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Introduction: The Nature and Scope of Political Psychology

Political psychology is a tradition of enquiry that has as its focus the interaction between the mind and political life (Iyengar and McGuire, 1993; Kressel, 1993; Monroe, 2001). Political psychologists have studied both terms of the interaction. They have explored the impact of the individual on processes of political continuity and change using research into cognition, affect, perception, personality, rational and irrational forces, consciousness and the unconscious. And they have evaluated the impact of political life on the individual and explored how the polity shapes the mind. Political psychology grounded in political economy or political sociology treats psychological outcomes as dependent variables and social-structural conditions as independent variables. According to Robert Lane, this approach entails: “turning political psychology upside down;” (2001: 367) an inversion which has been characteristic of a distinctive strand of Canadian political psychology.

In its substantive foci, political psychology is not new: thinkers from Aristotle to Althusser have contributed to the field. However, as a systematic field of enquiry it was not until the early 1970s that Jean Knutson (1973), Fred I. Greenstein (1975), William F. Stone (1974), Gordon J. DiRenzo (1974) and a handful of others began to articulate political psychology in a few introductory readers. By 1977, a professional association was formed, and in 1978 the International Society of Political Psychology (ISPP) held its first meetings. In 1979, the journal Political Psychology
was first issued. In light of ongoing global conflict, the systematic and sustained elaboration of models of the mind and the polity has never been more relevant, some might say urgent. Despite this, as a focus of enquiry political psychology has developed little presence in the political science community beyond that in the United States. This article is, in part, an attempt to generate a degree of self-awareness in Canada.

In Canada, one of the largest English-speaking centres of political science, there are 44 university departments of political science. Of the thousands of courses offered, only six are in political psychology, while there are a handful more in psychoanalytic approaches to politics. There are no programmes and no Canadian graduate schools that offer concentrations in political psychology. Despite the lack of institutional support for political psychology in Canada and the low membership of ISPP, however, there is a tradition of research in the field in Canada. One indicator of this is in data on authorship in the journal Political Psychology. From 1979 to September 1999, there were 74 issues (a few of them double) containing 688 articles, editorial introductions, research notes, rejoinders, presidential addresses and reports, written by 949 scholars. Given the largely American origins and academic presence in political psychology, it is not surprising to find that 715 (75.3%) of the authors had American institutional affiliations. The remaining 234 (24.7%) were affiliated to institutions in 28 other countries. Among these, Israel (52 authors: 5.5%), Canada (45 authors: 4.8%) and the United Kingdom (32 authors: 3.4%) had the most affiliations and were the only nations other than the United States to register substantial numbers of scholars publishing in the journal.

The evolution of Canadian studies in political psychology is appropriately unfolded in the familiar context of the behaviouralist transition, its origins and its aftermath. With the usual disclaimers concerning the artificiality of conceptual boundaries, my account is in three sections: “eclectic origins,” “behaviouralism,” and “post-behaviouralist alternatives.” In the Canadian context, this behaviouralist narrative is also necessarily an account of liberal individualism in tension with communitarianism, and Americanization versus English-Canadian national assertiveness. However, in setting out the principal tendencies in Canadian political psychology over three decades, it will become apparent that the pluralistic character of the field has bridged the gaps between these dualisms to some extent and, moreover, promises to do so even more in future.

A number of qualifiers should be established: First, my interest is in scholars who have generated political psychology for sustained periods in Canada. This includes those who were not born here, but who have made academic careers here. It necessarily excludes expatriate Canadians, including well-known political psychologists such as Paul Sniderman, and important non-Canadians who spent only a short time at a Canadian institution. Second, while I have attempted to capture French and French-
Abstract. While it remains a diffuse field of enquiry, political psychology has established itself as an important approach to the analysis of political life. In the United States, political psychology is offered as an optional programme in a number of leading graduate schools and is a recognized subfield of the American Political Science Association. Despite the existence of a number of active political psychologists in Canada, there has been relatively little curiosity about the status of the field. This article offers an account of research in the field. Central to this exploration is an evaluation of the ideological, cultural and substantive research in political psychology in Canada.

