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Self-correcting 'storytelling science'

Phase 1: Test by Auto-ethnographic A-I-D assumptions

Phase 2: Test A-I-D assumptions thus far by engaging in Conversational Storytelling inquiry

Phase 3: Test A-I-D assumptions thus far with the available sciences

Phase 4: Test A-I-D assumptions thus far by interventions or experiments

A=Abductions
I=Inductions
D=Deductions
4 Tests of Self-Correcting Method

1. Refutation test of *self-reflexivity, self-conversations*, or in autoethnography, to question assumptions,

2. Storytelling *conversations with others*,

3. *Understanding the science and processes of Nature*, and

4. *Doing experiments and practice interventions to get closer to the grounded situation.*
PHASE 1: Test by Autoethnographic Reflexivity

What is autoethnography?
What is your living story of your dissertation?

What is reflexivity?
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Self-Correcting Induction Methods

1. For Karl Popper it is Zigzag between intuitive hypotheses and testing theories by disconfirmation, not by confirmation.

2. For C. S. Pierce it is self-correcting induction by four tests to get closer to Truth.

3. For Henri Savall it is self-correcting by ’Agile’ intervention using Peirce’s Abduction-Induction-Deduction in Scientific Method of unleashing human potential.
Popper (1972: 243)
Self-Correction Formula

$$PS_1 \Rightarrow TT_1 \Rightarrow EE_1 \Rightarrow PS_2$$

- $PS_1$ = Problem situation, initial response
- $TT_1$ = Tentative theories (conjectures)
- $EE_1$ = Error elimination by testing
- $PS_2$ = Problem situation, theories surviving refutation process
Further predictions covered by hypothesis, and so providing for testability.

Further spread of data covered by additional leap.
Jim Sibel
Dissertation
Jim Sibel dissertation example

Peircean Self Correcting Method Applied to Bojean Deconstructed Story of Conversational Interviews

Figure 1
An Ontology of Industrial Work in the Digital Electronic Age
Thomas E. Kleiner, Jr.
Phase 2: Test by Conversations

Sound of footsteps

David: Ok, how can I help you? (Softly asked)

Grace Ann: I’m going to give him his second. So that’s his (points to one plastic tub)

David: OK

Grace Ann: And there’s a bowl, outside for now [more footsteps; sound of food being poured into the bowl] See that bowl there

David: OK?

Grace Ann: We keep them separate (scuffling sound) that’s all right, let him go, he’s going to go with you.
Sound of footsteps
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Grace Ann: I’m going to give him his second. So that’s his (points to one plastic tub)
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David: OK?

Grace Ann: We keep them separate (scuffling sound) that’s all right, let him go, he’s going to go with you.

David is in his home office in Las Cruces

Grace Ann walks in the office, interrupting David’s usual writing, with Sparkles who usually eats there in that office. The new puppy from the Rescue Shelter is about to get first meal in our home (Before). The new dog gets his food second to reinforce to the old dog that she is now the senior dog, she knows the rules, and the new dog should respect her and follow her lead

David agreeing, to show he has heard. There is history here (Before), since it is about how Sparky and Honey had been fed in separate rooms before Sparky died. Then Honey was alone, and then later when Sparkles came, Honey became top dog and was fed first. After Honey was gone, Sparkles was alone until the new male puppy was adopted. Now Sparkles is top dog and gets to eat first, and the new puppy is second in rank. This is (Rehistoricizing) the dog-to-dog relationship.

(Futuring) Giving her plan (Foretelling bets on the future) for how the feeding will be done.

(Grounding) David is to feed Sparkles in this office. Grace Ann points to Sparkles bowl, in his office.
PHASE 3: Test with Science

1. Taylor’s (2007) three-year ethnography of animal sanctuaries raises challenges to ‘animal personhood’ in the intersubjectivity between animals and humans (the animal workers).

2. Pet statistics tell a multispecies-story, one relayed in social media accounts of homelessness and euthanasia (for which the literal meaning of the root words is ‘Good Death’), and part of pet capitalism. “Each year, approximately 1.5 million shelter animals are euthanized (670,000 dogs and 860,000 cats).
PHASE 4: Testing Claims
Self-Correcting Inductive Research

Started with my own views based on my Frame and Sensemaking of the problem

Kōrero Praxis of ‘Conversational Sharing’ back and forth depicted by the internal double spiral

Frame – Time and place
Sensemaking – based on personal experience and literature
Self-Correcting Inductive Research

- Analytical comparison
- Self-reflection
- Tikanga
Self-Correcting Inductive Research

Diagram:

- Nodes labeled 1, 1+1, 2, 3, and ahau
- Arrows connecting the nodes in a spiral pattern
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Self-Correcting Inductive Research
Self-Correcting Inductive Research
Untold Story of Fashion, Pet Euthanasia, and Global Warming

PICK ONE VIDEO:
Overpopulation
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ye6-8ZCMJlg
Homeless pets
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gp5gwioRyGs
Pets and Global Warming
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sJGw_rR6RZk (UCLA Study)
It’s a bizarre injustice that this untold story is swept under the carpet due to the power of the pharmaceutical and agricultural industry lobbying
The more this is a story-told, the more awareness raised the better.