

Abstracts

G. A. Reynolds

January 22, 2014

Abstract

abstract

Contents

1	Pragmatism and Survey Research	3
2	A Critique of the Theory of Cognitive Interviewing	3
3	Mensuration without Representation	3
4	Deflating Validity	3
4.1	Validity, Reliability, Error	3
4.2	RCT and Self-validation	5
4.3	Deflation	5
5	The Deontic Scorekeeping Model of Discursive Practice and Survey Research	6
6	A Quality Assurance Model for Survey Research	6
7	Causality and the Space of Reasons	6
8	Vocabularies	6
9	Conflation of Causal and Logical Relations	7
10	Fact-Value	7
11	Word-World	7
12	Hypothetical Entities	8
13	Personal v. Subpersonal	8

14 Spaces	9
14.1 Natural space of causes	9
14.2 Discursive space of reasons	9
15 Notes	9
15.1 Evolution	9
15.2 Verum Factum	9
15.3 Rational Evidence	10
15.4 Misc	11
15.5 Erotetic Discursive Practice	11
15.6 Replication	11
15.7 Myths and Mythologies	11
15.8 Dopes	11
Appendices	12
A Bibliography	12

List of Figures

1 Pragmatism and Survey Research

Abstract

2 A Critique of the Theory of Cognitive Interviewing

Abstract

3 Mensuration without Representation

Abstract

Measurement pragmatism. No representation needed.

4 Deflating Validity

Abstract

Semantic and metaphysical deflationism works as well for validity as it does for truth and reference.

Remark 1 *Deflationism seems to depend essentially on some form of expressivism. Or maybe they amount to the same thing?*

4.1 Validity, Reliability, Error

Remark 2 *What is the point of worrying about validity? Is it something in the world that we are trying to discover? Then we're trying to find "the right description of the world" (Putnam). Or is it a concept, so that validity talk is about conceptual analysis and definition?*

Or: we try to find the right description, and validity talk is part of how we decide that we have found it.

Remark 3 *Why do psychometricians and the like worry so about validity?*

Hypothesis: when they say "validity", what they're really interested in is scientific legitimacy. Effectively, to say that a test (etc.) is valid is to say that it is in fact scientific. That's the practical import of the concept of validity for them.

Unpack this. Expose the assumptions and implications.

Remark 4 *The problem with validity (quantifiability) is circularity. If the task is to show that some property is quantitative, we have to do this without relying on quantitative vocabulary. So for example, if we want to show that temperature is quantitative, we cannot use the concept of a unit of temperature to do so, because that presupposes just the outcome we are supposed to demonstrate. This is similar to the problem we face in seeking to account for representational vocabulary in non-representational terms.*

quantifiability v. validity? distinct problems, but the latter depends on the former?

key concepts:

- validity treated as a special kind of property - of what?
- constructs
- (latent) variables
- indicators

“validity” as code for:

- legitimacy
- vindication
- credibility
- proof (good premises + valid inference)

Remark 5 *On the idea that validity something (a property, etc.) that we look for in scientific theories in order to distinguish good ones from bad: see Putnam on fact/value distinction. We use value judgments - simplicity, parsimony, etc. - in every aspect of science (thought), esp. in weeding out bad theories. For there is no external or objective criterion of acceptability for theories to which we can appeal, nor is there any such criterion that does not involve value judgments.*

Remark 6 *So along with the fact/value distinction, and the analytic/synthetic distinction, the internal/external distinction also collapses? Or do we just exclude the notion of external? No; we need to retain the idea of an external world that is independent of us and to which some of our judgments are answerable. We don't get to just make stuff up and call it true (correct) for at least some of our claims. There is no external absolute authority that can decide for us which theories are true, or rather which we should endorse, but that does not mean there is no external world that is authoritative for some of our sayings. But isn't that trying to have it both ways? How can our theories answer to the world if we cannot appeal to the world or some other external authority to sort them out? See Brandom.*

Related issue: what counts as evidence? How do we decide? What are we doing when we decide that something counts as strong (weak) evidence in support of a theory? What are the criteria of adequacy for an account of evidence?

4.2 RCT and Self-validation

See Cartwright on RCT as self-validating. This seems to mean that RCTs are valid by construction.

This nicely parallels industrial QA notions of guaranteeing quality by designing a production process that prevents defects.

What's the logic here? Is self-validation really possible? How can a process validate itself - isn't the very idea inherently circular? Or rather, don't we land in a regress? After all, if the idea is to specify a process that yields validity, how do we know that that process is itself valid?

4.3 Deflation

How can we get out of this mess? One way is to deflate the notion of validity, just deny that it is a substantive property. When we claim that a result is valid etc. what we are really saying is that we endorse it, approve of it, etc. It's an expressive device. Compare the semantic deflationist's idea that calling something true amounts to endorsing or approving of it.

So if we discard the notion of validity (since it does no real work), don't we find ourselves lacking something essential? Well, we just need a vocabulary that allows us to say explicitly the sorts of things we find it useful to be able to express with respect to a study or qx technique. For example: credibility, utility, legitimacy, vindication, justification, etc.

Remark 7 *The notion of validity seems to be connected to the problem of deciding which theories we should endorse. What are the criteria of adequacy for any notion (or theory) of validity? Or: what are the requirements that should be met by any purported explanation of validity? Both particular cases and the general idea. Tarski gives us something like this for logical validity; what about "validity" as the term is used by psychometricians, test theorists, etc.?*

Contrast: claims of validity for a case, v. explanation of what validity is.

The objection will no doubt be that we need some kind of standard, which is just to say that we want to measure this something (validity, credibility, whatever). Implicit in all this is the notion that there is some "objective" fact of the matter to which our study/technique/etc. is answerable. A study is valid iff - what? If it meets some definite "objective" criteria. Methodological criteria, conditions of validity, etc. In the psychometrics and testing tradition this appeal to external authority is expressed as something along the lines of "measures what it purports to measure". Which is only meaningful insofar as a) there is actually something there to measure, and b) it is in fact susceptible to measurement.

And usually this is expressed in statistical terms. But that dog won't hunt either - you cannot get to validity via statistics. All you can do is measure central tendencies and variance - not enough to establish validity, which is a substantive notion. (analysis elsewhere).

To say that sth is valid is just to say that it is admirable (Peirce?), or perhaps that it is virtuous, that it has the virtues we prize.

5 The Deontic Scorekeeping Model of Discursive Practice and Survey Research

Abstract

Why the deontic scorekeeping model is preferable to others, esp. the cognitive model.

Remark 8 *It's a model of discursive, that is rational, practice. Contrast this with most models on offer which tend to focus on subpersonal processes; hence the prevalence of talk about "the survey process", the "response process", etc.*

6 A Quality Assurance Model for Survey Research

Abstract

abstract

7 Causality and the Space of Reasons

Abstract

abstract

Abell, ["Narrative Explanation"](#)
 Crane and Brewer, ["Mental Causation"](#)
 Gross, ["A Pragmatist Theory of Social Mechanisms"](#)
 Jackson, ["Mental Causation"](#)
 Lowe, ["The Causal Autonomy of the Mental"](#)
 Lowe, ["Non-Cartesian Substance Dualism and the Problem of Mental Causation"](#)
 C. MacDonald and G. MacDonald, ["Mental Causes and Explanation of Action"](#)
 Menzies and Price, ["Causation as a Secondary Quality"](#)
 Morris, ["Causes of Behaviour"](#)
 Williamson, ["The Broadness of the Mental"](#)

8 Vocabularies

Measurement as description. Description v. evaluation. Price on naturalisms. The bifurcation thesis.

9 Conflation of Causal and Logical Relations

10 Fact-Value

Messick, for one, conflates two kinds of fact/value distinction. The Kantian idea that we structure our own experience (etc.), Sellars' Myth of the Given, and etc. - such stuff shows how there is no data that is "objective" and given i.e. "data is theory-laden".

So facts involve what Putnam calls "epistemic values".

Messick confuses epistemic and ethical values. He seems to think that although we cannot arrive at value-free facts, this is because brute facts are always packaged with ethical values. The idea seems to be that ethical values are something separate from facts but always attached to them somehow. Whereas the real problem is that there is no genuine distinction between fact and (epistemic) value. Facts express (as it were) our epistemic values.

Messick's confusion is clear in his distinction between the scientific and social "roles" of validity - as if the social (value-laden) aspect of (Messickian) validity is something distinct from the science. "[I]t is fundamental that score validation is an empirical evaluation of the meaning and consequences of measurement. As such, validation combines scientific inquiry with rational argument to justify (or nullify) score interpretation and use." (p. 742) But "scientific inquiry" and "rational argument" are not two distinct things that can be combined. They are the same thing, at least conceptually. If there is a difference here, it is sociological - science as a way of conduction oneself, etc.

Messickian validity boils down to some notion of empirical support for theoretical explanations. For him "evidential basis" seems to correspond to "real" science, and "consequential basis" to "rational argument".

"[B]oth meaning and values are integral to the concept of validity..." (p. 747). The problem here is that the contrast with value is fact, not meaning.

"Meaning" is not something that can be empirically "validated".

11 Word-World

One problem with e.g. Messick is fuzziness about the relation of language to world. Ditto for any notion of "measuring a concept".

Re: validity: is it supposed to be a property of things in the world, or just a concept? Per Messick, validity is "associated with" score interpretation and use. This would seem to imply that it is a matter of language (concepts). But the language is just sloppy; "score interpretation" might (should) refer to how we take a score to relate to some fact in the world, in which case the question is just what is validity-in-the-world.

In any case, Messick's whole discussion is muddled on this point; it is rarely clear when he is talking about facts, concepts, or the relation between the two. Is a "construct" supposed to be something in the world or a concept that describes some aspect of the world?

Construct v. "indicators".

Compare positivist notions of observational language v. theoretical language. So-called indicators are (I understand) supposed to be empirical observables. Their relation to the construct is (must be) a matter of theory; but then is that theoretical (conceptual) structure to be taken as a mirror of reality, such that the construct is a real (albeit “hidden”) bit of the world and its relations to the indicators are real relations in the world?

