

Notes for life: a Henrian research methodology in psychology

Apontamentos para a vida: uma metodologia Henriana de pesquisa em psicologia

Gillianno José Mazzetto de CASTRO¹  0000-0003-3354-4330

Abstract

This study aims to consider a Henrian methodology in Psychology. It is a theoretical, cross-sectional study that, drawing on the phenomenological tradition in Psychology, seeks to structure a research itinerary in two dimensions or layers of appearance. 1st – the intentional classical phenomenology display, and 2nd – the essence of the Henrian phenomenology manifestation. This route follows phases ranging from the design of the research and the constitution of the phenomenological view, reaching the synthesis scenario in which researchers can draw their conclusions about the content of the experience investigated. The insertion of the essence dimension manifestation enriches the traditional phenomenological method, opening up to Psychology the possibility of exploring the *pathos avec*. It provides Psychology with a methodological route to understand the dynamics of human experience beyond the health-disease model. It is necessary to continue the research in view of the development of the measurement instruments.

Keywords: Existentialism; Psychological practice; Research.

Resumo

Este estudo objetiva pensar uma metodologia Henriana em Psicologia. Trata-se de uma pesquisa teórica e transversal que, valendo-se da tradição fenomenológica em Psicologia buscará estruturar um itinerário de pesquisa em duas dimensões de aparição. 1º – Da mostraçõa intencional, fenomenologia clássica, e 2º – Da essência da manifestação, fenomenologia Henriana. Esse caminho é feito por fases que vão desde o design da pesquisa e a constituição do olhar fenomenológico, chegando ao cenário da síntese no qual o pesquisador poderá fazer as suas conclusões sobre o conteúdo da experiência pesquisada. A inserção da dimensão da essência da manifestação enriquece o método fenomenológico tradicional abrindo à Psicologia a possibilidade de exploração do pathos avec. Oportuniza à Psicologia um caminho metodológico de entendimento das dinâmicas da experiência humana para além do modelo saúde-doença. É necessário continuar a pesquisa em vista do desenvolvimento dos instrumentos de aferição.

Palavras-chave: Existencialismo; Prática psicológica; Pesquisa.

▼ ▼ ▼ ▼ ▼

¹ Centro Universitário Católica do Tocantins, Departamento de Psicologia; Curso de Psicologia. Av. Teotônio Segurado, Quadra 1402, Lote 1, Plano Diretor Sul, 77024-710, Palmas, TO, Brasil. E-mail: <gillianno@gmail.com>.

▼ ▼ ▼ ▼ ▼

How to cite this article

Castro, G. J. M. (2022). Notes for life: a Henrian research methodology in psychology. *Estudos de Psicologia* (Campinas), 39, e200192. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-0275202239e200192>



More and more, Henrian thoughts have been discovered in Psychology as an interesting way to think about the dynamics of the human experience of being alive, beyond the paradigm of health and disease (Fuchs, 2021; Martins, 2015; Sackin-Poll, 2020; Smith & Lloyd, 2020.).

Above all, studies based on Henry's thoughts have pointed to the need to think about the relationship between health and disease, between the experience of suffering and *jouissance* from a perspective that is structured under layers of apparition, that is, that which, in a given layer appears in the form of object and language and in another layer, it can manifest itself in the form of fruition and pathos, that is, affectation in and for life.

Method

This is a theoretical and transversal phenomenological reflection that seeks to propose and structure elements and steps for the construction of a phenomenological practice based on Henrian Psychology. By phenomenological reflection we mean the path of production of knowledge that, returning to the things themselves and inquiring about their foundations, is capable of clarifying the meaning of phenomena through a strict path (Henry, 2009; Husserl, 1950).

By theoretical and cross-sectional research, as stated by Demo (2000, p. 20), it is understood that "[...] dedicated to rebuilding theory, concepts, ideas, ideologies, controversies, with a view, in immediate terms, to improve theoretical foundations". This research is grounded on an attempt to methodological construction in accordance with the phenomenological epistemological matrix, asking about the sense and meaning of experiences (Denzin & Lincoln, 2006) of individuals or groups within the investigation carried out in the psychological domain.

Methodological description of the phenomenological schools used

Daseinsanalyse, in its reflection on psychic phenomena and, in particular, on the outbreak process, advanced in Psychology regarding an important reality: the description and analysis of the experience of being mentally suffering not only as a phenomenon with a biological or object basis, but rather, as a movement that points to and achieves existence. Such reflection or perspective brought to the phenomenological analysis in Psychology the possibility of thinking about the process of psychic suffering and psychopathologies, from the perspective of a movement constituting subjectivity in the world in the form of a situated existence (Jacinto & Salles, 2020). From this school, the categories of existence and units of meaning will be incorporated in this research.

