The role of terminological uses and semasiological analyses in the social sciences

[1]Dr. S. B. M. Marume, [2]R. R. Jubenkanda, [3]C. W. Namusi,
[4]N.C Madziyire

[1]*BA, Hons BA, MAdmin, MSoc Sc, PhD*
[2]*BSc, MSc, MSc Econ, DPhil candidate*
[3]*BAdmin (Hons) MPA, DPhil candidate*
[4]*BEd, MEd, DPhil candidate*

Abstract: *For some academics, both old and young, it seems frivolous if not a waste of space to devote some time in social research on the issue of terminological uses and semasiological analysis. Yet, the opposite is fundamentally true. That is, lack of special attention in any social research study to this issue is an academic suicide, a tragedy, a scientific offence, and un pardonable scholastic shortcoming [S. B. M. Marume: Work No. 17 of 1988]. In effect, one of the most celebrated the twentieth – century political scientists, namely, Arnold Brecht [1967:57] scholarly writers:*
Clarity and unambiguity of all terms used are the first requirements of logical reasoning
Key words: *terminological uses, semasiological analyses, science, research, and logical reasoning*

I.   Introduction

One direct consequence of the information explosion in recent years is an enormous increase in the number of specialised words/terms/concepts – new words/terms/concepts or new meanings for old ones. This has created a problem and challenge for the information user – the problem of not knowing exactly what a word/term/concept means. A standard dictionary no longer suffices. Every discipline, sub – discipline and even activity generates its semasiology, terminology, methodology, taxonomy/typology, phenomenology and its own buzzwords. This then increase the importance of terminological uses and semasiological analyses, the precise subject of this journal article.

Purpose of the article

This article specifically on the terminological uses and semasiological analyses demonstrating their vital role in scientific social research studies, in particular public administration political science, local government and administration, amongst other social sciences.

II.   Terminological uses and semasiological analyses
Advisability of clear and unambiguous terms in a study

Clarity and unambiguity of all terms used are the first requirements of logical reasoning
Arnold Brechts Political Theory 1967, p. 57.

For some academics, both old and young, it appears frivolous if not a waste of space to devote some time in research on the issue of ***terminological uses and semasiological analyses***. But the opposite is true. That is, lack of attention in any research study to this issue is ***academic suicide, tragedy, a scientific offence***, and an ***unpardonable scholastic shortcoming.***

One direct consequence of the information explosion in recent years is an enormous increase in the number of specialized words/terms/concepts – new words/terms/concepts or new meanings for old terms. This has created a problem for the information user – the problem of not knowing exactly what a word/term/concept means. A standard dictionary no longer suffices. Every discipline, sub-discipline and even activity generates its own semasiology, terminology, taxonomy/typology, phenomenology and its own buzzwords.

Public administration is no exception. In the last four decades, it has adopted words/terms/concepts from many other disciplines, as well as developing its own vocabulary. Authors may not seek to be the first to hone a new word/term/concept but the emphasis on brevity in today's sound byte culture puts a premium on single terms/concepts or short phrases that capture whole terms and concepts. And this does not begin to touch on the other menace of the age – the acronym.

The internationalization/globalization of the environment in which the public service operates adds another dimension to the problem and challenge. At its most basic, there is the question of language. How are

words, terms or concepts such as the following translated: *phenomenon, value, norm, proposition and hypothesis, premise, generalizations, facts, principles, basic laws or theories as major procedures, control, administration, processes, activity, action, method, approach, technique, tool, subject, discipline, science, methodology, semasiology, terminology, taxonomy, typology, phenomenology, epistemology*? New words/terms/concepts or phrases relate closely to the culture of the originating language; in other linguistic cultures, a single word/term/concept to say the same thing may not be readily available. Even odd words/terms/concepts can cause difficulties when making international/global comparisons, the same title, for example. Often means different things in different administrative cultures. This can lead to misunderstandings in discussion where people from different cultural, social, historical, geographical and economic environments seek to learn more about systems, structures, institutions, actions, dynamics and processes in other parts of the world. A new dictionary may help to build a common terminological and semasiological basis.

It will be noticed that some supranational and multilateral institutions have developed manuals or dictionaries for translators and, if they can be accessed, these can be a great assistance. But until now, there has been little provision in English for a meaning band, easy – reference guide to the meaning of words/terms/concepts and phrases used in political science, public administration, local administration and administration, strategic studies and business administration.

