

**INCORPORATING RESEARCH INTO YOUR
EXPERIENTIAL AND FOT PRACTICE:
Midwifing the Implicit**

Kevin C. Krycka, Psy. D.

ABSTRACT

Thinking freshly is at the heart of an approach to research I call Implicit Inquiry. Implicit Inquiry has a process-oriented methodology with practical ways to carry forward one's whole implicit knowing into a form that can be publicly shared. It is part Thinking At the Edge, part embodied phenomenology and part aesthetics.

With this approach in mind, anyone can 'do' research better, but mainly, I want to emphasize that everyone who is using their felt-sensing is already engaged in the fundamental processes of Implicit Inquiry that makes for creating inspired knowledge. The aim of the Implicit Inquiry approach is to open up the arena of Focusing-related research conceptually and practically so that new knowledge flows into the world from multiple sources (e.g. psychotherapy, business, economics, physics, and so forth). Especially important to the human sciences is the idea that we advance and create knowledge that is relevant, responsive, and able to move forward the focus of inquiry—regardless of content or location. Listening, dwelling, and responding are key attributes of this approach that are well known to the Focusing community through both practice and through Gendlin's philosophy.

My personal hope is to build an atmosphere within the Focusing community that holds itself as a legitimate source of new knowledge.

**INCORPORATING RESEARCH INTO YOUR EXPERIENTIAL
AND FOT PRACTICE: Midwifing the Implicit**

I think it a fair characterization to say that many within the Focusing community do not first see themselves as researchers. On the one hand, this is a good sign, as it shows we are primarily committed to dwelling deeply within as this is the fulcrum for moving forward in all sorts of directions and situations. Being-with, dwelling, resting alongside—these are in our blood. On the other hand, our community is maturing and is now in the position to offer to our respective specializations new forms of knowledge and new methods for birthing that knowledge. The Focusing community can offer to all researchers a generative attitude that includes acceptance, humility, and aesthetic appreciation. That an article on research is showing up in our community now, and in a volume highlighting the confluence of our work with science, does not surprise me. We are ready.

The poet Rainer Maria Rilke gave this observation to his young apprentice, Franz Kappus, regarding the moment a poem's life emerges within the poet:

For they are the moments when something new has entered us, something unknown; our feelings grow mute in the shy embarrassment, everything in us withdraws, a silence arises, and the new experience, which no one knows, stands in the midst of it all and says nothing.

Letters to a Young Poet, (Rilke, 1992), p. 64.

Most likely many of us have had this experience and have learned not only to honor the budding idea, but also to cultivate it. We know too something that Rilke doesn't mention. We know that *'the new experience, which no one knows . . . and says nothing'*, in fact has a great deal of wisdom. Research for me is cultivating those unknown feelings, especially at the beginning, and in fact, throughout its entire life cycle. It involves sensing something from the inside, letting it dwell perhaps in silence, but not always, and then having it assist me as I develop that 'something' into a project that will help give voice to some experience or situation.

I realized a few years ago that when I am purposefully tapping into my felt sense while working on a research project, I was giving something to the already defined method that hadn't existed before. My felt sense continued on in the sequences. When I refer to research approaches as sequences, I mean that they carry with them their basic assumptions and the host of possible applications and refined practices that will come with their use. But now my research continued in original, creative, and even unexpected ways. In doing qualitative research, which is my specialty, my felt sensing opened up the inquiry, taking me beyond the parameters set by the methodology. Out of this generative condition Implicit Inquiry developed.

In brief, Implicit Inquiry is the intentional use of bodily sensing for the production of knowledge.

I ask the reader to take this paper as an example of a way in which a knowing of something (in my case, knowing research methodologies) became silent, as something new wanted to come into it. By bodily referring to the something that wanted to come into an already established context (e.g. research methodologies), I do not abandon the context and its specificity (e.g. its sequences and symbolizations). Rather, my bodily stirrings become fresh sequences and spaces from/with new research conceptualizations and meanings can come.

PROBLEMATICS INVOLVED IN DOING FOCUSING-ORIENTED RESEARCH

Choosing Between Kinds of Sequences

All research strategies aim to reveal something about life, while at the same time they reveal assumptions about life. The many research approaches, which are already laid out and available to us, function as whole sequences. Each sequence has its own *implyings*: meanings, patterns and potential for carrying forward certain specific distinctions. If we use a research approach as its theory and practices dictate, we will get more of that sequence and what the approaches implying, imply. In other words, we will get more of the same,

only more complex. Admittedly I am putting this in either/or language while the actual practice of research often involves a creative element unanticipated by the original method (sequence).

