NTNU

Institutt for psykologi

Mal for sensorveiledning

Emnekode	PSY3101
Emnenavn	PSY3101 - Forskningsmetode - kvalitativ
Emneansvarlig/oppgavegiver	Lucas Bietti
Kvalitetssikret av	
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/PSY3101/2024/1#tab=omEmnet
Pensum	Bamberg, M. (2012). Narrative analysis. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, & K. J. Sher (Eds.), APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol. 2. Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological (pp. 85–102). American Psychological Association. Dubbels (2011). Cognitive Ethnography: A methodology for measure and analysis of learning for game studies. *International Journal of Gaming and Computer-Mediated Simulations*, 3(1), 68-78. Hazlehurst B., McMullen C. K., Gorman P. N. (2007). Distributed cognition in the heart room: How situation awareness arises from coordinated communications during cardiac surgery. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 40(5), 539–551. Hutchins, E. (1995). How a cockpit remembers its speeds. *Cognitive Science*, 19, 265-288. Sidnell, J. (2012). Basic conversation analytic methods. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 77-99). Wiley-Blackwell.
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

NTNU

Fakultet for informasjonsteknologi og elektroteknikk

Oppgave 1: Med utgangspunkt i prinsippene for Conversation Analysis (Sidnell, 2012), beskriv hvordan observasjon og transkripsjon av naturlig samtale gir innsikt i sosiale samhandlingsmønstre. Diskuter hvorfor Conversation Analysis legger vekt på «umotivert observasjon», og hvordan dette skiller seg fra andre kvalitative metoder. Bruk konkrete eksempler for å illustrere hvordan tilsynelatende små detaljer i samtale (som pauser, intonasjon eller selvkorrigering) kan ha analytisk betydning.

Oppgave 2: Diskuter de viktigste prinsippene for Cognitive Ethnography (Dubbels, 2011; Hazlehurst et al. 2007; Hutchins, 1995) som en metodologisk tilnærming for å studere menneskelig kognisjon. I svaret ditt, forklar hvordan kognitive prosesser forstås i forhold til sosiale, kulturelle og miljømessige kontekster, og hvordan kognisjon sees på som dynamisk, distribuert og forankret i kroppen. Gi eksempler på analyseenheter i kognitiv etnografi, og forklar hvordan tilnærmingen integrerer både kvalitative og kvantitative data for å gi en helhetlig forståelse av kognisjon i virkelige situasjoner.

Oppgave 3: Med utgangspunkt i Bamberg (2012), redegjør for de tre hovedtilnærmingene til narrativ analyse: (1) narrativer som språklig struktur, (2) narrativer som kognitiv struktur, og (3) narrativer som interaktiv og performativ handling. For hver tilnærming, beskriv sentrale analytiske prinsipper, hvordan narrativer forstås og analyseres, og hvilke aspekter av fortellinger de vektlegger (f.eks. språklige kjennetegn, fortellerens intensjoner eller kontekstens rolle). Drøft til slutt styrker og begrensninger ved de ulike tilnærmingene, og reflekter over hva de kan bidra med i forståelsen av komplekse sosiale og psykologiske fenomener. Bruk eksempler for å illustrere resonnementene dine.

Eksamenskrav

Oppgave 1:
Conversation Analysis (CA) begins not with theory, but with an empirical engagement with the world of talk-in-interaction. Rather than applying preconceived assumptions or seeking to confirm hypotheses, CA insists on starting by closely observing what actually happens when people speak with one another. This empirical grounding is central: the goal is to identify stable features and practices in interaction based on what is observable, repeatable, and verifiable. Analysts immerse themselves in naturalistic data (e.g., recordings of real-life conversations) to tune into the fine details of human communication. Through this immersion, recurring practices begin to emerge. Transcription plays a key role in this process: by carefully rendering speech into written form, analysts can attend to timing, intonation, pauses, overlaps, and other features often missed in casual listening. These subtle elements, once documented, reveal how meaning is co-constructed in real time.
Recordings provide the empirical basis for CA. Unlike field notes or memory-based descriptions, audio or video recordings can be revisited repeatedly, ensuring that the analysis remains anchored in what participants actually said and did. This allows analysts to catch details that might otherwise escape notice, e.g., an elongated pause, a shift in pitch, a slightly delayed response. These small moments often carry significant interactional importance. CA encourages attention to nuance. Analysts listen for how stress and intonation shape meaning, how speakers repair misunderstandings, how they manage turn-taking, and how social actions (e.g., inviting, refusing, or apologizing) are accomplished through language. Even so-called “errors” in speech are taken seriously, as they often illuminate the norms and expectations governing social interaction.

