

## *Introduction*

For the past twenty years, the Psychology Department of Duquesne University has been engaged in the project of re-founding the science of psychology as a human science. Its aims have been to identify and describe the perspective of traditional psychology, to broaden this perspective and to introduce other equally valid scientific perspectives, to arrive at research methodologies more appropriate to a human science and to formulate different approaches to the applied areas of psychology. Inspired by a vision of the human person radically new to the modern temperament, the Department has held to the two procedures consistent with this vision: description and reflection. The power of detailed descriptions of human experience along with reflections faithful to the descriptions has been amply demonstrated.

It is difficult to speak more definitively about the nature of the project since it is still emerging and many aspects of it remain to be worked out. However, at this point, it is possible to begin to notice trends or stages in the development of the project with regard to where we have been. By taking into consideration the present volume along with the two previous volumes of *Duquesne Studies in Phenomenological Psychology*, we may begin to discover what is consistent in the project and also what new trends have emerged.

The present volume begins, as do the two previous volumes, with theoretical articles, articles concerned with foundational issues, with paradigms and with issues that may have powerful implications for the conduct of psychology. It appears that the task of re-founding psychology in this way is a permanent feature of the project and that further horizons can be expected to keep emerging as we progress.

The studies in the second section of the present volume seem to represent a consensus of sorts on a particular way of doing qualitative research. In previous volumes there have been a few similar studies based on written descriptions by subjects. The fact that there are five in this volume does seem to reflect a trend toward the use of such protocols. In addition, similarities in the procedures also point to a growing consensus that this form of qualitative research holds promise. The fact that there is diversity with regard to further elaborations of these procedures also indicates that more refinements of the method remain to be worked out.

In a similar way, there are scattered articles in the first two volumes which could also be placed within the third section of the present volume, entitled "Hermeneutical-Phenomenological Psychology." This title and the procedures involved point to the emergence and more self-conscious use of another research method consistent with the project; that is, the interpretation of texts. At this point, the procedures are not as well spelled-out nor as consensual as those presented in the second section. Thus, this may also represent a trend.

In addition, the articles in the present volume are less concerned with a critique of the natural scientific or traditional approach to psychology and are addressed more to those who already have made their own critique. This trend may be an indication that the approach represented in these three volumes has arrived at a certain stage of maturity that is less dependent on the tradition for what it has to say. Rather, the task becomes one of finding and defining ourselves within the tradition of phenomenological thought and of sharing what we have discovered with each other.

Along with this trend, there is a growing acceptance of phenomenological thought and approaches within traditional psychology. Although we are not always happy with the depiction of phenomenology in traditional textbooks, there does seem to be a greater openness in that tradition to newer paradigms and approaches; moreover, many of the self-critiques made by traditional psychologists are reminiscent of our own statements, even if very moderately stated. Psychology in general seems to be moving slowly to a position closer to our own.

Thus, this volume represents where we have been. It also points to some new directions. As in the past, we will be concerned with foundational issues; there is no indication of an exhaustion of the many horizons remaining in this area. We have formulated and formalized a methodology which makes use of subjects' written protocols. Here there seems to be a growing consensus on the procedures involved—although many more elaborations of the method are possible. We have begun to formalize another methodology, hermeneutics, whose procedures remain to be worked out in a way appropriate for psychological research.

More generally, it appears that less energy will be devoted to identifying, describing or critiquing the perspective of traditional psychology. Many other psychologists have taken up this task, although not as radically. The work of broadening the perspective of traditional psychology will continue as well as the ongoing attempt to arrive at newer research methodologies and the elaboration of the ones already formulated. In the applied areas of psychology, there have been new understandings and different ways of doing traditional things presented. There is one area of psychology which seems to call for newer approaches such as have been developed in the research area and that is the clinical, to which David L. Smith addresses himself in one of the articles in this volume. Since most of the students attracted to phenomenology seem to have strong interest in the clinical area, this need seems great.

Thus, the articles in this volume represent the point at which we have arrived

after twenty years and also point to some possible directions for the future. We invite the reader to join in this project with us by reading the articles and assessing for himself what has been done and what needs to be done.