# In Memoriam: Donald J. Brenner (1932–2010)

**Robert A. Logan**
*Missouri-Columbia School of Journalism (Emeritus)*
*U.S. National Library of Medicine*

***Abstract:*** *In Don Brenner's memory, a news-style obituary is provided. This is followed by a few remarks about Don's intellectual contributions and some personal memories. Following this, Don speaks for himself in an edited version of his remarks to the 2009 ISSSS convention. While his talk concentrated on William Stephenson, Don also provided some career self-reflections. It was Don's last public address.*

## Obituary

Donald J. Brenner, Ph.D., 78, a founding member of the International Society for the Scientific Study of Subjectivity (ISSSS) and professor emeritus at the University of Missouri–Columbia (MU) School of Journalism, died on Saturday, Oct. 23, 2010, at his home in Columbia, MO, USA.

Dr. Brenner worked with William Stephenson, the founder of Q methodology, as a graduate research assistant, a co-researcher, and a faculty peer for almost three decades. During his 1984–1991 tenure as associate dean for graduate studies in the MU School of Journalism, Dr. Brenner helped found the Stephenson Research Center and helped ISSSS organize its initial academic meetings. Dr. Brenner also was a founding member of the health communication division of the International Communication Association.

Dr. Brenner was co-editor of a foundational book about Q method and William Stephenson: Steve R. Brown and Donald J. Brenner (Eds.) *Science, Psychology, and Communication: Essays Honoring William Stephenson.* New York: Columbia University Teachers College Press, 1972. The collection of essays about Q and its multidisciplinary influence was a festschrift, prepared to coincide with William Stephenson's retirement from the MU School of Journalism faculty. The book helped inspire the creation of an organization to honor Stephenson's research legacy, which became ISSSS. Dr. Brenner, who finished his Ph.D. in 1965, was one of 12 persons who received a doctorate from the MU School of Journalism under William Stephenson's supervision.

Contact author: rlogan@mail.nih.gov
*Operant Subjectivity: The International Journal of Q Methodology, 2011, 34(2): 85–99*

In spring 2010, ISSSS named its annual research paper competition award for Dr. Brenner.

In addition to the aforementioned co-edited book about Q method, Dr. Brenner was the author of 12 book chapters, 18 refereed academic journal articles, and 20 refereed papers. Don was the primary advisor for 40 doctoral and master's students during his MU journalism career. Don's disciplinary interests included health communication, journalism research, and Q methodology.

Dr. Brenner also was a publications consultant for 15 colleges and universities. Prior to pursuing a doctorate, Don was the night city editor of the Athens (Ohio) *Daily Messenger* and a staff writer for Gulf Oil's corporate magazine.

Don was born to John and Gertrude Brenner on April 12, 1932, in Lorain, Ohio, the second of three children. His parents were immigrants to the United States; both English and German were spoken in his home. His father, like many in Lorain, worked for the U.S. Steel Co.

Don graduated from Lorain High School in 1949. He was the first member of his family to attend college. He worked throughout his undergraduate years, including often-hilarious summer stints as a taxi driver for visitors to Put-In-Bay, an Ohio resort.

Don graduated with a journalism degree from Bowling Green State University in 1954. While there, he met Kathleen Shuler, an aspiring teacher, whom he married on Aug. 7, 1955, in Grelton, Ohio.

After finishing college, Don was drafted into the U.S. Army and served for two years. He took pride in his service and would regale family and friends with stories of hitting artillery targets on the White Sands Missile Range and fending off tent-invading rattlesnakes while on maneuvers.

Following an honorable discharge, Don completed a Master's degree in journalism at Ohio University. After he received his doctorate, Don joined the journalism faculty at Northern Illinois University. He returned to the MU School of Journalism as a faculty member in 1966.

Don assisted William Stephenson at the health communication research branch of the Missouri Regional Medical Program in the late 1960s–early 1970s. This led to Don's 1972 appointment at Texas Tech University to establish the first department of health communication in the U.S.

He returned to MU in 1977 to work with Donald A.B. Lindberg, M.D., in the Health Care Technology Center at the MU School of Medicine. (Dr. Lindberg ran MU's Health Care Technology Center before he became the director of the U.S. National Library of Medicine in 1985.) Dr. Brenner rejoined the MU journalism faculty in 1978. He was the director of the Stephenson Research Center, served as an associate dean for graduate studies, and retired in 1992.

