



行为主义 (英文)

日期: 2006-3-8 点击: 作者: 哲学在线 来源: 哲学在线

【字体: [小](#) [大](#) [简](#) [繁](#) [A](#)】

behaviorism

it has sometimes been said that “behave is what organisms do.” behaviorism is built on this assumption, and its goal is to promote the scientific study of behavior.

in this entry i consider different types of behaviorism. i outline reasons for and against being a behaviorist. i consider contributions of behaviorism to the study of behavior. special attention is given to the so-called “radical behaviorism” of b. f. skinner (1904-90).

- 1. what is behaviorism?
- 2. three types of behaviorism
- 3. roots of behaviorism
- 4. popularity of behaviorism
- 5. why be a behaviorist
- 6. skinner's social worldview
- 7. why be anti-behaviorist
- 8. conclusion
- bibliography
- other internet resources
- related entries

1. what is behaviorism?

loosely speaking, behaviorism is an attitude. strictly speaking, behaviorism is a doctrine.

wilfred sellars (1912-89), the distinguished philosopher, noted that a person may qualify as a behaviorist, loosely or attitudinally speaking, if they insist on confirming “hypotheses about psychological events in terms of behavioral criteria” (1963, p. 22). a behaviorist, so understood, is a psychological theorist who demands behavioral evidence. for such a person, there is no knowable difference between two states of mind unless there is a demonstrable difference in the behavior associated with each state.

arguably, there is nothing truly exciting about behaviorism loosely understood. it enthrones behavioral evidence, an arguably inescapable practice in psychological science. not so behaviorism the doctrine. this entry is about the doctrine, not the attitude. behaviorism, the doctrine, has caused considerable excitement among both advocates and critics.

behaviorism, the doctrine, is committed in its fullest and most complete sense to the truth of the following three sets of claims.

1. psychology is the science of behavior. psychology is not the science of mind.
2. behavior can be described and explained without making reference to mental events or to internal psychological processes. the sources of behavior are external (in the environment), not internal (in the mind).
3. in the course of theory development in psychology, if, somehow, mental terms or concepts are deployed in describing or explaining behavior, then either (a) these terms or concepts should be eliminated and replaced by behavioral terms or (b) they can and should be translated or paraphrased into behavioral concepts.

the three sets of claims are logically distinct. moreover, taken independently, each helps to form a type of behaviorism. “methodological” behaviorism is committed to the truth of (1). “psychological” behaviorism is committed to the truth of (2). “analytical” behaviorism (also known as “philosophical” or “logical” behaviorism) is committed to the truth of the sub-statement in (3) that mental terms or concepts can and should be translated into behavioral concepts.

other nomenclature is sometimes used to classify behaviorisms. georges rey (1997, p. 96), for example, classifies behaviorisms as methodological, analytical, and radical, where “radical” is rey’s term for what i am classifying as psychological behaviorism. i reserve the term “radical” for the psychological behaviorism of b. f. skinner. skinner employs the expression “radical behaviorism” to describe his brand of behaviorism or his philosophy of behaviorism (see skinner 1974, p. 18). in the classification scheme used in this entry, radical behaviorism is a sub-type of psychological behaviorism, primarily, although it combines all three types of behaviorism (methodological, analytical, and psychological).

2. three types of behaviorism

methodological behaviorism is a normative theory about the scientific conduct of psychology. it claims that psychology should concern itself with the behavior of organisms (human and nonhuman animals). psychology should not concern itself with mental states or events or with constructing internal information processing accounts of behavior. according to methodological behaviorism, reference to mental states, such as an animal’s beliefs or desires, adds nothing to what psychology can and should understand about the sources of behavior. mental states are private entities which, given the necessary publicity of science, do not form proper objects of empirical study. methodological behaviorism is a dominant theme in the writings of john watson (1878–1958).

psychological behaviorism is a research program within psychology. it purports to explain human and animal behavior in terms of external physical stimuli, responses, learning histories, and (for certain types of behavior) reinforcements. psychological behaviorism is present in the work of ivan pavlov (1849–1

936), edward thordike (1874–1949), as well as watson. its fullest and most influential expression is b. f. skinner’s (1904–90) work on schedules of reinforcement.

to illustrate, consider a food-deprived rat in an experimental chamber. if a particular movement, such as pressing a lever when a light is on, is followed by the presentation of food, then the likelihood of the rat’s pressing the lever when hungry, again, and the light is on, is increased. such presentations are reinforcements, such lights are (discriminative) stimuli, such lever pressings are responses, and such trials or associations are learning histories.

analytical behaviorism is a theory within philosophy about the meaning or semantics of mental terms or concepts. it says that the very idea of a mental state or condition is the idea of a behavioral disposition or family of behavioral tendencies. when we attribute a belief, for example, to someone, we are not saying that he or she is in a particular internal state or condition. instead, we are characterizing the person in terms of what he or she might do in particular situations. analytical behaviorism may be found in the work of gilbert ryle (1900–76) and the later work of ludwig wittgenstein (1889–51). more recently, the philosopher-psychologist u. t. place (1924–2000) advocated a brand of analytical behaviorism restricted to intentional or representational states of mind, such as beliefs, which place took to constitute a type, although not the only type, of mentality. (see graham and valentine 2004. see also mclser 2004.)

