

Kerry
Sample Review (Green Meeting) part 2 (conversation at the end)

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the last part of the second (January 14) “green meeting” for Kerry that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/N7R1N6Y7hJ0>. In brown are conversations about the Descriptive Experience Sampling process that took place during the interview. In green are Russ’s comments, and in blue are Julian’s comments about and explanations of the Descriptive Experience Sampling process inserted after the interview. If you have corrections, suggestions, or questions, please post them as YouTube comments.

RTH = Russ Hurlburt

JBK = Julian Bass-Krueger

MM = Mel May

Kerry = Kerry U.

[snip]

1:14:26 Russ comments: The green meeting has been ongoing for nearly four hours, 2.5 hours on January 3 and remaining today and 1.25 hours today. The transcripts are shown only for the beginning (see January 3) and the very end (here) of the green meetings, but the entire video recordings are available.

1:14:25 MM: Right. Right.

1:14:26 RTH: So I think, I think that that is what is a green meeting. [MM: Mm-hmm.]

1:14:30 MM: Fascinating. It is real.... Like, as I said before, it is really interesting to see the journey on all sides here in terms of everyone, you can see, all parties develop a greater understanding of Kerry’s experience of her and her being able to explain it as best she can. You can see that progress, and you can see us hone in on specificity and stuff. Like, I think it’s really cool.

1:15:04 RTH: And it is not just, it’s not just that we see our understanding *of Kerry* progress. I think we see our understanding of *experience in general* progress. [MM: Mm-hmm. Certainly.]

1:15:20 So lemme tell you what the next steps are, and then we can determine whether we want to engage in these steps. So, so the next step would be: each of us writes a brief (and by brief I mean like a 15 minute exercise or something could be an outline) of *this is what I think needs to be idiographically said about Kerry’s experience*. And by *idiographic*, I mean this is, this is what applies to Kerry as a person, as a singular person, which *doesn’t* mean *unusual*, but it’s something that you can’t, you can’t describe Kerry without talking about this kind of stuff. We each write (or outline or something) that, that we would, that we’re willing to stand behind as the result of 10 days of sampling. This is, this is what we do with Kerry. And if so, that would, that’s the next task. [MM: Mm-hmm.]

- 1:16:11 The task after that is that someone (probably me in this case) would write a joint description, assuming that we all agree. If we don't agree, then we have to get back together and determine, well, why is it that Mel saw this when Russ didn't see that, or whatever. [MM: Mm-hmm.] And uh, uh, then the next step would be we, we would write a general description of, of each individual characteristic and put that in a spreadsheet.
- 1:16:40 And *then* each of us would go through the spreadsheet and say, well, this applies to, to Mel. So for example, [he corrects himself] or to Kerry. So for example, we have talked about skillful imagery. [MM: Mm-hmm.] We would, we would make a spreadsheet and everybody would say, well, sample 4.1 is skillful and sample 5.3 is skillful [he makes up those sample numbers]. Everybody would get a chance to rate every sample on each one of those ratings, on each one of the, on each one of the *characteristics* that we have jointly identified as being idiographically significant for Kerry. [MM: Mm-hmm.]
- 1:17:12 And *then* we would determine where there were discrepancies. Why is it that Mel said skillful in sample 3.1, but Russ didn't. So we'd have a, we'd have a meeting that we call the *rectification meeting*. And, and that, the rectification meeting is not just to, not just looking for rater accuracy. It's, well, does this discrepancy indicate that Mel thinks one thing about skillful inner experience and Russ thinks something else? And if so, we gotta figure that out. Maybe Russ should change his mind. Maybe Mel should change her mind. Maybe we should both meet in the middle or whatever. [MM: Mm-hmm.]
- 1:17:56 But it's all part of the deal that you, that you were noticing just a minute ago, Mel, that the object is to improve ourselves as we, and improve our understanding of, of Kerry. And *then* once we've, once we have agreed with all that stuff, then it's finally time to write some kind of a description of, *well this is what we think about Mel or about Kerry*, excuse me. This is what we think about Kerry. Up until now everybody has been sort of personally responsible. This is what *I* think. We're gonna write the green things, the green thing, you, you have to understand it *your* way. I have to understand it *my* way. [MM: Mm-hmm.] Julian has to understand it his way. But that's not necessarily *the same* way. Only at the very end do we have to agree that we, that we see these things in the same way.
- 1:17:56 Russ comments: RE "Only at the very end do we have to agree that we ... see these things in the same way."
Even that is too extreme in its insistence on consensus. It would be better if RTH had said: If we agree on the characteristics of a particular aspect of experience, then we will try to come to consensus on the best way to describe it. But we do not necessarily have to agree: the final description can include alternative descriptions or explicitly stated disagreements about the characteristics of phenomena.
- 1:18:47 MM: [MM: Mm-hmm.]
- 1:18:48 RTH: So do we wanna play that game? That's the, those that would be the next game to be played.
- 1:18:55 MM: Yeah. So I think, so the best way then is we, it's like we have a homework activity now, right?

