

DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH IN PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS OF PSYCHOLOGY
The Professional Model for Research

Arne Collen, Ph. D.

Presented as part of a symposium at
The California State Psychological Association
March, 1977
Los Angeles

As many of you know the WASC Commission has recently given full accreditation to the Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco campuses of the school. CSPP as an educational institution grants the Ph. D. degree. These two events are not completely separable realities. Obviously, each one is important for specific reasons, but together they carry tremendous implications and responsibilities for the future of the Professional Psychology Movement. Therefore, this symposium is very appropriate at this time, to present directions for research, as we see it, in a professional school of psychology.

For my part, I will talk about the professional model currently in use at the school, as a context for my colleagues who will expound upon the model's implications for research in the school, community, and profession, present and future.

Many of our teachers and colleagues have taught us to believe that the scientist and the practitioner are two different entities. They maintain the perspective that each person is a member of a different social order within psychology and that each person pursues a distinctly separate everyday reality. This perspective is incompatible with the training model now in effect at CSPP.

From a traditional viewpoint a scientist engages in the pursuit of knowledge within a set of guidelines employing the scientific method and rules of logic. Objectivity and observation are cherished hallmarks. On the other hand, the practitioner is considered a healer, an alleviator of mental afflictions and a catalyst for change. As a therapist and interventionist he/she puts to use knowledge reaped from inquiry. Considering the primary educational goal of the school, any model which insists upon the separation, of practitioner from researcher, is inadequate. It shortchanges the graduate student, and subsequently the profession, of the full value to be attained from the training process. Like other dichotomies this one is primitive and superficial. Unfortunately it too often becomes a basis for personal value judgments setting direction and expectation in clinical practice.

At this point, I offer an anecdote. I recall a psychologist working with a group of children in a classroom setting. Against one wall of the room was an aquarium containing two turtles. One week a child pocketed the larger of the two turtles. Later the psychologist noticed the smaller turtle and lectured to the children on how miserable it was for the turtle to be alone and the need for companionship. A few days later to her surprise she discovered the smaller turtle had disappeared as well.

I suppose one could debate the psychologist's intended manipulation, but the basic point I wish to emphasize is the anticipated outcome. The psychologist, as an information gatherer and observer, the very essence of research, established a perspective before the experience and maintained it until rudely awakened by the child's action, and then it was too late. In this case, the observer fell victim to the alternatives. Allocating the realm of inquiry to the scientist, excusing the practitioner from drawing upon basic principles of observation, makes it easy to fall back to familiar territory, one's own value and belief system. Perhaps my example is naive, but it does carry a simple message. To restrict oneself to one narrow frame of reference denies one access to the fruits of alternatives. This self-denial is unnecessary and stultifying.

CSPP's primary mission is the training of professional psychologists. It is the position of the school that the professional is more competent and a better provider of services when he/she can draw upon research skills. This position stems from the significant shift in training taken at the Vail Conference. The Boulder or scientist-professional model was enunciated two decades earlier. Its impact on CSPP between the establishment of the school in 1969 and 1973 has been to favor research consumption in preference to research production. After much deliberation and some semantic juggling at the Vail Conference, the professional-scientist model was set forth in 1973 and adopted by the school. The central focus of the model is practitioner as researcher. Thus, the professional psychologist has the role of both consumer and investigator. Further, the model encourages the use of all research methodologies and active engagement in research on all human problems confronting the practitioner. Finally, it emphasizes the practicality and appropriateness of the method of study for the problem rather than fitting the problem to the method.

These characteristics of the model are antithetical to the scientist-practitioner dichotomy. Perpetuation of the dichotomy, a common side effect of traditional graduate programs, is considered counterproductive to the professional training process. Maintaining the duality is a noteworthy occupational hazard. CSPP recognizes its importance in the application of psychological knowledge to clinical practice and consultation by emphasizing research components at different levels of the educational program. This is apparent, for example, in the year long Masters level research sequence followed later by two years of doctoral level dissertation seminars and a choice of several advanced research electives. In addition, for many students the Masters level field placement in an agency provides an early exposure to patient populations and the setting for later thesis work.

This integration of the practitioner and scientist in the graduate school years is intended to lay the groundwork for post-doctoral inquiry and provides the latitude, skill-wise and attitude-wise, for the professional to deal with problems of living in today's society.

The versatility of the professional-scientist model and the futility of the scientist-practitioner dichotomy has set the stage for the directions in research to be presented by our remaining speakers.

Directions for Research in Professional Psychology

Norman Cavior, Theodore R. Dixon, Nathan Hare, Nathan Adler, Arne R. Collen,
and Michael Tiktinsky

California School of Professional Psychology
San Francisco

Clinical psychologists trained in standard academic settings too often acquire an approach to research which hampers their effectiveness in a number of significant ways. These include: 1) a false dichotomy between scientist and practitioner; 2) the separation of research from a field context; 3) a low level of evaluative feedback regarding the efficiency of delivery systems, leading to a neglect of many population groups as well as important areas of human existence; 4) resistance to methodological innovations; 5) a narrow focus on intrapsychic phenomena (personality) which minimizes the social contract; and 6) leaves no impact on clinical practice, producing practitioners who are unable to generate social accountability and self-regulation.

