Decolonizing Social Psychology in India: Exploring Its Role as Emancipatory Social Science

CHETAN SINHA
CHRIST UNIVERSITY, BENGALURU

The present article attempts to interrogate the role of social psychology in India in providing an emancipatory framework for creating an effective social movement for social change. The history of social psychology in India is driven by historicism presented through an epistemological stance that essentialized the dominant social structure. This article separates the history of social psychology in India into two factions - modern and traditional, and attempts to critically examine its contemporary image which seems to be derived from a shallow history rather than a deep and critical one. The article is inspired by the libertarian psychological approach and calls for a better perspective on social change that can cross the boundary of aloofness and scientific neutrality.

The basic tenets of scientific psychology in India largely depended on the culture of educated class and especially majoritarian worldviews of essentialism derived from ancient resources (see also Hopkins, 2015). The recent Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR) reports on the status of social psychology in India reveal an important stance (see Singh, 2009; Mishra, Akojam, & Misra, 2009; Misra & Kumar, 2011; see also Kumar, 2006), where the roots of modern psychology as modern science was looked at from a cultural point of view. Some of the work on the status of social psychology in India (e.g. Dalal & Mishra, 2001; Pandey & Singh, 2005) highlighted the mainstream approach for doing social psychology in India in the pre and post independent India. The first social psychology textbook in India (Mukherjee & Sengupta, 1928) evidenced the value of doing social psychology in that time period. The approach was experimental in nature and primarily studied human behaviour. For example, one of the studies in social psychology reported on the effect of the group on performance (Mukherjee & Sengupta, 1928), subsequent to this not much has been published. Meanwhile, the pioneering work on social identity highlighting the nature of group by Henri Tajfel and colleagues (Tajfel et al., 1971) as conducted in the European tradition, was not reflected in the research being done in social psychology in India, during the same time. However, that time-period witnessed very few non-experimental approaches to study human behaviour in the social context, possibly, due to the regulating paradigm of positivism. The present study attempts to reflect upon the status of social psychology in India deriving its premise from the recent work of Pickren (2009) and Adams et al. (2015) on 'indigenization of the history of psychology' and 'decolonization of psychological science' respectively. The current paper targets the dominant perspectives prevalent in Indian social psychology, and effort is made to

highlight the importance of a critical perspective, which may provide a better analytical framework.

The history of psychological sciences shows that mind and body, as two important concepts in psychology, were explored through the dynamic intervention of the sensory modalities, which have become an active tool for empirically establishing observable phenomenon. In social psychology, these concepts of mind and body were related to different moods. That is, either separate from the social context or causally connected units operating in the social context and reciprocally feeding into it. For example, the first formal social psychology textbook in the west (McDougall, 1908), understood the importance of individual agency as primary whereas other instances of textbooks on social psychology (e.g. Ross, 1908; Allport, 1924) considered social contexts as the primary. The juxtapositioning of the two perspectives in the history of social psychology in the west and in India underwent many debates because of new insights into the social context, cultures and subcultures and changing psychological perspective. Furthermore, these very debates found two major changes, first, changes in terms of adoption of metatheory to fit into the globalized rule of the market and second, movements of the indigenous issues emerging in the socio-political setup of the geographical arena. Evidently, the subdisciplines of psychology seriously tried to reformulate the metatheory of individualism by situating it in the social and cultural context, however, with the same metamethodology of doing accurate science to come out with true knowledge. As a philosophy of science doesn't give the accurate formulation of the cause behind the phenomenon, all which was captured in the history of psychology was exactly one method of exploration under the chimera of recapturing the chain of real causal factors behind the phenomenon. Thus, the question that emerges is 'How it can be a reality when the explanations are just relying on one way of doing psychology? As noted by Nola and Shankey (2007) that in science the disillusionment of discovering the reason behind something has never gone beyond the context of discovery; however, it was justified with rude enthusiasm. The context of justification has often fallen into heuristics, either as a negative or positive heuristic. The negative heuristic is arriving at a particular solution with some preconceived assumptions and then proceeding to justify it or search for new tools to justify it by rejecting anomalies (see Nola & Shankey, 2007). Thus, the present article attempts to highlight some critical aspects of the mainstream social psychology of India, which represents the indigenous picture despite being contested from the interdisciplinary arena.

