

AN EXISTENTIAL PHENOMENOLOGICAL
STUDY OF GAINING INSIGHT
INTO ONESELF THROUGH
PERCEIVING ANOTHER PERSON

TREVOR MARTIN HOEK

A Thesis submitted in partial
fulfilment of the requirements
for the Degree of Master
of Social Science in Psychology,
Rhodes University

February 1988

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to examine the structure of the experience of gaining insight into oneself through perceiving another person. Such a one-to-one situation was selected in order to ensure a minimal level of complexity. The researcher conducted a pilot study in order to check whether people could relate such an experience in response to a long and difficult interview question. One female first year student responded from among a group of thirty to whom the question was posed. She was then interviewed. The data appeared acceptable. This was confirmed after the data analysis using the phenomenological-psychological method of textual analysis. The analysis showed that the subject, while comparing herself with the person whom she was with, discovered that she structured her life too rigidly in her attempt to meet the expectations of others. This discovery gave her the opportunity to restructure her approach to her world and to the others whom she had seen in only a narrow and abstracted way. Lengthier interviews were then conducted with a further six potential subjects. These were then transcribed. Two of those subjects, though, were found to have experienced insight through perceiving more than one other person. The data from the four remaining subjects were then analysed using the phenomenological-psychological method. The researcher discovered that insight involves a clarity of perception which is achieved when the person becomes aware of clearly differentiated possibilities; these are

revealed to him through his intensely reflecting on where he stands in relation to the other person whom he perceives, or in relation to alternatives revealed to him by the other. The polarities that are revealed allow the person to take up a new approach to his world, since the person discovers that his experience has revealed that he has been inauthentic in his muddled concern about others, and this gives the person a perception of truth that he was previously unaware of. These findings were dialogued with the writing of psychologists and philosophers who have written on the subject of becoming aware of oneself in relation to others.

Without Contraries is no progression

William Blake *

* Plate 3 of the Marriage of Heaven and Hell

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank:

Professor Dreyer Kruger for supervising my work.

Michael Parker for his assistance and supervision in the early stages of the research.

My wife for her support and interest in my work.

All the people whom I interviewed, who willingly told me of their experiences so that I may learn.

Edna Meise and Colleen Mc Phillips for typing this thesis.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	5
 <u>CHAPTER ONE</u>	
1.1 INTRODUCTION	8
1.2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	16
1.3 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	54
 <u>CHAPTER TWO</u>	
2. METHOD AND FINDINGS	61
2.1 METHODOLOGY	61
2.2 TABLE OF CONTENTS: DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	70
2.3 DATA ANALYSIS TABLES	72
2.4 FINDINGS	149
 <u>CHAPTER THREE</u>	
3. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	171
3.1 AWARENESS OF THE SELF, AWARENESS OF THE OTHER, AND INSIGHT	171
3.2 TYPES OF EXPERIENCES OF GAINING INSIGHT	185

3.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	186
 <u>APPENDICES</u>	
APPENDIX A : SUBJECT 1 : INTERVIEW AND MEANING UNITS	188
APPENDIX B : SUBJECT 2 : INTERVIEW AND MEANING UNITS	196
APPENDIX C : SUBJECT 3 : INTERVIEW AND MEANING UNITS	201
APPENDIX D : SUBJECT 4 : INTERVIEW AND MEANING UNITS	207
APPENDIX E : PILOT INTERVIEW	220
APPENDIX F : PILOT : MEANING UNITS AND TRANSFORMED MEANING UNITS (T.M.U.'s)	225
 REFERENCES	 238

CHAPTER 1

1.1 INTRODUCTION

'Becoming aware', in Buber's (1947) terms, is a decisively different kind of perception to that involved in 'observing', or even 'looking on' (pp. 8-9). The 'observer', writes Buber (1947), is:

"...wholly intent on fixing the observed man in his mind, on "noting" him. He probes him and writes him up" (p.8).

This type of perception turns the observed person into an "object (which) consists of traits... (and) a face is nothing but physiognomy, movements nothing but gestures ..." (ibid., pp. 8-9).

The 'onlooker', on the other hand, pays no attention to traits; "what stands out for him from the object is what is not "character" and not "expression" " (p.9, emphasis added). Nonetheless, the "observer" and the "onlooker" are "similarly orientated, in that they have a position, namely, the very desire to perceive the man who is living before our eyes" (ibid.), who is, for them, an "object separated from themselves ...(and) what they experience neither demands action from them nor inflicts

destiny on them" (ibid.).

Such an orientation marks a relation, which Buber (1970,p.73) characterized as "I-It" or subject-object relations which are different to the meetings or encounters that occur in the realm between the "I" and the "Thou": "Spirit is not in the (detached) I but between the I and Thou" (Buber quoted by Theunissen, 1984, p.272). Buber (1947) alluded to this non-objective encounter 'between man and man' on page 9 of his book Between Man and Man :

It is a different matter (to an aloof perspective) when in a receptive hour of my personal life a man meets me about whom there is something which I cannot grasp in any objective way at all, that "says something" to me... says something to me, addresses something that enters my own life... The man himself has nothing to do with what is said. He has no relation to me, he has indeed not noticed me at all" (emphasis added).

The effect of this meeting is completely different from that of looking on and observing: "This man is not my object: I have got to do with him" (Buber, 1947, p.10): in fact "all real life is a meeting "(Buber quoted by Theunissen, 1984, p.278).

This type of perception, as we have noted, Buber (1947) terms "becoming aware" (ibid.), and it takes place in "the realm of the

between" (Buber quoted by Theunissen, 1984, p.278). It is also clearly an emergence of understanding and reality: a development of an authentic dialogue, the limits of which "are the limits of awareness" (ibid.). This "becoming aware" in terms of such a "meeting" is the focus of this study.

The emergence of awareness, in terms of the perception of others, has been discussed by various writers in psychology and philosophy. For example Leahy and Shirk (1985), in their review of cognitive developmental research, raise the problem of what they term the "functional (developmental) relationship between self and social self-conceptions" (p.133, emphasis added). They note that Herzberg et al (1981) found that, across school levels, self-conceptions tended to show greater depth than did social self-conceptions. This difference in the quality and depth between how I perceive myself, compared to how I perceive others to be thinking about me, "compromises the role of the social self-concept as a primary determinant of the self-concept" (p.134). Leahy and Shirk note that since the social self-concept is purported to have significance with regard to self-concept development, studies aimed at clarifying the issue of self-concept development and perception of how others perceive the self and the level of "social-cognitive functioning" are clearly needed (ibid.). Leahy and Shirk note, further, that a "within-subject comparison of the structure of self and social self-conceptions" (p.134. emphasis added), would more directly address the question

of the functional relationship between self - concept development and perception of how others perceive the self.

In these terms, this study will examine the structure of the situation in which one gains insight into oneself through perceiving another person and will include an explication of the relation between self and others in general, e.g. being concerned about how others perceive one, as well as the relation between self and the other significant person who is encountered.

In this regard there are two important issues to consider with respect to the relation between self and others. Firstly, Leahy and Shirk (1985) note that the Other, or our perception of the other in terms of how he/she perceives us, does not necessarily form the 'original ground' which we then imitate or internalize, since this does not adequately address the problem of how an individual might "question or reject values she has internalized" (p.135) on the one hand, or consider contradictions and "conflicting qualities in the self" (ibid, p.145) on the other hand. Secondly, though, Cooper (1983) tells us that the Other as such, in terms of the structure of our being-human, is, according to Heidegger, the "original unifying unity of what tends apart" (Heidegger cited by Cooper, p.203) and is, thus, a structure for the integrity of the person.

It is clear from the discussion so far that we are dealing with an implicit dialogue between the study of the ontogeny of the self as

the emergence of a relatively high level of "cognitive" differentiation that invokes alternative ('other') standpoints, on the one hand - and the ontological structure of the Other as the ground for integration, on the other hand. This dialogue forms the very ground for our research, in that our research problem is: 'what is the structure of realizing something about oneself, through perceiving someone else?' Such a question concerning the structure of a "realizing" of something, or a gaining insight, calls for the discussion of developmental approaches, since becoming aware, or making an alternative standpoint manifest in oneself, is a calling-forth of a new way of being that is another step in the project towards an authentic selfhood.

For example, Parker (1985) notes that:

"One's sense of self is not a given of one's existence, but rather a personal task to be fulfilled ... This implies that the self is not a static unchanging entity, but rather stems from continuous reappropriation, through reflection, of oneself from... ever-changing engagements with "objects" (in the widest sense of the word)..." (pp.181-182).

The structure of an experience that typifies this projected development forms the focus of this study, in which we examine the person's experience of a seeing into him/herself as-a-self, through perceiving another person, an experience which reveals to

the person who he/she is.

In order to conduct such a study of the person's experience of such an insightful encounter, we will conduct a psychological analysis of the subjects' own descriptions of a particular situation in which they had such an encounter. The method of textual analysis that will be used is the psychological-phenomenological method.

We will now go on to a discussion of our research question in order to set the boundaries of our study. This will serve to guide the reader through our subsequent review of the literature, a review which spans a broad spectrum of theory, but which is structured by our research problem as we will set it out.

The following question was formulated in order to elicit accounts of the experience of gaining insight into one's own life situation through perceiving another person:

"Please describe as concretely and in as much detail as possible an experience in which you had a leap of insight into your life situation because of some way that you perceived someone else."

The subject is asked to describe an experience which he/she lived through, rather than describe him/herself, or rather than give an explanation of any such event, since "pre-reflectively one lives

situations, and is never directly present to oneself" (Parker, 1985, p.8). Yet, in our case, the self, as it is 'lived pre-reflectively,' is itself the focus of our question: we examine the structure of the life-situation in which this 'pre-reflective' mantle falls away, because of some way the person perceives someone else. Hence the life situation in which the person is pre-reflectively living becomes transparent, and the person reflectively sees how he/she is being in that situation.

The question as it is posed, then, sets the subjects a difficult task, in that this question demands a particular account of a situation in which the person becomes authentically aware of his/her very situatedness, a situatedness which is usually lived pre-reflectively.

Szczepanski (1979) argues that this process of becoming aware, of reaching the level of awareness required for such a creative seeing-into one's life situations, is a "difficult process, rarely undertaken" (p.119). As such the difficult task which we set our subjects will not elicit responses from many people, save those whose experiences reached such an intensity of awareness that the situation is well remembered; furthermore, since "Heidegger uses the concepts "everyday" and "inauthentic" as meaning the same" (Theunissen, 1984, p.193), this type of experience is clearly not an 'everyday' experience, and is steeped in authenticity.

We will not be asking the subjects to describe an experience they had in terms of how they perceived another person to be thinking about them, since that is perhaps one "type"* of experience which might be examined at another time. This research serves to gain a view of the structure of the experience as well as to document some types of experience so that more particular questions may be asked in further research. Furthermore, since we have already noted the possible difficulty of the creative task we are investigating, we have decided to opt for a question that taps a high level* of intensity of experience, so that an examination of the types* of perception, as related to gaining insight, is to be part of our problem.

Our research, then, is clearly defined by the interrelationship between level, type and structure*. Since we have determined the level at which it is necessary to examine our phenomenon, as well as the type of "gaining insight" we will examine, it remains for

* Here we are referring to Giorgi's (1979) discussion of the relationships among level, type and structure, especially pages 86-88.

us to discover the various types of perceptual experiences involved in gaining insight through perceiving another, as well as to discover the structure that forms the basis, or essence of what is lived through, but not known, psychologically, by the subject.

Having outlined the boundaries of our research and articulated our research question, we move to a discussion of relevant theory, after which we will discuss the method and findings of our empirical work. Finally we will dialogue the empirical findings of our study with the theory, a dialogue structured by the boundaries of the research problem as set out.

1.2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Encountering Others

Szczepanski (1979) writes that the other is primarily necessary for me to become aware of my own existence (p.113). The other is a mirror, in which I test myself, and in which I discover my identity (ibid.). I discover my identity by opposing others in terms of the statement: here am I, this is where "mine" ends, there is the other and where "his" begins. However, although I thus become aware of my limits through contact with others, and the other is "the condition for ascertaining my identity"

(p.114), Szczepanski demands that we have to raise the question of whether there exists anything that can be called the essence of man in his pure form, not shaped by others (p.121). Szczepanski believes that there does exist such a thing, and it is the result of a process of the development of "individuality", the most important effect and manifestation of which is the creation of the "internal world" (ibid.). Szczepanski sees this as an essentially creative process (p.122). This creation not only gives its creator the beginning of a new life, but also represents an attempt to penetrate the internal world of other people. It also introduces 'new contents' into that peculiar human world "in-between", viz, 'between' my internal world and the one belonging to the other as a human being who is the creator of his own internal world, which might be similar to mine (pp. 122-123). It introduces "new contents," in as much as, if I construct my internal world - and it is only in it that my individuality manifests itself, then it is an individuality that "I can then radiate out into the world" (p.117). Furthermore, the most important human affairs taking place "in-between" originate in the "internal world": the drama of human existence begins only when internal worlds and the problems of the internal world come into play (p.115).

Szczepanski argues further, in these terms, that the other makes us human, not only in the "external world" of things, institutions and manipulation, but also in the world "in-between". According to Szczepanski, this means that the objects of the internal world are

"verified" and measured against the objects of the world "in-between", and if they are "approved" by the "measures" or ideas there in use, then they become a permanent element of that world (p.123). However, according to Szczepanski we discover the existence of this shared world as a result of building our internal world:

"If I am aware of my essence as my individuality, then I am aware of the autonomous dimension of my existence, and then I may become aware that there must exist a world of relations between people as "pure individualities", as people "in themselves"" (p.123).

Humanity is thus revealed as an interactive reality, the nature of which is shown to be within the world in-between. Our being fully human thus requires us to dialogue with the other's presence so that our presence as an individual requires us to bear the other in mind.

Szczepanski notes, further, that in the world "in-between," another human being is the partner of my individuality (p.118); if I do not live in my internal world, then the "image of the other remains at the level of externals - things ... and manipulation" (ibid.). The world in-between only exists between "internal worlds" (ibid.).

We, thus far, understand that the world in-between is the realm of the encounter, where we meet the other as a human being, and in which we become fully human, and in which we may thus presence, or "radiate out" as a person. (p.117).

Szczepanski claims that we do not know how someone may go about building an internal world (p.121), save to say that out of all the organically based forces, out of the sphere of the irrational, out of "introspection of the social world" - I construct my internal world (p.117). It originates through the process of growth, the process of socialization, upbringing and the influences of the entire environment (p.121). Szczepanski insists that this essence, this individuality, reflects a state that develops spontaneously (p.117), a state that is not shared by others, nor is it dependent on social relations and manipulatory relations in the external world (p.119), since, for all this, awareness sometimes remains at the level at which people do not realize its possibilities (p.117). Szczepanski thus, links 'individuality', which is also necessary for seeing the other as a human being, at a level higher than the image remaining at the level of externals, with awareness. In this dimension of existence, awareness of others requires awareness of the self, "awareness of the self in the internal world of one's individual, not typical essence" (pp.118-119). Szczepanski claims that this is a difficult process, rarely undertaken (p.119).

So far we might be forgiven for concluding that, although the

process is rarely undertaken, it is still feasible to claim that when a person has an awareness of self, and is thoughtfully involved in an encounter with another person in the world "in-between" the "internal worlds" of the individuals involved - in the sense of each "radiating out" into the world - that each are then fully present to the other, as a human being. However, this is not what Szczepanski concludes. Szczepanski is pessimistic with regard to the feasibility of a man being fully present to another; he argues that because I never really know the "other" in full, in terms of the "external world", the "in-between" world and the impenetrable internal world, I cannot encounter the other as completely human (p.124).

Szczepanski's argument is intriguing, but his final conclusions are faulty; this is, however, almost inevitable in the light of Szczepanski's dualistic language: the language demands that Szczepanski arrive at a conclusion that contradicts his argument. In order to support this, we first note that we have discovered that Szczepanski reveals that an essential integrity of the self is created by the person, away from the superficial influences of technical, social and institutionalized interactions with others. We have also seen that this integrity is the necessary condition for the coming into being of an "in-between" wherein he/she radiates out an awareness of his/her essence, also treating the "other" as the creator of his/her own "internal world" (pp.122-

123). We note, further, that Szczepanski tells us that "When I take refuge in my internal world, I am able to see the other in a different light, the light of what is my highest value, "that which makes me human" (p.119, emphasis added).

Szczepanski also notes that the "whole" of myself is not formed in the world of social relations, but, nonetheless, my essence is shaped in some measure by contact with others (p.117)", and that "pure individuality comes into relation with others and must then have measures and norms that originate not merely from itself. These exist in the world "in-between". Abiding by them ensures complete humanity." (p.123).

So it seems that achieving "complete humanity" not only requires that there exist a world "in-between", a world which is notably a world in which essential values are shared, but that if such a "complete humanity" is achieved in the light of a taking refuge in an internal world on the one hand, and a sharedness on the other, then the other person in the encounter is seen in the same light: the light that makes the perceiver human.

Yet, Szczepanski concludes that we can never encounter the other as completely human. This conclusion is based on Szczepanski's indefensible claim, in terms of its being inconsistent with his own argument, that a person needs to "penetrate the hermetically sealed" or encapsulated internal world of others in order to see

them as human (p.124). This in terms of Szczepanski's own understanding is not necessary, since we have already noted that on page 117, he writes of a "radiating out", a presencing-forth of one's integrity that "adds new contents into the 'in-between'."

Unlike Szczepanski, if we follow his very argument and then realize, further, that the "other" is not an encapsulated or "hermetically sealed" psyche, then we can safely conclude that when we encounter ourselves fully in ourselves, we then encounter others in-themselves, as human beings who presence-forth, or radiate-out their own being-human.

The Other As The Ground For The Emergence Of Self Awareness And Individuality

Robert Cooper (1983) writes that "we know ourselves only through the echo of the Other" (p.202). We can understand this in terms of the other returning us to ourselves, and we thus find ourselves in-one-another. This understanding lies within understanding the other as being "different", insofar as "difference is that which mediates between two and, in so doing, holds apart while holding together" (Cooper citing Heidegger, p.203). Who we are thus, "in-ourselves", is a being-integrated, structurally, in-one-another in terms of Heidegger's conception of "the Other" as an "in-one-anotherness" (ibid.) and, later, the concept as analyzed in terms of the "difference" we mentioned previously. In these terms

"everyone is the other, and no one is himself" (Cooper quoting Heidegger, p.202) and "the self is a function of the other" (Cooper quoting G.H. Mead, p.202).

Just as the seasons are revealed as different, as "other" than each other, insofar as "the seasons are in-one-another through a process of mutual reflection or reversal" (p.203), so am I revealed to be other than "others". This process of mutual reflection or reversal, writes Cooper, is much the same as you seeing yourself "in a mirror, which is equivalent to saying that the mirror returns you to yourself" (ibid.). Thus, "as ontology, the Other is that which includes disjunction and conjunction. It is like the rim of a glass, which while separating inside from outside at the same time brings them together... separates as well as joins..." (ibid.).

In these terms, Cooper notes that "in our own time, it has been Heidegger's special task to recover this original but lost meaning of the Other as the 'original unifying unity of what tends apart'" (Cooper citing Heidegger, p.203). Only in these terms is the everyday thought that "the other is that which is separate in the sense of not being this but that..." (Cooper, p.202) understandable as a 'separateness' that is, at the same time, a 'boundedness,' a structure, in terms of which we are held as integrated.

Cooper writes, further, that in Merleau-Ponty's ontology, reflexivity and reversibility become "the essential means by which the human being knows his or her world" (ibid., p.203). Cooper notes that in various of his works, Merleau-Ponty pursued and elaborated this definitive feature of his phenomenology, "namely, that the body knows itself only through taking the position of another through which it comes back to itself" (Cooper citing Merleau-Ponty, p.203). In these terms:

"Vision is not a certain mode of thought or presence to self; it is the means given me for being absent from myself, for being present at the fission of Being from the inside - the fission at whose termination, and not before, I come back to myself" (ibid., p.203-204, emphasis added).

Although in another section we consider Dillon's argument against this purely visual perspective, the point Cooper is making here tells us that here, the 'fission' is the point of difference or disjunction/conjunction, and that for Merleau-Ponty, the ontological significance of the point of difference lies in its "pivotal or axial function" and that it is at this point that things turn around each other. "The Other is no longer simple reflection but a structure in which actions take place in one another" (Cooper, p.204, emphasis added).

Cooper, in his further discussion of the 'social other' quotes Mead(1934) who writes: "Reflexiveness... is the essential condition, within the social process for the development of mind "(Cooper quoting Mead, p.205). Cooper then states that Mead tells us that reflexiveness means the "turning back of the individual's experience on him or herself, which suggests that his ontology is similar to that of Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty" (Cooper, p.205).

Robert L Leahy and Stephen R Shirk (1985) argue that theories of development that are based on models of internalization, imitation, or identification have difficulty explaining why an individual might question or reject values which she has internalized. Leahy and Shirk argue that if we believe that the strength of a response or a habit grows stronger with repeated exposure, then we would wonder why some older individuals would question or reject established values learned over many years. In their cognitive-developmental model, Leahy and Shirk propose that "the individual may be able to consider contradictions or limitations of those values" (p.135).

One particularly relevant issue, with respect to this argument, is that early adolescence may represent the period in development when "inferences about how the self appears to others exert their

greatest influence on the self-image "(p.131.). According to Leahy and Shirk there are, however, grounds for expecting that this influence will decrease "at higher developmental levels" (ibid.). Leahy and Shirk give the example of the "transition from conventional to postconventional moral judgement" which "reflects a change from the other-directed to self-directed forms of reasoning (ibid., emphasis added). This increased level of self-directed reasoning equates with a higher level of authenticity: "Rather than orientating to the expectations of significant others or the social group, the postconventional individual orients to the standards of conduct that are not contingent on social expectations "(ibid.). The individual is thus thrown back on himself, and the 'self' becomes "more reflective" of the relationship between his own view of self and the view of others (ibid.).

A lack of consensus emerges along with a "separation of the self from its social sources" (pp. 131, 134). From the dialogues that are thus entered into, "there may emerge, not a 'democratic' self which is a repository of the other's values, but rather a private self which strives for independence" (p.134). According to Leahy and Shirk this marks the beginning of the "individuating" of a self "which has its own fable, its own projected life history and its own values."(ibid., emphasis added). Selves exist both in relation to other values and in the awareness that self and other differ "(ibid.). According to Leahy and Shirk, it is this issue

which is most indicative of the failure of a "general process" model of person perception that reduces self and other-perception to the same model, in that it fails to take into account the existential separation of the self and other" (p.140). Instead of such a model, Leahy and Shirk propose a model of "levels of self-conception," and suggest that there are "qualitative changes in the dimensions used in describing the self and the relation of the other to the self" (p.144). On the first level the child sees the self and others as having similar interpretations of reality. The child at this level may focus on subjective experiences (eg. labeling the self as "bad"), but has difficulty recognising the other, possibly conflicting, qualities of the self (p.145, not original emphasis). We may note at this point Leahy and Shirk's choice of words, noting that the reason that a child may not recognise "the other" qualities of self may be that there is thus far a lower level of 'differentiation' in the child's experiencing of the world.

At the next level, differences between self and other are viewed as important sources of information in judging the self's performance through social comparison, and then attempting to conform to the expectations of others. This, then, represents a 'conventional' stage. We might, however, also label this level, the level of the emergence of inauthenticity prior to the beginning of a process of individuation.

The third level is the "subjective-process level" which is marked by "greater qualifications in self-descriptions as the self is seen as varying across situations and time..." (p.145). Leahy and Shirk also claim that there is an attempt to "integrate, or find acceptable, apparently conflicting qualities in the self" (ibid.). At this stage there is an increasing awareness that the other may have inaccurate impressions of the self (p.146). Leahy and Shirk claim that the distinctive quality of the self at this level is "the tendency to reflect on the process of the self's construction or change (ibid.). Values are less determined by a "particular reference group or one's reputation among peers" and more determined by self-chosen principles (p.147). This third level is "not free from conflict, since opposing qualities of the self are recognized" (ibid., emphasis added).

Being Authentic In Relation To Others.

In Heidegger's (1962) book Being and Time, in which he formulates his problem as 'the problem about the meaning of Being', i.e. that which determines entities as entities (p.25), he argues that, in order to formulate this question "explicitly and transparently, we must first explicate an entity with regard to its being" (p.27, not original emphasis). The entity that Heidegger chooses to explicate is "This entity which each of us is himself and which includes inquiring as one of the possibilities of its Being" (ibid., emphasis added). Heidegger, thus, in his attempt at

addressing the question concerning the meaning of Being, approaches his task by attempting to explicate the "entity which each of us is... (which) we shall denote by the term "Dasein" "(ibid.), which means, literally "Being-there" (Macquarrie and Robinson, 1962, p.27). Thus, according to Heidegger, Dasein is what each of us is, and is thus one among many, or "one-among-others" (Theunissen, 1984, p.184). Thus the 'subject' of everyday "Dasein" is himself an Other" (ibid., emphasis added). This is not to say that Dasein is only capable of conformity to what we are, since Heidegger distinguishes between inauthenticity and authentic being one's Self (Heidegger, 1962, p.167): each represents a different possible way for Dasein to have "mineness", or 'something of its own' (ibid., p.68), even though Dasein is what each of us is himself (ibid., p.27).

Inauthenticity arises in Dasein's lostness in being concerned about what "they" do, demand, or think, and how Dasein matches up to these (ibid., pp.163-164; Theunissen, 1984, p.187). Inauthenticity, then, is marked by:

"...constant care as to the way one differs from them (others)... The care about this distance... is disturbing to Being-with-one-another" (Heidegger, 1962, pp.163-164).

Heidegger thus, notes that this attempt at finding a sense of

"mineness" in conformity, and, thus, constantly caring about what others think, is not only 'excessive self-concern,' but is also an excessive concern about others. This means that someone who is so self-concerned loses himself, and loses meaningful contact with others:

"...Dasein, as everyday Being-with-one-another, stands in subjection to others. It itself is not; its Being has been taken away by Others" (ibid., p164, emphasis added).

As we noted earlier, Heidegger distinguishes this "everyday" way of being, as a being 'inauthentic' from the "authentic Self" (ibid., p167) which is "the Self which has been taken hold of in its own way" (ibid.). In order that Dasein achieve this, it must first "find itself" (ibid.). If Dasein discloses to itself its own authentic Being, and thus discovers the world in its own way, there is "a clearing-away of concealments and obscurities" (ibid.).

