CHARACTERISTICS OF CANADIAN PRIME MINISTERS:

RATINGS BY HISTORIANS AND POLITICAL SCIENTISTS

by

ELIZABETH JEAN BALLARD

B.Ed., The University of British Columbia, 1975

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(Department of Psychology)

We accept this thesis as conforming

to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

May, 1982

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of _Psychology_

The University of British Columbia
2075 Wesbrook Place
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1W5

Date _March 25, 1982_

ABSTRACT

Personality, situational and behavioural theories of political leadership
fall short of explaining the interaction among the leader, the followers
and the environment. In contrast, the transactional approach emphasizes
this reciprocal process of social, cognitive and situational influences.
Integrative complexity theory provides a framework and a methodology for
studying this interaction and its effect on how people process
information.

This study focuses on the Canadian Prime Ministers as a population of
political leaders worthy of investigation. In addition to studying their
integrative complexity level, other aspects of value in understanding
great leaders were examined. Based on items found in studies of American
Presidents (Maranell, 1970; Schlesinger, 1962) the following dimensions
were studied: difficulty, activeness, motivation, strength,
effectiveness, prestige, innovativeness, flexibility, honesty and overall
accomplishments.

Two sets of complexity scores (on prepared and spontaneous materials)
were obtained in order to test the question: Whose complexity is being
rated in prepared speeches -- the writer's or the speaker's? Prepared
speech scores came from the Response to the Speech from the Throne texts
in Hansard, while spontaneous speech scores were based on extemporaneous
responses to informal questions in the House of Commons. Two groups of
experts (historians and political scientists) on Canadian leaders were
approached for their opinions about the 16 Prime Ministers along the ten
dimensions mentioned. An eleventh item was included as a check on the
experts' knowledge of each leader.

There was no difference between the prepared and spontaneous

integrative complexity scores. Except for honesty, there were no correlations between complexity and the 11 dimensions rated by experts. The experts' ratings did not differ as a function of their discipline on 10 of the 11 scales. Only on the amount of information they had about each Prime Minister did the two groups differ. The difficulty of the political issues facing a Prime Minister had an effect on how he was rated on five dimensions: activeness, strength, effectiveness, innovativeness and accomplishments.

Based on the four items found to be most predictive of greatness in American Presidents (i.e., strength, prestige, activeness and accomplishments), Canada's five greatest Prime Ministers are: Macdonald, Laurier, Borden, King and Trudeau. Both primacy and recency effects can be seen in these choices. The difficulty of the issues facing a Prime Minister had an impact on 3 of the 4 components contributing to greatness. The 5 Prime Ministers selected as great tended to rate high on the items which correspond to the 3 major dimensions (evaluative, activity, potency) of the semantic differential.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is often the case with major projects that many people make valuable contributions in the form of support, effort and ideas. And so it is with this project. Thanks go to my many tolerant friends who never failed to encourage me whenever I slowed down. Grateful acknowledgements go to Sheryl Mitchell and Janet Granger for their library research efforts; to Dr. Margaret Prang, Dr. Peter Ward and Prof. Donald Blake for their constructive criticism and contributions to the items on the questionnaire; and to Patricia Waldron for her excellent and speedy typing. Special thanks go to Michael Perry for both his contribution of a testable hypothesis and his moral support at the beginning of this project. I also give special thanks to Dr. Ralph Hakstian who patiently led me through the intricacies of data analysis and to Dr. Robert Knox who quietly persisted in his request for quality work. My greatest thanks are reserved for Dr. Peter Suedfeld. His contributions were in all three forms. Besides providing intellectual guidance and professional advice, he always expressed faith in my abilities. He not only believed I <u>would</u> complete this project satisfactorily, but he also succeeded in convincing me, at the darkest moments, that I <u>could</u> and <u>should</u> complete it.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership

"How Hard it is to Keep From Being King When It's
in You and in The Situation"
(title of poem by Robert Frost, 1951)

Since before the time of Plato's philosopher-king people have been

fascinated with the concept of leadership and its attendant

characteristics. History records the effects of individuals like Christ,

Beethoven, Queen Victoria, Marx and Hitler who have had significant

impact on multitudes of people in their own time and beyond. Leaders and

their attributes first attracted intensive scientific attention around

the turn of the twentieth century. Since that time hundreds of studies

have been conducted in attempts to describe, categorize and predict the

tantalizing phenomenon of leadership.

One major theory of leadership could be referred to as the Great Man

theory. According to this view leaders possess a relatively small number

of special qualities, characteristics, or traits that set them apart from

non-leaders. These traits are considered to be stable across time and

situations. Proponents of this view of leadership chose to ignore the

effects of both non-leaders (i.e., followers) and of situational

variables upon the leader. The Great Man theory implied that the role of

leader was a stable one and that variations in the leader-follower

context across situations did not influence the role requirements of the

leader.

In empirical studies, using personality assessments, observers and

peer ratings, some common characteristics among leaders did seem to

emerge with considerable regularity. These included: intelligence, a

high rate of energy output, alertness, knowledge, originality, personal

integrity, self-confidence, decisiveness and fluency of speech

(Stogdill, 1974). Unfortunately, neither how much nor exactly which combination of these qualities were required for a successful leader has been specified.

Even as the Great Man or trait theory was being expounded, researchers were looking elsewhere for more complete explanations of leadership. The situationalists felt that it was a combination of timing, placement and circumstances which gave rise to great leaders, not personality characteristics.

As early as 1897 (Spencer) the type of leadership to develop in a group was thought to be a function of the group's particular nature and the problems it must solve. Thus different groups would require different qualities in their leaders. A labour union would require one type of leader while a research team would require another and a children's youth group yet another. According to Hollander and Julian (1969, p. 387) the major focus of the situational approach was "the study of leaders in different settings defined especially in terms of different group tasks and group structure." Lewin (1942) and his students conducted several laboratory experiments in situational effects using small groups. They demonstrated that as the situation changed so did the emergence or transformation of leadership. They varied the "atmosphere" in small experimental groups from authoritarian through democratic to laissez-faire. What they showed was that the democratic situations led to the most constructive and creative type of leadership. What they did not find was that under all circumstances democratic leadership was best. Taken to its extreme the situational view would suggest that there are no absolute leaders and that just about anyone, regardless of his or her particular personality traits, can become a leader if the conditions are right (Baron and Byrne, 1977).

Many studies undertaken from the situational approach to leadership tended to focus exclusively on the effects of various environments or situations upon the choice of leaders. Given a particular situation, interest lay in discovering what kind of leader would emerge, and how successful the leadership was. From this perspective the impact of the followers on the leader's behaviour was ignored as was the influence of the leader on the followers' perceptions of the situation.

Both the personality trait and the situational approach to leadership suffered from their attempt to isolate components within what is essentially a dynamic system. Because of this treatment of interacting parts as single forces, neither approach could account for certain basic observations. Trait theory (Great Man theory) could not explain which characteristics were required for a person to become a great leader (Mann, 1959), nor why traits required of a leader varied from one situation to another. The situational theory, for its part, could not account for the differences in ability and willingness of people to rise to the leadership position under the "right" circumstances (Beckhouse et al., 1975; Nydegger, 1975).

Concurrent with the rise of the situational view of leadership was the emergence of the behavioural approach to the issue. This view looked at those behaviours carried out by the leader in the process of leading. In the 1950's, Ohio State University and the University of Michigan together launched a series of field studies which explored the construct of leadership behaviour. They were interested in the relationship between specific leader behaviours and subordinate performance and satisfaction. The Ohio State studies led to the development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Hemphill and Coons, 1957). The LBDQ was later modified successfully by Halpin and Winer

(1957) who used US Air Force bomber crews as subjects. The two major

behavioural dimensions identified by the LBDQ which accounted for the

largest portions of the explained variance in leader behaviour were

consideration and initiating structure. Consideration was associated

with indications of mutual trust, respect and warmth between the leader

and subordinates. Initiating structure was related to the definition and

organization of the relationship between the leader and his subordinates.

The Michigan studies also examined leader behaviour. Their subjects

were supervisors and employees of the Prudential Life Insurance Company

in New Jersey. The researchers initially used nondirective interviews

from which they derived two major orientation dimensions (Katz, Maccoby &

Morse, 1950; Katz, Maccoby, Gurrin & Floor, 1951). These were employee

orientation, related to human relations and production orientation, which

dealt with task performance. It would seem that these dimensions are

comparable to the Ohio State studies' behaviour dimensions of

consideration and initiating structure respectively, (Bowers & Seashore,

1971).

Unfortunately, the behavioural approach to leadership, while defining

and describing the behaviours and roles of leaders, failed to correlate

the two major dimensions of leader behaviour with either performance or

satisfaction of subordinates. Another problem with this approach was its

failure to consider the possibility that particular effects of

consideration and initiation of structure depend upon the specific

circumstances of the situation (House and Mitchell 1974; Kerr,

Schreisheim, Murphy and Stogdill, 1974).

At this point it might be useful to note certain features of the

leader-led dyad. A leader is part of a group in which there is always a

leader-follower relationship. The leader's role is central to the group

in the sense that his or her presence in the group is significant and decisive, but all members of a group influence one another (Filella, 1969).

By combining the divergent and narrowly focused views of the trait, situation and behavioural approaches, theorists developed a new approach to the study of leadership. This one emphasized the interaction of personality traits and situational demands. One exponent of this new, more integrated view was Fiedler. His contingency theory of leadership (1967) attempted to account for the interrelationship among the leader's motivational characteristics, the situational characteristics, and group productivity. Fiedler held that it was the leader's style of interacting with his group members and the favourableness of the group-task situation which determined leadership effectiveness. He developed a measure of leader style called the Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale (LPC). This scale located a leader along a single dimension with ends labelled "task oriented" and "person oriented." The LPC score was viewed as a stable personality trait. Leader style was related to the task structure and the situational favourableness in such a way as to predict the likely effectiveness of the leader.

In a revision of his theory Fiedler (1973) said that the LPC score was an index of a hierarchy of goals. Initially a leader pursues his or her primary goal, which is either personal relations (for high LPC leaders) or task completion (for low LPC leaders). Once this is achieved, attention is focused on the secondary goal. This is task completion for the high LPC's and personal relations for low LPC's

In more recent years the focus has shifted from emphasizing the leader's needs, influence and qualities. Now such issues as the effects of environmental pressures are being studied as they relate to the

leader's behaviour and effectiveness (Hunt, Osborn & Schriesheim, 1978).

Osborn and Hunt (1975) proposed an Adaptive-Reactive Theory of leadership. Here, the leader's behaviour is seen as adapting to the conditions of the organizational system in which he or she is operating and reacting to the needs, wants, desires and pressures of his or her subordinates. The implications of this approach have yet to be tested empirically.

Most recently we seem to be concentrating on the transactional view of leadership (Baron and Byrne, 1977, p. 596) whereby "leadership is viewed as a reciprocal process of social influence in which leaders both influence followers and are influenced, in turn, by them." Situational aspects affect both parts of this dynamic interaction. This approach is in effect only an extension of Case's (1933) perception of the emergence of leadership. He held that leadership is produced when three factors intersect: (1) the personality traits of the leader, (2) the nature of the group and of its members, and (3) the event (change or problem) facing the group.

Political Leadership

> "Everything may depend upon the farmer, industrial worker, soldier
> and scientist, but we customarily hold only political leaders
> responsible for all conditions affecting agriculture, industry,
> security, and culture. They stand at the center of our communal
> expectations." (Paige 1977, p. 3)

The political leader is indeed the focal point of many desires for communal improvement. The citizens of most nations look to their leaders not only when times are good but also in times of economic hardship, industrial unease and agricultural distress. Today with alarming regularity headlines confront us with the terrible news of assassination

attempts upon world leaders. Editorials go on to explain the ripple effects that the loss of important world leaders will have on the rest of us. As Seligman (1950) points out, there is little doubt that in the twentieth century we have seen a tremendous rise in the emphasis on politics by leadership, and have also witnessed the growing importance of political leaders in creating and maintaining democratic societies. Yet in spite of the significance placed upon the role of political leadership we have not until recently seen an equivalent emphasis in working towards a clearer understanding of the nature of the position nor of the requirements of the role.

Not until 1950 did the first significant analytical study of political leadership appear. In his article, Seligman (1950) called for what psychologists later termed the transactional approach to leadership theory (Baron and Byrne, 1977). He suggested that we study, on the one hand, the social and environmental factors affecting "political leadership" behaviour and on the other hand, the personality traits that interact with these factors. It is interesting to note that while Seligman suggested this approach in 1950, it was not until the 1970's that psychologists began to respond.

In looking at the historical development of the study of political leadership, we find that the major contributions have occurred in the last four decades. Prior to that, the focus of attention relative to political leadership moved from Plato's philosopher-king to Machiavelli's Prince to the more modern contributions of Carlyle's (1841/1907) history as defined by great men's biographies, Weber's (1904-1905) idea of charismatic, traditional and rational-legal authority and more recently Lasswell's (1950) psychoanalytic interpretation of political motivations.

Paige (1977) feels that Sabine's (1937) History of Political Theory

was a contributing factor, as well as a prime example of, the lack of attention given to the systematic study of political leadership. He thinks that this text had a significant influence on the outlook of generations of political scientists. In this book there is only one reference to the concept of leadership. The entry referred to Fascism and National socialism. Although Sabine discussed ideas related to the notion of political leadership, the ideas were scattered throughout the text and left as unrelated concepts (Paige, 1977).

In spite of Sabine's impact the last forty years have seen a growing interest in the scientific analysis of political leadership among political scientists and others. The issues confronted in the study of political leadership are not much different from those encountered in the analysis of leadership in general.

Carlyle's (1841/1907) theory that the history of the world is but the biography of great men seems to be reflected in the works of modern researchers such as Wolfenstein (1967) in his psychoanalytic study of revolutionary leaders and Barber (1965, 1966, 1972) in his attempt to predict leader performance on the basis of the active-passive (propensity for activity) and the positive-negative (affect) dimensions. Each of these researchers sought to understand the personal characteristics of leaders. They assume that dispositional characteristics have a great deal to do with the emergence of great leaders.

However, in concentrating on the leader's personality traits these researchers and others like them failed to take into account that the leader's personal characteristics and values must suit the needs and expectations of his followers (Katz, 1973). Great leaders have lost their positions, not because they have changed but because the needs and wants of the followers have changed. The Shah of Iran, for example, had

a devoted following who supported his Western-oriented policies. But when a religious leader, the Ayatollah Khomeini, challenged his deviations from traditional Islamic faith, the Shah's influence began to crumble with tragic results for the country.

Still there is a need to study the personality characteristics of political leaders. At times, such traits may even be the critical factor in influencing followers and engendering in them attitudes of devotion, as in the case of charismatic leaders such as Napoleon, President Kennedy, and Ghandi. The thing to remember when studying personality characteristics is to relate the traits to the social field in which they are operating. Leadership is a dynamic process involving the leader, the led and the environmental circumstances of their relationship.

As in the general leadership literature, so we find in the field of political leadership, a controversy over which end of the situation-disposition continuum to focus on. Opposing the Great Man theory of leadership is the situational view which is preoccupied with the cultural determinants of political leadership. The culturalists (or situationalists) assume that social conditions are so firmly structured that the leader cannot manoeuver within them, and that there are a number of people who because of the circumstances could assume leadership positions (Katz, 1973).

Katz (1973) sees leadership as a relationship between the leader and the followers and the ways in which they communicate and interact within a social context. He lists four major dimensions of the social settings in which leadership takes place. The first is the degree of formal role structure. For example, in the military a great deal of role-determined behaviour exists whereas in a public meeting only a little structure would be imposed on behaviour. The second dimension is that of primary

versus secondary relationships. Is the relationship of the followers to
the leader direct, as in a club meeting, or secondary, as in a political
rally? The third dimension is the relationship of the "leader-followers"
unit to other systems. Is it an independent or dependent sort of
relationship with other organizations or groups? The last dimension Katz
discusses is the mixture of types of institutions within the system.
Here he seems to be speaking of a relatively large group of followers.
The types of institutions vary from primarily democratic to dominantly
authoritarian.

