, buvo berods tikrai nemažai žodžių*	the requirement, it seems, was quite a lot of words	Meeting requirements
11.	*kad ten išėjo apie 20 puslapių*	that it made about 20 pages	Developing 20 pages
12.	*nu jau toks normalus darbas ...*	a substantial piece of work	Creating a substantial piece of work
13.	*grynai, kad mes patys turėtumėm supratimą, kad mes patys išsiaiškintumėm*	purely for us to develop an understanding, that we ourselves would investigate	Maintaining the goal of understanding in order to introduce others
14.	*ir paskui kitiems turėjome pristatyti*	and then would be able to introduce it to others	Learning through presenting
15.	*ir tada dar dėstytoja duodavo savo feedback ...*	and then the professor provided feedback	Receiving feedback from the teacher

learning process in class is represented in Table No. 1. In the table, we provide excerpts from the interview in the original Lithuanian language, a gisted English translation and analytic notes that help us explore the processes involved in learning qualitative methodology within a qualitative research methods class. Line numbers represent information units developed based on the message-unit transcript and interview analysis system (Green & Wallat 1981; Skukauskaite 2006; 2014).

In describing the processes of learning qualitative research within the context of a doctoral qualitative research methods class, Daiva makes visible the opportunities for learning created within the class. First, a particular approach, in this example – phenomenology, is introduced by the professor, who provides an overview of "what kind of strategy it is and when it is used" (line 1). Then, the students engage in analyzing a sample text or film (2) and writing a reflection (3). This account makes visible three layers of knowledge on which the professor draws in guiding student learning of qualitative research. Knowledge constructed from texts, examples, and reflections forms the foundation for developing the practices a qualitative researcher needs to develop to acquire an understanding of an approach, to "try it out" through analytic processes and to reflect on the learning processes and the role of the researcher.

In lines 4-8, Daiva demonstrates how the logic of inquiry, introduced by the professor, is transferred to the students who are guided to engage in similar processes: read texts, make informed and reflective decisions about the sources to include and create a cohesive overview of the methodological approach. In line 4, she empha-sizes the practical nature of the task and the freedom to choose an approach the student is considering for a dissertation. In this way, she signals the professor's design to engage students in learning what may be relevant and interesting to the student. While the students have the freedom to choose an approach that may be useful for their dissertation, they still have to work within the parameters set by the professor. The professor sets the parameters, signaling that varied and multiple sources in English or other languages can help students develop understandings needed to become qualitative researchers.

The parameters and the particular requirement to use no Lithuanian sources emphasize this professor's value of students needing to understand the international context in order for new scholars to be able to contribute local work internationally. Our interviews with this professor revealed that her preference to use English sources stems from her personal experience as well as the sociohistorical understanding of the limitations Lithuanian researchers have had and continue to face in reading, learning and writing about qualitative research. She has shared her view that in order for doctoral students to be able to enter international research communities, students need to know the international literature. Once students see the bigger, international context, they can then create research projects that can contribute both locally and internationally.

The professor also guides students in creating "substantial" (12) work that PhD scholars will need to continue throughout their careers. The scope of the work, as well as the mention of the number of words and pages produced, signals the professional

practices that scholars develop as they engage in writing and publishing within the parameters set by journals and scholarly books. In this way, the professor is preparing doctoral students not only for the completion of a class assignment but for professional engagement in scholarly practices beyond a class or a doctoral program as well.

The global and professional practices embedded in this assignment are brought back to the local and personal space when the student states that the goal is "to develop an understanding" of the approach (13). However, in line 14, she also makes visible that the local task of understanding a particular methodological approach also involves a scholarly practice of teaching and knowledge transformation (Golde 2006). The feedback the professor provides (15) completes the cycle of learning of a new approach within the class context but also opens doors for further reflection.