However, although Heidegger notes the difference between being authentically one's own self, and the lostness in thinking about what "they" do, Heidegger still insists that: "Authentic Being-one's-Self does not rest upon an exceptional condition of the subject, a condition...detached from the "they" " (p.168.). Instead Heidegger notes that becoming an individual is, "rather an 'existentiell'" (a person's own path of choosing, c.f. Heidegger,

1962, p.33) modification of the "they" - of the "they" as an essential 'existentiale' "(an ontological 'category' of possible "who-ness" that Dasein can choose as its own, c.f. Heidegger, 1962 pp.70-71).

Parker (1985) writes that, in Heidegger's view, the 'understanding' characteristic of authentic being involves projecting oneself upon one's very own possibilities. In order to do this one needs to acknowledge one's very own being-guilty, in terms of one's having fallen away from these possibilities. Its only in the light of this owning of one's very own being-guilty that one can then go on to authentically choose, decide, or make up one's mind to be different in a resolute way. This resoluteness, reveals itself where one is open to silence:

"If we are to hear the call back to our authentic selves, it is necessary that we be quiet enough to listen to it. (Furthermore)... being one's self authentically does not imply an egocentric preoccupation with oneself... but rather is: "as something that keeps silent..." (Parker quoting Gelven, 1985, p.36).

Parker (1985) argues that the call from the self to the self is best described as "conscience", which is a being aware of one's being-in-the-world in general, as being-with-others; as also being

indebted, by having fallen into an entanglement with one's self, lost in the muddling "they". Furthermore, conscience as the call away from the incompleteness and fallenness of being lost in the "they", is "concerned specifically with the distinction between authentic and inauthentic modes of being..." (p.41).

Authenticity as the realization of one's authentic potentiality, and as an understanding of oneself, in Heideggers view, is structured around the human being's existence with others. Furthermore, authentic being involves a discovery of one's own rootedness in projects toward one's very own possibilities (Parker, 1985). This is contrasted with the undefined limits of inauthentic lostness in the "they", when man has fallen into a self-dissection, at his own hands, as a result of his being concerned in 'measuring' himself against the other:

"The reality sustained by the self of (losing oneself in) the "they" gives ... the impression conducive to tranquility that there is no need for authentic understanding (nor) the state-of-mind (anxiety) that goes with it" (Parker, 1985, p.24).

However this alienation: "drives it (Dasein) into a kind of Being which borders on the most exaggerated 'self-dissection'" (Parker quoting Heidegger, p.24). This then means that the inauthentic person becomes "caught up with himself" and can no longer see beyond himself" (Parker, p.24).

With respect to authentically being oneself in relation to others, R D Laing (1971) writes that: "To be 'authentic' is to be true to oneself, to be what one is, to be 'genuine'. To be 'inauthentic' is to not be oneself... a person who habitually uses action as a masquerade is not real" (p.127). Furthermore, according to Laing, it is an "achievement to realize one is not necessarily who others take one to be "(ibid.):

"True guilt is guilt at the obligation one owes to oneself to be oneself, to actualize oneself. False guilt is guilt felt at not being what other people feel one ought to be or assume that one is" (p.152).

The non-reality of the person who does not achieve this and who, thus, is "not real" is reflected in their very perception of the other and the other's picture of him.

"Those who deceive themselves are obliged to deceive others. It is impossible for me to maintain a false picture of myself unless I falsify your picture of yourself and of me" (p.143, emphasis added).

A quality of unreality thus pervades the person's very perceiving, but this muddle represents a confrontation, a confused encounter. In order to emerge from the muddle Laing notes that a therapeutic

context demands that the disjunction must be seen. Once seen, and faced for the first time confusion is converted to conflict. "False conflict is muddling. When the 'issue' is false and confused, the 'real' or 'true' conflict cannot come into focus, 'true' choices are not available ..." (p.143).

Opposition, the clarifying of poles - a 'genuine conflict' - thus emerges in the 'therapeutic' encounter. It is clear that such an encounter is rich with 'differences' and with 'truth' and with being-real, all of which lies in the "seeing" and the facing of the differences.

Laing tells us that only to the extent that the person is not completely 'in' this position, that he is "not totally estranged from his own experience and actions, can he experience his position as false "(p.131).

In these terms a person must at once, paradoxically, be absent to the situation as a false, "social" situation, an encounter in which he is being-for-the-other inauthentically, yet at the same time must be present to the situation in a way that he is not estranged from his own experience and actions. This means the person must at once be being false, but (in a way) authentically present to his being false - so that it may be lived as a conflict - as a situation in which the person is guilty in the "true" sense. The situation is then steeped in Otherness, in Opposition: the situation, though, remains a situation for the person, who in

putting himself into what he does, loses himself, and in so doing seems to become himself. Laing refers to this "putting himself into what I do" as "self-disclosure" (p.126-127) and then refers us to Heidegger's notion of truth as "that which is without secrecy, what discloses itself without a veil" (p.129). Laing notes that when one sees the other in the light of this form of truth, "one says a man is... 'true to himself' ... When a man's words, gestures, acts, disclose his real intentions, one says they are genuine" (pp.129-130).

This 'being-real' in its being a 'putting oneself into' and, thus, at the same time a losing of oneself from where one 'was', is a making "patent the latent self of the doer" (p.126), in that it progressively brings into being an "otherness" to what one 'was'/'is'. Once again we hear the echo of the Other in its calling one forward to who one really is.

The Other As An "Other I", Who Embodies Alternatives For Being Oneself.

Husserl considers the other to be "an Other I" (Theunissen, 1984, p.147). The other is the "not I" in the form of "Other I" (ibid.). Theunissen (1984) notes that Husserl takes it to be so self-

evident that the word "Other" means "Other I", that he does not take it to be necessary to justify it. This view holds that since the Other is an 'Other I'; the supposition that the "Other is made accessible originally only in empathy" (p.148) corresponds with it: "He is I, but not me... someone appears there who is as I am but not me" (ibid.). However, the I in the Other is indeed "the Other itself, the Other in his "very own" being, and is in fact "There" "(ibid., pp.149-150).

Bearing this in mind, and following Andrew's (1982) explication of Husserl's thinking, it can be claimed that the importance of the other as a structure for self-awareness lies in the "negation" that appears within my primordial world in the "there-ness" of the other (p.97). The "thereness" of the other as a really possible consciousness emphasises a lack of my ownness being-there-where-the-other-is, and so intensifies my ownness-here, where I feel myself to be:

"I apperceive that if my own body were out "There" instead of "Here,"... I would appear as a "body"... without an immediately "present"... psychic life... I apperceive the alter ego as a "being there too" which is not "itself there" (p.95).

This givenness of the other, as the verification of my primordial groundedness in the sense of my being a feeling-body "here," even though I see a potentially conscious body "there," is also emphasized by Husserl himself in the following words:

"The Other," according to his own constituted sense, points to me myself; the other is a "mirroring" of my own self and yet not a mirroring proper..." (Husserl quoted by Andrew, 1982, p.92).

The connection between my I and the I of the other is closer than the relation between me and my mirror image: "He is an appresented I that I myself am not, but, relative to me, a modification, an other I" (Theunissen quoting Husserl, p.149).

The grounds for this claim lies in Husserl's understanding that: "Human beings exercise upon one another an 'immediate' personal action... They have a 'motivating power' for each other "(ibid, p.126). The "immediacy" is the immediacy of perceiving a body "There" as a human being, in his very bodiliness, rather than as an image in a mirror: "If we look each other in the eyes, subject meets subject in an immediate interaction" (ibid., p.121, emphasis added). The interaction between "subjects," then can be understood as an intersubjective encounter, in which the other presents as a modified I. Since the other presents to me as I am, as a body which I understand empathically, that other who I encounter does

not "yield anything new" (ibid., p.159); Husserl claims that: "What I have not myself experienced, I am unable to encounter in the Other" (ibid). Nonetheless, I apperceive the other, as such, as there, and as potential consciousness that is other than me.

The apperception of the other, "There," as such, can allow my own essence to be contrasted for me with some other 'consciousness'. "(The fact) that I... can become aware of someone else (as an other consciousness) presupposes that not all my own modes of consciousness are modes of my self consciousness" (Husserl quoted by Andrew, p.91). The other, as someone else as well as a "community of others," are "possibilities to myself at the most radical levels of my being..." (Andrew, p.98). The reality of the otherness of myself, as it is revealed to me from 'there', gives the potentialities thus revealed a status unobtainable in terms of the sameness of my own beliefs 'here'.

Perception

Merleau-Ponty has argued that the perceived world is "the always presupposed foundation of all rationality, all value and all existence" (Merleau-Ponty quoted by Giorgi, 1977, p.81). This statement, according to Giorgi (1977) states that the thesis of "the primacy of perception" (ibid.), according to Merleau-Ponty, means that the experience of perception "is our presence at the moment when things, truths, values are constituted for us... it

summons us to the tasks of knowledge and action (ibid., pp.81-82, emphasis added).

This is the same thesis as Buber's (1947), which was discussed in the introductory section of this chapter:

"It is...different... (to an aloof perspective) when... a man meets me about whom there is something... that says something to me... speaks something that enters my own life..." (Buber, 1947, p.9, emphasis added).

Just as Buber (1947) differentiates between perception as a "becoming aware" (ibid., p.9), on the one hand, and 'observation' and 'looking-on,' on the other hand, arguing that the latter two are orientated towards the man who is for them "an object separated from themselves," so Merleau-Ponty also argues that perception which is the presence at the moment of the emergence of truth, introduce "difficulties for objective thought" (Giorgi, 1977, p.82). Although we will not discuss the "difficulties" as such, we will present the positive corollaries which contribute to a descriptive understanding of perception, as relevant to our study.

Firstly, perception has a certain opacity because it "rests on an already established engagement of the subject in the world" (Giorgi quoting Salis, 1977, p.83) and, thus, is in no way

dependent on a pure act of thought: perception is not simply the "correlate of a synthetic activity of thought performed by a (worldless) subject" (ibid.).

This means, secondly, that perception, rather than thought, is the primary original ground. In fact, "perception founds thought, rather than the other way around" (Giorgi, 1977, p.83).

Thirdly, according to Giorgi (1977), these same themes are involved with respect to perception and reality:

"The nature of perceptual experience cannot be exhaustively understood in terms of the laws of physical reality... As Merleau-Ponty says, scientific thinking is a derived mode of thinking... All explanatory systems presuppose a prior naive awareness and perceptual experiences are among those "naive givens" (Giorgi citing Merleau-Ponty, 1977, p.84).

Perception, thus, as a primary given, "makes us know existences" (Giorgi quoting Merleau-Ponty, 1977, p.84), and, thus is an act of 'becoming aware'. Furthermore such a 'becoming aware' refers to an embodied awareness: for Merleau-Ponty, "a theory of the body is already a theory of perception" (Giorgi citing Merleau-Ponty, 1977, p.84). Such a viewpoint, insofar as it proposes an embodied perception within the world, a bodily orientation within the world (Giorgi, 1977, p.89), differs from the traditional scientific

approach to perception. Internality is thus not a content in consciousness, but "mind in the world" (ibid, p.94). As Merleau-Ponty puts it:

"...behaviour, far from being a thing... is a whole significative for a consciousness which considers it; but it (is) at the same time and reciprocally to make manifest in "expressive conduct" the view of a consciousness under our eyes, to show a mind which comes into the world" (Merleau-ponty quoted by Giorgi, 1977, p.94)..

The importance of this view of the internal relation of consciousness in the world, "under our eyes" is that it is at least "visible or intelligible to another..." (Giorgi, 1977, pp.94-95).

This aspect of Merleau-Ponty's thesis, i.e. that consciousness in its 'becoming aware' is dependent upon the gaze of the other has been criticized by Dillon (1978).

Dillon (1978), in his discussion of the psychogenesis of the self, critically argues against Merleau-Ponty's claim that, in the early stages of self-development, recognition of the self, in the specular image, takes place long before the infant has transcended the stage of immediate identification with the world (syncretic sociability) and somehow "anticipates the "confiscation" of the

self by the other's look" (p.89). Dillon argues that Merleau-Ponty's claim that self-awareness that arises in the recognition of the body in the mirror precedes the one that takes place through the recognition that one is a perceptual object for others, is erroneous in that, if the two processes of the recognition of self as self on the one hand, is strictly correlative to the awareness of other as other, on the other hand, then the two processes must be concurrent. Dillon argues that this is evident from the understanding that "to identify oneself in a body image (or specular image) is to take up a distanced or alienated perspective,"(p.90) some sense of seeing from a point of view beyond oneself.

Dillon argues that the sources of Merleau-Ponty's error of claiming temporal priority for the recognition of one's image lies in the "overt visibility" of the specular image: "the image is there, reflected in the mirror, a ready-made body image for the infant to assimilate and use to provide ... an identity or sense of selfhood" (ibid.). Dillon claims that this appealingly simple account is insufficient. In addition to the claim that this argument ignores the need to already have a stance beyond oneself in order to recognize an image of oneself as "there", Dillon argues, further, that this argument "fails to do justice to the affective dimension of selfhood (ibid.)." Dillon writes that "The infant is, for himself, what he feels himself to be; and here feeling includes not only physical sensations...but also emotional

feelings of completion, at-one-ness... and so forth..." (ibid.). Dillon emphasises the point that the total experience of the person as phenomenal body is "not primarily a visual experience; it incorporates all the senses...this total self that occupies a perspective, is vulnerable to the reactions of others..." (ibid.).

It is Dillon's "belief that the identification of a visual representation (i.e. the specular image) with what one feels oneself to be must be a relatively late occurrence (requiring the sophistication implicit in any kind of abstraction)..." (pp.90-91, emphasis added).

Thusfar we might argue that the developing person's sense of himself is grounded in, but not limited to the phenomenal body as lived and as object of reflective awareness (p.95). Dillon notes that this "introduces a distinction between the self posited as theme and the self doing the positing. That is, one can distinguish between body-object and body-subject" (p.96). This distinction is necessary to account for the possibility of being sufficiently 'beyond' one's own behaviour, appearance, and so on, in a thoughtful way: " reflection allows me to distance or alienate my body from myself, for I am simultaneously and ambiguously my body and a perspective upon it" (ibid.).

It is clear that selfhood as an awareness, and as a perspective upon oneself as a feeling, thinking body, is the very ground for

otherness in its transcendence and beyondness. Selfhood is also an 'ownedness' insofar as one owns the possibilities that lie in one's goals, in interpretations of past experience and decisions confronting one, in the present. In sum, I am more than my body, an identity which goes beyond the de facto history of my incarnate being, but always "remaining tied to that primordial ground". (ibid., p.84).

Insight As Gaining A New Perspective

With regard to the phenomenon of 'gaining a new perspective,' Norman (1978) discusses T E Hulme's argument that it is possible for a person to experience a change of world-view or "Weltanschauung" without a deliberate "conscious" attempt: "a Weltanschauung is not consciously adopted, but it is absorbed unconsciously from one's social and cultural environment" (p.318).

In order to illustrate such a change in world-view, Norman (1978) cites the example of the experience of Prince Andrey Bolkonski in Tolstoy's War and Peace:

"Andrew (sic) (in the midst of battle) seizes a standard and leads a desperate and futile charge; he falls, wounded:

'What's this? Am I falling?... He opened his eyes, hoping to see how the struggle... had ended... But he saw nothing. Above him there was now nothing but the sky - the lofty sky, not clear yet immeasurably lofty, with great clouds gliding slowly across it. 'How quiet, peaceful, and solemn, not at all as I ran,' thought Prince Andrew - 'not as we ran, shouting and fighting, not at all as the gunner and the Frenchman with frightened and angry faces struggled... How was it I did not see that lofty sky before? And how happy I am to have found it at last... Thank God!...' (p.321).

Norman notes that Andrey's 'discovery' represents the acquisition of an enlarged and clearer view of man's relation to the world (p.326). Norman also raises the question as to whether we can speak of a 'conversion' here; he answers this by noting the nature of Prince Andrey's change:

'What is crucial, I think, is the experience of seeing a whole range of things with which one is familiar, but seeing them in a new light, as though for the first time. (p.327, emphasis added).

The conversion experience, then, is one of seeing things in a new light, seeing the same things and yet seeing them differently, and is a way of seeing that "forces itself upon me" (p.334) and we can speak of a dawning of an aspect, of the way in which (it) strikes me" (ibid.).

In his discussion of the nature of this experience, Norman raises the question as to whether we can speak of anything more than a "casual relation" (p.337) between Prince Andrey's experience and his commitment to a new perspective, or "is there some sense in which Andrew's (sic) experience consititutes a verification or confirmation (of the essential reality) of this view of the world?" (ibid.).

Norman notes that he thinks there is such a sense of confirmation, but that we shall not see it if we look for 'verification by experience' in the traditional empiricist sense. Thus, some of the differences that Norman cites are worth examining. Firstly Norman notes:

that the experience in question is "not the passive recording of perceptual data, but essentially a matter of activity..." (p.337). Furthermore that that which provides the 'verification' of a world view is not an object of experience, but that the nature of experience itself, involves a relation between the self and its world. Norman also argues that the way in which experience serves to 'confirm' a world-view is not a matter of comparing a hypothesis against corresponding observation(s), but, rather, one finds that "a certain perspective enables one to make sense of and to render intelligible the experiences one has lived through (ibid.). Thus, Norman notes that Prince

Andrey's vision of the sky enabled him to "look back at his previous experiences and see them for what they were: the empty gestures of military heroism..." (pp.337-338, emphasis added).

Norman notes that:

"this ...is the form that people's moral development characteristically takes. One encounters a certain view of the world, and realizes that one's past actions, experiences... all fit into place when seen in this light." (p.338).

Norman's (1978) discussion of the nature of insight reflects some aspects of Rycroft's (1972) note that 'insight' (in psychoanalysis) refers "in the first instance to self awareness and self-knowledge, (but) it is also used to refer to the capacity to understand others "(Rycroft, 1972, p.73). In addition to this Rycroft, notes that "emotional insight" is evidence of "freedom from alienation and of 'being in touch with the unconscious" (ibid., pp.72-73).

In traditional psychoanalytic therapy "insight" means "the total understanding of the unconscious determinants of one's irrational feelings, thoughts, or behaviors that are producing...personal misery" (Phares, 1984, p.394). Kruger (1988) on the other hand,

critically rearticulates the experience of gaining an understanding of "unconscious determinants" in his discussion of insight in the case of "Sara":

"...in a sense, we can say that Sara was conscious of her actions but... she did not see what the significance of those actions were... By achieving... insight she was sharing a level of consciousness that was already present in some people around her, notably her therapist. What was 'unconscious' in the life of Sara was conscious in the life of people with whom she was interacting" (Kruger, 1988, p.131).

Kruger goes on to note that, following Van den Berg, the unconscious of the person may be said to be located, "not inside the client, but in the world openness characterized by the relationship between the client (in this case) and...others" (ibid.,p.132).

Following on from Kruger, we can argue that the "content" of what was "repressed," or limited was not "rejected drives and wishes... moral standards" (Fromm-Reichman quoted by Phares, 1984, p.395), but, instead, Sara had "limited her involvement with and openness to the world in terms of her lived bodiliness" (Kruger, 1988, p.130). As such Sara herself as a body was withdrawn from a full and open involvement with the world, not that merely some or the

other objective content' had been withdrawn. Schafer (1976) expresses this 'involvement' thus: "the person is his or her own impulses, defense, insights, and so forth, for they are his or her own actions" (p.147).

Kruger's (1988) understanding of 'insight' as being an involvement, and an understanding of the full significance of actions, as they are already manifested by 'others', provides further evidence that our research question demands, correctly, a description of insight as an interpersonal experience.

Prior Research In The Area Of Perceiving Oneself And Others Differently

The spirit of otherness involved in the discovery that one is, potentially, other-than-oneself, as well as discovering this in terms of perceiving someone else, is echoed in Steen Halling's (1983) description of the phenomenon of 'seeing another as if for the first time.'

Halling describes a sense of surprise and wonder that is experienced in such an encounter. These words "surprise and wonder" suggest to Halling at least three things: (a) the experience was not one that was deliberately worked toward, (b) the person is "significantly touched" by whatever he/she is

surprised by, (c) the person's "assumptions or expectations collapsed in the face of some new reality" (p.125). Furthermore, just as the experience was not deliberately worked toward," the transformation does not come about as the result of an exercise of the will" (p.126). Instead, the encounter "calls forth a response from a deeper and more fundamental level of our being" (ibid.). This does not mean, though, that it happens involuntarily: "The moment is a simultaneity of choosing and being chosen, and it is precisely the free person who responds to the new and unique..." (ibid.). This moment in which the person encounters the new and unique, also gives rise to the person becoming free:

"The situation... is one that in its perceived newness renders irrelevant, inaccessible, or inappropriate previously taken for granted or habitual ways of interacting or understanding" ... This "freedom" from the (now) inappropriate past which was lived in the present, is also lived as an openness to others, and also has implications for the person's future freedom (ibid.).

Halling also describes the essential separateness of the other who we encounter: "...there is an intrinsic distance between each of us that also connects us and draws us together" (p.129), and it is this that forms a necessary feature of the "beyondness" that relationships call us to move toward (ibid.). This results in what Halling refers to as "movement of the self" (p130), and this

"movement" is marked by a changed perception and experience of oneself, as well as a new awareness of the other person (ibid.). Halling also notes that for all this "movement" the other person may well be "largely" unaware of our presence" (ibid.).

Prior Research In The Area Of Being-Authentic.

Parker (1985) notes that the phenomenon of conscience, which he defines as a call to oneself from oneself, alerts us to the fact that, except under certain circumstances we are, for the most part, not aware of ourselves. We are too caught up in the world to be aware that it is our selves that are thus engaged: we are mostly inauthentic, mostly not ourselves in our relations with others. It is only through the act of reflecting, in an "effort to recapture the ego..." (Parker quoting Ricoeur, p.181.), that the self can once again be appropriated.

Parker writes that this need for the self to be appropriated again stems from the understanding that inauthenticity is a fallenness, a 'having become lost', so that the self cannot be wholly lived in a meaningful relation to others:

"I must recover something which has first been lost... I am lost, 'led astray' among objects and separated from the centre of my existence, just as I am separated from others and as an enemy separated from all men" (Parker quoting Ricoeur, p.181).

Parker, thus, draws our attention to the importance of reflective awareness for the establishing of a sense of self. This "reflection" as an awareness towards re-appropriating the self is, according to Parker, part of one's development: "the self is not a static, unchanging entity, but rather stems from continuous reappropriation" (Parker, p.181) and, this occurs through reflection on the "ever-changing engagements" in which one is involved (ibid,pp.181-182). This reappropriation, as a positing of the self, "which I do not at first possess," (Parker quoting Ricoeur, p.181) yet still am, means that "the self is not given, it is a task" (ibid.).

Parker also notes that "it is difficult to conceive of an experience of conscience (as a call to oneself from oneself) which does not involve others "(Parker, p.182). This, according to Parker, is because "it is only in the context of one's relationship with others (even though they might be "internalized" others) that one experiences not being true to oneself" (ibid.). Parker notes that development of the self, as a reappropriation of 'the self that I am, but do not at first possess', stems from, not only reflection, but a reflective answering to the call away from being-guilty at being so 'lost':

"In Heidegger's terms, without the "they" we would scarcely develop a "they-self" and so could, in principle not be

inauthentic, and, by implication, could not experience conscience (as a call away from this "they-self" to the authentic self)," (ibid.).

In these terms, the other forms the basis for inauthenticity and lostness, but, thus also forms the ground for the reflective reappropriation necessary for authenticity. Parker notes that in his research he found clear evidence for this movement away from conformity, "away from others in their immersion in the received reality" (p.183).

The call away from fallenness does not occur easily. Rather, "self-awareness comes to the fore when one experiences discomfort in being ill-at-ease in one's situation" (ibid., p.190). Furthermore, Parker quotes Harding (1973) who writes:

"As has been truly said, consciousness arises only at the point of discomfort... conflict might be called the mother of awareness. When all goes well for us, we swim with the current... when things do not go well... we become aware of the conditions of our lives and arouse ourselves to play an active role in regard to our own fate" (p.190).

Parker also notes that when the person is muddled and confused, lacking clarity, he lacks a clear understanding of others (p.179), but that "through one's resolutely acting in terms of one's

conscience, one is able to co-disclose the authentic possibilities of others (p.183), and thus authentically be with the other as he really is (p.38).

1.3 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

If we follow Szczepanski (1979) we can describe a coming-into-being of a new world that exists between two people when one discovers his identity by opposing the other, in terms of his becoming aware of his individuality and the individuality of the other. The "becoming aware" would be spontaneous, but have something to do with the contact, or - as it emerges - the 'encounter'. This encounter will include, in its structure, an absence from an external thing-like, institutional, social, or manipulatory-relationship with the other, and will emerge as a 'dwelling' in the "internal world". It will also involve a level of "validation" of reality, a "testing" of the "new contents" of the "sharedness".

We have discovered in our discussion of Cooper's (1983) review of the literature that it is possible to understand the Other as a structure - not simply another person or thing - a structure which is paradoxical, in that unity, wholeness or integrity can emerge through difference: through a boundedness that at once separates us from ourselves, as Merleau-Ponty tells us, that perception of

others is a means given me for being absent from myself, prior to re-turning back to myself, and that this reflexiveness, according to Mead, is the essential condition for the development of mind. The other as a mirror returns us to ourselves so that we may develop towards who we are. Visually, perceptually, we discover ourselves in-one-another.

The developmental model proposed by Leahy and Shirk (1985) describes a process of maturation that has its ground in specific types of cognition and perception that a person enters into. The process of cognition, reflection and perception is marked by increasing "differentiation" and opposition that results in greater integration and individuality. Furthermore this integration eventually allows for the viewing of the self as more open in his/her understanding that he/she "varies" across situations and time (pp.145 and 146). There is thus an increasing "decentering, such that the subjective qualities of the self are seen as variable ... "(p.147, not original emphasis). Leahy and Shirk thus describe a paradoxical process of integration in which there is a "separation of self from its social sources" (p.131, Leahy and Shirk citing Byrne (1985), and p.134), and a decentering, or opening up of the self as "variable across situations and time" (p.147).

At this important developmental level the person, "rather than embedded in the multiplicity of inferred social views of the

self," becomes more reflective of the relationship between his own view of self and other's views of self (p.131, emphasis added). Clearly the earlier stages, marked by the person being embedded in the views of others represents a being less authentic; furthermore the possible authenticity has to be achieved through reflective differentiation, which allows an awareness of otherness both in terms of 'other than others' and 'other qualities that one has oneself.' The person who is thus "thrown back" on himself is also thrown back upon who he is not.

According to Laing (1971), the other is the ground for being in a false position in which the person who is false, must see the muddle that he is in, and must see the conflict. The person must see the polarity between being false and being-authentically-present to the falsehood. Being-false is grounded within being-deceptive, to oneself and others. Emergence out of this being-inauthentic is also, equally, grounded in Otherness and opposition in which case the person is authentically present to who he is in his being beyond himself - moving forward in his self-disclosure, and becoming really who he truly is.