On historical grounds, it can be argued that the assumption of the
immutable impact of the situation appears to be based on shaky ground.
Hook (1943), in defending the personality view of political leadership,
hypothesized not only that the significant results of particular events
can be ascribed to a specific individual, but also that no other
individual could have behaved in a similar manner. Therefore one might
argue that even with the general social unrest in 1939 Europe, without
Hitler the particular atrocities of World War II would never have come to
pass.

In his review of research on political leadership, Seligman (1950)
analyzed five approaches to the study of that body of work. The first
emphasized the social status or position of the leader; focusing on the
leader's demographic background. According to Seligman its major
contribution is a "statistical tabulation of collectivities of leaders"
(p. 908). He concluded that this approach has produced little of
significance, and would be much improved if it looked at social class
impediments faced by potential leaders and the extent to which these
might interfere with the free recruitment of leadership.

A second approach to examining leadership focuses on the type of

social structures existing in the political milieu. While work in the

area of social atmospheres (Lewin, 1942) was done in small group

laboratory experiments, Seligman felt that the results could apply to

political life in such ways as "understanding the inner workings of large

political parties" and "the study of chief executives in their inner

circles" (p. 909). This approach awaits further applications and

research.

A third approach to studying leadership is to look at it in the

context of formal industrial organizations. After pointing out a series

of seemingly crucial limitations to the generalizability of this approach

Seligman conceded that factors other than political ones could be

examined for their contribution to the understanding of leadership

behaviour.

A fourth method is one we should now be familiar with, the study of

personality types. The problems inherent in this approach have been

discussed in the previous section. Seligman wisely points out that "a

good full-length treatment of particular political leaders that will

attempt to cast psychological factors in their social contextual mold is

needed" (p. 911).

A fifth approach to leadership analysis is the political biography.

This was the approach taken by Carlyle (1841/1907) and centuries before

him by the well-known Greek, Plutarch (ca. A.D. 40-120), who wrote at

least fifty biographies of Greek and Roman leaders (cited in Paige 1977,

p. 16). Seligman holds out hope for this approach. Although he says it

lacks "criteria and conceptualization" it abounds in rich insights which

he thinks are to be gained through the application of the theoretical

perspective of social science (p. 912).

Looking at the analysis of political leadership from the point of

view of a political scientist, Paige (1977) reviewed six current approaches to the topic. In each he noted their relationship to political leadership. The first approach is through the notion of power. Paige refers to Dahl's (1963) <u>Modern Political Analysis</u> as a good summary of an approach to political analysis in terms of the notions of influence and power. He says that although Dahl does not link these concepts to leadership himself, he defines influence as "a relation among actors in which one actor induces others to act in some way they would otherwise not act." This coincides with McFarland's (1969, p. 155) definition of the leader as "the one who makes things happen that would not happen otherwise."

Dahl's measurement of leader's influence places emphasis on the behaviour of the followers. The five measures he suggests are: "(1) the amount of change in the actor influenced, (2) the subjective psychological costs of compliance, (3) the amount of difference in the probability of compliance, (4) differences in the scope of the responses, and (5) the number of persons who respond" (cited in Paige, 1977, p. 17).

The second approach to political analysis that Paige discusses focuses on the study of decision-making. Snyder (1958) stressed the processes of organizational decision-making by officials in a "decisional unit." Out of a series of alternatives, he suggested, one project would be selected through the interaction of three "variable clusters" ("spheres of competence", "communication and information," and "motivation") to achieve the outcome desired by the decision-makers. Like Dahl (1963) Snyder did not link his theory of decision-making to political leadership. That connnection is made by Paige (1977).

A third approach to political analysis comes through Deutsch's (1963) discussion of cybernetics. Paige (1977) interprets this approach as

viewing "leadership as the behaviour of a steersman-communicator who decides, controls, allocates, learns and innovates" (Paige, p. 21). Deutsch sees government less in terms of power and more in terms of steering.

Easton's The Political System (1953) is representative of the fourth approach Paige discusses. In attempting to shift the discipline's emphasis away from the concept of power, Easton said "political science is the study of the authoritative allocation of values as it is influenced by the distribution and use of power" (1953, p. 146). Paige suggests that Easton sees leadership as a "need" that is "imposed" by requirements of the general political system. Therefore, like power, it is not a central concern of government.

In his later work Easton (1965) focused on the behaviours of political leaders. As Paige points out, he introduced the notion of leadership as "gatekeeping", and the function of the leader as a "structural mechanism" for controlling the conversion of wants into demands and demands into social policy.

The fifth approach to political analysis that Paige discusses is structural functionalism. Paige treats Almond's (1960) paper as a significant introduction to this approach. In it no explicit mention is made of the functions of leadership within the political system . Instead, related behaviours such as "initiation, modification and vetoing" are mentioned.

The sixth and last approach to political analysis dealt with by Paige is the one he terms "the new political economy." Its major proponents, Ilchman and Uphoff (1969) do not deal directly with the concept of leadership but rather with the job of the "statesman." However, Paige suggests that leadership behaviour will be highly visible in this

approach to political science because it deals with the decisions made concerning the allocation of scarce resources. The interest of the "political economists" (a new kind of political scientist) is in improving the choices made by the "statesman" and by other "resource allocators" (Paige, 1977, pp. 30-31).

While only one of these six approaches examines political leadership explicitly they all deal with the concept to some degree. Paige attributes this general lack of focus to the "European intellectual influences" upon political science in the West. The combined impact of three kinds of determinism--evolutionary, psychological, and economic--served to create an atmosphere in which no individual political leader was thought capable of altering the course of events. (If this were true one would expect the Great Man theory of leadership within political science to have gained very little favour). Despite this restrictive influence, Paige believes that "wherever relatively free social science inquiry is possible, it is likely that the scientific study of political leadership will arise" (p. 40).

Twenty-seven years after Seligman's pivotal paper, Hermann (1977) published a book which focused exclusively on the personal characteristics of political leaders. Her definition of personal characteristics says that they are comprised of factors on a continuum. At one end are "traits," which are those characteristics remaining stable across a wide variety of situations. On the other end of the continuum are "states," those personal characteristics which are related to specific kinds of situations. Although it is true that this approach still places the major emphasis on the leader rather than on the led or their interaction with each other, her definition of "states" makes it obvious that she understands the impact of situationally defined

conditions.

Measuring the personal characteristics of political leaders can be a wearisome task. Securing access to a leader, gaining his or her cooperation and finally trying to prevent the interference of image maintenance behaviour all enter into the job and complicate the data collection.

There are a variety of techniques being used to assess the personal characteristics of political leaders. Hermann (1977) has enumerated six of them and has pointed out which problems are avoided through their use.

The first is the questionnaire, which is the most difficult technique to use with political leaders. These people are often inaccessible, unwilling to participate and have a vested interest in maintaining a particular image. The second method is the interview. There are two kinds. The first, the research interview, which is conducted specifically for research purposes; the second, the acquired or political business interview which may be conducted for reasons other than research. Obviously the first type of interview gives the researcher more control over the topics discussed. The acquired interview however does not require the permission of the political leader in question to use the information for research.

Because of their frequent public exposure observation is useful in assessing political leaders. One type of observation is self-observation where the leader writes about himself. Another type uses informants such as colleagues to outline the leader's personal characteristics and their effects. A third type is participant observation in which an observer participates in the process he is observing. Field observation is a fourth type where the political leader is observed in his natural political situation by an observer who describes what is happening. This

last method of observation obviates the need for cooperation by the leader but does not control for image management.

Hermann discusses biographical statistics as a fourth way of assessing a political leader's personal characteristics. This method is similar to Seligman's social status approach. None of the assessment problems found among the other techniques is found in this method.

Another technique Hermann discusses is simulation. The definition she uses for simulation is: "a flexible imitation of processes and outcomes for the purposes of clarifying or explaining the underlying mechanisms involved" (Abelson, 1968b, p. 275). The advantage of this approach, whether it be computerized, all-person or person-machine simulations is the availability and accessibility of the "simulated" leaders and lack of image maintenance problems. The major question about the use of this method concerns its validity.

A final technique in the analysis of political leaders is content analysis. According to Hermann this method involves the coding of spoken or written work into meaningful categories. Some decisions to be made in categorizing content revolve around the issues of quality versus quantity and structure versus content. The advantages of this technique are its availability and accessibility. Only the problem of image maintenance must be considered.

Integrative Complexity

In contrast to Hermann's (1977) content analysis of verbal material is the structural notion of conceptual complexity (Harvey, Hunt and Schroder, 1961, and Schroder, Driver & Streufert, 1967). This theory analyzes the structure of information processing (i.e. the way a person combines information from both external and internal sources for adaptive

purposes) and is only minimally interested in the measurement of content variables such as attitudes, beliefs and needs.

Historically, the theory of conceptual complexity grew out of the developmental personality theory proposed by Harvey, Hunt & Schroder (1961). This theory viewed conceptual complexity as a personality trait with four major stages of development that range along a concreteness-abstractness continuum. These four stages were labelled Stage I - dependent, Stage II - counterdependent, Stage III - other directed, and Stage IV - independent. Dependence, counterdependence other-directedness and independence all refer to the nature of the relationship between an individual and authority.

It is assumed that development occurs as a progression from a concrete and rigid method of concept formation and organization to a more abstract and flexible perception and integration of schema and rules for adapting to the environment. Which one of the four stages an individual reaches is said to depend on childhood training conditions. Development could be arrested at any of the stages if conditions for progress were not met. Harvey, Hunt & Schroder outlined four training conditions that they called (1) reliable unilateral training, (2) unreliable unilateral training, (3) protective interdependent training and (4) informational interdependent training. These four conditions lead to the development of Stages I to IV respectively. According to the Harvey, Hunt & Schroder theory a training environment that provides all the rules for behaviour and also reliably administers rewards and punishments would cause a person to develop only to a Stage I, or dependent level of conceptual complexity. At the other extreme of the training dimension is the informational interdependent environment. This environment is assumed to be so structured that the trainee has all the components necessary for

independently generating effective rules of behaviour. Under this condition the trainee is allowed to experience the consequences of behaviour and to evolve his own internally generated rules, concepts, and connecting links.

While training conditions are said to determine a person's characteristic level of conceptual complexity over the long term, the environment is assumed to have short-term effects on the level of conceptual complexity expressed. For example, in novel and ambiguous situations individuals will tend to revert to a Stage I level of information processing. Gradually, as information is filtered, organized and interrelated, the characteristic level of functioning will be resumed.

The theory of information processing outlined by Schroder, Driver & Streufert (1967) concerns itself with how people integrate, combine, organize, and connect their rules for perceiving and differentiating informational inputs. Their theory seeks to correct what they felt were shortcomings in the Harvey, Hunt & Schroder (1961) version. This earlier version while claiming to be content free, actually depended heavily on one domain of interpersonal relations (reaction to authority) to define the stages of development. In a truly content free theory the information processing mechanism should apply equally to the entire range of possible domains. In addition, Schroder, Driver & Streufert (1967) noted that there is a lack of empirical evidence supporting the contention that the process is developmental in nature.

In the second version of the theory, Schroder, Driver & Streufert (1967) focus on a personality variable that is structural in nature: a person's characteristic level of complexity in processing information under changing decision-making conditions. They consider levels of complexity to vary as a function of particular elements in the

environment. These will be discussed below.

The Schroder, Driver & Streufert theory of information processing complexity is largely concerned with how a person perceives different kinds of information and how these perceptions are then organized for adaptive purposes. Perception is measured in terms of the differentiation or placement of a given set of stimuli along unique dimensions. Organization is seen in terms of the nature of the linkages among the various aspects of the stimuli which were placed along those unique dimensions. The number of connections among these aspects and the character of their interrelatedness determines the level of complexity. Basically the theory deals with "the nature of the relationship between a person and the objects of his world" (Schroder et al., 1967, p. 9).

The characteristic level of information processing develops over time. It "evolves through the development of new and conflicting differentiations" (i.e. new interpretations of the same event) "and the use of new and more complex rules to interrelate and unify these differentiated components" (Schroder et al., 1967, p. 45). The level reached is a consequence of learning and learning is limited only by an individual's "neurological potential."

According to Schroder, Driver & Streufert (1967), the kind of training environment an individual experiences affects both the particular responses or rules for relating to environmental stimuli and the nature of the coping strategies used with particular classes of stimuli (p. 12). They describe two basic kinds of training environments, the unilateral or deductive environment where rules for behaviour are externally generated and the interdependent or inductive environment in which rules for behaviour are internally generated.

In the unilateral deductive training environment the training agent

(parent, teacher, guide) structures the environment by providing all the necessary rules for "correct behavior". The trainee's responses are controlled through the application of rewards and punishments. Under these conditions the trainee learns the basic responses required to satisfy the trainer. And he or she also learns to adapt to changing environmental conditions by looking to external rules as guidelines for "correct" responding. The consequences of the oversimplification of a unilateral training environment is to inhibit the emergence of alternative perceptions of the same stimuli and to interfere with the potential development of abstract structural characteristics (Schroder, et al., 1967, p. 48). These characteristics have some behavioral similarities to the Stage I and II functioning individuals under Harvey, Hunt & Schroder's (1961) theory.

Within the interdependent or inductive training environment the training agent structures the environment so that all the components necessary for generating adaptive schema or rules for behaviour are present. This kind of learning environment encourages exploration and questioning, while at the same time allowing the trainee to experience the consequences of his or her interaction with the environment. Through the exploration of his or her environment the trainee learns to generate new and different perceptions of objects and events and to integrate these in more complex ways.

The interdependent or inductive training condition allows the trainee to learn to apply self-generated rules and schema when adapting to a changing environment. On the other hand, the unilateral or deductive training condition teaches adaptation in terms of the application of fixed, externally given rules (Schroder et al., 1967, p. 49).

Levels of Conceptual Complexity

The two structural variables that determine the level of information processing complexity are differentiation and integration. As mentioned earlier, differentiation refers to the number of different attributes or components a person sees in a set of stimuli within a situation, and integration refers to the extent to which complex interrelations develop among these differentiations. Low levels of integration reflect a compartmentalized view of the differentiated characteristics. Increasing amounts of interactions among the components is a sign of increasing structural complexity.

Characteristics of a low level of complexity have been outlined by Schroder, Driver & Streufert (1967). Differentiation at this level tends to be rigid, with objects, events and issues being perceived as either belonging or not belonging to a particular category. No fine gradations are made along any perceived dimensions. Integration among differentiated categories tend to be hierarchical. Seeking fast closure when solving problems reflects the avoidance of uncertainty and conflict that is characteristic of this level of complexity. Behavior at this level tends to depend on external cues. The low complexity individual tends to over-generalize responses to a range of stimuli. Subtle changes in the situation will go undetected until finally the threshold for category inclusion is passed; at that point, dramatic changes in behaviour occur.

At high levels of conceptual complexity Schroder et al. (1967) characterize functioning as being less determined by the environment and more a product of internally generated schema. More differentiations are made and more complex interrelations occur. Complex rules for comparing and contrasting alternative interpretations are used and multiple points

of view can be considered simultaneously. Perception of changing

environmental conditions occurs rapidly and behaviour can be readily

adapted to meet new situations. Individuals at this end of the dimension

tend to search for novelty and for more information.

Effects of the Environment Upon Levels of Information Processing Complexity

While training conditions have a long-term impact upon the

development of characteristic levels of information processing, there are

several environmental conditions that affect information processing in

the short run. They are environmental complexity, noxity and eucity.