In his lecture series, the psychology of science, Maslow (1966) highlighted the mechanomorphic tradition of physical science, which was extensively used and promoted in the discipline of psychology and human sciences. This period which endorsed the use of scientific criteria to explore psychology made such an impact that the legacies have been quite untouched by culture or context (see Misra & Gergen, 2015). The Indian context had

witnessed the politics of dominant culture, traditions and also modernity, yet the utilization of the politics for the benefit and emancipation of the marginalized and the oppressed, in the form of liberating experiences and freedom, has hardly made any recourse to the history of modern India. The phrase 'history of modern India' can be metaphorized as 'psychology of modern India' derived from the colonizing experiences and preferences that western educated middle class Indian propagated. Scholars like Ashis Nandy highlighted this in the form of the psychology of dissent, partially happening in opposition to the banality of caste, gender and class politics (Nandy, 1983, 2002). The theoretical exploitation and dominance of the occident (see also Guru, 2009; see also Pickren, 2009; Said, 1978), as witnessed in the history of colonized India and its continuation in the post-colonial India reflects the psychology which was popularized and used as a tool for promoting inequality both in objectivity and perceptions. In the context of caste discrimination in India, Guru (2009) questioned the egalitarian status of social sciences and suggested theorization based on one's 'lived in experience'. The literature in social psychology falls short of, in representing the lived experiences of people from the underprivileged and marginalized background.

Thus, the current work demands the critical reflection on the ubiquity of research happening in an Indian context by highlighting key tenets to the process of doing social psychology. Positioning its stand under the metatheory of liberation and as a critique of the methodology of colonial and nevertheless, postcolonial way of doing social psychology, the current article will trace the evidence of decolonizing sciences and thus social psychology by reflecting on the following tenets viz, hegemony of social psychology, poverty of social psychology and space of social psychology. The article hopes for the transformation of modernity under the broader umbrella of decolonization, through the healthy bridging of traditional and modern. It was also observed that modernity may also revive subtle social biases, such as racial and caste based prejudices and microaggressions (e.g. Sue & Sue, 2007) in the name progressiveness. However, modernity also gives the platform to reexamine various prejudices prevailing in our society and engages in self-motivation to resist from indulging in discrimination (see also Johansson, 2000).

The point of contention here is "why researchers in social psychology did not bring any social change despite their scholarship?" Why has social psychology become so unsocial (Moscovici, 1972)? Some of the significant issues which did not find any place in Indian social psychology have raised significant questions about the process and motivation behind doing social psychology. Historical process, colonialism, political makeup, the economic scene has been largely neglected in the background of the research. As pointed by Parker (2005), the discipline of psychology often busies itself with finding out what is wrong with people and putting things right. In order to do that, this discipline usually draws on shared cultural representations of what 'normal' behaviour and cognitive

functions are like (P. 1). Coexistence of the diverse ideology in the same institution seems to be untenable and impractical for a peaceful coexisting culture like India. The need also arises to deconstruct the idea of India as a nation and to explore its historical origin. Yet, it was speculated that social psychological aspects of Indian culture are embedded in its social structure and fabric which has a deep-seated association with its historic past, for example, the Vedic period. The connection of memory with its historic past diverges into two main identities, that is, Brahmanical and non-Brahmanical, which constructed one's belongingness for the oppressors' or oppressed identities respectively. The nostalgic association with the past especially, with the traditional values and Brahmanism, have created new politics of social psychological researches in the name of indigenization, coming to the results which confirmed the deep-seated traditional values (see also Pandey et al., 2014; Shankar et al., 2013). However, when the contemporary values and social psychological aspects are explored they connect to the colonial pasts in terms of using western methods, objective and scientific knowledge and observation-based approaches (see Nandy, 1974, 1983; Okazaki, David, & Abelmann, 2008; see also Paranjpe, 2006; Dalal & Misra, 2001). The comparison of modern India with traditional India is not new in social psychology in India, where modernity is observed as giving space for diversity, but traditional was based on cultural dominance. This dominance of one culture is observed to be the driving force for religious authoritarianism in India (for example, right-wing authoritarianism in India) (see also Pal & Sinha, 2016). The role of social psychology in the social emancipation was debated on many significant topics like the silence of psychology, role of queries and methodical observation. The nature of inquiry sustained in the research process or mainstream way of exploration, and it was indeed a significant point made, which must be looked into. The dominance of psychology achieved its position by transformation of innovative methodology into mere techniques. Thus, the practice of social psychology in the present is derived from the psychology of powerful culture, which framed the consciousness of the discipline as working on universally derived principles, neglecting the social context of oppression and cultural relativism. This was well understood in the three versions under which existing or on-surface psychology could be looked into. These are 1) political impetus and effect of psychology, 2) process of its exploration and research, and 3) the betrayal of radical promise by neutralizing the alternative methodological paradigms (Burman, 1997).

