

# Creating a Synthesis of Intentionality

## The Role of the Bracketing Facilitator

*Nancy Drew, PhD*

The role of a bracketing facilitator during the analysis phase of phenomenological research is discussed. As a research colleague, a bracketing facilitator plays an important part in a fellow researcher's task of uncovering his or her constitutive relationship with the research phenomenon. The primary task of a bracketing facilitator is providing assistance for a colleague in moving away from the usual cognitive mode of thinking during data analysis and into a state of emotional sensitivity to personal history and experience of the phenomenon. A step-by-step approach to the search for personal connections is presented, including an example of the process of facilitating this search. A table of guidelines that includes specific points for the act of bracketing as well as the content to be bracketed is intended as a tool for the development of phenomenological description. **Key words:** *bracketing, intentionality, meaningfulness, method, phenomenology*

**W**HETHER it is conducted within the positivistic paradigm of the natural sciences or from a phenomenological perspective, the hallmark of credible research is evidence of objectivity in the planning and execution of the research. A study's credibility hinges on how well the researcher has ensured that the data that have been collected are valid and analysis procedures clearly and completely described. Phenomenological research views objectivity, and thus the construed truth value of the study, as dependant on how rigorously and effectively the researcher's subjective experience with the phenomenon is explicated. Such explication means that the researcher's own experience of the phenomenon, the event or thing under investigation, is recognized for its contribution to the phenomenon.<sup>1-3</sup> In phenomenological parlance, the task of sorting out the qualities that belong to the researcher's experience of the phenomenon is referred to as

*bracketing*. Gadamer's term for content that is bracketed is *preunderstanding*, the presuppositions and prejudices that all researchers bring to their work.<sup>4</sup> Bracketing preunderstanding is a never-ending task that begins at the inception of a research project and continues throughout until the research is completed.

In Paley's provocative article, he correctly asserts that identifying preconceptions is an activity that the phenomenological researcher must do alone.<sup>5</sup> Individuals are the sole arbitrators of their own subjective experience, for no one can experience firsthand another's subjectivity. The phenomenon that a phenomenological study explores should be understood as stemming not simply from the empirical world, but from the researcher's consciousness of the empirical world. Although in typical phenomenological studies, researchers gather others' accounts of their experiences, the impetus for the research, the selection of the topic, and the final description are products of and belong to the researcher as phenomenologist. This is why researchers self-awareness is crucial to the validity of phenomenological research.<sup>6,7</sup> Although Paley<sup>5</sup> refers to the identification of

---

*From the Saint Joseph College, West Hartford, Conn.*

*Corresponding author: Nancy Drew, PhD, Saint Joseph College, 1678 Asylum Ave, West Hartford, CT 06117 (e-mail: ndrew@sjc.edu).*

preconceptions as a solipsistic activity, the daunting nature of this task can often be accomplished more readily with some practical help from research colleagues, which is the focus of this article.

### RETURNING TO THE DATA

Bracketing is a state of mind as well as an act. Phenomenological researchers entertain a bracketing state of mind continuously, but the act of bracketing is undertaken according to researchers' understanding of and convictions about it.<sup>8</sup> Beech discusses bracketing as an element of interviewing style and attests to the difficulty encountered in phrasing questions and responses to an interviewee without implying personal beliefs and values.<sup>9</sup> Munhall characterizes such an approach to phenomenological interviewing as taking an attitude of "unknowing" to be open to the meanings that others attribute to their experiences.<sup>10</sup> LeVasseur distinguishes bracketing everyday assumptions of the natural attitude as less problematic than the more radical stance of bracketing all theory and prior knowledge of a phenomenon.<sup>11</sup> When Giorgi spoke at the University of Minnesota's 1998 Conference on Phenomenological Nursing Research, he maintained that bracketing is properly done in the analysis phase of research, and asserted that bracketing is not appropriate while interviewing, when engagement with the other takes precedence. Although phenomenological researchers do not want their own values and experience to influence the process of interviews by swaying interviewees toward their perspective, the importance of establishing open and trusting relationships with interviewees is unquestioned.<sup>12</sup> The objective of bracketing and of the phenomenological reduction is to uncover the way that phenomenological researchers understand their own experience and the natural tendency to assume that others see it that way too. Merleau-Ponty beautifully expressed the nature and purpose of the phenomenological reduction when he wrote,

"... it slackens the intentional threads which attach us to the world and thus brings them to our notice."<sup>13</sup>(pxiii)