On the other hand, the Dutch school and the Chicago school, based on the Husserlian reflections, enrich the phenomenological reflection in Psychology through the structuring of a rigorous and gradual methodological proposal, which finds, in the description, in the phenomenological attitude and, in the variations, its path of structuring and proposal for the understanding of psychic phenomena. In this reflection, the following elements will be assumed from the Dutch school and the Chicago school: The first-level phenomenological attitude, which consists in clarifying epistemological and situational prejudices, which can hamper the process of understanding the phenomena; The reduction and categorization of phenomenological units with the process of building the route of reflection; the phenomenological variations.

Methodological description of Henry's Phenomenology

However, in light of Henrian reflection, it can be seen that there is a second and original dimension to be considered in the process of unveiling the phenomenon, that is, the dimension of the essence of the manifestation, which is much more than a repetition of traditional models from Classical Phenomenology, points to the flow of life in its immanence.

Henry's phenomenology is characterized by a reflection that seeks to overcome the limits of the first proposal of classical phenomenology, that is, that of Husserl. The central point of Henrian criticism orbits around the concept of *cogitatio*, that is, manifestation. Henry (1990) states that classical phenomenology made a mistake by associating manifestation to the very core of what would be the essence of things, their ipseity. Henry comments (2009, p. 106, author's emphasis):

[...] the error made by him [Husserl] that the coming of the *cogitatio* to evidence under the view of thought is taken for the essence of said *cogitatio*, that is, the error by which the reduced phenomenon, the pure phenomenon, the phenomenon in the sense of phenomenology, is taken by the original essence of phenomenology itself, by the essence of life.

This fact pointed out by Henry (2009) would reduce the phenomenon to its manifestation. To overcome this weakness in the classical approach to phenomenology, Henry (2009) proposes immanence as a path for phenomenological reflection. By this category Henry (2009, p. 110, author's emphasis) understands: "[...] that the *cogitatio*, that is, pure phenomenology in its original phenomenization, in order to be immanent, assumes the meaning that it phenomenizes itself without leaving itself, without producing any distancing". In our reflection, the following categories of Henrian thoughts will be used: Essence of manifestation; display layer; meaning layer; Life; Incarnation; Body Ownership; *Pathos* and *Pathos avec*.

Considering this paradigm, in which the Henrian reflection operates, the dimensions for a Henrian phenomenological research in Psychology are structured. As this is a theoretical and cross-sectional study, the formal sections of the article entitled "results and discussion" will be merged into the same topic as it is understood that, as it is a methodological proposal, such sections are intertwined.

Procedures

The methodology that will be developed sought to comply with the graduality principles and consistency with the epistemological base of origin. In this way, the steps developed below seek to structure a gradual construction path, either from the phenomenological standpoint in which the psychic phenomenon will be studied, or from the way in which the results obtained should be selected, classified, organized and synthesized.

As a procedure for organizing the subsections, the strategy of the *Narrative Literature Review* (Rother, 2007) was used, based on the productions of traditional Psychology phenomenology schools, such as *Daseinsanalyse*, the Dutch school, the Chicago school, of Henrian tradition, as well as the warnings and advances that have been made on the national scenario.

The databases consulted in this research were: SciELO, Lilacs, Medline, Capes Periodicals, Google Scholar. For the classical phenomenological literature, such as Husserl's, works we used books in the following languages: Portuguese, English, Spanish, French, German; in turn, as to Henry's works, we tried to read them in their original version in French. The main descriptors used were: Phenomenology AND Health; Phenomenology AND Psychology. Once found, the articles were selected according to the criterion of correspondence to the research theme.

Results and Discussion

The phenomenological look

The first stage is concerned with defining the scenario of the immanent constitution, or the scenario of manifestation (Souto, 2019), in which the phenomenon emerges, in two forms, as presented by Henry

(1990). The 1st in the form of a phenomenological object, the result of an eidetic reduction, and the 2nd in a more constitutive level, as an apparition that produces an affective mark, a *pathos* and manifests itself as an immanent flow of life, or space of the original ipseity (Henry, 2009).

This implies for the investigator the need to think of the research space not as an object or a “space” of objects, but as a “place” of the living present (Henry, 2010), which is intersubjective and immanent. Henry (2009, p. 111) comments on this: “In experiencing oneself from absolute subjectivity, the original ipseity is born, the oneself captured in its interior possibility”. This is the basis for the constitution of the phenomenological research space in general (Englander, 2020) and, in particular, a phenomenological Henrian research space (Henry, 1997; Santos, 2020).

The original ipseity, when reflected within the psychological horizon, opens up the possibility of thinking about the individual not only in an isolated or reduced way, as in the case when we think about the subjects solely from the point of view of their mental suffering or even from a strictly pathological perspective. The phenomenological immanence points to us the fact that it is only possible to speak of a subjectivity from the moment it is considered in its original condition and experience, that is, in the perception of oneself alive without any mediation or objectification. This would be the most profound and immanent concept of the phenomenological category for subjectivity, namely: *Selbstgegebenheit*, self-donation (Mitscherlich-Schönherr & Anselm, 2021).

