INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

The Possibilities for a Post-War Canadian Social Psychology.

by

Sheri A. Getz, B.A

**A thesis submitted in to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of**

Masters of Arts

Department of Psychology

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario**

September 10, 2001

**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-66820-7

Canada

The undersigned recommend to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
Acceptance of the thesis:

"The Possibilities for a Post War Canadian Social Psychology"

submitted by

Sheri Getz

in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Chair

Thesis Supervisor

Carleton University
September, 2001

Abstract

This thesis contributes to a critical history of Canadian social psychology by investigating the avenues open to the field in the post-World War Two era. The possibilities for the development of a uniquely Canadian perspective were explored through the writings of psychiatrist, Brock Chisholm, and psychologists, William Line and J.D. Ketchum. A focus on the effects of the two World Wars on the differential development of Canadian and American social psychology was undertaken. The significance of the MacLeod Report, and the Opinicon and Couchiching conferences for the development of social psychology in Canada was also explored. It was found that while mid-century desires for the development of a uniquely Canadian social psychology were voiced in the immediate post-war era, these interests dissipated by the early 1960s in favour of an imported American-style experimental social psychology. Various explanations are offered for this outcome.

Acknowledgements

There are a number of individuals whom I would like to thank for their assistance in this thesis. First, many thanks to my advisor Dr. Frances Cherry for her supervision of this project in particular, as well as her general assistance in helping me to fully develop and pursue my interest in the history of psychology. I would also like to thank her for making time for me when I returned to Ottawa, from my new home in London, Ontario, where I had moved in the middle of this project.

I would also like to thank Dr. Mary Wright for her memories, stories, and general input into my research and research processes. Additionally, I would like to thank the late Dr. Jack Griffin and Dr. Cyril Greenland for their recollections regarding the involvement of psychologists and psychiatrists in the war, as well as Dr. Griffin's memories regarding his work and involvement with Brock Chisholm.

I would like to thank my partner Gil for his support and encouragement in seeing this project through as well for accompanying me to those many late-night library trips and photocopy sessions. Thanks to my parents who gave me a good start in my education, and who let me move back home during my trips to Ottawa, dog and all. Last but not least, many thanks to Pyke, Micco, and Jessie who warmed my feet, and kept me company through the late nights and long revision sessions.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acceptance Sheet	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
Chapter One: Introduction.	1
Chapter Two: The Impetus of Wartime for Social Psychology in Canada and the United States	7
Chapter Three: Brock Chisholm and a Socially Responsible Psychology	16
Chapter Four: Academic Social Psychology as Community Psychology	29
Chapter Five: Social Psychology in the Context of the MacLeod Report And Subsequent Conference Proceedings	53
Chapter Six: Conclusion: Understanding the Importation of an American Social Psychology.	71
Archives Consulted	78
Interviews	79
References	70

Chapter One

Introduction

While the systematic study of social life has its roots in nineteenth century European social thought (Graumann, 1988; Apfelbaum, 1992), post-World War two experimental social psychology is primarily an American invention. Experimental traditions did exist in Europe. However, they did not come to define the epistemological boundaries of psychological social psychology as clearly as was the case in the United States. As Cartwright (1979) has noted, by the end of the Second World War social psychology “had become primarily an American product, and when it was finally reestablished abroad it had a completely American flavor” (p. 85).

Perhaps not surprisingly then, histories of social psychology have focused on its development in the United States, particularly on its expansion as an empirical science from the 1920s onward (Cartwright, 1948, 1979; Collier, et. al, 1991; Danziger, 1992; Herman, 1995; Farr, 1996; Capshew, 1999). Standard historical accounts (Jones, 1985; 1998) view experimentation as a defining characteristic of the field, and to a large extent dismiss longstanding traditions that view social psychology as a cultural rather than a natural science.

Graumann (1988) has noted two roles that disciplinary histories can play. The first role is to help construct a unique identity, helping to distinguish one discipline from another, while the second role is a “justificatory function” which helps to legitimate the discipline as it stands, by focusing on its achievements and contributions to society or to knowledge in general. Most histories of social psychology incorporate these two roles in one way or another and have traditionally been written in much of a celebratory and ‘feel

good' manner. Ash (1983) for example, noted that while traditional histories have been seen as an important element in the development of social psychology, many of these histories have served as "pedagogical self-presentation" (p. 144), and have left as much out of the story as they have put in. Such histories have often lacked an external focus, and tend to be written as if the development of social psychology occurred in a social and political 'vacuum'. Lubek and Apfelbaum (2000) have also noted the consequences of a privileged view of official histories for students of the field:

Official histories have been treated as epistemological foundations for training the next generation to accept the ontological and methodological guidelines of the current generation, as justified and legitimated by a selected vision of past generations (p. 407).

Beginning in the 1970s, *critical*¹ historical scholarship emerged which began to challenge the official histories in the field (Apfelbaum, 1992; Danziger, 1994; Lubek, 2000). This new focus of critical work was an integral part of the 'crisis' period in social psychology that had evolved throughout the 1960s and 1970s (Collier, et. al, 1991) and which brought forward questions of disciplinary relevance, ethics, and scientific status (Steiner, 1974; Elms 1975; Strickland, Aboud and Gergen, 1976; Collier, et al., 1991; Apfelbaum, 1992). It was through this examination of the field that "historians of psychology... produced their own reflections upon the ways their craft should be plied" (Hilgard, Leary & McGuire, p. 89, 1991) turning to historical and philosophical analyses as a way of understanding social psychology as a historical and cultural science.

¹ "Critical" is not used here in the same specific way as it is in sociology. Rather, "critical" is used in a more general historiographic sense. See for example, Lubek and Apfelbaum (2000).

Critical historians have questioned social psychology's foundation and knowledge base, focusing on the ideological, social, and power structures involved in the construction of knowledge and the building of disciplines (Ash, 1983; Apfelbaum, 1992; Collier et al., 1991; Danziger, 1992, 1994). They have critiqued both the presentism in the story of social psychology as a progression from social philosophy to social experiment and the limitations generated by an exclusive story of 'great men' and 'great ideas' (Hilgard et al, 1991). Such internal histories have excluded examining the societal forces shaping disciplines (Hilgard et al., 1991) and have failed to examine the relevance of culture and nation in knowledge production.

Over the past several years various writers have created more inclusive histories of social psychological thought for incoming generations of students, focused on the development of social psychology in countries other than the United States. Much of this work has examined the form that social psychological theory and practice have taken in other national and ethnocultural contexts. These accounts have included Japan (Hotta, 1993), Russia (Strickland, 1991), France (Apfelbaum, 1992), Holland (van Strien, 1997), and India (Sinha, 1977). Recently, similar attention has been turned to the development of Canadian social psychology (Cherry, 1999). Given, however, that the development of Canadian social psychology has remained largely an untold story, the primary aim of this thesis is to add both to the history of Canadian science and to disciplinary history.

The mainstream view of social psychology's history in Canada is that, despite limited resources at the outset, social psychology in Canada began to prosper as an experimental discipline during the 1970s, leaving one with the impression that there were no

possibilities for a uniquely Canadian social psychology prior to that time. As Rule and Wells reported in a 1981 review of social psychology in Canada:

Experimental social psychology has flourished within the last decade in Canada. After the formative years in the '50s and '60s when new staff appointments and graduate programs were established, the area became a focal one in Canadian research (p. 69).

Rule and Wells (1981) noted a rise in interest in social psychological research that focused on attitudes, group processes, aggression, attribution, and moral judgement. None of these research areas significantly differed from those topics being examined in the United States. As they reported:

Finally, we note that our review found little that was particularly "Canadian" about experimental social psychology in Canada. Perhaps this is partly due to the fact that we did not include non-experimental social psychology since one could surely consider the bilingualism research to be somewhat unique to Canada. Among the experimental areas that we reviewed, however, it appears to be neither Canadian, American, nor anything else, other than social psychology (p. 78).

This brings us to the central focus of this thesis, which is to explore the nature of the possibilities for a uniquely Canadian social psychology voiced prior to the importation of experimental social psychology to Canada. Was non-experimental social psychology limited in Canada, as Rule and Wells state, to the study of a particular content area such as bilingualism? How did national and international events manifest themselves in the shape that the psychological study of "the social" took in Canada?

This thesis will examine the various possibilities that existed for the development of psychological social psychology in Canada from the immediate post-World War II era through the 1960s. In examining the history of social psychology's development, two things become clear in preliminary research. First, there is evidence that various visions concerning what a 'social psychologist' could offer Canadian society and the international community were being articulated at war's end. Second, there were arguments made continuously in the history of academic psychology for a uniquely Canadian contribution to the discipline.

In chapter two, I will briefly summarize the way in which World War II impacted differently on the development of social psychology in Canada and the United States. In chapter three, I will explore the work of psychiatrist, Brock Chisholm and his call for an action-oriented social psychology that would focus on community problems at national and international levels, and would apply social knowledge to the solution of social problems. In chapter four, I will examine the translation of Chisholm's call for social responsibility through the writings of two academic psychologists: William Line and J.D. Ketchum, both professors of psychology at the University of Toronto. For Line, social psychology was in fact no more or less than a community psychology. Ketchum, on the other hand, grappled with the divergences between defining social psychology in psychological or sociological terms in the post-war period. One sees in Ketchum's work of the 1940s and 1950s the difficulties experienced in shaping the field in the context of emerging departments of psychology. In chapter five, the key documents of psychology's development in Canada are re-examined (MacLeod, 1955; Bernhardt; 1961; Webster, 1967) with the goal of understanding their relevance to social psychology. This chapter

examines the MacLeod Report (1955) and the subsequent Opinicon (1961) and Couchiching (1967) conference proceedings as a way of understanding how psychology and social psychology were being articulated by Canadian psychologists. In addition to these statements from within the field, the thesis summarizes in chapter six, the various factors outside of the discipline that resulted in the importation of a U.S.- style experimental social psychology, providing the framework of global power structures (Moghaddam, 1987) and colonization (van Strien, 1997) as a way of understanding this development.

Chapter 2:

The Impetus of Wartime for Social Psychology in Canada and the United States

Perhaps the most notable developments in the organization of North American social psychology can be linked back to the years surrounding the two World Wars. While World Wars I and II had advanced American psychology and social psychology, respectively, developments in Canadian psychology were somewhat different, as Canadian psychologists did not participate in the First World War to the extent of their American neighbours (Bernhardt, 1947; Wright, 1974).

Following the First World War there was a keen awareness among Canadian psychologists that their participation in the war effort could have been more significant. Canadian psychologists were aware of the roles that American psychologists had played in the First World War, and how that participation had advanced American psychology in general (Ferguson, 1992). As the Second World War approached, Canadian psychologists began to prepare themselves, determined to bring their growing expertise to the upcoming war. Reflecting after the war in his Presidential Address to the Canadian Psychological Association (CPA), Bernhardt (1947) captured the enthusiasm of Canadian psychologists for the war effort:

As the skies over Europe and Asia clouded with approaching disaster, Canadian psychologists began to ask 'What is our part in this threatened war?' And while statesmen were making futile gestures to try to stem the flood, Professor Bott and Dr. Humphrey and others were already planning for action. Already memoranda were being written and lost in government files.

But lack of governmental response could not dampen the enthusiasm and confidence of our leaders (p. 51).

Indeed, it was participation in the Second World War that had an immediate organizational impact on the development of Canadian psychology. In 1939 the Canadian Psychological Association formed in direct response to the imminent war. While many Canadian psychologists had been members of the American Psychological Association (APA) there was a general feeling that the APA would not be able to direct Canadian psychologists through the upcoming war years, as it was believed that Canada would be entering the war before the United States (Myers, 1965).

For Canadians, psychological expertise on issues surrounding training methods and test construction was paramount during the war (Bernhardt, 1947; Myers, 1965; Wright 1974). Early in the war, the Canadian Psychological Association established the Test Construction Committee (later renamed the War Committee). Then, in 1941 the Army developed a Directorate of Personnel Selection while the RCAF developed a Directorate of Personnel Selection and Research (Blair, 1966; Wright, 1974; Ferguson, 1992). Both directorates aimed at examining ways in which to find the best possible 'fit' between individuals and their jobs, and in fact, some of the most noted contributions of Canadian psychologists were to be found in this work. One year after the establishment of these Directorates, an interest in morale research began to emerge, and the Research and Information Section was established in order to examine Army morale (Blair, 1966).

Throughout the Second World War the Canadian Psychological Association held annual meetings to address the uses of psychological expertise during the war, but quite early on, the focus shifted to the post-war possibilities for the development of Canadian

psychology. In particular, Canadian psychologists were eager to ensure a place for their expertise in the post-war era. As early as the December 1940 meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, a roundtable format involved a “discussion of Psychological Problems in [the] Post-war Rehabilitation” of soldiers, while a second roundtable involved a “discussion on The Status of Psychology as a Profession within and without the University” (Hebb, 1941, p. 26). Similarly, the 1944 meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association included sessions on psychology and education, psychology and industry, as well as sessions on the rehabilitation of military personnel (Bernhardt, 1944, p. 31).

It has been noted by several historical accounts that by the end of the Second World War Canadian psychology had finally ‘come into its own’ (Wright, 1969; Wright 1974; Belanger, 1992; Ferguson, 1992; Williams 1992; Wright and Myers, 1995). This was reflected in the fact that following the war many Psychology departments in Canadian universities made their departure from Philosophy, or were founded in new universities established in the 1950s (Myers, 1965). Myers (1965) noted, for example, that between 1947 and 1958, independent departments were established at the University of Saskatchewan, The University of Western Ontario, the University of New Brunswick, Carleton University, Mount Allison, Ottawa University and McMaster University. Furthermore, the growth of Canadian psychology was also evident through an increase in CPA membership from 110 individuals in 1940 (Myers, 1965) to 238 in 1946 (“List”, 1946).

By the close of the war, Canadian psychologists had a significantly different professional identity than they had before entering the war. However, despite the

abundance of war-related activity, psychology as a coherent academic discipline in Canada was not well defined, and entering into the post-war era there was an increased pressure to structure and build the discipline. While American social psychology had been growing steadily, social psychology in Canada remained far more amorphous with respect to a recognizable field.

During the First World War American psychologists had made great strides in the development of their discipline through the application of their knowledge to the overall war effort, primarily through work on psychological testing. Intelligence testing, in particular, put psychology on the map in the U.S. (Hunter, 1946; Samelson, 1977; Hilgard, 1987; Von Mayrhauser, 1989).² This work helped to build a firm basis of psychological expertise by war's end, and helped to exemplify the useful nature of psychological research and knowledge (Samelson, 1977), while selling psychology as a whole to the American public.