A style of engaged objectivity for phenomenological interviewing means that interviewers are present in the moment as empathic listeners and at the same time aware of the potential for their own prejudices, beliefs, and assumptions to influence the way that the other responds. Phenomenological interviewers strive to be open from a step-removed position where they can watch their own mental processes. Not an easy task! Schutz expressed it as a "... turning back from the seemingly ready-made object of our thought to the different activities of our mind in which and by which it has been constituted step by step."<sup>14</sup>(p111)

As have all phenomenological researchers, I have struggled to understand what bracketing means and what it entails. One day I had an "ah-ha!" experience when the thought came that psychodrama and phenomenology have something in common in the notion of meaningfulness. In this moment of insight it occurred to me that meaningfulness is epistemologically significant because it informs phenomenologists about what to bracket.

I discovered the relationship between meaningfulness and epistemology during my training as a psychodramatist. Intimately held values and beliefs are revealed when a psychodramatist helps a protagonist to show the group a meaningful experience from his or her life.<sup>15</sup> What is considered meaningful points toward one's deepest feelings and desires. Having enacted a meaningful experience, protagonists discover something about who they are. The meaningfulness they enact articulates preunderstanding.

Both psychodrama and phenomenology uncover preunderstanding and personal meaning. For phenomenological researchers, self-discovery and self-knowledge are directly available during data analysis. The process of explicating interviewees' experiences gives phenomenological researchers the opportunity to know themselves. When researchers choose passages of transcript

text for analysis, they do so because the passages seem meaningful, even if they are not sure at the moment what that meaning is. Those choices carry information about the values and beliefs that researchers have acquired from their own life experience. The choices indicate how researchers are already connected to the research phenomenon. Recognizing the significance of the choices of text passages is the first step in identifying one's preunderstanding to temporarily set it aside as data are analyzed. Meaningfulness is an epistemological tool because it shows phenomenologists what to bracket. Such self-knowledge is crucial for effective bracketing as they craft descriptions of interviewees' experiences.

Although bracketing is an ongoing process throughout research activities, it is the bracketing done during the analysis phase of phenomenologic research that is of particular concern here. Field logs or journals are recommended as a bracketing strategy,<sup>9,10,16</sup> but this is a limited tactic. There is a more specific path available for bracketing researchers' assumptions and beliefs during analysis and it begins by returning to the passages in an interview transcript that earlier had captured the researcher's attention while looking for the meaning of the interviewee's experience. Most likely the researcher had highlighted these passages and then had written statements of premise next to them in the margin of the transcript. A statement is a premise if it makes a judgment or expresses a belief rather than simply reiterates the interviewee's words. For example, in a transcript of an interview with a teacher, I had highlighted a passage in which she was talking about her experience as a graduate student working toward a master's degree in education. She described how she had learned teaching techniques by watching a videotape of herself in a classroom. "Actually, that was the most valuable year of my life as far as looking back on all my education because it gave me skills and not just theory." In the margin next to this passage I had written, "action and doing have priority over mere discussion." I had made

a statement expressing a judgment about learning.

The statement of premise written for a transcript passage reflects the researcher's understanding of the interviewee's experience and transforms the interviewee's words into language that echoes the researcher's own beliefs as well as those of the professional discipline. Now, returning to the transcript to see his or her own part in the study, the researcher selects one of these passages that had stood out and for which a premise had been written. Looking at the premise in the margin of the transcript may convey a sense of excitement about the passage again. The researcher may sense that, as well as indicating an idea with which to characterize the interviewee's experience, it also holds personal meaning. A premise that is personally meaningful recalls the sense of excitement and intensity that was felt as the transcript passage was read for the first time.

As the researcher asks, "why have I noticed this particular passage?" it becomes clear that, rather than the interviewee's experience, the focus now is on the researcher's own thinking, perceiving, and understanding. The researcher is now wondering how his or her own personal history and experience prompted the statement of premise—the judgment—that was written in the margin of the text. In this moment of wonder, the researcher has shifted into the phenomenological frame of mind in which his or her own consciousness, own mental process, is the object of reflection. In short, the researcher has now undertaken the phenomenological reduction to see, to intuit the research phenomenon.<sup>1</sup> *Intuiting*, as Husserl intended the term, means to see the phenomenon in an all-at-once grasp of its meaning. Spiegelburg<sup>17</sup> and van Manen<sup>18</sup> provide clear and useful discussions of the phenomenological reduction and bracketing. In his historical exposition of bracketing and the phenomenological reduction, Spiegelburg stated, "The primary function of all reduction is to prepare us for a critical stock-taking of what is indubitably given before our interpreting beliefs rush

in.<sup>17(p119)</sup> Similarly, in van Manen's glossary, he described 4 aspects of the phenomenological reduction. His description captures the shift in attitude that characterizes how phenomenologists intuit lived experience.<sup>18</sup>

