

June 17th

The 28th International Human Science Research Conference
Molde University College, Molde, Norway

Oral Presentation

On multiple ways of living with the multiplicity of multiple psychologies

Akihiro YOSHIDA, Ph.D.

Professor of Shukutoku University, Chiba, Japan
Professor Emeritus of the University of Tokyo, Japan
e-mail address: yoshida@soc.shukutoku.ac.jp

Foreword

I have a personal history of wandering/roaming through relatively many varieties of psychologies for these 52 years from 1957 to the present, i.e., 2009. A part of the personal history has already been narrated and published on the *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology* (Yoshida, 2001), in which the focus was given on the possible meanings of fiction in the science of psychology. This time, here and now, let me first attempt to explicate the motives and values behind the series of the transitions in my wandering. Then I will attempt to present the insights I have obtained from the experiences of transitions through and among the multiple psychologies. Next, I will consider the multiple ways of living with the multiplicity of psychologies, based upon the insights obtained from my personal life and also upon those obtained from authors who have written on the relevant issues. Finally, I will propose the possible roles/functions the Phenomenological Psychology should play to contribute to create a cosmos out of the chaos in the present world of Psychology.

A reflection on the motives and values that activated and governed my wandering journey: A 2009 version.

Let me first take up my personal wandering journey through a little part of the world of Psychology, experiencing a variety of psychologies, as a typical example of series of transitions that are quite often observed among the students in this world. The spots of transitions in my journey were: 1. Mathematical Psychology (MP), 2. Soviet Rubinsteinian Psychology (SRP), 3. Cognitive Psychology (CP), 4. Folklore Psychology of Master Teachers (FPMT) 5. Phenomenological Psychology (PhP).

Let me attempt to explicate reflectively the motives and values that activated and governed these transitions of mine. I will attempt to imagine the lived-experiences I had at the time of the transitions, and I would ask myself the Why-question (Yoshida, 1992): "Why did I do that?", which would imply some other related questions such as "What did I experience, when I did that?", "What did I *perfin*k ("perceive, feel and/or think" a la J.S. Bruner), when I did that?", "What motivated me to do that, when I did that.?" and/or "What my personal values moved me to do that, when I did that?". I have written up a more detailed version of the narrative of the

experiential history on my journey. However, the narrative turned out to be too long to be orally presented here, therefore it had to be omitted entirely from this presentation. Metaphorically, only the skeleton of the narrative will be presented as follows.

1. *Mathematical psychology (MP)*. Why did I choose MP as my specialty? I had been relatively good at Mathematics up to that time. I wished to fully develop my potential mathematical talent. I was encouraged to perceive MP as the frontiers of psychology conceived as developing linearly upward as a unified science. I was flattered by my seniors to join their newly developing research activities. I perceived that I might possibly be able to achieve excellence in MP, if I chose that specialty. I was too easily and naively convinced that psychology would be developing just as a natural science, because of my previous background in natural sciences. The atmosphere in Japan as I then perceived was favorable to new American positivistic psychology, as distinguishable, to be known only later in my personal history, from German, French and/or Soviet psychologies. MP was admired as the most recently developed approach in Psychology. As an ignorant novice in the field, I was unable to choose on my own but had to accept what was recommended as good and hopeful, by my trustworthy seniors, and, in addition, even as the most recently advanced as the cutting edge. Why did I leave the mathematical psychology, in spite of the fact that I was making progress in MP quite successfully? Perhaps, I became keenly aware of the serious epistemological problems of MP. I was disillusioned by the meanings of the possible achievements in MP, particularly by the "*principle of parsimony*" as the foundation of "Factor Analysis" in MP and the unconvincing arguments on validity issues in MP. I considered the real possibility of leaving even the entire field of Psychology as I knew it then. I was wandered out from MP into Soviet Rubinsteinian Psychology.
2. *Soviet Rubinsteinian Psychology (SRP)* Why did I choose SRP as my specialty? My trusted mentor, whom I respected for his personality and wisdom in Psychology, advised me and encouraged me to do so. I sensed the richness in SRP that I never before encountered elsewhere. I had the excitement of exploring the new Continent, so to speak, of SRP. Soviet Psychology was then considered by common people as somewhat dangerous for its association with Communism, which activated in me the spirit of a frontier to explore the dangerous terrain. Leaving the group of friends in MP brought me a new group of friends attracted by SRP. We translated "Foundations of General Psychology" by Rubinstein into Japanese and published (1981-86). *I learned that changing one's specialty inevitably means changing one's group of friends*. New kind of talents previously unnecessary, --- such as the abilities of reading German/Russian and of understanding philosophical arguments, --- became indispensable to invigorate new active interests. Philosophical arguments in Dialectical Materialism was convincing to an ignorant novice, naturally one among naïve realists, especially regarding ontology and epistemology.
3. *Cognitive Psychology (CP)* Why did I choose Piagetian Psychology as my specialty? My mentor, who recommended Rubinstein to me and who was fluent in French as well as in English and in German, recommended Piaget to me also. He was the introducer into Japan of the books by young Piaget in the early 1930s, such as "The Worldviews of Children". SRP also evaluated Piagetian Psychology highly. Simultaneously, the Piagetian Psychology was attracting much attention in the US then, especially after the publication of J.S. Bruner's "*The Process of Education*" (1960). Everything, all in all, affected me. While Neo-behaviorism

was still domineering in the US at that time, as I recall it, I was very much attracted to newly developing CPs of J.S.Bruner and D.P.Ausubel, the latter being my academic adviser for a while. I familiarized myself also with Cybernetics of Dr. W. Ross Ashby along with Information and System theories, with my mathematical talents being called back substantially, because the Piagetian Psychology used the mathematical Group theory and Ashby's Cybernetics used Set Theory extensively. *Isomorphism* and *Homomorphism* were the central ideas in Cybernetics. Therefore, I even attempted to reinforce my mathematical trainings in Illinois. CPs were not in serious conflicts with SRP. For instance, both Bruner and Ausubel highly evaluated Vygotsky, however, SRP were just unknown in the U.S., with no English translation available at that time. All of them harmoniously inhabited within my little lived-world. I believed around at that time that I had prepared the foundation of knowledge for researching education in practice for the coming years.