However, this subjectivity is not separated from a context, but interacts and constitutes itself within it. This is the fundamental core of the phenomenological idea of the world of life, namely: Subjectivity, to be constituted, needs a space from and with which it interacts. This reality makes it essential to think of it in a situated way, that is, as a subjectivity that is constituted within a place of the living present (Henry, 2015; Husserl, 1977).

The constitution of the place of the living present, which is the field of research in which psychological phenomena occur, gives the investigator the opportunity to think about the research scenario beyond the simplism of the linear and direct relationship between subject and object, also called by Henry (2009) donation-donated duplication relationship. This relationship is characterized by reductionism that does not allow access to the core of subjective experience.

Such perspective opens up for reflection, from a phenomenological practice in Psychology, the ability to conjecture a more holistic reading model of human phenomena in Psychology in the light of what Henrian thoughts propose as the essence of manifestation, that is, the space in which self-giving is constituted within a horizon of multiple affectations, called the living present of the world of life.

Therefore, it is necessary to consider and value that every single experience is born within a general experience of the world, and it is in this experience that the perception and impression of the world gain sense and meaning through the constitution of a flow, and not a reduction to the figure of the thematic object or research section.

Some elements that can contribute to the process of understanding the space of the living present, in which phenomenological research in Psychology is born, may be, at the level of primordial affectation in life, the processes of homeostasis and social interoception that have been proven by the studies of Nummenmaa et al. (2018), Matthews and Tye (2019), and Adolphs et al. (2019), as well as the dynamics of habits communities constitution (Mello, 2019).

Thus, in order to build a Henrian phenomenological research in Psychology, it is necessary and appropriate to start from an implied transversality of the real, in which what gives coherence to the process of experience are not the polarized dynamics of subject and object, but rather, the constitution of the flow of implication and affectation in the immanence of life.

The phenomenological attitude

Having considered the constitutive elements of the research space, we now address the phenomenological attitude, with which the researcher interacts with the question and the field in which psychological phenomena will be investigated. This constitutes the setting for reflection and constitution, within which the phenomenological attitude can be structured.

However, one could ask: What is the specificity of a phenomenological attitude in Psychology in relation to a traditional phenomenological attitude?

The phenomenological attitude is one of the strategies that Husserl (2001) used to build his phenomenological method in which the phenomenological attitude is characterized by the clarification of points of view, as well as the damages that can hinder access to the phenomenon based on its quiddity, namely, its very reality.

In Husserl (1950), the phenomenological attitude is constituted as a mental exercise to suspend, *epoché*, previous knowledge, as well as clarify the limitations and losses that may contribute to the process of understanding and describing the phenomenon. In turn, in the light of Henrian's reflection in Psychology, the exercise of the phenomenological attitude constitution, much more than an eidetic activity that causes a distancing of the researcher from the research context, providing an *Ek-stasis* (Henry, 1990), seeks to be a process of discernment and clarification of the flow of life from how it presents itself in *pathos avec*, in an implied way. The first, Husserlian, seeks to find the "what" that can signal a who; the second, Henrian in Psychology, seeks to find a "who" that may contain several "what".

In this connection, from the practices within the psychological field, it can be seen that, in the light of a Henrian Psychology phenomenological attitude, the investigator or psychologist does not only relate or study a set of anomalies, disorders or psychic illnesses, but, yes, it is related to a "who", a person who manifests himself from the set of his possibilities, one of which can be being or perceiving himself healthy, or the opposite. Suffering is an attribute of the sufferer and not his identity.

From this perspective, the investigator/psychologist is not someone who is content to make an inventory of anomalies or nonconformities, but rather who seeks to recognize, in the enjoyment of life or lives with which he comes in contact, habits and proof of himself in the process of incarnation, body-ownership and disincorporation, which were constituted within a history of ways and habits of life (Grzibowski, 2019).

Having made this fundamental distinction, it is possible to establish the steps or elements of construction of the Henrian-based phenomenological attitude in Psychology, namely: 1st affirmation of the pre-judgments scenario and the natural attitude that constitutes the awareness of what personal interests are or existential situations, or situations of value, that contribute to the valuation of the phenomenal elements manifested in the construction process of the research question/problem, or even in the description of the experience.

Within this context, it is necessary to pay attention to a particular mechanism: confirmation and enhancement, which occur consciously or unconsciously in the process of affectation/phenomenological observation.

Once these pre-conditions have been established for the investigator to adopt a Henrian-based phenomenological attitude in Psychology, the second one seeks to think about the criteria for the phenomenological suspension or *epoché* and which are their possible dimensions, through the perception that they provide opportunities for opening up the research space to the phenomenality. However, before deepening the criteria for the constitution of the phenomenological attitude, it is necessary to clarify the stages of phenomenological syntheses in Psychology (Silva et al., 2020).

