SENSURVEILEDNING

Emnekode og navn:	Semester / År / Eksamenstype: H-2021/Skriftlig hjemmeeksamen, 4 timer

PSY3101 (A)

Besvar to (2) av de tre oppgavene nedenfor

Oppgave 1:

Explain Labov's Narrative Model: narrative categories, narrative question, narrative function and linguistic form. Based on your explanation on the example that it was given in class (story about John and Mary at the pub, see PDF version of lecture. Indicate when each of the categories (i.e., sections of the narrative) begins and ends in the story.

Oppgave 2:

Present and discuss differences between Cognitive Psychology and Conversation Analysis (as used in Psychology).

Oppgave 3:

Explain why conducting focus groups is more beneficial than individual interviews when doing research with marginalized groups, sensitive topics and taboo topics

PSY3101 (B)

Besvar to (2) av de tre oppgavene nedenfor

Oppgave 1:
Du skriver prosjektbeskrivelsen til ditt PhD-prosjekt. I dette prosjektet planlegger du å undersøke risikooppfattelsen av COVID-19 blant norske helsearbeidere. Det er antatt at det vil være en høy sannsynlighet for dem å bli smittet. Du planlegger å gjennomføre 40 kvalitative forskningsintervju for å besvare forskningsspørsmålene dine. I den metodologiske seksjonen av prosjektbeskrivelsen skriver du at du er overbevist om at Grounded Theory er den riktige kvalitative tilnærmingen som svarer på dine forskningsspørsmål. Du mener subjektiviteten hos forskeren er essensiell i kvalitativ forskning og du identifiserer deg selv som en konstruktivist. Forklar hvilken Grounded Theory tilnærming ville du valgt for dette prosjektet og hvorfor. Hva er forskjellen mellom den tilnærmingen du har valgt og den andre tilnærmingen i Grounded Theory? Hvilken kritikk er rettet mot tilnærmingen du har valgt?

Oppgave 2:
Du har nylig gjennomført et intervju og beslutter å benytte Tematisk Analyse (Thematic Analysis eller Thematic Content Analysis) som kvalitativ metode. Du tenker at du har nok erfaring med metoden for å forklare Tematisk Analyse til en medstudent som aldri har hørt om kvalitative

metoder før. Forklar til medstudenten hvilke steg man må følge i en Tematisk Analyse og inkluder minst tre kritikkpunkter som metoden utsettes for. Du kan enten basere forklaringene dine på Anderson (2007), Braun and Clarke (2006) eller begge artiklene.

Oppgave 3
Forklar og diskuter likheter og ulikheter mellom konseptene rolle og posisjon som presentert i Positioning Theory (Moghaddam, Harré, & Lee, 2008). Kan en posisjon bli til en rolle over tid? Hvis den gjør det, forklar hvorfor? Gi et eksempel på en ondartet (malignant) posisjon og forklar de negative effektene det kan ha for personers identitet, selvfølelse og tilfredshet/psykologisk velvære.

Relevant pensumlitteratur:

PSY3101 (A)

Oppgave 1:

Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis. In J. Helm (Ed.), Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts (pp. 12– 44). Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Oppgave 2:

Potter, J. & Edwards, D. (2012). Conversation analysis and psychology. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 701-725). Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Oppgave 3:

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Dickinson, W. B., Leech, N. L., & Zoran, A. G. (2009). A qualitative framework for collecting and analyzing data in focus group research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8 (3), 1–21.

PSY3101 (B)

Oppgave 1:
Glaser, B.G. & A.L. Strauss, (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, (pp. 1-77).
Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory. A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. London: Sage (pp. 1-71).
Kenny, M., & Fourie, R. (2015). Contrasting Classic, Straussian, and Constructivist Grounded Theory: Methodological and Philosophical Conflicts. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(8), 1270-1289. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol20/iss8/9

Oppgave 2:

Anderson, R. (2007). Thematic Content Analysis. Descriptive Presentation of Qualitative Data.
Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Oppgave 3:

Moghaddam, F. M., R. Harré & N. Lee (Eds.) (2008). *Global Conflict Resolution through Positioning Theories*. New York: Springer (pp.3-20; 65-78; 293-294).