12 Hypothetical Entities

Putnam, Brandom, etc. - if the existence of (some) hypotheticals makes no difference in the way things are then we can just discard them. As Putnam puts it, “Would mathematics *work one bit less well if these funny objects stopped existing? Those who posit “abstract entities” to account for the success of mathematics do not claim that we (or any other things in the empirical world) interact with the abstract entities. But if any entities do not interact with us or with the empirical world at all, then doesn’t it follow that everything would be the same if they didn’t exist?”* (Collapse, p. 33)

This points out another problem with e.g. latent variables, namely that they are supposed to have causal powers, but, insofar as they are abstract at least, they have no connection to the empirical world and so cannot cause anything. The counterargument would presumably be that hidden does not necessarily mean abstract. But in that case they must have a location in space-time, even if we don’t know what it is. But this just leads to more problems: where are hidden psychological processes supposed to occur? It can’t be the brain, since they are (by stipulation) psychological, not neurological.

So it seems we have no choice but to treat postulation of hidden stuff as a matter of Brandomian methodological pragmatism: useful, but without ontological consequences. “Constructs” may be useful for explaining observable indicators, but they don’t really exist in any meaningful sense. But the usual story goes the other way around: indicators are useful because they are how we get constructs.

13 Personal v. Subpersonal

Reasons v. causes

14 Spaces

14.1 Natural space of causes

14.2 Discursive space of reasons

15 Notes

15.1 Evolution

Instead of "the QA process", the proper object of investigation is the local evolution of discourse.

EM studies local produced order. It may come up with a structural description. But locally produced order is the outcome of an essentially evolutionary process - the mutual adaptation of the participants to each other and the context. Also, any such model may not (probably will not) generalize. But what does generalize is the evolutionary mechanism itself, just like in biology.

Rational selection as the mechanism of the evolution of discursive performances. What accounts for the deontic attitudes we adopt regarding performances? Brandom's account describes the architecture of such posturings and the significances the institute. But it does not really address the logic of discourse as an evolutionary process.

The idea is that Brandom provides an account of discourse qua rational action. Different attitudes are endorsed or undertaken for reasons - that is the source or ground of the intelligibility of discursive practice. So if we view the unfolding of discourse as being governed by the logic of evolution, we can treat Brandom's sort of rational pragmatism as the selection mechanism that accounts for why some attitudes (meanings) survive (are endorsed) and others do not. Meanings that survive must fit into the space of reasons - they must be assertable and justifiable, even if the participants are unable to explicitly articulate this. This makes the evolution of discourse intelligible as a rational process, rather than a natural process. Responses to questions are not explicable as effects caused by "true values" or the like; this would make them fundamentally non-rational. Or to borrow a bon mot from Garfinkel, this would make respondents "rational dopes".

Similar language: "negotiation", e.g. "...I suggest that the content of talk indicates that imposed hierarchies are continually re-negotiated..." Negotiation as rational evolution?

The "true score" and other orthodox models account for sentience, not sapience.

15.2 Verum Factum

Cartesianism (spectator, etc.) inspection, discovery, certainty, foundationism (external foundation grounding knowledge) v.

Verum Factum, geneological/historical, following growth/development, not certainty but ???; no foundationism, no privileged vocab, no external source of authority

Critical notions: authority. For evidence etc. key idea is authority - the only kind of authority is the kind we assent to. So the question is what do we treat as authoritative and why, rather than

how can we discover the One True external foundational source of authority and learn to speak its language

Critical notions: vocabulary. Regardless of what there is, we can only talk about it by using vocabs.

Relevance to SR: we make our truths, by engaging in dialog with respondents in order to teach/train them to understand what we want. In other words we work to make our scorecards converge. We can never be sure that researchers and respondents understand each other; have the same interpretations of qx text, etc. But we can do what nature does in evolution and learning: institute a cyclic process of experiment, feedback, and correction. This is operational even at the most simple and basic level of communication. So we can use this fact to our advantage.

Communication interactions as not essentially different from processes of evolution and learning. Evolutionary process tend to coordinate organism and environment; learning processes adapt the learner to the task environment, etc. Any discursive exchange - even simple greetings, etc. - does the same sort of thing: coordinate and mutually adjust the parties to the exchange.

15.3 Rational Evidence

Evidence-Based Rational SR

RCT: isolate the causal factor that links Treatment to Outcome

The mistake made by orthodox SR (shown by its vocab of measurement, error, etc.) is that it confuses the space of causes and the space of reasons.

In RCT, we observe a stimulus followed by a response (T followed by O) and postulate a causal relation. In SR, we observe a Q performance followed by a R performance. In fact this is an idealization since Q and R cannot be isolated - they are both joint performances. Ignore that for now; the point is that what makes them intelligible as performances is the space of reasons, not causes. That is, as discursive episodes they are essentially rational in a way the T-O trials are not. By definition, "rational" means involving concepts. Stimulus-response does not involve concepts and so is not rational in this favored sense. The natural world may be lawful, but it is not rational.

So SR should abandon the orthodox vocab of measurement, etc. in favor of one involving rationality. What would "evidence-based" mean, then? Not the kind of evidence involved in natural science, since such evidence does not involve concepts and thus meaning. Instead evidence inescapably involves meaning and understanding. What counts as evidence is what we count as a rational explanation or story. And this necessarily involves the perspective of the participants - it is their rationality, their giving and asking for reasons, that provides the observational basis of evidence.

One consequence: Qx does not involve measurement. SR can use stats to statistically measure the collected data, but that is quite separate from whether the data measure anything. So you can say that x% of respondents pick option X, but that does not mean that you have measured the distribution of "true values" of some latent variable. What you have measured is a distribution of deontic scores, or discursive postures. There is no warrant for claiming that each member of the x% means the same thing by picking X.

15.4 Misc

1. *What is a question? Better: what counts as a question, what is it to ask a question?*
2. *Ditto for answer.*
- Q and A as parts of a whole (holistic view)*
- Q token v. Q performance, etc.*

15.5 Erotetic Discursive Practice

EDP as production of data rather than discovery of truth

15.6 Replication

Goal is replication. Compare: blood work, e.g. measuring cholesterol. The measuring apparatus reacts to the sample, not the other way around. For EDP, respondent reacts to the question, so the question is analogous to the blood sample. The response is a kind of measurement of the question, not the other way around.

Replicability means same setup, same experimental conditions; in EDP this means replication of conceptual structure, which is accomplished by the dialog preceding the question. Traditionally, "ask the same question"; in practice this is impossible, since what counts is not the question text but respondent's grasp of the sense. So the "experimental setup" should be viewed as the work of teaching the respondent what the sense of the question is. Survey interviewing is essentially interventionist, but this is not necessarily a bad thing, since lab experiments are too - they "intervene" to set up experimental "initial conditions". The difference is that setting up initial conditions ("same meaning") in question asking means tutoring the respondent.

15.7 Myths and Mythologies

- *The Myth of Question Independence says that the meaning of a question is independent of context. But the meaning of a question is always dependent on what came before it.*
- *Myth of Autonomy. Interviewer and Respondent.*
- *Myth of Error*

15.8 Dopes

Garfinkel's dopes - cultural, judgmental, psychological

Dehumanization. Orthodox Survey Research (OSR) dehumanizes participants. The R is a sampling unit. The mythology of OSR measurement treats the human R as a natural object to be measured rather than a person.

Appendices

A Bibliography

- [1] Peter Abell. “Narrative Explanation: An Alternative to Variable-Centered Explanation?” In: *Annual Review of Sociology* 30 (Jan. 2004), pp. 287–310. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29737695> (visited on 12/08/2013) (cit. on p. 6).
- [2] E. Andreouli. “Identity, Positioning and Self-Other Relations”. In: *Papers on Social Representations* 19.1 (2010), pp. 14.1–14.13.
- [3] Michael Bacon. *Pragmatism: an introduction*. Cambridge, UK ; Malden, MA: Polity, 2012. ISBN: 9780745646640.
- [4] Patrick Baert. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences: Towards Pragmatism*. en. Polity, Nov. 2005. ISBN: 9780745622477.
- [5] Patrick Baert. “Pragmatism as a Philosophy of the Social Sciences”. en. In: *European Journal of Social Theory* 7.3 (Aug. 2004), pp. 355–369. DOI: [10.1177 / 1368431004044198](https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431004044198). (Visited on 12/24/2012).
- [6] Patrick Baert. “Pragmatism, Realism and Hermeneutics”. In: *Foundations of Science* 8.1 (Mar. 2003), pp. 89–106. DOI: [10.1023/A:1022445814115](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022445814115). URL: <http://link.springer.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/article/10.1023/A:1022445814115> (visited on 12/08/2012).
- [7] Patrick Baert. “Realism versus Pragmatism – an Introduction”. en. In: *Foundations of Science* 8.1 (Mar. 2003), pp. 1–2. DOI: [10.1023/A:1022491321867](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022491321867). URL: <http://link.springer.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/article/10.1023/A:1022491321867> (visited on 01/27/2013).
- [8] Patrick Baert. “Towards a Pragmatist-Inspired Philosophy of Social Science”. In: *Acta Sociologica* 48.3 (Sept. 2005), pp. 191–203. DOI: [10.2307/20059943](https://doi.org/10.2307/20059943). URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20059943> (visited on 12/24/2012).
- [9] Mikhail Mikhaïlovich Bakhtin. *Speech genres and other late essays*. Trans. by Vern W. McGee. University of Texas Press, 1986. ISBN: 9780292775602.
- [10] Mikhail Mikhaïlovich Bakhtin. “The Problem of Speech Genres”. In: *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. University of Texas Press, 1986, pp. 60–102. ISBN: 9780292775602.
- [11] Barry Barnes. “Ethnomethodology as Science”. In: *Social Studies of Science* 15.4 (Nov. 1985). ArticleType: book-review / Full publication date: Nov., 1985 / Copyright © 1985 Sage Publications, Ltd., pp. 751–762. ISSN: 0306-3127. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/285404> (visited on 01/22/2012).

