

Dialogue Paper 2 Assignment

Dialogue Paper 2 Assignment

Jeremy Gillentine

Department of Counselor Education and Supervision, Liberty University

COUC750 Qualitative Research

Dr. Lynn Bohecker

September 22, 2024

Author Note

Dialogue Paper 2 Assignment

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to

Email: Jeremy Gillentine—jgillentine@liberty.edu

Synopsis of Article

This article sheds light on some variations of methodologies of viewing research and data, though a couple appear to be based in the lack of methods or the ability to derive valid or even general conclusions. I find a couple of these theories as only reasonable when seen as thought exercises to check for possible variations that may not be seen through more distinct understanding of reality. Though I can see the potential value, I also see them as dangerous and having the potential to lead those not grounded in reality down a relativistic rollercoaster ride that likely ends in the destruction of reality and values that are grounded on the premise of understanding absolute truth. God's truth is indeed absolute and must be considered as so to be followed and well lived.

Thinking Hat Process by Edward Bono

Blue Hat-- Management and Organization of the Thinking Process

- I will work through the major topics in the article “The Three Epistemological Stance for Qualitative Inquiry: Interpretivism, Hermeneutics, and Social Constructionism”. I will go through the thought processes of each hat and consider the various aspects in the article. This process should help me in the process of preparing to do great research that has validity and can add to the current data pool of information.

White Hat-- Neutral and Objective

Dialogue Paper 2 Assignment

- **Interpretivism**—This philosophical approach to how I will see my participants allows me to understand what has been done by seeking to understand what led them to the actions they chose. To interpret the why helps lead to a clearer vision of the action performed. I can work towards achieving my goal of understanding by considering the “conscience and the intent of the participant. I will be able to learn these aspects by both observing and by conversing with them.
- **Philosophical Hermeneutics**—It is open to various interpretations. It looks to find the out of the box ideas that may not be seen when seeking to look objectively or logically.
- **Social Constructionism**—One of the references by Gergen and Denzin indicates they believe SC will “somehow leads to an improvement of the human condition.” This may potentially be accomplished through the realm of no predetermined notion of right or wrong, up or down, and give a clean slate for which to view research data.

Yellow Hat-- Positive and Optimistic

- **Interpretivism**—This philosophical approach is one that I would use because it has not laid aside the ability to see and interpret what is being accomplished through observation. This method has not thrown out generally accepted norms of the physical world. It appears that you can know, to an extent, what has occurred. This approach sees people’s actions as having meaning, has respect for the participant, and is aware of potential biases but does not consider this to make knowing unobtainable. The idea that interpretivist see “human action has meaning and that that meaning is in principle determinable or decidable by the interpreter” is based in reason and logical thought.

Dialogue Paper 2 Assignment

- **Philosophical Hermeneutics**—A positive of PH is the concept of needing to be aware of my biases and preconceived notions to keep my data and reporting of the data from being corrupted or at least having these potentialities acknowledged alongside of the reporting. I hope it is meant to be a philosophical approach of thinking and exploring rather than how someone sees and believes the world to be.
- **Social Constructionism**—Allows for the awareness that we each come to data “against a backdrop of shared understandings, practices, language, and so forth”.

Black Hat-- Negative Assessment

- **Interpretivism**—It seems a bit convoluted that, to understand, I may have to ““participate” in the life world of the other”, while also being “unaffected and external to the interpretive process”.
- **Philosophical Hermeneutics**—It seems absurd to have a philosophy that has a non-objectivist view of meaning. I choose to infer they mean purely objective and without any bias. However, a person can be considerably objective when they choose to seek data and see what the data indicate whether in alignment with their preconceived ideals or not. The article says PH sees truth as an “interpretation” and not as being discovered. This seems to indicate truth as being unknowable. PH considers realism and objectivism to be naïve and thinks that a conclusion will never arrive at a final “correct interpretation”. What a terrible way to see the world!! It seems insane to believe that to “understand is to always understand differently”. It is possible that with some topics we may find new information

Dialogue Paper 2 Assignment

that adds to our understanding, but the implication points away from order, laws, and logic.

- **Social Constructionism**—This is ridiculous! Facts are not constructed but found, discovered, learned, etc. SC understands realist and empiricist epistemology to be naïve. SC thinks knowing the empirical world is unachievable. The real problem with this ideal is the potential to develop “a more radically skeptical and even nihilistic stance.” I think the term **radical** social constructionism is more appropriate.

Green Hat-- Creativity and New Ideas (Where will this idea get us?)

- **Interpretivism**—I could see this perspective helping me to observe my participants and gain valuable insights and then to dialogue with them to further refine my observations. This should help to promote my knowledge base that will help me to ask better questions.
- **Philosophical Hermeneutics**—PH should indeed lead to new ideas since it is not looking for facts or achieving a clear and repeatable conclusion. The whole concept seems to be based on whichever way the wind happens to be blowing today and different at another time if the wind happens to change direction.
- **Social Constructionism**—Has a propensity to be creative by the tenet of playing with the possibilities to discover new thought and variations of understanding.

Red Hat-- Emotional View

- **Interpretivism**—I feel pretty good about this thinking process. The idea that this view would be classified as to “share the neo-Kantian” perspective (I believe indicating they endorse a moral law that transcends man’s philosophical reasoning and creation of

Dialogue Paper 2 Assignment

subjective values) is encouraging. I am a bit confused about the thought to “emphasize the contributions of human subjectivity to knowledge” while then stating “without... sacrificing the objectivity of knowledge”. This has the appearance of being oxymoronically rich while also sharing the insight that our subjectivities have the propensity to flavor or possibly taint our outcomes or collection and recording of data.

- **Philosophical Hermeneutics**—This thought process, as presented, seems problematic. In one place it indicates we cannot gain truth due to our biases and then says “we do not merely reenact our biases in our interpretation which seems to indicate I can harness my biases and preconceived ideas to move towards understanding the data accurately. Some of the implications of PH have the idea that there is no absolute truth. It is distressing to take truth (absolute truth), that would apply to all mankind, off the table because to do so would by necessity allow for your truth and my truth with no need for alignment (chaos). The universe clearly delineates order and order demands truth that indeed transcend man’s subjectivities.

• **Social Constructionism**—I find the concept that I am able and expected to construct knowledge as beyond ridiculous and even disgusting, as well as the following: “many (but not all) constructionist accounts hold that there is no truth to the matter of interpretation.” Just imagine I put a head exploding emoji here!

Reflective Summary of Learning

These variations of reasoning about research and data are vastly different avenues of seeing the world. I am more aligned with the tenets of reason that use logic, observation,

Dialogue Paper 2 Assignment

accepted facts, and other definitively focused approaches to reality. I see the world from a Biblical Worldview and therefore I am centered on the concept of truth. For me to accept philosophical approaches such as constructivist are not in the realm of rationality or realistic. It basically appears to be counter to all that I understand to be factual. I can see the potential value as a thought exercise but not as a rational or valid method of viewing and experiencing the world. This has all the tenets of chaos and destruction embedded within by throwing society into a relativistic tailspin. Of these concepts, I believe I am most aligned with Interpretivism due to its remaining true to rationality and reasonability.

References

- de Bono, Edward (1999). *Six thinking hats* (revised and updated). New York: Little, Brown, and Co.
- de Bono, Edward (1985). *de Bono's thinking course*. New York: Facts on File Publications.
<https://www.debonogroup.com/services/core-programs/six-thinking-hats/>
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research*, (2nd ed., pp. 163-188). Sage.