The Comparative Turn in Canadian Political Science

Edited by Linda A. White, Richard Simeon, Robert Vipond, and Jennifer Wallner

The Comparative Turn in Canadian Political Science

UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto

16 15 14 13 12 11 10 09 08 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in Canada on ancient-forest-free paper (100 percent post-consumer recycled) that is processed chlorine- and acid-free, with vegetable-based inks.

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

The comparative turn in Canadian political science / edited by Linda A. White ... [et al.].

Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-7748-1427-0

1. Political science – Canada – History – 20th century. 2. Comparative government. 3. Political science – Study and teaching – Canada. I. White, Linda A. (Linda Ann), 1967-

JA84.C3C64 2008 320.0971'09045 C2007-907476-6

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada through the Book Publishing Industry Development Program (BPIDP), and of the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Aid to Scholarly Publications Programme, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

UBC Press
The University of British Columbia
2029 West Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2
604-822-5959 / Fax: 604-822-6083
www.ubcpress.ca

Contents

Preface and Acknowledgments

Over the past decade, the study of Canadian politics has changed profoundly. The introspective and sometimes insular style that informed Canadian political science for most of its history has given way to a deeper engagement with, and integration into, the theory and practice of comparative politics. This volume is the first sustained attempt to describe, analyze, and assess "the comparative turn" in the study of Canadian politics in three major areas of the discipline: multiculturalism, diversity, and rights; federalism and multilevel governance; and political parties and public policy.

This collection had its genesis in a series of informal corridor conversations in the Department of Political Science at the University of Toronto, loosely organized around the question "where is the study of Canadian politics headed?" Canadian political scientists are a diverse lot, and attempts to distill the essence of the discipline, much less predict its trajectory, are difficult. Yet even within our own eclectic department, our local "self-study" returned again and again to the same theme: increasingly, what unites the study of Canadian politics is the conviction that scholars of *Canadian* politics can both learn from and contribute to the study of *comparative* politics. Scholar by scholar, subfield by subfield, almost all of our Canadianist colleagues at the University of Toronto have taken a comparative turn away from the habit of studying Canada as a stand-alone exercise. For some, this turn means using theoretical categories developed in the literature of comparative politics to illuminate essentially Canadian subjects. For others, it means placing the Canadian case in a larger comparative perspective, the better to understand the distinctive patterns of our own politics. For still others, it means understanding Canada's place in the context of larger, global processes. One way or another, however, there is a shared scholarly tendency to resituate the study of Canadian politics in a comparative perspective. At some level, we're all comparativists now.

From those informal conversations emerged the idea for a day-long workshop, held under the auspices of the Canadian Political Science Association,

to probe, test, and refine our intuition that disciplinary tectonic plates have shifted beneath our feet – and not just at the University of Toronto. Is it in fact the case that Canadian political scientists have taken a comparative turn in their scholarship? If so, are Canadians just "takers" of comparative theory, or are they "makers" as well? If Canadianists are becoming more comparative in their scholarship, are mainstream comparativists, for their part, taking Canada more seriously? Are some subfields within Canadian political science already more deeply integrated into comparative politics than others? Are the patterns of Canadian politics in some cases simply too idiosyncratic and *sui generis* to make comparison valuable or worthwhile? Does the comparative turn risk compromising the depth and richness of concentrated single-unit analysis?

The co-editors of this volume first invited leading scholars from across the country to reflect systematically on these questions. While we were keen to construct a fully representative slate of participants, we were especially sensitive to ensuring a prominent place in the workshop for younger scholars, including senior doctoral students, for it is they who will be most affected by the shifting boundaries of Canadian political science. These papers commissioned, we then invited a number of senior scholars, many from outside Canada, to serve as commentators on the thematic panels.

Our first debt of thanks, therefore, is to all of those who participated in the series of panels held during the CPSA annual meeting at the University of Western Ontario in June 2005. We wish especially to thank the chairs and commentators in those sessions as well as those whose presentations could not be included in this volume. The panels were enriched by the participation of Ken Carty, Will Coleman, Alain Gagnon, Vivien Hart, John McGarry, Thomas Scotto, Campbell Sharman, Miriam Smith, Laura Stephenson, and Graham Wilson.

The panels' success convinced us to pursue the possibility of publishing a volume of chapters on the topic. All of the authors cheerfully accepted the challenge of transforming the papers presented into publishable chapters. We thank them all for their co-operation. Éric Montpetit deserves special mention for agreeing to significantly broaden the scope of his empirical analysis on the presence and impact of Canadian scholarship in the world of comparative politics. Will Kymlicka did not participate in the original workshop, but when we read his critique of the ways in which Canadian pluralism has been used as a model internationally we realized that it would make a signal contribution to the volume. We thank him for embracing our project. Finally, we wish to thank Alan Cairns, who has reflected on the themes of this volume for many years (Cairns 1974a, 1974b, 1975), for agreeing to write a concluding chapter for the volume. It provides a (somewhat sobering) assessment of the success of the comparative turn and serves as a fitting bookend to the collection.

We wish to thank as well Chris Alcantara and Arjun Tremblay, both PhD students in political science at the University of Toronto, for their able research assistance. The department itself provided generous financial assistance from start to finish. More importantly, the department provided – and continues to provide – the sort of congenial intellectual atmosphere that is hard to match by any comparative standard.

Finally, we wish to thank Emily Andrew, Megan Brand, Darcy Cullen, Dallas Harrison, and George Maddison at UBC Press. Their enthusiasm, good judgment, and patience made it a pleasure to publish this book.

Part 1
Establishing Benchmarks

1
Introduction: The Comparative Turn in Canadian Political Science

Robert Vipond

Imagine, if you will, that you were a student entering a doctoral program to study Canadian politics at some point between the mid-1960s and the early 1980s – that is, during the most rapid expansion in graduate education at Canadian universities. You had chosen to pursue your studies at the University of Toronto, then as now the country's largest PhD program in political science, where the crucible for your initiation into graduate training would have been a year-long core seminar in Canadian politics and government. Normally taught by two (and, in the old days of budgetary comfort, three and occasionally four) scholar-specialists, the core course would have provided you with "an overview of the area at an advanced level and an opportunity to discuss some current controversies and recent publications." The seminar was expressly designed to prepare students for their qualifying examination in Canadian politics and so provided a window on the best scholarship in the field. The choice of authors and topics reflected both the eclecticism of mainstream Canadian political science and the distinctiveness of Canadian politics. Not surprisingly, the course syllabi were dominated by institutional themes and approaches. Thus, large portions of the seminar were devoted to the workings of formal institutions (including parties, Parliament, cabinet, and the bureaucracy), federalism, and the policy-making process. Still, society-centred approaches to politics gradually worked their way into the course and became increasingly prominent over the years. Similarly, literature derived from the Canadian political economy tradition developed a firm toehold in the seminar's structure; so, too, did approaches that reflected the enduring importance, within Canadian political science, of applied political theory. And bowing to the need to keep abreast of current controversies and events, the ongoing crises of national unity made sections on Quebec and constitutional reform a curricular staple.[1]

Course content varied somewhat of course from instructor to instructor and year to year. Certainly by the early 1980s students would have been expected, borrowing Stephen Clarkson's metaphor,[2] "to genuflect at the side

altar of the American deities" of political science before they encountered the "nitty Gritties" of Canadian politics, though even here religious observance was limited. Students were typically spared even this ritual when it came to material that would have introduced them to the theory and practice of comparative politics. And this is the point. In retrospect, what is most striking about mid-twentieth-century graduate education in Canadian political science is less what was taught than what was not taught. With rare exceptions, little attention was paid to integrating the study of Canadian politics into the larger literature of comparative politics, whether by viewing Canadian politics through the lens of comparative theory or by studying Canada in the context of other national units. Nor was the mainstream curriculum offered by the University of Toronto atypical in this regard. Even those who were critical of conventional approaches to Canadian politics rarely seized on the comparative isolation of Canadian political science as one of its principal vices (Macpherson 1974). This was political science created by Canadians, for Canadians, about Canadians.

Now fast-forward. The core course in Canadian politics still exists at the University of Toronto, but it is now a semester rather than a year in length, and students take it only after they have completed a core seminar in their first semester in the doctoral program that introduces them to the major debates in the study of comparative politics. Typically led by an Africanist or an Asianist, their colleagues in the seminar will be other PhD students in comparative politics whose interests span the gamut of geographical region, problematics, and methodological approach. The topics covered in the seminar – the state and development, the new institutionalism, democratization, collective action, nationalism, the welfare state, the interface of domestic and international – clearly offend the CRTC's Canadian content rules. But then that is precisely the purpose: to provide graduate students embarking on a doctoral program with the tools that they will need to integrate the study of Canadian politics into the field of comparative politics and, reciprocally, to signal to comparativists that Canada is fertile territory for testing comparative theory. This two-way movement – building Canadian politics out and inviting comparativists in – is what we call the comparative turn in Canadian politics.