Following Heidegger (1962), we can argue that a person can emerge from a muddled and excessive concern about how he matches up to what others think, or what others are like, by resolutely choosing his own path from among the possibilities that are revealed to him by others. Such a choosing is necessary for being one's Self.

Following Heidegger (1962) and Parker's (1985) explication of Heidegger's thinking, the authentic move to being beyond one's own inauthenticity is an answer to the call of conscience. The call of conscience is a call back to oneself, and is a call to become aware of one's guilt, insofar as the person must own his very own being-inauthentic. This resolute 'owning' of one's guilt is experienced when the person is open to silence, and then carefully chooses between being-authentic and being-inauthentic.

This is contrasted with a being entangled in one's own muddled self-concern, and a hectic involvement in 'self-dissection' so that the person who is constantly measuring himself against abstracted others, cannot see beyond himself, and, thus, cannot resolutely choose to be different, or other than what he is.

We can claim, following Andrew (1982) and Theunissen (1984), that Husserl postulates a level of being that is an "ownness" grounded in bodily experience, but that this "Here-ness creates a sense of a "lack," an indebtedness, that owes itself to its as yet absent possibilities still owned by "others", which are revealed to the person from over "there".

The encounter with the other, then, is always an encounter with one's own unrealized possibilities, which, when seen, are seen to emanate from "There," but which throw one back upon who one is

oneself. One's other possibilities, thus, are the possibilities of others.

Following Dillon (1978) it is important to note that the affective body as object of a (bodily) awareness is the primordial ground for otherness i.e. a perspective on itself. This otherness, however, always returns us to that very original ground as the rootedness of selfhood.

Secondly it is necessary to note that, according to Dillon, the original ground for the discovery of selfhood does not lie primarily in a visual experience, instead the phenomenal body incorporates all the senses, and is, thus, a "total self that is vulnerable to the reactions of others..." (p.90).

Halling (1983) describes the sense of wonder and surprise that is experienced when the person gains an unexpected view of something new in his understanding of both himself and the other: when the person's assumptions and expectations collapse in the face of the new reality. This transformation is a movement "beyond" oneself, and, although not worked towards, nor a result of an exercise of will, is, nonetheless, the result of a 'choosing,' which is a "response from a deeper and more fundamental level of our being" (p.125), as well as being-chosen, which both calls forth and heralds a new being-free, or an openness to others, and oneself. This "movement" is only possible in the light of a distance

between each of us, a distance that also connects and draws us together. (p.129).

Parker (1985) brings our attention to focus on the integrative role of reflective awareness in times of discomfort and being-ill-at-ease with others. This reflective awareness is borne out of that 'discomfort and conflict', and we become aware of the conditions of our lives and arouse ourselves to play an active role when things do not go well.

Parker writes that it is necessary for us to be muddled, and lost in the "they" before reappropriating who we are authentically. This clearing of the muddled 'lostness' not only allows our true selves to be disclosed, but allows us to be authentically with others, as they really are. Seeing the other person clearly is not possible when one is confused or lacks clarity oneself.

Parker notes that this "clarification" occurs through reflection on encounters with others, since this "task" demands a resolute owning of one's guilt at being lost in conformity: Just as it is through others that we become lost in conformity, so "it is only in the context of one's relationship with others... that one experiences not being true to oneself "(Parker p.182).

We have thus far discussed some of the important theoretical and empirical writings related to the phenomenon of perceiving oneself

differently, especially in terms of how this pertains to one's individuality in relation to others. We now move on to an account of the method and findings of our empirical study.

CHAPTER 2

2. METHOD AND FINDINGS

2.1 METHODOLOGY

The phenomenological method of textual analysis is well established as a method of research in psychology and has been described by, inter alia Stones in Kruger (1988), Parker (1985), Colaizzi (1978), Wertz (1985) and Giorgi (1985).

In the following section a description is presented of the procedure that was followed is presented.

COLLECTION OF DATA

Research Question

In phenomenological research the subject is usually asked to describe a situation, not himself, since pre-reflectively one lives situations (Parker, 1985). Our research presupposes that the phenomenon of gaining insight, in terms of an experiencing of a "becoming aware" (Buber, 1947, p.9), is indeed a situation steeped

in reflection, but it is nonetheless, still lived as a situation. Parker (1985) also notes that phenomenology deals with phenomena as they are experienced by people in the "everyday lived world," yet, once again our phenomenon is by no means an "everyday" experience, instead it is likely to be, as Szczepanski (1979) notes, a 'difficult' process rarely undertaken: and, if we are to take Heidegger (1962) seriously when he notes:

"The "they"... prescribes the kind of Being of everydayness (p.164)...the they-self, which we distinguish from the authentic Self - that is, from the Self which has been taken hold of in its own way "(p.167),

then we can justify the asking of a question that is not an everyday question, but a difficult one. The following question was, thus, decided on and put to test in a pilot study:

Could you describe as concretely and in as much detail as possible, an experience in which you had a leap of insight into your life-situation because of some way that you perceived someone else?

If the potential subjects claimed that they could describe such a situation they were then interviewed.

Pilot Study

Since the question that was formulated was long and difficult, even though this seemed to be justifiable given the difficulty of the phenomenon, it was decided to test the question, following Giorgi (1985 b) who has articulated the value of doing such pilot work. However, even though this pilot work was done, the original question was formulated in the spirit of Giorgi's (1971) statement that:

"The method of phenomenology essentially involves the processes of intuition, reflection and description. This means that one should first concentrate to the best degree possible on what is given or being experienced and only secondly ask more specific questions (p.10, emphasis added).

The pilot study which was conducted to test our research question was structured as follows:

- (a) Since Parker (1985) found that the most suitable descriptions, in his study of the situation in which a person felt he/she was not being true to him/herself, came from more mature subjects (in their thirties), the researcher decided to test the question by posing it to a group of thirty first year university students. It was reasoned that if any of the young first year students could answer the question

adequately, then the question could be retained in the form that has been posed in that pilot work, and as described in an earlier section of this chapter.

- (b) When one female student from the pilot group contacted the researcher she was interviewed.
- (c) The interview was transcribed and analysed according to the procedures outlined in this chapter.
- (d) The interview was found to be an adequate description of an experience of the phenomenon of gaining insight into one's own lived situatedness through perceiving another person. So although the questioning in the interview was structurally weaker than the full interviews conducted later, the analyses of these data gained has been presented along with the four other subjects' interviews, but the results from the pilot work is clearly described as having emerged from that study.

Subjects

Besides the subject in the pilot study, descriptions of experiences were collected from a further six potential subjects. Of these descriptions, two were found not to be faithful descriptions of the phenomenon, in that they were descriptions of gaining insight

into one's life-situation through perceiving more than one other person. The four descriptions which faithfully revealed experiences of gaining insight through perceiving an other person were retained for analysis. This was done to increase the likelihood of a 'baseline' clarity of description, since the phenomenon is complicated enough, and having the question focussed on the perception of one person helps to ensure that potential unnecessary increases in complexity are avoided. The four (additional) subjects were all adults, three men and one woman, two of the men in their thirties, the woman in her late twenties and the third man was twenty four at the time.

Interviews

The researcher interviewed each subject, and each interview was transcribed. The interviews were very open ended. The subjects were asked to describe their experience as fully as possible. Aside from this, questions and comments were restricted to requests for clarification or elaborations consisting mainly of reflecting back to the subject what he or she had already said, or, when necessary, restating the essence of the initial question, in order to ensure that the subject describes as fully as possible the situation as it was experienced. All five interviews, including the pilot interview, are presented in this study, as appendices.

PROCEDURE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.

The interviews were analysed using the psychological-phenomenological method developed by Giorgi (1975, 1985). In the present study Giorgi's method was modified by including two extra steps. The first additional step is a step used by Wertz (1985, p.167); the second additional step follows on from Giorgi's (1985) use of the term 'general situated structure' (p.20), as well as Wertz' (1985) similar step which he refers to as the "individual psychological structure" (p.178). These steps were added since the phenomenon is sufficiently complex to warrant these additional steps used by Wertz (1985) in his "study of a complex life-event" (p.155, not original emphasis).

1. Each complete description was read as many times as was necessary in order to understand it as a whole experience, and, in these terms, to achieve the sense of what the subject experienced.
2. Once the researcher was satisfied that he had grasped the general sense of the whole description, he read through the text once more with the goal of breaking up the text into manageable units which, following Giorgi (1985), are referred to as "meaning units" (p.11). The meaning units are discriminations made in order to break up the text according to changes in the psychological meaning of the situation for

the subject. A psychological attitude is thus necessary, as is a set in favour of believing that the subject has indeed described an experience of gaining insight into his/her life situation through perceiving another person. The meaning units are then re-written and expressed in the third person. Whereas the subject's language was unchanged, where ever "I" occurred, it was transformed into "S" (for "subject;" c.f. Parker, 1985, pp.69-70). The meaning units are placed in the left hand column of a table, two examples of which are presented in this study, one in this chapter, the other in the appendices.

3. The researcher then reflected on the subject's own expressions, as demarcated in terms of meaning units and, then, re-articulated each of these expressions, in terms of the psychological essence of the situation with respect to gaining insight through perceiving another person. The transformations take place "through a process of reflection and imaginative variation" (Giorgi, 1985, p.17). These transformations are referred to as T.M.U's (transformed meaning units) (ibid.). The results of this step appear in the right hand column of Table 1 in the two examples presented, and in Table 2 of all four of the analyses in this study. Each 'Table 2' presents the results of the next step to be discussed.

4. This step follows Wertz (1985). The researcher regroups the relevant constituents together according to their intertwining meanings and places them so that they accurately express the pattern of the original event through time. Wertz (1985) notes that this operation is particularly necessary for interview data which tends to jump around. At this stage irrelevant data or repetitive data is excluded. The constituents to be excluded are marked with an asterix and are labelled "N.R.O.P" which means not revelatory of the phenomenon (c.f. Parker, 1985).
5. The researcher synthesizes and integrates the insights expressed in the transformed meaning units into a consistent description of the psychological structure of the experience. This description is referred to as the specific description of the situated structure of the phenomenon, and is presented as Table 3 in all four instances of the analysis in this Chapter. The structure is described as being "specific and situated," in that it remains true to the specific contextual experience of the subject.
6. This step follows Giorgi (1985) and Wertz (1985). The researcher, after reading through the specific situated structure, then tried as much as possible to depart from the specifics of the situation to communicate the most general meaning of the phenomenon in a truly psychological-

phenomenological way. This step is referred to as the 'general situated structure' and is presented in each case as "Table 4". The term "situated" is retained because only one subject is the base.

THE EXTENDED DESCRIPTION.

On the basis of the additional depth of reflection available through having to write a general situated structure, the researcher then could also re-read the transformed meaning units as they had been ordered in Table 2, as well as re-reading the 'specific description,' until complex themes that were common to each case emerged. The "complex" themes serve to also reveal 'sub-themes' not necessarily common to all cases. All themes are presented with evidence from the subject's own descriptions.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE STRUCTURE OF THE PHENOMENON

The last procedure involved formulating an integrated description of the structure of the phenomenon. It is distinguishable from the extended description in that the 'sub-themes' contained in the complex themes are described in their own right, without reference to the relevant unifying complex theme, thus, these themes must be generally valid: "...it is not required that it must have already been made explicit in all cases..." (Wertz quoted by Parker, 1985, p.73). The aim here is to establish what is typical of the

phenomenon (Parker, 1985).

2.2 TABLE OF CONTENTS: DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

DATA ANALYSIS TABLES

The analysis is presented as follows:

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Page</u>
Part 1 : Subject 1: Table 1: meaning units and transformed meaning units.	72
Part 2 : Subject 1: Table 2: Re-ordered T.M.Us	96
Part 3 : Subject 1: Table 3: Specific Situated Structure.	103
Part 4 : Subject 1: Table 4: General Situated Structure.	107
Part 5 : Subject 2: Table 2: Re-ordered T.M.U's	108
Part 6 : Subject 2: Table 3: Specific Situated Structure.	113
Part 7 : Subject 2: Table 4: General Situated Structure.	116
Part 8 : Subject 3: Table 2: Re-ordered T.M.Us	117
Part 9 : Subject 3: Table 3: Specific Situated Structure.	122
Part 10 : Subject 3: Table 4: General Situated Structure.	125
Part 11 : Subject 4: Table 2: Re-ordered T.M.Us	127
Part 12 : Subject 4: Table 3: Specific Situated Structure.	135
Part 13 : Subject 4: Table 4: General Situated Structure.	140
Part 14 : Pilot : Table 2: Re-ordered T.M.Us	141
Part 15 : Pilot : Table 3: Specific Situated Structure.	145
Part 16 : Pilot : Table 4: General Situated Structure.	147

FINDINGS

The findings are presented as follows:

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Page</u>
Part 1 : Extended Description	149
Part 2 : General Structure.	167

2.3 DATA ANALYSIS TABLES

Part 1 : Subject 1 : Table 1: Meaning units and T.M.U's

1. ..., in 1975, S was 20 years old; he was working at the in the advertising department, selling retail advertising.

1. S was a young man who had a job which involved selling advertising. (N.R.O.P)*

* Not revelatory of the phenomenon.

2. And there were a group of about, S would imagine eight or ten of them. And they were a fairly motley crew,

2. S worked with a small, rather diverse group of people. (N.R.O.P)

3. S was a "sharp young man!"

3. S understood himself as being a rather sharp, quickwitted and clever young man.

4. S didn't have a - S wasn't overburdened with morality - it seemed to him at the time to be a fairly

4. S was less concerned with people and their feelings, than making money and selling his

important component in a salesman's life - the objective was to sell the item, rather than to make the person happy. If you could combine the two, then that was great.

I:But "morality" was not terribly important?)

'Morality' was not terribly important - it, S was, what he thinks he'd in nowadays terms call 'capitalist orientated'. The major objective was "the bucks".

5. S had worked a couple of months, S had settled in, was feeling comfortable. S got on well with the people there, and was doing well: he was cracking it. In fact they were very pleased with the way he was working.

product, and, as such, morality and integrity were not important issues in S's life.

5. S felt comfortable and successful in his job, and felt that his superiors were impressed by his work.

6. As S said we had quite a range of different types of people, from what could almost be described as elderly women, in their forties and fifties, approaching their sixties. There were a group of what S would then have termed "men" in their thirties and forties, and there was himself and a friend of his. And they were the "sharp young men".

7. One of the people that was working there's name was B.. (S can't remember his surname anymore). And although S never found out whether it was true or not, the existent rumour was that he was a Mormon, but that need not have necessarily been the case. He was a Mormon.

6. S understood himself and another co-worker friend to be sharp young men, in contrast to their older co-workers.

7. One of the older co-workers' was somewhat different in that he was rumoured to belong to a comparatively uncommon religious group. (N.R.O.P)

8. And B. and S used to get on quite well together. S would say that he - B., wasn't S's friend, but, you know, but they related within the workplace on a slightly more than purely "work" level. Which was the case with most of the people there.

9. The incident in question occurred one day when S had organised to have a proof of an advert ready for one of the people, one of S's clients. And S had made a mistake on it. And, anyway, they were telephoning him to find out what the hell he was doing about this, and S didn't want to talk to him on the telephone. So, S said to B.. (the phone rang, and S knew that

8. S remembers one particular person amongst the people, whom he got on with on a slightly more than 'work' level in the workplace.

9. An incident occurred one day when S had made a mistake which he did not wish to take responsibility for: S asked the person whom he worked with to lie for him, which that person then politely refused to do.

it was going to be those people telephoning) so S said to B.: "Listen B., answer the phone and tell them that I'm not here." And he said "No, I'm sorry, I'm not going to do that."

10. And, because they had this sort of 'bonhomie camaraderie', S thought that he was just joking.

11. S thought that it was natural that a person would tell a lie like that for him. It was just how-that's what life was about: helping each other by lying for you when you needed it.

10. Because S enjoyed a relationship with that person that involved an element of fun and jovial companionship, S thought that this person was just joking.

11. S believed that dishonesty was a natural thing, and he expected others to be dishonest for him.

12. So he said "No". So S laughed, slightly embarrassedly, you know, to be turned down like that, especially in front of others, was quite embarrassing. So S laughed embarrassedly

13. and S said to him :
 "No, no, look, just tell them I'm not here, and I'll get back to them later."
 And he said again: "No!"

14. And, as far as S can recall he didn't ask him 'why not?' S thinks he was sufficiently embarrassed to not even have the aggression to say to him "but why not?"

12. That other person's refusal to comply with S's request, in front of other people, was embarrassing for S.

13. S in an attempt to recover the situation for himself made a direct statement that this person should just tell the lie, but the request was refused for the second time.

14. S was struck silent by embarrassment, even though S was puzzled as to why his request was refused.

15. And he just said himself: "If I can lie for you, I can lie to you, and you wouldn't want me to do that. So I'm not going to lie for you."

16. S's embarrassment deepened, but simultaneously something became very clear to him, and that was the deep truth of what he was saying.

17. S thinks that, S doesn't know that his relationship with B.. changed after that moment, S can't say that it did, but his relationship with

15. The other person explained, spontaneously, that dishonesty in the service of S implied an ability to be dishonest (to S), something which S would not want done to him, hence his refusal to be dishonest (in the service of S).

16. S experienced a deepening of his embarrassment, and at the same time experienced a clarity of understanding—understanding the deep truth of what that other person was saying.

17. Although S is not sure that his relationship with that particular person changed, he is certain that his relationship with himself changed.

himself did.

18. It gave him an insight into one of the qualities he newly perceived as being important in human relationships,

19. in that whereas S had, he thinks, previously looked on relationships - and he's speaking purely of superficial ones, he's not talking about ones with his good and sincere friends - but his casual acquaintances - the people he came across in everyday life - his normal response to those sorts of relationships was to get what he could, and to, in quite a manipulatory way, to get what he could out of them - whilst giving only as much as was necessary.

18. S's experience gave him insight into a quality he newly perceived as being important in human relationships.

19. Prior to his insight, S had looked on casual associations in terms of what he could get out of them - giving only what was necessary in order to manipulate people into giving him what he wanted.

20. And it occurred to S after that moment that there was more to relationships even with people on a casual sort of basis; that S thinks he'd perceived that a deeper quality could exist in even transitory casual acquaintances,

21. which would give more meaning to his life - and S thinks possibly, even somewhat conceitedly, more meaning to their life, if S was to behave in a more sincere manner with them.

20. It occurred to S after his encounter with that other person that there was more to casual relationships, that a deeper quality could exist than he had understood.

21. Such a deeper quality S understood as potentially giving his own life, and the lives of others, more meaning - and such an increase in meaningfulness could be experienced if S was to be more sincere.

22. And S thinks a direct consequence of that occurrence with B.. was that he adopted that as a motto. More than merely as a 'brag motto' sort of thing that you can use to manipulate people even further by saying to them: "But you're a liar, and I won't do it for you!" Which is, can be, quite a manipulatory move. But, more sincerely within himself, its a code that he has done his very best to adhere to. He doesn't tell lies to people. He doesn't lie for his friends and he doesn't lie to them.

23. And S thinks that he feels a lot better about it,

22. S took up, as a motto, that other person's understanding of dishonesty, as that person had articulated it, incorporating it within his understanding of the world as a code which reflected, for him his project towards a new way of relating - both in terms of how he related to others, as well as more seriously within himself.

23. S felt a lot better about his new way of being sincerely honest.

24. and S also thinks that those people who know him and realize that this is how he feels about things, enjoy it as well. S avoided the word "respected", but he thinks it is also something that can be respected.

25. (I:Ah ha. (pause) Could you add anything more about how your understanding changed in terms of how you perceived that other person?)

S thinks that one of the things that surprised him-- the sort of things that were important to him in those days were a person's ability to "extract stuff" from other people, and the cost, as far as they were concerned, that extraction, were not terribly

24. S feels that others enjoy his sincerity with respect to being honest, and S feels that this sincerity can be respected.

25. That encounter with that other person forced S to re-evaluate the truth of his beliefs that a person, like B... who did not have any of the (superficial) qualities S held to be important could be so self-assured as to refuse to try to gain popularity and, also, not avoid possible rejection by others by, sticking to his own beliefs.

important. The sort of things that were important were "looking good" and sort of things like "physical attractiveness", "popularity at any cost"; S thinks he probably would have shied away from the sort of behaviour which would have run him the risk of offending somebody- Anyway, B.. was short, in his 30's S thinks, bald and not terribly good looking, and S thinks that... he would have thought that B.. couldn't really have afforded any of these sort of "risky behaviours" like refusing to lie for people, sticking to his own beliefs rather than blending in with other peoples'. Because S thinks he would have risked "alienation",

and S thinks this was an added factor in his courage, the conviction that he obviously had that he could say something like that to him.

26. S means he thought of that he had it really going for him, without needing moral convictions like that.

27. And also, in addition, S realized that there were other facets to peoples' existence - it wasn't merely how they looked, or how they handled people. It wasn't only an outward relationship that they had with other people.

26. S had thought of himself as not needing moral convictions, since he thought he had sufficient of the qualities which he held to be important.

27. S realized that there were other facets to peoples existence beyond the superficial qualities he had held to be important, that, in fact, people can have an integrity that lies deeper than in inauthentic relationship.

28. S thinks that, prior to that point, he related much more to himself in terms of what he got back from others. So, consequently, if his relationships with others were O.K., then S felt O.K..

28. Up to that point, S had related to others in terms of what he could get from them, and the extent of what he got back constituted S's sense of self worth: the more he could get, the better he felt about himself.

29. Naturally in order to have his relationships with others to remain O.K. he had to, in almost contradictory fashion really, he had to handle himself in such a way that he could still get as much as he could out of them as possible, but he had to be careful that he gave them sufficient: that he gave them back what they wanted.

29. S was living intensely in a relationship with the others in his life. Such was it that S understood that, in order for him to feel fulfilled, he had to get from others and in order to get things out of others he had to 'give' sufficient of what they wanted back to them.

30. S realized after that a person's relationship with himself is the most important component in their relationships with other people and an improvement in the quality of his relationship with himself could only benefit, in the long term, his relationship with others.

31. The realization that you have to go through times of hardship with other people, some of which may never be resolved because you meet, you talk, you interact, and then maybe they pass on, and they pass on maybe not liking you too much, or not having the great impression

30. S realized, after his encounter with that other person, that a person's relationship with himself is the most important component in his relationships with other people, and that an improvement in the quality of his relationship with himself, in himself, could make his relationships with others more meaningful.

31. S realized that inauthentic relationships with others might not be as fulfilling as might be wished, and that, ultimately, the advantage of being true to himself is considerably more than the superficial gratification he could get from just handling people,

of you that you might like just manipulating people.
them to have. But,
ultimately, in the long
term the benefits of being
true to oneself, the sort
of relationship which you
can have with yourself if
you are true to yourself,
is actually considerably
more important than the
superficial gratification
that you can get from just
'handling' people, just
manipulating people.

32. (I:Could you say a little bit more about what it was about that person, in that situation that allowed you to have that experience?)

S:(pause) ..., S sort of, he saw B.. differently, S thinks; that most of the people in his life tended to be quite two dimensional. They were like movies, films. But B.. added a depth to himself through having made that stand, which S admired, which S respected.

32. S had come to see that one person differently. Other people in S's life tended to be quite two dimensional, but that person added depth to himself which S admired and respected.

33. And it came as quite a surprise, like in conjunction with what S said earlier, it came as quite a surprise to him that he found he could respect a person like B., when he didn't possess any of the qualities that S had previously thought were important, if S was going to respect somebody -.

34. Like he moved out of a two dimensional mold.

35. S realized that the stuff he had admired in people, that he had respected in people previously, were pretty two-dimensional things.

33. S was surprised that he could respect a person like that other person, when he didn't possess any of the qualities that S had previously thought were important if he was to respect somebody.

34. That person moved out from a two dimensional mold.

35. S realized that the terms in which he had admired and respected people previously were two-dimensional, superficial and flat, not having depth.

36. (I:Had you reflected much on Alf's "two dimensionality" at all?

S:Prior to that?

I:Prior to that.)

No, that was just how he was, just how he presented himself to S. It was how most people presented themselves to him. They were there for his benefit. They were there so that he could -: they were there to provide him with what he wanted.

37. And up to that stage B.. hadn't really provided S with anything at all, because, as S says, he didn't feel as if he fell within the orbit of being the sort of person he could get anything from.

36. That person, and other people in S's life, presented themselves to S as lacking a depth of their own, and as being there only for S's benefit - to provide him with what he wanted.

37. Up to that stage, one other person in particular had not appeared to be important to S, since S felt that he (that other person) had nothing to give him, and none of the qualities S admired or respected.

38. But, having done that, having made that stand he revealed a depth to S which he admired, which he respected, and which he wanted to have for himself

-

39. (and this depth) which was, like it occurred to S then, which was different to the sort of things that he'd been reaching for, ah - the sorts of things which S had been acquiring previously.

38. That other person who S encountered, having made a stand, revealed a depth to S which S admired, which S respected and which S wanted to have for himself. That other person, thus, revealed himself as being more human, as being real, and S wished to have such a depth himself.

39. This quality of depth was different to the things S had owned in the past, since the other things were things S had been acquiring, or merely collecting from others. S had never reached for such things before, since that required a reaching out and a grasping of real things: and the reality of many such things had not

yet been apparent to S.

40. I:(Could you say a little more about how you felt and what you felt right at the time?)

S: It was like a sudden deepening of the world.

41. It was a sudden realization of relief-like 3-dimensionality.

42. It opened up a
.....(pause)

43. (I:Could you tell me one or two of the actual thoughts you might have had?)

Well, S's initial response was, as he says, embarrassment.

40. S experienced a sudden deepening of the world at the time of his encounter.

41. S experienced a sudden realization of a coming into relief - like three dimensionality. Things seemed more real, more solid.

42. S experienced an opening up.

43. S was initially embarrassed.

44. S thinks the embarrassment was for two reasons. One was because he hadn't got what he wanted, so he felt embarrassed at that - that having his inadequacy revealed to those who were standing around. It was just one of those times when there were quite a few people standing around.

45. And also an embarrassment at the realization of his own shallowness, and the shallow way he tended to relate to casual acquaintances.

44. S was, in the first instance, embarrassed that his inability to handle or manipulate had been revealed to others, in terms of which S felt his own sense of "looking good" and being popular was compromised.

45. S was also embarrassed and ashamed at his own lack of depth, his own shallowness with respect to how he related to his acquaintances.

46. (I:And that you remember realizing at the time?)

..., S realized then, S thought to himself : "You're so shallow, and your relationships with people are so plastic, manipulatory."