In explaining the way the professor provides feedback, Daiva makes visible the dialogic and responsive processes of learning embedded in the teaching and learning of qualitative research. Table No. 2 includes the excerpt from the transcript in Lithuanian with a translation in English:

		Lithuanian interview excerpt	English translation
1.		*jeigu dėstytoja matė, kad iš tavo aiškinimo draugai nelabai supranta*	if the professor sees that your peers do not quite understand what you are explaining
2.		*tai ji dar paprasčiau schematiškai paaiškina kaip kas vyksta*	she demonstrates schematically what is involved
3.		*ir tas schematinis paaiškinimas labai padėdavo suprasti iki galo*	and that schematic explanation helped us understand more fully
4.		*jinai supranta, ką tu nori pasakyti*	she understands what you want to say
5.		*bet mato, kad auditorija nelabai supranta, nesuvirškina to, ką tu sakai*	but sees that the audience doesn't' understand, doesn't process what you are saying
6.		*tai ji prieina prie lentos ir braižo*	so she comes to the board, draws
7.		*parašo, kuo ji ypatinga ta strategija*	and writes down what makes this strategy special
8.		*kada ji naudojama*	when it is used
9.		*ir kokie pagrindiniai tos strategijos bruožai*	and what its main characteristics re

In this accounting of how the professor provides feedback, Daiva emphasizes the professor's focus on ensuring student understanding of the qualitative research approach being presented. The professor evaluates not only the understanding of the presenter but of the whole group as well (lines 1, 4, 5) and then uses multiple techniques – drawing on the board, schematics and an explanation (2, 3, 6-9) – to help students distinguish the key characteristics (9) of a particular approach and the uses of that research approach (8). In this way, the professor provides closure for the task she designed to ensure the students' understanding of a particular research methodology.

This account of learning qualitative research in class demonstrates the multifac-

eted practices students and teachers engage in as the students seek to develop a deep understanding of the "strategy" they are studying. Learning practices involve students reading the newest international literature, analyzing scholarly sources and sharing their understandings with their peers and the professor. The professor guides the students by providing an introductory overview, verbal and visual explanations and feedback in the process of learning as well as by being sensitive to student needs and supporting their learning. All these practices enable the students to learn the strategy in full – "iki galo," as Daiva concludes.

Learning Qualitative Research through Engaging in Qualitative Research Practices

In addition to reading, synthesizing the literature and presenting their understandings of chosen methodological "strategies" in class, doctoral students are provided with opportunities to learn qualitative research through hands-on practice. They create and conduct mini-studies that help students learn the processes of qualitative research, including reflection and data collection through interviewing. Table No. 3 includes Daiva's accounts of her learning in the qualitative research methods class that required practical engagement in qualitative research processes.

This account of learning qualitative research through hands-on activities reveals some of the opportunities the student has to put theory into practice. In the interview, Daiva has talked about her learning about data collection through conducting qualitative interviews. She makes visible that the professor creates an opportunity

for students to collect research data in a real-life situation (2), using the student's dissertation topic (5) as the base for exploring interviewing as a data collection method in qualitative research. The student is then asked to prepare the recorded interviews for analysis by transcribing (2). Daiva makes visible her developing understandings that data collection is not a neutral activity but is tied to the choice of a research "strategy (phenomenology, ethnography or other). By asking the students to ground their interviewing in the phenomenon they want to study for the dissertation and in the research approach they are exploring, the professor signals that data collection methods are tied to the researcher's worldview, the ontological perspectives and the epistemological choices embedded in the choice of a research "strategy."

Our interviews with Daiva's professor revealed that learning data collection through practice first involves building a foundation through reading and analyzing methodological literature on interviewing. The professor explained, that the first task involved reading chapters on interviewing in Lithuanian research methods textbooks and marking areas students found unclear or confusing. Students were also asked to find and read at least one chapter on interviewing published in English in a recent methodology textbook. As the professor shared in an interview, she recommends that students read in English and in Lithuanian as not every doctoral student is fluent in English. The using of texts in two languages equalizes the opportunities for all students and provides a foundation for building common knowledge within the class. The reading of the newest English

Table No. 3 . Interview excerpts about learning qualitative research through practical engagement.