Gendlin's Process Model (1997a) points to how felt sensing encourages something new to come from a given sequence, thereby changing that sequence and all it will further be. In chapter eight, he discusses how the felt sense can work to open up 'new sequences and spaces' from the sequence we are using. Let me describe it this way. When we use a sequence with precision and thoughtfulness, such as a particular method of research, we may notice that a kind of particular space has opened up for us that we can feel. Perhaps you have had this experience and recognize this space as 'being in the zone' or 'dropping into' a creative rhythm. The sequence is still there working, but now in a different way.

Gendlin explains his specialized use of the terms 'sequences' and 'spaces' in chapters seven and eight of *A Process Model* (a PM) (Gendlin, 1997a). In this spirit I refer to the major research paradigms as kinds of VII sequences that open up fresh sequences and spaces in which the VII sequence will go forward, even if unpredictably so. As Dunaetz (2011) has pointed out, in chapter eight, Gendlin also indicates that whole new approaches (sequences, in Gendlin's language) can come from the generative felt sensing we do. The freshly generative sequences 'drop out' a whole new space.

In the context of research, the first challenge in working with our whole felt-sensing process (what Gendlin terms *VIII process* in his Process Model) is the conundrum of choosing between the dominating research sequences: quantitative, qualitative, or mixed. It might also appear that this is a much too simplistic choice and does not fit the deeper understanding that life cannot be contained by these sequences. For those so inclined, determining the underlying philosophical, ontological, epistemological (three kinds of VII sequences) basis of each methodology is critical. However, as I discuss later, the real challenge is to be able to think freshly *with* and *beyond* these sequences.

Pragmatically, working from one's implicit knowing doesn't necessarily mean choosing between methods for research, but does imply that we have some basic understanding of their underlying methodological dimensions (their VII characteristics). Before I present more on Implicit Inquiry, let me say a little about the three predominant kinds of strategies currently used by the majority of social and human science research practitioners. I will necessarily leave to others more qualified to discuss research procedures and issues as they relate to biological, neurological, or environmental concerns.

Historical Overview: Three Classical Research Methods

Quantitative. Most current approaches to social and human science research emphasize creating a quantitative measurement to demonstrate the truth/validity of a hypothesized theory about a condition, situation, behavior, thought process, etc.—basically, anything that can be transformed into a numeric value. Quantitative methodology asks the questions 'why' and 'how', based largely on a positivist worldview of cause and effect relations between independent parts. In this view, the world is given to us already complete. We unearth its

hidden parts and arrange them in casual relations through developing theory and methods that can ‘prove’ their existence in space and time. Quantitative methods have set notions of what constitutes validity, reliability, and generalizability. Validity refers to whether a measure (e.g. any test) will actually measure what it intends to measure. Reliability refers to the consistency of a measure. A measure is considered valid if the test items are found to relate to the intended concept under study. It is reliable if we get the same or nearly the same results repeatedly of the measure over time. Specific methods (e.g. survey and experimental research) are designed to test the hypotheses by asking why something is so, (e.g. why it is as it is) and how we can stop or encourage what is so . . . from happening again. For example, we want to study the effect of Focusing on depression. To help us determine if Focusing has any effect on depression, the quantitative researcher may have participants fill out the same depression scale before and after receiving Focusing instruction. The results give us a measurement of the level of depression which we can compare.

In many places Gendlin refers to the approach to reality underlying quantitative methodology as the ‘unit model’ (Gendlin, 1993; Gendlin, 1997c; Gendlin & Johnson, 2004). Limitations of this strategy include reliance upon causality and determinism, and reducing vast and nuanced experience to numeric values. Additionally, quantitative approaches focus on demonstrating effects. A significant part of qualitative research involves evaluating effects (i.e. outcomes) based upon measures of validity, reliability, and generalizability of findings. In the Focusing community there are many fine examples of quantitative research that help address questions like, ‘Why does Focusing work?’ or ‘To what extent does body-awareness make for successful weight reduction?’ A good resource to find out more about quantitative studies and Focusing can be found at <http://www.focusing.org/research.html>.