It is realized that students, lecturers, social scientists, practitioners and administrators of Public Administration communicate through the use of words/terms/concepts. Often this communication is *restricted* due to the *lack of a clear understanding* of the terminology used and semasiology advocated. One can hardly refer to effective communications if the message is assembled in terms and concepts which the receiver does not understand or related to. At both the macro and micro levels such a state of affairs has countless implications for teaching, study, research and profession: it may range from students looking at lecturers with strange facial expressions to public officials carrying out policies never intended by government. In short, we have observed as practitioners and as lecturers how *terminology and semasiology* can *impede* communications and indeed, the learning process itself.

Students, lecturers, public administrators, technocrats and politicians involved in the business of government and administration have one thing in common, and that is to serve society better through public institutions. Equally common is their use of a subject language to facilitate learning, understanding and practising Public Administration. Our concern is that although a subject language in the broad field of Public Administration exists, the words/terms/concepts of the vocabulary are vague, unchecked, and unrefined. Most first – year courses in Public Administration should be structured to include in their syllabi, a debate on the terminological uses and semasiological analyses. It is sincerely hoped that their section of the study will make a significant contribution towards meeting this need.

During the research studies, the writer as an aspiring social scientist have been concerned about the inter – and – multi – disciplinary locus and focus their studies should adopt. They believe that a study of this kind must certainly reflect the key areas of study in Public Administration. After extensive consultations and debriefing, it has become manifestly clear that the study should cover sub-disciplinary areas like *public policy analysis; organization theory; public financial administration; public personnel administration; determination of work procedures and methods; control measures; SADC economies; SADC transport and communications; SADC politics; SADC development economies; SADC information management*; and *SADC history*. These sub-disciplines and sub – sub – disciplines studied under the umbrella of Public Administration use an increasingly impressive eclectic approach, meaning that it has a high multi – disciplinary focus. Furthermore it uses words, terms, concepts, theories, terminologies and methodologies from many other sciences. For the writer, this enormously contributes to the vast richness of the study.

It must be appreciated that at no point did the writers expect this study to be problem – free. Words, terms and concepts are normally defined within a specific context, and if a term is used without taking cognizance of its context, it confuses the receiver of messages. The writer has tried to overcome this problem in many cases by offering two or more explanations to certain basic terms/concepts.

III.   Definitions of key terms and concepts relevant to the study

Key terms associated with science

The following terms are associated with the term *science*: terminology; semantics; semasiology; methodology; logic; phenomenology; epistemology; taxonomy; typology; eclectism; multi – methodism; research.

Terminology: concerns itself with the *correct use* of terms.

Semantics: on the other hand, is the study of the *meaning* of our terms.

Semasiology: as a branch of systematic philosophy is a *science* which concerns itself with the *choice, meanings, uses/applications*, and contexts of terms.

We as public administration scientists, scholars and practitioners must train ourselves to be always *specific* and *definite*. This means that throughout our studies we must be dedicated *terminologists, semanticists and semasiologists*, in addition to being *methodologists* and *epistemologists* [*S. B. M. Marume, Methodological, semasiological, epistemological and operational aspects of social research studies: 1982*].

Methodology: is viewed in several ways as follows:
a)   The systematic study of dynamics, actions, processes and principles that guide scientific investigation and research;
b)   The study of processes and principles that guide scientific investigation;
c)   The systematic study of the plurality of policy analytical methods and techniques;
d)   But most importantly, methodology, as a branch of systematic philosophy, is defined as that particular science which concerns itself with the approaches, methods, procedures, and techniques of acquiring and establishing reliable and valid systems of knowledge.

Source S. B. M. Marume: Methodological, semasiological, epistemological and operations aspects of social research studies 1982.

IV.   Methodology and methods

But there is a debate about the distinction between methodology and methods. The following examination may help clarify the issues.

Research methodology is seen as a way to systematically solve the research problem. It may be understood as a science of studying how research is done scientifically. In it we study the various steps that are generally adopted by a researcher in studying his research problem along with the logic behind them. It is necessary for the researcher to know not only the research methods/techniques but also the methodology. Researchers not only need to know how to develop certain indices of tests, how to calculate the mean, the mode, the median or the standard deviation or chi – quare, how to apply particular research techniques, but they also need to know which of this methods or techniques, are relevant and which are not, and what would they mean and indicate and why. Researchers also need to understand the assumptions underlying various techniques and they need to know the criteria by which they can decide that certain techniques and procedures will be applicable to certain problems and others will not. All this means that is necessary for the researcher, For example, an architect who designs a building, has to consciously evaluate the basis of his decisions, that is, he has to evaluate why and on what basis he selects particular size, number and location of does windows and ventilators, uses particular materials and not others and the like. Similarly in research the scientists have to expose the research decision to evaluation before they are implemented. He has to specify very clearly and precisely what decisions he selects and why he selects them so that they can be evaluated by others also.