- [12] Randy Elliot Bennett. "Consequences That Cannot Be Avoided: A Response to Paul Newton". In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 30–32. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.686865](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.686865).
- [13] T. J. Berard. "Rethinking Practices and Structures". In: *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 35.2 (June 2005), pp. 196–230. ISSN: 0048-3931, 1552-7441. DOI: [10.1177/0048393105275290](https://doi.org/10.1177/0048393105275290). URL: <http://pos.sagepub.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/content/35/2/196> (visited on 11/15/2012).
- [14] Richard J. Bernstein. *The Pragmatic Turn*. Polity, Apr. 2010.
- [15] Jack Bilmes. "Ethnomethodology, Culture, and Implicature: Toward an Empirical Pragmatics". In: *Pragmatics* 3.4 (Feb. 2010). ISSN: 1018-2101. URL: <http://elanguage.net/journals/index.php/pragmatics/article/viewArticle/181>.
- [16] Paul Black. "EPMA Professionals—Servants or Masters?" In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 33–37. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.677342](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.677342).
- [17] Simon Blackburn. "Invited Introduction: Finding Psychology". In: *The Philosophical Quarterly* 36.143 (Apr. 1986), pp. 111–122. DOI: [10.2307/2219763](https://doi.org/10.2307/2219763). URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2219763> (visited on 12/08/2013).
- [18] Simon Blackburn. "The Steps from Doing to Saying". In: *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society (Hardback)* 110.1pt1 (2010), pp. 1–13. DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-9264.2010.00276.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9264.2010.00276.x). URL: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9264.2010.00276.x/abstract> (visited on 12/08/2013).
- [19] S. F. Blinkhorn. "Past imperfect, future conditional: Fifty years of test theory". In: *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology* 50.2 (1997), pp. 175–185. DOI: [10.1111/j.2044-8317.1997.tb01139.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8317.1997.tb01139.x).
- [20] David Bloor. "Wittgenstein and the priority of practice". In: *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. Routledge, 2001, pp. 103–114.
- [21] Herbert Blumer. "Sociological Analysis and the "Variable"". In: *American Sociological Review* 21.6 (Dec. 1956), pp. 683–690. DOI: [10.2307/2088418](https://doi.org/10.2307/2088418).
- [22] Denny Borsboom. "The attack of the psychometricians". In: *Psychometrika* 71.3 (Sept. 2006), pp. 425–440. DOI: [10.1007/s11336-006-1447-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-006-1447-6).
- [23] Denny Borsboom. "Whose Consensus Is It Anyway? Scientific Versus Legalistic Conceptions of Validity". In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 38–41. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.681971](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.681971).
- [24] Denny Borsboom and Gideon J. Mellenbergh. "Why Psychometrics is Not Pathological A Comment on Michell". In: *Theory & Psychology* 14.1 (Feb. 2004), pp. 105–120. DOI: [10.1177/0959354304040200](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354304040200).

- [25] Denny Borsboom, Gideon J. Mellenbergh, and Jaap van Heerden. “The theoretical status of latent variables”. In: *Psychological Review* 110.2 (2003), pp. 203–219. DOI: [10.1037/0033-295X.110.2.203](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.110.2.203).
- [26] Tom Bramley. ““Measurement” and “Construct” Need to Be Clarified First. Commentary on Newton, P. E. “Clarifying the Consensus Definition of Validity””. In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 42–45. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.677344](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.677344).
- [27] Robert Brandom. *Articulating Reasons : An Introduction to Inferentialism*. Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- [28] Robert Brandom. *Between saying and doing : towards an analytic pragmatism*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- [29] Robert Brandom. *Making it explicit: reasoning, representing, and discursive commitment*. Harvard University Press, June 1998.
- [30] Robert Brandom. *Perspectives on Pragmatism : Classical, Recent, and Contemporary*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- [31] Robert Brandom. “Précis of Making It Explicit”. In: *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 57.1 (Mar. 1997). ArticleType: book-review / Full publication date: Mar., 1997 / Copyright © 1997 International Phenomenological Society, pp. 153–156. DOI: [10.2307/2953784](https://doi.org/10.2307/2953784). URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2953784> (visited on 12/31/2012).
- [32] Robert Brandom. “The Pragmatist Enlightenment (and its Problematic Semantics)”. In: *European Journal of Philosophy* 12.1 (2004), pp. 1–16. DOI: [10.1111/j.0966-8373.2004.00196.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0966-8373.2004.00196.x).
- [33] Robert Brandom. “The Social Anatomy of Inference”. In: *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 53.3 (1993), pp. 661–666. DOI: [10.2307/2108089](https://doi.org/10.2307/2108089).
- [34] Robert B. Brandom. “Analyzing Pragmatism: Pragmatics and Pragmatisms”. In: *Perspectives on Pragmatism*. Cambridge Mass. ; London: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- [35] Robert B. Brandom. “Classical American Pragmatism: The Pragmatist Enlightenment - and Its Problematic Semantics”. In: *Perspectives on Pragmatism*. Cambridge Mass. ; London: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- [36] Robert B. Brandom. “Introduction: From German Idealism to American Pragmatism - and Back”. In: *Perspectives on Pragmatism*. Cambridge Mass.; London: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- [37] Robert B. Brandom. “Linguistic Pragmatism and Pragmatism about Norms: An Arc of Thought from Rorty’s Eliminative Materialism to his Pragmatism”. In: *Perspectives on Pragmatism*. Cambridge Mass. ; London: Harvard University Press, 2011.

- [38] Robert B. Brandom. "Pragmatism, Expressivism, and Anti-Representationalism: Local and Global Possibilities". In: *Perspectives on Pragmatism*. Cambridge Mass. ; London: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- [39] Robert B Brandom. *Reason in philosophy*. Cambridge, Mass. [etc.]: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009.
- [40] Robert B. Brandom. "Vocabularies of Pragmatism: Synthesizing Naturalism and Historicism". In: *Perspectives on Pragmatism*. Cambridge Mass. ; London: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- [41] Henry Braun. "Conceptions of Validity: The Private and the Public". In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 46–49. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.679159](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.679159).
- [42] Svend Brinkmann. "Psychology's Facts and Values: A Perennial Entanglement". In: *Philosophical Psychology* 18.6 (2005), pp. 749–765. DOI: [10.1080/09515080500355244](https://doi.org/10.1080/09515080500355244).
- [43] Svend Brinkmann. "The ethical subject: Accountability, authorship, and practical reason". In: *SATS* 11.1 (Sept. 2010), pp. 75–89. URL: <http://www.degruyter.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/view/j/sats.2010.11.issue-1/sats.2010.007/sats.2010.007.xml> (visited on 04/21/2012).
- [44] Svend Brinkmann. "The Mind as Skills and Dispositions: On Normativity and Mediation". In: *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science* (Aug. 2011). ISSN: 1932-4502, 1936-3567. DOI: [10.1007/s12124-011-9183-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-011-9183-6). URL: <http://www.springerlink.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/content/g2222336gjn7x61k/> (visited on 01/02/2012).
- [45] Svend Brinkmann. "Towards an Expansive Hybrid Psychology: Integrating Theories of the Mediated Mind". In: *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science* 45.1 (Oct. 2010), pp. 1–20. ISSN: 1932-4502, 1936-3567. DOI: [10.1007/s12124-010-9146-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-010-9146-3). URL: <http://www.springerlink.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/content/ejq3033k4108g430/> (visited on 02/04/2012).
- [46] Mary Bucholtz and Kira Hall. "Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach". In: *Discourse Studies* 7.4-5 (Oct. 2005), pp. 585–614. ISSN: 1461-4456, 1461-7080. DOI: [10.1177/1461445605054407](https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407). URL: <http://dis.sagepub.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/content/7/4-5/585.short> (visited on 02/12/2012).
- [47] Graham Button, ed. *Ethnomethodology and the Human Sciences*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991. ISBN: 9780521389525.
- [48] Edward G. Carmines and Richard A. Zeller. *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. SAGE, Nov. 1979.
- [49] Robyn Carston. "Linguistic Communication and the Semantics/Pragmatics Distinction". In: *Synthese* 165.3 (Dec. 2008). ArticleType: research-article / Full publication date: Dec., 2008 / Copyright © 2008 Springer, pp. 321–345. ISSN: 0039-7857. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40271119>.