Qualitative. Qualitative methodology is best described as a family of approaches that can help us understand and articulate some aspect of life, and our living of life, by asking questions related to revealing ‘what’ is life? The ‘what’ is sometimes referred to as an essence (e.g. Husserlian and Giorgi descriptive approach), its interpreted meaning (e.g. Heideggerian and Hermeneutic approaches), its linguistic structure (e.g. Narrative approach), or its situational-environmental structure (e.g. Grounded Theory), to name a few. An example of a qualitative approach using Focusing can be found in my study on the impact of learning Focusing on persons with AIDS (Krycka, 1997).

Detractors of quantitative approaches like to say that qualitative work brings back the human element into research, and our understanding of the world in which we exist. Like quantitative methodology, a qualitative approach is based on a particular worldview, but a different worldview than the positivist one. Qualitative work emphasizes the world as given, interpreted, constructed, or participatory. Qualitative methodologies are really like a ‘family’, and like many families, are full of different opinions regarding how to best gather data and describe ‘what’ the phenomenon under study is or represents. Unlike quantitative methodology where there is a central group of guiding principles for conducting research (e.g. establishing validity, reliability, and generalizability), there are a vast number of guiding principles and versions of qualitative methodology, too many to present here.

The limitations of this approach are generally voiced as contrasts to the dominating quantitative strategies. Qualitative methodologies view validity and reliability as constituted through the rigor of study and systematic ways about how we conduct research. Since qualitative strategies are about producing deep knowledge and not generalizability to large populations, this is not a very important issue for the qualitative researcher. Examples of qualitative strategies include, Ethnography (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999), Grounded Theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), Case Studies (Stake, 1995), Phenomenological (Giorgi, 2009; Moustakas, 1994), Narrative (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), Heuristic (Moustakas, 1990), Embodied (Todres, 2007), and Intuitive (Anderson, 2004). As you can see there are probably as many qualitative approaches as there are self-defined qualitative researchers!

Two very fine general texts on both approaches are Creswell's, *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*, (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007) and *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods approaches*, (Creswell, 2009). Additionally, Anderson and Braud (2011) have an excellent book on transpersonal research methods that might be of interest.

Mixed Methods. A seemingly creative solution to the limitations of quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and human sciences is to 'mix' them together, by looking at one phenomenon through both lenses (Creswell, Klassen, Plano Clark, & Smith, 2011). The aim is to broaden understanding of an area of interest and thus better explain it. It is assumed that doing so will help cover the deficits of the quantitative and qualitative strategies and give us a more 'truthful' accounting of the world in which we live. Many mixed methods strategies have evolved in the health sciences, such as nursing and occupational therapy (Lysack & Krefling, 1994), communications studies (Daymon & Holloway, 2010), AIDS prevention, (Janz et al., 1996), and education (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004) are other examples.

As I have mentioned above, a problematic for doing Focusing-oriented research lies in understanding the orientation (e.g. the philosophical, ontological, and epistemological ground) upon which the methods we choose stand. Mixed methods strategies do not release us from the tough questions and decisions that arise from attempting to blend two methodologies; in fact, they may make it all that much harder because they come from very different starting points. Part of any successful program of research, even if it involves one project, is thoughtfully considering the basic orientation of the methods at our disposal. Focusing-oriented research has many options for research. The question for me has become whether the existing models and methods, mixed or not, do indeed have what it takes to reveal what is going on in the many practices of Focusing and felt-sensing that have emerged over the past 50 years.

Thinking from Whole Felt-Sensing Process, Not Distinctions First

Another, second problematic issue for doing Focusing-oriented research exists to the extent that we are learning to think from implicit knowing. Anyone who has tackled A *Process Model* (a PM) will likely attest to the challenges it brings. But understanding a

dense philosophical text like a PM, with its many philosophically important terms, is not as important to me as the challenge in recognizing when I am reflexively thinking from sequences, particularly those VII sequences we know as quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies.