Among his experiences as a teacher, administrator and researcher, Don relished lifelong friendships with his many students and took joy in their accomplishments. He was pleased to have students visit his home—often as dinner guests. His sons vividly remember international students who sometimes prepared meals traditional to Southeast Asia, western Africa, and other points around the globe.

His family and friends remember Don for his unbridled enthusiasms. His collection of Christmas ornaments eventually required three oversize trees for proper display. His large collection of Lego blocks allowed him to express his creative side, and Ping Pong table-filling scale models of aircraft carriers—built with his sons—filled his home. His collection of classical music on reel-to-reel tape was of museum comprehension and quality.

Don is survived by his three sons and two daughters-in-law, Jay and Vicki Brenner of Chesterfield, Missouri, John and Laura Brenner of Columbia, Missouri, and Jerrell Brenner of Columbia, Missouri; his brother and sister-in-law, Bob and Pamela Brenner of Lake Orion, Michigan; and six grandchildren, Michael, Dan, Chris and Kathryn Brenner of Chesterfield, Missouri, and Adam and Rachel Brenner of Columbia, Missouri.

Dr. Brenner was preceded in death by his wife, Kathleen, and his sister and brother-in-law, Dolores and Peter Homka.

## At Work: A Few of Don Brenner's Intellectual Contributions

Don's writing and editing abilities were underrated. He co-authored three of the initial six articles I published (cited below). Don understood the tension and uncertainty that beset a novice who tries (and tires) to create a scholarly reputation. It was Don's encouragement, confidence, and editing that helped me polish and publish some of the manuscripts that launched my career. He did similar favors for others.

Don was a great admirer of Will and Mamie Stephenson, and wanted ISSSS (and Q method) to gain traction and be sustained. I am confident his 2009 ISSSS keynote address and the naming of the ISSSS research paper competition award after him were deeply appreciated. He also was a pioneer in health communication.

I was introduced to Don's intellectual gifts in 1972-73 during the publication *of Science, Psychology, and Communication: Essays Honoring William Stephenson.* At least one of the original reviews of the book is on the web at: http://epm.sagepub.com/content/33/3/749.full.pdf+html.

Don was confounded by book reviewers' inability to grasp that there are options in quantitative social science besides assessing whether investigator-imposed constructs are statistically significant. In addition

to the accumulation of evidence so a social science-derived trait might be considered the rough equivalent of a clinical biomarker, Don believed social researchers *also* should be interested in human subjectivity and the generation (rather than the confirmation) of literature-derived hypotheses.

Regarding the latter, Don explained that investigator predispositions frequently are eclipsed by the subjectivity of what is under scrutiny as well as operant human dynamics. "Methods should enhance one's ability to let a situation speak for itself," Don often said.

Don believed some traditional research methodological issues (such as reliability and validity checks/manipulations) were extraneous when a researcher seeks to appreciate human subjectivity. As a result, Don was disappointed by reviews (such as the one cited above) where Q is criticized for not eliminating ambiguous statements or requiring mutually exclusive statements. Other common Q criticisms in the reviews included participant-related issues, such as subject comprehension of statements, study fatigue, and consistency of statement selection, as well as a lack of basic research about the optimal length of Q sorts and whether results are impacted by statement presentation order.

Such insights on the nature of methodological criticisms infused Don's views of some related topics. For example, he became upset when faculty peers judged the contributions of a qualitative researcher by quantitative standards (or vice versa). "The issue is whether the investigator advances the literature within his or her research genre," Don argued.

Incidentally, in the first graduate research methods class that I took from Don at MU in 1972, he never mentioned Q or William Stephenson. (Please remember the context; Don had just finished a book about Q and Stephenson!) The class' purpose was to provide an overview of mass communication historical and legal research methods plus public opinion polls. Don spent the entire class on traditional topics in order to create a foundation so students could take more advanced research courses. He quietly disagreed with Stephenson's pedagogical approach of focusing only on Q—and implies so in his 2009 remarks to follow.

While I thanked Don for his pedagogy and gracious assistance, I regret we never co-authored essays to contrast Q with qualitative and quantitative research. Don had few peers in understanding the contextual underpinnings of the term "operant subjectivity." I wish I had encouraged him to compare Q plus other mixed methods with other qualitative and quantitative research approaches.

