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Abstract

This study had 24 participants. These participants were divided into three 8-person samples. One sample was comprised of retired low-income elderly, one was comprised of retired university professors, and one was comprised of retired university staff. All of the participants were age 50 or over. I collected data from the participants through one-on-one face-to-face interviews, and through observations I conducted of participants’ during-interview behavior (I conducted those observations by watching videos of the interviews.).

An interesting result of this study was the occurrence of particular nonverbal responses of participants’ bodies when those participants were trying to give answers to interview questions in the study (Those nonverbal responses of the body were motions I have labeled eyes wander (where the participant’s eyes wandered a particular way), eyes open a little wider and brow furrows (where the participant’s eyes opened wider and his or her brow furrowed, suddenly and simultaneously), and head nodding (where the participant nodded a particular way).). I postulate that these nonverbal responses of the body were not induced by what I posit is the nature of the mental in the participant (i.e., the participant’s mind), and yet they seemed to correspond with something mental that was happening in the participant--a mental need for an answer to an interview question. These nonverbal responses of the body make me wonder, is there another level of
intelligence in the person, one that is not a mind or what has been called an “unconscious mind” or “subconscious mind,” that is trying to help the mind when it is at a loss in its seeking an answer for something?

Another interesting result of this study is related to the first result I noted, and it is the following question: Why was it that this study’s participants, in trying to answer this study’s interview questions, were seemingly sometimes unable to find words to say until one or multiple of the nonverbal responses of the body noted above, occurred?

A result of this study that I found interesting was that all of the participants in the study (with one exception), somewhere in my interviews of them, verbally expressed happiness about their life, somehow. Also, in my interviews of this study’s participants, most of the participants verbally expressed that they are satisfied they did the best they could with their lives so far. All of the participants indicated verbally that they have more to live for--e.g., many said that they are learning and that they will continue learning. Also, the interview data I collected from participants showed no evidence that the participants are experiencing complacency (i.e., not taking an active role, but instead being given one). Thus, striving and hope (which one might see as the characteristics of healthy living, I posit) were expressed verbally by the participants. None of the participants, in my perception, were so burdened that they were depressed or could not handle things.

In addition, the interview data I collected in this study showed that because the participants are retired, many of the participants are (a) not engaged anymore in the struggle to produce, and (b) not aiming to prove themselves. No longer having to earn
money through work, they now have a regulated life, and the interview data I collected showed that, as a result, most of the participants, for the most part, have no more worries. People in their 20’s and 30’s may not have verbally responded to the questions on this study’s interview schedule in the same way that this study’s participants--retirees age 50 and over--did. Future research could determine if people in their 20’s and 30’s would give different answers to the questions on this study’s interview schedule.
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Preface

I have absorbed guidance, vocabulary, and understanding from many sources in my life, and much of that guidance, vocabulary, and understanding comes out in my work, of course. I would say that the following six sources in my life have influenced me and my worldview (i.e., life view) the most:

1. The Ohio State University (where I earned my Ph.D.).
2. Antioch University Seattle (where I earned my M.A.).
3. My comparing of American life with life in other countries I have been to (those countries are Jamaica, Canada, Lichtenstein, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, England, Spain, France, Italy, and Egypt).
4. Personal visit experience in the countries listed above.
5. Norman Edgar Wengert, D.C., of Williamsport, Pennsylvania, for his unique lifestyle, professional practice, and writing, and for my and his attempting to learn the very difficult methods of self-analysis he teaches.
6. My own instinctive interest that maintains and deepens my intellectual desire to know, understand, experience, teach use of, and research both of the following: (a) what I perceive is the component next to intellect or mind that is the source, I posit, of intuition or anything that comes to the mind, not from the mind (I refer to this component as “instinctive responsiveness” in this dissertation), and (b) the full spectrum of somatic response phenomena the
human can experience (This spectrum includes the following, I perceive: reasoning, logic, body movements, intuition, feelings, the traditional five senses, memory, dreams we can have when sleeping, a posited “sixth sense” capability that belongs to a posited instinctive responsiveness in us, believing that does not use reasoning to either support or challenge that believing, fantasy, and what Schwandt (2001) describes as the mind’s apparent creation of “abstractions or concepts” (p. 30) in response to “sense data” (p. 30).).

In my perception, that which is responsible for the full spectrum of what has been variously called psychic, spiritual, religious, is one source. Whatever that source is, is what I am interested in.

My rationale for why I conducted this study is the following: the rationale comes down to developing a view that makes sense to me, that convinces me of why people have gotten religions, philosophies, and psychologies confused with whatever the Universal Reality is.

For this study, I created and maintained what is known in the qualitative research domain as an audit trail, which Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (2002) define as follows: “A qualitative researcher’s documentation of how a study was conducted, including what was done, when, and why. It allows an independent auditor to examine the study from beginning to end and judge the trustworthiness of the outcome” (p. 555). Anyone who wishes to obtain an electronic copy of this study’s audit trail can do so by contacting me via e-mail at mullins.224@osu.edu.
Also, I conducted interviews for this study, and I typed transcripts of those interviews; those transcripts, however, are not included in this research report. Anyone who wishes to obtain electronic copies of this study’s interview transcripts can do so by contacting me via e-mail at mullins.224@osu.edu.

Lastly, I video-recorded the interviews I conducted for this study. At my discretion, I will permit my colleagues (graduate students and individuals with a doctorate) to view digital video discs (DVDs) of the interviews I conducted for this study, so that these colleagues can evaluate my interpretations regarding the participant behaviors that are on the DVDs. Colleagues who wish to view the DVDs for the purpose described in the previous sentence can contact me via email at mullins.224@osu.edu.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Complete understanding appears to be an elusive feature of our existence which, were it realizable by us, would change our lives dramatically, it would seem.

Social scientist and writer Harman (1986) observes that “in the tradition of our ancestors, man was possessed of a conscience, an inner and valid sense of morals and values” (p. 5), one that if practically accessible today would ostensibly enable us to know, with complete understanding, “what we most truly want to be and do” (p. 5). He thus refers to this source of complete understanding as a “sense” (p. 5), and yet in the same writing he identifies it also as “a deep part of the mind” (p. 5). These differing labels complicate our attempt to grasp what such a source within the human might be, since Harman’s notion of a “sense” (p. 5) implies something which would belong to a category of what could be called a “sixth sense,” while his notion “a deep part of the mind” (p. 5) suggests something that is not of a sixth sense domain, but that, to me, is operant within the mind’s function. Further complicating understanding of the source of completed understanding Harman discusses is the fact that its very existence, he notes, has been considered illusory in broadly influential segments of contemporary Western thought such as Freudian psychology, in which one’s “sense of morals and values” (p. 5), Harman writes, is taken to be merely the product of the conditioning one received in interactions with one’s parental figures, and then internalized. That Harman applies differing labels to the source of complete understanding--i.e., he refers to it both as a
“sense” (p. 5) and as “a deep part of the mind” (p. 5), as noted above—shows that what it actually is within the human organism, its nature, is not well understood; as well, Harman’s reference to the above-noted Freudian view of this source indicates that its existence is easily “explained away” (p. 5), as he writes. This intangible that Harman discusses, which can appear as nothing but perhaps is behind everything, may be existent within us, undoubtedly. Those who assert that a source of complete understanding does not exist are in error, since making such a statement requires that they have access to a source of complete understanding, which they themselves say does not exist. These individuals can rightly doubt that a source of completed understanding within us exists, and they may also be able to observe rightly that they, personally, have not found it to be existent in their lives or others’. Even so, those who doubt the possibility of complete understanding, or who observe that they have not found evidence of complete understanding, cannot claim we will never get closer to finding complete understanding. After all, it is axiomatic that if there is incomplete understanding, there is also complete understanding. All fields are driving toward complete understanding, aiming to achieve greater accuracy. All investigators in all fields seek the end of completed understanding, unless they give up, float. Thus, it cannot be denied that the source of complete understanding within us that Harman discusses possibly exists, but what if our discovering that existence in ourselves means that using the mind, alone, disregardful of that existence, is not how we identify, as Harman says, “what we most truly want to be and do” (p. 5) (i.e., in my words, who we are)? What if, in other words, the source of complete understanding is not “a deep part of the mind” (p. 5), as Harman suggests, but
another nature in us that is separate and different from *the mind*, therefore making that nature not necessarily easily understood by *the mind*? If a source of completed understanding exists in us, and it is another nature that is separate and different from *the mind*, it would seem that the best we can do is try to access that source with *the mind*. Such was the primary aim of this study. There was no one field of knowledge out of which I built this study, and the content of this study is not contained by any combination of current fields. That suggests we ultimately need a separate field.

As noted above, Harman (1986) refers to the source of completed understanding as our “conscience” (p. 5), our “sense of morals and values” (p. 5), and as “a deep part of the mind” (p. 5). He also refers to it as “our capacity for intuitive judgment” (p. 5), “deep intuition” (p. 5), and “the deep intuitive mind” (p. 5), implying that any judgment we label as “intuitive” (p. 5), or as having originated in “deep intuition” (p. 5) or “the deep intuitive mind” (p. 5), self-evidently, is “intuitive” (p. 5), or did originate in “deep intuition” (p. 5) or “the deep intuitive mind” (p. 5). The question of the extent to which we are correct in labeling judgments we make as “intuitive” (p. 5), or in asserting that they have come to us by “intuition” (p. 5), however, Harman does not ask. He thus assumes that when we label a judgment “intuitive” (p. 5), or say we have made a judgment based on “intuition” (p. 5), our correctness in doing so is simply self-evident. No one can force me to relinquish my position that what is “intuitive,” or has come to us by “intuition,” is not simply self-evident.
The following passage by educator Marienthal (1992) describes the actions of Professor William Taylor as Taylor was making a Greek salad. In the passage, Marienthal refers to himself as “Paul” (p. 165):

Bill made a Greek salad. The onions seemed to grow out of the palms of his hands. He caressed the cucumbers, and removed their seeds with the back of a spoon as if he were performing a delicate surgery. After carefully layering the sliced tomatoes and the feta and peppers, he spread a handful of dark spicy olives with a gentle sweep so that each one nestled comfortably into a place among the other inhabitants of the dish. The light green olive oil poured over it all from the ends of his fingers.

All the while he moved and turned and leaned in the space. Taking things from storage bins, moving from sink to drawers to shelves to counters. Silently pulling out bowls and jars and spoons. When he was finished, and gently offered the gorgeous plate of food to the table, Paul had somehow even acquired eating utensils, and the kitchen was clean! Overall it was one of the loveliest cooking performances Paul had ever witnessed. (pp. 164-165)

Is it possible for us to correctly say that Taylor’s actions were coming from instinctive responsiveness, an ostensible source of complete understanding that provided knowledge to him that he had not learned--knowledge that was not coming from his conscious mind, or from unconscious mental activity, but just his individual ability? Could we separate where the judgments he was making originated--e.g., in instinctive responsiveness, or in his mind’s reasoning or logic, or in his mind’s preferences regarding what he should do and how? Could we say that Taylor had an instinctive “knack” for making Greek salads, that he simply picked-up that knowledge easily, without having to struggle to learn it in the way another person most certainly might? We need to be able to separate where within the person such displays of knowledge come from, in my view, so that we can figure out how we work inside better. What if, as educators, we could teach people how to access such a source of knowledge--a source that is ostensibly a source of complete
understanding--within themselves? Such would not explain theoretically what that source is, or how it operates, but the field of education could provide a way for people to access that source within themselves so that they could then make practical use of that source in life endeavors.

In his historical review of intuition, psychiatrist Deikman (1982/1998) describes intuition as “any process of acquiring knowledge that differs from conscious thought and bypasses the senses and memory” (p. 177). He observes that for thousands of years, thinkers have attempted to grapple with the issue of our knowing more than we should and have used the term intuition in different ways, each reflecting particular theories of knowledge based on the assumptions of specific cultures. (p. 178)

Because there have been different ways to approach intuition, it is a dangerous subject. The topic’s territory is akin to religious or spiritual territory (and probably will turn out to be the same territory, I speculate) in that, like religious and spiritual perspectives, there are many opinions about the subject, the opinions often do not agree with one another, none of them is probably entirely correct, and none entirely incorrect. The subject of intuition is dangerous because it is not just theoretical territory. It is personal. People have personal opinions about it. Given the personal nature of the subject, it is expected, guaranteed that we will find that. The subject, however, has too many unknowns to it, so anybody who has any strong reaction to it is expressing only an opinion, and not facts, because the subject is not empirical. In every case, in other words, when someone reacts strongly to the subject, he or she is expressing only an opinion, because there is no explicit knowledge behind it. In my view, there should be explicit knowledge behind the subject of intuition, someday, however, and that is my interest: how our interior design
actually functions, from a functional, practical point of view,\textsuperscript{1} so that we can learn how to work it, what we can work with people, how to show them how to research their person. A place to start that, I posit, would be with teaching them how to separate what comes to \textit{the mind} via intuition (after having had its origin in a posited instinctive source of completed understanding--another nature in us that is separate and different from \textit{the mind}, I posit) versus what comes \textit{from the mind} (i.e., from its use of reasoning or its use of logic, or from its conditioned preference or liking, for instance). In this study, I looked for clues for how to further research and potential for separating what comes to \textit{the mind} (via intuition) versus what comes from it, so that we might better figure out how things work inside.

Returning to Harman (1986), and the question of whether or not we are correct in identifying a judgment we make as “intuitive” (p. 5), or as having come by “intuition” (p. 5)--a question he apparently did not notice--, I would like to point out that Harman was not alone in his oversight. This same question is overlooked, but with one exception, in every contemporary academic\textsuperscript{2} writing (i.e., academic writings published since 1958) I am aware of that cites the subject of intuition (The reference citations of those writings--including the one exception I noted--, are listed in this dissertation’s Chapter 2, its literature review.). This is in spite of the fact that Wild--in 1938--observed the following

\textsuperscript{1} I.e., as opposed to from a mechanical point of view, from which one could study intuition using electroencephalography or magnetic resonance imaging, for instance, to observe, say, brain activity during a presumed experience of it.

\textsuperscript{2} I have defined as “academic” any writing about which at least one of the following is factual: (a) The writing was required reading in an academic course I took at Antioch University Seattle (where I earned my M.A.) or The Ohio State University (where I earned my Ph.D.); (b) the writing was recommended to me, or to a student other than me, or to all of the students in an academic course I took at Antioch University Seattle or The Ohio State University, by the professor of that academic course; or (c) the writing was published by an academic press or scholarly journal.
about intuition, which still holds today: “There is (so far) no...method of distinguishing between ideas acquired...through...intuition and those acquired through reason or perception...” (p. 229). In other words, Wild pointed out that what we label as “intuitive,” or as having come to us by “intuition,” is not self-evident, because we have not yet evolved a method enabling us to differentiate which of our ideas (e.g., judgments we make) are intuitive, or have come by intuition, and which have come from “reason or perception” (p. 229), as she writes. This study sought to differentiate human verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came to the mind of research participants by intuition (ideas that I postulate originated in a posited instinctive responsiveness, another nature in the person that is a source of complete understanding), versus verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came from the mind of the participants (and more specifically, from the mind’s reasoning and logic).

My Definition of Intuition, and My Definition of Other Key Terms Used in This Dissertation

Wild (1938) defines intuition as “a method by which a subject becomes aware of an entity without...aid from the senses or...reason...” (p. 226). She defines “entity” (p. 226) in her definition as broadly as possible: it includes “idea, fact, situation, indeed any one individual particular of any nature whatever from...the memory of a sound, to...the Absolute...” (p. 226). In this section, I shall review several aspects of Wild’s definitions of the terms “intuition” (p. 226), “reason” (p. 226), and “perception” (p. 229), in order to elucidate particular features of the definition of intuition I propose. I shall then offer my definition of intuition. I caution the reader, however, to aim to not ascribe his or her own
meanings to the terms I use to discuss what I posit intuition is and is not, but to instead seek to gain understanding of the meanings I specify in my definitions of those terms.

First, I disagree with Wild’s (1938) statement that “intuition is a method” (p. 226). Referring to intuition as a “method” implies that intuition is a procedure that one employs willfully. I propose that intuition is not a procedure one employs willfully, but a process that occurs spontaneously (i.e., of its own volition).

Second, I agree with Wild’s (1938) statement that intuition occurs “without...aid from the senses” (p. 226), but only if by “senses” (p. 226) we mean the traditional five senses, and not a “sixth sense,” because I propose that intuition itself is a “sixth sense,” that it belongs to a broader category of “sixth sense” capabilities.

Third, I agree with Wild’s (1938) statements that “reason”3 (p. 226) and intuition are distinct from one another, that reason is a capability we can actively use to play with or experiment with ideas or facts, and that ideas we gain by intuition are not actively obtainable by will, but received. I shall discuss in greater detail below that it is this distinction between ideas actively played with and experimented with using reason, on the one hand, and ideas not actively obtained, but received via intuition, on the other hand, that I sought to isolate and gain evidence of in this study.

Silliness can be the most serious of events, if we were able to understand origin, meaning, and what was accomplished by it. We do not know where it comes from, or why, so, we dismiss it. Why? We are a long way from finding the artfulness inherent in many somatic responses that occur naturally, as well as induced by, you know, body

---

3 In her text, Wild (1938) does not give an explicit definition of “reason,” so I have paraphrased the description of reason she offers, in order to represent what she means by the term.
movement, words, feelings, etc. We need to understand what our somatic responses are, where they come from, and why they come.

Fourth, although Wild (1938) does not state a complete definition of what she means by “perception” (p. 229), I have concluded, based on my review of her discussion of that term, that (a) I am partially in disagreement, and partially in agreement, with the meaning she gives to it, and that (b) in order to show what I mean by the term, I have to make a distinction between what I see as four different kinds of perception. I shall now elucidate the way in which I am in disagreement and the way in which I am in agreement with the meaning Wild gives to the word “perception” (p. 229); I shall also elucidate the distinctions between the four different kinds of perception that I see, so that I can show what I mean by the term “perception.” I disagree with the following aspect of the meaning Wild gives to the word “perception” (p. 229): that perception is distinct from intuition. I propose that intuition is instead a kind of perception, and that each of the traditional five senses is, also. Intuition and the five senses, I propose, provide knowledge which the mind (“Mind” is a term I define below.) can then take into consideration, and try to make sense of. This knowledge, before the mind can consider it and try to make sense of it, I shall refer to as unclarified perception. Once the mind considers an unclarified perception and tries to make sense of it (i.e., if the mind does that, for the person whose mind it is may not be capable of recognizing a given unclarified perception), the mind makes an interpretation regarding it which I shall call a clarified perception. Now, Wild, in discussing “perception” (p. 211), asserts that it involves a “process of interpretation” (p. 211). That assertion of Wild’s is the aspect of the meaning
Wild gives to “perception” (p. 211) that I agree with—a *clarified perception*, in my view, is formed through interpretation and is itself an interpretation. Because, in both my definition of the term *clarified perception* and in Wild’s definition of “perception” (p. 211), perception involves interpretation, it of course follows that any perception can be a *misperception*—i.e., an interpretation that, although accurate from the perceiver’s perspective, is inaccurate from another, larger, and perhaps more complete perspective. An example of such a misperception would be that of the color-blind person who perceives he or she is viewing a particular color that, in actuality (i.e., from the perspective of non-color-blind people), is not that color. *Clarified perception*, in my definition, then, as the example in the previous sentence shows, is perspective—it is our mind’s take on something—, and a *clarified perception* can be a misperception, without our knowing it. Thus our *clarified perceptions* of the knowledge provided by the five senses and intuition, in the view I propose, can be in error—they are interpretations that do not necessarily reflect the knowledge that was provided in *unclarified perception*. A *clarified perception* that does not reflect the knowledge provided in the *unclarified perception* it interprets, is an example of what I shall call *incomplete perception*. On the other hand, a *clarified perception* that does reflect the knowledge provided in the *unclarified perception* it interprets, is an example of what I shall call *complete perception*; in stating that, however, I wish to add that in my view, it is probable that no perception is ever complete.

Now that I have reviewed certain aspects of Wild’s (1938) definitions of “intuition” (p. 226), “reason” (p. 226), and “perception” (p. 229) for the purpose of
elucidating particular features of the definition of intuition that I propose, I offer the following as my definition of intuition: A posited process of direct, spontaneous, nonverbal, felt knowing occurring distinct from reasoning (in my definition, a process for reaching conclusions that includes use of comparison, logical deduction, and assumption), logic (in my definition, the process of reasoning toward an acceptable rationale), the traditional five senses, and memory.

Many of the words I have used in my definition of intuition, of course, hold different meanings for different individuals. I shall now define how I am using certain of those words. Like I wrote above, however, I caution the reader to aim to not ascribe his or her own meanings to the terms I use to discuss what I posit intuition is and is not, but to instead seek to gain understanding of the meanings I specify in my definitions of those terms.

Process: One of the ways that the *Oxford American Dictionary* (Ehrlich, Flexner, Carruth, & Hawkins, 1980) defines the noun “process” (p. 532) is as “a natural operation” (p. 532); that dictionary then states that an example of such a natural operation is “the digestive process” (p. 532). I posit that, like the digestive process, intuition is a process, a natural operation which, as noted above, one does not employ willfully, but that occurs spontaneously (i.e., of its own volition).

Direct: When I propose that intuition is a process of direct knowing, I mean that the knowing that occurs appears immediately, bypassing reasoning and logical processing, and it does not require any voluntary processing on the part of the knower. The knowing that arrives via the process of intuition, I propose, gets provided to mental
processing (which I define below), and mental processing was either already stopped when the knowing via intuition arrived, it stops when the knowing arrives, or it continues occurring when the knowing arrives. Intuition is a process that the mind (which I define below) does not do, I propose; instead, I postulate that the mind simply receives the knowing that is provided via the process of intuition.

Spontaneous: In positing that intuition is a process that occurs in a spontaneous manner, I mean (as noted above) that it occurs of its own volition, by which I mean that it occurs without our being able to coax or cajole it, or control it so that it is under our command. In this way, I propose that intuition is not a process that we can turn to and necessarily receive knowledge via, for, it may not provide knowledge if we turn to it.

Nonverbal: By “nonverbal” I mean, knowing that comes before it is verbalized or otherwise represented symbolically (e.g., in numbers, musical notation, or design elements). After this knowing comes, we can put words, other symbols, or both words and other symbols, to it, then try to communicate it or otherwise put it to use.

Felt: In describing intuition as “felt,” I mean we get a sense of something profoundly not of conscious, or mental origin, almost as if it is felt elsewhere in the person as it perhaps also infiltrates the mental (intellectual) domain (I shall define “mental” (which I use as a synonym for “intellectual”) below.).

There are other terms I use in this dissertation which I shall now define.

Instinctive responsiveness: A posited awareness in us that is not visible, that we are born with, that is separate from what I posit is our mind (i.e., our nature of the mental, our intellect, our nature of thinking, which I define below), and that knows, without any
thoughts (which I define below). I postulate that this posited awareness is a nature that
does not and cannot think (i.e., that it does not and cannot use reasoning (as defined
above) and logic (as defined above)), but I also postulate that it is a source of completed
understanding. I postulate that we involuntarily respond toward life with this posited
awareness, and that we can be wholly or partly unaware we are doing that. This posited
awareness, I postulate, is the origin of the intuitive; accordingly, I propose that the origin
of the intuitive is not the mental as defined below. I propose that what I presume are our
feelings are automatically produced but very complicated responses that did not come
from thinking (i.e., from reasoning and logic, as defined above), but from the posited
instinctive responsiveness. I also propose that the posited instinctive responsiveness is
capable of sensing, and that it provides the knowledge of what it senses to the mind (as
defined below) via the process of intuition as I defined it (That knowledge, I propose,
inherently possesses preexistent meaning, apart from any meanings we construct.). This
posited sensing capability of the posited instinctive responsiveness, and what I presume
are our feelings, I postulate, are from and of what I perceive as a “sixth sense” category.

Feelings: As stated in my definition of instinctive responsiveness, I postulate that
what I presume are our feelings are automatically produced but very complicated
responses that did not come from thinking (i.e., from reasoning and logic, as defined
above), but from the posited instinctive responsiveness. What I presume are our feelings,
I postulate, originate as realities, and they do not originate as thoughts, or as words or
other kinds of symbols.
Insight: Understanding or knowing (e.g., “the apparent appearance of insight”); an understanding or knowing (e.g., “What if insights are coming at us much of the time by intuition…?”).

The nature of the mental--i.e., the mind, the intellect, the nature of thinking: A process that is not visible, and that performs the process of thinking (As stated below in my definition of thinking, thinking comes in the form of either reasoning or logic, both of which I define as processes.). Even though I postulate that the nature of the mental (i.e., the mind) performs the process of thinking, I posit that instinctive responsiveness is the nature behind thinking that allows thinking to take place.

I would like to point out that I defined both instinctive responsiveness and the mind as not visible. Also, I have posited that instinctive responsiveness is the nature behind thinking that allows thinking to take place, but that the mind performs the process of thinking. Do you not think that if instinctive responsiveness indeed allows the mind to perform the process of thinking, then the mind should be respectful of instinctive responsiveness when performing thinking? Is it not possible that the mind is not supposed to take over thinking, but that, instead, the mind is supposed to respectfully allow its performance of thinking to be guided by instinctive responsiveness? Did we not let the mind take over thinking?

I hold that we do not know what the mind is; I also hold that we do not know what instinctive responsiveness is. We know that the brain is required for the mind to function, but I posit that the brain does not produce the mind’s function. In addition, I posit that the term the nature of the mental--i.e., the nature of thinking--should perhaps be stated as
“the natures of the mental” or “the natures of thinking,” because I posit that all mind’s do not work the same. My dissertation is not geared toward explaining that postulation, however; that postulation is another realm of consideration.

Consciousness: What the mind, as defined above, is conscious of, or consciously aware of.

Mental, or intellectual: Of or related to the nature of the mental (i.e., the intellect), as defined above.

Mental processing: The use of reasoning (as defined above) or logic (as defined above) or both of these, by the mind as defined above.

Thinking: A process that comes in the form of either reasoning or logic, both of which I defined above as processes. The posited instinctive responsiveness is the thing behind thinking that allows thinking to take place, I postulate, but I also postulate that the posited instinctive responsiveness does not perform the process of thinking (As stated above, I postulate that the mind performs the process of thinking.).

Thoughts: Products of the process of thinking as defined above.

Belief/Beliefs: My definition of belief is the following: Mental acceptance of something, even though certainty is absent. Beliefs, in my view, are what we accept as probably true, as far as we know--the point being that we do not know enough to be absolutely certain. Parenthetically, I perceive that anything that can be shown to be of use to make things a little more certain, is to be desired. I also perceive that any method that can be applied to thinking (as defined above) to give a greater degree of certainty, is to be desired.
My view is that this whole dissertation--inclusive of my and others’ ideas in it--is comprised of beliefs as defined above. In other words, I hold that both my and others’ ideas in this dissertation are beliefs. I also hold that others’ ideas (which I view as others’ beliefs) stated in this dissertation are no more factual or less factual than mine stated in it. In my perception, perhaps 90% of what goes on in any of our minds is mostly about beliefs as defined above, and the remaining percentage is dedicated to our attempt to suspend our beliefs as we encounter new experiences. Parenthetically, because I gave my definition of belief, above, and some readers may find that the word belief seems similar to the word faith, I wish to state that the word faith, to me, implies the complete unquestioning of something in the absence of physical proof, and when that something is not supported by reason. Faith, to me, is something one adds to belief to make the belief stronger, even if that adding is not justified.

Also, since I discussed the notion of certainty in my definition of beliefs, above, I shall state that it is my perception that as far as one knows, absolute certainty may be absent. We may or may not be able to tell whether absolute certainty is absent or not. However, I find it safe to say that some things are certain--for example, physical death is certain. I also hold that one can be pretty certain about things, but just not absolutely certain, because there is always more to know, more to be certain about.

“Intrapersonal [italics added]” (Mullins, 2003, p. 8): When I use this word as an adjective, I mean “within-the-person.” When I use this word as a noun (e.g., “the ‘intrapersonal [italics added]’ (Mullins, 2003, p. 8”)”), I mean “within-the-person territory” or “territory within the person” or “our inner selves.”
Discussion of the Beginning, Tentative Theory That Guided This Study’s Design

“In the future, how will instructional technology respond to the requirements of fluid, multiple knowledge structures negotiated at the local level?” (Taylor & Swartz, 1988/1991, p. 61)

One of the aims of instructional technology, as Taylor and Swartz (1988/1991) indicate in using that term in the essay from which I have excerpted the question above, is to produce outcomes in the education of students that are the same across historical and social milieus. Consensus, or, that the people teaching with and learning from an instructional technology will come to the same understanding as a result of using that technology, is the implied possibility of that use. Consensus is also the implied possibility of the empirical science upon which, as Taylor and Swartz point out, the development of instructional technology is based: use of the methods of that science, it is assumed, leads to knowledge on which we can universally agree. The authors observe, however, that “fluid, multiple knowledge structures negotiated at the local level” (p. 61)—i.e., changeable and multiple structures of “concepts, ideas, theories, the world, reality, and facts” (Bruffee, 1986, as cited in Taylor & Swartz, 1988/1991, p. 56) formed when communities of religious fundamentalists and people of color, for example, Taylor and Swartz note, influence local public school curriculum negotiations—do not necessarily generate student outcomes, or understandings, that agree with the knowledge produced

---

4 In their essay, Taylor and Swartz (1988/1991) use the definition for instructional technology developed by Heinich (1984, as cited in Taylor & Swartz, 1988/1991). That definition, the authors note, emphasizes replicability (i.e., a particular instructional technology is replicable to the extent that it “can be reproduced endlessly and used repeatedly” (Taylor & Swartz, 1988/1991, p. 60)), reliability (i.e., the use of an instructional technology can generate student outcomes that do not vary across temporal and spatial contexts), communication, and control.
by empirical science. The issue thus becomes, Taylor and Swartz point out—as stated in the question above--, how instructional technology will respond to this multiplicity.

I would like to suggest that one way instructional technology could respond to that multiplicity would be to uncover a possible real universal language, although not a language that is verbal. This language I propose, would qualify as a language in that it would function as a way to understand, but instead of being a verbal language, it would be one of feeling. Uncovering this language of feeling, I propose, would require that we find a way to assess its meanings without thinking serving as the arbiter of what those meanings are. In this way, thinking would need to seek to not judge what feeling is, but instead be receptive to what feeling is—to allow feeling to communicate on its own terms. At the same time, thinking would need to be able to grasp the meanings of feeling in terms that it could understand.

The notion of a posited universal language of feeling that I discussed in the previous paragraph was the core concept of the beginning, tentative theory that guided this study’s design. That concept emerged in my qualitative analysis of the following: (a) information (i.e., notes) I wrote-down that recorded informal observations I made regarding the behavior of roughly 35 low-income elderly who participated in a service-learning project I designed and led in April and May, 2007, as a member of the Ohio State University Multicultural Center’s Social Justice Cohort, as well as (b) data I

---

5 Service-learning is defined thusly:

A form of experiential education characterized by student participation in an organized service activity that ... is connected to specific learning outcomes ... [,] meets identified community needs ... [and] provides structured time for student reflection and connection of the service experience to learning. (Service-Learning Initiative, n.d.)
collected (in 2007) that represent my own personal experiences, data which exist in the form of written autobiographical reflections (I wish to point-out, here, that the community of low-income elderly with which I conducted the service-learning project is one of two groups from which I drew samples for this study (In Chapter 3, I discuss this study’s samples and the sampling strategy I used in this study.). Also, I wish to point-out that the service-learning project, as a whole, and all activities within the project, were non-research activities. I did not obtain the names of the participants in the project, and, during it, I was unaware it would eventually come to inform a research activity, as it did in eventually coming to inform this study. It was not until six months after the project (i.e., in November, 2007), when I was reflecting on the experience I had had in a two-hour workshop that I conducted as a part of the project, that I realized that several things I observed about the project participants’ behavior during that workshop, would be worthwhile following-up on in a research activity. Upon realizing that, I wrote-down what I had observed during the workshop about the project participants’ behavior, and then I used grounded theory (Punch, 2005; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) qualitative data analysis procedures to analyze what I wrote-down (The grounded theory data analysis procedures I used, which I also used in analyzing the data I collected during this study, are described in Chapter 3.). The observations I made about the project participants were general observations I made about them as an entire group, rather than observations I made about particular individuals within that group. Also, those observations were informal observations I made as a workshop leader, rather than formal ones I made as a researcher conducting a participant observation to collect data. Accordingly, in this study,
I refer to the notes I wrote-down regarding the project participants’ behavior as “information,” rather than “data.”). Using the beginning, tentative theory and numerous major and minor hypotheses I deduced from it, I selected sampling strategies and developed interview questions that I used in this study to test the theory’s various features against data (The interview schedule I used to collect data in this study is in Appendix A.). One of the interview questions I used, for example, enabled me to test the theory’s feature which held that individuals living in the low-income elderly community with which I conducted the service-learning project, are negotiating life as happily as they can. Another of the interview questions I used, enabled me to test the theory’s feature which held that individuals living in that low-income elderly community listen to and follow their feelings in making decisions. Other of the interview questions I employed sought to enable me to test the theory’s feature which held that individuals who perceive themselves as listening to and following their feelings in making decisions, learned to do that at other times and places than in school, and through different ways of learning than are fostered in school. And, all of the interview questions I used were designed to prompt either an intellectual verbal response or an intuitive verbal response, to see whether or not I could discern differences between those two proposed types of verbal responses-- differences which would be evidence for indicators for future research on intuition, since they would enable identification of intuition.

This Study’s Purpose

This study had three primary purposes. First, it sought to investigate whether people see listening to and following their feelings in making decisions as a contributor to
negotiating life as happily as they can. Second, it sought to investigate when, where, and how people who perceive themselves as listening to and following their feelings in making decisions learned to do so. Third, it aimed to try to find a way to separate (a) human verbal responses that convey ideas that originate in a posited instinctive responsiveness in us from (b) human verbal responses that convey ideas that originate in what I have posited is our mind. Building on these three primary purposes, the study ultimately was an attempt to gather evidence which could be interpreted to suggest that a non-mental, instinctive responsiveness exists.

This Study’s Research Questions

The following are this study’s four research questions (In this dissertation, I refer to the following four research questions as Research Question 1, Research Question 2, Research Question 3, and Research Question 4, respectively):

1. Does listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions contribute to negotiating life as happily as one can?

2. When, where, and how did individuals who perceive themselves as listening to and following their feelings in making decisions learn to do so?

3. Can research participants’ verbal responses to interview questions be separated based on whether they convey ideas that came via intuition from an instinctive responsiveness in the participant, versus whether they convey ideas that came from the reasoning and logic employed by a separate nature of the mental in the participant?

4. Can we propose a new paradigm for discovery? The purpose of this paradigm for discovery would be to focus on discovery of the following three things:

(a) Making a firm distinction between what I posit are our two natures, those natures being (i) the mind, and (ii) this other nature I have called an “instinctive responsiveness” but which, in my view, is actually best to remain unlabeled (otherwise we are likely to have our opinions about what it is, based on meanings we might give to a word or words
used to label it). Making such a firm distinction, I posit, would allow us to make a distinction between what I speculate are the mind’s thoughts and this other nature’s feelings.

(b) That we are not able to make such decisive distinctions (i.e., as those noted in (a) in this list) in separating our inner selves using the means thus far proposed or acted upon by non-scientific psychological, scientific, religious, didactic, etc., means.

(c) That in the absence of firm proof that we can make such decisive distinctions (i.e., as those noted in (a) in this list), all beliefs regarding such distinctions must be considered irrelevant.

Research Question 4 I added to the preceding list of research questions after I obtained the results I obtained in seeking to answer Research Questions 1, 2, and 3. I asked Research Question 4 because I found that the need to ask it naturally emerged from this study.

Statement About the Content of This Document

In academia, there currently is no method taught that allows a person to do the following thing—a thing that this study attempted to do using qualitative and quantitative methods, but without success:

Separate verbal responses based on whether they convey ideas that came via intuition from an instinctive responsiveness in the participant, versus whether they convey ideas that came from the reasoning and logic employed by a separate nature of the mental in the participant.

Also, in academia, there currently is no method taught that allows a person to do the following thing—a thing which this study, I found, showed us who are in academia that we have a need for learning how to do it, even if it does not come out of what is known in academia, and it is a paradigm jump:

Make a firm distinction between what I posit are our two natures, those natures being (i) the mind, and (ii) this other nature I have called an “instinctive responsiveness” but which, in my view, is actually best to remain unlabeled
(otherwise we are likely to have our opinions about what it is, based on meanings we might give to a word or words used to label it).

