

01 Jan 2024

## Editors' Introduction: June 2024

Thalia R. Goldstein

Amy M. Belfi

*Missouri University of Science and Technology*, amybelfi@mst.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/psysci\\_facwork](https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/psysci_facwork)



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Goldstein, T. R., & Belfi, A. M. (2024). Editors' Introduction: June 2024. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 18(3), pp. 257-258. American Psychological Association.

The definitive version is available at <https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000709>

This Editorial is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars' Mine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychological Science Faculty Research & Creative Works by an authorized administrator of Scholars' Mine. This work is protected by U. S. Copyright Law. Unauthorized use including reproduction for redistribution requires the permission of the copyright holder. For more information, please contact [scholarsmine@mst.edu](mailto:scholarsmine@mst.edu).

## EDITORIAL

## Editors' Introduction: June 2024

Thalia R. Goldstein<sup>1</sup> and Amy M. Belfi<sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, George Mason University<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychological Science, Missouri University of Science and Technology

Welcome to the June 2024 issue of *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*. We start with some happy news. Together with our publisher, the American Psychological Association, we are excited to announce another increase in our page count per year! Following our 2023 increase to six issues per year and 800 pages, we will now increase to 1,100 pages per year! This means more exciting science about aesthetics, creativity, and art, and also a faster time from article acceptance to publication in an issue. Our submission rate has gone up more than 100% in the last few years, and while the time from submission to first decision and online first publication has remained the same, we are aware that issue numbers and pagination are important to our authors, and the increasing time for issue placement has been a source of frustration. We hope this will help ease our backlog, and we are thankful for all of the patience and understanding our authors and readers have shown as we continue to grow. With that happy news, on to the issue. For June 2024, we present 15 articles and four book reviews, crossing the breadth and depth of our topics.

We begin with six articles that look at audience and viewer responses to visual arts in different contexts and different forms. First, Elliot and colleagues ask whether individual differences in empathy are associated with attention and reaction time to emotive areas in works of visual art. They find, using mixed methods, that individuals who score high on empathy measures also have faster reaction times for faces of background figures, and for body language in artworks, using eye tracking. They triangulate these findings with discussion of emotional engagement with ambiguous artworks, and the ways in which various individual differences affect viewer experience. Next, Morris and Alevy look to ideas in the intrinsic value and biases of fine art. They specifically ask about a modern problem—looking at art in person versus digitally when making judgments about value. Over two studies, they find that the amount of previous experience about art and background information given affect valuation more than the digital/in-person divide. However, viewing time also affects valuation, but apparently only for in-person viewing. This brings up important questions not only about how art is perceived and judged, but also the continuing role

of expertise and experience on judgment and evaluation in research studies on art.

Choi, Lee, and Lee then take on a question about savoring art and its effects on happiness and well-being. In two studies with 645 participants, they find that the attitude that viewers take towards art, specifically the feeling of appreciating the full value of artworks, is associated with better markers of health (including biomarkers for inflammation) and with self-reported psychological and subjective well-being. While art lovers have long linked their enjoyment of art with positive psychological effects, this connection between the approach of savoring specifically and a possible biological mechanism for positive outcomes is an exciting step forward. Next, Muth and Carbon take on the role that valence-driven ambivalence plays in interest and engagement when looking at photography. They find that ambivalence is associated with heightened interest, especially after thinking about positive and negative aspects of an image. This finding is supported by eye-tracking methods showing that individuals choose and look longer at ambivalent photos. Next, in a connection to our cover art, Rodriguez and colleagues look at the emotions that are experienced by visitors to an art museum. They conducted a field study with almost 300 visitors to a museum which focuses on contemporary and modern art, asking about the diversity of emotions the viewers experienced while in the museum as a whole. They find wide variability in emotional experience, particularly for those who scored highly on the personality trait of openness to experience, and those who were visiting for the first time. Balance was also higher for those more open to experience and with higher interests in art. This work shows the importance of considering museum visits as a whole for their emotional value, and looking beyond responses to single artworks when thinking about aesthetic responses. We then continue in this vein of feelings in response to art, moving from museum to online, with Schino and colleague's paper on emotional responses to art, and their mapping in the body. Here, the researchers asked online participants to view new media visual art, and note where in their bodies they felt activity. They find that the collection of art evoked both basic and complex emotions, and that there were general patterns of deactivation of lower limbs and increased activity in the head and hands for these works viewed online. This paper shows how additional methodologies can be applied to aesthetic responses, and how complex new media art activates increased cognitive effort.