The resolution of these and related problems demands alternative approaches. In addition, the integration of research and intervention is a crucial prerequisite to effective participation in the emerging concern with social, economic and environmental problems.

While traditional academic analysis is insufficient to deal with complex field problems which cannot be broken down into objects of laboratory experimentation, professional schools must become more proficient in preparing students to function independently in a multiplicity of settings. Our goal is to enhance health service delivery as well as preventive endeavors. Individual intervention in office practice must be combined with services oriented toward public or collective measures. This includes the development of new roles for psychologists as change agents in the public arena.

⑤
how
example:
thoughts
& feelings
child
child predicted on
to the
with better
some could debate
to support the
but basic point
of a change is
the therapist
These put
a focus into
importance
research, was
and main
with research
for the child
practice
Focus on
Practitioner
Some
allocated &
A practical
highly
on that it
to fall back
to
As
a
belly
Perhaps
Helen
carry a
meaning.

Toward that end, it is necessary to provide an optimal environment for the development of new experimental and non-experimental approaches to the subject matter of psychology, such as subject empiricism, in the quest for new knowledge and solutions to important problems which traditional methodologies have been unable to solve.

Psychologists share a responsibility in the improvement of psychological and social existence equal to that of the physical scientist in the area of technological development. Negligence in the area of psycho-social inventions permits the psycho-social decay now gripping industrialized society.

Outstanding clinical-researchers have testified that much research has had little, if any, impact on practical intervention. Applied psychologists must therefore be trained to evaluate their intervention methods, including all forms of psychotherapy. It seems of value to emphasize methods that facilitate accountability and self-regulation.

Research Substance and Method for Professional Psychologists

Norman Cavior

California School of Professional Psychology
San Francisco

Direction implies not only where to go but also what to leave behind. Probably the major research approach to de-emphasize in professional schools of psychology is traditional personality research. This research, fostered in clinical training programs by faculty with access to large undergraduate populations, emphasizes the investigation of intrapsychic variables (e.g., locus of control, anxiety) utilizing large scale correlational and between group designs. These studies, when publishable, typically report statistically significant, but clinically irrelevant, results. Large scale group designs do not facilitate research once the clinical psychology student leaves the university. The median number of publications by clinical psychologists is still zero. Many Psychology departments openly acknowledge that they do not expect most of their clinical students to do research. Instead they justify traditional research training on the grounds that the student will be a consumer of research. I doubt that many clinicians outside university settings read many data based research studies. Thus, this training is not cost effective and the cost benefit ratio is extremely low. Many outstanding clinical researchers have stated that many group design research studies have had almost no impact on their clinical work.

An alternative to large scale intrapsychic/personality research is to emphasize training clinical students to evaluate what they are interested in doing most, that is, evaluating intervention strategies. The rapidly developing single case experimental design methodology seems eminently suitable for this purpose. Without complicated statistics, it

allows every applied clinician, including those in private practice, to evaluate the effectiveness of their treatment strategies and to participate in the endeavor to develop and validate intervention strategies. Single case experimental designs also have the advantage of being able to interface with less traditional methodologies.

We suggest that professional schools of psychology emphasize training students in methodologies and content areas that facilitate evaluation research, accountability to the client and self-regulation. The use of single case experimental designs to evaluate change strategies seems useful.

Settings for Research: Separation of Research from Field Context

Michael Tiktinsky

California School of Professional Psychology
San Francisco

One of the most important tasks that a professional school of psychology has is to train its graduates to function independently in a broad spectrum of situations and settings, each of which requires independent, unbiased and objective evaluations. Traditional psychological research has usually occurred in the laboratory or with large samples of college undergraduates. In addition to the setting constriction, traditional psychological research has suffered from two important hindrances which serve to place the results in a questionable perspective: psychological reductionism and "physics envy."

The problem of psychological reductionism requires analyzing anything psychological into its smallest components usually within the canons of strict experimentalism. These results leave the broader context of human interaction and life systems relatively untouched and not understood.

The problem of physics envy stems from a long historical trend in American psychology that, if anything is worth serious study, it must be measurable. These measurements may or may not have anything to do with the phenomena. Rather, the numbers used to represent some happening often become ends in themselves subjected to the rigors of the calculus or other highly sophisticated mathematical formulae. To be as the physicist without knowing if a phenomena actually exists is the goal to which many psychologists aspire and with which tenure is too often awarded.

