Quali-Quanti Virtual Symposium, 18-19 September 2020

"Quantitative Preserving the Qualitative: a Teaser for Integrating Methodologies"

PROGRAMME & ABSTRACTS

GMT-10 Honolulu	GMT-4 New York	GMT+1 London	GMT+2 Warsaw	GMT+8 Beijing	GMT+10 Sydney	FRIDAY, 18th of September
4:00	10:00	15:00	16:00	22:00	00:00	Prof. Joanna Rączaszek-Leonardi Introduction to the conference
						Prof. Hanne De Jaegher "Loving and Knowing: Enactive Methodology"
						Prof. Mark H. Bickhard "Science Doesn't Work That Way"
						Q & A (20 min)
5:15	11:15	16:15	17:15	23:15	1:15	break (15 min)
5:30	11:30	16:30	17:30	23:30	1:30	Prof. Bert H. Hodges "Looking for Values in All the Wrong Places"
						Prof. Sarah Bro Trasmundi "How can we understand reading and readers?"
						Q & A (20 min)
6:35	12:35	17:35	18:35	00:35	2:35	break in a virtual room (25 min)
7:00	13:00	18:00	19:00	1:00	3:00	discussion panel (60 min)
8:00	14:00	19:00	20:00	2:00	4:00	day closure

Please see the abstracts of all presentations on the following pages.









GMT-10 Honolulu	GMT-4 New York	GMT+1 London	GMT+2 Warsaw	GMT+8 Beijing	GMT+10 Sydney	SATURDAY, 19th of September
20:00	2:00	7:00	8:00	14:00	16:00	Prof. Vasu Reddy "Is it even a 'thing'? Getting a grip on 'new' phenomena"
						Q & A (10 min)
20:40	2:40	7:15	8:40	14:40	16:40	break (10 min)
20:50	2:50	7:50	8:50	14:50	16:50	Prof. Michael Richardson "The Symmetries and Order of Perception, Action and Cognition"
						Prof. John Sutton, Prof. Rachel W. Kallen, Sara Kim Hjortborg "Mixed-method studies of coordination: movement timing, conflictual interaction, and collaborative recall"
						Q & A (20 min)
21:50	3:50	8:50	9:50	15:50	17:50	break (10 min)
22:00	4:00	9:00	10:00	16:00	18:00	Prof. Li Wei "Doing Family Language Policy Research and the need to go beyond the quantitative versus qualitative dichotomy"
						Q & A (10 min)
22:35	4:35	9:35	10:35	16:35	18:35	break in a virtual room (25 min)
23:00	5:00	10:00	11:00	17:00	19:00	discussion panel (60 min)
00:00	6:00	11:00	12:00	18:00	20:00	day closure

Please see the abstracts of all presentations on the following pages.









Loving and Knowing: Enactive Methodology

Hanne De Jaegher, University of the Basque Country

What does it mean to penetrate the very being of something we are investigating, and what does this have to do with intersubjectivity and loving? Knowing something means: knowing what *it* is—and at the same time, knowing is done *by someone*. In the act of knowing, the known and the knower cannot but become entangled with each other. Their beings become mutually affected, at least. We gain the deepest knowledge of what it means for our very being to be affected, in our loving relationships (for better and for worse). (Kym Maclaren (2018) calls this "ontological intimacy".) What is it that we know about loving (in our relationships of friendship, family, and intimacy, and with all the tensions these entail) that can inform our scientific methodology? And what does this say about qualitative and quantitative methods? This is a huge topic for a 20 minute teaser presentation, and we'll only be able to touch on a few issues, which I will attempt to make as pointed as possible, so that they can be maximally generative and inspiring. One way to achieve this, is to talk about it in terms of an enactive research logic.

- 1. Kym Maclaren. 2018. Intimacy as Transgression and the Problem of Freedom. [link]
- 2. Hanne de Jaegher. 2019. Loving and knowing: reflections for an engaged epistemology. [link]









Science Doesn't Work That Way

Mark H. Bickhard, Lehigh University

Ernst Mach had an important influence on views of science, and that heritage is still strong in some domains, especially in Psychology. Mach was a strong materialist and empiricist. Science, in the views descendent from these positions, is a process of discovering and stitching together empirical data patterns, perhaps with statistical relations. In Psychology, this view is carried in several ways, but most strongly in current times by the ideology of operational definitions. Bridgman proposed operational definitions as definitions of scientific terms in line with the empiricism of the Logical Positivists' verificationist theory of meaning. The Logical Positivists recognized that neither the verificationist theory of meaning nor the related thesis of operational definitions could possibly work—in the 1930s. Psychology is still struggling to recognize these problems. I will outline this history and offer some alternative models of the workings of science.

- 1. Mark H. Bickhard. 2017. How to Operationalize a Person? [link]
- 2. Laurence D. Smith. 1986. Behaviorism and logical positivism: A reassessment of the alliance.
- 3. Frederick Suppe. 1977. The Search for Philosophic Understanding of Scientific Theories. In F. Suppe (Ed.) The Structure of Scientific Theories.









Looking for Values in All the Wrong Places

Bert H. Hodges, University of Connecticut

Values are generally treated as human possessions—my values, your values, our values—or perhaps, as human aspirations—justice, freedom, beauty. This leads to a search for measuring people's values (e.g., ratings, rankings, factor analyses) or trying to define the "objects" of aspirations through measurement (e.g., algorithms for complexity, geometries of beauty). But what if values are neither subjective nor objective, but relational opportunities and obligations? Using Asch's (1956) famous studies of social influence, I'll talk about how we cannot measure values, but we can stress ecosystem relationships in ways that reveal, qualitatively, the constraints by which we properly evaluate human actions (i.e., values), and in ways that are amenable to quantitative measurements.