### **ROLE OF THE BRACKETING FACILITATOR: DISCOVERING THE QUESTION**

A shift into the phenomenological frame of mind and curiosity about their own mental processes brings researchers to the most arduous aspect of seeing their own connection to the phenomenon, for now they must search for the personal question for which the statement of premise is a response. Gadamer asserts that "... every statement has to be seen as a response to a question and the only way to understand a statement is to get hold of the question to which the statement is an answer."<sup>4(p106)</sup> Once discovered, this personal question, for which a statement of premise was a response, points to the origin of involvement with the research phenomenon. Discovery of the personal questions that underlie responses to the data is a challenging task, but often easier to undertake if the assistance of a trusted fellow researcher is available, one who can listen unconditionally as the researcher peels back the layers of personal history with the phenomenon.

Phenomenological researchers who assist colleagues to reflect on the mental activities involved in the analysis phase of a phenomenological study, specifically, bracketing personal experience and preunderstanding, have an extremely important role in the research. When a colleague begins the task of looking for personal connection to a study, it is essential that he or she abandons the cognitive mode of an analytic thinker and moves instead into the often-unsettling mode of emotional sensitivity to the memories, ideas, and beliefs associated with the research topic. The task as bracketing facilitator is to help a colleague find this emotional connection to the data. If the emotional level of involvement is

not accessed, bracketing will be done cognitively and superficially, without reaching the meaning that resides, often hidden, within emotions. The role of bracketing guide is to offer responses that help a colleague remain in touch with feelings. Toward this end, giving directives rather than asking questions is a more productive tactic. Questions can often require the other to think logically to formulate an answer, thus moving away from inchoate feelings that can be the segue to intuited meaning. The simple directive, "stay with that feeling," can gently encourage a colleague to follow the feelings where they lead.

The importance of an emotional approach to bracketing cannot be emphasized too strongly because the influence of positivism continues to cling to research. Positivistic science tries to rule subjective experience out of the research process. The goal of such research is to make the individual researcher superfluous so that with the appropriate method and research procedures anyone can reproduce a particular study. But accessing emotions is crucial to phenomenological research because personal involvement with something that is meaningful is first understood in a bodily way before it is articulated with language.<sup>19</sup> Experience is first understood bodily; emotions are the body's reaction to information.<sup>20</sup> Merleau-Ponty tells us that our perceptions and understanding have corporeal roots.<sup>13,21</sup> He addresses the age-old problem of the relation between mind and body:

... the body is no longer *merely an object of the world*, under the purview of a separated spirit. It is on the side of the subject; it is our *point of view on the world*, the place where the spirit takes on a certain physical and historical situation. ... We grasp external space through our bodily situation. A "corporeal or postural schema" gives us at every moment a global, practical, and implicit notion of the relation between our body and things, of our hold on them. ... For us the body is much more than an instrument or a means; it is our expression in the world, the visible form of our intentions. Even our most secret affective movements, those most

deeply tied to the humoral infrastructure, help to shape our perception of things.<sup>21(p5)</sup>

Merleau-Ponty's foremost thesis is the pre-eminence of perception as the "ground level for all knowledge."<sup>17(p560)</sup> Thus, bodily experience of the world is the gateway to understanding. Emotions show what is important to pay attention to. Emotions lead to the origins of interpretation.

### BRACKETING DONE FOR A PILOT-STUDY

Following is an example of the search for personal connection to a research phenomenon as it happened in a group of research colleagues. One of the members of the group had conducted a pilot-study to explore the experience of being an adjunct faculty. She had interviewed 2 adjunct professors of nursing at a small, private college in the Northeastern part of the United States. Following the typical procedure for the analysis phase of phenomenological studies, she had read each transcript several times, noting ideas that characterized her interviewees' experiences as adjunct faculty.