3. roots of behaviorism

each of methodological, psychological, and analytical behaviorism has historical foundations. analytical behaviorism traces its historical roots to the philosophical movement known as logical positivism (see smith 1986). logical positivism proposes that the meaning of statements used in science be understood in terms of experimental conditions or observations that verify their truth. this positivist doctrine is known as “verificationism.” in psychology, verificationism underpins or grounds analytical behaviorism, namely, the claim that mental concepts refer to behavioral tendencies and so must be translated in to behavioral terms.

analytical behaviorism helps to avoid substance dualism. substance dualism is the doctrine that mental states take place in a special, non-physical mental substance (the immaterial mind). by contrast, for an analytical behaviorist, the belief that i have as i arrive on time for a 2pm dental appointment, namely, that i have a 2pm appointment, is not the property of a mental substance. believing is a family of tendencies of my body. in addition, for an analytical behaviorist, we cannot identify the belief about my arrival independently of that arrival or other members of this family of tendencies. so, we also cannot treat it as the cause of the arrival. cause and effect are, as hume taught, conceptually distinct existences. believing that i have a 2pm appointment is not distinct from my arrival and so cannot be the cause of the arrival.

psychological behaviorism’s historical roots consist, in part, in the classical associationism of the british empiricists, foremost john locke (1632–1704) and david hume (1711–76). according to classical associationism, intelligent behavior is the product of associative learning. as a result of associations

or pairings between perceptual experiences or stimulations on the one hand, and ideas or thoughts on the other, persons and animals acquire knowledge of their environment and how to act. associations enable creatures to discover the causal structure of the world. association is most helpfully viewed as the acquisition of knowledge about relations between events. intelligence in behavior is a mark of such knowledge.

classical associationism relied on introspectible entities, such as perceptual experiences or stimulations as the first links in associations, and thoughts or ideas as the second links. psychological behaviorism, motivated by experimental interests, claims that to understand the origins of behavior, reference to stimulations (experiences) should be replaced by reference to stimuli (physical events in the environment), and that reference to thoughts or ideas should be eliminated or displaced in favor of reference to responses (overt behavior). psychological behaviorism is associationism without appeal to mental events.

don't human beings talk of introspectible entities even if these are not recognized by behaviorism? psychological behaviorists regard the practice of talking about one's own states of mind, and of introspectively reporting those states, as potentially useful data in psychological experiments, but as not presupposing the metaphysical subjectivity or non-physical presence of those states. there are different sorts of causes behind introspective reports, and psychological behaviorists take these to be amenable to behavioral analysis. (see, by comparison, dennett's method of heterophenomenology; dennett 1991, pp. 72-81).

the task of psychological behaviorism is to specify types of association, understand how environmental events control behavior, discover and elucidate causal regularities or laws or functional relations which govern the formation of associations, and predict how behavior will change as the environment changes. the word "conditioning" is commonly used to specify the process involved in acquiring new associations. animals in so-called "operant" conditioning experiments are not learning to, for example, press levers. instead, they are learning about the relationship between events in their environment, for example, that a particular behavior, pressing the lever, causes food to appear.

in its historical foundations, methodological behaviorism shares with analytical behaviorism the influence of positivism. one of the main goals of positivism was to unify psychology with natural science. watson wrote that "psychology as a behaviorist views it is a purely objective experimental branch of natural science. its theoretical goal is ... prediction and control" (1913, p. 158). watson also wrote of the purpose of psychology as follows: "to predict, given the stimulus, what reaction will take place; or, given the reaction, state what the situation or stimulus is that has caused the reaction" (1930, p. 11).

though logically distinct, methodological, psychological, and analytical behaviorisms often are found in one behaviorism. skinner's radical behaviorism combines all three forms of behaviorism. it follows analytical strictures (at least loosely) in paraphrasing mental terms behaviorally, when or if they cannot be eliminated from explanatory discourse. in verbal behavior (1957) and elsewhere, skinner tries to show how mental terms can be given behavioral interpretations. in about behaviorism (1974) he says that

when mental terminology cannot be eliminated it can be “translated into behavior” (p. 18, skinner brackets the expression with his own double quotes).

radical behaviorism is concerned with the behavior of organisms, not with internal processing. so, it is a form of methodological behaviorism. finally, radical behaviorism understands behavior as a reflection of frequency effects among stimuli, which means that it is a form of psychological behaviorism.