- [50] Miguel Castillo-Díaz and José-Luis Padilla. “How Cognitive Interviewing can Provide Validity Evidence of the Response Processes to Scale Items”. In: *Soc Indic Res* (), pp. 1–13. DOI: [10.1007/s11205-012-0184-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0184-8).
- [51] A M Chang, J P Chau, and E Holroyd. “Translation of questionnaires and issues of equivalence”. In: *J Adv Nurs* 29.2 (Feb. 1999). PMID: 10197930, pp. 316–322. URL: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10197930> (visited on 08/28/2011).
- [52] Hasok Chang. *Inventing temperature: measurement and scientific progress*. Oxford studies in philosophy of science. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. ISBN: 0195171276.
- [53] Hasok Chang. “Measurement, Justification, and Scientific Progress”. In: *Inventing temperature: measurement and scientific progress*. Oxford studies in philosophy of science. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2004, pp. 220–234. ISBN: 0195171276.
- [54] Hasok Chang. “Spirit, Air, and Quicksilver”. In: *Inventing temperature: measurement and scientific progress*. Oxford studies in philosophy of science. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2004, pp. 57–102. ISBN: 0195171276.
- [55] Jeasik Cho and Allen Trent. “Validity in qualitative research revisited”. In: *Qualitative Research* 6.3 (2006), pp. 319–340. DOI: [10.1177/1468794106065006](https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794106065006).
- [56] Lindsey Churchill. “Ethnomethodology and Measurement”. In: *Social Forces* 50.2 (Dec. 1971), pp. 182–191. DOI: [10.2307/2576936](https://doi.org/10.2307/2576936).
- [57] Aaron V. Cicourel. “Interviews, Surveys, and the Problem of Ecological Validity”. In: *The American Sociologist* 17.1 (Feb. 1982), pp. 11–20. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27702491> (visited on 03/11/2012).
- [58] Andy Clark. *Being there : putting brain, body, and world together again*. Cambridge, Mass. [u.a.]: MIT Press, 1997. ISBN: 0262032406 9780262032407 0262531569 9780262531566.
- [59] Andy Clark and Josefa Toribio. “Doing without Representing?” In: *Synthese* 101.3 (Dec. 1994), pp. 401–431. DOI: [10.1007/BF01063896](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01063896).
- [60] Herbert H. Clark. *Using language*. Cambridge University Press, May 1996. ISBN: 9780521567459.
- [61] David A. Cook and Thomas J. Beckman. “Current Concepts in Validity and Reliability for Psychometric Instruments: Theory and Application”. In: *The American Journal of Medicine* 119.2 (Feb. 2006), 166.e7–166.e16. DOI: [10.1016/j.amjmed.2005.10.036](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2005.10.036).
- [62] Deborah J. Coon. “Standardizing the Subject: Experimental Psychologists, Introspection, and the Quest for a Technoscientific Ideal”. In: *Technology and Culture* 34.4 (Oct. 1993), p. 757. DOI: [10.2307/3106414](https://doi.org/10.2307/3106414).
- [63] Jeff Coulter. “Cognition: cognition in an ethnomethodological mode”. In: *Ethnomethodology and the Human Sciences*. Ed. by Graham Button. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991, p. 176. ISBN: 9780521389525.
- [64] Jeff Coulter. “Discourse and Mind”. In: *Human Studies* 22.2/4 (Oct. 1999), pp. 163–181. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20011238>.

- [65] Jeff Coulter. "Language Without Mind". English. In: *Conversation and Cognition*. Ed. by Hedwig te Molder and Jonathan Potter. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2005, pp. 79–92.
- [66] Jeff Coulter. "Logic: ethnomethodology and the logic of language". In: *Ethnomethodology and the Human Sciences*. Ed. by Graham Button. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991, pp. 20–50. ISBN: 9780521389525.
- [67] Jeff Coulter. "What Is "Discursive Psychology"?" In: *Human Studies* 27.3 (Jan. 2004), pp. 335–340. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20010378>.
- [68] Angélique O. J. Cramer. "Why the Item "23 +1" Is Not in a Depression Questionnaire: Validity From a Network Perspective". In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 50–54. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.681973](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.681973).
- [69] Tim Crane and Bill Brewer. "Mental Causation". In: *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volumes* 69 (Jan. 1995), pp. 211–253. ISSN: 0309-7013. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4107076> (visited on 12/08/2013) (cit. on p. 6).
- [70] Lee J. Cronbach and Paul E. Meehl. "Construct validity in psychological tests". In: *Psychol Bull* 52.4 (July 1955). PMID: 13245896, pp. 281–302. URL: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/13245896> (visited on 03/17/2012).
- [71] Simon Cullen. "Survey-Driven Romanticism". en. In: *Review of Philosophy and Psychology* 1.2 (June 2010), pp. 275–296. DOI: [10.1007/s13164-009-0016-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13164-009-0016-1).
- [72] Bronwyn Davies and Rom Harré. "Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves". en. In: *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20.1 (Mar. 1990), pp. 43–63. DOI: [10.1111/j.1468-5914.1990.tb00174.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1990.tb00174.x).
- [73] G. Scott Davis. *Believing and Acting: The Pragmatic Turn in Comparative Religion and Ethics*. en. Oxford University Press, Mar. 2012.
- [74] Robyn M. Dawes. "Psychological measurement". In: *Psychological Review* 101.2 (1994), pp. 278–281. DOI: [10.1037/0033-295X.101.2.278](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.101.2.278).
- [75] Daniel C. Dennett. "Styles of Mental Representation". In: *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*. New Series 83 (Jan. 1982), pp. 213–226. ISSN: 00667374. URL: <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.uchicago.edu/stable/4545000> (visited on 02/19/2011).
- [76] Jacques Derrida. "Signature Event Context". In: *Limited Inc.* Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1988.
- [77] Vincent Descombes. *The Mind's Provisions: a Critique of Cognitivism*. New French thought. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001. ISBN: 0691001316.
- [78] Robert F DeVellis. *Scale development : theory and applications*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 2003. ISBN: 0761926046 9780761926047 0761926054 9780761926054.
- [79] Santo Di Nuovo. "Variables and Quantity: What Else?" In: *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science* 43.1 (Nov. 2008), pp. 84–88. DOI: [10.1007/s12124-008-9081-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-008-9081-8).

- [80] Morris Dickstein. *The Revival of Pragmatism: New Essays on Social Thought, Law, and Culture*. Duke University Press, Nov. 1998.
- [81] Eli Dresner. "Language and the Measure of Mind". In: *Mind & Language* 25.4 (Sept. 2010), pp. 418–439. DOI: [10.1111/j.1468-0017.2010.01396.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0017.2010.01396.x).
- [82] Hubert L. Dreyfus. "How Representational Cognitivism Failed and is being replaced by Body/World Coupling". In: *After Cognitivism*. Springer Netherlands, 2009, pp. 39–73. URL: <http://www.springerlink.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/content/q4kt33m51hh41456/abstract/> (visited on 10/16/2012).
- [83] Hubert L. Dreyfus. "Intelligence without representation – Merleau-Ponty's critique of mental representation The relevance of phenomenology to scientific explanation". In: *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 1.4 (Dec. 2002), pp. 367–383. DOI: [10.1023/A:1021351606209](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021351606209). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1021351606209>.
- [84] Judith A. Droitcour, Eric M. Larsen, and Fritz J. Scheuren. "The Three-Card Method: Estimating Sensitive Survey Items—With Permanent Anonymity of Response". In: *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the American Statistical Association*. Aug. 2001. URL: <http://www.amstat.org/sections/srms/proceedings/y2001/Proceed/00582.pdf>.
- [85] Judith A. Droitcour and Eric M. Larson. "An Innovative Technique for Asking Sensitive Questions: the Three-Card Method". In: *Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique* 75.1 (July 2002), pp. 5–23. DOI: [10.1177/075910630207500103](https://doi.org/10.1177/075910630207500103). URL: <http://bms.sagepub.com/content/75/1/5.abstract> (visited on 10/25/2011).
- [86] William Egginton and William Egginton Mike Sandbothe. *The Pragmatic Turn in Philosophy: Contemporary Engagements Between Analytic and Continental Thought*. SUNY Press, Apr. 2004.
- [87] Susan E. Embretson. "Construct Validity: A Universal Validity System or Just Another Test Evaluation Procedure?" In: *Educational Researcher* 36.8 (Nov. 2007), pp. 449–455. DOI: [10.3102/0013189X07311600](https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X07311600).
- [88] Mustafa Emirbayer and Douglas W. Maynard. "Pragmatism and Ethnomethodology". In: *Qualitative Sociology* 34.1 (Nov. 2010), pp. 221–261. DOI: [10.1007/s11133-010-9183-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-010-9183-8).
- [89] George Engelhard and Nadia Behizadeh. "Epistemic Iterations and Consensus Definitions of Validity". In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 55–58. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.681974](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.681974).
- [90] Christopher Essex and William E. Smythe. "Between Numbers and Notions A Critique of Psychological Measurement". In: *Theory & Psychology* 9.6 (Dec. 1999), pp. 739–767. DOI: [10.1177/0959354399096002](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354399096002).
- [91] Ronald Fischer and Taciano L. Milfont. "Standardization in psychological research." In: *International Journal of Psychological Research* 3.1 (July 2010), pp. 88–96. URL: <http://mvint.usbmed.edu.co:8002/ojs/index.php/web/article/view/463> (visited on 12/09/2013).

- [92] J A Flaherty et al. "Developing instruments for cross-cultural psychiatric research". In: *J. Nerv. Ment. Dis.* 176.5 (May 1988). PMID: 3367140, pp. 257–263. URL: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3367140> (visited on 10/23/2011).
- [93] J. A. Fodor. "Methodological Solipsism Considered as a Research Strategy in Cognitive Psychology". In: *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 3.01 (1980), pp. 63–73. DOI: [10.1017/S0140525X00001771](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00001771).
- [94] Melissa Freeman. "Validity in Dialogic Encounters With Hermeneutic Truths". In: *Qualitative Inquiry* 17.6 (July 2011), pp. 543–551. DOI: [10.1177/1077800411409887](https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800411409887).
- [95] Barbara Fultner. "Inferentialism and Communicative Action: Robust Conceptions of Intersubjectivity". In: *Philosophical Studies* 108.1 (Mar. 2002), pp. 121–131. DOI: [10.1023/A:1015768316114](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015768316114).
- [96] Mary J. Gallant and Sherryl Kleinman. "Symbolic Interactionism vs. Ethnomethodology". In: *Symbolic Interaction* 6.1 (May 1983). ArticleType: research-article / Full publication date: Spring 1983 /, pp. 1–18. ISSN: 0195-6086. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/si.1983.6.1.1> (visited on 01/14/2012).
- [97] U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO). *Estimating the Undocumented Population: A "Grouped Answers" Approach to Surveying Foreign-Bord Respondents*. Tech. rep. GAO-06-775. Washington D.C.: U.S. General Accounting Office, Sept. 2006. URL: <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d06775.pdf>.
- [98] Harold Garfinkel. *Ethnomethodology's program : working out Durkeim's aphorism*. Ed. by Anne Warfield Rawls. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002. ISBN: 0742516415 9780742516410 0742516423 9780742516427.
- [99] Harold Garfinkel. *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, UK : Polity Press, 1984.
- [100] Charles Goodwin. "The Interactive Construction of a Sentence in Natural Conversation". In: *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Irvington Publishers, 1979, pp. 97–121. ISBN: 9780470266700.
- [101] Joanna S. Gorin. "Reconsidering Issues in Validity Theory". In: *Educational Researcher* 36.8 (Nov. 2007), pp. 456–462. DOI: [10.2307/4621100](https://doi.org/10.2307/4621100). URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4621100> (visited on 01/27/2013).
- [102] H. P. Grice. "Meaning". In: *The Philosophical Review* 66.3 (July 1957). ArticleType: research-article / Full publication date: Jul., 1957 / Copyright © 1957 Duke University Press, pp. 377–388. ISSN: 00318108. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2182440>.
- [103] H. P. Grice. "Utterer's Meaning and Intention". In: *The Philosophical Review* 78.2 (Apr. 1969). ArticleType: research-article / Full publication date: Apr., 1969 / Copyright © 1969 Duke University Press, pp. 147–177. ISSN: 00318108. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2184179>.

