

FOREWORD

John Fairweather's paper on "Reliability and Validity of Q-Method Results" focuses on two issues which have received little attention, partly because several writers regard them as of little import so far as Q methodology is concerned. If these other writers are wrong, then Fairweather's results are especially welcome since they reveal Q to be quite adequate both as to reliability and validity. A native of New Zealand, to which he intends shortly to return, Fairweather is completing his doctorate at the University of Missouri where he is examining agricultural development in late 19th and early 20th century New Zealand. He has co-authored a manuscript on "Agricultural Production and Capitalism" (currently under review) and is presently engaged in a comparative content analysis of the journals *Rural Sociology* and *Sociologia Ruralis*. His future research plans include a study on the relationship between Q methodology and phenomenology.

Franklin Shontz is likewise concerned with validity and reliability, and in his paper provides a solution to the problem of making direct statistical comparisons between Q sorts containing different items which have been chosen (to enhance validity) by the Q sorters themselves. Shontz's interest in Q technique dates back at least as far as his 1954 dissertation (see "Q Bibliographic Update," July 1981), and his publications since then include *Research Methods in Personality* (1965), *Perceptual and Cognitive Aspects of Body Experience* (1969), *The Psychological Aspects of Physical Illness and Disability* (1975), and *Cocaine Users* (with J. Spotts, 1980), the latter being a Q study. He is also the author of 70 chapters and articles.

Beginning with this issue: *RESEARCH IN PROGRESS*, summaries of current work, including the Q samples employed. In this issue: "American Civil Religion."