4. popularity of behaviorism

behaviorism of one sort or another was an immensely popular research program or methodological commitment among students of behavior from about the second decade of the twentieth century through its middle decade, at least until the beginnings of the cognitive science revolution (see bechtel, abrahamsen, and graham, 1998, pp. 15-17). in addition to ryle and wittgenstein, philosophers with sympathies for behaviorism included carnap (1932-33), hempel (1949), and quine (1960). quine, for example, took a behaviorist approach to the study of language. quine claimed that the notion of psychological or mental activity has no place in a scientific account of either the origins or the meaning of speech. to talk in a scientifically disciplined manner about the meaning of an utterance is to talk about stimuli for the utterance, its so-called “stimulus meaning”. hempel (1949) claimed that “all psychological statements that are meaningful ... are translatable into statements that do not involve psychological concepts,” but only concepts for physical behavior (p. 18).

among psychologists behaviorism was even more popular than among philosophers. in addition to pavlov, skinner, thorndike, and watson, the list of behaviorists among psychologists included, among others, e. c. tolman (1886-1959), c. l. hull (1884-52), and e. r. guthrie (1886-1959). tolman, for example, wrote that “everything important in psychology ... can be investigated in essence through the continued experimental and theoretical analysis of the determiners of rat behavior at a choice point in a maze” (1938, p. 34).

behaviorists created journals, organized societies, and founded psychology graduate programs reflective of behaviorism. behaviorists organized themselves into different types of research clusters, whose differences stemmed from such factors as varying approaches to conditioning and experimentation. some clusters were named as follows: “the experimental analysis of behavior”, “behavior analysis”, “functional analysis”, and, of course, “radical behaviorism”. these labels sometimes were responsible for the titles of behaviorism’s leading societies and journals, including the society for the advancement of behavior analysis (saba), and the journal of the experimental analysis of behavior (begun in 1958) as well as the journal of applied behavior analysis (begun in 1968).

behaviorism generated a type of therapy, known as behavior therapy (see rimm and masters 1974; erwin 1978). it developed behavior management techniques for autistic children (see lovaas and newsom 1976) and token economies for the management of chronic schizophrenics (see stahl and leitenberg 1976). it fueled discussions of how best to understand the behavior of nonhuman animals, the relevance of laboratory study to the natural environmental occurrence of behavior, and whether there is built-in associative bias in learning (see schwartz and lacey 1982).

behaviorism stumbled upon various critical difficulties with some of its commitments. one difficulty is confusion about the effects of reinforcement on behavior (see gallistel 1990). in its original sense, a stimulus such as food is a reinforcer only if its presentation increases the frequency of a response in a type of associative conditioning known as operant conditioning. a problem with this definition is that it defines reinforcers as stimuli that change behavior. the presentation of food, however, may have no observable effect on response frequency even in cases in which an animal is food deprived. rather, response frequency can be associated with an animal's ability to identify and remember temporal or spatial properties of the circumstances in which a stimulus is presented. this and other difficulties prompted changes in behaviorism's commitments and new directions of research. one recent and fresh direction has been the study of the role of short term memory in contributing to reinforcement effects on the so-called trajectory of behavior (see killeen 1994).

another stumbling block, in the case of analytical behaviorism, is the fact that the behavioral sentences that are intended to offer the behavioral paraphrases of mental terms almost always use mental terms themselves (see chisholm 1957). in the example of my belief that i have a 2pm dental appointment, one must also speak of my desire to arrive at 2pm, otherwise the behavior of arriving at 2pm could not count as believing that i have a 2pm appointment. the term "desire" is a mental term. critics have charged that we can never escape from using mental terms in the characterization of the meaning of mental terms. this suggests that mental discourse cannot be displaced by behavioral discourse. at least it cannot be displaced term-by-term. perhaps analytical behaviorists need to paraphrase a whole swarm of mental terms at once so as to recognize the presumption that the attribution of any one such mental term presupposes the application of others (see rey 1997, p. 154-5).

5. why be a behaviorist

why would anyone be a behaviorist? there are three main reasons (see also zuriff 1985).

the first is epistemic. warrant or evidence for saying, at least in the third person case, that an animal or person is in a certain mental state, for example, possesses a certain belief, is grounded in behavior, understood as observable behavior. moreover, the conceptual space between the claim that behavior warrants the attribution of belief and the claim that believing consists in behavior is a short and in some ways appealing step. if we look, for example, at how people are taught to use mental concepts and terms—terms like "believe", "desire", and so on—conditions of use appear inseparably connected with behavioral tendencies in certain circumstances. if mental state attribution bears a special connection with behavior, it is tempting to say that mentality just consists in behavioral tendencies.

the second reason can be expressed as follows: one major difference between mentalistic (mental states in-the-head) and associationist or conditioning accounts of behavior is that mentalistic accounts tend to have a strong nativist bent. this is true even though there may be nothing inherently nativist about mentalistic accounts (see cowie 1998).