This volume is the first sustained attempt to describe, analyze, and assess "the comparative turn" in the study of Canadian political science; it grew out of a workshop organized by the Department of Political Science at the University of Toronto held in conjunction with the Congress of Learned Societies in June 2005. The workshop was informed by the editors' intuition that the introspective, insular, and largely atheoretical style that informed Canadian political science for most of the postwar period has given way to a deeper engagement with, and integration into, the field of comparative politics. The workshop confirmed the intuition, but it also reminded

us that the extent to which Canadian political scientists have taken the comparative turn is variable and uneven across the subfields. In some subfields, Canadian political science is already well integrated into and is frequently cited within the comparative context; in others, the Canadian case is less well integrated. What we have attempted to do, then, is provide a roadmap to Canadian political science that will both give readers a sense of the varieties of analysis in Canadian political science and serve as a guide to its potential.

The chapters are drawn from three broad thematic areas: diversity, multiculturalism, and rights; political parties and public policy; and federalism. This thematic organization is, to be sure, somewhat unorthodox for readers who are used to the conventional subdivisions favoured by the American and Canadian Political Science Associations, but it follows directly from the basic premise that informs the collection. Our goal is to assess key areas of Canadian political science in light of their engagement with the theory and practice of comparative politics, an assessment that, it turns out, does not always correspond precisely to the usual subdisciplinary clustering employed by North American political scientists. Put slightly differently, our overriding goal is to plot Canadian political science at different points along the intellectual arc of the comparative turn. Thus, the volume begins with a series of chapters on diversity, multiculturalism, and rights, related areas in which Canadians have made signal contributions to comparative politics and in which, reciprocally, Canadian policy approaches are often used illustratively by comparativists. *The Comparative Turn in Canadian Political Science* then moves to a group of chapters on federalism, where Canadian scholars made early contributions to comparativism, then receded into introspection, and have now re-emerged on the cutting edge of federalism studies internationally. And the collection concludes with a cluster of chapters on political parties and public policy, disparate subjects that, historically, have been rather poorly integrated into the comparative literature yet possess real potential for comparative scholarship. These are all areas of considerable scholarly strength, both in Canada and abroad. They draw on, and hence provide evidence from, a broad range of scholarly methods, approaches, and preoccupations. Finally, and most importantly, they allow our contributors to reflect systematically on both the current state of Canadian political science and its potential for contributing to the theory and practice of comparative politics.

Let us pause, though, to consider the backdrop against which the comparative turn can best be understood. Why was Canadian political science so introspective in the mid- to late twentieth century? And what has changed? Three mutually reinforcing explanations stand out. First, Canadian political science has long been dominated by the study of federalism, and federalism scholarship – especially from the mid-1960s to the mid-1980s

– was in turn preoccupied with the ongoing and "compounded crisis" of national unity. As Richard Simeon (2002, 1) has noted in his magisterial survey of Canadian federalism scholarship, more often than not the Canadian study of federalism "has been overwhelmed by the events surrounding it." This practical urgency profoundly affected both its tone (where it was given to pessimism) and its substance (where it emphasized fragility, tenuousness, and imperfection). Exhibit A in this regard is Donald Smiley's *Canada in Question: Federalism in the Seventies* (1972), the most important treatise on Canadian federalism written during the period. Smiley explains in the introduction that completion of the book was "delayed by two periods in which I ceased work because of the judgment that the federation would not last as long as it would take to finish the manuscript." *Canada in Question* was supplanted by *The Federal Condition in Canada* (1987), and acute care gave way to chronic care, but the brooding sense of pathology remained. To be sure, Smiley's perspective was particularly bleak, but Smiley set the tone for federalism scholarship more generally. In more ways than one, we were all "Smiley's people."

This existential anxiety had the effect of producing a highly introspective style of scholarship. What is striking about most of the scholarship devoted to Canadian federalism in the 1960s and 1970s is its steadfast focus on Canada – and Canada alone. Faced with the real possibility of national disintegration, federalism scholars tended overwhelmingly to circle the wagons so as to concentrate on the home front. Here again Smiley's *Canada in Question* is useful, for one of the implicit themes of the book is the extent to which Canadian federalism is really *sui generis* and inhospitable to comparison. This sense of Canadian exceptionalism runs like a red skein through the entire book: the constitutional division of legislative powers under the British North America Act of 1867 is idiosyncratic, judicial review is technical and labyrinthine, and the obsession with constitutional reform is incomprehensible outside the peculiarly Canadian context of linguistic and cultural dualism (Chapters 1, 2, and 6). The distinctively Canadian marriage of federalism with executive-dominated parliamentary government institutionalizes political competition and conflict in especially intractable ways (Chapter 3). The party system is anomalous in that it does not have the unifying effect that party systems in other federations typically have (Chapter 4). The mismatch between the federal government's fiscal capacity and the provinces' constitutional responsibilities renders the political economy of Canadian federalism almost impenetrable – even to Canadians (Chapter 6). And Canada's proximity to the United States creates unique political challenges for managing the balance between national and regional governments (Chapter 7). The message of *Canada in Question* was that Canada is essentially alone in its existential dilemma. At just about every turn, *Canada in Question* closed off comparison rather than engaged it.

Actually, there was nothing inevitable about this scholarly path. Canada's federal exceptionalism could just as easily have led toward rather than away from comparative politics. For example, the development of the modern federal state in Canada seems to fly in the face of the usual assumption that modernization and centralization go hand in hand. Samuel Beer (1973) explored the modernization/centralization nexus systematically in the American case; the Canadian counterpoint, playing off Beer's analysis of American federalism, is still waiting to be written.

The discipline's parochialism was not confined to Canadians or to Canadian political science (Almond 1956; Dahl 2004), but it was particularly tenacious in Canada. So what else was going on that helps to explain the comparative insularity of mid-century Canadian political science? As the example of American federalism suggests, the most obvious way to extend the analysis of Canadian politics in a comparative direction would have been through a serious encounter with the politics of the United States, familiar and important as it was. But there were several impediments to such an encounter. The first is that there has never been a strong scholarly foundation in Canada for studying American politics. Until the Second World War, the centre of gravity for Canadian scholarship in comparative politics was Britain, not the United States. To paraphrase the title of Alexander Brady's famous text (1960), Canada was a democracy among the dominions, whose political institutions were best illuminated in the refracted light cast by the British Empire (Malloy 2002; Sproule-Jones 1984). This relative indifference to the United States was reinforced in the 1960s and 1970s by a heightened sense among English Canadian nationalists that Canadian independence – political, cultural, and intellectual alike – depended centrally on maintaining critical distance from, and frequently moral superiority to, things American. Having outgrown one empire, Canadian nationalists were not about to be "swallowed" by another without a fight, especially when that empire, they argued, was responsible for extravagant militarism abroad and social decay at home. To put the point somewhat more provocatively than it probably deserves, the growth of a truly comparative Canadian political science in the 1960s and 1970s was stunted by anti-Americanism (Macpherson 1974; Whitaker 1979).

This resistance to American paradigms was powerfully expressed in two texts that achieved iconic status in the 1960s – George Grant's *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism* (1965) and Gad Horowitz's "Conservatism, Liberalism, and Socialism in Canada" (1966). At one level, Grant and Horowitz make for strange bedfellows. Grant wrote from the political right, Horowitz from the left. Grant's "lament" evoked an ironic nostalgia for a world that was essentially unrecoverable; Horowitz's interpretation of Canadian political culture stressed the creative, social democratic possibilities of a "fragment" culture that was not monolithically liberal. Grant railed

against modernity, while Horowitz pointed toward postmodernity. Yet whatever their differences, the crucial point of agreement between Grant and Horowitz was that the United States was ultimately an unattractive object of scholarly attention. For Grant (1969), America epitomized the degrading spirit of modernity and the triumph of technique. For Horowitz, following Louis Hartz (1955), America represented the uncontested blandness (and intolerance) of hegemonic liberal individualism. Why, if these interpretations of America were accurate, would any self-respecting Canadian political scientist want to study it seriously? And, sure enough, this is precisely the effect that Grant and especially Horowitz had on those who developed and deepened their interpretations in the years that followed. It is telling, in this context, that most of the scholarship that has been inspired by the Hartz-Horowitz thesis has focused either on Horowitz's interpretation of the historical roots of the Canadian polity and the local processes by which it "congealed" culturally (Ajzenstat and Smith 1995; Preece 1977; Soderlund, Nelson, and Wagenberg 1979; Wiseman 1981) or on the normative implications for Canada of Grant's critique (Forbes 2007). Perhaps even more telling is the fact that the most prolific scholar of comparative political culture whose work engages Canadian-American comparisons is Seymour Martin Lipset (1950, 1990, 1996) – an American. For Canadians of that generation, American politics was something of an intellectual no-fly zone (Cairns 1975).

It was not just America that was to be resisted but also the related and broader phenomenon of Americanization – including, or especially, the Americanization of Canadian universities (Mathews and Steele 1969). The fear that American modes of studying Canada would contaminate Canadian political science came to a head in the late 1960s when Canadian universities began to appoint large numbers of American and/or American-trained political scientists and, concurrently, to confront the new approaches to social science research that they brought with them. "By the latter part of the decade," Reg Whitaker notes (1979, 5), "the behavioural or empirical revolution had arrived in Canada, and with a vengeance." Actually, the term "behaviouralism" was used extremely loosely and referred to a variety of intellectual sins. Generally speaking, the term was applied to approaches to political science that attempted to separate "facts" from "values" and that subjected what was knowable – facts – to much more rigorous, usually quantitative, scrutiny. To be sure, the point at which the critique of American power ended and the critique of American behaviouralism began was often unclear. But that, of course, was precisely the point. "By refusing to recognize explicitly the place of values in the study of man," Whitaker suggests, "the behaviourists were accepting, through the back door, the entire set of values embodied in the status quo of wealth and power in American society" (1979, 7). In this sense, the battles over behaviouralism in Canadian political science departments were not just about methodological soundness. They

were about "American imperial penetration of indigenous Canadian ways of life and thought" (Whitaker 1979, 8; see also Butler and Shugarman 1970).