4. *Folklore Psychology of Master Teachers (FPMT)* With much expectation to contribute to educational practices with my kinds of psychologies, I jumped into the pond of practicing teachers led by a prominent Japanese master teacher. Soon, I had to discover that my kinds of psychologies did not work, or more accurately speaking, they did not provide what the master teacher needed. Teachers with the master teacher were studying teaching-learning activities and teaching materials for the purpose of enriching their own teaching practices. I realized I had not been prepared to able to analyze their teaching practices so rich in concrete details. After a while, I began anew to learn from the teachers what they are doing in everyday teaching practices. As regard to psychology, theirs might be called as FPMT, never in any pejorative sense. The teachers were seeking to discover lively vivid psychological insights out of the lived meanings of teacher's and children's worlds and actions. They were studying the meanings of the teaching materials, such as understanding a mathematical concept, enjoying a literary works of art, drawing pictures, singing songs, reading poems, running and jumping and so on. I was unable to find the way to relate them to my kinds of psychologies beyond explaining what we observed by applying and using the psychological technical terms, i.e., jargons, familiar and known to me. I was aware that my comments were only stroking the surface of the matter. Teachers were "greedily" learning from everything available. They were learning how to teach and learn, particularly from reading literary works of art. Psychologies aside, I also began to learn "greedily" from what they were doing. I again was disillusioned by the lack of power and relevance of my preceding psychological knowledge and trainings. I searched for everywhere to seek helps even as a hint from any academic discipline whatsoever. I encountered Phenomenological Psychopathology, then Phenomenology and finally Phenomenological Psychology.
5. *Phenomenological Psychology (PhP)*. Why did I choose *PhP* as my specialty?

Why have I continued to stay with it for 34 years after my first encounter with it in 1975 ? I was then searching for something that would enable me to become helpful to and to convince myself of the meanings for my working with the respectful practicing teachers who were sincerely expecting me to be so. I almost randomly searched for everywhere, including psychiatry, marshal art secrets, Noh players' secrets, artists' writing on their skills, literary works of art, literary critics' writings and so on. I was perhaps already sensing some possibilities hidden in the insights from the writings recorded from the first person perspective. Finally, I encountered, on my own, Phenomenological Psychopathology of

Mieko KAMIYA, and then Koichi OGINO and others. I felt that the gate to a new world was finally open to me. Soon, I moved to study Husserl's *Experience and Judgment* and Merleau-Ponty's *Phenomenology of Perception*. I was delightfully surprised to find that Husserl was originally a mathematician and also that his important idea of the *Free Imaginative Variation* originates from mathematics, which I had learned as a high school student from Polya's little book (1945/1954). I later encountered the little books of : van den Berg, Ernest Keen and Amedeo Giorgi. Soon, I familiarized myself with the works of many authors such as Max van Manen, Bernd Jager, Paul Ricoeur, Alfred Schutz, Roman Ingarden and so on. I became confident that I finally discovered the rich fertile land of PhP which I had long been looking for as a psychologist. I felt that I should explore the land intensively. I found a wealth of insights that enable me to help practicing teachers and learning children in education, which refreshingly blew my anxieties away regarding powerlessness and helplessness of my own previous kinds of psychologies. The heartily welcome of friendly teachers on my transformation and my transmigration into PhP world encouraged me to pursue still further. The new world of PhP has gradually but steadily become my own world. I found many new friends in PhP not only in Japan but also in all over the world through Duquesne University and IHSRC. I no longer mind whether I am among the majority or the minority in the world of Psychology. Even if I were in a minority, I would be so with pride, hope and delight. I would not pursue popularity, even though I would not refuse it. I have become far more deeply and richly conscious of my own psychological world than before. The possibility of the First Person Psychology (FPP), which had long been a taboo and a blind spot in the field, has now come to look as a real possibility. I can see the great fertile land now open in front of us all. Perhaps, what makes and keeps me most satisfied with phenomenological psychology is that it enables me to remain honest and sincere to what I believe. I can feel that I am permitted even doubt and question myself and also what I am doing, if necessary, and yet to remain still in and with Phenomenological Psychology, which situation differs, I am convinced, from those in other psychologies I have known of.

In sum, 1) With the background of my naïve faith in natural sciences, I was initiated into MP. 2) With the fundamental belief in the naïve realism, I was disillusioned with MP and entered the world of SRP. 3) While being attracted to the American openness, the new possibility of the emerging CP protesting against then dominating neo-behaviorism caught and drawn me into excitement. 4) The robustness and flexibility of practicing master teachers confronting the difficulties of real life, which challenged them as teachers, inspired the yearning for understanding their mind as FPMT. 5) As if parallel to FPMT, the world of PhP, along with Phenomenological Psychopathology and Phenomenology itself, has finally become accessible to me as a wanderer, as the motherland where I can breathe a free and fresh air, where I can swim freely in clean spring water, to allow me grow as I wish, while enabling me to pursue what I would really like to pursue in and with my life.

Some of the insights obtained from the self-reflections upon the course of my wandering personal history in psychology

Now, I would like to describe some of the insights I have accumulated along with my self-reflections on the course of my wandering personal history in psychology. If I were asked

about the method for doing this, I might wish to refer to the David Bakan's "a 'miniature' investigation" method (Bakan, 1974, 94-112). The method is, as he puts it, "the use of the psychoanalytic method (the objective of which is therapy) with the objective of the classical introspectionists (the acquisition of knowledge)" (102). Allow me only cite the rationale of the method Bakan succinctly and proudly claims: "...psychologists can make a major contribution to society not only by rendering to society established truths, but also rendering established possible with respect to psychological dynamics. In the matter of prediction and control of human behavior, a knowledge of what an individual might possibly do, or possibly feel, or possibly think, places us well on the way toward the achievement of our objective. Given a detailed knowledge concerning the possible, we can act in such a fashion as to discourage some from becoming actualities, and to encourage others into becoming actualities. The pragmatic usefulness of knowledge of possible extends from the clinical situation to world affairs."(112). Some of the insights obtained from my use of a "miniature" investigation method are as follows:

1. There are multiple varieties of psychologies in the world of psychologies, the totality of which would be impossible for any single person to specialize or even to know thoroughly in his/her limited life time.
2. No single person will, within her/his lifetime, ever be able to know the whole domain of modern psychologies, much less the entire world of human knowledge.
3. The impossibility for a single person to cover the whole domain of psychologies absolutely necessitates the cooperative works among people toward the integration of psychologies, if such integration were ever desired.
4. Faced with the multiplicity of psychologies, an ignorant novice student in the field would seem to have no other way than to choose one, anyone, out of the multiple psychologies quite "by chance" or "by fate", but possibly not with careful consideration "of necessity".
5. Even though the choice by a novice could be characterized as "by chance", being seen from the perspective of the novice student, the choice would have his/her own understandable-----far more than "by chance"----- reasons. The choice is made in the context of his/her lived world. As an example case, my choice of MP (Mathematical Psychology) seems to have been based upon multiple reasons: 1) With my academic background of previously aspiring to be a mathematician, the MP was perceived as within my attainable reach. 2) The perspectives of many seniors then influential to me as a novice, that MP was the cutting edge of newly developing American psychology, which was rapidly overcoming the traditional "obsolete" German Gestalt psychology. 3) The perception that I was perceived as mathematically talented by many of my teachers and seniors, to suit to be specialized in MP. Being young, I was naturally too flattered to resist the tempting invitation to join them. 4) The perception that many psychologists were rushing to join to get on the "Band Wagon" of MP, which encouraged me also merrily to get on and join together. 5) Under the circumstances, I seemed to have perceived that the choice of MP would assure me of my life career in Psychology. Simply put, I perceived that I will have no difficulty to get an academically sustainable job if specialized in MP. 6) The perception that background of MP, the victorious US culture in general, with its victory of the World War II, looked much more attractive to many young Japanese people, including me as a novice and survivor of the WW II, with its prospective dominance over the World Psychology in the future. Many more could further be enumerated, but these reasons would seem sufficient to convince me that my choice of

MP was not simply “by chance” and that the choice was irresistible then for an ignorant novice under the given situations.