We can say that research methodology has many dimensions and research methods do constitutes a part of the research methodology. The scope of research methodology is wider then that of research methods.
Thus, when we talk of research methodology we not only talk of the research methods but also consider the logic which lies behind the methods we use in the context of our research study and explain why we are using a particular method or technique and why we are not using others so that research results are capable of being, evaluated either by the researcher himself of by others.

Methodological questions
When we talk of research methodology, we are concerned with the following questions:
1.   Why a research study has been undertaken?
2.   How the research problem has been defined?
3.   In what way and why the hypotheses have been formulated?
4.   What data have been collected?
5.   What particular method has been adopted?
6.   Why particular technique of analysis data has been used?
7.   A host of similar other questions are usually answered

Research methods
Many maybe understood as all those methods and techniques that are used for conduction of research. Research methods or techniques, refers to the methods the researched use in performing research operations.

In others words, all those methods which are used by the researcher during the course of studying his research problem are termed or research methods.

Since the object of research, particularly the applied research, it to arrive at a solution for a given problem, the available data and the unknown aspects of the problem have to be related to each other to make a solution possible. Keep this in view, research methods can be put into the following three groups.

In the *first group* we include those which are concerned with the collection of data. These methods will be used where the data already available are not sufficient to arrive at the received solution.

The *second group* of research methods consists of those statistical techniques which are used for establishing relationships between the data and the unknown.

The *third group* of methods consists of those methods which are used to evaluate the accuracy of the results obtained.

Research methods falling in the above stated last two groups are generally taken as the analytical tools of research.

Therefore, there is a distinction between methodology and methods.

> But most importantly, methodology is defined as that particular science which concerns itself with the approaches, methods, procedures and techniques of acquiring and establishing reliable and valid systems of knowledge.
>
> **Source: S. B. M. Marume: Methodological semasiological, epistemological and operational aspects of social research studies, 1982.**

Logic: [Greek and Latin word logos = speech/ science; discourse, reason], is a branch of systematic philosophy, *which is most briefly defined as the science of reasoning*.

Eclecticism

The **eclectic approach** means selective approach, implying that it has a multi – disciplinary *locus and focus*. The main argument in public administration is that we will not use one approach and one method, *but a variety of approaches and methods*. This is also because of the differences in the subject - matter. The intelligent use of such a variety of *approaches and methods* in the same subject is commonly labelled as *eclecticism or multi – methodism*.

There is a great merit (value) in employing **eclecticism**. It is very strongly recommended to use this kind of approach and method in Public Administration as we shall see very shortly. *This intelligent, penetrating selective and scientific use of a variety of respectable approaches and recognizable methods in a systematically articulated and coherently integrated way at the same time, in the same field of study, and by the same social research scientists, brilliantly provides an extremely useful and unique methodological framework of reference.* It enables the social scientists to objectively and critically view in a balanced way possible the many facets of the complex public administration phenomena from different angles and from all viewpoints. Therefore, the *approach* and *method* to be adopted in the study of public Administration will be *eclecticism* and *eclectic method* respectively, meaning intelligently using a variety of all available approaches and methods to the subject – matter. The best contributions which they can offer, and from these and other reputable sources and trying to fashion the most balanced treatment possible that will make sense to the social scientists, practitioners, and students. It is not a matter of mere choice between and among approaches and methods, but we would like to exhaustively, intelligently, systematically and scientifically use all the available approaches and methods in the most practically fruitful way reasonably conceivable in order to obtain optimum balanced knowledge (results) about the complex empirical public administration world.

What then is the basis of this systematic approachism or scientific multi – methodism? *Eclecticism of approaches and of methods will be based on the discernible premises that each particular approach and each specific method that will be used will have particular contributions to make; relative merits and strengths as well as own weakness, shortcomings and limitations; but each approach and each method will enhance respective strengths and practical usefulness by means of complementarity*. Thus, the high degree of **complementarity** of approaches and methods increases the *strengths, objectivity, reliability, validity, generality, and universality* of scientific investigations. Again the breath, depth and level of sophistication of the discipline of Public Administration demands, therefore, the most sagacious, eclectic application of a variety of generally acceptable approaches and methods, each complementing, as it does, the other approaches and universally recognizable methods, where both appear best, when all these approaches and all these methods are thoroughly articulated and coherently integrated at the same time, in the same field of study and by social scientist to obtain optimum (maximum) results feasible.

