

TO: Vivian Weil, CSEP  
FROM: Michael Davis, CSEP  
DATE: April 26, 1995  
SUBJECT: 2nd Hollander e-mail/Software Proposal

Rachelle suggests "a note of caution...the problem of generalizability and [that] data as such [can] be 'read' in more than one way". We should agree, I think, a) that the generalizability of any claims derived from our project would be contestable and b) that even our specific findings would be open to alternate interpretations. We should agree to that because that is true of all empirical claims. We should, however, not conclude either a) that we should avoid generalizing from a single case or b) that we should avoid interpreting our data. Indeed, in a field like this, where there are, for practical purposes, no well-documented studies (and generalizations resting on theory rather than empirical studies), we are not only entitled to generalize but should generalize to provide a thesis others can try to falsify. We should, of course, not try to say something false; but we should also try to be as daring as we can (rather than as cautious as we can). Daring is more likely to provoke research, more likely to bring the field alive.

We should, of course, take care as well not to be misunderstood. This may be harder than I thought. Rachelle (generally a careful reader) read in the contrast between "selfish" and "selfless". We did use the word "selfish" (having suggested what we meant in the previous paragraph). But we did not use the term "selflessness" (and, indeed, suggested certain self-regarding considerations might be appropriate, such as what it was reasonable to expect of people trying to earn a living).