mentalistic accounts tend to assume, and sometimes even explicitly to embrace (see fodor 1981), the hypothesis that the mind possesses at birth or innately a set of procedures or internally represented proc

essing rules which are deployed when learning or acquiring new responses. behaviorism, by contrast, is anti-nativist. behaviorism, therefore, appeals to theorists who deny that there are innate rules by which organisms learn. to skinner and watson organisms learn without being innately or pre-experientially provided with implicit procedures by which to learn. learning does not consist, at least initially, in rule-governed behavior. learning is what organisms do in response to stimuli. for a behaviorist an organism learns, as it were, from its successes and mistakes. "rules," says skinner (1984a), "are derived from contingencies, which specify discriminative stimuli, responses, and consequences" (p. 583). (see also dennett 1978).

much contemporary work in cognitive science on the set of models known as connectionist or parallel distributed processing (pdp) models seems to share behaviorism's anti-nativism about learning. pdp takes an approach to learning which is response oriented rather than rule-governed and this is because, like behaviorism, it has roots in associationism (see bechtel 1985; compare graham 1991 with maloney 1991). whether pdp models ultimately are or must be anti-nativist depends upon what counts as native or innate rules (bechtel and abrahamsen 1991, pp. 103-105).

the third reason for behaviorism's appeal, popular at least historically, is related to its disdain for reference to inner mental or information processing as explanatory causes of behavior. the disdain is most vigorously exemplified in the work of skinner. skinner's skepticism about explanatory references to mental innerness may be expressed as follows.

behavior must be explained in terms which do not themselves presuppose the very thing that is explained. this is behavior. the outside (public) behavior of a person is not accounted for by referring to the inside (inner processing) behavior of the person (say, his or her internal problem solving or thinking) if, therein, the behavior of the person is unexplained. "the objection," wrote skinner, "to inner states is not that they do not exist, but that they are not relevant in a functional analysis" (skinner 1953, p. 35). 'not relevant' means, for skinner, explanatorily circular or regressive.

skinner charges that since mental activity is a form of behavior (albeit inner), the only non-regressive, non-circular way to explain behavior is to appeal to something non-behavioral. this non-behavioral something is environmental stimuli and an organism's interactions with, and reinforcement from, the environment.

so, the third reason for behaviorism's appeal is that it tries to avoid circular, regressive explanations of behavior. it aims to refrain from accounting for one type of behavior (overt) in terms of another type of behavior (covert), all the while, in some sense, leaving behavior unexplained.

it should be noted that skinner's views about explanation and the purported circularity of explanation by reference to inner processing are both extreme and scientifically contestable, and that many who have self-identified as behaviorists including guthrie, tolman, and hull, or continue to work within the tradition, broadly understood, including killeen (1987) and rescorla (1990), take exception to much that skinner has said about explanatory references to innerness. it should also be noted that skinner's derivative attitude towards explanatory references to mental innerness stems, in part, not just from fears of

explanatory regression but from his conviction that if the language of psychology is permitted to refer to internal processing, this goes some way towards permitting talk of immaterial mental substances, agents endowed with contra-causal free will, and little persons (homunculi) within bodies. each of these skinner takes to be incompatible with a scientific worldview (see skinner 1971). finally, it must be noted that skinner's aversion to explanatory references to innerness is not an aversion to inner mental states or processes per se. he readily admits that they exist. skinner countenances talk of inner events provided that they are treated in the same manner as public or overt responses. an adequate science of behavior, he claims, must describe events taking place within the skin of the organism as part of behavior itself (see skinner 1976). "so far as i am concerned," he wrote in 1984 in a special issue of behavioral and brain sciences devoted to his work, "whatever happens when we inspect a public stimulus is in every respect similar to what happens when we introspect a private one" (skinner 1984b, p. 575; compare graham 1984, pp. 558-9).

6. skinner's social worldview

skinner is the only major figure in the history of behaviorism to offer a socio-political world view based on his commitment to behaviorism. skinner constructed a theory as well as narrative picture in walden two (1948) of what an ideal human society would be like if designed according to behaviorist principles (see also skinner 1971). skinner's social worldview illustrates both his aversion to free will, to homunculi, to dualism as well as his reasons for claiming that a person's history of environmental interactions controls his or her behavior.

one remarkable feature of human behavior which skinner deliberately rejects is that people creatively make their own environments (see chomsky 1971, black 1973). the world is as it is, in part, because we make it that way. skinner protests that "it is in the nature of an experimental analysis of human behavior that it should strip away the functions previously assigned to autonomous man and transfer them one by one to the controlling environment" (1971, p. 198).

critics have raised several objections to the skinnerian social picture. one of the most persuasive, and certainly one of the most frequent, adverts to skinner's vision of the ideal human society. it is a question asked of the fictional founder of walden two, frazier, by the philosopher castle. it is the question of what is the best social mode of existence for a human being. frazier's, and therein skinner's, response to this question is both too general and incomplete. frazier/skinner speaks of the values of health, friendship, relaxation, rest, and so forth. however, these values are hardly the detailed basis of a social system.