- 1:19:01 RTH: That's right. Yeah. We have each have, we, we each have a homework activity now first to write a a, an idiographic characterization of what I think we call a personal idiographic characterization [DES actually calls it *an independent informal characterization*] of Kerry. And, and, and this is not meant to be detailed, but it's meant to be adequate so that we can make the spreadsheet, which is coming as the next step.
- 1:19:24 MM: And so, sorry, that just what you mean by that phrase is a overview of basically everything we just went through, right?
- 1:19:32 RTH: That's right. And you, and you can do that by, I I will, I will immediately send you what this document that we've just been marking up, and I'll send it to you and your task is to go back through this and think, well these are the themes *that I see* when we go through this stuff. Yep,
- 1:19:48 MM: Yep. Okay. So we go away, do that homework activity and then we reconvene. Oh, and, and then do we reconvene on that or we make this or is
- 1:19:55 RTH: That, well, you'll send, you'll send, so your object is to send them to me without looking at anybody else's. You have to, this is an *independent* characterization. So we can send these things to each other, but you can't look at anybody else's until you've committed yourself to your own. And then you can't change what *you* said without, without fessing up to that. You can say, well, you know, Mel was right, I missed that, or whatever. That would be fine. But you can't just go back and change your, change your characterization.
- 1:19:55 Russ comments: The no-fair-peeking independence is one of many instantiations of the DES ethos to encourage investigators to take responsibility for their own impressions or understandings.
- 1:20:24 MM: But so do we need to, um, meet to discuss those?
- 1:20:28 RTH: We don't unless there's something to be discussed. [MM: Or... Okay.] So you're gonna, so we're gonna, we're gonna circulate these things and everybody's to look at 'em, and if everybody says, *yeah, we seem to have sort of the same thing*, then I will create idiographic categories [Mel: Uh huh.] that we will then rectify. And I'll put that into a special spreadsheet that I've got, which will identify where we're, where we're, uh, where we disagree. [MM: Yep.] And then, and then that's the time when we can actually get down to the nuts and bolts about where we, how, how we might wanna still further refine these categories that we're making. [MM: Okay.] So the first task is I will send everybody this document that's on the screen right now. [MM: Yep.] The second task is everybody writes their own personal idiographic description of Kerry. [MM: Okay.]
- 1:20:28 Russ comments: RE "We don't unless there's something to be discussed."

Most of the time, investigators are pretty clear in their independent informal characterizations about what should be included in the spreadsheet. An exception is in the case of Mel (part X of this series).

- 1:21:20 RTH: And do that within a, I think, uh, I think my rules about that is you gotta write that within a day. [MM: Okay.]
- 1:21:25 JBK: Within a day! Alright.
- 1:21:28 RTH: And it, it's not designed to be *long*, but it's designed to be *fresh*.
- 1:21:32 MM: Yeah. Yeah. That's fair. That's fair. Okay. So
- 1:21:35 JBK: The next you recommend, uh, doing it without that sleeping on it.
- 1:21:40 RTH: That would be the best way if you can, but yeah, sure. That would be, depending on what time of day it is. Not sleeping on it, not sleeping on it *twice*, for sure.
- 1:21:53 JBK: Okay. Yeah.
- 1:21:54 RTH: That's, that's actually the rule. The rule is not sleeping on it *twice*. Better to do it without sleeping on it, but,
- 1:21:59 JBK: And sleep is okay,
- 1:22:01 RTH: But, you know, we recognize that world, the world goes on. [JBK: Mm-hmm.]
- 1:22:06 MM: Okay. Okay. So let's do that. And then I think based on the next 48 hours, then we work out what we need to do after that. Right?
- 1:22:14 RTH: Right. Exactly.
- 1:22:17 MM: Yep. That's, that's fine with me.
- 1:22:20 RTH: All righty. Sounds like a plan.
- 1:22:22 MM: This is very, very, very interesting.
- 1:22:26 RTH: Yeah. I think it's, I think it's you, I've, I've done this a lot and it's as interesting [JBK: Mm-hmm.] now as it ever was for me, cuz it's all, it's
- 1:22:37 MM: [they talk over each other] Sorry, continue.
- 1:22:38 RTH: I'm trying to figure out how to, how to stop sharing a screen. There it is.
- 1:22:43 MM: Um, no, I was just gonna say the other thing, too, is I think, to be honest, it was helpful to not have Kerry today because I think it would've only muddied waters, having her here for those earlier beeps where, you know, she would've got confused by herself.