**Brenner-Logan publications**

Brenner, D. & Logan, R. A. (1981). Some considerations in the diffusion of medical technologies: Medical information systems. In Nimmo, D. (Ed.). *Communication Yearbook 4* (pp. 608–623). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Logan, R. A. & Brenner, D. (1982). The effects of physicians' values and role perceptions on the diffusion of medical information systems. In Pettegrew, L. (Ed.). *Straight talk: Explorations in provider and patient interaction* (pp. 95–109). Louisville: Humana.

Logan, R. A. & Brenner, D. (1987). Innovative physicians and medical information systems. In Levy, A. & Williams, B. (Eds.). *Proceedings AAMSI Congress 1987* (pp. 197–201). Washington, DC: American Association for Medical Science and Informatics.

## At Play: A Few Personal Memories of Don Brenner

By the time I joined the MU journalism faculty in 1986, Don had three ornament-laden Christmas trees. I remember a pre-Christmas visit circa 1990 when one of Don's former students (MU journalism faculty member Jean Gaddy Wilson) arrived with her two then-mid-teenage daughters. They were dressed identically in white and looked uncomfortably angelic as they pranced through Don's holiday exhibition.

He grasped the humor of the moment and sensed the girls were in an unintentionally awkward spot. Don whispered: "better leave them alone."

Don blended awareness with a self-contained dignity. His personality and demeanor were distinctive; he was acutely alert but judgmentally disciplined.

Don enjoyed the insights he gleaned by befriending others with contrasting experiences, lives, and ideas. For example, since Don raised sons he was interested in Jean Gaddy Wilson's parental experiences—because she raised daughters. He was interested in my childhood and teen experiences because how and where I grew up contrasted with Don's formative years.

Rather than surround himself with like-minded and culturally similar persons, Don relished the reverse. This may explain why Don quickly embraced Q methodology and became close to William Stephenson.

My last conversation with Don was in late fall 2009. I told him I was scheduled to give a keynote address at an annual, winter dinner sponsored by the mass communication school at Texas Tech. (Don knew I had never been to Lubbock, Texas.) His immediate response was "you will discover why Buddy Holly left." As I boarded the plane to leave Lubbock, I said to myself, "Don was right!"

I will miss the playful personality of Don's earlier years, his huge Lincoln (automobile), the backyard of his house that I called "DGC" (daughter of the Grand Canyon), his collection of classical music on tape, his kindness, and his affection for Kathleen and his family. Most of all, I think Don would like me to remember him as the most devoted dad and grandfather I have ever met.

## In His Own Words: Excerpts About William Stephenson and His Own Career—From Dr. Don Brenner's Keynote Address to the 2009 ISSSS Convention

### On Meeting William Stephenson for the First Time

I came to Missouri in the summer of 1961. I had a Bachelor's and a Master's degree in journalism but absolutely no experience in quantitative research methods. I thought *Journalism Quarterly*, with all of its research reports and statistical tables, was a bunch of gobbledy-gook. Frank Luther Mott, who was then-teaching at the University of Missouri, won a Pulitzer Prize for his four-volume *History of American Magazines* and still is considered the most distinguished historian in the School of Journalism's history. I had some background in both newspapers and magazines—and I came to Missouri because I thought I would get to do a magazine-oriented historical dissertation . . . under Mott's direction.

I met Earl English, who was the dean of the journalism school, when I showed up to register for the first term. Earl English took me by the arm and led me over to this red-faced man with thick glasses and he said, "You will work with him."

Now, I had been in the Army, and I knew the difference between a suggestion and an order! So, from that moment, my life was changed and William Stephenson proceeded to make me a quantitative researcher.

### On William Stephenson's Pedagogy

Stephenson taught graduate courses in research methods, communication theory, and information theory, usually in the form of seminars. He had a large conference table in his office and normally his classes met around it. Good students, if they worked at it, soon learned to appreciate that something wonderful was happening in the seminars. Other students usually ended up perplexed.

Stephenson never gave examinations, very rarely gave written assignments, but at the end of the term he would have to grade students. He once told us that he gave A's to students if he could see a twinkle in their eye! That wasn't really true. Instead, Stephenson valued contributions during his seminars when students asked intelligent questions or made comments suggesting they understood him.