Résumé. La psychologie politique, bien qu'elle demeure un domaine d'investigation assez diffus, s'est constituée en une approche majeure de l'analyse de la vie politique. Aux États-Unis, la psychologie politique est offerte comme cours optionnel de troisième cycle dans plusieurs grandes universités et elle constitue un champ reconnu par l'Association américaine de sciences politiques. Au Canada, malgré l'existence d'un certain nombre de psychologues qui s'intéressent activement à la vie politique depuis une trentaine d'années, on constate un relatif manque de curiosité quant au statut de ce champ de recherche. Cet article présente un compte rendu de l'état de la recherche dans ce secteur particulier. Au centre de cette exploration, on trouve une évaluation des recherches sur le plan idéologique, culturel et de la pratique, dans le domaine de la psychologie politique au Canada.

language contributions to political psychology in Canada, my immersion into psychologie politique is somewhat limited. Third, my perspective is from a formal academic training in political science and my principal network includes a preponderance of political scientists. Academic social psychology in Canada resembles political science both in its patterns of institutional growth and its unselfconsciousness concerning political psychology. While Canadian social psychology has been institutionally unresponsive to political psychology, it has nonetheless generated some important work in the areas of intergroup conflict, prejudice, discrimination, persuasion, bargaining, conflict resolution and cross-cultural psychology. Among the key contributors in this area are John Adair (Adair and Rule, 1984; Adair et al., 1998), Cynthia Chataway (1997), Ken Dion (2002), Victoria Esses (Esses and Gardner, 1996; Esses et al., 1998), Ronald Fisher (1993, 1997) and Simon Laflamme (1987). Fourth, in conducting the research upon which this article is based, I have discovered a range and depth of writings from Canadian universities that I had not anticipated. The discovery of all this material encourages me to produce this article. In fact, it seems unusual that it has not been attempted so far.

Eclectic Origins

The early roots of political science in Canada, conducted in a handful of departments by no more than tens of scholars, left a legacy of brilliant and insightful documents. These contributions easily drew upon, and combined insights from philosophy, political economy, social psychology, cultural studies, history and constitutional law. They can be called eclectic in their meandering and curiosity-driven evolution, their lack of disciplinary boundaries and the absence of self-conscious systematization. Apart from
a constitutional-institutional and historical approach, which undergirded the research of the traditional conservative scholars of the time, Marx and Freud were also powerful influences. Guided by Marx and Freud, a number of Canadian scholars theorized the irrational in social and psychological life. In certain respects, the traditionalists and irrationalists promoted a joint vision of Canada that was, if not entirely coherent, at least assertively communitarian and nationalistic. The eclectic era in Canadian political psychology was from the Second World War and continued into the 1960s. It featured an open social scientific discourse in combination with the relative isolation of Canadian faculty and the absence of more than limited financial support for research. These combined to stimulate broad, general, approaches to scholarship. Given the amorphous publications, it is difficult to identify “political psychologists” from among those founders of political science in Canada. However, three in particular might be identified as substantial contributors.

Political theorist Christian Bay of the University of Toronto wrote on ideology and community (1965, 1970, 1981). Like others of his generation, Bay drew widely from a range of sources to support his classical vision of civic virtue. Arguing that the purpose of politics is to achieve a more perfect society, Bay criticized both liberalism and liberal theory for limiting human progress and condoning oppression in the name of freedom. Bay argued that the avowed freedoms of liberalism were limited, partial and contingent, and that in practice they resulted in impaired psychological freedom (alienation) and impaired social freedom (oppression). Individual and social actualization necessitated a more communitarian approach. Bay’s communitarianism, synthesizing strands of both conservatism and socialism, is a common leitmotif of Canadian political scholarship of the era, and is characteristic of a distinctive Canadian presence in social analysis (for example Grant, 1970; Innis, 1962, 1971; Taylor, 1970). In his sustained interrogation of the behaviouralist persuasion in politics, Bay argued that the quest for value neutrality was futile. Those political scientists who remained “detached” were in effect relegating ethical decision making to the powerful. However, his critique of behaviourism did not imply a rejection of its methodologies. In fact, he argued for an integrated normative and empirical approach toward political analysis, with psychology at its core: “The best hope for a development toward a politically more useful political science...rests with an increasingly close interaction between students of politics and students of psychology” (1970: xvi).