47. And there's more to people in life than what he'd been doing previously."

48. And S couldn't say that it was a small event, because S, like he remembers it after all this time as being quite a major occurrence in his life.

46. S remembers realizing and thinking, reflecting, that he was shallow, that his relationships with people were plastic, manipulatory.

47. S realized that people have more depth and integrity than what he had allowed before.

48. The experience was a very significant experience in S's life.

49. The effect that it has
- that it had, that it has
had, and that it has - S
believes it has contributed
to his enjoyment of life.

49. The new understanding
contributed to S's
enjoyment of life.

Part 2: Subject 1: Table 2 : Ordered T.M.U'S

5.

S felt comfortable and successful in his job, and felt that his superiors were impressed by his work.

3.

S understood himself at the time as being a rather sharp, quick-witted and clever young man.

6.

S understood himself, and another young co-worker, to be sharp young men, in contrast to their older co-workers.

11.

S believed that dishonesty was a natural thing, and he expected others to be dishonest for him.

26.

S had thought of himself as not needing moral convictions, since he thought he had sufficient of the qualities he held to be important.

19.

Prior to his insight, S had looked on casual associations in terms of what he could get out of them - giving only what was necessary in order to manipulate people into giving him what he wanted.

28.

Up to that point, S had related to others in terms of what he could get from them, and the extent of what he got back constituted S's sense of self worth : the more he could get, the better he felt about himself.

29.

S was living intensely in a relationship with the others in his life. Such was it that, in order for him to feel fulfilled, he had to get from others, and, in order to get things from others he had to 'give' sufficient of what they wanted back to them.

4.

S was less concerned with people and their feelings, than making money and selling his product.

8, 37.

Up to that stage one other person in particular had not appeared to be important to S, since S felt he (that other person) had nothing to give him and had none of the qualities S admired or respected.

36.

That person, and other people in S's life, presented themselves to S as lacking a depth of their own, and as being there only for S's benefit, to provide S with what he wanted.

9.

An incident occurred one day when S had made a mistake which he did not wish to answer for: S asked the person whom he worked with to lie for him, which that person politely refused to do.

10.

Because S enjoyed a relationship with that person that involved an element of fun and jovial companionship, S thought this person was just joking.

12.

That other person's refusal to comply with S's request, in front of other people, was embarrassing for S.

43, 44

S was, in the first instance, embarrassed that his inability to handle or manipulate had been revealed to others, in terms of which S felt his personal sense of 'looking good' and being popular was compromised.

13.

S, in an attempt to recover the situation for himself made a direct statement that this person should just tell the lie, but the request was refused for the second time.

14.

S was struck silent by embarrassment, even though S was puzzled as to why his request was refused.

15.

The other person explained, spontaneously, that dishonesty in the service of S implied an ability to be dishonest to S, something which S would not want done to him, hence his refusal to be dishonest in the service of S.

16.

S experienced a deepening of his embarrassment, and at the same

time experienced a clarity of understanding - understanding the deep truth of what that other person was saying.

40.

S experienced, at the time, a sudden deepening of the world.

42.

S experienced an opening up.

41.

S experienced a sudden realization of a coming into relief - like three dimensionality - things seemed more real, more solid.

45.

S was also embarrassed and ashamed at his own lack of depth, his own shallowness with respect to how he related to his acquaintances.

46.

S remembers realizing and thinking, reflecting, that he was shallow, that his relationships with people were so plastic and manipulatory.

18.

S's experience gave him insight into a quality he newly perceived as being important in human relationships.

30.

S realized, after his encounter with that other person, that a person's relationship with himself is the most important component in his relationships with other people, and that an improvement in the quality of his relationship with himself, in himself, could make his relationships with others more meaningful.

20, 47

It occurred to S, after his encounter with that other person, that there was more to casual relationships, that a deeper quality could exist, than he had previously understood.

31.

S realized that inauthentic relationships might not be as fulfilling as might be wished, and that ultimately the advantage of being true to himself is considerably more important than the superficial gratification he could get from just handling people, just manipulating people.

27.

S realized that there were other facets to people's existence beyond the superficial qualities he held to be important, that, in fact, people can have a level of integrity that lies deeper than in inauthentic relationships.

21.

Such a deeper quality S understood as potentially giving his own life, and the lives of others, more meaning, and such an increase in meaningfulness could be experienced if S was to be more sincere.

25.

That encounter with that other person forced S to re-evaluate the truth of his belief that a person, like that other person, who did not have any of the (superficial) qualities S held to be important, could be so self-assured as to refuse to try to gain popularity and, also to not avoid possible rejection by others, by

sticking to his own beliefs and refusing to comply with S's request.

34.

That person moved out from a two dimensional mold.

32.

S had come to see that other person differently. Other people in S's life tended to be quite two-dimensional, but that person added a depth to himself which S admired and respected.

33.

S was surprised that he could respect a person like that other person, when he (that person) didn't possess any of the qualities that S had previously thought were important if he was to respect somebody.

38.

The other person who S encountered, having made a stand revealed a depth to S which S admired, which S respected and which S wanted for himself. That other person, thus, revealed himself as being more human, as being real, and S wished to have such a depth himself.

39.

This quality of depth was different to the things S had owned in the past, since the other things were things S had been acquiring, or merely collecting from others. S had never reached for such things before, since that required a reaching out and a grasping of real things: and the reality of many such things had not yet been apparent to S.

35.

S realized that the terms in which he had admired and respected people previously were two-dimensional, superficial and having no depth.

22.

S took up, as a motto, that other person's understanding of dishonesty, as that person had articulated it, incorporating it within his understanding of the world as a code which reflected, for him, his project towards a new way of relating - both in terms of how he related to others, as well as more seriously within himself.

17.

Although S is not sure that his relationship with that particular person changed, he is certain that his relationship with himself changed.

48.

The experience was a very significant experience in S's life.

49.

The new understanding contributed to S's enjoyment of life.

23.

S felt a lot better about his new way of being sincerely honest, way of being.

24.

S feels that others enjoy his sincerity with respect to being honest, and S feels that this sincerity can be respected.

Part 3: Subject 1: Table 3 : Specific Situated Structure

Insight into his life situation was gained by S in an encounter with another person who was being true to himself, in the face of S's expectation to the contrary. S believed that it was natural for people to be dishonest, and natural to want to look good, be popular and want to just be successful, rather than be concerned about other people's feelings. S, saw himself, in these terms, as being successful and popular, believing also, that he was 'sharp', and thus could "handle" that person whom he encountered. S believed he could manipulate that person into being dishonest for him, because that person had none of the qualities S valued. This implied, for S, that that other would "naturally" want to be popular with S and so he would "naturally" be dishonest. Furthermore, that other person, and, indeed, most other people, appeared to S as being two-dimensional and rather superficial, lacking any depth, and thus S had no respect for them. Indeed, S had no respect for them even though he depended upon them intensely, for it was exactly his manipulating them, and getting things out of them, that gave him his sense of self and sense of selfworth.

S, then, faced this other and asked him to be dishonest, but that person politely refused. Since S was so convinced that his point of view was the natural point of view, and that that other person needed to maintain his cordial, even jovial relationship with S, S

reasoned that that person must have been joking. Also, S was embarrassed, since his inability to easily manipulate that person had been shown up in public. So, S, believing that person to have been joking, and, also, in an attempt to recover the situation for himself, repeated his request in a more matter-of-fact manner.

S had thus far been thrown into a state of being reflective, a state of being more aware of what was happening in his situation, since things were not following the expected course. But, still, S's own beliefs had not been brought into question - S had only thought about why that other person was behaving contrary to character, and how he had been shown up as unable to easily manipulate that person.

After S's second request, that other person refused once again, and this time S was struck silent with embarrassment, and so, even though S was puzzled as to why this person would not do something that S took to be natural, S could not voice his question.

S, thus, had been thrown from the usual course of events and had been struck silent, revealing the intensity of his embarrassment. S had also been thrown into a state of intense reflection, since S was confused and puzzled.

That person, whom S was facing, spontaneously gave his reason:

that he understood that to be dishonest for S meant he could be dishonest to S, and he knew that S would not want that, and so he refused to be dishonest for S.

S felt his embarrassment deepen, along with an experience of a gain in clarity of understanding: S came to understand the deep truth of what that person was saying.

In addition to revealing a level of courage by sticking to his own beliefs, that person, in refusing to conform to S's expectations, revealed a level of concern for S's feelings, as well as a level of personal integrity. S was struck by that person's integrity, and he found himself admiring that person, and respecting the qualities he perceived that person to have.

S, thus, being struck by that person's having made a stand, and having been thrown back upon himself in the light of that person's integrity, became embarrassed as he was made to look upon himself as being shallow and plastic and manipulatory.

Along with his experience of a clarity of understanding S also experienced a sudden deepening of the world, and a sense of an opening up, and a sudden realization of a coming into relief-like 3-dimensionality. Things thus seemed more real and more solid. That other person also moved out of his two-dimensional mold, as S discovered that he had a level of integrity that went

beyond any inauthentic relationships with other people, making that person seem real and whole, as opposed to flat and empty. S's new experience of the reality of things, especially the reality of that other person, made S want such a depth for himself. S understood that depth as being grounded in a sincerity and integrity that was different to the things S had been merely acquiring from others in the past. Indeed, these qualities needed to be taken up, reached out for, something that S had not yet done, since he had been depending on what he could get out of others, rather than what he reached out for himself. However, now that S saw these qualities as real, he could reach out and try to take them up. S then took up, as a motto, that other person's understanding of honesty as he had articulated it, revealing S's new, sincere, project towards a more meaningful being-with-others, as well as revealing a more sincere relationship with himself. S, thus, understood that if he had such a quality of personal integrity, his relationships with others would be more meaningful and deep, in a sense that implied a sharedness of meaning and pleasure, rather than the one-sidedness S had experienced up to then. S felt, in these terms, that others would enjoy and respect those qualities he had taken up, just as it had allowed him to feel better about himself. This experience, thus, was a particularly significant experience for S.

Part 4 : Subject 1: Table 4 : General Situated Structure

S was living in an inauthentic and intense relationship with others, in so far as he saw others as flat and empty and as being there only for him; although he was intensely self-concerned, his very sense of selfworth depended upon how much he could get out of others. S thus had no concern for the feelings of others, and, thus, no concern for morality.

S, in his project toward enhancing his feelings of selfworth, sought to enlist the help of another person, who he asked to tell a lie for him.

That other person, though, refused to comply with S's request. S was struck silent by embarrassment, his situation became an intense focussing on his own discomfort, as well as a confused puzzling about why that person would not comply with his request.

When that person then gave his reason for not complying, S experienced an intensification of his feeling embarrassed as he was struck by the clarity of the truth of that person's point of view. S, thus, found himself experiencing a sudden deepening of the world, an opening up and a coming into relief - like three-dimensionality, as he saw, not only the truth of what that person said, but also that person's level of integrity and courage - a level of integrity that made that person move from out of a two-

dimensional mold.

This perception of that person as having a depth of reality in his integrity made S wish he had those qualities. S's perception had taken him beyond himself, revealing the integrity S did not have, and now wished he had. These qualities were perceived as being more real, and were qualities he understood he would perhaps have to reach out for and take up, reflecting, for S, a project towards a more meaningful being with others.

This experience was a particularly significant experience for S, and an experience which led him to feel much better about himself.

Part 5 : Subject 2 : Table 2 : Ordered T.M.U'S

17.

S was over-sensitive to the opinions that other people might have about her, and so was over-concerned about what others might be thinking.

1.

S's experience concerns a person who S met many years ago, who, on the first meeting presented himself somewhat ambiguously, having something about his mannerisms which S interpreted as meaning he had a sarcastic and dry way about him.

3.

This other person was, at the time of their first meeting, a student. He later became a lecturer. (N.R.O.P)

20.

That person was a person she was suspicious of, even from the very first time that she met him.

2, 4, 11.

S interpreted that person's ambiguous appearance as indicating that he was being hostile, especially toward her.

13.

S is not sure of how it was that her perception changed, but it did, her perception of that person changed. It was a sudden "seeing": a pre-reflective change in her perception of the person.

5.

After years of this concern for the fact that this person was hostile toward her, there occurred an encounter during which S saw that other and he hadn't seen S, but he was still behaving as he had always done, in that very way that S had interpreted as him being hostile toward her.

15.

S's encounter with the other revealed that other as being wrapped up in concerns of his own, and thus he appeared as not being-there-against-her. That other appeared as he was in himself, for himself.

12.

After S's encounter S realized that the person is as he is within

himself, rather than appearing in her terms, and, so, she realized that she should accept him as he really is.

6.

The encounter made S question her conviction that that other person was being hostile toward her. S thought about the situation and thought that maybe that other person was unhappy about something.

26.

S realized she had been wrong and it seemed to change her perception of that person.

21.

S reflectively realized that through her own imaginative perceiving she had interpreted that other person as being other than he was in himself. But he was really being in a way she had lived herself, and thus could understand him.

27.

S's encounter changed her whole experience of relating to that person.

16.

S realized that people are not necessarily people only for others, but that there is a quality that they own for themselves in themselves, and that, in order to see that she has to look deeper than the mere surface.

25.

S now sees that other as a person who lives in accordance with his own concerns: sometimes being friendly to others, but sometimes

involved in his own thoughts, and S realizes that people are like that, living their own lives, and that a person should not misread that as meaning something it doesn't.

7.

S realized that one shouldn't jump to conclusions or read things into situations unless you understand the person who one encounters, within himself.

23.

S's whole attitude changed towards that other person, because she realized that person wasn't being hostile towards her all that time. S's whole understanding of her past was changed. - Her past with that person no longer was a past filled with negative encounters. S's past and present was thus altered.

24.

After that encounter S approached that other, who then appeared as friendly, confirming how wrong her original thoughts had been.

10.

Although that person hasn't changed as such, S relates to him in a different way.

9.

After S's encounter she opened up more to that person, and S finds that other person really quite pleasant.

19.

S realized that S should be more open to and accepting of people the way they are in themselves, instead of how they appear because of one's assumptions.

8.

The encounter made S question her other assumptions and reactions to other people in general.

22.

S realizes that she is a shy person who tends to be defensive, thinking that others should always be concerned for her; but she also now realized that perhaps others also are concerned that she should be concerned for them. S, thus, could understand the world as a world in which she was human in the same way as others were human, rather than her being in a world in which all concerns were her concerns.

18.

That encounter with that other person made S realize she had been wrong and that she should not be overly concerned with others as they appear to her.

14.

S has begun to be more thoughtful about how she assumes people to be. S has realized that some of the assumptions she makes about people do not reflect who they really are in themselves, and are thus not true.

28.

S experienced an opening up; she could relate more openly within her own little group - she was also less intensely concerned with her own life - she felt more open minded.

29.

S felt like she had really seen something quite amazing. The self-

evident clarity of what she now saw made S wonder at why she had never seen it before.

Part 6: Subject 2 : Table 3 : Specific Situated Structure

S was over-sensitive to others so that they presenced to her in an intense and powerful way. S felt demanded to be concerned about the attitudes of others, linking their concerns to her concerns. One person who presented himself powerfully to S, and whom she had been very concerned about for a long time, was someone who S had met many years ago and who from the very start presenced to S in an ambiguous way, but a way which S interpreted as a dry, sarcastic and hostile way - attitudes S saw as being directed specifically at her, indicating for S that he didn't like her.

S was not reflectively sure of how it was that her perception changed, but she knows that it did, and she recalls that it was a sudden "seeing", a pre-reflective change in her perception of that person during an encounter in which S was unobserved by that other person. During that encounter S saw the other person behaving as he had always done, in that very way S had interpreted as being directed at her. S's encounter revealed that person as being wrapped up in concerns of his own, and thus he appeared as not being there in conflict with her, he appeared as he was in himself, for himself.

The very nature of the encounter, with S being unobserved, but that person appearing to be still behaving as he had always done, along with S's intensive concern about how that person presenced to her, meant S reflected intensely about how he appeared, allowing S to realize how wrong she had been; and that seemed to change her perception of that person, making her more open toward him, allowing her to question her conviction that he was hostile toward her, and allowed her to consider other possible understandings of how he was being, eg. she saw that, like her, he might be unhappy or sad about something.

After S's encounter she realized that that person is as he is within himself, rather than appearing in her terms, and she realized that she should accept him as he really is. S, thus, reflectively realized that through her own imaginative perceiving she had interpreted that other person as being other than he was in himself. S's encounter, then, changed her whole experience of relating to that person, since she now saw him more in terms of himself.

S also realized that people in general are not only there for others, but that there is a quality that they own for themselves, in themselves, and that in order to see that, she has to look deeper than the mere surface, and not to misread people or jump to conclusions about them, but only make judgements about people that she encounters if she understands them within themselves.

S's encounter made her reflect upon her entire historical experience of that person, and her understanding of her historical experience of him changed, and her past thus became a past no longer filled with negative encounters. S's past, present and future (because she resolved to be more accepting of people) was thus altered.

After that encounter S approached that other who then appeared as friendly, confirming for her how wrong her original thoughts had been. S came to relate differently to this person, who she understands as not having changed in himself; instead, she opened up more to that person. S, afterwards, found that person to be really quite pleasant. S's encounter made S question her assumptions and reactions to other people in general: the encounter made her realize that she had been wrong, and that she should not be overly concerned with others as they present for her. S understood that she is a shy and introverted person who tends to be defensive, thinking that others are or should be always concerned for her, but she could now raise the possibility that others are also concerned that she should be concerned for them: S, thus, could understand the world as a world in which she was being human in the same way as others were being human, rather than her being in a world in which all concerns were her concerns.

S began to be more thoughtful about how she assumes people to be,

realizing that being overly and incorrectly concerned with others' orientation towards her was destructive, and a waste of energy and thought. S realized that her assumptions about other people, just as in the case of that particular person whom she encountered, do not reflect who they really are in themselves, and are thus not necessarily true.

S's encounter thus, meant she experienced an opening up, she felt more open minded, and could also relate more openly within her own little group, and felt less intensely concerned with her own life. S, felt like she had really seen something quite amazing; the self-evident clarity of what she now saw made S wonder at why she had never seen it before.

Part 7 : Subject 2: Table 4: General Situated Structure

S's experience of gaining insight was lived in an encounter with another, whose ambiguous presence she had always interpreted as a hostile presence. This was one instance of an intense concern for how people presented to her in general.

In her encounter S perceived that person as being the same as she had always seen him as being, but without him having seen her. S, thus, saw him as not being hostile toward her; S could see him as being for - himself, and saw him being unambiguously concerned

with his own concerns. In the light of S's reflecting, beyond her own immediate self-concern on the truth of that person's being himself, S was able to look back upon herself. S then discovered herself as having been wrong in her assumptions, and as being excessively concerned with others as they appeared to her.

S was also thrown back on her past, and she not only discovered that her assumptions in the past were wrong, but that she could now see her past as filled with encounters in which that person had not in fact been hostile toward her. Her beliefs and assumptions about others in general thrown into question. S could then not only open up to that person, but also open up to others. In terms of her experience of her encounter as one in which she learned that she had been wrong, S established a project towards being more thoughtful. S, thus, having seen something quite amazing, and seeing the self-evident clarity of what she now saw, could raise the possibility that others are much like herself in their concerns.

Part 8: Subject 3: Table 2: Ordered T.M.U'S

1.

S woke up to the loud sounds of a whistle accompanied by threats, and, after the initial confusion of someone emerging from the comfort of sleep realized that he was in a military situation, one which he did not want to be in.

2.

S rose, in accordance with the demands of others, but realized that he needed to go to the toilet, a situation which took him away from the preparations he needed to make in answer to these demands.

3.

S experienced a lack of comfort and warmth while he listened to the distant sound of the others preparing to move off.

4.

S got back to his tent in a state of being lived as a loss of control over his own being-a-body: having messed himself, hurt himself, and, in addition, being unable to see anything. S thus found himself becoming very worried and very tense.

5.

S, in his worried and tense state, sought help from others who milled about him, talking and shouting to each other, but saw his plea go apparently unheard, and no one came to his assistance. Although S soldiered on in his attempt to recover his situation, he was very uncomfortable, and really worried about being left completely alone - and worried about being more lost than he was: S was alone in his troubled world.

18.

S was lost in his need to be physically strengthened by others who he depended upon; S thus lacked a sense of personal power.

13.

When S was in the tent, surrounded by others who were absent for

S, S experienced fright, a sense of loss, an intense need not to be left behind, and an uncertainty about his future. As such, S was afraid and anxious until that other person entered his situation.

6.

At that moment at which S was most immersed in his despair, someone else who S knew, broke S's isolation by placing his arm on S's shoulder and saying, in a light hearted fashion that everything was going to be all right. S, without thinking shared this light hearted moment, laughing along with that other person.

16.

S was, up to that stage quite dependent on that other person, for support, for friendship.

7.

Having transported S from his total despair into a shared moment of laughter that other person then left, leaving S alone.

20.

That other person who entered S's situation, and thus, came into his life as it was, allowed S to step back from the immediacy of his anxiety and fear, and to gaze upon the absurdity of his situation, and to see it in its truthful perspective.

8.

When S stopped laughing he was struck by a thought, thrown by it- S intensely, reflectively, brought his entire orientation towards despair into question. S became angry with himself and with the military as he realized the extent of his having "fallen" into a

trap, and the subsequent lack of integrity in his being-a-body, "behaviorally" as a lived loss of control.

17.

The experience gave S the opportunity to be himself, to view things as they really are, to be more independent and to do things for himself - not to be in that other person's shadow.

11.

S's insight into his situation as being a fallen one, one which he lived in an unintegrated way, brought about "a sense of reality" for S. Instead of an intensely narrowed focus on people and his surroundings as frightening, S experienced an opening up of his perception of the world: he could "look around and see things", and, with his new sense of calmness, from that time onwards he "could see things for what they were." It brought about a perspective of things as they really were - without his world being clouded by the tension of living according to the demands of others.

19.

S understands that it can be that even though he is all alone he may still be comforted by others he has lived with, in so far as the type of people they are might be revealed to be potentially part of how he is himself. So, although that other person left S alone after joking with S, S was left feeling integrated and whole, having realized the extent of how much he had fallen, and he realized that he was not totally alone-in-the world, as well as realizing how he could be, i.e. calm like that other who came to

him.

15.

What happened to S, at that time, was that the experience gave S a sense of independence.

21.

S's way of seeing his situation as it appeared in the immediacy of his lostness and fallenness was unfree and restricted, it was shit all the time. Whereas after S's encounter with that other person who threw S back upon himself, allowing him to recover things as they really are, he was liberated from his lostness, and able to look at things in themselves as beautiful. Also S thought differently.

10.

Although S was eventually left alone in the tent he was no longer intensely concerned, he no longer felt on extreme demand from others that he be punctual, and, even though S found his kit to be below the standards of the military he wasn't overly worried; he did not, thus, feel demanded to be exactly how these others wished him to be. S, then, in his own time completed his tasks and addressed himself in terms of his new understanding that "everything is going to be all right".

12.

S supposes that the full extent of the new understanding he had gained wasn't immediately available, but it gave S an opportunity to grow, to own it as a part of his world view and to make it part of his experiences.

9.

Having been thrown back upon himself, having gathered himself together it seemed easy to go about his tasks - to pick up his things and get everything together. S's own (recovered) integrity and resoluteness allowed him to carry out his tasks carefully and purposefully.

14.

S doesn't think there is anything to add to this description except his own explanations as to what happened at the time, and his theoretical understanding as to how he then understood his experience.

(N.R.O.P)

Part 9 : Subject 3: Table 3: Specific Situated Structure

S was living through a compulsory military situation in which he felt demanded by others to live his life according to their authority. S also found himself feeling cold, lost, powerless and out of control with respect to his being-a-body, and mostly, S felt alone and lacking the warmth and comfort he depended on others for; S, thus, felt helpless and alone and unable to control his own life.

At the point at which he was feeling the most anxious, helpless, lost and alone - having actually pleaded for help from those who

milled about him and then having received no answer - one other person who S knew and particularly depended upon, came up to S and broke S's isolation by placing his arm on S's shoulder and lightheartedly said that S shouldn't be so worried, everything was going to be all right. S, without thinking, shared this lighthearted moment, laughing along with that other person. That other person transported S from his total despair, by being there for him in a comforting way, interacting with him in a warm way, and allowing S to share a lighthearted moment - but then just disappeared.

That other person, coming into S's situation for him and then leaving, left S alone but also left him feeling comforted and more lighthearted. That person left S removed from his situation of anxiety. S had been allowed to step back from the immediacy of his anxiety and to gaze upon the absurdity of his situation, and see it in its truthful perspective.

When S stopped laughing he was struck by a thought, thrown by it-S intensely, reflectively, brought his entire orientation towards despair into question. S became angry with himself, and with the military, as he realized the extent of his having "fallen" into a trap, and the consequent lack of integrity in his being-a-body, lived "behaviorally" as a loss of control.

The experience gave S an opportunity to be himself, to view things as they really are, to be more independent and to do things for

himself - not to be in that other person's shadow.

Having thus been transported from his state of anxiety and then living a sense of lightheartedness after that other person had left him, S discovered himself as being calm. S's insight into his situation as being a fallen one, one in which he lived in an unintegrated way brought "a sense of reality" for S. Instead of an intensely narrowed focus on people and his surroundings as frightening, S experienced an opening up of his perception of the world: he could "look around and see things" with a new sense of calmness, seeing them for what they were. It brought about a perspective of things as they were, without his world being clouded by the tension of living according to the demands of others.

S understands that it can be that even though he is all alone he may still be comforted by others he has lived with, in so far as the type of people they are might be revealed to be potentially part of how he is himself. So, although that other person left S alone after joking with S, S was left feeling integrated and whole. S had realized that he was not totally alone, and also S realized how he could be: calm like that person he encountered, and calm as that person had left him feeling.

S compared his way of seeing his situation, as it appeared in the immediacy of his lostness and fallenness, with his experience after

his encounter with that other person; S understood that previously he had felt unfree and restricted, whereas after his encounter he was liberated from his lostness, and able to look at things in themselves as beautiful. S also thought differently. S no longer felt an extreme demand from others to be how he understood they wanted him to be. Instead of being just fearful of them, or experiencing a demandedness which he felt powerless to control, S saw others in a more realistic way.

Even though S experienced his ability to go about his tasks and gather his things together after he had recovered himself, S understood that the full extent of the new understanding he had gained wasn't immediately available. However, it gave him an opportunity to grow, to own it as a part of his worldview, and to make it part of his experiences, eg. when S had completed his tasks, S could say to himself, in a satisfied way, that everything was going to be all right. S, thus, understands that he took up the words and meanings of that encounter he had, and progressively used them to look upon his world and to think about it differently.