Eksamenskrav:

PSY3101 (A)

Oppgave 1:

These are the elements of Labov's Narrative Model. The example I included here is the same I gave in class and it is the one they have to use in their response.

Abstract: What was this about? Signals that the story is about to begin and draws attention from the listener.

- Example: *You don't know what happened to me last Friday.*

Orientation: Who or what are involved in the story, and when and where did it take place? Helps the listener to identify the time, place, persons, activity and situation of the story.

- Example: *You don't know what happened to me last Friday. I got to the pub at around 8pm and met John and Mary.*

Complicating action: Then what happened? The core narrative category providing the «what happened» element of the story.

- Example: You don't know what happened to me last Friday. I got to the pub at around 8pm and met John and Mary. *We ordered 3 pints of Guinness and were having a great time when all of the sudden a random guy showed up and punched John in the face. Imagine, you are there drinking a beer with friends and someone you don't know comes and punches you in the face. Completely crazy, right?*

Resolution: What finally happened? Recapitulates the final key event of the story.

- Example: *You don't know what happened to me last Friday. I got to the pub at around 8pm and met John and Mary. We ordered 3 pints of Guinness and were having a great time when all of the sudden a random guy showed up and punched John in the face. Imagine, you are there drinking a beer with friends and someone you don't know comes and punches you in the face. Completely crazy, right?* Then, we understood what actually happened. This random guy was wasted and confused John with another guy who stole his Iphone at the pub a couple of weeks ago.

Evaluation: So what? Functions to make the point of the story clear.

- Example: *You don't know what happened to me last Friday. I got to the pub at around 8pm and met John and Mary. We ordered 3 pints of Guinness and were having a great time when all of the sudden a random guy showed up and punched John in the face. Imagine, you are there drinking a beer with friends and someone you don't know comes and punches you in the face. Completely crazy, right? Then, we understood what actually happened. This random guy was wasted and confused John with another guy who stole his Iphone at the pub a couple of weeks ago. You never know what can happen in the pub, do you know what I mean? Sometimes there are so many drunks around that it is better to call it a day.*

Coda: How does it end? Signals that a story has ended and brings listener back to point in which s/he entered the narrative.

- Example: *You don't know what happened to me last Friday. I got to the pub at around 8pm and met John and Mary. We ordered 3 pints of Guinness and were having a great time when all of the sudden a random guy showed up and punched John in the face. Imagine, you are there drinking a beer with friends and someone you don't know comes and punches you in the face. Completely crazy, right? Then, we understood what actually happened. This random guy was wasted and confused John with another guy who stole his Iphone at the pub a couple of weeks ago. You never know what can happen in the pub, do you know what I mean? Sometimes there are so many drunks around that it is better to call it a day. I just wanted to share this with you because it was completely nuts.*

Oppgave 2:

Conversation Analysis (CA) provides for an account of Psychology that is nuanced and located within actual interaction in actual settings. It provides a foundational method and body of findings for a discursive, social interactional approach to Psychology. It offers a way of building a naturalistic perspective on Psychology starting with records of people living their lives in families, workplaces and professional settings

Main differences between Cognitive Psychology (CP) and Conversation Analysis (CA).

- CP: Focus on abstract notions of information.
- CA: Focus on concrete notions of information.
- CP: Focus on competence.
- CA: Focus on performance.
- CP: About computational models rather than psychological reality.
- CA: About psychological reality.
- CP: About abstract processes.
- CA: About ecological naturalism.
- CP: About experimental manipulation of variables.
- CA: About the observational study of unconstrained interaction.
- CP: Explain underlying symbolic representations.
- CA: Explain psychological processes by using systematic descriptions in talk.
- CP: About the decomposition of mental objects into inner modules.
- CA: About psychological matters being built and displayed in talk.

Oppgave 3:

Conducting focus groups is more beneficial than individual interviews when doing research with marginalized groups, sensitive topics and taboo topics. Reasons:

- They are widely used to examine people's experiences of disease and of health services.
- Effective technique for exploring the attitudes and needs of staff.
- Sense of belonging to a group can increase the participants' sense of cohesiveness and help them to feel safe to share information.
- Interactions among the participants can create the possibility for more spontaneous responses.