Donald Smiley refers admiringly to the “Social Credit Series” of studies, conducted in the 1950s as “...scholarship [that] was eclectic and showed a marked disregard for the boundaries of academic disciplines” (1974: 38-39). Among them was John Irving’s penetrating and moving account of the political psychology of leadership and followership in Alberta, The Social Credit Movement in Alberta, which details the rise of the charismatic
William Aberhart. Irving’s study is a compelling and detailed testimony to the ignorance, despair and want of the time, and evokes how the deep-seated needs of the farmers were soothed by Aberhart’s reassuring messages. Based on interviews, private papers, newspapers, government documents, articles and books, Irving’s research generates a broad humanistic social psychology, careful in historical documentation and detail, yet eclectic in its theoretical sweep. Apart from an acknowledgement to Hadley Cantril, there is not a single psychological reference in the entire 369 pages.

Among Canada’s most respected senior scholars in the international community is Jean Laponce, whose avowedly eclectic work began in the 1950s. His intellectual reach is formidable, integrating into his analyses perspectives and insights from psychology, empirical political analyses, cultural anthropology, biology, philosophy, sociolinguistics, historical studies and geography (Laponce, 1969, 1981, 1987). Laponce’s *Left and Right* explores the cognitive mapping of politics with particular focus on the spatial imaginary of the left-right spectrum. The central contention of his *Languages and their Territories* is that languages tend to act in a territorial manner. Like his French intellectual predecessor, Andre Siegfried, Jean Laponce brings to political analysis a profoundly rooted sensitivity toward Canadian cultures and consciousnesses.

**Behaviouralism**

Behaviouralism in political science began in the post-Second World War United States as an attempt to systematize political enquiry—somewhat similar to Canada, US political scholarship was regarded as diffuse and unsystematic (Almond, 1956; Loewenstein, 1944). The rise of behaviouralism in Canada coincided with large-scale growth in Canadian departments of political science. Many of the US-trained behavioural scholars who joined Canadian political science departments in the 1960s adopted a self-consciously scientific stance, and explicitly disavowed the more varied and improvised approaches of eclecticism. Broadly defined, the behaviouralist approach to systematic analysis introduced some much-needed rigour into research practices and stimulated both quantitative and qualitative methodologies that continue to inform most political psychological research in Canada as elsewhere. More narrowly conceived, behaviouralism came under fire in Canada (Macpherson, 1974; Smiley, 1974), as it had already in the US (Easton, 1969), for its ahistorical nature, its methodological individualism and for its support of the status quo.

Among the earliest Canadian scholars to integrate the behaviouralist approach was John Meisel (1962, 1964, 1974, 1975). Meisel was a pioneer in the field of election studies in Canada and began a tradition of publications associated with the 13 federal elections from 1957 (see Elkins and
Blake, 1975; Gidengil, 1992). Characteristic of the context in which he began his studies, Meisel’s early electoral research is more discursive, more varied in its techniques of analysis, less systematic and, in my opinion, often more engaging than later studies by other scholars. While paling in comparison with US output, there were a substantial amount of election- and voting-related publications in the 1960s to 1990s (for example Blais et al., 2002; Brown et al., 1988; Clarke et al., 1979, 1984, 1991, 1996; Lambert et al., 1986, 1988; Johnston et al., 1992; 1996; Nevitte et al., 2000; Pammett, 1987, 1991). Psychologist Leon Kamin contributed to the study of Canadian elections (1967), even though he is better known for his pioneering work, The Science and Politics of IQ (1977). Increasingly, Canadian studies of elections and referenda applied the broad research methodologies of influential US centres—notably Michigan, Columbia and Rochester—to their analyses, though they often manage to retain a substantive relevance to Canadian issues and perspectives. Harold D. Clarke and his colleagues developed a well-informed critical diagnosis of the national scene through their studies of federal elections from 1974 to 1993. As is evident in the subtitles to the Absent Mandate series, they offer a distinctive perspective on the state of the federation (1984, 1991, 1996). As such, their work is profoundly resistant to the tendency toward the abstraction of individual data from the socio-historical context, and their analyses offer subtle insights into the evolving nature of the polity.