To better understand Implicit Inquiry it is important to know that we do not need the philosophical concepts of a PM to make our way freshly to a new area. The process of thinking from one's whole felt-sensing of something is already available (even if you are not a PM geek!) For example, I may start off with a relatively small item to work on, and then find I am creating a whole new discipline, or maybe re-conceptualizing a well-known field. The Implicit Inquiry process calls me to make room for a big pause inside—at any juncture in the work—sometimes followed by an accompanying big smile of recognition, and then intentionally turning inward to find the implicit whole from which I mean to work, and the threads inherent there that I meant to get to. Simply put, thinking from implicit knowing within the Implicit Inquiry framework reveals that I cannot be sure where I will end up!

Let me offer two examples of knowledge-building that may help further distinguish thinking in unit model terms and thinking from the implicit. Each example might appear to be *like* process thinking (VIII process) but actually isn't, at all. I will then suggest a way for us to reveal what (I do believe) Focusing can offer to research and science.

Example One: The Relativity of Approaches. It is clear that in our various settings we Focusing researchers demonstrate the capacity to live along side differing orientations, even fostering well-matched connections between apparently divergent strains of theory and practice. We do this, I believe, with good intentions. We see that we do not 'own' the world of ideas and practices. We try not to exhibit hubris or solipsism. Still, we run the risk of stopping generating new authenticity in our situations (our freshly living of *this* living sequence) when we forestall the creative impulse found inwardly as we attend there. We rightly sense we are 'crossing' different kinds of knowing when we do so. We are indeed 'crossing' as Gendlin describes it in a PM when we 'make connections' to other conceptual families and practices, *if* we are not merely thinking reflexively from that conceptual family. We are crossing kinds of sequences, for instance, as we move toward making connections between Focusing and Mindfulness (e.g. more thinking from VII patterns). We are involved in Implicit Inquiry when we use our felt sense space (VIII) to make the connection and possibly then re-conceptualize them entirely. In Implicit Inquiry, crossing *kinds* of sequences helps carry forward its distinctive contributions while their very meeting changes each (Gendlin, 1995). Every bit of living is also an implying, a crossing *of* everything *by* everything. If we were simply bridging, or bringing closer together well-formed ideas (VII sequence kinds), we gain a small step but potentially forfeit something new in the world. This is good work insofar as we primarily wish to retain citizenship in our interest domains, but we can do more.

Example Two: The Apparent Gulf Between Body-Sensing and Sociality. It is clear that the Focusing community has championed the right and relevance of the *inner life* in many ways and places across the planet. The ongoing transformational work being done in the Mideast (Omidian, 2011; Lawrence, 2005) and Central America are just two examples.

This work is a significant and ongoing revolution. I heard Mary Hendricks once say at a conference (2000, Fifth International Conference on Client-Centered and Experiential Psychotherapy), that Focusing with its attendance to inward truth-telling brings with it freedom from the constraints of judgment, suspicion, and oppression—inwardly and outwardly. In this sense, she correctly captured the social import of living a life with felt-sensing at its heart.

A problem can arise though, when we assume that the richness of our inner world possesses a guarantee of a place in the public world where all we need do is go inside and find the correct word for it. Our body-sensing tells us that our inner reality is precious, but it tells us more, I believe. When we open to the knowledge within, we sometimes see that it (whatever IT is) is present to us, not only in finding a symbol's 'fit' to our inward body-sense, but also in our making an effort to bring the whole process sequence (not just this symbol fitting now) out into the world. As Gendlin (1997a) puts it, "The body-sensing is the new rendering, the new registry, the new environmental versioning of what the body is, implies, just was", (p. 239). In this regard, I understand felt body-sensing to function not only to make a bridge between major conceptual ways of understanding human existence (the *going on in* a VII sequence), but also to function in its own way—a way that is both inner directed and yet ultimately societal. But just here I have left Gendlin a bit. I am taking his 'new rendering' further to imply a new environment, a societal environment that the VIII sequence goes on in.

Implicit Inquiry as Midwifery

Through the new rendering brought forth through embodied dwelling, listening, and responding, we have already created an open space for emerging forms of knowledge by simply 'doing' what we know so well to do as Focusers. But this kind of open/creative space, the generative kind, also needs some assistance from us (and by extension our Focusing community). A metaphor that resonates for me is that of the midwife. Midwifery may not be well known to traditional science as a metaphor, but for those of us working with body-sensing, it is likely something very well known. Midwifery helps me imagine the legitimization of the art of birthing knowledge through and with the embodied organization of my innerness.