Binswanger (2010) warns about three important moments: *Aisthesis*, *Mnémé* and *Phantasia*. These three moments, at the level of the appearance of the phenomenon, constitute the space for intuition and primary apprehension. Intuition is understood as “[...] the unit synthetically formed by impressions” (Binswanger, 2010, p. 34). *Aisthesis* corresponds to the impression that the phenomenological experience produces, *Mnémé* says of “[...] all the moments that lead to identification” (Binswanger, 2010, p. 37) which, in turn, produces *phantasia*, understood as “[...] the prediction that, in the present or in the current moment, it puts in relation the pre-current, be it retained or remembered” (Binswanger, 2010, p. 35). These three elements constitute the primary intuitive apprehension and are expressed in the first impressions that the investigator and the participants have when contacting each other.

However, there is also the level of the essence of the manifestation that deals with the affectations in life, in the *pathos avec*, that both the researcher and the participants suffer and produce. These impressions can be better understood when thought from the space of bodily resonance or empathy from the phenomenological point of view.

Fuchs and Koch (2014, p. 3), commenting on this theme, state that: “Emotions are experienced through what we call body resonance. They include all kinds of local or general bodily sensations”. This theme is corroborated by more current studies, presenting this dimension, resonance, as important, if not fundamental, in the reflection on intersubjectivity (Ryan & Gallagher, 2020; Van Rhyn et al., 2021).

Faced with this, we can see one more contribution and differentiation in light of Henry's (1990) thoughts, since, based on this author, the attitude of those who seek to know the phenomenon is based on an opening that allows oneself to be affected, through a pre-intentional structure, in which, as stated by Henry (2010, p. 120, author's emphasis):

[...] there is no intentionality, but only an intentional life. Recognizing the phenomenality proper to this life, the pathetic self-affection, *l'auto-affection pathétique*, which makes it precisely possible as life, is the function of an unintentional Phenomenology. Since intentionality is not possible as an intentional life.

Intentional life understood here as the ability to receive impressions and perceive the world in the very act of becoming aware of oneself, thus escaping from Husserlian hylectic phenomenality. The dimension of the essence of the manifestation or affectation in life produces a characteristic which is peculiar to Henrian-based Phenomenology when operating within the field of Psychology, since, based on it, not taking into account the affectations that the research produced in life and, in the flesh of the investigator, means to disregard the affectation process and, therefore, obscure the dimension of the essence of the manifestation in the investigator's own life.

By taking this theoretical stance, the researcher/psychologist inserts himself into the reality of the research as part of it, constituting with it a tissue that is eminently alive; this happens through the proof of himself with others (Henry, 1990). In this scenario, the researcher/psychologist enters the plot of fruition, for which the research is being carried out.

Designing the research question

The question/research question is the driving force behind the whole reflection. It is through the question that it is also possible to establish the thematic cut necessary so that it can be carried out satisfactorily; to that effect, it is necessary to define and establish the thematic scenarios, in which the research question/issue will be constituted (Orengo et al., 2020)

This thematic scenario, which comprises the set of themes that orbit around the phenomenon investigated and that help to define it, are organized in levels or observation strata, such as, for example,

level of spatiotemporal constitution, level of symbolic-axiological constitution, level of affective-implicative constitution, which are initially assumed under the same level of value. However, in another stage of the methodological discussion, each level will be considered more relevant or less relevant, the relevant criterium being the conformity with the theoretical design and the research question/issue.

After defining the thematic scenario, it is important to observe the reality investigated in detail, considering all data with equal importance, thus building the attitude of remaining open and in the phenomenological way of being or attitude (Husserl, 1950) which must be organized through a description of the observed phenomena.

This description deals with the research participant's perception of their experience. And here, it is necessary to consider the warning by Giorgi (2009) regarding the distinction between the participant's direction and conduction. In this regard, explains Giorgi (2009, p.123): "[...] leading the participant includes the investigator's attempt to obtain from the participant certain specific things that the researcher is looking for in the research data". Giorgi (2009, p. 123) further comments, "[...] directing the participant refers to the fact that the investigator encourages the participant to talk about the phenomenon which is of interest in the investigation", and this seems to be more timely and coherent with the phenomenological way of constructing the research.

By way of illustration in the case of an interview, this can be done using questions such as: Please describe your experience with this fact; could you please say how you felt? What did you notice? In the case of bibliographic material, this can be done through the resource of content analysis, always seeking the meaning of the whole.

At the same time, it is important to consider the dynamics of the second level of phenomenological manifestation pointed out by Henry (1990), that is, the setting of the manifestation essence. This level can be accessed through observation of how the participant reacts when reporting a certain experience, whether through gestures, body expressions, cadence and enhancement of some words.

However, it also seems appropriate to use instruments that enable access to interoceptive and homeostatic dimensions of life (Damasio, 2018). Such instruments could help the investigator to understand how the individual who expresses himself also produces interactions with himself when expressing himself, thus enabling a better understanding of the flow of life modalization strategies, body ownership and incarnatory dynamics, using Henry's terminology (2015).