- [104] H. P. Grice. "Utterer's Meaning, Sentence-Meaning, and Word-Meaning". In: *Foundations of Language* 4.3 (Aug. 1968). ArticleType: research-article / Full publication date: Aug., 1968 / Copyright © 1968 Springer, pp. 225–242. ISSN: 0015900X. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25000329>.
- [105] H. Paul Grice. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press, 1989.
- [106] Paul Grice. "Logic and Conversation". In: *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge Mass ;London: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- [107] Neil Gross. "A Pragmatist Theory of Social Mechanisms". en. In: *American Sociological Review* 74.3 (June 2009), pp. 358–379. DOI: [10.1177/000312240907400302](https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240907400302). (Visited on 10/10/2012) (cit. on p. 6).
- [108] Robert M Groves. "Measurement Error Across the Disciplines". In: *Measurement Errors in Surveys*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1991.
- [109] Susan Haack and Robert Edwin Lane. *Pragmatism, old & new: selected writings*. Prometheus Books, Apr. 2006.
- [110] Brian D. Haig. "From Construct Validity to Theory Validation". In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 59–62. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.681975](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.681975).
- [111] J. Haiman. "Ritualization and the Development of Languages". In: *Perspectives on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1994.
- [112] John Hale. "Uncertainty about the Rest of the Sentence". In: *Cognitive Science* 30.4 (2006), pp. 643–672. URL: <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=EJ747089> (visited on 03/19/2012).
- [113] Rom Harré. "Discursive Psychology and the Boundaries of Sense". In: *Organization Studies* 25.8 (Oct. 2004), pp. 1435–1453. DOI: [10.1177/0170840604046351](https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840604046351). URL: <http://oss.sagepub.com/content/25/8/1435.abstract> (visited on 02/06/2012).
- [114] Rom Harré. "The Discursive Creation of Human Psychology". In: *Symbolic Interaction* 15.4 (Nov. 1992). ArticleType: research-article / Full publication date: Winter 1992 /, pp. 515–527. ISSN: 0195-6086. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/si.1992.15.4.515> (visited on 01/19/2012).
- [115] Rom Harré et al. "Recent Advances in Positioning Theory". In: *Theory & Psychology* 19.1 (Feb. 2009), pp. 5–31. ISSN: 0959-3543, 1461-7447. DOI: [10.1177/0959354308101417](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354308101417). URL: <http://tap.sagepub.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/content/19/1/5> (visited on 01/23/2013).
- [116] John Heritage. *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York, N.Y.: Polity Press, 1984. ISBN: 0745600603 9780745600604 0745600611 9780745600611.

- [117] C. S. Herrman. “Fundamentals of Methodology Part I: Definitions and First Principles”. In: *SSRN eLibrary* (Apr. 2009). URL: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1373976 (visited on 01/21/2012).
- [118] S. Brian Hood. “In Defense of an Instrument-Based Approach to Validity”. In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 63–65. ISSN: 1536-6367. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.681976](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.681976).
- [119] S. Brian Hood. “Validity in Psychological Testing and Scientific Realism”. In: *Theory & Psychology* 19.4 (Aug. 2009), pp. 451–473. DOI: [10.1177/0959354309336320](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354309336320).
- [120] Lisa Tsoi Hoshmand. “Can Lessons of History and Logical Analysis Ensure Progress in Psychological Science?” In: *Theory & Psychology* 13.1 (Feb. 2003), pp. 39–44. DOI: [10.1177/0959354303131003](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354303131003).
- [121] David Houle et al. “Measurement and Meaning in Biology”. In: *The Quarterly Review of Biology* 86.1 (Mar. 2011), pp. 3–34. DOI: [10.1086/658408](https://doi.org/10.1086/658408).
- [122] Dorothy Howie and Michael Peters. “Positioning Theory: Vygotsky, Wittgenstein and Social Constructionist Psychology”. In: *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 26.1 (Mar. 1996), pp. 51–64. ISSN: 1468-5914. DOI: [10.1111/j.1468-5914.1996.tb00285.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1996.tb00285.x). URL: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1996.tb00285.x/abstract> (visited on 01/20/2012).
- [123] Frank Jackson. “Mental Causation”. In: *Mind* 105.419 (July 1996), pp. 377–413. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2254828> (visited on 12/08/2013) (cit. on p. 6).
- [124] Michael Kane. “All Validity Is Construct Validity. Or Is It?” In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 66–70. ISSN: 1536-6367. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.681977](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.681977).
- [125] Antti Kauppinen. “The Rise and Fall of Experimental Philosophy”. In: *Philosophical Explorations* 10.2 (2007), pp. 95–118. DOI: [10.1080/13869790701305871](https://doi.org/10.1080/13869790701305871).
- [126] Matthias Kiesselbach. “Constructing Commitment: Brandom’s Pragmatist Take on Rule-Following”. In: *Philosophical Investigations* 35.2 (2012), pp. 101–126. DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-9205.2011.01450.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9205.2011.01450.x). (Visited on 12/14/2012).
- [127] Gary King et al. “Enhancing the Validity and Cross-cultural Comparability of Measurement in Survey Research”. In: *American Political Science Review* 98 (2004), pp. 191–207. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-531-91826-6_16](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-91826-6_16).
- [128] Suzanne R. Kirschner. “Sociocultural Subjectivities Progress, Prospects, Problems”. In: *Theory & Psychology* 20.6 (Dec. 2010), pp. 765–780. ISSN: 0959-3543, 1461-7447. DOI: [10.1177/0959354310375745](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354310375745). URL: <http://tap.sagepub.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/content/20/6/765> (visited on 01/23/2013).
- [129] Paul Kline. “Commentary on Michell, Quantitative Science and the definition of measurement in psychology”. In: *British Journal of Psychology* 88.3 (1997), pp. 358–387. DOI: [10.1111/j.2044-8295.1997.tb02642.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1997.tb02642.x).

- [130] Joshua Knobe. "Experimental Philosophy and Philosophical Significance". In: *Philosophical Explorations* 10.2 (2007), pp. 119–121. DOI: [10.1080/13869790701305905](https://doi.org/10.1080/13869790701305905).
- [131] Joshua Knobe. *Experiments in Philosophy*. <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/09/07/experimental-philosophy/>. Sept. 7, 2010. URL: <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/09/07/experimental-philosophy/> (visited on 12/24/2012).
- [132] Joshua Knobe et al. "Experimental Philosophy". In: *Annual Review of Psychology* 63.1 (2012), pp. 81–99. DOI: [10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100350](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100350).
- [133] Robert Kraut. "Varieties of Pragmatism". In: *Mind* 99.394 (Apr. 1990), pp. 157–183. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2254958> (visited on 12/08/2013).
- [134] Frederick Kroon. "Theory-dependence, warranted reference, and the epistemic dimensions of realism". In: *Euro Jnl Phil Sci* 1.2 (May 2011), pp. 173–191. DOI: [10.1007/s13194-010-0004-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13194-010-0004-4).
- [135] Donald Laming. "A critique of a measurement-theoretic critique: Commentary on Michell, Quantitative science and the definition of measurement in psychology". In: *British Journal of Psychology* 88.3 (1997), pp. 389–391. DOI: [10.1111/j.2044-8295.1997.tb02643.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1997.tb02643.x).
- [136] Suzanne Lane. "Consequences of Assessment and Accountability Systems Are Integral to the Argument-Based Approach to Validity". In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 71–74. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.679160](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.679160). (Visited on 01/24/2013).
- [137] Jeanette A Lawrence and Agnes E Dodds. "Three approaches to the disjunction between psychological measurement and psychological persons: methodological and ethical considerations". In: *Integr Psychol Behav Sci* 44.4 (Dec. 2010). PMID: 20490955, pp. 299–309. DOI: [10.1007/s12124-010-9129-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-010-9129-4).
- [138] David Lewis. "Psychophysical and theoretical identifications". In: *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 50.3 (1972), pp. 249–258. DOI: [10.1080/00048407212341301](https://doi.org/10.1080/00048407212341301).
- [139] Robert W. Lissitz and Tiago Calíço. "Validity is an Action Verb: Commentary on: "Clarifying the Consensus Definition of Validity"". In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 75–79. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.677346](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.677346).
- [140] Robert W. Lissitz and Karen Samuelsen. "A Suggested Change in Terminology and Emphasis regarding Validity and Education". In: *Educational Researcher* 36.8 (Nov. 2007), pp. 437–448. DOI: [10.3102/0013189X07311286](https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X07311286).
- [141] Robert W. Lissitz and Karen Samuelsen. "Further Clarification regarding Validity and Education". In: *Educational Researcher* 36.8 (Nov. 2007), pp. 482–484. DOI: [10.2307/4621104](https://doi.org/10.2307/4621104). URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4621104> (visited on 01/27/2013).
- [142] Ronald Loeffler. "Neo-Pragmatist (Practice-Based) Theories of Meaning". In: *Philosophy Compass* 4.1 (2009), pp. 197–218. DOI: [10.1111/j.1747-9991.2008.00186.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-9991.2008.00186.x).