6. An ignorant novice necessarily has to follow the advice by the knowledgeable in his lived neighborhood. S/he has no other choice, because s/he knows nothing about the science. Here, with his first choice, his or her luck, whether good or bad, comes in.
7. Until s/he acquires his/her intellectual independence and confidence in the field, a junior novice will normally tend to follow the advices by his/her seniors, based proportionally upon how much these seniors are perceived by him/her as dependable and trustworthy. Of course, s/he could be contrary by his/her nature to choose on his own against the advices by the seniors, which, however, will result and be reflected in his/her fate, whether good or bad.
8. A young novice will tend to accept a psychology which s/he perceives to be advantageous /helpful to promote her or his career in the future.
9. A young novice tends to accept a psychology which s/he perceives to enable her/him to develop and exhibit her/his potential talents in the future to her/his advantage/ benefit.
10. A junior who look into the future will tend to accept a psychology which s/he perceives has the potential to develop to achieve popularity and power in the future world of psychologies.
11. The following possibility should not be excluded: the possibility that a transfer, by a certain kind of noble people, could be activated entirely by non-ego-centric and/or non-egoistic motives to devote oneself for the great causes such as the welfare of the human kind and/or the mission for the pursuit of the truth, or even for the greater causes of the universe.
12. A senior who look into the future will attempt to recruit, to guide and/or to invite juniors to follow after her/him, at least partly motivated, whether consciously or not, to make her/his own popularity and power in the field of the world psychologies in the future.
13. Since a young novice inevitably has made his/her first choice “by chance” or “by fate”, with good or bad luck, under the very situation of the multiplicity of multiple psychologies, s/he has every opportunity to be disillusioned later with his first choice. The disillusionment will be the result of “mismatch” between the progressively and increasingly revealed nature of the particular psychology s/he had chosen and his/her individually willed deeply-rooted meanings of life and desires: such as truth, wealth, mental health, well-fare, fame, status, power and so on.
14. With the particular psychology s/he had first chosen “by chance” or “by fate”, each psychology student, sooner or later, would be destined to experience disillusionment, more or less. However, whether or not s/he leaves the particular psychology, because of the disillusionment, would depend upon many reasons: perhaps including the strength of his/her already formed commitment to it, the strength of his/her personal ties with those who are associated with it, his remaining energy to start anew all over again, the perceived length of remaining years in his/her life, the psychological distances, the perceived similarities and differences, of the attractive neighbor’s family garden, metaphorically, from the present garden of one’s own family residence. For example, I was at the age of 40 when I began to consider transferring from Cognitive Psychology to Phenomenological Psychology. Many Japanese friends of mine, doubtlessly out of their goodwill, advised me then to refrain from making such a transfer anew at my age. However, I recklessly made it nevertheless, while believing in the abstract naïve idea of pure academic freedom. A professor having been employed for his/her specialty in behaviorism, for instance, will usually have difficulty to

change his specialty to phenomenology without causing many socially difficult troubles around him/her.

15. Transfer from one psychological school to another could recur as long as s/he could experience the kind of disillusion and repulsion with the presently belonging school, on the one hand, and the kind of attraction to the newly encountered one, on the other. The nature of the disillusion and the attraction will vary in relation to his/her willed deeply-rooted meanings of life and desires; such as truth, wealth, mental health, well-fare, fame, status, power and so on. The desires mentioned above could naturally vary as the context of the person changes, such as the time and the space, the period and the society/culture changes. For example, in Japan, the social and cultural context drastically changed before and after the WW II. Dominating culture in psychology explicitly changed from German to American.
16. The meanings of the transferring experiences will differentially be understood/ interpreted as the contextual situations change. For example, a transfer from CP to PhP would have been understood/ interpreted as one of transfer from "scientific" to "philosophical", from "objective" to "subjective", from "mainstream/ major" to "distributary/ minor", from "newly fashioned" to "old fashioned", from "quantitative" to "qualitative", from "American" to "German", from "progressive" to "conservative", from "democratic" to "authoritative", and so on. I once heard a comment by an American Cognitive Psychologist on Phenomenological Psychology: "It is authoritative because, like little gods, Husserl, Merleau-Ponty, and so on are uncritically being worshiped and bowed down by phenomenological psychologists."
17. With regard to a possible transfer from one school to another, people would experience the conflict between the willingness to transfer and the resistance to do so. Everybody naturally has both progressive tendencies and conservative ones, for instance. Therefore, some hesitancy, under the situation, is universally common.
18. A psychologist in a free democratic society can independently choose and decide whether or not s/he remains with the particular school of psychology to which s/he presently belongs. S/he can remain with the psychology of his first choice for life or can choose to wander through psychologies. An old friend of mine had remained contentedly as a neo-behaviorist of Hullian school through his life even around 2000.
19. A personal choice among academic schools is not necessarily confined to the level of a purely academic matter, but it always accompanies with it some socio-economical, political, cultural, historical implications, whether or not intended to be so. This point might be obvious, but it must be explicitly stated at least once.
20. A transfer from one school to another necessarily changes the group of people being associated with. Just think of the academic associations to which the person wishes to belong. It could happen that friend today may become an enemy tomorrow and vice versa.
21. The accumulation of psychological knowledge to be absorbed and systematized into the "Psychology" has not necessarily been the case. Viewed from my own perspective, a huge quantity of energies and papers has been wasted and are being wasted even now, without leaving any solid foundations to build a skyscraper of psychological knowledge. It is sufficient to recall many of neo-behavioristic psychological researches, which are no longer consulted by anybody in the world and simply piled in the libraries and had disappeared from the scene today. Many research papers were, are and will be disappearing in the similar manner in vain from the scene, with no prospect of returning to the scene in the

future.