Part 10 : Subject 3: Table 4: General Situated Structure

S gained insight into his life-situation when he encountered another person who transported him beyond the immediacy of his

panic, so that he could gaze upon the absurdity of his intense concern about meeting the demands he had felt were made on him by others.

Prior to S's encounter, S was feeling lost and alone, isolated, helpless and out of control; he felt that he was controlled by people who made extreme demands on him, and S was living an intensity of concern for his well-being in the face of these demands.

At the moment in which S was feeling the most helpless, out of control and alone, another person transported S from his total despair, by being there with him in a comforting way, interacting with him, then he left S alone, but still calm. Then from his new perspective outside the immediacy of his panic, S could see the absurdity of his intense concern and could see his situation in its truthful perspective. S became angry with himself and the demanding context he was in, realizing, as he did, the extent of his having "fallen".

S, having discovered himself to be beyond his own dependence on others, was liberated to the extent that he could look around from his more secure place and see things for what they were. He could also look around and see other people in a more realistic way.

S was left feeling integrated and whole, having realized he could be like that person he encountered, and calm as that person had left him feeling.

S took up the words and meanings of that encounter, and progressively used them to look upon his world more independently and to think about it differently.

Part 11 : Subject 4 : Table 2 : Ordered T.M.U'S

16.

S's understanding of his, and one particular other person's task, in the light of their commitment to God, was to be honest and true.

35.

S saw himself as having been placed in a position of tremendous prestige by God Himself, and so S had placed himself just below God, and one step above other Christians: between fellow men and God.

1.

S became disturbed and upset by the way one particular married person treated his wife: criticizing her and paying her undue negative attention, such that he appeared irritable and as lacking understanding of her as a person.

15.

S saw that other person as ungodly because of that one area of his

life which appeared to S as being out of step with God.

14.

S saw that other person as guilty, of choosing to be disobedient to God.

17.

In S's eyes that other person revealed an extremity of being bad that appeared as something bad-in-itself, and which called to it the attention of others.

7.

That other person appeared to S as having no time for others, and appeared as someone that one couldn't approach with your problems since he appeared to S to be wrapped up in himself, arrogant, and as treating everyone badly, especially his wife.

2.

Although S has never seen that other person lose his temper, S raised the possibility that notwithstanding the fact that that other is a Christian, he still might have a problem with his temper - since S understands irritability and temper to go hand in hand, and that person appeared to S to be very irritable.

3.

S was struck by how unjust that person's attitude was, how out of balance it was compared to how things should be - that, in the first place, that person deserved to be alone, and furthermore, if he was not satisfied he should leave his wife. S was, thus, very critical of that person.

4.

S was puzzled, in his critical dwelling on the situation of the other, as to why that other wasn't doing anything about his own attitude, since that other was a Christian yet his attitude was contrary to his professed beliefs: it was unbiblical and ungodly.

38.

S saw that other person as being intensely and ruthlessly seeking to establish a sense of power, trying to establish his own authority, and S didn't want to be like that.

27.

S saw in that other person an ugliness that S understood as being something he did not want: that he did not want to be like that.

8.

After getting to know that other person better, S came to see him as being an incomplete person, someone who was not yet fully developed, even though S saw that he had good points as well as bad, and that he wasn't, thus, completely "bad".

5.

In S's dwelling on the situation of that other, in itself, as a puzzle about that other, something in that person's mannerisms reminded S of himself, and S was called back (re-called) to himself, to look upon himself.

19.

After seeing that other's attitude as being here as his own attitude, S addressed himself, bringing his own integrity with respect to his religious convictions into question.

9.

In the light of the other's unawareness about his (that other's) own attitude being extreme, S's own life became illuminated; because that other was 'in the dark', S's life was lit up to reveal an area that needed attending to: a contrast, thus, became apparent between S and that other, in so far as S was reflectively aware of his life while that other was not reflectively aware of how he was living.

37.

S was thrown back on his past, remembering how he had been: self-concerned, single mindedly pursuing his own projects towards his own ends.

11, 18, 36.

S saw that other person's attitude, and he saw his own attitude as being the same, as well as seeing how disgusted he was by what he saw. S thus became determined to change, after seeing how guilty he was himself, and feeling ashamed of it.

13.

S saw himself as having the same problem as that other person: that his relationship with God wasn't right, and that it was not as good as it should be. Thus, S saw himself as guilty.

12.

S's understanding of himself as sharing a guilty way of being with that other person was uncomfortable for S, since as that other appeared to S to be ungodly, so S was forced by his own reflecting to see that there was something wrong with his own relationship

with God. Thus S experienced the discomfort of his own having been convicted - his own being guilty.

20.

Prior to his encounter with that other person, who S then saw as embodying who he himself was, S had been forgetful of his relationships with fellowmen and his relationship with God. When S, then, encountered himself as he was with respect to being with others and being with God he was reminded of how he should be. He was recalled to who he was as a human being walking with God. He was thus also recalled from his forgetfulness and judged himself as having been not mindful of God, and, so owned his guilt.

10.

In the light of S's reflection on how his life was being lived, S saw himself as being a critical person, and thus became aware of his "badness" as bad, rather than his "badness" as 'merely' a living out of his projects, and thus as not bad at all.

6, 26.

S was forced to look upon himself, in his short-temperedness, his lack of patience, his critical attitude and, ultimately his self-concern and lack of respect for others. S saw himself as proud and self-centred, and as living as if he was above others, and, thus, had seen others as being of less value than him, with nothing of their own to offer for the good.

22.

S understood himself as having put himself above other people, and understood that this was pride and an overly intense concern about

himself - a self-centeredness that S also understood as a fallenness; S understood that, even within its attempt at raising oneself above others, pride is a falling.

34.

S understood himself to have been, prior to his encounter, lost in a pursuit of God's being as his (S's) very own being - S was filled, thus, with a sense of himself as being a god. This realization of his having been lost in pride and lost in his self (as a self lived as a "god-self"), was brought about when he saw that other person as being proud. Having seen that, S saw that, although his self understanding was one of being of great importance as a "god-self", that very god-self appeared in contrast to a true God's-being, insofar as it meant he lived a life which excluded everything and everybody, and God Himself. As such, S had fallen (away) from others and away from God-as-the-ultimate-other.

24.

S had presupposed that Christians were "different" - supposing, then, that he was in fact different to non-Christians, but, in his encounter with that other person, and thus his encounter with himself, S was reminded of how he was being, and that it was no different to an ungodly way of being: S thus found himself to be an inauthentic Christian, as not being true to himself as a Christian.

25.

S saw himself as not having an integrity with respect to his

living - that he had taken parts and pieces of what should have been a whole understanding in order to live according to his own distorted view of himself as being above others.

30.

S lived an experience of discovery when he experienced a sense of truth in so far as he experienced a verification of reality that had, up to then, merely been words. These words took on an added depth of meaning as S discovered something in its actuality, as "physically" happening.

28.

S saw the pride, self-centeredness and the arrogance for what it really was, in all its openness, as being fully revealed in its wickedness: a total lack of respect for other human beings.

40.

S became aware of the place of others in his projects towards being a concerned person who lives according to God's will. This S contrasted with his sense of pride and his being arrogant and self satisfied and his being deeply concerned with his own projects toward self-aggrandizement.

21, 23, 29.

For S, being irritable and critical affected his ability to be mindful of the needs of others and the commands of God, since S now understood that being intensely mindful only of one's own needs meant that he was forgetful of God and fellowman.

32.

S realized that his way of living was a continuous falling away

from God into an unintegrated, inauthentic life devoid of true peace, since a sense of wholeness, especially with God, requires a complete commitment in order to search for that wholeness.

31.

S was made aware of his God's greatness and his light by the contrasting dark intensity of that other person's attitude. Thus, for S, that other person's nature, as it contrasted with God's greatness and humility, revealed God more clearly.

39.

S, thrown back on his past, compared his past way of being with his understanding of what God had said about the way he was being. Having compared those understandings with his own experience (of disgust) S saw that what he felt, and what God had said he felt, were the same, and so S became more aware of God. S, thus, through a process of becoming aware of how God's word had been verified in his own experience, gained a greater sense of the reality of God.

33.

S's perceiving of that other person as being in an extreme position, illuminated S's relationship with God, since whereas that other had fallen completely, God had prevented S from falling quite as far by showing S where he was, and how he might potentially end up. S, thus, understood his own situation as having been illuminated by the Light of God Himself, and, thus that S's Self was found, and found to be in God.

41.

S understands his experience to be one which has had some impact

on his life, because of the way he had been 'physically' moved.

Part 12 : Subject 4: Table 3: Specific Situated Structure

S was situated within a world in which he believed he was walking with God, believing also that his task was to be honest and true. Since S believed that his walk with God was as a result of his having been called by God, S saw himself as having been placed in a position of tremendous prestige by God Himself - considering himself placed just below God and one step above other Christians; S lived out this being-proud by being extremely critical of how others conducted their lives. S then became disturbed and upset by the way one particular person treated his wife: criticizing her and paying her undue negative attention such that he appeared irritable and as lacking understanding of her as a person. S reflected much on that person and his situation - seeing him as ungodly because of that one issue, seeing him as guilty of choosing to be disobedient to God - S also saw that that person revealed an extremity of being-bad that called to it the attention of others. That other person, though, appeared to S as having no time for others, someone wrapped up in himself, as arrogant, and as treating everyone badly, especially his wife. S dwelt much on that person's irritability, and found himself being very critical of that person. S also considered it possible that that person might have a problem with his temper too - since S links temper

and irritability. S, in his critical dwelling on that person's situation was also struck by how unjust it was, how out of balance it was, and thought that that person deserved, rather, to be alone. S was puzzled as to why that person wasn't doing anything about his attitude, since that person was a Christian, yet his attitude was contrary to his professed beliefs: it was unbiblical and ungodly.

S critically saw that person as intensely and ruthlessly seeking to establish a sense of power, to establish his own authority, and S didn't want to be like that, since S saw it as ugly. Later, during his reflecting on that person and getting to know him better S came to see he had some good points, but the way S understood him was as not yet fully developed in the sight of God: an incomplete person.

But, in S's being critical and dwelling on the situation of that other, in itself, as a puzzle about that other, something in that person's mannerisms reminded S of himself, and S was re-called to himself, to look upon himself. S saw that presencing of the other's attitude as bad, calling to itself, the attention of others. Furthermore, though, S saw it not only as revealing itself as 'there' in the other's life, but also saw it as being 'here' as S's own critical attitude. S saw himself and this other person as sharing the same way of being.

S's own life was illuminated because that other person was in the dark, unaware of his way of life to the extent he lived it out in an extreme, pre-reflective way: a contrast thus became apparent to S between S as reflecting, and the other as pre-reflectively "bad".

S in his reflecting was thrown back on his past, remembering how he had been: proud and self-concerned, single mindedly pursuing his own projects towards his own ends, and thrown back on himself as he still was. Prior to his encounter with that other person, S had been forgetful of his relationships with fellowman and forgetful of his relationship with God, thus, when S encountered himself, he encountered himself as he was with respect to being with others and his being with God. S thus, having been recalled from his forgetfulness, judged himself as guilty of being proud and self-concerned, and thus as not mindful of God, and of being critical of others rather than concerned for their well-being. Then, having seen how disgusted he had been and how he had felt the hatred welling up in him toward that person's way of living, and seeing himself as guilty of the same attitude, S became determined to change, to become less self-concerned and less critical, and more mindful of God. S, thus, could not live as being disgusted without, in these terms being somewhat disgusted at himself.

S, thus, had come to understand himself as having "fallen", as having put himself above other people, as having pride and an overly intense concern about himself; S understood that even within his attempt at raising himself above others he had "fallen", since he saw himself as lost in a pursuit of God's being as his (S's) very own being - as living as a god-self; and that this had meant excluding everything and everybody. As such S had fallen away from others and, thus, from God as the ultimate other.

S understood, then, that although he had seen himself as different to non-Christians, he was no different from them. S was reminded of his being an inauthentic Christian, as not having integrity with respect to his living - since he had taken parts and pieces of what should have been a whole understanding, in order to live according to his own distorted view of himself as being above others.

S, then, in his understanding that he was not living according to his belief that he was a Christian, and was thus being inauthentic, lived an experience of discovery: S discovered a sense of 'truth'; what S had merely experienced as words took on an added depth of meaning as S discovered the actuality, the lived reality of the disgust, hatred and remorse that he had read about with respect to God's word about pride.

Since S saw the pride, arrogance and self-centredness for what it really was, in all its openness, as being fully revealed in its wickedness, as a restricted being, centering around his own narrow concerns to exclusion of any concern for other people, he made it a project of his to become more concerned with living according to God's will. In his becoming aware of the place of others in this project, S could reflectively contrast this project with his previous project, towards his own self-aggrandizement, part of which was belittling and criticizing others.

S's new project was based upon his understanding that an absence from others and absence from a loving concern for them reflected a lack of concern for God, making it impossible to live a true peace, and, thus, impossible to acquire a sense of wholeness in God. S's reflections, discoveries and feelings meant, for S, that he experienced the reality and relevance of God's teaching in his own life. S was made aware of God's greatness and His light, revealing God more clearly. For S the sense of the verification of God's word as true in his own lived experience, gave S a greater sense of the reality of God. Especially since S felt that his perceiving of that other person as being completely fallen, illuminated S's relationship with God: God had prevented him (S) from falling quite as far, by showing S where he was, and how he might potentially end up. S, thus, understood his own situation as having been illuminated by the light of God himself, and, thus, that he himself was found, and found to be closer to God. S

understands his experience to be one which has had some impact on his life, illustrated by S's own level and type of knowledge being different to how it had been before then, eg. S had made it a project to learn, verbatim, most of the biblical verses dealing with pride.

Part 13 : Subject 4 : Table 4 : General Situated Structure

S gained insight into his life-situation when he encountered another, who was being so extremely unconcerned about the dignity and well-being of others, that his behaviour called S's critical attention to it, subsequently allowing S to see his (S's) own pride, arrogance and critical attitude illuminated. S, thus, in his intense reflecting about that person in terms of that person's situation was taken beyond himself. S could then be thrown back upon himself, to reflect on his situation, a situation which was marked by disgust and anger which he felt towards himself.

S, thus, encountered himself intensely as he was, discovering that he had been forgetful of others.

S, thus, had, come to understand himself as having "fallen", and as not having integrity with respect to his living,

S's encounter was lived as a sense of discovery: this was lived as a perception of truth and reality which he had been unaware of

previously. In the light of this he, then structured a project for himself to become aware of the place of others in this life, and to have more integrity with respect to his own beliefs.

Part 14 : Pilot : Table 2 : Ordered T.M.U'S

9.

S planned her work intensely, structuring all her time in terms of her work - allowing herself no time for her life to unfold in a free and open way.

3.

S was only partially present to another person, feeling guilty at not answering the call back to her work.

2.

In a social context which should be a context for relaxed being-with-others, S was only partially present to the person she was with, as well as only partially present to that situation, since S was living in an intense concern for her own projects. S was, in terms of this intensity of concern called back to her work, and called away from this being-with-the-other. All this time, thus, S was dwelling intensely on her situation, thinking upon it and reflecting.

1.

S was in a situation usually reserved for relaxed social intercourse with a person who S understood as being very different

to her in that he seemed to have so much time to relax in the company of others.

7.

S saw that other in contrast to her own intensity of concern, as being very relaxed and having a carefree attitude - qualities that S felt herself admiring

6.

That other person was not doing anything significant to draw S's attention to his way of living, he was merely being free.

4.

At the time of her dwelling on her situation S found herself comparing herself with that other person, and she wished she could be more like that other person in many ways.

5.

S, in her dwelling on her life situation, wished she could be less intensely concerned about living up to the expectations of others.

10.

By listening and watching that other person, specifically in terms of his being free, S discovered the extremity of her own planning and control, and, thus, the extremity of her own restricting of her freedom.

8.

S discovered herself as being too rigid in her approach to her work.

11.

S experienced herself as having learned that she needed to see her

work in a more realistic way, in the light of her seeing her life situation for what it was: a too intense process of structuring her life, rather than her adequately planning her life.

16.

S feels that by not answering the call of her own intense demand to work, that she ultimately would be more involved, both in her work and in her being-with-others.

17.

S, struck by her perception of that other person as more carefree, and allowing herself more time, worked out a project to allow herself to be more free and yet to still be responsible in terms of the work she had to do.

12.

S changed her approach to structuring her life in order to allow herself more freedom to do things that she wanted to do, rather than only live in an intense relationship to her work.

13.

S initially had to carefully and deliberately establish for herself a project towards giving herself more freedom with respect to time. This project, which initially involved a conscious effort on S's part, gradually became part of S's everyday life as she got better at it, freeing her from her own demand to deal with less significant things.

20.

S incorporated into her way of living a way of being that was revealed to her by that other person.

22.

S's own freedom was enhanced through a restructuring of her approach to her work.

21.

Although that other person revealed a potential way of being that was different to the way S had been living, S still did not base her whole way of relating to her work and to others on his way of living, as it appeared to her. Instead S took up the way of being revealed to her by that person in her own unique way, living it as a newly revealed way of living her own life as she knew it to be (historically).

18.

S was careful to weigh up, reflectively, that person's embodiment of a potential way of being, since S realized that that other was, ultimately, living a freedom that was extreme.

19.

S learned something significant, notwithstanding having considered that that other person does not embody for her an ideal type of being.

14.

S experienced the situation with that other person as a situation in which she learned something from another person - thus, S resolved to remind herself of the value of being with others for her.

15.

S made it a project of hers to be more attentive to others, and

not think of other things, since S was reflectively aware of her absence from that person during her encounter. S also understood that by being more fully present to any situation, that by concentrating everything on that moment, she would experience it in a deeper, fuller way.

Part 15 : Pilot : Table 3 : Specific Situated Structure

S was overly concerned with the expectations of others, and had, as her only project, a project towards working to meet those expectations of others. Life was unfree and unspontaneous, and she felt guilty if she was unable to work towards those expectations.

In her encounter with one particular other, S was reflecting intensely on her being guilty for being in the presence of that other person rather than working at her project.

The person S was with appeared to S as being different to her, and she saw him as always being able to relax and to be carefree with others.

While S was in the presence of this person she was dwelling on her situation as a situation for feeling guilty, her situation was being lived as a guilty absence from her work, until S began to reflect on how that other person was living. S now saw that person as being free, as being very relaxed, and S found herself admiring

those qualities. S then lived her situation as one for admiring that person, and wishing she could be more like that; S was wishing beyond herself, seeing that person as essentially different.

S thus was called to examine the contrast between that person and herself, and by listening to and watching that person as free, and then reflecting on how she was in comparison to him she then discovered herself as not free.

S had, thus, been called back to reflecting back upon herself and her situation as it was, and discovered herself as being restricted, as being too rigid in her approach to her life-situation as a project towards working only according to the demands of others.

S learned that she needed to see her work in a more realistic way, and she understood that she needed to become less intense in her planning, and to become more involved with being with others.

S, then, worked out a project to allow herself to be more free and more open to being-with-others; she used her ability to plan in order to develop projects towards being more fully present to her own life, in terms of seeing her work in a more balanced way, and also towards being more fully present to others so that she may, potentially, be more fully present to her work when appropriate.

S realized that she needed to be more fully present to others in terms of two issues: firstly S had been reflectively aware of herself as being excessively absent from that person and the situation, and secondly that, even though she had been absent from that person in order to come to a reflective understanding of her situation, she understood that she had learned something from that person, and thus understood the importance of the meaningful presence of others for the unfolding of her life.

The project S established for herself at first required a conscious effort on S's part, but she gradually became better at it without having to regularly remind herself of her project. S thus systematically owned that way of living revealed to her by that other person, but owning it in her own unique way, grounding it in her own historical being, since S understood that other person as being too unconcerned with his work.

Part 16 : Pilot : Table 4 : General Situated Structure

Insight into her life-situation was gained by S in an encounter with another person who was being free in the face of S's being unfree. She initially found herself wishing she could be more like him, since she saw him as being essentially different to her.

Then, out of the situation as a situation for reflecting, and as a situation in which she had begun comparing herself with that person, S was called to look at herself as different to that other, specifically in terms of "freedom". S, thus, discovered herself as restricted, as being too rigid, a restricting of her being that reflected itself in her inability to live the situation fully with others. S then understood that she needed to approach her work more realistically, so that she could be more present to herself and others.

S then used her ability to plan - that very ability that had restricted her - to structure a greater freedom for herself. She also established a project towards being more open to the meaningful presence of others, had since she understood that another (thoughtfully) called her back to herself. S, thus, saw her encounters with others as potentially meaningful.

This encounter led S to gradually own a way of living that was revealed to her by that person, a way of living that S took up in her own unique way, grounding it in her own historical being.

2.4 FINDINGS

PART 1: EXTENDED DESCRIPTION

A: BEFORE THE ENCOUNTER

Before the person encounters that other person in the significant way required for achieving insight, (s)he is intensely self-concerned, but not concerned with the self that he or she truly is. Instead, the person is intensely and reflectively concerned about him/herself as (s)he understands him/herself to be in terms of abstract, absent or generalized others. This inauthentic self-understanding, although pre-reflectively held as a taken for granted reality, is lived in the form of concerns and fears and projects that are reflectively held as important, or are of intense reflective concern. For example: Subject 1 believed that looking good, being popular and being successful were the only qualities worthy of respect. Subject 2 believed that she was a self at the mercy of the gaze others, a self which everyone was concerned about. Subject 3 saw himself as answerable to the demands of certain others, while also completely dependent on others; Subject 4 believed himself to be an other-self to the very extent that he saw himself as a god-self, especially chosen to be above other Christians;

The person in the Pilot Study structured her every moment around her work in order to meet the expectations of others.

Although the danger lies in the intense reflective concern that is related to how one is with respect to others, there too lies the saving power (to coin a Heideggerian phrase), since it is this very being-reflective in the face of others and oneself that allows the person to gain insight.

B: THE INTENSITY OF THE PRESENCE OF THE OTHER PERSON IN THE ENCOUNTER CALLS THE SUBJECT AWAY FROM THE IMMEDIACY OF HIS/HER CONCERNS.

The encounter with the other reveals that other person as being an intensely present other - another person so intensely present that they call the person to beyond her immediate intense reflecting and living in her projects, fears or concerns as an inauthentic self. The person is called away from that immediacy of concern to reflect on the being of that other person, or to reflect on another way of being revealed to him by the encounter.

Subject 1 was called away from the immediacy of trying to be sharp and dishonest to reflect on the intensity of the other person's integrity.

Subject 2 was called away from the intensity of concern about being present to others to reflect on the intensity of the other person's being concerned with his very own concerns.

Subject 3 was called away from the intensity of his despair and aloneness to living and reflecting on his own new state of being-calm, and on the "absurdity" of his despair.

Subject 4 was called away from his everyday projects to an intense critical reflection on the other's being-unconcerned, critical, and also being uncaring about the dignity of others.

The person in the pilot study was called away from her intensity of concern about her work to an intensity of reflection on the being-free of the other person.

C: THE ENCOUNTER THROWS THE PERSON INTO A STATE OF BEING THAT IS A LIVED CONTRAST TO HIS/HER EVERYDAY TAKEN-FOR-GRANTED BEING.

The person finds himself/herself to be standing in two places at the same time. Having been transported from the immediacy of his/her everyday inauthenticity, he/she discovers him/herself to be living a contrasting understanding. The person authentically discovers the very extent to which he/she has been, or is living inauthentically. This emerges as a contrast between how the person is/was living as opposed to the beliefs the person holds/held. The

person thus discovers that his new/old way of living contrasts with how he thinks/thought, or lives/lived.

Subject 1 lived as an understanding that that other was being real and authentic in his refusing to be dishonest, in contrast to S's belief that that person was two-dimensional and unreal. This revealed the previously unexplored possibility of a reality and authenticity that contradicted S's very way of living/understanding.

Subject 2 found herself to be living as a person who the other was unconcerned about, in contrast to having lived as a person who believed that she was subject to the negative attention of (all) others.

Subject 3 discovered himself as being calm and lighthearted when he was left alone, in contrast to his belief that he depended upon others, and in contrast to his belief that the negative demands of his context could only be lived as despair.

Subject 4 discovered himself as being critical and being self-concerned and proud with respect to that other, in contrast to his belief that he was a godly man and a step above other Christians. S's life was thus revealed as a lived contradiction which called out to S for resolution when he

intensely and critically reflected on that other person.

The person in the pilot study discovered that she was doing things which restricted her own freedom. This discovery contrasted with S's belief that she was naturally different to one other person who appeared, initially, as merely having more time for himself. When S discovered that he was being (deliberately) free, she could discover that she was restricting her own freedom.

D: A SEEING BEYOND THE SITUATION

Insight is, in terms of the structure of the phenomenon at hand, not only a seeing-into, but "seeing beyond".

Subject 1 had seen the other as being real, and saw into his situation as being a dishonest one, but S also saw beyond it, to a possible being-real and being sincere for himself, since it was revealed to him as real enough to take up for himself - beyond a mere wanting or wishing to be different and an admiring of qualities he did not have.

Subject 2 saw beyond her merely not being noticed by the other, and then seeing herself as (merely) being wrong. S saw herself as being the person others were not negatively concerned about. S saw the other as being wrapped up in his

own concerns. S saw beyond her situation into her future as a future potentially filled with meeting that other on his own terms, and in terms of how he might reveal himself in himself. S saw beyond her situation into her past which became a different past.

Subject 3 saw beyond his situation as just shit all the time, and beyond his immediate sense of being calm, and then even beyond his sense of anger at his having fallen - S saw people and things differently, he could "look around" and see that 'everything is going to be all right.'

Subject 4 saw beyond his disgust at himself and then could more clearly see others, and God. S experienced seeing through his life, as a being-critical, to a life lived more meaningfully with God and with others.

The Subject of the Pilot Study had already "seen into" her situation as a situation for not being able to do as she wished; but her insight was seeing a freedom that was potentially hers. S saw beyond her being-restricted to seeing herself as unfree until she changed. This was beyond her wishing to be different, and wishing to be like that other.

E: (i) A SEEING OF THINGS AS REAL

The person not only gains insight by seeing something in its transparent clarity so that he/she sees beyond it, but the person experiences a reality as real to the extent that there can be a taking up of that reality.

Subject 1 stated that something became "very clear" to him, and that was "the deep truth" of what that other person was saying. S also states that that person, having made that stand "revealed a depth" which S admired, and that that depth was different to the sorts of things he had been acquiring previously. S also experienced a sudden deepening of the world, and a sudden realization of a coming into relief "like 3-dimensionality". S could then adopt as a motto, sincerely within himself as a code, those words which revealed that person as having moved from out of a two-dimensional mold.

