

1938

A Technique for Inter-Translating Psychological Theories

Joseph C. Trainor
Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/cepsfac>



Part of the [Educational Psychology Commons](#), and the [Theory and Philosophy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Trainor, J. C. (1935). A Technique for Inter-Translating Psychological Theories. In H. Baugh (Ed.), *General semantics: papers from the first American Congress for General Semantics* (pp. 50-51). Arrow Editions.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Education and Professional Studies at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Faculty Scholarship for the College of Education and Professional Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@cwu.edu.

would mean eliminating them, which, in turn, would mean a stable and peaceful society. General Semantics points the way to the education method necessary to the achievement of this end.

A TECHNIQUE FOR INTER-TRANSLATING PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORIES*

By Joseph C. Trainor

Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg

(Condensed)

The present situation in psychology is a strange mixture of paradox, dilemma and confusion, with many self-confident schools of thought in the field, each somewhat antagonistic to the others. The history of other sciences reveals that these are the growing pains out of which there will emerge the matured science. Meanwhile, the squabbles and the confusion are here and we must do something about them.

Three possibilities present themselves: (1) Dismiss the whole argument by saying that human behavior is so varied that we can use all the theories. This is not satisfying: we cannot synthesize elements from conflicting theories and have a coherent system as the result. (2) Analyze each theory in terms of its basic postulates; utilize the known techniques of mathematical philosophy and symbolic logic and other pertinent subjects, and derive a clear-cut statement of each field or theory of human behavior. This very much needs to be done, and would reveal to the wrangling theorists the reason for their disagreements; but its limitation is that, with the superstructure removed from their theories, they would not be able to talk to one another. (3) Attempt to devise a technique of inter-translating theories as found, granting each the assumptions it requires and allowing it to manufacture the terms it chooses. A tentative device for serving the purpose of this method is here attempted.

A hierarchy of levels of structural complexity is assumed, with the following finite number of levels: 1. The sub-atomic; 2. The atomic; 3. Molecular, microscopic; 4. Macroscopically-observable point-events; 5. Descriptive names for point-events; 6. Names for groups or sequences of point-events; 7. Types of such sequences; 8. Class names for these types of sequences; 9. Types or kinds of classes; 10. Groups or patterns of classes of sequences of point-events ("elements"); 11. Types or kinds of evaluations of level 10; 12. Groups of patterns of elementalistic concepts; 13. Evaluations of level 12; 14. More-general classifications.

Terms used in the different theories characteristic of the various schools are then assigned arbitrarily SINGLE values for the argument, and in accordance with such values are assigned to positions on the assumed scale. From the theory of General Semantics we borrow the valuable observation that as we progress to the higher levels of abstraction the certainties of the concept become less and less, and, further, the range of application of the particular concept becomes less and less also. With these assumed and operational techniques we are left with a diagrammatic representation of the verbal tools of different psychologists, and our problem becomes one of translating the term used by one into the term used by another which is to be found at the same level of abstraction in the hierarchy.

The following points should be noted: (1) The hierarchy was arbitrarily chosen;

* Read at the Ellensburg Congress, 1935.

any other logically consistent hierarchy could have been chosen. (2) The scale was one-dimensional; an examination of the concepts in vogue would suggest that a multi-dimensional set of relationships should be represented to give a method of inter-translation which would have wider applicability. (3) The terms used were for the purposes of this discussion used in SINGLE-valued meanings. Actually they are multi-ordinal and infinite-valued; with many meanings and belonging on many different levels. A more general treatment allowing the terms to slide up and down the scale may be possible of construction. (4) There may be possible a general treatment of the problem involved, in terms of the mathematics of probabilities, which would yield a general technique applicable to other fields of knowledge as well.

SEMANTICS AND PRAGMATISM*

By C. E. Rugh
University of California

This paper aims merely to make some practical suggestions to educators who have discovered that we are living and must live in a new age and at the same time must live with and must work with persons who have not discovered this or are unwilling to try to face the consequences of trying to meet the new conditions.

In 1902 in the Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology (Baldwin), President Wheeler defined semantics as follows: "The systematic discussion of the history and development of changes in the meanings of words. The value of a word at any time is determined solely by its power to convey meaning in a speech-community. What is called the etymology of a word serves only to help explain how a present meaning came to be what it is. Changes of meaning are in general brought about through the interplay of the normal and the occasional or special uses of a word. When the occasional entirely displaces the normal then the change is complete".

These statements express the common linguistic point of view and attitude. It employs the persisting superstitions that "words convey meaning" and that meaning just happens to words and must be respected. Semantics has the problem of clearing up these propositions so that they correspond to the facts or showing that they must be abandoned.

If semantics is to become a science in the modern sense, it has other obligations than treating the history of the changes of meanings. Two such additional duties are evident: (1) it must invent accurate and adequate ways and means of creating new meanings for old terms, and (2) of creating new terms for radically new meanings. This paper aims to suggest a pragmatic way of performing this first obligation. Because of the very nature of language, these new meanings must be distinguished from the former meanings. To do this the following technology has been used in Theory of Education.

Suggestions for Creating a Glossary for the Theory of Education

I Etymology and other historical facts.

President Wheeler says, "What is called the etymology of a word serves only to

* Read at the Ellensburg Congress, 1935.