

Phenomenology as a healthcare research method

RODRIGUEZ, Alison and SMITH, Joanna

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/32757/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

RODRIGUEZ, Alison and SMITH, Joanna (2018). Phenomenology as a healthcare research method. *Evidence-based nursing*, 21 (4), 96-98.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Research Made Simple Series

Title: Phenomenology as a healthcare research method

Authors: Alison Rodriguez¹, Joanna Smith²

¹Dr Alison Rodriguez, Lecturer Child and Family Health, School of Healthcare, University of Leeds, a.m.rodriguez@leeds.ac.uk

²Dr Joanna Smith, Associate Professor Child Nursing, School of Healthcare, University of Leeds, j.e.smith1@leeds.ac.uk

Correspondence: Dr Joanna Smith

Qualitative research methodologies focus on meaning and although use similar methods, have differing epistemological and ontological underpinnings, with each approach offering a different lens to explore, interpret or explain phenomena in real world contexts and settings. In this article, we provide a brief overview of *phenomenology*, and outline the main phenomenological approaches relevant for undertaking healthcare research.

What is phenomenology?

Edmund Husserl (1859-1938), a philosopher, established the discipline of phenomenology. In Husserl's approach to phenomenology, now labelled *descriptive phenomenology*, experiences are described and researcher perceptions are set aside or 'bracketed' in order to enter into the life-world of the research participant without any presuppositions.¹ Experience is recognised to involve perception, thought, memory, imagination, and emotion, each involving 'intentionality', as the individual focuses their gaze on a specific 'thing' or event.¹ Martin Heidegger (1889-1976), a student of Husserl, rejected the theory of knowledge or 'epistemology' that influenced Husserl's work, and instead adopted 'ontology', the science of being. In relation to research, 'epistemology' is concerned with what constitutes valid knowledge, and how knowledge is gained with a distinction between justified belief and opinion, while 'ontology' 'is more concerned with the nature of reality and now we understand what exists and is experienced.

Heidegger developed *interpretive phenomenology* using hermeneutics, the philosophy of interpretation, and postulated about the concept of 'being' in the world, asking, '*What is being?*' Heidegger, was interested in interpreting and describing human experience, but rejected 'bracketing' because he accepted that prior understandings impact on our interpretations of the world.¹ Table 1, adapted from Rodriguez (2009),² provides an overview of the key differences between Husserl's and Heidegger's phenomenological perspectives.

Table 1. Key differences between Husserl and Heidegger approaches to phenomenology

Descriptive phenomenology (Husserl) also labelled transcendental phenomenology	Interpretive phenomenology (Heidegger) also labelled hermeneutic phenomenology
Epistemological in orientation, questioning knowledge: <i>How do we know what we know?</i>	Ontological in orientation, questioning experiences and understanding: <i>What does it mean to be the person in this context, with these needs?</i>
Historical context is irrelevant	Historical context is implicit to understanding the concept being explored
The meaning rich data is the subject of analysis	The interaction between the situation and the individual that we seek to identify and interpret is implicit
Essences of consciousness or conscious experience can be shared	One's culture, practices and language can be shared
Meaning is not influenced by researcher belief systems and experiences	Meaning is influenced by researcher belief systems
Data stands alone but meanings can be reconstructed	Interpretation explains what is already known
Bracketing supports the validity of interpretation, enabling a level of objectivity	Developing an understanding of the experience is known as the hermeneutic circle

What is phenomenological research?

The philosophy of phenomenology resides within the naturalistic paradigm; phenomenological research asks: ‘*What is this experience like?*’, ‘*What does this experience mean?*’, and ‘*How does the lived world present itself to the participant or to me as the researcher?*’ Not all health research questions that seek to describe patient or professional experiences will be best met by a phenomenological approach, for example service evaluations may be more suited to a descriptive qualitative design, where highly structured questions aim to finding out participant’s views, rather than their lived experience.

Building on the work of Husserl and Heidegger, different approaches and applications of phenomenological to research have developed. Table 2, adapted from Rodriguez (2009),² highlights the differences between the main traditions of phenomenology.

