

HISTORICAL DIMENSIONS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SYSTEMS AND SCHOOLS

VID PEČJAK*

University of Ljubljana

There have been many attempts to classify psychological conceptions according to certain historical dimensions. MURRAY (1938) distinguished peripheral and central aspect. The former is oriented toward the periphery of organism; it is positivistic, mechanistic, elementaristic and objectivistic. The latter is oriented toward the center of organism; it is conceptualistic, holistic, intuitivistic, dynamic and subjectivistic. One is represented by behaviorism, the other by psychoanalyses and gestalt psychology.

ANSBACHER (1971) divided psychology into elementaristic and holistic. The former is characterized by determinism, mechanism and reductionism, the latter by concepts as personality growth, creativity, selfactivity and selfactualisation. One is illustrated by structuralism and behaviorism, the other by personalism and humanistic psychology.

BRUNSWICK (1952) described two dimensions: subjectivism-objectivism and rationalism-empiricism. Typical subjectivistic schools are Titchenerian structuralism and gestalt psychology; typical objectivistic schools are reflexology and behaviorism. Gestalt psychology is also rationalistic and behaviorism empiricistic.

ALLPORT and BRUNER (1940) used three basic dimensions: rationalism-empiricism, a teleological-mechanical approach, and quantitativism-qualitativism. MURPHY postulated

*VID PEČJAK: Department of Psychology, University of Ljubljana, Askerceva 12, 61000 Ljubljana, Yugoslavia.

four dimensions: structure-function, part-whole, experimental-statistical approach and quantitativism-qualitativism.

R. COAN (1968) found out 6 basic dimensions: subjectivism-objectivism, holism-elementarism, transpersonal-personal psychology, quantitativism-qualitativism, dynamic-statistical approach, endogenous-exogenous approach. R.I. WATSON (1967) comes up with 17 such dimensions.

There are many other attempts to classify psychological concepts along certain dimensions. Two dimensions are commonly used (though not always named in the same way): subjectivism-objectivism and elementarism-holism. In addition, the dimension passivity-activity was also often used, whereas the other dimensions were more typical of individual investigators. These three dimensions were present through the history of psychology. The fight between their extremes was the "motor" of its development.

The question is, how much are the dimensions determined by the personal opinion of the authors and to what extent they reflect characteristics of psychological schools and theories. It is also not clear whether the dimensions are independent.

METHOD

In this investigation 7 professors of the history of psychology from different countries (3 from U.S.A.: J. BROŽEK, W. HILLIX and T. KRAWIEC; 3 from Yugoslavia: V. PEČJAK, J. MUSEK and A. TRSTENJAK; 1 from Czechoslovakia: J. HOSKOVEC) assessed conceptions of 83 great psychologists who have influenced the development of world psychology in the last hundred years.

The judges used a graphic rating scale with 5 steps (from 0 to 5). Ratings scales for 4 basic dimensions were used: subjectivism-objectivism, elementarism-holism, passivity-activity and significance. The meaning of these concepts was explained in detail. Subjectivism means an emphasis on experience, phenomena and consciousness, while objectivism emphasizes behavior, responses and/or physiological processes. Elementarism is mostly concerned with parts, isolated processes, analyses, and holism with wholeness, integrity, organization and synthesis. Passivity includes determinism, reflection and reduction, while activity includes autonomy, freedom, will and selfrealization. The forth scale was different. The judges evaluated how much these psychologists influenced the development of psychology.

RESULTS

TABLE I shows average ratings given to 83 great psychologists by 7 judges-professors of the history of psychology.

TABLES II, III, IV and V show coefficients of correlation between the judges. Cluster analyses gave no meaningful clusters of judges.

TABLE VI shows coefficients of correlation between the scales.

