Original Article

Conceptual Tensions And The Road To Integration Between Evolutionary And Differential Psychology

Waleed Saeed Aldosari

(Psychologist I)
DOI: 10.47750/pnr.2013.4.1.14

Abstract

Most of the success of evolutionary psychology has been in examining adaptive aspects of the mind that are thought to be common to all of ourspecies. This has led to the idea that the field of differential psychology,which focuses solely on the ways in which people systematically differ from one another, can benefit little from the adaptationist approach. In order to identify the conceptual and theoretical issues that have kept differential psychology apart from evolutionary psychology and from explanatory approaches in general, the current article frames the historical origins of both disciplines and examines the ways in which theyeach address the particular difficulties of psychological description and explanation. The authors examine how modern evolutionary research is overcoming these conceptual issues, paying particular attention to them, and provide insightful recommendations about how differential researchers (and others) can best advance these advancements.

Keywords: Differential Psychology, Evolutionary Psychology,Psychology.

Introduction:

The arguments in this paper aim to cast as broad and pertinent a net aspossible, despite the fact that both evolutionary psychology and differential psychology are incredibly varied and heterogeneous fields. As a result, the main emphasis will be on the basic conceptual and methodological components that are almost universal in their respectivefields, with more detailed examples taken from the most pertinent and representative research domains (Bandura, 1989). The authors attemptto investigate the apparent theoretical isolation of differential psychologyby using some frequently disregarded distinctions from the larger philosophy of science, looking at the basic scientific tasks of descriptionand explanation (and beyond this, forms of explanation), and making the case that integration is only feasible when descriptive efforts are intended to inform causal explanations (Aron, 2010). This paper adds a new argument to the collective evolutionary-differential integration efforts initiated by David Buss nearly 30 years ago (1984) by addressing this controversial topic from a neglected theoretical perspective. The argument is intended to address the fundamental conceptual concerns echoed by some evolutionary psychology critics (Buller, 2005; Richardson, 2007).

There will also be a discussion of the present status of integration initiatives and potential directions for future individual differences research.

Differing priorities and opposing approaches:

The past 150 years of technological advancement have prevented the study of human variation and human evolutionary design from coexisting. A lack of understanding of the molecular mechanisms underlying heredity hindered Darwin's initial formulation of evolutionarytheory. Although the fundamentals of biological trait inheritance had long been known, biologists were unable to conduct significant research on how different traits spread across a population until over 50 years later,when Mendel's genetic theories and Morgan's chromosome theory werecombined (Olsson et al., 2006).

Many of the experimental psychology approaches of the time were heavily influenced by the early differential techniques (Tucker et al., 2005), which survived behaviorism's dominance before being revitalizedby the subsequent

cognitive revolution. Differential psychologists became increasingly dependent on their strong statistical constructs and growing capacity for outcome prediction during this period, distancing themselves from the quickly evolving theories in related fields. Differential psychology developed strong ties with many branches of applied psychology, expanding beyond early concerns about enhancingthe military recruitment process (Tyler, 1965). Particularly, personality and intelligence testing have become increasingly important in forecasting and influencing outcomes such as risk management, careerchoice, educational development, and mental and physical health outcomes.

The unique challenges of psychological inquiry:

It is important to define exactly what is meant by "science" before delvinginto the difficulties psychology faces as a science. Although opinions onwhat exactly qualifies as "science" differ, the scientific endeavor typicallyconsists of two main components: the methodical observation anddescription of a specific group of natural phenomena, as well as the theory-guided explanation of the phenomena' causes. By utilizing this definition, the authors aim to approximate the stance taken by Wilson (1998) and stress that science's job is to "factor out human values" through procedural error-checking in order to create "representations ofreality that are as accurate as possible (Ali , 2011; Banduram 1999).

A black box of a science:

In order to comprehend the conceptual challenges of psychological research, it is instructive to view all elements that are not readilyobservable as existing inside a symbolic "black box." Any system with traceable outputs and at least partially traceable inputs that offers little to no direct insight into the internal processes that connect them is referred to as a "black box" in the engineering sciences. Since observation and description tasks typically focus on the inputs and outputs of the system (behaviors, activity levels, etc.), the black box nature of psychological phenomena presents few challenges. However,black boxes present significant obstacles to the explanation process (Allen , 2002; Barkow, 1992).

