

STUDI

Reflecting on psychology through a double lens: The Psychological Humanities as an integrated approach

Lisa Malich^(α) & David Keller^(β)

Ricevuto: 16 marzo 2023; accettato: 24 marzo 2024

Abstract In this paper, we argue that the recent debates and proclaimed crises in psychology are partly due to a reflection deficit and the reductionist understanding of psychology as exclusively a science. For this reason, we introduce Psychological Humanities as a novel interdisciplinary approach that defines psychology as its object of investigation and opens a field of reflection. Although the study of psychological topics with an orientation toward the humanities is not new, either within or outside of psychology, we argue for the introduction of the collective term Psychological Humanities for four reasons: (1) the definition of Psychological Humanities does more justice to central psychological subject areas such as subjectivity, (2) it serves as a common term of interconnectedness and visibility, (3) it resonates with new reflective fields in related disciplines, such as the medical humanities, and (4) it is more consistent with intersubjective practice in applied psychology. In what follows, we present our approach to Psychological Humanities, developed at the University of Lübeck. Our model differentiates between two fundamental views: a view from the outside on the discipline of psychology and its contexts (e.g., through history, cultural studies, and ethics) and a view from the inside on psychology (e.g., through theoretical psychology, critical psychologies, or epistemology of psychology).

KEYWORDS: Interdisciplinary Research; Subjectivity; Epistemology of Psychology; Applied Psychology; Psychological Humanities

Riassunto *Guardare la psicologia attraverso una doppia lente: le Psychological Humanities come approccio integrato* - In questo articolo sosterremo che le discussioni recenti e le crisi proclamate in psicologia sono dovuti in parte a un deficit di riflessione e a una comprensione riduttiva della psicologia come disciplina esclusivamente scientifica. Per questo motivo presentiamo le *Psychological Humanities* come nuovo approccio interdisciplinare che ha la psicologia come proprio oggetto di indagine e apre un campo d'indagine. Sebbene lo studio di argomenti psicologici con un orientamento verso le discipline umanistiche non sia nuovo, né all'interno né all'esterno della psicologia, sosterremo l'introduzione del termine collettivo *Psychological Humanities* per quattro motivi: (1) la definizione di *Psychological Humanities* rende maggiormente giustizia ad aree tematiche psicologiche centrali come la soggettività, (2) funge da termine comune di interconnessione e visibilità, (3) richiama altri ambiti di riflessione in discipline affini quali le *medical humanities* ed (4) è più coerente con la pratica intersoggettiva in psicologia applicata. Nel lavoro che segue presenteremo l'approccio alle *Psychological Humanities* che abbiamo sviluppato presso l'Università di Lubecca. Il nostro modello differenzia tra due prospettive fondamentali: uno sguardo esterno alla psicologia come disciplina e ai suoi contesti (per esempio attraverso la storia, gli studi culturali e l'etica) e uno sguardo interno alla psicologia (per esempio attraverso la psicologia teoretica, le psicologie critiche o l'epistemologia della psicologia).

PAROLE CHIAVE: Ricerca interdisciplinare; Soggettività; Epistemologia della psicologia; Psicologia applicata; Psychological Humanities

^(α)Institut für Medizingeschichte und Wissenschaftsforschung, Universität zu Lübeck, Königstrasse, 42 - 23552 Lübeck (D)

^(β)Zentrum für Kulturwissenschaftliche Forschung, Universität zu Lübeck, Königstrasse, 42 - 23552 Lübeck (D)

E-mail: lisa.malich@uni-luebeck.de (✉); david.keller@alumni.hu-berlin.de



1 Successes and crises of scientific psychology

PSYCHOLOGY IS A SUCCESS STORY. Since its formation at the end of the 19th century, the discipline has grown so much that it has become one of the most popular fields of study in Western countries at the beginning of the 21st century. Accordingly, the professional fields of psychology are constantly expanding: from clinical psychology and psychotherapy to educational, occupational, and traffic psychology to hybrid fields in which psychologists work – in advertising agencies, data processing, or consulting for government agencies. In connection with this expansion, the self-understanding of many people increasingly operates within the terminological framework of psychology and related psy-sciences: a lot of human beings describe themselves as “intelligent” or “intrinsically motivated”, as “introverted”, “resilient”, or “traumatized”. In this way, the academic discipline of psychology has progressively gained discursive and epistemic authority over its central object, which it shares with the humanities, including philosophy: understanding and interpreting human subjectivity and experience. Despite the shared goal, part of psychology’s success story has been precisely to distance itself from the humanities. Academic psychology increasingly emphasized its identity as a “science” and followed the methodological imperative of quantification (DANZIGER 1985; UHER 2021). One manifestation of this is, for example, the renaming of the academic US-American psychological society from the American Psychological Society to the Association for Psychological Science (APS) (GREENWOOD 2017). Self-definition as a science is at the heart of mainstream academic psychology. Accordingly, human subjectivity and experience, mind, language, and behavior now also appear to be areas that can be understood primarily through science – especially the science of psychology.

However, the rise of psychology is not only a story of success. The history of psychology is also a history of crises, of which some have become more prominent in recent years: The replication crisis and credibility crisis that have plagued the discipline from 2011 to the present are the best known (FLIS 2019; MALICH & MUNAFÒ 2022; VAZIRE 2018). Some psychologists have also recently declared a theory crisis and a universality crisis in the discipline (HUTMACHER & FRANZ 2024). In addition, there are debates around unresolved issues of validity, generalizability, and measurability (UHER 2022). Besides these methodological problems in the realm of psychological research, other scandals involving psychologists have left a mark on the public perception of the discipline: In 2015, the *Hoffman Report* revealed that psychologists had been involved in aggressive

interrogations and torture measures by the CIA and the U.S. Department of Defense (HOFFMAN *et al.* 2015). This publication led to a critical discussion of psychology’s institutions and professional bodies (AALBERS & TEO 2017; ELKINS 2016). Such highly problematic cooperation between actors from psychology and intelligence services has certainly not happened for the first time. For example, since 2016, several commissions and research projects in Germany have been looking into the role of psychology in the German Democratic Republic, which was involved in manipulation, information dissemination, and psychological torture as part of the State Security (MAERCKER & GIESECKE 2021). These cases demonstrate the powerful role that psychology can play in specific political and social contexts.