TABLE 1: AVERAGE RATINGS FOR PARTICULAR SCALES

1.- A. ADLER	1.1	3.7	3.3	3.7
2.- J. ANGELL	2.1	2.3	1.9	2.4
3.- G. ALLPORT	1.7	3.7	3.9	3.9
4.- A. BINET	2.6	2.3	2.1	4.3
5.- L. BINSWANGER	0.5	4.2	4.0	1.8
6.- V. BEKHTEREV	4.9	0.6	0.6	2.9
7.- A. BANDURA	3.3	2.4	2.2	2.5
8.- J. BRUNER	2.5	3.0	2.9	2.8
9.- F. BRENTANO	0.1	2.9	3.9	2.6
10.- F. BARLETT	2.7	2.5	2.8	3.3
11.- K. BÜHLER	1.8	2.7	2.8	2.6
12.- J. CATTELL	2.6	1.4	1.1	3.7
13.- R. CATTELL	3.7	2.2	1.4	3.0
14.- E. CLAPAREDE	1.8	2.8	2.7	2.7
15.- L. DOLLARD	3.4	2.4	2.0	2.6
16.- J. DEWEY	2.6	3.3	2.6	2.4
17.- H. EBBINGHAUS	2.7	1.1	1.3	3.1
18.- E. ERIKSON	1.3	3.4	3.3	2.6
19.- C. EHRENFELS	1.1	4.0	2.9	2.6
20.- H. EYSENCK	4.1	2.1	1.6	3.4
21.- A. FREUD	0.5	3.3	2.0	1.2
22.- G. FECHNER	1.7	0.3	1.0	4.1
23.- S. FREUD	0.6	3.6	1.4	4.9
24.- E. FROMM	0.7	3.9	3.9	3.9
25.- F. GALTON	3.3	2.3	0.9	3.4
26.- K. GOLDSTEIN	1.7	4.8	4.5	2.8
27.- J. GUILFORD	4.2	3.3	1.7	3.2
28.- E. GUTHRIE	4.9	0.6	0.1	2.3
29.- H. HARTMANN	0.8	3.5	3.0	1.6
30.- K. HORNEY	0.9	3.7	3.3	2.6
31.- C. HULL	4.7	0.9	0.4	3.4
32.- G. HALL	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.8
33.- E. HOLT	4.2	1.3	0.3	1.5
34.- D. HEBB	4.1	2.3	1.4	3.1
35.- W. HUNTER	4.0	0.7	0.7	1.9
36.- W. JAMES	1.6	3.3	3.3	4.6
37.- C. JUNG	0.3	4.6	4.6	4.0
38.- O. KÜLPE	0.7	2.0	2.7	3.1
39.- W. KÖHLER	2.3	4.7	3.3	4.3
40.- M. KLEIN	0.6	3.6	2.0	1.2
41.- F. KRUEGER	1.2	4.2	3.2	2.0
42.- H. KELLEY	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.4
43.- E. KRETSCHMER	3.6	3.1	1.2	2.6
44.- K. KOFFKA	1.7	4.6	3.3	3.0
45.- K. LASHLEY	4.4	1.3	1.0	2.9
46.- A. LURIA	3.6	2.3	1.4	3.4

47.- B. LAING	0.7	4.3	3.8	2.0
48.- P. LERSCH	0.2	3.7	3.7	1.4
49.- K. LEWIN	1.9	4.7	3.0	4.1
50.- W. McDOUGALL	2.1	2.9	3.0	2.7
51.- G. MÜLLER	2.6	0.6	1.3	2.2
52.- H. MÜNSTERBERG	2.6	2.4	1.9	3.0
53.- A. MASLOW	1.0	4.1	4.3	3.3
54.- N. MILLER	4.1	1.0	1.3	2.9
55.- A. MEINONG	0.7	3.0	3.6	2.0
56.- C. OSGOOD	3.4	2.4	2.3	3.1
57.- I. PAVLOV	5.0	0.4	0.0	4.9
58.- J. PIAGET	2.3	3.0	2.7	4.6
59.- H. PIERON	3.7	2.0	1.7	3.0
60.- O. RANK	0.7	3.1	2.1	1.4
61.- C. ROGERS	0.7	4.6	4.9	3.6
62.- W. REICH	0.9	3.4	2.9	1.6
63.- W. STERN	1.5	3.8	4.0	2.6
64.- C. STUMPF	1.1	1.9	2.3	2.7
65.- I. SECHENOV	4.9	0.7	0.7	2.4
66.- E. SPRANGER	0.8	4.0	4.0	2.4
67.- C. SPEARMAN	3.7	2.6	1.6	3.6
68.- S. STEVENS	4.0	0.7	1.0	2.6
69.- B. SKINNER	5.0	0.6	0.4	4.6
70.- W. SHELDON	3.6	2.6	1.0	2.3
71.- H. SULLIVAN	1.6	3.7	3.0	2.6
72.- E. THORNDIKE	3.7	1.6	1.7	4.0
73.- E. TOLMAN	3.4	3.6	2.1	3.4
74.- D. TEPLOV	3.6	1.8	1.6	1.4
75.- H. THOMAE	1.4	3.7	4.2	2.3
76.- L. VIGOTSKI	3.0	2.8	2.5	2.7
77.- M. WERTHEIMER	1.4	4.9	3.6	4.0
78.- E. WEBER	1.8	0.4	1.0	2.9
79.- J. WATSON	5.0	0.5	0.0	4.6
80.- R. WOODWORTH	2.6	2.0	2.3	3.0
81.- A. WEISS	4.5	0.8	0.7	1.2
82.- W. WUNDT	0.7	0.3	1.7	4.6
83.- A. WELLEK	0.3	4.0	4.3	1.0