Although, as noted above, there currently is no method taught in academia that allows a person to do these two things, I perceive that there is a method taught outside of academia that allows a person to do them. That method is called Enchanted Sight©, which doctor of chiropractic Wengert started developing in his clinical practice in the early 1990’s, and which Wengert has been developing in his clinical practice since that time. I have known Wengert for 10 years and, during that time, I have been learning Enchanted Sight© from him, mainly via spoken communication that has occurred on the telephone and in-person. My four years of master’s level work resulted in my master’s thesis (Mullins, 2003) that was on Wengert’s work; Wengert’s work was not published at the time I completed my master’s, however, and his work has only recently become available in published form in three books (Wengert, 2007, 2009a, 2009b). I would not have done this study if it was not for doing the work I have done with Wengert. Doing that work with him has made me aware that the other nature I have called an “instinctive responsiveness,” to me, exists. Doing that work with him has also made me aware of my interest in showing a need for that other nature. In this dissertation, I abided by the tenets of science, and thus I abided by the following tenet of science noted by Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (2002) and Punch (2005): ideas are tested against data in science. To abide by that tenet, in this dissertation I stated that I posited the existence of the other nature (the existence of which is an idea, in the scientific view), and then I sought data which can be interpreted to suggest that the other nature exists. But, at the same time, there is absolutely no doubt, for me, because of my experiences (wide experiences I have had in
my education in academia, in learning Enchanted Sight©, in extracurricular reading I have done, in my private life, and as a staff member at New York’s Omega Institute for Holistic Studies), that the other nature exists. Many of my words, concepts, and ideas that I wrote in this dissertation have evolved from what Wengert gave me, taught me via spoken communication in my learning of Enchanted Sight©, and I wrote those words, concepts, and ideas with Wengert’s knowledge. In writing this dissertation, I have not used any of Wengert’s publications (i.e., his three recent books cited above), or any unpublished writing he has done.

What I am seeking in this dissertation is to argue that there is a need, in academia, for methodology that is not currently taught in academia--methodology that would allow a person to do the two things noted at the start of this section. As stated above, I perceive that Enchanted Sight© provides such methodology; I am interested in investigating Enchanted Sight©, in academia, after this dissertation--even though Enchanted Sight© is taught only outside academia--to see if Enchanted Sight© withstands academic scrutiny. I perceive that there is no reason why methods that are taught only outside academia should not be investigated in academia, to see if they withstand academic scrutiny.

In this research report, I am not trying to prove any method. But, I am trying to convey that a result of this study is that it provides indicators that show a need for a method (These indicators are certain body movements participants did in this study’s interviews.). Those indicators show a need for a method because they might indicate some of the phenomena named in the two things noted at the start of this section (e.g., *instinctive responsiveness*, verbal responses that convey ideas that came via intuition),
but whether those indicators indicate those phenomena or not is not definitive using qualitative or quantitative methods--hence those indicators show a need for a method that could show whether or not they are definitive indicators of those phenomena. In sum, this research report seeks to convey the point that our methods, in academia, are limited.

We have, in our methods in academia, I perceive, a way that is more outside-in. We need, among our methods in academia, in my perception, a method that is more inside-out but that also makes sense of the subjective--i.e., a method to decipher, to interpret meanings of things (e.g., the body movements referred to above), meanings that established themselves as definitives. That is what we need a method to do.

In this study, I found several indicators that suggest there may be a lot more under them, and we need a method to determine that.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Intuition is said to provide knowledge labeled “direct” (Myers, 2002, p. 1), “immediate” (Myers, 2002, p. 1), not necessarily accurate (Jung, as cited in Deikman, 1982/1998), and “nonverbal” (Epstein, as cited in Myers, 2002, p. 30)—knowledge interpreted to be “perception” (Berube et al., 1992, p. 440), “truth” (Fuller, as cited in Noddings & Shore, 1984, p. 37), and merely produced by unconscious reasoning (Deikman, 1982/1998). I define intuition as a posited process of direct, spontaneous, nonverbal, felt knowing occurring distinct from reasoning (in my definition, a process for reaching conclusions that includes use of comparison, logical deduction, and assumption), logic (in my definition, the process of reasoning toward an acceptable rationale), the traditional five senses, and memory. In describing intuition as “felt,” I mean we get a sense of something profoundly not of conscious, or mental origin, almost as if it is felt elsewhere in the person as it perhaps also infiltrates the mental (intellectual) domain. Despite disagreements about what intuition is, I and the writers above in this literature review agree that intuition apparently exists.

Notwithstanding such openness to the notion that intuition exists, nor attempts to study intuition (e.g., Ambady and Rosenthal, 1993; Zelman, 2002), Wild’s observation—from 1938—still holds: “There is (so far) no...method of distinguishing between ideas acquired...through...intuition and those acquired through reason or perception...” (p. 229). This observation of Wild’s pointed out that if we label something as having come to us
by “intuition,” it is not self-evident that it did, because we have not yet evolved a method enabling us to differentiate which of our ideas (e.g., judgments we make) have come by intuition, and which have come from “reason or perception” (p. 229), as she writes.

Wild’s observation points to the fact that what we need to give us further understanding of what intuition is, is a method that enables us to distinguish whether or not an idea has come by intuition, for, without being able to distinguish whether or not an idea has come by intuition, we are unable to isolate the posited phenomenon of intuition so that we can study that posited phenomenon.

Despite the fact that Wild observed in 1938 that we have no method allowing us to identify which ideas have come by intuition and which have not, the question of whether or not we are correct in identifying an idea as having come by intuition (as noted in Chapter 1) is overlooked, but with one exception, in every contemporary academic writing (i.e., academic writings published since 1958) of which I am aware that cites the writing (i.e., academic writings published since 1958) of which I am aware that cites the

6 The one contemporary academic writing about the subject of intuition to my knowledge that raises this question is Braud and Anderson (1998b). The authors ask the question using one sentence, and do not discuss possible answers to it. They write: “Can we learn to recognize internal reference points or indicators of accurate paranormal impressions that might help us distinguish these from irrelevant mental noise, idle wishes, fears, apprehensions, and projections?” (p. 153) In response to Braud and Anderson’s question, I am prompted to ask another: What are “irrelevant mental noise, idle wishes, fears, apprehensions, and projections”? From my point of view, each of these can be seen as signs of our healthy, regular internal function as human beings, somehow—i.e., things that we experience perhaps, at times, for decidedly non-pathological reasons. How to distinguish them from knowledge ostensibly provided through intuition is not yet understood, as Braud and Anderson observe. Whether yet named or not, the field in which investigators can attempt to find ways to distinguish these from intuitive knowledge is wide open for research from a variety of approaches and perspectives. Who is to say that it is not? We all have experiences that we do not understand (some of these may be experiences of irrelevant mental noise, idle wishes, or fears, as Braud and Anderson name them, or knowings which can be attributed, seemingly, to intuition). But this does not mean that we cannot understand them.

7 All of the writings cited in this study’s Chapter 2 (its literature review) are academic writings. As noted in Chapter 1, I have defined as “academic” any writing about which at least one of the following is factual: (a) The writing was required reading in an academic course I took at Antioch University Seattle (where I earned my M.A.) or The Ohio State University (where I earned my Ph.D.); (b) the writing was recommended to me, or to a student other than me, or to all of the students in an academic course I took at Antioch University Seattle or The Ohio State University, by the professor of that academic course; or (c) the writing was published by an academic press or scholarly journal.
Examples of Contemporary Academic Writings That Cite the Subject of Intuition, That Overlook the Question of Whether or Not We Are Correct in Identifying an Idea as “Intuitive,” or as an “Intuition,” or as Having Come by “Intuition”

Braud (1998a) describes intuitions as things that can be used in “integral inquiry” (p. 35), a social science research method where the researcher aims to employ “a pluralistic epistemology” (p. 64), one seeking to be inclusive of as many of the researcher’s facets as possible, facets which Braud identifies as “bodily reactions, imagery, emotions and feelings, intuitions, and aesthetic sensibilities, as well as cognitions” (p. 64). The researcher using integral inquiry (a method which came from the disciplines of transpersonal psychology and transpersonal studies), aims to use a pluralistic epistemology “to [study a]...topic from as many perspectives...possible” (p. 64), and to evaluate findings using an inclusive, integrated set of indicators. In referring to intuitions as a facet of the researcher, Braud does not explicitly focus on his view of what intuitions are, but in his list of the researcher’s facets--i.e., “bodily reactions, imagery, emotions and feelings, intuitions, and aesthetic sensibilities, as well as cognitions” (p. 64)--he does present intuitions as things that are different from the rest of the things in that list. By situating intuitions as distinct phenomena that are distinguishable from, e.g., cognitions, Braud overlooked the fact that we have no method to distinguish what is an intuition from what is, say, a cognition.

Miller (2005), writing from within the discipline of holistic education, contrasts intuition with “rationality” (p. 2) in his introduction to the book *Holistic Learning and*

---

8 In integral inquiry, the participant, also, can be asked to employ this pluralistic epistemology.
Spirituality in Education. A basic principle of holistic education, Miller (2001, as cited in Miller, 2005) writes, is “balance” (Miller, 2005, p. 2), and, he states, recognizing both intuition and rationality in the classroom is one example of how that balance can be achieved. Miller (2005) does not state a definition of “rationality” (p. 2). “Rationality” implies, however, running the gamut of comparisoning, and choosing what appears to be the most rational or logical route to take; whereas the intuitive, in my view, comes differently--it is not arrived at by rationality. To say that the intuitive comes via a different process than rationality as defined in the previous sentence, however, does not mean that the intuitive is not rational. Indeed, in my view, what is truly intuitive is rational, but it did not come through rationality as defined above. I thus hold that when Miller (2005) writes that “the intuitive” (p. 2) is different from “the rational” (p. 2), his wording could be worded better. I am not saying that Miller is wrong in stating that the intuitive is different from the rational, because that statement makes sense to him at his level of understanding about the subject; I am only saying that in my view, Miller’s statement could be worded better, because what is truly intuitive, from my point of view, is not different from the rational, since, from my point of view, the truly intuitive is rational. To me, it may sometimes take some work to understand why the truly intuitive is rational, but it is rational, in my view.

Miller (2005) does not give his definition of intuition in the book Holistic Learning and Spirituality in Education, but in his book The Holistic Curriculum (1988) he offers the following as his definition: “Intuition is a direct knowing” (p. 74). One way to bring intuition into the classroom, Miller (1988) writes, is through the technique of
undirected visualization. Miller explains that in undirected visualization, the student closes his or her eyes, and “may start with a few general guidelines” (p. 79) (Such as “Listen to the following sounds, and remain open to any response you may have to them.”), but then he or she simply “wait[s] for images to appear” (p. 79) in his or her “mind’s eye” (p. 79). Undirected visualization can be useful in facilitating students’ creative process, Miller writes, and he presents an undirected visualization exercise from Williams (1983, as cited in Miller, 1988) that in Miller’s view can be used to facilitate students’ creative writing, in particular. In the exercise from Williams, however, any image that comes in the visualization is assumed by Miller to have come by intuition; in other words, Miller overlooks that there is no way to distinguish which of those images came via intuition, and which did not.

In an article in the American Psychological Association’s publication *Monitor on Psychology*, Winerman (2005b) discusses experiments by social psychologists Ambady and Rosenthal (1993, as cited in Winerman, 2005b) that examined what Ambady and Rosenthal identify as “intuitive judgments” (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993, p. 440), judgments which Winerman refers to alternatively as “immediate intuitions” (para. 4) that arrived via “social intuition” (para. 6). Those experiments looked at how well undergraduate students could predict a teacher’s effectiveness when those students were using only their first impressions of the teacher (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993; Winerman, 2005b). The students formed their first impressions by observing silent video clips that showed the teachers teaching (Ambady and Rosenthal refer to these clips, which lasted 30 seconds or less, as “‘thin slices’” (p. 431)) (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993; Winerman,
Winerman describes the methods and results of Ambady and Rosenthal’s (1993) experiments—which used tapes of 13 graduate student Teaching Fellows (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993)—as follows:

“[The authors]…took three random 10-second clips from each tape, combined them into one 30-second clip for each teacher and showed the silent clips to students who did not know the teachers. The student judges rated the teachers on 13 variables, such as “accepting,” “active,” “competent” and “confident.” [The authors]…combined these individual scores into one global rating for each teacher and then correlated that rating with the teachers’ end-of-semester evaluations from actual students. “We were shocked at how high the correlation was,” [Ambady]…says. It was 0.76. In social psychology anything above 0.6 is considered very strong. Curious to see how thin [they]…could make [their]…slices before affecting the student judges’ accuracy, [the authors]…cut the length of the silent clips to 15 seconds, and then to six. Each time, the students accurately predicted the most successful teachers. “There was no significant difference between the results with 30-second clips and six-second clips,” Ambady says.

In a later experiment in the same study, [the authors]…cut out the middleman—the global variable—and simply asked students to rate, based on thin-slice video clips, the quality and performance of the teachers. Again, the ratings correlated highly with the teachers’ end-of-semester evaluations. [The authors]…also replicated [their]…results with high school teachers. (Beyond Personality section, paras. 2-6)

As noted above, Ambady and Rosenthal view their experiments as having examined students’ “intuitive judgments” (p. 440), which Winerman refers to as “immediate intuitions” (para. 4) (which she writes came by “social intuition” (para. 6)). Ambady and Rosenthal do not give a definition of the term “intuitive judgments” (p. 440), and Winerman does not give a definition of what she means by “immediate intuitions” (para. 4) or “social intuition” (para. 6) (Also, in an article that introduces and is a companion to the Winerman article I have been discussing in this paragraph, Winerman (2005a) does not state her definition of “intuition” (para. 6); because Winerman does not state, in that
introductory companion article, her definition of intuition, one is unable to infer what Winerman’s (2005b) definitions of “immediate intuitions” (para. 4) and “social intuition” (para. 6) might be.). In not defining what they mean by these terms, is it because they assume they know what intuition is, or is it because they do not know what it is? Nonetheless, in my perception, the first impressions that Ambady and Rosenthal’s experiments examined may not have been properly called either “intuitive judgments” (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993, p. 440), or “immediate intuitions” (Winerman, 2005b, para. 4) that came via “social intuition” (Winerman, 2005b, para. 6), for they may simply have been reasonable assumptions that the students formed based on the video clips they saw—reasonable assumptions formed using a process of reasoning, not intuition or “social intuition” (Winerman, 2005b, para. 6). Calling the students’ first impressions “intuitive judgments” (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993, p. 440), or “immediate intuitions” (Winerman, 2005b, para. 4) that came via “social intuition” (Winerman, 2005b, para. 6), then, creates misunderstanding. We do not know if the students’ first impressions were intuition (i.e., if they were “intuitive judgments” (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993, p. 440) or “immediate intuitions” (Winerman, 2005b, para. 4)) or if they were reasonable assumptions, because we have no method to separate them. That we have no method to separate them is a lack that Ambady and Rosenthal, and Winerman, overlooked.

I perceive that we should have a methodology to make sense of “intrapersonal [italics added]” (Mullins, 2003, p. 8) function. “Intrapersonal [italics added]” (Mullins, 2003, p. 8) function already does fit together, is what it is, I posit, it is just that it has not made sense to us, as evidenced by what has been and is our inability to differentiate
whether an idea has come via intuition or not. This study sought to find a way to differentiate ideas (or more particularly, verbal responses, the particular representations of ideas this study attempted to verify) that came to the mind of research participants by intuition, versus those that came from reasoning and logic employed by the mind of the participants. In doing so, it sought to find a way to contribute to making sense of “intrapersonal [italics added]” (Mullins, 2003, p. 8) function.

As noted in Chapter 1, Deikman (1982/1998) describes intuition as “any process of acquiring knowledge that differs from conscious thought and bypasses the senses and memory” (p. 177). With Deikman’s description of intuition that is in the previous sentence, I would like to put a caveat: intuition might bypass the five senses, but I postulate that it does not bypass the sixth. That is because it is what the sixth is, I speculate. The sixth sense, I posit, produces the intuitive into conscious awareness. What if the sixth sense was responsible for the beginning of thought? What if its nature is responsible for life itself? What if it is our aliveness, and it and the five senses preceded mentation with which we are familiar? What if all we needed was a method to directly connect with the intelligence that is perhaps inherent in the sixth or psychic sense? As it stands now, we have got many kinds of ideas, from the most bizarre to the most credible, about perhaps all aspects of what that is, including concepts of God. What if all we needed was a method to probe its nature, using it as guidance factor? After all, I perceive, the mind cannot do it by itself, has not been able to; that is just history, it appears to me.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS

This study’s design was mainly qualitative, but one aspect of the study’s design used a quantitative measure. Also, into the qualitative portion of this study’s design, I incorporated design elements which I drew from the rationales of certain quantitative designs. In this chapter, I shall discuss the following in turn:

1. The characteristics which made this study’s design qualitative.
2. The one major hypothesis that provided the primary direction for this study.
3. The one aspect of this study’s design that used a quantitative measure, and the two hypotheses that provided the direction for that aspect of this study’s design.
4. Elements from the rationales of certain quantitative designs that informed the mainly qualitative design that I used to investigate two functional relationships (By “functional relationship,” I mean a relationship between an independent variable and a dependent variable.) in this study.
5. The sampling strategy used for this study (The recruitment procedures that I used to form samples for this study are listed in Appendix D.).
6. The data collection procedures used in this study.
7. The data analysis procedures used in this study.
Characteristics Which Made This Study’s Design Qualitative

This study’s design exhibited all of the following five characteristics which Merriam (1998) observes typify qualitative research:

1. This study was based in what Merriam identifies as the interpretivist philosophical assumption…[--]that reality is constructed by individuals interacting with their social worlds” (p. 6); accordingly, it displayed the characteristic of qualitative research which says: “qualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed” (Merriam, 1998, p. 6). This study aimed to find out about and understand participants’ experiences as they represented them in their own words. (Although this study was rooted in the interpretivist position, and thus sought to understand the meaning its participants have constructed, it also was an attempt to gather evidence which could be interpreted to suggest that, inside us, there exists a non-mental, instinctive responsiveness that I posit we are born with, and that I posit provides knowledge to us that inherently possesses preexistent meaning, apart from any meanings we construct. In attempting to gather evidence which could be interpreted to suggest that such an instinctive responsiveness exists, this study sought gather evidence which could be interpreted to suggest that deeper meanings--ones not socially constructed--exist. I thus held, in this study, that the realities people construct in interacting with their social worlds are possibly not the only realities--and that deeper realities may exist. The posited non-mental, instinctive responsiveness is one such possible reality.)
2. The study’s design evidenced the characteristic of qualitative research which holds “that the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis” (Merriam, 1998, p. 7). That the researcher functions as the primary instrument for collecting and analyzing data in qualitative research affords a flexibility (Ary et al., 2002) that allows him or her, for instance, to “adapt techniques to the circumstances” (Merriam, 1998, p. 7) and to gain knowledge “about the situation...through sensitivity to nonverbal aspects” (Merriam, 1998, p. 7). Dillard (2006) observes that she has found in her work as an educator and qualitative researcher that one can “intuitively know what to do and how to respond” (p. 117). This, to me, means that the researcher can get an idea from somewhere, not from reasoning and logic, not from the literature, and not from anything else he or she has seen, but that he or she just goes on with it anyway. I noted in this study’s literature review that in the social science method named “integral inquiry” (Braud, 1998a, p. 35), use of intuition can be sought throughout research by the researcher, who aims to employ “a pluralistic epistemology” (p. 64)--one that seeks to be inclusive of as many knowledge sources in the researcher-as-instrument as possible (e.g., imagery, intuition, cognition). This is done, Braud notes (as indicated in this study’s literature review), “to [study a]...topic from as many perspectives...possible” (p. 64), and to evaluate findings using an inclusive, integrated set of indicators. I have organized my intuitive function, and trusted it in this research.
3. The study’s design exhibited the central characteristic of qualitative research which holds that that research “involves fieldwork” (Merriam, 1998, p. 7). I conducted fieldwork to collect data for this study, interviewing and observing each participant in a setting with which he or she was at least generally familiar.

4. The study’s design exhibited the characteristic of qualitative research which holds that qualitative studies “primarily employ[] an inductive research strategy” (Merriam, 1998, p. 7). In employing an inductive strategy, the study generated constructs, hypotheses regarding the relationships between them, and a theory which integrated these through analysis of data collected in this study.

5. The study sought to exhibit the characteristic of qualitative research which maintains that the written research report is to be “richly descriptive” (Merriam, 1998, p. 8). In seeking to offer a rich description in this report of the study, I have included “descriptions of the context, the players involved, .... [and] data in the form of participants’ own words” (Merriam, 1998, p. 8).

The One Major Hypothesis That Provided the Primary Direction for This Study

As noted in the previous section’s discussion of the characteristics of this study’s design which marked it as qualitative, this study employed an inductive strategy, and was thus aimed at theory-generation. As Punch (2005) observes, however, the researcher conducting a theory-generation study also utilizes a deductive strategy, since after collecting and analyzing a portion of data and generating theory from it, that researcher
deduces hypotheses from the theory and then collects additional data against which he or she can test those hypotheses. This study used a deductive strategy to test--against the additional data I collected during the study--various major and minor hypotheses I deduced from the beginning, tentative theory that emerged in my analysis of both (a) the information I gathered in the service-learning project that I conducted “Pre-Dissertation” (i.e., prior to the study), and (b) the data in the form of written autobiographical reflections that I collected “Pre-Dissertation.” Of the hypotheses I deduced from that beginning, tentative theory, it was the following major hypothesis, in particular, that provided the primary direction for this study: *Listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions leads one to negotiate life as happily as one can under the circumstances in which one lives.* This hypothesis stated that there was an expected positive relationship between the independent variable named *does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions*\(^9\) and the dependent variable named *does or does not negotiate life as happily as one can under the circumstances in which one lives.*\(^{10}\) In this research report, I shall refer to the relationship between the variables that I have named, here, as “Functional Relationship 1.” (I would like to state, here, also, that this study’s Research Question 1--i.e., Does listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions contribute to negotiating life as happily as one can?--asked whether there is a positive relationship between the variables in Functional Relationship 1. The strategy that I employed to seek to answer Research Question 1 simply is the strategy

\(^9\) The name of this variable can be restated as *does or does not listen to and follow an awareness of a sense other than one’s thoughts in making decisions.*

\(^{10}\) The hypothesis I have stated here can be stated differently in order to reflect that its opposite, also, was expected not to be the case: *Listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions leads one to not get down about what he or she does not have, or what others have, materially.*
In order to make testable the hypothesis that I stated regarding the variables in Functional Relationship 1, I had to operationally define the variables (i.e., to specify the operations by which they would be made identifiable) about which the hypothesis stated an expected relationship. I operationally defined the variables using a qualitative approach rather than a quantitative one, in that I made the variables identifiable, but not measurable. With regard to the variable does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions, I selected one operation to make it identifiable, and that operation was this: I asked each participant if, in his perception, he generally listens to and follows his feelings in making decisions. With respect to the variable does or does not negotiate life as happily as one can under the circumstances in which one lives, I selected one operation to make it identifiable, and that operation was this: I asked each participant if, in his perception, he is negotiating life as happily as he can under the circumstances in which he lives. To observe the hypothesized relationship that Listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions leads one to negotiate life as happily as one can under the circumstances in which one lives, I did the following: I asked each participant who said both (a) that he generally listens to and follows his feelings in making decisions, and (b) that he perceives himself to be negotiating life as happily as he can, if, in his perception, his listening to and following his feelings contributes to his negotiating life as happily as he can.
The One Aspect of This Study’s Design That Used a Quantitative Measure, and the Two Hypotheses That Provided the Direction for That Aspect of This Study’s Design

One aspect of this study’s design used a quantitative measure: for each interview question, I measured (in hundredths of a second) the participants’ *pre-verbal-response time*, which is the length of time a participant took to begin answering a question once the interviewer finished asking it. This measure functioned in this study as an indicator that would potentially allow for the differentiation of participant verbal responses according to whether they conveyed ideas that came from reasoning and logic, or whether they conveyed ideas that came by intuition. In using this measure, I assumed, prior to this study, that reasoning and logic are *mental* processes that require time to execute, and that intuition, conversely, is a sudden, instantaneous, and spontaneous process that could thus lead participants to offer verbal responses just a short amount of time after the interviewer finished asking an interview question.

*Pre-verbal-response time* was conceptualized in this research as a possible quantitative indicator of two dependent variables: *does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions*, and *does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions*. I hypothesized that these two dependent variables relate to the independent variable *does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions*,¹¹ which is the same independent variable named in this study’s Functional Relationship 1 (I specified the operational definition of this independent variable in the previous section.). I hypothesized that there was an

¹¹ As noted above, the name of this variable can be restated as *does or does not listen to and follow an awareness of a sense other than one’s thoughts in making decisions.*
expected negative relationship between the variables *does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions* and *does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions*; in this study, I have referred to the relationship between these two variables as “Functional Relationship 2.” I hypothesized that there is an expected positive relationship between the variables *does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions* and *does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions*; in this study, I have referred to the relationship between these two variables as “Functional Relationship 3.” My hypothesis statements regarding the independent variable and respective dependent variables in Functional Relationships 2 and 3 were as follows: (a) *Listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions leads one to not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions*; and (b) *Listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions leads one to use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions.*

The *pre-verbal-response time* measure was a possible quantitative indicator of the dependent variables *does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions* and *does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions*; I also searched for possible qualitative indicators of these variables in (a) the data I collected through the interviews, and in (b) the data I collected through the observations I conducted of each participant’s during-interview behavior in this study (Note: In the previous sentence, I obviously referred to the possible

\[12\] In stating these hypotheses, I assumed that any given participant *could* offer verbal responses to interview questions in a way that used reasoning and logic, on the one hand, and *instinctive responsiveness*, on the other hand, equally, but that, typically, any given participant probably would not do this.
qualitative indicators that I searched for in the interview and observation data as “qualitative.” In this study, however, I tallied instances of those possible indicators, timed the length of occurrence of certain of them, and counted the number of head nods done during certain of them, so, one could call these possible indicators “quantitative” also.\textsuperscript{13}

Thus, in the operational definitions I used for these variables, I specified operations that would hopefully make the variables measurable, as well as operations that would hopefully make the variables identifiable qualitatively. The operations I used to try to make the variables measurable were the same for the two variables, and those operations were as follows: (a) I interviewed a participant using the interview schedule I created for this study (The interview schedule I used in this study was a sufficient interview schedule to use in executing this operation. Appendix A includes a copy of the interview schedule I used in this study.); (b) I added together the participant’s pre-verbal-response times for all of the interview questions I asked the participant; (c) I divided the sum of the participant’s pre-verbal-response times by the number of interview questions I asked him or her, in order to obtain the participant’s mean pre-verbal-response time score; (d) the participant’s mean pre-verbal-response time score was one possible indicator of the extent to which he or she does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions, and does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions. The operations I used to try to make the variables identifiable qualitatively were as follows: (a) I interviewed a participant using the

\textsuperscript{13} Below, in this chapter’s section entitled, “The Data Collection Procedures Used in This Study,” I discuss the interview and observation procedures I used in this study. Also below, in this chapter’s section entitled, “The Data Analysis Procedures Used in This Study,” I discuss the procedures I used to analyze the interview and observation data I collected in this study.
interview schedule I created for this study, and video-recorded the interview; (b) I watched the video of my interview of the participant, conducting an unstructured observation of the participant’s during-interview behavior (In these observations, I sometimes observed, and then hand-wrote notes about, particular types of participant body movement that I postulated were possible indicators of either or both of the variables *does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions* and *does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions*; after I hand-wrote notes about these types of participant body movement, I typed those notes directly into the audit trail I kept during this study.); (c) I watched the video of my interview of the participant, conducting structured observations of the participant’s during-interview behavior; in these observations, I searched for instances of the types of participant body movement I observed in the unstructured observations—types of movement I postulated were possible qualitative indicators of either or both of the variables *does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions* and *does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions*; (d) I analyzed the interview transcripts, searching for qualitative indicators of *does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions* and *does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions*.

I would like to note, here, that *pre-verbal-response time*, because it functioned as an indicator that would potentially allow for the differentiation of the two types of verbal responses noted above in this section, was a measure I hoped would help me to answer
this study’s Research Question 3, which was as follows: Can research participants’ verbal responses to interview questions be separated based on whether they convey ideas that came via intuition from an *instinctive responsiveness* in the participant, versus whether they convey ideas that came from the reasoning and logic employed by a separate *nature of the mental* in the participant? In addition to examining whether *pre-verbal-response time* would allow for the differentiation of these two types of verbal responses, I also sought to find, in the interview and observation data I collected in this study, qualitative indicators that would allow for the differentiation of these two types of verbal responses. My act of searching those data for qualitative indicators of verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came via intuition (from a posited *instinctive responsiveness* in the participant), simply was my act (described in the immediately preceding paragraph) of searching for qualitative indicators of the Functional Relationship 3 variable named *does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions*. Likewise, my act of searching those interview and observation data for qualitative indicators of verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came via reasoning and logic, simply was my act (described in the immediately preceding paragraph) of searching for qualitative indicators of the Functional Relationship 2 variable named *does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions*. In sum, my strategy for trying to answer this study’s Research Question 3 was to undertake two acts: a) to seek to find, in the data I collected in this study, indicators of verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came via intuition, and b) to seek to find, in the data I collected in
this study, indicators of verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came from reasoning and logic.

Elements From the Rationales of Particular Quantitative Designs That Informed the Part of This Study’s Design Which I Used to Investigate Functional Relationships 2 and 3

The part of this study’s design that I used to test the hypothesis of Functional Relationship 1 (plus various other major and minor hypotheses I deduced from the beginning theory that emerged through my analysis both of (a) the information (i.e., notes) I wrote-down regarding the service-learning project participants’ behavior, and (b) the data I collected that represent my own personal experiences) was qualitative, and was not informed by elements of the rationales of particular quantitative designs. The part of this study’s design that I used to investigate Functional Relationships 2 and 3, however, used certain elements from the rationales of two quantitative designs--the true experimental design and the correlational design--to inform its overall, mainly qualitative design. The part of this study’s design that I used to investigate Functional Relationships 2 and 3 was like the true experimental design in that it (a) had an independent variable and a dependent variable (in Functional Relationship 2, the independent variable was \textit{does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions}, and the dependent variable was \textit{does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions}; in Functional Relationship 3, the independent variable was \textit{does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions}, and the dependent variable was \textit{does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions}), and (b) was seeking to maximize the elimination of (i.e., control)
extraneous variables in order to seek to study the respective relationships between the independent variable and dependent variables it studied (These extraneous variables are listed in Appendix C). The part of this study’s design that I used to investigate Functional Relationships 2 and 3 was not like a quantitative, true experimental design, however, in the following three ways: (a) the researcher did not manipulate an independent variable, (b) it did not use random assignment, and (c) it did not measure anything (with the exception of *pre-verbal-response time*, as discussed above--a measure which functioned as a possible quantitative indicator of the respective dependent variables in Functional Relationships 2 and 3).

A second quantitative research design that informed the part of this study’s design that I used to investigate Functional Relationships 2 and 3 was the design that is used in correlational research. The part of this study’s design that I used to investigate Functional Relationships 2 and 3 was like a correlational design in that the researcher did not manipulate an independent variable. It was unlike a correlational design, however, because it was not trying to investigate the strength and direction of the relationship between either of the sets of two variables it studied, for, it instead tried--like the true experimental design--to investigate whether a person might reasonably infer that there is a causal relationship between the independent and dependent variable in the two functional relationships it studied.
The Sampling Strategy Used in This Study

Concepts That Emerged in My Analysis of the Information I Wrote-down That Recorded Informal Observations I Made Regarding the Service-Learning Project Participants’ Behavior, and How These Concepts Guided This Study’s Sampling Strategy

Below, in this chapter’s section entitled, “The Data Analysis Procedures Used in This Study,” I explain that in this study I employed the qualitative data analysis procedures of grounded theory (Punch, 2005; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) (I describe those procedures in that section). Using grounded theory procedures, I developed each concept that was a part of the beginning theory of this study; I developed these concepts during my analysis of both (a) the information I wrote-down regarding the service-learning project participants’ behavior, and (b) the data that represent my own personal experiences. The three primary concepts that emerged during my analysis of the information I wrote-down regarding the service-learning project participants’ behavior were “negotiating life as happily as they can,” “a surprising honesty in their response,” and “listening to feeling as a guide for their thinking.” Another researcher may have looked at the same information I wrote regarding the participants’ behavior and not generated these concepts. They resulted from what I saw in the information I wrote, and came to me by intuition upon examining that information.

Each of the three concepts I have named, here, represents a phenomenon. In order to analyze how the above-described phenomena may have related to one another in the group of approximately 35 people with whom I conducted the service-learning project, I used an analytic scheme developed by Strauss and Corbin (1998) called “the paradigm
Strauss and Corbin explain that the paradigm is a means by which data analysts using grounded theory can integrate a phenomenon’s structure (i.e., the conditions or circumstances which make possible the manifestation of that phenomenon) with its process (i.e., the sequences of individual and group action/interaction over time that are relevant to the phenomenon). Using the paradigm, I evaluated each one of the three above-named phenomena and asked myself which of the following three components of Strauss and Corbin’s paradigm I thought the phenomenon was: (a) a condition which made some other phenomenon possible, (b) an action/interaction that arose under certain conditions, or (c) a consequence--i.e., an outcome of an action/interaction. My process of sorting the phenomena resulted in my identifying “listening to feeling as a guide for their thinking” as an action/interaction, “negotiating life as happily as they can” as a consequence of that action/interaction, and “a surprising honesty in their response” as three different things: (a) an example of “negotiating life as happily as they can,” (b) a consequence of “negotiating life as happily as they can,” and (c) a category of eventuality, by which I mean that the cause of it, realistically, we may never identify.

In considering how the phenomenon “negotiating life as happily as they can” may have manifested in the group, I followed a path of logic which led me to figure that if the phenomenon “negotiating life as happily as they can” was indeed occurring, it probably had to do with the conditions or circumstances within which the group existed at the time of the service-learning project during which I observed the group. I surmised that because the group members were probably retired at that time, it afforded them a degree of
freedom from having to make money to survive, which both (a) made it easier for them to negotiate life as happily as they can, and (b) made them more likely to evidence “a surprising honesty in their response”--which, as noted above, I tentatively concluded was both an example and a consequence of their negotiating life as happily as they can, as well as a phenomenon for which we may never know the cause. I also surmised that the circumstance in which the group finds itself makes it easier for the group members to perform the action/interaction “listening to feeling as a guide for their thinking,” which, in my observation, the group members evidenced in the following two ways: (a) they appeared to be acting from the heart (e.g., in my view, they expressed a feeling of respect in what they said and what they did) as well as the mind (e.g., the group members conveyed what they said and what they did in a way that was both reasonable and readily comprehensible to my mind, which suggested to me that they used their minds in saying and doing what they did); (b) they appeared not to be using critical thinking to deliberate about and then decide what they should and should not say, given the circumstances they were in, but instead appeared to be allowing what came to them spontaneously to guide their decisions regarding what they should and should not say.

The three primary concepts that emerged during my analysis of the information I wrote-down regarding the service-learning project participants’ behavior--i.e., “negotiating life as happily as they can,” “a surprising honesty in their response,” and “listening to feeling as a guide for their thinking”--influenced my sampling strategy for this study in the following two ways: (a) I asked residents of the low-income elderly community in which I conducted the service-learning project to join the sample of retired
low-income elderly that was one of the three samples in this study, in order to try to learn if these concepts did indeed name phenomena which I hypothesized were evident in their community; and, (b) based partly on my conclusion that these concepts represented phenomena that were probably made possible by what I assumed was the service-learning project participants’ circumstance of being retired, I drew samples comprised of retired persons, a population which I assumed was likely to exhibit these phenomena, and which I therefore expected would help me to answer questions regarding these phenomena in the study.

The Specific Strategies I Employed in Selecting Samples for This Study

Utilizing a sampling strategy that Patton (1990) identifies as “combination or mixed purposeful sampling” (p. 181) (which is used for studies employing qualitative methods), I selected the following three samples for this study:

1. Sample 1, an eight-person sample comprising (a) four residents of the low-income elderly community with which I conducted the service-learning project, and (b) four residents of another low-income elderly community owned and operated by the agency that owns and operates the community with which I conducted the service-learning project (Residents of this second low-income elderly community were in this sample because after I was only able to enroll four residents from the community noted in “(a)” in this list, I required four more low-income elderly in order to make this sample an eight-person sample. The reason I was only able to enroll four residents from the community noted in “(a)” in this list is, seemingly, that residents of that
community were generally not interested in participating in this study because I was not providing incentives to participate in this study.