It is important not to exaggerate Canadian anti-Americanism. After all, the tempest surrounding behaviouralism blew over soon enough, and in fairness one cannot attribute all of the resistance to American approaches to politics to anti-Americanism. A simpler and less ideological explanation is that for many Canadian political scientists pluralism, functionalism, and behaviouralism – the dominant approaches stateside during the 1960s and 1970s – were not well suited to studying key aspects of Canadian politics. The emphasis in American political science on the dynamic and fluid processes of politics that emphasized preferences and persuasion (Barber 1972; Lowi 1969; Neustadt 1960; Truman 1951) did not speak to the dominant Canadian tendency to view institutions and historical context as key political drivers. By this argument, it is not that American political science was morally offensive; rather, the methods and preoccupations of American political science were just not particularly helpful or useful in illuminating the core puzzles of Canadian politics.

A similar sort of intellectual disconnect estranged Canadian political science from the dominant approaches to more broadly comparative politics as well. Jeffrey Kopstein and Mark Lichbach (2005, 8) have observed that "comparative politics developed as a subdiscipline in the United States after World War II" when "Americans suddenly found themselves in a position of leadership, with a need for deep knowledge about a huge number of countries." The emergence of the Cold War put security issues first, and this priority in turn informed scholarly interest. The most urgent question was to know whether countries in southeast Asia, Latin America, and Africa, for instance, "would become increasingly democratic and capitalist or whether some version of communism would be more appealing." One influential answer was supplied by modernization theory, according to which states would become more democratic "as they became wealthier, industrialized, educated, and less bound by unquestioned tradition."

Clearly, Canada did not fit the preoccupations of postwar comparativists. Security along the forty-ninth parallel was indeed an issue from time to time, but it manifested itself in ways that looked more like intramural disputes among allies than fundamental threats. Throughout the period, the "world's longest undefended border" remained psychologically, if not always physically, intact. Since Canada already qualified as a modern, industrialized state, it was also a poor candidate to test theories of "convergence" through economic and political development. True, modernization theory was sometimes used as a lens through which to understand the Quiet Revolution in Quebec (McRoberts and Posgate 1976). But even with suitable qualifications, analyses that described the mid-twentieth-century transformation of traditional Quebec society into a modern welfare state were

criticized for exaggerating Quebec's assumed developmental lag (Rudin 1997).

What is perhaps more surprising is that most of the reactions to modernization theory had little traction in Canada either. Some critics of modernization, for instance, maintained that the path to modernization was compromised by a poorer state's dependence on wealthy countries, such as the United States. "Dependency theory" had some vogue in Canada as a way of understanding Canada's underdevelopment vis-à-vis the United States (Clement 1977; Levitt 1970), but earlier versions of this argument were generally more popular (Drache 1976; Innis 1930, 1950). Other critics argued that modernization theorists painted with too broad a brush and obscured the varying historical, geographical, and political contexts that produced different developmental stories in different regions and countries. Yet the growth of area studies largely passed Canada by as well. The dominance of the United States and the vastly different circumstances of Canada and Mexico made it largely implausible to talk about "North American" studies as one might speak about Asian studies or European studies. Canada remained a "region" unto itself; there were no ready-made regional candidates for comparative analysis.

Even among other industrialized states Canada slipped to the bottom of the dance card. Canada did not hold colonies, so its relationship to postcolonialism was much different and arguably less interesting from an analytical perspective than, say, Britain or France. Canadian democracy did not emerge out of fascism, as the German and Italian varieties had; here again Canada lacked one of the characteristics that spawned considerable social scientific interest after the war. The politics of class and religion were much more muted in Canada than in most European countries, so some of the most interesting conditions for understanding state-society relations, social movements, political parties, and elections were absent in Canada. Canada's liberal welfare state was too similar to the American welfare state to provide the sort of pointed comparison that drew scholars of public policy to the Nordic countries. And it was too idiosyncratic, given the centrality of linguistic and regional cleavages, to isolate other key variables. This does not mean that the study of Canadian politics was entirely divorced from the themes, arguments, and paradigms of comparative politics, but it does help to explain the doubly limited scope of the comparative project for most of Canadian political science during the period. On the one hand, there was room to take theories, models, and explanations that had been developed elsewhere and apply them to Canada, but Canada was rarely the source of innovation in comparative theory. We were at best "takers" of comparative theory and methods, not "makers." On the other hand, the Canadian case attracted relatively little attention from major figures in the

field of comparative politics. As a result, the study of Canadian politics remained somewhat insulated from the main trends in the field.

Clearly, this rather tight-fitting suit no longer fits the body of Canadian political science – although the subject's measurements are not altogether straightforward. In the case of Canadian federalism, what is immediately striking is the contrast between the continuity of practice and the metamorphosis in scholarship. Despite all of the profound economic, social, and political changes of the past four decades, the architecture and environment of Canadian federalism are remarkably stable. Anxiety about the possible secession of Quebec waxes and wanes; regionalism remains an important source of political conflict; and the institutions of executive federalism continue to drive intergovernmental relations. What *has* changed is the increasingly comparative approach to framing questions of Canadian federalism. Part of this redirection follows from exogenous events. The evolution of the European Union especially has provoked broad interest in ways of reconciling unity and diversity; many of the questions that have recently become salient in Europe with respect to institutional design, political economy, and democratic legitimacy have been central to the scholarship of Canadian federalism for some time. By the same token, federalism is now taken seriously as a way of managing social and political conflict in deeply divided societies around the world. Here, too, the Canadian experience resonates, and Canadians have been at the forefront of both developing the study of comparative federalism and, as a matter of practice, using the Canadian federal experience as an instructive (and sometimes cautionary) model for "managing" regionally based social, cultural, and linguistic cleavage (Simeon 2002, 30; Watts 1999).

The comparative shift of federalism scholarship in Canada, however, also reflects endogenous factors that reflect changes in Canadian scholarly interests and norms. One is the "extraordinarily fruitful marriage of federal studies and political theory" (Simeon 2002, 44). This marriage has occurred across three related planes that have broadened the scope of federalism studies in Canada. One set of questions focuses on "the multiple dimensions of identity and community, and the recognition and accommodations of diversity and difference" within a federal polity (Simeon 2002, 44; see also Robinson in this volume). A second set focuses on the relationship – empirical and normative – between the Canadian federal polity and Aboriginal communities; a remarkable literature has emerged out of, but extends beyond, the Canadian experience on the subject (Cairns 1995a; Ivison 2002; Russell 2005). The third set engages what is perhaps the largest question of all – namely, the compatibility of federalism and democracy; here, too, Canadian scholars are addressing questions that engage a broadly comparative literature (Bakvis and Skogstad 2007; Cameron and Simeon 2000; LaSelva

1996; Smith 2004; Young 1999). In sum, it is hard to disagree with Simeon's assessment that the encounter between federalism studies and political theory has lent the study of Canadian federalism "a new energy" (2002, 44).

Canadian resistance to things American has also relaxed, although here again there is a somewhat puzzling difference between practice and scholarship. At one level, Canada is at least as fertile a ground for anti-Americanism as it was in the 1960s. The Canadian economy is more deeply integrated with, and arguably more dependent on, the American economy than it was in the 1960s. The American invasion of Iraq has rehabilitated and re-energized discussion of American imperialism. And since 9/11, the US-Canada border has become a major source of political contestation. Under these circumstances, it would be easy enough to imagine a desire to maintain a healthy distance from what might be perceived as the toxicity of American politics. Yet in the scholarly world of political science precisely the opposite has occurred: there is considerably more openness in Canada to the study of the United States than existed in the 1960s. Grant and Horowitz have lost their iconic status (Forbes 1987) as the best guides to understanding Canadian political culture, and they have no successor on the horizon. The most significant recent trend in Canadian studies of political culture, on the contrary, is the attempt to refocus discussion away from bilateral, historically grounded studies and toward cross-national, survey-based research (Nevitte 1996). It is also significant that, within the past decade, a number of Canadian universities have created research and teaching programs dedicated to the scholarly study of the United States; equally significant is the creation of the US-Canada Fulbright program of scholarly exchange. These institutional developments have been encouraged by the common sense (including among Canadian nationalists; see Clarkson 2002; Drache 2004) that, under conditions of greater economic integration, it is crucial that Canadians understand the American political process. But perhaps the most compelling evidence of the decline of anti-Americanism in Canadian political science is provided, almost inadvertently, by the studies in this volume. In assessing the comparative turn in Canadian political science, none of our contributors warns against the potential contamination by American methodologies and approaches. In the late 1960s and on into the 1970s, such a discussion would have been unavoidable; now it is largely a non-issue. Indeed, if anything, the tables have been turned entirely: the principal hurdle to engaging the United States in a comparative way these days more often than not follows from the insularity of American political science, not from the anti-Americanism of Canadians.