When I became a faculty member, graduate students would ask for advice about enrolling in Stephenson's courses. I always said the same thing, "Pay no attention whatsoever to what the catalogue describes as the course that you are going to enroll for." I said, "What's going to happen, if you enroll in, say, the Spring of 1963, what you are going to get is 'Stephenson's Spring '63'. He's going to talk about whatever interests him or whatever he's involved in at the moment." And that's the way it went.

I once asked him to come speak to one of my seminars, and he did. He came and gave his usual performance. And as we were leaving, he said to me, "That ought to give you something to live up to!" And of course he was right.

**On Stephenson as a Scholarly Pioneer**

Stephenson believed that he was a modern equivalent of Galileo. Stephenson thought he was cutting new paths in philosophy and science as well as research methods because Q methodology was contrary to prevailing values and opinions about research approaches. The consequence was Stephenson spent the rest of his life battling for the acceptance and understanding of his ideas about Q methodology.

Ironically, if there are any areas of human activity where adults ought to be open-minded and understanding, scientific research ought to be the exemplar. Yet, that's never been the case . . . and Stephenson's ideas and methods ran into great difficulty being accepted.

**On Distinguishing Q from R Methodology**

The prevailing research models were R methodology and the hypothetico-deductive method. R methodology was undergirded by sampling and concern about whether samples were large and representative enough so when you found differences you could demonstrate, statistically, that these differences were too impressive to be random. R factor analysis also focused on factoring items—not people.

Hypothetico-deductive method (HD) professed there was only one scientific method. HD advocates believed in devising a narrowed hypothesis, finding valid tests for them and then assessing whether to reject the null hypotheses.

When I talked to my classes, I gave them this example of the difference between Q methodology and hypothetico-deductive methodology.

I said, "Imagine a room with a door and if you open the door there's another room that is completely dark and you can't see anything in it. You want to know what's in that room.

You have two choices.

You can take a flashlight and shine it around, one place at a time, see what's there, and try to understand it. That's a metaphor for a hypothetico-deductive approach.

Alternatively, you can turn on the room light, see everything at once, and have some idea about how things are related. You devise possible hypotheses by seeing the totality of what's there. The latter is a metaphor for Q methodology and "operancy"—and conceptually differentiates Q and R methodology. In Q, the totality of the interaction drives interpretation and data should speak for themselves, always retaining the possibility of surprise. In R, you focus on empirically confirming or rejecting a narrower focus within a range of possibilities.

**On Stephenson's Interactions with Cyril Burt**

Stephenson invented Q methodology while working with British psychometrican Charles Spearman, who was an R-type factor analysis pioneer. Stephenson had famous debates with Cyril Burt, another distinguished British psychologist, about the differences between Q and R.

Burt claimed that Q factor analysis was simply the inverse of R factor analysis. You just turned it around . . . factored people over items rather than items over people. Stephenson steadfastly maintained Burt's description was inaccurate, and Stephenson believed Burt's views ignored the differences in psychological theory and scientific approaches that each approach represented.

When Steve Brown and I were doing the festschrift, *Essays Honoring William Stephenson*, Steve had the thoughtful idea to seek Cyril Burt's participation. Burt at the time was quite elderly and long retired. Steve tracked Burt down; he was living in the Orkney Islands (UK) in isolation. Burt replied in a spidery pencilled handwriting that he would do a chapter for the book and indeed participated. It was the last thing that Cyril Burt published.

When Stephenson saw it in the book he shook his head, he said, "Poor Burt. He never did understand!"

**On Stephenson's Criticisms of Students and Peers**

There was, about William Stephenson, one thing we all learned quickly. When it came to academics, research, or science, he did not suffer fools gladly. He had no hesitance to object to what he thought was not intelligent, foolish or, as he said, "along the wrong lines."

Stephenson criticized quite harshly—and his comments were undergirded by a macroscopic British education and perspective.

Yet, Stephenson's criticisms always were constructive. He was trying to help people think along different lines, or attempting to straighten out their thinking. Often, he was role-playing and believed scholars (at

all ages) should perform this function for others.

Stephenson's uninhibited-criticism tendencies were exhibited during Elias Porter's keynote speech at an ISSSS meeting, (probably in late 1970s).