Both methodological and social aspects converge in another case that was hotly debated in German- and English-speaking psychology at the time this text was written: In late 2022, incidents at the APS journal *Perspectives on Psychological Science* led to a discussion of diversity in psychology, abuse of editorial power, and the persistence of racist structures in academia. The case sheds light on the social contexts in which the science of psychology operates. In this discussion, US-American psychologist Steven Othello Roberts (2022) made public the questionable handling of critical comments on his already-published study *Racial inequality in psychological research: Trends of the past and recommendations for the future* (ROBERTS *et al.* 2020). In their quantitative study of top-tier psychology journals, Roberts and his co-authors discovered, among other things, that most examined articles were edited and written by White psychologists, that White editors were less likely than editors of color to publish articles on race, and White authors were less likely than authors of color to undertake research with samples of color. Subsequently, the German psychologist Bernhard Hommel submitted a critical comment on Roberts’s article to the journal, in which he warned that “political activist arguments” are “likely to damage scientific freedom and independence” (HOMMEL 2022). The then editor-in-chief of the journal, German psychologist Klaus Fiedler, seemed to agree – at least he was so delighted with the peer reviews of Hommel’s critique, all of which agreed with him, that he made the unusual editorial decision to turn them into critical comments of their own and publish them as well. Among other things, these comments (all by White authors) stated that Roberts’s report on the lack of diversity in psychology reflected «everything that is currently wrong in academia» and will «harm our science» (ROBERTS 2022, pp. 4-5). After Fiedler had to resign as editor-in-chief, the Australian online medium *quilllette* echoed this belief by declaring that Roberts’s research lay «out-

side the domain of real science» (The Quillette Editorial Board 2022). Here it is again – the reference to psychology as purely a science. This underlying self-definition as a “real science” – which immediately excludes a reflection of social contexts as “unscientific” – might be part of the problem. We will argue that all these just-mentioned crises and scandals of psychology, despite their differences and complex causal structures, have at least one factor in common: the increasing and one-sided orientation of psychology towards an unreflective understanding of scientificity combined with its distancing from the humanities.

In the following article, we will first take a closer look at the relationship between psychology and the humanities and present our definition of the humanities as a means of reflection and contextualization. We will then argue that the above-mentioned crises in psychology are due to a reflection deficit and an exclusive orientation towards supposed scientificity. Finally, we will explain which reasons speak for the establishment of Psychological Humanities as a new field and present the Lübeck approach in more detail.

2 Humanities and the lack of reflection in scientific psychology

To begin with, what is the relationship between psychology and the humanities? As a discipline, psychology emerged partly from the humanities, philosophy in particular. Not least, the chair of Wilhelm Wundt – one of the early central actors of psychology in the late 19th century – belonged to the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Leipzig (ASH & GEUTER 1985; Pickren & RUTHERFORD 2010). To this day, psychology and many fields of the humanities share some common goals, especially understanding and interpreting the human experience as well as grasping aspects of mind, language and behavior. While mainstream academic psychology uses scientific methods, primarily focusing on individuals, the humanities apply practices of theorizing and use a variety of both reflective and empirical methods. Furthermore, they tend to include their research subject’s cultural, social, historical, or theoretical contexts. This definition follows a broad notion of the “humanities” that encompasses the study of all languages and literature, the arts, history, philosophy, and ethics – including the (self)reflective subfields of science studies as well as history, philosophy, and ethics of science and the humanities. By explicitly assigning itself to the sciences, psychology distances itself from all these humanities fields and practices.

Nevertheless, drawing a clear line between the sciences and the humanities is difficult. C.P. Snow’s famous separation of the sciences and the humanities/arts into two different cultures, incorporating Wilhelm Dilthey’s distinction between

the *Naturwissenschaften* and the *Geisteswissenschaften* at the end of the 19th century, has its own history – and is by no means uncontested (BOD, MAAT & WESTSTEIJN 2014). If one examines the practices of the two supposed “cultures”, one can discover complex interactions, commonalities, circulated concepts, and shared practices. Some theorists, such as the historian and computer scientist Rens Bod, even argue that the traditional opposition between the sciences (supposedly mathematical, experimental, governed by universal laws) and the humanities (seemingly concerned with unique events and hermeneutic methods) is a fallacy: at the core of inquiry in the humanities is the search for general – sometimes even universal – patterns (BOD 2016). Regardless of whether one agrees with Bod’s thesis, and regardless of interactions and the many similarities to the sciences, one specific feature of the humanities is without dispute: they provide tools for contextualization and critical reflection, with possible application in the sciences. This contextualization and critical reflection is currently lacking in psychology.

The described crises and scandals in psychology testify to a lack of reflection on at least two levels: (1) an epistemological level (including methodology and theory) and (2) a contextual level (including social effects and ethical considerations).

- (1) *Epistemological level*: The replication crisis reveals a failure to question common statistical methods for too long, insufficient epistemological scrutiny, and little knowledge of theoretical psychology and philosophy of science (FLIS 2019; MALICH & REHMANN-SUTTER 2022; MORAWSKI 2019; WIGGINS & CHRISTOPHERSON 2019). Some scholars argue that psychological research should engage more with works of theoretical and philosophical psychology, as these can show ways of dealing with the inherent indeterminacy of psychological concepts (HUTMACHER & FRANZ 2024). Others relate psychology’s problems with validity and generalization to psychometric reductionism, insufficient conceptual work, and lack of foundational knowledge from analytic philosophy and science studies (ALEXANDROVA & HAYBRON 2016; UHER 2022; WIJSEN, BORSBOOM & ALEXANDROVA 2021).
- (2) *Contextual level*: In contrast, the scandal on the involvement of psychologists in abusive military interrogation programs touches another aspect. It shows that the idea of psychology as a neutral and objective science can go hand in hand with a lack of awareness of the role of psychology in politics and society (WIESER 2020). This may contribute to the fact that professional ethics in this area are not well developed or could be very easily ignored in these cases. Context may also

play a role in the replication crisis. Some critics have also pointed out that a lack of awareness of the socio-economic context in which science takes place has contributed to the crisis (CALLARD 2022; SYED 2021).

The case surrounding the handling of comments in the journal *Perspectives on Psychological Science* touches on both the epistemological and the contextual level. In addition to discussing suitable research methods, the case also dealt with an understanding of psychology as a science that seems isolated from the rest of society. Such a perspective neglects social power structures that have historically manifested themselves both in the content of research questions and in the personnel organization of scientific fields. In this way, structural racist discrimination continues to operate in science, as exemplified in biased editorial decisions (and as distinct from personal and intentional racism). Roberts (2022) explains that science takes place in specific social-historical contexts. For that matter, «to evolve one's discipline into one that is truly robust and objective, it must first become diverse and self-aware» (p. 2).

It is precisely the reflexive potential of the humanities that can promote self-awareness and recognition of diversity and thus, paradoxically, perhaps even contribute to improving psychology as a science.

3 The potential of Psychological Humanities

The Psychological Humanities are a novel interdisciplinary field, defining psychology as an object of inquiry and a space to think in response to the reflection deficit in current psychology. In their diversity, the humanities pursue a wide range of questions, addressing their objects of inquiry by employing various research practices (see BOD, KURSELL, MAAT & WESTSTEIJN 2016, pp. 1-2). Their affinity for complex considerations and theorizing, for critical reflection, and discussion holds special potential for psychology.