A few brief references illustrate that Canadian political psychology has been well represented in the study of political attitudes. The essays in the volume on political socialization edited by Jon Pammett and Michael S. Whittington offer much more than a geographical extension northwards of the work on imitation, interpersonal transference, apprenticeship and other forms of direct and indirect socialization. They make challenging and original claims about the nature of growing up politically in Canada that remain relevant decades after they were written (1976). Richard Simeon and David J. Elkins’ research into political efficacy and political trust generated a typology of political personalities (supporter, deferential, critic and disaffected) that they employed to great effect in their analyses of regional political cultures in Canada and beyond (1980). The work of Neil Neville and his colleagues places extensions of research into postmaterialism into the Canadian context (Nevitte, 1996; Neville et al., 1990, 1996). While the theory of postmaterialism has been tested in a broad range of Western politics, Neville’s research makes several important claims about the changing nature of political psychology in contemporary Canada—particularly his informative empirical analysis of the decline of deference in Canada. Finally, the empirically based work of Joseph Fletcher, who has collaborated with Canadian psychologist, John Bassili, is noteworthy in the area of experimental studies of political attitudes (Bassili and Fletcher, 1991; Fletcher, 2000). Joseph F. Fletcher has
contributed to the advancement of experimental political science, a field that remains underdeveloped in Canada (see Kinder and Palfrey, 1993).

From the 1970s to the 1990s, research in empirical political psychology has evolved from questionnaire-based study of attitudes to more intensive and experimental work in cognitive mapping. Canadian cognitive political psychology has been led by psychologist Peter Suedfeld of the University of British Columbia, who has also co-authored articles on the topic of cognitive complexity with Philip E. Tetlock, Jack L. Granatstein and Michael D. Wallace and Kimberly A. Thachuk (Granatstein and Suedfeld, 1994; Suedfeld, 1981, 1992a, 1992b, 1994; Suedfeld and Granatstein, 1995; Suedfeld and Tetlock, 1977; Wallace et al., 1996). Born in Hungary and educated in the United States, Suedfeld has written on the political psychology of torture (1990), the positive face of stress (1997) and, with Tetlock, on the vexed issue of value neutrality versus commitment in political psychological research (1991). He and his colleagues have contributed richly to our understanding of political leadership in the US, Canada and elsewhere. Elizabeth J. Ballard, a student of Suedfeld’s, has written on Canadian prime ministers (1983; Ballard and Suedfeld, 1988; Suedfeld et al., 1990). A large feature article on the integrative complexity of Canada’s political leaders appeared in The Globe and Mail (1998). Mark Pancer, Stephen D. Brown and Cathy Widdis Barr have also developed the analysis of leaders through cognitive complexity assessment (Pancer et al., 1992a, 1992b, 1999).

Among other scholars to contribute to cognitive psychological analysis is David Elkins (1993). Elkins’ research on the degree to which voters can be manipulated by political elites is built upon data gathered in British Columbia, but he regards his sample as representative of voters in North America. His central finding is, to put it colloquially, “you can fool some of the people some of the time, but not all of the people all of the time.” Elkins’ research reveals interested citizens who are ignorant of some issues, yet engaged in a complex appreciation of others; thus the ablest leaders are brokers, piecing together coalitions among the various committed and knowledgeable constituencies while attempting to expand such coalitions through manipulation, education and persuasion among the less committed and less knowledgeable.

A number of Canadian scholars have contributed to the political psychology of international relations, including Bruce Thordarson (1972), Blema Steinberg (1981, 1991, 1996) and Janice Gross Stein (1988, 1994). Steinberg’s thoroughgoing analyses of US presidents Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon incorporates psychopathological explanations of their narcissistic personalities and explains how such characteristics conditioned their political leadership styles and influenced their decision making in critical foreign policy dilemmas. A leading Canadian scholar in international relations, Stein’s academic work incorporates important applications
of political psychological techniques. She has been a regular collaborator
with US political psychologist Ned Lebow, using historical data and psy-
chological concepts to explore international conflict, notably in the Mid-
dle East (Lebow and Stein, 1989, 1994; Stein et al., 1985). Stein’s work on
misperceptions of threat employs schema and script theory to illustrate an
array of considerations, biases, loyalties, emotional states, strategic goals
and other barriers to the unhindered and realistic perceptions of threat.