- [143] Nathalie Lovasz and Kathleen L. Slaney. “What makes a hypothetical construct “hypothetical””? Tracing the origins and uses of the ‘hypothetical construct’ concept in psychological science”. In: *New Ideas in Psychology* 31.1 (Apr. 2013), pp. 22–31. DOI: [10.1016/j.newideapsych.2011.02.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2011.02.005).
- [144] A. D. Lovie. “Commentary on Michell, Quantitative science and the definition of measurement in psychology”. In: *British Journal of Psychology* 88.3 (1997), pp. 393–394. DOI: [10.1111/j.2044-8295.1997.tb02644.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1997.tb02644.x).
- [145] E. J. Lowe. “Non-Cartesian Substance Dualism and the Problem of Mental Causation”. In: *Erkenntnis* (1975-) 65.1 (Jan. 2006), pp. 5–23. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27667849> (visited on 12/08/2013) (cit. on p. 6).
- [146] E. J. Lowe. “The Causal Autonomy of the Mental”. In: *Mind* 102.408 (Oct. 1993), pp. 629–644. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2254049> (visited on 12/08/2013) (cit. on p. 6).
- [147] R. Duncan Luce. “Quantification and symmetry: Commentary on Michell, Quantitative science and the definition of measurement in psychology”. In: *British Journal of Psychology* 88.3 (1997), pp. 395–398. DOI: [10.1111/j.2044-8295.1997.tb02645.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1997.tb02645.x).
- [148] R. Duncan Luce and Patrick Suppes. “Representational Measurement Theory”. In: *Stevens’ Handbook of Experimental Psychology*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2002. URL: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1002/0471214426.pas0401/abstract> (visited on 01/27/2013).
- [149] William Lycan. “Representational Theories of Consciousness”. In: *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. by Edward N. Zalta. Fall 2008. 2008. URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/consciousness-representational/>.
- [150] Michael Lynch. “Cognitive activities without cognition? ethnomethodological investigations of selected ‘cognitive’ topics”. In: *Discourse Studies* 8.1 (Feb. 2006), pp. 95–104. DOI: [10.1177/1461445606059559](https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445606059559).
- [151] Michael Lynch. “Ethnomethodology and the logic of practice”. In: *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. Routledge, 2001, pp. 140–157.
- [152] Michael Lynch. “Method: Measurement - ordinary and scientific measurement as ethnomethodological phenomena”. In: *Ethnomethodology and the Human Sciences*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991, pp. 77–108.
- [153] Cynthia MacDonald and Graham MacDonald. “Mental Causes and Explanation of Action”. In: *The Philosophical Quarterly* 36.143 (Apr. 1986). ArticleType: research-article / Issue Title: Special Issue: Mind, Causation and Action / Full publication date: Apr., 1986 / Copyright © 1986 The Philosophical Quarterly, pp. 145–158. DOI: [10.2307/2219765](https://doi.org/10.2307/2219765) (cit. on p. 6).
- [154] Graham Macdonald and Philip Pettit. “The Nature of Naturalism”. In: *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volumes* 66 (Jan. 1992), pp. 225–266. ISSN: 0309-7013. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4106978> (visited on 12/08/2013).

- [155] Alan R. Malachowski. *The New Pragmatism*. Acumen, 2010.
- [156] Norman Malcolm. "Wittgenstein: The relation of language to instinctive behaviour". In: *Philosophical Investigations* 5.1 (Jan. 1982), pp. 3–22. DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-9205.1982.tb00531.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9205.1982.tb00531.x).
- [157] Michael D. Maraun. "Validity and Measurement". In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 80–83. ISSN: 1536-6367. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.682523](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.682523).
- [158] Michael D. Maraun and Stephanie M. Gabriel. "Illegitimate concept equating in the partial fusion of construct validation theory and latent variable modeling". In: *New Ideas in Psychology* 31.1 (Apr. 2013), pp. 32–42. DOI: [10.1016/j.newideapsych.2011.02.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2011.02.006).
- [159] Joseph Margolis. *Pragmatism without foundations: reconciling realism and relativism*. 2nd ed. London ; New York: Continuum, 2007. ISBN: 9780826491374.
- [160] Joseph Margolis. *Reinventing pragmatism: American philosophy at the end of the 20th century*. Cornell University Press, 2002. ISBN: 9780801439957.
- [161] S.W. Margulis. "Measurement Error and Reliability". In: *Encyclopedia of Animal Behavior*. Ed. by Editors-in-Chief: Michael D. Breed and Janice Moore. Oxford: Academic Press, 2010, pp. 424–428. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B978008045337800231X>.
- [162] Keith A. Markus. "Constructs and Attributes in Test Validity: Reflections on Newton's Account". In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 84–87. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.677348](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.677348).
- [163] Keith A. Markus. "Science, Measurement, and Validity: Is Completion of Samuel Messick's Synthesis Possible?" In: *Social Indicators Research* 45.1/3 (Nov. 1998), pp. 5–34. DOI: [10.1023/A:1006960823277](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006960823277).
- [164] Keith A. Markus and Denny Borsboom. "Reflective measurement models, behavior domains, and common causes". In: *New Ideas in Psychology* 31.1 (Apr. 2013), pp. 54–64. DOI: [10.1016/j.newideapsych.2011.02.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2011.02.008).
- [165] Keith A. Markus and Denny Borsboom. "The cat came back: Evaluating arguments against psychological measurement". In: *Theory & Psychology* 22.4 (Aug. 2012), pp. 452–466. DOI: [10.1177/0959354310381155](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354310381155).
- [166] Aryn Martin and Michael Lynch. "Counting Things and People: The Practices and Politics of Counting". In: *Social Problems* 56.2 (May 2009), pp. 243–266. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2009.56.2.243> (visited on 10/16/2012).
- [167] Jack Martin. "Positivism, Quantification and the Phenomena of Psychology". In: *Theory & Psychology* 13.1 (Feb. 2003), pp. 33–38. DOI: [10.1177/0959354303013001760](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354303013001760).
- [168] Per Martin-Löf. "Truth of a proposition, evidence of a judgement, validity of a proof". In: *Synthese* 73.3 (Dec. 1987), pp. 407–420. DOI: [10.1007/BF00484985](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00484985).

- [169] Rosa L Matzkin. “Nonparametric Survey Response Errors”. In: *International Economic Review* 48.4 (Nov. 2007), pp. 1411–1427. DOI: [10.1111/j.1468-2354.2007.00468.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2354.2007.00468.x).
- [170] Douglas W. Maynard and Steven E. Clayman. “The Diversity of Ethnomethodology”. In: *Annual Review of Sociology* 17.1 (1991), pp. 385–418. DOI: [10.1146/annurev.so.17.080191.002125](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.17.080191.002125). URL: <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.so.17.080191.002125> (visited on 02/18/2013).
- [171] Douglas W. Maynard and Nora Cate Schaeffer. “Toward a Sociology of Social Scientific Knowledge: Survey Research and Ethnomethodology’s Asymmetric Alternates”. In: *Social Studies of Science* 30.3 (June 2000). ArticleType: research-article / Full publication date: Jun., 2000 / Copyright © 2000 Sage Publications, Ltd., pp. 323–370. ISSN: 0306-3127. DOI: [10.2307/285806](https://doi.org/10.2307/285806). URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/285806> (visited on 01/30/2013).
- [172] Roderick P. McDonald. “Measuring Latent Quantities”. In: *Psychometrika* 76.4 (Oct. 2011), pp. 511–536. DOI: [10.1007/s11336-011-9223-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-011-9223-7).
- [173] Louis Menand. “An Introduction to Pragmatism”. In: *Pragmatism: A Reader*. Ed. by Louis Menand. New York: Vintage Books, 1997.
- [174] Louis Menand, ed. *Pragmatism: a Reader*. New York: Vintage Books, 1997.
- [175] Peter Menzies and Huw Price. “Causation as a Secondary Quality”. In: *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 44.2 (June 1993). ArticleType: research-article / Full publication date: Jun., 1993 / Copyright © 1993 The British Society for the Philosophy of Science, pp. 187–203. ISSN: 0007-0882. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/687643> (visited on 12/08/2013) (cit. on p. 6).
- [176] Samuel Messick. “Test Validity: A Matter of Consequence”. In: *Social Indicators Research* 45.1-3 (Nov. 1998), pp. 35–44. DOI: [10.1023/A:1006964925094](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006964925094).
- [177] Samuel Messick. “Validity of psychological assessment: Validation of inferences from persons’ responses and performances as scientific inquiry into score meaning”. In: *American Psychologist* 50.9 (1995), pp. 741–749. ISSN: 1935-990X(Electronic);0003-066X(Print). DOI: [10.1037/0003-066X.50.9.741](https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.50.9.741).
- [178] Joel Michell. “Constructs, inferences, and mental measurement”. In: *New Ideas in Psychology* 31.1 (Apr. 2013), pp. 13–21. DOI: [10.1016/j.newideapsych.2011.02.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2011.02.004).
- [179] Joel Michell. “Item Response Models, Pathological Science and the Shape of Error Reply to Borsboom and Mellenbergh”. In: *Theory & Psychology* 14.1 (Feb. 2004), pp. 121–129. DOI: [10.1177/0959354304040201](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354304040201).
- [180] Joel Michell. “Normal Science, Pathological Science and Psychometrics”. In: *Theory & Psychology* 10.5 (Oct. 2000), pp. 639–667. DOI: [10.1177/0959354300105004](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354300105004).
- [181] Joel Michell. “Quantitative science and the definition of measurement in psychology”. In: *British Journal of Psychology* 88.3 (1997), pp. 355–383. DOI: [10.1111/j.2044-8295.1997.tb02641.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1997.tb02641.x).