Psychological Humanities emerged as a term in 2017 (MALICH & KELLER 2018, 2020; PICKREN & TEO 2018; TEO 2017) in connection with the then-conference *Territories of Critique in Psychology: Lübeck Colloquium of Psychological Humanities* in Germany. But regardless of the specific labeling, related ideas and approaches date back at least to the 20th century. After all, neither psychologies oriented towards the humanities nor a critique of purely scientific psychology are new. Throughout the history of psychology, there have been psychological approaches that were theoretical in scope and adopted knowledge and practices from fields such as philosophy, ethnography, and semiotics. For example, in the German-speaking world of early 20th century Germany, Wilhelm Wundt cre-

ated not only experimental psychology but also the so-called *Völkerpsychologie* (WUNDT 1906), which was partly close to cultural studies (although some of his premises can undoubtedly be seen today as stereotypes or even racist) (PICKREN & RUTHERFORD 2010). In the following decades, multiple approaches with different origins emerged in psychology, among others, by scholars such as Karl Bühler (BROCK 1994), Kenneth Gergen (1973), Ignacio Martín-Baró (MARTÍN-BARÓ, ARON & CORNE 1996), Jill Morawski (1994), Klaus Holzkamp (1983, 1992), Ian Parker (1989), Ann Phoenix (PHOENIX, WOOLLETT & LLOYD 1991) or Elizabeth Valentine (2014).

On an institutional level, associations such as the *Society for Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology* (a division of the APA since 1963) or the *Society for the History of Psychology* (a division of the APA since 1965) testify to the fact that there continues to be psychological research which interacts with the humanities (at least in the USA).

Nor is the criticism of a purely scientifically oriented psychology new, which has already been put forward in a wide variety of ways both within and outside the discipline (TEO 2005). For example, in 1959, Henry Winthrop had already complained about «scientism in psychology» (WINTHROP 1959, p. 112). Starting in the 1960s, feminist psychologists such as Naomi Weisstein criticized the methods and epistemology of scientific psychology (EAGLY & RIGER 2014), and Kurz Danziger (1985) coined the critical term of the «methodological imperative in psychology». The philosopher Mary Midgley (1994) argued that scientific psychology suffers from a narrow focus on individualistic and reductionistic explanations of human behavior. She argued that this approach often ignores the complex social and cultural contexts in which human behavior occurs. Such kinds of reductionism, if left unwatched, can have untowardly narrowing effects on human self-understanding. Thus, there is already a large body of argumentation, approaches, and research (of which we could only mention a small part) that the Psychological Humanities can build on.

So, if such approaches from theoretical and critical psychology or the history of psychology have already existed for much longer – why is the new term “Psychological Humanities” necessary? We argue that it is useful to define Psychological Humanities as a new field of research and teaching for four reasons.

- (1) First, human subjectivity is a core issue in psychology – particularly general psychology – that transcends a narrowly defined, purely scientific approach operating alone. The human condition, human experiences, cognition, emotions, and behavior, are the subject of disciplines such as philosophy, cultural studies, and

history. As Thomas Teo (2017) argues, various humanistic approaches from philosophy, history, social theory, postcolonial studies, and science and technology studies can contribute to a better understanding of subjectivity.

- (2) Second, a common collective term like Psychological Humanities facilitates visibility, contact, and collaboration. While there are various research areas (such as the history of psychology, ethics of psychology, or theoretical, cultural, critical and philosophical psychology), they often operate on the fringes of mainstream psychology and work on heterogeneous topics. As a result, these approaches hold a precarious status at many universities and are hardly interconnected nationally and internationally. Often the representatives of one approach do not even know about the contributions of others in the field. The reference to the humanities in the term itself serves as the lowest common denominator of these diverse psychological approaches. In this way, Psychological Humanities can provide the umbrella for joint conferences, publications, and teaching modules. From a professional policy perspective, it makes sense to act together to represent the interests of the various humanities-oriented approaches in psychology.
- (3) Third, the term marks the inter- and transdisciplinary research direction and the direct engagement with the humanities. The notion of Psychological Humanities is related to a broader implementation of "... humanities" approaches in several disciplines in the natural and life sciences, such as the "health humanities" (CRAWFORD *et al.* 2015), the "environmental humanities" (HUTCHINGS 2014), or the "medical humanities" (COLE *et al.* 2015). These approaches aim to bring analytical and reflexive skills from the humanities and cultural studies into productive dialogue with scientific outputs and methods to foster reflexive competence within the discipline and explore the interaction of research and society. The extension of these approaches to the field of psychology is long overdue – as demonstrated not least by the crises and debates described above.
- (4) Additionally, psychology faces continuously growing application fields, especially in counseling, clinical psychology, and psychotherapy. Here, the focus is on professional interaction with individual people. It is about building an interpersonal relationship against the background of often diverse cultural ties, social positioning, and experiences of otherness. Psychological practices often require developing a common language, understanding a personal

problem, and working together on a possible solution. In such intersubjective contacts, scientific knowledge is undoubtedly valuable, but it is insufficient to understand and navigate the complexities of personal encounters. Statistical averages and the hypothetical-deductive model of scientific psychology do not quite do justice to the complexity of human understanding and relationship building – for this, hermeneutic models and theoretical concepts of the humanities are an appropriate complement. It is philosophy, which attempts to make human subjectivity comprehensible, cultural studies and history, which shed light on diverse perspectives, and the arts, which offer myriad ways to express and explore human experience and suffering. Taken together, they can improve the field of applied psychology.

4 Looking through a double lens: The Lübeck model of Psychological Humanities

In what follows, we present the objectives of the Psychological Humanities in more detail. These objectives respond to the current reflective deficit in psychology, which we located on the two levels of epistemology and contextualization. In order to illustrate what the Psychological Humanities offer, we turn to experiences and examples from our own research and course teachings. As lecturers at the University of Lübeck, both authors of this text were given the rare opportunity to integrate reflective elements into a German psychology degree program and to design a module for the history, ethics, and theory of psychology, which otherwise hardly exists in German-speaking countries.

We shared common experiences and backgrounds: we both are psychologists and psychotherapists, wrote our dissertations in the humanities, and conduct research in the history of psychology and cultural studies of the psy-sciences. At the University of Lübeck, we have designed courses in the psychology program from which we have developed our Psychological Humanities approach in exchange with our students and colleagues from the Institute of Psychology and the Institute for the History of Medicine and Science Studies. It proved helpful to divide the Psychological Humanities into two perspectives, which follow the respective disciplinary classification of the various approaches and their respective research objects. Like two different "lenses", they can bring the reflection deficits on the two levels described into sharper focus. At the same time, the two perspectives into which we divide the Psychological Humanities are gradual and locally situated since they correspond with our own academic trajectories. Thus, the two lenses are a heuristic division, which may differ at other locations and institutions. The lenses allow (1) the view on psychology

as an object of reflection and research, which enables contextualization, and (2) the view from within psychology, contributing to questions of epistemology, methodology, and theory.