2. Sample 2, which consisted of eight retired university faculty.

3. Sample 3, which consisted of eight retired university staff.\textsuperscript{14}

As Patton explains, “combination or mixed purposeful sampling” (p. 181) makes use of a combination or mix of particular purposeful sampling strategies, each of which aims to isolate “information-rich cases...from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research, thus the term purposeful sampling” (p. 169). Patton identifies the particular purposeful sampling strategies that I employed, as “confirming and disconfirming cases” (p. 178), “theory-based or operational construct

\textsuperscript{14} When I started forming this study’s three samples, my intent was that each of them would have 20 participants. Participant recruitment for this study proved to take longer than expected, however, as did the transcription of interview data collected in this study. Those two factors caused a time constraint that forced me to see that I would not be able to enroll 20 participants in each sample, because enrolling that many participants would have cost me time (which I did not have) recruiting participants and collecting data from those participants. Operating under the time constraint noted above in this footnote, I enrolled only 36 participants in this study; I enrolled 11 of these participants in the study’s low-income elderly sample (Sample 1), 12 in its retired university professors sample (Sample 2), and 13 in its retired university staff sample (Sample 3). However, prompted by the time constraint noted above in this footnote, after I enrolled these participants I considered that another way for me to save time in this study would be to do the following: of the data collected in this study, use, in this study, only those data collected from the first eight participants who enrolled in each sample. In the end, I decided that, of the data collected in this study, using only the data collected from the first eight participants enrolled in each sample was the best move for this study; I made that decision after I determined that sample sizes of eight (as opposed to sizes of 11, 12, and 13) were adequate for the following reasons:

1) My initial analysis of the qualitative data I collected from the 8-person samples revealed that no new qualitative information relevant to this study would have been added by including more participants in the samples (Note: In qualitative research, this point at which no new information comes from adding participants is referred to as “data saturation” (Ary et al., 2002, p. 558)).

2) The quantitative data I collected from the 8-person samples (Note: These data are the participants’ pre-verbal-response times, defined above in this chapter. Using these data, I performed inferential statistics procedures in this study.) provided enough indicators to serve as a seed for future work. That is so even though these 8-person samples are less likely to be representative of this study’s population (i.e., retirees over age 50) than the 11-, 12-, and 13-person samples I could have used, and that that decrease in likelihood of representativeness decreases the confidence with which the findings obtained from observing these samples can be generalized to this study’s population.
sampling” (p. 177), and “stratified purposeful sampling” (p. 174); each served a different purpose in this research. I used the “confirming and disconfirming cases” (Patton, 1990, p. 178) strategy with the segment of Sample 1 that lives in the low-income elderly community with which I conducted the service-learning project; in my study of this segment of Sample 1, I sought, as the name for the “confirming and disconfirming cases” (p. 178) strategy suggests, cases which confirmed and cases which disconfirmed my two initial, emerging findings from the service-learning project: (a) that the members of the low-income elderly community are negotiating life as happily as they can; and (b) that the actions and verbal responses of members of this community may largely use the posited instinctive responsiveness. The cases within Sample 1 that I examined as potentially confirmatory or disconfirmatory were the individual participants who made up the segment of Sample 1 that lives in the low-income elderly community with which I conducted the service-learning project. I utilized what Patton calls “theory-based or operational construct sampling” (p. 177)--which he indicates can be used to sample “people on the basis of their potential manifestation or representation of important theoretical constructs” (p. 177)--in selecting the three samples that I did for the study, anticipating that each sample would comprise individuals who because they are elderly and retired, would be more likely to exhibit the theoretical constructs “instinctive responsiveness,” “negotiating life as happily as they can,” “a surprising honesty in their response,” and “listening to feeling as a guide for their thinking” than would individuals who are not elderly and retired. I used the third sampling strategy noted--“stratified purposeful sampling” (Patton, 1990, p. 174)--in order to “capture major variations”
that may have existed between the retired university faculty and retired university staff samples (i.e., Samples 2 and 3), which represent, respectively, two different strata (i.e., retired university faculty and retired university staff) of the pool of retired university employees from which I selected those samples.

The Data Collection Procedures Used in This Study

I began data collection for this study prior to this study’s start, since the data representing my own personal experience (data which came in the form of written autobiographical reflections, as noted above) were ones I both collected and analyzed before the start of this study; in analyzing those data, I developed the beginning, tentative theory that was both emerging at the start of this study and that contains some features that continued to emerge throughout this study. As noted above, I also developed the tentative theory that was emerging at the start of this study by analyzing the notes I wrote-down that recorded informal observations I made regarding the service-learning project participants’ behavior (As noted earlier, in this study I have referred to these notes as “information” rather than “data,” since the notes were a record of informal observations I made during a non-research activity.). In this study, I refer to the information I wrote regarding the service-learning project participants’ behavior, and the data that I collected that represent my own personal experiences, as information and data, respectively, that I collected “Pre-Dissertation” (i.e., prior to this study). In this study, I refer to the data that I collected during this study simply as data that I collected during this study, or data that I collected in this study.
In collecting the data and information that I collected Pre-Dissertation, I used two data collection procedures. The first procedure I used was the one I used to collect the 
*data* I collected Pre-Dissertation, data which came in the form of written autobiographical reflections. To collect these data, I simply hand-wrote and then typed the autobiographical reflections that contained the data. I did so in November, 2007, and the process took about eight hours. The second procedure I used in collecting the data and information that I collected Pre-Dissertation, was the one I used to collect the *information* that I collected Pre-Dissertation. To collect that information, I simply hand-wrote and then typed the notes that contained that information--notes that recorded informal observations I made regarding the behavior of the participants in the above-mentioned service-learning project. I wrote those notes in November, 2007, but, as noted in Chapter 1, the service-learning project whose participants’ behavior I was recalling in writing those notes, ended six months before then. Thus, when I recorded my informal observations about the service-learning project participants’ behavior, I was working off of my memory of that behavior. As noted in Chapter 1, the observations I made about the project participants were general observations I made about them as an entire group, rather than observations I made about particular individuals within that group. Also, those observations were informal observations I made as a workshop leader, rather than formal ones I made as a researcher conducting a participant observation to collect data.

I shall now turn to my discussion of the data collection procedures I used during this study. In collecting the data that I collected during this study, I used four data collection procedures: (a) structured interviews, (b) unstructured observations of each
participant’s during-interview behavior, (c) structured observations of each participant’s during-interview behavior, and (d) measurement of participants’ pre-verbal-response *times* for each interview question in each interview. I conducted one interview with each participant. Each interview lasted approximately 1-1.5 hours. The interviews consisted of either 18 or 19 questions for members of Sample 1 (I asked 19 questions of members of Sample 1 who were residents of the low-income elderly community with which I conducted the service-learning project, and 18 questions of members of Sample 1 who were residents of another low-income elderly community owned and operated by the agency that owns and operates the community with which I conducted the service-learning project. The additional question I asked residents of the low-income elderly community with which I conducted the service-learning project, concerned the change of residence they would be making in 2009.). The interviews consisted of 18 questions for members of Samples 2 and 3. Also, depending on how a given participant answered a given interview question, I asked additional questions that were built into the interview schedule. The total number of interview questions I asked each participant was roughly 36 (The interview schedule that I used in this study is in Appendix A.). The interview questions that I used were aimed at testing hypotheses deduced from the tentative theory that was emerging at the start of this study. Thus, the interview questions were used to seek to verify that theory. In addition, as noted in Chapter 1, all of the interview questions were designed to prompt either an *intellectual* verbal response or an intuitive verbal response, to see whether or not I could discern differences between those two proposed
types of verbal responses--differences which would be evidence for indicators for future research on intuition, since they would enable identification of intuition.

I video-recorded the interviews for the following two reasons: (1) So that, after the interviews, but still during the study, I could view the videos of the interviews and conduct unstructured and structured observations of the participants’ during-interview behaviors; and (2) so that, once the study was complete, colleagues of mine would be able to view the videos of the interviews in order to evaluate my postulations regarding the participant behaviors that are on the videos. I transcribed each interview by listening to and watching the videos of the interviews.

As noted above, I conducted unstructured observations of each participant’s during-interview behavior. At the start of this study, I had intended to conduct an unstructured observation of each participant while I was interviewing him or her; in these observations, I was going to write-down notes regarding what I observed, in field notes I took during the observations. However, I found that conducting these observations during the interviews was not feasible because during the interviews I was too busy executing the following tasks: (a) asking the participant interview questions and listening to his or her answers to those questions; (b) writing-down things that the participant said--things I had to remember in order to ask subsequent questions on the interview schedule which addressed those things the participant had said; and (c) making sure that the video equipment I was using to record the interviews was functioning properly. Although the unstructured observations I had intended to conduct during the interviews were not feasible, after each interview, when I was transcribing it while watching the video of it, I
was able to conduct an unstructured observation of the participant’s during-interview behavior. I wrote-down very few notes during these unstructured observations, and the notes I wrote-down I typed directly into the audit trail I kept during this study. These notes I typed into the audit trail concerned participant body movements I postulated were possible indicators of one or more of the following: (a) the variable *does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions* (which I sought to find indicators of, as noted above, in order to study Functional Relationship 3), (b) the variable *does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions* (which I sought to find indicators of, as noted above, in order to study Functional Relationship 2), (c) verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came via intuition (which I sought to find indicators of, as noted above, in order to seek to answer Research Question 3), and (d) verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came from reasoning and logic (which I sought to find indicators of, as noted above, in order to seek to answer Research Question 3). Sometimes these notes that I typed into the audit trail concerned only one movement done by one participant; other times these notes concerned multiple movements of one kind that were done by multiple participants. After I typed these notes into the audit trail, and after I finished transcribing all of the interviews I conducted in this study, I conducted the structured observations noted above--structured observations which were of participants’ during-interview body movements, and which I conducted by viewing videos of the interviews.

In these structured observations, I looked for those movements that, during my unstructured observations, I postulated were possible indicators of one or more of the
following: (a) the variable *does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions*, (b) the variable *does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions*, (c) verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came via intuition, and (d) verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came from reasoning and logic. Also, in these structured observations, I sometimes observed movements that I was not looking for in the structured observations, but that I postulated were possible indicators of one or more of the following: (a) the variable *does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions*, (b) the variable *does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions*, (c) verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came via intuition, and (d) verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came from reasoning and logic. When I observed these movements that I was not looking for in the structured observations, I wrote-down notes regarding those movements, typing those notes directly into this study’s audit trail. Sometimes those notes concerned only one movement done by one participant, and other times those notes concerned multiple movements of one kind that I observed multiple participants do. After I typed into the audit trail these notes I made regarding movements I was not looking for in the structured observations, I eventually looked for seemingly clear-cut instances of those movements by watching videos of the interviews, and thus was again conducting structured observations of participants’ during-interview body movements. Parenthetically, the four types of body movement I looked for in the structured observations were as follows (again, these were movements I postulated were possible indicators of one or more of the following--(a) the variable *does or does not use*
instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions, (b) the variable does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions, (c) verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came via intuition, and (d) verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came from reasoning and logic: (a) eyes wander (where the participant’s open eyes wandered in a particular way that I will offer a thorough description of in Chapter 4), (b) eyes open a little wider and brow furrows (In Chapter 4, I will offer a thorough description of this movement type.), (c) head nodding (where the participant nodded a particular way that I will give a thorough description of in Chapter 4), and (d) symmetrical hand movements of many subtypes--e.g., twiddling one’s thumbs, folding one’s hands so that the fingers were interlaced symmetrically (This movement type that I have labeled “symmetrical hand movements of many subtypes” was the first movement type I observed in this study that seemed to me to be important or potentially important to this study. I conducted structured observations in which I looked for seemingly clear-cut instances of this movement type, but I eventually concluded that perhaps the symmetrical hand movements done in this study by the study participants, were not important or potentially important to this study (because the meaning of them was too uncertain).).

In conducting structured observations in which I looked for seemingly clear-cut instances of the above-noted movement types, I feel I gradually became adept at being able to distinguish which participant movements were seemingly clear-cut instances of the above-noted movement types, and which were not. Through repeated, careful observation of participants’ movements--repeated and careful observation in which I
sometimes viewed video of participants’ movements in slow-motion--, I came to notice nuances in those movements that would remain unnoticed by individuals who do not observe people’s movements in like fashion (E.g., I came to be able to differentiate between a seemingly clear-cut instance of head nodding (where the participant nodded his or her head in a particular way that I will give my full description of in Chapter 4), and a very subtle quivering of the head that sometimes occurred just by virtue of the fact that the participant exhibiting the movement was speaking). I became, toward the participants’ movements, what Eisner (1976) refers to as a “connoisseur” (p. 140), one who he describes in the following manner:

To be a connoisseur of wine, bicycles, or graphic arts is to be informed about their qualities; it means being able to discriminate the subtleties among types of wine, bicycles, and graphic arts by drawing upon a gustatory, visual, and kinesthetic memory against which the particulars of the present may be placed for purposes of comparison and contrast. (p. 140)

Eisner’s description of the connoisseur, here, conveys precisely what I became able to do in observing participants’ movements--i.e., it became possible for me to see nuances among movement types, and I accomplished that seeing, in Eisner’s words, “by drawing upon a…visual…memory against which the particulars of the present…[could] be placed for purposes of comparison and contrast” (p. 140).15

Although I feel I became a connoisseur of participants’ movements, I would like to point out that my connoisseurship about participant movements enabled me only to distinguish nuances among movement types. My connoisseurship about participant

15 Thank you to William Taylor, my doctoral co-advisor, both for making known to me Eisner’s (1976) description of the “connoisseur” (p. 140), and for pointing out to me that that description of Eisner’s conveys what I became as I studied the movement types defined above.
movements thus did not provide to me the knowledge necessary to know, with certainty, that seemingly-clear-cut instances of the four above-named movement types were indicators of the following things that, as stated above, I postulated they were possible indicators of: (a) the variable *does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions*, (b) the variable *does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions*, (c) verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came via intuition, and (d) verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came from reasoning and logic. In other words, in studying participant movements, I became a connoisseur of participant movements, but I did not become a connoisseur of, for example, the posited *instinctive responsiveness* and the posited process of intuition that I postulated the four above-named movement types were possible indicators of. Had I become a connoisseur of the posited *instinctive responsiveness*, I would have become able to distinguish both when participants used *instinctive responsiveness* in verbal responses to interview questions, and when participants did not do that. Also, had I become a connoisseur of the posited process of intuition, I would have become able to distinguish both which verbal responses conveyed ideas that came via intuition, and which verbal responses conveyed ideas that did not come via intuition.

In academia, there seem not to be any connoisseurs of the posited *instinctive responsiveness*, or of the posited process of intuition. That, in academia, there seem not to be any connoisseurs of the posited *instinctive responsiveness*, is understandable, because the posited *instinctive responsiveness* is something that, just now, in this dissertation, is being presented in academia as something an academic might be able to be a connoisseur
of. That, in academia, there seem not to be any connoisseurs of the posited process of
intuition, however, is less understandable, because intuition as a subject is cited
frequently in academic writings (e.g., the writings cited in this study’s literature review).
That, in academia, there seem not to be any connoisseurs of the posited process of
intuition, is evidenced by what has been and is our (i.e., academics’) inability to
differentiate whether an idea has come via intuition or not--an inability which makes us
unable to isolate the posited process of intuition so that we can study it. The reason that,
in academia, there seem not to be any connoisseurs of the posited process of intuition, is
that we in academia do not have a method that allows understanding of the posited
process of intuition. Maybe we in academia should be open to the prospect of making
use, in academia, of the connoisseurship of intuition that people outside academia have
achieved. Some academics have made use, in academia, of the connoisseurship that
people outside academia have achieved. For example, this has occurred, as I shall now
explain, in the field of somatics, which “focuses on ‘the body as perceived from within’
(Hanna, 1986b, p. 4)” (Mullins, 2008, p. 22). Somatics was started outside academia in
1976 by Hanna (1976, as cited in Mullins, 2008), who, in starting the field, Mullins
(2008) explains, “gathered into…[it] a variety of practices for achieving mind-body
[italics added] integration that had emerged in North America, Australia, and Europe in
the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Johnson, 1995, 1997a)” (p. 24) (I shall refer
to these practices, here, as “somatic practices.”). Histories of somatic practices--such as

16 Mullins (2008) writes that “among the practices [drawn together into somatics at its inception] were F.
M. Alexander’s Alexander Technique, Marion Rosen’s Rosen Method, Mary Starks Whitehouse’s Moving
in Depth, now known as Authentic Movement (Knaster, 1996), Moshe Feldenkrais’s Functional Integration
and Awareness through Movement, Ida Rolf’s Rolfing, Bonnie Bainbridge Cohen’s Body-Mind Centering,
collection of histories edited by Johnson (1995), and the histories of somatic practices written by Knaster (1996)—show that most of those practices started and grew wholly outside academia. Thus, from the time when academics began moving somatics into academia at various accredited educational institutions after the field was started (Kleinman, 1986, 1994-95, as cited in Mullins, 2008; Mullins, 2008), those academics have been making use, in academia, of connoisseurship that somatic practitioners achieved mostly wholly outside academia (These practitioners’ connoisseurship has been a connoisseurship of “combination[s] of ‘touch, movement, . . . body-awareness’ (Johnson, 1997a, p. 1), and verbal instruction” (Mullins, 2008, p. 24) that these practitioners studied in the somatic practices they did.). That those academics have been making use, in academia, of connoisseurship achieved by people outside academia, might explain why somatics has such a hard time being seriously considered in academia (That somatics has such a hard time being seriously considered in academia is evidenced by the fact that, currently, i.e., 33 years after somatics was started, in the United States there are only three graduate-level course of study in somatics at accredited educational institutions (Those institutions are the California Institute of Integral Studies, John F. Kennedy University, and Naropa University.). If the reason that somatics has such a hard time being seriously considered in academia is that academics in somatics have made use, in academia, of connoisseurship achieved by people outside academia, then that might be...
seen as an example of unfortunate prejudice. Likewise, if we academics’ are not open to making use, in academia, of connoisseurship of intuition that people outside academia have achieved, it might be seen as an example of unfortunate prejudice if we are not open to that prospect simply because that connoisseurship has been achieved by people outside academia. I shall now return to my discussion of the structured observations I conducted in this study.

Because I collected a considerable amount of video data in this study (As stated above, I conducted one 1-1.5-hour interview of each of the 24 participants in this study, and video-recorded each of those interviews; that means I collected roughly 24-36 hours of video data in this study.), I decided to conduct my structured observations of the first three movement types noted above by viewing the videos of the interviews of only every other participant in this study’s three 8-person samples, in order to save me the time I would have spent viewing the videos of the interviews of all of the participants. When I conducted structured observations in which I looked for seemingly clear-cut instances of the first three movement types noted above, I followed the following procedures:

1. I viewed the entire video of my interview of a given participant, looking for seemingly clear-cut instances of the movement (Note: One exception to the immediately preceding statement concerns the head nodding movement that I looked for seemingly clear-cut instances of. I looked for seemingly clear-cut instances of head nodding after I had conducted structured observations in

17In the list of participant names from which I selected every other participant interview to view, the participants’ names were listed in the order in which they first contacted me about participating in this study.
which I looked for the first two types of movements noted above, and, when I
looked for seemingly clear-cut instances of *head nodding*, I viewed only those
portions of my interview of a given participant during which one or more of
the first two above-noted types of movements appeared to me to have possibly
occurred. I did that to save me the time I would have spent had I viewed the
entire interview of a given participant and looked for seemingly clear-cut
instances of *head nodding*.) (Note: When I looked for seemingly clear-cut
instances of *eyes wander*, I followed the procedure stated above--i.e., in which
I viewed the entire video of my interview of a given participant, looking for
seemingly clear-cut instances of the movement--., but I did so only during the
stage in my understanding of *eyes wander* in which I postulated that *eyes
wander* movements consisted of a particular kind of eye movement where the
participant’s eyes wandered up. At a later stage in my understanding of *eyes
wander*--a stage I am still in as I write this document--., I postulated that *eyes
wander* movements consisted of a particular kind of eye movement where the
participant’s eyes wandered in any direction except onto my (i.e., the
interviewer’s) eyes, or onto the body parts below my eyes (During these
movements, the participant and I were sitting in chairs that were about four
feet apart, directly facing each other.). In this later stage in my understanding
of *eyes wander*, I did not follow the procedure described above--i.e., the
procedure in which I viewed the entire video of my interview of a given
participant, looking for seemingly clear-cut instances of the movement.
Instead, in order to save time, I viewed only a two-minute portion of each of the videos of the interviews I viewed to conduct structured observations of the first three movement types noted above (I arbitrarily chose to view the following two-minute portion of those interviews: minutes 35:00-37:00 of the interviews.).

2. When I observed a movement that was perhaps a seemingly clear-cut instance of the movement, I determined whether it met the criteria that a movement had to meet to qualify as a seemingly clear-cut instance of that movement (These criteria are listed in Appendix B.). If it did not meet those criteria, I classified it as a kind of movement about which it was too undiscernable to conclude whether or not the movement was a seemingly clear-cut instance of the movement I was looking for (These kinds of movements are listed in Appendix B.).

3. I hand-wrote the following information about the movement: (a) whether it met the criteria that a movement had to meet to qualify as a seemingly clear-cut instance of that movement, or, whether it did not meet those criteria, and thus had to be classified as a movement about which it was too undiscernable to conclude whether or not the movement was a seemingly clear-cut instance of that movement; (b) the time on the video that the movement occurred; (c) the interview question during which the movement occurred; (d) the number of seconds the movement lasted; (e) and, for the head nodding movement type that I observed, the number of head nods that occurred during the movement.
4. I typed into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet all of the hand-written information described in #3 in this list.

As written above, the fourth and final data collection procedure I used in this study was measurement of participants’ pre-verbal-response times for each interview question in each interview. I measured the pre-verbal-response times for each participant by viewing the video of my interview of him or her; I measured the pre-verbal-response times in hundredths of a second using a stopwatch.

Each participant’s total time commitment in this study (including the time in which I described to the participant the purpose of the study, explained to the participant what participation in the study would entail, answered any questions the participant had about participating, obtained the participant’s informed consent, and conducted my interview of him or her) was approximately 2-3 hours. That time commitment took place on different dates for different participants, in the first four months of 2009.

Finally, at the start of this study, I planned to conduct two one-on-one interviews with each participant. At the start of this study, I had not developed an interview schedule to use in my second interviews of the participants, but I expected that (a) that schedule would consist of about the same number of questions as the interview schedule I used in this study, and (b) the interview questions I would have used in my second interviews of the participants would have aimed at testing hypotheses deduced from postulations that were emerging in the study. As this study developed, however, it became clear that it was unnecessary for me to conduct two interviews with each participant, because the data I collected by conducting only one interview with each participant, were enough to finish
the study. The reason why the data collected through only one interview with each participant were enough to finish this study, is that those data enabled me to discover answers to this study’s research questions.

The Data Analysis Procedures Used in This Study

The most enlightening work I have ever done is the following seeming discovery I began to make in this study: that the human mind and body are perhaps undisciplined, even when we discipline them, and they may be influenced quite often by the posited instinctive responsiveness--so that our body movement is influenced and our spoken word use is influenced--, even when we do not know this is happening.

The Procedures I Used to Analyze the Qualitative Data and Information I Analyzed for This Study

To analyze the qualitative data and information I analyzed for this study, I employed the procedures of grounded theory (Punch, 200518; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) (Note: As noted above in this chapter and in Chapter 1, for this study (but prior to it) I analyzed notes I wrote-down that recorded informal observations I made regarding the behavior of the participants in a service-learning project I conducted in April and May, 2007. In this study, I have referred to those notes (as stated above in this chapter and in Chapter 1) as “information,” rather than as “data,” since those notes were a record of informal observations I made during a non-research activity. However, to make the text

18 In noting that I have drawn off of Punch’s (2005) writing on grounded theory, I wish to add that Punch explains that his writing on grounded theory is based on the following five publications that have defined the grounded theory research strategy since its origination in the 1960’s by Glaser and Strauss: Glaser and Strauss (1967, as cited in Punch, 2005), Glaser (1978, as cited in Punch, 2005), Strauss (1987, as cited in Punch, 2005), Strauss and Corbin (1990, as cited in Punch, 2005), and Glaser (1992, as cited in Punch, 2005).
of this section flow more smoothly for the reader, I shall refer to all data and information
I analyzed for this study simply as “data,” rather than “data and information.”). Using the
procedures of grounded theory, I created abstract categories that described the qualitative
data I analyzed for this study--categories I then used to generate a theory which seeks to
explain that data. To create those categories and then use them to generate a theory, I
employed the three types of coding that are used in grounded theory data analysis--open
coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Punch, 2005; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Each
of these served a distinct purpose for me in this study: I used open coding to create and
develop my understanding of categories that described the qualitative data I analyzed for
this study--categories into which I placed pieces of that data that were similar in some
way (these categories are called substantive codes in grounded theory); I used axial
coding to develop hypotheses or propositions regarding how those categories were
connected or related to each other (these hypotheses or propositions are called theoretical
codes in grounded theory); and, finally, I used selective coding to generate the core
category (called the core code, in grounded theory) which sits at the center of the theory I
generated (Punch, 2005). In the following subsections, I shall describe further, in turn, the
procedures I employed in using open coding, axial coding, and selective coding.

The Procedures I Employed in Using Open Coding. (Note: Most of the
procedures I discuss in this subsection on open coding are described in Punch (2005), and
my writing about these procedures has drawn off of Punch’s description of them.) As
noted above, in using open coding, I created categories (called substantive codes) that
described the qualitative data I analyzed for this study--categories into which I placed
pieces of that data that shared some similarity. These categories described and were defined by the pieces of data they represented, yet they were more abstract than those pieces of data themselves. The pieces of data that defined a category came in the following various forms: words, phrases, sentences, and paragraphs that were present in the verbal data I analyzed, as well as images that were present in the video data I analyzed. To name each category I created, I used single words or phrases that in my view described the group of data that was represented by the category; sometimes, also, these single words or phrases described the meaning that I perceived the group of data that was represented by the category, may have had.

After I created a given category in open coding, I sometimes investigated that category by engaging in the open coding procedure known in grounded theory as “develop[ing]… [a category] in terms of its …properties [italics added] and dimensions [italics added]” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 116). When I executed that procedure, I searched through portions of the data I analyzed for this study, looking for both of the following: (a) the category’s properties--i.e., its characteristics or attributes, such as “when/timing” (i.e., when the something represented by the category occurred), “duration” (i.e., the duration of each of those somethings), and “frequency” (i.e., the frequency of occurrence of those somethings); and (b) the category’s dimensions, which indicated where a property of the category sat on a range (thus, various dimensions of the property “when/timing” that I examined for one category were: the number of the interview question during which the something represented by the category occurred, whether that something started occurring before vs. during the participant’s verbal
response to the interview question, and that the something started occurring after I finished asking the interview question) (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). When I developed a category by detailing its properties and dimensions, I did so tentatively, knowing that my understanding of the category would not be finalized until I got a clear sense of what was consistent in the data I was analyzing. Nevertheless, in developing a category by detailing its properties and dimensions, I assumed I might use that category as a building block in the theory I have developed that seeks to explain data I analyzed for this study.

In open coding, the central activity in which I engaged was the following: making comparisons between pieces of data. In making these comparisons, I assessed the similarities and differences between pieces of data, and then (a) placed some of those pieces of data into the category or categories they indicated, or (b) identified some of those pieces of data as properties (i.e., characteristics) of a category, and documented them as such. In addition to making comparisons between pieces of data during open coding, I was constantly asking one question--a question articulated by Punch (2005) that comes in the following three forms: “What is this piece of data an example of? Or, … What does this piece of data stand for, or represent? Or, … What category or property of a category does this piece of data indicate?” (p. 207) The activity of making comparisons between pieces of data, and the activity of constantly asking the question(s) indicated in the previous sentence, defined the procedure of open coding for me; these activities helped to guide my choice-making process throughout my open coding.

The Procedures I Employed in Using Axial Coding. In my axial coding, I generated theoretical codes that hypothesized the nature of the connections or
relationships between the categories I created during open coding. Punch (2005) notes that axial coding can be seen as the second stage of coding in grounded theory analysis, although in practice the researcher can undertake open coding, axial coding, and selective coding, to be discussed shortly, concurrently; indeed, in this study, I undertook these three types of coding concurrently. Punch notes that the term axial, used by Strauss and Corbin, two of the primary authors in the grounded theory literature, is meant to denote the notion of an axis running through the data, connecting categories. The axes connecting categories are theoretical concepts that are propositions about the ways that the data that define different categories relate. I generated such theoretical concepts in this study, summing them up into words or phrases that constituted the theoretical codes.

In creating these theoretical codes, I was proposing how the categories I created during open coding related to one another. Each of the categories I created during open coding represented a phenomenon, which Strauss and Corbin (1998) define as a “central … [idea] in the data represented as … [a concept]” (p. 101), so, in proposing how the categories I created during open coding related to one another, I was proposing how the phenomena those categories represented related to one another. In analyzing how certain of those phenomena related to one another, I used an analytic scheme developed by Strauss and Corbin called “the paradigm [italics added]” (p. 128) (In this chapter’s section entitled “The Sampling Strategy Used in This Study,” I pointed-out that I used the paradigm in analyzing data for this study. In that section, I offered a definition and description of the paradigm, and I shall now re-present that definition and description.). Strauss and Corbin explain that the paradigm is a means by which data analysts using
grounded theory can integrate a phenomenon’s *structure* (i.e., the conditions or circumstances which make possible the manifestation of that phenomenon) with its *process* (i.e., the sequences of individual and group *action/interaction* over time that are relevant to the phenomenon). When I used the *paradigm*, I thought about a phenomenon and asked myself which of the following three components of Strauss and Corbin’s *paradigm* I thought the phenomenon was: (a) a *condition* which made some other phenomenon possible, (b) an *action/interaction* that arose under certain conditions, or (c) a *consequence*—i.e., an outcome of an *action/interaction*. When I used the *paradigm* to identify phenomena according to whether I thought they were *conditions*, *actions/interactions*, or *consequences*, it enabled me to hypothesize how those phenomena related to one another. When I chose not to use the *paradigm* to identify phenomena according to whether they were *conditions*, *actions/interactions*, or *consequences*, I evaluated those phenomena on the basis of how I thought they related to one another. *Figure 1* shows the key categories of data I created in this study (each of those categories, as stated in the caption below *Figure 1*, represents a phenomenon).
Figure 1. Model showing the key categories of data I created in this study. In the model, each white shape represents a category of data. Each of those categories represents a phenomenon, which Strauss and Corbin (1998) define as a “central … [idea] in the data represented as … [a concept]” (p. 101). In the model, text written outside of the shapes is a theoretical code I created in this study (a theoretical code is a hypothesis or proposition regarding how certain categories were connected or related to each other (Punch, 2005)).
The Procedures I Employed in Using Selective Coding. (Note: Most of the procedures I discuss in this subsection on selective coding are described in Punch (2005), and my writing about these procedures has drawn off of Punch’s description of them.)

The third of the three stages of grounded theory coding I undertook was selective coding, in which I established the core code, or core category, of the data I analyzed (My study’s core category was “universal language of feeling”; that category is shown in Figure 1.). My core category is an abstract concept which sits at the center of the theory I developed in this study. Around the core category, the data I determined were necessary to answer this study’s research questions were integrated and refined. These data were only a portion of the data I collected in this study, but they comprised what emerged as central to it, in my perception. Strauss and Corbin (1998), in discussing the role of the core category in the grounded theory researcher’s analysis and in the theory developed by that researcher, emphasize that the core category the researcher generates may be unique to their particular analysis:

[The core category] consists of all the products of analysis condensed into a few words that seem to explain ‘what the research is all about.’ … This explanation is our interpretation of what the research is all about …. Another researcher, coming from a different theoretical orientation and having another research question, might arrive at quite another interpretation. (p. 146)

I spotted the core category of this study early in my data analysis, during open coding. When I spotted the core category, I noted that I spotted it, but, like with the substantive codes I created in open coding, I developed the core category tentatively, because I knew the core category might have been replaced with a substitute as my analysis proceeded. When I decided that the core category I created would be at the
center of my theory, however, it marked the end of my open coding and my data analysis altogether.

My Use of NVivo 8 in This Study. In this study, I used the qualitative research software NVivo 8. I used NVivo 8 to store the qualitative data I collected in this study. I also used NVivo 8 to code the verbal data I analyzed for this study. Finally, I used NVivo 8 to make the model presented in Figure 1.

The Procedures I Used to Analyze the Quantitative Data I Analyzed for This Study

In analyzing the quantitative data collected through measurements of participants’ pre-verbal-response times, I first calculated the mean pre-verbal-response time score and the variance for each of the study’s three samples. Then, I used one-way (or one-factor) analysis of variance (ANOVA) to test the statistical significance of the differences that existed between the mean scores of the samples. Prior to conducting the ANOVA, I did not formulate hypotheses regarding potential differences between the samples’ mean scores, because at that time there existed no sound theoretical base from which to deduce such hypotheses. I used the software program called SPSS Statistics 17.0 to analyze the quantitative data I analyzed for this study.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

In this chapter, I shall discuss the results I obtained in seeking to answer Research Questions 1, 2, and 3; the development of Research Question 4; and the results I obtained from investigating Functional Relationships 1, 2, and 3 (I explained in Chapter 3 that by “functional relationship,” I mean a relationship between an independent variable and a dependent variable.). This chapter is divided into the following main sections: (a) “The Results I Obtained in Seeking to Answer Research Question 1, and the Results I Obtained From Investigating Functional Relationship 1”; (b) “The Results I Obtained in Seeking to Answer Research Question 2”; (c) “The Results I Obtained in Seeking to Answer Research Question 3, the Results I Obtained From Investigating Functional Relationships 2 and 3, and the Development of Research Question 4”; (d) “The Theory I Have Developed That Seeks to Explain Data I Analyzed for This Study.” In Chapter 1, I listed this study’s four research questions. For ease of reference, the four research questions are re-presented here:

1. Does listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions contribute to negotiating life as happily as one can?

2. When, where, and how did individuals who perceive themselves as listening to and following their feelings in making decisions learn to do so?

3. Can research participants’ verbal responses to interview questions be separated based on whether they convey ideas that came via intuition from an instinctive responsiveness in the participant, versus whether they convey ideas that came from the reasoning and logic employed by a separate nature of the mental in the participant?
4. Can we propose a new paradigm for discovery? The purpose of this paradigm for discovery would be to focus on discovery of the following three things:

(a) Making a firm distinction between what I posit are our two natures, those natures being (i) the mind, and (ii) this other nature I have called an “instinctive responsiveness” but which, in my view, is actually best to remain unlabeled (otherwise we are likely to have our opinions about what it is, based on meanings we might give to a word or words used to label it). Making such a firm distinction, I posit, would allow us to make a distinction between what I speculate are the mind’s thoughts and this other nature’s feelings.

(b) That we are not able to make such decisive distinctions (i.e., as those noted in (a) in this list) in separating our inner selves using the means thus far proposed or acted upon by non-scientific psychological, scientific, religious, didactic, etc., means.

(c) That in the absence of firm proof that we can make such decisive distinctions (i.e., as those noted in (a) in this list), all beliefs regarding such distinctions must be considered irrelevant.

In Chapter 3, I laid-out the independent variable and dependent variables that comprise this study’s Functional Relationships 1, 2, and 3. For ease of reference, I re-present here the variables of Functional Relationships 1, 2, and 3:

**Functional Relationship 1:**
- Independent variable: *does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions*
- Dependent variable: *does or does not negotiate life as happily as one can under the circumstances in which one lives*

**Functional Relationship 2:**
- Independent variable: *does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions*
- Dependent variable: *does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions*

**Functional Relationship 3:**
- Independent variable: *does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions*
- Dependent variable: *does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions*
Also, before discussing this study’s results, I wish to state that, in this study’s data, I did not find major differences between this study’s retired low-income elderly, retired university professors, and retired university staff groups. Because I did not find major differences between these groups, I have presented the results of this study (except when otherwise specified) as if the study participants were one group of participants, rather than three groups.

Finally, at several places in this chapter, I display interview data spoken by me (i.e., the interviewer) and participants in this study. In some of that data, numbers (e.g., “5”) are inserted in-between certain of the words that are displayed. Each of those numbers signifies that a pause in speaking occurred at that place in the interview, and the number indicated indicates the number of seconds that that pause lasted. A number is displayed only for pauses that were 5 sec or longer.

The Results I Obtained in Seeking to Answer Research Question 1, and the Results I Obtained From Investigating Functional Relationship 1

Research Question 1 of this study, as stated above, was as follows: Does listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions contribute to negotiating life as happily as one can? As noted in Chapter 3, Research Question 1 asks whether there is a positive relationship between the independent variable does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions and the dependent variable does or does not negotiate life as happily as one can under the circumstances in which one lives. I noted in Chapter 3, as well, that in this study I have chosen to refer to the relationship between

---

19 As noted above, the name of this variable can be restated as does or does not listen to and follow an awareness of a sense other than one’s thoughts in making decisions.
variables asked about in Research Question 1, as “Functional Relationship 1.” I also stated in Chapter 3 that my strategy for seeking to answer this study’s Research Question 1, simply is the strategy I used to investigate Functional Relationship 1. Now, before I begin my presentation of the results I obtained from investigating Functional Relationship 1 (a presentation which simply is my presentation of the results I obtained in seeking to answer Research Question 1), I shall briefly review how I investigated that relationship.