Environmental complexity varies as a function of informational input

load. The input complexity varies across two features—the number of

dimensions of information presented during a set time and the diversity

of information, including the number of alternatives added by each piece

of information (Schroder et al., 1967, p. 55).

Schroder, Driver & Streufert (1967) hypothesize that increasing

environmental complexity and load appear initially to increase

information processing complexity (as measured by the degree of flexible

integration used in decision-making) to a peak, then cause the level to

decrease under conditions of "information overload" (Schroder et al.,

1967, p. 61). The relationship between environmental complexity and

level of integrative complexity seems best to be described by an inverted

U curve.

Environmental noxity refers to "the amount of threat, pain or

frustration in the environment" while eucity refers to "the amount of

promise, pleasure, and reward" (Schroder et al., 1967, p. 67). Schroder,

Driver & Streufert (1967) report that when environmental complexity and

interest are held constant at a high level, increasing noxity decreases

the level of conceptual complexity (p. 81). On the other hand increasing eucity increases the level of complexity when the environmental input load is held constant (p. 81). Schroder, Driver & Streufert suggest that there is some evidence (Driver, 1962, cited in Schroder et al., 1967), that when eucity and noxity become superoptimal the information processing structure may diminish to a less complex level of function (pp. 83-84). \

The effects of varying degrees of ambiguity or uncertainty in a situation depend upon the level of complexity of the individual in the situation. In general in an ambiguous situation the abstract individual will spend more time processing information about the situation than will the concrete individual. As uncertainty in the situation increases the abstract person will increase his or her amount of information searching and processing more than will the conceptually concrete person. The conceptually simple person's peak searching and processing times occur at lower levels of environmental uncertainty and demand than do a complex person's peaks. The complex person's conceptual complexity should increase rapidly as a function of increasing information input load. With more information more connections can be generated. In turn more information is required to evaluate the plausibility of the additional integrations. The concrete person on the other hand will tend to structure the information so as to reduce the number of alternative interpretations. Thus lower complexity individuals will tend to spend less time searching for, or processing information.

Upon reaching a decision abstract people are more likely to qualify the outcome by retaining a sense of uncertainty and hesitancy about it than are concrete people (Schroder et al., 1967, p. 114).

Measuring Integrative Complexity

According to Schroder, Driver & Streufert's (1967) theory, complexity can be measured in verbal material. They use the semi-projective Paragraph Completion Test (PCT) to generate the scoring material. The PCT consists of sentence stems which tap a variety of interpersonal domains. For example, relationships with authority are sampled by stems such as "Rules" and "Parents", while responses to interpersonal uncertainty are elicited by stems such as "When my friend acts differently towards me," or "When I am criticized."

The completions that individuals are instructed to write in response to these stems are scored on a 7-point scale (See Appendix B). The guidelines instruct the rater to score the material for differentiation rules and for the nature and degree of linkages among the rules expressed in the responses. (For a detailed scoring manual see Schroder et al., 1967, Appendix B).

Integrative Complexity

In the third generation of the structural complexity theory of information processing, Suedfeld (1976) analyzes a different aspect of the notion. He suggests that rather than focusing on a relatively stable personality characteristic he would consider complexity to be a purely cognitive aspect of information processing that interacts with the environment. In this respect complexity is a state specific variable that can vary across situations, whereas Schroder, Driver & Streufert's (1967) primary interest is in complexity as a relatively stable, dispositional variable.

In Suedfeld's (1976) version the issue of the individual's characteristic level of complexity is not addressed. Instead he

explicitly looks at the environmental conditions that affect the manifest level of information processing. Under increasing degrees of environmental stress, for example, integrative complexity would rise to an optimal peak and then diminish as stress continues to increase.

Schroder, Driver and Streufert (1967) claimed to have left behind the evaluative component of structural complexity that was implied in the original version of Harvey, Hunt & Schroder (1961). However, the feeling that to be more complex was "better" than being simple still emerged. For example, in Streufert & Schroder's (1965) study of changes in levels of information processing as a function of increasing input complexity, the authors suggest that concrete individuals tend to be "tied to" their environment. As a result they react "in a direct (retaliatory) way" to each and every input, whereas more abstract individuals avoid reacting to every input. Streufert & Schroder (1965) infer that there is an inverse relationship between quality and quantity of decisions.

In the Suedfeld (1976) iteration with the focus on the interaction between situational components and processing structure, the non-evaluative nature of the theory can more easily be seen. For example, situations spring readily to mind where a simple, concrete level of information processing would be far more adaptive than a more abstract, hypothesis testing approach. Responding quickly and exactly to a fireman's instructions during the evacuation of a burning building is just one case where a simple level of processing and responding would be most adaptive.

Suedfeld and Rank's (1976) version of the integrative complexity theory differs from the earlier ones in two other ways, involving the methodology and the context of hypothesis testing. The methodology uses verbal material found in various public documents: letters, speeches,

transcripts of interviews, editorials, etc. Material relevant to a particular issue (or historical period, major crisis or individual) is selected and randomly sampled. The scoring units or paragraphs are rated by trained judges following a revised (Suedfeld, 1978) version of the scoring manual (Schroder et al., (1967) developed for rating the Paragraph Completion Test responses.

With this change in methodology, from scoring sentence completions to rating archival material, comes the opportunity to broaden the context of hypothesis testing. We can go back into history and score the complexity of well-known historical figures whose written work has survived. We can now ask questions about world events, historial issues and about individuals from the past. Easy access to such rich material has tremendously expanded the usefulness of this technique.

The following studies have used this approach to examine questions concerning the relationship between the environment and information processing in a variety of historically exciting periods.

Suedfeld and Rank (1976) tested the hypothesis that differing political environments would require drastically different types of leadership. They examined the integrative complexity of revolutionary leaders during their period of eminence prior to a successful attempt to overthrow the existing government. During this period effective leadership calls for a single-minded, dogmatic approach. However, continued success in a government in control would require a more flexible, compromising and pragmatic stance in its leader. Therefore, individuals who were successful during the revolution and who maintained their position of leadership in victory should show a pattern of low integrative complexity prior to the takeover of power and increased complexity afterwards. Written material for nineteen leaders chosen from

five successful revolutionary movements during the 17th, 18th, and 20th centuries were scored for integrative complexity. The results show that indeed successful leaders were those who exhibited an increase in complexity from a pre-revolutionary takeover low to a post-victory high.

In another study Suedfeld, Tetlock & Ramirez (1977) scored the integrative complexity of speeches by representatives of Israel, Egypt and Syria, the USA and the USSR. Given in the United Nations General Assembly, the speeches were concerned with Middle East conflicts. Samples were taken from a twenty year period between 1947 and 1976. The researchers were interested in whether changes in integrative complexity in the speeches were related in a systematic way to the recurrent outbreak of armed hostilities in the Middle East. The results indicated that in the months prior to each Middle East war (1948, 1956, 1967 and 1973) the complexity of information processing decreased significantly from its peacetime level in all speeches except the Russians. Further, the Israeli level dropped to the lowest score each time. Interpreting these results Suedfeld et al. (1977) suggest that the prewar drop in complexity is related to the seriousness of the possible negative consequences for the particular country. They go on to suggest that to the Russian government the nearness of war in the Middle East may represent the possibility of positive outcomes for the USSR and therefore does not lead to a decrease in complexity.

Another study by Suedfeld & Tetlock (1977) applied the integrative complexity techniques to the analysis of communications among high level decision-makers during crises in international relations. In two studies they examined five crises, two resulting in war (WW I and the Korean War) and three being resolved peacefully (the Agadir incident of 1911, the Berlin Blockade in 1948 and the Cuban Missile crisis of 1962). When the

archival material was scored it appeared that peacefully resolved conflicts are characterized by higher levels of communicative (communicative both among members of one party to the conflict, as well as between parties) complexity, and crises ending in war, with lower levels.

Levi & Tetlock (1980) analyzed records from both private and public statements made by Japanese policy makers in the period leading to the Japanese decision to go to war with the United States in 1941. The authors were testing the "disruptive stress" hypothesis (Hermann & Brady, 1972) that suggests crisis-produced stress has detrimental effects on individual policy makers' cognitive coping responses. Their results, however, showed no evidence of decreasing complexity as the decision to go to war drew near. Only one central leader (the Chief of Staff of the Imperial Navy) showed the expected change. It was suggested that perhaps he perceived that greater losses would occur within his department than elsewhere should Japan go to war with United States. These results tend to weaken the argument for the generalizability of the disruptive stress hypothesis for explaining how crises qualitatively influence decision making. However, the results may also be interpreted to mean that the disruptive stress hypothesis does not apply to an extended period of frustrated negotiations but might still explain decision-making behaviour in the case of rapidly intensifying belligerent acts following an initial dramatic event (Suedfeld 1980).

An interesting trend emerged from these data. Integrative complexity scores were consistently lower in the Liaison Conferences where policies were being formulated than in Imperial Conferences where these policies were being presented to the Emperor and his advisors for their approval. Levi and Tetlock suggest that when interpreting measures of cognitive

structure, researchers should consider the social context in which the statements are made.

To investigate the degree of influence that psychological variables have on high-level political decisions, Tetlock (1981) examined the foreign policy preferences of United States senators. He focused his analysis on senators who varied in their commitment to American isolationism. In choosing this variables he intended to test McClosky's (1967) hypotheses concerning the psychological superstructure of isolationism. McClosky argued that isolationists (those who oppose giving aid or commitments to other nations) vary from nonisolationists on a variety of dimensions, including tolerance of ambiguity and cognitive inconsistency, categorical versus flexible thinking, and emotional responses to in- and out-groups (Tetlock, 1981, p. 738).

Tetlock scored the integrative complexity of senatorial speeches in the 82nd Congress that were relevant to foreign policy. He also performed an evaluative assertive assessment that measured intensity of speakers' attitudes towards a particular group or issue on the same material (Osgood, Saporta and Nunnelly, 1956).

The results supported McClosky's (1967) hypotheses as applied to isolationist senators in the 82nd Congress. These people were significantly less integratively complex than nonisolationists, made fewer complex policy statements, held more extreme and polarized attitudes, and evaluated out-groups more negatively and in-groups more positively.

Porter & Suedfeld (1981) investigated the relationship between the integrative complexity of five eminent 19th and 20th century novelists and various personal and social stresses in their individual environments. This is the first study to focus on the effects of

environmental stress on the information processing of non-political individuals. The results indicated that events in a person's life can result in changes in integrative complexity. Not surprisingly, complexity tended to increase with age. Decreased levels of complexity were associated with illness and one's terminal years (that is, the last few years prior to death). Integrative complexity varied as a function of the arena of conflict. International hostilities were correlated with relatively low levels of complexity while civil unrest was correlated with higher complexity levels. This differential response to conflict, depending on whether it is civil or international, may be a reflection of the varying levels of threat perceived under the two conditions. In the case of internal disruptions, information concerning the various sides of the issue is relatively easy to obtain. This availability interacts with the likelihood of frequent public debates over possible solutions to the problem to produce an environment where more flexible and open-ended information processing can occur. This kind of processing may tend to diffuse some of the threat posed by the situation.

Evaluations of Canadian Prime Ministers

Continuing interest in political leadership is reflected in both the popular (Gwyn, 1980) and the professional literature (Hermann, 1977; Paige, 1977). What makes our leaders successful, effective, under what motives do they operate, what are their common characteristics? All of these questions are frequently asked. An abundance of research concerning American leaders is available showing the heroic effort of researchers to answer just such questions. The success or failure of the United States Presidents as leaders have been ranked (Schlesinger, 1948, 1962), their motives have been categorized (Lasswell, 1930, 1960), both

their performance and their greatness as president have been analyzed (Maranell, 1970; Simonton, 1980) and the development of their presidential style in terms of active-passive energy and positive-negative affect has been outlined (Barber, 1972).

We can find studies about American presidents from just about every aspect of leadership previously mentioned: personality traits, situational determinants, behavioural aspects and environmental-dispositional interaction.

What we cannot find is an equivalently broad selection of research literature related to our national Canadian leaders. There are descriptive books dealing chapter by chapter with each Prime Minister's term in office. Authors such as Donaldson (1969), Hutchison (1967) and Ondaatje and Catherwood (1967) have outlined the major political issues facing each Prime Minister, given some biographical history of each man and discussed their individual characteristics. And now almost all of our sixteen Prime Ministers have had individual biographies written about them. However, to date, there has been no systematic ranking, rating or comparison of our Prime Ministers. Nor has there been any quantitative examination of their effectiveness in office.

When looking at our sixteen national leaders is it reasonable to assume that each one has an "absolute" value on such dimensions as honesty in dealing with the public, strength of role, amount of current prestige, etc.? Further, could experts in the field of Canadian history and Canadian political science both recognize such a value, should it exist? Are professionals whose perspective is perhaps broader and more long-term (i.e. the historians) better equipped to evaluate a leader's position along a particular continuum than professionals with a more current and perhaps narrower focus (i.e., the political scientists)?

One purpose of this study is to ask the experts their opinions of the Prime Ministers on a variety of dimensions. These ratings will then be examined for their internal consistency among members on each dimension. Next they will be analyzed for differences between professions.

A long-standing problem in the analysis of the integrative complexity of speeches given by political representatives of one kind or another has been the issue of whose complexity we are actually scoring. Is it the complexity of the speaker? Or is it that of the speech writer? Whenever this question is posed the assumption has been that the two are not the same; that is, that the speaker has had the speech written by a "ghost" writer. In the past, the response to this question has been that even when a ghost writer is involved the compatibility of complexity levels can be assumed. It is unlikely that a very concrete speaker will comfortably deliver, time and again, speeches of abstract complexity. Furthermore, it is assumed that speakers have some control over the structural aspects, if not always the content, of their own speeches. William Lyon Mackenzie King for example, was known to habitually alter his prepared speeches. In some instances he even deleted "purple passages" (Courtney, 1976, p. 90).

In this study the issue of whose complexity is being scored will be addressed indirectly. Samples of the prepared speeches, in the form of Responses to the Speech from the Throne, will be scored for their integrative complexity. It is irrelevant to the issue whether these speeches were prepared solely by the Prime Minister or by a speech writer or perhaps jointly by both. The only requirement is that they have been prepared in advance of delivery.

Then samples of extemporaneous speeches, collected from the Prime Ministers' spontaneous responses to unexpected questions will be scored

for integrative complexity. Since these responses will be sampled from debates occurring outside the formal question period (where some responses may have been prepared) it is assumed that they will represent the integrative complexity of the Prime Minister alone.

These two samples of complexity will then be compared to see if there really is a difference between prepared speech complexity and spontaneous speech complexity. If no difference is found we will continue to assume that speech writers match the integrative complexity of the speeches they write to that of the intended speaker.

Once the Prime Ministers have been rated and ranked on the ten different dimensions (difficulty of political issues, activeness, motives, strength of role, effectiveness, prestige, innovativeness, flexibility, honesty, and accomplishments) it will be of interest to see what systematic relationships may exist among and between the dimensions, and also between the dimensions and the Prime Ministers' level of complexity. For example, it would appear likely that increased levels of complexity would be positively associated with flexibility of approaches to implementing programmes and with innovativeness in problem-solving. This study will examine the correlations among the dimensions rated by the experts and between the dimensions and the integrative complexity scores of the Prime Ministers.

The purpose of this study is to examine experts' opinions about our Prime Ministers, on certain dimensions, to analyze the integrative complexity of both prepared and spontaneous speeches of the Prime Ministers, to determine whether any systematic relationship exists between expert's ratings of the Prime Ministers and the leaders' integrative complexity and finally what relationships exist among the dimensions scored by the experts.

METHOD

Expert Opinions Questionnaire

Starting with Schlesinger's (1962) opinion poll items and Maranell's (1970) extension of those questions a revised set of items relating to various attributes of the Canadian Prime Ministers and the nature of the times in which they were in power was developed. The initial items were modified, refined or replaced after consultation with two historians and one political scientist.