TABLE VI: CORRELATIONS AMONG THE SCALES

	S-O	E-H	P-A
S-O	x	-.68	-.74
E-H		x	-.15

TABLE II: CORRELATIONS AMONG JUDGES FOR THE SCALE SUBJECTIVISM-OBJECTIVISM

	BROZEK	HILLIX	KRAWIEC	HOSKOVEC	TRSTENJAK	MUSEK	PECJAK
BROZEK	1.00						
HILLIX	0.69	1.00	0.64	0.75	0.77	0.77	0.82
KRAWIEC	1.00	0.64	1.00	0.63	0.70	0.79	0.76
HOSKOVEC		0.63	1.00	1.00	0.73	0.72	0.69
TRSTENJAK				1.00	1.00	0.78	0.80
MUSEK						1.00	0.79
PECJAK							1.00

TABLE III: CORRELATIONS AMONG THE JUDGES FOR THE SCALE ELEMENTARISM-HOLISM

	BROZEK	HILLIX	KRAWIEC	HOSKOVEC	TRSTENJAK	MUSEK	PECJAK
BROZEK	1.00						
HILLIX	0.68	1.00	0.53	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.77
KRAWIEC	1.00	0.60	1.00	0.50	0.47	0.52	0.78
HOSKOVEC			1.00	1.00	0.61	0.74	0.56
TRSTENJAK					1.00	0.70	0.77
MUSEK						1.00	0.69
PECJAK							0.85
							1.00

TABLE IV: CORRELATIONS AMONG THE JUDGES FOR THE SCALE ACTIVITY-PASSIVITY

	BROZEK	HILLIX	KRAWIEC	HOSKOVEC	TRSTENJAK	MUSEK	PECJAK
BROZEK	1.00						
HILLIX	0.73	1.00	0.62	0.66	0.72	0.63	0.77
KRAWIEC	1.00	0.61	1.00	0.50	0.58	0.70	0.70
HOSKOVEC			1.00	1.00	0.58	0.55	0.57
TRSTENJAK					1.00	0.56	0.67
MUSEK						1.00	0.71
PECJAK							0.68
							1.00

TABLE V: CORRELATIONS AMONG THE JUDGES FOR THE SCALE OF SIGNIFICANCE

	BROZEK	HILLIX	KRAWIEC	HOSKOVEC	TRSTENJAK	MUSEK	PECJAK
BROZEK	1.00						
HILLIX	0.68	1.00	0.33	0.55	0.64	0.59	0.50
KRAWIEC	1.00	0.56	1.00	0.44	0.61	0.70	0.58
HOSKOVEC			1.00	1.00	0.15	0.50	0.47
TRSTENJAK					1.00	0.55	0.23
MUSEK						1.00	0.27
PECJAK							0.57
							1.00

DISCUSSION

The agreement among the judges about the characteristics and significance of the great psychologists' psychology is generally moderately high. It varies much from pair to pair (though it was expected that the American judges would correlate higher among themselves than with the Europeans, no such clusters were found) and from scale to scale.

