

## NEWS, NOTES &amp; COMMENT

*Socio-history of Spearman's g*

Bernard Norton (Leicester U, England). Charles Spearman and the general factor in intelligence: Genesis and interpretation in light of sociopersonal considerations. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 1979, 15, 142-154. According to the abstract, "This article addresses the why and the how of Spearman's production and promotion of his conception [of general intelligence]. It is seen that the interpretation Spearman gave to his theory is broader than is generally acknowledged, and, consequently, that the 'real' Spearman differed interestingly from the prototypic factor analyst that bears his name in many texts. It is argued that, for Spearman, the attractiveness of the theory resided not so much in its fit with empirical data as in its conformity to various philosophical, ethical, and social propositions which he strongly favored." As is known, William Stephenson was Spearman's last graduate assistant prior to the latter's retirement from the University of London, and Professor Norton's comments can be supplemented with Stephenson's observations in the October 1977 and July 1979 issues of *Operant Subjectivity*.

*New and Forthcoming*

Hearnshaw, L.S. *Cyril Burt: Psychologist*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1979 (ISBN 0340171634). Available for £7.95 (about \$18), plus postage, from B.H. Blackwell, Broad Street, Oxford, England OX1 3BQ.

Gillespie, J.D. & M.L. Mitchell. *Bakke, Weber, and race in employment: Analysis of informed opinion*. Read at a meeting of the American Political Science Assn., Washington, DC, Aug. 31, 1979 (forthcoming, *Policy Studies Journal*, winter 1979-80).

Thomas, D.B. Psychodynamics, symbolism, and socialization: "Object relations" perspectives on personality, ideology, and political perception. *Political Behavior*, 1979, 1, forthcoming.

Thomas, D.B. & L.R. Baas. Personality and political participation: Does self-ideal discrepancy make

a difference? *Psychological Reports*, forthcoming.

### *Reader Response to Literature*

In "A Comment on Alan Purves' Model for Research in Reader Response," Ellen Strenski encourages teachers of literature to consider the value of Q methodology. She quotes Purves as saying that "each reader is not truly unique, nor is each response truly unique, nor each text. Some variations appear systematic, and one must seek to note the variations and their systematic natures." Strenski then goes on to say that "Q-methodology quantifies just such systematic variations, and has produced, for instance, some startling results on readers' responses to 'Ode on a Grecian Urn' and *Lord of the Flies*. Sociologists and political scientists working with Q-sorting conclude that responding to literature does not entail an infinite number of idiosyncratic impressions. Instead, 'whenever subjective thought is at issue, as in interpreting literature, there will invariably emerge a limited number of factors of *operant subjectivity*.'" Strenski's comments are scheduled to appear in the October 1979 issue of *College English*.

### *N Again*

In his recent review of Bruce McKeown's "Identification and Projection in Religious Belief" (in T. Shapiro (Ed.), *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Science*, Vol. 5, 1977), S.B. Narramore states that "McKeown presents an excellent summary of Freud's understanding of the idea of God and a good brief review of several attempts to objectively assess Freud's projective hypothesis for the existence of the God concept. He utilizes a Q-Technique (with three subjects) to attempt to measure the processes of displacement, identification, and projection. The difficulty in assessing these processes and the extremely limited sample size seriously bring into question the author's conclusion that his study supports Freud's assumptions. Similarly, the author's assumption that there is unanimity among analysts on Freud's religious hypotheses detracts from the paper. Overall, it is a stimulating summary statement of a

fundamental concern to both psychoanalysis and religion." Methodologically, of course, the assumption is that large numbers are required, and that the only avenue to scientific credibility is through reliance on inductive enumeration. But as Stephenson has said, our subject is *mind*, not *minds*; in principle, therefore, *any* mind can serve as the focus for our operations. Narramore's comments appear in the *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 1978, 6, 159.

### *Factor Analysis Simplified*

John Goddard and Andrew Kirby, *An Introduction to Factor Analysis* (Concepts and Techniques in Modern Geography No. 7), a 39-page monograph published in 1976 by Geo Abstracts Ltd., University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, England, and available for \$1.75 plus postage at the current exchange rate (\$2.30/£1). Geographical examples are used in touching base with most of the major points in factor analysis in a fairly comprehensible manner. (Q factor analysis is no more misrepresented than in any other basic or advanced treatise.) Still the best simple introduction, perhaps, is C.J. Adcock's *Factorial Analysis for Non-Mathematicians* (Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 1954), a 90-page classic which has been long out of print but available in xerography from Books on Demand Order Dept., University Microfilms International, Box 1467, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (Book No. PS2-OP42162; \$10.80 paper, \$15.80 cloth, plus postage).

### *Encouraging Words About Volume 2*

"The second year has been even better than the first.... It is probably the only academic publication that I sit down and read thoroughly immediately upon receipt." "Let me be among those who have said that it's worth every penny!" "Your *Operant Subjectivity* is really in inspiring newsletter/journal. It brings me back to the moments of intellectual and academic excitement."

### *Multiple Hypotheses*

In "The Method of Multiple Working Hypotheses"

(*Journal of Geology*, 1897, 5, 837-848), T.C. Chamberlin distinguishes among the ruling theory (roughly comparable to Kuhn's paradigm), the working hypothesis (broadly abductory), and the method of multiple working hypotheses. The first claims full allegiance of the emotions and easily produces scientific dogma. The second approach represents an improvement due to its tentativeness; with each partial success, however, the working hypothesis mobilizes affect in its behalf and is always in danger of evolving to the status of a ruling theory. The method of multiple working hypotheses disperses the scientist's fondness over a variety of possible explanations, thereby liberating the intellect to examine each freely and fairly. It is the road, Chamberlin says, to creative thought, and it is the kind of attitude which is both fostered and best suited for Q methodology. A Q study normally begins under the auspices of a ruling theory or working hypothesis (provisionally accepted as a starting point and structured into the Q sample), but the factor structure which eventuates is often unexplainable in its specifics by the preceding theory, hence places demands on the investigator to exceed his original theoretical framework. In the hypothetico-deductive tradition, Stephenson has said, operations are merely used to *test* a single hypothesis, but "I require operations to do much more; they must derive hypotheses for us *de novo*" (*The Play Theory of Mass Communication*, p. 192). Chamberlin's little classic was first resuscitated by J.R. Platt (in "Strong Inference," *Science*, 1964, 146, 347-353), and is currently available as a 16-page monograph under the title "Multiple Hypotheses" (item no. H-1, \$1). Order from IHS Publications, Box 2256, Wichita, KS 67201, and make checks payable to Institute for Humane Studies.

*It is a good morning exercise for a research scientist to discard a pet hypothesis every day before breakfast. It keeps him young. (Konrad Lorenz)*