Stephenson invited Elias Porter, a colleague in the psychology faculty at the University of Chicago, to be the dinner-keynote speaker. Stephenson gave him a warm introduction and Porter began his prepared remarks.

It quickly became apparent that Porter's thinking about research was misaligned with Stephenson's. Within minutes after Porter started speaking, Stephenson interrupted him and objected.

Please remember that it is uncommon behavior to interrupt and challenge a dinner speaker—especially when he is a peer and a distinguished invitee.

At first, Porter took the challenges calmly and went on with his remarks. But the interruptions continued.

The audience (which was composed of many who knew Stephenson) became a bit uncomfortable. And we could see his wife Mamie kicking him in the shins under the table.

Porter went on and actually got through his speech.

Afterwards, Steve Brown and I talked about the possibility of creating the Elias Porter Memorial Lecture.

**Two Additional Stories about William Stephenson's Character**

*1: A dangling dinner conversation.* On one occasion Stephenson invited me and my wife plus Keith Sanders, a colleague, and his wife for dinner. It always was a memorable occasion to go to the Stephensons' because Mamie Stephenson was a wonderful cook. After a marvelous dinner, we repaired to the family room with our glasses of sherry and Stephenson proceeded to monopolize the conversation for the next 45 minutes.

At that time Mamie interrupted him and said, "Will, I don't think they understand a word that you're saying!" And he stopped and he looked at her and said, "Of course they don't!"—and went right on talking.

*That* was Will Stephenson.

*2: Confederate exasperation.* Before Will and Mamie built a lovely house in another area of Columbia, MO, they lived in a home that was walking distance from the MU journalism school. Stephenson daily walked to school—usually in his trench coat and with his umbrella over his arm. One day he arrived a bit miffed and reported the following.

Stephenson encountered a student driving in his car with two Confederate flags sticking up on the front fender. When the student stopped at a stop sign, Stephenson walked up to the car, rapped on his

window with his brolly, and proceeded to give the young man a lecture on the inappropriateness of displaying Confederate flags on his car.

I still can envision the student's reaction. He was in Columbia, Missouri—which was known at the time as "Little Dixie" because it was settled by many Confederate veterans after the Civil War. Suddenly, he's being lectured in a defined British accent by a proper English gentleman on a public street about the inappropriateness of a Confederate flag.

*That* also was Will Stephenson.

**A Rejoinder about William Stephenson**

Now, I want to be careful to explain that despite some of the more outlandish examples regarding Stephenson's demeanor, he was not a difficult or hard man. Conversely, he was the essence of kindness, care, and generosity. And a delightful man to know.

**How Stephenson Came to the MU School of Journalism**

In 1958, the dean of the school, Earl English, had a meeting at a club in New York with William Stephenson and became intrigued with the conversation, and very audaciously offered Stephenson a faculty position in the MU School of Journalism.

Picture the situation: here was William Stephenson, British background, Ph.D.s in psychology and physics, being appointed to the Green Eyeshades School of Journalism in Missouri. You might say that what happened is that Earl English out-Chi-squared the Chi-square schools when he hired William Stephenson!

*(Logan's explanation: "Green eyeshades" was a term mass communication researchers once used to describe veteran U.S. newspaper editors, who were critical of journalism education. "Chi-square schools" once referred to research-oriented mass communication and journalism programs.)*

**On Stephenson's Initial Graduate Students at the Missouri School of Journalism**

Stephenson's group of Ph.D. students when I began the program was a handful of outstanding women: Joye Patterson, who has a national reputation for teaching science journalism; Wilma Crumley, who became the Associate Dean at University of Nebraska; Tina Cummings, who became the Executive Secretary of the American Psychological Association; and the late Mary-Jane Rowlands. The only other male at that time was Tom Danberry. Danberry was a native Missourian, a very bright fellow, who wrote the very first computer programs for analyzing Q data and performing factor analysis.

**On Tom Danberry**

Tom would have been, and should have been, Stephenson's first Ph.D. in the MU School of Journalism.

However, Malcolm MacLean, who was teaching at Michigan State, which was one of the leading chi-square (quantitative and R-oriented) schools at the time, suddenly became interested in Q methodology. MacLean contacted Stephenson and asked if it was possible for Stephenson to send someone who was trained in Q methodology to assist MacLean's work. So, when Tom Danberry arrived at the school one day. Stephenson said, "You're going to Michigan State."

