NTNU

Institutt for psykologi

Mal for sensorveiledning

Emnekode	PSY2118/PSYK4318
Emnenavn	Kvalitativ metode 2
Emneansvarlig/oppgavegiver	Lucas Bietti
Kvalitetssikret av	Renzo Bianchi; Rumi Anne Holbech Nielsen
Semester, år	Vår, 2025
Vurderingsform, lengde	Skole-eksamen
Tillatte hjelpemidler	E – ingen hjelpemidler tillatt

Emnets læringsutbyttebeskivelser angitt I kunnskaper, ferdigheter og generell kompetanse.	https://www.ntnu.no/studier/emner/PSY2118/2023/1#tab=omEmnet
Pensum	Braun V. & Clarke, V. (2006.) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101. Knott, E., Rao, A. H., Summers, K. & Chana, T. (2022). Interviews in the social sciences. *Nature Reviews Methods Primers* 2. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43586-022-00150-6 Morgan, D. L. (1996). Focus Groups. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 129-152
Eventuelle formelle krav til besvarelsen	Nei
Hvordan de ulike oppgavene i eksamenssettet er vektlagt	Likt vekting

Sensurveiledning

Besvar to (2) av de tre oppgavene nedenfor

Oppgave 1: Basert på artikkelen "Interviews in the Social Sciences" av Knott et al. (2022), drøft de viktigste etiske hensynene forskere må ta når de gjennomfører intervjuer i kvalitativ forskning. Fokuser på utfordringene som kan oppstå når sårbare deltakere blir intervjuet om sensitive temaer. Hvordan kan forskeren håndtere etiske dilemmaer knyttet til informert samtykke, konfidensialitet og emosjonell trygghet? Diskuter også strategier for å sikre at deltakerne føler seg trygge gjennom hele intervjuprosessen, og hvordan forskeren kan minimere risikoen for skade.

Oppgave 2: Med utgangspunkt i Morgan (1996), drøft styrker og svakheter ved fokusgrupper som kvalitativ forskningsmetode. Hvordan bidrar de interaktive dynamikkene i fokusgrupper, slik Morgan beskriver dem, til å avdekke komplekse sosiale atferder og motivasjoner som kanskje ikke kommer frem

i individuelle intervjuer? I svaret ditt skal du også reflektere over mulige begrensninger, som moderatorens innflytelse og gruppedynamikk, særlig når det gjelder sensitive temaer eller kulturelt mangfoldige kontekster. Bruk konkrete eksempler for å underbygge poengene dine.

Oppgave 3: Svaret ditt bør være strukturert i to deler: Først, beskriv og eksemplifiser de seks fasene i tematisk analyse slik Braun og Clarke (2006) definerer dem, med enten et reelt eksempel fra pensum eller et hypotetisk prosjekt. Deretter vurder tematisk analyse kritisk som kvalitativ metode i psykologi, ved å peke på hovedfordelene (som fleksibilitet og dybde i innsikt) og de viktigste begrensningene (inkludert mulig forskerskjevhet og utfordringer knyttet til reliabilitet og validitet).

Eksamenskrav

Oppgave 1
Knott et al. (2022) highlight the importance of ethical guidelines throughout the interview process. Key ethical considerations such as obtaining informed consent, ensuring confidentiality, and minimizing harm are stressed as essential for the integrity and success of qualitative research.
Informed consent involves making sure participants understand the purpose of the interview, what is expected of them, how their responses will be used, and the option to withdraw without penalty. This principle is crucial not only to safeguard the participant's autonomy but also to ensure that the research process is transparent and ethically sound. For example, if a participant is involved in research regarding personal trauma, informed consent would require clear communication about how their sensitive data will be handled, and a reassurance that they can stop the interview at any time.
A significant ethical challenge arises when interviewing vulnerable groups or dealing with sensitive topics, such as trauma, illness, or personal abuse. Interviews focused on these topics can evoke strong emotional reactions or bring up past trauma for participants. The ethical risk here lies in causing harm or distress to the participant, which could affect their well-being beyond the scope of the research. To mitigate these risks, researchers must take precautions, such as providing the participant with a clear understanding of the sensitive nature of the interview ahead of time and offering support resources if needed.
The researcher's responsibility extends to maintaining the confidentiality and privacy of the interviewee. This is particularly important when discussing sensitive personal information, where the participant's identity must be protected. Researchers should explain to participants how their data will be stored, who will have access to it, and how it will be anonymized, ensuring that their identities remain confidential.
Knott et al. (2022) stress the need for ethical reflexivity. The researchers should be aware of their own biases and potential power imbalances that may arise during the interview. This includes considering the interviewer's role in shaping the interview dynamics and how their questions or demeanor may influence the participant's responses. Ethical reflexivity also involves recognizing when participants might feel uncomfortable or coerced into answering certain questions, especially in emotionally charged contexts. This requires the interviewer to be particularly sensitive and flexible, ready to adjust their approach to protect the participant's emotional and psychological well-being.
To address these ethical, one could create a supportive environment where participants feel comfortable and empowered to speak candidly, knowing they are in control of the conversation. Clear communication, emotional sensitivity, and a non-judgmental approach will help maintain a positive and

ethical interview process. After the interview, debriefing sessions can be valuable, especially when discussing sensitive topics. The researcher should offer an opportunity for participants to ask questions and reflect on their experience, while ensuring that they have access to appropriate support, whether through counseling services or other resources.

