

- Stephenson, W. (1987) Q-methodology: Interbehavioral and quantum theoretical connections in clinical psychology. In D.H. Ruben & D.J. Delprato (Eds.), *New ideas in therapy* (pp. 95-106). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Thurstone, L.L. (1947) *Multiple-factor analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ward, J. (1933) *Psychological principles*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolff, V. (1928) *Orlando: A biography*. New York: Penguin Books.
-

NEWS, NOTES & COMMENT

Recent and Forthcoming Scholarship

William Stephenson, "William James, Niels Bohr, and Complementarity: IV-The Significance of Time," *Psychological Record*, 1988, 38, 19-35. *Abstract*: There are efforts by theoretical physicists to explain indeterminism, using time significantly in the process. They hope to restore time to science, as in everyday life, as substantive. According to this standpoint Western civilization has been time centered, as in the humanities, in contrast with science which has been time indifferent. Experimental psychology has given much attention to a substantial time; James Ward in 1881 put forward the concept of "specious present," embracing past, now, and future. The new physicist's propositions leave quantum theory intact. In Q-methodology, time, like consciousness, is a non-ens. Ward's "specious present" remains as the viable hub of creative thought, so-called, taking place at time $t=0$, that is always

now, whatever time may or may not be substantively. But Ward's "specious present" can extend for much clock-time.

According to Sage Publications, Inc. (2111 W. Hillcrest Drive, Newbury Park, CA 91320), an April publication is planned for Bruce F. McKeown and Dan B. Thomas's *Q Methodology* (Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, Vol. 66), 96 pp., \$6.00. Contents include: Introduction overview; Q-samples, Q-sorting, and conditions of instruction; Person samples and the single case; Statistical analysis; Research applications; and Key works in Q methodology.

J. David Gopoian (Political Science, Kent State U, Kent OH 44242-0001) and Steven R. Brown, "Public Opinion and Campaign Strategy," in Samuel Long (Ed.), *Political Behavior Annual* (Vol. 3), Boulder, CO: Westview Press, forthcoming autumn 1988. *Abstract*: This literature summary first examines the research which supports, contradicts, and extends the candidate-positioning theories advanced by Anthony Downs and Benjamin Page. Second, the field of nonverbal campaign communication is examined, and the conclusion is reached that pleasant physical appearance provides the only consistent advantage to candidates; there is little research concerning the impact of physical distance, eye movement, and height. In a third area, verbal communication, generally inconsistent and contradictory findings are reported for electronic and nonelectronic media with respect to candidate preferences, turnout, and other effects. Finally, Q methodology is singled out as important to campaign strategies inasmuch as it focuses on voters' subjective perspectives, and summaries are given of applications in various areas.

Kathleen Dolan (Dept Govt & Politics, U Maryland, College Park MD 20740), Bruce F. McKeown, and James M. Carlson, "Popular Conceptions of Political Corruption: Implications for the Empirical Study of Political Ethics," *Corruption and Reform*, forthcoming. *Abstract*: Corruption is an ever present feature of the American political experience. Yet, despite its sometimes dramatic history and the attention afforded it by journalists, the related literature in political science surprisingly is not extensive. Since the

1970s, several systematic studies have investigated its origins and conditions; however, the topic remains conceptually muddled in large part due to the varying and idiosyncratic operational definitions employed. This circumstance, in turn, has obstructed comparative analyses and the development of sound empirical theory. The research reported in this paper is representative of alternative methods devised to ascertain popular conceptions and meanings of political corruption. The resulting public conceptions are then studied in light of professional and social science opinions. It is our contention that the approach which examines operant subjectivities as a first step in the research process facilitates more direct testing of a priori theoretical constructs of political science and addresses some of the methodological problems of mainstream social science. (Revised from a paper presented at the 1985 meeting of the Northeastern Political Science Association, Philadelphia.)

Osmo A. Wiio (U Helsinki, Finland) and Leonard Barchak (McNeese State U, Lake Charles LA), "Two Faces Have I: Finnish Images of the USA and the Americans," to be read at the 36th annual conference of the International Communication Association, May 29-June 2, 1988, New Orleans. This paper compares a Q study of 63 advanced students of communication at the University of Helsinki with a national Gallup survey of the Finnish population. Although the results of the studies are comparable, the two severely critical views of America are more precise in the Q study.

The Importance of Factors

In the first volume of *Operant Subjectivity*, Steven R. Brown wrote about "The Importance of Factors in Q Methodology: Statistical and Theoretical Considerations" (July 1978, pp. 117-124), in which a distinction was made (within Q methodology) between factor importance as statistically determined (e.g., in terms of the magnitude of each factor's eigenvalue) and as theoretically determined. In the latter case, factor importance was determined in reference to the social and psychological situation from which the factors emerged, and in the course of demonstrating the substantive irrelevance of the statistical strength of Q factors, it was suggested

that the same might also apply vis-a-vis factors in R methodology.

In two recent articles, John J. Gargan has demonstrated this principle in terms of two R factors emanating from responses to questionnaires administered to a sample of municipal finance directors who were asked to judge the importance (along a 5-point Likert scale) of several financial management problems in their communities (e.g., "Local governments lack the ability to project future revenues adequately," "Federal and state regulations have prevented the coordination of local programs to achieve local goals," etc.). The unrotated solution was judged acceptable, and the first factor, as usual, accounted for the greater proportion of variance (41.7% compared to 7.3% for the second factor). Factor 1 was consensual, all statements being significantly loaded on it: it represented a general "Recognition of Financial Management Problems," which was the title given it. Factor 2 was bipolar and represented the recognition of "Internal v. External Problems." Factor scores--which in this R-methodological case are associated with the municipal finance directors who responded to the questionnaire--were then calculated for the two factors, and these factor arrays were then correlated with other variables representing community characteristics and management professionalism.

