

NEWS, NOTES & COMMENT

Recent Publications

Stephen Jay Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1981. Gould teaches geology, biology, and the history of science at Harvard University, and has written a very readable critique of craniometry, mental measurement, and other efforts to rank persons along single unilinear dimensions. Readers of this newsletter will have particular interest in Gould's sixth chapter--"The Real Error of Cyril Burt: Factor Analysis and the Reification of Intelligence" (pp. 234-320)--in which the factor-analytic positions of Charles Spearman, Burt, and L.L. Thurstone are compared and contrasted. Gould does a very able job of clarifying the metatheoretical and technological controversies at issue--involving Spearman's two-factor theory, Burt's group-factor theory, and Thurstone's theory of primary mental abilities--as well as the covert assumptions (largely of a social and cultural nature) which attended those controversies.

But despite clarity of exposition, it is not easy to locate in this chapter any perspective which has not appeared elsewhere: As to the analytic-objectivist tendency in modern psychology, for example, Gould's complaints are no more pointed than Liam Hudson's (in *Cult of the Fact*) or Stanislav Andreski's (in *Social Sciences as Sorcery*). As to the tendency to reify the results of IQ tests, William Stephenson's *Testing School Children* (1949) and "Intelligence and Multivalued Choice" (*Psychological Record*, 1973) provide far more sophisticated critiques and, moreover, suggest practical alternatives missing in the negativity of Gould's presentation (notwithstanding his final chapter entitled "A Positive Conclusion"). Finally, Gould's criticism of the factor analytic positions of Spearman and Burt (principal components) and of Thurstone (rotation to simple structure) can be found in Stephenson's *The Study of Behavior* (chapter 2) where the latter's concept of dependency analysis really goes beyond Gould's critique of what amounts to interdependency analysis. It

is worth noting, in addition, that Gould refers to Burt as a pioneer of Q factor analysis (which is true in a certain sense), but makes no reference to Stephenson; it is worth noting as well that when presented with various writings of Stephenson appearing in this newsletter, Professor Gould indicated (in a private communication) that he had always regarded Q and R as reciprocal, and had never been aware that Q methodology had a distinct philosophy.

In "Factors as Operant Subjectivity" (*Operant Subjectivity*, 1977, 1, 3-16), Stephenson notes that psychology has remembered Spearman's metatheory (theory of two factors) but has forgotten the principles (such as noesis and eduction) which the metatheory was meant to model, and so it is with Gould's chapter 6. It is interesting reading nonetheless, and provides a good summary and criticism of R methodological metatheory. Although critical, however, Gould has little to offer as an alternative, aside from a few abstract nods in the direction of modern biology. Consideration of the operant, as opposed to metatheoretical, aspects of factors is notably absent.

John F. Cragan and Donald C. Shields [Eds.], *Applied Communication Research: a Dramatistic Approach*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1981. (421 pp., \$17.95 cloth) The studies in this volume are based on Ernest G. Bormann's rhetorical theory, and Q technique figures prominently as a way of providing operational foundation for "rhetorical visions." Of the more than 20 chapters and appendices, about half involve Q technique in one way or another (see "Q Bibliographic Update")--as applied to political speeches, candidate imagery, political cartoons, campaigning, marketing, and organizational communication. As usual, William Stephenson's *The Study of Behavior* is cited approvingly, but it is clear, especially in Shields' "Critiquing Factor Analysis Studies," that Stephenson's viewpoint is only paid lip service and that the authors have instead chained into the rhetorical visions (to follow their own nomenclature) of the Cattells, Burts, Harmans, and other *dramatis personae* of R methodology.

Among the fantasy themes in the R-methodological vision of Q methodology, for example (and uncritically accepted for the most part in this volume), is that Q is somehow related to O, P, S, and T techniques; that there is an optimal number of Q sample items ($n = 40$ is judged to be poor) which exists objectively apart from the specifics of the scientific situation; that there is a ratio of items to persons the violation of which invalidates subsequent findings; that the only acceptable basis for generalizations is inductive enumeration, hence $N = 400$ Q sorts in one study; that reliability and validity of Q sample statements and the factor solution are of critical importance; that statistical criteria are the final arbiters in determining the number of factors; and so on. (The chapters by Rarick et al. and Bormann et al. stand somewhat outside this rhetorical vision, and reflect a closer affinity with Q-methodological fantasies.) Not only has Stephenson never advanced these views, of course: He has been an outspoken critic of them.