there is a notorious difficulty in social theory of specifying the appropriate level of detail at which a blueprint for a new and ideal society must be presented (see arnold 1990, pp. 4-10). skinner identifies the behavioristic principles and learning incentives that he hopes will reduce systematic injustices in social systems. he also describes a few practices (concerning child rearing and the like) that are intended to contribute to human happiness. however he offers only the haziest descriptions of the daily lives of walden two citizens and no suggestions for how best to resolve disputes about alternative ways of life that are prima facie consistent with behaviorist principles (see kane 1996, p. 203). he gives 1

little or no serious attention to the crucial general problem of inter-personal conflict resolution and to the role of institutional arrangements in resolving conflicts.

in an essay which appeared in the behavior analyst (1985), nearly forty years after the publication of walden two, skinner, in the guise of frazier, tried to clarify his characterization of ideal human circumstances. he wrote that in the ideal human society “people just naturally do the things they need to do to maintain themselves ... and treat each other well, and they just naturally do a hundred other things they enjoy doing because they do not have to do them” (p. 9). however, of course, doing a hundred things humans enjoy doing means only that walden two is vaguely defined, not that its culturally instituted habits and the character of its institutions merit emulation.

the incompleteness of skinner’s description of the ideal human society or life is so widely acknowledged that one might wonder if actual experiments in walden two living could lend useful detail to his blueprint. at least two such experiments have been and are being conducted, one in virginia, the other in mexico. both can be indirectly explored via the internet (see other internet resources).

7. why be anti-behaviorist

behaviorism is unpopular. it is dismissed by cognitive scientists developing intricate internal information processing models. it is neglected by cognitive ethologists and ecological psychologists convinced that its methods are irrelevant to studying how animals and persons behave in their natural and social environment. it is rejected by neuroscientists sure that direct study of the brain is the only way to understand the causes of behavior.

remnants of behaviorism survive in both behavior therapy and laboratory-based animal learning theory. in the metaphysics of mind, too, behavioristic themes survive in the approach to mind known as functionalism. functionalism defines states of mind as states that play particular causal-functional roles in animals or systems in which they occur. paul churchland writes of functionalism as follows: “the essential or defining feature of any type of mental states is the set of causal relations it bears to ... bodily behavior” (1984, p. 36). this functionalist notion is similar to the behaviorist idea that reference to behavior and to stimulus/response relations enters centrally and essentially into any account of what it means for a creature to behave or to be subject, in the scheme of analytical behaviorism, to the attribution of mental states.

remnants, however, are remnants. behaviorism has lost strength and influence. why?

the deepest and most complex reason for behaviorism’s demise is its commitment to the thesis that behavior can be explained without reference to non-behavioral mental (cognitive, representational, or interpretative) activity. behavior can be explained just by reference to its “functional” (skinner’s term) relation to or co-variation with the environment and to the animal’s history of environmental interaction. neurophysiological and neurobiological conditions, for skinner, sustain or implement these functional relations. they do not serve as ultimate or independent sources of behavior. behavior, skinner (1953) wrote, cannot be accounted for “while staying wholly inside [an animal]; eventually we must turn to forces operating upon the organism from without.” “unless there is a weak spot in our causal chain so

that the second [neurological] link is not lawfully determined by the first [environmental stimuli], or the third [behavior] by the second, the first and third links must be lawfully related.” (p. 35) “valid information about the second link may throw light on this relationship but can in no way alter it.” (ibid.) it is “external variables of which behavior is a function.” (ibid.)

skinner was no triumphalist about neuroscience. neuroscience, for him, more or less just identifies organismic physical processes that underlie animal/environment interactions. therein, it rides epistemic piggyback on radical behaviorism’s prior description of those interactions. “the organism”, he says, “is not empty, and it cannot adequately be treated simply as a black box” (1976, p. 233). “something is done today which affects the behavior of the organism tomorrow” (p. 233). neuroscience describes inside-the-box mechanisms that permit today’s reinforcing stimulus to affect tomorrow’s behavior. the neural box is not empty, but it is unable, except in cases of malfunction or breakdown, to disengage the animal from past patterns of behavior that have been reinforced. it cannot exercise independent or non-environmentally countervailing authority over behavior.

for many critics of behaviorism it seems obvious that, at a minimum, the occurrence and character of behavior (especially human behavior) does not depend primarily upon an individual’s reinforcement history, although that is a factor, but on the fact that the environment or learning history is represented and how (the manner in which) it is represented. the fact that the environment is represented by me, to me, constrains or informs the functional relations that hold between my behavior and the environment and may, from an anti-behaviorist perspective, partially disengage my behavior from its reinforcement history. no matter, for example, how tirelessly and repeatedly i have been reinforced for pointing to or eating ice cream, such a history is impotent if i just don’t see a potential stimulus as ice cream or represent it to myself as ice cream or if i desire to hide the fact that something is ice cream from others. my conditioning history, narrowly understood as unrepresented by me, is behaviorally less important than the environment or my learning history as represented to me.