Line	Interview excerpt	English translation	Practices in learning qualitative research
1.	*pasirinkę strategiją*	having chosen the strategy	Using a learned approach for further learning
2.	*mes turėjome atlikti interviu būtent pagal tą strategiją,*	we had to conduct an interview according to that strategy	Collecting data through interview
3.	*transkribuoti*	transcribe it	Transcribing interview
4.	*bet analizuoti nereikėjo, tiesiog tą interviu pabandyti padaryti*	but we didn't need to analyze, just do the interview	Focusing on learning data collection
5.	*... pagal savo disertaciją...*	on the topic for our dissertation	Making a connection to the dissertation topic
6.	*teko pabandyti ir supranti tada, kad visiškai netinka kažkas... klausimai netinka arba kad neatsiskleidžia niekas tuo klausimu ar anuo*	we had an opportunity to try and then you understand that something doesn't work... questions do not work or that nothing gets revealed through one question or another	Gaining an understanding that an inappropriate use of the method may lead to inappropriate or unusable data
7.	*ir kaip tik tą klausimą reikėtų plėsti ...*	and how the question may need to be expanded	Exploring changes in a research question
8.	*mokytis tą giluminį interviu imti tai yra labai sudėtinga...*	doing in-depth interviewing is complicated	Understanding the complexity of interviewing as a data collection method
9.	*tu negali sau pasidaryti lentelę su šešiais klausimais, ateiti ir sakyti: „dabar tu man pasakyk".*	you can't just have a table with six questions, go and tell the participant "now you tell me"...	Realizing there is no simple linear way to learn from participants
10.	*tai tas labai sudėtinga... Turi išmokti to žmogaus kalbą*	and that is complicated... you have to learn the language of the other person	Gaining an understanding of the essence of interviewing
11.	ėmiau interviu iš [grupės] vadovės... pas ją daug ateina studentų *... tie žmonės įpratę šnekėti ką reikia, o ne ką galvoja.... labai nukrypsta į formalumus... mokytojai bijo pasakyti ką jie galvoja...*	I did an interview with the group leader... she has many students... those people are used to saying what they are supposed to tell, not what they are thinking... we end up with formalities... teachers are afraid to say what they think	Developing an understanding that participants may not be open to revealing their thinking
12.	*jie įpratę formaliai kalbėti, formaliai atsakyti į klausimus...*	they are used to talk formally, to answer questions formally	Realizing that participants have particular patterns of talking with outsiders

Table No. 3 (continuation). Interview excerpts about learning qualitative research through practical engagement.

Line	Interview excerpt	English translation	Practices in learning qualitative research
13.	*sunkiausia buvo ją perlaužti, jai sakau: „kodėl tu man šneki tai? Juk tu man gali papasakoti daug ką"... jie sako: „kaip paprastai papasakoti? Juk mes šnekame kaip reikia"...*	The hardest thing was to "break her", I asked her – "why are you telling me this? you really could tell me a lot"... and they say, "how do I tell you simply? we say what is necessary"	Learning to "break" the patterns and to get participants to talk more openly takes time and conversations
14.	*jie nori padėti... kad man viskas gerai...*	they want to help me... to make it well for me	Understanding that participants want to help the researcher
15.	*tada sakau, kad noriu sužinoti ne kaip reikia daryti, o kaip iš tikrųjų darote ...*	then I say that I want to learn not what you're supposed to do but what you really do	Learning to approach the participant in multiple ways, explaining the intent of the research
16.	*kol neįjungiu diktofono, gaunu daugiau informacijos nei jį įjungus... įsitempia žmogus iš karto įjungus diktofoną...*	I get more information before I turn on the recorder... once the recorder is turned on, the person gets tense	Understanding that a technological tool intended to help the researcher may cause tension for the participant
17.	*ir tada pamatai, kurie klausimai padeda atskleisti, kad kiti klausimai duoda tik labai lakoniškus atsakymus ...*	and then you find out which questions enable the participant to open up, while other questions produce very laconic answers	Trying out different questions to find out what works in a particular interview
18.	*labai sunku prakalbinti... pajunti, kai jie atsiveria ...*	at first it is hard to get them to talk... then I can feel how they start opening up	Developing a sense of interview flow
19.	*pasitikrinimui buvo labai verta, pamatei, kas tinka ir kas netinka...*	it was useful to try it out, to check what fits and doesn't fit	Learning through trial and error
20.	*padėjo ir literatūra... su interviu man labai padėjo Spradley ... ką klausti, kaip klausti, nuo ko pradėti*	literature was also helpful... in preparing for the interview Spradley was very useful to me..., what to ask, how to ask, how to begin	Reading and applying literature on methods

literature enables students to learn from the most current developments in the field and to share those learnings with peers who may be less fluent in English.