Next, we have five articles that investigate various forms of artistic personality, career, and activities, looking at a range of psychological overlaps and engagement. First, Brisson and Bianchi conduct an investigation with 873 high school-age students, looking specifically

Thalia R. Goldstein  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3892-0852>

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Thalia R. Goldstein, Department of Psychology, George Mason University, 4400 University Drive, MSN 3F5, Fairfax, VA 22030, United States. Email: [tgoldste@gmu.edu](mailto:tgoldste@gmu.edu)

personality, socioeconomic status, aesthetic disposition, and eclecticism. Echoing many other studies, they find openness specifically from the Big Five personality traits is associated with aesthetic judgment, including musical eclecticism (together with socioeconomic status). However, they also propose that given the range of their results, that eclecticism, openness, and aesthetic disposition should not be conflated, and specifically that eclectic tastes may differ greatly depending on the domain of art. Then, Black and Barnes look at whether writing was associated with social cognition, specifically comparing writing about people compared to objects, and whether content was fictional, real, or social, and how linguistic content mediated the effects. They find that fictionality of what participants were writing about did not matter, but that writing about persons increased social cognition more than writing about objects. Writing with people as a topic also contained more emotional language. This extends previous work on simply reading or watching fictions' effects on social cognition, and shows how the activity of writing, regardless of its imaginary content, matters for social cognitive priming. Moving from writing to drawing, Drake and colleagues looked at whether art students had different local and global processing skills than nonart majors through assessing drawing skills, copying skills, and preferences, as well as measuring for autistic-related traits. They find art students are more likely than nonart students to copy global features and do better on both types of processing tasks, suggesting that being an art student is associated with an attentional flexibility and raising important questions about how art training may be associated with this flexibility. Next, moving from students to world-class artists, Feist and colleagues investigated the popular notion that eminent creativity in arts and sciences is associated with psychopathology and mental illness. By looking at 199 biographies of eminent creative artists, scientists, and athletes, they find that artists' biographies were judged as more likely to show mental illness, specifically among alcoholism, anxiety disorder, drug abuse, and depression at rates higher than athletes, scientists, and the general population. These findings raise important questions, though, about the role of gender, as many fewer women have biographies written about them, differing rates of psychopathologies across type of art and subtype of practice, and the role of culture, as most biographies examined were of European and white Americans. Keeping with world-renowned creatives, Lebeda and Karwowski performed a linguistic analysis of Nobel Prize laureates in art and science, specifically inferring their personalities from their speeches. They find writers, compared to scientists, to be more open, introverted, and neurotic. These findings echo previous work on historiometric studies, while expanding into investigating Wikipedia and Encyclopedia Britannica entries and connecting them to these findings opens up these questions to the broader notion of how Nobel Prize laureates gain wider recognition.

Now, we turn to two articles on increasing creativity and two on measuring creativity and aesthetics. First, Murray and colleagues look to previous work showing how mind wandering may be beneficial for creativity. To do this, they conduct a conceptual replication across two studies and 443 participants, finding no evidence that mind wandering during creative-incubation period is associated with later divergent thinking. They note that conceptualizing mind wandering as task-relevant or not is important for future work in this area, and the importance of mechanistic conceptualization and measurement when engaging in research on creativity enhancement. Second,

Grosser and colleagues look at creative self-enhancement in teams, specifically the role that overly positive self-perception may play on creative performance. They find that men and individuals who are more hypercompetitive are at higher risk of creative self-enhancement. Because hypercompetitive individuals are more likely to be affected by suboptimal performance, they are more motivated to protect their self-concept, and hence have more biased self-focused sensemaking.

Next, Weiss and colleagues have proposed a useful taxonomy of the wide variety of creativity measures, focusing on assessment features, and categorizing based on measurement approach, construct, the type of data generated, scoring methods, and possible psychometric problems. Looking to 228 different creativity measurements from the last 100+ years, they find a need to increase multiapproaches and constructs of creativity measurement simultaneously, and look to the promises of virtual reality to provide more settings to capture novel aspects of creative potential. We think this is a fascinating taxonomy that will provide a real guide when researchers are trying to choose which creativity measures to use for what purposes in future work. Then, Specker provides further validation of the Vienna Art Interest and Art Knowledge measure, a questionnaire that looks at participants' general interests and knowledge of art. She provides additional important psychometric validation of the measure for future use, and answers common questions about length, using CFA, EFA, and reliability. Taken together, these two articles provide tools to help all researchers in aesthetics and creativity move ahead.

Finally, we present four book reviews, each on very different deep dives into specific, unique, and important topics. We thank our former and current book review editors Jeff Smith and Roni Reiter-Palmon for the handling of these reviews. Taking on the role of art education in general forms of education across time and context, and providing the readers with a journey of career and research, Goldstein reviews Ellen Winner's "beautifully written, easy to read, and truly informative" *Uneasy Guest in The Schoolhouse*. Next, Specker discusses the "welcome library addition" *Routledge International Handbook of Neuroaesthetics*, edited by Skov and Nadal. This handbook offers a broad overview of the relatively new but expansive and widely popular field of neuroaesthetics—the combination of neuroscience and aesthetic response and reasoning. Third, Wang reviews Gal's "fresh and valuable" *Visual Metaphors and Aesthetics: A Formalist Theory of Metaphor*, a deep exploration of the world of metaphor is visual and aesthetic components. Finally, taking on the enormous and exponentially growing field of music science, music cognition, and psychology and neuroscience of music, Belfi reviews *The Science-Music Borderlands: Reckoning with the Past and Imagining the Future*, edited by Margulis, Loui, and Loughridge. She calls it "ambitious, novel, and important." All of these books present necessary perspectives on topics important to our readership, and we encourage you to check them out, ask your library to support these authors by ordering the books for distribution, or purchasing them yourself! This will enable our growing field(s) to grow even more into the future.

To conclude, we hope you enjoy this issue and our new expanded issues to come. We value the work of our authors and are so excited by the exponential growth of truly high-quality research in this field. We look forward to receiving your work at *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*.

Received May 23, 2024 ■