1

Gerhard Kleining

The emergence of theory in qualitative heuristics

> Motto
> Eine Theorie ist desto eindrucksvoller, je größer die Einfachheit ihrer Prämissen ist, je
> verschiedenartigere Dinge sie verknüpft, und je weiter ihr Anwendungsbereich ist (Albert Einstein
> according to Galaprice 2007, p. 177).[1]

Abstract
The report deals with the concept of „trust" as reflected by two methods: an ad-hoc group of research persons
practicing Dialogical Introspection and a non-systematic collection of reports about the subject in print media in
2010 and 2018. The methodology was that of "qualitative heuristics" (Kleining 1982, Burkart 2018, Burkart,
Kleining & Witt 2010). The paper shows how empirical data can be treated by a continuous search for
similarities among most different views thus transforming additive elements into a structured whole. The overall
pattern is that of conflict between personal values and public practice as reported by the media. The research
process indicates dialectical tension between some concepts even for the same individual.
The kind of analysis is explorative and intended to structure the data for further considerations.

Gerhard Kleining, Prof Dr., Universität Hamburg, Fakultät für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften", retired,
Privat: Elbchaussee 159, 22605 Hamburg. gerhard.kleining@uni-hamburg.de. Phone +49408801977

The four rules that govern discovery research in accordance with the process of qualitative heuristics are current
in the entire research process. *Research personnel* should be "open" whenever a problem arises and deal with it
in accordance with the data – or defer it until it subsequently resolves itself (rule 1). Equally, the *subject* of the
research should remain flexible; whenever necessary, it is adapted to the respective data situation (rule 2).
Additional information may be required in order to improve viewpoints or "*variation of perspectives*" (rule 3).
All information is considered in the analysis process with respect to which similarities or *common features*
appear between data of different origins, and this should be done throughout the entire course of the research,
although increasingly towards the end. The approach has been presented in various ways (Kleining 1982, 2010a,
2010b; the method used here under Burkart, Kleining & Witt 2010).

The process of analysis lies in searching for and finding common features in the diversity of the information
collected. In the case of qualitative data, these are *analogue* forms of communication (Watzlawick 2017 p. 70).
Similarities and analogies were considered to be a "guiding principle of research" even for physicist and
philosopher Ernst Mach (Mach 1980, pp. 220–231). According to Sigmund Freud (1952), progress in the process
of analysis corresponds to the process of solving a jigsaw puzzle for children. It begins with the simple and
familiar and a building of interrelated elements is constructed gradually into a greater whole. This is often a
painstaking process; it produces diversions and errors. Intuition and feeling have helped in various areas of
research (Kleining 2003).

From one of the respective relevant aspects of integrating analysis, a theory can develop. A theory is the
summary of various empirical analyses, which respectively address or resolve sub-problems.

The way to do this should be demonstrated using the *example* of an investigation by the author.

The subject of the research was the term *trust*. The research design used two methods: *dialogical introspection*
with 10 people and 16 tape recorded, and *textual analysis* of 30 sources mostly from national newspapers in
which the term trust was covered (Kleining 2010b, pp. 127–146; sample descriptions pp. 129 and 142). The
newspaper texts were attached to the investigation with the method of dialogical introspection, as they
corresponded in method to research by variation of perspectives (rule 3) and were easy to procure.

---

[1] A theory is the more impressive the greater the simplicity of its premises, the more different the things are
which it connects and the wider its scope of its application. Albert Einstein according to Calaprice (2007, p. 177).

When reviewing my text from 2010, certain similarities stood out to me between the reporting then and the reporting today, which likewise uses the term trust, e.g. both in national newspapers and in the public service media. One student, Leon Aumann, collected. 20 text passages relating to this from present print media (10.03.2018). On the basis of all the data, the previous research subject of "trust" was expanded to include the negation ("mistrust", "distrust", "loss of trust", "breach of trust" etc.) as well as circumstances affecting trust, such as "credibility" and "conflict" through to "crisis", "hostility" and "division". Associated previous history was also taken into account (rule 2, the subject of the research can change/expand). Thus, the topic was adapted better to the present texts and the previous investigation was moreover given a historic dimension (rule 3).