Once the students develop foundational understandings from English and Lithuanian readings on interviewing, they engage in an extended discussion in the class. In the discussion, the students share their readings and the questions the readings raised. The professor guides the students in exploring possible answers to

student questions, engaging all students and requesting that they consider how their own readings may answer a question raised by another student. Throughout this discussion, the professor models how students can build on their prior knowledge to develop new understandings and to share those understandings with others. At the end of the discussion, students are given the task of conducting pilot interviews and thus implementing their new knowledge of interviewing. The professor guides students to decide on the approach they are considering for their dissertation (e.g., ethnography, phenomenology or case study), read about interviewing within that approach, write a proposal for the pilot interview study, gain the professor's approval and only then conduct the interview, which would have to be transcribed.

In asking students to connect their interviewing to the research approach they are considering for their dissertation (1, 5), the professor provides an opportunity for students to use their interest, prior reading on the dissertation topic and their academic curiosity. In this way, a pilot interview study enables the student to "get her feet wet" in collecting real data for her research project. As Daiva makes visible in the interview, this practical experience helps students understand that their choices and actions in the field have particular consequences for the kinds of information they can gain (relevant or not useful, 6, 17, 19) and the kinds of relationships they can build with research participants (14–16, 18). Reflecting on their experiences, successes and areas for redesign, students have an opportunity to learn that they may need to make changes in the research pro-

cess (6, 7, 13, 15, 19) and that qualitative research interviewing is more complex than students may have considered previously (8–10, 13, 18).

Daiva makes visible that this practical experience in the field has helped her understand that qualitative research and qualitative interviewing are complex processes in which the researcher's knowledge, skills, reflexivity and relationships with the participants play a significant role (11–12). In other words, students realize that qualitative research is not as easy as they may have imagined. Daiva refers to the difficulties four times in this brief excerpt, using the words "sudėtinga" (complicated) and "sunku" (hard) twice each: "doing in-depth interviewing is complicated" (8); it "is so complicated" (10) that one can't just have a table with prepared questions (9); "the hardest thing was to 'break her'" and get the participant to share openly rather than give preformulated responses (13); "at first, it is hard to get them to talk" (18). These difficulties become opportunities for learning that help Daiva determine one key element that makes qualitative interviewing "complicated" – the need to learn the language of the interviewee (10) or, as Agar (1994) would conceptualize it, to learn the *languaculture* of the people with and from whom we seek to learn. Daiva demonstrates her understanding that in order to get people to talk openly in a qualitative interview, the researcher and the interviewee need to find a common ground in which the interviewee's desire to help (14) and the interviewer's goal to learn from the people are synced and lead to deeper understandings of the social situation and perspectives studied.

Given that most qualitative research is about and is dependent on relationships among people (Hays & Singh 2012) practical data collection in the field enables students to experience firsthand the importance of people's feelings, relationships and interactions. Daiva encountered the participant's willingness to help the researcher (14) but also her reluctance to talk openly (15), to share what is on her mind (11), especially in the presence of the recorder (16). Daiva also understood the need to analyze participant discourse to uncover when responses are genuine and when they are veiled in formalities (12). These encounters facilitated Daiva's actions of trying out different ways of talking with the participant, posing new questions (7, 8, 13–18) and assessing how the changes impact her research process and the kinds of data she can gain from the interview. Through these trials in the field, doctoral students develop a sense (18) of research and a way of seeing (19) people, social situations and research through the eyes of a qualitative researcher.

In the last two sentences of this interview segment, Daiva states that the practical experience was useful to assess the fit of the methodological approach and the interviewing techniques for her research question. She also mentions a methodological text she had used to help her develop and conduct her interview study. In referring to Spradley and his book on *Ethnographic Interviewing*, Daiva makes visible how she matched her chosen research approach/strategy (ethnography) with the methodological literature (Spradley's book on ethnographic interviewing) and with the interview practices of seeking to understand insider perspectives.