Oppgave 2

Focus groups (Morgan, 1996), offer a powerful qualitative research method characterized by the unique advantage of group interaction. One of their primary strengths lies in the ability to generate data through the interaction between participants, rather than solely from the researcher-participant exchange. This interaction enables participants to build upon each other's responses, question one another, and express agreement or disagreement, which can lead to the emergence of more nuanced and layered insights than might arise in individual interviews. Morgan (1996) emphasizes that this collective process can help uncover complex social behaviors, shared norms, and underlying motivations. For example, in a focus group on parenting practices, one participant might bring up a common challenge, prompting others to share similar experiences or provide alternative perspectives. Such dynamics can reveal both consensus and divergence in views, being particularly useful for understanding culturally embedded practices or contested social issues.

Another strength is that focus groups are relatively efficient. Researchers can collect rich qualitative data from multiple individuals in a single session, which is both time- and cost-effective. Moreover, for participants who may feel uncomfortable in a one-on-one interview, the group setting can foster a more relaxed atmosphere, encouraging openness and spontaneity.

Focus groups also come with significant limitations. One key issue is the influence of the moderator. The moderator's style, tone, and level of control can shape the discussion in subtle ways. If the moderator dominates or unintentionally signals approval or disapproval, it may bias participants' responses. Similarly, if the moderator fails to manage the discussion effectively, dominant voices may drown out quieter participants, limiting the diversity of views expressed.

Group dynamics can also pose challenges, especially when discussing sensitive topics or working with culturally diverse groups. In such cases, social desirability bias or fear of judgment may lead participants to withhold their true opinions. For instance, in a focus group discussing mental health in a conservative cultural context, participants may conform to perceived group norms rather than share personal experiences. Cultural hierarchies or gender dynamics may further inhibit open dialogue. Morgan (1996) recommends careful planning of group composition, skilled moderation, and attention to group norms. In some cases, conducting homogenous groups (e.g., by gender or cultural background) may encourage more open discussion, while in others, mixed groups might stimulate valuable debate as participants can share different viewpoints on the same phenomenon.

Focus groups offer a unique window into collective meaning-making processes and social interactions. Their strength lies in capturing the co-construction of knowledge, but their success depends heavily on the researcher's awareness of group dynamics and ethical considerations.

Oppgave 3

Part 1

Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase process of thematic analysis offers a structured yet flexible approach to analyzing qualitative data. The process begins with *familiarizing yourself with the data*, which involves deeply engaging with the material, reading and re-reading transcripts, listening to recordings, or watching videos if applicable. This phase helps the researcher develop a solid understanding of the content and begin noticing interesting features or recurring ideas. It's also common to jot down early observations at this stage. The second phase, *generating initial codes*, is where the researcher systematically labels meaningful segments of the data that relate to the research question. These codes might describe surface-level observations or hint at more abstract concepts, and some parts of the data may be coded multiple times, while others might be left untagged if they're irrelevant. Coding helps reduce and organize the data into manageable pieces for further analysis.

Next is *constructing themes*, a creative and interpretative step where the researcher looks for broader patterns by clustering related codes. Here, the goal is to identify coherent and meaningful groupings that say something important about the data. The themes are built around a central organizing concept that brings together the essence of the grouped codes. Visual tools like thematic maps can be especially helpful during this phase. Once initial themes are constructed, the researcher moves on to *reviewing potential themes*. This is a vital quality-check step where themes are assessed against the coded extracts and the dataset as a whole. Some themes may be refined, merged, or discarded. The goal is to ensure that each theme is internally coherent, clearly defined, and distinct from others, avoiding overlap or blurriness in meaning.

In the fifth phase, *defining and naming themes*, the researcher takes a more interpretative stance, developing clear definitions that capture the essence of each theme. These definitions should reflect what each theme reveals about the data in relation to the research question. Naming themes is also important—these names should be concise yet descriptive, often capturing the core message of the theme. Finally, the last phase is *producing the report*. This is where all the analytic work comes together in a coherent narrative that presents the themes, supports them with illustrative quotes or examples from the data, and connects the findings to relevant literature. The goal here is not just to describe what was found, but to tell a compelling story that answers the research question and provides meaningful insights into the topic under investigation.

Part 2

Thematic analysis is a flexible and accessible method that can be applied across various theoretical frameworks, making it suitable for a wide range of qualitative research. It offers a clear, systematic structure (as outlined by Braun and Clarke), supports both small and large data sets, and allows for rich, detailed exploration of patterns in subjective experience. However, it also has limitations. The method relies heavily on the researcher's interpretation, which can introduce bias and affect reliability if coding is not clearly defined. Without careful analysis, results may remain superficial, and themes can lack coherence if not well-justified. It's also less suited for research requiring fine-grained linguistic or narrative analysis.

NTNU

Fakultet for informasjonsteknologi og elektroteknikk

Karakterskala som er benyttet

Bokstavkarakter: https://innsida.ntnu.no/wiki/-/wiki/Norsk/Karakterskalaen