Returning to the transcripts to look for her own constitutive part in the study and her preconceptions of the adjunct faculty role, she found 7 statements of premise that she had written next to the various passages that had caught her attention. She had grouped these statements of premise on index cards according to similarity and had begun to consider personal questions for which the premises might be responses. To explicate her process of finding her own connections to the study, a portion of one of the interviews follows. In the interview, one of the adjunct professors is describing her experience with another professor, who had a full-time tenure-track position at the college where each was employed. The adjunct professor describes the setting, a large classroom laboratory in which each professor was working with a small group of students as they learned basic nursing skills:

*Interviewee:* We were sharing a lab in one large room with two different groups of students. [The other professor] didn't share her teaching tools with my group or with me.

*Researcher:* Did you ask her?

*Interviewee:* No. I didn't feel that I could. There's a boundary there and I didn't want to cross it.

In the margin of the transcript next to this passage the researcher had written, "A boundary exists between those with power and those without, leaving adjuncts to feel inadequate and insignificant." Considering this passage in the research group, the researcher was asked to articulate the personal question that might have called forth her statement of premise. She replied without hesitation that, for her, the question was, "Will I become an oppressor?" She then proceeded to identify, without difficulty, the origin of this question. She described how she had recently been intensely engaged in reading and thinking about theories of oppressed group behavior. In addition, she had just accepted a full-time tenure-track position with a college, where, until recently, she had been employed as adjunct faculty.

More problematic for the researcher, however, was finding the personal question underlying another one of her statements of premise. In each of the 2 transcripts there were several passages in which the interviewees talked about the loneliness of the adjunct faculty role. The researcher had written a summary statement of premise for these several passages. The statement was "Loneliness is painful." In her search for the personal question for which this statement was a response, she suggested to the research group that it might be something like, "what is loneliness?" But the group was dubious about this question and, after some discussion, rejected it as superficial. In the role of bracketing facilitator, the members of the group urged her to find the feelings she associated with loneliness. Eventually, her research colleagues posed a different question, asking her if it

might not be something like, "when will I feel loved?" Her reaction to their proposed question was startling. Her expression changed from that of someone who is thinking hard to solve a problem to the wide-eyed expression of one who suddenly has the right answer. "Oh, that's it," she said without hesitation, and proceeded to talk at some length about her own life, substantiating the proposed question, "when will I feel loved?" and describing its origin.

Gendlin has described the experience of finding the right words to fit inner feelings as a sudden bodily shift of the "felt sense" of our interior experiencing.<sup>19</sup> He explains that individuals have a sense of what they are experiencing before they have the words to name it. Part of the task of conveying to others what one is experiencing is learning to be aware of this bodily shift that occurs when the right words are found to express the feeling. This sudden shift was visible on the face of the researcher as she reacted to the group's intuiting of her experience. Later, as she recounted her experience in the research group, she stated, "The group helped find the trigger for me about loneliness. They steered me away from a direct, but superficial response to the statement of premise, instead the group led me to a more deep, personal reflection of loneliness." In this particular example of the collaborative work of colleagues in a research group, the group members intuitively understood that their fellow researcher's reluctance to enter into the feelings of loneliness made it hard for her to see her connection to the phenomenon.

The researcher stated that without the help of trusted colleagues she would never have seen the connection between her own experience and that of her interviewees. Her colleagues in the research group saw what she could not. Their intuitive grasp of her connection with the study facilitated her bracketing process. She also offered an important observation about the problem of objective engagement as an interviewer. She stated that her own experience as an adjunct professor had been important to the success of her

interviews. "Without my own experience of the phenomenon of being an adjunct faculty I wouldn't know to ask certain questions." While phenomenologists are careful to put aside, as far as possible, connections to the phenomenon under investigation, it is precisely those connections that engender the responses that can produce an interview of depth. The depth that is desired is realized when an interviewer evokes the other's experience not only rationally, but emotionally as well.

### CREATING A SYNTHESIS OF INTENTIONALITY

The act of identifying personal, historical connections to the phenomenon that is to be described automatically places this information within brackets where it can be seen in relation to the phenomenon. When facilitating bracketing for another, this role means allowing intuition to guide responses while listening to a colleague talk about personal connections to text passages. Experience in this role fosters the ability to sense when a colleague is in touch with feelings regarding particular passages. Trusting intuitive understanding, a bracketing facilitator asks for confirmation of a hunch, "would it be the case that . . .?" If a hunch is accurate, a colleague's response will immediately be recognizable as confirming; if inaccurate, he or she will clarify. For the person who is bracketing, the act of clarifying another's misperception is itself a segue to discovery of what may have been heretofore hidden self-understanding. Such understanding is crucial for phenomenologists to see their constitutive part in research.