> *Phenomenology*: has two meanings that are given of this concept, namely:
> - The science of phenomena as distinct from that of being (ontology).
> - That division of any science or systematic philosophy which describes and classifies its phenomena.
>
> **Source: The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, p. 1487**.

The philosophy of phenomenology, and the work of *Alfred Schuts [1899 – 1959],* with its focus on *consciousness*, have a long history and is now a very important modern trend thinking to which attention should be drawn.

> *Phenomenology* is a philosophical and psychological approach that holds that our behaviour is derived from our individual perceptions or phenomena. We actively and consciously interpret and give meaning to the world

around us. We are also conscious of our interpretations; it is our interpretation of what we and others see that becomes our reality.
Source: S. B. M. Marume: Methodological, semasiological, epistemological and operational aspects April 1982.

According to phenomenology as a school of thought, man is *an imagining, inquitive* and creative being. Man is a *creative* being because he *possesses self – awareness. Self – consciousness is the ability to see oneself as an object. Because he is able to see himself as an object, man is also capable of seeing other people and the rest of the reality objectively. The ability to dissociate means that man can detach himself from things, his fellowmen (beings) and himself.* This is also known as the capacity for dissociation, which implies that man is *not subject* to determining factors. At the same time, it also offers the requirement for *creativity, originality, imagination and initiative. Creation* cannot be explained in terms of the maintenance of any from of determination. Since the concept of creation is *incompatible* with a total subordination to determining factors, it is obvious that a person who is totally subordinate to determining factors will be *incapable of creating, originating, and initiating.*

The phenomenologist sees creation as at least one of the three things:-
a)   supporting or promoting a certain datum, or opposing it;
b)   changing a particular datum in one way or other;
c)   creating something new in contrast with, in addition to or supplementary to given data.

The phenomenologist maintains that conditions (physical or socio – cultural) should be connected with human creativity. This means that they are not given, but that man himself is responsible for them. The processes known as social processes are dependent upon human dissociation and the human ability to constitute things. Man is not forced into any specific form of social existence. He can dissociate himself from his role – playing and can change it by means and ways of his creative ability.

Because non – phenomenological models of analysis represent society as a closed system, either in the sense of an organism or in the sense of subservience to a perfect transcendental world, they are utopian. The phenomenologist, in direct contrast, sees society as an open social system of meanings, that is, meanings which man gives to things in order to make his own existence meaningful. In this kind of reasoning, social research scientists are in effect phenomenologists who undertake research undertakings to define problems, collect data to answer the problems, create and develop meaningful systems of knowledge in empiricistic and rationalistic ways possible [*S. B. M. Marume: Methodological, semasiological, epistemological and operational aspects of social research studies: April 1982*].

Taxonomy:
Taxonomy [French word: taxonomie; Latin word: taxonomia; Greek word: taxix = arrangement + vopia = distribution] *is that department of science, or of a particular science or subject which consists in or relates to classification, especially in relation to its general laws or principles.*
Source: The Shorter English Dictionary, 1959, p. 2138.

Taxonomy which is the system of classification is a word derived from the *Greek* tasso, meaning *to arrange* or place in order.

Typology
Typology which is closely related to taxonomy is the study symbolic representation, significance, or treatment, or classification of remains and specimens according to the type they exhibit and its evolution.
Source: The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, p. 2277.

Questions:
  i.   What distinguishes a study as a science?
 ii.   What is the aim in scientific investigation?
iii.   What are the characteristics of a science?

V.   Answers, examples and explanations:
Lerche and Said [concepts of international politics: 1970, p. 5]: 'Today we are all theorists, analyzing the data that come before us not for their intrusive interest or even their policy relevance, but rather in an attempt to develop a conceptual system (roughly defined as a workable scheme for classification of data) that will make it possible to deal with universals rather than particulars'.
David V. Edwards [international Political Analysis, 1969, p. 1260 defines: 'A theory is, in the language of science, a collection of propositions systematically organized'.

Another author, **John Wakelin** [**The Roots of Diplomacy: 1965, p. 16**] puts it clearly as follows: "What distinguishes a study as a science is its purpose and its method. Its purpose is the ascertaining of truth; its method – scientific method – involves observing nature, asking questions, collecting evidence with which to answer these questions, formulating and testing hypotheses to explain the data and modifying those hypotheses in the light of new data".