22. The newer is not necessarily better than the older. I recall a persuasive epigram by Schopenhauer to the same effect. And I am convinced of it now.
23. The later/recent development is not necessarily more advanced and richer in its meanings than the earlier/old one.
24. The popularity of any psychological schools changes as time goes on and as the places change, i.e. as the context changes. The least popular school of psychologies here and now may become the most popular there and/or in the future.
25. The popularity of a psychological school does not assure it of its truth. A most popular school may turn out to be false and may consequently become most unpopular in the future. However, any school may have a grain of truth, nevertheless.
26. The truth in psychology is not necessarily only one. There can be many truths not necessarily compatible to each other.
27. The deepest psychological insights of today can remain the least popular among the populace being satisfied with shallow psychological insights, and can become the most popular among the populace with deeper insights tomorrow. The same applies to places, cultures, societies and historical periods. How could Freud and Nietzsche, for instance, have been popular among the psychological populace in the US under the hegemony of Watsonian behaviorism. Naturally, and interesting enough, the value judgments regarding the depth of any insights will also differ according to the schools of psychologies.
28. The quality of the popular psychology reveals the quality of the training/education of the populace who support the popular one. The replacement of the poorer psychological school by the richer one requires the enhancement of the quality of psychological education/training of the people/populace that is expected to support the richer in the future. Thus the value of dissemination activities to enrich psychological culture of the populace should not be underestimated.
29. Every school of psychology has its own way of evaluating doing psychology, including its own, regardless of whether implicit or explicit.
30. Every school of psychology has, so long as it sustains its existence, its own defenses and attacks, its supporters and critiques, its friends and enemies. And every school has its own ways of evaluating, supporting and criticizing other schools, whether with friendliness or with hostility.
31. Any novice cannot know the details of the long histories of battles among the schools of psychology, even the history of the particular psychology s/he has chosen "by chance" or "by fate". It is as if s/he has been born into the particular psychology, rather than as if s/he has deliberately and voluntarily chosen it to live in. A child never chooses to be born to a particular family, but is born into it "by chance" or "by fate". The same would apply to a novice person's birth into a particular school of psychology.
32. Every school of psychology has its own methodology, along with its own ontology and epistemology of mind, experience and behavior, regardless of whether implicit or explicit and whether conscious or unconscious.

And so on and so on ... ad infinitum.

We could continue any further if we wish. However, at this point, let me state a little semi-conclusive observation to allow me to move to the next step in this consideration.

33. Under the circumstances described in 1-32, and possibly even more, the problem of choosing, transferring to/from and/or settling down on a psychology among the once-existed, now-disappearing, now-existing, now appearing, somewhere-existing multiple psychologies raises *an ever vexing problem for a psychologist* in his/her life, regardless of whether or not s/he squarely and consciously confronts with the problem, avoids and escape from any serious consideration of it, or negligently and ecstatically forget about it, or even letting oneself flow together with the majority in the mainstream of the period, culture, society or a group s/he belongs, and so on.

On the multiplicity of multiple psychologies

So far in this paper, I have described the multiplicity of psychologies, mainly based upon my own personal subjectively observed experiences, therefore as powerfully convincing to myself personally. Perhaps it may not necessarily be so convincing to you. However, on the multiplicity of psychologies, a more objectively observed, persuasive and convincing argument has been offered by Sigmund KOCH, who wrote:

"I am under no illusion that huge subcartels of the knowledge industry can be made to reorganize by rational suasion. I nevertheless propose that the essential noncohesiveness of the activities denoted by the term 'psychology' be acknowledged by replacing it with some such locution as the 'psychological studies'. Student should no longer be tricked by a terminological rhetoric into the belief that they are studying a single discipline or any set of specialties rendered coherent by any actual or potential principle of coherence. The current 'departments of psychology' should be called 'departments of psychological studies.' The change of name should mark corresponding change in pedagogical rationale. The psychological studies, if they are really to address the historically constituted objectives of psychological thought, must range over an immense and disorderly spectrum of human activity and experience. If significant knowledge is the desideratum, problems must be approached with humility, methods must be contextual and flexible, and anticipations of synoptic breakthroughs held in check. At the very least, students should not be encouraged to believe it their responsibility to put together the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle that their professors long ago gave up trying to solve---a puzzle which is insoluble in principle, and which has the strange property of becoming less solvable with each attempt to assemble the fragments."(Koch, S. 1999, 134-135)

Perhaps needless to mention, but the late Prof. Sigmund KOCH(1917-1996) was the well-known editor of the voluminous six volumes of "*Psychology: Study of a Science*". I would feel very much tempted to accept his advice obediently, and would thank him for alleviating the heavy burden, from my own little shoulder, of the self-imposed responsibility to "put together the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle". However, on the second thought, even if a novice student might be permitted to follow his advice, a vexing question may be raised as to how could the psychology professors, the psychologists as a whole and/or the psychology as a scientific discipline remain exempt from the responsibility. The responsibility refers to, in my mind, to guide their novice students in such ways as to protect from or guard against the fate of inevitably wandering for life in vain through the labyrinth of the chaotic world of psychologies. Incidentally, I must admit that I have wandered through only a small portion of the chaotic world of psychologies. In addition, a question may be raised: Could a so-called science of psychology remain

self-contentedly satisfied just by simply renaming itself as “psychological studies” and by assuming the false name of a Science?

Who is going to take the responsibility for overcoming these chaotic situations under the “false” name of Psychology?

The issue would take multiple meanings according to the perspectives of the person who squarely face it. A novice student may be allowed, following Prof. KOCH's advice, to concentrate upon studying just one of the psychologies s/he has chosen “by chance” or “by fate”. However, what about a professor who teaches in the Psychology department? What about a psychological theoretician who aspires to integrate and unify diverse psychologies toward a single science: proudly to be called as “Psychology”? Naturally, the issue would be viewed differently from the different perspectives. However, the distribution of the perspectives according to the roles and functions of the persons does not really solve the problem, it only defer the solution, because the problem still remains.

As a novice student ignorant of both the psychology and the academy, I have wandered through psychologies, as I wrote previously.

As a teacher, what should we tell the students who are unknowingly facing the chaotic world today of psychologies and are at a loss? I found an advice, surprising to me at the time of knowing it, by a highly respected Japanese clinical psychologist and a professor, Dr. Tokuji SHIMOYAMA(1919-), who wrote (translation from Japanese by YOSHIDA): “From the very beginning, I have always been strictly prohibiting my young students from becoming too early a psychological specialist of names with “-ian”, such as Sullivanian, Freudian, Jungian, Rogerian and so on. I am concerned about the following situation; that is, many of excellent young clinicians, to whom an old retiring clinician like me entrusts the future of the field, are seen to have become small scale specialists, to avoid from or to stop making efforts for, becoming generalists who are needed as true clinicians. As for psychotherapy, there exists no imposed one. Each individual has to endure the labors suitable to his/her caliber and, importantly, each should have his/her own psychotherapy [“Jeder hat seine Psychotherapie.”]. It needs a long way of journey. Students of my group are centered around the clinical psychology, but I am allowing all of my students to choose to do freely whatever they want to. Accordingly, some take educational analysis of psychoanalysis, some are specialized in behavior therapy, some others are specialized in Gestalt therapy, Miniature-garden therapy, Drawing therapy, Music therapy, Dance therapy, Psychodrama, Naikan therapy, Morita therapy and so on. The atmosphere is really bustling. Criticisms are often directed against it as being devoid of the unified color of a single group. However, I am silently and favorably watching them now as living their “passing identity”. (Tokuji SHIMOYAMA, 1989, 150)

Let me hurry to add that Prof. SHIMOYAMA defines himself as having been “specialized in phenomenological anthropological psychopathology” and also that he has extensively published books on phenomenological psychopathology and is publicly well known in Japan today for his lucid Japanese translation, early in 1956, of “*Ein Psycholog Erlebt Das Konzentrationslager*” (translated as “*Night and Fog*”) by Viktor Frankle, being his personal friend.