Subject 2 states that she had "seen something", she had "really seen something" quite amazing - and it seemed "strange" that she had never seen it before. S could then "be more open" within her group and feel that things weren't so serious. S felt more open minded to the extent that her "whole attitude changed towards him" because she "realized the person wasn't being hostile". S could thus take up a new perspective based on a discovery of things as they really

were/are.

Subject 3 states: "... I think it brought about a sense of reality. It brought about a perspective of things as they really were ..." This then allowed S to "look around and see things, and S states that "from that time onwards I could see things for what they were." This allowed S to gradually take up a new perspective: "It gave me the opportunity to grow, and to incorporate that within me ... it could take root and grow." It, thus allowed S to take up a project towards independence: "... it gave me the opportunity to start doing things for myself ... I had a change in attitude - thinking, I certainly thought differently."

Subject 4: states: "I saw it ... Because it really is, you see it for... all its openness: (and) ... it made me want not to be like that... So it became real, ...(and) it also made God more real to me ... when you see, it physically happening ..." When S saw 'that,' he could then take up, as a project, his goal to change: "... When I saw him, when I saw his attitude, and I saw my own reaction towards it ... I said to myself, I determined, I tried to change, never to do that again - never to have that attitude, because I saw what it looked like."

The person in the Pilot Study saw that what that other had

was something she could take up: "I learned something from the fact that he was totally carefree. I took a bit out of him to put into my life... taking that carefree element and trying to fit it into what I was doing before."

E (ii) REALITY PRESENTS ITSELF AS BEING IN CONTRAST TO INAUTHENTICITY.

The reality revealed to the resolutely guilty person presents itself as a reality in contrast to a non-reality, or absurdity, or inauthenticity, and, as such, presents itself as a way of being real in itself. It thus demands in itself to be taken up as real. As such the person, in his guilt, has to take up projects toward wholeness:

Subject 1 notes: "I realized that the stuff I had admired ... were pretty two-dimensional things ... I realized then, I thought to myself: "You're so shallow, and your relationships ... are so plastic, manipulatory ... and an improvement in the quality of my relationship with myself could only benefit ..."

Subject 2 notes: "And" in that moment it occurred to me that maybe I had been wrong all the time ... I suddenly realized that people - that you shouldn't ... assume ... things unless you can understand the person behind it. And it made me look

through all my other reactions to people as well.

Subject 3 notes: "... I thought: 'What in the hell am I doing ... I've fallen into this fucking trap ... there is just no reason for behaving this way.'" S, notes that that "... bit of insight grew. It gave me the opportunity to grow."

Subject 4 notes: "So it made me realize..., his attitude seemed to focus a spotlight on an area of my life that needed cleaning up, and reflecting ... it saw my attitude as BAD... But it showed me, in his attitude, that I didn't want to be like that ... I tried to change."

The subject in the Pilot Study notes: "I...was being ... too methodical .. extreme ... what I learned was that I should find more of a balance (and so)... I put time aside for things I wanted to do."

F INSIGHT AS DEPTH OF PERCEPTION OR AN EXPERIENCE OF A DEPTH OF MEANING

Part of the experience of perceiving of reality as it appears in its self-evident clarity, is a perception of a "being-deep" or experiencing a level of intensity characterized by deep or forceful feelings, or a depth of meaning. This, thus, focusses the person on his/her own feelings, and the intensity of his/her own

experience, which is often also an experience of surprise at the newness, intensity and clarity.

Subject 1 states: My embarrassment deepened, but simultaneously something became very clear...and that was the deep truth of what he was saying" (which is) actually considerably more important than the superficial gratification you can get from just 'handling' people ..." S also notes: "(that other) added a depth to himself...he revealed a depth..." S also notes "It was like a sudden deepening of the world."

Subject 2 states: "... Some people are often deep in thought...it doesn't mean they are being unfriendly or something. You have to look deeper than that." S notes that up to that point she was "extremely sensitive ..." and tended to "take things a bit hard." Then, during her encounter S "felt like (she) had seen something... had really seen something quite amazing..."

Subject 3 notes that "there was a qualitative change in my experience...whereas, before that...it was simply shit all the time - that liberated me ... I had a change in attitude-thinking. I certainly thought differently." When S experienced his insight he was "struck" and "thrown" by it: "... I was thrown by it, it struck me that - I thought: 'what

in the hell am I doing?'... I suppose I became a little bit angry at myself ..."

Subject 4 notes: "I became disturbed and upset ..." and "I saw myself, also, as a very critical person, as an overly critical person" S also notes that "I mean he was "BAD"! His attitude is "BAD! and it saw my attitude as BAD, and then I said to myself: "But your attitude is really bad as well... I saw the ugliness of it ... Because it really is, you see it for its ... all its openness, and its self centredness and its wickedness, and its total lack of - disrespect for other people ..." S also noted that: "So that in itself showed up God's greatness and his holiness because he, S was the exact opposite of a godly nature ... S also notes that "... then you seeing in yourself, this hatred for it ... and ... God telling you: "Gee but I hate this! "... And this hatred which rose up inside me, this disgust ..."

The person in the Pilot Study states: "I saw him as being very relaxed ... The way I saw myself was being perhaps, too methodical ... I realized that perhaps I was doing that to the extreme." S also realized that, with respect to her being-with-others she needed to overcome the 'being-absent from others' that she lived while thinking about her work by becoming more intensely involved: "... I must try not to think of other things while listening ... but concentrate

everything on that moment. And thereby, I would get more out of that moment ... I would learn to work harder, more intensely ... by forgetting about the less ... significant things."

G CLARITY OF PERCEPTION IN INSIGHT AS AN OPENING UP.

The clarity that is experienced is also experienced as an intensity of experience and feelings, but, paradoxically, just as there is an increase in INTENSITY, there is equally an opening-up, a greater sense of being open to the world, as if the more "INTEGRATED" the person becomes, the more open they are to the world:

Subject 1 notes: "It opened up ..." and notes "... there's more to people in life than what I had been doing previously ... it has contributed to my enjoyment of life."

Subject 2 notes: "And that incident made me realize that I have been wrong; that you shouldn't take things so seriously you know. That you should be more accepting of people." S, also notes "...ever since (her encounter) I have sort of opened up more to this person." Later S also notes: "I felt I could be more open maybe, within my own little group - I felt that things like that weren't so serious. I felt more open minded."

Subject 3 notes: "... instead of just looking at these people ... in terms of fright ... I experienced a sense of calmness - and from that time onwards I could see things for what they were." S notes, further, that "... I could look around and see things ..."

Subject 4 notes: "Because it really is, you see it for its ..., all its openness ..." S also notes: "It makes you more aware (of God.)" S also noted the contrast between his closed, self-centred attitude and a concern for others: "... it was just me, me, me...I want this, I'm going to be that ... And there are people out there who ... are not interested in your pride ... All they need is for somebody to bring them the gospel."

The person in the Pilot Study notes: "I put more time aside for things I wanted to do ... I gave myself more free time..." S also became more open to others, making it a project of hers to realize that when she was talking to someone, that she was learning something."

H (i) THE ENCOUNTER AS A CONTEXT OF DISCOVERY

The realization of how one is, is lived, in these terms as a sense

of discovery, as a sense of "having realized something" and the person looks upon reality in terms of who (s)he is, and discovers, also, the reality and truth of things as they are - or the world as it is in itself. This sense of a discovery lends towards the experience being lived as a rather profound experience:

Subject 1 notes: "My embarrassment deepened but simultaneously something became very clear...the deep truth of what he was saying..." S also notes that: " he revealed a depth to me." And S "remembers it after all this time" as being quite a major occurrence.

Subject 2 notes: "It suddenly struck me that this person was really deep in their thoughts... in that moment it occurred to me that maybe I had been wrong all the time ..." S also notes "... I felt like I had seen something ... I couldn't understand that I hadn't seen it before."

Subject 3 notes: "... it struck me, I was thrown by it, it struck me that - I thought: "What in the hell am I doing...?" S notes that his experience "... gave me the opportunity to realize the absurdity of the situation."

Subject 4 articulates his discovery in these terms: "And then, When I saw him, when I saw his attitude, and I saw my own reaction towards it...And then, when you see that, when

you see your own disgust ... and then I said: "Wow, but gee, that's how you were ..." S notes that his reading of God's word became real: "So it became real, by God's word in the Bible became manifest as such, in an, experience...It was no longer just words ..."

The subject in the Pilot Study notes: "... I learned something from the fact that he was totally carefree ... I realized that perhaps I was doing that to the extreme ... what I learned was that I should find more of a balance."

H (ii) THE ENCOUNTER AS A CONTEXT OF DISCOVERY IS ALSO
LIVED AS A DISCOVERY OF THE OTHER: SEEING THE OTHER, OR OTHERS IN
A NEW LIGHT

Subject 1 notes: "I saw B... differently. B... added a depth to himself... like he moved out of a two dimensional mold."

Subject 2 notes: "... ever since then, I have sort of opened up more to this person... My perception of that person changed... my whole attitude really changed towards him... and changed the whole experience of relating to that person..."

Subject 3 notes: "... because I was calmer, I could look around and see things, and I could see him for the arsehole

that he was. He became much more real to me - and so did everybody else..." Subject 3 also notes that his encounter "gave me a sense of independence... I was ... quite dependent on R... ...and it gave me the opportunity... not to be in his shadow - I grew out of being in his shadow."

Subject 4 notes: "... it also made God more real to me... it sort of illuminates His holiness and His purity ... it illuminated God..."

The subject in the pilot study initially saw others as interfering with her work, but then came to see that: "...when I was talking to someone, that I was learning from them - from just chatting, and that I must try not to think of other things while listening..." The discovery occurred after S experienced a subtle shift in her perception of the other person: initially S saw him as being different only in terms of the time he had "... just to sit and talk...", but then came to see him as "relaxed and carefree..."

I AFTER THE ENCOUNTER

After reality has been revealed in an intensity, an openness and a beyondness in all the senses of a discovery that calls forth new projects for the person, there is a sense of the verification of that newly discovered reality, a sense of a continued reality in

an ongoing project, one in which the person either reminds himself of his discovery or discovers his reality being verified as he tests it out:

Subject 1 notes: "... those people who know me and realize that this is how I feel about things, enjoy it as well (and) ... I remember it after all this time."

Subject 2 notes: "...and after that he always greeted me with a smile ... and just confirmed how completely wrong my original thoughts had been."

Subject 3 notes: "... After that there was a qualitative change in my experience on the border. ... and from that time onwards I could see things for what they were."

Subject 4 notes: "... it was a warning that had relevance in my life... now I know most of those verses off-by-heart ... and that in itself shows that ... its had some impact on my life." S notes, also, that he found himself saying: "Yes Lord you really mean it. And you've proven it, by Your Spirit..."

The Subject in the Pilot Study notes: "I would say the difference now is that I'd say 'alright this week I have to hand in this'... like major priorities and I would set time

aside... and sort of try and realize that when I was just talking to someone that I was learning from them."

PART 2: GENERAL STRUCTURE

The situation in which the person gains insight by perceiving someone else has its origins in the person's being intensely involved in his/her inauthentic life. The person begins the situation in his usual and familiar way: he is intensely concerned with himself, lost in the immediacy of his (being concerned with his) projects, tasks and orientations which have been molded through a taking up of the abstracted values, demands and orientations of others, others who have also been abstracted. Thus, the person is curiously present to abstracted "others" in his living through a being-inauthentic, but is curiously absent from others as lived-bodies in their own right, in the present. The person cannot, thus, be fully present to others and cannot be fully with others who are living their own unique historical-presence.

Then, however, the person encounters someone whose presence is so powerful, especially in terms of the subject's inauthentic concerns, tasks or projects, that it calls the subject away from the immediacy of his being concerned with himself, towards being intensely and reflectively concerned with that other person or towards another way of being. The very presence of the other

person invokes contrasts, conflicts and polarities. The clarity of this opposition and contrast in the person's own living beliefs shows the person's convictions to be muddled. The person, having seen, or 'experienced for himself' another, conflicting way of perceiving/experiencing, feels demanded to (reflectively) bring his own beliefs/actions into question in the light of the reality that is discovered. Reality, thus, presents itself so intensely in contrast to the person's inauthenticity, that the person feels that he must take it up, and must include it in projects which he subsequently develops toward being more authentic. The person, thus, resolutely acknowledges his/her guilt.

Truth, then, has a quality of being an imperative presence that radiates forth so intensely that its contours, lines and depth, demand, with such power, to be grasped and taken up, that the person is subject to its reality, rather than being its creator. The person lives in accordance with truth as he discovers it, rather than him molding a reality. The person is "struck" by reality, "struck" by the truth: it has a forcefulness and a profundity that is obvious. This is experienced as a discovery, and it is steeped in reflection and awareness. The person's very intensity of concern that forced him to be inauthentic in turn forced him to be concerned with the call "from" the other, toward an awareness of contrasts. This first arose within the subject's own intensity, rather than in any deliberate attempt by the encountered other to reflectively "call" the subject towards

conflict. Since, even though the other might have (incidentally) called-out to the other, it is only the lived experience of a discovered polarity that awakens the person to reality.

The experience is felt to reveal an intensity of ownness that is lived as a depth of understanding and a depth, or extremity to the person's own being in the situation, or being absent from it. This depth of perception finds its climax in a seeing into and beyond the newly revealed (transparent) reality. The person, thus, in the intensity of his/her affective involvement in who he/she is, gazes into his/her past, present and projected future and sees all three, as intertwined in a new configuration. The person thus sees beyond his/her situation into the differences and possibilities that are revealed, while the other person who had so moved the subject recedes into the background and becomes part of a newly opened world.

With the person's intensification of his ownness and his gazing in and out and round about, he/she experiences an opening up of the world. People appear differently, and are perceived as more important and more real. An atmosphere of clarity, reality and openness prevails. The person in his guilt experiences a sense of having discovered truth, and a sense of having learned something. The person then attempts to own these things in his/her ongoing projects: although reality is at hand, it still has to be taken up. With each subsequent experience which verifies or re-confirms

the newly perceived reality, the person re-lives the sense of meaningfulness which he associated with his discovery of truth as it exists, out there in the world.

CHAPTER 3

3. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the previous chapter we presented the analysis of five descriptions of gaining insight through perceiving another person. In this chapter we will discuss three areas. Firstly, we will discuss the experience of gaining insight in terms of perceiving another person. This we will do across three clear dimensions, i.e. awareness of Self, awareness of Others and Insight; Secondly we will discuss the types of experiences that people have in gaining insight (through perceiving another person) and, thirdly we will discuss some of the limitations of the study and outline some areas for further research.

3.1 AWARENESS OF THE SELF, AWARENESS OF THE OTHER, AND INSIGHT

Awareness of the Self

The structure of the emergence of 'self-awareness' in terms of perceiving another person, reveals the essentially intersubjective nature of the self as it lives in such situations: i.e. that the self and others are involved together, whether or not in an authentic way. Heidegger's (1962) view is that Dasein is, itself, an other, or one among others (Theunissen, 1984, p.184), so that becoming an individual among others is the result of choices that

modify what is revealed by others. This transformation, though, as Halling (1983) has noted does not come about purely as the result of an exercise of will, since the choices emerge in a way that calls forth, perhaps demands, a response from "a deeper... level of our being" (Halling, 1983, p.126). Thus, we can understand the experience of Subject 2 who had been standing "in subjection to others" (Heidegger, 1962, p.164):

"And in that moment it occurred to me that maybe I had been wrong all the time, and that maybe he was in fact very unhappy about something. And all the time I had assumed it was directed at me - so it made me think... look through all my other reactions to people as well".

Clearly the experience constituted what Buber (1947) termed a "meeting" or encounter, in which the person becomes aware in a way that is different from other types of perception. Buber (1947) notes that in this type of perception, the other is not my object but rather, in Szczepanski's (1979) terms, the self encounters the other in the world of relations between people... 'in themselves' (p.123). Subject 2's experience mirrors Buber's account of when, "in a receptive hour... a man meets me about whom there is something... says something to me addresses something that enters my life... (yet) he has indeed not noticed me at all" (p.9). Indeed, Subject 2 stated: "...and he hadn't seen me. And in that moment it occurred to me that maybe I had been wrong all the

time".

Our study found, in these terms, that it is in this world in between people, that self awareness emerges from out of an intense concern about how one is living one's life. The intense concern typically centres around the self in relation to others, revealing the extreme extent to which the person considers the opinions, demands or even favours of other people. Our study also found, though, that, in these terms, it is the person's very concern for the appearance of others in his/her life that allows the other to become powerfully present to him/her in a moment of conflict, contrast and polarity. This "otherness" that addresses itself to him/her calls him/her back to himself/herself. The person's situation, which was lived initially in an intense but paradoxically taken for granted or forgotten way, becomes a situation in which otherness and difference demands that the person reflect back on themselves in an authentic way: just as Cooper (1983), citing Merleau-Ponty, notes: "The body knows itself only through taking the position of another through which it comes back to itself" (p.203, not original emphasis).

The other, then, presents an "otherness" which the person then can possibly take up, or an "otherness" which the person 'finds' that he/she has already embodied, through having been addressed by the other. The person thus finds herself to be different, or potentially different.

An example of this embodiment of another way of being that is in contrast to the subject's own prior way of living, is Subject 3's experience.

"I was really worried... And at that moment R... came up to me and put his arm on my shoulder and said... "don't worry..." and... we both laughed... And when I stopped laughing ... it struck me".

Subject 3 notes, then that, after his encounter "...instead of just looking at these people... in terms of fright... I experienced a sense of calmness".

"Otherness," thus, can emerge as an already owned, but contrasting "mineness" or, conversely, potential "mineness":

"... having made that stand he revealed a depth to me which... I wanted to have... which was different to the... things that I'd been... acquiring previously.

In such cases, the encounter emphasises a "here-ness" that the person is thrown back on, which is also, paradoxically, an "otherness." We have already noted in chapter 1 that the polarity and, thus the clarity of different choices has been discussed by

Laing (1971) who writes that for any encounter, to be therapeutic or allow the person to become aware insightfully it is necessary that: "the disjunction... be seen" (p.143).

The disjunction between ways of living, or ways of believing that become obvious, serve to clear up false-hood and confusion: "...when the issue is false and confused... 'true' choices are not available" (p.143).

This clarification of choice and the focussing on where the person was, allows the person then to project himself, or find himself projected, to beyond himself. Laing (1971) writes that 'being-real' or realizing oneself is a losing of oneself from where one was, and this is, thus a making "patent of the latent self of the doer" (p.126).

The experience of becoming aware of oneself is bound up with becoming authentically separate from the tyranny of others (Heidegger 1962). This process of an increase in integrity also results in the person being increasingly open and "variable across situations and time" (Leahy and Shirk, 1985, p.147) as the person experiences a "separation of self from its social sources" (p.131).

It is thus clear, from our findings, that the roles of what Leahy and Shirk (1985) term the "social-self concept" in the development of authentic selfhood is a negative one. Conformity, imitating

others and being overly concerned with how others relate to you, all restrict the person, until, if he/she is thoughtful enough, and perhaps has suffered sufficiently, the person sees his/her position as an individual clearly.

In the light of the fact that being authentic is a way of relating to others we will discuss in the next section dealing with the other.'

Awareness of the Other

The person who experiences a becoming aware of who he/she is in-him/herself also, experiences the other person, whom they encountered, in a new and different way. Subject 1 notes: "I saw B... differently. Subject 2 notes: " My perception of that person changed."

Subject 1 notes, further, in these terms: "B...added a depth to himself." Subject 2 notes "I have sort of opened up more to this person...I find him really quite pleasant." Subject 3 notes "He became much more real to me." Subject 4 notes "It also made God more real to me."

In these terms Laing (1971) wrote "It is impossible for me to maintain a false picture of myself unless I falsify your picture..." (p.143), and Szczepanski (1979) wrote conversely:

"If I am aware of my essence as my individuality, then I am aware that there must exist... relations between people... "in themselves" " (p.123).

The person who achieves insight experiences the other whom he encountered, as having receded back to his own place over "there" The subject generally also gains the freedom to experience others in a different way: Subject 1 notes: "There's more to people..." Subject 2 notes "It made me realize...you should be more accepting of people... I felt I could be more open... within my own little group." Subject 3 notes: "...instead of...looking at these people...in terms of fright... I could see things for what they were."

Halling (1983) also notes this sense of openness that he found when his subjects described an experience, in which they saw another person as if for the first time:

"...in responding to the new in a situation, one becomes a free person. In fact, the situation in which one sees the other "as if for the first time" is one that in its perceived newness renders irrelevant, inaccessible or inappropriate previously taken for granted... ways of interacting with or understanding the other person" (p.126).

Halling (1983) also notes that the recognition of the other is a process that has two poles, which both involve insight. The two poles are, on the one hand, a new awareness of the other, but, on the other hand, at the same time, there is a changed experience and perception of oneself. In the next section we will discuss the nature of this change in perception.

Insight

Insight, in terms of becoming aware of oneself and others is different to the "very desire to perceive," in that in a "receptive hour... a man meets me about whom there is something...that "says something" to me... says something to me, addresses something to me, speaks something that enters my own life" (Buber, 1947, p.9). Insight, then, is a way of perceiving something without necessarily wanting to see it - the perceived reality presents itself to me:

"The moment is a simultaneity of choosing and being chosen"
(Halling, 1983, p.126).

Norman (1978) considers insight to be the same as a "conversion":

"What is crucial...is the experience of seeing...things with which one is familiar, but seeing them in a new light, as

though for the first time" (p.327).

Norman (1978) notes that this is a way of seeing that "forces itself upon me. We can speak of the dawning of an aspect...(it) strikes me "(p.334).

In our empirical study we found Subject 2 saying: "It suddenly struck me that this person was really deep in their thoughts... I couldn't understand that I hadn't seen it before" Subject 3 states: "...it struck me, I was thrown by it, it struck me that- I thought: "What in the hell am I doing...?"

The second dimension of insight is how one is not only struck, but struck by reality, and that, as Norman (1978) notes, there is a sense of a confirmation of a new more real view of the world:

"One encounters a certain view of the world, and realizes that one's past actions, experiences... all fit into place when seen in this light" (p.338).

In the example Norman (1978) cites from Tolstoy's War and Peace, he notes that "Prince Andrew's (sic) conversion... enables him to look back at his previous experiences and see them for what they were "(pp.337-338).

Subject 3 notes "I could see things for what they were..." and also "It gave me the opportunity to see the situation in its truthful perspective." Subject 2 states: "...it made me think... it made me look through all my other reactions to people as well." Subject 1 stated that "I realized that the stuff I had admired in people... previously, were pretty two-dimensional things."

The third dimension to insight is that the force of the experience of seeing reality confirms or verifies reality so that the person becomes committed to a new perspective (Norman, 1978, p.137).

In our empirical study we discovered Subject 1 stating "...he revealed a depth to me which I...wanted to have for myself... which was different." Subject 4 states "...I saw the ugliness of it, and it made me not want to be like that. I saw it... I tried to change, never to do that again-never have that attitude, because I saw what it looked like."

The fourth dimension of insight is the clarity, or transparency of the situation, such that the person not only sees his situation clearly in the present, but sees beyond it. As we noted earlier, Laing (1971) wrote of how the person must see where they were in order to see beyond it, so that being-real is a "putting oneself into" or projecting oneself, and thus, is, at the same time a losing of oneself from where one 'was'. There is thus, a making "patent the latent self of the doer" (p.126). In a similar vein

Dillon (1978) notes "...to identify oneself ...is to take up a distanced or alienated perspective" (p.90).

In these terms we found Subject 4 stating: "...his attitude seemed to focus a spotlight on an area of my life... I saw his attitude, therefore seeing my attitude." Subject 4 having found himself to be already beyond the point at which he was, said:

"...you see it for its - all its openness...and its total lack of - disrespect for other people... it also made God more real to me... when you see it you say: But gee, this is what my God was warning me about..."

As we have already mentioned, the person also sees his/her previous experiences and sees them for what they were; he/she projects him/herself into his/her future, revealing a commitment to the new perspective. Insight, thus, is a clear perspective upon the situation as such, but also reveals a clear perspective beyond it, so that a light falls upon the temporal dimensions of the person's past knowledge and expectations as well as his/her projected future. This future reveals itself to be filled with new perspectives: Subject 2 notes: "I felt more open minded." Subject 3 states that:

"...after that there was a qualitative change in my experience... I would look at things, like the dawn for

instance and look at the nature around me, and look at the actual beauty of the place. Africa, there, is really very very beautiful - whereas before that... it was simply shit all the time."

The fifth dimension we will discuss with respect to insight is that it is a perceiving that is from a place (even if that place is beyond where the person was). In fact, it must be emphasised that the person not only perceives himself and others, but perceives himself to be a perceiving, experiencing body which is, thus, a place for him to be. Perception, in these terms, has a certain opacity because it "rests on an already established engagement of the subject in the world" (Giorgi quoting Sallis, 1977, p.83) i.e. a bodily orientation within the world (Giorgi, 1977, p.89). As Merleau-Ponty puts it:

"...behaviour... is a whole significative for a consciousness which considers it" (Merleau-Ponty quoted by Giorgi, 1977, p.94).

For example, in our research we found Subject 1 saying: "My own embarrassment deepened, but simultaneously something became very clear to me, and that was the deep truth of what (the other) was saying." Subject 3 notes "...I became a little bit angry at myself..." Subject 4 notes: "When you see that, when you see your own disgust for what you see... and this hatred which rose up

inside me..."

Embarrassment, disgust, hatred and anger, all part of the very way the person "sees" the truth. Subject 1 was embarrassed by his shallowness yet, along with the deepening of this feeling he experienced a perception of the depth of truth which was revealed to him. Subject 3 felt himself to be angry at having allowed himself to fall into a trap, and found that he could see his way out of the situation. Subject 4 saw his own disgust at what he saw, and thus saw himself being disgusted at himself: "and (then) you're sorry for what you did." Perception of one's own bodily orientation thus implies a difference between "body-object and body-subject" (Dillon, 1978, p.96). Dillon (1978) writes that "I am simultaneously and ambiguously my body and a perspective upon it" (ibid.).

Insight, then, is a becoming aware of a new bodily orientation towards the world : Subject 2 stated : "(It) changed my whole experience of relating to that person." Achieving insight thus is also a thoughtful responding to the call back to our authentic selves from ourselves as bodies. However, if we are to hear this call "...it is necessary that we be quiet enough to listen to it" (Parker quoting Gelven, 1985, p.36). This requires that I "take refuge in my internal world" (Szczepanski, 1979, p.119).

