
Background

I was recently asked to contribute a chapter on Kellian reflexivity in my own research. Fortunately I had managed to get the old stencils scanned and made legible on internet. and was eager to see to what extent there was a continuity from my methodological work and my major clinical Kellian contribution from 1977. This seemed to me rather obvious as I try to tell in my chapter see OODYSSEY.DOC under Current projects. The common theme is the quest for an underlying, latent, reality which has been obfuscated by various distorting mechanisms so that special effort is needed to get beyond, purify the manifest observations.

This theme, however, is a result of hindsight, I was not carrying out a project existing on a ‘high level of conscious awareness’ to use a Kellian concept. How would I then mostly be inclined to answer the question of how, if at all, the problems raised in my doctoral dissertation had been carried on in my later research? First, I was in the late sixties early seventies heavily influenced by Roger Shepard who first outlined procedures for multidimensional scaling (MS), based on ‘weak’, ordinal, data. Shepard did this in order to continue a William James type quest, the study of ‘the image’ or ‘structure of appearance’. So my thinking was that after ‘tidying up’ MS I could continue with substantive studies. (A tribute is paid to Shepard in a somewhat different context, see the Gibson paper under ‘Bits and pieces’.)

After having finished my dissertation, however, I became more and more involved with Kelly’s personal construct theory. I recognized that grid techniques were much simpler to apply than MS, furthermore grids provided results more amenable to interpreting dimensions than MS. Grid work is a major part of my ventures (thousands of hours spent on programming). My grid programs provide several provisions for checking purification, and this will be discussed in another book chapter.

Reader’s guide

When scanning the 255 pages were at least reduced to 155 pages. Still this is far too much to expect anyone to read.

I here slightly extend the recommendations provided in the preface from 1972 (see CONTENTS).

The two first chapter parts, 2.1, and 3.4, are of special importance; odyssey1.doc quote figures from these.

2.1 A metamodel p. 16-24, especially 2.1 p. 16-19

3.4 Direct judgments of true fit. An empirical approach

4.5 Implications from the metamodel p. 68-71

6.2 Inadequacy of the tree structure models.
Comments on tree grid matrices, G. A. Miller’s semantic matrices,

6.42 The general model as a conceptual model

CONCLUDING REMARKS p. 143-147

I would like to give a special emphasis to CONCLUDING REMARKS. In some post modern quarters I have the impression that the concept latent structure will be completely rejected, and thus my defense may be a much needed alternative voice. I hope that my ‘softening’ of latent structure, may serve to open for a productive discussion!

Download PhD-FinnTschudi-1972.pdf (ca 2,2 Mb).