A pilot test using the revised items was run on five historians and one political scientist. The results indicated that the items were understandable and could be rated without an experimenter present to explain the format. The responses showed that experts could differentiate among Prime Ministers on each of the items.

The final set of questions consisted of ten items dealing with evaluations of the Prime Ministers and their situation. An eleventh item served as a check on the amount of information the rater had about each Prime Minister (see Appendix A).

For each of the first ten items the rater was asked to score every Prime Minister on a scale from 1 to 7. The points were labelled and a glossary was provided explaining, where necessary, the meaning of the labels in this context.

In order to examine the possibility of systematic bias the following personal information was asked of each expert: age, sex, professional specialty within his or her field, academic rank, highest degree held and the institution from which the highest degree was received.

Rater Selection

Lists of 96 historians and of 139 political scientists, specializing in Canadian studies, were compiled from university calendars. These experts were faculty members of universities across Canada.

Packages of material were sent to the historians and political scientists (see Appendix A). Each package contained a cover letter explaining the nature of the study and the request being made; a two-page information packet describing integrative complexity and giving a brief; referenced account of research that had used integrative complexity as a measure; a 13-page rating booklet; and a stamped self-addressed envelope for returning the questionnaire. An offer was made in the cover letter to send the results to the respondent should he or she so request. A space was left on the personal information sheet to indicate interest in receiving the results of the survey.

The anchor points were randomly set so that a low score did not always represent a "poor" score or one which might be considered politically undesirable. Except for the eleventh item an option of not scorable (NS) was provided. This alternative was included in response to the comments of the pilot study participants, who felt that some Prime Ministers had been in office for too short a period to be fairly rated on certain dimensions.

Integrative Complexity Scores

Two sets of complexity scores were obtained. The first was calculated from prepared speeches and the second from spontaneous speeches.

The Response to the Speech from the Throne was used as the prepared speech. These speeches were found in Hansard, which is a book that

reports verbatim the debates in the House of Commons. Hansard is available from 1875 onward. For the 1867 and 1873 speeches, the Scrapbook Debates were used as source material. These books contained major speeches from the House but not in first-person form; rather, they are in third-person verbatim form. It was not difficult to return the speeches to the first person for scoring purposes.

The Responses to the Speech from the Throne for thirteen of the sixteen Prime Ministers were photocopied. Because appropriate material could not be located for Abbott (1891), Bowell (1894) and Tupper (1896), these Prime Ministers were omitted from the rest of the analyses. Only the speech in the first session of parliament following an election was used. For Prime Ministers Macdonald and King, who were re-elected to office after having been voted out of office, the Response Speech for each newly returned term was sampled. In the cases of Meighen and Trudeau, only the Response Speech from the first election was used, but for different reasons. Hansard does not record a Response to the Speech from the Throne for Meighen's second, brief term in office in 1926. In Trudeau's case, it has only been just over a year since he was returned to office after a brief period in Opposition. Because of this, only the Response Speech from his initial election to office in 1968 was sampled.

Sampling from spontaneous speeches was a more complicated matter. Spontaneous speeches were ones that seemed to occur as the result of an unexpected question from the floor of the House of Commons. Because many questions asked during Question Period and during the Inquiries of the Ministries were submitted for consideration in advance of their official presentation in the House, it cannot be assumed that the responses were entirely unprepared. For that reason only responses to questions occurring outside these formal periods were used as samples of

extemporaneous speech. Except for Mackenzie (1873-1878), for whom Session Two was sampled, all responses to informal questions were chosen from the first session of Parliament following the Prime Minister's taking office. Again, appropriate material could not be found for Abbott, Bowell and Tupper.

Each speech was divided into scorable units. (In archival work, Suedfeld (1978) has defined a scorable unit as a section of material, usually several sentences long, that focuses on one topic. In some cases a paragraph in the original material may be broken up into two or more scorable units, each in turn being called a paragraph). The paragraphs were numbered sequentially. Using a random number table, ten paragraphs were arbitrarily selected from every speech, yielding a total of 260 samples. For Prime Ministers Macdonald, and King, who had multiple terms to sample, the paragraphs were selected from the first session in each of their terms. The number of paragraphs selected from any one term corresponded to the proportion of total-time-in-office that that term represented.

RESULTS

Expert Opinion Questionnaire

Returns

Of the 96 historians approached, 37 returned completed
questionnaires; 15 others sent back the materials, declining to
participate in the study. The reasons for refusal ranged from
discountings of expertise in the required area to attacks on the study's
validity. A variety of constructive remarks accompanied a portion of the
completed returns. These will be discussed in the next chapter.

A total of 60 political scientists returned completed booklets, while
11 sent letters of refusal. Again there was a similar range in the tone
of the letters. The helpful comments which came from both participants
and nonparticipants will be discussed later.

The Experts

Twelve of the 37 historians who completed the questionnaire chose to
do so anonymously. Of the 25 identifying themselves, 14 requested copies
of the results of the study. Only 10 of the 60 political science
participants omitted their names. Thirty-three of the remaining 50
indicated a desire to receive copies of the results.

Ninety-four of the 97 respondents indicated the institution where
they currently teach as well as the university from which they had
received their highest degree. All ten provinces were represented (See
Table 1 for details). Their training was not limited to Canadian
universities, although by far the largest number of the experts were
educated in Canada. Fifty-two respondents were graduates of Canadian
universities, 28 of American universities, 13 graduated from British

Table 1

Distribution of Experts Currently Holding Academic

Positions in Canada

Province	Number of Raters
British Columbia	18
Alberta	11
Saskatchewan	2
Manitoba	5
Ontario	51
Quebec	2
Prince Edward Island	1
New Brunswick	1
Nova Scotia	1
Newfoundland	2
Total	94

institutions and one from the University of Paris.

Interrater Reliability

To find out the interrater reliability of the ratings, Cronbach's coefficient alpha was calculated for each of the eleven scales. The sum of the ratings was treated as the value on which reliability was assessed. The first analysis was made for the 37 historians and 60 political scientists separately. Since the resulting interrater reliabilities were all satisfactorily high, (.94 to .99) across both the 37 and 60 respondents, the scores from the two groups of raters were pooled and interrater reliabilities were determined for the ratings across this combined sample of 97 respondents. In Table 2, the interrater reliabilities are given -- over the 97 respondents -- for each of the 11 scales. The alpha coefficients for the 11 measures were .977 or higher, indicating that the raters were not only measuring the same quality within each dimension, but also that they had good agreement on the rank ordering of the Prime Ministers within each scale.

The Prime Ministers

During the years 1891 to 1896 Canada had four Conservative Prime Ministers who were virtual "caretakers." When Macdonald died in 1891 the two likeliest successors, Thompson, aged 47 and Tupper, aged 70, both declared their lack of interest in the position. Thompson demurred because he was too young and a converted Catholic from Nova Scotia, attributes guaranteed to lose him votes in Ontario. Tupper declined because he was comfortably retired in London. Consequently, 70 year old Sir John Abbott was chosen. In his own words he was selected because he was "not particularly obnoxious to anybody."

Table 2

Interrater Reliabilities for the Responses of Historians and

Political Scientists Taken Together

(97 raters)

Dimension	Interrater Reliability
1. Difficulty of the political issues	.982
2. Active versus passive approach to governing	.988
3. Motivating consideration – idealistic vs. practical	.977
4. Strength of role	.994
5. Effectiveness as party leader	.988
6. Current prestige	.996
7. Approach to solving national problems – traditional vs. innovative	.985
8. Flexibility in implementing policies or programmes	.992
9. Honesty in dealing with the public	.983
10. Significance of overall accomplishments	.996
11. Amount of information rater has about each Prime Minister	.992

Abbott, in effect, governed from the Senate while Thompson provided

the leadership in the Commons. Faced with economic depression and

charges of serious governmental scandal, Abbott resigned in poor health,

a year and five months after taking office.

Sir John Thompson replaced Abbott. His unselfishness and high

standards had earned him the respect and love of his countrymen but

within two years the Conservatives lost their best leader for that era.

Thompson was dead at the age of 50.

The third replacement, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, 61, was perhaps the

worst leader the Conservatives could have selected. He has been

described as "stupid, bigoted, conceited and a slightly paranoic little

man" (Donaldson, 1969, p. 52). He is the only Prime Minister to have had

a full scale cabinet revolt. After seven of his Cabinet ministers

resigned and warned off potential replacements, Bowell was forced to

resign. He held office for one year and four months.

The final successor to Macdonald was Sir Charles Tupper. Almost 75,

Tupper finally claimed the role to which he had an undeniable right.

Unfortunately when he went to the electorate to secure his position, the

unresolved issue of the Manitoba Catholic schools proved too great an

obstacle. Tupper lost. His was the shortest term of any Canadian Prime

Minister--three months.

Many of the experts felt that these four men were in office for too

brief a period to be reliably scored. Consequently they have been

dropped from all further analyses. Because Clark was a contemporary

Prime Minister and information concerning his performance in office is

readily, available, most experts rated him. Clark, therefore, was

included in most of the analyses. Unless specifically stated otherwise,

the twelve Prime Ministers who became the focus of attention in

subsequent analyses are: Macdonald, Mackenzie, Laurier, Borden, Meighen,

King, Bennett, St. Laurent, Diefenbaker, Pearson, Trudeau and Clark.

Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient

To compare the rankings of the twelve major Prime Ministers by the

historians with those by the political scientists, a Spearman rank

correlation coefficient was determined for each leader according to his

mean score for each scale in the questionnaire. The correlation

coefficients are reported

in Table 3. As could be expected from the high interrater reliabilities

given earlier, the agreement between the rankings by the two groups of

experts was very high, with the coefficient for only one scale lower than

.90.

Multiariate Analysis of Variance of Mean Ratings

To test the overall null hypothesis that historians and political

scientists do not differ in their mean ratings of any of the twelve major

Prime Ministers, eleven separate multivariate analyses of variance were

performed, one on each dependent variable (i.e. the eleven dimensions

seen in the questionnaire in Appendix A). Means were not substituted for

missing data in order to avoid artificially reducing the variance. As a

result the number of raters involved in judging the Prime Ministers

varies across dimensions. Table 4 shows the means, F ratios,

significance levels and numbers of raters for each dimension.

Only on the eleventh item, which deals with the amount of information

each rater had about the various Prime Ministers, did the two groups of

experts differ significantly [$F(35,58) = 6.1154$, $p < .0001$] in their

Table 3

Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient for Rank Ordering of

12 Prime Ministers

Dimension	Spearman's r_s
1. Difficulty of the political issues	.94
2. Active versus passive approach to governing	.90
3. Motivating consideration - idealistic vs. practical	.78
4. Strength of role	.91
5. Effectiveness as party leader	.97
6. Current prestige	.94
7. Approach to solving national problems - traditional vs. innovative	.91
8. Flexibility in implementing policies or programmes	.98
9. Honesty in dealing with the public	.90
10. Significance of overall accomplishments	.97

Table 4

Multivariate Analysis of Variance of Mean Ratings on Eleven Dimensions

by Historians and by Political Scientists for 12 Prime Ministers

Dimension	Means (standard deviation)		F	p
	Historians	Pol. Sci.		
1. Difficulty of the political issues H = 31 PS = 47 (1 = easy, 7 = difficult)	5.57 (.63)	5.37 (.83)	1.08	.39
2. Approach to governing H = 30 PS = 43 (1 = passive, 7 = active)	4.97 (.64)	4.81 (.68)	1.50	.15
3. Political motivation H = 26 PS = 38 (1 = idealistic, 7 = practical)	4.45 (.76)	4.27 (.71)	1.79	.08
4. Strength of role H = 30 PS = 42 (1 = weak, 7 = strong)	4.53 (1.05)	4.41 (1.06)	.90	.56
5. Party leadership H = 30 PS = 44 1 = effective, 7 = ineffective)	3.44 (1.29)	3.57 (1.07)	.88	.58
6. Current prestige H = 31 PS = 48 (1 = low, 7 = high)	4.39 (1.41)	4.42 (1.47)	.77	.68
7. Approach to solving national problems H = 27 PS = 37 (1 = innovative, 7 = traditional)	4.14 (.67)	3.78 (.89)	1.55	.14
8. Implementation flexibility H = 30 PS = 38 (1 = inflexible, 7 = flexible)	4.29 (1.19)	4.36 (1.27)	.84	.61
9. Honesty in dealing with the public H = 27 PS = 36 (1 = honest, 7 = dishonest)	3.27 (.76)	3.19 (1.00)	1.83	.07
10. Accomplishments H = 31 PS = 46 (1 = little, 7 = great)	4.08 (1.49)	4.15 (1.55)	.69	.76
11. Amount of information rater has about each leader H = 36 PS = 59 (1 = very little, 7 = great deal)	5.52 (.66)	5.42 (.80)	6.12	.01

ratings. The historians rated themselves as having more information about the individual leaders than did the political scientists. This is not unexpected since political science, as a discipline, focuses more on political institutions than on political figures, while history, by definition, deals with people and events throughout time.

On the other ten dimensions there were no significant differences between the means of the Prime Ministers' ratings by the two groups of experts. Because the two groups did not differ in their ratings of the Prime Ministers the scores from each group of experts were pooled and a mean score for each Prime Minister on every scale (except the eleventh) was determined. On the basis of these mean ratings, the Prime Ministers were rank ordered within each dimension. Two orderings are shown for the information scale, where the experts differed in their ratings. The rank orderings are given in Table 5.

Integrative Complexity

Two sets of integrative complexity scores were obtained for the 13 Prime Ministers whose material was available. In addition to the twelve major leaders, Thompson was included in this analysis. The Response to the Speech from the Throne was representative of a "prepared" speech. That is, one which could have been written by someone other than the speaker, because it was written in advance of its delivery in the House of Commons. Responses to unexpected questions from the floor of the House represented a "spontaneous" speech. Mean scores for prepared and for spontaneous integrative complexity were subjected to a t-test for correlated samples to determine whether the two types of complexity differed.