Post-Behaviouralist Alternatives

Behaviouralism is predominantly, but not exclusively, an American social
scientific tradition. Its principles render it an easy fit with the dominant lib-
eral-individualistic and entrepreneurial values of US society. While much
American scholarship in political psychology is liberal, individualistic or
behaviouralist, political psychology is sufficiently pluralistic in its organi-
zational ethos to incorporate scholarship that falls outside those bound-
aries. Political Psychology contains a number of articles by US environ-
mentalists, feminists, peace activists, radical philosophers and others
whose theoretical and methodological predispositions originate in the slip-
streams and eddy currents of academe. Of greater dominance in Europe,
such approaches have also been represented in political psychological
scholarship in Canada, where perhaps social scientists benefit from greater
“idiosyncrasy credit” than in the more ideologically uniform United States
(Hollander, 1958). While the US presence in Canada has always been pow-
erful and, at times overwhelming, bringing with it the liberal-individualis-
tic impulses of the frontier nation, Canada has always been balanced by a
“tory touch,” and by a modest, yet continuing, socialist and social demo-
cratic tradition.

Paul Roazen has written the best-known systematic analysis of Freud
and his relevance to politics (1999). A political theorist with broad reading
in psychoanalytic literature, Roazen’s integration of Freudian principles
into political analysis is profound, subtle and nuanced. Roazen has been a
standardbearer for the psychological analysis of political life since the
1960s, and complains that political scientists “remain reluctant to entertain
the need to explore systematically the psychological dimension to all politi-
cal events” (1999: xv). Roazen provides a useful contribution to the politi-
cal acceptability of Freudian analysis in political science—he refers to the
intellectual advantages of being an outsider on the inside (1999: xx).
Roazen is among a number of scholars to have offered psychoanalytically
inspired readings of political leadership in Canada. There is a reasonable
collection of works on the political psychology of leadership in Canada
and Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King has attracted particular
attention (Esberey, 1976, 1980). From the context of his study of King, it
is clear that the specifically Canadian aspects of the leadership of King do
not play a role in Roazen’s analysis (1998). He offers a cautious, sympathetic and appropriately qualified reading of Mackenzie King’s psyche through an extensive analysis of detailed case notes on King’s 1916 breakdown and recovery. In providing a compelling account of King’s nervousness, anxieties, sexual repression, sublimations and complexes, he is able to shed light on King’s religious beliefs, interpersonal relations and his successes in political life.

Early research on authoritarianism was rooted in Freudianism. Wilhelm Reich (1969), Erich Fromm (1965) and Theodor Adorno et al. (1950) established the field. The research basis established by Adorno and his colleagues generated great interest in the 1950s and 1960s, but then dropped off. Two Canadian scholars have taken up the challenge of research into authoritarianism in the 1970s and beyond, psychologist Bob Altemeyer (1981, 1988, 1996) and political scientist H. D. Forbes (1985, 1990, 1997). While Altemeyer has continued to develop a scale of authoritarianism, Forbes has generalized his research to ethnocentrism and ethnic conflict. Altemeyer has replaced a Freudian analysis with Bandura’s social learning theory. Forbes’s work makes ingenious use of methodological characteristics to question long-standing assumptions. Contesting the necessity of linkages between ethnocentrism and authoritarianism, Forbes employs Canadian attitudinal data to explore the (non-authoritarian) character of Canadian nationalism. In an empirically grounded critique of the contact thesis of ethnic conflict, Forbes’s research concludes that contact among persons of diverse ethnic origins differs at individual and aggregate levels.

Altemeyer’s work on right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) has achieved international status and references to his RWA scale are prominent in the pages of Political Psychology. From his own highly readable and entertaining accounts of his academic career, it is apparent that Altemeyer was an eccentric in a small university, unable/unwilling to attract grant money or to publish anything for decades. Nevertheless, he followed a sustained research agenda and produced his first book in 1981. Dealing with the challenges of response set bias, Altemeyer created the Right Wing Authoritarianism scale consisting of three attitudinal clusters: authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression and conventionalism. The substance of the items on the latest versions of the RWA scales is social conservative: order, control, obedience, hierarchy and conformity. Over hundreds of experiments, Altemeyer’s scale has achieved admirable robustness in its reliability and validity, and discriminates consistently among groups, such as political parties, who would be expected to score high or low (Robinson et al., 1999).