Just a few remarks should be made. SHIMOYAMA's comments are limited within the domain of clinical psychology, in contrast to KOCH's observations being made on psychology in general, the issue remains essentially the same. Both recognize the multiplicity of psychologies

and take the chaotic situation for granted. SHIMOYAMA would positively allow his students to choose a single school of psychology out of many, "by chance" or "by fate", while viewing the identity of the student resulting from the choice as "passing identity". That means SHIMOYAMA views it necessary and even desirable for each student to travel through plural schools of psychotherapy in the life course in order to become a generalist, rather than a small-scale specialist, in the field of clinical psychology. This is because a generalist, rather than a small-scale specialist, is the one needed as the true clinician, from his perspective. SHIMOYAMA would favor and recommend the situation where each student starts with a single school of psychology, whatever it is, chosen "by chance" or "by fate" as a "passing identity", continues to journey on to experience multiple psychologies in succession finally to find out his own as "Jeder hat seine Psychotherapie", and still continue to develop as a generalist and to journey on until the end of his/her life as a clinician. Over the long period of time, in SHIMOYAMA's view, each student would be expected and recommended not to stay with his/her first choice too long but soon to begin to continue to move on journeying through multiple psychologies in the course of life, finally to find out a psychology suitable to his/her "caliber" based on the idea of "Jeder hat seine Psychotherapie". SHIMOYAMA inhibits himself to impose any psychological school on his students, even his own school of "Phenomenological Anthropological Psychopathology". Rather, he leaves his students free to choose on his/her own, on his/her responsibility. In case a student should choose a school antagonistic to his own, he would still accept and approve the choice warmly and encouragingly, viewing the choosing as "passing identity".

What SHIMOYAMA would inhibit the student is that the student too quickly settle down on his first choice and become a small-scale specialist. SHIMOYAMA would, after a while, encourage the student to begin journeying to the new psychologies, until s/he find the psychology suited to his/her caliber. SHIMOYAMA seems to be approving and positively accepting the multiplicity of multiple psychologies. The multiplicity enables the students to explore and discover the psychology suitable to their respective calibers.

Where has gone the very problem of integrating and unifying psychologies into "the Psychology"? SHIMOYAMA even seems to be convincingly approving the status quo of the chaotic world of psychologies. Students must choose his/her own psychologies on his own. Imposition will not help student develop better in the long run of the course of life. He encourages to explore the wider world of psychologies, not to impose or invite to his own psychology but to make it possible for each student to encounter a psychology suited to his caliber. From this perspective, the multiplicity of multiple psychologies would be positively and affirmatively valued as providing multiple possibilities for students to choose, rather than negatively viewed as chaotic, distracting and disastrous. The problem of the integrative unification of psychologies into a single discipline, would seem to have completely vanished. If the integration and unification should occur, it should occur in the individual lived world of a generalist clinician and of a generalist psychologist, so he seems to be implying.

In the context of "*Theories of Personality*", Hall & Lindzey (1957) were discussing: 1) the first issue of the possibility of creating a unified "uniquely powerful theory" of personality in contrast to the coexistence of multiple theories of personality, and 2) the second issue of a novice student who must choose a theory while facing with the multiplicity of personality theories. Both issues can be interpreted, if I may say, as essentially the same and homo-morphic in its

structure, on the one hand, with those in psychology in general by S.KOCH and, on the other, with those in clinical psychology by SHIMOYAMA.

HALL & LINDZEY's views were elaborated in the last chapter "Personality Theory in Perspective". On the first issue of creating "a uniquely powerful theory", they prepared a section titled as "Theoretical Synthesis versus Theoretical Multiplicity". They raise the question: "Would it not be better to provide a single viewpoint which incorporated all that was good and effective from each of these theories so that we could then embrace a single theory which would be accepted by all investigators working in this area?"(554). The uniquely powerful theory would be combining individual strengths of all existing theories to be more comprehensive and verifiable than any presently existing single theory. They admit that the line of reasoning is intriguing, but enumerate a number of serious objections to it. They express their strong conviction that "this is not the appropriate time or circumstance for an attempted synthesis or integration"(557) and that "an amalgamation of existing theories" offers less hope for advance than almost any qualified theory. Impressive was their statement: "... theoretical formulation is a 'free enterprise'.... No theorist has the right to tell his fellow theorists their business."(553) It was 50 years ago when they wrote "this is not the appropriate time". After 50 years, it seems no better time yet, and we do not know when and how "the appropriate time" will come. Please, notice that they conceived the synthesis or integration only as "an amalgamation of existing theories". On the second issue of how a novice student should learn, they argue strongly against leading students to believe "there is only one useful theory,...". They ask the question of the psychology teachers to "Why should the student be given a false sense of harmony? Let him see the field as it really exist... different theorists making different assumptions about behavior, focusing upon different empirical problems, using different techniques for research"(556). Finally, they write: "Our general proposal to the student is that he first acquaint himself broadly with the field... Then let him immerse himself in one theory....Wallow in it, revel in it, absorb it, learn it thoroughly and think that it is the best possible way to conceive of behavior....After the romance is over and the student is seduced by the theory, he may set about the cold hard business of investigation in order to find out whether his theoretical marriage will withstand the ravages of reality."(557)

At this point, let me just give a short remark on the key words for the respective writers; for KOCH, an unsolvable "*jigsaw puzzle*", for SHIMOYAMA, "*passing identity*", and, for HALL & LINDZEY, "*amalgamation*" and "*marriage*". These key words give us the clues for revealing the perspectives each of them are adopting. In my interpretation, regarding the multiple psychologies: KOCH was viewing the outer horizon of multiple psychologies with the metaphor of a "jigsaw puzzle" from a longer distance; SHIMOYAMA was viewing the existential issues with the term "passing identity" from the temporal perspective of the life courses of the individuals studying them; HALL & LINDZEY were viewing, on the one hand, their inner horizon with "amalgamation" of multiple theories at a shorter distance, and on the other hand, also an existential problems with the metaphor of "marriage".

On multiple ways of living with the multiplicity of multiple psychologies

(a) The case of a psychology teacher.

Now that the multiplicity of multiple psychologies seems to have been unanimously recognized by authors and also by us, our next question should be how we should live with the

“chaotic” multiplicity. The answer would differ according to who is the person raising the question. A novice student, for instance, could already have been given good advices from SHIMOYAMA and HALL & LINDZEY.

In the following, I would like to consider, as a convinced phenomenological psychologist, how a psychology professor, as an educator of next generation of psychologists should face and live with the multiplicity and b) how a phenomenological psychological researcher/theoretician, as proudly responsible to create a cosmos out of the chaos, should live therewith. My speculative considerations here are not at all intended to be the dictation that should be followed, but, rather, only the development and elaboration of possibilities to be taken into consideration for the purpose of facilitating the development of the phenomenological psychology in particular and the Psychology in general.