Following World War I, American psychologists continued in the advancement of their discipline. It was during the interwar period that the field of American *social* psychology underwent rapid development due in part to the work of such social psychologists as Floyd Allport, Rensis Likert and Daniel Katz (Johnson and Nichols, 1998). In 1924, for example, Floyd Allport's textbook *Social Psychology* was published as the first American social psychology textbook to be written from a psychological perspective (Collier, et al., 1991). Behaviourism, the experimental method, and a focus on the individual were the main underpinnings of Allport's work during this period (Collier, et al., 1991). It was developments in American social psychology such as these

² Other activities undertaken by American psychologists during World War One included work in personnel selection and classification, as well as experimental work on pilot selection (Hunter, 1946).

that led Smoke to report by 1935 that American social psychology had begun to develop a wide range of phenomena to study, clearly defined problems, and objective research methods. In fact, Collier et al. (1991) have argued that by the early 1940s “experimental social psychology had moved into the forefront within psychological social psychology” (p.141).

However, during this period, other directions for American social psychology had also emerged with the founding of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI). SPSSI was developed in 1936, largely in response to the Depression, and was initiated by a group of American psychologists who strongly advocated the involvement of psychologists in social and political change (McClung Lee, 1986; Capshew, 1999). The formation of this group was an important step in the development of a socially responsible problem-focused American social psychology, not overly defined by any single method. SPSSI brought together psychologists to address concerns about various social conditions and to contribute to the solution of social problems (Johnson and Nichols, 1998), not the least of which was their own unemployment in the Depression (Collier, et al., 1991).

Both of these inter-war developments put American social psychologists in a good position to meet the challenges of the Second World War with both social concern and increased focus on empirical methods (Cartwright, 1948, Danziger, 1992; Herman, 1995; Capshew, 1999). As Johnson and Nichols (1998) stated “U.S. social psychologists could not have played high-level significant roles in World War II without having established a great deal of methodological expertise and leadership capabilities prior to it” (p. 55).

The Second World War provided an excellent opportunity for American psychologists to work on various large-scale projects related to social psychology. Cartwright (1948) noted that American social psychologists were involved in seven main areas of war related work: research on morale, combating demoralization, reducing enemy spirit, military administration involving the placement of personnel and the building of morale, international relations, public sentiment, and the study of economic behaviour such as consumer spending and saving patterns. As a result World War II had an immense impact on the development of the field, occurring, as Cartwright (1979) argued, at a critical stage of American social psychology's development:

During the first three or four decades of its existence, social psychology had been mainly concerned with the problem of establishing itself as a legitimate field of empirical research. Social psychologists had directed their attention primarily to the task of developing basic concepts and devising appropriate methods of research. By the mid-1930's, the field was prepared to undertake research on significant substantive problems (p. 84).

In summary, while World War I had advanced American psychology in general, World War II advanced American social psychology in particular by providing an opportunity for social psychologists to use their skills to solve social problems (Capshew, 1999). Many American social psychologists met the challenges of the post-war era by taking seriously broad notions of social responsibility and optimism regarding the application of research to the solution of social problems (Herman, 1995; Jacobs, 1989; Cherry & Borshuk, 1998). As Collier, et al. (1991) noted, the three p's – poverty,

prejudice and peace - became the main concerns of American social psychologists and the call for a socially responsible psychology was evident at war's end (Capshe, 1999).

These post-war endeavors on the part of American psychologists helped to fully establish social psychology as a legitimate field in the United States, and as a result American social psychology experienced rapid expansion and increased funding (Collier, et al., 1991). As Johnson and Nichols (1998) explained:

Because World War II increased social psychology's importance to public administrators, who held the purse strings to universities and research grants, social psychology suddenly received more than sufficient resources to thrive (p. 69).

Following the war, American social psychologists returned to the classroom, and many new graduate departments and research centres were established (Collier, et al., 1991). Johnson and Nichols (1998) noted that by the immediate post-war period American social psychologists had ensured a future for their field within psychology as they had become skilled at recruitment, were training greater numbers of students, and were involved in increased research and publication.

However, by the early 1960s, it was clear that U.S. based social psychology had, itself, turned from an engagement with social problems to a laboratory based science (Collier, et al., 1991; Danziger, 2000). One cannot fully understand the shift seen in psychological social psychology away from the study of social problems, without taking into consideration the impact of the Cold War, and the McCarthy era on American Psychology (Apfelbaum, 1992). McCarthyism, which reached its height during the early 1950s (Collier, et al., 1991) introduced a social conservatism to the United States, and has

been primarily associated with anti-Communist convictions. During this period all social sciences in the United States were held under the suspicion of having socialist leanings (Herman, 1985), and those who worked within the academic environment “generally abandoned...political ideologies based on collective action” (Collier, et al., 1991). For example, within social psychology the political environment stifled research on issues surrounding peace as this topic was seen as too risky for American social psychologists to pursue (Jacobs, 1989). As Jacobs (1989) explained:

Psychological involvement in matters of foreign policy and peace had taken on a new meaning. Psychologists working with peace issues were seen as subversive, as it was thought that Communist infiltrators were using peace campaigns to weaken and defeat the United States (p. 26).

While SPSSI remained a viable organization and engaged with McCarthyism and domestic issues of racial prejudice and discrimination throughout the 1950s (Collier et al., 1991), its orientation to a problem-focused social psychology gave way to a laboratory experimentally oriented field. By the early 1960s, the post-war international focus was lost to the Cold War and the social psychology later available for export to Canadian psychology departments was defined as an experimental science.

In the immediate post-war period many Canadian psychologists were also interested in social problem solving, particularly through the strengthening of the international community. In speaking about Canadian psychologists in general, and social psychologists in particular, Robert MacLeod (1949) reflected the mood of Canadian aspirations for a socially responsible psychology that was more attuned to society's needs:

This is the hope that steers a great deal of current investigation in social psychology. It is a hope supported by a newly awakened realization on the part of psychologists that if their science is to fulfil its mission it must come to grips with the problems of man not merely as an individual in isolation but as a member of society. One need not repeat what is now becoming almost a trite argument, namely that the threat to human survival today lies less in the release of new sources of physical power than in the fact that this power is controlled by human beings who have not yet mastered the most elementary techniques of co-operative living. This fact, we all realize, places an enormous burden of responsibility on the shoulders of all the social sciences. Part of this burden must be accepted by *social* [italics added] psychology (p. 210).

For some, the applied psychological expertise that Canadians had developed during the war, combined with cooperative living in the nuclear age represented the ideal direction for the development of a socially responsible Canadian social psychology. It can be argued that one possibility for social psychology was, not unlike the United States, to develop an action oriented social psychology that would seek to understand the processes of group living (Lewin, 1943). One of the strongest proponents for this general model in Canada was psychiatrist, Brock Chisholm, whose work will be examined in the next chapter.

Chapter 3:

Brock Chisholm and a Socially Responsible Psychology

Brock Chisholm was the embodiment of global thinking in the post-war period, and his thoughts on social responsibility and social health were very appealing to some psychologists in both Canada and the United States. Chisholm was born in 1896 in Oakville Ontario. At the age of nineteen he enlisted in the Canadian Army, first serving as a private. He was commissioned Lieutenant in 1917, and emerged from the war in 1918 appointed Captain and was awarded a Military Cross and Bar ("Biographical Data"; Irving, 1998). Following World War I, Chisholm studied Medicine at the University of Toronto, graduating in 1924, and in 1931 he completed further studies at Yale's Institute of Human Relations where he specialized in psychiatry until 1933. He was the first psychiatrist to set up a private practice in Toronto in 1934 (Irving, 1998).

While Chisholm began to move into the public spotlight in the mid 1930s, lecturing to community groups about various topics such as mental hygiene (Irving, 1998), it was his work during the Second World War and the immediate post-war era that launched him into the public arena. During World War II Chisholm made significant contributions to the Canadian war effort as the Director of Personnel Selection, and later as the Director of Medical Services. In these positions he was also actively involved in the development of Canadian psychological expertise. Early in the war Chisholm wrote a pamphlet titled *A Platoon Commander's Responsibility for the Morale of His Men*. In this pamphlet he spoke of building group spirit and of the importance of maintaining good morale among soldiers, while additionally providing instructions for commanders to ensure good morale. Furthermore, as the Director of Personnel Selection he developed and

implemented a new selection system for recruits. It had generally been felt that previous selection methods had misplaced recruits by focusing solely on the physical attributes of the soldier. Alternatively, Chisholm's system focused on the whole person, examining both physical and psychological characteristics. Through such initiatives, Chisholm helped to highlight the uses of psychological expertise, particularly in keeping military personnel healthy and properly placed.

Chisholm's World War II work brought him increased attention and resulted in his 1944 appointment as a Deputy Minister in the newly established Canadian Department of National Health and Welfare (Irving, 1998). Chisholm was responsible for the 'health' side of the department (Irving, 1998), and in this position his notion of health expanded from his wartime definition of physical and psychological health to a more encompassing definition, which included social health. This latter inclusion reflected post-war concerns for wellness defined as tolerance and cooperative living and their proposed link to world peace.

Chisholm's name was a familiar one in the Canadian press at a time when the public was beginning to take psychological expertise seriously, and in the post-war era he became somewhat of a leader and a spokesperson in Canadian society. During the period of 1945 to 1955 inclusive, Chisholm delivered one hundred and forty-five lectures, speeches and articles on his notions of social health and social responsibility. In these lectures, he spoke out to citizens, educating them and guiding them into becoming 'new world citizens'. His venues were varied, ranging from university graduations, to lectures for parents and teachers of various schools, to lectures at various clubs. These lectures were often general, utopian, and somewhat simplistic by contemporary standards.

However, they were quite representative of an era when professionals spoke generally about their area of expertise (Herman, 1995). It is through these lectures that we can see the early possibilities for an action-oriented social psychology being voiced in post-war Canadian society, as Chisholm's main themes of *social health and responsibility*, *child socialization*, and *the development of a socially responsible psychology*, were emphasized throughout his lectures. These themes will be examined in the next few pages in order to provide a better insight into his 'social psychology', or perhaps more accurately, his psychology of 'the social'.

In the post-war period in Canada and the United States, the prevention of an outbreak of another world war, and the re-building of democratic social institutions were paramount (Herman, 1995). Given the recent technological advancements, particularly in warfare, Chisholm believed that another war would mean the annihilation of the human race, and that proactive measures needed to be initiated to avoid this fate. Chisholm stated in 1957, for example: "[p]erhaps our greatest responsibility is to help our children to grow beyond ourselves. It is said that the worst thing that could happen to the next generation is that they might turn out to be just like us" (p. 23).

One of the most noted themes of the post-war era was the focus on the 'sick society' which saw a shift in metaphorical thinking from seeing individuals as sick, to seeing them as reflections of the sick society in which they lived (Herman, 1995). Herman (1995) noted that this post-war period saw the introduction of countless disease and infection metaphors. Terms such as 'community disorders' began to appear in the vocabulary of many clinicians in reference to various social ills such as prejudice and greed (Herman, 1995). As a result, many psychologists turned their focus to healing

society. Along with this interest came notions of prevention, and of creating healthy societies through preventative means with the focus on health rather than illness at all levels of analysis (Herman, 1995). According to Herman (1995), society became the patient, while psychology became the cure.

Consistent with this view, Chisholm argued that healthiness consisted of being physically, psychologically and socially healthy, the latter being an expansion of customary ways of defining health. Being socially healthy, according to him meant “being able to live in peace and contributing to the welfare of other people” (Chisholm, 1948d, p. 364). While all forms of health were intermingled, Chisholm believed that social health was far more important. As he wrote in 1949: “[i]ndeed, it is mental and social ill-health which is responsible for most of the continuing physical ill-health of the world” (1949a, p. 9).

Despite the somewhat elusive nature of social health, Chisholm was confident that it could be attained, and he spent many of his lectures talking about the importance of achieving and maintaining social health. A socially healthy person, according to him was one free from prejudice, hate, greed, religious intolerance, and the like. As he told his audience in an address to the International Committee on Mental Hygiene in New York City in 1948: “[n]othing keeps the diseases alive except ignorance and shortsighted self-interest” (1948d, p. 367).

Social health, according to Chisholm, could only be obtained through tolerance, understanding and acceptance, particularly in terms of cultures, religions, and ways of living. These ideas dovetailed with the American post-war domestic agenda that was largely concerned with the building of racial and religious tolerance (Herman, 1995). It

did not dovetail with the turning inward of American society in the 1950s and the threat of communism. Throughout much of Chisholm's work phrases like "experiment in living" (Chisholm, 1948d, p. 370), and the "great evolutionary experiment" (Chisholm, 1955, p. 532) appeared, highlighting the importance that Chisholm placed on the connection between social health and group living (Lewin, 1943). His message was consistent with Lewin's (1943) statements concerning these matters. Lewin (1943) predicted, for example, that such a focus would be of utmost importance to both scientific developments and human survival:

[a]lthough the scientific investigations of group are but a few years old, I don't hesitate to predict that group work - that is, the handling of human beings not as isolated individuals, but in the social setting of groups- will soon be one of the most important theoretical and practical fields... There is no hope for creating a better world without a deeper scientific insight into the function of leadership, of culture, and of the other essentials of group life. Social life will have to be managed much more consciously than before if man [sic]³ shall not destroy man (p. 114).

Like many American social psychologists (Herman, 1995) Chisholm was interested in the democratic engineering of a new society with a new type of citizen. He believed that old patterns of living had to be evaluated, and where necessary, new ones needed to be established, and he strongly believed that many of these changes had to begin with children, as they represented the future, and were in the best position to learn new and

³ While the generic terms "man", "he" etc. are used in various quotes throughout this thesis, I will only be noting them in this first instance.

healthier behaviour and thought patterns. For Chisholm, child socialization was key to changing future human and social behaviour (Chisholm, 1946b; 1948c; 1958).

Chisholm believed that the individual conscience was fully developed between the ages of six and eight and that the years prior to this age would often determine what type of an adult a child would become. He believed that one of the main problems in child rearing was that many children were exposed to social illnesses such as prejudice and intolerance through their parents, and that these convictions would carry themselves into adulthood; it was this link between generations that needed to be broken. Chisholm advocated children learning how to “live effectively in the future” (1958, p. 95). This involved teaching children to be flexible and open in their thinking, and allowing them the freedom to maintain minds which were “undistorted and free” (Chisholm, 1946b, p. 10).

Not surprisingly Chisholm saw parenting as one of the most important roles in society, and he urged parents to take advantage of the early childhood period to raise socially healthy and responsible children. He recommended that parents look at themselves and at their own patterns of behaviour, advising them to critically examine what needed to be changed. He suggested that they identify those things that had ‘gone wrong’ in their own upbringing, and to use this insight in order to ensure better living and behavioural patterns for their own children, pointing out that “[t]olerance does not come out of intolerance” (Chisholm, 1947, p. 6).

