

FORWARD

This issue of the *Newsletter* offers a variety of topics, beginning with Richard Martin and Richard Taylor's study of political obligation, which clarifies and extends an earlier Q study on the same issue. In broadening the representativeness of their statements, Martin and Taylor show that conclusions reached previously (by Reid and Henderson, *Polity*, 1976) were constrained by the Q-sample structure, and that 'conditionally disobedient' factors will emerge when given the opportunity. They also show that the political theories of their subjects have affinities with concerns expressed by theorists of earlier times, hence provide support for Holton's 'thematic' dimension in science. Stephenson, too, has been interested in Holton's work, stimulated by the recent discovery of Newton's unpublished fifth rule, and we can expect additional papers on this topic to appear in due course.

James W. Creaser addresses the important problem of factor rotation, perhaps the least understood feature of factor analysis. Aside from *The Study of Behavior* itself, the Q-methodological view on rotation has been fairly and extensively treated only by J.W. Thompson (*Psychological Bulletin*, 1962), and it is Creaser's intent to elaborate one aspect of Stephenson's thinking in terms of a 'factor wheel' routine which permits the researcher to select factors on the basis of factor score patterns rather than in terms of factor loadings, as is typical of varimax and other analytic schemes. In brief, Creaser describes a procedure whereby patterns of Q items and their associated factor scores are printed for each 5° of rotation, permitting the analyst to select that factor solution which produces the clearest and simplest interpretation. Creaser is also the author of the best single reference on the mechanics of calculating factor scores in Q method (*Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1955).

In part for therapeutic purposes, we include

Stuart H. Schwartz's "Reflections on a Q Dissertation and Its Opposition" (or, How I Was Sadistically Beaten by R-Methodologists and Learned to Love It), an autobiographical account of the trials and tribulations of employing Q technique in an unreceptive atmosphere. Younger psychologists who were introduced to Q as 'one among a variety of assessment techniques' may wonder what all the shouting is about, but an older generation may be stimulated to recall the controversies of the 50s and early 60s. Students of communication and political science who happen to be stationed in benign departments may also be puzzled by all the fuss; their frustration may mount, however, once they discover that journal editors and manuscript reviewers consider their training to be controversial and misguided. Professor Schwartz's paper will hopefully be welcome company for the miserable--past, present, and future.

It is therefore an absolutely wrong conception, if, according to the tradition of the old psychology, imagination is called the specific property of art, and understanding that of science. Science without imagination is worth just as little as art without understanding. (Wilhelm Wundt)