



# Perspectives and transparency: methodological considerations

Conference 2022: CHILD MIGRATION AND INTEGRATION: TRENDS & CHALLENGES

Tina Høegh

University of Southern Denmark





# Purpose of the study

*Perspectives and transparency: methodological considerations*

**The question: how to gain access to other people's mindset and experiences**

Short discussion of the basic ground of our methods in fieldwork and interviews and examine some of the possibilities and limitations in field and interviews. Three concepts:

- **key event** (Erickson 1977),
- **perspective awareness** (Perregaard 2016) (replacing *intentional patterning* (Perregaard 2018 today) in abstract
- **interest** (Schutz 1975, 1967/1932).



# Purpose of the study

*Perspectives and transparency: methodological considerations*

Because, who are the participants? What are the institutional surroundings for our meeting, and with which expectations and presuppositions does the child see us? What is an interview to them ?

What *traces of perspectives can we see*, e.g., the child's, the researcher's, the teacher's, and/or the institution's?



# Methodological transparency and opacity /opaqness

Consider: when we are looking out the window, we want to look “through” the glass, the transparent glass....

...not noticing maybe raindrops on it. To look to see the “content” of our interest outside.

Transparent methodology in research is an interest to get to know the texture and material on the glass, maybe even of the glass. It means, we are studying the methodological opaqueness, opacity.



# *Key event*

A very useful way to see people, observe social life and get closer to an understanding of peoples' everyday experiences is by noticing and analysing *key events* (Erickson 1977)

## **A key event:**

“A key event is key in that the researcher assumes intuitively that the event chosen has the potential to make explicit a theoretical ‘loading’. A key event is key in that it brings to awareness latent, intuitive judgments the analyst has already made about salient patterns in the data. Once brought to awareness these judgments can be reflected upon critically” (ERICKSON 1985, p. 108).



## *Key event*

**Ethnographic attitudes:** distinctions especially in ethnography in education, between

*doing ethnography, adopting an ethnographic perspective, and using ethnographic tools* (Kroon & Sturm 2000)

Still, useful prints in our minds. But also, they are a researcher's third person perspective and interpretations. How can we come closer to the child perspective?

- the core is of course by working child centred and though art-based setup, but still: *how* are we displaying these ?



# *Perspectives*

- *awareness of perspectives* (Perregaard 2016)(replacing *intentional patterning* (Perregaard 2018) in abstract)
- *interest* (Schutz 1975, 1967/1932).



# *Perspective awareness*

## *First-, second-, and thirdperson*

- The *first-person perspective* is an *experiential* dimension: All experiences are pervaded with ‘the quality of *mineness*’ (Gallagher and Zahavi, 2008, 204, emphasis in original): these things happened to me, I was the one to be in the predicament, I felt the joy, indifference, despair, and so on and so forth.” (Perregard, 2018: 42), and in a first-person perspective we are upheld in the intentionality of consciousness.
- In a second-person perspective we are engaged in the *we-relation*. You and I are in *interaction* engaging ourselves and each other, and this interaction can have strong forces. It is dynamic and maybe committing in directions difficult to foresee.
- The *third-person perspective* is the object-perspective – where we look at something, observe something *as something else*.

(Phenomenology, Language socialization, Integrational linguistics)



# *Interest*

- In everyday life we take things for granted, taking and turning our interest in multiple direction along the day.
- So, *interest* is a pure choice in a situation, not necessarily conscious or deliberate, can be habitual
- A trace to inquire when interviewing someone: language use, gestures and gazes in communicating experiences in certain expressions, voicing and attitudes.
- The interviewee's choices are traces to investigate if we explore the interests in a flow of thoughts and talk. And trace back from where expressions come from, the school, the teacher, peer, or maybe the researcher.
- The art-based productive processes where *interests and choices* become more explicit in visibility, audibility and not least in the multimodality when the child is handling, pointing to, explaining etc. A flow interviewee's *interest* in successive *Nows* is the core object. (Schutz 1976/1932)