In examining Chisholm’s work, it is interesting to note the similarities between this work and the research occurring at the University of Toronto, particularly at the Institute of Child Study (ICS). Like Chisholm, the work of various psychologists at the University

of Toronto, such as Bott, Line, Blatz and Bernhardt, involved ways to ensure the development of mentally and socially healthy children (Bernhardt, 1990; Pols, 1999). David Bernhardt (1990) noted, for example, that during the 1940s and 1950s, Bill Blatz and Karl Bernhardt “were committed to spreading the word about the development of secure independent adults and about the philosophy of child rearing and discipline that they believed was associated with it” (p. 177). These endeavors for healthy child development came in the form of lectures, symposia, the *Parent Education Bulletin* (edited by K. Bernhardt), and textbooks (Bernhardt, 1990) and were a part of the growing mental health movement in Canada and the United States after the war. In Canada the Canadian National Committee for Mental Hygiene (CNCMH; later known as The Canadian Mental Health Association) promoted mental health education for students, teachers, and parents, while also making ties with the fields of medicine, religion and social work (“Answer to some questions”, 1947). Roland (1989) noted, for example, that this period was

punctuated by a number of events in the mental hygiene field: a great expansion of the work of the Canadian National Committee across Canada; the development of the World Federation for Mental Health; the change of the name from the CNCMH to the Canadian Mental Health Association in 1950; close co-operation with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; establishment of a nationwide Mental Health Week; consultation with the National Film Board in the production of mental health films; increased attention to the mental health needs of older citizens; participation in the development of the Canadian

Psychiatric Association; a mental health survey of Newfoundland, in 1949; and the promotion of research (p. 109).

While trying to engineer a democratic world with a new kind of citizen, Chisholm delineated a new role for psychologists that was a part of this larger mental and social health movement. Chisholm profiled psychologists and psychiatrists as playing a key role in the creation of a peaceful and tolerant society, as he felt that they had a unique understanding of human nature, as well as scientific expertise, and were consequently in a favourable position to lead the nation and save the world from war. For example, in 1948 Chisholm warned that “[w]ithout the extensive help of psychologists and psychiatrists it is quite probable that mankind will not long survive the fearful changes which are taking place” (1948a, p. 543). Prevention, healthy development, and global education were his main interests and were integral to the role he envisioned for social scientists.

According to Chisholm, clinicians were placing too much emphasis on the value of therapeutic treatment, particularly in helping individuals once problems had surfaced. He believed that psychologists and psychiatrists needed to take much more of a *preventative* role in society by getting out of their offices and into the community where they could serve the greater good.

What the world needed from psychologists and psychiatrists, according to Chisholm, was some understanding of the human personality, as well as the development of methods by which humans could learn to live in peace. He argued that it should be the role of psychologists and psychiatrists to study the living patterns of individuals, identifying the factors involved in stunted personal and social development, in the hopes

of finding a 'cure'. As Chisholm noted in 1946, post-war psychologists and psychiatrists were to become "specialists in living" (1946b, p. 20). As he told his listeners at the annual meeting of the American Psychiatric Association in 1947:

we must ask ourselves: Are there any groups other than psychologists and psychiatrists who are qualified to accept, and therefore to bear the responsibility of accepting, this great burden of charting the development of children so that the following generations will not need to die wholesale? Some groups would indeed answer "Yes" to this question, but they would not be scientifically trained people, nor would their approach be objective...there is no doubt as to where the major responsibility lies, squarely in the hands of psychiatry and psychology; whether accepted or refused, this responsibility cannot be avoided (1948a, p. 544).

Chisholm envisioned psychologists and psychiatrists working with parents, schools, and the community as a whole to educate society about child rearing, and peaceful living. By seizing these opportunities in teaching the world to live in peace, he believed that psychology and psychiatry could justify their existence by becoming "real leaders in the planned development of a new kind of human being, one who can live at peace with himself and his fellow men" (Chisholm, 1948a, p. 546). While Chisholm emphasized the roles of psychologists and psychiatrists, he recognized that the task set out before them was somewhat substantial, and he called to other disciplines to participate in this responsibility. Like several others of his time, he blurred boundaries across disciplines,

encouraging people from different fields to work together in a common effort (Chisholm, 1946b).

As can be seen, Chisholm's ideas closely paralleled those of some social psychologists and psychiatrists immediately after World War II in the United States (Herman, 1995). In fact, Saxton, in his 1995 doctoral dissertation, highlighted Chisholm's links to the United States, noting in particular the connection between Harry Stack Sullivan and Brock Chisholm. Saxton (1995) indicated that Chisholm's "exposure to the flowering of the social sciences in the early 1930's led him later to join Sullivan in activist projects after the end of the Second World War" (p. 74). In fact, Sullivan had been instrumental in arranging for Chisholm to give the William Alanson White Memorial Lectures, highlighting the collaborative interests in social health and social responsibility shared by both U.S. and Canadian professionals during this period. However, as mentioned earlier, this shared outlook on group living and human relations was short lived in the United States, and as will be discussed later, only slightly less short lived in Canada.

In 1946, Chisholm's interests turned towards the international level and he participated in the founding of the World Health Organization (WHO) (Irving, 1998). In fact, it was Brock Chisholm who proposed the name World Health Organization. He had attended various conferences such as the International Health Conference in June and July of 1946, taking his message of social health to an international level. This work helped to shape the direction, purpose, and structure of the WHO. In his biography of Chisholm, Irving (1998) noted, for example, that as a member of the Technical Preparatory Committee of the WHO, Chisholm introduced and emphasized his broad

definition of health defined as “a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity” (p. 90).

Chisholm resigned in 1946 from his post as Deputy Minister in order to pursue these international interests, and later that year he was elected the Executive-Secretary of the Interim Commission of the World Health Organization, working in this position until 1948 when he became the first Director General of the WHO, a position which he held until 1953 (Irving, 1998). In these positions, Chisholm emphasized the role that the social sciences could play at the international level. As Saxton (1995) noted: “[d]espite financial, political and social impediments, Sullivan and Chisholm continued to urge that there be psychiatric and social science representation in the WHO” (p. 27). Chisholm also highlighted health at the international level, emphasizing the importance of *world* communities working together as one. As always, his focus remained on human relations and the prevention of war. As Irving (1998) described:

From his perch at WHO he warned of the folly of continuing our present course. World health for him became the key instrument for the international prevention of world destruction. It was nothing short of a crusade for which he daily buckled on his armour (p. 113).

As can be seen, Chisholm promoted a multi-level psychology in which individual, social, and world health were interconnected. This kind of focus reflected a Canadian concern for playing a role on the international scene. For example, during the Second World War, and particularly as the war was nearing an end, many Canadians were interested in developing international relations and in building strong international ties to ensure future peace and security. While at the end of the First World War Canada had

shown an interest in participating in the League of Nations (Department of External Affairs, 1977), this organization never materialized. Events surrounding the Second World War renewed Canada's interest in the building of an international organization, and attention was turned to the then developing United Nations. A January 1945 Gallup poll found that 90 percent of Canadians supported participation in the development of the United Nations (Soward and McInnis, 1974), and it was in this spirit that Canadian representatives made significant contributions to the drafting of the U.N. Charter (Department of External Affairs, 1977), while later participating in various Specialized Agencies of the U.N. (Department of External Affairs, 1977).

While Brock Chisholm was not an academic, he did come to the attention of American social psychologists who, as mentioned previously, had been pressing for an action-oriented psychology since the 1930s. While there was "no documented relationship between Lewin and Chisholm" (Saxton, 1995, p. 153), in 1948, Chisholm was awarded the first annual Kurt Lewin Memorial award by the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI). In introducing Chisholm for the award, Donald MacKinnon stated that it had been established to commemorate Kurt Lewin who had died suddenly in 1947, and to recognize and encourage the work of individuals who, like Kurt Lewin, integrated psychological research and social action (MacKinnon, 1948). Given Chisholm's emphases on the social responsibility of social scientists to ensure world peace and tolerance, it is no surprise that he was chosen for the award as he typified the outlook of many American social psychologists, who, after the war, continued to participate in SPSSI and to advocate for an action-oriented approach to the discipline.

At the time of receiving the award, Chisholm was working on the Interim Commission of the World Health Organization. During his career, Chisholm had several opportunities to come into contact with American social psychologists, and at times worked closely with Harry Stack Sullivan. Although it is not clear, it may have been through the Yale Institute for Human Relations, the William Alanson White lectures, or his work at the World Health Organization that he furthered his connections with U.S. psychologists. Nevertheless, this honour highlights the post-war expression in both the United States and Canada for a globally-oriented Canadian social psychology that stressed concerns for human relations, prejudice and world peace, much like that highlighted by MacLeod in 1949.

Chapter 4:

Academic Social Psychology as Community Psychology

While Chisholm was an ‘outsider’ to Canadian academic psychology, there were ‘insiders’ who saw the potential for a socially responsible psychology based on the needs of the community while also focusing internationally. Two examples of such insiders were William Line, and J.D. Ketchum, both professors of psychology at the University of Toronto. Line’s work reveals strong interests in social and mental health, and, like Chisholm, he focused on the importance of child socialization and prevention. This translated for him into a community psychology. J.D. Ketchum was more intellectually challenged by various possibilities for social psychology, and one can see through his work the struggles involved in the defining and building of an academic social psychology in Canada.

William Line

William Line was born in England, and began his post-secondary education at the University of London during World War I (“William Line: A CMH Tribute”, 1964; Wright, 1987). His studies were cut short when he enlisted for the war. However, after the war Line immigrated to Canada and attended Mount Allison University where he graduated with a B.Sc. in chemistry (“William Line: A CMH Tribute”; Wright, 1976). He then began further studies at Harvard, but left his program and returned to Canada. Upon his return he started lecturing at the University of Alberta, and it was here that he became interested in psychology (Wright, 1987). By 1926 Line had completed a B.Ed, and an MA in psychology from the University of Alberta. He then earned his Ph.D. in psychology from the University of London, and again returned to Canada to teach at

Mount Allison University in 1928. In 1929 he joined the faculty at the University of Toronto (“William Line: A CMH Tribute”, Babarik, 1976). Similar to Brock Chisholm, Line was focused on the multiple levels at which social health needed to be understood. As psychiatrist Jack Griffin described, Line was “a David against the Goliath of intolerance, discrimination, and exploitation of man by man [sic]” (1964, p. 20).

Early in his career, Line became interested in the promotion of mental health in children. After arriving in Toronto he worked with psychologist William Blatz on the Regal Road Public School project which was supported by the Committee on Mental Hygiene (Babarik, 1976; Wright, 1987), and examined the mental health of elementary school children (Wright and Myers, 1995). During this period a focus on positive mental health was beginning to emerge in the mental health movement (Griffin, 1989) and Griffin (1989) noted Line to be “a significant leader” (p. 89) in the development of this concept.

Throughout the 1930s, Line took his message of positive mental health to the schools of York Township (Wright, 1987). As a member of the National Committee on Mental Hygiene he was involved in the development of a ‘Division on Education and Mental Hygiene’ (Griffin, 1989) and in 1937, Line “persuaded the Canadian Educational Association to adopt a resolution making mental health an objective of education, the 4th ‘R’” (Babarik, 1979, p. 364).

Line also wrote a book with Griffin and Laycock entitled, *Mental hygiene: A manual for teachers* (1937). This book educated teachers on the importance of mental health and how to teach mental hygiene, among other things. Line, Griffin, and Laycock also carried out two projects in the York Township schools related to education and mental

health (Wright, 1987). The first project examined unstructured teaching methods, while the second examined the link between shy children and schizophrenia (Wright, 1987). It was this type of work that allowed Line to participate in revising the curriculum for the Ontario Public Schools in 1939 (Wright, 1987).

During World War II Line worked with Chisholm in the Directorate of Personnel Selection as Chisholm's deputy, later succeeding him as Director. He also participated in many important psychological developments during the war such as the initiation of Chisholm's 'PULHEMS' selection system (Babarik, 1976), as well as the development of the veteran's civilian rehabilitation program (Babarik, 1976).

Following the war, Line began to advocate the building of a socially responsible Canadian psychology. In his Presidential address to the Canadian Psychological Association in 1945, he highlighted future directions for the development of Canadian psychology, and emphasized the roles that Canadian psychologists should be taking in the building of a new society. He noted that Canadian psychologists had made great strides in the war, and he encouraged them to continue in the applied, rather than the scientific, direction:

I know you will say that our science is young...[b]ut is this a valid excuse, does it justify a return to the textbook, the laboratory, the locked door, the erograph, the stopwatch and the newt? I submit as my answer an unequivocal and resounding NO (1945, p. 56).

Like Chisholm, Line believed that Canadian psychologists needed to address the needs of society, stating in his address that:

If we can do this we may yet have a Five Year Plan for the Social Sciences- and we may make over, not a country, but a world. If we, with our scientific confreres, can agree on a set of priorities, based on the needs of our society rather than our precious individual whims and foibles, then our task as an [Canadian Psychological] Association and our tasks as individuals immediately fall into place. We are rescued from our present preoccupations with the refinement of the insignificant to a meaningful relation to the tasks of our age. We are called to an enterprise that has meaning. We may yet earn our keep. We might still justify our existence (1945, p. 65).

It was with these sentiments that Line carried out his career during the post-war period when Canadian psychologists were striving to define their discipline and to find their niche both nationally and internationally. Line believed that it was by focusing on 'the community' that psychologists would find their appropriate place (Line 1945; Line 1951b; "The challenge of society to psychology"). As he stated in 1951:

If psychology can address itself significantly to the study of man [sic] as he is in his community, the Canadian scene is unusually rich for this purpose; and because of its nature, will have remarkable impact on psychology itself (1951b, p. 152).

Like Chisholm, Line focused on the early childhood period as one of the most important times in human development (Line 1945; 1949; 1950a; 1951b), and he believed that one of the primary purposes of education should be the promotion of social health (Line, 1950), and the reduction of social ills. Another useful place for psychologists to focus on the building of good social and mental health, according to Line, was in the adult

industrial population. As he stated in 1948 “[w]ork and industry are public health matters of the first priority” (p. 370). He later noted in 1951 that work should be “an experience in continuous growth” (p. 181). In fact, Line envisioned psychologists as community mental health practitioners (Line, 1945). This meant studying individuals in their communities, examining basic needs, and typical life experiences (Line, “Challenge of society to psychology”). By taking this initiative Line believed that psychologists could become leaders in society “chart[ing] the course of human relations” (Line, “Challenge of society to psychology”, p. 76), while teaching individuals how to live and work together ‘effectively’ (Line, 1950b). Like Chisholm, he blurred the boundaries of social science disciplines, calling for the social sciences as a whole to work together with a common goal (Line 1945; 1948; “The challenge of society to psychology”).

Line was also interested in taking his message of mental health to the international level, and was actively involved in this endeavor. Wright (1987) noted, for example, that in the mid-1940s Line participated as a member of the task force that later formed the World Federation for Mental Health. He also helped to prepare this organization’s first meeting which took place in 1948 (Wright, 1987; Griffin, 1989), and was elected its president in 1951 (Babarik, 1976; Wright, 1987). Furthermore, as Wright explained:

Through his active involvement in WFMH he became, for more than a decade, an important consultant to the Health Department of the United Nations, the World Health Organization and UNESCO (p. 4).