As Gendlin has pointed out since his first published articles and book, it is through our consciously attending to and following our felt sense that we birth fresh thinking (Gendlin, 1997a). How human beings can 'Do thinking' from their felt sense is the focus of much of his philosophical and psychological writing. For Gendlin, sensing is what gives rise to our thinking. His concepts point to how 'thinking' comes from a whole process, not merely cognition or feeling. I find thinking from my felt sense to be amazingly generative work. It is personally refreshing and interpersonally compelling. My hope is that doing research from *thinking* (in Gendlin's way) will likewise be as refreshing and compelling to you in your life situation.

As mentioned earlier, to start research from inner experience may seem oddly out of place in traditional methods—such as quantitative ones—as they appear too slippery

and 'subjective'. Arguably body-sensing is everywhere, ubiquitous to everything we are, do, contemplate, and envision. Embodied knowledge, on the other hand, presents us with a precise form of knowledge (embodied felt-knowledge) that we can intentionally utilize in our work. Implicit Inquiry uses this precise, inner knowing (inherent in all of us) to freshly form and explicate ideas and also to distribute these ideas and research in the many forms they may take.

Implicit Inquiry is an emerging model for research that understands any phenomenon being studied as a distinction from a much broader implicitly functioning world. The *ongoing occurring of environment, body, and language as one* is a way to describe both the implicit functioning of existence and our experiencing of it. 'Implicit' knowing is different in character and *feel* than knowledge based on already explicated, logically-ordered units. Just as Body is not just tissue processes, knowledge is not merely logical in origin. The Body and its knowing has its own experiential order, a wider order in which processes and sequences are distinguished from the experiential order (Gendlin, 1997c; Krycka, 2007). This experiential order is more precise than the precision of our logical thinking. For instance, we know far more than we can ever say. How is this so?

Gendlin, and now many others, have produced a significant body of work that attempt to give answers to that question. Gendlin's response is found throughout his works, but is notably articulated in his new philosophy of 'entry into the implicit' (*A Process Model*). In my reading of it, *A Process Model* presents a model about living that has a great deal to say about research. In it, Gendlin speaks of key principles that I believe can be shown to directly relate to research: *Occurring into Implying*, *Interaction First*, and *Interaffecting*. Each is a very rich territory that deserves the attention of a researcher. For our purposes we want to see these principles in action and see how they can inform a fundamentally more generous view of research.

Occurring-into-Implying (OI)

Events are studied in quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches. The general attitude in science and in most quantitative and mixed research (and even some qualitative) starts not with process events but distinct events (e.g. perceptions, feelings, behaviors, etc.). Gendlin's genius is to start with process events by making new distinctions. Process events are thus startlingly fresh and relevant. Inasmuch as Implicit Inquiry helps us think freshly, it arises from any process event that can be studied as freshly specified distinctions. In commonly used research methods, the entire process is first subdivided, paying very little attention to the whole that is prior to its divisions needed for study. If we first name the sequences (e.g. kinds of research practices, behaviors, events, feelings, complex thoughts) as such, we can then move toward making of any aspect (the entire sequence, event, or behavior) of the whole process our focus of study and experimentation. Any sequence is still its own occurring-into-implying that can be bodily recognized, but is now also a 'separate' event. Distinction-first tends to leave out our whole living, but the OI concept helps us bring along the entire sequencing of events into our research.

Interaction First—Everything by Everything

Before we are, there is *interaction*. We humans (also caterpillars, governments, events, etc.) do not begin as separated units. This is true for bodies, fish, concepts, ecosystems, and the universe. It is even true of doing research. We are whole first and the character of that ‘wholeness’ is a “gigantic system of here and other places, now and other times, you and other people—in fact, the whole universe” (Gendlin, 1982 p. 77). This is a bit of a philosophical phrase, one that may seem out of place in discussing research practices. However, if we extend *interaction first* into research, we will see that phenomenon interrelate already, waiting for us to distinguish significant aspects for study. Thus, instead of seeing research as involving discrete parts that can be rearranged and merged into some ‘whole’, we can see the research enterprise as a process, keeping in mind that the ‘things’ and ‘parts’ we find to study are products of the concepts we employ. Implicit Inquiry encourages researchers to make new concepts that will enhance experiencing in new ways. Thus, there is no one entire thing that we study; the sum of the parts does not equal a whole, but we need the freshly arriving new parts to do our work.