As stated in Chapter 3, my hypothesis regarding the variables in Functional Relationship 1 was that *Listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions leads one to negotiate life as happily as one can under the circumstances in which one lives.* I said in Chapter 3 that in order to test that hypothesis, I had to operationally define the variables about which it stated an expected relationship. I explained that I operationally defined those variables using a qualitative approach rather than a quantitative one, in that I made the variables identifiable but not measurable. With regard to the variable *does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions*, I explained that I selected one operation to make it identifiable, and that that operation was this: I asked each participant if, in his perception, he generally listens to and follows his *feelings* in making decisions (The interview question I asked each participant, in executing this operation, is the first interview question shown in Table 1.).
Table 1

*The Interview Questions on This Study’s Interview Schedule That Were Used Both to Seek to Answer Research Question 1 and to Investigate Functional Relationship 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number on this study’s interview schedule</th>
<th>Interview question</th>
<th>Purposes of the interview question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7.                                                | Generally, would you say that you arrive at your ideas about what to do, say, and be by thinking, or by using how you feel inside to guide your thinking? | • To enable me to seek to answer Research Question 1, which was as follows: “Does listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions contribute to negotiating life as happily as one can?”
• To ask each participant if, in his perception, he generally listens to and follows his feelings in making decisions, so that I could make identifiable Functional Relationship 1’s independent variable, which is named *does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions* |
| 1.                                                | Would you consider yourself to be negotiating life as happily as you can?            | • To enable me to seek to answer Research Question 1, which was as follows: “Does listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions contribute to negotiating life as happily as one can?”

Continued
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number on this study’s interview schedule</th>
<th>Interview question</th>
<th>Purposes of the interview question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To ask each participant if, in his perception, he is negotiating life as happily as he can under the circumstances in which he lives, so that I could make identifiable Functional Relationship 1’s dependent variable, which is named does or does not negotiate life as happily as one can under the circumstances in which one lives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To enable me to seek to answer Research Question 1, which was as follows: “Does listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions contribute to negotiating life as happily as one can?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To enable me to test my hypothesis regarding the variables in Functional Relationship 1, a hypothesis which stated that Listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions leads one to negotiate life as happily as one can under the circumstances in which one lives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Either 7B.II. or 7C.IV., depending on how the participant answered Question 7 (which is listed above in this table), earlier in the interview.

(Note: The only participants who I asked the following interview question were those participants who said, in response to Question 1, above, that they consider themselves to be negotiating life as happily as they can.) You mentioned earlier that in your view you are negotiating life as happily as you can. Do you think that using your feelings to guide your thinking contributes to your ability to negotiate life as happily as you can?
Then I explained that with respect to the variable does or does not negotiate life as happily as one can under the circumstances in which one lives, I selected one operation to make it identifiable, and that that operation was this: I asked each participant if, in his perception, he is negotiating life as happily as he can under the circumstances in which he lives (The interview question I asked each participant in executing this operation, is the second interview question shown in Table 1.). I then indicated in Chapter 3 that in order to observe the hypothesized relationship that Listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions leads one to negotiate life as happily as one can under the circumstances in which one lives, I did the following: I asked each participant who said both (a) that he perceives that he generally listens to and follows his feelings in making decisions, and (b) that he perceives himself to be negotiating life as happily as he can, if, in his perception, his listening to and following his feelings contributes to his negotiating life as happily as he can (The interview question I asked participants in executing this operation, is the third interview question shown in Table 1.). I shall now present the results I obtained from following the procedures I have reviewed in this paragraph.

As a result of following the procedures I just noted, I learned that 17 of the 24 participants in the study (these 17 were roughly evenly distributed across the three samples) said both (a) that they perceive that they generally listen to and follow their feelings in making decisions, and (b) that they perceive themselves to be negotiating life as happily as they can. Of those 17, 16 said that, in their perception, their listening to and following their feelings in making decisions contributes to their negotiating life as happily as they can. (One participant of the 17--a participant who I shall refer to using the
pseudonym “Dan”—said that in his perception, listening to and following his feelings in making decisions does not contribute to his negotiating life as happily as he can, but I shall discuss this perception more thoroughly, below in this section.). Of the seven participants who did not say both (a) that they perceive that they generally listen to and follow their feelings in making decisions, and (b) that they perceive themselves to be negotiating life as happily as they can, two said that in their perception, they do not generally listen to and follow their feelings in making decisions; these two participants did say that in their perception, they are negotiating life as happily as they can, but because they reported that in their view they generally do not listen to and follow their feelings in making decisions, I did not ask them if they saw listening to and following their feelings in making decisions as a contributor to their negotiating life as happily as they can. The remaining five of the seven participants who did not say both (a) that they perceive that they generally listen to and follow their feelings in making decisions, and (b) that they perceive themselves to be negotiating life as happily as they can, reported that, in their perception, they either are not or sometimes are not negotiating life as happily as they can; of these five participants, three perceived that they generally listen to and follow their feelings in making decisions, one perceived that she listens to and follows her feelings in making decisions and that she also thinks an equivalent amount in making those decisions, and one perceived that in making decisions, she both thinks and listens to and follows her feelings, “and maybe a little stronger on the thinking side,” she said. I did not ask these five individuals who said they either are not or sometimes are not negotiating life as happily as they can, if they see listening and following their feelings in
making decisions as a contributor to their negotiating life as happily as they can, because these individuals did not say they are negotiating life as happily as they can.

In obtaining the findings I just reviewed, I discovered that the participants perceived that they knew what something was, just because they gave a name to it. For example, when I asked the participants if, in their perception, they listen to and follow their *feelings* in making decisions, I discovered that the participants (but with one partial exception which I shall discuss below in this section) perceived that they knew what the term “*feelings*” meant, just because they used it as a name for something. I noted above in this section that 17 of the 24 participants in this study said both (a) that they perceive that they generally listen to and follow their *feelings* in making decisions, and (b) that they perceive themselves to be negotiating life as happily as they can. Then I noted that of those 17, 16 said that, in their perception, their listening to and following their *feelings* in making decisions contributes to their negotiating life as happily as they can. I then pointed out that one participant of the 17--Dan--said that in his perception, listening to and following his *feelings* in making decisions does not contribute to his negotiating life as happily as he can; in pointing out this perception of Dan’s, I said I would discuss it more thoroughly, below in this section. In the next paragraph, I shall discuss this perception of Dan’s more thoroughly. But, briefly, before that discussion, I wish to point out that (a) this perception of Dan’s prompted me to investigate what this study’s participants meant when they used the words “*feelings*” and “*feeling*,” and (b) I discovered in that investigation that what this study’s participants meant when they used the words “*feelings*” and “*feeling*” varied considerably across the participants, a fact that
led me to question just how much importance I or one should give to the findings I obtained in investigating Functional Relationship 1, when the independent variable of Functional Relationship 1—*does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions*—meant different things to different participants in the study.

Now, Dan said that the reason he perceives that listening to and following his *feelings* in making decisions does not contribute to his negotiating life as happily as he can, is that he cannot quite make the link between *feelings* and his decision-making process—a decision-making process he referred to both as a “thought process” and as “thinking.” So, Dan said he perceives he listens to and follows his *feelings* in making decisions, but when I asked him if he perceives that his doing that contributes to his negotiating life as happily as he can, he said “No” because he cannot quite make the link between *feelings* and his decision-making process (a process, again, which he called both a “thought process” and “thinking”). When Dan said he perceives that listening to and following his *feelings* in making decisions does not contribute to his negotiating life as happily as he can, it contradicted the statements of the 16 participants who said that listening to and following their *feelings* in making decisions *does* contribute to their negotiating life as happily as they can.

I personally found that the reason Dan stated for why his self-perceived listening to and following his *feelings* in making decisions does not contribute to his negotiating life as happily as he can—that reason, again was that Dan cannot quite make the link between *feelings* and his decision-making process, a decision-making process that he referred to both as a “thought process” and as “thinking”—, was an adequate explanation.
In fact, Dan’s reason that I just stated made me question the statements of the 16 participants who said that their self-perceived listening to and following their feelings in making decisions contributed to their negotiating life as happily as they can; in particular, Dan’s reason made me ask to myself, These 16 participants say they perceive that they listen to and follow their feelings in making decisions--more specifically, they said that they arrive at their ideas about what to do, say, and be by using how they feel inside to guide their thinking--, but how do these participants really know they are doing that? I also said to myself, Dan has a good point in observing that he cannot quite make the link between (a) his feelings and (b) his decision-making--i.e., his “thought process,” his “thinking,” as he said--, and, indeed, there is no method that allows one to, first, differentiate feelings from thinking, and then, second, make the link between feelings and thinking so that one can tell how the former relates to the latter. I then wondered to myself, So, what do the 16 participants who say they listen to and follow their feelings to guide their thinking, mean when they say “feelings,” since, in fact, one cannot differentiate feelings from thinking, nor make the link between feelings and thinking so that one can tell how the former relates to the latter? With that question in mind, I looked at the interview data to try to see how these 16 participants defined “feelings” and “feeling.”

I found that one participant (who I shall refer to as “Sally,” a pseudonym) said that, to her, “‘feelings’ and ‘intuition’...are kind of the same.” Sally did not define what she meant by “feelings” or “intuition.” Her statement that feelings and intuition are kind of the same, however--because it compares feelings and intuition--led me to compare
my understanding of “feelings” and my understanding of “intuition,” and to realize, upon making that comparison, that a characteristic that I know applies to intuition actually applies to feelings, as well. That characteristic, as it applies to feelings and intuition, is as follows: knowing what one’s feelings are at a given time is as unverifiable at the present time as knowing which ideas have come via intuition versus via, say, reasoning and logic, because we have no method to verify what our feelings are, just as we have no method to verify which ideas have come via intuition versus not. This observation led me to question how much we really know about the feelings aspect of the “intrapersonal [italics added]” (Mullins, 2003, p. 8)—i.e., how much we really know, say, about what our feelings are, why they come, and when we are listening to our feelings to guide our thinking, versus not doing that.

In continuing my search through the interview data to try to see definitions of “feelings” and “feeling” given by the 16 participants who said they perceive they listen to and follow their feelings to guide their thinking, I found that one participant (who I shall refer to by the pseudonym “Jim”) said that that which we (all people) feel is right or wrong is determined largely by how we have been conditioned. Another participant, “Walt,” referred to “feelings” as “attitude,” and said that he controls his attitude (i.e., what he perceives as his feelings) in his mind. A participant named “Sheena,” on the other hand, said that what she feels, can be determined strictly by other people’s actions. The participant named “Flo” said that she knows that her self-perceived listening to her feelings to guide her thinking contributes to her negotiating life as happily as she can, but that she cannot put into words why that is. The participant named “Stacy”—who, like Flo,
Walt, and Jim, both (a) did not define “feelings” or “feeling,” and (b) perceived she knew what these meant just because she gave a name to them--said that she has been an expert for years at making sure that what she referred to as “negative feelings,” do not enter her, so that her feelings stay, as she said, “positive.”

As the preceding examples of participants’ viewpoints about “feelings” and “feeling” show, what this study’s participants meant when they used the words “feelings” and “feeling” varied considerably across the participants. That fact, as stated above, led me to question how much weight I or one should give to the findings I obtained in investigating Functional Relationship 1, when the independent variable of Functional Relationship 1-- does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions--meant different things to different participants in the study. Also, the preceding examples of participants’ viewpoints about “feelings” and “feeling” are representative of the fact that this study’s participants did not question their meanings of the terms “feelings” or “feeling” (The only partial exception to the statement immediately preceding this one was the participant I mentioned above named “Dan,” who did question the meaning of the term “feelings.” Dan only partially questioned the meaning of the term “feelings,” however, because even after he questioned the meaning of the term (which he did not arrive at a definition for), he used the term without reservation, and even put names to some feelings, without questioning whether those names were verifiable (i.e., whether he had named the feelings he was naming, accurately)).

As noted above, the fact that what this study’s participants meant when they used the words “feelings” and “feeling” varied considerably across the participants, led me to
question how important the findings I obtained in investigating Functional Relationship 1 were, when the independent variable of Functional Relationship 1--does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions--meant different things to different participants in the study.

The Results I Obtained in Seeking to Answer Research Question 2

Research Question 2 of this study, as stated above, was the following: When, where, and how did individuals who perceive themselves as listening to and following their feelings in making decisions learn to do so? The format I used to try to answer Research Question 2 was not to simply ask the participants in this study if they perceive themselves as listening to and following their feelings in making decisions, and then, if those participants indicated that they perceive they do that, to ask them when, where, and how they learned to do it. Instead, the format I used to try to answer Research Question 2 was to ask the participants interview questions (these questions are shown in Table 2) which sought to see how important the perceived action of listening to and following their feelings was to the participants, so that I could assure I was focusing, as a researcher, on what was important to the participants, and not merely on what I hypothesized was important to them. I found that to the participants in this study, the perceived action of listening to and following their feelings in making decisions is not perceived to be of central importance to them. In discovering that about the participants, I learned how important it is for a researcher, in my view, to suspend his or her assumptions about what he or she is studying. For, if a researcher only looks for what he or she assumes may be present in what he or she is studying, he or she is programmed to
see only certain things in what he or she is studying, and he or she will miss other things that may be present in what he or she is studying. I assumed that the participants in this study would indicate that the perceived action of listening to and following their feelings in making decisions, was important to them, and that once they indicated that perceived action was important to them, I would ask them when, where, and how they learned to do that perceived action. I had to live in a suspended state of alertness, however, when I found that the participants did not see the perceived action of listening to and following their feelings in making decisions as centrally important to them.

Table 2

The Interview Question Numbers and Interview Questions on This Study's Interview Schedule That Were Used to Seek to Answer Research Question 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Do you get down about what you don’t have, materially, compared to what others have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A. If YES to 2:</td>
<td>Is there something you do to try to stop getting down about that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A.I. If YES to 2A.:</td>
<td>Can you describe that to me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A.I.a.</td>
<td>Where did you learn how to do that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A.I.b.</td>
<td>When did you learn how to do that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A.I.c.</td>
<td>How did you learn how to do that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B. If NO to 2:</td>
<td>Why would you say that is? (looking for the kind of mindset it takes to not get down about it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B.I. Probe (ask this to investigate the interviewee’s answer to 2B more deeply):</td>
<td>Is there something you do to prevent getting down about what you don’t have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B.I.a. If YES to 2B.I.:</td>
<td>What do you do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B.I.a.i.</td>
<td>Where did you learn how to do that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B.I.a.ii.</td>
<td>When did you learn how to do that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B.I.a.iii.</td>
<td>How did you learn how to do that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B.I.b. If NO to 2B.I.:</td>
<td>Why do you think it is that you do not get down about what you don’t have? (the interviewee’s answer is...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 continued

likely to be his explanation, or theory, of the datum that, from his perspective, he does not get down about what he does not have, materially, compared to others.

2C. If the interviewee answers “SOMETIMES,” or “NOT NECESSARILY,” or something else that conveys he or she is in effect saying both “YES” and “NO” to question 2, ask: When you do get down about what you don’t have, materially, compared to what others have, is there something you do to try to stop getting down about that?

2C.I. If YES to 2C.: Can you describe that to me?
   2C.I.a. Where did you learn how to do that?
   2C.I.b. When did you learn how to do that?
   2C.I.c. How did you learn how to do that?

2C.II. When you do not get down about what you don’t have, materially, compared to what others have, why would you say that is? (looking for the kind of mindset it takes to not get down about it)
   2C.II.a. Probe (ask this to investigate the interviewee’s answer to 2C.II. more deeply): Is there something you do to prevent getting down about what you don’t have?
      2C.II.a.i. If YES to 2C.II.a.: What do you do?
         2C.II.a.i.1. Where did you learn how to do that?
         2C.II.a.i.2. When did you learn how to do that?
         2C.II.a.i.3. How did you learn how to do that?
      2C.II.a.ii. If NO to 2C.II.a.: When you do not get down about what you don’t have, materially, compared to what others have, why do you think it is that you do not get down about it? (the interviewee’s answer is likely to be his explanation, or theory, of the datum that, from his perspective, he sometimes does not get down about what he does not have, materially, compared to others)

So, in my experience of seeking to answer Research Question 2, I learned that the researcher has to be in that suspended state I described in the previous paragraph, and that I had to be willing to give up my assumptions, and be willing to say that what I was looking for was found to be not useful. This experience I had in seeking to answer Research Question 2 was, in my view, an example of how open a researcher has to be, or
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even a person, in life; we have to be careful for what we are programmed for, in my perception; we have to be open, or we miss things, I perceive.

Now, the participants did not perceive, as stated above, that listening to and following their feelings in making decisions was centrally important to them. As a result of that, the format of my interview schedule led me to not ask the participants interview questions which asked when, where, and how the participants learned to do the perceived action of listening to and following their feelings in making decisions. Therefore, the participant data that would have allowed me to answer Research Question 2--i.e., data revealing when, where, and how the participants learned to do the perceived action of listening to and following their feelings in making decisions--, I did not obtain in this study. In sum, then, I did not answer this study’s Research Question 2 in this study. In asking the participants interview questions which sought to see how important the perceived action of listening to and following their feelings was to the participants, however, I found that the participants said, in response to these interview questions, things I did not anticipate. These things the participants said that I did not anticipate, were also expressed elsewhere by the participants in the interview data, I found. These things the participants said that I did not anticipate, were study results that I did not anticipate, and I shall now give a synopsis of these study results, then discuss them in greater detail. The synopsis of these study results I did not anticipate is as follows:

All of the participants in this study (with one exception), somewhere in my interviews of them, verbally expressed happiness about their life, somehow. Also, in my interviews of this study’s participants, a majority of the participants verbally expressed that they are satisfied they did the best they could with their lives so far. In this study’s interviews, all of the participants indicated verbally that they have more to live for--e.g., many said that they are learning and that they will continue learning. Also, the interview
data I collected from participants showed no evidence that the participants are experiencing complacency (i.e., not taking an active role, but instead being given one). So, in sum, striving and hope (which one might see as the characteristics of healthy living, I postulate) were expressed verbally by the participants. None of the participants, in my perception, were so burdened that they were depressed or could not handle things.

In addition, the interview data I collected in this study showed that because the participants are retired, many of the participants are not engaged anymore in the struggle to produce. No longer having to earn money through work, they now have a regulated life, and the interview data I collected showed that, as a result, most of the participants, for the most part, have no more worries. People in their 20’s and 30’s may not have verbally responded to the questions on this study’s interview schedule in the same way that this study’s participants—retirees age 50 and over—did. Future research could determine if people in their 20’s and 30’s would give different answers to the questions on this study’s interview schedule.

I shall now discuss in greater detail the study results stated in the immediately preceding synopsis. In my discussion, I shall list each of the results listed in the synopsis, and under each result, give examples of that result that I have selected from this study’s interview data.

- **Study Result:** *All of the participants in this study (with one exception), somewhere in my interviews of them, verbally expressed happiness about their life, somehow.*

**Example 1:**

**Interviewer: (question 3)** Would you consider yourself to be concerned about how others perceive you?

**Participant Flo:** No.

**Interviewer: (question 3B)** Why not?

**Participant Flo:** I told you that earlier, further back. I don’t care about what other people think. As long as I’m happy within myself, what’s going on in my life and everything. But other people don’t run my life, you know. Because, for instance, if my kids say, “Well, mom, why don’t you do this, or why don’t you do that?” Well, as long as I’m happy with what I’m doing, they, nobody else, should worry about it, you know?
Example 2:

**Interviewer:** *(question 1)* Would you consider yourself to be negotiating life as happily as you can?

**Participant Walt:** Yes.

Example 3:

**Interviewer:** Okay. Thomas, I just want to ask you one question, going back a little bit. The first question I asked you was “Would you consider yourself to be negotiating life as happily as you can?” And you said “No.”

**Participant Thomas:** (nod)

**Interviewer:** *(question 1B)* And my question for you at this time—although you did say some reason why that was for you—, I just want to ask you as a follow-up, to see if you would have anything to say to this, I just want to say, Why is that?

**Participant Thomas:** Well, I answered that. I’m perfectly contented with my life, except for the fact that I don’t have my helpmate along to be with me now. We were married for 62 years, and it just wasn’t long enough. [Participant Thomas explained to me, elsewhere in my interview of him, that his helpmate—his wife—died two years prior to my interview of him.]

As noted above, one participant in this study—I shall refer to that participant as “John”—did not verbally express happiness about his life, somehow, in my interview of him. I shall discuss what John shared with me in my interview of him, once I have listed each of the results in the above synopsis and given examples of each of those results.

- **Study Result:** *In my interviews of this study’s participants, a majority of the participants verbally expressed that they are satisfied they did the best they could with their lives so far.*

Example 1:

**Participant Jan:** … I have such a good life. I really do. I have a husband who adores me. I have wonderful friends. I have a very charming apartment. I’m
engaged with a lot of interesting things. I have a very good life. 5 Rewarding. I’m respected (sigh) professionally--very respected.

Example 2:

Interviewer: (question 1) Would you consider yourself to be negotiating life as happily as you can?

Participant Stacy: Yes, I do.

Interviewer: (question 1A) What, if anything, do you do inside yourself, in terms of your thinking, to negotiate life as happily as you can?

Participant Stacy: I take a mindset that, If I’m doing my best, however I’m doing it, I’m satisfied at that time.

Example 3:

Interviewer: (question 12) (Instructions for interviewer: For this question, state to the interviewee that you would like him/her to act as if he/she is asking the question of himself/herself, and then answering it. Once you have explained this to the interviewee, read the question.) Am I able to see myself as I am in the mirror, or do I only see this aging and deteriorating and heading-for-oblivion body?

Participant Leo: I would say the former. Not the latter part of what you said.

Interviewer: (question 13) Why do you say that?

Participant Leo: Actually, something that came to mind, it’s like Socrates used to say, “The unexamined life is not worth living,” so, I’ve tried to answer all those questions about how I think and feel, about certain things in life, and that’s about it.

Example 4:

Interviewer: (question 4) What’s the best way to be happy?

Participant Mary: Not to beat-down on yourself, I think. And everybody else, for that matter. Just try to think about the way it could be and the way it is. It could be a lot worse. It’s pretty good now. 5 Could be a lot worse and has been a lot worse. It’s great now. I’m just a happy person (small laugh).
• Study Result: In this study’s interviews, all of the participants indicated verbally that they have more to live for--e.g., many said that they are learning and that they will continue learning.

Example 1:

**Interviewer:** (question 5) Would you say that education is unnecessary beyond a certain point?

**Participant Dan:** Oh, not at all. I think education is a lifelong process. I’ll be [76 years old] in a few weeks here, and every day that I wake up, I know that I’m going to learn something new that day.

Example 2:

**Participant Walt:** … Trying to understand people is a constant learning endeavor for me. And I think that’s the most important thing for me right now, is to understand other people, and why they behave the way they do, why they feel the way they do.

Example 3:

**Participant Stacy:** And, [her daughter’s first name] wants me to dye my hair again. So, that’s a goal I can set as soon as I get my April money: you know, get a thing of hair dye, because it makes me look another ten years younger when my hair’s all one color….

• Study Result: The interview data I collected from participants showed no evidence that the participants are experiencing complacency (i.e., not taking an active role, but instead being given one).

I shall not give examples of this result, because doing so would require that I show entire interviews of participants in this study, and space does not permit that.

• Study Result: Striving and hope (which one might see as the characteristics of healthy living, I postulate) were expressed verbally by the participants.
Example 1:

**Interviewer: (question 5)** Would you say that education is unnecessary beyond a certain point?

**Participant Leo:** No.

**Interviewer: (question 5B)** Why?

**Participant Leo:** I think it’s important that people learn at all ages. The danger, I guess, perhaps, might be over-intellectualizing about things. But learning is important.

Example 2:

**Participant Gertrude:** And if you keep thinking you can’t do anything more in life, you can’t. And I don’t ever want to get to that point. I want to constantly be learning. I think that’s important. And just don’t give up; if you say you can’t do something, you won’t do it. Just keep trying. There’s just a whole lot of life out there I haven’t seen yet. Places I want to go. And that’s exciting.

Example 3:

**Participant Sally:** What I’m doing now, after all these years, is I’m spending my time volunteering, doing the things that I truly enjoy doing, and putting everything that I have into those volunteer efforts. So, that’s really what I enjoy doing, is volunteering and doing things to help others, in all different areas: you know, raising money for scholarships, doing volunteer things for the university where I worked, traveling, doing all sorts of things. But primarily volunteer.

- Study Result: *None of the participants, in my perception, were so burdened that they were depressed or could not handle things.*

Example 1:

**Participant Rachel:** I get up, I do what I do (laugh), I go on, I’m very happy-go-lucky….

Example 2:

**Interviewer: (question 2BI)** Is there something you do to prevent getting down about what you don’t have?
Participant Mary: No. I just don’t get down about it. I don’t think that there’s anything I do. Like I said, I think about the things I used to have, but I don’t get down about it. So I used to have them, I don’t have them anymore--big deal. You know. I’m happy like I am.

My situation: I have multiple sclerosis, and I can’t breathe too well. So, for me to be able to get up out of this chair [In the interview that this excerpt is taken from, Mary was sitting in a regular chair; she had moved out of her wheelchair for the interview. Her wheelchair was next to her.] and go to that [wheelchair], I’m lucky. Because I’ve seen a lot of other people in a lot worse shape. And that’s the way I look at it. Because I can still walk. You know, there’s a lot of things I can still do. So, I guess that’s why I’m happy (laugh). I’m not as down as I could be. 7

Hope that answers it. I don’t know if it does or not.

Interviewer: The last question I asked you was, “Is there something you do to prevent getting down about what you don’t have?”

Participant Mary: The only thing I could say is, I think about what could be, and it’s not. And, I’m pleased with the way it’s going right now. Because I know it could be a lot worse. So, no, I don’t get down about it. I’m happy (laugh).

Study Result: The interview data I collected in this study showed that because the participants are retired, many of the participants are not engaged anymore in the struggle to produce.

Example 1:

Participant Illa: I am comfortably off. I have enough for myself and everything that I want to do that requires money. …

… I am very fortunate. I’m single. I have my university pension. And I have funds established from my mother’s estate--the sale of the house--, and they have been well-invested (again, I was most fortunate) by a competent investor.

Example 2:

Interviewer: (question 7CIII) Please give me an instance of when you do not use feeling to guide your thinking, but use only thinking.

Participant Deborah: I’d say when I was working, that was a lot more the case in my day-to-day life. I would be sort of on autopilot, just following my thoughts. Now, that’s assuming that there was no feeling that was intruding on me, like, to make me notice it. But, I wasn’t often times looking inside to see what I’m
feeling. I would just be, like, go, go, go--you know, just following my plan of action.

Example 3:

**Participant Walt:** It’s different now. I don’t have to worry about--professionally--being astute at everything that was involved with my work…. I think I was overly concerned about how I performed in the work environment. And, of course, I don’t have to worry about that anymore--I’m retired. You’ll be there, Scott (laugh).

**Interviewer:** (laugh)

**Participant Walt:** So, that’s what’s nice about retirement. For me, one thing, is not to have to worry about performance reviews anymore.

- **Study Result:** *No longer having to earn money through work, the participants in this study now have a regulated life, and the interview data I collected showed that, as a result, most of these participants, for the most part, have no more worries.*

Example 1:

**Participant Sheena:** …I’m going back to thoughts of my past, and I thought about the interview that we had Monday, especially the discussion about how I felt about the money part--not having as much money since I’ve become a senior citizen. I thought about: I’ve had such a beautiful life, and have been able to travel and see a lot of things that I wanted to see--and there are still a lot of things I do want to see. 7

That’s why I think it doesn’t bother me too much about the [money part]. You know, like, I had a good childhood, and good teenage years. Although I had difficulties in raising my children, the state that I’m in now, because of the children’s successes, I don’t feel bad about what I don’t have [materially]. And, as I was drinking my coffee this morning, I thought, “The roles are reversed now: where I took care of them, I see them looking after me.” And, just about anything I need (within reason), if I can’t afford it, I’ve got four children that I invested in, that give me and make sure I have the needs that I should have. So, I don’t worry about it.

Example 2:

**Interviewer: (question 2)** Do you get down about what you don’t have, materially, compared to what others have?
Participant Gertrude: No, that’s never bothered me. I’m always very happy with what I’ve got. I might aspire to take more cruises, you know, do some of those types of things, but that’ll come in time. I’m at a pretty sweet spot in my life right now. Retirement is very good to me.

Example 3:

Interviewer: (question 2BI) Is there something you do to prevent getting down about what you don’t have?

Participant Dan: No, I don’t think so. I’m not particularly conscious of what I don’t have. I have health, family, security--I have the fundamentals. And if I have a million dollars but I don’t have a hundred million dollars, I’m sure not going to get bogged down on that basis.

As stated above, people in their 20’s and 30’s may not have verbally responded to the questions on this study’s interview schedule in the same way that this study’s participants--retirees age 50 and over--did. Future research could determine if people in their 20’s and 30’s would give different answers to the questions on this study’s interview schedule.

I shall now discuss what Participant John shared with me in my interview of him. I shall discuss what John shared with me not only because John was a case that was sometimes an exception to the study results I obtained in seeking to answer Research Question 2 (study results which I listed above in this section), but also because John was a case that was an exception to what appeared, overall, in the data I collected from this study’s participants.

Of the 24 participants in this study, John was the only one who both (a) said that he is not negotiating life as happily as he can, and (b) said “Yes” to the question, “Do you get down about what you don’t have, materially, compared to what others have?” (Twenty of the participants, in effect, said “No” in response to the question, “Do you get
down about what you don’t have, materially, compared to what others have?” and three participants said that they only sometimes, or not to a terrible extent, get down about what they do not have, materially, compared to what others have.). As stated above, John was the one participant in this study who did not verbally express happiness about his life, somehow, in my interview of him. John was a member of this study’s low-income elderly sample. Like the rest of the members of that sample, John lives in a large city in the American Midwest, in an apartment building owned and operated by a public housing agency. Like the rest of the members in this study’s low-income elderly sample, John rents the apartment in which he lives, and his rent payments are subsidized by the public housing agency that owns and operates the building in which he lives. John qualified to live in that building because of his low income level and his elderly status.

As stated above, John indicated that he is not negotiating life as happily as he can. The following interview segment shows John’s statement in which he said he considers himself not to be negotiating life as happily as he can, and his statement as to why that is:

**Interviewer: (question 1)** Would you consider yourself to be negotiating life as happily as you can?

**Participant John:** No.

**Interviewer: (question 1B)** Why is that?

**Participant John:** The reason is: the first thing is your health condition; secondly, your financial condition; thirdly, your environment. Those three factors tell me to answer the question as “No.”

As stated above, when I asked John if he gets down about what he does not have, materially, compared to what others have, he said “Yes.” When I asked John if there is something he does to try to stop getting down about that, his answer was simply, “As far
as possible,” and, later in my interview of him he indicated that the three factors he said led him to say he is not negotiating life as happily as he can (i.e., his health condition, his financial condition, and his environment), may also prevent him from being able to try to stop getting down about what he does not have, materially, compared to what others have. In saying that his health condition, financial condition, and environment may prevent him from being able to try to stop getting down about what he does not have materially, compared to what others have, John exhibited a mindset that none of the other participants in this study exhibited.

Justice, I posit, is seeing that our circumstances (if we have done everything we can to impact and make the best of those circumstances) are what they are. It is justice because seeing that our circumstances (if we have done all we can to impact and make the best of them) are what they are, makes things right, just, at that time. That rightness, justness, is perhaps the best we can experience in life, I perceive.

The Results I Obtained in Seeking to Answer Research Question 3, the Results I Obtained From Investigating Functional Relationships 2 and 3, and the Development of Research Question 4

This study’s Research Question 3, as stated above, was the following: Can research participants’ verbal responses to interview questions be separated based on whether they convey ideas that came via intuition from an *instinctive responsiveness* in the participant, versus whether they convey ideas that came from the reasoning and logic employed by a separate *nature of the mental* in the participant? (The interview questions I asked in order to obtain participant verbal responses to interview questions--so that I...
could then see if those verbal responses were separable in the way discussed in Research Question 3--; were the interview questions on this study’s interview schedule. Because the 101 questions on that schedule make the schedule approximately six single-spaced pages long, I have opted not to list those questions in a table, here, but instead simply to state that those questions can be viewed by seeing this study’s interview schedule, which is in Appendix A.) Before I present the results I obtained in seeking to answer Research Question 3 and the results I obtained from investigating Functional Relationships 2 and 3, I shall review how I sought to answer Research Question 3 and how Research Question 3 relates to Functional Relationships 2 and 3. Then I shall review Research Question 4, and discuss why I created that question.

As noted in Chapter 3, my strategy for trying to answer this study’s Research Question 3 was to undertake two acts: 1) to seek to find, in the data I collected in this study, indicators of verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came via intuition, and 2) to seek to find, in the data I collected in this study, indicators of verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came from reasoning and logic. I noted in Chapter 3 that, during this study, pre-verbal-response time (the length of time a participant took to begin answering an interview question once the interviewer finished asking it) was viewed as a possible quantitative indicator both of verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came via intuition, and verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came from reasoning and logic. I wrote in Chapter 3 that pre-verbal-response time was a measure I identified prior to this study, and that I said I would examine in this study to see if it would indeed serve as an indicator that would allow me to separate the two kinds of verbal responses noted in the
previous sentence. Pre-verbal-response time was conceptualized in this study, as noted in Chapter 3, as a possible indicator of the following two dependent variables: (a) does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions, and (b) does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions. In Chapter 3 I noted that, in this study, I hypothesized that these two dependent variables relate to the independent variable does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions, which is the same independent variable as the one named in this study’s Functional Relationship 1. I stated in Chapter 3 that, in this study, I hypothesized that there is a negative relationship between the variables does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions and does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions; I stated in Chapter 3 that, in this study, I refer to the relationship between these two variables as “Functional Relationship 2.” In Chapter 3, I wrote that, in this study, I hypothesized that there is an expected positive relationship between the variables does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions and does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions; I wrote in Chapter 3 that, in this study, I refer to the relationship between these two variables as “Functional Relationship 3.” In Chapter 3, I noted that, in this study, my hypothesis statements regarding the independent variable and respective dependent variables in Functional Relationships 2 and 3, were as follows: (a) Listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions leads one to not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions; and (b) Listening to and following one’s
feelings in making decisions leads one to use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions.  

In Chapter 3, I noted that while the pre-verbal-response time measure was a possible quantitative indicator of the dependent variables does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions and does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions, in this study I also searched for qualitative indicators of these variables in both (a) the data I collected through interviews in this study, and (b) the data I collected through the observations I conducted of each participant’s during-interview behavior in this study. My act of searching those interview and observation data for qualitative indicators of the variable does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions, simply was my act of searching for qualitative indicators of verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came via reasoning and logic--which was the second of two acts I used, as noted above, to seek to answer Research Question 3. Likewise, my act of searching the interview and observation data for qualitative indicators of the variable does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions, simply was my act of searching for qualitative indicators of verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came via intuition (from a posited instinctive responsiveness in the person)--which was the first of two acts I used, as noted above, to seek to answer Research Question 3.

---

20 As noted in Chapter 3, in stating these hypotheses, I assumed that any given participant could offer verbal responses to interview questions in a way that used reasoning and logic, on the one hand, and instinctive responsiveness, on the other hand, equally, but that, typically, any given participant probably would not do this.
I noted in Chapters 1 and 3 that once I obtained the results I obtained in seeking to answer Research Questions 1, 2, and 3, I added Research Question 4 to this study’s list of research questions. I asked Research Question 4 because I found that this study showed the need to ask it. Research Question 4, as stated above, is as follows:

Can we propose a new paradigm for discovery? The purpose of this paradigm for discovery would be to focus on discovery of the following three things:

(a) Making a firm distinction between what I posit are our two natures, those natures being (i) the mind, and (ii) this other nature I have called an “instinctive responsiveness” but which, in my view, is actually best to remain unlabeled (otherwise we are likely to have our opinions about what it is, based on meanings we might give to a word or words used to label it). Making such a firm distinction, I posit, would allow us to make a distinction between what I speculate are the mind’s thoughts and this other nature’s feelings.

(b) That we are not able to make such decisive distinctions (i.e., as those noted in (a) in this list) in separating our inner selves using the means thus far proposed or acted upon by non-scientific psychological, scientific, religious, didactic, etc., means.

(c) That in the absence of firm proof that we can make such decisive distinctions (i.e., as those noted in (a) in this list), all beliefs regarding such distinctions must be considered irrelevant.

Research Question 4 is a question I am prompted to ask frequently. For instance, anytime the words “feeling,” “feelings,” “thinking,” “thought,” “thoughts,” and “mind,” for example, are used, I am prompted to ask Research Question 4. I am prompted to ask Research Question 4 when those words are used because, at that time, asking Research Question 4 is the next step for me to take as a researcher, since I see that the presumed things that those words represent are not things we can currently make firm distinctions about, be those firm distinctions between thoughts and feelings, for example, or between the mind and the other nature that I perceive is best left unlabeled.
Anytime any of us perceives that he or she has experienced something in the “intraperonal [italics added]” (Mullins, 2003, p. 8)—e.g., a “feeling,” “feelings,” “thinking,” a “thought,” “thoughts,” the “mind”—, that perception is based on what the perceiver believes he or she perceived, not a firm, decisive distinction. In other words, that perception is based on a belief, which I defined in Chapter 1 as a “mental acceptance of something, even though certainty is absent.” I postulate that there is absence of certainty unless the posited instinctive responsiveness comes into play. Perhaps it has greater certainty. In other words, maybe greater certainty is present when the posited nature of thinking, or mind, and the posited instinctive responsiveness, corroborate (instead of just the posited nature of thinking corroborating).