Tom said, "Right away?" And Stephenson said, "Yes!"

Tom retorted, "But I'm almost finished with my Ph.D., and I *want* to finish it."

Stephenson explained the invitation represented an opportunity to spread Q methodology within one of the better journalism schools within the U.S. Stephenson added the prospect to influence faculty research within a major journalism program would be a long-term boost to Tom's career. Stephenson added Tom could finish his doctorate later.

Tom left Michigan State after several years and went to work for Reuben Donnelly, the giant printing company in Chicago that specialized in mailing list development and maintenance. Tom wrote some computer programs for dealing with mailing lists. He used those to form his own company in Connecticut, which became a huge success. When Tom retired from that company, 8 to 10 years ago, more than 300 people were working for him. He died in his Hawaiian home in 2007 and (sadly) never finished his Ph.D.

**On Mary-Jane Rowlands**

Mary-Jane Rowlands was the first Stephenson Ph.D. from MU in 1964. She was the first woman to get a doctorate in journalism at MU and also was the youngest person ever to get a Ph.D. from the MU School of Journalism—at 28 years old. She went to work for the Chicago-based Leo Burnett advertising agency as a research director and became an adjunct professor at the University of Illinois–Chicago. She wrote a book on marketing research with Stuart Henderson Britt. Sadly, Mary-Jane died of cancer when she was 46 years old.

**On Some of Stephenson's MU Journalism Doctoral Students who Began Marketing Research Careers**

Of the 12 MU journalism grads who received a doctorate under Stephenson, four developed academic careers—while the rest started their own marketing research firms, focusing on Q methodology. The latter pleased Stephenson, who encouraged the diffusion of Q in advertising and marketing research.

Charlie Mauldin was one of these graduates. Others included Dorian Levy; Bob Olins, and Richard Schriver. Charlie occasionally contributes to the Q listserv. He has his own marketing research firm in Boulder,

Colorado, which he started after teaching for a few years at Michigan State. Dorian Levy first went to work in marketing research for Pillsbury in Minneapolis, Minnesota and then started his own marketing research firm. His firm does Q-based marketing research exclusively. Dorian has published two books about the marketing research of his organization and remains active.

Bob Olins started a marketing group in Chicago, Illinois. He had the technical assistance of Norm Tubergen, who wrote the Quanal computer program to assess Q data when he was a graduate student at the University of Iowa.

**The Only Time Stephenson was Speechless**

A graduate student from Cameroon spoke at one of the ISSSS meetings that Stephenson attended before his death in 1989. The speaker was a student of a faculty member who had received his Ph.D. from the MU School of Journalism. The graduate student was sent to ISSSS (held at the MU School of Journalism that year) to present some findings.

After an introduction he said, "I want to take a moment to honor genius the way we do in our country." He came over and kneeled on one knee before Stephenson and bowed his head.

Stephenson was speechless. Although Stephenson declined to discuss the incident, it was a memorable moment.

**On Stephenson's Opinions about Tobacco Use**

Stephenson had strong feelings about the dangers of tobacco use. He proudly told us on a number of occasions that he was one of the founders of the Anti-Tobacco League in Britain. We learned it was a mistake to take out a cigarette in his presence. On one occasion, a graduate student who had a remarkably dysfunctional personality made the mistake of doing so—and Stephenson got up out of the chair and firmly escorted that man out into the hall by the seat of his pants.

When he was teaching at the University of Chicago, Stephenson had a second floor office within the psychology department. When students came in smoking, Stephenson would take great pleasure in watching them trying to figure out what to do with cigarette ashes. Since Stephenson deliberately refused to provide an ashtray, he would watch students try to put ashes in the cuff of their pants or wonder whether they should throw ashes out the window. He had a wonderful game going on and enjoyed the discomfort that he created among his students and colleagues.

**Stephenson on Religion**

Although Stephenson never tried to influence his students about religion, he acknowledged (if asked) that he was an atheist. Stephenson explained that when he was at Oxford one of his colleagues was C.S.

Lewis, the famous religion writer, who wrote *The Screwtape Letters* among other things. Stephenson said if someone had to arrange a program on short notice, they could always get Stephenson and C.S. Lewis up on a stage to debate religion.

