Pergamon

The Arts in Psychotherapy, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 307–314, 1995

0197-4556/95 $9.50 + .00

0197-4556(95)00016-X

TOWARD A TYPOLOGY OF RESEARCH IN THE CREATIVE ARTS THERAPIES

ROSALIE H. POLITSKY, PhD*

The purpose of this paper is to support the assertion made by Junge and Linesch (1993) that it is crucial to effective and enjoyable research that there be a match between the art therapist's personal style and the particular research methods used in inquiry (pp. 62–63). The empirical/analytic paradigm of the physical sciences has dominated research in the social and human sciences. Burdened by the assumptions of the physical sciences, the arts therapies have suffered bouts of inadequacy and insecurity, and have questioned the legitimacy of their research. Junge and Linesch have noted the uneasy fit of the field of art therapy with the empirical research tradition and have pointed out the need to incorporate new paradigms that offer diverse ways of knowing (p. 61). Such diversity of knowledge may actually be traced back to the scientist. McNiff (1993) has noted the link between art and science and the need to examine the role of the scientist. Mitroff and Kilmann (1978) researched how scientists classify scientists and have developed four typologies. They have presented four alternative psychological typologies and methodologies to the dominant positivist paradigm. When utilizing their research, art therapists will be able to recognize various types of researchers, and distinguish which types of research may be best suited to their particular typology. Their model, particularly their examination of the various types of logic, may also help us validate both ourselves and our inquiry—inquiry that does not always follow the analytic model.

Mitroff and Kilmann noted that their four methodologies are the outer manifestations of the inner psychological attitudes of Jungian typology. The four typologies may be understood in terms of Jung's thinking and feeling processes. The Analytic Scientist (AS) and Conceptual Theorist (CT) typologies are based on thinking—a process of reaching a decision based on formal, impersonal or theoretical modes of reasoning. These types seek to explain things in scientific, technical and theoretical terms, independent of human needs, purposes or concerns. Opposite thinking and less valued are the typologies based upon feeling—the Conceptual Humanist (CH) and the Particular Humanist (PH). Feeling is a process of reaching a decision based on personal value judgments that may be unique to the particular person. Feeling types are particularly sensitive to people and to individual differences. Mitroff and Kilmann compare the four different typologies by analyzing nine different attributes as demonstrated in the tables below.

The Analytic Scientist

The Analytic Scientist (AS) (Mitroff & Kilmann, 1978, chap. 3) is the outer manifestation of the inner psychological attitude of the Sensing-Thinking (ST). The basic drive of the AS is toward certainty and the elimination of uncertainty. The need for certainty links up with other attributes—precision, accuracy and reliability. Another important aspect of the world of the AS is the belief in the value-free nature of science. The goal of science is to uncover impersonal facts and erect theories, which are then tested, measured and quantified independent of human biases. Thus, the AS takes the position of the impartial observer. The type of logic includes the Law of Contra-

*Rosalie Politsky is Chairperson of the Division of Art Education and Art Therapy, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.

diction—no proposition can be both true and false at the same time; and The Law of the Excluded Middle—every proposition is either true or false. Validity of scientific observation is guaranteed when duplication of systematic protocol yields the same results. Consensus and certainty set science apart from other fields such as art, philosophy and morals where consensus is lacking. Mitroff and Kilmann presented the attributes of the typologies as a guiding spirit of their overall scheme of reasoning. I have summarized Mitroff and Kilmann's main points in the following Tables 1–4.

Example

The AS typology is best suited for empirical/analytical research. Bergland and Gonzalez's (1993) article is a classic example of the AS typology and method. Their study is aimed at determining "whether the Sheppard Pratt Art Rating (SPAR) Scale could be a valid and reliable instrument for systematically quantifying art productions" (p. 83). The SPAR Scale was broken into six discrete parts including space, figures, energy, color, composition and general. Each category was divided into seven progressive developmental levels. Using 67 portfolios of artwork from patients with personality disorders, the researchers were able to quantify the scores and found significant differences in the scores of six subjects who later commit suicide (p. 81). The scale was found to be effective in advancing the notion that the quantity of organization reflects the subjects' internal organization (p. 89). Their study is characteristic of the AS typology in the involvement of large numbers of subjects, observation and standardized measurements, testing, treatment and normative scoring. Reliability and predictability were also key elements in this study.

Table 1
The Characteristics of the Analytical Scientist (AS)

Main concern	Certainty, preciseness, accuracy and reliability
Status of science	Hierarchical, privileged, value-free, apolitical, disinterested; separable from other fields
Nature of knowledge	Impersonal, value-free, precise, reliable, causal, valid, reductionist, apolitical; clear standards, realistic, anti-mystical, unambiguous
Guarantors of knowledge	Consensus, reliability, validity, rigor; controlled, distance between scientist/object
Aim of science	To generate precise, unambiguous, empirical, impersonal data, theories, schema and laws
Logic	Aristotelian, strict classical logic; Law of Contradiction and the Law of the Excluded Middle
Ideology	Value-free, apolitical or anti-political, scientific knowledge is independent of the personality of the researcher, disinterestedness—critical attitude toward the ideas of colleagues
Mode of inquiry	ANOVA (Analysis of variance)—able to consider various degrees of presence of one factor; if factors *X* and *A* overlap—confounding effect
Properties of scientist	Disinterested, unbiased, impersonal, precise, specialist, exact, skeptical

Table 2
The Characteristics of the Conceptual Theorist (CT)

Main concern	Seeks multiple conflicting explanations; paradigm bridging
Status of science	Privileged, not separable from other fields; not independent, no strict hierarchy; all fields depend upon one another; value-free, apolitical
Nature of knowledge	Impersonal, value-free, holistic, valid, disinterested, imaginative, multicausational, apolitical, purposeful ambiguity, uncertainty
Guarantors of knowledge	Conflict between anti-theoretical, imaginative theories; holistic theories; ever-expanding research programs; comprehensive
Aim of science	Construct broadest possible conceptual schemas; production of multiple conflicting schemas
Logic	Dialectical; uses dialectical debate
Ideology	Norms are a function of one's theoretical perspective and cannot be separated from one's conceptual theoretical interests
Mode of inquiry	Conceptual inquiry; treatment of innovative concepts from multiple perspectives; invention of new schemas
Properties of scientist	Disinterested, unbiased, holistic, imaginative, speculative, generalist, impersonal