I postulate that in the following interview excerpt, which is taken from an interview I conducted in this study, the posited instinctive responsiveness of the interviewee comes into play and corroborates or affirms, with the last sentence of the excerpt, what the interviewee has said in the sentence that immediately precedes that last sentence. In postulating that the posited instinctive responsiveness of the interviewee comes into play and corroborates what the interviewee just said, I also postulate that the posited instinctive responsiveness is agreeing with what was said not as the final, best way to say it, but as the best way the interviewee could say it at that time. The interviewee (who I shall refer to as “Participant Mary”), in the last sentence of the excerpt that follows, I posit, is giving voice to her posited instinctive responsiveness’s sense about what she said in the immediately preceding sentence. The word “education,” in the
excerpt that follows, parenthetically, was defined by the interviewee as meaning both
going to school, and learning on one’s own, outside of school.

**Interviewer: (question 5BI)** What about education makes it necessary?

**Participant Mary:** How do answer that, I mean-? I think I already did, in a sense. Because you can always learn something new, and always have new use for things that you learn. 7 That’s the best way I can answer that, I think.

My intuition tells me I have to make the following statement: The importance of this work I am beginning, in my view, lies in one assumption: We do not know how to science what goes on in the “intrapersonal [italics added]” (Mullins, 2003, p. 8), or, in other words, we do not know how to know, in a way in which replication and verification (beyond only inter-subjective determinations of these) of findings are practically achieved, what goes on in our inner selves, presently. And it is my contention that this work I am beginning confirms our need to know how to science what goes on in the “intrapersonal [italics added]” (Mullins, 2003, p. 8). That is my conviction. Now, the last sentence in the immediately preceding interview excerpt, I postulate, is a verbal response that conveyed an idea that came from the posited instinctive responsiveness of the interviewee; I postulate that that idea came to the posited mind of the interviewee, via the posited process of intuition as defined in Chapter 1. As stated above, I postulate that when the interviewee says the last sentence in the interview excerpt above, she is giving voice to a sense that her instinctive responsiveness had about what she said previously.

The next interview excerpt, I posit, also contains an example of the interviewee’s posited instinctive responsiveness coming into play and corroborating or affirming what the interviewee has just said. The next interview excerpt, like the interview excerpt
written in the previous paragraph, is taken from my interview of Participant Mary. I postulate that in the next interview excerpt, the posited instinctive responsiveness of Participant Mary comes into play and corroborates, with the last sentence of the excerpt, what Participant Mary has said in the two sentences that immediately precede that last sentence. In the excerpt that follows, the word “education” was defined by Participant Mary as meaning both going to school, and learning on one’s own, outside of school.

**Interviewer: (question 6)** In your view, does education lead to happiness?

**Participant Mary:** Yes. Yes, it does. If you are ignorant on a certain subject, you can’t discuss it. You just can’t deal with it. Yes, it’s important.

**Interviewer: (question 6A)** Ok. The last question I asked you was, “In your view, does education lead to happiness?” and, in response to that question, you said that, in your view, education does lead to happiness. My next question is, How does it?

**Participant Mary:** It teaches you to deal with different situations. If you’re educated on a subject, you can deal with that subject a lot better. I don’t know that I can explain it much better than that.

I postulate that the last sentence in the immediately preceding interview excerpt, like the last sentence in the interview excerpt in the previous paragraph, is a verbal response that conveyed an idea that came from the posited instinctive responsiveness of the interviewee; I postulate that that idea came to the posited mind of the interviewee, via the posited process of intuition as defined in Chapter 1. I postulate that when the interviewee says the last sentence in the interview excerpt above, she is giving voice to a sense that her instinctive responsiveness had about what she said previously.

If we are interested in certifying that the last sentence in each of the two immediately preceding interview excerpts was indeed a verbal response that conveyed an
idea that came via the posited process of intuition as defined in Chapter 1, we are unable to do so, because there is no certification for “intrapersonal [italics added]” (Mullins, 2003, p. 8) activity. Likewise, if we are interested in certifying that with the last sentence in each of the two immediately preceding interview excerpts, a posited instinctive responsiveness was coming into play and corroborating what the interviewee had just said, we are unable to do so, because there is no certification for “intrapersonal [italics added]” (Mullins, 2003, p. 8) activity.

Even though, as indicated in the previous paragraph, there is no certification for “intrapersonal [italics added]” (Mullins, 2003, p. 8) activity, in this study, I sought to verify what was occurring in “intrapersonal [italics added]” (Mullins, 2003, p. 8) activity. In seeking to answer Research Question 3, for instance, I looked at research participants’ verbal responses to interview questions, and attempted to verify whether those responses conveyed ideas that came via intuition from a posited instinctive responsiveness in the participant, or whether those responses conveyed ideas that came from the reasoning and logic employed by a posited separate nature of the mental in the participant. As noted above in this section and in Chapter 3, my strategy for trying to verify whether those responses conveyed ideas that came via intuition from a posited instinctive responsiveness in the participant, or whether those responses conveyed ideas that came from the reasoning and logic employed by a posited separate nature of the mental in the participant, was to undertake two acts: 1) to seek to find, in the data I collected in this study, indicators of verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came via
intuition, and 2) to seek to find, in the data I collected in this study, indicators of verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came from reasoning and logic.

As noted above in this section and in Chapter 3, pre-verbal-response time was a measure I examined in this study to see if it would serve as a quantitative indicator of both kinds of verbal response noted in the previous sentence. In this study, I found that the pre-verbal response times could not satisfy my desire to isolate a firm indicator of the two kinds of verbal response noted in the previous sentence. As noted above in this section and in Chapter 3, pre-verbal-response time was conceptualized in this study as a possible indicator of the following two dependent variables: (a) does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions, and (b) does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions (Above, I noted that the first of these dependent variables is the dependent variable of this study’s Functional Relationship 2; above, I also noted that the second of these dependent variables is the dependent variable of this study’s Functional Relationship 3.). In this study, I found that the pre-verbal response times could not satisfy my desire to isolate a firm indicator of the two dependent variables just listed. In addition, I analyzed this study’s participants’ pre-verbal-response time scores using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), in order to determine if participants’ sample (retired low-income elderly vs. retired university professors vs. retired university staff) affected the participants’ pre-verbal-response time scores. The means and standard deviations of the participants’ pre-verbal-response time scores are displayed in Table 3. The analysis used to determine if
pre-verbal-response time scores were affected by sample resulted in an insignificant ANOVA, $F(2, 867) = .80, p = .45$.

Table 3

Pre-Verbal-Response Times of Retired Low-Income Elderly, Retired University Professors, and Retired University Staff Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Mean pre-verbal-response time</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired low-income elderly</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired university professors</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired university staff</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted above in this section and in Chapter 3, in addition to examining whether or not the pre-verbal-response time measure functioned as a quantitative indicator of Functional Relationship 2’s dependent variable does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions and Functional Relationship 3’s dependent variable does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions, in this study I also searched for qualitative indicators of these variables in (a) the data I collected through interviews in this study, and in (b) the data I collected through the observations I conducted of each participant’s during-interview behavior in this study. My act of searching those interview and observation data for qualitative indicators of the variable does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions, as stated above, simply was my act of searching for qualitative indicators of verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came via reasoning and logic--
which was the second of two acts I used, as noted above, to seek to answer Research Question 3. Likewise, as stated above, my act of searching the interview and observation data for qualitative indicators of the variable *does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions*, simply was my act of searching for qualitative indicators of verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came via intuition (from a posited *instinctive responsiveness* in the person)—which was the first of two acts I used, as noted above, to seek to answer Research Question 3. In this study, I found no qualitative indicators that could satisfy my desire to isolate firm indicators of the two dependent variables listed above in this paragraph. Accordingly, in this study, I found no qualitative indicators that could satisfy my desire to isolate firm indicators of the two kinds of verbal responses described above.

This study’s Research Question 3, again, was as follows: Can research participants’ verbal responses to interview questions be separated based on whether they convey ideas that came via intuition from an *instinctive responsiveness* in the participant, versus whether they convey ideas that came from the reasoning and logic employed by a separate *nature of the mental* in the participant? Because I was unable to identify any qualitative or quantitative indicators that could satisfy my desire to isolate firm indicators of the two kinds of verbal responses described in Research Question 3, I perceive that the answer to Research Question 3 is as follows: Yes, we can separate the two kinds of participant verbal responses named in Research Question 3, but not if we are using only the kinds of methods used in this study—i.e., qualitative and quantitative methods. In other words, I perceive that the answer to Research Question 3 is, Yes, we can separate
the two kinds of participant verbal responses named in Research Question 3, but not if we are using only the methods that are currently taught in academia.

Because I was unable to identify any qualitative or quantitative indicators of Functional Relationship 2’s dependent variable--i.e., does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions--I was unable to observe the relationship between that dependent variable and Functional Relationship 2’s independent variable, does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions. As well, because I was unable to identify any qualitative or quantitative indicators of Functional Relationship 3’s dependent variable--i.e., does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions--I was unable to observe the relationship between that dependent variable and Functional Relationship 3’s independent variable, does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions. As a result of the fact that I could not observe either the relationship between the variables in Functional Relationship 2 or the relationship between the variables in Functional Relationship 3, I was unable to test my hypothesis statements regarding Functional Relationships 2 and 3 (As stated above in this section and in Chapter 3, my hypothesis statement for Functional Relationship 2 was Listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions leads one to not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions, and my hypothesis statement for Functional Relationship 3 was Listening to and following one’s feelings in making decisions leads one to use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions.).
In spite of the fact that I found no qualitative or quantitative indicators that could satisfy my desire to isolate firm indicators of both (a) the two kinds of verbal responses described in Research Question 3, and (b) the respective dependent variables of Functional Relationships 2 and 3, in this study I did find indicators that I perceive may indicate certain of the phenomena listed in (a) and (b). There is no method taught in academia that allows us to know if these indicators do indeed indicate those phenomena, however, and hence these indicators show a need for a method that could show whether or not they do indicate those phenomena. These indicators are body movements that participants in this study did in my interviews of those participants; these movements are classified into three types of body movement I discussed in Chapter 3, and those movement-types are called eyes wander, eyes open a little wider and brow furrows, and head nodding. In the following three subsections, I shall describe and discuss these movement-types in turn. In doing so, regarding each movement-type I shall state: (a) the primary characteristics of instances of that movement-type; (b) the number of participants in this study that did instances of that movement-type; (c) the average number of times in an interview that those participants did that movement-type; (d) the meaning, I postulate, that is inherent in instances of that movement-type; and (e) the phenomena I perceive may be indicated by instances of that movement-type. In Appendix B, I list the criteria a body movement had to meet to be classified as a seemingly clear-cut instance of one of three movement-types noted in this paragraph; Appendix B also contains lists of the kinds of body movements about which it was too undiscernable to conclude whether or
not instances of that kind of body movement were seemingly clear-cut instances of one of three movement-types noted in this paragraph.

Before presenting my description and discussion of the three movement-types noted in the previous paragraph, I wish to state the following about when any one of these three things happen: (a) I think there is something happening at that point--I think it is where *the mind* and *instinctive responsiveness* are in interplay; (b) I think we need to identify these three things when they happen; and (c) I think we need a methodology to explore their meanings once we identify them.

The *Eyes Wander* Body Movement

This is a body movement that participants did in my interviews of them. In the interviews in which this movement occurred, the participant was sitting in a chair about four feet away from where I was sitting in a chair, and we were directly facing each other. Instances of this movement had the following characteristics:

1. The participant’s eyes wandered away from both my (i.e., the interviewer’s) eyes and the parts of my body that were below my eyes.
2. The participant’s eyes stopped at some point in the movement, at a place that was away from my (i.e., the interviewer’s) eyes and the parts of my body that were below my eyes.
3. The movement occurred at a time when the participant, I postulate, was engaged in the phenomenon called “stopping thinking, then trying to listen to the posited instinctive responsiveness, to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question.” The participant’s engagement in this phenomenon, I posit, was indicated by the occurrence of points 1 and 2 listed above in this paragraph and any one of the following:
   a. The participant stopped talking before the movement, and resumed talking after the movement began.21

---

21 The participant is considered to have stopped talking if there was a perceptible pause in his or her talking. The pause can have been long (e.g., 3 sec or more) or quite short (i.e., one that met the following definition of the word “pause”: “a brief suspension of the voice to indicate the limits and relations of sentences and their parts” (Mish, et al., 2008, p. 909).). Also, utterances such as “um,” “uh,” and “hmm,” and even “and,” can have been viewed as part of a pause, if they appeared to serve to delay the participant’s speaking.
b. The participant was not talking, and he or she was listening to something I (the interviewer) was saying to him or her.

c. The participant was not talking, but he or she was preparing to verbally respond to the interviewer (as evidenced by the fact that the participant spoke soon after the movement), and the interviewer was not talking.

Of the 12 participants whose interviews I observed in order to look for instances of this movement, 9 of the participants did the movement. Of those nine participants, the average participant did this movement 9.55 times in my interview of him or her. The movement typically lasted from 1 to 10 sec, but sometimes it lasted considerably longer (e.g., one instance of this movement lasted 44 sec).

Each eyes wander movement, I postulate, had the following meaning: the movement occurred because the participant’s mind was helpless, i.e., in a state where it did not know what to say in response to an interview question, so, in response to that state, the participant stopped thinking, then tried to listen to the posited instinctive responsiveness, in order to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question. I posit that the participant did not voluntarily or consciously do an instance of the eyes wander movement (i.e., he or she did not think, “I am going to look away from the interviewer’s eyes and the parts of his body that are below his eyes, now.”). I also postulate that this movement was not generated by an “unconscious mind” (which, as written in Chapter 5, Freud defined as a part of the mind, and as something

---

22 Parenthetically, I did not evaluate whether doing this phenomenon was effective at helping the participant find something worthwhile or important to say in response to an interview question. The interview data could be gone over for that, but I did not do so because, in this study, I was not using any method that enabled me to assess what is worthwhile or important to say, and thus judging what is worthwhile or important to say would have just been a matter of opinion. Also, if I reviewed the data to see if the movements were effective at helping the participant find something worthwhile or important to say, the possibility that the participant would have said the worthwhile or important something anyway, even without doing the movement, would always exist.
that comprises mental activities which come in the form of unconscious wishes, which may take the form of unconscious sexual desires and aggressive impulses (Mischel et al., 2004)), but by a posited instinctive responsiveness that I postulate is: (a) in us, (b) not a part of the mind, (c) something that we involuntarily respond with toward life, and (d) something that we can be wholly or partly unaware we are responding with. Also, I posit that seemingly clear-cut instances of this movement were not done to communicate anything to anyone, but, rather, I posit, they were done so that the organism could express. These movements were just expression for its own sake, for God’s sake, I postulate. I postulate that an instance of this movement is an indicator both of (a) the variable does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions, and of (b) a verbal response that conveyed ideation that came via intuition.

There is no method taught in academia, however, that allows us to know if an instance of this movement is an indicator of the phenomena listed the previous sentence.

The Eyes Open a Little Wider and Brow Furrows Body Movement

This is a body movement that participants did in my interviews of them. In the interviews in which this movement occurred, the participant was sitting in a chair about four feet away from where I was sitting in a chair, and we were directly facing each other. Instances of this movement had the following characteristics:

1. The participant’s brow furrowed (Note: The brow unfurrowing signaled the end of the movement.).
2. In the same movement in which the brow furrowed, the eyes opened a little wider than they were open immediately before the movement.
3. The movement occurred at a time when the participant, I postulate, was engaged in the phenomenon called “stopping thinking, then trying to listen to the posited instinctive responsiveness, to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question.” The participant’s
engagement in this phenomenon, I posit, was indicated by the occurrence of points 1 and 2 listed above in this paragraph and any one of the following:

   a. The participant stopped talking before the movement, and resumed talking during or after the movement, and the interviewer did not speak at any time during that sequence.

   b. When the movement occurred, the participant was not talking, but he or she was preparing to verbally respond to the interviewer (as evidenced by the fact that the participant spoke soon after the movement), and the interviewer was not talking.

Of the 12 participants whose interviews I observed in order to look for instances of this movement, 6 of the participants did the movement. Of those six participants, the average participant did this movement 9.33 times in my interview of him or her. The movement typically lasted from 1 to 7 sec, but sometimes it lasted considerably longer (e.g., one instance of this movement lasted 18 sec).

Each eyes open a little wider and brow furrows movement, I postulate, had the following meaning: seconds before the movement occurred, the participant’s mind was helpless, i.e., in a state where it did not know what to say in response to an interview question, so, in response to that state, the participant, first, (a) stopped thinking, then tried to listen to the posited instinctive responsiveness, in order to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question, and then, second, (b) when the

23 The participant is considered to have stopped talking if there was a perceptible pause in his or her talking. The pause may have been long (e.g., 3 sec or more) or quite short (i.e., one that met the following definition of the word “pause”: “a brief suspension of the voice to indicate the limits and relations of sentences and their parts” (Mish, et al., 2008, p. 909)). Also, utterances such as “um,” “uh,” and “hmm,” and even “and,” can have been viewed as part of a pause, if they appeared to serve to delay the participant’s speaking.

24 Parenthetically, I did not evaluate whether doing this phenomenon was effective at helping the participant find something worthwhile or important to say in response to an interview question. The interview data could be gone over for that, but I did not do so because, in this study, I was not using any method that enabled me to assess what is worthwhile or important to say, and thus judging what is worthwhile or important to say would have just been a matter of opinion. Also, if I reviewed the data to see if the movements were effective at helping the participant find something worthwhile or important to say, the
movement began, started thinking hard on focusing, concentrating, in such a way that his or her whole organism was engaged (i.e., thinking was occurring, and instinctive responsiveness was initiating the process of intuition). I posit that the participant did not voluntarily or consciously do an instance of the eyes open a little wider and brow furrows movement (i.e., he or she did not think, “I am going to open my eyes a little wider and furrow my brow, now.”). I also postulate that this movement was not generated by an “unconscious mind” (which, as written in Chapter 5, Freud defined as a part of the mind, and as something that comprises mental activities which come in the form of unconscious wishes, which may take the form of unconscious sexual desires and aggressive impulses (Mischel et al., 2004)), but by the instinctive responsiveness that, as stated in the previous section, I postulate is: (a) in us, (b) not a part of the mind, (c) something that we involuntarily respond with toward life, and (d) something that we can be wholly or partly unaware we are responding with. Also, I posit that seemingly clear-cut instances of this movement were not done to communicate anything to anyone, but, rather, I posit, they were done so that the organism could express. These movements were just expression for its own sake, for God’s sake, I postulate. I postulate that an instance of this movement is possibly an indicator of any one or any combination of the following: (a) the variable does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions, (b) the variable does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions, (c) a verbal response that conveyed ideation that came via intuition, and (d) a verbal response that conveyed ideation that came via reasoning and possibility that the participant would have said the worthwhile or important something anyway, even without doing the movement, would always exist.
logic. There is no method taught in academia, however, that allows us to know if an instance of this movement is an indicator of the phenomena listed the previous sentence.

The Head Nodding Body Movement

This is a body movement that participants did in my interviews of them. In this movement, the participant’s head nodded. It is important for me to note that head nods participants did when apparently silently nodding “yes” to a question I asked them, did not qualify as instances of the head nodding movement, because such nods may have been voluntary movements the participants did in response to the question I asked, and thus not been involuntary movements carried out by the posited instinctive responsiveness. Also, it is important for me to note that nods participants did seconds before, or as, they said “yes” or “okay” to something I said or asked, did not qualify as instances of the head nodding movement, because such nods may have been voluntary movements the participants did in response to the something I said or asked, and thus not been involuntary movements carried out by the posited instinctive responsiveness.

In the interviews in which this movement occurred, the participant was sitting in a chair about four feet away from where I was sitting in a chair, and we were directly facing each other. Instances of this movement had the following features:

1. Either of the following two sets of characteristics had to be present during the movement:
   a. First set of characteristics:
      i. The chin lowered, and then stopped lowering. As the chin lowered, the forehead moved forward.
      ii. Shortly after the chin stopped lowering, it rose, with the forehead moving backward during that rising, until the rising stopped.
      iii. If the movement consisted of multiple nods, then shortly after the chin-rising described in 1aii stopped, 1ai and 1aii in this list
repeated (If the movement consisted of only one nod, then 1ai and 1aii in this list did not repeat).

iv. In the movement, the head moved independently of any torso movement there was (Therefore, a movement in which 1ai and 1aii in this list occurred, but where the relation of the head to the torso did not change--because the neck did not bend--did not exhibit this characteristic.).

b. Second set of characteristics:
   i. The chin rose, then stopped rising. As the chin rose, the forehead moved backward.
   ii. Shortly after the chin stopped rising, it lowered, with the forehead moving forward during that lowering, until the lowering stopped.
   iii. The chin then rose again, and then stopped rising. As the chin rose, the forehead moved backward.
   iv. If the movement consisted of multiple nods, then shortly after the chin-rising described in 1biii stopped, 1bii and 1biii in this list repeated (If the movement consisted of only one nod, then 1bii and 1biii in this list did not repeat.).
   v. In the movement, the head moved independently of any torso movement (Therefore, a movement in which 1bi, 1bii, and 1biii in this list occurred, but where the relation of the head to the torso did not change--because the neck did not bend--did not exhibit this characteristic.).

2. The movement was apparently not merely a very subtle quivering of the head that sometimes occurred just by virtue of the fact that the participant exhibiting the movement was speaking.

3. The movement occurred at a time when the participant, I postulate, was at least partially engaged in the phenomenon called “stopping thinking, then trying to listen to the posited instinctive responsiveness, to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question.” The participant’s engagement in this phenomenon, I posit, was indicated by the occurrence of point 1 listed above in this paragraph and any one of the following:
   a. The participant stopped talking before the movement, and resumed talking during or after the movement, and the interviewer did not speak at any time during that sequence.²⁵

²⁵ The participant is considered to have stopped talking if there was a perceptible pause in his or her talking. The pause may have been long (e.g., 3 sec or more) or quite short (i.e., one that met the following definition of the word “pause”: “a brief suspension of the voice to indicate the limits and relations of sentences and their parts” (Mish, et al., 2008, p. 909)). Also, utterances such as “um,” “uh,” and “hmm,” and even “and,” can have been viewed as part of a pause, if they appeared to serve to delay the participant’s speaking.
b. The participant was not talking, but he or she was preparing to verbally respond to the interviewer (as evidenced by the fact that the participant spoke soon after the movement), and the interviewer was not talking.

Of the 12 participants whose interviews I observed in order to look for instances of this movement, all 12 participants did the movement. Of those 12 participants, the average participant did this movement 16.75 times in my interview of him or her. The movement typically lasted from 1 to 6 sec, but sometimes it lasted slightly longer (e.g., one instance of this movement lasted 13 sec).

Each *head nodding* movement, I postulate, had one of the two following meanings:

1. The participant’s *instinctive responsiveness* was showing agreement with what the participant’s *mind* worked-out using *thinking*. (In these cases, I posit, the participant was *thinking* just before the movement occurred, and, during that *thinking*, he or she was also, perhaps, trying to listen to the posited *instinctive responsiveness*, in order to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question that he or she did not know what to say in response to.)

2. The participant’s *instinctive responsiveness* was showing agreement with the fact that it gave the participant’s *mind* an idea via intuition. (In these cases, I postulate, the participant may have stopped *thinking* just prior to the movement, and the participant, just prior to the movement, was trying to listen to the posited *instinctive responsiveness*, in order to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question that he or she did not know what to say in response to.)

26 Parenthetically, I did not evaluate whether doing this phenomenon was effective at helping the participant find something worthwhile or important to say in response to an interview question. The interview data could be gone over for that, but I did not do so because, in this study, I was not using any method that enabled me to assess what is worthwhile or important to say, and thus judging what is worthwhile or important to say would have just been a matter of opinion. Also, if I reviewed the data to see if the movements were effective at helping the participant find something worthwhile or important to say, the possibility that the participant would have said the worthwhile or important something anyway, even without doing the movement, would always exist.

27 Parenthetically, I did not evaluate whether doing this phenomenon was effective at helping the participant find something worthwhile or important to say in response to an interview question. The interview data could be gone over for that, but I did not do so because, in this study, I was not using any method that enabled me to assess what is worthwhile or important to say, and thus judging what is worthwhile or
I posit that the participant did not voluntarily or consciously do an instance of the head
nodding movement (i.e., he or she did not think, “I am going to nod my head now.”). I
also postulate that this movement was not generated by an “unconscious mind” (which,
as written in Chapter 5, Freud defined as a part of the mind, and as something that
comprises mental activities which come in the form of unconscious wishes, which may
take the form of unconscious sexual desires and aggressive impulses (Mischel et al.,
2004)), but by a posited instinctive responsiveness that I postulate is: (a) in us, (b) not a
part of the mind, (c) something that we involuntarily respond with toward life, and (d)
something that we can be wholly or partly unaware we are responding with. Also, I posit
that seemingly clear-cut instances of this movement were not done to communicate
anything to anyone, but, rather, I posit, they were done so that the organism could
express. These movements were just expression for its own sake, for God’s sake, I
postulate. I postulate that an instance of this movement is an indicator of either: (a) all of
the following three things at the same time--(i) the variable does or does not use
instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions, (ii) the variable
does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions, and
(iii) a verbal response that conveyed ideation that came via reasoning and logic--; or (b)
both of the following at the same time--(i) the variable does or does not use instinctive
responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions, and (ii) a verbal response that
conveyed ideation that came via intuition. There is no method taught in academia,

---

important to say would have just been a matter of opinion. Also, if I reviewed the data to see if the
movements were effective at helping the participant find something worthwhile or important to say, the
possibility that the participant would have said the worthwhile or important something anyway, even
without doing the movement, would always exist.
however, that allows us to know if an instance of this movement is an indicator of the phenomena listed in the previous sentence.

The Theory I Have Developed That Seeks to Explain Data I Analyzed for This Study

I have a theory I have developed that seeks to explain data I analyzed for this study, but that theory is not entirely worked out yet. The reason that that theory is not entirely worked out yet is that that theory has to be open to change. While any given theory has to be open to change because of the fact that new data can necessitate that that theory be changed to explain those new data, the theory I have developed has to be open to change for an additional reason: the armamentarium of research methods used in this study (i.e., qualitative and quantitative methods) does not make available enough definitive answers regarding the data indicators found in this study--definitive answers that would allow one to state a set theory about those indicators. The theory I have developed is sufficient to guide future investigation of those indicators, however, and the theory I have developed may even provoke other investigators to research those indicators to try to understand them. But, this study found those indicators, and now the aim is to try to understand what they indicate.

The theory I have developed that seeks to explain data I have analyzed for this study, is as follows:

We do things, inadvertently, instinctively, but typically those things are not considered intellectually significant until we can justify their occurrence, and I do not think that is right or fair. I postulate that a lot of these things that we do inadvertently, instinctively, are body movements we do. I also postulate that our right brain hemisphere
judges these things as significant, and uses feelings to do them, while our left brain hemisphere typically judges these things (if it is aware of their occurrence) as insignificant, and ignores them. I perceive (a) that we in academia have ignored too much in ignoring these things, (b) that we in academia need a method to study and understand these things, and (c) that what the right hemisphere has to offer has to be respected.

The data I analyzed for this study prove extensively the many body movements we do, but there is no universal technique or means of understanding what is happening in these movements--i.e., no universal method to understand or discern (with certainty) origin, intention, purpose, or whatever meanings are evidenced by these movements. If a body movement is not consciously executed, and we presume there is no meaning and no purpose to it, why do we presume there is no meaning and no purpose to it, instead of presuming there is meaning and purpose to it?

I posit that the three types of body movements noted above (i.e., eyes wander, eyes open a little wider and brow furrows, and head nodding) are done inadvertently, instinctively, but that these movements are not done for communication, but for expression of the organism. I perceive that these movements are just expression for its own sake, for God’s sake. We need a method of discernment to analyze these movements, otherwise it is just opinion what they are. And, I hold, those with the highest degrees get the worldly authority to interpret what these movements are: Maybe those individuals are dead wrong, or only half right. We need a method to cut across those hierarchies.
An interesting result of this study is the following question: Why was it that this study’s participants, in trying to answer this study’s interview questions, were seemingly sometimes unable to find words to say until one or multiple of the nonverbal responses of the body noted above, occurred?

We have a lack of somatic armamentarium to explain somatic response phenomena (As noted in this dissertation’s preface, somatic response phenomena include the following, I perceive: reasoning, logic, body movements, intuition, feelings, the traditional five senses, memory, dreams we can have when sleeping, a posited “sixth sense” capability that belongs to a posited instinctive responsiveness in us, believing that does not use reasoning to either support or challenge that believing, fantasy, and what Schwandt (2001) describes as the mind’s apparent creation of “abstractions or concepts” (p. 30) in response to “sense data” (p. 30)). When we try to understand a somatic response that happened, our perceptions of what happened in that response are all strictly opinion. We have experiences of somatic responses, and there can be many different interpretations of the meaning of each of those responses. We have different religions, philosophies, and psychologies, for example, which would interpret the meaning of each response differently. Who is going to sort out what each response meant? Nobody is going to sort out what each response meant, I perceive, without a methodology to sort out what each response meant--a methodology that can be taught and that can be used.

One has to have the right tools to open a box. Without the proper tools to open a box, the box can be very difficult to open. For example, if opening a box requires a Phillips head screwdriver, one has to have a Phillips head screwdriver to open the box,
and if one does not have a Phillips head screwdriver, he or she will probably have a very
difficult time opening the box as it is intended to be opened. My point is that we need
tools to match the subject of our somatic responses, in order to open that subject so we
can understand what those responses mean. Before developing those tools, however, one
has to be able to identify types of somatic response phenomena--such as the type of body
movement referred to above as head nodding--to be able to recognize when instances of
those phenomena occur. Then, once one can identify a somatic response phenomenon and
recognize that an instance of it has occurred, he or she could, I postulate, use tools that
allow understanding of the meaning of that instance, to gain understanding of the
meaning of that instance. Thus, if an instance of head nodding occurred in a person
named Joe when Joe was talking with a friend and viewing a piece of art, one could use
the tools to assess whether that instance of head nodding signaled the concurrence or
agreement of Joe’s instinctive responsiveness with his own thought, or with Joe’s friend’s
thought, or with the piece of art, for example. The question, when using such tools, would
be, Why did the body respond that way? Without such tools, however, we cannot know
the answer to such a question--we only have opinions about what the answer to such a
question might be. Thus, a professor of art history, for example, would only have an
opinion or opinions about why Joe’s body responded that way. A professor of art history
might say that Joe’s response occurred because the artist who made the piece of art that
Joe was viewing used a certain technique in making that piece of art; alternatively, the
professor of art history might say that Joe’s response occurred because the maker of the
piece of art that Joe was viewing had a certain intention in making that piece of art. Now,
the professor of art history’s opinion about why Joe responded that way, is probably based on a wealth of knowledge, and it is good, in my view, for students, for instance, to be exposed to that professor’s opinion, because of the knowledge of art history that that professor possesses. But it would also be good, in my view, for students of that professor to have the tools—a method—, to evaluate what is an accurate opinion on why Joe’s response occurred.

What I am stating is that when the data (e.g., a somatic response such as an occurrence of head nodding such as the hypothetical one discussed in the previous paragraph) are inconclusive, that is the time to shift to a different method. In empirical science, we have to narrow subjects of study down to subject them to empirical testing, because the world is too large to test empirically without being narrowed down. But, things in nature are never reduced when we do not reduce them. We reduce things in nature into things we can grasp. For example, we can reduce the human body to anatomy, then reduce that anatomy to the circulatory system, but we cannot understand the whole. So, there is a point at which reductionism fails if we think we know everything. We reduce the whole so we can make it small enough for us to grasp, because the mind is not great enough in size to grasp the whole. You cannot reduce some things. It seems some people are so insistent on reductionism that they think they can understand everything. And, models we develop to study the whole will not work, because it is its own model, and we have to learn to study the model that already exists, somehow.
My proposal is that a method should be developed to study “the model that already exists” referred to in the previous sentence. The following two principles would have to be adhered to, I perceive, in the operation of that method:

(a) in the person operating the method, something other than that person’s mind would have to manage that person’s mind (Because that person’s mind would have to congeal with the above-noted model that already exists in order to study that model, I perceive, the part of that model that is in us, I perceive, would be the something that would have to manage that person’s mind. In this study, I have referred to that something as “instinctive responsiveness,” the other nature in us.); and
(b) achieving a neutral state of intellect (Achieving a neutral state of intellect is a principle that would have to be adhered to in the operation of a method to study “the model that already exists,” because if the intellect were not neutral in studying that model (i.e., that whole), the intellect would reduce that model to something the model is not, and hence would not be studying that model.).

The previous two principles would have to be adhered to, I perceive, in the operation of a method developed to study the above-noted “model that already exists,” if the finest sensitivity or discernment is desired. In my perception, Enchanted Sight© is the only current method to my knowledge that has the potential to adhere to the two principles just noted. I state that Enchanted Sight© possesses the “potential” to adhere to the two principles just noted, because the person operating Enchanted Sight© still has to ensure that those two principles are adhered to, and, if that person adheres to them, Enchanted Sight© achieves the potential of adhering to those two principles.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Wild—in 1938—observed the following about intuition, and her observation still holds today: “There is (so far) no...method of distinguishing between ideas acquired...through...intuition and those acquired through reason or perception...” (p. 229).

In other words, Wild pointed out that what we label as “intuitive,” or as having come to us by “intuition,” is not identifiable as such, because we have not yet evolved a method enabling us to differentiate which of our ideas (e.g., judgments we make) are intuitive or have come by intuition, and which have come, for example, from “reason or perception” (p. 229), as she writes. The study reported on in this dissertation sought to differentiate human verbal responses that conveyed ideas that came to the mind of research participants by intuition (ideas that I posit originated in an instinctive responsiveness, defined above as a non-mental awareness existent in the person), versus those that conveyed ideas that came from the mind of the participants (and from its reasoning and logic). In spite of the study this dissertation reports, we still cannot claim we understand how to differentiate which ideas (or verbal responses, or judgments, or motivations, or insights) came via intuition, and which did not. Finding a way to differentiate ideas that have come via intuition is what is required at this time to give us a better grasp of what intuition is, for, without being able to differentiate ideas that have come by intuition from those that have not, we are unable to isolate the posited phenomenon of intuition so that we can study it.
In this dissertation’s introduction, I offered the following as my definition for the term intuition: a posited process of direct, spontaneous, nonverbal, felt knowing occurring distinct from reasoning (in my definition, a process for reaching conclusions that includes use of comparison, logical deduction, and assumption), logic (in my definition, the process of reasoning toward an acceptable rationale), the traditional five senses, and memory. In describing intuition as “felt,” as noted in this dissertation’s introduction, I mean we get a sense of something profoundly not of conscious, or mental origin, almost as if it is felt elsewhere in the person as it perhaps also infiltrates the mental (intellectual) domain. I propose that the origin of the intuitive is not the mental (i.e., the mind), but an awareness that does not and cannot think (i.e., an awareness that does not and cannot use reasoning and logic, as defined above). I propose that this awareness—which I have termed an instinctive responsiveness, and which I posit is in us--knows without any thoughts. This awareness, I suggest, is something we are born with that knows. The mind, on the other hand, I suggest, is something which, when we are born, knows nothing. I propose that after birth, the mind of the typical human being gradually learns language and perhaps other symbol systems (e.g., numbers, musical notation), and that it also learns gradually to manipulate symbols using reasoning and logic. The mind, however, cannot use reasoning and logic to access the knowledge known by the instinctive responsiveness, I suggest; I surmise that, instead, it must use a different protocol to gain access to that knowledge.

Professor of language and literacy Barton (1994) writes: “With terms like computer literacy...[and] visual literacy[,] ...we see [the meaning of the word] literacy
[italics added] loosely as understanding an area of knowledge” (p. 13). If we view the meaning of the word _literacy_ in this way, then distinguishing which ideas, judgments, motivations, or _insights_ came via the posited phenomenon of intuition, and which came, say, via reasoning and logic, or from conditioned preferences or likings, would be, if practically achievable, viewable as a literacy. What might it mean if we developed literacy in this presumed aspect of inner function?