Finally, both the sociological and the intellectual environments have changed in ways that have made studying Canadian politics in a comparative context more appealing, even compelling. One dimension of change is demographic and sociological. The traditional mode of studying Canadian

politics fit the preoccupations of scholars and students for whom the great challenges facing the country were defined by, and largely inherited from, the Confederation settlement of 1867 – cultural dualism and political independence foremost among them. As Alan Cairns has argued thematically (1988a, 1991, 1995a), the persuasiveness of these "official" priorities is no longer self-evident, either with members of those communities who felt excluded from the master narrative or with the large number of recent immigrants to the country for whom deference to the inherited priorities of 1867 is a question rather than an answer. It is at least plausible to suggest that greater interest in comparative politics follows from this sociological change. Our students are much more closely attuned to the varieties of multinational identity and transnational citizenship than ever before. These interests almost inevitably raise a host of questions that are part of the menu of comparative politics.

Another dimension of change is intellectual. As both Rodney Haddow and Grace Skogstad note in their chapters in this volume, the comparative turn in Canadian political science may also reflect the perception that the mainstream study of comparative politics itself has become more hospitable to Canadian intellectual tendencies. The rise of institutional, ideational, and historical approaches to comparative politics (Hall 1986; Pierson 2004; Rockman and Weaver 1993; Skocpol 1979), in particular, simply makes it easier to see how Canadian politics "fits" prevailing paradigms and concerns in the comparative literature. One measure of this turn, documented systematically by Éric Montpetit in this volume, is the extent to which Canadian scholars have begun to publish their work in non-Canadian journals. Another indication is the nature of the research itself; increasingly, Canadian scholars have sought to place their understanding of Canada in a broader comparative context. There was no central edict and coordinated plan, yet remarkably, in subfield after subfield, the study of Canadian politics has turned comparative. This is true at the macrolevel, where the study of comparative constitutionalism has taken hold (Hanafin and Williams 1999; Hirschl 2004; Simeon 1998); it is equally true at the microlevel, where the study of urban political economies is firmly entrenched in a comparative literature on innovation and governance (Florida 2005; Wolfe and Gertler 2006). The comparative turn can be detected in a range of social policy fields, including health (Drache 1999; Maioni 1998; Tuohy 1999), education (Manzer 2003), and child care (Jenson and Sineau 2001; White 2002), as well as in economic (Banting, Hoberg, and Simeon 1997), industrial (Haddow and Klassen 2006), and environmental policy (Harrison and Hoberg 1994). And this is to say nothing of broader studies of the Canadian welfare state (Banting 1997), the politics of retrenchment (Jenson 2000), and the enormous field of globalization (Cameron and Stein 2002; Clement and Vosko 2003; Panitch and Leys 2004). Scholarship in the area of social

movements has turned smartly in a comparative direction (Bashevkin 2002; Rayside 1998); especially important are the many contributions of feminist scholars to understanding women and politics in a broadly comparative context (Bashevkin 2006; Briskin and Eliasson 1999; Jenson and Sineau 2001). As readers will see in greater detail later in this volume, the study of formal political institutions in Canada, including parties and elections, is increasingly comparative; so is the scholarship devoted to the study of administration and policy implementation (Aucoin 1995). And what goes for areas of study also applies to methodological approaches; here, too, there has been a noticeable diversification in Canadian political science that underscores the discipline's enduring eclecticism (e.g., Blais 2000; Mendelsohn 2003; Soroka 2002).

Yet these developments pose another paradox. While Canadian political scientists have become more deeply engaged with comparative politics, comparativists appear not to have deepened their engagement with Canada. For most comparativists, even those whose methodological orientation is historical and institutional, Canada remains somewhat off the beaten track. Canadian scholars may be publishing more actively in non-Canadian journals, but with rare exceptions Canada has not attracted broad and deep attention from non-Canadians. Montpetit's analysis notwithstanding, the representation of Canada in leading journals such as *World Politics, Comparative Politics,* and *Comparative Political Studies* remains thin – especially from non-Canadian scholars. The fundamental purpose of this volume is to describe, analyze, and assess the emerging Canadian contribution to the theory and practice of comparative politics. Our aim is to assess the strengths and weaknesses of this turn, what is gained and what is lost, the territory that it covers, as well as the gaps that it leaves. But we have what one might call a "missionary" goal as well. Canadianists have built *out* from their base in Canadian politics. We hope that this volume will serve as an invitation to comparativists to build Canadian politics *into* their comparative frameworks.

What, precisely, does "the comparative turn" mean in Canadian politics? And how is it to be evaluated? In addressing the core question around which this volume is organized, we asked the contributors to consider three sets of questions as they prepared their case studies.

1 To what extent, in what ways, and how successfully have Canadian scholars contributed to the study of comparative politics? In particular, in what ways have Canadians contributed to building theory in the area under study?
2 What is it about the Canadian example that has advanced, or may advance, the comparative discipline? What is unique or distinctive about the Canadian case that may allow comparativists to isolate variables that provide explanatory power for the phenomena under discussion?

3 To what extent can Canadian practice and policy be reproduced in other countries? Are there better and worse candidates for the strategy to export Canadian values? Is it desirable to do so?

Not all of the chapters have treated these three sets equally. Some have concentrated on one or two questions. Some have addressed these questions from a more theoretical perspective and some from a more empirical one. However, these are the three core sets of questions that underlie the collection as a whole.

In Chapter 2, Éric Montpetit "audits" the field of Canadian politics and establishes an empirical baseline for the rest of the volume by assessing quantitatively the extent to which scholars of Canadian politics have indeed turned their sights in a more comparative direction. The first thematic cluster of essays, by Andrew Robinson, Keith Banting, Ran Hirschl, and Will Kymlicka, engages the broad questions of multiculturalism, diversity, and rights from the perspectives of normative theory, institutional development, and policy. As the chapters demonstrate in quite different ways, the Canadian case cuts both ways. In one respect, Canada is a living laboratory for important questions of diversity; it has generated significant work in the area and seems to be an obvious candidate for comparative analysis. But is it also possible that the idiosyncratic conditions in Canada that have allowed themes of diversity to flourish actually make Canada atypical and so limit its generalizability? This is an important theme in the collection; the debate about it is front and centre in the chapters by Robinson, Banting, Hirschl, and Kymlicka.

The second set of essays deals thematically with federalism. If Canadian scholarship has a comparative advantage in any subfield, then it is surely federalism. The essays by Martin Papillon, Thomas Hueglin, and Jennifer Wallner provide eloquent testimony both to the vigour of Canadian scholarship in this area and to the staying power of debates about the effectiveness of the Canadian model.

The third group of essays engages questions of political parties, elections, and public policy – all significant themes within the broader corpus of comparative politics. Brian Tanguay (on parties), James Farney and Renan Levine (on parties and elections), Grace Skogstad (on policy communities), and Rodney Haddow (on the connection between party systems and public policy) all provide evidence for the comparative turn in Canadian political science even as they confront, in general, the limited extent to which comparative politics engages with Canada. All of this leads to Alan Cairns's concluding reflections on the comparative turn in Canadian political science. Cairns has contributed mightily to the development of Canadian political science for four decades, so it is fitting to give him the last – and suitably measured, even skeptical – word on the subject.

Acknowledgments
I wish to thank Rod Haddow, Ran Hirschl, Jeff Kopstein, Graham White, and the co-editors of this volume for comments on this chapter. I would also like to thank Alan Cairns, Don Forbes, Dick Johnston, and Neil Nevitte for their help in understanding the history of various subfields within Canadian political science.

2
A Quantitative Analysis of the Comparative Turn in Canadian Political Science

Éric Montpetit

This chapter offers a quantitative assessment of the so-called comparative turn in Canadian political science. It is based on a data set that I constructed using information on the publications of Canadians provided by the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI). The SSCI has become a widely used tool to provide assessments of scholarly publications across the world. Simon Hix (2004) used it to produce a ranking of political science departments worldwide, while Thomas Plümer and Claudio Radaelli (2004) published a similar SSCI ranking for Italian political science departments. And Charles Lees (2006) relies on the SSCI list of journals compiled by Hix (2004) to measure the decline of single-country journals and the concomitant increase of comparative journals in political science. In this chapter, I also use information provided by the SSCI. Similar to Lees, my goal is to better understand the extent to which political scientists have taken a comparative turn. In contrast to Lees, however, my focus is on Canadian political scientists, and I use data on their articles indexed in the SSCI rather than data on journals only. To be sure, use of the SSCI has been criticized, with some analysts preferring reputation-based measures over the measures provided by citation records (Garand 2005). I prefer the index because it is easily accessible and relatively cheap. Moreover, it is not my claim that the SSCI provides the best possible account of the comparative turn in Canadian political science; I claim only that it provides an interesting one. It is particularly interesting since I am aware of only one other quantitative account of the publications of Canadian political scientists, that of Jean Laponce (1980), which had different objectives.

The results obtained with the SSCI method confirm the comparative turn in Canadian political science. Canadian political scientists, working on traditional Canadian themes, such as political parties and elections, institutions, public administration and public policy, and rights and multiculturalism, produce knowledge relevant outside Canada. Moreover, they often publish

their work in journals read internationally, hoping that their work will contribute to research conducted outside Canada. This comparative effort, however, is not equally distributed among sectors. In fact, the comparative effort of scholars working on elections and political parties appears to be more important than in other political science subfields. To demonstrate this, I have divided the chapter into four sections. I begin with a detailed discussion of the investigated question, and then I describe the construction of the data set. In the third section, I explain how informative the data set can be about the investigated question. In the last section, I present the results of a regression analysis.