During the early 1950s Line was also involved in influencing UNESCO to set up a Research Institute in a developing country as a pilot project to study the educational needs of children. As a result of his efforts Line went to Thailand in 1953 and

established the International Institute of Child Study (Babarik, 1976; Wright, 1987). In this way, social psychology was not differentiated from community psychology, at least in so far as William Line interpreted Brock Chisholm's call for a socially responsible psychology. From the predominant themes in Line's work, one can see that his underlying messages of social responsibility and the development of good mental and social health were quite consistent with the broader message Chisholm was advocating. Indeed, their writings taken together highlight the possibilities for a Canadian social psychology focused at the level of communities and not distinct from the growing expertise of mental health practitioners and educators.

Although there was interest voiced in the post-war period for the development of an action-oriented psychology in Canada (e.g. MacLeod, 1949) this possibility did not flourish. The writings of Brock Chisholm and William Line had relatively little impact on the development of a uniquely Canadian social psychology. In fact, the possibility that appears closest to the social psychology that was voiced by Chisholm and Line during this early period was what later developed into a Canadian community psychology (Babarik, 1979; Walsh-Bowers, 1999). Although community psychology did not formally emerge as a sub-discipline in Canada until the 1980s, it had substantial roots in the work undertaken by both Line and Chisholm in the 1930s and 1940s (Babarik, 1979; Wash-Bowers, 1988; 1999). Line, in fact, used the term 'community psychology' in a 1951 Report on psychology (Line, 1951; Babarik, 1979). In defining the contemporary field of community psychology, Walsh-Bowers has argued:

Community psychology, in my view, is the applied sub discipline that is explicitly oriented to developing psychological theory, values, and research

methods and to creating innovating social interventions, all for the purposes of: preventing social, economic, health, and mental health problems; improving the quality of life and well-being, particularly for marginalized groups; and building the sense and reality of community and empowerment (1999, p. 280).

From this definition, the similarity of community psychology to Chisholm and Line's ideas becomes apparent. As well, this definition is compatible with what many American social psychologists, involved in SPSSI were advocating. However, in both countries much of the interest for a community based and a socially responsible social psychology began to dissipate by the 1950s. Saxton (1995) noted, for example, that both Chisholm and Sullivan had experienced frustration in regard to the overall lack of attention that their ideas received at the international level, reporting that it took a lot of effort on Chisholm and Sullivan's part to have the WHO vote world mental health "even a low priority" (Saxton, 1995, p. 27). Perhaps it was, as Saxton indicated, due to the fact that such ideas "often tended to be more moralistic than scientific in outlook" (p. 28). Certainly, Chisholm and Line's ideas did not easily translate into a theory or a set of investigative practices that could be taken up by those in a position to create a sub-field of social psychology. Therefore, while these ideas resonated with the goals of organizations such as SPSSI, in reality social psychology was going in another direction in the development of psychology departments in Canada, as concerns for methodological rigor increased in psychology generally.

J. D. Ketchum

While an action-oriented community based psychology was highlighted through the post-war work of Chisholm and Line, there was also an interest among some Canadian psychologists concerning how such a social psychology could become a part of the academic curriculum in Canada. One of the academics who grappled with questions of defining social psychology was J.D. Ketchum. As an early voice for, and another insider to, Canadian psychology, Ketchum consistently reported on, and drew attention to, the developing state of social psychology throughout the post-war era. His work illustrates how the possibility for a community oriented, Canadian focused, social psychology took shape at the academic level. As will be seen, this possibility was short lived and was lost by the 1950s, leading social psychologists such as Ketchum to look for other possibilities for the development of an academic Canadian social psychology.

J.D. Ketchum was born in 1893 in Cobourg, Ontario (Hebb, 1965). Originally a music student, he studied at the University of Toronto, leaving Toronto in 1912 to further his studies in London and Germany (Hebb, 1965). In Europe in 1914, and at the outbreak of World War I, Ketchum was interned at the Ruhleben Prison Camp in Germany, where he and four thousand other prisoners stayed until 1918. This experience turned his interests towards psychology, and particularly towards social psychology (Ketchum, 1965).

Following the war Ketchum studied psychology and sociology at the University of Toronto, as well as at the University of Chicago (Wright and Myers, 1995). While his experience in Ruhleben aroused his interest in the social, it was likely the University of Chicago that further developed these interests, as it “dominated American sociology throughout the 1920s and 1930s” (Collier et al., 1991, p. 37) and was considered to be *the*

primary centre for sociological research⁴. Much of the emphasis at Chicago during this period focused on the social environment, and how the environment influenced human development (Farr, 1996) - ideas emphasized in Ketchum's own work.

While Canadian psychology itself was just in its beginning stages entering the Second World War, Ketchum had already formed a clear conception of what he believed the field of social psychology should encompass. For example, at a 1938 lecture, he stated:

The Social Psychologist is primarily concerned with the relations between individuals, and these relations upon personality and conduct. He is particularly interested in the group affiliations of the individual; the number and nature of the groups to which a person belongs, and the way in which he "fits into" these groups... (1938, p. 1).

Throughout his work Ketchum emphasized the importance of social psychology becoming a knowledge base for psychology in general, and for the social sciences as a whole. As he explained:

[s]ocial psychology should be to the social sciences what physics is to the natural sciences –not a substitute for their own types of analysis, but a solid basis of knowledge about the social activity and experience of the human being, a reliable doctrine of social man (1953, p. 1).

In examining the academic development of Canadian social psychology during the 1940s, there are three of Ketchum's papers that are of particular interest, as they illustrate the state of social psychology in Canada, and the possibilities for a community-based and

⁴ In 1927 Ketchum made a trip to the University of Chicago under the auspices of the Toronto Mental Hygiene Research Committee (Ketchum, 1927). Reporting on this trip Ketchum explained the impact that the Chicago School had on his thinking, stating: "[t]his visit came for me at a very opportune moment. In trying to expand my conception of the psychological individual far enough to explain social phenomena of

internationally focused, Canadian social psychology. The first paper was a speech delivered by Ketchum at the 1947 annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association. Here Ketchum examined the state of social psychology in Canada, focusing on a survey that he and a colleague had completed in 1939. According to Ketchum, this early study found Canadian social psychology to be lacking in both content, as well as direction stating: “[i]n 1939 Professor N.W. Morton and I compiled a bibliography of Canadian psychological research, and the social section of it is depressing reading” (1947b, p. 105). Ketchum also expressed concern regarding the “appallingly miscellaneous character” (p. 106) of the studies being produced, and noted the “apparent lack of any major problems on which social psychology might focus” (p. 106). He viewed the state of American social psychology as similar, but indicated that the situation was more serious for Canadians, as they lacked the resources of their American neighbours. Ketchum was likely referring to academic appointments, post-war funding, and support for graduate students, among other aspects of a disciplinary infrastructure; however, this is not stated explicitly in his writings.

Ketchum reiterated his concerns for post-war social psychology, in the second paper of interest, titled *Psychology and the Canadian Social Science Research Council* (1947a). In this paper Ketchum presented an overview of post-war Canadian psychology. In examining the field of social psychology in particular, he reported: “there has never been much research in social psychology in Canada” (p. 14).

The third paper of Ketchum’s which is of interest to this essay, is a 1948 report on social psychology, which was prepared for *The Canadian Journal of Psychology*.

various sorts I had got into considerable confusion of mind. Much of that has now disappeared, thanks to the new emphasis which struck me continually at Chicago” (1927, p. 12).

Beginning with the statement: “[w]e are not producing researchers in Social Psychology” (p. 14) Ketchum again highlighted a lack of progress, noting social psychology to be weak in comparison to the other fields. He sighted a lack of structure, interested individuals, and relevant topics. Indeed, a close examination of the early issues of the *Bulletin of the Canadian Psychological Association* (1940 through 1944) (later known as the *Canadian Journal of Psychology*) verifies Ketchum’s position. While fields like physiological, animal, and clinical psychology were making progress, social psychology remained behind.

Ketchum’s work illustrates that although there were avenues open to it, Canadian social psychology was lacking in its development during the 1940s. This is not surprising given that psychology in general had just established itself in World War II. It appears, however, that there was more than a time factor involved in this stunted growth.

According to Ketchum, this lack of progress was linked to problems with University psychology programs. In particular, he noted three main problems. First, Ketchum believed that research in social psychology was more difficult to carry out than research in other fields of psychology. He noted that while the other fields tended to rely on statistics and laboratory studies involving animals, that social psychological research lacked comparatively well-defined concepts and techniques. The second problem with University programs, according to Ketchum, was that the undergraduate classes often concentrated on social psychological theories while failing to approach social psychology as an empirical discipline. Ketchum believed that this misrepresentation on the part of the universities lead to the belief that little skill was involved in social psychology, while also improperly preparing students with the knowledge necessary for performing

research. Finally, Ketchum criticized university graduate programs for their part in stunting the growth of Canadian social psychology. He believed that social psychology was often overlooked in favour of other fields which had better defined concepts, techniques, and job prospects. Ketchum further indicated that many graduate students were overwhelmed by the complexity of social problems studied, and that social psychology's contact with other disciplines, such as anthropology and sociology, led students to question whether social psychology had a unique perspective to offer to the social sciences. He noted the most significant problem with graduate programs to be, however, the lack of social psychological research performed by the university teaching staff.

In light of the state of social psychology, Ketchum suggested two possibilities for consideration for social psychological research. The first possibility, according to Ketchum, was for social psychologists to focus on *uniquely Canadian* social problems. He cited several examples such as French-English relations, issues concerning Native Canadians, Canadian political behaviour and public opinion, and the effects of social change on the Canadian family (Ketchum, 1947b).⁵ It is interesting to note that at this time lists began to appear outlining uniquely Canadian cultural issues amenable to psychological investigation. It appears that Ketchum believed that addressing these Canadian issues would help to establish Canadian psychology, while balancing it with developments in American psychology. For example, he noted that:

We have among our twelve million population as many ethnic and cultural sub-groups as there are in the United States, but one looks almost in vain for

⁵ These themes highlighted by Ketchum reflected similar concerns to those voiced by Bernhardt in his Presidential address to the Canadian Psychological Association that same year.

psychological studies of their capacities, their attitudes, or the particular pressures and tensions to which they are exposed (1947b, p. 106).

By addressing these issues Ketchum believed that Canadian psychologists would find “limitless possibilities for research in social psychology” (Ketchum, 1947b), and like Chisholm and Line, he called on the other social sciences to join in the efforts (1947b).

The second possible direction for social psychological research according to Ketchum, was for a social psychology with a more universal focus. This type of research would examine international rather than local issues, and was seen by Ketchum as “broader and more fundamental” (Ketchum, 1947b, p.107). Ketchum stated that such a possibility had been shaped by Brock Chisholm, and represented a perfect example of what Canadian social psychologists should be exploring:

Last year a distinguished Canadian, Dr. G. Brock Chisholm, aroused warm discussion by his provocative observations on man’s chances of surviving even a few years longer on this planet...What Dr. Chisholm actually did for social psychologists, it seems to me, was to tell us what we should be working at, to make clear to us what are the fundamental questions which we have to answer (1947, p. 108).

This second recommendation is particularly interesting, especially as it highlighted the possibilities for the development of an international, and community-based social psychology - one focused on social action, social responsibility, and community involvement, although for Ketchum, one based within the academic environment.

It appears that it was this second approach to social psychology that Ketchum embraced. In fact, throughout the immediate post-war era, Ketchum’s work was similar

to the social psychology advocated by Chisholm and Line. For example, throughout the 1930s and 1940s Ketchum was focused on the study of groups, and was interested in the dynamics involved in conflicts, crime, delinquency, etc. He was also interested in socialization, and in a 1940 lecture to the Girl Guides, he echoed sentiments similar to Chisholm's when he stated:

[b]y socialization I mean that he is fit to live in society because he has learned the rules of the game; not only learned them in the sense of memorizing them, but made them a part of himself so that he can be trusted to play the game wherever he is put. And by security I mean the feeling of belonging, of being part of something that matters, of having a part to play and knowing how to play it (1940, p. 2).

This emphasizes on 'the group' as a desirable approach to Canadian social psychology was not unusual, as during this period many social psychologists were interested in studying small groups (Collier, et al., 1991). As Collier, et al. explained, many psychologists had turned their interests away from the study of 'the individual' that had characterized the 1920s, towards the study of groups and group processes. This change was a reflection of the social environment of the 1930s, which had seen the development of the Depression and other social problems (Collier, et al., 1991).

Although Ketchum proposed two possibilities for the development of social psychology, both of these avenues represented opportunities for the development of a uniquely Canadian social psychology. A Canadian focus was of utmost importance to Ketchum. As he wrote in 1947:

But on the basis of my experience in the [Canadian Social Science Research] Council I would suggest that the social *significance* of the study, i.e. its relevance to some real social problem (and particularly to a Canadian problem) will be more important than the mere fact that it deals with social behavior (1947b, p. 15).

Had social psychology 'picked up' either of the possibilities voiced by Ketchum, a uniquely Canadian social psychology may have developed. This, however, did not happen, as an undercurrent of change was occurring in Canadian psychology. As a result, the type of social psychology that had been advocated by Chisholm and Line began to dissipate.

An examination of Ketchum's work in the 1950s again indicates a lack of development in social psychology within the universities. For example, in a 1953 lecture to a School of Social Work, Ketchum told his audience that while social psychology should be providing a solid knowledge base for psychology in general, this was not a role that it was fulfilling (Ketchum, 1953). In response to this lack of development Ketchum again attempted to spur research by suggesting three possibilities for the development of social psychology: perception and cognitive processes, a Gestalt approach, and phenomenology.

In Ketchum's 1951 Presidential Address to the Canadian Psychological Association, he touted the move towards perception and cognitive processes, stating that this path would not only improve the situation for psychology in general, but would also improve the situation for social psychology in particular:

A cognitively centred psychology will not solve all our problems - there is no danger of working ourselves out of jobs - but it will finally put social psychology in a position to co-operate effectively with the other social sciences without being false to psychological principles. For, whatever one's theoretical standpoint, the fact remains that it is in cognitive experience, not in the realm of needs and drives, that self and other, individual and social, are bound together in a single framework. And that is the obvious attack on all our practical problems, psychological as well as social (1951, p. 98).

Ketchum believed that a focus on organization, perception, learning and personality, would lead psychologists to an interest in the social contexts involved in human development. He felt that social psychology would benefit from this approach as psychologists could turn their interests to studying topics such as social organization, multiple group identities, and multiple group conflicts. In prescribing such an approach, Ketchum aimed to move social psychology beyond the predominant focus on behaviourism that had been popular throughout the 1930s and 1940s. This was likely a reflection of the 'cognitive revolution' of the late 1950s and early 1960s which resulted in an increased interest in topics such as attitudes, cognitive consistency, and social-learning theories (Collier, et al., 1991).