In interviewing the professor, we learned that the kinds of opportunities and learning Daiva reveals in her account are purposefully designed. The professor shared that she gets students to design and conduct a pilot study in order for students to experience how the theories and methodological literature they have been reading play out in practice. The professor believed that good research and its conduct is dependent on the actions of the researcher ("tyrimo atlikimas yra paremtas labai praktiniais tyrėjo veiksmais") and that reading alone is not sufficient to prepare students for research. The professor stated that "[b]ecause the conduct of research is based on practical actions of the researcher, it is not sufficient to read about such actions or their nuances and gain the competencies needed for doing research" (*Kadangi tyrimo atlikimas yra paremtas labai praktiniais tyrėjo veiksmais, vien skaitant apie tai, kaip atlikti tokius veiksmus ir tokių veiksmų niuansus, neįmanoma įgyti tyrimo atlikimui reikiamas kompetencijas*).In this statement, as well as in the way she designs the course, the professor makes visible her stance that experiential learning by doing is an important component to help prepare doctoral students for research.

In addition to practical experiences of learning in the field, this professor also emphasized the value of reflexivity, student sharing and writing of research. In the interview, she explained that after the students conduct their interviews, in class, they get to reflect, share about their experiences, raise and discuss methodological questions and get feedback from their peers and the professor. Afterwards, the students

have to write a research report following a "traditional research methodology outline" (*tradicinę tyrimo metodologijos schemą*), which included research questions, context, participant selection, the methods and process of data collection, adding the transcription. The professor hoped that her assessment and feedback provided students with opportunities to continue learning their chosen approaches further.

Analyses of Daiva's account of her interviewing practice, as well as the professor's explanations about the design of the task, make visible the importance of learning through doing. Through reading methodological literature, through practice in the field, through trial and error (*supranti tada, kad visiškai netinka kažkas*, "understanding that something doesn't work," line 6) and through reflection and sharing of the experience, the students make connections between theories, epistemological and methodological choices and practical applications. In this way, doctoral students understand the complexity and difficulty of qualitative research, its challenges and flexibility, the role of the researcher and the importance of strong theoretical and methodological foundations for conducting sound qualitative studies. The professor is a guide whose careful design leads students from reading relevant methodological literature to developing a pilot study on their dissertation topic and chosen methodology, which is then applied in the field. Field experiences of selecting participants and interviewing expose students to challenges and opportunities for learning about qualitative methodologies. Transcribing, reflecting, class discussions and feedback enable students to deepen their learning. Through iterative and recursive processes of learning in class and in the field, doctoral students, with the support of their professor, bring theoretical learning to life. In this way, the qualitative research methods class serves as a foundation for student subsequent analyses and an implementation of specific research methodologies for their dissertations.

Discussion

The analyses of a doctoral student's interview excerpts and her professors' accounts revealed multiple opportunities for learning constructed within a qualitative research methods class. These opportunities were based on purposefully designed professor and student practices that led to deeper understandings of qualitative research for students. The taxonomy below, based on Spradley's domain analysis methodology, makes visible the students' and the professor's actions involved in learning and teaching qualitative research. Table No. 4 comprises the included terms, the cover terms and the "strict inclusion" semantic relationship (x is a kind of y) (Spradley 1980/2016), where x is a kind of practice involved in y, the learning of qualitative research.

As the taxonomy demonstrates, students and professors engage in varied practices to facilitate student learning of qualitative research. Students had an opportunity to (1) hear professor introductions to a variety of qualitative research methodologies; (2) to read the most recent and carefully chosen relevant English and Lithuanian methodological literature; (3) to choose one qualitative approach, to write its overview and to present it to the

Table No. 4: *The taxonomy of student and professor practices involved in learning qualitative research within the context of a course.*