The Investigated Question

This edited collection seeks to investigate the so-called comparative turn in Canadian political science. A number of themes, often consistent with Canadian history, have been popular among Canadian political scientists over the years. Cultural diversity and federalism are prime examples (e.g., Smiley 1987). However, until recently, these themes and others were treated in an idiosyncratic manner. The books and the articles of Canadian political scientists were written to shed light on Canada and Canada only (Simeon 1989). Political science work on health policies, political parties, multiculturalism, or the Constitution, to name just a few topics, was informative enough for Canada but had little relevance beyond this country's borders. The contention behind this book is that things have changed in the past few years. Increasingly, Canadian political scientists have framed their research and presented their results with the intention of making them relevant outside Canada. Far from abandoning traditional Canadian political science, Canadian political scientists have begun to use the expertise built in their country to make it valuable to others. The objective of this chapter is to provide a measure of the extent to which a comparative turn has indeed been taken by Canadian political scientists.

Most chapters of this volume provide qualitative accounts of the comparative turn. They seek to identify particular contributions of Canadians, in a diversity of traditional subfields of Canadian political science, and to explain the extent to which these contributions add to the broader bodies of international knowledge. Here I take a different approach in seeking to provide a quantitative account of the comparative turn. My account is based on the assumption that the comparative turn involves Canadian scholars, working on conventional Canadian political science themes, publishing more frequently in international venues. This chapter is therefore based on a data set of publication patterns among Canadian political scientists. In the next section, I provide more details on the construction of the data set and the information that it contains.

The Data Set

Construction of the data set began with a complete list of the political scientists who held full-time professorship positions in the political science departments and the schools of public administration and policy of Canadian universities. This list was made using information provided on the websites of political science departments in the fall of 2005. Professors who retired before this date and those who were hired after it do not appear on the list. The list includes the name of the scholar, his or her institutional affiliation in the fall of 2005, and his or her area of specialization, and it comprises 898 political scientists, forming the active political science scholarly community in Canada in 2005. The length of this list was then reduced for two reasons. First, not everyone on the list does work that resonates with the purpose of this book, which is to see whether the traditional themes of Canadian political science are studied comparatively. Second, and more importantly, searching for the publications of 898 political scientists would have required too much time and too many resources.

The areas of specialization investigated in this chapter are (1) administration and public policy, (2) elections and political parties, (3) rights and multiculturalism, and (4) institutions (more details on the sectors are provided in Table 2.2). All political scientists on the list of 898 whose area of specialization does not match with any of these subfields were removed from the list. Among those eliminated were most political scientists in international relations, comparative politics with a developing world or regional focus, and political theory. Canadian scholars of international relations, unlike scholars of policy or institutions, have always published, presumably, in international journals because the object of their research has always lent itself to a broader audience. The same reasoning applies to scholars in comparative politics who contribute to knowledge about democratic development in a foreign region or country and to political theorists who study non-Canadian philosophers. However, political theorists whose work relates to questions of rights, multiculturalism, nationalism, or citizenship remained on the list. The same is true of comparativists who study public policy, administration, and parliamentary or federal institutions.

It was sometimes difficult to eliminate political scientists using the information about their research activities provided by their respective department's website. The amount of information on websites varies greatly from one political scientist to the next, and I had no way of knowing when the information was last updated. When doubts arose about the contribution of someone to themes traditionally associated with Canadian political science, he or she was included on the list. Therefore, the reduced list might overestimate the number of political scientists working on traditional Canadian themes. However, I am confident that this list includes most, if not

all, political scientists whose work is relevant to one or more of the four traditional Canadian themes presented above. Moreover, I am confident that this process, and the errors that came with it, did not create any statistically significant selection bias. The process reduced the list from 898 political scientists to 487, a reduction of 47 percent. This rate is consistent with that of most departments taken individually. In other words, the reduction process did not discriminate against departments by retaining very few of their faculty members in comparison with other departments. Table 2.1 presents the departments of twenty professors or more, the proportion of their academics represented on the list, their publications weighted according to the number of authors, and the ratio of publication per faculty member on the list. Where the ratio of publication per professor is far from the average, the departments were verified twice for possible errors. Table 2.1 gives me great confidence that the errors likely to have occurred in the process to reduce the length of the list were either insignificant or randomly distributed.

The publications of each scholar who appeared on the list of 487 were searched in the Web of Knowledge's Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) for the period 1985-2005. The publication figures in Table 2.1 come from this search. SSCI indexes only articles published in peer-reviewed journals, leaving out books and articles in edited volumes. Although it would be ideal to

Table 2.1

Information contained in the data set per department

Institution	Faculty size	Faculty retained	Percent retained	Publications (weighted)	Publications/ faculty retained
Alberta	23	11	48	15	1.36
Carleton	57	28	49	51	1.82
Concordia	27	15	56	15.5	1.03
Laval	29	14	48	39.5	2.82
McGill	30	15	50	57	3.8
McMaster	26	17	65	35.83	2.11
Montréal	29	16	55	129	8.06
Ottawa	32	20	63	20	1.0
Queen's	25	15	60	31	2.07
Simon Fraser	21	12	57	41	3.42
Toronto	73	45	62	156.43	3.48
UBC	24	13	54	31.25	2.4
UQAM	37	17	46	14	0.82
Victoria	24	13	54	48	3.69
Western Ontario	31	18	58	23.66	1.31
York	53	20	38	9	0.45

include books and edited volumes in this analysis, they are not indexed in any accessible places. We should keep in mind, therefore, that the data set constructed for this analysis may underestimate, if not squarely leave out, the contributions of some prolific scholars who prefer publishing books or articles in edited volumes. That being said, the exclusion of books and edited volumes might not be as problematic as it appears at first sight. Hix (2004, 295) argues that, while SSCI analyses may discriminate against individuals whose publication strategy centres on books, the publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals is correlated most of the time with the publication of books or articles in edited volumes at the departmental level. Departments in which professors publish many articles in peer-reviewed journals also publish books or articles in edited volumes diffused internationally. The primary purpose of the present analysis, however, is not to compare the publications of individual scholars or departments but to see whether the community of Canadian political scientists, in four sectors, publishes more in international venues than in the past. Therefore, if the biases related to the use of the SSCI diminish as one moves from the level of individual scholars to the level of departments, as Hix (2004) suggests, then we can expect the biases to be relatively insignificant at the level of the Canadian scholarly community of political scientists.

More worrisome at first sight is the quasi-exclusion of French-language journals from the SSCI. Three large political science departments are in Quebec's French-speaking universities, and an additional large one, Ottawa, is in a bilingual university. For most professors in these four departments, it is normal to devote a share of their writings, if not all, to French-speaking publications. One such significant venue, unfortunately absent from the SSCI, is *Politique et sociétés,* the peer-reviewed journal of the Société québécoise de science politique. Again, though, the primary purpose of this analysis is not to compare departments and even less to compare French-speaking with English-speaking scholars. Therefore, the SSCI's bias toward English-speaking publications is problematic, for the purpose of this analysis, only if the international contributions of French-speaking political scientists are primarily published in French-only journals that are excluded from the SSCI. A rapid comparison of the publications coming out of the four French-speaking and bilingual departments with the other departments presented in Table 2.1 suggests that it might not be the case. In fact, the average number of publications per capita found in the SSCI for these departments is not systematically different from that of all the other departments. With the *Canadian Journal of Political Science, Canadian Public Administration,* and *Canadian Public Policy* providing publication venues for French-language articles, it may be fair to conclude that French-only journals, excluded from the SSCI, are not primary publication venues for Canadian political scientists, even in French-speaking universities.

Despite a language bias, largely unproblematic for this analysis, the SSCI includes a wide range of journals. It indexes over 1,725 journals in as many as fifty social science disciplines. Appendix 2.1 presents the 173 SSCI-indexed journals in which Canadian political scientists on the list of 487 have published articles. The appendix also displays publication frequency by Canadians in each of these journals, the journal's impact score, a measure discussed at length below, and the post-1985 year when the journal was first indexed in the SSCI. The range of journals in Appendix 2.1 gives me great confidence that the data set provides a fair sample of publications by Canadians who work on typically Canadian political science themes.

From the list of 487 authors, 229 had 947 articles listed in the SSCI index for the period 1985-2005. In the data set constructed from this information, I counted a publication as one, regardless of whether it was a single- or a multiple-author article. Therefore, multiple-author articles, when they involve more than one person from the list of 487, appear more than once in the data set. However, I also included a variable to weight every single article in statistical analyses according to the number of authors. The value of this variable is 1.0 for single-author articles, 0.5 for articles authored by two people, 0.33 for three-author articles, and so on. Hix (2004, 299) used the same procedure in his SSCI analysis of political science departments. The data set thus constituted has 1,109 cases.