This can be done through the use of portable encephalography, for example, when measuring brain activity and combining it with cardiac and respiratory activity, as pointed out by Cowen and Keltner (2017) and Depraz and Desmidt (2018). Other resources that can be used are the *Body Awareness Questionnaire* (Todd et al., 2019) and the *Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness* (Machorrinho et al., 2019). Such features have been pointed out by Cowen and Keltner (2017), Cordaro et al. (2018); Borg et al. (2018), as valid paths to reach a deeper and more sound understanding of what, in Henrian language, can be called an impressive experience of the world.

This combination aims to enrich the process of phenomenological perception, thus making the process of analysis and description of the phenomena researched to be organized, always aiming at pointing out the individual's or group's experience with which the researcher interacts in the investigation performance.

Next, the researcher transcribes the report considering each level of reality or situation presented by the participant. Such description should always respect the meaning that the participant attributed in the act of reporting the experience because, as Husserl (1977, p. 48) had already warned when proposing a phenomenological psychology, "[...] a world appears to an experience, a particular experience that combines all the perceptions and memories within a flux [...] therefore, we immerse ourselves almost intuitively into the experiential-world and look to an experienced world".

This report, once organized, should be combined with the results and impressions resulting from the observation of the participants' expressions while building the report, as well as the results of the encephalography readings. If questionnaires are used, they can be applied immediately after the construction of the narratives, thus enabling the measurement of the interoceptive and homeostatic state resulting from the reconstruction of the experience through the report.

It is important that the questionnaires, if applied, are made after the construction of the report, as the narrative does not only have an informative function, but rather a performative construction of subjectivity (Silva & Nahur, 2020).

Afterwards, it is important to record all the levels presented by the participants, always looking for the sense of the whole that is established and guided by the research question/issue (Oliveira & Borba, 2019). After completing the full description of the participant's experience report, a new research time begins, which is characterized by the identification of variables and of meanings present in the reports.

Clarification scenario

Once the description of the participants' experience is concluded, it is necessary to identify and compose the meaning scenario and the meaning units that will have the narrative binding function in the report. However, it is necessary to consider that, unlike what Giorgi (2020) says, who prefers to think of the report and experiences under the category of units of meaning, when considering the double dimension, or double appearance of the phenomenon in the experience of the report, it seems to be more appropriate to think of a flow of meaning that can be divided into flow presentification units (Henry, 2015).

The *flow presentification units* represent the combination between the two dimensions of the appearance of the phenomenon, because, on the one hand, there is the report and its meaning units, in line with the proposal of Giorgi (2009) and, on the other hand, there are the notes that life, in the dynamics of intersubjective interaction, have signaled in the process of construction of the report. These two dimensions, when combined, point to the state of manifestation of life and indicate the position towards which life, in the processes of constitution of habits and ways of life, is signaling at that moment.

An important warning arises for the flow presentification units. They are meaningless by themselves, but only find value when thought of within the process of constituting the flow. It is in the enjoyment or while enjoying that it is possible to notice the "where to" life is signaling in its process of proving itself (Henry, 2003).

One of the first steps towards this delimitation of the flow presentification units is anchored in the fact of the identification and delimitation of the invariant quality which, in turn, Husserl (2001) will call a non-repeated theme, that is, the identification and delimitation of the elements present in the report, whether situational or psychic that appear only once in the participants' statements.

This methodological step allows the researcher to understand the variations in the perception of the phenomenon and, consequently, of the experience of a given reality. When this is applied to a group, for example, families or communities, such a device allows the perception of the different nuances that make up the world scenario of the members of the community or the group involved in the research.

The identification of the invariable qualities, when combined with the result of the self-tests that the participants had been taking when reconstructing the experience, produces the flow presentification units which, once identified, should be organized into thematic groups corresponding to the sum of the elements arising out of the flow presentification units. In the case of research with groups, the units must be correlated with the description of the experience of each participant, seeking to identify the transfer and modalization mechanisms.

As a result of this process, a composite texture is obtained, which comprises the set of all individual descriptions organized in a coherent way, using the research question as a criterion.

After differentiating and organizing the reports into textures to ensure a minimum homogeneity, it is necessary to work on the presentification units flow, so that they cease to be a description of the experience and become a source of meaning of the described reality. So far, the content obtained is the result of the report of the participants' experience; from here on, we will seek to identify the meanings inherent in the report and, in turn, the construction of a meta-report, that is, a text written in third person.

In classical or historical phenomenology, this is done through what Husserl (2006) calls variations, which seek to identify the internal consistency and the relevance of themes and textures. Based on Husserl (2001) and Giorgi (2009), it is possible to identify the following variations families: *Variation regarding the quality of content*, in which the question is asked about isolated content, also called pieces, and about the content that integrates the set of the flow of meaning, called the moment; *Variation regarding the presence of content*, in which the question is asked about explicit or implicit content in the description of the participants' experience.