4.1 *The View from outside: Perspectives on psychology in context*

What does psychology look like from the outside, from the perspective of disciplines in the humanities? How do scholars from the cultural studies, science and technology studies, ethics or historians of science regard psychological knowledge? To take this perspective in the Psychological Humanities, it is useful to come from another discipline – but not necessary. Rather, it is a matter of looking at one's own discipline through the lens of the humanities with an alien eye and, with the early words of Michel Foucault, doing a kind of «ethnology of the culture to which we belong» (CARUSO 1999 p. 91). Through this perspective, the discipline of psychology, psychological practices, forms of knowledge, and institutions themselves become objects of research – they can thus be contextualized and evaluated. The “view from outside” combines two dimensions: a historical and an ethical one.

Historical research plays a central role because diachronic analyses reveal the historical contingency of psychological knowledge. From a distance, supposedly certain and universal truths turn out to be constructed and context-specific facts; moreover, the direct and indirect socio-political influences on psychological doctrines becomes comprehensible. Vice versa, through the historical lens, different effects of psychological knowledge on politics, culture and society become tangible. Therefore, the first lens of the Psychological Humanities approach can mean looking at psychology informed by history, particularly the history of science and knowledge. In terms of historiographic methods, the Psychological Humanities follow plural approaches. Overall, practices of theorizing and qualitative inquiry are particularly prominent. However, scholars also approach their subject with mixed methods designs and quantitative methods stemming, for example, from the digital humanities, which are currently gaining attraction in the history of psychology (e.g., BURMAN 2018; FLIS & VAN ECK 2018; PETTIT *et al.* 2015).

Above all, several questions arise from this perspective. On a more general level, one might ask: What histories of modern psychologies, their ruptures, and continuities are conceivable? How did psychology succeed in gaining interpretive sovereignty over the psyche in the 20th century, and what got lost in the process? Which power relations informed and structured the production of psychological knowledge? What role did the activity of technologies, the importance of practices, or

social factors play? What are the social and political effects of psychological knowledge? To what extent are intersectional categories such as gender, class, race, and disability formative?

More specific questions might follow: What was the relationship between psychological science, so-called “folk psychology” and applied fields? Why is clinical psychology today dominated primarily by cognitive-behavioral approaches? What crises preceded the replication crisis? To what extent have there been historical ramifications between psychology's knowledge production and structural racism? And, regarding the unethical use of psychological knowledge and practices and practices in applied settings, how, when, and where did psychological techniques play a role in torture, political persecution, and military interrogation?

Questions from this perspective prove useful in our teaching to create a reflective distance for students from their own subject. Most of the questions have been answered to some extent in the history of psychology and in science studies, so there is a rich body of literature to use. We will refer here – in addition to the literature already cited in the article – only to a few exemplary standard works (ASH & STURM 2006; FEEST 2010; GREENWOOD 2015; PICKREN 2019; RUTHERFORD 2009). Needless to say, there is also a lot of literature on many of the sub-questions. Concerning racism and psychology, the book by Graham Richards (2012) is highly relevant, and there is research on the history of intelligence testing and racism (CARSON 2007; FLUEHR-LOBBAN 2006) or the importance of historical knowledge to avoid psychologization (TRAWALTER, BART-PLANGE & HOFFMAN 2020).

However, despite the extensive literature, there is still much room for research. Unlike medicine, for example, psychology has relatively rarely been the focus of the history of knowledge and science and technology studies. In particular, the history of many applied psychologies, psychology beyond the Anglo-American context and transnational entanglements, has many voids.

However, the view on psychology as an object of research within a specific context can also include its examination by *ethics*. Psychological practices are readily available for abuse and political instrumentalization – for example, in the case of torture and the secret service described above – but they can also have more indirect social and cultural effects that need to be discussed. The already mentioned case study on *Perspectives on Psychological Science* and Roberts/Hommels also has ethical implications: It deals with the question of how good science can take place in a social context characterized not only by values of equality and objectivity but also by a problematic tradition of discrimination (be it racist discrimination or, for example, sexist and anti-Semitic discrimination).

The case also shows that ethical assessments are often difficult and ambivalent because they involve conflicting values. Hence, sometimes, there are no clear ad hoc answers, but a more detailed ethical discussion is required. The psychological humanities can provide a space for more complex debates that incorporate approaches from philosophical ethics and other relevant fields. Fortunately, ethics committees (such as the APA ethics committee) and institutional review boards already exist and are crucial institutions. They follow a standardized procedure and are formally designated to protect human subjects from harm by reviewing and monitoring psychological research. As important as such institutions and procedurally designed guidelines are, they are not a place for more complex ethical debates that go beyond the pure harm and discuss more subtle ethical implications of human subject research. The Psychological Humanities, in turn, could provide a forum for such debates, even at a fundamental level.

Another area worth examining in this regard is the increasing behavioral genetics research and neurogenetics. For example, studies show a correlation between a specific mutation in the MAO-A gene and criminal and aggressive behavior in males that occurs in combination with childhood trauma (CASPI *et al.* 2002). The scenarios of how this supposedly “evil gene” might be dealt with socially interfere profoundly with individual lifestyles and involve fundamental ethical dimensions. Problematic implications also include latent racist categorizations, as, for example, one study postulates differences between the propensity to violence, variants of the MAO-A gene, and skin color (WIDOM & BRZUSTOWICZ 2006). Unfortunately, the commonly institutionalized ethics committees on psychological research are not very well equipped to address these complex ethical issues. Psychological Humanities, therefore, could advocate a psychological practice sensitive to the ethical implications of its actions – in all its different settings and for the society as a whole. National and international psychological professional societies have corresponding orientation frameworks for this purpose (e.g., APA 2017; BPS 2021; DGPS & BDP 2016). These frameworks are necessary and address critical issues in the practice of the profession. However, knowledge of these frameworks is often lacking in practical training and academic contexts. Compared to the study of medicine, ethical issues generally occupy even less space in psychology programs. The framework of Psychological Humanities could provide ample room for ethical questions and critical interventions.

Ethical considerations of Psychological Humanities also include the diverse fields of applied psychology. In specific practical contexts, ethical challenges are often more heterogeneous than a general professional code of conduct can capture.

For example, complex questions about the best interests of the child might arise in psychological reports for the family court, and problems of victim protection may arise from credibility assessments in forensic psychology. Moreover, ethical questions permeate many aspects of clinical psychological practice, even in subtle ways: from the selection of a specific therapeutic technique, for example, in the exposure-based treatment of anxiety disorders, to implicit promises of optimization, to the subtle influence of psychotherapists’ unreflective personal moral concepts on their clients and their way of life. Such subtle ethical conflicts often simply run with. So far, everyday professional life offers little opportunity for reflection – also against the background of the growing economic imperative in the health care system.

Concerning ethical aspects, the following questions, among others, might arise in the Psychological Humanities: Are all the norms formulated by professional associations ethically sound as they stand? What conflicts beyond general ethical guidelines and professional codes emerge in psychological research and practice? What ethical dilemmas emerge in the fields of applied psychology and psychotherapy?