I recall the secrets of teaching presented by the Japanese Master teacher Enosuke ASHIDA (1873-1951). He described three types of teachers: A) The first kind is the teacher who attempts to let students know by telling and preaching. B) The second kind is the teacher who narrates what s/he had been feeling along the road s/he had traversed, while behaving as if s/he him/her-self is enjoying his/her own narration. C) The third kind is the teacher who hits the vital points of his/her students to invite sounding and enjoys listening to the resounds emanating from the students. Putting his rationales aside, let me inform you, not to avoid playing the role of a teacher of the first kind just to save our time, that Ashida values the third C) as the best, the second B) as the next best sometimes inevitable when no other better way is available, and the first A) as the poorest and the worst, because it may kill the intrinsic interests of the students. You might recall the distinction of “Care”[Sorge, Besorge, Fuersorge] by M. Heidegger. Particularly noteworthy is the distinction between the “vorspringend befreiend Fuersorge”/(垂範的=解放的顧慮) which would correspond to B (and/or C), and the “einspringend beherrschend Fuersorge”/(尽力的=支配的顧慮), which would correspond to A. Also, I recall the saying by Tsuneo TAKEDA (1929-1986) to the effect that “to teach is not to teach”, and also that “to teach is to spare and spare, on one’s own responsibility, teaching what one would really like to teach”. These points above given in the secrets of teaching by ASHIDA correspond to SHIMOYAMA’s idea of “passing identity” behind leaving students free to choose, and perhaps also to HALL & LINDZEY’s idea of “theoretical marriage” to be individually tested later by the ravages of reality.

(b) The case of a psychological researcher/ theoretician

A psychological researcher/ theoretician could choose and take either absolutism or relativism. With the former, s/he would believe the psychology s/he adopts as the nearly absolute truth and all other else as, frankly speaking, false. With the latter, s/he would sincerely believe that there are many truths and that the psychology s/he adopts is just one truth among many other truths. Whichever the choice may be, s/he will have to struggle to persuade others, including psychologists, students and the populace, to believe and accept the psychology of her/his kind against others. Putting aside the politico-socio-economic elements involved in the persuasion, the psychologist will have to make her/his kind of psychology more convincing, attractive and persuasive to more people, so much as to sound as if her/his kind would be the only one worthwhile. This is the situation named by HALL & LINDZEY as a ‘free enterprise’ market. Our kind of psychology, Phenomenological Psychology is also a kind of psychology among many others. What contribution can it make to the students and the psychology teachers

struggling in their confrontation with the chaotic world of psychologies, while taking either absolutism or relativism.

The paradox and the dilemma inherent in the perspective of phenomenological psychologist facing the multiplicity of multiple psychologies

I am now contentedly a phenomenological psychologist. In other words, I am living contentedly within the world of phenomenological psychology and/or phenomenology. Because I am so, I have a vexing problem which I would believe I could share with you.

Living within a psychology, a school of psychology, is, it seems to me, very much like living within that particular world of psychology among "the many worlds" in "the multiple realities" (James, William. 1890/1981. 920), or within that "province of reality with finite meaning" (Schutz, Alfred. 1973.23-28), or within that "assumptive world" (Frank, Jerome.1991. 24), or, to extend a little further, within that particular "world hypothesis" (Pepper, Stephen.1-10) among others.

Now, the vexing problem for me is the following:

After a long personal history of wandering, I have arrived at PhP to feel it as my motherland finally discovered to settle down. How am I going to persuade other people, researchers, students and/or populace as well to accept my kind of Psychology, i.e., Phenomenological Psychology? Which of the following three, A, B or C, am I qualified to profess.

- A) Phenomenological Psychology is good.
- B) Phenomenological Psychology is better, better than any others I have known so far.
- C) Phenomenological Psychology is the best among the psychologies known to have existed up to the present on this earth and/or universe.

I notice that I can make the statement A comfortably with much confidence, and that I can also make the statement B with my confidence formed through my self-reflection over and through my personal wandering history. However, I become keenly aware that I cannot make the statement C, because I have not yet experienced and will not experience, in my limited life-time, the entirety of the existing psychologies. After having noticed this point, my confidence in the statement B begins to be endangered. Have I known and experienced every possible aspect of the psychologies I have known in every possible situation, space and time, with every possible person? Definitely "NO".

In addition, Phenomenological Psychology believes in the perspectivity of human knowledge, of human cognition. Then, how does this insight into the perspectivity relate to the statement A,B and C. As a would-be phenomenological psychologist at the least, I would be able to make these statements, if I add to each statement a phrase: "from my own present perspective", which would mean "as I believe it now". Therefore, simply put:

- 1) A phenomenological psychologist, if s/he is really and deeply convinced of the perspectivity of human knowledge, will not be able to make the final statement A, B, C. Notice, that psychologists with other orientations, neglecting and disregarding, or being ignorant of, the perspectivity, might and/or would ignorantly and arrogantly make the similar statements as A,B,C with regard to their own kinds of psychology. It may be out of their ignorance and arrogance perhaps, but they would do so nevertheless. To emphasize, a phenomenological psychologist should never do the same in principle, it seems to me.

- 2) However, under the politico-socio-economic circumstances described in items 1-33 above, a phenomenological psychologist will have difficulty in persuading the psychologists of other orientations into her/his own psychology, because those other psychologists already have strong faith in their own kinds of psychologies. Does the short-sighted ignorant arrogance necessarily defeat the well-sighted and long-sighted knowledgeable humble modesty, in the savage market of "free enterprise"?

Are there any possible effective ways for a phenomenological psychologist to persuade other psychologists of other psychologies into believing in what s/he believes in?

Are there any possible ways for phenomenological psychology to create the state of cosmos out of the chaos now observed in the world of psychologies?

The answer will depend upon the self-approved image of the phenomenological psychology itself.

- 1) PhP is just one school among many others, in the multiplicity of multiple psychologies. How should it then claim to integrate psychologies into the Psychology? Should not it remain satisfied with just remaining as one among many others?
- 2) PhP is the best of all known so far. How should this judgment then be known convincingly and persuasively to the majority of psychologists of many other orientations to be persuaded into the faith and the belief that PhP is the best. We should never forget that others are also attempting to claim the same to promote their own cause.
- 3) PhP is the best that will/shall govern the rest of all, in the future not near but not too far. The actualization of the future project full of dreams will involve politico-socio-economic struggle in the market of the "free enterprise", so that the future will not be assured at all. The success of the future project will not come of itself without necessary and sufficient efforts on the part of Phenomenological Psychologists.
- 4) PhP is the one that is expected to be able to take the responsibility of integrating the multiple psychologies which are believed to be now in the state of chaos.

I would believe now in 4) above. I would propose to enrich *the phenomenological psychology of multiple psychologies and psychologists*, in order to make it possible to facilitate the *mutual understanding among*, and consequently also the *integration of*, the multiple psychologies.