The sixth dimension of insight is that it is a perceiving of a

reality and a significance that is embodied by the other person:

The person in the pilot study states: "I saw him as being relaxed and carefree... I admired his carefree attitude." Subject 1 said: "Having made that stand he revealed a depth to me which I admired." Subject 2 stated "... it was obvious to me that he was behaving in the same way that I had always associated that he behaved with me, and he hadn't seen me." Subject 3 said: "(it) metaphorically and spiritually brought him inside me.. and that feeling of loss... disappeared." Subject 4 notes " He is 'BAD!' His attitude is 'BAD!' and it saw me, it saw my attitude as BAD."

In these very terms Husserl notes that "not all my own modes of consciousness are modes of my self consciousness "(Husserl quoted by Andrew, p.91). Kruger's (1988) understanding of insight is similar to this. In his discussion of the case study of Sara, Kruger (1988) notes:

"What was 'unconscious' in the life of Sara was conscious in the life of people with whom she was interacting ...By achieving ... insight she was sharing a level of consciousness that was already present in some people around her" (p.131).

Insight, thus, is a seeing of one's other possibilities which are, thus, the possibilities owned by others, and it occurs when the

person is sufficiently silent in order to see, hear and feel, his/her own life calling them forth to who they are. Insight is also an unveiling or uncovering of truth (Heidegger, 1962, p.261f., and Laing 1971). The person discovers the truth that lay hidden amongst the others whom he was so concerned about, and sees truth in its new transparency. eg. Subject 1 said "Something became very clear to me."

3.2 TYPES OF EXPERIENCES OF GAINING INSIGHT

In our study we found four types of experiences with regard to gaining insight. The first type is a seeing of oneself as living in opposition to one's own fundamental beliefs, eg. Subject 4 who believed himself to be Christian, but discovered himself as being self-centred, proud and critical. The second type is discovering oneself to be living completely in accordance with one's beliefs, but discovering, further, that one's beliefs and life is shallow or inauthentic, eg. Subject 1 who discovered a depth he wanted for himself. A third type is a discovery of one's living wholly in accordance with a distorted perception of other people eg. Subject 2 who discovered herself to have been wrong in her assumption that the other was hostile towards her. A fourth type is a discovery of oneself as already being beyond one's inauthenticity eg. Subject 3 discovered himself to be calm, even while alone, whereas previously he had been dependent on others.

3.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Clearly, the abundance of different types of experiences indicates that the descriptions of five subjects are too few to enable one to map all the dimensions of the phenomenon. Nonetheless, to have analyzed more data was beyond the scope of this study. A further limitation is the complexity of the research question, which tended to confuse many potential subjects. Nonetheless the few people who understood the overly long question could offer very rich descriptions of an experience of gaining insight.

As such the research provides a useful follow up to Parker's (1985) research, in which he proposed that more research in the area of the emergence from out of the inauthentic mode of being, be conducted.

One of the main limitations of our research, is that it addressed the phenomenon of becoming aware from the bias of a search for spontaneous instances of gaining insight through perceiving another, in situations that are not structured for promoting such insight i.e. the clinical context. However, it is this researcher's opinion that further research into the psychotherapeutic context is required in order to examine whether it could be designed from more of an understanding that the lifeworld is the home for Dasein's authenticity; that

psychotherapists need to research the extent to which the therapeutic context is an artificial one which attempts to mimic meaningful being-with-others in a structured way, so that, in the end, the structure can be developed to more closely mirror 'spontaneous authentic life.' Another area of further research is the area of 'disruption' in the process of self-awareness. Work that has already been done in the area of the pathological nature of the inability to presence forth and encounter the other in the world in-between includes that of Bin Kimura (1982), who notes that what has been disturbed in the case of a schizophrenic patient is the 'between' as the ground for founding the self; usually persons meet in the intersubjective between to not only merge into a unity that goes beyond the subject-object split, but at the same time they "arise and return to their own origin in order to fulfil the meaning of themselves again..." (p.181). This act of meaningful actualization of oneself from the "between" degenerates in the case of schizophrenia (ibid.). The transcending movement from himself and to himself comes to a standstill (p.184). We refer also to the work of R.D. Laing (1971) which we discussed, in part, in this study.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A : Subject 1 Interview

S: Yeah, in 1975, I was 20 years old; I was working at the in the advertising department, selling retail advertising./ 2. And there were a group of about, I would imagine eight or ten of us. And we were a fairly motley crew,/ 3. I was a "sharp young man!"/ 4. Didn't have a - I wasn't overburdened with morality - it seemed to me at the time to be a fairly important component in a salesman's life - the objective was to sell the item, rather than to make the person happy. If you could combine the two, then that was great.

I: But "morality" was not terribly important?

S: 'Morality' was not terribly important - it, I was, what I think I'd in nowadays terms call 'capitalist orientated'. The major objective was "the bucks"./ 5. I'd worked a couple of months, I had settled in, I was feeling comfortable. I got on well with the people there, and I was doing well: I was cracking it. In fact they were very pleased with the way I was working./ 6. As I said we had quite a range of different types of people, from what could almost be described as elderly women, in their forties and fifties, approaching their sixties. There were a group of what I would then have termed "men" in their thirties and forties, and

there was myself and a friend of mine. And we were the "sharp young men"./ 7. One of the people that was working there's name was B... (I can't remember his surname anymore). And although I never found out whether this was true or not, the existent rumour was that he was a Mormon, but that need not have necessarily been the case. He was a Mormon./ 8. And B... and I used to get on quite well together. I would say that I, - B... wasn't my friend, but, you know, but we related within the workplace on a slightly more than purely "work" level. Which was the case with most of the people there./ 9. The incident in question occurred one day when I'd organised to have a proof of an advert ready for one of the people, one of my clients. And I had made a mistake on it. And, anyway, they were telephoning me to find out what the hell I was doing about this, and I didn't want to talk to him on the telephone. So, I said to B... (the phone rang, and I knew that it was going to be those people telephoning) so I said to B...: "Listen B..., answer the phone and tell them that I'm not here." And he said "No, I'm sorry, I'm not going to do that."/ 10. And, because we had this sort of 'bonhomie camaraderie', I thought that he was just joking./ 11. I thought that it was natural that a person would tell a lie like that for me. It was just how - that's what life was about: helping each other by lying for you when you needed it./ 12. So he said "No". So I laughed, slightly embarrassedly,/ 13. you know, to be turned down like that, especially in front of others was quite embarrassing. So I laughed embarrassedly and I said to him : "No, no, look, just tell them

I'm not here, and I'll get back to them later." And he said again: "No!"/ 14. And, as far as I can recall I didn't ask him 'why not?' I think I was sufficiently embarrassed to not even have the aggression to say to him "but why not?"/ 15. And he just said himself: "If I can lie for you, I can lie to you, and you wouldn't want me to do that. So I'm not going to lie for you."/ 16. My embarrassment deepened, but simultaneously something became very clear to me, and that was the deep truth of what he was saying./ 17. I think that, I don't know that my relationship with B... changed after that moment, I can't say that it did, but my relationship with myself did./ 18. It gave me an insight into one of the qualities I newly perceived as being important in human relationships,/ 19. in that whereas I had, I think, previously looked on relationships - and I'm speaking purely of superficial ones, I'm not talking about ones with my good and sincere friends - but my casual acquaintances - the people I came across in everyday life - my normal response to those sorts of relationships was to get what I can, and to, in quite a manipulatory way, to get what I could out of them - whilst giving only as much as was necessary./ 20. And it occurred to me after that moment that there was more to relationships even with people on a casual sort of basis; that I think I'd perceived that a deeper quality could exist in even transitory casual acquaintances,/ 21. which would give more meaning to my life - and I think possibly, even somewhat conceitedly, more meaning to their life, if I was to behave in a more sincere manner with them./ 22. And I think a direct

consequence of that occurrence with B... was that I adopted that as a motto. More than merely as a 'brag motto' sort of thing that you can use to manipulate people even further by saying to them: "but you're a liar, and I won't do it for you!" Which is, can be, quite a manipulatory move. But, more sincerely within myself, it's a code that I have done my very best to adhere to. I don't tell lies to people. I don't lie for my friends and I don't lie to them./ 23. And I think that I feel a lot better about it,/ 24 and I also think that those people who know me and realize that this is how I feel about things, enjoy it as well. I avoided the word "respected", but I think it is also something that can be respected./ 25.

I: Ah ha. (pause) Could you add anything more about how your understanding changed in terms of how you perceived that other person?

S: I think that one of the things that surprised me - the sort of things that were important to me in those days were a person's ability to "extract stuff" from other people, and the cost, as far as they were concerned, that extraction, was not terribly important. The sort of things that were important were "looking good" and sort of things like "physical attractiveness", "popularity at any cost"; I think I probably would have shied away from the sort of behaviour which would have run me the risk of

offending somebody - Anyway, B... was short, in his 30's I think, bald and not terribly good looking, and I think that I would have thought that B... couldn't really have afforded any of these sort of "risky behaviours" like refusing to lie for people, sticking to his own beliefs rather than blending in with other peoples'. Because I think he would have risked "alienation", and I think this was an added factor in his courage, the conviction that he obviously had that he could say something like that to me./ 26. I mean I thought that I had it really going for me, without needing moral convictions like that./ 27. And, also, in addition I realized that there were other facets to peoples' existence - it wasn't merely how they looked, or how they handled people. It wasn't only an outward relationship that they had with other people./ 28. I think that, prior to that point, I related much more to myself in terms of what I got back from others. So, consequently, if my relationships with others were O.K., then I felt O.K../ 29. Naturally in order to have my relationships with others to remain O.K. I had to, in almost contradictory fashion really, I had to handle myself in such a way that I could still get as much as I could out of them as possible, but I had to be careful that I gave them sufficient: that I gave them back what they wanted./ 30. I realized after that, a person's relationship with themselves is the most important component in their relationships with other people and, an improvement in the quality of my relationship with myself could only benefit, in the long term, my relationship with others./ 31. The realization that you

have to go through times of hardship with other people, some of which may never be resolved because you meet, you talk, you interact, and then maybe they pass on, and they pass on maybe not liking you too much, or not having the great impression of you that you might like them to have. But, ultimately, in the long term, the benefits of being true to oneself, the sort of relationship which you can have with yourself if you are true to yourself is actually considerably more important than the superficial gratification that you can get from just 'handling' people, just manipulating people./ 32.

I: Could you say a little bit more about what it was about that person, in that situation that allowed you to have that experience?

S: (pause) Yeah, I sort of, I saw B... differently, I think; that most of the people in my life tended to be quite two dimensional. They were like movies, films. But B... added a depth to himself through having made that stand, which I admired, which I respected./ 33. And it came as quite a surprise, like in conjunction with what I said earlier, it came as quite a surprise to me that I found I could respect a person like B..., when he didn't possess any of the qualities that I had previously thought were important, if I was going to respect somebody./ 34. Like he moved out of a two dimensional mold./ 35. I realized that the stuff I had admired in people, that I had respected in people

previously, were pretty two-dimensional things./ 36.

I: Had you reflected much on B...'s "two dimensionality" at all?

S: Prior to that?

I: Prior to that.

S: No, that was just how he was, just how he presented himself to me. It was how most people presented themselves to me. They were there for my benefit. They were there so that I could, - they were there to provide me with what I wanted./ 37. And up to that stage B... hadn't really provided me with anything at all, because, as I say, I didn't feel as if he fell within the orbit of being the sort of person I could get anything from./ 38. But, having done that, having made that stand he revealed a depth to me which I admired, which I respected, and which I wanted to have for myself -/ 39. which was, like it occurred to me then, which was different to the sort of things that I'd been reaching for, ah - the sorts of things which I had been acquiring previously./ 40.

I: Could you say a little more about how you felt and what you felt right at the time?

S: It was like a sudden deepening of the world./ 41. It was a

sudden realization of relief - like 3-dimensionality./ 42. It opened up a (pause)/ 43.

I: Could you tell me one or two of the actual thoughts you might have had?

S: Yeah, well, my initial response was, as I say embarrassment./ 44. I think the embarrassment was for two reasons. One was because I hadn't got what I wanted so I felt embarrassed at that - at having my inadequacy revealed to those who were standing around. It was just one of those times when there were quite a few people standing around./ 45. And also an embarrassment at the realization of my own shallowness, and the shallow way I tended to relate to casual acquaintances./ 46.

I: And that you remember realizing at the time?

S: Yeah, I realized then, I thought to myself : "You're so shallow, and your relationships with people are so plastic, manipulatory."/ 47. And there's more to people in life than what I've been doing previously."/ 48. And I couldn't say that it was a small event, because I, like I remember it after all this time as being quite a major occurrence in my life./ 49. The effect that it has - that it had, that it has had, and that it has - I believe it has contributed to my enjoyment of life.

APPENDIX B : Subject 2: Interview and Meaning Units

S: My experience concerns a person I met many years ago, in fact when I first came to university. Even when I was introduced briefly to him he seemed to have a sarcastic and dry way about him - something about his mannerisms and that./ 2. I immediately assumed that this person did not like me./ 3. At the time he was still a student, and after that he became a lecturer./ 4. And I always, over the years, he always looked sad and that, but I didn't see it that way at the time. It was more like hostility, you know. You'd see him walking around and he would look so hostile. And I always got the impression it was aimed specifically at me./ 5. And many years later I was walking from Kaif when he came around the corner - and it was obvious to me -I saw him first - and it was obvious to me that he was behaving in the same way that I had always associated that he behaved with me, and he hadn't seen me./ 6. And in that moment it occurred to me that maybe I had been wrong all the time, and that maybe he was in fact very unhappy about something. And all the time I had assumed it was directed at me - so it made me think./ 7. I suddenly realized that people - that you shouldn't take for the moment what everyone said - you shouldn't assume meanings into things unless you can understand the person behind it./ 8. And it made me look through all my other reactions to people as well./ 9. Because, ever since then, I have sort of opened up more to this person. And he is a lecturer in the department - I find him rather really quite

pleasant./ 10. He still has that manner about him - but I understand it now and I relate to him in a different way. That's all I have to say./

11. (I: Could you say a bit more about how you felt before you saw that person at that particular time?)

Ja, well, I distinctly felt that this person did not like me. Because, whenever I saw him, he always seemed to be looking disapprovingly. Basically unfriendly./ 12. It was only after that incident that I realized that it's his personality - he doesn't mean anything by it. And in fact he really is quite a pleasant person. Its just that people have their ways and you just have to accept them./13

(I: Could you say a little more about how you understood that at the time of that experience?)

I can't really remember.

(I: Ah ha.)

I can't really remember - I mean it just happened. It was just something I suddenly saw and realized. Although I must say it was after quite a few years and I hadn't seen this person for a while before then. It was upon seeing the person after being away for a while and not seeing that person. Maybe somehow I had changed or grown or what - but my perception of that person changed./

14. (I: Did just your perception of that person change?)

No, because after that experience it made me think and I realized that maybe some of the assumptions we make about people generally are not necessarily correct. And sometimes when you catch yourself starting to make a basic generalization or an assumption like that regarding another person, perhaps it is time to stop and re-evaluate it. And I have started doing that a bit more./

15. (I: Could you describe a little more the details of the actual experience - about the time you saw the person?)

Well there is not really much - the person just came around the corner - he was walking towards Kaif and I was walking away. And he seemed so wrapped up in something - we didn't even greet or anything - maybe he didn't remember me because I had been away quite a long time. But it suddenly struck me that this person was really deep in their thoughts, and maybe he is like that./ 16. Some people are often deep in thought, especially academics- people don't always just walk around thinking of being friendly to the next person - because there is a lot of other things to think about as well. And if a person doesn't greet you or that, then it doesn't mean that they are being unfriendly or something. You have to look deeper than that./

17. (I: Could you say a little bit more specifically about the insight you had into your own life situation because of this perceiving of this other person?)

Ja. Well, basically I was, up to that point extremely sensitive about the way people reacted towards me, you know. I did tend to take things a bit hard./ 18. And that incident made me realize that I had been wrong; that you shouldn't take things so seriously, you know./ 19. That you should be more accepting of people the way they are, and maybe not trust your assumptions so much. You know, your initial assumptions about people./ 20. It was funny, right from the start I had this feeling about this bloke,/ 21. and, you actually realize, well I realized afterwards that a lot of people are actually quite introverted and shy you know,- give that impression. And what you imagine them to be thinking or experiencing towards you isn't really there at all. It's just something you lived through yourself. It's a waste of energy, a waste of your thoughts, and its a bit destructive too./

22. (I: The way that you saw this person, you said that you realized that you lived through that that you saw, or thought you saw within this person's life, you lived through it in your own life?)

What? That I lived through the experience of being shy or what?

(I: Is that what you said?)

No, not necessarily. But, although perhaps it is true, but the thing is - Ja, maybe it is true, because I could see the other person in me. Ja it is true. Ja, that's actually true!

(I: Could you say a bit more about that?)

Ahm...(pause)... Ja, well, I am actually a shy person, and that. And you always tend to, well I always tends to go on the defensive, thinking that that person must always respond to me or something, but maybe they also wait for me to respond to them./

23. (I: Could you say a little bit about how you experienced that person afterwards, after that particular incident?)

Ja, well, my whole attitude really changed towards him because I realized the person wasn't being hostile towards me all that time./ 24. In fact, after that, in the department, after I had actually approached him about something, which I had to approach him about, because he was one of my lecturers, and after that he always greeted me with a smile, and everything, and just confirmed how completely wrong my original thoughts had been, you know./ 25. The proof of the fact of what I am also saying about him being a very introverted sort of person is that sometimes you'll see him and he will smile at you and greet you and that - other times he will walk past and won't even look as if he's seen you, staring right in front of his face; no he's very lost in thought sometimes. You get people like that, and you know you shouldn't misread that - that it means something negative that it doesn't mean./ 26. But I realized afterwards that it was wrong it seemed to change my perception of the person/ 27. - and changed the whole experience of relating to that person - Ja!//

28. (I: Could you say a little about how you related to and experienced yourself after that incident?)

Ja, in a way I felt I could be more open maybe, within my own little group - I felt that things like that weren't so serious. I felt more open minded.

(I: You felt a little more open minded?)

Ja, Ja,/ 29. I felt like I had seen something, I had really seen something quite amazing - Ja, and it seemed strange that I had never seen it before. I couldn't understand that I hadn't seen it before.

APPENDIX C : Subject 3 : Interview and Meaning Units

1. Right, well, I woke up, because there was a bloody loud whistle and somebody rushed into the tent and said: "Put on your clothes, 'aantree, aantree' we're moving off - come on you fuckers, we've got five minutes and that's it! Any of you that are not going to be ready are going to be in deep shit." Well, I was confused, I was still a little bit dazed and stunned, and I suddenly realized "Oh Christ, I'm fucking on the border," because sleeping and dreaming takes you away from all that crap./ 2. So I got up and realized that I needed to go to the loo very very badly - just put on my trousers - grabbed some loo paper - I don't think I had enough - and rushed off to the toilet, and there I sat./ 3. And I heard the sounds of people moving and shouting, whistling - down the line, at further tents I heard vehicles starting up - I could

see the dawn in the distance. It was a muggy sort of morning but I felt damp and cold./ 4. And I just couldn't stop crapping. I used my toilet paper but, then, I just had to crap again; with the result that I got myself into quite a bloody mess - put on my trousers and ran back to the tent, fell over one of the rope-things - well I didn't fall over but I hurt myself a little bit - got into the tent - and became very concerned because I couldn't see anything. Became very worried, and very tense./ 5. There were lots of people talking and shouting to each other (Somebody had taken someone else's boots). I then called: "Does somebody have a torch for me, please give me a torch, somebody give me a torch!" Nobody heard me, probably. No one came to my assistance -. Somebody else had a torch, and, in that light I found my sleeping bag and I put on my shirt, which was dirty - I was sweaty - my mouth felt dry. I was really worried. I then had visions of the trucks going off and me being left there - me even being more lost than I was./ 6. And at that moment R... came up to me and put his arm on my shoulder and said to me: "C..., don't worry man, everything is going to be all right!" And it was a joke; we both laughed./ 7. And he then just disappeared./ 8. And when I stopped laughing, I..., it struck me, I was thrown by it, it struck me that - I thought: "What in the hell am I doing - what can really happen to me? If I am late, what in the hell? So what?" I suppose I became a little bit angry at myself and at the army - and thinking to myself: "You know I've fallen into this fucking trap! And its really affected me - and there is just no reason for

behaving this way."/ 9. Well, it seems to me I managed to pick up my things very easily, just get everything together. Didn't tie up my shoe laces, I thought I'd do that in the truck./ 10. And by the way, everyone had then left, I was the only one in the tent, but I was beyond caring. I think I didn't really care about being late. And I heard some trucks moving off and I chucked my bag over my shoulder and left the tent. And, as I got out, there was a lot more light outside, I remember that. And I opened my bag and I had everything - I noticed that my rifle was dirty, some ground had got into the thing, and I thought to myself: "Oh shit - dit ook nog"! But it didn't sort of worry me. And I then trotted over to the last truck, threw my bag up and got up; sat down, breathed deeply - thought to myself: "Well I can sleep again, and relax, because 'everything is going to be all right!"/

11. I: So you felt that you could relax? (pause) Could you say a bit more about how this experience gave you insight into your life situation?

S: Well, I think it brought about a sense of reality. It brought about a perspective of things as they really were - without my world being clouded by anxiety and tension - because I was calmer, I could look around and see things, and I could, for instance, if the sergeant shouted out the odds I could see him for the arsehole that he was. He became much more real to me - and so did everybody else. And instead of just looking at these people - at the

surroundings in terms of fright - because I suppose that in the tent I was really frightened - extremely unhappy - and sitting in the truck I experienced a sense of calmness - and from that time onwards I could see things for what they were./ 12. I suppose it was also a gradual thing, I mean something like that doesn't just happen immediately, but that bit of insight grew. It gave me the opportunity to grow, and to incorporate that within me. And when it was incorporated it then had the opportunity to take root and grow./

13. I: So you say you were experiencing fright in the tent?

S: And a sense of loss - a sense of 'I don't want to be left behind!', 'what's going to happen to me?' which are all related to the fear and anxiety.

I: And then R... came up to you?

S: Ja./ 14. I don't know if there's really any more than that to be said. I could talk of the implications of this, the deeper significance of this, but I'm sure you're not interested in that./

15. I: Yes, C..., lets stay away from the broader implications of it. Could we just discuss how you related to yourself in terms of this experience, in terms of this insight - in terms of your everyday experience.

S: Something important - I think it gave me a sense of

independence/ 16. - I was, up to that stage, I was very, I suppose, quite dependent on R..., for support, for friendship, things like that./ 17. And this, because it gave me the opportunity to be myself, to view things as they really are - it gave me the opportunity to be independent - to be more independent - and to start doing things for myself - and not to be in his shadow - I grew out of being in his shadow.

I: So this situation allowed you to be more independent?

S: More independent. It certainly allowed me to be myself - It allowed me to view the world more realistically - and that, I think, gave me the independence. That gave me a sense of independence.

I: So it allowed you to see the world more realistically?

S: Very much so - (pause)/ 18. it satisfied some sort of need, it..., ah, 'passify' certainly isn't the word, it, it comforted me, in that..., this sounds contradictory, but..., I don't quite know how to put this... You see, first you have loneliness, and you have a need to be in somebody else's shadow. You have a need for another person, because you, yourself are lost - you lack a sense of wholeness, (pause)/ 19. so, even though we are all alone, it seems to me that this experience physically removed me from R..., but, metaphorically and spiritually brought him inside me,

and brought my mother inside me, and that feeling of loss, of those feelings disappeared, because they were not far away from me - the strength that I needed, that I needed to be with him in order to get it, because he was now inside me.

I: So you felt comforted by those words?

S: Very much so - I would say that was a very important aspect./

20. I: You felt comforted by those words even though they were said in a joking fashion?

S: They were certainly said in a joking fashion, but there was an underlying message - I'm sure that when he said them, those words to me, jokingly, in a joking fashion, gave me the opportunity to realize the absurdity of the situation. It also gave me the opportunity to realize - to see the situation in its truthful perspective./

21. I: So you saw in that situation a great deal of truth, and it allowed you to see the world in more real terms?

S: Very much so, absolutely, there is no doubt about it. You know, I'm not quite sure whether I'm exaggerating, but I think, after that there was a qualitative change in my experience on the border. I would look at things, like the dawn for instance and

look at the nature around me, and look at the actual beauty of the place. Africa, there, is really very very beautiful - whereas, before that I was simply ..., it was simply shit all the time - that liberated me from the army. And even though I was in the army, physically, I had a change in attitude - thinking, I certainly thought differently.

APPENDIX D : Subject 4 : Interview and Meaning Units

1. I became disturbed and upset by the way one of the men at college treated his wife. Throughout the day he kept..., he kept criticizing her, and treating her as a child, really coddling her, not in the right sense of the word, in the wrong sense of the word, he kept finding fault and really treating her as a six year old.