- [182] Joel Michell. ““The constantly recurring argument”: Inferring quantity from order”. In: *Theory & Psychology* 22.3 (June 2012), pp. 255–271. DOI: [10.1177/0959354311434656](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354311434656).
- [183] Joel Michell. “The psychometricians’ fallacy: Too clever by half?” In: *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology* 62.1 (2009), pp. 41–55. DOI: [10.1348/000711007X243582](https://doi.org/10.1348/000711007X243582).
- [184] Joel Michell. “The Quantitative Imperative Positivism, Naive Realism and the Place of Qualitative Methods in Psychology”. In: *Theory & Psychology* 13.1 (Feb. 2003), pp. 5–31. DOI: [10.1177/0959354303013001758](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354303013001758).
- [185] Cheryl Misak, ed. *New Pragmatists*. Oxford University Press, USA, May 2007.
- [186] Robert J. Mislevy. “The Case for Informal Argument”. In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 93–96. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.682525](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.682525). (Visited on 01/24/2013).
- [187] Robert J. Mislevy. “Validity by Design”. In: *Educational Researcher* 36.8 (Nov. 2007), pp. 463–469. DOI: [10.3102/0013189X07311660](https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X07311660).
- [188] Hedwig te Molder and Jonathan Potter, eds. *Conversation and Cognition*. English. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [189] Michael Morgan. “Measurement in psychology: Commentary on Michell’s Quantitative Science and the definition of measurement in psychology”. In: *British Journal of Psychology* 88.3 (1997), pp. 399–400. DOI: [10.1111/j.2044-8295.1997.tb02646.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1997.tb02646.x).
- [190] Michael Morris. “Causes of Behaviour”. In: *The Philosophical Quarterly* 36.143 (Apr. 1986), pp. 123–144. DOI: [10.2307/2219764](https://doi.org/10.2307/2219764) (cit. on p. 6).
- [191] Pamela A. Moss. “Reconstructing Validity”. In: *Educational Researcher* 36.8 (Nov. 2007), pp. 470–476. DOI: [10.3102/0013189X07311608](https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X07311608).
- [192] Pamela A. Moss. “Recovering a Dialectical View of Rationality”. In: *Social Indicators Research* 45.1/3 (Nov. 1998), pp. 55–67. DOI: [10.1023/A:1006925226003](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006925226003).
- [193] Kevin R. Murphy. “Validity for What? The Peril of Overclarifying”. In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 97–99. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.677362](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.677362).
- [194] Thomas Nadelhoffer and Eddy Nahmias. “The Past and Future of Experimental Philosophy”. In: *Philosophical Explorations* 10.2 (2007), pp. 123–149. ISSN: 1386-9795. DOI: [10.1080/13869790701305921](https://doi.org/10.1080/13869790701305921).
- [195] Paul E. Newton. “Clarifying the Consensus Definition of Validity”. In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 1–29. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.669666](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.669666).
- [196] Paul E. Newton. “Questioning the Consensus Definition of Validity”. In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 110–122. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.688456](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.688456).

- [197] Hugh J. Parry and Helen M. Crossley. "Validity of Responses to Survey Questions". In: *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 14.1 (Apr. 1950), pp. 61–80. DOI: [10.1086/266150](https://doi.org/10.1086/266150).
- [198] Elazar J. Pedhazur and Liora Pedhazur Schmelkin. *Measurement, design, and analysis: an integrated approach*. Psychology Press, 1991. ISBN: 9780805810639.
- [199] Charles Sanders Peirce. "How to Make Our Ideas Clear". In: *Popular Science Monthly* 12 (1878), pp. 286–302.
- [200] David Pitt. "Mental Representation". In: *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. by Edward N. Zalta. Winter 2012. 2012. URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2012/entries/mental-representation/>.
- [201] Alastair Pollitt. "Validity Cannot Be Created, It Can Only Be Lost". In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 100–103. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.686868](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.686868). (Visited on 01/24/2013).
- [202] Deborah Poole. "Routine Testing Practices and the Linguistic Construction of Knowledge". In: *Cognition and Instruction* 12.2 (Jan. 1994), pp. 125–150. DOI: [10.1207/s1532690xc1202_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xc1202_3).
- [203] Jonathan Potter. "Post-Cognitive Psychology". en. In: *Theory & Psychology* 10.1 (Feb. 2000), pp. 31–37. DOI: [10.1177/0959354300010001596](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354300010001596).
- [204] Dag Prawitz. "Inference and Knowledge". In: *Logica Yearbook 2008*. London: College Publications, 2009, pp. 183–200.
- [205] Dag Prawitz. "The epistemic significance of valid inference". In: *Synthese* (Mar. 2011), pp. 1–12. DOI: [10.1007/s11229-011-9907-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-011-9907-7).
- [206] Dag Prawitz. "Truth as an Epistemic Notion". In: *Topoi* (), pp. 1–8. DOI: [10.1007/s11245-011-9107-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11245-011-9107-6).
- [207] Dag Prawitz. *Validity of Inference*. Abstract. Feb. 2008.
- [208] Huw Price. "'Could a Question be True?': Assent and the Basis of Meaning". In: *The Philosophical Quarterly* 33.133 (Oct. 1983), p. 354. DOI: [10.2307/2219162](https://doi.org/10.2307/2219162).
- [209] Huw Price. *Expressivism, pragmatism and representationalism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [210] Huw Price. "Naturalism without representationalism". In: *Expressivism, Pragmatism, and Representationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp. 3–21.
- [211] Huw Price. "Pluralism, 'world', and the primacy of science". In: *Expressivism, Pragmatism, and Representationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp. 22–44.
- [212] Huw Price. "Two expressivist programmes, two bifurcations". In: *Expressivism, Pragmatism, and Representationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp. 22–44.
- [213] George Psathas. *Everyday language: studies in ethnomethodology*. Irvington Publishers : distributed by Halsted Press, 1979. ISBN: 9780470266700.

- [214] Hilary Putnam. *Representation and reality*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991. ISBN: 0262660741 9780262660747.
- [215] Hilary Putnam. *The Collapse of the Fact/Value Dichotomy and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002. ISBN: 0674009053.
- [216] Hilary Putnam. "The Three Enlightenments". In: *After Cognitivism: A Reassessment of Cognitive Science and Philosophy*. Springer, 2009.
- [217] Louis Quéré and Cédric Terzi. "Some Features of Pragmatist Thought Still Remain Insufficiently Explored in Ethnomethodology". In: *Qualitative Sociology* 34.1 (Nov. 2010), pp. 271–275. DOI: [10.1007/s11133-010-9182-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-010-9182-9).
- [218] Panu Raatikainen. "Causation, Exclusion, and the Special Sciences". In: *Erkenn* 73.3 (Nov. 2010), pp. 349–363. DOI: [10.1007/s10670-010-9236-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10670-010-9236-0).
- [219] Anne Warfield Rawls. "Garfinkel, Ethnomethodology and the Defining Questions of Pragmatism". In: *Qualitative Sociology* 34.1 (Dec. 2010), pp. 277–282. DOI: [10.1007/s11133-010-9185-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-010-9185-6).
- [220] François Recanati, Gerhard Preyer, and Georg Peter. "Literalism and Contextualism: Some Varieties". In: *Contextualism in Philosophy: Knowledge, Meaning and Truth*. Clarendon Press, 2005, pp. 171–196.
- [221] Mark D. Reckase. "The Interaction of Values and Validity Assessment: Does a Test's Level of Validity Depend on a Researcher's Values?" In: *Social Indicators Research* 45.1-3 (Nov. 1998), pp. 45–54. DOI: [10.1023/A:1006973109164](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006973109164).
- [222] A. Kimball Romney, Susan C. Weller, and William H. Batchelder. "Culture as Consensus: A Theory of Culture and Informant Accuracy". In: *American Anthropologist*. New Series 88.2 (June 1986), pp. 313–338. DOI: [10.1525/aa.1986.88.2.02a00020](https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1986.88.2.02a00020).
- [223] Richard Rorty. "Method, Social Science, and Social Hope". In: *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 11.4 (Dec. 1981), pp. 569–588. DOI: [10.1080/00455091.1981.10716323](https://doi.org/10.1080/00455091.1981.10716323). URL: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00455091.1981.10716323>.
- [224] Richard Rorty. *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [225] Richard Rorty. "Representation, Social Practise, and Truth". In: *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition* 54.2 (Sept. 1988), pp. 215–228. DOI: [10.1007/BF00354514](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00354514).
- [226] Richard Rorty. "The Philosopher as Expert". In: *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Thirtieth Anniversary Edition. Princeton University Press, 2009, pp. 395–421.
- [227] Philip J. Rosenbaum and Jaan Valsiner. "The un-making of a method: From rating scales to the study of psychological processes". In: *Theory & Psychology* 21.1 (Feb. 2011), pp. 47–65. DOI: [10.1177/0959354309352913](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354309352913).