similarly, for many critics of behaviorism, if representationality comes between environment and behavior, this implies that skinner is too restrictive or limited in his attitude towards the role of neurophysiological mechanisms in producing or controlling behavior. the brain is no mere passive memory bank of behavior/environment interactions (see roediger and goff 1998). the central nervous system, which otherwise sustains my reinforcement history, contains systems or sub-systems that implement or encode whatever representational content the environment has for me. it is also an active interpretation machine or semantic engine, often critically performing environmentally untethered and behavior controlling tasks. such talk of representation or interpretation, however, is a perspective from which behaviorism—most certainly in skinner—wished to depart.

one defining feature of traditional behaviorism is that it tried to free psychology from having to theorize about how animals and persons represent their environment. this was important, historically, because it seemed that behavior/environment connections are a lot clearer and more manageable experimentally than internal representations. unfortunately, for behaviorism, it’s hard to imagine a more restrictive rule for psychology than one which prohibits hypotheses about representational storage and processing.

stich, for example, complains against skinner that “we now have an enormous collection of experimental data which, it would seem, simply cannot be made sense of unless we postulate something like” information processing mechanisms in the heads of organisms (1998, p. 649).

a second reason for rejecting behaviorism is that some features of mentality—some elements in the inner processing of persons—have characteristic ‘qualia’ or presentationally immediate or phenomenal qualities. to be in pain, for example, is not merely to produce appropriate pain behavior under the right environmental circumstances, it is to experience a ‘like-thissness’ to the pain (as something dull or sharp, perhaps). behaviorist creatures may engage in pain behavior, including beneath the skin pain responses, yet completely lack whatever is qualitatively distinctive of and proper to pain (its painfulness). (see also graham 1998, pp. 47-51 and graham and horgan 2000. on the scope of the phenomenal in human mentality, see graham, horgan, and tienson forthcoming).

the philosopher-psychologist u. t. place, although otherwise sympathetic to application of behaviorist ideas to matters of mind, argued that qualia cannot be analyzed in behaviorist terms. he claimed that qualia are neither behavior nor dispositions to behave. “they make themselves felt,” he said, “from the very moment that the experience of whose qualia they are” comes into existence (2000, p. 191; reprinted in graham and valentine 2004). they are instantaneous features of processes or events rather than dispositions manifested over time. qualitative mental events (such as sensations, perceptual experiences, and so on), for place, undergird dispositions to behave rather than count as dispositions. indeed, it is tempting to postulate that the qualitative aspects of mentality affect non-qualitative elements of internal processing, and that they, for example, contribute to arousal, attention, and receptivity to associative conditioning.

the third reason for rejecting behaviorism is connected with noam chomsky. chomsky has been one of behaviorism’s most successful and damaging critics. in a review of skinner’s book on verbal behavior (see above), chomsky (1959) charged that behaviorist models of language learning cannot explain various facts about language acquisition, such as the rapid acquisition of language by young children, which is sometimes referred to as the phenomenon of “lexical explosion.” a child’s linguistic abilities appear to be radically underdetermined by the evidence of verbal behavior offered to the child in the short period in which he or she expresses those abilities. by the age of four or five (normal) children have an almost limitless capacity to understand and produce sentences which they have never heard before. chomsky also argued that it seems just not to be true that language learning depends on the application of reinforcement. a child does not, as an english speaker in the presence of a house, utter “house” repeatedly in the presence of reinforcing elders. language as such seems to be learned without, in a sense, being taught, and behaviorism doesn’t offer an account of how this could be so. chomsky’s own speculations about the psychological realities underlying language development included the hypothesis that the rules or principles underlying linguistic behavior are abstract (applying to all human languages) and innate (part of our native psychological endowment as human beings). when put to the test of uttering a grammatical sentence, a person, for chomsky, has a virtually infinite number of possible responses available, and the only way in which to understand this virtually infinite generative capacity is to suppose that a person possesses a powerful and abstract innate grammar (underlying whatever competence he or she may have in one or more particular natural languages).

the problem to which chomsky refers, which is the problem of behavioral competence and thus performance outstripping individual learning histories, seems to go beyond merely the issue of linguistic behavior in young children. it appears to be a fundamental fact about human beings that our behavior and behavioral capacities often surpass the limitations of our individual reinforcement histories. our history of reinforcement often is too impoverished to determine uniquely what we do or how we do it. much learning, therefore, seems to require pre-existing or innate representational structures or principled constraints within which learning occurs. (see also brewer 1974, but compare with bates et al. 1998 and cowie 1998).