Result of the textual analysis:

- The 2010 study classified the statements about "trust" with those of "baddies" on the one hand and those of "goodies" on the other. The "baddies" (again or still) included: former Italian Prime Minister Berlusconi for his stories of sex and lies, billion-dollar fraudster Bernard Madoff, Hypo boss Funke for causing and concealing the losses of Real Estate Bank, Deutsche Bank and its boss Ackermann for a sex and spying affair assumedly organised there. By contrast, people who were considered particularly trustworthy in 2010 were: Pope Benedict XVI, German Chancellor Merkel with consistently top confidence values, a joint appeal of 50 Noble prize winners for a new set of values, automotive manager Wendelin Wedeking who – among other things – donated 25 million of a settlement of 50 million to charity (quotes in the publication stated).

- The feature that all information from 2010 has in common with the 2018 addition is the creation of a *values scale* with strong variation of the contents and people. Only Berlusconi has maintained his negative status. Among the new "baddies" in 2018" is Donald Trump, who appears as sexist and racist and whose truthfulness is doubted, who falls out with his advisers and from whose advisers the term "alternative facts" originates, which was the "non-word" of the year in 2017. Trump contrasts with former president Barak Obama and his confidence-building speeches.

  Other topics come to light in public in a new form, such as the scandal from the sexual assaults by Harvey Weinstein (November 2017) and the Me-Too movement. The problematic military operations and the tension areas from Afghanistan to the Middle East, Syria, Yemen, Turkey and an impending trade war with the USA were expanded. Also, time and again, the media refer to the "refugee crisis" and tensions with right-wing extremists as well as the time taken to form a government, which is generally covered critically.

  Media research can provide an overview of the frequencies of the everyday topics and the respective people operating in public. In most cases, this requires representative random samples. These can illustrate the changes in user behaviour but are less suited to the development of theories.

- When reading the texts in 2018, *new trust problems* emerge: "good" and "bad" are not different people but rather exist in *the same person.*
  (1) The fall in trust from 100 % when Martin Schulz was elected Party Chairman and Chancellor candidate to under 20 % for the SPD (Social Democratic Party of Germany) in the three following state elections and his resignation from all offices was spectacular. He was blamed for the swing from proclamation of the SPD as an opposition party to entry into a grand coalition and his battle for the post of Foreign Minister with his colleague Sigmar Gabriel, who himself lost credibility and trust as a result of several ineptitudes.
  (2) According to one ranking, Gabriel was consistently the most popular German politician, yet he lost his office.
  (3) In a milder form, Angela Merkel also lost trust; in "Stern" magazine she was consistently the most trustworthy German politician but her trust suffered heavy losses in the 2017 federal election if the resistances within her own party and the drastic CDU (Christian Democratic Union of Germany) losses of the last federal election are connected with "trust".
  (4) Extrapolated to the whole of society, the simultaneous occurrence of positive and negative is the statement of one CDU delegate concerning the double murder in Slovakia, which speaks of shock and *division* in society.
  (5) "Division" was discussed in the political reporting in the USA and by AfD (Alternative for Germany party) in Germany.
  (6) Towards the end of the study in May 2018, a *trust crisis* became public in the media, which may possibly prove to be the most serious since the fraud with the diesel manipulations: the *data scandal*, which is associated with Facebook and the company Cambridge Analytica and apparently concerns data

of approx. 50 m users that have been exploited politically and commercially without their consent.

Mark Zuckerberg is one of the world's richest dollar billionaires; he emerged as an industrialist and patron (Wikipedia 25.03.2018). He controls one of the "Big Five" (Microsoft, Apple, Facebook, Amazon, Google) "These founders have won immense public trust in their emergent technologies from home computing to social media to the new frontier, artificial intelligence"… "Zuckerberg, in a well-known incident he now surely regrets, was asked in the early days of Facebook why people would hand over their personal information to him. He responded, 'They trust me – dumb fucks'" (Shaw 2018).

- The last example in particular concerning the "major breach of trust" (Zuckerberg) demonstrates that simple listing of "good" against "bad" and their distribution among various people does not always take research forward. People are not always "either/or". From the data, the task arises to introduce "unity of the contradictory" or the "simultaneity of the non-simultaneous" as behaviour patterns. In the attempt to identify connections between opposites, this intention leads us from simple description or sequencing to the next stage of analysis and thus closer to the theory.[2]

- Analysis of the information from dialogical introspection suggests strong support for it. In it, early childhood experiences with "basic trust" are brought to the table as stories, and likewise more recent and current conflicts, in astonishing openness. Contradictions in the emotional development and handling of behavioural alternatives become evident. This can result in inner conflicts, a battle of the different mental channels, through to apparent "division", for which society is then blamed as a possible projection onto a living environment that is experienced as dangerous.