- [228] Nora Ruck and Thomas Slunecko. "A Stale Challenge to the Philosophy of Science". In: *Integr. psych. behav.* 44.2 (June 2010), pp. 168–175. DOI: [10.1007/s12124-010-9121-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-010-9121-z).
- [229] Gilbert Ryle. *The concept of mind*. University of Chicago Press ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Pres, 1984. ISBN: 0226732959.
- [230] Uwe Saint-Mont. "What measurement is all about". In: *Theory & Psychology* 22.4 (Aug. 2012), pp. 467–485. DOI: [10.1177/0959354311429997](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354311429997).
- [231] Robert E. Sanders. "Validating 'observations' in discourse studies: A methodological reason for attention to cognition". English. In: *Conversation and Cognition*. Ed. by Hedwig te Molder and Jonathan Potter. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2005, pp. 57–78.
- [232] Kevin Scharp. "Brandom on Communication". In: *Philosophical Profiles in the Theory of Communication*. McGill-Queen's University Press.
- [233] Theodore R. Schatzki, Karin Knorr Cetina, and Eike von Savigny, eds. *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. Routledge, Jan. 2001.
- [234] Annette C Scherpenzeel and Willem E Saris. "The Validity and Reliability of Survey Questions A Meta-Analysis of MTMM Studies". In: *Sociological Methods & Research* 25.3 (Feb. 1997), pp. 341–383. DOI: [10.1177/0049124197025003004](https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124197025003004).
- [235] Verena D. Schmittmann et al. "Deconstructing the construct: A network perspective on psychological phenomena". In: *New Ideas in Psychology* 31.1 (Apr. 2013), pp. 43–53. DOI: [10.1016/j.newideapsych.2011.02.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2011.02.007).
- [236] Peter Schroeder-Heister. "Validity Concepts in Proof-theoretic Semantics". In: *Synthese* 148.3 (Feb. 2006), pp. 525–571. DOI: [10.1007/s11229-004-6296-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-004-6296-1).
- [237] Michael Schwarz. "Is Psychology Based on a Methodological Error?" In: *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science* 43.3 (Sept. 2009), pp. 185–213. DOI: [10.1007/s12124-009-9089-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-009-9089-8).
- [238] Wilfrid Sellars. *Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- [239] Wilfrid Sellars. "Language as Thought and as Communication". In: *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 29.4 (June 1969), pp. 506–527. DOI: [10.2307/2105537](https://doi.org/10.2307/2105537).
- [240] David Sherry. "Thermoscopes, thermometers, and the foundations of measurement". In: *Studies In History and Philosophy of Science Part A* 42.4 (Dec. 2011), pp. 509–524. DOI: [10.1016/j.shpsa.2011.07.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsa.2011.07.001).
- [241] Klaas Sijtsma. "Correcting Fallacies in Validity, Reliability, and Classification". In: *International Journal of Testing* 9.3 (2009), pp. 167–194. DOI: [10.1080/15305050903106883](https://doi.org/10.1080/15305050903106883).
- [242] Klaas Sijtsma. "Future of Psychometrics: Ask What Psychometrics Can Do for Psychology". In: *Psychometrika* 77.1 (Jan. 2012), pp. 4–20. DOI: [10.1007/s11336-011-9242-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-011-9242-4).

- [243] Klaas Sijtsma. "Psychological measurement between physics and statistics". In: *Theory & Psychology* 22.6 (Dec. 2012), pp. 786–809. DOI: [10.1177/0959354312454353](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354312454353).
- [244] Stephen G. Sireci. "On Validity Theory and Test Validation". In: *Educational Researcher* 36.8 (Nov. 2007), pp. 477–481. DOI: [10.3102/0013189X07311609](https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X07311609).
- [245] Stephen G. Sireci. "The Construct of Content Validity". In: *Social Indicators Research* 45.1-3 (Nov. 1998), pp. 83–117. DOI: [10.1023/A:1006985528729](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006985528729).
- [246] Tom W. Smith. "Refining the Total Survey Error Perspective". In: *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 23.4 (2011), pp. 464–484. DOI: [10.1093/ijpor/edq052](https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edq052).
- [247] Ernest Sosa. "Intuitions and meaning divergence". In: *Philosophical Psychology* 23.4 (2010), pp. 419–426. DOI: [10.1080/09515089.2010.505859](https://doi.org/10.1080/09515089.2010.505859).
- [248] Henderikus J. Stam. "The Fault is Not in Ourselves, but in Our Methods: Comment on Schwarz". In: *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science* 44.4 (Dec. 2010), pp. 281–287. DOI: [10.1007/s12124-010-9144-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-010-9144-5).
- [249] S. S. Stevens. "On the Theory of Scales of Measurement". In: *Science* 103.2684 (June 1946). PMID: 17750512, pp. 677–680. DOI: [10.1126/science.103.2684.677](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.103.2684.677).
- [250] R. Steyer. "Classical (Psychometric) Test Theory". In: *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Ed. by Editors-in-Chief: Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes. Oxford: Pergamon, 2001, pp. 1955–1962. DOI: [10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/00721-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/00721-X). (Visited on 02/18/2013).
- [251] Milton E. Strauss and Gregory T. Smith. "Construct Validity: Advances in Theory and Methodology". In: *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology* 5.1 (2009). PMID: 19086835, pp. 1–25. DOI: [10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.032408.153639](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.032408.153639).
- [252] B. G Sundholm. "Inference versus Consequence". In: *LOGICA Yearbook 1997, 26 - 35 (1998)*. Prague: Filosofia Publishers, Czech Academy of Science, 1998, pp. 26–35. URL: <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/10419> (visited on 01/16/2012).
- [253] Shirley Anne Tate. "Foucault, Bakhtin, Ethnomethodology: Accounting for Hybridity in Talk-in-Interaction". In: *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 8.2 (May 2007). ISSN: 1438-5627. URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/247/545>.
- [254] L. L. Thurstone. "A Law of Comparative Judgment". In: *Psychological Review* 34.4 (1927), pp. 273–286. DOI: [10.1037/h0070288](https://doi.org/10.1037/h0070288).
- [255] Michael Tomasello. *Origins of human communication*. 1st. MIT Press pbk. ed. Cambridge Mass. ;London: MIT Press, 2010. ISBN: 9780262515207.
- [256] Aaro Toomela. "Variables in Psychology: A Critique of Quantitative Psychology". In: *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science* 42.3 (June 2008), pp. 245–265. DOI: [10.1007/s12124-008-9059-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-008-9059-6).

- [257] Roger Tourangeau, Lance J. Rips, and Kenneth A. Rasinski. *The Psychology of Survey Response*. Cambridge University Press, Mar. 2000. ISBN: 9780521576291.
- [258] Günter Trendler. “Measurement Theory, Psychology and the Revolution That Cannot Happen”. In: *Theory & Psychology* 19.5 (Oct. 2009), pp. 579–599. DOI: [10.1177/0959354309341926](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354309341926).
- [259] Anand J. Vaidya. “Philosophical methodology: The current debate”. In: *Philosophical Psychology* 23.3 (2010), pp. 391–417. ISSN: 0951-5089. DOI: [10.1080/09515089.2010.490940](https://doi.org/10.1080/09515089.2010.490940).
- [260] Guy C. Van Orden, Christopher T. Kello, and John G. Holden. “Situated Behavior and the Place of Measurement in Psychological Theory”. In: *Ecological Psychology* 22.1 (2010), pp. 24–43. DOI: [10.1080/10407410903493145](https://doi.org/10.1080/10407410903493145).
- [261] Stéphane Vautier et al. “The ambiguous utility of psychometrics for the interpretative foundation of socially relevant avatars”. In: *Theory & Psychology* 22.6 (Dec. 2012), pp. 810–822. DOI: [10.1177/0959354312450093](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354312450093).
- [262] Meike Watzlawik. ““Der Weisheits letzter Schluss”? Wisdom’s Last Conclusion?”. In: *Integr. psych. behav.* 43.3 (Sept. 2009), pp. 214–220. DOI: [10.1007/s12124-009-9094-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-009-9094-y).
- [263] Bernhard Weiss and Jeremy Wanderer. *Reading Brandom: on making it explicit*. Taylor & Francis, June 2009. ISBN: 9780415380362.
- [264] Michael A. Westerman. “Conversation analysis and interpretive quantitative research on psychotherapy process and problematic interpersonal behavior”. In: *Theory & Psychology* 21.2 (Apr. 2011), pp. 155–178. DOI: [10.1177/0959354310394719](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354310394719).
- [265] Michael A. Westerman and Stephen C. Yanchar. “Changing the terms of the debate: Quantitative methods in explicitly interpretive research”. In: *Theory & Psychology* 21.2 (Apr. 2011), pp. 139–154. DOI: [10.1177/0959354310393565](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354310393565).
- [266] Susan E. Whitely. “Construct validity: Construct representation versus nomothetic span”. In: *Psychological Bulletin* 93.1 (1983), pp. 179–197. DOI: [10.1037/0033-2909.93.1.179](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.93.1.179).
- [267] Timothy Williamson. “The Broadness of the Mental: Some Logical Considerations”. In: *Noûs* 32 (Jan. 1998), pp. 389–410. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2676155> (visited on 12/08/2013) (cit. on p. 6).
- [268] Peter Winch. *The Idea of a Social Science and its Relation to Philosophy*. English. 2nd. London; New York: Routledge, 1958.
- [269] Christopher Winship and Christopher Muller. “Ethnomethodology and Consequences: Comment on Emirbayer and Maynard’s “Pragmatism and Ethnomethodology””. In: *Qualitative Sociology* 34.1 (Nov. 2010), pp. 283–286. DOI: [10.1007/s11133-010-9179-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-010-9179-4).
- [270] Alan Wolfe. “The Missing Pragmatic Revival in American Social Science”. In: *The Revival of Pragmatism: New Essays on Social Thought, Law, and Culture*. Duke University Press, 1998.

- [271] Annemarie Zand Scholten. “The Consensus Definition Redefined From a Representational Perspective”. In: *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective* 10.1-2 (2012), pp. 104–109. DOI: [10.1080/15366367.2012.681978](https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2012.681978).
- [272] Don H. Zimmerman. “Review: Ethnomethodology and the Human Sciences”. In: *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 4.1 (1994), pp. 94–95. DOI: [10.1525/jlin.1994.4.1.94](https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.1994.4.1.94).
- [273] Donald W. Zimmerman. “Commentary on ‘Science, Measurement, and Validity: Is Completion of Samuel Messick’s Synthesis Possible?’ by Keith A. Markus”. In: *Social Indicators Research* 45.1-3 (Nov. 1998), pp. 69–72. DOI: [10.1023/A:1006977210073](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006977210073).
- [274] Donald W. Zimmerman. “How Should Classical Test Theory Have Defined Validity?” In: *Social Indicators Research* 45.1-3 (Nov. 1998), pp. 233–251. DOI: [10.1023/A:1006949915525](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006949915525).
- [275] Bruno D. Zumbo. “Opening Remarks to the Special Issue on Validity Theory and the Methods Used in Validation: Perspectives from the Social and Behavioral Sciences”. In: *Social Indicators Research* 45.1/3 (Nov. 1998), pp. 1–3. DOI: [10.1023/A:1006956722368](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006956722368).