8. conclusion

in 1977 willard day, a behavioral psychologist and founding editor of the journal behaviorism, published skinner's "why i am not a cognitive psychologist" (skinner 1977). skinner began the paper by stating that "the variables of which human behavior is a function lie in the environment" (p. 1). skinner ended by remarking that "cognitive constructs give ... a misleading account of what" is inside a human being (p. 10)

more than a decade earlier, in 1966 hempel announced his defection from behaviorism:

in order to characterize ... behavioral patterns, propensities, or capacities ... we need not only a suitable behavioristic vocabulary, but psychological terms as well. (p. 110)

hempel had come to believe that it is a mistake to imagine that human behavior can be understood exclusively in non-mental, behavioristic terms.

contemporary philosophy and psychology largely share hempel's conviction that the explanation of behavior cannot omit invoking a creature's representation of its world. psychology must use psychological terms. behavior without representation is blind. psychological theorizing without reference to internal processing is explanatorily impaired. behaviorism, not cognitive science or psychology, offers a misleading account of what is inside the head.

bibliography

- arnold, n. s., 1990. *marx's radical critique of capitalist society*. oxford: oxford university press.
- bates, e., ellman, j., johnson, m., karmiloff-smith, a., parisi, d., and plunkett, k., 1998. "innateness and emergentism". in w. bechtel and g. graham (eds.), *a companion to cognitive science*. oxford, uk: blackwell.
- bechtel, w., 1985. "contemporary connectionism: are the new parallel distributed processing models cognitive or associationist?", *behaviorism*, 13, 53-61. (see skinner 1977.)
- ----., and abrahamsen, a., 1991. *connectionism and the mind*. oxford, uk: blackwell.
- ----., abrahamsen, a., and graham, g., 1998. "the life of cognitive science". in w. bechtel and g. graham (eds.). (see bates 1998).
- black, m., 1973. "some aversive responses to a would-be reinforcer." in: h. wheeler (ed.), *beyond the punitive society* (pp. 125-34). san francisco: w. h. freeman.

- brewer, w. f., 1974. "there is no convincing evidence for operant or classical conditioning in adult humans". in: w. weiner and d. palermo (eds.), *cognition and symbolic processes*. hillsdale, n. j.: earlbaum.
- carnap, r., 1932/33. "psychology in physical language," *erkenntnis*, 3, 107-42.
- chisholm, r. m., 1957. *perceiving*. ithaca: cornell.
- chomsky, n., 1959. "review of verbal behavior," *language*, 35, 26-58.
- -----, 1971. "the case against b. f. skinner," *new york review of books*, 30, 18-24.
- -----, 1975. *reflections on language*. new york: pantheon books.
- churchland, p., 1984. *matter and consciousness*. cambridge, ma.: mit press/bradford books.
- cowie, f., 1998. *what's within: nativism reconsidered*. oxford: oxford.
- dennett, d., 1978. "why the law of effect will not go away." in: d. dennett (ed.) *brainstorms* (pp. 71-89). cambridge, ma.: mit press/bradford books.
- -----, 1991. *consciousness explained*. boston: little, brown and company.
- erwin, e., 1978. *behavior therapy: scientific, philosophical, and moral foundations*. cambridge: cambridge university press.
- fodor, j., 1981. "the present status of the innateness controversy". in j. fodor (ed.), *representations* (pp. 257-316). cambridge, ma.: mit press/bradford books.
- gallistel, c. r., 1990. *the organization of learning*. cambridge, ma.: mit press.
- graham, g., 1984. "sensation and classification". *behavioral and brain sciences*, 7, 558-559.
- -----, 1991. "connectionism in pavlovian harness". in t. horgan and j. tienson (eds.), *connectionism and the philosophy of mind* (pp. 143-66). dordrecht: kluwer.
- -----, 1998. *philosophy of mind: an introduction*, 2nd edition. oxford: basil blackwell.
- graham, g. and horgan, t., 2000. "mary, mary, quite contrary", *philosophical studies*, 99, 59-87.
- graham, g. and valentine, e., 2004. *identifying the mind: selected papers of u. t. place*. oxford: oxford university press.
- graham, g., horgan, t., and tienson, j., forthcoming. "phenomenology, intentionality, and the unity of mind". in a. beckermann and b. mclaughlin (eds.), *oxford handbook of philosophy of mind*. oxford: oxford university press.
- hempel, c., 1949. "the logical analysis of psychology". in h. feigl and w. sellars (eds.), *readings in philosophical analysis* (pp. 373-84). new york: appleton-century-crofts.
- -----, 1966. *philosophy of natural science*. englewood cliffs, n. j.: prentice-hall.
- honig, w. and j. g. fetterman (eds), 1992. *cognitive aspects of stimulus control*. hillsdale, n. j.: erlbaum.
- kane, r., 1996. *the significance of free will*. oxford: oxford.
- killeen, p., 1987. "emergent behaviorism". in s. modgil and c. modgil (eds.), *b. f. skinner: consensus and controversy* (pp. 219-34). new york: falmer
- -----, 1994. "mathematical principles of reinforcement," *behavioral and brain sciences*, 17, 105-172.
- lovaas, o. i. and newsom, c. d., 1976. "behavior modification with psychotic children". in h. leiteberg (ed.), *handbook of behavior modification and behavior therapy*. englewood cliffs, n. j.: prentice-hall.
- o'donnell, j., 1985. the origins of behaviorism: *american psychology*, 1870-1920. new york: nyu press.
- mackenzie, b., 1977. *behaviorism and the limits of scientific method*. london: routledge & kegan paul.
- maloney, c., 1991. "connectionism and conditioning". in t. horgan and j. tienson (eds.), *connectionism and the philosophy of mind* (pp. 167-95). dordrecht: kluwer.
- melser, d., 2004. *the act of thinking*. cambridge, ma: mit press.
- place, u. t., 2000. "the causal potency of qualia: its nature and its source". *brain and mind*, 1: 183-192. reprinted