# Example from artbased interview: 16 year old "Kay" from Thailand

Examination of the interview:

- Key event: not much observation, short meetings (*using ethnographic tools*)
- Perspectives:
  - 1.-person-perspective: Awareness of researcher's needs and process, e.g., relistening to interview (sentiments and atmosphere) relational needs, not enough to read transcript. Kay's information-domains: "Denmark good, the weather good", but minus relations (not mentioning mum, dad etc.)
  - 2.-Interviewer-perspective was overworking here to make a good relation, and interviewer and interviewee no use of complex language: Kay reads Danish, but oral Danish is difficult for him
  - 3.-person-perspective: researcher and Kay together are looking at Kay's experiences as *historical objects*.

...>



# Example from artbased interview: 16 year old "Kay" from Thailand

...>

- Interests: traces pointing to researcher herself and former activities, only a few could be traced back to Kay himself:

From researcher and former activities terms like *drawing, mathematics, leisure time* at the "school for young people" in the afternoon.

Words from Kay was *cozy rain, indoor drawing*



# Conclusion upon suggestions

- **These three focuses to stay aware in our analysis that the analysis is based on, as a human being, the qualitative researcher first**
- **We are sliding between perspectives, coorporated and managed skilfully.**
- **But also remember that this human communcation also makes research**

**Thank you for listening**

# References

- Clark, A. and Moss, P. (2001). *Listening To Young Children: The Mosaic Approach*. London: *National Children's Bureau*.
- Erickson, F. (1985). *Qualitative methods in research on teaching*. *Handbook of research on teaching*. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/c74e/735826d50018235b98dd4723a9fad28b3956.pdf>
- Lomax, H. (2012). Contested voices? Methodological tensions in creative visual research with children, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 15(2): 105-117.
- Perregaard, B. (2018) The dynamics of interactional and intentional pattern formation in children's language socialization. *Language and Communication* 62, p.39-50.
- Procter, L. & Hatton, A. (2015): Producing Visual Research with children: Exploring Power and Meaning Making. In: Stirling & Yamada-Rice, *Visual Methods with Children and Young People*, Palgrave Macmillan).
- Schutz, A. (1976) *The Phenomenology of the Social World (Der sinnhafte Aufbau der sozialen Welt)*. Heinemann Educational Books.
- Schutz, A. (1975) *Hverdagslivets sociologi* [Eng.title: *The Sociology of Everyday Life*]. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

## Extra slide on Erickson's key event if time

- ERICKSON: a “strong relationship between a key incident and an **emblem**, a mainly 16th and 17th century tripartite work of art with strong pretensions to teaching people (moral) lessons. An emblem consists of a pictura, (...) a lemma, often a proverb or classical quotation, which, together with the pictura forms a ‘mystery’. By explaining this mystery, usually in the form of an epigram, universal knowledge will be gained from the particular.” (Kroon & Sijm, 2000, p. 565)

“As a final observation, we would like to indicate that an (educational) researcher who works in the other, i.e., the empirical-analytical tradition, takes a similar line in his research. He reduces his data to codes and numbers. The statistician arranges the numbers into a statistical table: the pictura (cf. VAN VEEN et al. 1999).” (Ibid: 574)



	Subject matter (DF=4; 419)		Age (DF=3; 421)	
	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>
Learning-oriented	.14	.68	.59	2.96*
Transmission-oriented	2.02	3.22*	.34	.54
Moral-oriented	2.44	7.97**	.50	1.63
Qualification-oriented	.48	1.09	.29	.67
Consultation with subject colleagues	.42	2.92*	.16	1.08
with other teachers	.85	3.57**	.19	.81
with management	.28	1.15	.31	1.26
Influence of teacher him/herself	.48	1.83	.02	.07
of other teachers	.81	1.94	.60	1.44
of management	.32	1.30	.49	2.04