As for the implicit contents, these can be indirectly perceived by the context, by the phenomenality, from which the description of the experience stems; *Variation in the possible meanings*, that is, whether the significant words used by different members of the group investigated are understood in a different, similar or analogous way; *Variation of the phenomenon's perspectives*, that is, how the members of the researched group perceive, or not, the phenomenon in a similar or different way; *Free imagery variation*, in which one asks why, why the phenomenon appears within a particular researched context. Such variations can be used in line with the type of research, with the question and with the reality investigated; it is not necessary to use all of them in the same research.

Added to the variations, we ought to compose the units of meaning of the second dimension phenomenological manifestation, that is, of the immanent and essential reality. This process, from the point of view of methodology, can be done by composing the flow through what was expressed, either through observation, or through the results of the instruments. Here, the investigator must pay attention and correlate which was the corporal note when a certain element of the report was being expressed and re-signified in the experience. What were the sense triggers that produced changes either from the point of view of expression, or from the point of view of interoceptive and homeostatic interactions.

The combination of these two dimensions, that of classical intentionality and that of the manifestation essence, generates, for the researcher, the elements of a first organized account of the meaning of the world experience and the dynamics of the flow of that individual or group present there.

Considering these points, it is interesting to ask about the investigator's perception of the research construction process, taking as a reference that, as Henry (2004) states, the life scenario, in which psychological issues are born, and is characterized by a self-affection and by an immanent affectivity, which is a condition for the possibility of all experiences (Henry, 2004).

This element of the method is important, because it is the result of Henry's (1990) critique of what he calls historical phenomenology, in which Husserlian and Heideggerian thoughts are inserted. Henry (1990, p. 100) states: "[...] not only what is seen is taken when living, but seeing itself is just a modality of life: without its self-affection, nothing would be consequently seen". Therefore, it is important to insert, consider and think, within the research methodological process, which were the experiential impressions experienced by the researcher when affected by the participants.

The first point that can be explored by the investigator, as his/her experience report, touches on the process of describing and structuring his/her experience when contacting, as a researcher, in the research field. The reason for this methodological step is based on the fact that the investigator, when researching,

is also part of the research and not only is he affected, but he also interacts with the environment and with the people in this process. He is also a *pathos avec*.

This set of qualitative attributes includes, for example: the receptivity or not of the individual or group; the description of the environment and the relationships that are built in it; contextual elements such as time, space, causal or intentional gestures, rhythms and habits. One of the resources that can make this process feasible is the use of the researcher's "field diary", in which he describes and scores his own observations.

After scoring the observations of the set of qualitative attributes of the experience, these should be organized into thematic groups, or descriptive families. Once this step is completed, it is important to describe the general characteristics of the individual(s). How they present themselves, if the research experience was something embarrassing or not; what were the sensations, images, or intuitions that the researcher had when working with the participants. Finally, this information is organized through a composition that seeks to contextualize the descriptions made by the participants about the phenomenon in question, fulfilling the function of presenting the context of the report about the experiences made by the participant(s). Once this step is further trailed, it is possible to reach the Synthesis scenario.

Synthesis scenario

Once all the steps have been established, it is the researcher's duty to produce a synthesis of the meanings and phenomenal perceptions of the experiences lived during the research process, together with their contextual impressions, within an organic discourse that has an internal tension and an inherent ethical commitment. Internal tension, because the synthesis is not only the result of the mere description of the experiences of the researched individual(s) in relation to a given phenomenon, but, also, it is not just a mere interpretation of the researcher about the experience of a human group in relation to a given phenomenon. It is configured as an eminently interactive and intersubjective construction, in which there is a research proponent (commonly called researcher/investigator) and a research participant researcher (commonly called participant), thus replacing the dialectical relationship of subject and object by an intersubjective relationship of subjects who have as an included and ethical third party, the term of reliability and cooperation (Souza & Moraes, 2020).

Such reality makes room for ethical positioning that is not axiological or procedural, but constitutive, because if the research is proposed by a subject to other subjects, there is a relationship that is structured in the form of alterities, one of the constituent elements of what Henry (2010) will call the Phenomenology of Life, and further, in another work, Henry comments (1990, p. 4, author's emphasis):

It is paradoxically the life that, in itself, refers to nothing else, that provides the environment where all possible intersubjectivity is fulfilled [...] *ego* and *alter ego* have a common birth, the same essence, and it is through this that they 'communicate' because they are alive.

Therefore, the return of research results to the community is not an artifice under the responsibility of the researcher, or just an act of courtesy, but rather a mandatory and constitutive condition of the research that becomes one of the production and affirmation life scenarios.

Conclusion

This study sought to organize, in the light of what the different schools of the phenomenological tradition in Psychology are calling phenomenological research methodology, an integrative proposal based on the advances and contributions of Henrian thoughts. Nevertheless, the present reflection did not seek to do it only in terms of synthesis or state-of-the-art, but rather, adding and bringing Henrian thoughts closer to this field.