Included term (x)	Semantic relationship	Cover term for the domain	Semantic relationship	Taxonomic cover term
Listening to an overview				
Watching a film				
Analyzing text or film		Student practices		
Writing a reflection	Is a kind of			
Choosing an approach				
Creating an overview of a chosen approach				
Using varied sources				
Reading the newest literature				
Creating a report				
Presenting				
Listening to other reports				
Discussing data collection methods				Practices involved in learning qualitative research
Preparing for and collecting data in the field				
Learning from personal experience of data collection				
Solving problems in the field				
Transcribing records				
Writing up data collection methods				
Reflecting on research practice				
			Is a kind of	
Providing an overview				
Directing students to relevant methodological literature				
Discussing specific research methodologies and methods for data collection				
Designing tasks for the students	Is a kind of	Professor practices		
Setting parameters				
Monitoring student progress in collecting data relevant for the research study				
Advising on ways of improving and changing practices in the field				
Checking for understanding				
Clarifying				
Explaining				
Reflecting				
Providing closure				
Assessing student learning				

class; (4) to hear other reports, participate in discussions and receive feedback from both colleagues and professors. Additionally, students had an opportunity to put this learning to practice. In the second part of the course, they read, analyzed, presented and discussed literature on data collection methods in qualitative research, focusing on interviewing. They had an opportunity to develop a pilot interview study that matched the chosen design for the student's dissertation topic, then to implement the study in the field. In practicing interviewing with research participants, students had opportunities to experience the processes and challenges of interviewing, to make decisions in the field and to learn through trial, error, problem solving, research writing, reflection and discussions in the class.

Student learning was facilitated through purposefully designed teaching practices. To guide student learning, professors provided overviews of qualitative research methodologies, directed students to relevant methodological literature in English and Lithuanian, engaged students in in-depth discussions about research methodologies and methods for data collection and provided explanations and feedback. Professors also designed hands-on tasks that involved student explorations of a particular research approach and its fit for a student's dissertation topic. The learning of methodology was extended to opportunities for the experiential learning of data collection through interviewing on the dissertation topic. Throughout the learning process, professors guided students by setting task parameters, monitoring student learning, advising on the ways

of improving and changing practices in the field, checking for understanding, providing explanations, clarifications, task closures and sharing reflections on their own and student learning. The analyses of student and professor interviews made visible that throughout the class, the professors focused on the goal to engage students in developing deep and multifaceted understandings of qualitative research approaches and methods. This engagement took place in a supportive, reflective environment, where professors and students had opportunities to share their knowledge, questions, errors, successes, thoughts and experiences of learning.

The learning and teaching processes uncovered through our analyses align with other ethnographic studies that demonstrate that the process of *preparing the mind, engaging individually and with others,* and *going public* provides opportunities for in-depth learning of disciplinary knowledge and practices in any field – in this case, in qualitative research methodology. This cycle aligns with the work of a researcher whose work involves the cycle of reading and learning about the topic, prior literature, theories, methodology, phenomenon, formulating the research problem and question (*preparing the mind*), then designing and conducting a research study with research participants and varied sources of data (*engaging individually and with others*) and, finally, reporting on research results orally or in writing in conference presentations and research publications (*going public*).

In summary, our research demonstrates that despite the earlier historical challenges (described in the context section), current

Lithuanian scholars have good opportunities to teach and learn qualitative research in the context of doctoral studies. We have not examined yet how broadly this kind of teaching of qualitative research is available in other Lithuanian universities and doctoral programs. However, what we have learned so far demonstrates a strong potential for Lithuanian doctoral students to develop deep knowledge and understandings of qualitative research methodologies. Lithuania has the researchers and professors who are current in their knowledge of research methodologies and teaching practices, who engage students in experiential learning opportunities and who can help prepare new generations of scholars able to contribute qualitative research internationally. Despite the historical challenges, over the past two decades, Lithuania has made great strides in the teaching and learning of qualitative research.

REFERENCES

Agar, M. (2006). An ethnography by any other name... *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research,* Vol. 7(4). Retrieved from http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs

Anderson, T. (1963). *Vvedenije v mnogomernyj statisticheskij analiz.* Moksva: Fizmatgiz.

Bitinas, B. (1971). *Mnogomernyj analiz v pedagogike i pedagogicheskoj psihologii.* Vilnius: NII shkol MP MSSR.

Bitinas, B. (2010). *Gyvenimas ugdymo verpetuose.* Klaipėda: KU leidykla.