When personal connections have been made explicit, the next step on the path toward phenomenological description is to create a synthesis of intentionality (SOD).<sup>7</sup> Intentionality is central to phenomenological philosophy.<sup>1</sup> It refers to the historical relationship between an individual and the objects or events of experience, or more simply,

directed awareness toward the things and events of everyday life. Surrounding objects are imbued with significance, "*as meant*."<sup>22(p85)</sup> Such meaning indicates a personal and historical relationship with the objects and events of life that is carried to all subsequent perceptions.

#### **GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING A SYNTHESIS OF INTENTIONALITY**

An SOI has 2 components: (1) themes derived from interviewees' accounts and understanding of their experiences and (2) the researcher's own assumptions, beliefs, and preunderstanding that have been bracketed. It is the second component that is the focus here.

Bracketing preunderstanding during the analysis phase begins by selecting those passages in the interview transcript that stood out as meaningful when the transcript was first read. Premise statements, already written in the margin next to meaningful passages, reflect beliefs and values about the content of the passage. At this point, it is not important

to know why the passage is meaningful. This will become apparent as the bracketing process proceeds.

With a statement of premise in view, the researcher is ready to discover a question that reflects the beliefs and values contained in the premise. The researcher looks for a personal question, and quite likely, it is an existential question, one that is central to his or her life. Once this core question is found, the search for its origin begins. Personal, existential questions often have roots in past experiences with others. There may be a particular incident or event that comes to mind. Or it may reflect a familiar family attitude. After the origin of beliefs is identified, those beliefs and any assumptions associated with them are listed. Then, referring to this list, the researcher writes a short biographical summary that traces a premise statement back to its source.

The biographical summary is compared with the themes that have been extracted from interviewees' accounts of their experiences. There will be similarities and differences. The task now is to combine the ideas and thoughts from the researcher's own

**Table 1.** Bracketing the researcher's experience for a synthesis of intentionality

The bracketing act	
1.	Choose a trusted research colleague who can assist in the bracketing process.
2.	Identify passages in the narrative data, eg, transcript or text, that are meaningful.
3.	For each meaningful passage, write a statement of premise that expresses the researcher's beliefs and judgment about the passage.
4.	Look for the personal question for which the statement of premise is relevant. This question is pertinent to the researcher alone, not to the interviewee or to the interview in general. It comes from the researcher's own life.
The bracketed content	
The origin of the personal question is the source of the researcher's preunderstanding about the phenomenon. It may be a specific life event, or a prevailing attitude.	
1.	List the assumptions and beliefs associated with the personal question.
2.	Write a brief summary that describes the source of preunderstanding about the phenomenon and the resulting assumptions.
3.	Compare the summary just compiled with the themes derived from interviewees' experiences. Merge the ideas from the researcher's biographical summary with the interviewee's themes into a synthesis that reflects both.
4.	Use the synthesis of intentionality to guide the written description of the research phenomenon.

experience of the research phenomenon along with that of the interviewees so that together they depict the phenomenon. The themes derived from the interviewees' accounts, compiled with the researcher's bracketed beliefs, create an SOI with which to begin writing a description of the phenomenon under investigation.

The phenomenon to be described comprises both the researcher's and interviewees' experience. Although it is a composite of both researcher's and interviewees' experience, ultimately the description is of the study participants' experience as the researcher, the phenomenologist, perceives it. The result of phenomenological research is solely the product of the researcher.

Guidelines for bracketing researcher's experience and developing an SOI are presented in Table 1. The guidelines discriminate the act of bracketing from the content that is bracketed.<sup>3</sup> The second and third steps of the bracketing act will already have been accomplished during the early phase of data analysis, wherein transcripts or text was read for recognition of ideas and concepts pertaining to the interviewee's experience.

In phenomenological research, a written description is more than a reiteration of the themes. Phenomenological description moves beyond the "parts" stage of analysis, where ideas were extracted as discrete data, toward a reassembling of the experience into a whole.<sup>4,23</sup> The final phenomenological description is a written account that captures the whole experience and conveys it as vividly as possible. Successful phenomenological description is instantly recognized by readers as something that they too have, or could have, experienced.