The chaos, from a different perspective, may not necessarily be totally denied and devoid of its value. The chaos could be the fertile soil necessary for bearing the fruits of human wisdom. A set of phenomenological psychologies of multiple psychologies may prove in the future the productivity of the chaos affirmatively, not negatively. The integration of psychologies may result not in a single authoritative psychology as the Psychology, but in the integrative system of multiple psychologies as they are, each independently actualizing its own strength while, viewed from the system-builder's perspective, complementing each other in such a way that the integrative system as a whole works most effectively in dealing with any human problems now needing solution. A garden of all tulips is as beautiful as a garden of many varieties of flowers, whether wild or grown.

I would like to post a public announcement, if I may:

Wanted: Phenomenological Psychology of multiple psychologies and psychologists.

Conclusion

Let me conclude this little presentation by citing a section from "Pansees"(1670) by Blaise Pascal: "When we want to correct someone usefully and show him he is wrong, we must see from what point of view he is approaching the matter, for it is usually right from that point of view, and we must admit this, but show him the point of view from which it is wrong. This will please him, because he will see that he was not wrong but merely failed to see every aspect of the question. Now, no one is annoyed at not seeing everything, but no one wants to be wrong; the reason for that may be that man is not by nature able to see everything, and by nature cannot be wrong from the point of view he adopts, as sense impressions are always true."(Pascal, 1670/1966, 248)

When and if the Phenomenological Psychology were formed and organized as the integrated unity of phenomenological psychologies of multiple psychologies, then every psychologist, regardless of the school he belongs to, will be pleased to learn it, not only to know that he is not wrong from the point of view he adopts but also to know that he will be able to know better other aspects of the question that he has not seen yet. Thus, hopefully, everyone will be delighted to learn the Phenomenological Psychology. I hope such a day will come in the future not too far.

After my retirement to be expected in 2010 spring at the age of 75, I am looking forward to concentrating on reading the following two books, that is, Roman Ingarden's "*Der Streit um die Existenz der Welt*" and Robert Musil's "*The Man without Qualities*". I now seem to be interested more in possibilities than in realities and/or necessities.

My last words. An old proverb says: "A rolling stone gathers no moss." It may be true. However, *I am now gathering moss from my past wandering.*

Thank you for your listening.

References ordered chronologically "by the years encountered by Akihiro YOSHIDA(1934-): Naturally neither exhaustive nor complete.

Those references which most impressively colored my lived world of the respective periods as remembered in my present memory.

1950s

- Tolstoy, Leo (undated) *War and Peace*. Translated from the Russian by Constance Garnett. A Modern Library Giant
 Jaspers, Karl (1954) *Psychologie der Weltanschauungen*. Vierte Auflage. Springer-Verlag
 Polya, George (1945/1954) *Ikanishite Mondai wo Tokuka*. [The Japanese translation of *How to Solve It*] Maruzen
 Woodworth, Robert S. (1931/1948/1956) *Contemporary Schools of Psychology*. Methuen

1960s

- Hovland, Carl I. & others (1953) *Communication and Persuasion: Psychological Studies of Opinion Change*. Yale UP
 Torgerson, Warren S. (1958), *Theory and Methods of Scaling*, John Wiley & Sons.
 Turstone, L.L. (1947), *Multiple-Factor Analysis: A Development & Expansion of The Vectors of Mind*. Chicago UP
 Hall, Calvin & Lindzey, Gardner (1957) *Theories of Personality* John Wiley
 Ashby, W. Ross (1956), *An Introduction to Cybernetics*. Science Editions
 Vygotsky, L.S. (1962) *Thought and Language*. The M.I.T. Press
 Vygotsky, L.S. (1962) *Shikou to Gengo*. Trans. Shibata, Y. 2 vols. Meiji-tosho. Tokyo
 Rubinstein, S.L. (1946/1959) *Grundlagen der allgemeinen Psychologie*. Volk und Wissen Berlin
 Rubinstein, S.L. (1961) *Das Denken und die Wege seiner Erforschung*. VED Deutscher Verlag Der Wissenschaften, Berlin
 Rubinstein, S.L. (1963) *Prinzipien und Wege der Entwicklung der Psychologie*. Akademie-Verlag Berlin
 Rubinstein, S.L. (1973) *Sein und Bewusstsein: Die Stellung des Psychischen im allgemeinen Zusammenhang der Erscheinungen in der materiellen Welt*. Akademie-Verlag Berlin
 Payne, T.R. (1968) *S.L. Rubinstein and The Philosophical Foundations of Soviet Psychology*. D. Reidel Publishing Co. Dordrecht-Holland
 Rubinstein, S.L. (1960-1961) *Sonzai to Ishiki* 2 vols. (The Japanese translation by K. Terasawa from the Russian original of *Sein und Bewusstsein*) Aoki Shoten
 Rubinstein, S.L. (1961-1970) *Shinrigaku: Genri to Rekishi* 2 vols. (The Japanese translation by K. Naito and S. Kimura from the Russian original of *Prinzipien und Wege der Entwicklung der Psychologie*) Aoki Shoten
 Rubinstein, S.L. (1962) *Shikou Shinrigaku*, (A Japanese translation by K. Ishida from the Russian original of *Das Denken und die Wege seiner Erforschung*.) Meiji-tosho
 Sechenov, I. (undated) *Selected Physiological and Psychological Works*. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow.
 Sechenov, I. (1964) *Shikou no Yohso*. Trans. Shibata, Y. Meiji-tosho. Tokyo
 Bauer, R. A. (1952) *The New Man in Soviet Psychology*, Harvard UP
 Bruner, S. Jerome (1960/1963), *Kyōiku no Katei*, (*The Process of Education*), Harvard UP
 Ausubel, David P. (1958) *Theory and Problems of Child Development*. Grune and Stratton
 Ausubel, David P. (1963) *The Psychology of Meaningful Verbal Learning*, Grune and Stratton
 Ausubel, David (1968) *Educational Psychology: A Cognitive View*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston
 Ausubel, David P. & Robinson, F.G. (1969) *School Learning*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston
 Piaget, Jean (1960) *Chinoh no Shinrigaku*. (A Japanese translation by K. Hatano and T. Takizawa from the French original of *Psychology of Intelligence*) Misuzu-shobo
 Piaget, Jean (1957) *Logic and Psychology* Basic Books
 Flavell, John H. (1963), *The Developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget*. D. Van Nostrand

Neisser, U.(1967) *Cognitive Psychology*. Appleton-Century-Crofts

Ackoff, R.L. & Emery, F.E.(1972) *On Purposeful Systems: An Interdisciplinary Analysis of Individual and Social Behavior as a System of Purposeful Events*. Tavistock

MacKay, Donald M.(1969) *Information, Mechanism and Meaning*. MIT Press

1970s

McKellar, Peter(1957) *Imagination and Thinking* A Psychological Analysis. Basic Books

Saitoh, Kihaku(1969) *Kyoikugaku no Susume, (An Invitation to a Science of Teaching)* Chikuma Shobo