- Provide a setting where the participants can discuss personal problems and provide possible solutions.
- More appropriate with emotionally charged topics that generate high levels of participant involvement.
- They give each participant more time to discuss her or his views and experiences on topics in which they all are highly involved.
- Advantages for researchers in the field of health and medicine.
- They do not discriminate against people who cannot read or write.
- They can encourage participation from people reluctant to be interviewed on their own or who feel they have nothing to say.
- Examine not only what people think but how they think and why they think that way
- Encourage participants to explore the issues of importance to them, in their own vocabulary, generating their own questions and pursuing their own priorities
- Group work can actively facilitate the discussion of taboo topics.
- Participants can also provide mutual support in expressing feelings that are common to their group but which they consider to deviate from mainstream culture (or the assumed culture of the researcher). This is particularly important when researching stigmatized or taboo experiences (for example, sexual behaviors, drug use, violence).
- Study of sexual behavior led to the use of focus groups in research on the spread of HIV, both in the Global South and developed countries. In the 1980s, epidemiologists used focus groups to gain a better understanding of at-risk groups with whom they had little prior experience, such as gay and bisexual men.

Focus groups considered as a basis for empowering "clients" or as a tool in action and participatory research.

PSY3101 (B)

Oppgave 1:
The approach students must choose is Constructivist Grounded Theory (Charmaz, 2006). Constructivist Grounded Theory relies on adaptable coding guidelines and a principle of flexibility. It has an emphasis on in-depth, intensive interviewing aimed at achieving an intimate exploration of the meanings that participants attribute to their experiences. The researcher's interpretative understanding is presented in the form of a story or narrative and it more descriptive than explanatory. The coding departs from two key questions: 1) What is the chief concern of participants?; and 2) How do they resolve this concern?. From this approach it is advised to use codes for actions and potential theoretical cues rather than for themes, thereby it is preferable to

use gerunds (e.g. revealing, defining, feeling, or wanting). Using gerunds helps to define what is happening in a fragment, making connections between codes, and keeping analyses active and emergent. It is also suggested to utilize the language of the participants as codes. Then, it is important to identify the codes that are recurring or significant for the studied phenomenon. These codes are relevant to conduct the analysis. Codes should be considered as provisional theoretical categories. Memo writing is vital to the process of constructing a theory. The researcher can scrutinize the codes and categories, highlight determining conditions, and trace progression and consequences. The memos may also document "gaps in the data" and help develop conceptual hypotheses. Writing and sorting memos captures the unfolding process of interpreting the phenomena and constructing a theory.

Differences to Classic Grounded Theory approach (Glaser & Straus, 1967). Classic Grounded Theory aims at discovering an emergent theory through systematic analysis of data. Charmaz's approach encapsulates a more impressionistic coding, the goal of which is to construct a grounded theory instead of finding a grounded theory. Thus, the subjectivity of the research in more important in Charmaz approach than Glaser and Strauss' approach. In Charmaz approach the literature should be employed throughout all phases of the research, from conception to conclusion. She suggests including specific sections for the literature review as well as recommends using the literature for the interpretation of results and conclusions. On the other hand, Glaser and Strauss argue that it is essential not to consult relevant academic literature because prior knowledge interferes with the understanding of the new phenomenon. However, the literature may be used to make comparisons at the end of the analytic process. These two approaches have distinct coding conventions that arise from opposing philosophical positions embedded within competing research paradigms. In addition, in Charmaz

Criticisms to Charmaz. The researcher interferes with the phenomenon under investigation. The interviewer and the interviewee's mutual construction and interpretation of data puts the researcher as co-creator/participant.