Comprehensive characteristics of a study as a science: *S. B. M. Marume: April 1982]* candidly relates them when he writes:

In any social science research it is supremely important to clearly state and distinguish those particular characteristics that make a study a science. These characteristics are as follows: its particular purpose; its special method of operation; its degree of complementarity; and its level of sophistication.

a) Its purpose: which is the ascertaining of its truth [**VERACITY**] covering such elements as *facts. truth, proof and reality*, is manifold:

Academically, the pursuit of truth;

Practically, the facilitation of the formulation [conceptualization] and adoption [deliberate choice of alternatives available] of the necessary and appropriate public policy (ies);

Implementally, the economical effective and efficiently carrying out public policies into practical effect, and

Evaluatively, the control and evaluation of public activities inclusive of actual policy results.

b) **Its special method** – scientifically eclectic method which involves empirically observing nature, asking relevant questions, collecting proper evidence with which to answer these questions, formulating and testing propositions and hypotheses in order to explain the data, and modifying these propositions and hypotheses in the light of new data.

c) **Its degree of complementarity**: which relates to putting pieces of evidence together, forming or contributing to coherent totality.

d) **Complementarity** signifies *three* key terms namely, *reliability, validity and rationality*.

Reliability

The social scientist endeavours to systematically establish reliability. The term reliability is then used to refer to the trustworthiness, stability, repeatability (replicability), or consistency of the study. The judicious and scientific use of the various sources of data has the special merit in that each source has a complementarity value to the other sources of the required data. This complementarity maximizes and optimizes the chances of greater and better reliability.

Validity

Every social research study must be valid. The ability of the study to investigate methodologically what it originally intends to find out is generally referred to as validity. The validity, or certainty or soundness of a study can be established empirically. The various sources of data must be both relevant and authentic.

Rationality:

A given statement is rational when it is compatible with already existing statements. It will be easy to establish the interconnectedness between it and the other statements

Closely connected and operating terms and concepts are as follows:-

Reliability: trustworthiness; stability; consistency/exchangeability; constancy; replicability or repeatability; dependability; invariability

Validity: genuineness; soundness; relevance; authenticity; certainty; generality; comprehensiveness; objectivity and neutrality; complementarity; universality

Rationality: intelligibility; compatibility; meaningfulness; recognisability; coherence; unity; interconnectedness; logic; orderliness

Source: Systematic Philosophy: Arnold Brecht: 1967

e) **Its high level of sophistication** – which refers to the *universality* of its knowledge system. *Two* significant terms are associated with the term *universality*. These are:

• comprehensiveness of its subject – matter, and

• the generality of its results of investigations

Further basic terminologies

Further basic terminologies that are relevant to the study comprise the under mentioned:-

---

Research: is the activity by which new knowledge is collected and existing one tested. Research is further defined as the conscious, intensive, controlled, diligent, and systematic enquiry into some observable phenomenon with a view to discovering or revising facts, theories and applications, and establishing regularities and relating the particular phenomenon empirically observed to some existing systems of knowledge.
Source: The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, 1959, p. 1712.

Research has always, therefore, a ***reliable*** and ***valid*** basis [Goode and Hatt: ***1952:119***].

Other basic terms and concepts which may require further clarifications are: understanding; explaining; predicting; control and evaluation; conference; development; cooperation and coordination; regional system; programme.

Social scientist must therefore, spend more time on the ***meanings*** and ***uses*** of further terminologies. This gives him the opportunity to gain further scientific clarifications on issues under investigations. And to avoid confusion such terms as above must be clearly defined. This, therefore, enhances the greater operationalization of these basic concepts and terms, a significant factor in increasing the degree of reliability and validity of required information.

A social theory aims at understanding, explaining, predicting, evaluation, and, therefore, eventual control of social phenomena.

The definitions of these important terms are briefly given as follows;

1. **Understanding:** [the Shorter Oxford English dictionary, 1959: 2293 – 4; pp. 1778]:
- ability to comprehend clearly the meaning or important of
- the faculty of comprehending and reasoning
- intelligence, judgement
- the degree or quality of the intellectual faculty in a particular person or set of persons
- sagacious meaning, being exceptionally gifted with acuteness of mental discernment; of keen and sound penetration and judgement.

2. **Explaining:**
- intellectually accounting for
- interpreting soundly
- unfolding methodologically
- making clear with a view to adjusting a misunderstanding and reconciling differences [pp. 657].