There is a substantial tradition of left-wing political psychology in Canada. Social psychologist W. Peter Archibald has written a number of Marxist critiques of psychology and social psychology (1978, 1985). His Social Psychology as Political Economy contributes both a thoroughgoing
critique of mainstream social psychology and a range of insights into alienation, class, race, gender and nationality. It is a bold foray into territory that deserves far greater attention. Isaac Prilleltensky is another socialist political psychologist, critical of the major strands of research in his field and anxious to suggest alternatives. His critique of the politics of abnormal psychology lambastes the profession for overreliance upon highly individualized accounts of mental illness (1990). Prilleltensky has written eloquently and extensively of the need for psychology to be on the side of the oppressed and the marginal. Employing concepts such as surplus powerlessness, self-oppression and learned helplessness, he illustrates how theories of social psychology and strategies of liberation, such as Friere’s conscientization might be used in struggles against oppression (Fox and Prilleltensky, 1997; Prilleltensky, 1994a, 1994b; Prilleltensky and Gonick, 1996). Reminiscent of the French communist psychologist Lucien Seve, John O’Manique’s attempt to write a Marxist reading of political psychology begins with a radical insistence on the individual-in-community (1994).

While not governed by those disciplinary constraints that have generated the hybrid “political psychology,” there is a range of postmodern, feminist, post-feminist, post-Marxist and other related work on the politics of identity and difference. Postmodern and post-structuralist social theory have rendered increasingly problematic the very boundaries between self and polity inherent in those modernist conceptions of psychology and sociology described so far. In this respect, political psychology is integral to future developments in Canadian political science. It is decreasingly viable to study policy making in isolation of the mind or institutions apart from identities. Political psychology in Canada has been a largely male pursuit, but in the new field of identity politics it is women who dominate: Sylvia Bashevkin (1998), Shannon Bell (1994), Janine Brodie (1996; Brodie et al., 1992), Joanna Everitt (1998a, 1998b), Elizabeth Gidengil (Everitt and Gidengil, 1999, 2000), Jane Jenson (1999), Cindy Schultz (Schultz and Pancer, 1997) and Miriam Smith (1998, 1999) are prominent in the field. These scholars have theorized and articulated the politics of women’s difference and identity across a range of contemporary issues and movements. Brodie, Shelley A. M. Givigan and Jenson explore the politics of abortion, perhaps the most obvious contender to illustrate the phrase “the personal is political.” Bashevkin is concerned with the social and psychological consequences of how women in the United Kingdom, US and Canada have negotiated through the neoliberal decades. Everitt and Gidengil have written on gendered discourse in the media and the consequences for the presentation of political leadership in Canada. Smith’s work explores the complexities of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered and transsexual identity politics and the relationships among social movement politics, charter litigation and the evolving Canadian polity. Schultz
and S. Mark Pancer have constructed an elegant research design to test the proposition that female political candidates who act aggressively are viewed more negatively than their aggressive male counterparts. Their findings illustrate an important gender gap: while male respondents dis-favour aggressive female candidates, female respondents actually favour aggressive female candidates.

Testing the limits of scholarship, and always ahead of their time, are Arthur and Marilouise Kroger (Kroger et al., 1994a, 1994b, 1997). Their Panic Encyclopedia, Data Trash and Digital Delirium have achieved international recognition, notably for their work on the “virtual class” that governs cyberspace. The Krogers do more than write about consciousness; they enter into the textured worlds of our subjectivity and intersubjectivity through a multimedia carnival of effects including books, articles, web sites (www.ctheory.com), performance art, costume, music (they lead an avant-garde electronic music ensemble) and a range of other dadaist activities. Perhaps to label this “political psychology” is not the point. The Krogers might themselves regard the term as artificially constraining, while more mainstream political psychologists would recognize little in their endeavours that might warrant the appellation. Nonetheless, their work merits inclusion here for its probings into the intermeshing of bodies, psyches, systems, organizations, regimes and machines.