The mean differences between the two sets of complexity scores was

Table 5

Rank Orderings of 12 Prime Ministers on Eleven Dimensions

---

1. <u>Difficulty of Issues</u> - most difficult to easiest

1.   Bennett
2.   Macdonald
3.   Borden
4.   King
5.   Trudeau
6.5 Laurier
6.5 Clark
8.   Pearson
9.   Meighen
10. Mackenzie
11. Diefenbaker
12. St. Laurent

2. <u>Approach to Governing</u> - most active to most passive

1.   Macdonald
2.   Trudeau
3.   Borden
4.   Laurier
5.   King
6.   Bennett
7.   Diefenbaker
8.   Meighen
9.   Pearson
10. Clark
11. St. Laurent
12. Mackenzie

3. <u>Political Motivation</u> - most practical to most idealistic

1.   King
2.   Macdonald
3.   St. Laurent
4.   Borden
5.   Clark
6.   Bennett
7.   Laurier
8.   Mackenzie
9.   Pearson
10. Trudeau
11. Diefenbaker
12. Meighen

Table 5 (continued)

4. <u>Strength of Role</u> – strongest to weakest

1. Macdonald
2. Trudeau
3. King
4. Laurier
5. Borden
6. Bennett
7. Meighen
8. Diefenbaker
9. Pearson
10. St. Laurent
11. Mackenzie
12. Clark

5. <u>Effective Leader</u> – most effective to most ineffective

1. Macdonald
2. King
3. Laurier
4. Trudeau
5. Borden
6. St. Laurent
7. Pearson
8. Bennett
9. Diefenbaker
10. Mackenzie
11. Meighen
12. Clark

6. <u>Current Prestige</u> – most prestigious to least prestigious

1. Macdonald
2. Laurier
3. King
4. Trudeau
5. Borden
6. Pearson
7. St. Laurent
8. Diefenbaker
9. Meighen
10. Mackenzie
11. Bennett
12. Clark

Table 5 (continued)

7. <u>Approach to Problem Solving</u> – most innovative to most traditional

1. Macdonald
1. Trudeau
3. Laurier
4. Pearson
5. Borden
6. Diefenbaker
7. Bennett
8. King
9. Clark
10. Meighen
11. St. Laurent
12. Mackenzie

8. <u>Implementation Flexibility</u> – most flexible to most inflexible

1. King
2. Macdonald
3. Laurier
4. Pearson
5. St. Laurent
6. Borden
7. Trudeau
8. Clark
9. Bennett
10. Diefenbaker
11. Mackenzie
12. Meighen

9. <u>Honesty in Dealing with the Public</u> – most honest to most dishonest

1. Mackenzie
2. Meighen
3. Borden
4. St. Laurent
5. Clark
6. Laurier
7. Pearson
8. Bennett
9. Diefenbaker
10. Trudeau
11. Macdonald
12. King

Table 5 (continued)

10. Significance of Overall Achievements - most significant to least significant

1. Macdonald
2. Laurier
3. King
4. Pearson
5. Trudeau
6. Borden
7. St. Laurent
8. Diefenbaker
9. Bennett
10. Mackenzie
11. Meighen
12. Clark

11. Amount of information rater has about each Prime Minister - most to least

HISTORIANS
1.5 Macdonald
1.5 King
3. Laurier
4. Borden
5. Meighen
6.5 Diefenbaker
6.5 Trudeau
8. Mackenzie
9. Pearson
10. Bennett
11. St. Laurent
12. Clark

POLITICAL SCIENTISTS
1. Trudeau
2. King
3. Diefenbaker
4. Pearson
5. Macdonald
6. Clark
7. Laurier
8. St. Laurent
9. Borden
10. Bennett
11. Meighen
12. Mackenzie

only 0.15 and the resulting $\underline{t}$ nonsignificant [$\underline{t}$(12) = .94]. Table 6

shows the individual means and the averaged means for the thirteen Prime

Ministers. The direction of the differences was not the same for all

Prime Ministers. For example, Meighen's spontaneous complexity mean was

considerably higher than his prepared mean. On the other hand, both

Trudeau and King showed large differences in the opposite direction.

Correlations Among Measures

The means for both types of integrative complexity scores were

correlated with each of the mean ratings on the twelve Prime Ministers

across the eleven dimensions in the experts' questionnaire. The

correlation matrix is shown in Table 7.

The only significant correlation involving complexity was between

spontaneous complexity and perceived honesty. The higher a Prime

Minister's spontaneous complexity, the more likely he was to be rated as

honest in his dealings with the public (r = −.56, $\underline{p}$<.05). As can be seen

in Table 7, many of the items in the questionnaire tended to be

interrelated. Some significant correlations are identified below.

As the difficulty of the political issues facing the Prime Minister

increased, he was more likely to be seen as taking an active approach to

governing (r = .70, $\underline{p}$<.01), playing a strong role in shaping events and

directing government (r = .60, $\underline{p}$<.05), and being innovative in his

approach to solving national problems (r = −.62, $\underline{p}$<.05).

The stronger the role the Prime Minister was rated as playing, the

more likely he was to be perceived as active in governing (r = .89, $\underline{p}$<

.01), currently prestigious (r = .88, $\underline{p}$<.01), an effective party leader

(r = −.85, $\underline{p}$<.01), and having achieved a great deal while in office (r =

.88, $\underline{p}$<.01). The experts were also likely to have more information about

Table 6

Integrative Complexity Scores for 13 Prime Ministers

Rank Order of Mean Complexity	Prime Minister	Prepared Speech Complexity	Spontaneous Speech Complexity	Mean Speech Complexity
1.	Clark	2.60	2.50	2.55
2.	St. Laurent	2.45	2.35	2.40
3.	Borden	2.40	2.00	2.20
4.	Trudeau	2.80	1.55	2.18
5.	Meighen	1.40	2.55	1.98
6.	Thompson	1.90	1.95	1.93
7.5	Macdonald	2.10	1.70	1.90
7.5	Pearson	1.85	1.95	1.90
9.	Bennett	1.95	1.45	1.70
10.	King	2.00	1.25	1.63
11.	Laurier	1.45	1.50	1.48
12.	Diefenbaker	1.40	1.35	1.38
13.	Mackenzie	1.25	1.50	1.37

Table 7

Correlation Matrix on 11 Rated dimensions and Two Complexity Scores for 13 Prime Ministers

Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Difficulty (1=easy; 7=difficult)	1.00												
2. Approach to Governing (1=passive, 7=active)	.70**	1.00											
3. Political Motivation (1=idealistic, 7=practical)	.26	-.09	1.00										
4. Strength of Role (1=weak, 7=strong)	.60*	.89**	.18	1.00									
5. Party Leadership (1=effective, 7=ineffective)	-.42	-.60*	-.52	-.85**	1.00								
6. Prestige (1=low, 7=high)	.34	.69**	.27	.88**	-.95**	1.00							
7. Problem Solving (1=innovative, 7=traditional)	-.62*	-.87**	.06	-.78**	.64*	-.75**	1.00						
8. Implementation (1=inflexible, 7=flexible)	.27	.32	.67*	.53	-.84**	.76**	-.49	1.00					
9. Public Honesty (1=honest, 7=dishonest)	.50	.58*	.47	.68**	-.70**	.62*	-.63*	.59*	1.00				
10. Accomplishments (1=little, 7=great)	.45	.70**	.32	.88**	-.94**	.98**	-.77**	.78**	.62*	1.00			
11. Information (1=very little, 7=great deal)	.38	.75**	.01	.70**	-.61*	.69**	-.72**	.46	.64*	.70**	1.00		
12. "Prepared" Complexity (1=simple, 7=very complex)	.27	.22	.28	.17	-.23	.12	-.27	.22	.31	.10	.17	1.00	
13. "Spontaneous" Complexity (1=simple, 7=very complex)	-.41	-.28	-.15	-.42	.41	-.40	.44	-.23	-.56*	-.47	-.28	.28	1.00

*p < .05   **p < .01

him (r = .70, p<.01). Surprisingly, such a Prime Minister was rated as less honest in his dealings with the public (r = .68, p<.01).

Prime Ministers who were rated as flexible in implementing their policies or programmes were likely to be seen as motivated by practical rather than idealistic considerations (r = .67, p<.05), as dishonest (r = .59, p<.05), as currently having high prestige (r = .76, p .01), being effective party leaders (r = -.84, p<.01) and having accomplished a great deal (r = .78, p<.01).

An intriguing set of interrelationships appeared with the honesty dimension. The stronger (r = .68, p<.01), more active (r = .58, p<.05), and more effective (r = -.70, p<.01) a Prime Minister was rated, the more likely he was to be seen as less honest. The dishonest leader was viewed as innovative in his approach to solving national problems (r = -.63, p< .05) and as flexible in his approach to implementing policies and programmes (r = .59, p<.05). He was also likely to be rated as currently having high prestige (r = .62, p<.05).

In order for a Prime Minister to be rated as having achieved significant overall accomplishments, he had to be perceived as a strong, active, and effective leader who was innovative, flexible and slightly dishonest. Such a man is likely to be considered highly prestigious today (r = .98, p<.01)!

The Effect of Difficult Political Issues

To assess the impact of both complexity level and of the relative difficulty of issues facing the Prime Minister upon the other nine dimensions, a two-way analysis of variance was performed using the following data. A mean complexity score was obtained for each Prime Minister by averaging the prepared and the spontaneous complexity

scores. Two levels of complexity were specified. The six most complex men (St. Laurent, Borden, Trudeau, Pearson, Macdonald and Meighen) formed one level and the five least complex men (Mackenzie, Laurier, King, Bennett and Diefenbaker) formed the second level. Clark was omitted from this analysis because of his relatively brief tenure in office.

According to the rank ordering on the difficulty-of-issues scale (see Table 4) these eleven Prime Ministers were grouped into "difficult" and "easy" categories. The resulting 2 x 2 experimental design can be seen in Table 8. Two-way analyses of variance were then run on the following nine dimensions: approach to governing, motivating considerations, strength of role, party leadership effectiveness, prestige, approach to solving national problems, flexibility in implementing policies, honesty in public affairs and significance of overall accomplishments.

There were no main effects for complexity and no significant interactions. However, the relative difficulty of the issues facing a Prime Minister had a significant effect on how he was rated along five different dimensions: his approach to governing [$F(1,7) = 10.34$ $p<.015$], strength of role [$F(1,7) = 20.08$, $p<.003$], effectiveness as party leader [$F(1,7) = 7.68$, $p<.028$], approach to problem solving [$F(1,7) = 5.56$, $p< .05$] and the significance of his overall accomplishments [$F(1,7) = 5.65$, $p<.049$].

It appears that environmental pressure is an influential factor in determining the historical stature of Canadian Prime Ministers.

Table 8

Fourfold Table Categorizing 11 Prime Ministers According to Their Integrative

Complexity and the Difficulty of the Political Issues They Faced

Political Issues

	Easy	Difficult
Simple	1. Mackenzie 2. Diefenbaker	1. King 2. Bennett 3. Laurier
Complex	1. St. Laurent 2. Pearson 3. Meighen	1. Borden 2. Trudeau 3. Macdonald

Integrative

Complexity

DISCUSSION

Four major questions were posed in this study: Was there a difference
between the integrative complexity of the Prime Ministers' prepared
speeches and their spontaneous speeches? How were the Canadian Prime
Ministers viewed by experts in the fields of Canadian political science
and Canadian history? What correlation was there between the experts'
opinions of the Prime Ministers and the leaders' integrative complexity?
And finally, what relationships existed among the rankings of the various
Prime Ministers by the experts? The discussion will begin with an
examination of the results relating to the question of prepared and
spontaneous integrative complexity.

Spontaneous versus Prepared Speech Integrative Complexity

Archival researchers measuring integrative complexity in the speeches
of prominent political figures have long maintained that any public
speech given by a particular person was a fair reflection of his or her
level of information processing ability. Until this study was completed,
the argument was that all speeches, even speeches prepared by someone
other than the speaker were indicative of the true complexity level of
that speaker. However, one could maintain that some speeches were merely
memorized and delivered, as if by an actor, and that the complexity level
measured was actually that of the speech writer.

I would like to suggest that such an argument could not apply to all
speeches given by political leaders. In fact, it seems unlikely that
such prominent figures as Prime Ministers or Presidents would merely read
a speech written by a subordinate at major public functions. What seems
more likely--and what has been reported (Courtney, 1976) is that
competent writers draft speeches for particular occasions (The Today

Magazine, Jan. 2, 1982) and these may then be edited by the Prime

Minister. As mentioned in the introduction, King is known to have

repeatedly deleted "purple passages" from the texts of one of his

speechwriters because the public was too likely to remember these parts

(Courtney, 1976, p. 90).

The results of this study serve to support the hypothesis that the

speaker's complexity is accurately reflected in the text of public

speeches, regardless of the authorship of such material. There was no

difference in mean complexity between speeches prepared for a specific

occasion (in this case, the Response to the Speech from the Throne) and

speeches known to originate solely with the Prime Minister (i.e.,

spontaneous responses to questions during debates in the Commons).

Accordingly, archival researchers may continue to sample public speeches

with the assumption that regardless of authorship, the integrative

complexity expressed will be a fair reflection of the speaker's level of

information processing.

Experts' Opinions

The second question asked in this study may be subdivided into three

related issues. One, how did historians and political scientists rate

the sixteen Canadian Prime Ministers on eleven different scales or

dimensions: another, whether the two disciplines viewed the leaders

differently; and still another, how the ratings of the Prime Ministers

were related.

It was hypothesized that the two disciplines which deal with the

behaviour of Canadian political figures and the consequences of that

behaviour should evaluate these according to different terms of

reference. Historians, by definition, "record and explain events" and

study the significance of particular occurrences. They synthesize the factual material at their disposal in order to produce scholarly reports of particular periods (Webster's Third International Dictionary, 1966). In this study the historians were mainly interested in Canadian events occurring since 1867.

Political scientists, on the other hand, are more likely to be interested in the "description of political and governmental institutions and processes" (Webster's Third International Dictionary, 1966, p. 1755). They might use material from other social sciences such as psychology, history and economics to assist them in their analyses of different phenomena, such as power, within various societies. The political scientists in this study were chosen because of their focus on Canadian content.

Because of this difference in perspective, it was hypothesized that the two groups of experts would evaluate the Canadian Prime Ministers according to different criteria. This would lead to differences in the values assigned to the various leaders as well as inconsistencies in the overall rankings within each dimension.

The results did not support this hypothesis. Not only was there no significant difference between the ratings assigned to the leaders, but there was also high agreement on the rank order of each Prime Minister within ten of the eleven scales. This finding was unexpected but pleasing. If experts with divergent frames of reference can agree upon the relative amounts of particular characteristics within various leaders, then it may be that a predictable pattern of attributes can be found in our Prime Ministers. This lends support to the Great Man theory of leadership, which states that leaders possess a relatively small number of special qualities which differentiates them from non-leaders.

In support of this view, it is worth noting that the alpha coefficients of the pooled ratings approached unity. Thus we may infer that regardless of the definition of the particular quality that the historians and political scientists were evaluating within each of the scales, they agreed upon the amount of it present in each Prime Minister.

There was only one scale which differentiated between the two disciplines: the amount of information that each rater had about the individual leaders. As was pointed out in the previous chapter, historians rated themselves as having more overall information about the Prime Ministers. From an examination of Table 5 it is clear that the historians feel that they know more about the earlier Prime Ministers than about some of the later ones, while the political scientists appear to be more familiar with the last four leaders, as well as with two of the leaders who are of continuing historical interest, Macdonald and King.

This disparity seems consistent with the author's intuitive sense of the two disciplines. One naively expects historians to have more information about events and people in the past. Political scientists, on the other hand, are expected to know more about current events and institutions. One might also expect them to have more than a nodding acquaintance with the major Canadian Prime Ministers, particularly ones whose impact on governmental institutions was large.

Integrative Complexity and the Experts' Opinions

This section deals with the correlation between a Prime Minister's integrative complexity and his ratings by experts. Except for the dimension of honesty, there was no correlation between the integrative complexity of the twelve scorable Prime Ministers and the eleven dimensions they were rated on by the historians and political

scientists. There is a small but significant positive correlation ($\underline{r}$ =.56, $\underline{p} < .05$) between the spontaneous complexity level of the twelve Prime Ministers and their degree of honesty in dealing with the public. Thus it seems that the more abstract a Prime Minister was the more likely he was to be rated as honest in his public affairs.

When complexity was compared with the difficulty of the issues facing the Prime Minister, the effect of environmental pressure far outweighed the complexity factor. Significant main effects for the difficulty-of-political-issues factor were found on five dimensions: activeness, strength, effectiveness as party leader, innovativeness and accomplishments. More will be said about this later.

While the low impact of the integrative complexity factor was disappointing, it should not have been altogether surprising. The literature supplies evidence suggesting that a change in level of integrative complexity is associated with particular and specific fluctuations in external pressures or demands (Porter & Suedfeld, 1981; Suedfeld & Rank, 1976) but there is no evidence to suggest that complexity, as scored during the first session of Parliament following an election, will correlate with the Prime Minister's perceived behaviour throughout his entire term, nor with his current level of prestige.

One approach to establishing the relationship between complexity and environmental conditions would be to identify specific important issues that arose within the lifetime of each Prime Minister's government, have these rated by experts for their relative degree of difficulty and then sample speeches before, during and after each issue was dealt with. One might then expect to see variations in the level of complexity as a function of time relative to the emergence, processing and resolution of the issue (Suedfeld & Tetlock, 1977; Suedfeld, Tetlock & Ramirez, 1977).

