

WU

WIRTSCHAFTS
UNIVERSITÄT
WIEN VIENNA
UNIVERSITY OF
ECONOMICS
AND BUSINESS

Harvey Systems and Maruyama types by Maurice Yolles and Gerhard Fink



Presenter: Gerhard Fink

IACCM 2015

Vienna, 1-3 October 2015

Vienna University

Types and mappings

- Types/typologies (ideal and normal types).
- Maps/mappings (graphic and epistemic mappings).
- Illusions of simplicity through leaving out large part of available information.
- Directing the focus of attention of a reader to a few most impressive features.

- The **Ideal type** (Max Weber) tends to focus on extreme phenomena ... it is difficult to show how the types and their elements fit into a theory of a social system. The ideal type moves from concrete empirical findings to the abstract.

(Harvey 1966; Maruyama 1988, 2008; Mary Douglas 1966).

- The **Normal type** (Tönnies) is a conceptual tool created on a logical basis, ... open to subsequent refinement from a confrontation with the empirical evidence. Moves from the abstract to the empirical.

(Gittinger 1992, Briggs Myers 1995, Yolles & Fink 2014).

Graphic and epistemic mappings

- **Graphic mapping:** procedures of putting non-geographic data into a map (or a mapping) are interpreting numerical distances between data vectors or data points as if these distances would be representative of geographical distances.

(Multidimensional Scaling, Primary Factor Analysis, Rotated Factor Analysis; Co-plot graphic display method, by Raveh 2000).

- **Epistemic mapping** is a method of investigation into differences and similarities between differently labelled constructs, which basically may have the same meaning, but authors may have preferred to address their core issues with different terms or were not aware of each other.

(Maruyama 2006, Yolles & Fink 2013)

Harvey (1966) – from data to types

Harvey (1966) had had been giving psychological tests to university students over several decades, and as a result had identified four frequent epistemological types, which he called systems:

- System 1: High absolutism and closeness of beliefs.
- System 2: Deep feelings of uncertainty and distrust of authority.
- System 3: Manipulating of people through dependency upon them.
- System 4: High perceived self-worth.

Harvey System 1:

- High absolutism and closeness of beliefs, high evaluativeness; high positive dependence on representatives of institutional authority; high identification with social roles and status positions; high conventionality; high ethnocentrism.

Harvey System 2:

Deep feelings of uncertainty; distrust of authority, rejection of the more socially approved guidelines to action accompanied by lack of alternative referents; psychological vacuum; rebellion against social prescriptions; avoidance of dependency on God, tradition.

Harvey System 3:

Manipulating of people through dependency upon them; fairly high skills in effecting desired outcomes in his world through the techniques of having others do it for him; autonomous internal standards, especially in the social sphere; some positive ties to the prevailing social norms.

Harvey System 4:

High perceived self-worth despite momentary frustrations and deviation from the normative; highly differentiated and integrated cognitive structure; flexible, creative and relative in thought and action; internal standards that are independent of external criteria, in some cases coinciding with social definitions and in others not.

Maruyama Mindscapes

(Maruyama 1974, 1988, 1993, 2008)

In Mindscape theory the personality of an agency is described in terms of epistemic cognitive meta-types (rather than the individual cognitive characteristics), and therefore really constitutes a meta-theory (offering meaning able to respond to both theory-doctrine and problem based issues). He originally referred to three types called **Independent, Hierarchical and Mutualists** (Maruyama, 1974) but later settled on four basic epistemic types of mindscape (Maruyama, 1988).

The four Maruyama Mindscapes

(Maruyama 1988, 1993, 2008)

The four epistemic meta-types identified by Maruyama maintain proprietary cognitive types which differentiate agencies on the basis of logical processes and the way in which they **analyze and synthesize** information. **Control processes** such as cycles of deviation-counteraction and deviation-amplification are important to an agency:

- H(Hierarchical/Bureaucrat): stands for “hierarchy and homogeneity.”
- I(Independent/Prince): stands for “isolationism, individualism, and independence.”
- S(Social/Reformer): stands for “stabilising”.
- G(Generative/Revolutionary): stands for “generating.”

H(Hierarchical/Bureaucrat):

Hierarchical, homogenistic (conventionalist), classification (neat categories), universalist, sequential, competitive, zero-sum, oppositional, extension, one truth, optimalist, ethics to dominate the weak, in-group, self-stereotyping, group bounded, prone to collectivism.

I(Independent/Prince)

Independent, heterogenistic (unconventionalist),
randomising (embraces uncertainty),
individualistic, uniqueness, negative-sum,
separation, caprice, subjectivity, self-sufficiency,
poverty self-inflicted, prone to individualism.

S(Social/Reformer):

Heterogenistic (non-conventionalist), interactive, pattern-maintaining, mutualising, simultaneous, cooperative, positive-sum (mutual aid through individual difference so all gain in interaction), absorption, stability, poly-ocularity, cause-effect, harmonious patterning, interactions are non-hierarchical, positive sum, self-contained universe.

G(Generative/Revolutionary):

Liberational, heterogenistic, interactive, pattern-generating, mutualizing, simultaneous, co-generative, positive-sum, unfolding, evolution, poly-ocularity, pattern-generating causal loops, non-hierarchical, diversity, relational emergence.

Maruyama's epistemic mapping

Largely equivalent:

- Maruyama Type H – Harvey System 1
- Maruyama Type I – Harvey System 2
- Maruyama Type G – Harvey System 4

Not equivalent:

- Maruyama Type S -/- Harvey System 3

(Maruyama 2006: 84).

Maruyama's epistemic mapping

Gammack (2002) notes that Maruyama specifies an epistemological basis from which communicative and behavioural styles are a result. Cultures are seen to be epistemologically heterogeneous, and a number of canonical mindscape types exist that are each represented within them in some proportion.

These epistemological types are seen to be prior to, and transcendent of nationality and culture (Maruyama, 1988; 2001).

Boje (2004): A trait basis for Maruyama mindscapes

- Foucaultian Traits in terms of Boje 2004:
- (1) **Knowledge trait:** Transaction scripts vs. Transformation scripts involve the dialectic of deviation-counteracting and deviation-amplifying.
- (2) **Ethics trait:** Control by others and control by self. Control by others is poly-ocular and perhaps involves more social harmony, control by self is more achievement oriented and connected with mono-ocular self-interest.
- (3) **Power trait:** orientation to power is rather related to hierarchy, and orientation to service is rather related to egalitarianism.

Concluding Remark:

Three bi-polar traits generate 8 extreme types.

Maruyama mindscapes in a trait space