Interaffecting

This is another new term that further signifies how interaction first functions in the world. The many possibilities are already affected by countless other influences, which are themselves already affected by (. . .). A version of this statement seems common knowledge today in the human and social sciences, but it retains the old model—though somewhat improved. In the old models, possibilities, events, and determinants still act by themselves. But any alternative has not been described or explained well, until now. Interaffecting helps explain/describe how perception, feeling, thinking, and behaving come to be as a shared (derived from unseparated ongoing living). Additionally, interaffecting describes how already distinct things relate (they inter-affect) and change each other (carry each other forward). In research developed from Implicit Inquiry, interaffecting is a key principle, as it can help us conceptualize how this or that phenomenon under study exists as it does, already shaped and constituted by a host of other unseen influences, such as how the phenomenon changes (even by just looking at it).

Implicit Inquiry: Three Principles in a New Kind of Research Practice

These three principles (occurring-into-implying, interaction first, and interaffecting) form a conceptual scaffolding upon which research practices can be shaped and carried out. Since we are living beings, it is reasonable to suggest that we are also in each and every aspect of our work. Bringing the human along into research is just now being done, but we have a long way to go.

Including ‘felt knowing’ (e.g. embodied experience) as a fundamental aspect of research is relatively new to qualitative, quantitative, and mixed practices, in general. Phenomenology has a deep philosophical appreciation for embodied experience, but with

some exception (e.g. Moustakas (1990), Finlay (2011), Todres (2007)), has not recognized its importance beyond philosophy. Now felt knowledge, referred to sometimes as embodied knowledge, is the basis for a new family of human science research and professional practices that return embodied human experience to their center.

Implicit Inquiry is the term I give to a distinct development within a broader emerging family of human science research practices emphasizing Body as truth teller. Implicit Inquiry has two aims: to provide a conceptual scaffolding upon which the entire research enterprise can be re-enlivened and extended from the ground of the Body and to provide new ways to conceive, engage, and evolve current research practices: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods.

Implicit Inquiry explicitly employs our native wisdom, sometimes called embodied felt-knowledge, or felt knowing or body-sensing, at all steps in research—from its innovative beginnings, to modeling how to proceed, to finding the right method and form of analysis, and disseminating our findings. It can be used to enliven existing methods and create new ones.

TABLE I

Body-sensing as Implicit Inquiry in Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods

| Innovating® | Procedures & Analysis® |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exploration: Finding body-sense of topic, determining fit and potential | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Phase: Refine specific procedures based upon body sensing & knowledge of subject matter |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion: Period for idea development using body-sensing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd Phase: Employ procedures |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development: Determining the method; Consider subject selection, interview protocols adopted or created, surveys, experimentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3rd Phase: Collect Data (from interviews, surveys, experiments, etc.) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement: Return to body-sense of project as a whole, adjust method as necessary | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4th Phase: Perform Analysis per method |
| Verification® | Furthering® |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intersubjective Resonance: Finding yourself there, back to the original idea as body-sense | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deriving Concepts: With aid of processes like TAE new concepts come from any research project |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressive (written) Product: Determine right form and placement, publish, disseminate in some appropriate form • Getting Feedback: from audience & self | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept & Theory Formation: Some projects develop whole new areas |

In this very brief table, I am attempting to demonstrate how body-sensing, as its own, new environment, can carry across all levels of research both implicitly and explicitly. Implicit Inquiry is not confined to a particular method of research or approach to research practices, neither to the idea-formation stage, nor the revision stage when writing up our results. Body-sensing (and directly referring, though ubiquitous to our existence) is also a special kind of environment that can be engaged throughout our research. The Implicit Inquiry model, quite new, is evolving. I think of it as a holding space for new, more innovative approaches and practices to develop. In Implicit Inquiry our body-sense, that freshly forming sense of the whole of (. . .), becomes a new environment enabling us to create new versions of the contexts (VII sequences/spaces) in which we work.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Knowledge that is demonstration-focused (e.g. cause-effect oriented) is often preferred today; this cannot be denied, but at its worst, in my opinion can be a mute kind of knowing, a kind of knowledge that may easily turn its ear away from the something that is yet to be seen. As Gendlin consistently points out, knowledge that is of or about an outcome or procedure is only half the equation of a more potent knowledge that is grounded in process distinctions rather than incremental bits of data (Gendlin, 2004; Gendlin & Johnson, 2004). As we emphasize the demonstration-focused approach in research, we fall risk of becoming numb to the nuances, character, and situation accompanying the phenomenon under study. Instead of placing discrete information first in our philosophic, epistemic, and aesthetic ways toward understanding some phenomenon, we can explore bodily sensing as it can be applied to research.