Overall, the view from the outside thus enables a contextualization, situating, and evaluation of psychology and psychological practices. This perspective can gain weight above all through historical studies and ethical discussions.

4.2 *The view from inside: Epistemological and theoretical perspectives in psychology*

In response to the theory deficit diagnosed at the beginning, Psychological Humanities also promote theoretical debates and a room for reflection within psychology. In contrast to the first perspective, which focuses on the contextualization of psychology, on a transdisciplinary exchange, and opens up psychology to scholars and students from the humanities, this second perspective aims primarily at debates and approaches within psychology. The approaches gathered here directly contribute to acquiring knowledge about psychological objects and psychological methods. The “view from inside” distinguishes two dimensions: an epistemological and an object-related theoretical one.

First, there is a need for a more thorough and self-reflexive engagement with internal epistemological ideas and methodological habits. Although the psychological methodology is very thorough concerning quantitative data collection and statistics, the associated philosophy of science usually does not go beyond mentioning Popper’s principle of falsification. Accordingly, empirical psychological research is primarily oriented towards methods and data, remains mainly descriptive, and aims primarily at hypothesis testing. Regarding its con-

cepts, psychological research prefers the operationalization of used “constructs” at the expense of a clear theoretical definition beforehand and without dealing with questions of content validity. Already historically, the intensive orientation toward methods was connected to the formation of the discipline of psychology itself (CAPSHEW 1999). Accordingly, the methodological approaches used in psychology have always been more than just research tools for data collection. They have shaped the self-understanding of academic psychologists in fundamental ways. A striking example is the fundamental distinction between quantitative and qualitative methods, which forms an almost insurmountable schism in psychology. In quantitative research, this includes the identity-forming distinction between correlational and experimental psychology – a division going back to Lee Cronbach in the 1950s (FLIS & VAN ECK 2018). Kurt Danziger (1985) has described psychology’s strong focus on methods as its «methodological imperative» (p. 1). More generally, such an over-privileging of methods to the detriment of content-related theoretical reflection is an example of scientism (RYDER 2005): the primacy of a (natural) scientific approach leading to specific procedures in excess, which, regardless of the fit with the respective object of investigation, always applies the respective current scientific methods and no longer questions the results generated. As a consequence, this brings a considerable limitation of validity – a central quality criterion of psychological tests and measurement procedures. In addition to the theory deficit, this psychological scientism leads to the recurrent epistemic crisis moments in psychology, with the “replication crisis” being the most recent. One of the reasons discussed for the replication crisis is that – in line with the methodological imperative – attention has often been paid solely to significance values established by convention, while considerations of the validity of the constructs or of basic anthropological assumptions have remained secondary at best (UHER 2022; WIESER 2016). To be clear: despite an epistemological critique of scientism and the methodological imperative in psychology, Psychological Humanities is in no way about a rejection of quantitative approaches. It is not another restatement of psychology’s opposition between quantitative and qualitative methods. Instead, it is about critically questioning such oppositional formations.

From an epistemological perspective, questions such as the following arise: which theories of science – be they postmodern approaches, realist or universalist-positivist paradigms – apply to psychology or have been used in its research so far? What does current psychological research practice look like, and what epistemological problems can arise from it? How can researchers improve the validity of their results when operationalizing var-

iables? Why are specific methods so central to psychology’s disciplinary positioning? What alternatives are conceivable?

Second, Psychological Humanities provide theoretical impulses for thinking about the psyche and subjectivity, about the mind, language, and human behavior. Thus, they aim at the discipline’s core concern and main research subjects. In much of the discipline, there is a tendency to view “the psyche” as an isolated entity and to subdivide it relatively unsystematically into different “variables”. These variables form the basis for subsequent empirical operationalization (DANZIGER & DZINAS 1997). Whereas common psychological approaches usually capture psychological phenomena descriptively, Psychological Humanities can propose a more complex and, above all, reflexive theorizing in line with the argumentative criteria of Theoretical Psychology (KUKLA 2001). This aspect of our concept of Psychological Humanities thus corresponds most closely to Teo’s (2017) version, which centers on notions of subjectivity. This means examining the psyche not in isolation but rather in its complex socio-ecological contexts. In this way, the impact of power relations (BUTLER 1997), political conditions, and «looping effects» (HACKING 1995a) on the psyche become tangible.

To conceptualize the interwovenness of the psyche with the social, theoretical, yet often marginalized currents in psychology that correspond to topical ideas from the humanities and cultural studies provide a reference here. Particularly worthwhile is an engagement with cultural psychology (e.g., VALSINER 2014; STRAUB, WEIDEMANN, KÖLBL & ZIELKE 2006) or queer and feminist approaches (e.g., CLARKE & PEEL 2007; EAGLY & RIGER 2014). Furthermore, poststructuralist narrative psychology (BROCKMEIER 2015; MURRAY 2015) and subject science (HOLZKAMP 1983; SCHRAUBE & OSTERKAMP 2013) incorporate social aspects in their conceptions of the psyche. Some of these approaches are alive in neighboring disciplines and even in some applied psychology settings. In most psychology departments, however, there is currently very little discussion of them. Overall, a stronger integration of the Psychological Humanities could, therefore, lead to a more intensive examination of existing epistemological and theoretical approaches in psychology, resulting in better methods and a sharper conceptualization of the objects of research.

5 Psychological Humanities in action

The “trauma” concept provides a vivid example to illustrate the value of a Psychological Humanities perspective. With a distinct meaning, “trauma” has emerged as a key category within the psy-sciences, particularly prominent in the discourses and practices of clinical psychology, psy-

chotherapy, and psychiatry. Beyond these specialized fields, “trauma” maintains numerous cross-connections with the broader political, cultural, and social context. Being at the intersection of different discourses and due to its cultural significance, “trauma” is also particularly suitable for a Psychological Humanities perspective in academic teaching. Course instructors will find many points of departure from the disciplines of the humanities and cultural studies, which have increasingly dealt with the phenomenon of “trauma” in recent years.

While classical textbooks from the field of psychology provide students with criteria of post-traumatic stress disorder based on the latest version of the DSM (APA 2013) and the ICD (WHO 2022), give information about the prevalence and course of “trauma and stressor-related disorders,” present diagnostic techniques in the form of self-report scales and interview guidelines, or provide an overview of established treatment protocols, the Psychological Humanities follow a different path: They focus on the contexts and the epistemology of trauma. Thus, they pursue the goal of contextualizing and expanding this knowledge and opening up a space for critical reflection.

To achieve this, it is first of all necessary to trace the coming-into-being of “posttraumatic stress disorder” as a clinical entity and epistemic object (e.g., HACKING 1995B; LAYS 2000) and to include the political context of its emergence (BRUNNER 2014). Furthermore, the concept of “trauma” raises fundamental epistemological (KOCH 2013) and cultural questions (MAERCKER, HEIM & KIRMAYER 2019). However, this also includes examining the popularization of trauma in contemporary cultures (ZIV & BAR-HAIM 2023). This can be seen, for example, in the widespread political practice of “trigger warnings,” which also has social and ethical implications.