The second possible direction for Canadian social psychology noted by Ketchum in the 1950s was a "Gestalt emphasis on structure or relationship" (Ketchum, 1953, p. 6). As Collier, et al. (1991) explained: "Gestalt psychology focused on perception and stressed the fact that perception tends to be organized in terms of basic principles of form and closure" (p. 129). Gestalt theory focused on psychological events as a part of a larger

system, using them to infer human behaviour (Collier, et al., 1991) while taking into consideration the social environment. In support of this framework Ketchum argued:

...we have at least the possibility of a social psychology which will do justice to man's intellectual abilities, his ability to perceive relationships, to his objective, non ego-centred interest in his surroundings, to his own ends, and to his devotion to such values as justice, truthfulness, trust, co-operation, which represent some of the norms by which he judges the structure of a given social structure (1953,p. 6).

Ketchum argued that such a theoretical framework would allow for a focus on the social environment.

The final suggestion made by Ketchum concerned phenomenology, a method that he believed best suited social psychological research. As Collier, et al., (1991) explained: "Phenomenology is not a social theory but a technique for describing the contents of immediate experience in as much detail as possible" (p. 279). This method was believed to imply a quality of clarity and purity without theoretical bias (Collier, et al., 1991), and was no doubt, Ketchum's response to the emerging emphasis in psychology on experimental methodology.

It can be seen that Ketchum's ideas for Canadian social psychology in the 1950s had changed from those in the 1940s. While his proposed directions continued to highlight ways in which to study 'the social', the cultural/Canadian context was lessened, while the focus on an international social psychology was completely absent.

Primarily, what can be seen in Ketchum's work is a shift from his early sociological social psychological leanings that dominated the 1940s, to a psychological social

psychological perspective that dominated the 1950s. This shift reflected the growing distinction between psychological social psychology and sociological social psychology that was taking place in the 1950s. During this period the separation of the two disciplines was reflected in the production of textbooks, development of methods, and levels of investigation. Collier, et al. (1991), for example, have documented this separation by examining the number of textbooks produced in psychological versus sociological social psychology (see Table 1).

Table 1.

Production of Psychological Versus Sociological, Social Psychology Textbooks

<u>Period</u>	<u>Psychologists</u>	<u>Sociologists</u>
1908-1929	7	8
1930-1942	9	7
1948-1953	10	3
1960s	12	3
1970s	30	8
1980s	21	11

Note. *From Currents of Thought in American Social Psychology* (p. 6). By, G. Collier, H.L. Minton, and G. Reynolds, 1991, New York: Oxford University Press.

As can be seen, during the period 1948 to 1953 psychology textbooks rapidly began to outnumber sociology textbooks, a trend that continued throughout the next thirty or so years, in part, illustrating the expansion of psychological social psychology. In the course of other post-war developments in the two fields, psychological social psychology began to rely primarily on experimental methodologies, while sociological social

psychology relied on such non-experimental methodologies as participant observation, interviews and surveys (Collier, et al., 1991). Furthermore, while psychological social psychology focused primarily on individuals, sociological social psychology emphasized groups, and the social environment (Collier, et al., 1991) - themes commonly seen in Ketchum's earlier work. While these differences reflected a part of the reason for Ketchum's change in focus during the 1950s, other factors were likely involved.

Over the years it appears that Ketchum may have realized that the problems facing the academic development of social psychology were much more deeply rooted in definitions of 'the social', and in methodology, than he had originally thought. Additionally, it appears that he also began to realize that the sources of social psychology's difficulties might not have been what he had earlier suggested. Rather, during the 1950s Ketchum began to argue that the problems facing social psychology were connected to the *relationship* between social psychology and the more dominant fields of psychology, as opposed to their place within the department. According to Ketchum the main problem was the role that social psychology played within the larger scope of Canadian psychology. In a 1956 lecture at the University of Western Ontario, Ketchum criticized social psychology's position stating "social psychology... has always been a dependent variable, slowly, but directly, responsive to every change in psychology" (p. 3). He noted two main problems that resulted from this relationship.

The first problem, according to Ketchum, was that the dominant fields of psychology tended to work within theoretical frameworks that did not suit social psychology. He noted two main frameworks: the biological and the Freudian. Ketchum argued that while the biological framework focused solely on the biological needs of humans, ignoring

such concepts as rationality and thinking, the Freudian framework focused primarily on human motives, denying rational cognitive processes. Both frameworks left little room for the examination of the social.

The second problem facing social psychology, according to Ketchum, was the methodology of the dominant fields of psychology. In particular, Ketchum was concerned with the post-war shift in Canada to the use of more experimental methodologies, a shift earlier seen in American psychology (Collier, et al., 1991; Wright and Myers, 1995; Danziger, 1992). While Ketchum believed that social psychologists could work within this framework, he emphasized that the field would benefit by stepping outside of this milieu. Ketchum did not believe that the experimental approach was the best way for social psychologists to perform their research, and he sighted the emphasis on this approach as one of the primary factors contributing to Canadian social psychology's lack of development. In a 1955 lecture to the Ontario Psychological Association titled *Psychology Versus Man*, Ketchum questioned this methodology, stating:

It is rather late for me to become an expert on mediaeval costume, so I shall probably continue to call myself a psychologist. But during the years that remain to me I shall be trying, ineffectively, no doubt, to instil (sic) in my students a deeply sceptical (sic) and questioning attitude with respect to the most popular assumptions of North American psychology, the meaning of experiments based on them, and the empirical generalizations drawn from them (p. 91).

These methodological changes were hitting ‘close to home’ for Ketchum, as the psychology department at the University of Toronto was moving towards an experimental paradigm during this period. According to Wright and Myers (1995), during the early to mid 1950s the department at Toronto “was scientifically ‘invisible’” (p. 91), and when Myers became the chair in 1965 he “made [it] his primary goal to recruit scientists who would make the Department visible” (Wright and Myers, 1995, p. 91). Myers hired Endel Tulving and Richard Walters, among others, in his desire to bring scientific focus and respectability to the department (Wright and Myers, 1995).

However, it should be noted, that the idea that ‘nothing was going on’ in Toronto and that the department of psychology was, consequently, scientifically invisible has been challenged by Pols (1999a). Pols, noted, for example, that between the years 1915 and 1956, “psychologists at the University of Toronto...were not particularly enthralled with laboratory-based research...[however] they, and following their lead, many Canadian psychologists, developed methodologies and research strategies for work in the field, most notably in public schools” (p. 3). This re-analysis illustrates how redefining psychological work (i.e. looking beyond experimentation) can create new histories and levels of investigation (Lubek and Apfelbaum, 2000).

During the 1950s experimental social psychology was equated with laboratory research, and Ketchum was not convinced that this had much to offer social psychologists who were often interested in studying human behaviour in its social context. He argued that the predominant methods of experimental psychology inevitably “*must* lead to a psychology of abstract processes, a psychology with man left out” (Ketchum, 1955, p.

101). Experimental psychology did not provide the means to tap into the complexity of human behaviour (Ketchum, 1955).

Given the experimental developments in U.S. social psychology, one may question why Ketchum did not believe that the experimental study of groups, such as that being promoted by the Research Center for Group Dynamics (RCGD) with which Lewin was associated, was a good direction for Canadian social psychologists to pursue.

Interestingly, this may have allowed for the study of social problems such as those advocated by Chisholm and Line, to come into the laboratory, and into the academic setting. The answer to this may lie in a 1950 report written by J.D Ketchum and Neil Agnew regarding a Group Dynamics Conference that took place March 23-26, 1950, at the University of Michigan. It appears that Ketchum attended the proceedings, but was not convinced of the direction with which the group was taking social psychology. For example, it was reported:

This was not, as I had anticipated, a meeting of all interested in the psychological study of groups; Chapple, Cattell and Bronfenbrenner, for example were not there. It was rather a gathering of those interested in "group dynamics," and this turned out to mean those who had already been in contact with the Lewinian group...Apart from Bales and Riecken of Harvard, Goodwin Watson of Columbia and Ketchum of Toronto, all participants may be said to have represented the RCGD viewpoint. The meeting was in some sense a 'home-coming' of the clan (1950, p. 1).

Ketchum and Agnew also observed the contrast of the Research Center for Group Dynamics with other interdisciplinary centres where social psychology existed alongside sociology, anthropology and psychoanalysis:

RCGD thus presents a sharp contrast to the kind of “human relations” establishments set up at Yale, Harvard and elsewhere. Instead of a collective attack by psychologists, sociologists and anthropologists of varying theoretical predilections, we have a corps of psychologists at work, and psychologists of only one stripe. They have, of course, many contacts with workers in related disciplines, but it was interesting to have three days’ discussion of social psychology without ever hearing the word “culture” (1950, p. 4).

While Ketchum may have entered the conference with an interest in the Research Center for Group Dynamics, he left convinced that this was not the right direction for Canadian social psychology. However, rather than trying to find another way in which to promote the study of groups, he sought alternative ways in which to study ‘the social’.

Again, in addressing the problems facing social psychology, Ketchum noted that social psychologists had two options: they could either accept their role as the ‘dependent variable’ and “try desperately to keep up with present trends” (Ketchum, 1956, p. 9), or they could accept a much more challenging role by asserting “theoretical independence” (Ketchum, 1956, p. 9). It was the latter way, according to Ketchum, that would lead social psychology out of the background and into the forefront, as a leader of the discipline. As will be seen in the next chapter, however, this was a difficult task to carry out as there were changes on the horizon for Canadian psychology. A focus on research

would soon take hold, and ideas that did not easily translate into investigative practices were left behind.

Chapter 5:

Social Psychology in the Context of the MacLeod Report and Subsequent Conference Proceedings

While it is clear from the foregoing that Chisholm, Line and Ketchum all promoted their own 'brand' of psychology dealing with social concerns, none of these directions came to define Canadian social psychology. Rather, it was a series of internal and external events during the 1950s and 1960s that had the greater influence and ultimately shaped the discipline. This chapter will examine the MacLeod Report, the Opinicon and Couchiching Conferences, and the expansion of Canadian universities. While these cornerstone documents and events have been examined in the past (Liddy, 1955; Wright & Myers, 1995; Cherry, 1999), what has not been examined are the implications that these events held for the development of Canadian social psychology. As will be illustrated, these were a series of occurrences that moved Canadian social psychology towards the U.S. model.

As already described, as a result of the two World Wars, American social psychology flourished as an experimental discipline, while the action-oriented model was largely abandoned. As Collier et al. (1992) noted:

...by the early 1940s experimental social psychology had moved into the forefront within social psychology, and it now dominated the study of both individuals and groups. While the number of active researchers was relatively small compared with the post-World War II period, the foundation for a social psychology based predominately on experimental procedures was already laid (p. 141).

Danziger (1992) noted that Kurt Lewin had helped to transform social psychology into an experimental discipline. However, the U.S. paradigm for experimentation was ultimately not Lewinian, but rather a paradigm that stressed relationships between independent and dependent variables requiring statistical analysis, the measurement of behaviour, and highly stylized laboratory scenarios (Danziger, 2000). U.S. social psychologists had limited their research to topics that could be studied experimentally, narrowing their field and “leading to a significant restriction of social-psychological research” (Collier, et al, 1991, p. 188).

Unlike the U.S., Canadian psychology had not yet coalesced around specific methods and topics. This is not a surprising finding however, as the 1950s turned out to be an important time in deciding the overall direction that Canadian psychology in general would take. In fact, the 1950s have been referred to in Canadian Psychology as “The Frustrating Fifties” (Williams, 1992), as it was during this period that the discipline experienced some of its greatest conflicts and divisions. As Williams (1992) noted:

By the mid-fifties, Canadian psychology had demonstrated its utility in helping to cope with the desperate demands of war and was extending these achievements into a world at peace. It had, however, also begun to realize that these successes had been achieved at the price of being unprepared academically, theoretically and experimentally for the emergence of psychology as a full-fledged scientific discipline. (p. 709).

During this period one of the major debates occurring within Canadian psychology surrounded whether psychology should be an applied or an academic discipline.

The MacLeod Report

In direct response to these underlying issues, in the early 1950s the Canadian Social Science Research Council (CSSRC) offered to support a study of psychology in Canadian Universities, in order to obtain a better understanding of the state of psychology in post-war Canada. R.B. MacLeod of Cornell University was asked to undertake the survey. MacLeod, who was the former chair of the psychology department at McGill University, seemed to be the perfect choice for this project as he was Canadian, yet was seen to be objective as he was no longer affiliated with a Canadian institution (MacLeod, 1955).

In 1951, MacLeod set out to survey academic psychology in various Canadian Universities and Colleges (MacLeod, 1955). He conducted this research through direct contact with these institutions, interviewing members of the administration, Deans, faculty members, and students. He sought to understand how psychology was taught as a subject, what facilities were available, and how individuals outside of the discipline saw psychology, among other issues. In this report MacLeod argued for more attention to basic science and less attention to professionalization, and he highlighted the importance of doing so without losing focus on issues of Canadian relevance, and the strengths of the liberal arts curriculum. For social psychology in the 1950s, this would work against an applied or community based field, in favour of a laboratory experimental social psychology with more specialized curriculum.

MacLeod was critical of the “premature professionalization” (1955, p. 53) of Canadian psychologists and was worried about the extent of American influence on Canadian institutions of higher learning. He argued that Canadian psychologists were not “fully exploiting the resources of their country” (1955, p. 54), and that “the peculiarly Canadian

phenomena that invite psychological investigation have been barely touched” (1955, p. 55). According to MacLeod, Canadian psychologists needed to take advantage of their multicultural issues, and he suggested four research areas: bilingualism, the assimilation of new groups, ‘sequestered communities’, and the far north. In addressing these areas, MacLeod emphasized the potential for the development of a social psychology that would reflect the diversity of Canada, while introducing a Canadian context to the discipline. He put the responsibility of developing a unique discipline into the hands of social psychologists stating: “[t]hese examples are largely social-psychological, and one feels that Canada’s most insistent challenge may be to the social psychologist” (1955, p. 56). In doing so, MacLeod echoed sentiments similar to those voiced by Bernhardt (1947) and Ketchum (1947b; 1948), indicating that there was still a vision for the development of a uniquely Canadian discipline, and a uniquely Canadian social psychology.

For MacLeod, the Canadian liberal arts tradition was one element of Canadian education that distinguished it from American education, and while he touted a focus on science, he was concerned about the possible loss of the tradition through the building of a scientific discipline. Many Canadians saw the liberal arts tradition as a part of their heritage, and as a unique part of their educational system (Emberley and Newell, 1994; McKillop, 1994). In emphasizing the importance of a liberal arts education, MacLeod urged psychology instructors to “rethink the role of psychology in liberal education, reconsider the content of their courses in light of their conclusions, and open their minds to the possibility of radical curricular revisions” (1955, p. 62).

In concluding his report, MacLeod highlighted both positive and negative aspects of Canadian psychology. On the positive side he noted that Canadian psychology had come into its own, that psychologists were making significant contributions to their science, that psychological work was beginning to be appreciated, that Canadian cultures were working together, and that applied psychology was making great strides. On the negative side, he noted the confused nature of the subject matter, the preoccupation with professional psychology, the under-equipped departments, and the Americanization of the discipline. In response to these concerns he made several recommendations, including that chairs of departments fight for more money for salaries and research, that Canadian psychologists pursue research and build a scientific discipline, and that a small group of Canadian psychologists get together to discuss the future of Canadian psychology.