nted in graham and valentine 2004.

- quine, w., 1960. *word and object*. cambridge, ma.: mit press.
- rey, g., 1997. *contemporary philosophy of mind: a contentiously classical approach*. oxford: blackwell.
- rescorla, r. a., 1990. “the role of information about the response–outcome relationship in instrumental discrimination learning,” *journal of experimental psychology: animal behavior processes*, 16, 262–70.
- rimm, d. c. and masters, j. c., 1974. *behavior therapy: techniques and empirical findings*. new york: academic press.
- roediger, h. and goff, l., 1998. “memory” . in: bechtel, w. and graham, g. (eds.) (see bates 1998.)
- ryle, g., 1949. *the concept of mind*. london: hutchinson. schwartz, b. and lacey, h. 1982. *behaviorism, science, and human nature*. new york: norton.
- sellars, w., 1963. “philosophy and the scientific image of man” . in *science, perception, and reality*. new york: routledge & kegan paul, pp. 1–40.
- skinner, b. f., 1948. *walden two*. new york: macmillan.
- -----, 1953. *science and human behavior*. new york: macmillan.
- -----, 1971. *beyond freedom and dignity*. new york: knopf.
- -----, 1974. *about behaviorism*. new york: vintage.
- -----, 1977. “why i am not a cognitive psychologist” . *behaviorism*, 5, 1–10. (this journal is now known as behavior and philosophy.)
- -----, 1984a. abstract for “an operant analysis of problem solving” . *behavioral and brain sciences*, 7, 583.
- -----, 1984b. “coming to terms with private events” . *behavioral and brain sciences*, 7, 573–581.
- -----, 1985. “news from nowhere, 1984” . *the behavior analyst*, 8, 5–14.
- smith, l., 1986. *behaviorism and logical positivism: a reassessment of their alliance*. california: stanford.
- stahl, j. r. and leitenberg, h., 1976. “behavioral treatment of the chronic mental hospital patient” . in: leitenberg (ed.). see lovass (1976)
- stich, s., 1984. “is behaviorism vacuous?,” *behavioral and brain sciences*, 7, 647–649.
- tolgan, e. c., 1938, “the determiners of behavior at a choice point,” *psychological review*, 45, 1–41.
- watson, j., 1913. “psychology as a behaviorist views it,” *psychological review*, 20, 158–77.
- -----, 1930. *behaviorism*. norton: new york.
- wittgenstein, l., 1953/1968. *philosophical investigations*, trans. g. e. m. anscombe. oxford: basil blackwell.
- zuriff, g., 1985. *behaviorism: a conceptual reconstruction*. new york: columbia university press.

other internet resources

- [association for behavior analysis](#)
- [behavior analysis homepage](#)
- [walden two, los horcones community, sonora, mexico](#)
- [walden two, twin oaks community, virginia](#)

- [上一篇文章: 副现象论 \(英文\)](#)
- [下一篇文章: 心灵哲学中的物理主义 \(英文\)](#)

最新5篇热点文章

著名伦理学家罗国杰教授简...
吴潜涛教授简介
葛晨虹教授简介
龚群教授简介
肖群忠教授简介

最新5篇推荐文章

吴付来副教授简介
孔德：实证哲学
孔迪亚克：人类知识起源论...
孔多塞：人类精神进步史表...
儒学与现代民主

相 关 文 章

 网友评论：（只显示最新5条。评论内容只代表网友观点，与本站立场无关！）

[设为首页](#) | [加入收藏](#) | [关于本站](#) | [版权申明](#) | [联系站长](#) | [友情链接](#) | [在线留言](#) | [与我同在](#)

Copyright© 2004-2008 Ethics.Com.Cn .All Rights Reserved

京ICP备05005293号

Designed by:闲心设计