

item Q sort. They also described a second legitimate, but different, orientation. Second-order Q-analytic techniques revealed two salient underlying dimensions: action versus insight. Theoretical and practical implications were discussed.

Arturo G. Pacho (P.O. Box 474, Manila, The Philippines), "Policy Concerns and Priorities: the Ethnic Chinese in the Philippines," *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 1981, 25. *Abstract*: Forty-seven ethnic Chinese respondents were asked to identify, specify, and rank their policy concerns with respect to improving their condition and status in the Philippines. The results indicate their positions given a continuum ranging from preserving ethnicity to advancing integration. Policy makers may scan the various policy alternatives offered by three significant factors--(A) assimilationist/pluralist, (B) instrumentalist, and (C) ameliorative--according to which the respondents in a Q study classify themselves. Each factor serves as a distinct approach to the needs and preferences of the ethnic Chinese respondents. The policy implications of the study include: participation, the need for amelioration, manifest concern for ethnic solidarity, preservation of Chineseness, expression of anxiety and insecurity, and division of responsibility for policies.

Q BIBLIOGRAPHIC UPDATE (CONTINUED)

- Aronson, D.E. & T.J. Akamatsu. Validation of a Q-sort task to assess MMPI skills. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1981, 37, 831-836.
- Brown, S.R. Intensive analysis. In D.D. Nimmo & K. R. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of political communication*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE, 1981.
- Brown, S.R. & K.J. Kim. The indigenization of methodology. *Social Science and Policy Research* [Seoul, Korea], 1981, 3(3), 109-139.
- Edvardsson, B. & J. Vegelius. O-factor analysis of mood ratings. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1981, 5, 459-465.
- Jackson, D.J. & D.F. Alwin. The factor analysis of

- ipsative measures. In G.W. Bohrnstedt & E.F. Borgatta (Eds.), *Social measurement: current issues*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE, 1981.
- Lorr, M. & G.K. Burger. Personality types in data from California Psychological Inventory as defined by cluster analysis. *Psychological Reports*, 1981, 48, 115-118.
- Manera, E.S. & R.E. Wright. Can you identify your source of stress? *Clearing House*, 1981, 55, 53-58.
- Martin, W.S. & F.D. Reynolds. On the usefulness of Q-methodology for consumer segmentation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 1976, 4, 440-445.
- Patterson, J. A dissection of attitudes about science. *Operant Subjectivity*, 1982, 5, 58-76.
- Peterson, K.D., S. Hines & D. Yaakobi. Self-concept and behavior perception changes of student teachers. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 1980-81, 5 (4), 41-50.
- Sommers, M.S. The use of product symbolism to differentiate social strata. *University of Houston Business Review*, 1964, 11, 1-102 (entire issue).
- Sommers, M.S. & G.D. Bruce. Blacks, whites, and products: relative deprivation and reference group behavior. *Social Science Quarterly*, 1968, 49, 631-642.
- Stephenson, W. Newton's Fifth Rule and Q methodology: application to self psychology. *Operant Subjectivity*, 1982, 5, 37-57.
- Weber, W.C. Curriculum priorities in secretarial education. *Delta Pi Epsilon*, 1970, 12(2), 6-11.
- Wells, W.D. Psychographics: a critical review. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 1975, 12, 196-213.
- Wilkenfeld, J., G.W. Hopple, S.J. Andriole & R.N. McCauley. Profiling states for foreign policy analysis. *Comparative Political Studies*, 1978, 11, 4-35.

[to be continued]