Conclusion

What does this survey of the impressive diversity of Canadian contributions to the field of political psychology tell us, if anything, about Canada? Even a cursory scan of some previous surveys of social and political science in Canada confirms the existence of that bifurcation in the Canadian identity that Robin Mathews describes as “The conflict between a balanced communitarianism and an unleashed competitive individualism [that] has been evident throughout Canadian history” (1988: 6). On the one side are the traditionalists and the radicals, whose research tends toward traditional conservatism or socialism; it is either unsystematic, eclectic and intuitive or based upon a model of science and theory of knowledge that challenges the premises of positivism. The communitarian approach undertaken by scholars outside the mainstream in Canada, as elsewhere, is also distinctly marginal. Whether conservative or socialist, this research is definitely engaged and critical. On the other side are the behaviourists. Their approach is based upon methodological individualism and the nomo-thetic-deductive method of scientific discovery. They work with questionnaires, samples, variables, dependent and independent variables, hypotheses, structural equations and factor analysis. Very few behaviourists have much to say about the socio-economic and historical context of those individuals they select for hypothesis testing.
In the mid 1970s, a number of English-Canadian, left-wing nationalists launched a series of attacks on the Americanization of academe and its consequences for the future of the state and the nation (see Nesbitt-Larking, 2002). C. B. Macpherson referred to:

the shallowness of the behavioural revolution and the affinity of behaviouralism to the materialist, maximizing, individualist culture of at least the leading North Atlantic country…the aggressive, bourgeois individualist culture, which has been at its strongest in North America, especially in the United States, during the whole period when the tone of current political science was set. (1974: 62-63)

There were also more moderate interrogations from Donald Smiley (1974) and Alan Cairns (1975) who argued against the indiscriminate application of imported theories and approaches, whether borrowed from the US or anywhere else. In particular they validated the ongoing importance of political economy (Marxist) and traditional institutionalist description (conservative). Surveying the field of Canadian political science in 1996, John Trent and Michael Stein conclude that while there are new ideas and perspectives, it is still “largely dependent on conceptual contributions developed in other countries, particularly the United States” (1996: 8) and they refer to this as “...the trap of intellectual dependency...” (1996: 33). Among their recommendations is that Canadian political science should develop “interdisciplinary studies, critical studies which challenge mainstream approaches and methodologies, and [which promote] philosophically idiosyncratic thinking” (1996: 35). Not only do I concur wholeheartedly with Trent and Stein’s recommendations, I suggest that the field of political psychology has already achieved some of the interdisciplinary, critical and methodologically innovative approaches they desire. Canada’s ideological plurality constitutes a welcoming home for the future development of political psychology, should we so wish it. A truly self-confident Canadian political psychology will draw deeply—as it has already done—upon insights and inspirations irrespective of their origins and their labels. Political psychology is a postmodern field that, at best, is open, eclectic, eccentric, marginal, playful and is sceptical of grand narratives, meta theories, nationalisms and research industries. Its focus on the mind and the polity continues to shed light on issues of identity, social cohesion, inter-societal conflict, regionalism, democracy, state forms and institutional practices that open Canada’s challenges and solutions to internal dialogue as well as to global scrutiny and debate. The studies touched upon in this review illustrate the depth of tradition and promise for the future of political psychology. To the extent that Canada’s research energies in political psychology are self-consciously reported, recorded and reflected upon, Canadians become better able to develop institutional support and academic initiatives that transcend our diversified origins. As one of the founders of the field, Fred Greenstein, said: “Let many flowers bloom” (1973: 469).
Notes
1 Data in this section were derived from the Canadian Political Science Association, *Directory of Political Scientists in Canada* (Ottawa: CPSA, 1998); inspections of Canadian university course calendars; e-mail communication with chairs of Politics, Political Studies and Political Science in October and November, 1999. Of the 44 departments contacted, 19 chairs responded.
2 I attempt to make mention throughout the article of each major contributor to political psychology in Canada. Given the richness of the field, there may be a few omissions. I would appreciate any information that assists me in filling the gaps. I have generated a comprehensive bibliography of political psychology in Canada on the basis of my research that is available on request.
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