3. **Predicting: [pp. 1567]**
- foretelling
- announcing in advance

4. **Control means: entailing monitoring and evaluating:**
- the deliberate, systematic and meticulous process of *monitoring* by authorized public functionaries of all the administrative activities;
- carefully *ensuring* that all the operations at all times at all levels of the public authority are being purposefully carried out in accordance with the policies made, with the *plans* adopted, with the *objectives predetermined*, with the *orders* given, with the *instructions* issued, and with the *principles* laid down;
- optimally utilizing all the *resources* made available;
- the objective of achieving the *actual, desired, expected* and *required* practical policy *results* within the *given timeframe*;
- vigorously *implementing*, where this is not being achieved, the corrective action to bring about *conformity* and *compliance* or making the necessary, appropriate and timely *adjustments*.

5. **Development**: is used to refer to the unfolding of the creative possibilities inherent in society. It means that human beings have the ability not only to adapt to wide – ranging changes in their environment, but also to modify purposefully that environment and to introduce innovations into their own lives in pursuit of humanly – conserved goals.

6. **Conference:** refers to a formal meeting which constitutes the governing body of an institution.

7. **Regional system**: refers to one state or two or more proximate and interacting states which have some common and historical bonds, and whose identity is sometimes increased by actions and attitudes of states external to the system.

8. **Coordination**: is the process of drawing together such diverse and sometimes conflicting aims, interests, and leading them towards a commonly defined and perceived objective

9. **Programme**: refer to a set of specific actions, which need to be undertaken either separately or simultaneously in order to reach a specific policy objective or to implement a plan.

Methodologies associated with knowledge systems:
The following methodological approaches are associated with knowledge systems:
Methodological approaches: normativism; positivism and empiricism; realism; pragmatism; rationalism; logical positivism.
According to **S. B. M. Marume** [**Academic work No. 5**: 1988], *all methodological approaches to the study of public administration and to most other fields of social phenomena may be broadly classified as empirical, logical positive, or normative*.

Empirical approaches [empiricism]
Types: positivism, realism, logical positivism, pragmatism are forms of empiricism.
Empiricism as an approach: maintains that observation is the basis of knowledge:
- *confines* to the questions: what is the actual state of affairs?
- *analyzes* and *systematizes* reality and allows results to speak for themselves, while avoiding questions of value.
- its purpose is the ascertaining of truth and its method is the scientific method, and
- its main concern: facts, proof, truth and reality.

Logical positivism: as an approach: to scientific research which emphasizes value neutrality and objectivity.
This comprises developing controlled empirical testing of logically obtained propositions and hypotheses. Logically convincing conclusions or generalizations from elementary observations do not apply, but should be combined in a scientific process which is guided by specific theories and verifiable projections.

Normativism: as an approach:
- loosely called theoretical [sic], value – laden, moral, subjective and evaluative approaches
- concept of norm as a value
- also called value – centric approaches
- normativism concerns itself with the terms *values* and *norms*
- condemns logical – positivism in strongest terms possible
- concerns itself with questions: what *should* or *ought* or must be?

We further briefly examine: *pragmatism* and *rationalism*.

Empiricism:
Empirical: observations that are based upon sense experiences or the direct logical extensions of sense experiences.
Empirical science: based upon direct, observable sensory experiences and logical extensions of these experiences and observations

Empiricism:
1. A doctrine that holds that perception precedes knowledge; that is, we can know only what we have previously perceived through sensory experiences. Likewise, our true and accurate knowledge of reality is gained through empirically variable sensory experiences. *Empirical* refers to observations that are based upon sense experiences or the direct logical extensions of these experiences and observations.
2. Based on the premises that all human knowledge is gained through *experience*. In science it represents the point of view that generalizations can be regarded as valid and reliable if based on experiences, observations and experimentations.

Pragmaticm:
1) A philosophical approach which focuses upon the actual consequences of a concept. Truth and meaning are derived from these consequences. A pragmatic theory of values proposes that *utility* be the main criterion for value choice.
2) A philosophical based upon belief that the meaning of ideas is contained in their practical application and that the function of thought is to direct action. Pragmatism is to determine whether or not a proposal or idea will work.
3) The belief that the meaning of ideas is contained in their practical application and that the function of thought is to direct action. In a pragmatic approach to government, political realities are acknowledged and interest groups are allowed to define public interest, the government acting as a broker or being regarded as one interest party among many which have to be accommodated by means of negotiation. In pragmatic problem solving the following questions are asked:
- What was the problem which arose initially? What is the exact problem?
- What will successfully complete our investigation? Are our thoughts solving the problem?
- As a result of further experience and reflection, what are our goals and objectives in the process of change?

