

## **Dialogue Paper 1**

Gregory C. Wright, LCPC, NCC

Department of Counselor Education & Family Studies, Liberty University

### **Author Note**

Gregory Cecil Wright

I have no known conflict of interest to disclose.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Gregory Cecil Wright.

Email: [gcwright@liberty.edu](mailto:gcwright@liberty.edu)

### **Synopsis of Article**

This article discusses and presents various points of views and shifts in thinking concerning how researchers can better view the controversies concerning action, the study's control, validity, voice, and reflexivity, as well as postmodern textual representation. One of the issues that the writers discuss pertains to maintaining rigor and the importance of truth and knowledge and how new-paradigm inquirers approach this controversy. While the authors spoke about the issues of objectivity, subjectivity, and bias, the authors present various ways of viewing validity, i.e. as resistant, as post-structurally transgressive, and as an ethical relationship. Voice and reflexivity's issues are explored, and the authors encourage the researcher to operate authentically concerning his/her voice, as well as the voices of the participants, and reflexive introspection during the research process (183). Finally, the writers discuss about postmodern textual representations, and the issues associated with the expanding definition of legitimate inquiry (185). The authors end this article by expressing their hope that researchers from the differing paradigms can work through their differing viewpoints, while, at the same time, acknowledging how truth, voice, controversies, and textual forms continue to grow, expand, and affect the validity of research (185).

### **Thinking Hat Process**

There are different ways to approach, view, or read articles. The use of de Bono's six thinking hats' methods can be quite effective and enlightening in processing what is written and read.

#### **Blue Hat**

There are several instances where I, as the thinker, had to organize my thoughts. The question about if the writer should truly rely on the authenticity of the findings caught my

attention (178). The author asked what he considered to be the central question as it pertains to validity and shared his conclusion that this question could not be finalized due to there being different alternative ways of viewing validity (180). Concerning reflexivity, I agreed with the writer about having to do some introspective questioning concerning the effects of paradoxes and binaries on our identities, our writings, and interactions with others (183).

### **White Hat**

There are aspects that I believe neutrality and objectivity were observed and present in the literature. I believe that the conversation about validity and the conflation between interpretation and method was neutral and objective, in that the result was that of two simultaneous disagreements (178). I also believe that the discussion about the 5 authenticity criteria was objectively written and believe that the shared facts about each one was done well (180). Finally, I believe that the discussion about the 7 new and emerging standards associated in the epistemology/ethics nexus was factual and well supported (182).

### **Yellow Hat**

There are several instances within this article where I felt positive, as well as optimistic. One instance is the discussion about how new-paradigm inquirers interact with the foundational controversy differently (177). I feel that this is constructive and positive thinking. Another instance is the positive discussion about the edges of the conversations concerning the paradigmatic issues and about the positive projection for qualitative methods down in the upcoming future (179). One of the most positive discussions in this text is about the elements of the crystal-as-metaphor and how this metaphor can be enlightening in the writing and reading to a text (182). This is very positive and inspiring.

**Black Hat**

There are several areas, which invoke a critical analysis and/or pessimism. One instance is where validity is discussed as a construct that is more irritating than the issue with objectivity (178). Another issue that I find to be negative is when voice was stated to be a multilayered problem (183). One of the most pessimistic statements in this text is in reference to the statement the author made about not believing that a resolution could be reached or would be beneficial concerning positivists and new-paradigm forms of inquiry (185).

**Green Hat**

Several instances are present, which present creative and new ideas. One instance is when the author suggested about the existence of several discussions that could be used toward judgments (professional & lay) concerning any piece of work (180). Another instance is the quotation used to shed clarification about how validity could be interpreted as seen by the properties in the crystal (181). That is a different way to view aspects of validity. A third instance could be the statement about us coming into a period of time in history that is presented with contested meanings, multivocality, etc. (183). These instances are enough to make you really pause and reflect.

**Red Hat**

There are several emotional views or thoughts in this piece of literature. One instance is when the writer wrote about the participatory and constructivist phenomenological models experiencing the sharpest shift (174). This language was emotional, and I could see the writer's basis for this discussion, which made me question my feelings about this discussion. Another instance is also the discussion about viewing validity with the crystal metaphor (181). I also

discuss about making paradigm shifts in looking at situations. This illustration helped me to view the issue with validity in a different way. I understood the conversation better.

### **Reflective Summary of Learning**

There are some key take aways from this week's reading. First of all, I had the opportunity to read and learn about the differing viewpoints concerning social action within research. As a researcher, I have to examine if I believe that action (social action) negatively affects my objectivity in producing rigorous research inquiry (175). Before reading this assignment, I did not know that such controversies existed. For right now, I believe that I need to read more about this controversy, in order to develop a better and more informed understanding. I do understand that there is a shift in thinking, especially as it pertains to people finding their voice(s) and how to express themselves.

Another take away from this reading is the discussion about the transgressive form of validity known as the "crystalline." I really could grasp the writers' discussion about examining the crystal metaphorically (181). This metaphor spoke well about validity because I believe that it aides people to better understand all aspects of interconnectedness in the research process (182). As a researcher, I plan to look at validity in this sense. I always discuss with clients about paradigm shifts and how looking at something from a different angle can produce a different perception all together. So, as a researcher, I plan to have an open mind concerning validity and what constitutes something as valid.

Overall, this was an interesting reading. I plan to reread this article again, in order to get a better grasp of the information presented. There are so many different aspects of qualitative research that I am just discovering and learning about. This can be overwhelming, but I am also

making a paradigm shift in my original thoughts or perceptions about qualitative research and all that it entails.