Saitoh, Kihaku(1970) *Collected Works of SAITOH Kihaku*, 15vols. Kokudo-sha

Takeda, Tsuneo(1971/1990) *Shinno Jugyousha wo Mezashite, (Aspiring toward a Genuine Teacher)* Kokudo-sha

Kamiya, Mieko(1966), *Ikigai ni tsuite, (On IKIGAI: On the raison d'être of life)* Misuzu Shobo

Kamiya, Mieko(1982) *Collected Works of KAMIYA Mieko*, 13vols. Misuzu Shobo

Ashida, Enosuke (1988) *ASHIDA Enosuke Kokugo Kyouiku Zenshu*. Collected Works. 25 vols. Meiji-tosho

Spiegelberg, H. (1972) *Phenomenology in Psychology and Psychiatry*. Northwestern UP

Ogino, Koichi (1973) *Genshougakuteki Seishinbyorigaku*, (Phenomenological Psychopathology) Igaku Shoin

Husserl, Edmund (1975), *Keiken to Handan*, [A Japanese translation from the German original of *Experience and Judgment*(1973), *Erfahrung und Urteil*(1948)] Kawade Shobo Shinsha

Husserl, Edmund (1974), *Yoroppa-shogaku no Kiki to Choetsuronteki Genshougaku*, (A Japanese translation from the German original of *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*) Chuoh-Koronsha

Giorgi, Amedeo(1970) *Psychology as a Human Science: A Phenomenologically Based Approach*, Harper

Keen Ernest(1975) *A Primer in Phenomenological Psychology* Holt, Rinehart and Winston

Berg, J.H.van den(1974) *A Different Existence: Principles of Phenomenological Psychopathology* Duquesne UP

Bakan, David (1974) *On Method: Toward a Reconstruction of Psychological Investigation*. Jossey-Bass Pub.

Bollnow, O. Friedrich (1963/1973) *Ningen to Kuhkan*. [The Jap. trans. from the German original by K. Ohtsuka & others of *Mensch und Raum*] Serika Shobo

1980s

Heidegger, Martin(1927/1960) *Sonzai to Jikan. 2vol* [A Japanese translation by Keikichi MATSUO of *Sein und Zeit*.] Keiso-shobo

Rubinstein, S.L. (1946/1959/1981-1986) *Ippan Shingigaku no Kiso*. 4 vols. [The Japanese translation, by Akihiro YOSHIDA, Harutomo AKIMOTO, Michihiko AKIYAMA, Kiyoshi AMAMO, Yoshio SATO, Yutaka MATSUNO, of *Grundlagen der allgemeinen Psychologie*(1959). Volk und Wissen Berlin. The Japanese translation from the Russian original(1946).] Meiji-tosho

Shimoyama, Tokuji(1989), *Suashi no Shinriryohou (Psychotherapy with naked Feet)* Misuzu Shobo

Schutz, Alfred (1973, 1983/1989) *The Structures of the Life-World*, 2vols. Northwestern UP

Husserl, Edmund (1962/1977), trans. John Scanlon. *Phenomenological Psychology* [The English translation of *Phenomenologische Psychologie*(1962)] Martinus Nijhoff

Kockelmans, J.J.(1967) *Edmund Husserl's Phenomenological Psychology*, Humanities Press

James, William (1890/1981), *The Principle of Psychology*, Introduction by George A. Miller. Harvard UP

James, William (1902/1985), *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. Penguin Classics

Manen, Max van (1990) *Researching Lived Experiences: Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy*, SUNY P

Pascal, Blaise,(1670/1966) *Pensees*, Penguin Books

Maddi, S.R.(1976) *Personality Theories: A comparative analysis*. Third edition. Dorsey Press

1990s

Ricoeur, Paul (1987-1990) *Jikan to Monogatari*, 3 vols. [A Japanese trans. of *Time and Narrative*, 3 vols. Chicago UP] Shinyo Sha

Ingarden, Roman (1973) *The Cognition of the Literary Works of Art*. Northwestern UP
 Yasunaga, Hiroshi (1987) *Seishin no Kikagaku, (Geometry of Mind)*, Iwanami Shoten

2000s

Welton, Donn (2000) *The Other Husserl: Horizons of Transcendental Phenomenology*. Indiana UP
 Keen, Ernst (2001) *A History of Ideas in American Psychology*. Praeger
 Koch, Sigmund (1999) *Psychology in Human Context*. The University of Chicago Press
 Pepper, Stephen C. (1942) *World Hypotheses: A Study in Evidence*. University of California Press
 Zahavi, Dan (2005) *Subjectivity and Selfhood: Investigating the First-Person Perspective*. MIT Press
 Welton, Donn ed. (2003) *The New Husserl: A Critical Reader*, Indiana UP
 Ookawa, Isamu (2003) *Kanousei kankaku. Moeglichkeitssinn*. Shoraisha
 Tran, Duc Thao (1951/1986) *Phenomenology and Dialectical Materialism*. D. Reidel Publishing Co.
 Frank, Jerome D. and Julia B. Frank (1991) *Persuasion and Healing: A Comparative Study of Psychotherapy*. 3rd ed. The Johns Hopkins UP.

Prospective Readings from the perspective of 2009

Ingarden, Roman (1964-1974) *Der Streit um die Existenz der Welt*. 4 vols. Max Niemeyer Verlag
 Musil, Robert (1995) *The Man without Qualities*. 2 vols. Alfred A. Knopf

Yoshida's publications available in English

Yoshida, Akihiro (1989) Beyond the Traditional Concept of Concepts: A Set-Theoretical and Phenomenological Case Study of the "Value" Concept in "Capital". *Psychologia – An International Journal of Psychology in the Orient*. Vol.32.No.1. 1-15
 Yoshida, Akihiro (1992) On the Why-What Phenomenon: A phenomenological Explication of the art of asking questions. *Human Studies* 15. 35-46. Kluwer Academic Publishers
 Yoshida, Akihiro (1992) On the Impossibility of the Perfectly Empirical and Practical Theory of Teaching. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Education*, The University of Tokyo vol. 32.257-264
 Yoshida, Akihiro (2000) A Phenomenological Explication of the Lived Worlds of Application System Engineers: a tiny attempt. *The Journal of Kawamura Gakuen Woman's University*, Vol.11.No.1.69-86
 Yoshida, Akihiro (2001) My Life in Psychology: Making a Place for Fiction in a World of Science. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*. Vol. 32. Fall, No.2. 188-202
 Yoshida, Akihiro (2006) Values embodied in choosing among possible interpretations: Multiplicity of teacher's values in teaching literary works of art. *Shukutoku University Graduate School of Integrated Human and Social Studies Bulletin* No. 13. 1-20
 Yoshida, Akihiro (2006) On Tamamushi-iro Expression: A Phenomenological Explication of Tamamushi-iro-no (Intendedly Ambiguous) Expressive Acts. *Essais de psychologie phénoménologique-existentielle*. Cercle interdisciplinaire de recherches phénoménologiques. Department of Psychology. University of Quebec at Montreal, 306-335