For teaching purposes, numerous literary, artistic, and cinematic contributions are at hand to illustrate the cultural significance of traumatic experiences, their processing, and their reflection (e.g., BÉNYEI & STARA 2014). With regard to psychological research and practice, numerous ethical questions arise when it comes to the sensitive topic of addressing traumatic experiences. In the case of “man-made trauma” (such as abuse or violence), ethical dilemmas regarding confidentiality or legal consequences sometimes emerge. Adding to the discussion, now also feminist positions for practice are available that aim at the socio-political context of trauma as well as the reflection of power relations within therapeutic settings (e.g. BROWN 2004).

6 Conclusion: Psychological Humanities as a space for critique, reflection, and integration

In this paper, we have outlined Psychological Humanities, a novel approach that focuses on the discipline of psychology itself. Our central argu-

ment is that, given the discipline’s continuous growth in scientific importance and social relevance since the second half of the 20th century, there is reason to call for an academic space that offers the possibility of reflexively examining psychology as a discipline – its approaches and methods, as well as its premises and practices. The need for such a reflective space arises from the observation that the interest in epistemological and contextualizing considerations within the discipline has declined sharply since the 1970s, coinciding with an ever-increasing influence and importance of psychological knowledge in Westernized modern societies. What the Psychological Humanities entail goes beyond the proposition of just another label. The open and critical space Psychological Humanities aim to provide responds to a deficit and a vacuum concerning the current condition of psychology. The approach we conceive consists of two dimensions: first, a perspective that makes psychology itself the object of reflection and investigation, centering on social norms and effects as well as historical and ethical analyses, and second, a perspective from within psychology, integrating epistemological approaches, philosophical psychologies and pluralistic theories of the psyche. The Psychological Humanities also transcend a purely analytical perspective by promoting critical engagement. Being integrative and interdisciplinary, they could counter this narrowing with a nuanced and differentiated perspective on human subjectivity shaped by different cultural ways of knowing. According to Foucault (1996), critique always concerns itself with forms of power effects. To Foucault, the possibilities of critique are less about ‘whether’ power exists than “how” it exists. Correspondingly, the critical stance of Psychological Humanities is thus less concerned with the “if” but more with the “how” of psychology. Inspired by a concept of critique that reflects on its positioning and modes of knowledge, the Psychological Humanities do not want to stop at mere questioning. Instead, they aim to establish a kind of “intervening thinking” that contributes concrete forms of intervention in research and practice. As a science of human experience and behavior, and given its growing importance and impact around the globe, it is time for psychology to reflect more deeply on itself and its subject matter.

The crises mentioned above in psychology have in common that there are no simple answers to them but that they require debates, extensive analysis, and multiple solutions. This is because it is a challenge to reconcile different epistemological and ethical values as well as to consider the context. On the one hand, for example, there is the critical value of neutral science that leads to objective findings independently of researchers. On the other hand, there is the important value of equality and the fact that science exists in a social context that is not free of power struc-

tures. We believe that it is not enough to dismiss references to inequality and power structures in science as “unscientific”. Instead, a more in-depth discussion is needed that promotes what Steven O. Roberts also called for: diversity and self-awareness in psychology. We believe a pluralistic and interdisciplinary approach, such as the Psychological Humanities, can contribute to this.

Literature

- AALBERS, D., TEO, T. (2017). *The American Psychological Association and the torture complex: A phenomenology of the banality and workings of bureaucracy*. In: «Journal of Psychology», vol. XXV, n. 1, pp. 179-204.
- ALEXANDROVA, A., HAYBRON, D. M. (2016). *Is construct validation valid?*. In: «Philosophy of Science», vol. LXXXV, n. 5, pp. 1098-1109.
- AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: Fifth edition (DSM-5)*. American Psychiatric Association, Washington (DC).
- AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (2017). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*. <https://www.apa.org/ethics/code>
- ASH, M.G., STURM, T. (eds.). (2006). *Psychology's territories: Historical and contemporary perspectives from different disciplines*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale.
- ASH, M., GEUTER, U. (Hrsg.) (1985). *Geschichte der deutschen Psychologie im 20. Jahrhundert*, Westdeutscher Verlag, Opladen.
- BÉNYEI, T., STARA, A. (eds.) (2014). *The edges of trauma: Explorations in visual art and literature*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Cambridge.
- BOD, R., KURSSELL, J., MAAT, J., WESTSTEIJN, T. (2016). *A new field: History of humanities*. In: «History of Humanities», vol. I, n. 1, pp. 1-8.
- BOD, R. (2016). *A new history of the humanities: The search for principles and patterns from antiquity to the present*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- BOD, R., MAAT, J., WESTSTEIJN, T. (2014). *Introduction: The making of the modern humanities*. In: R. BOD, J. MAAT, T. WESTSTEIJN (eds.), *The making of the humanities*, Volume III: *The modern humanities*, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, pp. 13-24.
- BRITISH PSYCHOLOGICAL SOCIETY (2021). *Code of Ethics and Conduct* – doi: <https://doi.org/10.53841/bpsrep.2021.inf94>.
- BROCKMEIER, J. (2015). *Beyond the archive: Memory, narrative, and the autobiographical process*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- BROCK, A. (1994). *Whatever happened to Karl Bühler?*. In: «Canadian Psychology», vol. XXXV, n. 3, pp. 319-329.
- BROWN, L. (2004). *Feminist paradigms of trauma treatment*. In: «Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training», vol. XLI, n. 4, pp. 464-471.
- BRUNNER, J. (2014). *Die Politik des Traumas. Gewalterfahrungen und psychisches Leid in den USA, in Deutschland und im Israel/Palästina-Konflikt*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt a.M.
- BURMAN, J.T. (2018). *What is history of psychology? Network analysis of journal citation reports, 2009-2015*. In: «SAGE Open», vol. VIII, n. 1, pp. 1-17 – doi: 10.1177/2158244018763005.
- BUTLER, J. (1997). *The psychic life of power: Theories in subjection*, Stanford University Press, Cambridge (MA).
- CALLARD, F. (2022). *Replication and reproduction: Crises in psychology and academic labour*. In: «Review of General Psychology», vol. XXVI, n. 2, pp. 199-211.
- CAPSHAW, J.H. (1999). *Psychologists on the march: Science, practice, and professional identity in America, 1929-1969*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- CARSON, J. (2007). *The measure of merit: Talents, intelligence, and inequality in the French and American republics, 1750-1940*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- CARUSO, P. (1999). *Who are you, Professor Foucault?*. In: J.R. CARRETTE (ed.), *Michael Foucault. Religion and culture. Selected and edited by Jeremy R. Carrette*, Routledge, London/New York, pp. 87-103 (First edition 1967).
- CASPI, A., MCCRAY, J., MOFFITT, T., MILL, J., MARTIN, J., CRAIG, I. (2002). *Role of genotype in the cycle of violence in maltreated children*. In: «Science», vol. CCXCVII, n. 5582, pp. 851-854.
- CLARKE, V., PEEL, E. (eds.) (2007). *Out in psychology: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and queer perspectives*, Wiley, London.
- COLE, T.R., CARLIN, N.S., CARSON, R.A. (2015). *Medical humanities: An introduction*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- CRAWFORD, P., BROWN, B., BAKER, C., TISCHLER, V., ABRAMS, B. (2015). *Health humanities*. In: P. CRAWFORD, B. BROWN, C. BAKER, V. TISCHLER, B. ABRAMS (eds.), *Health humanities*, Palgrave, New York, pp. 1-19.
- DANZIGER, K. (1985). *The methodological imperative in psychology*. In: «Philosophy of the Social Sciences», vol. XV, n. 1, pp. 1-13.
- DANZIGER, K., DZINAS, K. (1997). *How psychology got its variables*. In: «Canadian Psychology», vol. XXXVIII, n. 1, pp. 43-48.
- DGPS & BDP. (2016). *Berufsethische Richtlinien des Berufsverbandes Deutscher Psychologinnen und Psychologen e.V. und der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Psychologie e.V., zugleich Berufsordnung des Berufsverbandes deutscher Psychologinnen und Psychologen e.V.*, https://www.dgps.de/fileadmin/user_upload/PDF/berufsethik-foederation-2016.pdf
- EAGLY, A.H., RIGER, S. (2014). *Feminism and psychology: Critiques of methods and epistemology*. In: «American Psychologist», vol. LXIX, n. 7, pp. 685-702.
- ELKINS, D.N. (2016). *The American Psychological Association and the Hoffman report*. In: «Journal of Humanistic Psychology», vol. LVI, n. 2, pp. 99-109.
- FEEST, U. (2019). *Why replication is overrated*. In: «Philosophy of Science», vol. LXXXVI, n. 5, pp. 895-905.
- FEEST, U. (ed.) (2010). *Historical perspectives on Erklären and Verstehen*, Springer, Berlin/Heidelberg.
- FLIS, I. (2019). *Psychologists psychologizing scientific psychology: An epistemological reading of the replication crisis*. In: «Theory & Psychology», vol. XXIX, n. 2, pp. 158-181.
- FLIS, I., VAN ECK, N.J. (2018). *Framing psychology as a discipline (1950-1999): A large-scale term co-occurrence analysis of scientific literature in psychology*. In: «History of Psychology», vol. XXI, n. 4, pp. 334-362.
- FLUEHR-LOBBAN, C. (2006). *Race, intelligence, and mental*