The coefficients of correlation are the highest for the scale subjectivism-objectivism (from .53 to .82, the average .72). Followed by elementarism-holism (from .47 to .85, the average .67) and passivity-activity (.37 to .77, the average .63). Though these correlations are statistically significant, they mean that the influence of the subjective opinion is almost equal (52 per cent, 45 per cent, 40 per cent) to the influence of the judged psychologists' psychology. Since the judges are professors of the history of psychology, one should expect higher agreement among them.

The coefficients of correlation between the judges are the lowest for the scale of significance, what is understandable, since the judges' ratings reflect their own psychological orientation. They also used different criteria of significance.

The ratings on all the four scales are more homogeneous for the individuals who are high as well as for those rated very low on the scale of "significance" than for individuals with intermediate ratings of significance. The average standard deviations of the ratings of the 16 individuals who were rated high on the scale of "significance", of those who were intermediary, of the 15 who were rated lowest were 0.74, 1.15, and 0.81, respectively.

In the group of the most significant psychologists there are: PAVLOV (1.5 rank), FREUD (1.5), PIAGET (5), WATSON (5), WUNDT (5), SKINNER (5), JAMES (5), KÖHLER (8.5), BINET (8.5), FECHNER (10.5), LEWIN (10.5), WERTHEIMER (13), THORNDIKE (13), JUNG (13), FROMM (15.5), and ALLPORT (15.5). Most of them are the pioneers of the main psychological approaches and they are the most often cited and mentioned in psychological literature (specially in books on history of psychology). It means that the first 16 ranks are given to the most familiar psychologists. It could be the reason for greater homogeneity of the ratings.

But the homogeneity of the marks for the group of the least significant psychologists is less understandable. This group includes: KRUEGER (70), LAING (70), MEINONG (70), HUNTER (72), BINSWANGER (73), HARTMANN (75), REICH (75), RANK (77), TEPUOV (78.5), LERSCH (78.5), KLEIN (80), WEISS (81.5), A. FREUD (81.5), and WELLEK (83). Most of them are not founders of original schools, but continuators or modifiers (e.g. neoanalysts and neobehaviorists). Some are known as radical changers (e.g. LAING, REICH) and many are not much known even by professors of the history of psychology (the judges sometimes added the question mark (?) to their name).

The first three scales significantly correlate among themselves, i.e., they are not entirely independent.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALLPORT, G.W. & BRUNER, J.S.: "Fifty years of change in American psychology". *Psychological Bulletin*, 1937, 40.
- AMSBACHER, H.L.: "On the origin of holism". *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 1971, 17.
- COAN, R.W.: "Dimensions of psychological theories". *American Psychologist*, 1968, 10.
- MURRAY, H.A.: *Explorations in personality*. New York. Oxford University Press, 1938.
- WATSON, R.I.: "Psychology: A prescriptive science". *American Psychologist*, 1967, 22.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES OF WORK AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY IN SPAIN

JOSE MARIA PEIRO⁽¹⁾
Department of Psychology
University of Valencia, Spain

1. THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL FRAMEWORK

An adequate understanding of the recent developments of work and organizational psychology in Spain needs some reference to the economical, political and social factors and changes experienced throughout the last decades.

The Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) led to a dictatorial regime under the leadership of General Franco which lasted until 1975. Many years had to pass before the beginning of an economical and industrial development and a progressive recovery of scientific activities at the Universities. The increase of the standard of living as in other european countries, was an important factor which contributed to the modification of the spanish social structure, building up a wide middle class lacking in its previous history.

The beginning of a democratic regime, after Franco's death (1975) was supported by a great majority of the spaniards and the resistance created by extremist groups at both extremes. Anyway, during this last decade spanish society appears as a modern and democratic society in the mediterranean area, with a very prestigious Crown, two very large political parties, and carrying on an administrative

⁽¹⁾ Dr. JOSE MARIA PEIRO, Department of General Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, University of Valencia.