MacLeod's survey was an important step in organizing Canadian psychology, and it represented "the first opportunity Canadian psychologists at large ever had to gain an overall view of what was really going on in their field" (Belanger, 1992, p. 710). Furthermore, it challenged psychologists, particularly social psychologists to work on content and topics that were important to Canadians. While this report had a great effect on Canadian psychology, as will be illustrated, not all aspects of MacLeod's observations and recommendations were picked up, particularly his vision for the development of a uniquely Canadian social psychology.

The Canadian Conferences

MacLeod's report called for the need to focus, organize, and develop the discipline, and during the 1960s the Canadian Psychological Association organized two conferences

to address these areas. Given that the tension between applied and academic psychologists was growing (Canadian Psychological Association, 1971), it was hoped that these conferences would also result in a decision regarding whether Canadian psychology would take an applied or a research-oriented direction. The first conference, the Opinicon Conference, was organized in direct response to MacLeod's recommendation that a small group of Canadian psychologists meet to discuss the future of Canadian psychology (Bernhardt, 1961), while the second conference, the Couchiching Conference, was organized to address the perceived shortcomings of the first (Webster, 1967). Both conferences have held much historical significance in the development of Canadian psychology. As Wright and Myers (1995) explained, they "were important...because they were the first occasions when psychologists from all across Canada were given the opportunity to meet together to discuss the future of their science and profession" (p. 91).

The Opinicon Conference was held in Eastern Ontario, near Lake Opinicon, in the spring of 1960. While the Canadian Psychological Association organized the conference, the National Research Council of Canada, and the Canada Council provided the financial support. This support was provided, however, with the stipulation that the conference concentrate primarily on research and research training. This stipulation biased the proceedings at the outset (Bernhardt, 1961; Wright & Myers, 1995), and while the organizers of Opinicon would eventually oblige, it was not without discussion.

Although MacLeod (1955) had advocated a general meeting to discuss the future of Canadian psychology, diverse interpretations surfaced regarding the purpose of the

proposed conference. For example, on January 29, 1959 Dalbir Bindra wrote to members of the conference executive committee, Blatz, Turner, and Wake:

As you know, there is considerable difference of opinion between Roger Myers and Don Hebb both on the objectives of the conference and how the conference can best achieve them. For one thing, Roger Myers would like to see the conference prepare a blue print for the future of professional and academic psychology in Canada, while Don Hebb considers the main purpose of the conference to be promoting sound psychological research, though he sees no objection to those concerned with professional problems meeting at the same conference and discussing their problems among themselves and with the academicians. For another, Roger Myers thinks that the conference should not be filled with old-guard but should adequately represent (about 45 delegates) all segments of psychological interests in Canada, while Don Hebb thinks about 20-25 persons representing universities and other establishments where research is conducted (DRML, some hospitals, etc.) is all that is needed for a successful conference ("Letter to Blatz, Turner, and Wake. January 29", pp. 1-2).

It was only a few weeks later that Bindra wrote again, noting that the situation had grown more serious with diverse opinions becoming more obvious, to the point of threatening the proceedings. He noted that Hebb:

...feels that he would be unable to support our application in the NRC committee unless we can give him assurance (1) that the main purpose of the conference will be a discussion of means of improving the quality of and

extending psychological research in Canada, and (2) that the steering committee that selects the delegates would be made up mainly of persons actively engaged in research... *It is quite clear that these two conditions, if adhered to, would make the scope of the proposed conference much more restricted than was originally intended* [italics added] and was voted on by the membership of CPA at the Edmonton meeting. That meeting clearly asked for a Myersian rather than a Hebbian type conference (“Letter to Blatz, Turner, and Wake. February 9, 1959”, p. 1.).

After much correspondence and debate Reg Bromily reported to the Conference Steering Committee on May 5, 1959 that “[t]he Executive...in attempting to implement the members’ directive to hold a conference as soon as possible, accepted NRC and CSSRC support despite the limitations” (“First Letter to Steering Committee, May 5, 1959. National Archives of Canada, MG28I161, file 16-18, p. 1). This decision set forth the fate of Opinicon, restricting the general meeting to a narrowly defined research-oriented conference. It also highlighted the influence that some individuals, such as Hebb, had on the proceedings.

As a result, at Opinicon, participants turned their focus to research, training, and administrative problems, while also holding discussions concerning the role(s) of the psychologist (Bernhardt, 1961). Preliminary papers were written in advance of the conference, and were distributed to provide background material and information. In addition, sixty-four propositions regarding the future directions of Canadian psychology were put forward and voted on (Bernhardt, 1961), addressing the concerns which had been highlighted by the participants. While there was a brief focus on applied

psychology, this mainly concerned where it stood in relation to basic research. In addressing such issues, participants of Opinicon began to actively discuss and plan for the future of Canadian psychology. As Bernhardt (1961) described:

No verbal report could ever reflect adequately the “spirit” of Opinicon but all members felt that there was something real and important happening. Perhaps the nearest we can come to putting this into words is to say that there was a strong underlying current of agreement about the aims and goals of research and research training in psychology. But in this current of accord there were many ripples of difference of opinion about the means of attaining the objectives...it seemed to be universally implied that such differences were not only to be expected but to be desired (p. 13).

Bernhardt (1961) listed sixteen conclusions that were reached by Opinicon participants. The first two, however, represented the most important decisions, as they defined the key purpose and role of the psychologist. For example, the first conclusion stated that “[t]he primary responsibility of the psychologist is to contribute to the development, clarification and communication of the body of knowledge included in his science. That is, the psychologist is primarily a scientist” (Bernhardt, 1961, p. 75). The second conclusion followed, stating that the “secondary function of the psychologist ... is the use of the knowledge and insights accumulated, for the welfare of people. This is the professional role of the psychologist. It must be secondary but no less valuable or respectable” (p. 75). Bernhardt’s remaining conclusions stressed the importance of research and statistical training, and on the meaning of the term ‘psychologist’ (Bernhardt, 1961).

Similar to MacLeod's report there was at this conference some concern regarding whether psychology could be scientific and contribute to a liberal arts education. As Bernhardt (1961) described:

There were two conflicting trends in the discussions. One of these was the suggestion that the student entering a graduate programme in psychology should be so well grounded in psychology that there would be no need for further content courses. The other trend was to make sure that the undergraduate programme was broad and liberal even if it meant reducing the content of psychology. The latter seemed to have a stronger emphasis and in the consideration of statements formulated received a greater degree of approval (p. 28).

Nonetheless, the emphasis on science prevailed.

The groundwork laid at Opinicon represented the first significant steps that Canadian psychologists took towards the building of an academic and research oriented discipline, and this had defining effects. Myers indicated, for example, that Opinicon strengthened his "resolve to have the Department of Psychology at Toronto go 'scientific'" (Wright and Myers, 1995, p. 91). In laying this groundwork, however, the structure of Canadian psychology began to resemble that of American psychology. As Belanger (1992) explained:

Opinicon adopted the scientist professional model of practitioner which had been proposed at the APA sponsored conferences of Boulder and Chicago. Canadians again were following the American model (p. 711).

This movement towards the American model was not accidental but rather deliberate, and reflected a sense of acceptance on the part of Canadian psychologists. Bernhardt (1961) noted, for example, that the suggested readings for the conference included “the MacLeod report, reports of the various conferences of the American Psychological Association and about twenty-five articles which had appeared mainly in the *American Psychologist* and the *Canadian Psychologist*” (p. 9). It is clear that Canadian psychologists were looking to Americans for guidance during this period. Moreover, archival records reveal that as early as 1959 Canadian psychologists were consciously beginning to align themselves with the U.S.. For example, in a document written by Roger Myers and Reg Bromily, dated January 15 1959, Myers and Bromily wrote of the upcoming conference:

It is extremely important that the group be large enough to represent the diverse interests in psychology in Canada. In addition some U.S.A representation is desirable since they have had considerable experience with similar types of Conference [sic], and also, *whether we like it or not, development of psychology in Canada must be compatible with that in the U.S.A.* [italics added] (“The Future of Psychology in Canada”. National Archives of Canada. MG28I161, file 14-16, p. 1).

Indeed, there was a growing indifference on the part of Canadian psychologists regarding the development of a uniquely Canadian field.

In response to the lack of attention that was given to applied psychology at the Opinicon Conference, in 1965 the Couchiching Conference was organized. As Webster (1967) stated, “Opinicon provided no forum for professional psychologists and no

blueprint for professional training” (p.1). Not surprisingly, the Couchiching conference was “dominated by applied psychologists” (Wright & Myers, 1995, p. 92). Unlike the Opinicon Conference, no financial support for Couchiching came forward outside of the Canadian Psychological Association (Canadian Psychological Association [CPA], 1971; Wright and Myers, 1995) (although following the conference the Canada Council put forward some support to help with the preparation of the report (CPA, 1971).

The purpose of Couchiching was threefold: to define professional psychology, to examine professional training, and to examine ways in which to achieve these objectives (Webster, 1967). The majority of this conference examined such topics as the emerging roles of, and the training for, applied psychologists (Webster, 1967).

While Couchiching was focused on applied interests, it too served to further align Canadian psychology with U.S. models of research and practice (Belanger, 1992). Like participants of Opinicon, those at Couchiching adopted a research model, deciding that the professional psychologist “should receive his training within the scientist-professional model and should be a competent researcher” (Webster, 1967, p. 119). Again, science was the basis, while professional training was additional (Belanger, 1992).

While Opinicon and Couchiching were developed in response to the MacLeod report, these conferences appear to have overlooked part of MacLeod’s overall message regarding future developments for Canadian social psychology. While many may believe that it was MacLeod’s report that led Canadian psychology into the research focused discipline that is in place today, it was more accurately *the interpretation* of the report, particularly through the Opinicon and Couchiching conferences, that held the greater responsibility for this transformation. As Cherry (1999) noted “[t]he aftermath of the

MacLeod Report effectively steered Canadian psychology away from its unique multicultural outlook and history towards basic research in all areas of psychological practice..." (p. 103).

Returning to MacLeod's report, it can be seen that one of the recommendations made by MacLeod regarding the development of a conference was "that the agenda for this conference include, at least, the following topics...(h) the status and role of the research psychologist in the university, government, in industry and *in the community*" [italics added] (1955, p. 63). This focus on the community and on developing a 'social' psychology appears, however, to have gone unnoticed in the conferences, steering psychologists away from the opportunity to develop a uniquely Canadian perspective. By focusing primarily on MacLeod's emphasis on research, Opinicon and Couchiching moved Canadian psychology one step closer to the narrowly defined American model. Canadian social psychology would be more universal, and would be limited to research that contained variables that could be isolated and controlled (Danziger 1992). Danziger (1992) explained that in the U.S.:

[n]ot only did experimentally studied segments of social life have to be relatively brief, they also had to involve a rather direct form of social interaction. One could not experiment on the network of indirect effects to be found in complex social institutions, in markets, in cultural products (p. 314-315).

This situation was similar in Canada and as a result a focus on Canadian content was less likely. A laboratory science that was culture-free was moving in, and only those topics which could be grouped into independent and dependent variables would represent

'good' research. The broad ideas that had once been voiced by Chisholm, Line and to some extent Ketchum, would no longer fit into this social psychological framework.

These limits, however, were not immediately evident. As Cherry (1999) explained:

...for MacLeod, as for many others of his era, the proximity to U.S.-style methodology did not pose any special difficulties; the methods of science were regarded neither as historical nor cultural products in and of themselves (p. 103)

It is evident that at Opinicon and Couchiching ideas regarding the role of the Canadian psychologist were beginning to change. For example, Bernhardt (1961) noted that one of the decisions made at Opinicon was that "Psychologists should be scientists, scholars, and *socially responsible persons*" [Italics added] (p. 82). This social responsibility was, however, unlike the type of social responsibility that had been advocated by Line and Chisholm. Instead, a socially responsible psychologist was described as an individual who was "aware and concerned about the social consequences of his [sic] work" (Bernhardt, 1961, p. 83). Additionally, while applied psychology had shown an interest in social responsibility and community health in the immediate post-war period, by Couchiching, applied psychologists had turned their interests from healing society to healing individuals (Webster, 1967).⁶

It is also possible that the effects of McCarthyism were felt within Canadian psychology, as they had been in American psychology. Horn (1999) for example, noted that while the Cold War had less of an effect on Canadian universities than American

⁶ This was reflected in the expansion of clinical training programs in Canadian universities (Adair, 1981; Conway, 1984). As Conway (1984) noted: "[b]y 1969 there were 29 applied psychology graduate programmes in Canada and 17 of these were in clinical psychology" (p. 181).

universities, that it still cast its shadow over Canadian academics, cautioning them on their research:

A view of the Canadian universities during the Cold War pales in the glow of the McCarthyite blaze south of the border. This may foster the comforting belief that academic freedom was safer here than in the United States. Such a belief is almost certainly mistaken. To be sure, no witch-hunts by legislative committees took place in Canada, but smugness on this score is out of place. The absence of witch-hunts is evidence not of a higher degree of tolerance for communism in Canada and its universities, but of differences between the two North American societies (p. 217).

While a definite link has not been found between the Cold War and Canadian social psychology, it is possible that such an environment may have further convinced Canadian social psychologists to abandon interests in community-oriented research, instead tackling 'safer' topics, much like their American neighbours.

While the possibility for a uniquely Canadian social psychology had been emphasized in MacLeod's report, it can be seen that this possibility ended with Opinicon and Couchiching. Canadian psychologists were moving towards the "U.S. post-war professional developments of theoretical universalism and value-free methodology" (Cherry, 1999, p. 103).

The Expansion of Canadian Universities

While the decisions made at Opinicon and Couchiching defined the direction that Canadian psychology and social psychology would take, it is also important to consider the changes taking place in the universities during this period. During the 1950s and

1960s, Canadian Universities experienced a great expansion due to increased enrollments. According to Wright and Myers (1995), there were three factors responsible for this expansion. First, was the flood of war veterans who entered the Universities immediately following the Second World War, second was the baby boom of the 1950s, and third was the prosperous post-war economy that saw increased immigration and the desire of many immigrants to see their children receive a good education (Wright and Myers, 1995).

While this post-war boom affected all disciplines, psychology was especially affected (Wright and Myers, 1995). Wright and Myers noted that this interest occurred at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, stating that “[i]n many places ‘Psychology’ became the largest department in the university” (p. 236). This expansion in Canadian psychology ultimately resulted in an increase of *money* and *people*; two factors that were strongly involved in the development of Canadian psychology during the 1960s (Wright, personal communication, February, 23, 2000).