Complexity should also be expected to vary with the degree of difficulty inherent in the problem. Another factor which may be related to variations in complexity is the quality of the eventual resolution to the issue. For example, was the solution successful, was it democratically arrived at, and was it satisfactory to all parties involved?

In future studies it would be wise to narrow the focus of interest in order to pinpoint likely correlations among environmental factors, behavioural responses and integrative complexity, correlations which might have been lost in this study through the inclusion of irrelevant material.

Relationships Among the Rankings

Canada has had sixteen different Prime Ministers from 1867 to the present. Several of those men held the office more than once. This discussion of the relative positions of these men, however, will be restricted to the twelve leaders whom the experts felt most confident about evaluating. By way of a disclaimer, the author would like to caution the reader concerning the interpretation of these rankings. While it is true that there was an exceptionally high degree of agreement among the raters as to the amount of any particular characteristic or quality ascribed to each Prime Minister within the first ten items, there was some question concerning the exact nature of the quality measured. While the glossary provided with the questionnaire gave definitions of the end points of each scale, some experts found it necessary to qualify their interpretation of some scales. Below is a summary of some comments made by individual experts concerning each of the dimensions rated. (All quotations used will remain unattributed to preserve the anonymity of the rater.) A brief discussion of the rankings follows each summary.

(a) Item One: How would you rate the difficulty of the political issues facing the Prime Minister?

Judged on the basis of absolute number of comments generated, this item proved to be the most contentious of the set. The political scientists who commented tended to qualify their ratings with explanatory notations, such as in the case of Mackenzie who had been scored as 4 because of his "housekeeping functions, [and because he had] no organized party," or Diefenbaker's score of 5--which "could be higher, but often he made them difficult." One rater indicated that the length of term in office affected the score given.

The historians, besides qualifying their scores, also questioned the appropriate interpretation of the item. One wanted to know if this question included the economic conditions of the time as this is a very important factor in mediating the impact of other, more obviously political, issues. This particular respondent suggested that it was almost an axiom "that when times are bad economically, Canadians generally fall to squabbling with one another (the federal versus the provincial governments, region versus region, French Canadians versus English Canadians etc.) and that as a consequence political difficulties are enormously increased. Conversely, in boom times, with an expanding economy, people are less obsessed with their grievances (real or imagined), and it is much easier for a prime minister to accommodate or placate the various elements that make up this vast country."

Another historian clarified his responses by assuming that the difficulties evaluated were "not self created or autogenic."

One final comment worth mentioning about this item came from a nonparticipant. He felt that "one must ask 'difficulty for whom?' Difficulty for the man himself, difficulty in understanding the issues at all, difficulty in finding a solution which will ensure his

re-election?" The assumption the author made when including this item

was that the political issues themselves contained a degree of difficulty

which when viewed relative to other issues could be located along a

continuum. The exceptionally high degree of internal consistency and the

remarkable agreement in ranking among the raters would seem to support

this hypothesis.

As seen in the previous chapter, this dimension figures prominently

in the perception of the Prime Ministers on five different dimensions.

Four of the five men who faced the most difficult political issues.

(Macdonald, Borden, King and Trudeau) are also ranked as among the five

most active, effective and strong Prime Ministers. Macdonald, Trudeau

and Borden are also among the five most innovative Canadian leaders.

At the other end of the continuum we find Meighen, Mackenzie,

Diefenbaker and St. Laurent. These men were rated as having relatively

easier political issues to face. Meighen, St. Laurent and Mackenzie were

also ranked among the five most passive and traditional Prime Ministers

while Diefenbaker, St. Laurent and Mackenzie placed among the five

weakest and most ineffective Canadian leaders.

(b) Item Two: To what extent did the Prime Minister take an active
    approach to governing?

Most of the comments on this item tended to be qualifications of the

particular rating given. For example, Mackenzie's 7 (where 7 means

active and 1 means passive) was for a man "too active" in his approach,

while Diefenbaker's 2 was a reflection of a man who was "active, but not

in administration." Two comments, both from historians, challenged the

precision of the item's phrasing. One found it a "meaningless question

unless [the] context of [the] times is taken into account", which he said

he did. The other said "'active approach' is too imprecise." For

example, "King was very active to maintain Liberal interests and himself in power but not to promote change."

Wendt and Light (1976) suggested that activity was one of four factors involved in the concept of presidential greatness. Their study analyzed the data in Maranell's (1970) investigation and found, in addition to activeness, strength, prestige and accomplishments to be indicative of the rated greatness of American Presidents. The relative placement of the Canadian Prime Ministers on these dimensions will be discussed in turn.

Not surprisingly, Canada's first Prime Minister, Sir John A. Macdonald, was unanimously ranked as the most active leader. The other four highly active Prime Ministers were Trudeau, Borden, Laurier and King.

The five most passive leaders were: Meighen, Pearson, Clark, St. Laurent and Mackenzie. It is possibly Canada's good fortune that three of its five most passive leaders did not have difficult political issues to deal with during their time in office.

(c) Item Three: To what extent was the Prime Minister motivated by idealistic versus practical considerations?

It appears that this item might have been better stated in some other form than as an idealistic-practical dichotomy. Three comments pointed out the apparent inadequacy of these poles. Specifically, the notion of realism was omitted. "Trudeau is a realist, but very impractical in a number of areas" said one historian. A political scientist agreed, stating the rule that "a realist is not necessarily practical."

King's motivations were a bit more difficult to judge for one rater because "he would stress idealism but in fact was practical."

The weaker nature of this item is reflected in the Spearman

coefficient of .78. This indicates that the rank ordering of the Prime

Ministers by the two groups of experts differed somewhat more on this

scale than on the others. In spite of the lesser degree of agreement

between groups, the rankings were similar enough to be averaged.

The five idealists were Mackenzie, Pearson, Trudeau, Diefenbaker and

Meighen. Given the currently popular appraisal of Trudeau as a realist,

it could be that some of the other Prime Ministers at this end of the

dimension may have fit better into the realist category too.

The most practical leaders were Clark, Borden, St. Laurent, Macdonald

and King.

(d) Item Four: What was the strength of the role the Prime Minister
    played in shaping events and directing government? (i.e., Was he the
    master or the servant of events?)

In the American presidential studies one of the major factors

influencing the degree of greatness ascribed to a President was his

relative amount of strength (Maranell, 1970; Rossiter, 1956; Sokolsky,

1964). Given its importance in those studies, it is reassuring to note

the high degree of reliability with which the experts have rated the

element of strength within the Canadian Prime Ministers (see Table 2).

Notwithstanding the demonstrated statistical significance of reliable

measurement, one political scientist remarked that strength was

"virtually impossible to score, [as it was] too dependent on ideological

orientation." An historian felt that any evaluations on this scale had

to be very tentative as the implication was that a leader's strength

remained constant, even over a very long career.

The only other comment served to illustrate the ease with which a

seemingly precise question could become open to alternative

interpretations. The respondent simply stated that he "answered for

results, not attempts." The author agreed with this interpretation and assumed, however wrongly, that the other 71 raters who answered this question agreed too.

Strength was another variable in the four-element factor identified as indicative of presidential greatness (Wendt and Light, 1976). The five Prime Ministers who played the strongest roles in shaping and directing governmental events were Macdonald, Trudeau, King, Laurier and Borden. These same five were also the most active in their approach to governing, which was mentioned earlier as an element in the greatness factor.

Who were the weakest leaders? They were Diefenbaker, Pearson, St. Laurent, Mackenzie and Clark, the same five who were rated as most passive.Oddly enough, except for Clark, these men were also ranked as the most idealistic. From this we might assume that Canadian idealists tend to be weak and passive leaders.

(e) Item Five: To what extent was the Prime Minister effective as a party leader?

The nature of the Canadian system of party politics enters into the comments on this item. The evaluations depend on "how we define the role of party leader--organizational, electoral, etc." because "the nature of 'party' organization, and of styles of, and opportunities for...leadership have...changed greatly" over the years since 1867. It is true that the concept of a formal political party has evolved relatively recently and that prior to the 1920's the ideological boundaries between the major parties were even fuzzier than they are today. The author assumed that a leader-follower relationship existed between the Prime Minister and the elected members of his party. It is

this relationship that likely served as a basis for evaluating the leadership effectiveness of those Prime Ministers serving prior to the advent of formal party policies.

That assumption may be true because three of the five most effective leaders were in office prior to 1920. They were Macdonald, King, Laurier, Trudeau and Borden. Borden, Macdonald and King were also among the most practical of leaders, while both Trudeau and Laurier joined them in being ranked as the five most active Prime Ministers.

Bennett, Diefenbaker, Mackenzie, Meighen and Clark were the five least effective party leaders. The story circulated about Bennett, who while alone at his club was seen muttering to himself. "What's he doing?" asked a member. "He's holding a Cabinet meeting," was the reply (Donaldson, 1969, p. 134). Small wonder he was ranked as an ineffective party leader.

Mackenzie, Meighen and Diefenbaker were also seen as among the most idealistic Prime Ministers. To the qualities of weakness and passivity found in our idealistic Prime Ministers it seems we can add one more unfortunate characteristic, ineffectiveness.

(f) Item Six: What is the current prestige assigned to the Prime
        Minister?

This item caused something of a dilemma for a number of individuals. By far the most common comment was "By whom?" The author's answer was, "By the experts."

With a touch of comic irony one political scientist captured the ever present undercurrent of regional bias when he rated Trudeau as "West 0, east more" and Diefenbaker as "West 6, east 2." (A score of 1 means low prestige and of 7, high).

In his 1970 study Maranell attempted to expand the understanding of

what is involved in the rating of presidential prestige. He found it to be linked to strength and to accomplishments. If that linkage holds, the most prestigious Prime Ministers should also be the strongest and have made the most significant overall contributions.

Macdonald, Laurier, King, Trudeau and Borden are the Prime Ministers who currently enjoy the most prestige according to the experts. The five with the lowest prestige are Diefenbaker, Meighen, Mackenzie, Bennett and Clark. As can be seen from Table 5, Maranell's pattern matches exactly in terms of the five strongest and most prestigious Prime Ministers and almost perfectly with respect to great accomplishments. Pearson joined the top five Prime Ministers with the most significant accomplishments, pushing Borden into sixth position. The leaders with the lowest prestige were also those who had the least significant overall accomplishments.

(g) Item Seven: To what extent did the Prime Minister exhibit a traditional versus an innovative approach to solving national problems?

The two historians who commented on this item felt that it was difficult to answer for different reasons: one, because "the generation down to 1911 was really the first and hence formative generation" (i.e., the one setting the "traditional" standards); the other, because "given sufficient time almost any major problem will be resolved. And those leaders who have been in office for enough time can always be seen to be 'innovative'."

The second assessment of the effect of time is partially supported by the data. Macdonald, Trudeau and Laurier are ranked as the three most innovative Prime Ministers. All three held office for a minimum of twelve years. King, who was in office for a total of twenty-three years, does not fit this pattern. He is ranked as more traditional in his approach to problem solving than any of the above three.

Of the twelve major Prime Ministers, only two held office for less

than two years. Although those two (Meighen and Clark) rank as tending

toward the traditional approach, they are not the most traditional, as

would be expected if time had the hypothesized effect.

(h) Item Eight: How flexible was the Prime Minister in his approach to
implementing programmes or policies?

The experts had very little to say about this item. Although a

political scientist pointed out that being flexible "can be seen as a

'good' thing and a 'bad' thing," he did not explain how. Looking at

Table 7, one might see a possible explanation. Flexibility in programme

or policy implementation correlates positively with effectiveness as a

party leader, high prestige, a practical motivation and high overall

accomplishments, all evaluations which could be seen as good. However,

flexibility is also positively correlated with dishonesty in dealing with

the public, a questionable attribute at best.

Given these relationships one can see how the three most effective

party leaders, Macdonald, King and Laurier, can also be rated as the

three most flexible men when putting their polices into effect. It is

possible that in order to accomplish their individual political goals

(i.e., Macdonald's National Dream, King's national unity and Laurier's

national independence) it became necessary to take alternate routes when

obstacles emerged. Perhaps they had to resort to subterfuge when

explaining the political manipulations required to attain their goals.

It is certainly the case that Macdonald, King and Laurier are perceived

as men whose overall accomplishments were great. Is it possible that

these men felt that the ends justified the means?

Of the three most inflexible leaders, Meighen, Mackenzie and

Diefenbaker, the first two are also rated as among the most ineffective

party leaders and ones whose overall accomplishments are seen as few. The same two, however, were ranked as the most honest Prime Ministers, a deplorable correlation.

(i) Item Nine: By the standards of his time, how honest was the Prime Minister in his dealings with the public?

This item generated the most surprising and perplexing data of the questionnaire. While the experts had little difficulty in completing this item, one did excuse himself by noting that "before Arthur Meighen's time or perhaps Borden's, the public generally knew very little about national policies or political behaviour."

The surprising element was the fact that there was such high agreement on the relative honesty of the Prime Ministers. The author had felt that a judgment about someone's honesty was more open to personal bias than many of the other items rated. For that reason, less of a consensus was anticipated.

The perplexing note arose from the relationships discovered among the degree of public honesty and passivity in governing, weakness in shaping and directing events in governmental terms, ineffectiveness in leading a party, currently low public prestige, and being rated as having accomplished very little overall. The greater the degree of honesty, the more extreme was the rating of each of these characteristics or qualities in a leader.

To be considered an honest Prime Minister seems almost an insult. The men doomed to the rating of most honest are Mackenzie, Meighen and Borden. They are perhaps the three least well remembered leaders outside of the "Forgotten Four" of 1891 to 1896. Even the experts rated themselves as knowing less about the honest Prime Ministers than about the dishonest ones.

In a more neutral vein, the honest Prime Ministers tended to be rated as more flexible and traditional in their approach to solving national problems.

Who were the three most dishonest leaders? They were the same men who rated among the top four in degree of current prestige and among the top five in having achieved significant overall accomplishments: King, Macdonald and Trudeau. It appears that one factor (and one whose individual contribution has not yet been established) in the equation summing to a "great" Prime Minister is the element of dishonesty.

(j) Item Ten: What is your subjective evaluation of the significance of the Prime Minister's overall accomplishments?

Comments on this item were specifically clarifications of individual responses. Two experts agreed that the four men of the period 1891 to 1896 were in office for too brief a period to be rated. Another expert offered these summations with his ratings: King (6) "divided us least"; Pearson (5) "divided us most but accomplished a lot"; and Trudeau (6) pushed through important legislation." (A score of 1 means little; a score of 7 means great).

According to the Wendt and Light (1976) study, the fourth element in the presidential greatness factor was that of overall accomplishments. This is the final element of that factor, the other three being strength, activity, and prestige. Since this study was an extension of Maranell's (1970) investigation, it is expected that the four greatness variables that Wendt and Light found in Maranell's data would also cluster together in this study. They do: accomplishments are positively correlated with strength, activity and prestige. In addition to these, the item is also positively correlated with effective party leadership, innovative problem

solving, flexible implementation of policies, and being well known to the

experts. One wonders which comes first in this final relationship. To

become a well-known leader must the Prime Minister possess all these

qualities? Or having become a leader, do experts search more diligently

for evidence of these qualities in the men?

(k) Item Eleven: How much information do you have about the Prime
    Minister?

This item was included as a check on the experts. To be able to

evaluate a Prime Minister one needs to have a certain amount of

information about him. Because of both the comments and the scores given

on this item, the four Prime Ministers holding office from 1891 to 1896

had to be eliminated from the analyses. Only 7 of the experts rated

themselves as knowing a great deal about these four. There were

exceptions, though. One political scientist, while rating himself as

having a great deal of information about Sir Charles Tupper, admitted

that "none [of it was] useful." One historian felt that he knew as much

as could be known about the four.