The term pragmatic in public administration

Another answer to the question "What basis of decision does public administration accept?" is pragmatism.

Pragmatism is occasionally mentioned in the Political Science, Public Administration and Sociology texts, and some writers often appeal to or indicate that they wish to be judged by pragmatic standards or tests.

About the definition of the concept of pragmatism, I think we are on safe grounds to say that pragmatism is a protest against rationalism, against a priori methods of thought, and habits of mind. Its test of truth is usually considered to be chiefly "workability" or cash value; an idea is true if it works, if it has desirable effects when tried.

Pragmatism places emphasis upon experience and is hence characterised empiricism. Intelligent use of experience in testing for truth is an experiment; so experimental is a concept frequently found in pragmatic writings. Since the truth of an idea is determined by what it does, it is in some sense an instrument. Impatience with the abstract or theoretical, and use of such terms as scientific, experiences, empirical, practicability, experiments these characterise the pragmatic temper.

It is obvious, then, that in its negative side pragmatism accords, that is, pragmatism's test of truth is utilitarian [social pragmatism is indeed, a sophisticated rewrite of the greatness happiness of the greatest number].

It is well not to stretch the similarities too far, for it is beyond doubt that the outlines of pragmatist epistemology and metaphysics do not accord with positivist's tenants, In particular, pragmatism envisages a rather flexible, indeterminate, and relativist's world; positivism regards the things and relations of the world as fixed, determinable, and determining. Since both claim the sanction of science it seems probable that one, at least, is swinging on the wrong gate.

VI.   Rationalism

The view that planned change could be brought about by rational analysis of the situation and the formulation of long term strategies; an approach on decision making based on impersonal rules and techniques, as contained in *Max Weber's* view of bureaucracy and what is known as the rational – comprehensive model in the terminological of Lindblom

Rationality: a quality referring to a type of behaviour that maximizes one's goals in a constant, purposive, and somewhat comprehensive manner.

VII.   The role of rationality

Rationality is a characteristic of philosophical systems of knowledge. It is associated with knowledge. There are certain conditions with which a given statement must comply to be rational. These conditions are criteria upon which we base our arguments for accepting or rejecting a given statement as depicting knowledge or non – knowledge.

Firstly, a given state is rational if it is *meaningful or intelligible*. It must satisfy logical requirements relating to single statement and also to the relation between statements. A given statement is *rational* when it is *compatible* with already existing rational statements. It will then be easy to establish the *interconnectedness* between it and the other statements.

The *meaningfulness or intelligibility* of a given statement is established if each of the components or elements of that statement *is recognizable*. Furthermore, the elements must form a *unity*. This means that each given statement/ element stands in a special relationship to other elements. This special relationship must reveal *unity and coherence.* 'Man fat this is'. In this example we see a string of words which do not stand in a special way. They do not express a meaningful statement since they are not united.

But 'this man is fat', is rational statement. Key concepts that emerge from this: meaningfulness; intelligibility; logic; compatibility; interconnectedness; recognisability; orderliness; unity; coherence.

Secondly, we say a statement is rational if there is a *basis (ground) for its assertion*. A statement expresses a definite state of affairs. For example, when I say the man is fat, I am in effect expressing a fact, or a state of affairs. Because of this it is necessary to distinguish statement of facts from wishes, questions, or commands. If I say ' I wish I was rich', it means that I am not rich. I am merely wishing, but the state of affairs I want does not exist. Similarly questions and commands do not express an existing state of affairs.

Universality

In respect of the concept *universality*, we speak of *two* most important terms namely *comprehensiveness* and *generality*.

a) Comprehensiveness

We call something *comprehensive* when it includes all parts. When we say philosophy attempts to construct a world – view us thereby demonstrated the *comprehensiveness* of the discipline. In science, each separate science studies one particular aspect of reality; in philosophy we pose questions about reality as a whole without intentionally concentrating on just one particular aspect of reality.

b) Generality

But a theory or principle can very well be general. In stating that philosophy is general, we mean it seeks to find the general basis of something as a *totality.*

Summary

Universality entails:

a.   complementarity which signifies three aspects:
-    reliability (replicability);
-    validity (soundness/authenticity)
-    rationality (intelligibility, meaningfulness)

b.   **High – level – sophistication**: which refers to the term universality. Additional terms and concepts are closely related
-    *comprehensiveness* of the subject – matter;
-    *generality* of its results of investigations
-    scientific methodism of methods of study
-    universality of knowledge system.