- As a result of the analyses of the contradictory both from dialogical introspection and from the two textual analyses, it is probable that the solution to the problems discussed and thus the theoretical abstraction lies in a (dialectic) combination of two areas of life: *personal biography* and *society represented and interpreted by the media*. It comes to a head in the difference experienced between personal principles and values adopted through socialisation and those actually reflected in and through society.

Theory for qualitative heuristics is not an invented ideal but rather the findings generated, compressed and integrated from data. In this respect it is "grounded" or "grass-rooted". The process of naming and combining similarities or analogies or equivalences – there are different names for the same concept – means building a theory immediately from qualitative data. It should start as soon as data are available and guide all further research steps. Methods and further samples will be adjusted to the emerging structure and cause further research and considerations.

---

[2] Proofs of the unity of good and bad in the same person or their quick succession are numerous: examples: Winnie Mandela, human rights campaigner and later accused of breaches of law (2018); English Secretary of State for War Profumo who emerges from the Christine Keeler scandal reformed (1962); industrialist, footballer and Bayern Munich Manager Ulli Höneß returning to his former business position after serving a sentence (2014); even the conversion of Saul to Paul the apostle (minus 10 – 60 a Ch.) though not proven by the NT.

References

Burkart, T. (2019). Dialogic Introspection - a method of investigating experience. *Human Arenas. An Interdisciplinary Journal of Psychology, Culture, and Meaning.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s42087-018-0027-5

Burkart, T., Kleining, G. & Witt, H. (2010). Dialogische Introspektion. Ein gruppengestütztes Verfahren zur Erforschung des Erlebens. [Dialogical Introspection. A Group-Based Method to Explore Experience]. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, Springer.

Calaprice, A. (ed.) (2007). *Albert Einstein, Einstein sagt. Zitate, Einfälle, Gedanken.* [Einstein says. Quotes, Incidences, Thoughts]. München, Zürich: Piper.

Freud, S. (1952). *Zur Ätiologie der Hysterie.* In Gesammelte Werke 1. [On the Aetiology of Hysteria. In: Collected Works 1]. London: Imago. pp. 423 – 459 [first 1896].

Kleining, G. (1982). Umriß zu einer Methodologie qualitativer Sozialforschung. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, *34*, 234–252. http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-8619. Accessed 28 April 2018

Kleining, G. (2003). Ahnung und Gefühl im Entdeckungsprozess [Intuition and Feeling in the Discovery Process]. In C. Kumbruck, M. Dick & H. Schulze (Eds.) Arbeit – Alltag – Psychologie [Work – Everyday Life – Psychology] (pp. 45 – 59). Heidelberg, Kröning: Asanger.

Kleining, G. (2010a). Qualitative Heuristik [Qualitative Heuristics]. In G. Mey & K. Mruck (Eds.), *Qualitative Forschung in der Psychologie* (pp. 65–78).Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Kleining, G. (2010b). Vertrauen in den Medien und im Alltag [Trust in the Media and in Everyday Life]. In M. Hartmann & A. Hepp (Eds.) Die Mediatisierung der Alltagswelt [The Mediatisation of the Everyday World] (pp. 127–146). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag

Mach, E. (1988)[5] Erkenntnis und Irrtum. Skizzen zur Psychologie der Forschung [Knowledge and Error. Sketches on the Psychology of Enquiry]. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft [first 1905].

Qualitativ-heuristische Psychologie und Sozialforschung Hamburg. *Qualitative Heuristik* (2018). http://heuristik-hamburg.net.html. Accessed 28 April 2018

Shaw, T. (2018). Beware the Big Five. In *The New York Review,* April 5 – 18, 2018, Vol LXV, No. 6, pp. 33–35.

Watzlawick, P., Beavin J. H. & Jackson, D. D. (2017)[13]. *Menschliche Kommunikation* [Human Communication]. Bern: Hogrefe [first 1967].

Zuckerberg, M. In *Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia*. Editing status: 3rd April 2018, 19:43 UTC. https://de.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Mark_Zuckerberg&oldid=175734551. Accessed on 10 April 2018.