Importantly, CA discourages prescriptive observation. Rather than entering the data with a rigid coding scheme or fixed variables, analysts adopt what is called an "unmotivated" approach to looking. This doesn't mean aimless observation, but rather a disciplined openness to what the data reveal on their own terms. The analyst remains attuned to the sequential organization of talk, e.g., how utterances follow one another, how responses are shaped by prior turns, and how participants signal understanding, alignment, or resistance.

Points of importance for CA include transition spaces between turns, the openings and closings of conversations, moments of overlap, and repair sequences. Yet analysts are encouraged to remain sensitive to all details that might shed light on interactional practices, no matter how minor they seem. A false start, a stammer, or a subtle gesture may turn out to be central to how meaning is being negotiated.

The goal of CA is to uncover the social order embedded in the everyday. By focusing on actual instances of interaction, CA reveals the methods people use (often unconsciously) to navigate social life. In doing so, CA shows the ways in which our most ordinary conversations are structured, patterned, and meaningful in ways that deserve close and careful attention.

Oppgave 2:

Cognitive ethnography (Dubbels, 2011; Hazlehurst et al. 2007; Hutchins, 1995) is a methodological approach that blends cognitive science with ethnographic techniques to study human cognition in its natural context. Rather than seeing cognition as a purely internal process confined to the mind, cognitive ethnography emphasizes how it is deeply embedded within social, cultural, and environmental contexts. For example, when observing a group of workers in an office, it's clear that their thinking is not isolated but is influenced by their physical surroundings, the tools they use, the technologies available to them, and the interactions they have with one another. Cognitive processes are intricately tied to the environment, and the way people think is shaped by these external factors.

Cognition is not confined to the individual; it is distributed across people, tools, and environments. In an office, one worker might use a computer to organize files, while another uses a whiteboard to explain an idea. Both rely on external artifacts to enhance their cognitive processes, illustrating the concept of *distributed cognition*. This approach stresses that cognition involves interactions with external tools and technologies, and is a collective process involving more than just individual mental work.

Cognition is not something that happens exclusively in the brain. Cognition is embodied, meaning that physical actions, i.e., gesturing, moving objects, or even the way a person manipulates tools, play a critical role in shaping cognition. For instance, in a learning environment, a teacher might use hand gestures to explain a concept, and those gestures become integral to understanding. Cognitive ethnography explores how these bodily actions and interactions with the environment shape thinking and understanding.

Rather than viewing cognition as an isolated mental task, cognitive ethnography positions it within larger activity systems. These systems involve various roles, rules, and practices that govern how people interact with their environment. In a classroom, for example, cognition doesn't occur in isolation but is deeply connected to the activities, social roles, and norms that define the educational context. By examining how people engage in these systems, cognitive ethnographers gain insights into how cognitive processes are influenced by the larger social structures and practices at play.

Cognition is also dynamic and continuously changing in response to new challenges and contexts. The way a worker solves a problem today may differ from how they approach it tomorrow, based on new information, social interactions, or changing circumstances. Cognitive ethnography recognizes the fluid

nature of cognition, focusing on how it adapts in real-time to varying social, cultural, and situational factors. This dynamic quality of cognition makes it crucial to observe how people respond to shifts in their environment and interactions.

The goal of cognitive ethnography is to provide a comprehensive understanding of cognition by integrating both qualitative and quantitative data. It doesn't aim to reduce cognition to one singular factor but seeks to capture its complexity in real-world settings. Cognitive ethnographers immerse themselves in naturalistic settings, observing all aspects of interaction, from social exchanges to the use of tools, from cultural influences to the physical environment, in order to develop a rich, nuanced understanding of cognition.

Knowledge is not simply passed down from one person to another. Instead, it is co-constructed through social interactions. In a collaborative work environment, for example, colleagues build on each other's ideas, share knowledge, and construct new understanding together. Cognitive ethnography pays close attention to these social processes, observing how knowledge is collectively created within a community. It explores how individuals share, challenge, and build on one another's thoughts through dialogue and collaborative activities.