The variables in the data set are (1) the author, (2) the departmental affiliation, (3) the title of the article, (4) the sector of the article, among the four listed in Table 2.2, (5) the title of the journal in which the article is published, (6) the Canadian or the foreign origin of the journal, (7) the year of publication, (8) the impact score of the journal in which the article is published, (9) the frequency whereby the article is cited in other journals indexed in the SSCI, (10) the frequency by which the author cites his or her own article, and (11) the average impact scores of the journals in which the article is cited by people other than the author. Some of these variables are self-explanatory, but others deserve some further methodological explanation.

The sector is one of (1) administration and public policy, (2) elections and political parties, (3) rights and multiculturalism, and (4) institutions. This division of Canadian political science into sectors is consistent with that proposed by the editors of this book. It is based not entirely on the traditional subdisciplinary categorization but partly on a drawing out for the readers of where Canadians have made the greatest contributions. I and a research assistant arrived at the classification of each article into one or the other of the four sectors in the following manner. First we did the classification separately based on the title of the article, the abstract available in the SSCI, and the area of the author, as indicated on the first list of 898 political scientists. We had disagreements on 14 percent of the articles. We then met for a second classification of this 14 percent. Often

Table 2.2

Specification of the sectors for purpose of classification

Sectors	Topics
Administration and public policy (47.9%)*	Influence of political parties on policy Influence of institutions on policy Free trade Social policy Health care system Municipal governments
Elections and political parties (22.2%)	Public opinion (when unrelated to policy) Surveys Party leaders Candidates in elections Electoral systems
Rights and multiculturalism (8.5%)	Identity Citizenship Social movements Women and politics Diversity Nationalism Human rights Ethnicity
Institutions (21.4%)	Federalism and intergovernmental relations Regional politics Provincial politics Political economy Interest groups and the voluntary sector Media (when unrelated to policy or elections) Courts (when unrelated to policy) Representation Corruption Constitution

* The percentages correspond to the proportions of articles found in each sector.

we spontaneously agreed that one of us had it wrong the first time. When it was not the case, we had to specify the sector where specific topics should be classified. Table 2.2 provides the sectors in which we placed the articles on these topics. The table also provides the proportion of the 947 articles classified in each of the four sectors.

The SSCI provides impact scores for most journals. Impact scores are the frequencies by which journals are cited in other journals, divided by the number of articles that each journal publishes. All other things being equal,

the more one publishes in journals with a high-impact score, the more one has chances of being cited. Impact scores are used as indicators of the capacity of a journal to diffuse knowledge among scholars, but such scores can vary from one year to the next. Therefore, the impact scores used in the analysis are five-year averages covering 1999-2004. Impact scores dating back to the period before 1999 cannot be obtained from the SSCI. Again, Appendix 2.1 provides the five-year average impact scores of the journals in which the 947 articles of the data set were published. The SSCI also provides links between an article and all other indexed articles in which the article is cited. Thanks to these links, users can easily find out how frequently an article is cited and self-cited and the impact scores of the journals where the article is cited. On average, articles in the data set are quoted three times but with a large standard deviation of 6.2.

The Data and the Investigated Question

This data set provides useful information about the comparative turn in Canadian political science. It is a time-series data set, covering the period 1985-2005. Changes in publication patterns within that twenty-year period can therefore be tracked with the data set. It distinguishes between journals of Canadian and foreign origin, a measure that is useful if one assumes that publishing increasingly outside Canada is indicative of an effort to make Canadian knowledge relevant elsewhere. Publishing in foreign journals, however, is not sufficient or essential to conclude that a comparative turn has occurred. Some foreign journals poorly diffuse knowledge, and some Canadian journals can have broad audiences outside Canada. The impact scores of journals are useful to shed light on this matter. Lastly, contributions to international bodies of knowledge leave traces in the form of citations. I make the reasonable assumption that articles, which are known and considered as significant contributions to knowledge by peers, will be cited in their own publications. The data set provides the frequency whereby Canadian political scientists are cited as well as the capacity of the journals in which they are cited to diffuse knowledge. Solid measures of the comparative turn can therefore be found in this data set.

Moreover, the data set allows for comparisons among the four sectors. It is conceivable that one or more of the four sectors took a more decisive comparative turn. Similar comparisons can be made on the basis of the institutional affiliation of the author. It is in fact plausible that departments located in universities primarily devoted to teaching publish less internationally or squarely prefer a Canadian focus. I used *Maclean's* classification of universities to create a variable distinguishing between research and teaching universities. Finally, younger and older cohorts of scholars may have distinctive publication strategies. This variable was constructed using the year of publication. All scholars who published prior to 1995 were classified

as belonging to an older cohort and those who published only after 1995 as belonging to a younger cohort.

In this spirit, three regression analyses were conducted on the data set. The first one, a logistic regression, used the Canadian versus the foreign origin of the journal as the dependent variable. Journals of foreign origin were coded 1, and journals of Canadian origin were coded 0. Overall, 47 percent of all articles in the data set were published in journals of Canadian origin and 53 percent in journals of foreign origin. A second regression used the impact score of the journals in which the articles are published. Again, a comparative turn should involve Canadians publishing more in journals of foreign origin but possibly also in journals capable of diffusing knowledge outside Canada. The impact score is a measure of the diffusion capacity of journals. The average impact score of journals in which Canadian political scientists published between 1985 and 2005 was 0.469. The third regression was conducted using as the dependent variable the frequency whereby each article is cited, minus self-citation, weighted by the average impact scores of the journals in which each article is cited, plus 1 to avoid multiplications with a value below 1. This variable measures the effective diffusion of articles internationally. Table 2.3 lists the twenty most cited articles by Canadian political scientists.

The same independent variables entered the three regressions, with only one exception. Indeed, in all regressions, the sectors, the university type, the age of the cohorts, and the publication years appear in the equation. Naturally, the Canadian or foreign origin of the publication was part of the regressions on the impact score and on the effective diffusion; it was used as the dependent variable in the logistic regression.

Regression Results

The regression results provide evidence that a comparative turn in Canadian political science has occurred. Regression 1 confirms that political scientists publish more in journals of foreign origin now than in the past. Regression 2 suggests that publishing in journals of foreign origin increases the diffusion potential of an article significantly. And Regression 3 confirms that Canadian publications in journals of foreign origin are effectively diffused to wider audiences. The results are presented in Table 2.4.

Regression 1: Canadian versus Foreign Origin

The variable Year 1995 in Regression 1 indicates that, everything else being equal, articles published after 1995 were 2.4 times more likely to be published in a journal of foreign origin than an article published before 1995. Before 1995, 60.1 percent of all articles were published in journals of Canadian origin and 39.9 percent only in journals of foreign origin; after 1995, 62.1 percent of the articles were in journals of foreign origin and 37.9 percent

Table 2.3

The twenty most diffused articles

Author	Title	Journal	Year	Score for effective diffusion
Bennett, C.J.	Review article: "What Is Policy Convergence and What Causes It?"	*British Journal of Political Science*	1991	126.10
Carens, J.H.	"Aliens and Citizens: The Case for Open Borders"	*Review of Politics*	1987	115.36
Blais, A., D. Blake, and S. Dion	"Do Parties Make a Difference? Parties and the Size of Government in Liberal Democracies"	*American Journal of Political Science*	1993	106.38
Bassili, J.N., and J.F. Fletcher	"Response Time Measurement in Survey Research: A Method for CATI and a New Look at Nonattitudes"	*Public Opinion Quarterly*	1991	101.08
Atkinson, M., and W.D. Coleman	"Strong States and Weak States: Sectoral Policy Networks in Advanced Capitalist Economies"	*British Journal of Political Science*	1989	94.15
Bennett, C.J., and M. Howlett	"The Lessons of Learning: Reconciling Theories of Policy Learning and Policy Change"	*Policy Sciences*	1992	89.08
Stolle, D.	"Bowling Together, Bowling Alone: The Development of Generalized Trust in Voluntary Associations"	*Political Psychology*	1998	86.43
Abelson, J., et al.	"Deliberations about Deliberative Methods: Issues in the Design and Evaluation of Public Participation Processes"	*Social Science and Medicine*	2003	75.10
Stolle, D., and T.R. Rochon	"Are All Associations Alike? Member Diversity, Associational Type, and the Creation of Social Capital"	*American Behavioral Scientist*	1998	72.73
Jenson, J.	"Representations in Crisis: The Roots of Canada's Permeable Fordism"	*Canadian Journal of Political Science*	1990	69.80

Jenson, J.	"Naming Nations: Making Nationalist Claims in Canadian Public Discourse"	*Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*	1993	63.29
Siaroff, A.	"Corporatism in 24 Industrial Democracies: Meaning and Measurement"	*European Journal of Political Research*	1999	54.62
Hurley, J., J. Lomas, and V. Bhatia	"When Tinkering Is Not Enough: Provincial Reform to Manage Health-Care Resources"	*Canadian Public Administration*	1994	52.84
Blais, A., and R.K. Carty	"Does Proportional Representation Foster Voter Turnout?"	*European Journal of Political Research*	1990	51.65
Mendelsohn, M.	"The Media and Interpersonal Communications: The Priming of Issues, Leaders, and Party Identification"	*Journal of Politics*	1996	49.08
Harrison, K.	"Is Cooperation the Answer: Canadian Environmental Enforcement in Comparative Context"	*Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*	1995	45.03
Sabetti, F.	"Path Dependency and Civic Culture: Some Lessons from Italy about Interpreting Social Experiments"	*Politics and Society*	1996	41.22
Jenson, J.	"Paradigms and Political Discourse: Protective Legislation in France and the United States before 1914"	*Canadian Journal of Political Science*	1989	41.17
Borins, S.	"Electronic Road Pricing: An Idea Whose Time May Never Come"	*Transportation Research*	1988	39.10
Blais, A., and A. Dobrzynska	"Turnout in Electoral Democracies"	*European Journal of Political Research*	1998	38.53