- 1. Bert H. Hodges. 2019. Resisting knowledge, realizing values, and reasoning in complex contexts: Ecological reflections. [link]
- 2. Melissa A. Koenig, Valerie Tiberius, J. Kiley Hamlin. 2019. Children's judgments of epistemic and moral agents: From situations to intentions. [link]









How can we understand reading and readers?

Sarah Bro Trasmundi, University of Southern Denmark

As Di Paolo et al. (2018: 304) modestly suggest: "we are still a long distance from being able to say what happens while we are reading a text". Likewise, Dehaene, a neuropsychologist with expertise in the reading brain, states that reading, at first sight, appears to be almost magical, and a special talent that our brain was not originally designed for – and according to him, a true science of reading is only recently coming into being. Within this emerging framework, questions such as "how is a reader able to immediately understand written marks in ways that open up imagination?" Or, "what motivated the reader to grab a text or to finish it?" And "what guides the selection of the best way to read?" And at a larger scale, "why read at all?" Those questions cannot be fully answered by applying only one approach or method within interaction studies, cognitive psychology, linguistics, literacy or neuroscience. Similarly, neither qualitative nor quantitative methods, in themselves, will suffice. I suggest cognitive ethnography as a starting point to trace reading to how fine multi-scalar coordination enables readers to engage with written artefacts such as books. Ethnography of reading provides descriptions of how readers use sensorimotor activity to integrate understanding with saccading and actual or imagined vocalisation in ways that show how reading connects sensorimotor schemata with highly skilled use of written artefacts.

- 1. Ezequiel A. Di Paolo, Elena Clare Cuffari, Hanne De Jaegher. 2018. Linguistic Bodies: The Continuity Between Life and Language.
- 2. Sarah Bro Trasmundi, Matthew Isaac Harvey. 2018. A blended quantitative-ethnographic method for describing vocal sonification in dance coaching. [link]
- 3. Juan M. Loaiza, Sarah Bro Trasmundi and Sune Vork Steffensen. 2020. Multiscalar Temporality in Human Behaviour: A Case Study of Constraint Interdependence in Psychotherapy. [link]









Is it even a 'thing'? Getting a grip on 'new' phenomena

Vasudevi Reddy, University of Portsmouth

What do you do when you want to study something that grabs you but you don't know whether it can be an 'object' of study, and seems at the same time utterly entangled, ordinary and complex? The making of a division between the qualitative and the quantitative seems trivial. In this teaser talk—how can I resist—I am going to talk about the study of infant teasing and some of the issues that arose when I first embarked on it. Getting a grip on phenomena like this—or any phenomena?—may be hard. And it may in fact demand that we *be* gripped by them, not only at first, but throughout the research.

- 1. Vasudevi Reddy. 1992. Playing with Other's Expectations: Teasing and Mucking in the First Year. [link]
- 2. Vasudevi Reddy. 2017. Humility & openness to engagement (youtube lecture) [link]
- 3. Vasudevi Reddy. 2018. Why engagement?: A second-person take on social cognition. [link]









The Symmetries and Order of Perception, Action and Cognition

Michael J. Richardson, Macquarie University Rachel W. Kallen, Macquarie University

How is the patterning of behaviour organized? What defines what action possibilities or behavioural modes are afforded within a given task context? Is there a complementary relationship between the low-level physical laws that constrain the mechanics of embedded perceptual-motor behaviour and the higher-level cognitive decision making processes that define ongoing human activity? Using a range of complex systems phenomena we will discuss whether symmetry principles can provide a way of answering these questions. In particular, I will detail how Group theory and the theory of symmetry-breaking can be employed to understand and explain the dynamical order that defines everyday human behaviour.

Literature

1. Michael J. Richardson and Rachel W. Kallen. 2015. Symmetry-Breaking and the Contextual Emergence of Human Multiagent Coordination and Social Activity. [link]









Mixed-method studies of coordination: movement timing, conflictual interaction, and collaborative recall

John Sutton, Macquarie University
Rachel Kallen, Macquarie University
Sara Kim Hjortborg, Macquarie University

Three short talks offer a sampler of interdisciplinary studies of coordination dynamics being conducted at Macquarie University in Sydney. These projects span and seek to integrate methods and concepts from social, cognitive, and ecological psychology; sport science; cognitive ethnography; phenomenological philosophy; and science studies. These three six-minute micro-presentations address social motor coordination in relation to current challenges of social isolation and loneliness; patterns of interpersonal adaptation in a deceptive fighting sport; and the expansion of cognitive psychological experiments on memory to include embodied communicative action.

Short talks

- 1. Rachel W. Kallen, Michael J. Richardson, Daniel Richardson, Mario Di Bernardo & Lynden K. Miles. *Harnessing social coordination to promote interpersonal interaction and connectedness (in the time of COVID-19)*.
- 2. Sara Kim Hjortborg. Conflictual interaction dynamics in antagonistic sport: engaging through imposing in Muay Thai.
- 3. John Sutton, Kath Bicknell, & Celia Harris. *The Wisconsin moment: a cognitive ethnography of collaborative recall experiments*.









Doing Family Language Policy Research and the need to go beyond the quantitative versus qualitative dichotomy

Li Wei, University College London

This talk uses a current research project on Family Language Policy to argue that the dichotomy between quantitative versus qualitative approach is unhelpful. Research design and methods are driven by the research questions and in most cases both quantitative and qualitative data are needed to gain real understanding of the social phenomenon under investigation. Moreover, a critical approach is preferred in language and communication research.