The reason one is literate is so that he or she can understand and get along in the world. There are all degrees of literacy, too: some people are less literate in a given domain of knowledge than others, and some people are more literate than others in that domain. For example, if a person has a small vocabulary, there is knowledge and understanding that is (perhaps forever) beyond that person, but not beyond the person who has a large vocabulary. Developing literacy means developing capability so that you can use it to use and gain knowledge. How do we become aware of the _instinctive responsiveness_ whose existence I have posited? In other words, how do we develop literacy, develop capability, so that we can use that capability to use and gain the surmised _instinctive responsiveness_’s knowledge? I propose that our _feelings_ are automatically produced but very complicated responses that did not come from _thinking_, but from the posited _instinctive responsiveness_ (In other words, I propose that _feelings_ did not come from reasoning and logic, as defined above, but from the posited _instinctive responsiveness_). Our degree of literacy of our posited _instinctive responsiveness_, and of our _feelings_, specifically, is dependent on our _thinking_’s limits, I suggest; thus I am suggesting that it is our _thinking_’s limits that we meet when we are unsuccessful at using
and gaining knowledge of the posited instinctive responsiveness and feelings, the latter of which, again, I conceive come from the posited instinctive responsiveness.

Why don’t you, or we, have a method to explore the “intrapersonal [italics added]” (Mullins, 2003, p. 8) with any certainty? How could we develop one? Why is it that people employing the methods or thought, or both, of a school or schools of psychology, and people employing the thought or practices, or both, of a particular religion or multiple religions, do not agree sometimes on what they find when they explore the “intrapersonal [italics added]” (Mullins, 2003, p. 8)?

Why is there no science on how to know the things we seemingly know without thinking? Why is there no science to explain and make beneficial use of those things? What haven’t we figured out to make it a science?

What has prevented us from knowing a person’s “intrapersonal [italics added]” (Mullins, 2003, p. 8) better than he or she perhaps does (e.g., what they are feeling, or thinking)? What directions could we proceed in to develop that? Why haven’t we developed that? What is missing, or could be missing, that has not allowed that? How will we ever explain or understand the apparent appearance of insight that comes, seemingly, by intuition? From where might such apparent insight come? How does it happen? Could we make it happen? If so, how? What if insights are coming at us much of the time by intuition, giving us solutions to problems we encounter, but because we have no method to identify those insights, we often do not see those insights, and thus the solutions they provide go unfound? If such insights are frequently providing solutions to us, then people who are seeking solutions would seemingly benefit from a method
allowing them to identify such *insights*. My take is that these *insights* appear to exist, and that they may originate in a posited *instinctive responsiveness* in us. My take, also, is that these *insights* may frequently be giving us solutions to problems we encounter.

I posit that there is an *instinctive responsiveness* in us that we involuntarily respond with toward life, an *instinctive responsiveness* that we can be wholly or partly unaware we are responding with. And just because we can be, I propose, unaware of it in our *consciousness* state (i.e., I propose that we can be unconscious of it), that does not mean that it is what is referred to as “the unconscious mind” or as simply “the unconscious.” I shall now discuss the term the unconscious, so that I can make clear for the reader the differences I see between the posited *instinctive responsiveness* and what has been termed the unconscious.

Freud (1856-1939) was the first to formally use the term unconscious (Rychlack, 1981, as cited in Carich, 1994). He used it to name what he saw as one of three kinds of mental processes--conscious, preconscious, and unconscious (Freud, 1905, as cited in Mischel, Shoda, & Smith, 2004). In the following passage, Mischel et al. describe what Freud meant by these terms:28

We are instantly aware of our *conscious* thoughts. The immediately available level of consciousness refers to what is in one’s attention at a given moment. The many events that we can bring into attention more or less easily, from the background music on the radio to memories of things experienced years ago, are *preconscious*. Thus even though we are not aware of preconscious thoughts at a given moment, we can bring them into awareness voluntarily and fairly easily. In contrast, outside this range of the potentially available lies the *unconscious*. This third zone is not responsive to our deliberate efforts at recall…. Because their

---

28 The terms of Freud’s discussed in this passage from Mischel et al. were typed in boldface in Mischel et al., a textbook, because they were among key terms compiled in the book to aid students’ learning. I have left the terms boldfaced here so as to present Mischel et al.’s text as I found it.
content is threatening, unconscious mental activities are kept beyond awareness by a mechanism of repression that works actively to keep them away from our awareness…. (p. 95)

The threatening mental activities that constitute a person’s unconscious mind, in Freud’s view, are the unconscious wishes one has, wishes so unacceptable to the person that he or she represses them (Mischel et al., 2004). These wishes may take the form of unconscious sexual desires and aggressive impulses (Mischel et al., 2004). Freud believed that a person sought to fulfill these unconscious wishes in his or her dreams when sleeping, and he believed that one’s unconscious wishes that take the form of unconscious sexual desires and aggressive impulses were the primary sources of any anxiety in that person (Mischel et al., 2004). Freud held that that anxiety could prevent the person from consciously facing his or her unconscious sexual desires and aggressive impulses, and that when the person did not face these, they could be expressed indirectly and perhaps symbolically in apparently non-organically-caused physical symptoms such as loss of sensory ability (e.g., deafness, blindness) or motor paralysis (Mischel et al., 2004). As Mischel et al. explain, “[Freud] saw both sexual and aggressive urgings as basic human impulses or instincts, part of our heritage” (p. 96), and “he insisted that the route to self-acceptance was the honest recognition of one’s instinctual sexuality and aggressiveness” (p. 96). Mischel et al. state that, accordingly, Freud believed that “making the unconscious impulses conscious was the road to health” (p. 96).

In response to these ideas of Freud’s, I shall start by saying that the difference I see between the posited instinctive responsiveness and Freud’s notion of the unconscious mind is that the former, I propose, is not mental or a part of the mind, while the latter is
defined as a part of the mind, and as comprising mental activities (those mental activities, again, are one’s unconscious wishes, which may take the form of unconscious sexual desires and aggressive impulses). Next, I shall state that, in my view, it is important to remember that all of Freud’s ideas that I just reviewed are propositions, speculations, conjecture. I also find it important to remember the following: just because one assigns a name to something, as Freud did in generating the ideas of his that I just reviewed, it does not mean that that name is what that something is. Indeed, that name may not reflect what that something is at all, but that something is something, even if it is only imagined. I suggest that, in the future, (a) one will be able to find that what some have called the unconscious, the conscious, and the preconscious were helpful for a time, but that (b) these will be found to be erroneous in their understanding, because there is better knowledge, better methods to find knowledge, to be found.

The instinctive responsiveness that I propose is in us, and that I propose we involuntarily respond with toward life, and that I propose we can be unaware we are responding with, is perhaps an awareness that is superior to the mind’s consciousness (i.e., what the mind is conscious of). Perhaps it is a totally aware something, and the individual perspective (i.e., an individual’s consciousness, i.e., what that individual is conscious of) has only limited access to it and what it is aware of. What if the posited instinctive responsiveness is totally aware--i.e., what if it is a source of completed understanding--, and it is able to provide us, via intuition as defined above, with wisdom we can access to solve problems?
If such a source of completed understanding exists in us, and it is another nature that is separate and different from the mind, it would seem that the best we can do is try to access that source with the mind. The objective of such an attempt would be to backtrack an eventage which appears in the mind to have come from a source of completed understanding within us, backtrack it to its origin, to see what it is. Instead of merely accepting such an eventage as from a completed understanding and moving forward with it in our decision-making about, for instance, as Harman (1986) writes, “what we most truly want to be and do” (p. 5), we would go back to its source to more completely understand it. We could let our ideas about the eventage stand as we track it to its source, but the idea is to come to conclusions about it through study, not by having ideas about it. Tracing the eventage to its origin, we could ask the questions: What is behind this eventage? Why did it even come? Currently, we do not know answers to such questions, or how to answer them. In undertaking such a posited backtracking, the mind would be admonished not to pronounce what the eventage is, and would instead trace back to know more about where it initiated and why. I here introduce the term intuitivism as the name for this backtracking of an eventage to its origin, an origin which could be a source of completed understanding. Intuitivism would be some kind of a system of realignment, perhaps, or continual alignment, with that source.

I learned at age 18 that I was capable of making decisions using my own somatic potentials, without being steered by any ideas I had read or heard about in my life up until that point. From my own personal experience, I learned I was born with the equipment needed to figure out whatever I had to figure out, without following anybody else’s idea.
The ideas I had learned from without, which were various parts of one or another of what Kuhn (1970, as cited in Schwandt, 2001) referred to as a paradigm--the “commitments, beliefs, values, methods, outlooks, and so forth shared across a discipline...[--]a worldview or general perspective” (Schwandt, 2001, pp. 183-184)--were not necessarily useful when it came to making decisions in my life. I found I could make those decisions using my own thinking and what, in hindsight, I propose may have been an instinctive responsiveness, both of which I view as features for responding to life that are a part of me as a somatic organism, inherently.

The ideas from without that I could use to live my life are not necessarily sufficient because they do not necessarily coalesce with the instinctive responsiveness that I posit is within us. This posited instinctive responsiveness, I surmise, does not surrender to ideas if they do not coalesce with it. It is responsible for generating some of the ideas in us, I postulate--which I posit it does using the process of intuition. These ideas, I postulate, are therefore not produced by thinking. They simply come--fresh, original, not from outside us, although they can be fashioned of parts of ideas, constructs, phrases, and words that are from outside us, I speculate.

*The mind*, I posit, has the capability to think whatever it likes. I propose, in other words, that it has freedom. It can therefore choose willfully the parts of paradigms it wishes to exercise, I speculate. Instinctive responsiveness, on the other hand, I propose, is set--it does not make choices. It does not move with in accordance with whatever it wishes, freely, as the mind theoretically can, I posit, but instead simply provides its response. It can alert us of its presence, its response, anywhere in the body, I speculate--
informing us, in this way, if we listen to it, I propose. It is there as response feature for us
to respect, honor, and utilize, providing feedback to us that is inherently just, I postulate.

That which is “just,” in this intuitivist view I am proposing, I define as the right
answer in any given circumstance. That which is just is predetermined, and provided to
us in our *instinctive responsiveness* with definitive precision, I speculate. *Instinctive
responsiveness*, moreover, is providing meaning to us constantly, I posit: this meaning is
preexistent, exists independently of all of our ideas, notionally.

The knowledge provided to us in *instinctive responsiveness*, then, I propose, is
inherently meaningful and just. This knowledge is preexistent, and can be discovered
(i.e., found) by us, I propose. The notion that a knowledge preexists that is provided to us
in a posited *instinctive responsiveness*--a knowledge that inherently possesses meaning
and that provides feedback on what is just, or right in any given circumstance--runs
counter to the view Schwandt (2001) identifies as “everyday garden-variety
constructivism” (p. 30), in which it is held that “human beings do not find or discover
knowledge so much as construct or make it” (p. 30). It is either nothing or something,
knowledge which can be discovered, and in the everyday constructivist view it is nothing.
In the paradigmatic view of intuitivism that I propose--if that paradigm were realized
practically and not held as just a theoretical possibility---, however, knowledge which can
be discovered would be something. The constructivist notion that “we do not discover
knowledge” is accurate within the constructivist paradigm, within which one considers,
from my point of view, only *the mind*, its function, and what it sees or apprehends to be
evident, and within which one possesses no knowledge of the presence of an *instinctive
responsiveness as a provider of knowledge it could discover. If the mind was apprised practically of instinctive responsiveness and the preexistent knowledge provided in it, on the other hand—as would be the case in the proposed intuitivist paradigm—, the statement that we do not discover knowledge would not be accurate.

In the proposed intuitivist paradigm, meaning preexists and cannot be constructed. In the intuitivist paradigm, too, I posit, there are two kinds of knowledge: (a) a knowledge that preexists that can be discovered in instinctive responsiveness, and (b) a knowledge we do not discover, but that we construct. In the everyday constructivist paradigm, as noted, there is only one kind of knowledge: a knowledge we do not discover, but that is instead thought to be constructed. This is speculated to be so because it is believed, in the constructivist view, as Schwandt (2001) states, “that the mind is active in the construction of knowledge” (p. 30), in that “the mind does something with...[the] impressions [of data that the mind receives through the senses]—at the...least it forms abstractions or concepts” (p. 30). The proposed intuitivism would agree with this position—it would be conceived, in the intuitivist view, that the mind is active in the construction of the kind of knowledge that is constructed, and it would be conceived that that is so for the reason that the mind, in the intuitivist view, would be posited (as in everyday constructivism) to create “abstractions or concepts” (Schwandt, 2001, p. 30) to represent sensory data in constructing knowledge. In the posited intuitivist paradigm, in my view, it would also be the case that there are three ways the mind constructs the knowledge it constructs: observation, imagining, and fantasy. First, it constructs knowledge through observation in the way just described—it creates “abstractions or
concepts” (Schwandt, 2001, p. 30) to represent sensory data, which in intuitivism would include data obtained through the traditional five senses and any sixth sense response feature we might have (such as the posited instinctive responsiveness). Knowledge which the mind can construct through observation would also include the “abstractions or concepts” (Schwandt, 2001, p. 30) the mind forms when a person represents that which he or she observes in his or her memory. Second, in the proposed intuitivist paradigm, in my view, the mind constructs knowledge through imagining. I define all thinking as imagining. That which is imagined is not concrete (i.e., actualized) in any way that can be observed directly, but it has the chance of becoming so. For example, the thought that I might go to my kitchen late tonight to fix cereal--which is a thought that has a chance of becoming concrete, or actualized--is imagined. Third, the mind can construct, through fantasy, knowledge that is not concrete, and that we know is not ever going to be concrete (If we believe this knowledge has the chance of becoming concrete, it is sabotage of one’s intellect.). We amuse ourselves with this knowledge. We use it to fill-in where knowledge that either is or can become concrete, ends. An example would be the fantasy of a current-day human using one jump to jump to the moon, without any technology to achieve such.

The field of somatics, which I discussed in Chapter 3 and which has as its subject matter what Hanna (1986b, as cited in Mullins, 2008) referred to as “‘the body as perceived from within’” (p. 22), could really explore all the responses the human organism reveals to life. But in order to do that, somatics cannot be limited by previous attempts to locate the soul of being, and somatics would have to expand, or it would have
to be expanded in concept, considerably, so as to include in its subject matter instinctive somatic response phenomena (i.e., somatic response phenomena above and beyond, for instance, the traditional five senses and normal, consciously executed physical reactions).

If you are discussing instinctive somatic response phenomena--i.e., somatic response phenomena above and beyond, for instance, the traditional five senses and normal, consciously executed physical reactions (which already come under other categories, such as dance, physical therapy, or physical education)--, and you are thus discussing physical reactions that are engendered by something else (another nature inside us, I posit), you are discussing a new territory. If that territory, or the territory of non-instinctive somatic response phenomena, is investigated by using a method that adheres to the following two principles delineated at the end of Chapter 4--(a) in the person operating the method, something other than that person’s mind would have to manage that person’s mind, and (b) achieving a neutral state of intellect--, I would suggest that that field of investigation be called “wisdom science” (as opposed to “somatics” or some other name). What I am interested in doing in my academic time is starting university-level academic programs in wisdom science. Nothing in a wisdom science is continued by a mind, however; all in a wisdom science has to be of involuntary, instinctive origins, which come to the mind, I perceive, not from the mind. These instinctive origins have been called numerous things--e.g., psychic, religious, spiritual--., I perceive. You may have an attitude toward the word “psychic,” but if you do, let me be so bold to suggest that you do not know what it means. Psychic, religious, spiritual: the source of these is all from one origin, in my perception. I am interested in trying to understand that origin.
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Appendix A: The Interview Schedule Used in This Study

I used two criteria in developing the following interview questions, which I used in this study’s single round of data collection. First, I developed the questions with the understanding that participants would be allowed the freedom to answer the questions however they wished, and the freedom not to answer, without comment by the interviewer and without penalty. As the interviewer, I intended to have no expectation regarding participants’ responses, and I desired that the participants not be endeavoring to satisfy me in any way (e.g., by offering answers they thought I required for this research). Second, I developed the questions with the aim of avoiding criticism of me by the participants. In the service-learning project I did before this study with the low-income elderly community from which I recruited participants for this study’s Sample 1, the individuals from that community who I worked with did not criticize me or view me as a threat, I perceived. In my view they were delighted to help, cooperative, and interested--not in me, or in the work I was doing, but in being willing to take part in a project a graduate student was doing.

Instructions for Interviewer

1. Ask the interview questions exactly as they are written.
2. When asking an interview question, do not read aloud the interview question number.
3. Speak loudly and clearly.
4. Do not ask the participant any questions that are not on the interview schedule, unless you have to ask a question to (a) make sure you accurately heard what the participant said, or (b) make sure you understand something the participant said.

5. Repeat a question to the participant if (a) he or she asks you to repeat it, or if (b) after the participant verbally responds to the question, it becomes seemingly apparent that the participant may not have understood the question, and that he or she might understand the question if you repeat it.

6. Just before the start of the interview, read to the participant the information listed below in the “Information to Tell the Participant Just Prior to the Start of the Interview” section.

Information to Tell the Participant Just Prior to the Start of the Interview

Read the following aloud:

Okay. Just to remind you, you can answer the questions however you wish, and you do not have to answer any question that you do not want to answer.

Also, I can repeat any question I ask. Please let me know if you want me to repeat a question.

Also, please speak loudly and clearly.

Interview Questions

1. Would you consider yourself to be negotiating life as happily as you can?

   1A. If **YES** to 1: What, if anything, do you do inside yourself, in terms of your thinking, to negotiate life as happily as you can?

   1A.I. Probes (Instructions for interviewer: ask all of these questions, but only if the interviewee does not have an answer to 1A):

   1A.I.a. Probe 1: For example, do you think a certain way?
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1A.I.b. Probe 2: To negotiate life as happily as you can, do you not think about certain things?
1A.I.c. Probe 3: To negotiate life as happily as you can, do you try to not “think too much,” so you don’t interfere with your own happiness?

1A.II. Where did you learn to negotiate life as happily as you can?

1B. If NO to 1: Why is that?

1B.I. Probe (Instructions for interviewer: ask this question only if the interviewee does not have an answer to 1B): What makes it so that you are not negotiating life as happily as you can?

1C. If the interviewee answers “SOMETIMES,” or “NOT NECESSARILY,” or something else that conveys he or she is in effect saying both “YES” and “NO” to question 1, ask: In those instances when you are negotiating life as happily as you can, what, if anything, do you do inside yourself, in terms of your thinking, to negotiate life as happily as you can?

1C.I. Probes (Instructions for interviewer: ask all of these questions, but only if the interviewee does not have an answer to 1C):

1C.I.a. Probe 1: For example, do you think a certain way?
1C.I.b. Probe 2: To negotiate life as happily as you can, do you not think about certain things?
1C.I.c. Probe 3: To negotiate life as happily as you can, do you try to not “think too much,” so you don’t interfere with your own happiness?

1C.II. Where did you learn to negotiate life as happily as you can?

1C.III. In instances when you are not negotiating life as happily as you can, why is that?

1C.III.a. Probe (Instructions for interviewer: ask this question only if the interviewee does not have an answer to 1C.III.): What makes it so that you are not negotiating life as happily as you can, in instances when you are not?

2. Do you get down about what you don’t have, materially, compared to what others have?

2A. If YES to 2: Is there something you do to try to stop getting down about that?

2A.I. If YES to 2A.: Can you describe that to me?

2A.I.a. Where did you learn how to do that?
2A.I.b. When did you learn how to do that?
2A.I.c. How did you learn how to do that?

2B. If NO to 2: Why would you say that is? (looking for the kind of mindset it takes to not get down about it)

2B.I. Probe (ask this to investigate the interviewee’s answer to 2B more deeply): Is there something you do to prevent getting down about what you don’t have?
2B.I.a. If **YES** to 2B.I.: What do you do?
   2B.I.a.i. Where did you learn how to do that?
   2B.I.a.ii. When did you learn how to do that?
   2B.I.a.iii. How did you learn how to do that?
2B.I.b. If **NO** to 2B.I.: Why do you think it is that you do not get down about what you don’t have? (the interviewee’s answer is likely to be his explanation, or theory, of the datum that, from his perspective, he does not get down about what he does not have, materially, compared to others)

2C. If the interviewee answers “**SOMETIMES,**” or “**NOT NECESSARILY,**” or something else that conveys he or she is in effect saying both “**YES**” and “**NO**” to question 2, ask: When you do get down about what you don’t have, materially, compared to what others have, is there something you do to try to stop getting down about that?
   2C.I. If **YES** to 2C.: Can you describe that to me?
      2C.I.a. Where did you learn how to do that?
      2C.I.b. When did you learn how to do that?
      2C.I.c. How did you learn how to do that?
   2C.II. When you do not get down about what you don’t have, materially, compared to what others have, why would you say that is? (looking for the kind of mindset it takes to not get down about it)
      2C.II.a. Probe (ask this to investigate the interviewee’s answer to 2C.II. more deeply): Is there something you do to prevent getting down about what you don’t have?
         2C.II.a.i. If **YES** to 2C.II.a.: What do you do?
            2C.II.a.i.1. Where did you learn how to do that?
            2C.II.a.i.2. When did you learn how to do that?
            2C.II.a.i.3. How did you learn how to do that?
         2C.II.a.ii. If **NO** to 2C.II.a.: When you do not get down about what you don’t have, materially, compared to what others have, why do you think it is that you do not get down about it? (the interviewee’s answer is likely to be his explanation, or theory, of the datum that, from his perspective, he sometimes does not get down about what he does not have, materially, compared to others)

3. Would you consider yourself to be concerned about how others perceive you?
   3A. If **YES** to 3: Why do you think that is so?
   3B. If **NO** to 3: Why not?
      3B.I. How do you manage not to be concerned about how others perceive you?

4. What’s the best way to be happy?
5. Would you say that education is unnecessary beyond a certain point?

5A. If YES to 5: What makes you say that?
5B. If NO to 5: Why?
   5B.I. Probe (this is a way to possibly clarify or extend the interviewee’s answer to 5B): What about education makes it necessary?

6. In your view, does education lead to happiness?

6A. If YES to 6: How does it?
6B. If NO to 6: Why not?
6C. If the interviewee answers “SOMETIMES” or “NOT NECESSARILY” (or something else that conveys he or she is in effect saying both “YES” and “NO” to question 6), ask: In a case where it does lead to happiness, how does it?
   6C.I. In a case where education does not lead to happiness, why doesn’t it?

7. Generally, would you say that you arrive at your ideas about what to do, say, and be by thinking, or by using how you feel inside to guide your thinking?

7A. If BY THINKING to 7: Does feeling influence your thought processes?
   7A.I. If YES to 7A.: How do you use it?
   7A.II. If NO to 7A.: Does feeling have any role to play in your life?
      7A.II.a. If YES to 7A.II.: What role does it play?
      7A.II.b. If NO to 7A.II.: What makes it not play any role in your life?
         7A.II.b.i. What makes it not play any role as a guide for your thinking, specifically?

7B. If BY FEELING GUIDING THINKING to 7: Why do you give feeling importance?
   7B.I. Please give me an example of how you use feeling to guide your thinking.
   7B.II. If CONSIDER THEMSELVES TO BE NEGOTIATING LIFE AS HAPPILY AS THEY CAN (from Question 1, above): You mentioned earlier that in your view you are negotiating life as happily as you can. Do you think that using your feelings to guide your thinking contributes to your ability to negotiate life as happily as you can?
      7B.II.a. If YES to 7B.II.: Why is that?
      7B.II.b. If NO to 7B.II.: Why not? (the interviewee may already have given a reason for this in response to question 1A or question 1A.I., above)
   7B.III. Would you say that you give-up your personal will to listen to your feelings over your thinking?
7B.III.a. If **YES** to 7B.III.: Can you give me some examples of when you have done so?

7B.IV. What makes it so you do not mind listening to feeling instead of thinking?

7C. If **BOTH** to 7: How does feeling influence your thought processes?

7C.I. Why do you give feeling importance?

7C.II. Please give me an example of how you use feeling to guide your thinking.

7C.III. Please give me an instance of when you do not use feeling to guide your thinking, but use only thinking.

7C.IV. If **CONSIDERS HERSELF TO BE NEGOTIATING LIFE AS HAPPILY AS SHE CAN** (from Question 1, above): Earlier you mentioned that you consider yourself to be negotiating life as happily as you can. Do you think that using your feelings to guide your thinking contributes to your ability to do that?

7C.IV.a. If **YES** to 7C.IV.: Why so?

7C.IV.b. If **NO** to 7C.IV.: Why not? (the interviewee may already have given a reason for this in response to questions 1A and/or 1A.I., above)

7C.V. When you listen to your feelings over your thinking, would you say you give up your personal will in doing that?

7C.V.a. If **YES** to 7C.V.: Can you give me some examples of when you have done so?

7C.VI. What makes it so that you do not mind listening to feeling instead of thinking, when you do that?

7D. If **NEITHER** to 7: How do you arrive at your ideas about what to do, say, and be?

8. Would you say that the mindset you’ve shared with me in the interview so far is different from the mindset you had at other times in your life?

8A. If **YES** to 8: How so?

8B. If **YES** to 8: Please give me an example of how your mindset was different at another time in your life.

8C. If **YES** to 8: Why do you think your mindset was different at other times in your life?

9. Do you think we need to do anything special to be spiritual?

10. Is there anything that makes you fulfilled on a daily basis, and if so what is it?

11. “‘What grade had you completed when you left school?’” (I have excerpted this question directly from Ary et al., 2002, p. 394.).
12. (Instructions for interviewer: For this question, state to the interviewee that you would like him/her to act as if he/she is asking the question of himself/herself, and then answering it. Once you have explained this to the interviewee, read the question.) Am I able to see myself as I am in the mirror, or do I only see this aging and deteriorating and heading-for-oblivion body?

12A. IF THE INTERVIEWEE DOES NOT UNDERSTAND QUESTION 12, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTION INSTEAD: At what age do I respond to and come at people and the world?

12B. IF THE INTERVIEWEE DOES NOT UNDERSTAND QUESTION 12A, RE-STATE IT THIS WAY: How old do you feel you are?

12C. IF THE INTERVIEWEE DOES NOT UNDERSTAND QUESTION 12B, RE-STATE IT THIS WAY: How old do you feel inside?

13. REGARDING THE INTERVIEWEE’S RESPONSE TO QUESTION 12, 12A, 12B, OR 12C (WHICHEVER ONE HE/SHE ANSWERED): Why do you say that?

14. When you hear yourself think a thought, who thinks it?

15. I have six eggs. You can have two. Who gets the other four?

16. (THIS QUESTION IS TO BE ASKED ONLY OF THOSE LOW-INCOME ELDERLY IN SAMPLE 1 WHO ARE RESIDENTS OF [public housing community], SINCE THESE PARTICIPANTS WILL BE MOVING TO ANOTHER PUBLIC HOUSING COMMUNITY WITHIN THE NEXT YEAR.) I understand that you are going to be moving within the next year. When you get to where you’re going, what might change?

17. What do you appreciate or value most in life?

18. REGARDING THE INTERVIEWEE’S RESPONSE TO QUESTION 17: If we took that away, would anything else matter?

18A. IF THE INTERVIEWEE DOES NOT UNDERSTAND QUESTION 18, RE-STATE IT AS: Could the things that you value second-most, or third-most, or fourth-most, replace what you value most?

19. Do you feel that my questions were invasive or insulting or entering a private space that’s too personal?
Appendix B: The Criteria a Body Movement Had to Meet to Be a Seemingly Clear-Cut Instance of One of Certain Types of Body Movement That Pricked My Curiosity in This Study; and, Kinds of Body Movements About Which It Was Too Undiscernable to Conclude Whether or Not Instances of That Kind of Body Movement Were Seemingly Clear-Cut Instances of One of Certain Types of Body Movement That Pricked My Curiosity in This Study

This appendix concerns three types of body movement that participants did in my interviews of those participants in this study--movement-types that pricked my curiosity. The names of those three movement-types (types which I discussed in Chapters 3 and 4) are eyes wander, eyes open a little wider and brow furrows, and head nodding. Below, I discuss each of these movement-types in turn. Under each movement-type, I have written a list of the criteria a movement had to meet to qualify as a seemingly clear-cut instance of that movement-type. Also, under each movement-type, I have written a list of kinds of movement about which it was too undiscernable to conclude whether or not an instance of that kind of movement was a seemingly clear-cut instance of that movement-type.

I developed the following lists when conducting structured observations in which I looked for seemingly clear-cut instances of one or multiple of the movement-types noted above. I conducted those observations by viewing videos of my interviews of participants. The lists evolved as I viewed each interview multiple times and tried to see which movements seemed to be clear-cut instances of the movement-type I was looking for.

In each of the videos I watched when looking for seemingly clear-cut instances of these movement-types, the participant and I (i.e., the interviewer) were seated in chairs that were about four feet apart from each other. The chairs were directly facing one another. My chair was about 12 feet from the video camera (which was stationary), and the participant’s chair was about 13 feet from the video camera. In each of the videos I watched when looking for seemingly clear-cut instances of these movement-types, one can see the full length of both the participant’s body and my body. In those videos, the participant is facing the camera slightly, but I am not facing the camera at all; instead, the video simply shows my profile.

In each of the videos of interviews I watched when looking for seemingly clear-cut instances of the above-noted movement-types, there were no obstructions between the participant and me, although the following objects were present (some of the following objects were sometimes not present, as noted in the list that immediately follows this statement): (a) the clothing that was on our necks, torsos, arms, legs, and feet; (b) any jewelry and watches we were wearing; (c) the following items that were in my lap for most of the interview: a pencil I took notes with, an 8 1/2 x 11-inch notebook in which I took notes, and the interview schedule I used in the interview (that interview schedule...
was a 6-page packet of 8 1/2 x 11-inch papers); (d) a thin cord that ran from headphones I sometimes wore in the interviews, to the video camera that recorded the interviews (when present, this cord ran in front of my neck and torso); (e) a drink I sometimes drank from, but that was only an object between the participant and me when I was drinking from it, since it was on the floor next to me during the rest of the interview; (f) a 4 x 5 x 2-inch mobile accessories case that was attached to the front of my belt, and that held my personal digital assistant; (g) any of the following that the participant was holding in his or her hand, hands, or lap, or in multiple of those: a drink, a tissue, a small packet of 8 1/2 x 11-inch papers; (h) any hat or pair of eye glasses the participant was wearing (if he or she was wearing either of these, it perhaps obstructed the camera’s view of the participant’s face to some degree).

As stated in Chapter 4, I postulate that certain instances of the movement-types discussed in this appendix are possibly indicators of participant verbal responses that conveyed ideation that came via intuition. I also state in Chapter 4 that there is no method taught in academia, however, that allows us to know if an instance of one of the movement-types discussed here is an indicator of a participant verbal response that conveyed ideation that came via intuition. More broadly, in Chapter 5 I state the following: Finding a way to differentiate ideas that have come via intuition is what is required at this time to give us a better grasp of what intuition is, for, without being able to differentiate ideas that have come by intuition from those that have not, we are unable to isolate the posited phenomenon of intuition so that we can study it. Because we are unable to isolate the posited phenomenon of intuition so that we can study it, it is open to judgment as to what people really mean when they say “intuition,” or “intuitive,” or “intuitively,” or “an intuition,” for example. For instance, in the following segment quoted from Kleinman (1990), Kleinman uses the terms “‘intuitive’” (p. 123) and “intuitively” (p. 123), and one of the authors he cites uses the word “‘intuitive’” (p. 123), and when these authors use these terms, it is open to judgment what the authors really mean by them:

How do you recognize intelligent movement? What is considered to be a kinesthetically intelligent act? These questions were prompted by the work of … Gardner, who has received a great deal of attention since the publication of his book, Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences (1983).

I have asked these questions of dancers, actors, mimes, athletes, and even some of my colleagues [in academia]…. I have not been totally satisfied with any of the responses, and so I understand Gardner’s disclaimer and caveat about attempting to address intelligence as a series of particulars. He admits that the categories he is using, such as linguistic intelligence and spatial intelligence, are fictions. He says, “Nature brooks no sharp discontinuities” (p. 70). His intent is to “illuminate scientific issues” and to devise “scientific constructs” (p. 70). But, in the end, even he has to resort to resting his case in the realm of the intuitive. Gardner quotes the poet … Shapiro … : “Genius in poetry is probably only the intuitive knowledge of form. … Nothing can tell the poet which words to use … except his own intuitive knowledge of form” (p. 83).
... I like the phrase, “intuitive knowledge of form.” I like it intuitively. (p. 123)

What I am trying to do is define the word “intuition” (or variants of it such as “intuitive” and “intuitively”). My perception is that intuitioning is a process, not a word. So, I am trying to change how people use the word, if they are using it seriously. People with different training or backgrounds would interpret the word “intuition” (or variants of it) differently, so, it is not really clear what is meant by it. I would like to make it (i.e., what I perceive is the process intuitioning) a science, so that it is clear what it means to anyone who is using that science.

Eyes Wander

The Criteria a Movement Had to Meet to Be a Seemingly Clear-Cut Instance of the Eyes Wander Movement.

1. The movement was one where the participant’s eyes wandered away from both my (i.e., the interviewer’s) eyes and the parts of my body that were below my eyes. (Note: If the participant’s eyes wandered to parts of my body that were above my eyes, that movement met this criterion. That is because, I posit, the parts of my body that were above my eyes were not parts of my body which the participant saw as “under my watch,” and, therefore, I posit, he or she experienced those parts as a safe place to let his or her eyes wander to, a place that was not expecting him or her to produce something to say on-the-spot.)

2. The participant’s eyes stopped at some point in the movement, at a place that was away from my (i.e., the interviewer’s) eyes and the parts of my body that were below my eyes.

3. The movement occurred at a time where the participant appeared to be “stopping thinking, then trying to listen to the posited instinctive responsiveness, to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question in response to an interview question,” which, when it accompanies an eyes wander movement, I posit, is indicated by: the occurrence of points 1 and 2 listed above in this list and any one of the following:

   a. The participant stopped talking before the movement, and resumed talking after the movement began (i.e., not as the movement began) (Note: The participant is considered to have stopped talking if there was a perceptible pause in his or her talking. The pause can have been long (e.g., 3 sec or more) or quite short (i.e., one that met the following definition of the word “pause”: “a brief suspension of the voice to indicate the limits and relations of sentences and their parts” (Mish, et al., 2008, p. 909).). Also, utterances such as “um,” “uh,” and “hmm,” and even “and,” can have been viewed as part of a pause, if they
appeared to serve to delay the participant’s speaking.) (Note: If the participant was swallowing a drink as the movement began, and then started to talk, it is too undiscernable to conclude whether or not that movement was an instance of *eyes wander*, because had he or she not been swallowing a drink, he or she may have spoken as the movement began, and the movement would have then not been one where the participant resumed talking after the movement began.).

b. The participant was not talking, and he or she was listening to something I (the interviewer) was saying to him or her.

c. The participant was not talking, but he or she was preparing to verbally respond to the interviewer (as evidenced by the fact that the participant spoke soon after the movement), and the interviewer was not talking.

4. The movement did not occur during any of this study’s interview segments that did not qualify to be qualitative data for this study.29

The Kinds of Movements About Which It Was Too Undiscernable to Conclude Whether or Not an Instance of That Kind of Movement Was a Seemingly Clear-Cut Instance of the Eyes Wander Movement.

1. A movement that was done completely after the participant appeared to have given his or her verbal response to the interview question during which the movement occurred. A movement of this kind may indeed have signaled that the participant was, at the time of the movement, “stopping thinking, then trying to listen to the posited *instinctive responsiveness*, to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question in response to an interview question,” but because there was no pause in his or her speaking to observe, it was too undiscernable to say that that was the case.

2. A movement that was done during a participant’s verbal response to an interview question, but where the participant did not pause his or her speaking before doing the movement and then continue that pause until after the movement began. A movement of this kind may indeed have signaled that the participant was, at the time of the movement, “stopping thinking, then trying to listen to the posited *instinctive responsiveness*, to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question,” but because one

29 Nearly all of this study’s interview segments qualified to be qualitative data for this study, but there were a few segments that I decided did not qualify to be so, for one reason or another. The reason a given interview segment did not qualify to be qualitative data for this study is listed in the transcript of the interview to which the segment belonged. The reader can learn the reasons why certain of this study’s interview segments did not qualify to be qualitative data for this study; he or she can do so by requesting electronic copies of the transcripts from me, then receiving those transcripts from me, and then reading within those transcripts the reasons why certain of this study’s interview segments did not qualify to be qualitative data for this study.
could not observe a pause in the participant’s speaking which lasted until after the movement began, it was too undiscernable to say that that was the case.

3. A movement that occurred after the participant had stopped talking, but that began while the participant was swallowing a drink. Because it is possible that the participant might have spoken as this movement began, but could not because he or she was swallowing a drink, it was too undiscernable to say that the participant’s not talking at the start of the movement appeared to come as a result of the fact that he or she was swallowing, or that it appeared to come as a result of him or her possibly have been engaged in the phenomenon of “stopping thinking, then trying to listen to the posited instinctive responsiveness, to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question.”