Table 2.4

Regression analyses

	Regression 1 (logit)		Regression 2		Regression 3	
Variables	Exp (B)	Sig.	B	Sig.	B	Sig.
Year 1995	2.409	0.000	–0.007	0.780	–3.907	0.000
Sector 2	1.899	0.000	0.006	0.835	1.654	0.090
Sector 3	1.880	0.013	–0.027	0.515	1.018	0.479
Sector 4	2.083	0.000	0.009	0.755	–0.394	0.697
University	2.416	0.000	0.042	0.183	0.750	0.514
Young	1.071	0.720	0.009	0.754	–1.398	0.190
Origin	N/A	N/A	0.434	0.000	3.889	0.000
Constant	0.217	0.000	0.211	0.000	4.872	0.000
R^2	(Cox and Snell) 0.092		(adjusted) 0.310		(adjusted) 0.046	

only in journals of Canadian origin. As Appendix 2.1 suggests, however, fewer journals were indexed in the SSCI in 1985 than in 2005. The lower number of indexed journals early in the period could have biased the analysis since the three most popular Canadian journals (*Canadian Journal of Political Science, Canadian Public Policy,* and *Canadian Public Administration*) among Canadian political scientists are indexed for the entire period. To ascertain the absence of bias, we ran the same regression but only on the 765 articles published in journals indexed for the entire period. The results were largely similar. The odds ratio of publishing in journals of foreign origin after 1995, compared with before 1995, simply diminished from 2.4 to 1.7. Regardless of how one counts it, Canadian political scientists published more in journals of foreign origin at the end of the period 1985-2005 than at the beginning, a result indicative of a comparative turn.

Regression 1 also suggests that sharp differences exist in the propensity to publish in journals of foreign origins among sectors. In the three regressions, the administration and public policy sector serves as the basis of comparison. Thus, the variable Sector 2 tells us that political scientists whose articles were on elections and political parties were 1.9 times more likely to publish in journals of foreign origin than political scientists who wrote on administration and public policy. Table 2.4 presents similar results for the sectors of rights and multiculturalism (Sector 3) and institutions (Sector 4). In fact, 56.4 percent of the articles in the administration and public policy sector were published in journals of Canadian origin during the entire period, while less than 40 percent of the articles in the other three sectors appeared in journals of Canadian origin.

I can think of two explanations for the difference between the administration and public policy sector and the other three sectors. First, two of the

three most popular journals of Canadian origin are devoted to administration and public policy: *Canadian Public Policy* and *Canadian Public Administration*. *Canadian Electoral Studies* has yet to be created. Therefore, several political scientists who work in the area of public administration and policy might believe that they have sufficient venues in Canada to diffuse their work. By comparison, the political scientists working in the other three subfields might be more inclined to believe that they have to send their work outside Canada if they want to be published in scholarly journals. Second, public policy and administration is a subfield that might not lend itself as easily as the other subfields to comparative work. Quantitative scholars will not find many readily available and relevant comparative data sets, as is the case in the public opinion and election subfields. And data sets constructed from information gathered solely in Canada are unlikely to lead to articles of much interest outside Canada. In fact, most quantitative articles in public administration and policy published in the international journals of this subfield are focused solely on the United States (the articles published in *Policy Studies Journal* are evidence of this). Because policies provide an empirically distinguishable unit of analysis, however, qualitative comparative work in administration and public policy should have been undertaken and published abroad to the same extent it has in the subfields of institutions and rights. If this has failed to occur, it may be that Canadian scholars have not sufficiently distinguished themselves in administration and public policy for their contributions to be valued by the editors of foreign journals as much as the contributions of Canadian scholars working on questions of multiculturalism or federalism, for example. Perhaps Canadian administration and policy analysts prefer focusing on specific Canadian policy issues, without referring to an international literature, limiting their capacity to publish in journals of foreign origin.[1]

Scholars affiliated with research universities, Regression 1 indicates, are 2.4 times more likely to publish in journals of foreign origin than scholars who work in primarily teaching institutions. This difference is not entirely surprising since research universities often seek to improve their international reputations and therefore encourage their faculty members to publish their work in international venues. Interestingly enough, the variable Young, which distinguishes between the older and younger cohorts using the year of publication, is statistically insignificant. Unexpectedly, younger scholars do not publish more in journals of foreign origin than older scholars.

Regression 2: Impact Scores

The impact score of the journal in which each article was published is the dependent variable of the second regression, this time a typical Ordinary Least Square (OLS) regression. In a first step, the regression was run with the same independent variables as those entering Regression 1. The results were

almost identical. For example, publishing after 1995 increased the impact score by 0.09; scholars from research institutions obtained a score of 0.12 higher than scholars in teaching institutions; and articles on elections and political parties had a score of 0.07 higher than articles on administration and public policy. The only difference was that the sector rights and multiculturalism was no longer significantly different from the sector administration and public policy. In this first step, Regression 2 simply confirmed the results obtained with Regression 1.

The purpose of Regression 2, however, was to verify whether articles published in journals of foreign origin were correlated with a higher potential of knowledge diffusion. Thus, in a second step, I included in the model for Regression 2 the Origin of the publication venue, which had appeared as the dependent variable in Regression 1. The strength of the correlation between the origin of the journal and the impact scores practically eliminated the statistical significance of the other variables in the model, presented in Table 2.4. The impact scores of journals of foreign origin in which Canadian political scientists published were higher than the impact scores of domestic journals by 0.43. As a reminder, the average impact score for the entire period was 0.47. In other words, publishing in journals of foreign origin can roughly double the diffusion potential of the article.

As explained above, publishing more in journals of foreign origin is not, in itself, an indication that Canadian political scientists make an effort to increase their audiences beyond Canada's borders. Journals of Canadian origin may in fact diffuse knowledge as much as and even better than journals of foreign origin. Regression 2 suggests the opposite. The journals of foreign origin in which Canadian political scientists have published have a greater potential to diffuse knowledge widely than journals of Canadian origin. Therefore, that Canadian political scientists make a greater effort to publish in journals of foreign origin is indicative of a greater preoccupation with making available to scholars outside Canada the knowledge that they produce. Together, Regression 1 and Regression 2 provide strong indications that Canadian political scientists have taken or are taking a comparative turn.

Regression 3: Effective Diffusion

The dependent variable in Regression 3 is the effective diffusion of the knowledge produced by Canadian political scientists and not only the diffusion potential. The regression provides the basis for a discussion of whether the comparative turn was successful. I do not believe, however, that it provides a solid measure of the extent of the success. Any such measure would require a comparison of Canada with other comparable countries. The data set used here provides information on Canada only.

It might also be premature to try to measure the success of the comparative turn in Canadian political science. As argued above, the turn was much more pronounced after than before 1995, and the articles published in journals of foreign origin after 1995 are likely to be widely cited in the future. As Table 2.3 reveals, of the twenty most diffused Canadian articles, only one was published after 2000. In addition, this article is somewhat of an outlier because it is cited in medical journals whose impact scores are much higher than those of the most prestigious political science journals. The variable Year 1995 in Regression 3 suggests that it takes time for an article to be widely diffused: everything else being equal, articles published after 1995 received a score 3.91 points lower than articles published before 1995 in my measure of effective diffusion. In other words, a ten-year-old article is far from old, let alone outdated, and can still be useful to several scholars.

Consistent with the argument made thus far, Regression 3 shows that actual success in the diffusion of knowledge is more likely if the article is published in a journal of foreign origin. Everything else being equal, articles in journals of foreign origin received a score 3.9 points higher than articles in journals of Canadian origin. In other words, the turn toward journals of foreign origin after 1995 encourages an effective diffusion of Canadian knowledge abroad.

Regression 3 also shows that Canadian articles on elections and political parties are more likely to be effectively diffused than articles in administration and public policy, although the statistical significance is not very high. In contrast with Regression 1, however, the difference between rights and multiculturalism and institutions on the one hand and administration and public policy on the other is statistically insignificant. In short, the success of the comparative turn in Canadian political science appears to be slightly more important in the area of elections and political parties than in the other three areas. Interestingly enough, however, scholars in research universities are no more likely to be effective at diffusing knowledge than scholars in teaching universities. Likewise, older cohorts of scholars are not significantly more effective at diffusing knowledge than younger scholars, even if knowledge diffusion takes time.

A comparative turn in Canadian political science has indeed been taken, confirming the international trend observed by Lees (2006). The data set constructed to prepare this chapter does not allow me to draw a conclusion on whether articles written by Canadian political scientists compare countries more frequently than in the past.[2] However, the data set reveals that Canadian political scientists now publish more articles in journals edited outside Canada than in the past, thus making their knowledge more visible

outside the country. The data indicate also that they have not deserted the preferred themes of their predecessors, as typified by the traditional Canadian political scientist Donald Smiley (Simeon 1989; Smiley 1987). I assume that they simply frame their knowledge to make it fit within comparative bodies of knowledge, an avenue that Lees (2006) explicitly prescribes for single-country scholarship. Therefore, the work of Canadian political scientists on federalism, elections, or multiculturalism is deemed, more frequently than in the past, worthy of publication by the editors of non-Canadian journals. This trend, however, might not be as true in the subfield of administration and public policy as it is in the other three subfields covered in this chapter, especially elections and political parties.