Bormann's rhetorical theory is of considerable interest in and of itself, however, especially in its assumption that motivations do not lie within (as, for example, attitudes and traits *in* the actor's mind), but are embedded in the rhetorical vision itself--i.e., actors buy into plots and themes which are inherently schematical within an on-going social and political process. This is not as wholly innovative as devotees seem to imply, and has much in common (for instance) with the James-Lange theory of the emotions--i.e., to the effect that "we feel sorry because we cry, angry because we strike, afraid because we tremble, and not that we cry, strike, or tremble, because we are sorry, angry, or fearful..." (W. James, *The Principles of Psychology*. Vol. 2. New York: Henry Holt, 1890, p. 450). Bormann's theory is nevertheless a welcome reminder and a healthy balance against the more widespread fantasy of indwelling agents of causality.

Charles R. Britton and Robert L. Savage, *Popular Perceptions of Banks Among Arkansans: Explorations in*

Institutional Imagery. (Report in the James H. Penick Financial Research Series) Fayetteville: Bureau of Business & Economic Research, University of Arkansas [1981], 131 pp. This report was written by an economist and a political scientist at the University of Arkansas-Fayetteville, and is dedicated to "Ken Boulding and William Stephenson, whose examples allow no artificial boundaries to be placed upon the enterprise of inquiry." Q methodology is employed in the first part of the study, and reveals four institutional images among the 92 residents of Fayetteville sampled. Factor I prevails over a wide array of occupations and views banks as profit-motivated institutions which take little responsibility for affairs in the broader community, an alienated view which subsequent extensive sampling indicated to be distrust of modern institutions more generally. Factor II is more prevalent among bank personnel and depicts a "full service" organization sensitive to the needs of people within it. More highly educated, young females predominate in factor III which expresses a concern for public disclosure and the dissemination of information by and about banks. Factor IV is similar to I: Both view banks as "fat cat" institutions, but IV, an image more often rendered by less educated males, appears to accept this as entirely proper. The results of an "ideal bank" Q sort are also analyzed, and the findings are extended in questionnaire form to a larger sample. Persons interested in receiving copies of this study (limited supplies permitting) should write to: Bureau of Business & Economic Research, College of Business Administration, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR 72701.

R.C. Adams, *An Evaluation of Research Replication With Q Method and Its Utility in Market Segmentation*. Fresno: California State University, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 199 771). According to the abstract appearing in *Resources in Education*, 1981(Aug), 16(8), 65: Precipitated by questions of using Q methodology in television market segmentation and of the replicability of such research, this paper reports on both a reexamination of 1968 re-

search by Joseph M. Foley and an attempt to replicate Foley's study. By undertaking a reanalysis of the Foley data, the question of replication in Q method is addressed. By replicating the Foley work--with recommended modifications--in a different market and holding analytic methodology constant, the replication question is further explored; and by examining the results from Foley's two studies and from the present study in the context of the nature of Q method and its prior uses, comment is offered on the market segmentation question. Detailed discussions of the reanalysis and the replication demonstrate how Foley's Q sort was a potentially useful approach to audience segmentation within a uses and gratifications framework, although the progress of more than a decade has, to some degree, bypassed the tool and some of the ideas underlying it. Concluding remarks indicate that the Q method retains considerable utility for further investigation of audiences by segments. [Re reference to Foley, consult J.M. Foley, *A Functional Analysis of Television Viewing*, doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1968 (*Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1969, 29, 4033A). Cf. the critique by J.E. Fletcher, *Western Speech*, 1975, 39, 13-19; and the rebuttal by R.C. Adams and W.J. Ingenthron, *Western Speech Communication*, 1975, 39, 200-202.]

Adams is Professor, Radio-Television-Film Faculty, Department of Communication Arts and Sciences, California State University, Fresno, CA 93740. His 131-page report is available from the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) at \$10.25/paper-copy or \$0.91/microfiche, plus postage.

Kenneth R. Hammond and Nancy E. Wascoe (Eds.), *Realizations of Brunswik's Representative Design*. (New Directions for Methodology of Social and Behavioral Science, No. 3) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980. Egon Brunswik's concept of representativeness was incorporated by William Stephenson as a central principle in the composition of Q samples; Brunswik likewise made explicit room in his own elaborate system for Stephenson's methodological innovations. How-

ever, no mention is made of Q in this volume, which addresses a number of issues from the Brunswikian point of view. Among the contributions are: K.R. Hammond, "Introduction to Brunswikian Theory and Methods"; B. Brehmer, "Probabilistic Functionalism in the Laboratory: Learning and Interpersonal (Cognitive) Conflict"; J. Mumpower and L. Adelman, "The Application of Brunswikian Methodology to Policy Formation"; M.E. Doherty, "Assessing the Fairness of Social Policies"; and L. Petrinovich, "Brunswikian Behavioral Biology." Coeditors Hammond and Wascoe are associated with the Center for Research on Judgment and Policy, University of Colorado. Their volume was issued under a quarterly series edited by Donald W. Fiske, and was available for \$6.95 (paperback) prior to a rate increase due to go into effect January 1, 1982.