4. A movement that occurred after the participant had stopped talking, but that began while the participant was swallowing a drink. Because it is possible that the participant might have spoken as this movement began, but could not because he or she was swallowing a drink, it was too undiscernable to say that the participant’s not talking at the start of the movement appeared to come as a result of the fact that he or she was swallowing, or that it appeared to come as a result of him or her possibly have been engaged in the phenomenon of “stopping thinking, then trying to listen to the posited instinctive responsiveness, to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question.”

5. A movement that met all of the criteria that a movement must meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of eyes wander, but that was something the participant did when rearranging his or her hair by shaking his or her head. Such a movement may have been caused simply by the head-shaking movement the participant was doing to rearrange his or her hair, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited instinctive responsiveness.

6. A movement that possibly met all of the criteria that a movement must meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of eyes wander, but that was partly blocked from camera view (e.g., by a hat or a pair of glasses the participant was wearing, or because the participant’s head was turned away from the camera). Such a movement may indeed have been a seemingly clear-cut instance of eyes wander, but because the movement was partly blocked from camera view, we cannot tell if that is so.

7. A movement that met all of the criteria that a movement must meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of eyes wander, but that occurred when the participant appeared to be tilting his or her head back to stretch. Such a movement may have been caused simply by the head-tilting movement the participant was apparently doing as a stretch, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited instinctive responsiveness.

8. A movement that met all of the criteria that a movement must meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of eyes wander, but that occurred when the
participant appeared to be looking at one or more of the following: his or her body, an object that was on his or her body (e.g., clothing), an object that he or she was holding (e.g., a packet of papers), or an object that he or she had resting on his or her lap (e.g., a piece of paper). Such a movement may have occurred simply because the participant was voluntarily looking at one or more of these things, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

9. An upward-directed movement that met all of the criteria that a movement must meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *eyes wander*, but that occurred when the participant said a term such as “Higher Power” or “God,” or some other term that referred to a Higher Power of some kind (e.g., “the Lord”). Such a movement may have occurred simply because the participant was intentionally underscoring that he or she was talking about a Higher Power of some kind, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

10. A movement that met all of the criteria that a movement must meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *eyes wander*, but that occurred when the participant was leaning his or her head back while taking a drink. Such a movement may have been caused simply by the movement the participant was doing in leaning his or her head back while taking a drink, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

11. A movement that met all of the criteria a movement must meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *eyes wander*, but that occurred when the participant was rubbing his or her eyes. Such a movement may have been a voluntary movement the participant did as a part of the movement he or she did to rub his or her eyes, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

12. A movement that met all of the criteria that a movement must meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *eyes wander*, but that appeared to be simply the participant voluntarily rolling his or her eyes. Such a movement may have occurred because the participant was voluntarily rolling his or her eyes, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

13. A movement that met all of the criteria a movement must meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *eyes wander*, but that occurred when the participant was possibly peering out a window at a passerby. Such a movement may only have been a voluntary one the participant did so that he or she could see a passerby, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

14. A movement that met all of the criteria a movement must meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *eyes wander*, but that occurred when the participant, in his or her speaking, referred to the building, apartment, or room in which the interview was taking place. Such a movement may have been a
voluntary one the participant did to underscore the fact that he or she was talking about the building, apartment, or room in which the interview was taking place, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

15. A movement that met all of the criteria a movement must meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *eyes wander*, but that appeared to occur because I (the interviewer) first looked somewhere in the interview room (e.g., at the video camera that was in the room), and then the participant looked in that direction, seemingly because my look drew his or her attention to that place. Such a movement may have occurred only because the participant’s attention was drawn to that place in the interview room because my look drew his or her attention to that place, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

16. A movement that met all of the criteria a movement must meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *eyes wander*, but that appeared to be something the participant did when trying to one of the following:
   a. Remember something
   b. Calculate something mathematically in his or her head
   c. Consciously figure out how to get his or her voice and mouth to pronounce something

Such a movement may have occurred only because the participant was doing one of these three actions, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

*Eyes Open a Little Wider and Brow Furrows*

_The Criteria a Movement Had to Meet to be a Seemingly Clear-Cut Instance of the Movement Called Eyes Open a Little Wider and Brow Furrows._

1. The participant’s brow furrowed (Note: The brow unfurrowing signaled the end of the movement.).

2. In the same movement in which the brow furrowed, the eyes opened a little more than they were open immediately before the movement (Note: The participant can have blinked, at first, when the brow began to furrow, but the eyes must have then opened to a degree that was larger than they were open before the blink, and they must have done that while the brow was still raised.).

3. The movement occurred at a place where the participant appeared to be “stopping thinking, then trying to listen to the posited *instinctive responsiveness*, to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question,” which, when it accompanies an instance of this movement-type, I posit, is indicated by: the occurrence of points 1 and 2 listed above in this list, _and any one of the following:_
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a. The participant stopped talking before the movement, and resumed talking during or after the movement, and the interviewer did not speak at any time during that sequence (Note: The participant is considered to have stopped talking if there was a perceptible pause in his or her talking. The pause may have been long (e.g., 3 sec or more) or quite short (i.e., one that met the following definition of the word “pause”: “a brief suspension of the voice to indicate the limits and relations of sentences and their parts” (Mish, et al., 2008, p. 909.). Also, utterances such as “um,” “uh,” and “hmm,” and even “and,” can have been viewed as part of a pause, if they appeared to serve to delay the participant’s speaking.) (Note: If the participant was swallowing a drink as the movement began, and then started to talk, it is too undiscernable to conclude whether or not that movement was an instance of *eyes open a little and brow furrows*, because had he or she not been swallowing a drink, he or she may have spoken as the movement began, and the movement would have then not been one where the participant resumed talking *after* the movement began.).

b. When the movement occurred, the participant was not talking, but he or she was preparing to verbally respond to the interviewer (as evidenced by the fact that the participant spoke soon after the movement), and the interviewer was not talking.

4. The movement did not occur during any of this study’s interview segments that did not qualify to be qualitative data for this study. \(^{30}\)

*The Kinds of Movements About Which It Was Too Undiscernable to Conclude Whether or Not an Instance of That Kind of Movement Was a Seemingly Clear-Cut Instance of the Movement Called Eyes Open a Little Wider and Brow Furrows.*

1. A movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *eyes open a little wider and brow furrows*, but that was partly blocked from camera view (e.g., by a hat or a pair of glasses the participant was wearing, or because the participant’s head was turned away from the camera). Such a movement may indeed have been a seemingly clear-cut instance of *eyes open a little wider and brow furrows*, but because the movement was partly blocked from camera view, we cannot tell if that is so.

\(^{30}\) Nearly all of this study’s interview segments qualified to be qualitative data for this study, but there are a few segments that I decided did not qualify to be so, for one reason or another. The reason a given interview segment did not qualify to be qualitative data for this study is listed in the transcript of the interview to which the segment belonged. The reader can learn the reasons why certain of this study’s interview segments did not qualify as qualitative data for this study; he or she can do so by requesting electronic copies of the transcripts from me, then receiving those transcripts from me, and then reading within those transcripts the reasons why certain of this study’s interview segments did not qualify as qualitative data for this study.
2. A movement that met criteria 1, 2, and 4 that a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *eyes open a little wider and brow furrows*, but that was done completely after the participant had given his or her verbal response to the interview question during which the movement occurred (and thus did not meet criterion 3 that a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of this movement-type). Such a movement may indeed have signaled that the participant was, at the time of the movement, “stopping thinking, then trying to listen to the posited *instinctive responsiveness*, to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question” (in which case it would have met criterion 3 that a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of this movement-type), but because there was no pause in his or her speaking to observe, it is too undiscernable to say that that is the case.

3. A movement that occurred after the participant had stopped talking, but that began while the participant was swallowing a drink. Because it is possible that the participant might have spoken as this movement began, but could not because he or she was swallowing a drink, it was too undiscernable to say that the participant’s not talking at the start of the movement appeared to come as a result of the fact that he or she was swallowing, or that it appeared to come as a result of him or her possibly have been engaged in the phenomenon of “stopping thinking, then trying to listen to the posited *instinctive responsiveness*, to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question.”

4. A movement that met criteria 1, 2, and 4 that a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *eyes open a little wider and brow furrows*, but that occurred while the participant was listening to something the interviewer was saying to him or her (thus making it so the movement did not meet criterion 3 that a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of this movement-type). Such a movement may indeed have signaled that the participant was, at the time of the movement, “stopping thinking, then trying to listen to the posited *instinctive responsiveness*, to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question” (in which case it would have met criterion 3 that a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of this movement-type), but because the movement might have signaled that the participant was concentrating on listening to what the interviewer was saying, it was too undiscernable to say the former was the case.

5. A movement that met criteria 1, 2, and 4 that a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *eyes open a little wider and brow furrows*, and that was done during the participant’s verbal response, but that did not meet criterion 3 that a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of this movement-type, because (a) before the movement, the participant did not pause his or her speaking, and (b) during at least the beginning of the movement, the participant did not continue that pause. Such a movement may
indeed have signaled that the participant was, at the time of the movement, “stopping thinking, then trying to listen to the posited instinctive responsiveness, to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question” (in which case it would have met criterion 3 that a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of this movement-type), but, because one could not observe a pause in the participant’s speaking which lasted until after the movement began, it was too undiscernable to say that that was the case.

6. A movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of eyes open a little wider and brow furrows, but that occurred when the participant rubbed his or her eyes or the area around them. Such a movement may have been a voluntary movement the participant did as a part of the movement he or she did to rub his or her eyes, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited instinctive responsiveness.

Head Nodding

The Criteria a Movement Had to Meet to Be a Seemingly Clear-Cut Instance of the Head Nodding Movement.

1. Either of the following two sets of characteristics had to be present during the movement:
   a. First set of characteristics:
      i. The chin lowered, and then stopped lowering. As the chin lowered, the forehead moved forward.
      ii. Shortly after the chin stopped lowering, it rose, with the forehead moving backward during that rising, until the rising stopped.
      iii. If the movement consisted of multiple nods, then shortly after the chin-rising described in 1aii stopped, 1ai and 1aii in this list repeated (If the movement consisted of only one nod, then 1ai and 1aii in this list did not repeat.).
      iv. In the movement, the head moved independently of any torso movement there was (Therefore, a movement in which 1ai and 1aii in this list occurred, but where the relation of the head to the torso did not change--because the neck did not bend--did not satisfy this criterion.).
   b. Second set of characteristics:
      i. The chin rose, then stopped rising. As the chin rose, the forehead moved backward.
      ii. Shortly after the chin stopped rising, it lowered, with the forehead moving forward during that lowering, until the lowering stopped.
iii. The chin then rose again, and then stopped rising. As the chin rose, the forehead moved backward.

iv. If the movement consisted of multiple nods, then shortly after the chin-rising described in 1biii stopped, 1bii and 1biii in this list repeated (If the movement consisted of only one nod, then 1bii and 1biii in this list did not repeat.).

v. In the movement, the head moved independently of any torso movement (Therefore, a movement in which 1bi, 1bii, and 1biii in this list occurred, but where the relation of the head to the torso did not change--because the neck did not bend--did not satisfy this criterion.).

2. The movement was apparently not merely a very subtle quivering of the head that sometimes occurred just by virtue of the fact that the participant exhibiting the movement was speaking.

3. The movement occurred at a time when the participant, I postulate, was at least partially engaged in the phenomenon called “stopping thinking, then trying to listen to the posited instinctive responsiveness, to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question,” which, when it accompanies a head nodding movement, I posit, is indicated by: the occurrence of point 1 in this list, and any one of the following:

   a. The participant stopped talking before the movement, and resumed talking during or after the movement, and the interviewer did not speak at any time during that sequence (Note: The participant is considered to have stopped talking if there was a perceptible pause in his or her talking. The pause may have been long (e.g., 3 sec or more) or quite short (i.e., one that met the following definition of the word “pause”: “a brief suspension of the voice to indicate the limits and relations of sentences and their parts” (Mish, et al., 2008, p. 909).). Also, utterances such as “um,” “uh,” and “hmm,” and even “and,” can be viewed as part of a pause, if they appeared to serve to delay the participant’s speaking.) (Note: If the participant was swallowing a drink as the movement began, and then started to talk, it is too undiscernable to conclude whether or not that movement was an instance of head nodding, because had he or she not been swallowing a drink, he or she may have spoken as the movement began, and the movement would have then not been one where the participant resumed talking after the movement began.).

   b. The participant was not talking, but he or she was preparing to verbally respond to the interviewer (as evidenced by the fact that the participant spoke soon after the movement), and the interviewer was not talking.
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4. The movement did not occur during any of this study’s interview segments that did not qualify to be qualitative data for this study.\textsuperscript{31}

\textit{The Kinds of Movements About Which It Was Too Undiscernible to Conclude Whether or Not an Instance of That Kind of Movement Was a Seemingly Clear-Cut Instance of the Head Nodding Movement.}

1. A head movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of \textit{head nodding}, but that occurred as the participant either (a) sat up in his or her chair, (b) leaned forward in his or her chair, or (c) sat up and leaned forward in his or her chair. Such a movement may have been caused simply by the movement the participant did as he or she sat up, leaned forward, or sat up and leaned forward, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited \textit{instinctive responsiveness}.

2. A head movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of \textit{head nodding}, but that appeared to occur so the participant could look at something lower than what was within his or her line of sight before the movement. Such a movement may have been a voluntary movement the participant did so that he or she could look at something that was lower than what was within his or her line of sight before the movement, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited \textit{instinctive responsiveness}.

3. A head movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of \textit{head nodding}, but that appeared to occur so the participant could look at something higher than what was within his or her line of sight before the movement. Such a movement may have been a voluntary movement the participant did so that he or she could look at something that was higher than what was within his or her line of sight before the movement, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited \textit{instinctive responsiveness}.

4. A one-nod head movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of \textit{head nodding}, but that appeared to occur so the participant could do an \textit{eyes wander} movement in which his or her eyes wandered to parts of my (the interviewer’s) body that were above my eyes. Such a movement may have been done only so the participant could do the \textit{eyes wander} movement, and not a \textit{head nodding} movement.

\textsuperscript{31} Nearly all of this study’s interview segments qualified to be qualitative data for this study, but there are a few segments that I decided did not qualify to be so, for one reason or another. The reason a given interview segment did not qualify to be qualitative data for this study is listed in the transcript of the interview to which the segment belonged. The reader can learn the reasons why certain of this study’s interview segments did not qualify as qualitative data for this study; he or she can do so by requesting electronic copies of the transcripts from me, then receiving those transcripts from me, and then reading within those transcripts the reasons why certain of this study’s interview segments did not qualify as qualitative data for this study.
5. A head movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *head nodding*, but that occurred as the participant who did the movement was repositioning his or her head so that his or her chin rested on his or her hand. Such a movement may have been a voluntary movement the participant did so that he or she could reposition his or her head that way, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

6. A head movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *head nodding*, but that occurred when the participant who did the movement was apparently silently nodding “yes” to a question I asked them. Such a movement may have been a voluntary movement the participant did in response to the question I asked, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

7. A head movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *head nodding*, but that was a movement that the participant who did the movement did seconds before, or as, they said “yes” or “okay” to something I (the interviewer) said or asked. Such a movement did not qualify as an instance of the *head nodding* movement, because such a movement may have been a voluntary movement the participant did in response to the something I said or asked, and thus not been involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

8. A head movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *head nodding*, but that occurred while I (the interviewer) was speaking. Such a movement may have been a voluntary movement the participant did to communicate to me that (a) he or she approved or understood what I was saying, or that (b) he or she was listening to what I was saying, and thus may not have been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

9. A head movement that met criteria 1, 2, and 4 that a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *head nodding*, but that was done completely after the participant had given his or her verbal response to the interview question during which the movement occurred (and thus did not meet criterion 3 that a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of this movement-type). Such a movement may indeed have signaled that the participant was, at the time of the movement, at least partially engaged in the phenomenon called “stopping *thinking*, then trying to listen to the posited *instinctive responsiveness*, to receive from it something worthwhile to say in response to an interview question” (in which case it would have met criterion 3 that a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of this movement-type), but because there was no pause in his or her speaking to observe, it is too undiscernable to say that that is the case.
10. A one-nod head movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *head nodding*, but during which the participant who did the movement cocked his or her head to the side. Such a movement may have been a voluntary movement the participant did so that he or she could cock his or head to the side, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

11. A one-nod head movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *head nodding*, but that appeared only to have been a part of a movement in which the participant turned his or her head to see something. Such a movement may have been a voluntary movement the participant did so that he or she could turn his or her head and see something, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

12. A head movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *head nodding*, but that appeared only to have occurred because of the lung inflation and deflation that occurred in the participant as a result of his or her speaking and breathing. Such a movement may have been a voluntary or involuntary movement the participant did so that he or she could speak and breathe, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

13. A one-nod head movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *head nodding*, but that appeared only to have been a part of a movement that occurred because the participant burped. Such a movement may have been a voluntary or involuntary movement the participant did so that he or she could burp, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

14. A one-nod head movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *head nodding*, but during which the participant who did the movement jutted his or her head forward. Such a movement may have been a voluntary movement the participant did so that he or she could jut his or head forward, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*.

15. A head movement that met the criteria a movement had to meet to be a seemingly clear-cut instance of *head nodding*, but that appeared possibly only to have occurred because the participant who did the movement was laughing. Such a movement may have occurred only as a result of the fact that the participant was laughing, and thus not been an involuntary movement carried out by the posited *instinctive responsiveness*. 
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Appendix C: The Extraneous Variables That the Part of This Study’s Design That I Used to Investigate Functional Relationships 2 and 3 Sought to Maximize the Elimination of (i.e., Control), in Order to Seek to Study the Respective Relationships Between the Independent Variable and Dependent Variables Studied in Functional Relationships 2 and 3

As stated in Chapter 3, the part of this study’s design that I used to investigate Functional Relationships 2 and 3 was like the true experimental design in that it (a) had an independent variable and a dependent variable (in Functional Relationship 2, the independent variable was *does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions*, and the dependent variable was *does or does not use reasoning and logic in verbal responses to interview questions*; in Functional Relationship 3, the independent variable was *does or does not listen to and follow one’s feelings in making decisions*, and the dependent variable was *does or does not use instinctive responsiveness in verbal responses to interview questions*), and (b) was seeking to maximize the elimination of (i.e., control) extraneous variables in order to seek to study the respective relationships between the independent variable and dependent variables it studied. Each of the extraneous variables that that part of this study’s design sought to control were variables that would, I posit, make it less likely to observe *instinctive responsiveness* in participants’ verbal responses to interview questions. I sought to control variables that would presumably make it less likely to observe *instinctive responsiveness* in participants’ verbal responses to interview questions, because this study sought to gain evidence which could be interpreted to suggest that an *instinctive responsiveness* exists. The approach I took to control these variables was to select participants for this study who were over age 50; I expected that retirees over age 50 would be more likely to exhibit the proposed *instinctive responsiveness*—in particular, by using it in their verbal responses to interview questions in the research—for the following reasons (each of these reasons explicitly or implicitly states an extraneous variable I sought to control):

1. They are less likely to be experiencing causes of disharmony—causes which, if they are present, I surmise, influence the status of the whole organism as a functional, living organism, forcing it to use reasoning and logic so it can make decisions in a practical way (thus making it less likely to use *instinctive responsiveness*). The causes of disharmony that I anticipated retirees would be less likely to be experiencing are:
   a) ambition to make money through employment (I expected that they would be retired of this ambition.);
   b) lack of security with respect to having a place to live, and having access to food and water;
c) influences from children (e.g., having to provide for children; having to have their children live at home with them);
d) lack of financial wherewithal to the point where their survival is jeopardized.

2. They are less likely to be conditioned as a result of having monetary debts, because they are less likely to have them (because they have likely had sufficient time to pay off those debts). I assumed that if a person is not conditioned as a result of having monetary debts, he or she will be more likely to use *instinctive responsiveness*, as opposed to conditioning, in verbal responses to interview questions.

3. They are less likely to be having to deal with the pressures of problem-solving (i.e., those pressures which people who still need to employed typically are having to deal with, such as how to get and keep a job in which one can earn enough money to survive). I assumed that retired people are less likely to be having to deal with the pressures of problem-solving, and that they are thus more likely to use *instinctive responsiveness* in verbal responses to interview questions.

4. They are less likely to be socially ambitious (i.e., seeking to “get ahead,” or to “make a name for oneself”). This is a characteristic which, if one possesses it, I assumed, would make him or her likely to skew answers to interview questions in that way, as opposed to giving answers using *instinctive responsiveness*. I assumed that individuals who are over age 50 are less likely to be socially ambitious because, I assumed, they are more likely to realize they have only so much time left in their lives, and they wish to dedicate their attention to other things than being socially ambitious.

5. They are more likely to see things more clearly. I assumed that individuals who are over age 50 will be more likely to see things more clearly because, I surmised, they will have gotten better at evaluating things. Here, I assumed that older people are better at evaluating things because they have the benefit of having had more experiences. Younger people, on the other hand, I assumed, look on everything as exciting, and I speculated that this influences their ability to see things clearly. I anticipated that if a person sees things more clearly, he or she would be more likely to use *instinctive responsiveness* in verbal responses to interview questions.

6. They are more likely to be already over most of their defeats. I assumed that people over age 50 would be more likely to be already over most of their defeats (e.g., career failures, relationship failures), and that these defeats would thus be less likely to influence these people’s answers to interview questions, because the defeats are over with. I therefore assumed that if a person is already over most of his or her defeats, he or she is more likely to use *instinctive responsiveness* in verbal responses to interview questions.

7. They are more likely to have diminished worries. I assumed that because they are retired, retirees are more likely to have diminished worries. For example, they will either have saved enough money so that they can be retired, or are
having enough money provided to them so that they can be retired, or both, and thus they are more likely to have diminished worries about how to make money and survive. Also, retired people no longer have to satisfy work requirements such as deadlines and other performance standards, and thus they are free of the worries these can bring. I assumed that if a person has diminished worries, he or she is more likely to use \textit{instinctive responsiveness} in verbal responses to interview questions.

8. They are more likely to have more gratitude. I assumed that people over the age of 50 are more likely to have more gratitude. I assumed that they may be more likely, for example, to wake-up every day, see the sun, and realize they received another day to live, when they know they might not have, because they know, someday, that that hammer is going to fall. I assumed that if a person has more gratitude, he or she is more likely to use \textit{instinctive responsiveness} in verbal responses to interview questions.

9. They are more likely to be more peaceful, more content. I assume that retired people are more likely to be more peaceful, content, because they will have had some chance to settle into roles they like to fill, as opposed to roles they must fill to be employed. I also assumed that people over age 50 will be more likely to have learned how to be more peaceful, more content, than people under age 50. I assumed that if a person is more peaceful, more content, it changes his or her perspective, and, accordingly, that he or she is more likely to use \textit{instinctive responsiveness} in verbal responses to interview questions.
Appendix D: Procedures Used to Recruit Participants for This Study, and the Criteria Used to Select Those Participants

The Procedures Used to Recruit Participants for This Study

The procedures used to recruit participants for this study’s Sample 1 (i.e., this study’s sample of low-income elderly). To recruit participants for Sample 1 from the low-income elderly community with which I conducted the service-learning project that I noted in Chapters 1 and 3, I laid a flyer outside the apartment door of each resident of the community (each of the residents lives in one of two adjoining high-rise apartment buildings which house the community). The flyer briefly described (a) the study, (b) the activities in which each participant would be involved during the study, and (c) the time commitment involved for each participant in the study. In the flyer, I also asked that residents who were interested or potentially interested in participating in the study attend an information session about the study; that information session was held roughly one week after I distributed the flyers, in a cafeteria on the ground floor of one of the two apartment buildings in which the community lives. At the information session, I gave an oral presentation to the entire group of residents in attendance. In the presentation, I first informed the residents about the study and about what participation in it would involve. Then, I answered (in front of the entire group) any questions the residents in attendance had about the study or about what participation in it would entail. After the residents had the chance to ask questions about the study or about what participation in it would entail, I asked the residents to raise their hands if they were willing to participate. I then informed the residents of the three criteria they had to meet to be eligible to participate in the study, asking each resident who had his or her hand raised to keep his or her hand raised if he or she met each of the three criteria. It was through this procedure that I determined how many residents, and which residents, were eligible to participate.

Next, I obtained the name and contact information of each resident who was willing and eligible to participate. Then, I scheduled a meeting with each of those residents (a meeting in which I (a) obtained the resident’s informed consent, and (b) conducted my interview with and observation of him or her). Then, I indicated to each of these residents that a game room across the hall from where the information session was taking place was the location at which we would have the meeting I discussed in the previous sentence.

Since, in using the recruitment process described in the immediately preceding two paragraphs, I was unable to recruit 20 participants from the community with which I conducted the service-learning project (Note: At the time that I used the recruitment process just described (i.e., very early in this study), I was planning to enroll 20
participants in each of this study’s three samples. As noted in footnote 14 in Chapter 3, however, participant recruitment for this study proved to take longer than expected, as did the transcription of interview data collected in the study. Those two factors caused a time constraint that forced me to see that I would not be able to enroll 20 participants in each sample, because enrolling that many participants would have cost me time (which I did not have) recruiting participants and collecting data from them. Operating under that time constraint, I enrolled only 36 participants in the study. I enrolled 11 of these participants in the study’s low-income elderly sample, 12 in its retired university professors sample, and 13 in its retired university staff sample; however, prompted by the time constraint that I noted above, after I enrolled these participants I considered that another way for me to save time in this study would be to analyze only those data collected from the first eight participants who enrolled in each sample. In the end, I decided that analyzing only the data collected from the first eight participants enrolled in each sample was the best decision for this study, for reasons I stated in footnote 14 in Chapter 3.). I added the following steps to that recruitment process in order to seek to recruit 20 participants for this study’s low-income elderly sample:

1. I indicated to the participants I recruited using the process described above in this appendix, that they could give my name and phone number to any resident of their low-income elderly community whom they thought might be interested in participating, adding that they should tell that resident that if that resident was indeed interested in participating, then that resident should call me. If that resident called me, I then read a telephone script to him or her to: (a) explain the study, (b) explain what participation in the study would involve, and (c) determine if the resident was eligible to participate. If the resident was willing and eligible to participate, I then set-up a one-on-one face-to-face meeting with him or her at which I obtained his or her consent to participate. That meeting took place in the game room noted above in this appendix.

2. With all new participants I recruited using the procedure described in “1” in this list, I employed the following recruitment procedure: I indicated to these participants that they could give my name and phone number to any resident of their low-income elderly community whom they thought might be interested in participating, and added that they should tell that resident that if that resident was indeed interested in participating, then that resident should call me. If that resident called me, I read a telephone script to him or her to: (a) explain the study, (b) explain what participation in the study would involve, and (c) determine if the resident was eligible to participate. If the resident was willing and eligible to participate, I then set-up a one-on-one face-to-face meeting with him or her at which I obtained his or her consent to participate. That meeting took place in the game room noted above in this appendix.

3. I recruited participants for Sample 1 (i.e., my study’s low-income elderly sample) from another low-income elderly community owned and operated by
the agency that owns and operates the community with which I conducted the service-learning project. I recruited participants from this second community by first placing a flyer outside the apartment door of each resident of the community. The flyer briefly described the study and listed my name and phone number. The flyer also stated that the resident should call me if he or she was interested in participating or wanted to learn more about participating. If a resident of that community called me in response to the flyer, I read a telephone script to him or her to: (a) explain the study, (b) explain what participation in the study would involve, and (c) determine if the resident was eligible to participate. If the resident was willing and eligible to participate, I then set up a one-on-one face-to-face meeting with him or her at which I obtained his or her consent to participate. That meeting took place in a parlor room in the community in which the resident lived.

The procedures I used to recruit participants for this study’s Sample 2 (i.e., this study’s sample of retired university professors) and this study’s Sample 3 (i.e., this study’s sample of retired university staff). To assist me in recruiting participants from the organization of retired university employees through which I recruited participants for this study’s Samples 2 and 3, that organization ran a recruitment announcement discussing my study in its monthly newsletter (that newsletter is distributed to the organization’s members by e-mail and mail). In the announcement, I briefly described: (a) the study, (b) the activities in which each participant in the study would be involved while participating, and (c) the time commitment required for each participant in the study. In the announcement, I also indicated the number of participants I sought. Finally, in the announcement I stated that members of the organization who were interested or potentially interested in participating needed to contact me by phone at their earliest convenience.

Once the announcement ran in the organization’s newsletter, the retired university faculty and retired university staff who (a) called me in response to the announcement, (b) heard me explain my research in that phone call (including the criteria they had to meet to be eligible to participate, which I shall discuss below), (c) had any questions they had about the research answered to their satisfaction in the phone call, (d) gave to me their contact information, and (e) met me at a location of their choosing so that I could both obtain their informed consent, and conduct my first-round interview with and observation of them, became participants in this study’s retired university faculty and retired university staff samples, respectively. When each of those participants first called me in response to the newsletter announcement, I indicated to him or her that our meeting could be either at a research site at the university where he or she used to work, or, if he or she was unable to meet at that research site, at a location that he or she defined as his or her natural setting (as long as that location, I indicated, (a) was in or near a particular large city in the American Midwest, (b) was quiet and bright enough to allow for quality video-recording to be done, and (c) offered privacy).

Since, in using the recruitment process I described in the immediately preceding two paragraphs, I was unable to recruit enough participants from the organization of
retired university employees in order to enroll 20 participants each in Samples 2 and 3 (Note: At the time that I used the recruitment process just described (i.e., early in this study), I was planning to enroll 20 participants in each of this study’s three samples. As noted in footnote 14 in Chapter 3, however, participant recruitment for this study proved to take longer than expected, as did the transcription of interview data collected in the study. Those two factors caused a time constraint that forced me to see that I would not be able to enroll 20 participants in each sample, because enrolling that many participants would have cost me time (which I did not have) recruiting participants and collecting data from them. Operating under that time constraint, I enrolled only 36 participants in the study. I enrolled 11 of these participants in the study’s low-income elderly sample, 12 in its retired university professors sample, and 13 in its retired university staff sample; however, prompted by the time constraint that I noted above, after I enrolled these participants I considered that another way for me to save time in this study would be to analyze only those data collected from the first eight participants who enrolled in each sample. In the end, I decided that analyzing only the data collected from the first eight participants enrolled in each sample was the best decision for this study, for reasons I stated in footnote 14 in Chapter 3.), I added the following steps to that recruitment process in order to seek to recruit 20 participants each for Samples 2 and 3:

I indicated to the participants I recruited from the retirees organization using the procedures described in the immediately preceding two paragraphs, that they could give my name and phone number to any retired university faculty member or retired university staff member of the university where they used to work, if they thought that that person might be interested in participating in my study. I told the participants whom I recruited from the retirees organization using the procedures described above to tell any person who they thought might be interested in participating that if that person was indeed interested in participating, then that person should call me. If that person called me, I read a telephone script to him or her to: (a) explain the study, (b) explain what participation in the study would involve, and (c) determine if the person was eligible to participate. If the person was willing and eligible to participate, I then set-up a one-on-one face-to-face meeting with him or her at which I obtained his or her consent to participate. That meeting took place either at the university where he or she used to work, or at some other location that he or she defined as his or her natural setting (that location (a) was in or near a particular large city in the American Midwest, (b) was quiet and bright enough to allow for quality video-recording to be done, and (c) offered privacy).

The Criteria I Used to Select Participants for This Study

I used criteria to determine participant eligibility for this study, but the sets of criteria I used for the various groups from which I recruited participants, were different. Members of the group of people who lived in either of the low-income elderly
communities that I noted above in this appendix, had to meet the following criteria to be eligible to participate:

1. They had to have full decision-making capacity--i.e., they had to not have limited decision-making capacity or lacked the ability to consent (Participants had to meet this criterion because they had to be able to choose to answer or not answer interview questions in this study as they wished, and to choose to answer the questions however they wished. To determine if a participant met this criterion, I asked him or her (during recruitment) if he or she, at that time, had a legally authorized representative who had to provide consent for him or her, since having a legally authorized representative is a clear indicator that one has limited decision-making capacity. If the participant said that he or she did not, at that time, have a legally authorized representative, he or she met this criterion.)

2. They had to be retired (To determine if participants met this criterion, I asked them (during recruitment) if they were retired.).

3. They had to be able to plan to meet two times during the period of approximately 3.5 months that I would be collecting data, for interviews (To determine if participants met this criterion, I asked them (during recruitment) if they could plan to meet two times during the period of approximately 3.5 months that I would be collecting data.).

Members of the organization of retired university employees that I noted above in this appendix, had to meet the following criteria to be eligible to participate:

1. They had to have full decision-making capacity--i.e., they had to not have limited decision-making capacity or lack the ability to consent (As noted above in this appendix, participants had to meet this criterion because they had to be able to choose to answer or not answer interview questions in the study as they wished, and to choose to answer the questions however they wished. To determine if a participant met this criterion, I asked him or her (during recruitment) if he or she, at that time, had a legally authorized representative who had to provide consent for him or her, since having a legally authorized representative is a clear indicator that one has limited decision-making capacity. If the participant said that he or she did not, at that time, have a legally authorized representative, he or she met this criterion.)

2. They had to be retired (To determine if participants met this criterion, I asked them (during recruitment) if they were retired.).

3. They had to be able to plan to meet two times during the period of approximately 3.5 months that I would be collecting data, for interviews (To determine if participants met this criterion, I asked them (during recruitment) if they could plan to meet two times during the period of approximately 3.5 months that I would be collecting data.).
4. They had to be either retired university faculty or retired university staff
(Because I selected the university retirees organization members to be in one
of two samples—one comprising retired university faculty and the other
comprising retired university staff—members of the organization who were
the spouses or partners of retired university faculty and staff were not
eligible to participate. I wished to obtain samples drawn from only two strata
within the organization (i.e., the strata which can be identified as “retired
university faculty” and “retired university staff”) so that I would be able to
observe variations that may have existed between these samples when I
analyzed the data I collected from them. I would not have been able to
capture these possible variations as easily if partners and spouses were
included in the samples. To determine if potential participants met this
criterion, I asked them (during recruitment) if they were either retired
university faculty or retired university staff.).

5. They had to be age 50 or older (One had to be age 50 or older to be eligible
to participate in this study because I anticipated that individuals who had
lived that long were more likely to exhibit a theoretical construct that was
important to the research—“instinctive responsiveness”—than individuals who
had not lived that long. I selected 50 years, in particular, as the minimum age
one had to be to be eligible to participate in this study because I had to select
an age that was both (a) old enough to ensure that participants had lived a
long enough time to make it more likely they would exhibit the theoretical
construct “instinctive responsiveness,” and (b) as young as possible, so as to
include as many members of the organization of retired university employees
as possible in the pool of members of the organization who were eligible to
participate, so as to make it more likely that I would obtain a sufficient
number of participants for the samples that would consist of members of the
organization. Incidentally, members of the low-income elderly communities
noted above, already met the minimum age (50) one had to be to be eligible
to participate because, in order to qualify to live in either of those
communities, one has to be age 62 or older.).

The retired university faculty and retired university staff who I recruited who
were not members of the retirees organization noted above, had to meet each of the five
criteria that the retirees organization members who I recruited, had to meet. In addition,
they had to be retired university faculty or staff of the same university that members of
the retirees organization were retired from (as opposed to being retired university
faculty or staff of another college or university), for the following reason: By being
retirees of that university, those participants enabled this study’s university faculty and
university staff samples to consist exclusively of retirees of a single university, a fact
that standardized those samples and maximized the elimination of (i.e., controlled) any
extraneous variables that may have existed due to the university or college one retired
from.
Appendix E: First Flyer Used to Recruit Participants for This Study’s Sample of Retired Low-Income Elderly

I used the flyer on the next page to recruit participants for this study’s low-income elderly sample. I distributed the flyer to residents of the low-income elderly community that I conducted a service-learning project with in 2007 as a member of the Ohio State University Multicultural Center’s Social Justice Cohort. At the time I distributed the flyer, that low-income elderly community consisted of an apartment building that contained several hundred apartments. I placed the flyer on the apartment door of each resident. The person whose name and work telephone number were listed on the bottom of the flyer was a staff member of the Public Housing Agency that owns and operates the low-income elderly community I distributed the flyer within. I wrote her name and number on the flyer, with her permission, so that residents of the low-income elderly community who saw the flyer could contact her—someone with whom they were familiar—if they had questions about the information session advertised on the flyer.

The flyer on the next page states that I planned to conduct two interviews and to hold two follow-up meetings with each participant recruited through the flyer. At the time that I distributed the flyer, indeed I expected I would conduct two interviews and hold two follow-up meetings with each participant. It turned-out that it was unnecessary for me to conduct two interviews with the participants in this study, however, because after
one interview with each participant, I discovered I had collected enough data to complete
the study.

Research Study

Thank you very much to those of you who participated in the “Workshop for Seniors” I
(Scott Mullins) conducted in April, 2007, at [low-income elderly community A]. I really enjoyed it.
I am offering another project to seniors living in [low-income elderly community A], and I would
very much appreciate your participation in it.