Until the 1960s the majority of research funds made available for psychological research in Canada was provided by American sources (Wright and Myers, 1995). By the mid 1960s, however, American universities also experienced an increase in enrollment, and many American granting agencies began to limit their funding outside of the country (CPA, 1971; Wright and Myers, 1995). Consequently, Canadian psychologists experienced difficulties securing funding for their research (CPA, 1971). While Canadian funding was available through the National Research Council, the Canadian Defence Research Board, and the Canadian Department of National Health, this funding was minimal, and as a result “Canadian granting agencies were forced to

assume their responsibilities” (Wright and Myers, 1995, p. 236). By the mid 1960s, the National Research Council of Canada had substantially increased its funding to psychological research, while the Canada Council began to fund educational, child, and social research (Adair, 1981; Wright and Myers, 1995). Additionally, the Ontario Mental Health Foundation, and four American sources: the U.S. Public Health Service, U.S. Office of Education, U.S. Advanced Research Projects Administration, and the U.S. Office of Naval Research, also provided funding for research during this period (Appley and Rickwood, 1967).

With the expansion of psychology, Canadian departments lacked a sufficient number of qualified individuals. The style of experimentation that had taken hold in the U.S. was ready for importation and consequently, Canadian departments looked to the U.S. for assistance. As Wright reported in 1969:

During the present decade, when the number of graduate departments of psychology in Canada more than doubled, the country did not have sufficient persons with doctorates to develop its faculties. Hence, it was forced to rely on immigration to meet these needs. For psychology the best and most accessible academic market place was the United States (p. 242).

The effect was substantial to Canadian psychology, and by 1966 more than fifty percent of psychologists in Canada with Ph.D.’s were either Americans, or Canadians who had completed their education in the United States (Appley and Rickwood, 1967). This resulted in the direct importation of American style topics and social investigative practices into Canadian universities (Cherry, 1999). This solidified the ‘Canadian

transformation' and Canadian and American psychology became very much the same discipline.

Chapter 6:

Conclusion: Understanding the Importation of an American Social Psychology

It appears that J.D. Ketchum was right in his 1956 analysis that social psychology was a dependent variable, that is, highly responsive to the changes in psychology as a whole. Like Canadian psychology in general, with the expansion in the universities and the lack of trained individuals and structure, Canadian social psychologists readily imported American social psychologists, into the university, adopting both their topics and methods of study. This 'submission' (van Strien, 1997) to an American-style social psychology can be viewed a quiet surrender on the part of Canadian social psychologists who likely realized that the adoption of the American curriculum would be more fruitful to the field than the continuing search to develop something more uniquely Canadian. Canadian psychologists had been gradually moving closer to the U.S. model, and in the end acceptance of this model was not so much a choice, as it was an inevitability.

Although a focus on Canadian content was lost in social psychology, there was a profitability and advantage for Canadian social psychologists in orienting towards the U.S. model. Adopting this model was a practical solution for Canadian social psychologists who were facing pressures to meet the demands of the expanding, or, 'instant universities' (Wright and Myers, 1995). The adoption of American techniques provided structure to Canadian social psychology, and ensured that the field would develop in the scientific direction that had been endorsed at Opinicon and Couchiching.

Canadian social psychology modeled on U.S. practices took some time to flourish, however. For example, in a 1967 study of psychology in Canada (Appley and Rickwood, 1967), Kurt Danziger and Daniel Berlyne surveyed the state of social psychology.

According to their survey, in 1966 only 1.5% of Canadian psychologists identified themselves as social psychologists, a figure that was reportedly far below the 6% of self-identified American social psychologists. They further indicated that of this 1.5%, 78% were employed within the university, while noting that there were various obstacles facing social psychologists within that environment, such as an inadequacy of training (only 60% of social psychologists within the university setting had a doctorate), and a low level of financial support. Approximately 7% of research funds were allocated to social psychology; a small number when compared to the 18% that was provided to experimental psychology (Danziger and Berlyne, 1967).

Appley and Rickwood's 1967 report on the state of Canadian psychology confirms these observations, indicating that while topics such as group interaction, attitudes, and social perception were receiving moderate to little grant support, other areas such as leadership, public opinion, and role behaviour were receiving no support. Additionally, they noted that no area of social psychological research was receiving 'significant' grant support, defined as \$100,000 or more. (Appley and Rickwood, 1967). In fact, Mary Wright (1969) noted that the only consistent financial support provided for social psychology during this period came from the Canada Council. This support appeared to make a difference, as Wright further reported: "after only three years of support from the Canada Council, social psychology has already begun to show exciting growth" (p. 249). The extent of this growth is questionable, however, as Myers reported in 1970 that while funding "helped to make Canada a reasonably satisfactory place in which so-called 'experimental' psychologists can find support for their research"... "Social psychology, developmental psychology and industrial psychology ... are [all] relatively

weak in Canada because there has been no federal agency here (as there has been in the USA) that accepts national responsibility for their development” (p. 131). By 1971 the Canada Council was still the only government agency supporting social psychology in Canada (CPA, 1971). As Cherry (1999) noted “[u]nlike the U.S., until 1978 there was no Canadian national body that fostered the growth of social psychology through research funding” (p. 103).

Colonization as a framework for understanding Canadian social psychology

Some critical historians have found it useful to use the framework of global power structures and colonization to understand the processes surrounding the Americanization of psychology. Moghaddam, for example, studied the Americanization of psychology by looking at “the power structures of psychology communities at the global level” (Moghaddam, 1987, p. 912). He argued that there were three ‘power structures’. At the top was the ‘first world’, which consisted solely of the United States, and which had the greatest ability to export psychological knowledge to the other countries. The ‘second world’ was made up of other industrialized nations, such as Canada. While this world was influenced by the first world (e.g. United States), it had lesser abilities to export knowledge, and mainly influenced the ‘third world’. The ‘third world’ consisted of developing countries, was influenced by the first and second world, and had very limited abilities to develop and export its own knowledge. As Moghaddam (1987) argued:

the three worlds in which psychologists research and practice have markedly different capacities for producing and disseminating psychological knowledge, and for shaping modern psychology. The United States has grown to become the dominant “psychological superpower,” [i.e. dominant

exporter] although many ideas brought to fruition in the United States originated in the second and third worlds (p. 914).

According to Moghaddam the reason for these differences were largely due to an inequality in resources such as laboratories, research equipment, trained personnel, etc.

Pieter van Strien (1997) has also explored the dynamics involved in the Americanization of psychology, and has provided another analysis of these global power structures by examining the dynamic relationship between the Colonizer and the Colonized. According to van Strien, the Americanization of psychology can be seen as a form of 'scientific colonization', a term which he described as:

[the] intellectual domination of an existing culture by a foreign, more powerful culture. This domination is not meant here in the crude sense of an enforced suppression, but in the more subtle sense of a voluntary submission to a dominant culture (1997, p. 349).

He went on to note that this submission implied that:

The culture of the "colonizer" serves as a reference culture to the members of the "colony," whose own prior ideas are then looked upon askance; the upper layers of the "colony" learn the language of the "colonizer" and travel to get acquainted with the "master culture;" after some time there usually is a revolt against the "colonizer" and a de-colonization process sets in, but in such a way that much of the dominating culture is retained (1997, p. 349).

Many of the factors described by van Strien were experienced in post-war Canadian psychology, particularly during the 1950s and 1960s. During this period, Canadian psychologists struggled to build and define their discipline, and looked to the U.S. for

guidance (e.g. Myers & Bromily, 1959; Bernhardt, 1961). It is clear that U.S. psychologists did not step in and enforce their brand of psychology, rather it was Canadian psychologists themselves who gradually aligned themselves with the U.S. (e.g. through Opinicon and Couchiching), eventually importing U.S. personnel, topics, and methods.

This American colonization was not unique to Canadian psychology, but was also experienced in many European countries (van Strien, 1997). It was also experienced in other Canadian disciplines such as sociology (Liska, 1977; Hiller, 1980).

It would not be until the mid-1970s that Canadian social psychologists would begin to critically examine the lack of Canadian content within Canadian Social Psychology (Berry, 1974; Sadava, 1978)⁷. This period saw a heightened concern for Canadian sovereignty with the development of the “Commission on Canadian Studies” in 1972, which was established by the Association of Universities and Colleges to study and make recommendations on the state of Canadian studies and research at Canadian universities. With respect to psychology specifically, a symposium on “Teaching Social Psychology within the Canadian context” in 1978 (Cherry, 1999) reflected concerns regarding the American domination of Canadian social psychology. Reflecting on the state of social psychology in Canada, Berry concluded in 1974:

I think we may answer a clear “no” to “Is there a Canadian Psychology?”.

However, looking beyond the present state of affairs, I think different

answers may be given to further questions: “Could there be?” - “Yes”;

Should there be?” - “Yes, at least for some aspects of Social and Applied

⁷ It would be at this time that uniquely Canadian topics and research areas would surface in Canadian psychology. See, for example, Lambert and Lambert, 1964; and Gardner and Kalin, 1984.

Psychology”; “Will there be?” - “ I certainly hope so, but it is up to all of us” (p. 138).

Sadava (1978) highlighted similar concerns, noting the difficulties of teaching social psychology in Canadian classrooms. He indicated that students and instructors in the field often felt like outsiders given that “the vast majority of those who ‘do’ social psychology- formulate its theories, design its research and decide on funding, interests and priorities - are Americans” (p. 145). He noted that the predominance of American content made it difficult to teach a social psychology that was both useful and relevant to Canadian students, stating that the goal for Canadian social psychology would be to “begin to consider how to teach a social psychology in which we too are ‘insiders’” (Sadava, 1987, p. 150).

It is clear that issues concerning culture and nation have woven themselves through Canadian social psychology’s development. By examining these factors, a more critical historical account of Canadian social psychology has been developed, and while Rule and Wells (1981) noted that experimental social psychology “flourished” (p.69) in the 1970’s, what was missing from their report was a description of Canadian social psychology up to that point.

It can be seen that within the work of Chisholm, Line, Ketchum, and MacLeod possibilities for a different type of social psychology were voiced in the immediate post-World War II era. While such a social psychology would have focused on issues unique and important to Canadian culture and nation, this social psychology was ultimately abandoned in favour of the importation of the U.S. model. From this research, it is evident that the experimental social psychology of the 1970s was the product of the

narrowing interests of social psychologists from 'content' to 'methodology'. This focus on methodology began to dictate content, rather than content dictating methodology.

At the present time, there still nothing particularly Canadian about the social psychology studied and taught within Canada (Cherry, 1999). Despite the development of social psychology textbooks with Canadian content for Canadian students, the template follows American textbooks, and as Cherry (1999) noted, the field is still "experimentally derived and oriented around 'topics' and 'variables'" (p. 106). To go beyond this state of affairs, it might prove useful to return to Bernhardt's 1947 Presidential Address to the Canadian Psychological Association. Here he outlined a list of suggested topics for Canadian psychological research. Interestingly, one of the topics listed concerned "[p]roblems arising from Canada's relations with other nations, the United Nations, the British Empire, the *United States* [italics added] etc." (p. 57). The present research has begun to address these issues historically. However, more work remains to be done in furthering our understanding of how U.S. /Canada relations continue to shape the field of social psychology in Canada.

Archives Consulted

1. Archives of the Canadian Psychological Association. National Archives of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario.
2. Papers of Brock Chisholm. National Archives of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario.
3. Papers of Brock Chisholm. Archives for the History of Canadian Psychiatry and Mental Health, Queen Street Mental Health Centre, Toronto, Ontario.
4. Papers of J.D. Ketchum. University of Toronto Archives, Toronto, Ontario.
5. Papers of William Line. Archives for the History of Canadian Psychiatry and Mental Health, Queen Street Mental Health Centre, Toronto, Ontario.

Interviews

1. Dr. Jack Griffin, October, 1999.
2. Dr. Cyril Greenland, October, 1999.
3. Dr. Mary Wright, October, 1999.
4. Dr. Mary Wright, February, 2000.

References

Adair, J.G (1981). Canadian psychology as a profession and discipline: Developments, issues and trends in the seventies. *Canadian Psychology*, 22 (2), 163-172.

"Answers to some questions concerning the National Committee for Mental Hygiene (Canada)". (1947). Papers of the Canadian Psychological Association. MG 28 I161, Box 10, File 10-5. National Archives of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario.

Apfelbaum, E. (1992). Reflexions critiques et histoire. Critical reflections and history. *Canadian Psychology*, 33, (3), 529-539.

Appley, M.H., & Rickwood, J. (1967, September). *Psychology in Canada*. (Special study No.3). Ottawa: Science Secretariat, Privy Council Office.

Ash, M.G. (1983). The self-presentation of a discipline: History of psychology in the United States between pedagogy and scholarship. In Graham, L., Lepenies, W., & Weingart, P. *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*. Dordrecht, D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Axelrod, P. (1982). *Scholars and dollars: Politics, Economics, and the Universities of Ontario 1945-1980*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Babarik, P. (1976). Psychologists in Profile: William Line (1897-1964). *The Ontario Psychologist*, 8(5), 57-62.

Babarik, P. (1979). The buried Canadian roots of community psychology. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 7, 362-367.

Belanger, D. (1992). The structuring of Canadian psychology: Honni soit qui mal y pense! *Canadian Psychology*, 33, (3), 710-712.

Bernhardt, D. (1990). Blatz and Bernhardt: Reminiscences and Reflections. In R. Volpe, B. Flint & R. Fleming (Eds.), *Consciousness and Consequences: A Festschrift for W.E. Blatz*, pp. 173 - 187. Toronto: Heron Press.

Bernhardt, K.S. (1944). Annual Meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association. *Bulletin of the Canadian Psychological Association*, 4(2), 31-32.

Bernhardt, K.S. (1947). Canadian psychology - past, present and future. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 1 (2), 49-60.

Bernhardt, K.S. (Ed.) (1961). *Training for research in psychology: The Canadian Opinion conference*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Berry, J.W. (1974). Canadian psychology: Some social and applied emphases. *The Canadian Psychologist*, 15(2), 132-139.

Berry, R.G. (1988). Professional issues: A debtor to his profession. *Canadian Psychology*, 29(2), 174-186.

Biographical data: Dr. G. Brock Chisholm. (n.d). Finding Aid. National Archives of Canada, Ottawa, Ont.

Blair, W.R.N. (1966). In support. *The Canadian Psychologist*, 7a, (3), 185-196.

Canadian Psychological Association (1971). *The future of Canadian psychology: A report prepared by the Canadian Psychological Association for the Science Council of Canada*.

Cartwright, D. (1948). Social psychology in the United States during the second world war. *Human Relations*, 1, 333-352.

Cartwright, D. (1979). Contemporary social psychology in historical perspective. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 42 (1), 82-93.

Capshew, J.H. (1999). *Psychologists on the march: Science, practice, and professional Identity in America, 1929-1969*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cherry, F. (1999). Canadian social psychology: Fifty years of cross-border shopping. In W. Maiers, B. Bayer, B.D. Esgalhado, R. Jorna, & E. Schraube (Eds.), *Challenges to Theoretical Psychology* (pp. 100-108). North York, Canada: Captus University Publications.

Cherry, F. & Borshuk, C. (1998). Social action research and the Commission on Community Interrelations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54 (1), 119-142.

Chisholm, G.B. (1940). *A platoon commander's responsibility for the morale of his men*. Papers of Brock Chisholm. MG30, Box 56. National Archives of Canada, Ottawa, Ont.