Forthcoming Publications and Presentations

Mark J. Wattier (Dept Political Science & Public Affairs, Murray State U, Murray, KY 42071), "The Q Method of Voter Targeting," *Campaigns & Elections*, 1982(winter), 2(4). This article provides campaigners with an overview of Q technique and illustrates ways to use it in political campaigns. Following a brief description of Q, in which its intensive (as opposed to extensive) nature is stressed, Wattier goes on to discuss the structuring of Q samples and P sets, and the administration and analysis of Q sorts; he then goes on to suggest applications such as image analysis (as in D. Nimmo and R.L. Savage's *Candidates and Their Images*) and the composition of speeches (as in J. Cragan and D. Shields' "Foreign Policy Communication Dramas," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 1977). He concludes by saying that "Q provides the kind of information you need to plan your image campaign. It can also help you develop speeches that are pleasing to all and offensive to none. It can suggest information to gather in your public opinion poll, as well as help your organization reach a consensus on strategy and pretest your campaign messages. Q offers many exciting opportunities for the candidate who

needs reliable information for a reasonable price."

David Rarick (Dept Speech-Communication, U Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455), "Applications of Q-technique in Political Campaign Research: a Review of Research Findings and Methodological Issues," *Political Communication Review*. Following a comprehensive survey of the literature, the author located only 18 studies which deal with political campaigns, on the basis of which he identifies several methodological problem areas: Scaling issues (the quasinormal, forced distribution issue), sampling of items and persons, and clustering persons using factor analysis and the reliability of the resulting person-types. Rarick closes with various suggestions for further research, and warns that "mere identification and description of 'types' of persons is likely to be non-productive. It has been established that persons can be classified on the basis of the way they interpret political campaign messages. We must move beyond classification to investigations of how different patterns of perception relate to other critical factors in the political communication process.... Careful and well-planned applications of the method in combination with other methods will enhance our understanding of the political communication process. Mechanical and simplistic approaches to the method may create more confusion than understanding."

Dan B. Thomas (Political Science, Wartburg College, Waverly, IA 50677) and Larry R. Baas, "Presidential Identification and Mass-Public Compliance With Official Policy: the Case of the Carter Energy Program," *Policy Studies Journal*. Findings indicate that the correlation between Q-sort descriptions of the ideal self and President Carter is the best predictor of behavioral compliance with and attitudinal support of Carter's energy program.

Deborah K. Sell (Honors and Experimental College, Kent State U, Kent, OH 44242) and Richard B. Craig, "Intercultural Awareness: an Analysis of Perception Change in American Students in Mexico," scheduled to be read at a meeting of the Louisiana Tech Conference on the Americas, Ruston, LA, April 16-17, 1982. *Abstract*: A crucial factor in intercultural communica-

tion is perception: how we view people of other cultures and how we perceive that they view us. What happens to these perceptions after a lengthy day-to-day encounter with people of a particular culture is the focus of this study. Seven Kent State University students who participated in the 1979 Kent in Mexico program were asked at four different time periods to describe themselves, Mexicans, and how Mexicans view Americans: 1) pre fall semester orientation class, 2) pre Mexico semester, 3) post Mexico semester, and 4) two semesters after they returned from Mexico. Measurement and comparison of perceptions are accomplished by Q methodology, with Q sorts being analyzed through correlational and factor analyses to determine composite perceptions and individuals' relationships to them. Because the goals of foreign study programs such as Kent in Mexico include an expanded self awareness and a greater understanding of the host country and its people, attention focuses on the extent to which changes occur as a result of the Mexico experience, and to what extent these changes persist over time.

Q BIBLIOGRAPHIC UPDATE (CONTINUED)

- Behm, R.J. & S.T. Limberg. Accountants and teachers: Education aims are similar. *Journal of Studies in Technical Careers*, 1979, 1, 213-219.
- Berzins, J.I., R.L. Bednar & L.J. Severy. The problem of intersource consensus in measuring therapeutic outcomes: new data and multivariate perspectives. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 1975, 84, 10-19.
- Bradac, J.J., K.L. Sandell & L.A. Wenner. The phenomenology of evidence: information-source utility in decision making. *Communication Quarterly*, 1979, 27(4), 35-46.
- Cragan, J.F. & D.C. Shields [Eds.]. *Applied communication research: a dramatistic approach*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1981. Relevant chapters (and page numbers) include:
Shields. A dramatistic approach to applied commu-