She would've tried to over articulate now based on the progress that she has made and we have... Like, I think it was better to not have her for the earlier beeps.

1:23:10 RTH: I can appreciate that. I I, I definitely, I think we could argue...

1:23:15 JBK: I was gonna say it's definitely interesting to hear perspective, even if there's, sometimes it may involve more like arguing against, I don't think that's there. I think it's, it was super interesting to hear perspective that doesn't necessarily mean it was easier, made the process faster, but yeah, I, I see what you're saying. It probably went, went faster. Yeah.

1:23:36 MM: Well no, just cuz the earlier beeps are just, you know, there's more question marks in the earlier beeps. So I just think like, not having the participant for those is in a way helpful for like, what we're trying to do here, because we're, we can just accept them for what they are at that level.

1:23:56 RTH: So what I think is, I don't have a, I don't have a rule about that because I think yes, in a way it's helpful and yes, in a way it's helpful to have her there. So I think it can go, I think it can go either way. There's no one better, no one best way in that, in that regard.

1:24:14 MM: But yeah, it's really interesting to see the layers and the um, the improved detail over the weeks. That's really cool. Very satisfying to be honest. Yeah,

1:24:29 RTH: It totally is.

1:24:30 JBK: You've been doing this a lot. Is there anything new with Kerry that was new to you in your years of sampling? Or is that something you, you would talk about later in the process?

1:24:44 RTH: I, I don't, [pause] I, I would say I, I didn't discover phenomena with Kerry that I haven't seen before. If that's what that question is about. [JBK: Yeah.] What's new is every time it's a mix of what Kerry's presuppositions are and what Julian's presuppositions are and what Mel's interests are and how much time we've got and all that stuff to try to distill that into everybody profiting in the direction of genuine apprehension of experience. That's new every time. And that's what, that's part of

1:25:26 JBK: The struggle of discovery is [RTH: Exactly.] new each time.

1:25:31 RTH: The struggle is new each time.

1:25:33 MM: Genuine apprehension is a really lovely description for it, too. I like that.

1:25:40 RTH: It's, and, I think, I think it's totally, totally interesting every time. Every time is interesting from its own way.

1:25:47 MM: As I've said a thousand times. Like obviously I, I, you know, especially with Kerry, which is part of the reason why I selected her, because we had, I had suspicions

through my discussions with her that we had very different experiences. And so obviously like I frequently compare it to my experience. And it's so interesting, like even that one we were talking about, you know, with conversation and stuff, because my experience (as you guys are well aware) is like, well, I'm in a conversation, I'm locked in and I'm, I'm doing the speaking and then I'm doing the hearing. And so to like hear her describe so confidently her version of that, that is so that completely challenges my consistent experience of that is so fascinating. Cuz I, before all of this, I would never have imagined a world where that's how people can experience that. Like I, you know, you just think the way that you experience conversation (or the way that you experience anything) is the way everyone does. And this has been so different to me on so many levels that it is truly mind blowing [laughs].

- 1:25:47 Russ comments: RE "I frequently compare it to my experience...that completely challenges my consistent experience"
Mel's experience is described in Part X of this series. Mel's experience is indeed very different from Kerry's.
- 1:26:53 RTH: [laughs] And that is what it, that's what's challenging about this whole thing. So the interesting thing is that Mel's mind can be blown in her way, and Kerry's mind can be blown in hi her way, and Julian's can be blown in his way. And those are not necessarily the same way. [MM: Mm.] And yet they all come from the genuine, from doing what it takes to, to get it right, to get it as close to right as we can get it (not, it's not really right), but *trying* to get it right; we can do that. We can *aspire* to get it right.
- 1:27:28 MM: I mean this, the green meetings really prove the necessity of [laughs] repetition and time and stuff required here for the genuine apprehension part of this. Like the, the green meeting shows that of like, look, after all these weeks and all these hours and stuff, you cannot argue that everyone understands better. So there's no short cutting that.
- 1:27:51 RTH: Right. And you'll find probably the same thing af, in the rectification meeting. The rectification meeting turns out to be sort of as interesting as the green meeting for that reason. [MM: Mm-hmm.] Because now we, we all think we, we all think we now have an understanding of all these samples, but it turns out that's, that will *not* turn out to be the case, [MM: Interesting.] probably.
- 1:28:11 MM: All right, cool. I look forward to my homework. This is fascinating, as always.
- 1:28:17 RTH: All righty. Well, I will send, I will send this document that we have just done immediately, and uh, we'll press on.