But the biggest thing that struck home, which struck me was his irritability, his lack of understanding./ 2. I've never seen him lose his temper, I wouldn't say he has a problem with his temper. It could also be, I mean, temper and irritability tend to go hand in hand as well. I wouldn't say he has a violent temper obviously. I mean he is a Christian, he has been a Christian for 9 years now I think... (pause).../ 3. But I believe that when I saw him I remember saying that, or thinking that, he doesn't have a right to have a wife. If that's the way he wants to treat somebody he's

better off alone. If he's not happy then why did he get married in the first place? If he's not happy then why don't they separate, although it is unbiblical?/ 4. Why doesn't he do something about it? Because his attitude is unbiblical, is ungodly... (pause).../ 5. But something in his attitude, something in his mannerisms reminded me of myself -/ 6. and I saw myself in my short temperedness, my lack of patience, my critical attitude, my fault finding, ... possibly, well, it would have to be, to be honest, it would have to be a superiority complex. Although you don't realize it, that is the only answer: you think you're better than other people. And that causes you to look down on them, to constantly correct them, to always have the attitude that your, your answers are always the right ones, there is only one right way, and that's your way./ 7. Whereas he was more..., he, his, he showed, he had this attitude towards other people, but not as badly. He didn't treat other people as badly as he did his wife. In fact that bothered me as well, because surely there should be a consistency - why treat your wife worse? Surely you should treat all people badly if you're going to do that? But, he still had that same attitude, that same arrogant attitude, that same lack of time. I mean I would never..., he gives you the impression you could never go over to him and tell him your problems because he is too busy. You know, that type of person, too busy to listen to your problems./

8. I: Could you say a little bit about how you saw him after that?

Well, it was only as a result of having..., going and having lunch there at their home on a Sunday that I got to know him better, and after getting to know him I saw that there was still this irritable side to him, there was still this side to him, but that there was also a good side, and I realized that God hadn't finished with him yet. He had all his weaknesses but he also had good points, and that,/ 9. for some reason it had not dawned on him that his attitude was ungodly, is unbiblical, that his attitude is sin. So it made me realize that my attitude..., his attitude seemed to focus a spotlight on an area of my life that needed cleaning up, and rectifying and... (pause).../

10. I: Could you say a little about how you saw yourself after that?

I saw myself, also, as a very critical person, as an overly critical person. I saw myself as a fault-finding person, rather than a 'good-finding' person. Instead of looking for the good in people I saw myself looking to criticize,/ 11. together with him. And I put myself in a boat together with him,/ 12. and I didn't like the feeling, and I didn't like that: to be coupled with him. Because I believe that although you're a Christian (this is my philosophy, there's no biblical basis for this, or whatever), but I believe that although you're a Christian, God takes, - okay, God takes control of your life - you give him control - you still have

problems. I mean the problems don't disappear. You don't rub God like a lamp and out he pops and your problems dissolve. But I believe that to that extent his irritability was verging (I don't want to get dramatic now) but it was verging , there was no hint of a Christian, Godly attitude. It was as if he was one of these guys that was an alcoholic and used to come home and beat his wife, except that without the beating there was the criticism. On that level there was no..., I mean obviously Christians should be better, morally and spiritually, than people who do not know God, that aren't controlled by God - so his attitude was definitely, as I said, it was simple, but it was extreme, it really was extreme. And as I said earlier my philosophy is that God is dealing with you in all walks of life, in all your areas he's dealing with you. (Sure each Christian goes through different times of trial - one Christian might be going through a financial crisis, and one Christian might be going through a physical trial where her... one has to trust God financially, the one has to trust God physically) but God, when you become a Christian, God takes over and takes control in all areas of your life - but I saw him as like: 'Gee what's happened here, this area's been totally neglected'. And that wasn't God's fault. He had chosen to, to, not to change in this one area. And so, I believe, ja, what I'm trying to say is that, is that as God controls every area of your life, not just one this month and then another area another month - control every area, and if, yes - here we go - and if God isn't controlling every area of your life, there's something wrong with your

relationship between you and God./ 13. And I saw myself - I had the same problem. And I knew my relationship with God... I knew that because I was like that it reminded me that my relationship with God wasn't right as well. My relationship with God was not as good as it should be...(pause).../

14. I: Is that how you understood your life situation after that?

Ja. I saw it as a direct...as, as..., I saw his situation as a result of direct disobedience to God - of choosing - because God never forces a man to do anything - you choose to accept God in the first place, to say okay I believe in what You did, on what Your Son did on the cross. You choose, and God will never force any man to do things because we are free moral agents. I believe he had chosen to be disobedient to God in that area because his walk with God wasn't, it wasn't a Christian walk, if you see what I'm getting at./ 15. I didn't see in him, because of that one area I didn't see in him a Godly man./ 16. This is what God wants us to be, the salt and the light of the world, not for people to say: "Oh, look at that, he's got, he's got so many good points, but he's got so many bad points."/ 17. The bad points can be 'bad' or you, I mean you're still dealing with certain things in you life if you're a young Christian, but the 'bad' points mustn't be "BAD!" I mean he was "BAD!" He is "BAD!" His attitude is "BAD!" / 18. And it saw me, it saw my attitude as BAD,/ 19. and then I said to myself: "But your attitude is really bad as well. Your attitude

is bordering on the unsaved, I mean you have an unsaved attitude in this area," you know. Its totally an attitude of: "Where's the love that the Bible talks about?"/ 20. I remember that verse: "How can you say that you love people..." wait, how does it go? I got it mixed up again: "How can you say that you love Me who you have not seen if you cannot love people who you do see?" Its the same thing. So, I saw, it reminded me that my attitude - my relationship with God was not right, was not as good as it should be/

21. I: You say that reminded you of that verse - of not being able to love God if you cannot love other people who you can see. Could you say a bit more about that?

Ahm,...(pause)... Its the same as knowing God, when you know God you love God, and when you love God you..., its natural that you are going to have love, and tolerance, and long suffering, which the Bible commands: love, peace, tolerance, long suffering, understanding, compassion. And all of these are... are affected when you are irritable with a person, and you criticize the person./ 22. So, what you're doing, basically, is putting yourself above that person: and that is pride and self-centredness. And pride is the sin of the devil, Lucifer the fallen angel, and he said: "I will be as God," and God cast him from his presence, and when he came into the Garden of Eden he said: "If you eat of the tree of the knowledge ye shall be as gods." And that was Eve's

fall as well, mankind's fall as well: pride. They wanted to be as God, as gods./

23. I: So you say that 'not being able to love people...'

...it showed, it showed a direct reflection on your relationship with God. That's the bottom line. You cannot say you love people that you can see, you cannot say you love God who you have never seen if you cannot love people who you do see. That's the bottom line/

24. I: Could you say a bit more about how you understand your life situation in those terms?

Well Christians are supposed to be different, and with an attitude like that as I saw his attitude, therefore seeing my attitude, reminded me of my attitude, I didn't feel any different. I didn't feel any different from a non-Christian. My attitude was ungodly/

25. And I realized that I was playing games: that I had taken certain parts of the Bible, the parts and pieces which had suited me I had taken; but the rest, I didn't want the whole Gospel, I wanted certain parts of the Gospel; but I accepted certain things and I rejected others, and I threw out those things which are uncomfortable. And I wasn't living a true Christian life. I was living a partial Christian life, if that is possible. I was doing what I wanted to so, as such, which is as a result of this, which

is pride as well. Its pride that causes you not to accept a full, total teaching of Jesus Christ, only certain aspects of his word, of his commandments./

26. I: So you say you understand yourself as being proud?

Ja...(pause)...

I: And...?

... it showed a tremendous self-centredness, pride./

27. But it also showed me, in his attitude, that I didn't want to be like that. It showed me that I was proud, but I saw the ugliness of it, and it made me not want to be like that. I saw it./ 28. The Bible says: 'Don't be proud!' "Yes, fine I won't be, I'll try not to be." Then, when you actually see it, when you see somebody with that attitude and that arrogance and pride and self-centredness, then you see why God commands that you stay away from things like that. Because it really is, you see it for its..., all its openness, and its self-centredness and its wickedness, and its total lack of ..., disrespect for other people, for other human beings./

29. I: You say that pride involves a total disrespect for other human beings? And you understood that as being part of your life-situation?

Yes. I was self-centred. My irritability showed my self-centredness, my lack of concern for other people./

30. I: Could you say a little bit about how you understood your life situation, in terms of that insight, after that, with respect to other people?

Well it also made God more real to me, in that I'd read these verses in the Bible and I had seen them, and, here you have, you read all these thousands of verses about pride and God saying: "Stay away from pride, do not touch it, be aware of it, flee from it." You read so many verses about pride, and then when it actually happens, when you see it physically happening you say: "But gee, this is what my God was warning me about"./ 31. And then you say: "But He has every reason to be proud because he is God, and yet, He warns you from it." Then when you see that, then you say: "Well, God was warning you from that, and God has said that he hates that". And, when you see that it sort of illuminates His holiness and His purity. And it drew me closer to Him: That He had every reason to be proud. And I saw the Servanthood of God in His Son, Jesus, on the cross. I saw His, His Servanthood. So that in itself showed up God's greatness and His holiness because he, D..., was the exact opposite of a godly nature - that attitude - and a godly person. And, as I said, God had warned us against that in the Bible, and He says how He hates it: He hates pride, He hates it. Its an abomination to Him./ 32. And then you realize

that you are actually, by your actions, you are drifting away from God. Everytime you criticize somebody you're drifting away from God. Everytime you look down on somebody you are doing exactly the opposite of what God would do. And you're sinning against God. And you are going in the opposite direction. So you have to say to yourself: "You can carry on this lifestyle but you'll end up living a half-Christianity, you'll never experience the true, the true peace which God offers, the true knowledge of Himself which He offers, as He says in the Bible: "Every man that searches for Me with all his heart will be found of Me." But there's a condition, that we search for Him with all our heart./ 33. And with an attitude like that, D... didn't seem to want to change. He seemed to be carrying on; for months and months and months and months he seemed to show no remorse, no change. I was actually hoping that in the sermon I preached at chapel that he would change, that I'd see a change. And I was looking intently for a change in his attitude towards her, and his attitude towards other people -but he seemed to show no change. And so it illuminated my relationship with God and it illuminated God. Because there, what..., all He had spoken about was coming to pass. That which He warned me about was happening in my own life. And He had been good enough to warn me about it before it happened, to tell me "Look this is going to happen," so I learned from that./

34. I: The question I asked just before you told me this that you've told me was: 'How did it illuminate, or how did it give you

understanding of your life situation with respect to 'other people'? And then you answered that it illuminated, for you, God, and God's reality in your life. I'm quite interested by that, could you say a bit more?

Well, when a person has pride (which I had, which I saw in D... which made me realize I was like that), you become very self-centred. You exclude everything and everybody. And what I had done was I had excluded God as well.

I had put myself up as a little god here on earth./ 35. I was going to be a minister, I am going to be a minister, so I am one step above other Christians. I am between God (this is the way I put myself), I am between, just below God and just above human beings, because I have been "called" into the full time ministry. I've been placed in a position of tremendous prestige by God Himself because I know that God had called me./ 36. And then, when I saw him, when I saw his attitude, and I saw my own reaction towards it. And I saw my own discipline, I mean I discipline myself, I said to myself, I determined, I tried to change, never to do that again - never to have that attitude, because I saw what it looked like. And then, when you see that, when you see your own disgust for what you see. And you're sorry, there's a..., you're sorry for your attitude and you're sorry for what you did./ 37. And you remember what you were like in the past, in the past before you became a Christian: everything was 'everyman for

himself' everything was self-centred, everything centred around you: the survival of the fittest, strongest./ 38. And he was in a role of authority, he was being a "macho man", he was "showing strength". He was showing..., he was ruling, he was dominating, and when I saw that, I said I don't want to be like that,/ 39. and then I said: "Wow, but gee, that's how you were before you became a Christian, and then, since becoming a Christian you're reading verses like this; so together with the verses you've read in the Bible, God warning, and God telling you: "Gee but I hate this!" And then you seeing in yourself this own rising within yourself, this hatred for it, totally contrary to what you were like before you were a Christian, and then that makes God real. It makes you more aware of God. And you're saying: "Yes Lord you are still, you are in control of my life. You really have taken control of my life. You've said, in the Bible, when a person comes to you and acknowledges and confesses his sin, and then you come to live within him by Your Holy Spirit you will change him, and gee, here I have seen a change. This is real, this is serious. When You say in the Bible "I hate it", You really mean it - its not just 'lekker' words put in the Bible for..., just put there for, because it sounds good, and because it sounds holy, and its a "good thing" for a God to say, but You really mean it. And you've not only said it in the Bible but you've proven it, by Your spirit within me, convicting me. And this hatred which rose up inside me, this disgust of what I saw: the self-centred attitude which I had before - no concern for other people: it was just me, me, me, me;

me, me./ 40. And then God is saying: "But gee, but there are people out there who are not Christians, and here you are living for yourself, and here you are so full of yourself, so full of arrogance, so full of pride, so full of: 'I want this, I'm going to be that. I'm going to have the biggest church, I want the biggest church. I'm going to be the best preacher amongst all these students here.' And there are people out there who don't need, who don't need somebody above them, to look down on them. All they need is for somebody to bring them the Gospel. That's all they're interested in. They are not interested in your pride, and self-centredness and your abilities and talents, and wonderful gifts and that. They're not interested in that./ 41. So it became real, by God's word in the Bible became manifest as such, in an, in experience, in, what? An existential? (No, that's not the right word) in a, well, in a physical way, in a real way. It was no longer just words, but it was a warning that had..., it was a warning that had relevance in my life. Those verses in the Bible now had relevance to me, and now I know most of those verses off-by-heart, most of the verses on pride - well there's thousands, but I know the "heavy" ones off-by-heart now - and that in itself shows that the..., that it had some impact on my life.

APPENDIX E : Pilot Interview

PILOT

I Question is posed: Could you please describe, as concretely and in as much detail as possible, an experience in which you had a leap of insight into your life situation because of some way that you perceived someone else?

S It was one day that we were sitting outside res., on the steps, and I was speaking to this guy called R.., And he is very different to me, in that R.. seems to have so much time just to sit and talk about anything. And we were having a cup of tea. And the whole time we were sitting there I was listening to what he was saying, but, at the same time I was thinking of the work that I had to do, and that I should perhaps be doing the work, rather than sitting and talking to him. And I was listening, but half of me was feeling guilty - that I should rather be working - and, at the same time I was also thinking that I wish I could be like R.. in many ways, and not be so concerned about perhaps living up to others' expectations and getting my work in on time, and being so concerned about it.

I O.K. Could you just tell me a little more about what he was doing at the time and how you saw this person, R..,

at the time, that made you realize this.

S Ahm, he wasn't really doing anything, he was just sitting outside, on the steps, drinking tea, and we were basically just chatting - we were not doing anything specific.

I Ah ha; could you tell me a little more about how you saw him at the time?

S Ahm, do you mean his personality?

I Ja.... how you saw him that made you realize that.

S I saw him as being very, ahm, relaxed and carefree and perhaps not as concerned about his work as I was. In a way I don't think he puts in as much effort as I do - I'm not saying that's a bad thing, but the part of him that I admired was this carefree attitude that he had - that's how I would describe him.

I Ah ha; could you say a little more about how you understood yourself at the time.

S The way I saw myself was being, perhaps, too methodical in the things I do - I, for example, sit down and plan

the whole week literally to the hour, for every day, for every hour - and by listening to R., and watching R., I realized that perhaps I was doing that to the extreme, that - I'm not saying planning is a bad thing - I agree that a person should plan your life - but at the same time I, what I learnt was that I should find more of a balance and plan to a certain degree, the things I had to do, but not to the hour, for example.

I Ah ha; and could you say a little more, M, about how you related to yourself after that - after that particular incident in which you realized that.

S I, what I did was that I planned things, but not that much. I put more time aside for things that I wanted to do that weren't related to my work, and that. And, at first it was a conscious effort for me to, to ahm (how can I say it), I had to say 'alright, don't plan everything that well' and I gave myself more free time. And now its become - I think, I've become much better at it. I would say the difference now is that I'd say 'alright this week I have to hand in "this, this and this," ' like major priorities and I would set time aside for those things, the major things, and forget about the less, you know, significant things, - and sort of try and realize that when I was talking to someone,

that I was learning from them - from just chatting, and that I must try not to think of other things while listening to that person, but concentrate everything on that moment, and thereby, I would get more out of that moment. And even if it meant, say, slightly less time while working, I would then, by having listened to that person for that moment, learn to work harder, more intensely, for a lesser period of time. Do you understand what I'm saying?

I Ah ha; so what you're saying, then, is that because of some way that you perceived this other person: more carefree and allowing
themselves more time, you worked out some ways for yourself to actually give yourself more time and at the same time still do the same amount of work, and the level of work that you used to.

S Yeh. (Pause) But, R., see, I'm not saying R. has the perfect solution, because he is too carefree, in that he maybe doesn't do as much work as he should. But, even if he doesn't, I learnt something from the fact that he was totally carefree. I took a bit out of him to put into my life, so to speak. Not basing my life on his life, but taking that carefree element and trying to fit it into what I was doing before.

I Right. And you say you did this particularly with respect to your work?

S Yeh!

I Would you like to say a little bit more about how it has affected your life situation afterwards, or not?

S No, not more than I have already said.

APPENDIX F

PILOT

M.U

T.M.U

1.

It was one day that S (and friend) were sitting outside res., on the steps and S was speaking to this guy called R. And R is very different to S in that R seems to have so much time just to sit and talk about anything and they were having a cup of tea.

1.

S was in a situation usually reserved for relaxed social intercourse, with a person who S understood as being very different to her, in that he seemed to have so much time to relax in the company of others.

2.

And the whole time they were sitting there, S was listening to what he (R...) was saying, but at the same time S was thinking about the work that she had to do, and that S should perhaps be doing the work rather than sitting and talking to R.

2.

In a social context which should be a context for relaxed being-with-others, S was only partially present to the person she was with, as well as only partially present to that situation, since S was living in an intense concern for her own projects. S was, in terms of this intensity of concern called back to her work, and called away from this being-with-the-other. All this time, thus, S was dwelling intensely on her situation, thinking upon it and reflecting.

3.

And S was listening but half of her was feeling guilty, that she should rather be working.

4.

(and at the same time) S was also thinking that she wished she could be like R... in many ways

5.

and not be so concerned about perhaps living up to others' expectations and getting her work in on time, and being so concerned about it.

3.

S was only partially present to another person, while feeling guilty at not answering the call back to her work.

4.

At the time of her dwelling on her situation, S found herself comparing herself with that other person, and she wished she could be more like that other person in many ways.

5.

S, in her dwelling on her life situation, wished she could be less intensely concerned about living up to the expectations of others.

6.

(I: Okay could you tell me a little more about what he was doing at the time and how you saw this person, R... at the time, that made you realize this?)

He wasn't really doing anything, at the time he was just sitting outside on the steps, drinking tea and they were basically just chatting. They were not doing anything specific.

7.

(I: Ah ha; could you tell me a little more about how you saw him at the time?

S asks: "Do you mean his personality?

I: Ja ... how you saw him that made you realize that.)

6.

That other person was not doing anything significant to draw S's attention to his way of living, he was merely being free.

7.

S saw that other, in contrast to her own intensity of concern, as being very relaxed and having a carefree attitude - qualities that S felt herself admiring

S saw him as being very relaxed and carefree, and perhaps not as concerned about his work as S was. (In a way) S doesn't think that R puts in as much effort as she does. S is not saying that's a bad thing, but the part of him that S admired was the carefree attitude that he had - That's how S would describe him.

8.

(I: Ah ha; could you say a little more about how you understood yourself at the time?)

S saw herself as being too methodical in things she did -

8.

S understood herself as having too rigid an approach to her work.

9.

S, for example, - S sits down and plans the whole week literally to the hour, for every day for every hour.

10.

(and) by listening to R and watching R, S realized that perhaps she was doing that (planning) to the extreme

9.

S planned her work intensely, structuring all her time in terms of her work - allowing herself no time for her life to unfold in a free and open way.

10.

S, by listening and watching that other person, specifically in terms of his being free, discovered the extremity of her own planning and control, and, thus, the extremity of her own restricting of her freedom.

11.

that she is not saying planning is a bad thing - S agrees that a person should plan their life - but at the same time - what she learnt was that she should find more of a balance and plan to a certain degree the things she had to do, but not to the hour, for example.

12.

(I: ah ha; could you say a little more, M..., about how you related to yourself after that - after that particular incident in which you realized that?)
What S did was that she planned things, but not that much. S put more time aside for things that S wanted to do that weren't related to her work and

11.

S experienced herself as having learned that she needed to see her work in a more realistic way, in the light of her seeing her life situation for what it was: a too intense process of structuring her life, rather than her adequately planning her life.

12.

S changed her approach to structuring her life in order to allow herself more freedom to do things that she wanted to do, rather than only live in an intense relationship to her work.

that.

13.

(and) at first it was a conscious effort for S to say, "alright, don't plan everything that well", and S gave herself more free time, and now, it's become -, S thinks she has become much better at it. S would say the difference now is that she'd say: 'alright this week I have to hand in "this, this and this",' like major priorities and S would set time aside for those things, the major things, and forget about handling the less significant things.

14.

S would try and realize that when S was talking to someone, that S was

13.

S initially had to carefully and deliberately establish for herself a project towards giving herself more freedom with respect to time. This project which initially involved a conscious effort on S's part, gradually become part of S's everyday life as she got better at it, freeing her from her own demand to deal with less significant things.

14.

S experienced that situation with that other person as a situation in

learning from them, from just chatting (and...)

which she learned something from another person - thus S resolved to remind herself of the value of being-with-others for her.

15.

S must try and not think of other things while listening to that person but concentrate everything on that moment, and thereby, S would get more out of that moment.

15.

S made it a project of hers to be more attentive to others, and not think of other things. S also understood that by being more fully present to any situation, that by concentrating everything on that moment, she would experience it in a deeper, fuller way.

16.

and even if it meant, say, slightly less time while working, S would then, by having listened to that person for that moment,

16.

S feels that by not answering the call of her own intense demand to work, that she ultimately would be more involved,

learn to work harder, more intensely, for a lesser period of time.

17.

S asks interviewer: "Do you know what I mean"?

(I: Ah ha; so what you're saying then, is that because of some way that you perceived that other person: more carefree and allowing themselves more time, you worked out some ways for yourself to actually give yourself more time and at the same time still do the same amount of work, and the level of work you used to?)

Yeh (this is what S is saying).

both in her work and in her being-with-others.

17.

S, struck by her perception of that other person as more carefree, and allowing herself more time, worked out a project to allow herself to be more free and yet to still be responsible in terms of the work she had to do.

18.

S is not saying R... has the perfect solution, because, perhaps he is too carefree, in that he maybe doesn't do as much work as he should.

19.

But, even if R doesn't (do as much work as he should), S learnt something from the fact that he was totally carefree.

20.

S took a bit out of him to put into her life, so to speak;

18.

S was careful to weigh up, reflectively the person's embodiment of a potential way of being, since S realized that that other was, ultimately living a freedom that was extreme.

19.

S learned something significant, notwithstanding her having considered that that other person does not embody for her an ideal type of being.

20.

S incorporated into her way of living a way of being that was revealed to her by that other person.

21.

not basing her life on his life, but taking that carefree element and trying to fit it into what S was doing before.

21.

Although that other revealed a potential way of being that was different to the way S had been living, S still did not base her whole way of relating to her work and to others on his way of living, as it appeared to her. Instead S took up the way of being revealed to her by that person in her own unique way, living it as a newly revealed way of living her own life as she knew it to be (historically).

22.

(I: Right. And you say you did this particularly with respect to your work?)

Yes.

22.

S's own freedom was enhanced through a restructuring of her approach to her work.

23.

(I: Would you like to say a little bit more about how it has affected your life situation, afterwards, or not?)

No (S would not like to say more than she has already said.)

REFERENCES

- Andrew, W. The givenness of the self and others in Husserl's transcendental phenomenology. Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 13 (1), pp.85-100, 1982.
- Bakan, D. The Duality of Human Existence. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.
- Buber, M. Dialogue. In: M Buber, Between Man and Man, pp.1-39. Trans. R.G. Smith. London: Kegan Paul, 1947.
- Buber, M. I and Thou. Trans. W. Raufman. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1970.
- Colaizzi, P. Psychological research as the phenomenologist views it. In R. Valle and M King (Eds.), Existential - Phenomenological Alternatives for Psychology, pp. 48-71. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Cooper, R. The other. In G. Morgan (Ed.), Beyond Method: Strategies for Social Research, pp.202-218. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1983.
- Dillon, M. Merleau-Ponty and the psychogenesis of the self. Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 9 (1 and 2), pp. 84-98, 1978.
- Giorgi, A. Phenomenological and experimental psychology: I. In: A. Giorgi et al. (Ed.), Duquesne Studies in Phenomenological Psychology, Volume 1, pp. 6-16. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1971.

Giorgi, A. An application of the phenomenological method in psychology. In: A. Giorgi et al. (Eds.), Duquesne Studies in Phenomenological Psychology, Volume II, pp. 82-103. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1975.

Giorgi, A. The implications of Merleau-Ponty's thesis "the primacy of perception" for perceptual research in psychology. Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 8 (1), pp. 81-102, 1977.

Giorgi, A. The relationships among level, type, and structure and their importance for social science theorizing: a dialogue with Schutz. In: A. Giorgi et al. (Eds.), Duquesne Studies in Phenomenological Psychology, Volume III, pp. 81-96. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1979.

Giorgi, A. Sketch of a psychological phenomenological method. In. A. Giorgi (Ed.) Phenomenology and Psychological Research, pp. 8-22. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1985.

Giorgi, A. The phenomenological psychology of learning and the verbal learning tradition (1985b) In: A. Giorgi, 1985, PP. 23-85, op.cit.

- Halling, S. Seeing a significant other "as if for the first time." In: A. Giorgi et al. (Eds.), Duquesne Studies in Phenomenological Psychology, Volume IV, pp. 122-149. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1983.
- Heidegger, M. Being and Time. Trans. J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson. Great Britain: Basil Blackwell, 1962.
- Jarrett, J. The logic of psychological opposition - or how opposite is opposite? Journal of Analytical Psychology, 24, pp. 319-325, 1979.
- Kimura, B. The phenomenology of the between: the problem of the basic disturbance of schizophrenia. In: A. de Koning and F. Jenner (Eds.), Phenomenology and Psychiatry, pp. 173-185. London: Academic Press, 1982.
- Kruger, D. An Introduction to Phenomenological Psychology. Cape Town: Juta, 1988.
- Laing, R.D. Self and Others. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1971.
- Leahy, R. and Shirk, S. Social cognition and the development of the Self. In: R. Leahy (Ed.), The Development of the Self, pp. 123-147. Orlando: Academic Press, 1985.
- Macquarrie, J. and Robinson, E. (Trans.) Notes on Heidegger. In M. Heidegger (1962), *op.cit.*

- Markus, H. Smith, J. and Moreland, R. Role of the self-concept in the perception of others. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49 (6), pp. 1494-1512, 1985.
- Norman, R. D. The interrelations among acceptance-rejection, self-other identity, insight into self, and realistic perception of others. The Journal of Social Psychology, 37, pp. 205-235, 1953.
- Norman, R. On seeing things differently. In: R. Beehler and A. Drengson (Eds.), The Philosophy of Society, pp. 316-342. London: Methuen, 1978.
- Osberg, T. and Shrauger, S. Retrospective versus prospective casual judgements of self and other's behaviour. The Journal of Social Psychology, 126 (2), pp. 169-178, 1986.
- Papadopoulos, R. Jung and the concept of the other. In: R. Papadopoulos and G. Saayman (Eds.), Jung in Modern Perspective, pp. 54-88. Craighall: AD. Donker, 1984.
- Parker, M. A Phenomenological Analysis of the Psychological Manifestations of Ontic Conscience as Derived from Heidegger's Ontological Conception of that Phenomenon. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Rhodes University, 1985.
- Phares, E. Clinical Psychology: Concepts, Methods, and Profession. Homewood: The Dorsey Press, 1984.

Rycroft, C. A Critical Dictionary of Psychoanalysis.

Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972.

Schafer, R. A New Language for Psychoanalysis. New Haven:

Yale University Press, 1976.

Szczepanski, J. The Other. Dialectics and Humanism, 6 (1),

pp. 113-124, 1979.

Theunissen, M. The Other: Studies in the Social Ontology

of Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre, and Buber. Trans. C.

Macann with an introduction by F.R. Dallmayr.

Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1984.

Wertz, F. Method and findings in a phenomenological

psychological study of a complex life-event: being

criminally victimized. In: A. Giorgi (Ed.), 1985, pp.

155-216, op.cit.