Table 2: Comparison of the main phenomenological traditions

Approach and influence	Methods	Scholars
<p>Descriptive empirical phenomenology With foundations in the Husserlian method, seeks to identify the essence of the phenomenon through ‘epoche’ (bracketing) and psychological phenomenological reduction.</p>	The researcher compares written descriptions of the phenomenon of interest for example the experience of an illness, to identify the essential structures of the phenomenon, such as living with that illness.	Giorgi ³ and the Duquesne school, and more recently Les Todres ⁴
<p>The Sheffield School Builds on descriptive empirical phenomenology with additional analysis of the existentials of the life-world (selfhood or identity, sociality, spatiality, temporality, activities of daily living, discourse).</p>	The researcher undertakes interviews and analysis focusing on existential themes, for example the individual’s sense of self and their relationships with others through their day-to-day experience of the phenomenon of interest, such as their illness.	Ashworth and colleagues ⁵
<p>Heuristic Although has Husserlian foundations, the focus is the transformative effect of the inquiry on the researcher's own experience.</p>	The researcher reviews different types of data, as all experiences of the phenomenon of interest. The researcher considers the phenomenon of interest on themselves and their own experiences to develop a detailed description and creative synthesis of the experience.	Moustakas ⁶
<p>Relational approaches Although has Heideggerian foundations, the findings are viewed as being co-created through the research dialogue.</p>	The researcher might interview one individual and choose to concentrate on certain elements of that experience for example the sense of self, being-in-the world, ways in which they have coped. Reflexivity addresses the relational dynamics between researcher and co-researchers /participant in generating an interpretation.	Finlay ⁷
<p>van Manen approach van Manen further developed the Hermeneutic (interpretive) approach by identifying the four life-world existentials that are implicit to understanding lived experience: temporality (lived time), spatiality (lived space), corporeality (lived body) and sociality (lived relationships).</p>	The researcher uses a broad range of data collection methods that are appropriate to participants and the phenomena of interest Data is analysed using thematic analysis and is influenced by the researcher’s interpretations. The aim is to bring to light the lived experience by considering the four existentials of existence as different perspectives in analysis. Findings can draw on the arts to better convey meaning, for example translating key statements into a poem or using drawings or photographs to support or describe the meaning of a theme.	van Manen ⁸
<p>Interpretive Phenomenology Analysis (IPA) With foundations in the Hermeneutic method, the focus is on interpretation and</p>	The researcher undertakes interviews and individual experiences are illustrated through thematic analysis. Findings explore the lived experience of the	Smith ⁹

engagement with cognitive and social psychological literature.	phenomenon, influenced by researcher interpretations. IPA is inductive and grounded in the data but acknowledges the dominant literature.	
Critical Narrative Analysis. Again with foundations in the Hermeneutic method, this approach draws mainly on the philosophy of Gadamer and Ricoeur, ¹⁰ who take similar stances on the approach to the hermeneutic interpretation of texts, deciphering differences between the structure and use of language to create meaning. Hermeneutics is defined as the theory or practice of interpretation, whilst a hermeneutic (singular) is defined as a specific type or method of interpretation.	Narrative analysis is performed on interview data, where narratives are analysed in relation to their function, tone and content. In addition, a distinguishing feature of this narrative method is then the action that is taken “to interrogate the text using aspects of social theory as a hermeneutic of suspicion” (2007a, p.130). ¹⁰ Social theory, that relates to the phenomenon of interest, is drawn on to further critically examine our understanding.	Langdrige ¹⁰

In summary, in Husserlian (or descriptive) derived approaches, the researcher from the outset has a concrete ‘example’ of the phenomenon being investigated, presuppositions are bracketed and the researcher imaginatively explores the phenomena; a ‘pure’ description of the phenomena’s essential features as it is experienced can then be unveiled. While in Heideggerian, hermeneutic (or interpretive) approaches the researcher’s perspectives, experiences and interpretations of the data are interwoven, allowing the phenomenologist to provide an ‘interpretation’ rather than just a description of the phenomena as it is experienced. In all phenomenological approaches the researcher’s role in self-reflection and the co-creativity (between researcher and researched) is required to produce detailed descriptions and interpretations of a participant’s lived experience and acknowledged throughout the researcher’s journey and the research process. These reflections are deliberated to a greater degree in heuristic and relational approaches, as the self and relational dialogue are considered crucial to the generated understanding of the phenomena being explored.

We will provide more specific detail of IPA in the next *Research Made Simple* series.

References

¹Crotty, M. *Phenomenology and nursing research*. 1996; Melbourne: Churchill Livingstone.

²Rodriguez A. *We are here for a good time not a long time: Being and caring for a child with a life-limiting condition*. 2009; University of Huddersfield; PhD thesis.

³Giorgi, A. *Phenomenological and psychological research*. 1985; Pittsburg: Duchene University Press.

⁴Todres, L. *Embodied enquiry: Phenomenological touchstones for research, psychotherapy and spirituality*. 2007; New York: Springer.

⁵Ashworth, P. An approach to phenomenological psychology: the contingencies of the life world. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology* 2003; 34 (2), 145-156.

⁶Moustakas, C. *Heuristic research: Design, methodology, and applications*. 1990; London: Sage Publications.

⁷Finlay, L. The intertwining of body, self and word: A Phenomenological study of living with recently diagnosed multiple sclerosis. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology* 2003; 34 (2), 157-178.

⁸van Manen, M. *Researching lived experience, human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. 1996; Albany: State University of New York Press.

⁹Smith, J.A., Flowers, P., Larkin, M. *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis*. 2009; London: Sage.

¹⁰Langdrige, D. *Phenomenological Psychology: Theory, research and method*. 2007; London: Prentice Hall.