Gendlin's Process Model leaves little opportunity for reflexive thinking and speaks to the kind of research that inherently and simultaneously occupies intrapersonal, interpersonal, and social spaces in both implicit and explicit forms. As I see it, process methodologies and methods (developed from the Process Model) may, at some point in the future, stand out against/with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods approaches as new strategies for understanding human and non-human living. Unfortunately, we are not there yet.

However, what we can offer to research now (and to scientific inquiry in general) is the triumvirate foundation we find in our Focusing practices: embodied dwelling, listening, and responding. These three elements set our work aside from others' who rarely make credible and legitimize dwelling, listening, and doing (Fiumara, 1990). These three elements form 'how' we come to birth knowing in general, and new research ideas in particular. It forms our basic epistemic approach.

For me, the concepts laid out in the latter part of *The Process Model* have the most exciting application for research, as Gendlin offers a new form or platform for thinking and doing: the body-sensing occurring environment (Gendlin, 1997, VIII space). These concepts have not been offered elsewhere with as much thoroughness. To go further into Gendlin's insights contained in *The Process Model* would require many more pages, but let me add this piece from it that I believe speaks to how Focusers can better appreciate research space:

The vastness of that space [body-sensing] is therefore understandable: It isn't the kind of space that situations are. We are in them. Here is a space in which the whole situation moves. We are not in the situation anymore, but in the new space, and we are here, the situation is now a something, a new datum, there, over against us (p. 239).

To think about research as a 'whole situation that moves' is a wonderful way to imagine how we might incorporate research into our Focusing work. When I consider research as a whole situation that moves, I become less interested in mixing approaches in the hope that 'the many approaches will help me understand the one' situation I am studying. From that sense of movement, I know we have an alternative, or at least potentially so. We have the body-sensing environment from which to dwell and take what arises 'there' in the body into the public realm through research or some other form that can affect society.

I contend that it is precisely at the moment that we are tempted to 'mix models' of knowledge (including mixing research methods) that we are also prone to becoming *numbed* to their different and varied philosophical foundations and epistemological directions. I have also emphasized that we have the potential as a community, to seriously consider how the Process Model can inform our research, and how, by intentionally using our bodily sensing we can produce new knowledge in general and a new family of research practices in particular.

I will say again that I believe the Focusing community can offer a distinct philosophical and epistemic approach to research that has yet to fully exist in the world. Perhaps, fair to say, we also need to work at envisioning ourselves as holding a unique inwardly-oriented map, the VIII space of body-sensing, that is ready to listen even when such listening may inescapably draw us to give up our precious assumptions and patterned thinking. It gives us the advantage of a willingness to take leave of those patterned forms so that we can speak '*when something new has entered us*' (Rilke, p. 64.)

I caution us not to think that 'fresh concepts', such as those I hope we someday form through Implicit Inquiry or some other process, emerge or actively work 'from nowhere'. We do not want to give up the power that the existing concepts (VII sequences) offer and have. In Gendlin's way of saying it, we cannot even 'give up' VII sequences as we are always living VII-ingly (symbolically). That is, we could no more live without electricity (which was developed from many versions of VII patterns and sequences in science) than we can live without the air we breathe. Rather, it might be better that we zig-zag between the already distinguished methods of research (as VII sequences) and the freshly arriving sense of the whole (. . .) that marks VIII process. I hope that Implicit Inquiry, or some other model built from VIII sequences, can result in generative space for doing research that brings new and helpful VII distinctions and meanings. It is important that we break the habit of mind in which we endlessly reorder the known sequences (e.g. methods of research), even through creatively blending them. Undoubtedly, this will take some time.