I seek participants for a research study I am conducting as a graduate student at Ohio
State. The study seeks to know if people see listening to and following their feelings in making
decisions as something that helps them negotiate life as happily as they can. The study is also
trying to find a way to tell the difference between human verbal responses that come from a
mental origin, from those that come from a proposed feeling nature of who we are.

I will conduct two interviews with each participant in the study. I will also hold two
follow-up meetings with each participant. Each interview will last 60-90 minutes. Each follow-up
meeting will last 45 minutes. The total amount of time each participant will be involved in the
study is 4½-5½ hours. That will take place over roughly 3½ months, beginning in January,
2009.

I will keep all information I collect in the study confidential, unless you choose to allow
me to share some of the information. If you participate, you can withdraw from participation at
any time, without penalty. If you participate, you will not have to answer any questions that you
do not want to answer. I will use the information I collect in the study in presentations, journal
articles, and in my thesis for my graduate program at Ohio State.

If you are interested in participating, or want to learn more about participating, please
come to the INFORMATION SESSION on:

Wednesday, January 7, 2009  2:00-4:00 p.m.
[Room number], [low-income elderly community A]

At the information session, I will speak about the study, and about what participation will involve.
You will be able to ask me questions about the study, and/or about participating in it, at the
information session. Thank you. Scott Mullins

If you have questions about the information session, you can contact [name], [job title] for the
[Public Housing Agency that owns and operates low-income elderly community A], at [phone
number]
Appendix F: Script Read in an Information Session Held to Recruit Participants for This Study’s Sample of Retired Low-Income Elderly

I read the following script in the information session I held to recruit participants for this study’s low-income elderly sample. I held the information session for the low-income elderly community that I conducted a service-learning project with in 2007 as a member of the Ohio State University Multicultural Center’s Social Justice Cohort.

The following script states that I planned to conduct two interviews and to hold two follow-up meetings with each participant recruited through the script. At the time that I recruited with the script, indeed I expected I would conduct two interviews and hold two follow-up meetings with each participant. It turned-out that it was unnecessary for me to conduct two interviews with the participants in this study, however, because after one interview with each participant, I discovered I had collected enough data to complete the study.

Script

Hello. My name is Scott Mullins. I am a graduate student in education at Ohio State. I am going to tell you today about the research study I am conducting, and about participating in it. Everything I tell you is written on this script I am holding. If you would like for me to repeat anything I say, please let me know. I will be glad to repeat things. Also, you will have a chance to ask me questions later in the presentation.

I am seeking participants for a research study I am conducting as a graduate student at Ohio State. The project seeks to know if people see listening to and following their feelings in making decisions as something that helps them negotiate life as happily as they can. The project is also trying to find a way to tell the difference between two kinds of human verbal responses: ones that have come from a mental origin—that is, responses that result from thinking-it-out, reasoning, and the use of logic, for example—,
and ones that have come from a proposed intuitive-instinctive source, which may be from a proposed feeling nature of who we are, rather than mental.

If you participate in this study, I will conduct two face-to-face interviews with you. I will also observe you during each interview, and write down any observations I have. Each interview will last approximately one hour to one hour and a half. The interviews would take place in an office just across the hall from here.

If you participate, the interviews I conduct with you will be video-recorded, and a person other than me may be operating the video camera. If you participate, you will be able to choose to allow me to let certain other people view video-recordings of my interviews with you. If you allow me to let certain other people view video-recordings of my interviews with you, I might show them in professional presentations I give. I might also allow other professionals to view the video-recordings so that these professionals could test my interpretations about your behaviors that are on the video-recordings. Any words spoken on the video-recordings that would allow others to know who you are--such as the names of people, or places--will be erased from the video-recordings. Your visual image and voice would be on the recordings, however, and the people who view them would be able to identify you because they would be able to see your image, and hear your voice on the recordings. Again, if you participate, you will be able to choose whether or not to allow me to let certain other people view video-recordings of you--that is your choice.

If you participate, you will also be able to choose whether or not to allow me to play, in professional presentations, audio-recordings of my interviews with you. Any words spoken on the audio-recordings that would allow you to be identified--such as the names of people or places--would be deleted from the audio-recordings before I allow others to listen to them. Your voice would still be on the recordings, however, and people would be able to identify you because they would be able to hear your voice on the recordings. As I said, if you participate, you will be able to decide whether or not to allow me to play, in professional presentations, audio-recordings of my interviews with you.

If you participate in this study, several weeks after each interview I will hold a follow-up meeting with you. In these meetings I will confirm with you that I correctly recorded what you said in the interview. In these meetings I will also show you any interpretations I made about what you said in the interview--and/or what I observed about you during the interview--in order to gain your feedback about those interpretations. These follow-up meetings will last 45 minutes. The follow-up meetings will not be recorded. They would take place in the office across the hall.

If you participate, the total amount of time you will be involved in the study is approximately four and a half to five and a half hours. That time commitment will take place over approximately three and a half months, beginning in [insert month here], 2009.

If you participate in this study, you can withdraw from participation at any time, without penalty. Also, if you participate, you will not have to answer any questions in the study that you do not want to answer.

I will use the information I collect in this study in professional presentations, in journal articles, and in my thesis that I will complete for my studies at Ohio State.
If you have any questions about anything I have just said, please ask me now. Or, if you would like for me to repeat anything that I said, please ask me now. [At this time I will answer in front of the entire group any questions any potential participant has. I will repeat information in this script to the potential participants, as necessary.]

Okay. Now I want to see if you are eligible to participate in this study. In order for you to be eligible, you must meet three criteria. I am going to read to you the three criteria. What I want you to do first, however, is raise your hand if you are interested in participating in the study. Okay. Now, I am going to read the three criteria, and I want you to keep your hand raised if you meet all of the criteria. Okay? [At this time I will wait to see if the potential participants understand the directions. If any do not, I will repeat the directions as necessary.]

Okay. Now I am going to read the three criteria.

One, you must not have a legally authorized representative who must provide consent for you to participate in the study. [At this time I will repeat the criterion as necessary.]

Two, you must be retired. [At this time I will repeat the criterion as necessary.]

And, three, you are able to plan on meeting me for two interviews and two follow-up meetings during the study. [At this time I will repeat the criterion as necessary.]

[At this time, I will count the number of people whose hands are still raised. Since I am able to include only 20 participants from [low-income elderly community A] in the study, if more than 20 people have their hands raised, I will conduct a raffle procedure that was approved by an Institutional Review Board at The Ohio State University] in order to select 20 potential participants and a maximum of 15 alternates from among those whose hands are raised. At the end of the raffle procedure (or, immediately after I count the number of people whose hands are raised, if 20 or less people have their hands raised and it is thus not necessary to conduct the raffle), I will continue with the script.

Okay. To those of you who are willing and eligible to be participants in the study [if it was necessary for me to conduct the raffle, I will begin this sentence by saying instead, “To those 20 of you who had your numbers drawn in the raffle...”], I would like to obtain your contact information. I also want to set-up a date and time to meet you so that I can obtain your consent to participate in the research, and conduct my first interview with you. I want also to make available to you my name and phone number, so that you can call me if you need to change or cancel our meeting. [At this time I will obtain each potential participant’s contact information (name and phone number), and ask him/her the date and time he/she can meet me. I will record all of this information in a notebook. Also, I will offer to each potential participant a card containing both a) my name and phone number, as well as b) the date, time, and place of the meeting I schedule with him/her. Because some of the potential participants may not be able to read at a level high enough to make them able to read the information on the card, I will indicate to each potential participant that [person A], a [job title] for [agency focusing on aging] who works daily with the elderly residents of [low-income elderly community A] (and who is thus someone with whom the potential participants are very likely to be familiar), will be available on weekdays to help potential participants use this information, as necessary. I will explain to each potential participant that [person A]’s office is located across the hall from where the information session discussed in
this document will be taking place. I will also explain to each potential participant that [person A] will have, in her office, the information I listed on the card, and that the potential participant could obtain that information from [person A] if the potential participant misplaces the card. If, for some reason, a potential participant elects not to take the card from me when I offer it to him/her, I will explain that [person A] will have, in her office, the information I listed on the card, and that [person A] can help the potential participant use that information, if the potential participant wants that help.

I have informed [person A] that she cannot answer questions potential participants may have about the study, recruit potential participants to be participants, or recommend to potential participants that they participate. She understands that she can only facilitate a given potential participant’s use of a) my name and phone number, as well as b) the date, time, and location of the meeting I schedule with the potential participant. [Person A] will store this information in a locked filing cabinet in her office, since each potential participant’s name will be listed with the record I give to [person A] that contains the date, time, and location of the meeting I schedule with that potential participant. Once potential participants give their consent to participate in the research and thus become participants, [person A] will store my name and phone number, as well as the date, time, and location of each meeting I schedule with a participant from [low-income elderly community A], in a locked filing cabinet in her office. She will provide, to a participant who needs it, my name and phone number, and/or the date, time, and location of any meeting I scheduled with the participant. [Person A] will also help the participant use that information, if the participant wants that. At the end of the study, [person A] will return to me the information I have said she will store, at which time I will shred it.

[At this time, if there are alternates, I will continue with the script. If there are no alternates, I will conclude the meeting.] Okay. To those of you who are alternates, I want to obtain your contact information. I will contact you if, during the first two weeks after I have started the study, any of the people who were selected to be participants in the raffle decide they cannot participate. I will contact you in the order in which your numbers were drawn in the raffle. If space does not become available for you to participate, I will contact you to let you know that. I want also to make available to you my name and phone number, in case you need to tell me you cannot serve as an alternate. [At this time I will obtain each alternate’s contact information (name and telephone number). I will record this information in a notebook. Also, I will offer to each alternate a card containing my name and phone number. Because some of the alternates may not be able to read at a level high enough to make them able to read this information, I will indicate to each alternate that [person A], who I discussed above, will be available on weekdays to help the alternate use the information, as necessary. I will explain to each alternate that [person A]’s office is located across the hall from where the information session discussed in this document will be taking place. I will also explain to each alternate that [person A] will have, in her office, my name and phone number, and that the alternate could obtain that information from [person A] if the alternate misplaces the card that contained that information I offered to the
alternate. If, for some reason, an alternate elects not to take the card I offer to him/her, I will explain that [person A] will have, in her office, the information listed on the card, and that [person A] can help the alternate use that information, if the alternate wants that help.

If I eventually call any alternate and indicate that space has become available for him/her to participate in the study, I will set-up a date and time to meet him/her so I can both obtain his/her consent to participate, and conduct my first interview with him/her. In that phone call, I will indicate to the alternate that he/she can obtain a record of the date, time, and location of the meeting we schedule from [person A]. Once any alternate gives his/her consent to participate in the research and thus becomes a participant, [person A] will store, in a locked filing cabinet in her office, my name and phone number, as well as the date, time, and location of each meeting I schedule with that participant. As I noted above, [person A] will provide, to a participant who needs it, my name and phone number, and/or the date, time, and location of any meeting I scheduled with the participant. As I also noted above, [person A] will also help the participant use that information, if the participant wants that help. Finally, as I noted above, at the end of the study [person A] will return to me the information I have said she will store, at which time I will shred it.
Appendix G: Second Flyer Used to Recruit Participants for This Study’s Sample of Retired Low-Income Elderly

I used the flyer on the next page to recruit participants for this study’s low-income elderly sample. I distributed the flyer to residents of a low-income elderly community owned and operated by the Public Housing Agency that owns and operates the low-income elderly community that I conducted a service-learning project with in 2007 as a member of the Ohio State University Multicultural Center’s Social Justice Cohort. The low-income elderly community within which I distributed the flyer on the next page consists of several hundred apartments. I placed the flyer outside the apartment door of each resident.

The flyer on the next page states that I planned to conduct two interviews with each participant recruited through the flyer. At the time that I distributed the flyer, indeed I expected I would conduct two interviews with each participant. It turned-out that it was unnecessary for me to conduct two interviews with the participants in this study, however, because after one interview with each participant, I discovered I had collected enough data to complete the study.
Research Study

I am seeking participants for a research study I am conducting as a graduate student at Ohio State. The study seeks to know if people see listening to and following their feelings in making decisions as something that helps them negotiate life as happily as they can. The study is also trying to find a way to tell the difference between human verbal responses that come from a mental origin, from those that come from a proposed feeling nature of who we are.

I will conduct two interviews with each participant in the study. The total amount of time each participant will be involved in the study is 3-4 hours. That will take place over roughly 3½ months, beginning as soon as possible. Your participation in the study would take place in [low-income elderly community B].

I will keep all information I collect in the study confidential, unless you choose to allow me to share some of the information. If you participate, you can withdraw from participation at any time, without penalty. If you participate, you will not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. I will use the information I collect in the study in presentations, journal articles, and in my thesis for my graduate program at Ohio State.

If you are interested in participating or want to learn more about participating, please call me, Scott Mullins, at 614-843-0496, as soon as possible.
Appendix H: Newsletter Announcement Used to Recruit Participants for This Study’s Sample of Retired University Professors and This Study’s Sample of Retired University Staff

It was through a single organization of retired university employees that I recruited the participants who comprised this study’s retired university professors and retired university staff samples. To help me recruit these participants, that organization printed the announcement below in its first three monthly newsletters of 2009.

The announcement below states that I planned to conduct two interviews and to hold two follow-up meetings with each participant recruited through the announcement. At the time the announcement was published, indeed I expected I would conduct two interviews and hold two follow-up meetings with each participant. It turned-out that it was unnecessary for me to conduct two interviews with the participants in this study, however, because after one interview with each participant, I discovered I had collected enough data to complete the study.
RESEARCH STUDY IS SEEKING PARTICIPANTS

My name is Scott Mullins. I am a Ph.D. candidate in education at Ohio State. I am seeking 40 members of the [organization of retired university employees]--20 retired faculty and 20 retired staff--to be participants in a research study I am conducting. The study is investigating whether people see listening to and following their feelings in making decisions as something that helps them negotiate life as happily as they can. The study is also trying to find a way to tell the difference between human verbal responses that come from a mental origin, from those that come from a proposed feeling nature of who we are.

I will conduct two face-to-face interviews with each participant. I will also hold two face-to-face follow-up meetings with each participant. Each interview will last 60-90 minutes. Each follow-up meeting will last 45 minutes. The interviews and follow-up meetings will take place in the [city], [state], area. The total amount of time each participant will be involved in the study is 4½-5½ hours. That will take place over roughly 3½ months, beginning in [insert month here], 2009. If you are interested in participating, and/or want to learn more about participating, please call me at (614) 843-0496 at your earliest convenience. Thank you.
Appendix I: Telephone Script Used to Recruit Participants for This Study’s Sample of Retired Low-Income Elderly

Script

I am going to tell you today about the research study I am conducting, and about participating in it. Everything I tell you is written on this script I am holding. If you would like for me to repeat anything I say, please let me know. I will be glad to repeat things. Also, you will have a chance to ask me questions later in the phone call.

I am seeking participants for a research study I am conducting as a graduate student at Ohio State. The project seeks to know if people see listening to and following their feelings in making decisions as something that helps them negotiate life as happily as they can. The project is also trying to find a way to tell the difference between two kinds of human verbal responses: ones that have come from a mental origin—that is, responses that result from thinking-it-out, reasoning, and the use of logic, for example—and ones that have come from a proposed intuitive-instinctive source, which may be from a proposed feeling nature of who we are, rather than mental.

If you participate in this study, I will conduct two face-to-face interviews with you. I will also observe you during each interview, and write down any observations I have. Each interview will last approximately one hour to one hour and a half. The interviews would take place in the building in which you live.

If you participate, the interviews I conduct with you will be video-recorded, and a person other than me may be operating the video camera. If you participate, you will be able to choose to allow me to let certain other people view video-recordings of my interviews with you. If you allow me to let certain other people view video-recordings of my interviews with you, I might show them in professional presentations I give. I might also allow other professionals to view the video-recordings so that these professionals could test my interpretations about your behaviors that are on the video-recordings. Any words spoken on the video-recordings that would allow others to know who you are—such as the names of people, or places—will be erased from the video-recordings. Your visual image and voice would be on the recordings, however, and the people who view them would be able to identify you because they would be able to see your image, and hear your voice on the recordings. Again, if you participate, you will be able to choose whether or not to allow me to let certain other people view video-recordings of you—that is your choice.

If you participate, you will also be able to choose whether or not to allow me to play, in professional presentations, audio-recordings of my interviews with you. Any words spoken on the audio-recordings that would allow you to be identified—such as the names of people or places—would be deleted from the audio-recordings before I allow
others to listen to them. Your voice would still be on the recordings, however, and people would be able to identify you because they would be able to hear your voice on the recordings. As I said, if you participate, you will be able to decide whether or not to allow me to play, in professional presentations, audio-recordings of my interviews with you.

If you participate, the total amount of time you will be involved in the study is approximately three to four hours. That time commitment will take place over approximately three and a half months, beginning as soon as possible.

If you participate in this study, you can withdraw from participation at any time, without penalty. Also, if you participate, you will not have to answer any questions in the study that you do not want to answer.

I will use the information I collect in this study in professional presentations, in journal articles, and in my thesis that I will complete for my studies at Ohio State.

If you have any questions about anything I have just said, please ask me now. Or, if you would like for me to repeat anything that I said, please ask me now. \[At this time I will answer any questions the potential participant has. I will repeat information in this script to the potential participant, as necessary.\]

Okay. Now I want to see if you are eligible to participate in this study. In order for you to be eligible, you must meet three criteria. I am going to read to you each of the three criteria. After I read each criterion, I want you to tell me if you meet it, okay? \[At this time I will wait to see if the potential participants understand the directions. If he/she does not, I will repeat the directions as necessary.\]

One, you must not have a legally authorized representative who must provide consent for you to participate in the study. \[At this time I will repeat the criterion as necessary.\]

Two, you must be retired. \[At this time I will repeat the criterion as necessary.\]

Three, you are able to plan on meeting me for two interviews for the study. \[At this time I will repeat the criterion as necessary.\]

Okay.

I would like now to set-up a time and a place to meet with you so that I can obtain your consent to participate in the research and conduct my first interview with you. \[At this time I will set-up the meeting with the individual.\]

Okay. I would like now to obtain your contact information--your name and telephone number--, so I can contact you if for some reason I need to change the date or time of our meeting. I want also to make sure that you have my contact information--my name and telephone number--, in case you need to change the date, time, and/or location of our meeting. \[At this time I will exchange contact information with the potential participant, and conclude the phone call.\]

Okay. Finally, do you know any residents of your building that may be interested in participating in my study? \[At this time I will wait for the individual’s response. If the individual can think of a person or persons who may be interested in participating, I will ask the individual to give my name and phone number to that person/those persons, as well as ask the individual to tell that person/those persons that they should call me if they are indeed interested in participating. After doing this, I will conclude the phone call. If the individual cannot think of anyone who may be interested in participating in my study, I will conclude the phone call.\]
Thank you for calling about the study. I am going to tell you today about the study, and about participating in it. Everything I will tell you is written on a script I am reading. If you would like for me to repeat anything that I say, please let me know. I will be glad to repeat things. Also, you will have a chance to ask me questions later in the phone call.

I am seeking participants for a research study I am conducting as a graduate student at Ohio State. The study is investigating whether people see listening to and following their feelings in making decisions as a contributor to negotiating life as happily as they can. The study is also trying to find a way to separate human verbal responses that have come from a mental origin--that is, responses that result from thinking-it-out, reasoning, and the use of logic, for example--from those that have come from a proposed intuitive-instinctive source, which may be from a proposed feeling nature of who we are, rather than mental.

If you participate in this study, I will conduct two face-to-face interviews with you. I will also observe you during each interview, and write down any observations I have. Each interview will last approximately one hour to one hour and a half. My first preference is that the interviews would take place at [location A]. If, for some reason, you cannot meet at [location A], we would have to meet at a location in [city] that you would call your “natural setting.” If we meet at [location A], you would need to pay for any buses, taxis, or fuel you use in getting to and from there. You would also have to pay any parking fees you are charged at [location A].

If you participate, the interviews I conduct with you will be video-recorded, and a person other than me may be operating the video camera. If you participate, you will be able to choose to allow me to let certain other people view video-recordings of my interviews with you. If you allow me to let certain other people view video-recordings of my interviews with you, I might show them in professional presentations I give. I might also allow other professionals to view the video-recordings so that these professionals could test my interpretations about your behaviors that are on the video-recordings. Any words spoken on the video-recordings that would allow others to know who you are--such as the names of people, or places--will be erased from the video-recordings. Your visual image and voice would be on the recordings, however, and the people who view them would be able to identify you because they would be able to see your image, and hear your voice on the recordings. Again, if you participate, you will be able to choose
whether or not to allow me to let certain other people view video-recordings of you--that is your choice.

If you participate, you will also be able to choose whether or not to allow me to play, in professional presentations, audio-recordings of my interviews with you. Any words spoken on the audio-recordings that would allow you to be identified--such as the names of people or places--would be deleted from the audio-recordings before I allow others to listen to them. Your voice would still be on the recordings, however, and people would be able to identify you because they would be able to hear your voice on the recordings. As I said, if you participate, you will be able to decide whether or not to allow me to play, in professional presentations, audio-recordings of my interviews with you.

If you participate in this study, the total amount of time you will be involved in the study is approximately three to four hours. That time commitment would take place over approximately three and a half months, beginning as soon as possible.

If you decide to participate in this study, and you wish to withdraw from participation at any time, you can do so, without penalty. Also, you will not have to answer any questions in the study that you do not want to answer.

I will use the information I collect in the study in presentations, in journal articles, and in my thesis that I will complete for my studies at Ohio State.

If you have any questions about anything I just said, please let me know. I can repeat anything I just said, so please let me know if you have any questions.

[At this time I will answer any questions the potential participant has. I will repeat information in this script to the potential participant, as necessary.]

Okay. Based on the information I have told you, are you interested in participating in this study? [At this time I will wait to hear the potential participant’s response. If the potential participant answers in the affirmative, I will continue with the script. If he/she indicates that he/she is not interested in participating, I will conclude the phone call.]

Okay. What I want to do, then, is see if you are eligible to participate in the study. In order for you to be eligible, you must meet five criteria. I am going to read to you each of the five criteria, and after I say each one, I want you to tell me if you meet it, okay? [At this time I will wait to hear the potential participant’s response in order to make sure that he/she understands what I am asking. I will repeat the question and the two sentences that immediately precede it, if necessary. Once the potential participant indicates that he/she understands, I will proceed with the script.] First, you are able to give your consent to participate in the research on your own--that is, you do not already have a legally authorized representative who must do that for you. [At this time I will wait to hear the potential participant’s response in order to make sure that he/she meets the criterion. I will repeat my statement of the criterion if necessary. If the potential participant indicates that he/she meets the criterion, I will proceed with the script. If he/she indicates that he/she does not meet the criterion, I will conclude the phone call.] Second, you are retired. [At this time I will wait to hear the potential participant’s response in order to make sure that he/she meets the criterion. I will repeat my statement of the criterion if necessary. If the potential participant indicates that he/she meets the criterion, I will proceed with the script. If he/she indicates that
Third, you are able to plan to meet for two interviews for the study. \[At this time I will wait to hear the potential participant’s response in order to make sure that he/she meets the criterion. I will repeat my statement of the criterion if necessary. If the potential participant indicates that he/she meets the criterion, I will proceed with the script. If he/she indicates that he/she does not meet the criterion, I will conclude the phone call.\]

Fourth, you are a retired \[university A\] faculty member \[or, “a retired \[university A\] staff member,” as the case may be\]. \[At this time I will wait to hear the potential participant’s response in order to make sure that he/she meets the criterion. I will repeat my statement of the criterion if necessary. If the potential participant indicates that he/she meets the criterion, I will proceed with the script. If he/she indicates that he/she does not meet the criterion, I will conclude the phone call.\]

Fifth, you are 50 years of age or older. \[At this time I will wait to hear the potential participant’s response in order to make sure that he/she meets the criterion. I will repeat my statement of the criterion if necessary. If the potential participant indicates that he/she meets the criterion, I will proceed with the script. If he/she indicates that he/she does not meet the criterion, I will conclude the phone call.\]

Okay.

I would like now to set-up a time and a place to meet with you so that I can obtain your consent to participate in the research and conduct my first interview with you. \[At this time I will set-up the meeting with the individual.\]

Okay. Now I would like to obtain your contact information--your name and telephone number--, so I can contact you if for some reason I need to change the date or time of our meeting. I want also to make sure that you have my contact information--my name and telephone number--, in case you need to change the date, time, and/or location of our meeting. \[At this time I will exchange contact information with the potential participant.\]

Okay. Finally, do you know any retired \[university A\] professors or staff who may be interested in participating in my study? \[At this time I will wait for the individual’s response. If the individual can think of a person or persons who may be interested in participating, I will ask the individual to give my name and phone number to that person/those persons, as well as ask the individual to tell that person/those persons that they should call me if they are indeed interested in participating. After doing this, I will conclude the phone call. If the individual cannot think of anyone who may be interested in participating in my study, I will conclude the phone call.\]
Appendix K: Verbal Script Read to Participants When Obtaining Their Informed Consent to Participate in this Study

The Ohio State University

Verbal Script Read in the Informed Consent Process

I will read this script to each participant in the study. Here is a copy of the script that you can use to read along as I read my copy of the script to you. The copy of the script I just gave to you is yours to keep in case you need it for future reference.

This script contains important information about the study and what to expect if you decide to participate. After I read the script to you, I will ask you if you want to participate. At that point, you will tell me if you want to participate. You will not have to sign anything in order to agree to participate.

Your participation is voluntary.

Please carefully consider the information I read to you. Please let me know if you want me to re-read something. Feel free to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to participate.

**Study Title:** “Trusting Intuitive Reactions: Attempting Instinctive Responsiveness in Low-Income Elderly, Retired University Professors, and Retired University Staff”

**Researcher:** The name of this study’s Principal Investigator is Dr. William D. Taylor. Dr. Taylor is also my official co-advisor at Ohio State, as is Dr. Seymour Kleinman. I am this study’s Co-Investigator. Dr. Taylor oversees my work in the study.

**Purpose:** This study has three main purposes:

1. To understand if people see listening to and following their feelings in making decisions as something that helps them negotiate life as happily as they can.

2. To learn when, where, and how people who see themselves as listening to and following their feelings in making decisions learned to do so.

3. To try to find a way to tell the difference between two kinds of human verbal responses:
   - those that come from a mental origin--that is, from thinking-it-out, reasoning, and the use of logic, for example--,
• those that come from a proposed intuitive-instinctive source, which may be from a feeling nature of who we are, rather than mental.

**Procedures/tasks:** If you participate, you will be involved in a number of procedures. Those procedures are as follows:

1. At the start of your participation, you would take part in a 1-on-1 interview. The interview would last about an hour to an hour and a half. It would be video-recorded. A person other than me may be operating the video camera. In the interview, I would ask you questions which you could answer however you wish, and which you could decline to answer without penalty. I would also observe you during the interview, recording my observations in a notebook.

2. Later in your participation, you would participate in a second 1-on-1 interview. This interview would last about an hour to an hour and a half. It would be video-recorded. A person other than me may be operating the video camera. In the interview, I would ask you questions which you could answer however you wish, and which you could decline to answer without penalty. I would also observe you during the interview, and record my observations in a notebook.

**Duration:** If you participate, the total amount of time you will be involved in the study is about 3-4 hours. That time commitment will occur over about 3½ months, starting today.

You may leave the study at any time. If you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with The Ohio State University.

**Confidentiality:** Efforts will be made to keep your study-related information confidential.

Also, if you participate, you can choose to let certain other people view videos of my interviews with you. These people would be audience-members at professional presentations I give. They might also be professionals who would test my interpretations about what is on the videos. Words allowing you to be identified (such as the names of people or places) would be deleted from the videos before these people view them. Your face and voice would still be on the videos, however, so these people could possibly identify you. Therefore, if you let me show the videos to these people, I cannot guarantee that the information on the videos would be kept confidential.

If you participate, you can choose, also, to let certain other people listen to audio-recordings of my interviews with you. These people would be audience-members at
professional presentations I give. Words allowing you to be identified (such as the names of people or places) would be deleted from the recordings before these people listen to them. Your voice would still be on the recordings, however, so these people could possibly identify you. Therefore, if you let these people listen to audio-recordings of my interviews with you, I cannot guarantee that the information on the recordings would be kept confidential.

If you participate, I will collect information from you by which you could be identified. Once the study is complete, I will save that information until I retire about 35 years from now. I will make efforts to protect the confidentiality of that information during that time. At my retirement, I will dispose of that information.

Again, efforts will be made to keep your study-related information confidential. However, there may be circumstances where this information must be released. For example, personal information regarding your participation in this study may be disclosed if required by state law. Also, your records may be reviewed by the following groups:

- Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies;
- The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board or Office of Responsible Research Practices.

**Risks and benefits:** If you participate, there is a risk that there could be a breach of the confidentiality of the information I collect from you. To minimize the risk of a breach of confidentiality, I will follow certain procedures. I will now list those procedures:

1. I will store the following in either a locked file cabinet or a locked file box:
   - papers containing your name and contact information
   - compact discs (CDs) containing audio-recordings of my interviews with you
   - digital video discs (DVDs) containing videos of my interviews with you
   - notes I take when I observe you
   - a USB (universal serial bus) flash drive containing words that allow you to be identified

2. Words allowing you to be identified will be removed from the following:
   - quotes of things you say that I use in presentations and writings
   - video- and audio-recordings of my interviews with you
   - notes I take when I observe you
   - a USB flash drive on which I will store data during the study

3. I will store the following on password-protected computer hardware:
   - your name and contact information
   - videos of my interviews with you
• words allowing you to be identified that I remove from the following:
  ➢ video- and audio-recordings of my interviews with you
  ➢ notes I take when I observe you

4. I will identify the following using a confidential identification number, instead of your name:
• information I collect from you that I enter into a computer program in order to analyze that information
• each CD containing an audio-recording of one of my interviews with you
• each DVD containing a video of one of my interviews with you
• notes I take when I observe you

5. I will destroy or erase the following once I no longer need them for the study:
• papers containing your name and contact information
• videos stored on the camera used to record interviews
• CDs containing audio-recordings of my interviews with you
• DVDs containing videos of my interviews with you

6. If you choose to let professionals other than me view videos of my interviews with you, so that these professionals can test my interpretations about what is on the videos, and I let these professionals view the videos, I will do the following:
• give the videos to the professionals in-person, rather than by mail, so as to avoid the possibility of losing the videos in the mail
• tell the professionals that they:
  ➢ must store the videos in a locked storage unit
  ➢ cannot allow others to view the videos
  ➢ cannot view the videos for purposes other than testing my interpretations about what is on the videos
  ➢ must return the videos to me in-person, rather than by mail, so as to avoid the possibility of losing the videos in the mail

7. If you choose not to let me contact you after the study to recruit you to participate in future studies, at the end of the study I will erase your name and contact information from the computer hardware on which it will have been stored during the study.

8. The person who listens to CDs of the interviews so that he/she can type what is said in the interviews will store the CDs in a locked file box. He/she will return the CDs to me when he/she is done typing what is said on them.
Because I would follow the procedures I just listed, it is unlikely that there would be a breach of the confidentiality of the information I collect from you, should you participate. Also, the risk of there being a breach of the confidentiality of the information I collect from you, should you participate, is not a serious risk. That is because if there is a breach of the confidentiality of that information, the information is not the kind of information that could potentially cause you social, economic, or legal harms.

Okay. Now I will turn to the potential benefits one can reasonably expect will result from this study.

A potential benefit one can reasonably expect will result from this study is that the study will expand knowledge by achieving the three main purposes of the study I described earlier.

Another potential benefit one can reasonably expect will result from this study is that a new theory will result from it. That theory would seek to explain the information I collect from the study participants. It would also perhaps be a more developed version of the theory I have been developing which is currently guiding the study. That theory proposes there is a universal language of feeling people can understand.

Another potential benefit one can reasonably expect will result from this study is that the study will point to directions for future research. The study may do so by finding a way to tell the difference between the two kinds of human verbal responses I mentioned earlier. The study may not find a way to tell the difference between these two kinds of responses. If it does not, it may provide the benefit of pointing to directions for future research by creating a theory that can guide research into eventually, hopefully, finding such a way.

How the potential benefits I have named, if they result, would benefit the participants, society, and/or others, is uncertain at this time.

I do not anticipate that you will benefit directly from participating in this study.

**Incentives:** I am not providing incentives to participate in this research. You will not be paid to participate in the study.

**Participant rights:** You may refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you are a student or employee at Ohio State, your decision will not affect your grades or employment status.
If you choose to participate in the study, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. By giving your consent to participate in the study, you do not give up any personal legal rights you may have as a participant in this study.

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The Ohio State University reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

Contacts and Questions:

- For questions, concerns, or complaints about the study, you may call me, Scott Mullins, at (614) 843-0496.

- For questions about your rights as a participant in this study, or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may call Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at Ohio State, at 1-800-678-6251.

- If you are injured as a result of participating in this study, or, for questions about a study-related injury, you may call me, Scott Mullins, at (614) 843-0496.

If you need to call me or the other person I just mentioned, you can find our phone numbers in the copy of the script that I gave to you.

For participants to whom I am reading this script who are residents of [low-income elderly community A], at this point in the script I will read the sentences written immediately below this section of italicized text. I will do so because some of these participants may not be able to read and write at the 8th grade level, and as a result may need assistance contacting the people they can contact regarding particular study-related matters. The script that I read to residents of [low-income elderly community A] will not contain the text written in this section of italicized text.

You can also obtain our names and phone numbers from [person A], whose office is located on the ground floor of [low-income elderly community A]. [Person A] can help you call either or both of us about the study, if you want her help doing that.

[Person A] is a [job title] for [agency focusing on aging]. The [public housing agency that owns and operates low-income elderly community A] allows her to have an office in its [low-income elderly community A] community. She works daily with the elderly residents of [low-income elderly community A], and the participants I recruit from there are very likely to be familiar with her. I have obtained [person A]’s permission to write in this script the information about her I have written in it. I have informed her that she is not listed as key personnel for the study. I have informed her that she cannot answer questions participants may have about the study, but only facilitate participants’ calling the people they can call regarding particular study-related matters. The script that I read
Participant costs: If you participate, and you choose for my interviews with you to be conducted at locations other than your home, you may incur travel expenses in the form of bus or taxi fares, parking, and fuel costs.

Questions the participant may have at this time: I have read to you the information I need to give you about this study and what to expect if you decide to participate. At this time, I would like to ask if you have any questions. Do you have any questions? [At this time I will answer any questions the potential participant has, to his/her satisfaction.]

Giving consent to participate: Now that I’ve read to you what I need to tell you, I am going to ask you if you give your consent to participate in this study. I will read the following statement to you, and I want you to tell me whether you agree with it or not. If you say you agree with it, then you are giving your consent to participate in the study. Here is the statement:

You have had this script read to you, and you are aware that you are being asked to participate in a research study. You have had the opportunity to ask questions, and you have had them answered to your satisfaction. You voluntarily agree to participate in this study. You are not giving up any legal rights by agreeing to participate in this study. You have been provided with a copy of this script.
Do you agree with the statement I just read? Please say yes or no. I can repeat the statement if necessary.

[At this time, I will wait to hear if the potential participant says yes or no, or asks me to repeat the statement. If he/she says yes, I will continue reading the remainder of this script. If he/she says no, I will conclude the meeting.]

**Giving permission to let certain people view videos of my interviews with you:** Now I will ask you if you agree to let certain people view videos of my interviews with you. Because you don’t know what will be said in the interviews yet, I will ask you again, after my final interview with you, if you will let these people view the videos. That way you will know what was said in the interviews, and what these people could see when they view the videos.

Also, as I said earlier, words allowing you to be identified would be removed from the videos before the people view them. Your face and voice would still be on the videos, however, so the people could possibly identify you.

Okay. Please answer my question by saying yes or no. Do you agree to let the following people view videos of my interviews with you: audience-members at professional presentations I give, and professionals who would test my interpretations about what is on the videos? [At this time I will wait to hear if the participant says yes or no. I will record the participant’s decision in a notebook.]

**Giving permission for me to let certain people listen to audio-recordings of my interviews with you:** Now I will ask if you agree to let certain people listen to audio-recordings of my interviews with you. Because you don’t know what will be said in the interviews yet, I will ask you again, after my final interview with you, if you will let these people listen to the audio-recordings. That way you will know what was said in the interviews, and what these people could hear when they listen to the recordings.

Also, as I said earlier, words allowing you to be identified would be removed from the recordings before the people listen to them. Your voice would still be on the recordings, however, so the people could possibly identify you.

Okay. Please answer my question by saying yes or no. Do you agree to let audience-members at professional presentations I give listen to audio-recordings of my interviews with you? [At this time, I will wait to hear if the participant says yes or no. I will record the participant’s decision in a notebook.]

**Giving permission for me to contact you to recruit you to participate in future studies:** Please answer my question by saying yes or no. Can I contact you after the study to recruit you to participate in future studies? [At this time, I will wait to hear if the participant says yes or no. I will record the participant’s decision in a notebook.]