- testing. In: C. FLUEHR-LOBBAN, *Race and racism: An introduction*, Altamira Press, Lanham, pp. 137-167.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1996). *What is critique?*. In: J. SCHMIDT (ed.), *What is Enlightenment? Eighteenth-century answers and twentieth-century questions*, University of California Press, Berkeley/Los Angeles, pp. 382-398.
- GERGEN, K. (1973). *Social psychology as history*. In: «Journal of Personality and Social Psychology», vol. XXVI, n. 2, pp. 309-320.
- GREENWOOD, J.D. (2015). *A conceptual history of psychology: Exploring the tangled web*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- GREENWOOD, J.D. (2017). *The long and winding road: 125 years of the American Psychological Association*. In: «Behavioral Scientist». Retrieved from <https://behavioralscientist.org/long-winding-road-125-years-american-psychological-association/>
- HACKING, I. (1995a). *The looping effects of human kinds*. In: D. SPERBER, D. PREMACK, A.J. PEMACK (eds.), *Causal cognition: A multi-disciplinary debate*, Clarendon Press, London, pp. 351-382.
- HACKING, I. (1995b). *Trauma*. In: I. HACKING, *Rewriting the soul: Multiple personality and the sciences of memory*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 183-197.
- HOFFMAN, D.H., CARTER, D.J., LOPEZ, C.R.V., BENZMILLER, H.L., GUO, A.X., LATIFI, S.Y., CRAIG, D.C. (2015). *Report to the special committee of the board of directors of the American Psychological Association: Independent review relating to the APA ethics guidelines, national security interrogations, and torture*, Chicago (ILL) – <https://www.apa.org/independent-review/APA-FINAL-Report-7.2.15.pdf>.
- HOLZKAMP, K. (1992). *On doing psychology critically*. In: «Theory & Psychology», vol. II, n. 2, pp. 193-204.
- HOLZKAMP, K. (1983). *Grundlegung der Psychologie*, Campus, Frankfurt a.M.
- HOMMEL, B. (2022). *Dealing with diversity in psychology: Science or ideology?*. In: «PsyArXiv Preprints» - doi: 10.31234/osf.io/hvgrm.
- HUTMACHER, F., FRANZ, D.J. (2024). *Approaching psychology's current crises by exploring the vagueness of psychological concepts: Recommendations for advancing the discipline*. In: «American Psychologist» - doi: 10.1037/amp0001300.
- KOCH, U. (2013). *Shock of the real versus shocking realities: Critical theory and the normalisation of trauma*. In: J.A. LAVRIJSEN, M. VICK (eds.), *Is this a culture of trauma? An interdisciplinary perspective*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 267-276.
- KUKLA, A. (2001). *Methods of theoretical psychology*, MIT Press, Cambridge (MA).
- LAYS, R. (2000). *Trauma: A genealogy*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- MAERCKER, A., GIESEKE, J. (eds.) (2021). *Psychologie als Instrument der SED-Diktatur. Theorien – Praktiken – Akteure – Opfer*, Hogrefe, Göttingen.
- MAERCKER, A., HEIM, E., KIRMAYER, L.J. (eds.) (2019). *Cultural clinical psychology and PTSD*, Hogrefe, Göttingen.
- MALICH, L., REHMANN-SUTTER, C. (2022). *Metascience is not enough – a plea for psychological humanities in the wake of the replication crisis*. In: «Review of General Psychology», vol. XXVI, n. 2, pp. 261-273.
- MALICH, L., KELLER, D. (2018). *Psychological humanities are not medical humanities – impressions from the Luebeck approach*. American Psychological Association (APA) Annual Convention, San Francisco (USA).
- MALICH, L., KELLER, D. (2020). *Die „Psychological Humanities“ als reflexives Moment der Psychologie*. In: V. BALZ, L. MALICH (Hrsg.), *Psychologie und Kritik. Formen der Psychologisierung nach 1945*, Springer, Cham, pp. 87-113.
- MALICH, L., MUNAFÒ, M.R. (2022). *Introduction: Repliation of crises – interdisciplinary reflections on the phenomenon of the replication crisis in psychology*. In: «Review of General Psychology», vol. XXVI, n. 2, pp. 127-130.
- MARTÍN-BARÓ, I., ARON, A., CORNE, S. (1996). *Writings for a liberation psychology*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge (MA).
- MIDGLEY, M. (1994). *The ethical primate: Humans, freedom and morality*, Routledge, London.
- MORAWSKI, J.G. (1994). *Practicing feminisms, reconstructing psychology: Notes on a liminal science*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- MORAWSKI, J.G. (2019). *The replication crisis: How might philosophy and theory of psychology be of use?*. In: «Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology», vol. XXXIX, n. 4, pp. 218-238.
- MURRAY, M. (2015). *Narrative psychology*. In: J.A. SMITH (ed.), *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*, Sage, London, pp. 85-107.
- PARKER, I. (1989). *Discourse and power*. In: J. SHOTTER, K. GERGEN (eds.), *Texts of identity*, Sage, London, pp. 56-69.
- PETTIT, M., SERYKH, D., GREEN, C.D. (2015). *Multi-species networks: Visualizing the psychological research of the committee for research in problems of sex*. In: «Isis», vol. CVI, n. 1, pp. 121-149.
- PHOENIX, A., WOOLLETT, A., LLOYD, E. (eds.) (1991). *Motherhood, meanings, practices and ideologies*, Sage, London.
- PICKREN, W., RUTHERFORD, A. (2010). *A history of modern psychology in context*, Wiley, London.
- PICKREN, W., TEO, T. (2018). *Psychological humanities: Bridging the subtle and hard sciences*, Conference Humanities in Translation, Barcelona, Spain.
- PICKREN, W. (2019). *Psychology and health: Culture, place, history*, Routledge, London/New York.
- RICHARDS, G. (2012). *“Race”, racism and psychology. Towards a reflexive history*, Psychology Press, New York.
- RUTHERFORD, A. (2009). *Beyond the box: B. F. Skinner's technology of behavior from laboratory to life, 1950s – 1970s*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- ROBERTS, S.O. (2022). *Dealing with diversity in psychology: Science and ideology*. In: «PsyArXiv» - doi: 10.31234/osf.io/xk4yu.
- ROBERTS, S.O., BAREKET-SHAVIT, C., DOLLINS, F.A., GOLDIE, P.D., MORTENSON, E. (2020). *Racial inequality in psychological research: Trends of the past and recommendations for the future*. In: «Perspectives on Psychological Science», vol. XV, n. 6, pp. 1295-1309.
- RYDER, M. (2005). *Scientism*. In: C. MITCHAM (ed.), *Encyclopedia of science, technology, and ethics*, Macmillan, Thomson Gale, pp. 1735-1736.
- SCHRAUBE, E., OSTERKAMP, U. (eds.) (2013). *Psychology from the standpoint of the subject. Selected writings of Klaus Holzkamp*, Palgrave Macmillan, London/New York.
- STRAUB, J., WEIDEMANN, D., KÖLBL, C., ZIELKE, B. (eds.)