We are, after all, not panderers in the sense that we simply procure other knowledge from diverse areas or practices and squeeze our kind of embodied knowing into them. We

do not ‘wed’ differing orientations in an attempt to make of them better partners. Instead, we offer science, and in fact any kind of thinking, a way to midwife the birth of new thought relevant to its own focus. And as we continue to develop our own unique ways forward in research or any other area of interest, with Implicit Inquiry as a model or not, we will be legitimating body-sensing as an important part of creating knowledge. One day, very soon perhaps, our felt-sensing will lead to many more new avenues for exploration of human life than we already have and help further secure the strong tradition of Focusing for years to come.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, R. (2004). Intuitive inquiry: An epistemology of the heart for scientific inquiry. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 32(4), 307-341.
- Anderson, R. & Braud, W. (2011). *Transforming self and others through research: Transpersonal research methods and skills for the human sciences and humanities*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., Klassen, A. C., Plano Clark, V. L., & Smith, K. C. (2011). *Best practices for mixed methods research in the health sciences*. Washington, D.C.: National Institutes of Health, USA.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Daymon, C. & Holloway, I. (2010). *Qualitative research methods in public relations and marketing communications*. New York: Routledge.
- Dunaetz, N. (2011). Distinguishing felt sense formation as a KIND of process in Gendlin’s philosophy. Paper presented at the 23rd International Focusing Conference, Asilomar, CA.
- Finlay, L. (2011). *Phenomenology for therapists : Researching the lived world*. Chichester, UK: J. Wiley.
- Fiumara, G. C. (1990). *The other side of language: A philosophy of listening*. London: Routledge.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1993). Human nature and concepts. In J. Braun (Ed.), *Psychological aspects of modernity*. Westport, CT, US: Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1995). Crossing and dipping: Some terms for approaching the interface between natural understanding and logical formulation. [Journal Article]. *Minds and Machines*, 5(4), 547-560. doi: 10.1007/bf00974985

- Gendlin, E. T. (1997a). *A process model*. Chicago: Focusing Institute.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1997b). *Experiencing and the creation of meaning; A philosophical and psychological approach to the subjective*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1997c). The responsive order: A new empiricism. *Man and World*, 30(3), 383-441.
- Gendlin, E. T. (2004). Five philosophical talking points to communicate with colleagues who don't yet know focusing. *Staying in Focus*, 4(1), 5-9.
- Gendlin, E. T., & Johnson, D. H. (2004). Proposal for an international group for a first person science. Retrieved from http://www.focusing.org/gendlin/docs/gol_2184.html
- Giorgi, A. (2009). *The descriptive phenomenological method in psychology: A modified husserlian approach*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne.
- Janz, N. K., Zimmerman, M. A., Wren, P. A., Israel, B. A., Freudenberg, N., & Carter, R. I. (1996). Evaluation of 37 aids prevention projects: Successful approaches and barriers to program effectiveness. *Health Education Quarterly*, 23(1), 80-97.
- Johnson, R. B. & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-25.
- Krycka, K. C. (1997). Recovery of will with persons with AIDS. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 37(2), 9-30.
- Krycka, K. C. (2007). Thinking at the edge: Where theory and practice meet to create fresh understandings. *Journal of Indo-Pacific Phenomenology*, 6, 36-41.
- Lawrence, N. J. (2011). Focusing in Afghanistan. Focusing Connection. Retrieved from Focusing Institute website: <http://www.focusing.org/newsletter/sif4-2-2004/sif4-2-1.html>
- Lecompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). *Designing and conducting ethnographic research*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Lysack, C. L., & Krefting, L. (1994). Qualitative methods in field research: An Indonesian experience in community based practice. *The Occupational Therapy Journal of Research*, 14(20), 93-110.
- Moustakas, C. E. (1990). *Heuristic research: Design, methodology, and applications*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Moustakas, C. E. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Omidian, P. A. (2011). *When bamboo bloom: An anthropologist in taliban's afghanistan*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Rilke, R. M. (1992). *Letters to a young poet*. San Rafael, CA: New World Library.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Todres, L. (2007). *Embodied enquiry: Phenomenological touchstones for research, psychotherapy, and spirituality*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kevin C Krycka is director of the Master of Arts in Existential-Phenomenological Therapeutic Psychology at Seattle University, Seattle, WA USA. He specializes in phenomenological research on peacebuilding and the processes of change. Kevin is a certifying coordinator with the Focusing Institute. He can be reached at krycka@seattleu.edu