With this approach, some advances can be observed. The first one is the distancing from the Husserlian binary model, a model that is still based on an active intentionality that is structured in the manifestation of a cogito through the donation and donation-recipient duality.

When comparing this reflection with Henrian thoughts, we notice that, although the Husserlian proposal should not be abandoned, it is incomplete if not considered a second phenomenological dimension that is the essence of the manifestation and immanence of life.

It is in this sense that this study sought to articulate itself, always considering research as a procedure that operates in manifestation layers, and in the first one we observe the classical phenomenological tradition present in Psychology, such as the *Daseinanalyse*, the Dutch School and the School of Chicago, which, through Henry's thoughts, was enriched from the second and most constitutive layer of the phenomena appearance.

As main points of enrichment, we observe that the process of constitution of the field of research, the first part of the study, takes on a new form when thought from a phenomenological look that asks for an intentionality, but is also linked to experience through a *pathos avec*.

Another contributing factor is that this study sought to organize a step by step and general criteria for structuring a phenomenological research in Psychology, which in fact seeks to understand the phenomenon of health and mental illness, not from a centralized monism in suffering, but through the constitution of a space of exhibition in which life, healthy or psychically suffering, manifests itself.

Pathos avec, as an original intersubjective dimension, needs to be better explored from a methodological perspective, as, once this is done, new possibilities regarding the study of the role of empathy and social homeostasis may open up to the field of phenomenological research in psychology.

Finally, as limits and possibilities, it is necessary to develop the actual steps of a method, as well as possible measuring instruments. In particular, a point that deserves attention in the development process of future phenomenological research in Psychology is related to the role of empathy and the constitution of the common space and its influence on the results of a phenomenological research/intervention proposal in Psychology.

References

- Adolphs, R., Mlodnow, L., & Barrett, L. F. (2019). What is an Emotion? *Current Biology*, 29(20), 160-164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2019.09.008>
- Binswanger, L. (2010). *Délire: contributions à son étude phénoménologique et daseinanalytique*. Millon
- Borg, C., Chouchou, F., Dayot-Gorlero, J., Zimmerman, P., Maudoux, D., Laurent, B. M., & George A. (2018). Pain and emotion as predictive factors of interoception in fibromyalgia. *Journal of Pain Research*, 11, 823-835. <https://doi.org/10.2147/JPR.S152012>
- Cordaro, D. T., Sun, R., Keltner, D., Kambles, S., Nuddar, N., & Mcneil, G. (2018). Universals and cultural variations in 22 emotional expressions across five cultures. *Emotion*, 18, 75-93. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000302>
- Cowen, A. S., & Keltner, D. (2017). Self-Report captures 27 distinct categories of emotion bridged by continuous gradients. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(38), E7900-E7909. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1702247114>
- Damasio, A. (2018). *The Strange order of things: life, feeling, and the making of cultures*. Pantheon.
- Demo, P. (2000). *Metodologia do conhecimento científico*. Atlas.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2006). Introdução: a disciplina e a prática da pesquisa qualitativa. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Orgs.), *O planejamento da pesquisa qualitativa: teorias e abordagens* (2nd ed.). Artmed.
- Depraz, N., & Desmidt, T. (2018). Cardiophenomenology: a refinement of neurophenomenology. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 18, 493-507. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-018-9590-y>
- Englander, M. (2020). Phenomenological psychological interviewing. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 48(1), 54-73. <https://doi.org/10.1037/hum0000144>