- (2006). *Pursuit of meaning: Advances in cultural and cross-cultural psychology*, Transcript, Bielefeldt.
- SYED, M. (2021). *Reproducibility, diversity, and the crisis of inference in psychology*. Paper presented at the symposium data, rigor, and reproducibility in light of diversity, equity, and inclusion, University of Minnesota - <https://osf.io/r7j6d/download>
- TEO, T. (2017). *From psychological science to the psychological humanities: Building a general theory of subjectivity*. In: «Review of General Psychology», vol. XXI, n. 4, pp. 281-291.
- TEO, T. (2005). *The critique of psychology: From Kant to postcolonial theory*, Springer, Berlin/Heidelberg.
- THE QUILLETTE EDITORIAL BOARD (Producer) (2022). *A rush to judgement in psychological science*, retrieved from <https://quillette.com/2022/12/12/a-rush-to-judgement-in-psychological-science/>.
- TRAWALTER, S., BART-PLANGE, D.-J., HOFFMAN, K.M. (2020). *A socioecological psychology of racism: Making structures and history more visible*. In: «Current Opinion in Psychology», vol. XXXII, pp. 47-51 – doi: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.06.029.
- UHER, J. (2021). *Psychology's status as a science: Peculiarities and intrinsic challenges. Moving beyond its current deadlock towards conceptual integration*. In: «Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science», vol. LV, n. 2, pp. 212-224.
- UHER, J. (2022). *Rating scales institutionalise a network of logical errors and conceptual problems in research practices: A rigorous analysis showing ways to tackle psychology's crises*. In: «Frontiers in Psychology», vol. XIII, Art. Nr. 9893 – doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1009893.
- VALSINER, J. (2014). *An invitation to cultural psychology*, Sage, London.
- VALENTINE, E.R. (2014). *Philosophy and history of psychology: Selected works of Elizabeth Valentine*, Routledge, London/New York.
- VAZIRE, S. (2018). *Implications of the credibility revolution for productivity, creativity, and progress*. In: «Perspectives on Psychological Science», vol. XIII, pp. 411-417 – doi: 10.1177/1745691617751884.
- WHO (2022). *International classification of diseases. 11th revision* – <https://icd.who.int/en>.
- WINTHROP, H. (1959). *Scientism in psychology*. In: «Journal of Individual Psychology», vol. XV, n. 1, pp. 112-120.
- WIDOM, C., BRZUSTOWICZ, L. (2006). *MAOA and the "cycle of violence": childhood abuse and neglect, MAOA genotype, and risk for violent and antisocial behavior*. In: «Biological Psychiatry», vol. LX, n. 7, pp. 684-689.
- WIESER, M. (2016). *Psychology's "crisis" and the need for reflection. A plea for modesty in psychological theorizing*. In: «Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science», vol. L, n. 3, pp. 359-367.
- WIESER, M. (2020). *Über das „Messer des Chirurgen“ und „unangefochtene Inseln der Auslesearbeit“: Skizze einer Genealogie der psychologischen Moral*. In: V. BALZ, L. MALICH (Hrsg.), *Psychologie und Kritik. Formen der Psychologisierung nach 1945*, Springer, Cham, pp. 141-161.
- WIGGINS, B.J., CHRISTOPHERSON, C.D. (2019). *The replication crisis in psychology: An overview for theoretical and philosophical psychology*. In: «Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology», vol. XXXIX, n. 4, pp. 202-217.
- WIJSEN, L.D., BORSBOOM, D., ALEXANDROVA, A. (2022). *Values in psychometrics*. In: «Perspectives on Psychological Science», vol. XVII, n. 3, pp. 788-804.
- WUNDT, W. (1916). *Elements of folk psychology. Outlines of a psychological history of the development of mankind*, authorized translation by E.L. SCHAUB, George Allen & Unwin, London/New York (Original edition: *Elemente der Völkerpsychologie. Grundlinien einer psychologischen Entwicklungsgechichte der Menschheit*, Alfred Kröner Verlag, Leipzig/Stuttgart 1912).
- ZIV, A., BAR-HAIM, S. (2023). *Revising trauma*. In: S. FROSH, M. VYRGIOTI, J. WALSH (eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of psychosocial studies*, Palgrave Macmillan, London/New York – doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-61510-9_51-1.