

FOREWORD

In his reflections on Sir Cyril Burt and Charles Spearman, William Stéphenson (in this issue) recounts something of the intellectual excitement that was in the air during those years in which the principles of Q methodology were being formulated. Important scientific issues were being debated, and sides were being taken: Theory (Spearman) and application (Burt) defined the continuum. With Spearman's retirement, however, and with his succession by Burt, the revolutionary impetus was lost, and Stephenson's views (aligned with Spearman's theoretical advances) were thereafter passed over in silence, so that even today they are regarded in some quarters as controversial and off-beat. (One manuscript reviewer referred to him as "the Frankenstein of Q technique"!)

The "Burt scandal" threatens at times to be carried to excess, but it does provide opportunities to examine the effects of "paradigm fixations" and to re-examine old ideas prematurely laid to rest.

In "Newspaper Research on the Rocks," Stuart Schwartz and Roy Moore summarize the results of a study designed to define the nature of an audience to which a new weekly newspaper might appeal. In the process, they highlight the weaknesses of the conventional demographic approach, and feature the advantages of a psychographic approach based on Q method. Stuart Schwartz received his Ph.D. in communication from Temple University in 1978, prior to which he was a reporter and editor for three newspapers in New England and a free-lance writer for a number of magazines. He is a third-generation Q methodologist, having been trained by Edward Traves, a student of Malcolm MacLean and Stephenson at Iowa. Schwartz's "Reflections on a Q Dissertation and Its Opposition" appeared in the April 1978 issue of *Operant Subjectivity*; he also has a Q paper in the winter 1978 issue of *Journalism Quarterly*. Roy Moore is a 1974 mass communication Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, where Q "was one of those methodologies that we were told we should know about, but

were not encouraged to use"; he therefore joins a hopefully growing list of persons for whom education has not prove incapacitating. He taught at North Carolina and Virginia Polytechnic prior to moving to Georgia State where his research interests include communication theory, methodology, and consumer behavior. Co-editor of *Gathering and Writing News* (1975), his articles have appeared in *Journal of Advertising Research*, *Journal of Consumer Research* and *Journal of Retailing*.

Of historical interest...

WM. STEPHENSON' (London). — *Type Psychology and its Factor Representation.*

The author has previously described four systems of factor analysis, which make use of the well-known factor theorems of Spearman, Thurstone, Kelley, Hotelling and others. In system (1) analysis, persons constitute the population and tests etc. the variables; in system (2) the tests etc. are the population and persons are the variables. Systems (3) and (4) are dependent upon (1) and (2) respectively. The present paper draws attention to the ways in which systems (1) and (2) are rendered independent of each other, and to the significance of system (2) for the analysis of psychological types. The paper is illustrated with material from a study of Kretschmer typology.

The abstract above appeared in *Onzième Congrès International de Psychologie* [Eleventh International Congress of Psychology], Paris, 25-31 Juillet 1937, *Rapports et Comptes Rendus* [Reports and Abstracts] (Agen: Imprimerie Moderne, 1938), p. 263. The study of Kretschmer's typology was apparently taken from a previous paper, "Kretschmer's psychobiogram," written by Stephenson and R.J. Bartlett, and submitted to the *British Journal of Medical Psychology* (ca.1935). However, the paper never appeared, so far as can be determined, and the original manuscripts have since been lost. At the time of the Congress, Stephenson's address was listed in the program as Banbury Road, 34, Oxford, England.