Bibliography

[1].   Arnold Brecht; Political Theory: The Foundations of Twentieth – Century Political Thought: Princeton; New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1967.

[2].   Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss: Discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research: Chicago Aldine, 1967.

[3].   S. B. M. Marume: SADCC administration of economic programmes with reference to food and agricultural programmes: unpublished PhD [Public Administration] theses: California University for Advanced Studies; October 31, 1988.

Profiles of contributors and photographs

Samson Brown Muchineripi Marume: a former senior civil servant for over 37 years in various capacities and 10 years as deputy permanent secretary; ten years as a large commercial farmer; well travelled domestically within Zimbabwe, regionally [SADC countries: Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Mauritius, Swaziland, South Africa, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia and DRC]; and Africa [Kenya, Ethiopia, Sudan, Egypt, Nigeria, Libya, Uganda]; and internationally [Washington, New York and California in USA; Dublin and Cork in Ireland; England in United Kingdom; Netherlands, Spain (Nice), France, Geneva in Switzerland, former Yugoslavia-Belgrade; Rome and Turin in Italy; Cyprus – Nicosia; Athens – Greece; Beijing – China; Singapore; Hong Kong; Tokyo, Kyoto, Yokohama, Osaka, Okayama in Japan]; eight years as management consultant and part – time lecturer for BA/BSc and MA/MBA levels with Christ College- affiliate of Great Zimbabwe University, and PhD/DPhil research thesis supervisor, internal and external examiner; researcher with Christ University, Bangalore, India; currently senior lecturer and acting chairperson of Department of Public Administration in Faculty of Commerce and Law of Zimbabwe Open University; a negotiator; a prolific writer; vastly experienced public administrator; and a scholar with specialist qualifications from University of South Africa, California University for Advanced Studies, United States of America: **BA** with majors in public administration and political science and subsidiaries in sociology, constitutional law and English; postgraduate special **Hons BA** [Public Administration], **MA** [Public Administration]; MAdmin magna cum laude in transport economics - as major, and minors in public management and communications; **MSoc Sc** cum laude in international politics as a major and minors in comparative government and law, war and strategic studies, sociology, and social science research methodologies; PhD summa cum laude in Public Administration .

Roy Robson Jubenkanda: 2008, DPhil (Currently pursuing DPhil pursuing DPhil studies with (ZOU); 2000, MSc in Strategic Management – University of Derby, U. K; MSc. Econ. In international Economics, Banking and Finance- University of Wales, Cardiff College of Business Studies, U.K.; 1983, BSc (Hons) Degree in Economics – University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe; 1976 Business Studies Diploma – Solusi University, Zimbabwe; 2005, Certificate in Distance Education Practitioner (UNISA); 2011, Certificate in Higher Education Management in Southern Africa (University of the Witwatersrand) Johannesburg, South Africa.

Cornelius Wonder Namusi: current studies: DPhil (candidate) in Public Administration; 1991, Master of Public Administration (UZ); 1982, Bachelor of Administration Honours (UZ); 2011, Certificate: Module Writing; 2011, Certificate: Managing the training programme – ESAMI, Tanzania; 1990, Certificate advanced work study (Canada); 1986, Certificate: Organisation and methods O & M), Institute of Development Administration IDM – Botswana); 1983, Certificate in Labour Administration, African Regional Labour Administration Centre (ARLAC) (Nairobi); 1964, Primary Teachers Higher Certificate (PHT) Waddilove Teacher Training Institution, Marondera, Zimbabwe

N. C. Madziyire: current studies; DPhil (candidate); Master of Education (Educational Administration) (UZ); Bachelor of Education (Curriculum studies and Teacher Education) (UZ); Diploma in Teacher Education (Dip TE) (UZ); Primary Teachers' Higher Certificate (St Augustines); I am senior lecturer in the Faculty of Arts and Education at the Zimbabwe Open University; I serve as a Programme leader for The Bachelor of Education in Youth Development studies; I am also responsible for developing Distance materials for distance learners; I write, content review and edit modules in the Faculty.

The role of terminological uses and semasiological analyses in the social sciences
Learning objectives
To be able to:
1.   Define the concepts terminological uses and semasiological analyses
2.   Define terms associated with concept science:
- terminology
- semantics
- semasiology
- methodology
- logic
- phenomenology
- epistemology
- taxonomy
- typology
- eclecticism
- multi-methodism
- research
3.   Identify and describe various theories of administrative knowledge systems
4.   Appreciate the significance of these aspects to social research

---