Bitinas, B., Rupšienė, L., & Žydžiūnaitė, V. (2008). *Kokybinių tyrimų metodologija: Vadovėlis vadybos ir administravimo studentams.* Klaipėda: S. Jokužio leidykla-spaustuvė.

Bloome, D., & Egan-Robertson, A. (1993). The social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading and writing lessons. *Reading research quarterly,* Vol. 28(4), p. 305–333.

Bumblauskas, A., Butkevičienė, B., Jegelevičius, S., Manusadžianas, P., Pšibilskis, V., Raila, E., Vitkauskaitė D. (2004). *Universitas Vilnensis, 1579–2004.* Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches.* Los Angeles: Sage.

Eisenhart, M., & DeHaan, R. L. (2005). Doctoral preparation of scientifically based education researchers. *Educational researcher,* Vol. 34(4), p. 3–13. doi:10.3102/0013189x034004003

Girdzijauskienė, S. (2006). *Kokybinis interviu.* Vilnius: VU Specialiosios psichologijos laboratorija.

Gobo, G. (2005). The renaissance of qualitative methods. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/ Forum: Qualitative Social Research,* Vol. 6(3). Retrieved from http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/5/12

Golde, C. M. (2006). Preparing stewards of the discipline. In C. M. Golde & G. E. Walker (Eds.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing stewards of the discipline. Carnegie essays on the doctorate* (pp. 3–20). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Green, J. L., Skukauskaite, A., & Baker, W. D. (2012). Ethnography as epistemology: An introduction to educational ethnography. In J. Arthur, M. J. Waring, R. Coe, & L. V. Hedges (Eds.), *Research methodologies and methods in education* (pp. 309–321). London: Sage.

Green, J. L., & Wallat, C. (1981). Mapping instructional conversations: A sociolinguistic ethnography. In J. L. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), *Ethnography and language in educational settings* (pp. 161–195). Norwood, NJ: Ablex publishing corporation.

Hays, D. G., & Singh, A. A. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry in clinical and educational settings.* New York: Guilford press.

Jones, M. (2013). Issues in doctoral studies – forty years of journal discussion: Where have we been and where are we going? *International journal of doctoral studies, 8*, p. 83–104.

Kardelis, K. (1997, 2002). *Mokslinių tyrimų metodologija ir metodai.* Kaunas: Technologija, Judex.

Kendall, M. (1960). *Teorija statistiki.* Moskva: Statistika.

Kurtz-Costes, B. Helmke, L. A. ir Ulku-Steiner, B. (2006). *Gender and doctoral studies: the perceptions of Ph.D. students in an American university,* Vol. 18 (2), p. 137–155.

Lesko, N., Simmons, J., Quarshie, A., & Newton, N. (2008). The pedagogy of monsters: Scary disturbances in a doctoral research preparation course. *The Teachers College Record,* Vol. 110(8), p. 1541–1573.

Lietuvos Respublikos mokslo ir studijų įstatymas (1991). Vilnius: Lietuvos aidas, 1991 02 19 Nr. 35-0.

Millett, C. M., & Nettles, M. T. (2006). Expanding and cultivating the Hispanic STEM doctoral workforce: research on doctoral student experiences. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education,* Vol. 5(3), p. 258–287. doi:10.1177/1538192706287916

Nutarimas dėl mokslo doktorantūros nuostatų patvirtinimo (2010). Prieiga internete: https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/TAR.5B74633E27B5

Pallas, A. M. (2001). Preparing education doctoral students for epistemological diversity. *Educational Researcher,* Vol. 30(5), p. 6–11. doi:10.3102/0013189x030005006

Roulston, K., Preissle, J., & Freeman, M. (2013). Becoming researchers: Doctoral students' developmental processes. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education,* Vol. 36(3), p. 252–267. doi: 10.1080/1743727X.2013.806469

Rupšienė, L. (2007). *Kokybinių tyrimų duomenų rinkimo metodologija.* Klaipėda: Klaipėdos universiteto leidykla.

Rupšienė, L. (2016). Bronislovas Bitinas – ryškiausias XX a. antrosios pusės – XXI a. pirmosios pradžios postpozityvizmo atstovas Lietuvos edukologijoje. *Pedagogika,* t. 124(4), p. 28–46.

