

mental illness. Acting otherwise constitutes abdication of professional responsibility. Thus involvement of mental-health professionals in political activity could be considered a boundary violation. The responsibility of psychology and psychiatry to society should encompass a respect for those arenas of life that supersede medical practice and any temptation to employ training inappropriately should be resisted. It may be argued that mental health clinicians have no more authority than others to command the community's attention with regard to political issues. Mental-health clinicians should engage in political activism only as "concerned citizens" and not as professionals. Several historical illustrations exist demonstrating perils of mental-health involvement in politics including the Nazi era as the most gregarious example. In this manner, psychologists and psychiatrists face challenges to their professionalism and autonomy and subsequently to their ethical standards of conduct. Entering into political activity and discourse would constitute a violation of these standards. Political activism by the profession is too divisive and diminishes the mental health profession's standing and respect in the community. However, political psychology is a very legitimate and respectable sub-affiliate of the discipline which is an interdisciplinary academic field dedicated to the study of the interface between psychology and political behavior. Core principles of the profession should never be abandoned in light of any political activism.

Political Cognition, Power, and Metarepresentation : A New Theory of Thinking, Action, and Communication

**Cristian Popescu, Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris*

[Panel] 10E New Perspectives on Agency and Culture in Political Psychology

[Section] New Theoretical and Methodological Developments

This theoretical paper explores some fundamental features of the complex relationship between power and metarepresentation in a political cognitive context. My working hypothesis is that a coherent and comprehensive model can be built in order to better explain together a fair number of phenomena (both very wide and varied) pertaining to political cognition. This model draws empirical support already for several of its core contentions ; others however lack it for the moment. Its range of applications, actual and potential, is extremely large. To state it very briefly, starting from a relational definition of power as "action upon action" (Foucault, 1983)—and from a recursive definition of metarepresentation as "representation of representation" (e. g., Sperber, 2000): it becomes obvious that their respective basic building blocks (i. e., representation vs. action) are intimately linked. And this essential link between cognitive representation and political action provides a heuristic angle for analyzing the manifold manifestations of belief, behaviour, and discourse within political cognition. Therefrom, my paper has a double purpose : from an extensive standpoint, I explain how in a broad detailed dynamic network of power and metarepresentation people politically interact and cognitively integrate their interaction ; whereas, from an intensive standpoint, I advance two both rigorous and original typologies of power and, respectively, metarepresentation—in interconnection. Indeed, my competition model of power as well as computational model of metarepresentation are best understood together and through one another.

Political Cynicism and Electoral Choice

Aida Paskeviciute, University of Essex

**Martin Rosema, University of Twente*

[Panel] 4C Cynicism, Emotion, and Voting

[Section] Electoral Behavior, Participation and Public Opinion

Political trust and political cynicism are not key concepts in electoral research. However, if models based on traditional factors (social background, policy preferences, ideological positions, government approval, and candidate images) failed to provide an adequate explanation of the support of a particular party, political cynicism has been put forward as a relevant factor. Electoral support for so-called extreme right-wing and populist parties in Europe are well-known examples. The evidence for the impact of political cynicism on the vote is, however, rather limited and scattered. Moreover, how the concept of political cynicism relates to notions like political trust, political alienation, and political support is not sufficiently clear. The aim of this paper is to take up both issues. Its first aim is to provide some conceptual clarity regarding the meaning of political cynicism, by discussing both political science literature as well as the psychological foundation of the concept. The second aim is to provide a more systematic analysis of the impact of political cynicism on the vote (both electoral participation and party choice), by focusing on a wide range of European countries and a wide range of parties. This will be done on the basis of survey data from the European Social Survey (ESS) and the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES). Findings indicate that political cynicism affects voters' preferences for some parties but not for others. Furthermore, findings indicate that whereas in some countries political cynicism leads to abstention, in other countries it leads to support for particular parties. We conclude by discussing the implications for the functioning of democracy.