The unit of analysis in cognitive ethnography is multifaceted, examining a variety of elements that contribute to understanding cognition in context. It looks at activities and practices, i.e., how cognitive processes unfold during specific tasks, such as problem-solving or decision-making. It also focuses on social interactions, noting how dialogue and collaboration shape cognition. The role of artifacts, both physical and digital, is another key area of analysis, as these tools significantly influence cognitive processes. Additionally, broader cultural, social, and environmental factors are examined to understand how cognition is shaped by these contextual elements.

Cognitive ethnography considers the spatial and temporal dimensions of cognition. The arrangement of people, tools, and spaces can impact cognitive behavior. For example, the layout of a classroom or the seating arrangement in a meeting room can influence how people interact and think. Likewise, the timing of certain actions (e.g., whether a task is performed in the morning or after a break) can affect the cognitive process.

The language used by participants also plays a significant role in shaping cognition. Discourse and language are central to how individuals construct meaning and share knowledge. Whether through formal language in a meeting or casual conversation among colleagues, the way people talk and exchange ideas shapes how they understand the world and each other.

Cognitive ethnography provides a holistic framework for understanding human cognition. By examining cognition in its natural context (taking into account social interactions, cultural practices, tools, and environmental factors) this approach offers a richer, more complex view of how people think and solve problems in real-life situations. It highlights the dynamic, embodied, and distributed nature of cognition, providing insights that go beyond the individual mind and considering the broader systems that shape cognitive processes.

Oppgave 3:

Bamberg (2012) introduces three principal approaches in narrative research, each offering a distinct lens for analyzing stories. Though these approaches often overlap in practice, they serve as useful ideal types that illuminate different dimensions of narrative meaning.

The first approach treats narratives as *linguistic structures*, focusing on how stories are built through language. A narrative is defined minimally as two or more temporally ordered events, often suggesting a

causal link, like in the example, “The king died. Then the queen died of grief.” Storytelling involves breaking the continuous flow of time and organizing it into meaningful units. Key linguistic devices, i.e. shifts in reference using proper names, pronouns, and anaphora, help to segment the narrative and create coherence. These choices are not random. They signal the structure of the narrative and the roles of its characters. For example, changing from a name to a pronoun might indicate a shift in narrative focus or the speaker’s emotional stance. Thus, linguistic analysis reveals how storytellers package and structure experience in language.

The second approach considers narratives as *cognitive structures* that reflect deeper mental models and shared cultural grammars. This perspective emphasizes the internal architecture of stories, often following a recognizable pattern: an abstract to introduce the story, orientation to set the scene, complication to present a problem, resolution to solve it, and a coda to close. Narratives, from this view, are not only about recounting events but also about interpreting them. Characters are portrayed as intentional agents whose actions are motivated by beliefs, desires, and emotions. Analysis here tends to be top-down: starting with the narrative as a whole and examining how its parts work together to construct meaning. Through multiple readings and collaborative interpretation, researchers uncover how stories reflect human intentions, conflicts, and resolutions.

The third approach moves beyond the text to examine narratives as *interactive and performative acts* situated in specific contexts. Rather than focusing solely on linguistic or cognitive structure, this view emphasizes the dynamics of storytelling as a form of social action. Stories are shaped by the context in which they are told, the relationship between speaker and listener, the setting, and the goals of the interaction. For instance, a person recounting a traumatic event may do so not just to report what happened, but to elicit empathy, assert credibility, or repair trust. This perspective highlights how storytelling serves purposes beyond content transmission, it’s about positioning the self, managing impressions, and responding to social demands. However, this approach also presents methodological challenges: it requires close attention to non-verbal cues such as intonation, pauses, gaze, and gesture, making it time-consuming and often limited in scope.

Bamberg’s (2012) typology illustrates how narrative analysis can reveal different layers of meaning, from linguistic form and cognitive coherence to interactional purpose. Each approach sheds light on how people use stories not only to describe the world but also to make sense of it, and to position themselves and others within it.

NTNU

Fakultet for informasjonsteknologi og elektroteknikk

Karakterskala som er benyttet

X

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