

Forum

How Can We Make Ourselves Stronger? Response to Commentaries

Hak-Soo Kim¹

¹ Distinguished Professor
of DGIST & Professor
Emeritus of Sogang
University, Republic of
Korea

Corresponding author

Hak-Soo Kim
College of
Transdisciplinary
Studies, DGIST,
333 Techno jungang-
daero, Hyeonpung-eup,
Dalseong-gun, Daegu
42988, Republic of Korea
Email: hskim@dgist.ac.kr,
hskim@sogang.ac.kr

Received
27 July 2021

Accepted
22 August 2021

KEYWORDS

actor's point of view, actor's perspectives, theoretical construct, development

I think most of us have been so much exposed to empirical studies but rarely to full-fledged theoretical explications and explanations. The former are likely to provide us with familiarity, accompanied by semantic explanation, while the latter are likely to provide us with scientific explanation, but accompanying much novelty (Kaplan, 1964). In overall, two commentaries (Ahn, this issue; Y. Kim, this issue) on my article (Kim, 2020) show that it might or must cause some confusion and confounding when the distinction between the two explanations is not considered. So, this response is going to make further clarification for some points of my article so that those confusion and confounding in the commentaries could be resolved consequentially. This is expected to make my article's arguments more convincing, readable, and applicable in further research.

First, the actor's point of view. We are used to (or cherishing) the observer's point of view under the assumption of science's objectivity, as a matter of fact, inter-observer agreement. It's basically the static point of view, focused on discovering the difference between states (concepts, variables) measured over time. It has been productive on understanding, especially, non-living objects. However, it tends to overlook the actor's dynamic process of behavior. "Life" is so dynamic and making a change all the time, beyond the four forces of physics (gravitational force, electromagnetic force, weak force, strong force). We, individuals or team or community, are dynamic lives. We need to reconstruct the actor(s)'s dynamic process of behavior.

Second, the actor's perspective-1. Unfortunately, the actor's point of view was focused mostly on the actor's body states such as need, motive, intention, or objective. Then, the actor's process of behavior per se was

skipped, omitted, or unseen. Carter's "behavioral architecture" (2021) reconstructs the behavioral process by distinguishing between body and behavior (or step). The two are respectively independent but functionally interdependent. Now we can explicate and see the behavioral process of composing and operating team or community which has no corporeal body, unlike the individual(s).

Third, the actor's perspective-2. Any situational phenomena are to be both puzzles and problems to the actor. They are products or outcomes that are in and of consequence. It is natural that the actor comes to puzzle out what and how come they are. She or he is eager to dig into those products, which is the main business of traditional science. However, they also pose problems to the actor, however trivial, because they are of consequence for her or his future somehow. That's why, fundamentally, we are more concerned about problems than puzzles, more committed to solving problems than to solving puzzles, or even concerned with solving puzzles for subsequently solving problems.

Fourth, the actor's perspective-3. The actor ever-confronts the two kinds of problem: situational and behavioral. The former is a situational problem that threatens, bothers, annoys, or risks life. It is imminent or potential, inanimate or animate, real or hypothetical, tangible or intangible, and/or damaging or devastating. The latter is the general, behavioral problem that necessarily involves the actor to solve the former, situational problem. Solving the behavioral problem is to develop procedural technology (before the fact) to develop or use a solution (a device, tool, technology) for a situational problem. The behavioral process per se is the key to developing the procedural technology. It is unfortunate that we just make a choice of *available* procedures, and thereby, most time fail to make better consequences.

Fifth, the actor's perspective-4. A situational problem is sometimes a collective, shared one

such as pollution, global warming, or pandemic. An individual actor can't afford to solve such a collective problem. It demands "we," not just as aggregate but as team or community. However, team or community does exist not as a corporeal body but in the collective behavioral process. So, team or community problem solving needs development of procedural technology to compose and operate team or community before the fact. Kim's other article (2012) delineates that development too.

Sixth, empirical concept vs. theoretical construct. An empirical concept is a generalization of attribute(s) (assumed to be) shared in particular phenomena. Its main function is classification or categorization that marks a boundary between different kinds of phenomena. A theoretical construct derives from a general, systematic theory. It functions as both explanation and classification for phenomena, available or *potential*. For example, communicating and coorienting develop to become theoretical constructs in relation with others in my article and find more room to be functional to composing and explaining the process of community problem solving. Then, they could be conceptualized into *more valid* empirical concepts. They don't need to be limited to traditional, empirical conceptualizations (mostly of the particle-physics type) of communication and coorientation. However, in the first place I see severe scarcity of a fundamental, general theory in social and behavioral sciences except Carter's "Expansion theory" (2021).

Seventh, discovery vs. development. Discovery rests greatly on body's or entity's structures that are more in consequence. Development rests on behavior's or step's functions that are more of consequence. Community (and) problem solving rests on not structure but behavioral functional process. Any product is the outcome of process. Thus, community problem solving can develop new or different solutions or outcomes, drawing

upon what procedural technology it develops to realize community for problem solving.

Eighth, 3C – Cognizing, Communicating, and Community. Cognizing and communicating are key elements of/in behavioral process, individual or collective. They are qualities of not body but behavior per se that can be ever-developed. Cognizing brings ideational richness and communicating objectifies those rich ideas. The two's combination is essential to make community possible and constructive for problem solving. Certainly, remembering, questioning, and imagining will add functionally to 3C.

Last, how can we make ourselves stronger? We, team or community or interdisciplinarity, are compelled to be more interested in problem solving. To accomplish effective problem solving, we need to focus on our behavioral process per se that is ever-developmental. Then, we will be able to pay much less attention on such empirical concepts as decision making, attitude, and public. Instead, we will be able to innovate procedural technology for constructive community problem solving and, surely, for realization of better and effective democracy.

REFERENCES

- Carter, R. F. (2021). *Behavioral foundations of effective problem solving*.
<https://bfeps.org>
- Kaplan, A. (1964). *The conduct of inquiry*. Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Kim, H.-S. (2012). Climate change, science and community. *Public Understanding of Science*, 21(3), 268-285.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662511421711>
- Kim, H.-S. (2020). Realizing interdisciplinarity among science, humanism, and art: A new paradigmatic explication of community problem solving. *Asian Communication Research*, 17(3), 20-54.
<https://doi.org/10.20879/acr.2020.17.3.20>