Oppgave 2:

Thematic Analysis (or Thematic Content Analysis) is a method for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data. Themes represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set. It is both and inductive (bottom-up) and deductive (top-down) approach in qualitive research. Thematic analysis is a relatively easy and quick method to learn and do, as a result, it is accessible to researchers with little experience. Results of studies coming from the use of Thematic Analysis are generally accessible to the public as it enables researchers to summarize key features of a large body of data, and also to offer a "thick description" of a subset of the same data. Thematic Analysis allows researchers to highlight similiaries and differences in the data set, however, it has limited interpretative power beyond mere description if it is not used within another theoretical framework in the social sciences. Many approaches to qualitative analysis are better described as methodologies within particular theoretical frameworks and epistemological traditions (e.g., Constructivist Grounded Theory). Thematic Analysis is independent from any epistemological and ontological base and this makes it distinct from other qualitative approaches in the social sciences.

These are the steps researcher should follow when using Thematic Analysis (or Thematic Content Analysis). Students can explain one of the two approaches only or both in their response.

Braun and Clarke's 6 steps are: 1) Become familiar with the data; 2) Generate initial codes; 3) Search for themes; 4) Review themes; 5) Define themes; and 6) Produce the report.

Anderson's 15 steps are: 1) Before beginning a Thematic Content Analysis (TCA), make multiple copies of interview transcript (or other extant text, including post-interview notes) as relevant and stipulated in your Methods chapter; 2) Mark with a highlighter (real or electronic) all descriptions that are relevant to the topic of inquiry; 3) From the highlighted areas, mark each distinct unit of meaning; 4) Cut out units and put similar units together in a pile; 5) Label each pile as initial categories (themes) using key words or phrases copied from highlighted texts and revise categories

as you continue to code; 6) If obvious information is missing from text, identify categories that are missing; 7)Go through the entire interview transcript identifying distinct units, grouping and regrouping similar and dissimilar units, and re-labeling categories as you go along; 8) Read through all meaning units per category and redistribute units as appropriate; 9) After a few days, reread the original interview transcript or text without looking at your units or categories; 10) Return to meaning units and categories made on the first pass, and reconsider each unit and category; 11) Look over your categories as a whole; 12) For each additional interview transcript (or other texts), use the Thematic Content Analysis as above; 13) When all analyses are complete, read each of them separately and then while retaining meaning units, combine categories/themes for all interview transcripts and notes; 14) After a few days, reread your total categories as a whole and consider whether you have too many (or too few) categories to make overall sense of the interview transcripts given your topic; and 15) Redo all the instructions above until you are satisfied that the categories reflect the interview transcripts as a whole.

Oppgave 3

Positioning theory focusses on the ways in which people use words (and discourse of all types) to locate themselves and others in relation to rights and obligations. It is with words that we ascribe rights and claim them for ourselves and place duties on others. Positioning has direct moral implications, such as some person or group being located as 'trusted' or 'distrusted', 'with us' or 'against us', 'to be saved' or 'to be wiped out'.

Positioning Theory is complementary to the older framework of Role Theory. Roles are relatively long-lasting norms determining what a person in role can do. Roles are often formally defined, delineating possible and forbidden kinds of actions. Roles are sometimes realized in people's shared beliefs about what they can do, but often the location of role-content is in the living structure of the social world. Role are stable over time whereas positions concerns conventions of speech and action that are liable, contestable and ephemeral. Position may become roles over time. Assignments of rights and duties arising through an act of positioning can become crystalized into the long requirements of a role, therefore, in certain cases positioning acts are the birthplace of roles (e.g. bullying).

Malignant positioning refers to **c**atastrophic effects of a priori psychological categorizing of people with declining powers in old age or any other physical and/or cognitive disabilities. For instance, phrases such as `They don't know anything anymore' and 'Treating an Alzheimer's patient is like doing veterinary medicine' from health care professionals delete patients' rights and their duties towards them. These behaviors position people as having no right to be heard, on the presumption that such people have nothing worth listening to, the sufferer is cut off from communal cognition, the thinking together that is such a feature of language using beings like ourselves. However, by re-entering the communal conversation the effects of malignant positioning can be reversed by the restoration of rights (and sometimes the taking on of duties), that is by repositioning the person.

Karakterbeskrivelse:

Faglærer / oppgavegiver:

Navn:
Sted / dato: Trondheim, October 29th, 2021