Interestingly, Clark, who also had a brief term in power, did not

generate nearly so many "Not Scorable" responses as the others. When one

looks at his rating on the amount of knowledge the raters felt they had

about him, the explanation becomes clear. The political scientists rated

themselves as knowing a fair amount about Clark, while the historians,

who knew the least of all about Clark, rated themselves as having

slightly more than a moderate amount of knowledge about him. The

availability of information outweighed the brevity of office in the

evaluation of Clark.

It was on this dimension that the experts from the two disciplines

differed. Of the twelve major Prime Ministers, the historians knew most

about Macdonald, King, Laurier and Borden and less about Bennett, St. Laurent and Clark. In comparison, the political scientists knew most about Trudeau, King and Diefenbaker and considerably less about Bennett, Meighen and Mackenzie.

Before discussing the leaders who may be considered Canada's greatest Prime Ministers, a brief summary of relevant studies which deal with the elements of greatness in American Presidents will be given.

Studies of Presidential Greatness

It appears that the major determinant of perceived greatness is the President's strength. Rossiter (1956), who was interested in the growth of prestige and power in the office of President, examined the men who had held that office. He evaluated 31 Presidents on the basis of eight criteria, the first of which was concerned with the nature of the times in which the President served. Rossiter concluded that growth only occurred as a function of the strength of the man in office. Although he claims not to equate strength with goodness or greatness, his selection of the eight "great" Presidents was comprised solely of strong leaders: Washington, Lincoln, F.D. Roosevelt, Jackson, Wilson, T. Roosevelt, Jefferson and Truman.

Sokolsky (1964) used different criteria from Rossiter's for evaluating the Presidents. He looked at such attributes as courage, integrity, ideals, responsibility and unselfishness. After examining the leaders, he concluded that the greatest Presidents were the strongest.

Hamilton (1958) agreed with Schlesinger's 1948 listing of great Presidents. He concluded that it was the strong Presidents that win lasting admiration from the American public.

In his 1962 article on the "great" and not so great Presidents,

Schlesinger suggested that there were five factors, various subsets of which were common to the men defined as great Presidents in his poll of historians. These factors included being a leader at a critical time in American history, taking timely action which produced timely results, championing liberalism and the general welfare of the citizens, ambitiously seeking the role of President, and being a strong executive.

Maranell (1970) found that ratings of presidential prestige correlated highly with accomplishment ratings. Strength, he concluded, was not the same thing as general prestige, although it was closely correlated with both prestige and accomplishments.

In their factor analysis of Maranell's (1970) data, Wendt and Light (1976) found a greatness factor with strength emerging as one of the four major loadings. Strength alone, however, was not sufficient for a President to have attained greatness. He must also have been active, have made significant accomplishments while in office and currently have a great deal of prestige. In their discussion of the "cult of the activist Presidency" Wendt and Light hold that there is a "definite appreciation--if not outright admiration--of apparently forceful and militant behavior as corollaries of 'greatness' in the statesman" (p. 108).

Summarizing these studies, it seems that the quality of greatness in a President is largely determined by his strength. Subsidiary factors in the determination appear to be his current prestige, his activeness and the significance of his overall accomplishments while in office.

Canada's Five Greatest Prime Ministers

Based on the findings of the American studies of presidential greatness, the elements common to great American leaders are strength,

prestige, activeness and accomplishments. The major emphasis, though, is on the President's strength. If we take the strength dimension as the primary indicator of "greatness" in Canadian Prime Ministers, then our greatest leaders are Sir John A. Macdonald, Pierre Elliot Trudeau, William Lyon Mackenzie King, Sir Wilfred Laurier and Sir Robert Borden. Any doubt about the validity of this selection because of the single predictor used may be dispelled by an examination of the top five choices on each of the other three factors contributing to "greatness." Macdonald, Trudeau, Borden, Laurier and King are the five most active and most prestigious Prime Ministers. Only on the last dimension, the one rating the significance of the leader's overall accomplishments, do we have a change in the choices. Borden drops to sixth position while Pearson joins the top five. In spite of this slight change it seems the consensus is that Macdonald, Laurier, Borden, King and Trudeau are Canada's greatest Prime Ministers.

Both primacy and recency effects are found in the selection of great Prime Ministers, as both our first and our current Prime Ministers are among the top choices on all measures related to greatness. The impact of having had difficult issues to face while in office can also be seen in the selection of the five greatest Prime Ministers. They were all rated as having relatively difficult political issues to face. Although Bennett was rated as the Prime Minister facing the most difficult issues (i.e., those related to the Depression), he did not handle them well, as can be demonstrated by his low rating on the accomplishment scale. Thus, to be considered great, it is not sufficient to merely be faced with difficult issues. One must also do something about them. (Clark also suffered from this predicament of being faced with difficult issues but not acting to alleviate them).

Another interesting observation concerning our five greatest Prime Ministers is their relative position along the dimensions that correspond to the three factors of the semantic differential. Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1957) maintain that the connotative meaning of any concept can be described by its placement on three different continua: evaluative (e.g., good-bad), potency (e.g., strong-weak) and actvity (e.g., active-passive). They further propose that the direction of a judge's attitude towards a concept (i.e., positive or negative) is indicated by scores on the evaluative factor. In the present study the scales that most closely corresponded to the evaluative, potency and activity factors are, in order, significance of accomplishments, strength of role and approach to governing.

The five greatest Prime Ministers are, in fact, the five strongest and most active; and with the exception of Borden (who is ranked sixth) they have also accrued the most significant overall accomplishments.

The author did not undertake this research with the intention of using the semantic differential as a measure of greatness of Canadian Prime Ministers. However, the important dimensions that emerged in the study do correspond closely to these three factors. Perhaps the connotative meaning of great leadership can be defined in terms of relative placement along the evaluative, potency and activeness scales.

Conclusions

On the basis of the results of this study, archival researchers may continue sampling public speeches when measuring the integrative complexity of prominent figures. Because it was demonstrated that no difference in complexity level exists between speeches that were prepared in advance of delivery (either by the speaker or by speech writers) and

speeches which were composed entirely by the speaker, they can feel
confident that they are measuring the speaker's integrative complexity.

Further conclusions to be drawn from this study are (1) that the
perception of Canadian Prime Ministers is not likely to vary between
Canadian historians and Canadian political scientists; (2) that the
relative degree of difficulty posed by the political issues facing a
Prime Minister influences the evaluation he receives concerning his
activeness, strength, effectiveness as a party leader, innovativeness and
accomplishments; and lastly, (3) that Canada's five greatest Prime
Ministers are: Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Wilfred Laurier, Sir Robert
Borden, William Lyon Mackenzie King and Pierre Elliot Trudeau.

REFERENCES

Abelson, R.P.   Simulation of social behavior.   In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson
    (Eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology, (Rev. ed.), (Vol. 2).   Reading,
    Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968(b)..

Almond, G.A.   A functional approach to the study of comparative politics.   In
    G.A. Almond and J.S. Coleman (Eds.), The Politics of Developing Areas.
    Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960.

Barker, J.D.   The lawmakers: Recruitment and adaptation to legislative life.
    New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1965.

Barber, J.D.   Power in committees: An experiment in the governmental process.
    Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Barber, J.D. The presidential character: Predicting performance in the White
    House.   Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Baron, R.A., & Byrne, D. Social psychology: Understanding human interaction.
    (2nd ed.). Toronto: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 1977.

Beckhouse, L., Tanus, J., Weiler, J., & Weinstein, E.   And some men have
    leadership thrust upon them. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,
    1975, 31, 557-566.

Bowers, D.G., & Seashore, S.E.   Predicting organizational effectiveness with
    a four factor theory of leadership.   In B.L. Hinton (Ed.), Groups and
    Organizations.   Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.,
    1971.

Case, C.M.   Leadership and conjuncture. Sociology and Social Research, 1933,
    17, 510-533.

Carlyle, T. Heroes and hero worship. Boston: Adams, 1907 (original 1841).

Courtney, J.C.   Prime ministerial character: An examination of Mackenzie King's
    political leadership. Canadian Journal of Political Science, 1976, 9,
    77-100.

Dahl, Robert A. Modern political analysis.   Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall,
    1963.

Deutsch, K.W.   The nerves of government: Models of political communication and
    control.   New York: Free Press, 1963.

Donaldson, G. Fifteen men: Canada's prime ministers from Macdonald to Trudeau.
    Toronto: Doubleday Canada Limited, 1969.

Easton, D.A.   The political system.   New York: Knopf, 1953.

Easton, D.A.   A framework for political analysis.   Englewood Cliffs. Prentice-
    Hall, 1965.

Fiedler, F.E. A theory of leadership effectiveness.   New York: McGraw Hill,
    1967.

Fiedler, F.E. Personality and situational determinants of leader behaviour. In E.A. Fleishman & J.G. Hunt (Eds.), Current developments in the study of leadership. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973.

Filella, J. The psychology of leadership. In J.W. Airan, (Ed.), The Nature of Leadership. Bombay: Lalvani Pub. House, 1969.

Hamilton, H. White House images and realities. Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida Press, 1958.

Halpin, A.W.& Winer, B.J. A factorial study of the leader behavior description. In R.M. Stogdill & A.E. Coons (Eds.), Leader Behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1957.

Harvey, O.J., Hunt, D.E., & Schroder, H.M. Conceptual systems and personality organization. New York: Wiley, 1961.

Hemphill, J.K., & Coons, A.E. Development of the leader behavior description questionnaire. In R.M. Stogdill & A.E. Coons (Eds.), Leader Behavior: It's description and measurement. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1957.

Hermann, C.F., & Brady, L.P. Alternative models of international crisis behavior. In C.F. Hermann (Ed.), International crises: Insights from behavioral research. New York: The Free Press, 1972.

Hermann, M.G. (Ed.), A psychological examination of political leaders. New York: The Free Press, 1977.

Hollander, E.P., & Julian, J.W. Contemporary trends in the analysis of leadership processes. Psychological Bulletin, 1969, 71, 387-397.

Hook, Sydney. The hero in history. Boston: Beacon, 1943.

House, R.J., & Mitchell, T.R. Path-goal theory of leadership. Journal of Contemporary Business, 1974, 5, 81-97.

Hunt, J.G., Osborn, R.N., & Schreisheim, C.A. Some neglected aspects of leadership research. In C.N. Greene and P.H. Birnbaum (Eds.), Proceeding of the 21st Annual Midwest Academy of Management Conference, Ohio University, 1978.

Hutchison, B. Mr. prime minister: 1867-1964. Don Mills, Ontario: The Hunter Rose Co. Limited, 1964.

Ilchman, W.F., & Uphoff, N.T. The political economy of change. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Katz, D. Patterns of leadership. In J.N. Knutson (Ed.), Handbook of political psychology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Katz, D., Maccoby, N., Gurin, G., & Floor, L. Productivity supervision, and morale among railroad workers. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, 1951.

Katz, D., Maccoby, N., & Morse, W. Productivity, supervision and morale in an office situation. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Survey Research Center, 1950.

Kerr, S., Schreisheim, C.A., Murphy, C.J., & Stogdill, R.M. Toward a
contingency theory of leadership based upon the consideration and
initiating structure literature. Organizational Behavior and Human
Performance, 1974, 12, 62-82.

Knutson, J.N. Handbook of political psychology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
Publishers, 1973.

Lasswell, H.D. Psychopathology and politics. Chicago: University of Chicago
Press, 1930.

Levi, A., & Tetlock, P.E. A cognitive analysis of Japan's 1941 decision for
wars. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1980, 24, 195-211.

Lewin, K. Training in democratic leadership. Journal of Abnormal and Social
Psychology, 1942, 37, 115-119.

Mann, R.D. A review of the relationships between personality and performance
in small groups. Psychological Bulletin, 1959, 56, 241-270.

Maranell, G.M. The evaluation of presidents: An extension of the Schlesinger
polls. Journal of American History, 1970, 57, 104-113.

McClosky, H. Personality and attitude correlates of foreign policy orientation
In J.N. Rosenau (Ed.), Domestic sources of foreign policy. New York: Free
Press, 1967.

McFarland, A.S. Power and leadership in pluralist systems. Stanford, Calif.:
Stanford University Press, 1969.

Nydegger, R.V. Information processing complexity and leadership status.
Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1975, 11, 317-328.

Ondaatje, C., & Catherwood, R. The prime ministers of Canada 1867-1967.
Toronto: Canyon Press, 1967.

Osborn, R.N., & Hunt, J.G. An adaptive-reactive theory of leadership: The
role of macrovariables in leadership research. In J.G. Hunt and L.L.
Larson (Eds.), Leadership Frontiers. Kent: Kent State University, 1975.

Osgood, C.E., Saporta, S., & Nunnally, J.C. Evaluative assertion analysis.
Litera, 1956, 3, 47-102.

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., & Tannenbaum, P.H. The measurement of meaning.
Urbana: University of Illinois, 1957.

Paige, G.D. The scientific study of political leadership. New York: Free
Press, 1977.

Porter, C.A., & Suedfeld, P. Integrative complexity in the correspondence
of literary figures: Effect of personal and societal stress. Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology, 1981, 40, 321-330.

Rossiter, C. The American presidency. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1956.

Sabine, G.H. A history of political theory. New York: Holt, 1937.

Schlesinger, A.M. Our presidents: A rating by 75 Historians in The New York Times Magazine, July 29, 1962, pp. 12-13, 40-43.

Schlesinger, A.M. Paths to the present. New York: Macmillan Co., 1949.

Schroder, H.M., Driver, M.J., & Streufert, S. Human information processing: Individuals and groups functioning in complex social situations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.

Schroder, H.M., & Suedfeld, P. (Eds.), Personality theory and information processing. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1971.

Seligman, L.G. The study of political leadership. American Political Sciences Review, 1950, 44, 904-915.

Simonton, D.K. Presidsential greatness, dogmatism and performance. Journal of Personality, 1981, 49, 307-323.

Snyder, R.C. A decision-making approach to the study of political phenomena In Roland Young (Ed.), Approaches to the study of politics. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1958.

Sokolsky, E. Our seven greatest presidents. New York: Exposition Press, 1964.

Spencer, H. The study of sociology. (13th ed.). London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1887.

Stogdill, R.M. Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research. New York: Free Press, 1974.

Streufert, S., & Schroder, H.M. Conceptual structure, environmental complexity and task performance. Journal of Experimental Research and Personality. 1965, 1, 132-137.

Suedfeld, P. [Measuring integrative complexity in archival materials]. In H. Mandl & G.L. Huber (Eds.), Kognitive Komplexitat, Gottingen, West Germany: Hogrefe, 1978.

Suedfeld, P. Indices of world tension in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. Political Psychology, 1980, Fall/Winter, 114-123.

Suedfeld, P., & Rank, A.D. Revolutionary leaders: Long-term success as a function of changes in conceptual complexity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 169-178.

Suedfeld, P., Tetlock, P.E., & Ramirez, C. War, Peace, and integrative complexity: UN speeches on the Middle East problem, 1947-1976. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1977, 21, 427-442.

Tetlock, P.E. Personality and isolationism: Content analysis of senatorial speeches. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1981, 41, 737-743.

Tetlock, P.E. Pre- to Postelection shifts in presidential rhetoric: Impression management or cognitive adjustment? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1981, 41, 207-212.

Weber, M. The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism. New York: Scribner's, 1958. Originally published 1904-1905.

Wendt, H.W., & Light, P.C. Measuring greatness in American presidents: Model case for international research on political leadership. European Journal of Social Psychology, 1976, 6, 105-109.

Wolfenstein, E.V. The revolutionary personality: Lenin, Trotsky and Gandhi. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.

APPENDIX   A

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
#154 - 2053 MAIN MALL
VANCOUVER B.C. CANADA
V6T 1Y7

March, 1981

I am a graduate student working on my Master's thesis at the University of British Columbia. My thesis deals with the possibility of a systematic relationship existing between the integrative complexity level (see next page) of Canadian Prime Ministers and how each Prime Minister is rated on different dimensions by experts in Canadian history and political studies.