The concepts of adaptationism and reverse engineering:

Evolutionary psychology's paradigm is essentially focused on explanation, which is the reason it is conceptually incompatible with themost well-known areas of differential psychology. Through an analysis of the explanatory techniques used in evolutionary research, the authorswill show how, in contrast, differential psychologists have become accustomed to using explanatory shortcuts that keep them at odds withboth adaptationists and theoretically sound psychology in general (Anderson , 2005).

Recommendations:

- Because any construct defined by its function is conceivable and testable as a literal, neurophysical psychological mechanism, the adaptationist approach also offers a special way to bridge the gap between literal and non-literal construct-based theories. Despite these obvious advantages, the main cause of the significant discrepancy between the theories and methods of evolutionary and differential psychology is this idea of psychological mechanisms andthe thorough explanatory approach that such a conception necessitates.
- The aforementioned quantitative imperative in behavioral science is thought to benefit differential psychology the most. In fact, researchers frequently use differential descriptive constructs to demonstrate the applicability of theory-based explanatory models in the real world, especially when it comes to cognitive abilities and personality traits. The fact that the opposite is hardly ever true is telling.

Conclusion:

Finally, in light of the particular difficulties psychology faces as a science,this article has examined the historical causes as well as the current effects of the perceived incompatibility between differential and evolutionary psychology. This incompatibility stems primarily from misunderstandings and a lack of respect for the different scientific tasks of explanation and description. Differential psychology has become institutionally strong due to its exclusive focus on quantitative descriptivestatistics, but it is theoretically and conceptually isolated and has few tools to apply its descriptive skills to causal explanatory models. A variety of conceptual and empirical advantages have been shown by

evolutionary psychology to support its applicability as a platform for integrating functional cognitive and behavioral science.Most recently, this strength has shown itself in a number of complex and extremely successful attempts to delve deeper into the field of differential psychology, resultingin a variety of novel and creative ways to characterize and explain the fundamental reasons behind individual differences.

The groundwork has now been established for researchers to create novel, theoretically rich descriptive instruments that can directly support the testing of explanatory process models' hypotheses. Even researcherswho are unfamiliar with adaptationism can attempt to fill in the conceptual gaps between our explanations of tendencies and abilities in individuals and the general population and our theories of functional, psychological mechanisms, especially when they employ the heuristic tools of evolutionary psychology.

References:

1. Ali N., Chater N., Oaksford M. (2011). The mental representation of causal conditional reasoning: mental models or causal models. Cognition 119, 403–418.
2. Allen G. (2002). The measure of a Victorian polymath: pulling together the strands of Francis Galton's legacy to modern biology. Nature 145, 19–20 10.
3. Anderson M. (2005). Marrying intelligence and cognition: a developmental view,in Cognition and Intelligence: Identifying the Mechanisms of the Mind, ed Sternberg R. J. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press;), 268–287 10.
4. Aron A., Ketay S., Hedden T., Aron E. N., Markus H. R., Gabrieli J. D. E. (2010).Temperament trait of sensory processing sensitivity moderates culturaldifferences in neural response. Soc. Cogn. Affect. Neurosci. 5, 219–226 10.
5. Astbury B., Leeuw F. L. (2010). Unpacking black boxes: mechanisms and theorybuilding in evaluation. Am. J. Eval. 31, 363–381 10.
6. Baars B. (1984). View from a road not taken. Contemp. Psychol. 29, 804–805.
7. Bandura A. (1989). Social cognitive theory, in Annals of Child Development, 6: Six theories of child development, ed Vasta R. (Greenwich: JAI Press;), 1–60 10.
8. Bandura A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of personality, in The Coherence of Personality: Social-Cognitive Bases of Consistency, Variability, and Organization, eds Cervone D., Shoda Y. (New York, NY: Guilford Press;), 185–241 .
9. Belsky J. (1999). Modern evolutionary theory and patterns of attachment, in Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical Applications, edsCassidy J., Shaver P. R. (New York, NY: Guilford;), 141–161.