The main finding of this chapter, that political scientists increasingly choose to publish outside Canada, might not be read as good news by editors of Canadian journals. However, the comparative turn does not require publishing abroad, as I have already suggested. Canadian journals can indeed publish more comparative material and make efforts to become as effective as international journals in diffusing knowledge. The regressions presented in this chapter suggest that this was not the case during the period 1985-2005, but this is by no means an irreversible situation. After Canadian political scientists, it may now be time for Canadian journals to make a decisive comparative turn.

Acknowledgments
I would like to thank Frédéric Bastien and Martin Vézina for excellent research assistance.

Appendix 2.1

Journals in which Canadian political scientists published: 1985-2005

Journal	First year	Number of authors	Impact score
Health Affairs	1987	2	3.419
International Organization	1985	1	3.086
Northwestern University Law Review	1985	1	3.076
World Politics	1985	4	2.499
American Political Science Review	1985	5	2.476
American Journal of Political Science	1985	6	1.945
Social Science and Medicine	1985	1	1.907
Research Policy	1985	2	1.385
International Studies Quarterly	1985	1	1.348
Economy and Society	1985	1	1.339
Journal of Health Politics Policy and Law	1985	6	1.280
Journal of Rural Studies	1985	1	1.264
American Journal of Comparative Law	1985	5	1.254
International Journal of Urban and Regional Research	1985	2	1.231
Law and Society Review	1985	1	1.228
Politics and Society	1985	5	1.215
Regional Studies	1985	1	1.203
Journal of European Public Policy	1997	5	1.200
Ethics	1985	2	1.178
Comparative Political Studies	1985	13	1.128
European Journal of International Relations	1997	1	1.121
New Left Review	1985	4	1.109
Theory and Society	1985	2	1.102
Comparative Politics	1985	11	1.061
Public Opinion Quarterly	1985	14	1.036
Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration	1995	9	1.029
Journal of Policy Analysis and Management	1985	6	1.029
International Journal of Health Services	1985	3	1.028
Urban Studies	1985	2	1.023
British Journal of Political Science	1985	21	0.992
Journal of Common Market Studies	1985	2	0.992
Journal of Democracy	1996	1	0.951
Public Administration Review	1985	8	0.945
Journal of Urban Affairs	1993	1	0.922
Scientometrics	1985	1	0.912
Health Policy	1985	1	0.910
Public Administration	1985	1	0.847
Journal of Politics	1985	10	0.840
West European Politics	2000	2	0.814
Political Psychology	1985	3	0.787
Journal of Family Issues	1985	1	0.781

►

◄ *Appendix 2.1*

Journal	First year	Number of authors	Impact score
Cambridge Journal of Economics	1985	1	0.772
Policy and Politics	1985	2	0.758
Social Science Research	1985	2	0.758
Political Communication	1994	2	0.753
Business History	1985	1	0.745
Journal of World Trade	1985	2	0.730
Arctic	1985	2	0.728
Ethnic and Racial Studies	1985	4	0.726
Society and Natural Resources	1988	1	0.717
Energy Policy	1985	1	0.709
Journal of European Social Policy	1997	1	0.702
Journal of Development Studies	1985	3	0.694
American Behavioral Scientist	1985	1	0.692
Information Society	1997	2	0.686
Journal of World Business	1997	1	0.686
European Journal of Political Research	1985	30	0.656
Social Politics	1995	7	0.645
Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice	1985	1	0.640
Journal of Business Ethics	1985	1	0.623
Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy	1985	1	0.622
Public Money and Management	1993	1	0.597
International Migration Review	1985	3	0.596
International Political Science Review	1992	11	0.594
Journal of Public Health Policy	1994	1	0.590
Social Policy and Administration	1985	5	0.587
Government Information Quarterly	1985	1	0.570
Electoral Studies	1985	41	0.564
Journal of Modern African Studies	1985	1	0.561
Security Studies	1996	1	0.547
American Politics Research	2001	1	0.542
Public Administration and Development	1985	7	0.542
Third World Quarterly	1985	1	0.542
Marine Policy	1985	1	0.539
Journal of Political Philosophy	1998	3	0.535
Global Governance	1996	1	0.528
Coastal Management	1993	1	0.515
Legislative Studies Quarterly	1985	5	0.514
Studies in Comparative International Development	1985	2	0.504
Party Politics	1995	25	0.501
Political Behavior	1997	10	0.499
Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science	1985	1	0.490
Sociology of Sport Journal	1990	1	0.477
Human Rights Quarterly	1985	1	0.474

►

◄ *Appendix 2.1*

Journal	First year	Number of authors	Impact score
Political Research Quarterly	1993	4	0.468
Political Quarterly	1985	1	0.458
Latin American Politics and Society	2001	2	0.455
Scandinavian Political Studies	1994	1	0.454
Political Studies	1985	18	0.443
Environmental Politics	2002	2	0.435
Canadian Journal of Statistics/Revue canadienne de statistique	1999	1	0.433
Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics/Revue canadienne d'agroéconomie	1997	1	0.431
Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique	1985	3	0.431
Political Theory	1985	3	0.424
Communist and Post-Communist Studies	1993	1	0.401
Europe-Asia Studies	1993	5	0.393
Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers canadiens de sociologie	1985	12	0.390
Harvard International Journal of Press Politics	1998	4	0.389
IDS Bulletin: Institute of Development Studies	1985	1	0.383
Publius: The Journal of Federalism	1985	18	0.383
Policy Sciences	1985	9	0.382
PS: Political Science and Politics	1988	9	0.382
Administration and Society	1985	4	0.381
Parliamentary Affairs	1985	3	0.381
Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology/ Revue canadienne de sociologie et d'anthropologie	1985	11	0.373
Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations	1985	1	0.361
Australian Journal of Political Science	1990	7	0.360
Australian Outlook	1985	1	0.353
Public Choice	1985	8	0.351
Journal of Moral Education	1985	1	0.346
American Review of Public Administration	1995	4	0.338
Armed Forces and Society	1985	3	0.334
International Journal of Public Opinion Research	1992	9	0.313
Women and Politics	1991	7	0.312
Policy Review	1985	1	0.311
Public Interest	1985	2	0.299
Journal of Historical Sociology	1994	1	0.291
Canadian Public Policy/Analyse de politiques	1985	69	0.284
Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement	1985	1	0.277
Social Philosophy and Policy	1985	1	0.267
International Review of Administrative Sciences	1994	12	0.265
Latin American Perspectives	1985	4	0.265

►

◄ *Appendix 2.1*

Journal	First year	Number of authors	Impact score
Space Policy	1985	1	0.252
Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique	1985	243	0.251
Asian Survey	1985	1	0.250
International Journal	1985	6	0.250
Osteuropa	1985	1	0.230
Dissent	1985	3	0.227
International Social Science Journal	1985	11	0.223
Policy Studies Journal	1985	5	0.219
Social Science Information/Sur les sciences sociales	1985	1	0.218
Current History	1985	2	0.215
Australian Journal of Public Administration	1985	2	0.210
Dados: Revista de ciencias sociales	1985	3	0.208
Canadian Public Administration/Administration publique du Canada	1985	164	0.204
Curriculum Inquiry	1985	1	0.204
Pacific Affairs	1985	4	0.202
Quality and Quantity	1985	3	0.199
Forest Policy and Economics	2001	1	0.194
New Republic	1985	1	0.188
Justice System Journal	1985	1	0.170
Journal of Policy Modeling	1985	1	0.164
Political Science	1985	2	0.164
Revue canadienne d'études du développement/ Canadian Journal of Development Studies	1985	3	0.150
Revue canadienne des sciences de l'administration/ Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences	1992	1	0.146
Desarrollo economico: Revista de ciencias sociales	1985	1	0.138
Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science/ Revue canadienne des sciences de l'information et de bibliothéconomie	1993	1	0.131
Society	1985	2	0.108
Polity	1985	1	0.107
Nouvelles questions féministes	1994	1	0.000
Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice	2004	1	
Canadian Journal of Regional Science/Revue canadienne des sciences régionales	1985	3	
Commonwealth and Comparative Politics	1998	3	
Comparative Sociology	2002	1	
Critical Social Policy	2003	1	
Government Publications Review	1985	2	
Icon: International Journal of Constitutional Law	2004	1	
International Journal of Comparative Sociology	1985	1	

►

◀ *Appendix 2.1*

Journal	First year	Number of authors	Impact score
International Journal of Public Administration	1985	1	
International Journal of the Sociology of Language	1985	2	
Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études canadiennes	1985	1	
Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics	1985	6	
Journal of Developing Areas	1985	1	
Journal of Pacific History	1992	1	
Loisir et société/Society and Leisure	1995	1	
National Westminster Bank Quarterly Review	1985	1	
Politics and the Life Sciences	1985	1	
Public Finance Quarterly	1996	3	
Public Finance Review	1997	2	
Review of Politics	1985	2	
Socialist Review	1985	2	
Soviet Geography	1985	1	
Technology in Society	1985	2	