To obtain valid correlations I need the opinions of specialists in these fields. Would you be kind enough to assist me in this project by responding to the questions in the enclosed booklet? The whole exercise takes less than 30 minutes.

I would be pleased to send you a copy of the experts' averaged ratings, and the correlations between the ratings and the complexity scores of the Prime Ministers, if you would like them.

Enclosed is a description of integrative complexity and of several studies in which this tool has been used to supplement historical insights.

Yours truly,

Elizabeth Ballard

EB:pw
Encls.

What is Integrative Complexity?

Integrative complexity, also known as conceptual complexity, is the way in which an individual expresses his responses to problems, uncertainty, threat, opposition, conflict and other environmental variables. It can be measured from speeches and other published material such as interviews, articles and letters.

The scores represent the complexity with which a particular idea was being processed. Conceptual complexity ranges from a rigid, all-or-nothing, closed-ended, unclearly differentiated style characteristic of simple processing to a flexible, combinatorial, clearly discriminated and integrated, information-oriented, open-ended style indicative of complex functioning.

While this description of the range of integrative functioning sounds value-laden, the notion of integrative complexity is non-evaluative. There are, for example, situations in which simple levels of processing are more desirable and more likely to lead to success than are complex levels.

Some Studies Using Integrative Complexity

In 1976 Suedfeld and Rank published an article which compared the complexity scores of revolutionary leaders before and after successful revolutions. As was predicted, low complexity scores were most common among the leaders prior to the overthrow of the existing government. However, those pre-revolutionary leaders who increased in complexity after victory were more successful in maintaining a position of importance in the post-revolutionary government than those leaders whose complexity did not show such an increase.

In another study, Suedfeld, Tetlock and Ramirez (1977) found that there was a significant correlation between the drop in complexity levels of the speeches of UN delegates from Israel and the United Arab Republic and the subsequent outbreaks of armed conflict in the Middle East between 1948 and 1976. Based on their results, the authors suggest that public statements of spokesmen from mutually hostile countries reflect the perception of the leadership as to the near future of their relationship with each other and further, that reduced levels of complexity precede the outbreak of major armed conflict.

Articles That Have Used Complexity

Scores

Suedfeld, P., & Rank, A.D. Revolutionary leaders: Long-term success as a function of changes in conceptual complexity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 169-178.

Suedfeld, P., & Tetlock, P. Integrative complexity of communications in international crises. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1977, 21, 169-184.

Suedfeld, P., Tetlock, P.E., & Ramirez, C. War, peace, and integrative complexity: UN speeches on the Middle East problem, 1947-1976. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1977, 21, 427-442.

Tetlock, P.E. Identifying victims of groupthink from public statements of decision-makers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1314-1324.

Tetlock, P.E., & Levi, A. A multi-method study of the Japanese decision to attack Pearl Harbor. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Quebec City, June 14, 1979.

GLOSSARY

active: causing or promoting action or change

difficult: hard to accomplish or deal with; demanding effort or great care

directing: managing, controlling or administering; supervising and organizing

easy: requiring little work or effort; offering few difficulties

effective; producing or adapting to produce the proper result

flexible: able to adjust or adapt

honest: not characterized by falsehood or intent to mislead

idealistic: one who formulates or attempts to live in accordance with ideals

innovative: to introduce or bring in new ideas or methods

passive: not acting, working or operating; submitting or yielding without
          resistance or opposition; receptive to external force

practical: pertaining to or governed by actual use and experience or action

prestige: authority or importance based on past achievements, reputation
           or power

shaping: to give direction or character to events

traditional: relating or adhering to tradition; a custom so long continued
              that it has almost the force of a law

How would you rate the difficulty of the political issues facing the Prime Minister?

Please circle the number which corresponds to your rating of each Prime Minister on this dimension. Circle NS if the Prime Minister cannot be scored.

		easy						difficult		
1.	Sir John A. Macdonald	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
2.	Alexander Mackenzie	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
3.	Sir John Abbott	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
4.	Sir John Thompson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
5.	Sir Mackenzie Bowell	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
6.	Sir Charles Tupper	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
7.	Sir Wilfrid Laurier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
8.	Sir Robert Borden	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
9.	Arthur Meighen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
10.	W.L. Mackenzie King	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
11.	R.B. Bennett	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
12.	Louis St. Laurent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
13.	John Diefenbaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
14.	Lester B. Pearson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
15.	Pierre Elliott Trudeau	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
16.	Joseph Clark	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS

To what extent did the Prime Minister take an active approach to governing?

Please circle the number which corresponds to your rating of each Prime Minister on this dimension. Circle NS if the Prime Minister cannot be scored.

	passive					active		
1. Sir John A. Macdonald	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
2. Alexander Mackenzie	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
3. Sir John Abbott	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
4. Sir John Thompson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
5. Sir Mackenzie Bowell	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
6. Sir Charles Tupper	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
7. Sir Wilfrid Laurier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
8. Sir Robert Borden	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
9. Arthur Meighen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
10. W.L. Mackenzie King	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
11. R.B. Bennett	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
12. Louis St. Laurent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
13. John Diefenbaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
14. Lester B. Pearson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
15. Pierre Elliott Trudeau	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
16. Joseph Clark	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS

To what extent was the Prime Minister motivated by idealistic versus practical considerations?

Please circle the number which corresponds to your rating of each Prime Minister on this dimension. Circle NS if the Prime Minister cannot be scored.

		idealistic					practical			
		↑					↑			
1.	Sir John A. Macdonald	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
2.	Alexander Mackenzie	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
3.	Sir John Abbott	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
4.	Sir John Thompson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
5.	Sir Mackenzie Bowell	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
6.	Sir Charles Tupper	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
7.	Sir Wilfrid Laurier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
8.	Sir Robert Borden	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
9.	Arthur Meighen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
10.	W.L. Mackenzie King	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
11.	R.B. Bennett	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
12.	Louis St. Laurent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
13.	John Diefenbaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
14.	Lester B. Pearson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
15.	Pierre Elliott Trudeau	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
16.	Joseph Clark	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS

What was the strength of the role the Prime Minister played in shaping events and directing government? (i.e. Was he the master or the servant of events?)

Please circle the number which corresponds to your rating of each Prime Minister on this dimension. Circle NS if the Prime Minister cannot be scored.

		weak (servant) ↑					strong (master) ↑		
1.	Sir John A. Macdonald	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
2.	Alexander Mackenzie	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
3.	Sir John Abbott	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
4.	Sir John Thompson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
5.	Sir Mackenzie Bowell	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
6.	Sir Charles Tupper	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
7.	Sir Wilfrid Laurier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
8.	Sir Robert Borden	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
9.	Arthur Meighen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
10.	W.L. Mackenzie King	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
11.	R.B. Bennett	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
12.	Louis St. Laurent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
13.	John Diefenbaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
14.	Lester B. Pearson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
15.	Pierre Elliott Trudeau	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
16.	Joseph Clark	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS

To what extent was the Prime Minister effective as a party leader?

Please circle the number which corresponds to your rating of each Prime Minister on this dimension. Circle NS if the Prime Minister cannot be scored.

		effective					ineffective		
1.	Sir John A. Macdonald	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
2.	Alexander Mackenzie	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
3.	Sir John Abbott	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
4.	Sir John Thompson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
5.	Sir Mackenzie Bowell	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
6.	Sir Charles Tupper	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
7.	Sir Wilfrid Laurier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
8.	Sir Robert Borden	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
9.	Arthur Meighen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
10.	W.L. Mackenzie King	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
11.	R. B. Bennett	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
12.	Louis St. Laurent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
13.	John Diefenbaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
14.	Lester B. Pearson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
15.	Pierre Elliott Trudeau	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
16.	Joseph Clark	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS

What is the current prestige assigned to the Prime Minister?

Please circle the number which corresponds to your rating of each Prime Minister on this dimension. Circle NS if the Prime Minister cannot be scored.

	low						high		
	↑						↑		
1. Sir John A. Macdonald	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
2. Alexander Mackenzie	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
3. Sir John Abbott	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
4. Sir John Thompson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
5. Sir Mackenzie Bowell	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
6. Sir Charles Tupper	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
7. Sir Wilfrid Laurier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
8. Sir Robert Borden	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
9. Arthur Meighen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
10. W.L. Mackenzie King	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
11. R. B. Bennett	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
12. Louis St. Laurent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
13. John Diefenbaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
14. Lester B. Pearson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
15. Pierre Elliott Trudeau	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
16. Joseph Clark	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS

To what extent did the Prime Minister exhibit a traditional versus an innovative approach to solving national problems?

Please circle the number which corresponds to your rating of each Prime Minister on this dimension. Circle NS if the Prime Minister cannot be scored.

	innovative						traditional		
	↑						↑		
1. Sir John A. Macdonald	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
2. Alexander Mackenzie	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
3. Sir John Abbott	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
4. Sir John Thompson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
5. Sir Mackenzie Bowell	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
6. Sir Charles Tupper	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
7. Sir Wilfrid Laurier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
8. Sir Robert Borden	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
9. Arthur Meighen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
10. W. L. Mackenzie King	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
11. R. B. Bennett	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
12. Louis St. Laurent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
13. John Diefenbaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
14. Lester B. Pearson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
15. Pierre Elliott Trudeau	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
16. Joseph Clark	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS

How flexible was the Prime Minister in his approach to implementing programmes or policies?

Please circle the number which corresponds to your rating of each Prime Minister on this dimension. Circle NS if the Prime Minister cannot be scored.

	inflexible ↑					flexible ↑		
1. Sir John A. Macdonald	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
2. Alexander Mackenzie	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
3. Sir John Abbott	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
4. Sir John Thompson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
5. Sir Mackenzie Bowell	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
6. Sir Charles Tupper	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
7. Sir Wilfrid Laurier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
8. Sir Robert Borden	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
9. Arthur Meighen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
10. W. L. Mackenzie King	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
11. R. B. Bennett	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
12. Louis St. Laurent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
13. John Diefenbaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
14. Lester B. Pearson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
15. Pierre Elliott Trudeau	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
16. Joseph Clark	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS

By the standards of his time, how honest was the Prime Minister in his dealings with the public?

Please circle the number which corresponds to your rating of each Prime Minister on this dimension. Circle NS if the Prime Minister cannot be scored.

		honest						dishonest		
1.	Sir John A. Macdonald	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
2.	Alexander Mackenzie	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
3.	Sir John Abbott	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
4.	Sir John Thompson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
5.	Sir Mackenzie Bowell	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
6.	Sir Charles Tupper	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
7.	Sir Wilfrid Laurier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
8.	Sir Robert Borden	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
9.	Arthur Meighen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
10.	W. L. Mackenzie King	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
11.	R. B. Bennett	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
12.	Louis St. Laurent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
13.	John Diefenbaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
14.	Lester B. Pearson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
15.	Pierre Elliott Trudeau	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS
16.	Joseph Clark	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		NS

What is your subjective evaluation of the significance of the Prime Minister's overall accomplishments?

Please circle the number which corresponds to your rating of each Prime Minister on this dimension. Circle NS if the Prime Minister cannot be scored.

	little →				great →			
1. Sir John A. Macdonald	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
2. Alexander Mackenzie	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
3. Sir John Abbott	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
4. Sir John Thompson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
5. Sir Mackenzie Bowell	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
6. Sir Charles Tupper	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
7. Sir Wilfrid Laurier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
8. Sir Robert Borden	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
9. Arthur Meighen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
10. W. L. Mackenzie King	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
11. R. B. Bennett	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
12. Louis St. Laurent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
13. John Diefenbaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
14. Lester B. Pearson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
15. Pierre Elliot Trudeau	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS
16. Joseph Clark	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NS

How much information do you have about this Prime Minister?

Please circle the number which corresponds to your rating of each Prime Minister on this dimension .

	very little						a great deal
1. Sir John A. Macdonald	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Alexander Mackenzie	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Sir John Abbott	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Sir John Thompson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Sir Mackenzie Bowell	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Sir Charles Tupper	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Sir Wilfrid Laurier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Sir Robert Borden	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Arthur Meighen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. W. L. Mackenzie King	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. R. B. Bennett	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Louis St. Laurent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. John Diefenbaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Lester B. Pearson	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Pierre Elliott Trudeau	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Joseph Clark	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

1. Age_____   Sex_____

2. Professional specialty within history _____

    _____

3. Academic rank _____

4. Highest degree held _____

5. Institution from which my highest degree was received _____

    _____

    ____Please check this if you wish to have a copy of the results
        mailed to you.

        Name: _____

        Date: _____

APPENDIX   B

Princeton Manual Guidelines

Score 1: Response could be generated by single fixed rule; no alternative
interpretations were considered; subtle conditional changes would
produce no changes in the response. Responses which fit the event into
a category (inclusion v exclusion) with a high degree of certainty,
which unambiguously reduce conflict and avoid the use of gradations
(shades of gray and continua) are typically generated by simple
structure.

    a.   Viewing conflict, uncertainty or ambiguity as unpleasant or as a
flaw or weakness in people or functioning.

    b.   Seeking fast and unambiguous closure or resolution, and reacting
in such a way as to engage internally consistent processes which
reduce incongruity or dissonance.

    c.   Offering a specific guide or rule for reducing conflict.

    d.   Implying that an absolute solution can be found.

    e.   Stating that effects are compartmentalized, are all one way or all
another way.

    f.   Presenting only one side of a problem ignoring differences and
similarities with other views.

Score 2: When the response signifies a qualification of an absolute rule
but is not clearly identified as an alternative interpretation.

Score 3: Clear representation of availability of alternative rule
structures for perceiving the event. The response must indicate the
simultaneous generation of alternate and different perceptions of the
same information. It also includes a conditional rule for specifying
when each interpretation is used.

    a.   Listing similarities and differences between view, without
considering relationships.

    b.   Specification of at least two different interpretations of the
event in the stem.

    c.   Presence of "either-or" type responses expressing a possible
conditional rule about two ways of categorizing.

    d.   Probability statements about the occurrence of different views or
outcomes.

    e.   Reactions against absolutism in general (implying more than one
view is not necessarily being "anti" particular view which could
indicate a low level fixed rule structure).

    f.   The avoidance of dependency on external imposition, i.e., clearly
implying the availability of alternatives.

Score 4: When confident that the response implies alternate interpretations and also implies that both can interact, but the interaction is expressed as qualification rather than as the emergence of comparison rules.

Score 5: Response must give evidence not only of alternative interpretations but of the use of comparison rules for considering the _joint_ as opposed to the conditional outcome of these different perceptions. At this level differences can be held in focus simultaneously and viewed as having interactive effects...expresses the joint operation directly and the other processes must be inferred.

   a.   The integration of two conflicting or different interpretations so as to preserve and not "ward off" the conflict.

   b.   The generation of various meanings of alternate perceptions, e.g., various meanings of the perception of conflicting views about a person.

   c.   Evidence that the completion implies the ability to take another person's intentions (or perceptions) into account and to relate different perceptions of different people.

   d.   Implication that one's behavior is affected by the way another behaves as in a give-and-take strategy game.

   e.   A view of social relationship anchored in mutual responsibility (as opposed to fixed beliefs or rules) in which each person can "place himself in the other person's shoes" (relate alternate schema).

Score 6: Indication of the simultaneous operation of alternatives and some evidence of the consideration of functional relations between them.

Score 7: Not only states or implies that alternative perceptions occurred and were simultaneously held in focus and compared but also indicates that the outcomes of various comparisons can be considered in producing causal statements about the functional relations between "ways of viewing the world."...

   a.   Conflicting alternatives which we viewed as leading to new organizations and information.

   b.   The utilization of alternatives through exploratory action in order to obtain new information.

   c.   Generation of functional relations between alternatives.

   d.   Consideration of relationships among similarities and differences between the sides of a problem or question and the development of relationships between alternate reasons as to why these differences and similarities exist. The production of more "connectedness" between alternatives by theorizing as to why these reasons exist.