

DISSERTATIONS IN PROGRESS

James R. Carlton, *NATO Standardization Decision-Making* (Kent State University).

Nations comprising the North Atlantic Treaty Organization currently face the task of providing a credible defense while at the same time trying to maintain various social policies. This task has been complicated in recent years by shrinking national funds, and arms standardization has been viewed as one way to improve defense capabilities at a reasonable cost. Should it become necessary, sustaining a war effort in Europe would be rendered more difficult if the arms used were diverse--e.g., if the parts for German-made tanks could not be replaced by parts from U.S. tanks--but national manufacturing interests are reluctant to standardize for fear of suffering economic losses.

Table 1. Q-Sample Structure

Effects	Levels	
Forces	(a) driving	(b) restraining
Perspectives	(c) conditions	(d) expectations
Considerations	(e) military (g) political	(f) economic

At this point, approximately 20 NATO military and civilian elites in Europe have provided Q sorts bearing on the standardization issue as found in the concourse available in the current literature. The Q sample is structured as shown in Table 1, with Kurt Lewin's force fields providing the main orientation.

Driving forces are those which support change in the current situation, whereas *restraining* forces resist change. *Conditions*, taken from Harold Lasswell's work, refer to cause and effect factors in the situation; *expectations* refer to likely consequences of change or no-change. Finally, *military*, *economic*, and *political* considerations all enter the picture.

A preliminary analysis indicates the elites examined thus far to be divided into four groups, which the following statements serve to distinguish (scores in parentheses for the respective factors):

(+3 -2 +1 0) The lack of adequate investment capital among European defense industries, especially during the R&D phase, has retarded NATO efforts.

(-3 +4 -1 +2) Congressional restrictions on American technology stifles greater Alliance cooperation.

(+1 -4 +3 0) Cooperative arms efforts in the eyes of domestic industry will lead to the loss of technical expertise and the emasculation of their industrial base.

(0 -1 -3 +4) Cooperative arms projects result in greater political integration in the Alliance.

The first factor is in favor of standardization and appears concerned primarily with obstructions (such as investment capital for research and development) to greater cooperativeness. The second factor also favors standardization and primarily blames national political impediments. Economic competitiveness and its consequences are singled out by the third factor, whereas the fourth demonstrates the most enthusiasm concerning standardization. Despite divergencies, however, those responding are in agreement that "The traditional 'buy American' stance has spurred a 'buy European' movement in Europe," and they share a common apprehension that differing acquisition schedules may have contributed to military instability between NATO and Warsaw Pact countries.

Background information on this issue can be found in Thomas A. Callaghan, Jr.'s "The Structural Di-

sarmament of NATO," *NATO Review*, 1984, 32(3), 21-26; Keith Hartley's *NATO Arms Cooperation* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1986); and Michael Heseltine's "Towards an Integrated European Defence Industry," *NATO's Sixteen Nations*, 1986, 31(3), 24-26.

James Carlton can be reached c/o the Department of Political Science, Kent State University, Kent OH 44242-0001.

Q BIBLIOGRAPHIC UPDATE (CONTINUED)

Additional references appear in previous issues of this newsletter, and in "Bibliography on Q Technique and Its Methodology," Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1968, 26, 587-613 (available upon request).

Barchak, L.J. (1986) Review of *Max Weber's insights and errors*, by S. Andreski. *Operant Subjectivity*, 9, 102-107.

Brown, S.R. (1986) Review of *Data, instruments, and theory*, by R.J. Ackermann. *Operant Subjectivity*, 9, 107-108.

Luborsky, L., P. Crits-Christoph & J. Mellon (1986) Advent of objective measures of the transference concept. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 54, 39-47.

Nutt, P.C. (1984) A strategic planning network for non-profit organizations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5, 57-75.

Rohrbaugh, M. (1986) Q-sort comparisons of the structural, strategic and systemic family therapies. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 14, 40-48.

Stainton Rogers, R. & C. Kitzinger (1986) Human rights: Bedrock or mosaic? *Operant Subjectivity*, 9, 123-130.

Stephenson, W. (1986) Protoconcursus: The con-course theory of communication. *Operant Subjectivity*, 9, 37-58, 73-96.

Stephenson, W. (1986) Play theory of communication. *Operant Subjectivity*, 9, 109-122.