Skukauskaite, A. (2006). *Developing an analytic system for grounded interpretations: Studying the impact of educational changes on teachers in Lithuania.* (3238804 Ph.D.), University of California, Santa Barbara. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database.

Skukauskaite, A. (2014). Transcribing as analysis: Logic-in-use in entextualizing interview conversations.*SAGE research methods cases*. London, United Kingdom: SAGE Publications, Ltd. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/978144627305014532202

Skukauskaite, A., Rangel, J., Rodriguez, L. G., & Ramon, D. K. (2015). Understanding classroom discourse and interaction: Qualitative perspectives. In N. Markee (Ed.), *Handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 44–59). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Tidikis R. (2003). *Socialinių mokslų tyrimų metodologija*. Vilnius: LTU.

Walker, G. E., Golde, C. M., Jones, L., Bueschel, A. C., & Hutchins, P. (2008). *The formation of scholars: Rethinking doctoral education for the twenty-first century*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Young, L. J. (2001). Border crossings and other journeys: Re-envisioning the doctoral preparation of education researchers. *Educational Researcher,* Vol. 30(5), p. 3–5. doi:10.3102/0013189x030005003

Zickel, R. E. (1989). *Soviet Union – A Country Study*. Washington: Federal Research Division Library of Congress.

Zulumskytė, A. (2014). Aukštųjų mokyklų sistema Lietuvoje 1940–1990 metais: raidos bruožai. *Tiltai,* t. 66 (1), p. 105–120.

Želvys, R. (2005). Aukštojo mokslo kaita ir problemos. *Acta Paedagogica Vilnencia,* t. 14, p. 169–178.

www.lamabpo.lt/turinys/aukstosios-mokyklos/universitetai

http://www.edukologijosdoktorantura.lt/

KOKYBINIŲ TYRIMŲ METODOLOGIJŲ MOKYMAS IR MOKYMASIS LIETUVOJE BESIVYSTANČIOS DOKTORANTŲ EDUKACIJOS KONTEKSTE

Audra Skukauskaitė, Liudmila Rupšienė

S a n t r a u k a

Kokybinių tyrimų metodologijos mokymasis ir mokymasis doktorantūroje yra mažai tiriamas, bet tai svarbi tyrimų sritis, turint mintyje mokslininkų, gebančių savo kokybiškais tyrimais atliepti lokalios bendruomenės ir globalios visuomenės poreikius bei besivystančias kokybinių tyrimų metodologijas, rengimą. Kita vertus, tarptautiniu mastu mokslinėje literatūroje ypač mažai reprezentuojama besivystančių neanglakalbių šalių doktorantų edukacija.

Todėl, siekdami atliepti šią spragą, nagrinėjame kokybinių tyrimų mokymą ir mokymąsi tyrimų metodologijos kurse Lietuvoje. Straipsnyje analizuojami

duomenys, gauti vykdant didesnę mokslinių tyrimų programą. Jie buvo renkami, naudojant interviu kaip pokalbį su socialinių ir humanitarinių mokslo krypčių doktorantūroje dėstančiais profesoriais ir doktorantais. Be to, lygia greta buvo atliekama dokumentų analizė, vykdomas formalus ir neformalus stebėjimas, renkami interviu dalyvių reflektyvūs pasakojimai ir kiti kontekstualūs bei kontrastiniai duomenys, reikalingi daugiasluoksnei analizei. Straipsnyje remiamasi vieno interviu su doktorante ir jos dviem dėstytojais analize. Šis atvejis reprezentuoja kitų interviu metu pateiktus pasakojimus tų doktorantų, kurie pastaraisiais metais doktorantūros studijų metu mokėsi kokybinių tyrimų metodologijos kaip studijų dalyko ar jo dalies. Tyrimas rodo jau atsiradusį gana stiprų šalies profesorių potencialą gerai parengti mokslininkus kokybiniams tyrimams atlikti, apgalvotą šiuolaikišką mokymą ir bent dalies jau dabar studijuojančių doktorantų įvairiapusišką bei pasaulinius standartus atitinkantį mokymąsi atlikti kokybinius tyrimus.