- Fuchs, T. (2021). Time, the body, and the other in phenomenology and Psychopathology. In C. Tewes & G. Stanghellini (Orgs.), *Time and body: phenomenological and psychological approaches*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108776660>
- Fuchs, T., & Koch, S. C. (2014). Embodied affectivity: on moving and being moved. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, e508. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00508>
- Giorgi, A. (2009). *The descriptive phenomenological method in psychology: a modified Husserl an approach*. Duquesne University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156916210X526079>
- Giorgi, A. (2020). *Psychology as a human science: a phenomenologically based approach*. University professor press.
- Grzibowski, S. (2019). Fenomenologia do corpo em Michel Henry: uma leitura a partir da imanência subjetiva. *Voluntas: Revista Internacional de Filosofia*, 10(1), 53-61. <https://doi.org/10.5902/2179378636638>
- Henry, M. (1990). *L'essence de la manifestation*. PUF.
- Henry, M. (1997). *Philosophie et phénoménologie du corps: essai sur l'ontologie biranienne*. PUF.
- Henry, M. (2003). *De la subjectivité*. PUF.
- Henry, M. (2004). *La barbarie: une critique phénoménologique de la culture*. PUF.
- Henry, M. (2009). *Fenomenologia material*. Encuentro.
- Henry, M. (2010). *Phénoménologie de la vie*. PUF.
- Henry, M. (2015). *Incarnation: a philosophy of Flesh*. Northwestern University Press.
- Husserl, E. (1950). *Idées directrices pour une phénoménologie*. Gallimard.
- Husserl, E. (1977). *Phenomenological Psychology*. Martinus Nijhoff.
- Husserl, E. (2001). *Meditações Cartesianas: introdução à Fenomenologia*. Madras.
- Husserl, E. (2006). *Expérience et Jugement*. PUF.
- Jacinto, R. L. S., & Salles, M. A. M. (2020). A importância da fala no processo terapêutico na abordagem fenomenológica daseinsanalítica. *DOXA: Revista Brasileira de Psicologia e Educação*, 22(1), 315-328. <https://doi.org/10.30715/doxa.v22iesp.1.14136>
- Machorrinho, J., Veiga, G., Fernandes, J., Mehling, W., & Marmeleira, J. (2019). Multidimensional assessment of interoceptive awareness: psychometric properties of the portuguese version. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 126(1), 87-105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0031512518813231>
- Martins, F. (2015). Afeição e filosofia primeira: relação entre Fenomenologia e ciências da vida. *Psicologia USP*, 26(3), e0006. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0103-6564D20150006>
- Matthews, G. A., & Tye, K. M. (2019). Neural mechanisms of social homeostasis. *Annals of The New York Academy of Sciences*, 1457(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.14016>
- Mello, L. L. S. (2019). Os descaminhos da alma: Georg Simmel, Henry James e a "tragédia da cultura". *Pandaemonium Germanicum*, 22(37), 76-101. <https://doi.org/10.11606/1982-8837223776>
- Mitscherlich-Schönherr, O., & Anselm, R. (2021). *Gelingende Geburt*. De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110719864>
- Nummenmaa, L., Hari, R., Jari, K., Hietanen, K., & Glerean, E. (2018). Maps of subjective feelings. *PNAS*, 115(37), 9198-9203. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1807390115>
- Oliveira, T. C. A., & Borba, J. M. P. (2019). Contribuições da fenomenologia Husserliana para a Psicologia Clínica. *Revista do NUFEN*, 11(3), 154-169. <https://dx.doi.org/10.26823/RevistadoNUFEN.vol11.n%C2%BA03ensaio52>
- Orengo, F. V., Holanda, A. F., & Goto, T. A. (2020). Fenomenologia e psicologia fenomenológica para psicólogos brasileiros: uma compreensão empírica. *Psicologia em Estudo*, 25, e45065. <https://doi.org/10.4025/psicoestud.v25i0.45065>
- Rother, E. T. (2007). Revisão sistemática X revisão narrativa. *Acta Paulista de Enfermagem*, 20(2), 5-6. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-21002007000200001>
- Ryan, K. J., Jr., & Gallagher, S. (2020). Between ecological psychology and enactivism: is there resonance? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1147. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01147>
- Sackin-Poll, A. (2020). Michel Henry and the Resistance of the Flesh. *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia*, 76(2/3), 857-880. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26922254>
- Santos, G. A. O. (2020). Vitalismo cristão e psicologia: contribuições de Michel Henry e Wilhem Reich. *Revista do NUFEN*, 12(2), 156-169. <http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/pdf/rnufen/v12n2/a10.pdf>

- Silva, C. M., Vieira, E. M., & Freire, J. C. (2020). Pesquisa fenomenológica em psicologia: ainda a questão do método. *Revista da Abordagem Gestáltica*, 26(2), 199-207. <https://dx.doi.org/10.18065/2020v26n2.7>
- Silva, J., & Nahur, M. T. M. (2020). A força transformadora da narrativa em Paul Ricoeur: enfrentamento do “analfabetismo” existencial-cultural. *Kínesis - Revista de Estudos dos Pós-Graduandos em Filosofia*, 12(31), 54-76. <https://doi.org/10.36311/1984-8900.2020.v12n31.p55-76>
- Smith, S. J., & Lloyd, R. J. (2020). Life Phenomenology and Relational Flow. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 26(5), 538-543. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800419829792>
- Souto, S. S. (2019). Vida enquanto absoluto incondicionado: sobre a materialidade da essência da manifestação na fenomenologia de Michel Henry. *Griot: Revista de Filosofia*, 19(3), 105-114. <https://doi.org/10.31977/grirfi.v19i3.1241>
- Souza, C. M., & Moraes, F. M. (2020). Construção e aplicação de modelo metodológico com base na tríplice mimese de Ricoeur. *Reves: Revista Relações Sociais*, 3(2), 0004-0017. <https://doi.org/10.18540/revesv3iss2pp0004-0017>
- Todd, J., Aspell, J., Barron, D., & Swami, V. (2019). Multiple dimensions of interoceptive awareness are associated with facets of body image in British adults. *Body Image*, 29, 6-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2019.02.003>
- Van Rhyn, B., Barwick, A., & Donnelly, M. (2021). Embodiment as an instrument for empathy in social work. *Australian Social Work*, 74(2), 146-158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2020.1839112>

Received: September 3, 2020

Final version: April 30, 2021

Approved: January 4, 2022