earlier study was generally vindicated, one of the types which surfaced in factor analysis did not closely match any of the five types identified in the earlier study. One explanation of the latter result is that university students move through levels of maturation and therefore their interpretation of experiences could differ from that of their teachers. Furthermore, when graduate students' understanding of aesthetic music education was compared with Reimer's description, the correspondence was not generally overwhelming. All groups nevertheless agreed that aesthetic music education was the ideal goal. Questions about teacher education necessarily arise.

Hanley's dissertation research is critiqued by Elizabeth Oehrle (Music Educ, U Natal, Durban, Natal, South Africa), "Educators' Attitude to Philosophies of Music Education: A Q Study," *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education,* 1989, no. 100, 86-89. Following her summary of the dissertation, Oehrle criticizes various conceptual and non-Q features of the study, but concludes that "the author is to be commended...for making inroads regarding the difficult task of exposing attitudes concerning philosophies of music education through a Q study, a methodology which could be extremely beneficial to music educators."

Research in Progress:

(1) South African Apartheid

Project Director: Subash M. Shah, Department of Social Sciences, Winston-Salem State University, Winston-Salem, SC 27102.

This study focuses on attitudes about U.S. policy in South Africa as it exists among various subgroups within the U.S. The statements were drawn (then revised) from various articles

and books about South Africa. They were then categorized into (a) pro status quo and (b) anti status quo, and then cross-classified into (c) bias, (d) wish, and (e) policy. The 25+ respondents thus far participating include experts (e.g., political and social scientists with expertise in South African affairs), authorities (religious figures, diplomats, U.S. Congressman, representatives of international aid groups), special interests (members of Students Against Apartheid, Association of Concerned Africa Scholars), and ordinary citizens.

A preliminary analysis indicates at least two well defined factors, the first being more actively pro-change than the go-slow second factor:

+4   −1   The U.S. government should increase pressure on South Africa by tightening the arms embargo, ending nuclear dealings, preventing investments by American corporations, and by opposing any move toward making South Africa an ally.

+2   +4   The most prudent and cost-effective policy to protect American economic and strategic interests would be to work with, rather than against, the indigenous African forces of change.

+4   +3   The U.S. government policy should be based on the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and all political prisoners, for the right of all exiles to return, for the unbanning of all individuals and organizations, and for the free election in South Africa.

−4   −4   The international campaign against apartheid should be viewed as a campaign against the Afrikaner and the white race.

As can be seen from the last two statements, there is cross-attitudinal support for racial and political rapprochement, for

which there is evidence in recent events which are unfolding in the region.

Selected Bibliography

Africa Report, (1985, May-June), entire issue.

Fatton, R. (1984) The Reagan foreign policy toward South Africa: The ideology of the new cold war. *African Studies Review, 27,* 57-82.

Lemarchand, R. (Ed.) (1978) *American policy in southern Africa: The stakes and the stance.* Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Sheperd, G.W. (1984) The United States' South Africa policy: The failure of "constructive engagement" and the emergence of new options. *Africa Today,* 2nd quarter, 15-35.

Selections from the Apartheid Q Sample (N = 38)

Space precludes publication of the entire Q sample, which can be obtained from the project director.

(1) More good can be achieved by American corporations under pressure from the Congress, church groups, and universities to hasten the process of reform than could be achieved by the British, French, German and Japanese corporations that will inevitably take their place if the U.S. implements a policy of total divestment. (2) The actions of the South African government in suppressing black political dissent have so polarized the country that the only competing parties left are the government and the African National Congress. (3) Slowing economic growth through American sanctions will decrease the pressure for reform in South Africa. (4) The American government should give serious attention and weight to the views and pleas of the churches and all those organizations in South Africa which are trying to bring about fundamental change by peaceful means. (5) It is clear that the only option available for those who support investment in South Africa is to promote not only economic reform, but radical political compromise on the part of the South African government. (6) The American policies should be based on the premise that U.S. interests are best served by developing stronger economic and cultural ties with South Africa which will contribute to the gradual liberalization and ultimately to the demise of apartheid. (7) It is important to note that the policy of apartheid is the real threat to peace and stability not only of South Africa, but also of the whole Southern Africa. (8) The American policy ignores the institutionalized violence of apartheid, rejects the legitimacy of a black revolution, and blames the Soviets for the unrest. This

is a flawed perception which favors white supremacy. (9) It is in the interest of the U.S. to accept the legitimacy of the ANC cause and build bridges to this organization instead of accepting cold war considerations as inevitable. (10) A revolution in South Africa would result in infinite suffering for countless blacks and whites. The toll in human suffering will be much worse than that which has to be endured through slower evolutionary change.

(2) Gender and Humor

Project Director: **Joanne Gallivan, Department of Psychology, University College of Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, Canada B1P 6L2. (This project, under the title** *Explorations in Gender and Humor: Developing and Applying a Methodology,* **has been awarded a two-year, $22,000 grant by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. The Q sample(s) for the study has not as yet been developed.)**

The psychology of humor literature makes frequent mention of sex differences in humor appreciation and production; however, there are several problems inherent in much of the research. There are mixed findings, but attention is focused on results demonstrating a sex difference, and the difference achieves the status of a given. In those studies in which a sex difference is found, other factors beside the one of interest are not controlled, so the "difference" is ascribed to the wrong source, i.e., it is not really a *sex* difference. Many reported "sex" differences are not actually due to group membership, but are based on certain characteristics which happen to occur more frequently, but not exclusively, in one sex or the other. Humor and comedy are mainly male-authored and male-controlled, and public joke-telling is normatively male in our culture, so much humor is more relevant to the lives of men or is more meaninful to them. Thus, some reported sex differences in humor, especially those that suggest that women are deficient in humor appreciation, may be a function of the particular humorous materials used.

There are few studies that examine *why* certain items are found funnier than others, or certain groups differ in their responses. Most psychology of humor studies rely on ratings of humorous stimuli and correlations of those ratings with personality traits, or on attitude measures, or on grouping variables to assess humor appreciation and its influences. Reliance on such methods, along with the problem of the particular sorts of materials used, has limited our knowledge of the psychology of humor, especially gender and humor. Suggested alternative methods include structured and unstructured self-report and naturalistic and paricipant observation. In this project, Q methodology will be employed as a way of studying empirically the nature of individuals' conceptions of humor. The purpose is to explore how features of the different response patterns produced are related to the characteristics of humorous materials or situations or the individuals themselves. The study should be able to provide information on the extent to which men's and women's conceptions of humor and their humor preferences confirm current theoretical notions of what makes something humorous, and how they are influenced by such factors as the type and content of humor stimuli and nominal group membership. This approach should add to our knowledge not only of the relation of humor and gender, but also the utility of various theoretical notions in explaining the individual psychology of humor.

Selected Bibliography

Chapman, A.J. & N.J. Gadfield (1976) Is sexual humor sexist? *Journal of Communication, 26,* 141-153.

Crawford, M. (1988) Humor in conversational context: Beyond biases in the study of gender and humor. In R.K. Unger (Ed.), *Representations: Social constructions of gender* (pp. 155-166). Amityville, NY: Baywood.

Moore, T.E., K. Griffiths & B. Payne (1987) Gender, attitudes towards women, and the appreciation of sexist humor. *Sex Roles, 16,* 521-531.

Stillion, J.M., & H. White (1987) Feminist humor: Who appreciates it and why? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11,* 219-232.