In a professional school, we have the opportunity to drive beyond the reductionism and physics envy and deal with the realities and complexities of everyday life. We encourage our students to do research in their field settings and to apply their newly learned material to a real field problem. If psychology is truly a science of human behavior, the responsibility of the psychologist must be as an advocate to improve the life situations and circumstances that detract from quality of life and reduce human potential. Psychologists must be willing to face the broader issues within which individuals live--overpopulation, environmental degradation, adequate health care, food, and housing--and do it in real situations.

Implicit and Explicit Values in Psychological Research

Nathan Hare

California School of Professional Psychology
San Francisco

Something is wrong with the field of psychology. Its failures occur to me from my vantage point of having discovered the discipline with a background of training and experience as a social philosopher and as a black individual whose destiny as a psychologist is inseparable from his psycho-social experience. I lack the luxury of the haughty detachment and abstracted irrelevances that conventionally pass for psychological inquiry.

Psychology, having entered the scientific hierarchy late in human history, and occupying as yet an ambiguous position, is given to excessive reverence and mimicry of the modalities of the natural (physical) sciences; and thus the psychologist exhibits a similar devotion to gadgeteering and word-mongering instead of deeply human insight. Indeed, the psychological researcher tends to strip psychological phenomena of their social (human) elements, minimizing the dialectics of culture and society and the ambiguities and unconscious (over-determined) qualities of individual behavior. His results thus lose and miss the essence of science--understanding--and simultaneously trip over basic elements of human existence in the process.

In the pursuit of amoral knowledge, the researcher detaches himself from society and its values and separates his inquiry from the values (emotional base) of the people he studies. He pretends not to see that research itself is a social enterprise and a psychological process. Research accordingly is separated from the real world and, frequently, fact-finding from theory. In the frenzy to become scientific, the re-

searcher overcompensates and grows scientific, blinded by quantomania, too often lacking a sense of the qualitative except insofar as it is quantified or quantifiable. In the endeavor to be objective he relinquishes control over the inextricable interplay of the objective and the subjective.

Promising alternatives readily present themselves but fail to capture the psychological imagination. Thus an open-ended model seems indicated, based on a willingness unashamedly to face up to a new commitment out of which can eventually evolve the full potential of psychological research.

The Past and the Future in Professional Psychology

Theodore R. Dixon

California School of Professional Psychology
San Francisco

The California School of Professional Psychology was founded because traditional programs were not sufficiently responsive to at least two major areas of Doctoral education. The first of these involves improved training in many applied areas of psychology. CSPP has already done, and will continue to do a responsible job in this domain and intends to continue improving intervention training. The second area which has received much less publicity and which is, in the final analysis, integrally related to training in applied areas, is that of research.

Before elaborating our perspective on research in our professional school, it should be noted that there has, in some quarters, been marked resistance to Ph.D. level research in professional schools and this view has resulted in claims that the Ph.D. should be reserved for traditional departments and the Psy.D. awarded by the professional schools. This curious perspective is, we think, somewhat reactionary and essentially based on the unfortunate dichotomy that has too long characterized the thinking of many psychologists; namely, there are scientist/academicians (in traditional departments doing traditional--and usually experimental--research and training others to do the same, hence, Ph.D.s) and there are various kinds of applied/professional psychologists who usually do not work in graduate departments--unless they establish expertise in traditional research! Thus, we have such long-standing dichotomous classifications as "clinicians vs. experimentalists", and "pure researchers vs. applied researchers". It is our opinion that this kind of tradition, be it implicit or explicit, is seriously counterproductive to both the basic

science of psychology and to the empirical development of improved intervention technology. In short, we propose that at least a significant amount of basic research deserves a new home outside the abstract domain of the traditional university. Moreover, we believe that the professional school, appropriately conceived and staffed, is ideally one such new home. A number of the explicit kinds of such research and related issues have been elaborated by several of the participants of this seminar. More still will be mentioned in the longer version of this paper. Suffice it to say here that the intellectual perspective of rigorous basic science will have an extraordinarily fertile base camp at the cutting edge where psychological intervention is taught, developed, and continuously studied.

Paradigms and Poker: What do Boys in the Backroom Want

Nathan Adler

California School of Professional Psychology
San Francisco

Methodological innovations and their setting in academia or professional schools are not alone matters of predilection and choice. An understanding of the determinants for decisions and operations requires data from the sociology of knowledge and from psychohistory. Hypothetical constructs and intervening variables are embedded in implicit value and power relations. Paradigms not only facilitate research, they imply a metaphysic, legitimate power and institutional relations and establish a cognitive habitat which orders a universe.

Instances are adduced from the history and status of psychoanalysis and its "americanization"; the mobility and status problems of the behavior modification movement; the newer sex therapies; the critique of energy and linguistic models; and neo-populist anti-elitism.

The fission of academic and professional schools reflecting ideological and power issues, are a function of accelerated crisis and change and, it is suggested, will replicate the stages of development of medical and other professional schools.