Chisholm, G.B. (1946a). The re-establishment of peacetime society: The responsibility of psychiatry. *Psychiatry*, 9, 3-11.

Chisholm, G.B. (1946b). The re-establishment of peacetime society: The responsibility of psychiatrists. *Psychiatry*, 9, 12-20.

Chisholm, B. (1947). Changing sources of security. *Etc.*, 5 (1), 1-7.

Chisholm, B. (1948a). The future of psychiatry. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 104, 543-547.

Chisholm, G.B. (1948b). The individual's responsibility for world peace. *Bulletin of the Menniger Clinic*, 12, 73-80.

Chisholm, B. (1948c). A new look at Child Health. *The Child*, May 1948.

Chisholm, B. (1948d). Organization for world health. *Mental Hygiene*, 32, 364- 371.

Chisholm, B. (1949a). Health. In J.R. Rees (Ed.), *Modern Practice in Psychological Medicine* (pp. 1-9). London: Butterworth & Co. Ltd.

Chisholm, B. (1949b). Social responsibility. *Science*, 109, 27-30, & 43.

Chisholm, B. (1955). Mental health in our new kind of world. *Mental Hygiene*, XXXIX (4). 529-532.

- Chisholm, G.B. (1957a) *Prescription for survival*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Chisholm, B. (1958). *Can people learn to learn?: How to know each other*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Collier, G., Minton, H.L., Reynolds, G. (1991). *Currents of Thought in American Social Psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Danziger, K. (1992). The project of an experimental social psychology: Historical perspectives. *Science in Context*, 5 (2), 309-328.
- Danziger, K. (1994). Does the history of psychology have a future? *Theory and Psychology*, 4 (4), 467-484.
- Danziger, K. (2000). Making social psychology experimental: A conceptual history, 1920-1970. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 36 (4), 329-347.
- Danziger, K., Berlyne, D.E. (1967). Social and developmental psychology. In Appley, M.H., & Rickwood, J. *Psychology in Canada*. (Special study No.3). Ottawa: Science Secretariat, Privy Council Office.
- Department of External Affairs. (1977). *Canada and the United Nations 1945-1975*. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.
- Elms, A.C. (1975). The crises of confidence in social psychology. *American Psychologist*, 30 (9), 967-976.
- Emberley, P.C. & Newell, W. (1994). *Bankrupt education: The decline of liberal education in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- English, A. (1992). Canadian psychologists and the aerodrome of democracy. *Canadian Psychology*, 33, 663-674.
- Farr, R.M. (1996). *The roots of modern social psychology: 1872-1954*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ferguson, G.A. (1992). Psychology in Canada 1939-1945. *Canadian Psychology*, 33, 697-705.

- Gardner, R.C. & Kalin, R. (1981). *A Canadian social psychology of ethnic relations*. Toronto: Methuen
- Goodspeed, D.J. (1958). *A history of The Canadian Defence Research Board of Canada*. Ottawa: Queens Printer.
- Graumann, C.F. (1988). Introduction to a history of social psychology. In M. Hewstone, W. Stroebe, J.- P. Codol and G.M Stephenson (Eds.), *Introduction to social psychology: A European Perspective*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Griffin, J.D. (1964). I remember Bill.... *Canada's Mental Health*, XII, (4), 20-22.
- Griffin, J.D. (1989). *In search of sanity: A chronicle of the Canadian Mental Health Association 1918-1988*. London, Ontario: Third Eye.
- Griffin, J.D., Laycock, S.R., Line, W. (1940). *Mental hygiene: A manual for teachers*. New York: American Book Company.
- Henderson, D. (1970). *Will mankind listen: A tribute to Dr. Brock Chisholm*. Vancouver: Best-Printer Co. Ltd.
- Hebb, D.O. (1941). Proceedings of the first annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, McGill University, December 30 and 31, 1940. *Bulletin of the Canadian Psychological Association*, 1, 25-26.
- Hebb, D.O. (1965). John Davidson Ketchum: 1893-1962. In Ketchum, J.D. (1965). *Ruhleben: A prison camp society* (pp. 381-382). Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Herman, E. (1995). *The Romance of American Psychology: Political Culture in the Age of Experts*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Hilgard, E.R. (1987). *Psychology in America: A historical survey*. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Hilgard, E.R., Leary, D., & McGuire, G. (1991). The history of psychology: A survey and critical assessment. *Annual review of psychology*, 42, 79-107.
- Hiller, H.H. (1980). Paradigmatic shifts, indigenization, and the development of sociology in Canada. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 16(3), 263-274.

- Horn, M. (1999). *Academic freedom in Canada: A history*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hotta, M. (1993). The development of social psychology in Japan and its political context. *Societes Contemporaines*, 13, 113-119.
- Hunter, W.S. (1946). Psychology in the war. *The American Psychologist*, 1, 479-492.
- Irving, A. (1998). *Brock Chisholm: Doctor to the world*. Markham, Ontario: Fitzhenry & Whiteside.
- Jacobs, M.S. (1989). *American psychology in the quest for nuclear peace*. New York: Praeger.
- Johnson, B.T. & Nichols, D.R. (1998). Social psychologists' expertise in the public interest: Civilian morale research during World War II. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54 (1), 53-77.
- Jones, E.E. (1985a). Major developments in social psychology during the past five decades. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology*. 3rd edition New York: Random House.
- Jones, E.E. (1985b). History of social psychology. In G.A. Kimble & Schlesinger (Eds.), *Topics in the history of social psychology*. Hillside, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ketchum, J.D. (1927). *Journal and impressions of visit to Chicago Nov. 2nd to 8th*, 1927. Papers of J.D. Ketchum. B74-0072, Box 36. University of Toronto Archives, Toronto, Ont.
- Ketchum, J.D. (1938). *Social Psychology and the Camp*. Papers of J.D. Ketchum. B74-0073, Box 31. University of Toronto Archives, Toronto, Ont.
- Ketchum, J.D. (1939). *Y.W.C.A.* Papers of J.D. Ketchum. B74-0073, Box 31. University of Toronto Archives, Toronto, Ont.
- Ketchum, J.D. (1940). *Guides*. Papers of J.D. Ketchum. B74-0073, Box 31. University of Toronto Archives, Toronto, Ont.

Ketchum, J.D. (1947a). Psychology and the Canadian social science research council. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 1 (1), 14-16.

Ketchum, J.D. (1947b). Research objectives for social psychology. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 1 (3), 105-110.

Ketchum, J.D. (1948). II. Report on social psychology. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 2 (1), 14-15.

Ketchum, J.D. (1949). Meaning, motives and social organization. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 3 (4), 218-225.

Ketchum, J.D. (1951). Time, values, and social organization. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 5 (3), 97-109.

Ketchum, J.D. (1953). *Recent advances in social psychology*. Papers of J.D. Ketchum. B74-0072, Box 35. University of Toronto Archives, Toronto, Ont.

Ketchum, J.D. (1955). Psychology versus man. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 9 (2), 91-102.

Ketchum, J.D. (1956). *The prospects of social psychology*. Papers of J.D. Ketchum. B74-0072, Box 35. University of Toronto Archives, Toronto, Ont.

Ketchum, J.D. (1965). *Ruhleben: A prison camp society*. Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Ketchum, J.D. & Agnew, N. (1950). Work conference in group dynamics. Papers of J.D. Ketchum. B74-0072, Box 34. University of Toronto Archives, Toronto, Ont.

Lambert, W.W. & Lambert, W.E. (1964). *Social psychology*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

"Letter to Blatz, Turner, and Wake. January 29, 1959". Papers of the Canadian Psychological Association. MG28I161, Box 16, File 16-14. National Archives of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario.

"Letter to Blatz, Turner, and Wake. February 9, 1959". Papers of the Canadian Psychological Association. MG28I161, Box 16, File 16-14. National Archives of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario.

Lewin, K. (1943). Psychology and the process of group living. *Journal of Social Psychology, S.P.S.S.I. Bulletin, 17*, 113-131

Liddy, R.B. (1955). The MacLeod report on Canadian psychology. *Canadian Journal of Psychology, 9*(3), 144-148.

Line, W. (n.d). *Mental health in industry and industrial relations*. Papers of William Line. Box 1, File 3. Queen Street Mental Health Archives, Toronto, Ontario.

Line, W. (n.d). *The challenge of society to psychology*. Papers of William Line. Box 1, File 3. Queen Street Mental Health Archives, Toronto, Ontario.

Line, W. (1945). Psychology and social purpose. *Bulletin of the Canadian Psychological Association, 5*, 55-67.

Line, W. (1948). Mental hygiene in industry. *Psychiatry, 11*, 367-370.

Line, W. (1949). Anxiety and guilt in the modern community. *Psychiatry, 12*, 27-35.

Line, W. (1950a). Mental health and education. *Mental Health, vol. ix* (4), 92-93.

Line, W. (1950b). Mental health and John Doe. *The Bulletin of the World Federation for Mental Health, 2*(4), 43-48.

Line, W. (1951a). Human relations in industry - a systematic challenge. *The British Journal of Medical Psychology, vol. xxiv, part 1*, 42-48.

Line, W. (1951b). Psychology. *Royal Commission studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences*. Ottawa: King's Printer.

Line, W. & King, M.R. (1956). Cross-cultural research. *Journal of Educational Sociology, 29*(7), 281-291.

Liska, A.E. (1977). The dissipation of sociological social psychology. *The American Sociologist, 1977, 12*, 2-23.

"List of members of the Canadian Psychological Association" (1946). *Bulletin of the Canadian Psychological Association*, 6(1), 17-27.

Lubek, I & Apfelbaum, E. (2000). A critical gaze and wistful glance at *Handbook* histories of social psychology: Did the successive accounts by Gordon Allport and successors historiographically succeed? *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 36 (4), 405-428.

MacKinnon, D.W. (1948). Kurt Lewin memorial award meeting. Introductory remarks. *The Journal of Social Issues*, 4, 3-5

MacLeod, R.B. (1949). New psychologies of yesterday and today. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 3 (4), 199-212.

MacLeod, R.B. (1955). *Psychology in Canadian Universities and Colleges: A Report to the Canadian Social Science Research Council*. Ottawa: Canadian Social Science Research Council.

MacLeod, R.B. (1965). The teaching of psychology and the psychology we teach. *American Psychologist*, 20, 344-352.

McClung Lee, A. 1986. Depression, war, SPSSI, and SSSP. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42 (4), 61-69.

McKillop, A.B. (1994). *Matters of mind: The university in Ontario 1791-1951*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Moghaddam, F.M. (1987). Psychology in the three worlds as reflected by the crisis in social psychology and the move toward indigenous third-world psychology. *American Psychologist*, 42 (10), 912-920.

Myers, C.R. (1965). Notes on the history of psychology in Canada. *The Canadian Psychologist*, 6, 4-20.

Myers, C.R. (1970). Whatever happened to Canadian psychology? *The Canadian Psychologist*, 11 (2), 128-132.

Myers, C.R. & Bromiley, R.B. (1959). *The future of psychology in Canada: A report from the working party*. Papers of the Canadian Psychological Association. MG28I161, Box 16, File 16-14. National Archives of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario.

Pols, H. (1999a). The world as laboratory: A reappraisal of the department of psychology at the University of Toronto, 1915-1956. *History and Philosophy of Psychology Bulletin*, 11(2), 3-9.

Pols, H. (1999b). The world as laboratory: Strategies of field research developed by mental hygiene psychologists in Toronto, 1920-1950. In T.R. Richardson & D. Fisher (Eds.), *The Development of the Social Sciences in the United States and Canada: The Role of Philanthropy*. Greenwich, CT: Ablex.

Roland, C.G. (1989). *Clarence Hincks: Mental health crusader*. Toronto: Hannah Institute and Dundurn Press.

Ross, D. (1993). An historian's view of American social science. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 29(2), 99-112.

Rule, B.G. & Wells, G.L. (1981). Experimental social psychology in Canada: A look at the seventies. *Canadian Psychology*, 22 (1), 69-78.

Sadava, S.W. (1978). Teaching social psychology: A Canadian dilemma. *Canadian Psychological Review*, 19(2), 145-151.

Samelson, F. (1974). History, origin myth, and ideology: Compté's "discovery" of social psychology. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 4, 217-231.

Samelson, F. (1977). World War I intelligence testing and the development of psychology. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 13, 274-282.

Samelson, F. (1993). History from the top down. In H.V. Rappard, P. Van Strien, L.P. Mos, & W. Baker. (Eds.), *Annals of Theoretical Psychology* v. 8 (pp. 59-64). New York: Plenum.

Shore, M. (1987). *The science of social redemption: McGill, the Chicago School, and the origins of social research in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Sinha, D. (1977). Orientation and attitude of the social psychologist in a developing country: An Indian case. *International Review of Applied Psychology*, 26(1), 1-10.

Smoke, K.L. (1935). The present status of social psychology in America. *Psychological Review*, 42, 537-543.

Soward, F.H. & McInnis, E. *Canada and the United Nations*. Westport Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Steiner, I.D. (1974). Whatever happened to the group in social psychology? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 10, 94-108.

Strickland, L.H. (1991). Russian and Soviet social psychology. *Canadian Psychology*, 32(4), 580-593.

Strickland, L.H., Aboud, F.E. & Gergen, K.G. (eds.) (1976). *Social psychology in transition*. New York: Plenum Press.

Thorngate, W. (19xx). Possible limits on a science of social behavior.

van Strien, P.J. (1997). The American "colonization" of Northwest European social psychology after World War II. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 33, 349-363.

Von Mayrhauser, R.T. (1989). Making intelligence functional: Walter Dill Scott and applied psychological testing in World War I. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 25, 60-72.

Walsh-Bowers, R. (1988). Current developments in Community Psychology in Canada. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 16, 296-305.

Walsh-Bowers, R. (1999). Community Psychology in the Canadian psychological family. *Canadian Psychology*, 33 (4), 280-287.

Webster, E.C. (Ed.) (1967). *The Couchiching conference on professional psychology*. Montreal: Eagle Publishing.

William Line. (1964). *The Canadian Psychologists*, 5(3), 154-155.

William Line (1897-1964): An appreciation. (1964). *O.P.A. Quarterly*, 17(1), 43-44.

William Line 1897-1964 - A CMH tribute. (1964). *Canada's Mental Health*, XII, (4), 19-20.

Williams, D.C. (1992). The frustrating fifties. *Canadian Psychology*, 33(3), 705-709.

Wright, M. J. (1969). Canadian psychology comes of age. *Canadian Psychologist*, 10, (3), 229-253.

Wright, M.J. (1974). CPA: The first ten years. *The Canadian Psychologist*, 15, (2), 112-131.

Wright, M.J. (1987). *The history of developmental psychology in Canada: Note 9 William Line*. Unpublished Manuscript. William Line Papers. Box 1, File 1. Queen Street Mental Health Archives, Toronto, Ontario.

Wright, M.J. & Myers, C.R. (Eds.) (1995). *History of Academic Psychology in Canada*. Toronto: C.J. Hogrefe.