A phenomenological study that is based on an SOI provides the "auditability" de-

manded of credible qualitative research<sup>24</sup> because the ensuing description/interpretation can be traced back to its origins, the perceptions of interviewees as well as the researcher's experience and understanding of the phenomenon. The validity of such a study rests, in part, on the fact that the researcher has executed upon his or her own understanding the very method used to explicate interviewees' accounts of the phenomenon. To make consciousness itself subject to the phenomenological method is to act on Husserl's conviction that "...the mental processes of this research itself...should, when taken in phenomenological purity at the same time belong to the realm to be explored."<sup>1(p150)</sup>

Finally, as phenomenological researchers, the act of bracketing is more than setting aside assumptions and beliefs. In a larger sense, it is self-discovery. But such self-discovery is not a mental process learned and then incorporated into phenomenological work. Self-awareness is always part of consciousness. It is the nature of consciousness to be aware of itself and its acts.<sup>13</sup> "Self-consciousness is the very being of mind in action. The act whereby I am conscious of something must itself be apprehended at the very moment at which it is carried out..."<sup>13(p371)</sup> Since self-awareness cannot be escaped, it must be explored and understood. Phenomenologists raise self-awareness to a prominent level of functioning in their work. When they perform the phenomenological reduction and bracket personal experience they acknowledge the inherent position of transcendental subjectivity.<sup>25</sup> In Fink's words, to "...[disclose my] transcendental life...lifts it out of a hiddenness and 'anonymity' that is as old as the world."<sup>3(p14)</sup> Phenomenologists awake to the way that the world is constituted, and in the process may learn to see themselves for the first time.<sup>3</sup>

## REFERENCES

1. Husserl E. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Vol 1. Kirsten F. trans. Boston: Kluwer; 1998.
2. Heidegger M. *Being and Time*. Stambaugh J, trans. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press; 1996.
3. Fink E. *Sixth Cartesian Meditation*. Bruzina R,



- trans. Bloomington, Ind: University of Indiana Press; 1995.
4. Gadamer H-G. *Truth and Method*. Weinsheimer J, Marshall D, trans. New York: Continuum; 1994.
  5. Paley J. Husserl, phenomenology and nursing. *J Adv Nurs*. 1997;26:187-193.
  6. Drew N. A return to Husserl and researcher self-awareness. In: Polifroni C, Welch M, eds. *Perspectives on Philosophy of Science in Nursing: An Historical and Contemporary Anthology*. New York: Lippincott; 1999.
  7. Drew N. Meaningfulness as an epistemologic concept for explicating the researcher's constitutive part in phenomenological research. *Adv Nurs Sci*. 2001;23(4):16-31.
  8. Ashworth P. Presuppose nothing! The suspension of assumptions in phenomenological psychological methodology. *J Phenomenol Psychol*. 1996;27(1):1-25.
  9. Beech I. Bracketing in phenomenological research. *Nurs Researcher*. 1999;6(3):35-51.
  10. Munhall P. *Revisioning Phenomenology*. New York: NLN Press; 1994.
  11. LeVasseur JJ. The problem of bracketing in phenomenology. *Qual Health Res*. 2003;13(3):408-420.
  12. Boyd CO. Philosophical foundations of qualitative research. In: Munhall PL, Boyd CO, eds. *Nursing Research: A Qualitative Perspective*. 2nd ed. Boston: Jones & Bartlett; 2000.
  13. Merleau-Ponty M. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Smith C, trans. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul; 1962.
  14. Schutz A. *The Problem of Social Reality*. The Hague, The Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff; 1973. Natanson M, ed. *Collected Papers*; Vol 1.
  15. Nolte J. Protagonist without a problem. Presentation for American Society of Group Psychotherapy & Psychodrama; 1994; Baltimore.
  16. Munhall PL, Boyd CO, eds. *Nursing Research: A Qualitative Perspective*. 2nd ed. Boston: Jones & Bartlett; 2000.
  17. Spiegelburg H. *The Phenomenological Movement*. 3rd ed. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff; 1982.
  18. van Manen M. *Researching Lived Experience*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press; 1990.
  19. Gendlin E. *Focusing*. New York: Everest House; 1978.
  20. De Rivera J. *A Structural Theory of the Emotions*. New York: International Universities Press; 1977. Psychological Issues Monograph, No. 40.
  21. Merleau-Ponty M. *The Primacy of Perception*. Wild J, ed. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press; 1964.
  22. Natanson M. *Edmund Husserl: Philosopher of Infinite Tasks*. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press; 1973.
  23. Giorgi A, ed. *Phenomenology and Psychological Research*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press; 1985.
  24. Burns N, Grove S. *The Practice of Nursing Research*. 4th ed. Philadelphia: Saunders; 2001.
  25. Husserl E. *The Crisis of European Sciences*. Carr D, trans. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press; 1970.