Unlike the consensual factor 1, factor 2 represented a divergence in opinion concerning the source of municipal problems (those intrinsic to the locality vs. those attributable to nonlocal variables), and although factor 2 was the smallest factor from the standpoint of variance explained, it was far and away the more important in terms of its connection to selected community characteristics (e.g., indices of need in the areas of poverty and housing) and in terms of the municipalities' levels of professionalism (e.g., mayor-council vs. city manager form, elected vs. appointed finance director, etc.). In sum, these two R studies verify the same principle demonstrable in the Q case: the importance of factors in a substantive and practical sense is not necessarily related to their statistical size.

Gargan's findings are reported in "Judgments on Financial Management Problems: National Perspectives

and Local Views," *Public Administration Quarterly*, 1986, 9, 382-413, and "The Knowledge-Interest Context of Local Public Finance: Judgments of City Finance Officers," *International Journal of Public Administration*, 1987, 9, 245-271.

More "For the Record"

Another "record" is to be found in Cordell M. Overby's dissertation, *Comparison of Analytical Hierarchy and Q-sort/Nominal-Interactive Processes in Group Activities* (School of Engineering and Applied Science, George Washington University, 1985) in which Q sorts of size $N=5$ and $N=4$ items are used to help determine how risk perceptions influence individuals' rankings of programmatic alternatives. Other records are contained in previous issues of OS: 1983, 6, 67-71; 1984, 8, 34-36.

Q Methodology Syllabus

A 20-page Q bibliographic-syllabus is available for \$2.50 (mailing included) from Steven R. Brown, Political Science Department, Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242-0001. (Alternatively, the file can be obtained free of charge through Bitnet, and then printed locally: contact SBROWN@KENTVM.) The syllabus was created for a graduate seminar on Q methodology, and contains the following headings:

Selected Bibliography: Books on Q Technique and Methodology (6 entries), Chapters on Q Technique and Methodology (8), Books Utilizing Q Technique and Methodology (30).

Selected Writings of William Stephenson: Methodological Foundations (8 entries), Philosophical Contributions (15), Communication Theory (14), Newton's Fifth Rule (6), Quantum Theory (13), Miscellaneous (15).

Fundamentals of Q Technique and Method: Q and R Methodologies (17 entries), Factor Analysis (7), Structuring Q Samples (4), Intensive Analysis (Single Cases) (13), Forced vs. Free Distributions (10), Reliability, Validity, and Operantcy (12), Miscellaneous (3).

The more than 10 pages of references which follow are grouped into four clusters based on the Q factor analysis of interests expressed by members of the 1988 spring seminar; the references are therefore specific to this collection of students. The interest clusters are: (A) Media, Images, Candidates, Campaigns, Practical Politics (95 entries), (B) Health, Ethics, Decisionmaking, Groups (89), (C) Current Events, Social Issues (27), (D) Policy, Administration, Decisionmaking (43).

Book Sale

The Yale University Press book sale, which ends May 31, includes Steven R. Brown's *Political Subjectivity* at a deep discount: cloth \$10.00 (down from \$50.00), paper \$8.50 (down from \$16.95). Shipping costs are \$2.00 for the first title and \$0.60 for each additional title (plus 7.5% tax for Connecticut residents). Orders can be placed with Yale Sale, Yale University Press, 92A Yale Station, New Haven, CT 06520.

As a Public Service

Given the nearness of the U.S. political conventions and general election, the following "Guide to a More Enlightened Citizenry," which still appears valid more than 13 years after its original appearance, is reproduced (from the *Florence Morning News*, February 16, 1975, p. 5A) to assist voters in distinguishing Republicans from Democrats:

1. Democrats buy most of the books that have been banned somewhere. Republicans form censorship committees and read them as a group.

2. Republicans consume three-fourths of all the rutabaga produced in the U.S. The remainder is thrown out.

3. Republicans usually wear hats and almost always clean their paint brushes.

4. Democrats give their worn-out clothes to those less fortunate. Republicans wear theirs.

5. Republicans employ exterminators. Democrats step on the bugs.

6. Democrats name their children after currently popular sports figures, politicians, and entertainers. Republican children are named after their parents or grandparents, according to where the most money is.

7. Democrats keep trying to cut down on smoking but are not successful. Neither are Republicans.

8. Republicans tend to keep their shades drawn, although there is seldom any reason why they should. Democrats ought to, but don't.

9. Republicans study the financial pages of the newspaper. Democrats put them in the bottom of the bird cage.

10. Most of the stuff you see alongside the road has been thrown out of the car window by Democrats.

11. Republicans raise dahlias, Dalmations and eyebrows. Democrats raise Airedales, kids and taxes.

12. Democrats eat the fish they catch. Republicans hang them on the wall.

13. Republican boys date Democrat girls. They plan to marry Republican girls, but feel they're entitled to a little fun first.

14. Democrats make up plans and then do something else. Republicans follow the plans their grandfathers made.

15. Republicans sleep in twin beds--some even in separate rooms. That is why there are more Democrats.