**On Stephenson's Relations with MU School of Journalism Faculty**

The MU journalism school had a large faculty—about 60 people. While on the faculty, Stephenson rarely was involved in political intrigues and internal politics. Those things just did not interest him. He ran his own show.

If you look at Steve Brown's bibliography that contains many pages of Stephenson's publications, there are few with a co-author. While other journalism faculty were somewhat in awe, they were never close to him.

Stephenson was not a team player and his solo pattern apparently began before he came to MU at the psychology departments at the University of Chicago and the University of California-Berkeley.

**Brenner on his Career: Three Reflections**

*Working with Don Lindberg.* I have been privileged to work with two geniuses in my career. Stephenson was one of them and the other was Don Lindberg, M.D., the director of the U.S. National Library of Medicine (NLM) since 1985. Some ISSSS members met Lindberg at the ISSSS meeting held at NLM in 2007.

In 1977, Lindberg received funding (from NLM) for a pioneering MU Health Care Technology Center. To provide some perspective, the final competition for NLM/NIH funding came down to Harvard, Stanford, and Lindberg. And Lindberg won. The focus of the MU Health Care Technology Center was to build artificial intelligence-based clinical diagnostic systems and be a pioneer in fostering computer-based clinical decision support for health care providers.

Here's an example of Lindberg's genius. He explained the goal of artificial intelligence by using a metaphor about how a child recognizes a dog. Lindberg said when a child is familiar with one dog, he or she often is able to recognize other dogs regardless of breed. If the dog is a poodle, collie, German shepherd, or beagle, it makes no difference in the child's recognition. The goal of artificial intelligence, Lindberg said, is for computers to provide a similar, granular level of recognition.

*His interest in health communication.* Stephenson got me back to MU after I had been away for awhile when he received funding for the Missouri Regional Medical Program.

Previously, Stephenson persuaded me to do my dissertation on public health reports and people's reaction to them. Later, Stephenson received funding for the creation of a health communication research unit within the Missouri Regional Medical Program. We spent about five

or six years on this effort.

Stephenson was the Director; I was the Associate Director. Our focus was to gather data about the attitudes of people towards health, healthcare, and illness. We did about 30 studies.

The idea was to use the research as a basis to create campaigns to impact health behaviors. We conducted one anti-smoking campaign. A second campaign urged Kansas City, Missouri residents to use store-front medical clinics. A third campaign encouraged college students to major in allied health programs, such as occupational, respiratory, and physical therapy.

These efforts eventually resulted in a new job. I created the world's first department of health communications at Texas Tech University. After five years in Lubbock, I returned to MU to work in Don Lindberg's Health Care Technology Center. I was rehired at the MU School of Journalism (to be the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies by then-Dean Roy Fisher) while I was working at the Health Care Technology Center.

*Stephenson's reaction to the book Brenner edited with Steve Brown.* Steve Brown and I published a book with the subtitle *Essays Honoring William Stephenson* in 1972. We managed to keep the book a secret until we were ready to present it to Stephenson on his 70th birthday. We gathered quite a crowd for the presentation and Stephenson was equal to the occasion. When we presented him the book, he waved his arms and said, "You haven't heard the last of me yet!"

And he was right. He went on publishing position papers for another 17 years until he passed away.

**Brenner's Reflections on his Q Studies**

One study (published in *Science, Psychology, and Communication: Essays Honoring William Stephenson)* was about public attitudes during the Vietnam War. It was serendipity that we were able to gather data before and after the Tet Offensive, which was a watershed event in how the Vietnam War was framed by U.S. news organizations.

In the study, we were able to show that prior to Tet, there were three distinct attitudes—two were Hawkish (people in favor of the Vietnam War), and only one attitude was Doveish. After Tet, public opinion factors were exactly the opposite. There were three types of Dove attitudes, and only one Hawk attitude.

So the study turned out to be quite interesting.

We also did some studies to show that the results of a Q study were reliable. That is, you could repeat the study in different circumstances and different places and get essentially the same factors. We did that several times.

**Author's Note:** Don Brenner, Don Lindberg, and Rob Logan worked together in the early 1980s. The triangle set up Logan's career that spans appointments at the MU School of Journalism faculty and, more recently, at the U.S. National Library of Medicine. The contributions of John Brenner, Jay Brenner M.D., and Jerry Brenner (Dr. Brenner's three sons) and Amanda Wolf, Ph.D., are gratefully acknowledged.