SUBJECTIVITY IN PSYCHOLOGICAL SCIENCES: WHY PSYCHOLOGY IS POLITICS?

It is a hard fact that colonial psychology inspired by the metatheory of individualism rejected culture and human subjectivity. This orientation and position were, however, critiqued by the proponents of culture but in a limited way. However, Bar-Tal (2001) critiqued the universal and objective approach of mainstream psychology by showing that epistemology of psychological understanding is a kind of politics. Some of the researchers

doing social psychology in India, embark upon the fundamental question raised by Serge Moscovici as - 'what is social in social psychology?' (e.g. Dalal & Misra, 2001; Sinha, 1994; Pandey & Singh, 2009). The irony is whether this exploration of social contents is itself a real social process, or is it the politics of framing or legitimizing the dominant social agenda, for example, legitimizing the caste system, or legitimizing the patriarchy? The prominent researchers in the interdisciplinary domains of social sciences highlighted the subtle evolution of discriminatory factors in society, where the reflections were limited to the diverse world views of the educated class. The presence of intellectuals as part of the university culture did generated some major debates and acted as an eye-opener for the general population, but that too was limited.

The disciplinary advancement may depend on the various factors such as, a society that which the culture depends on, critical pejoratives, the character of antinomies and duality, people understanding of their social structure and others. In such conditions, a discipline like social psychology flourished in India under a scientific guise. The scientific history of India as observed (Misra & Kumar, 2009), showed that the process of doing science was laden in the metaphysical speculations; however, a few scholars paved the way of doing philosophy in one aspect of the matter, but not losing it metaphysical character, for example, individualism (see Hopkins, 2015; Pickren, 2009; Sinha, 1986, 1998). For example, the culture of open-mindedness and critical outlook as begun by Thales in the Greek era can be observed in the vad-vivada (debates and argumentations) in ancient Indian thought. However, the culture of criticality was misunderstood and in the later phase, this process of exploring knowledge was restricted to understanding the universal structure of consciousness, e.g. the representations of ultimate reality such as god as the truth. In the Indian case, the colonial expansion left a deep mark on identity, from the view of where is the location/existence of an identity, what is it and in what way it will be understood in the future? The advent of the modern sciences in the post-renaissance period and shaping of the modern psychology derived the emerging modern intellectuals who had the knowledge about various social problems and thought that modern psychology had the potential to improve. So, some of the pertinent inquiries which are raised from the present were about the emergence of the methodical discourse or the emergent nature of discourse among people, at least, among the English educated. The duality of individualism and society constructed the scientific nature of psychology, for example, Girindrasekhar Bose's (see Sinha, 1994) effort to bridge the western way of exploring unconsciousness with Indian culture. The matter is to see whether one's culture fits into the western scientific exploration and gets legitimized under the garb of modern, authentic and socioculturally superior culture or takes radical departure and confirms one's cultural frame. The choice among Indian intellectual was quite obvious as to retain the best tradition under the modern outlook. The urge to be scientific and modern was important, and it had brought social change at least in the consciousness of one's identity,

but the tradition of doing social psychology in India didn't account for this, the very core of understanding the change that was happening outside the rooms of social psychologists. Applying the methods of natural science to understand the experience was a difficult task, and that limited the intensity of the force to understand and refuel the social movement phenomenon.

The explorations of the important journals reflected the meager amount of studies on social change and movement. However, their fervor to report scientific studies showing numerals assigned to the psychological variable was immense. The urge was more to see any phenomenon in universal terms or to essentialize the identity and very nature of the existence. The report about the urgent issues such as caste movement, social class movement, gender movement, etc. was categorical and the real meaning of those categories was very much missing. The discourses among the social scientist about some of the prominent issues were filtered as unscientific among the scientific psychologists in India. Burr (1995) raised one very important question: Do individuals have the agency to construct the world through their discourse, or are we all the products of social structure beyond our control? Recently, Fuster (2014) discussed the neuroscientific basis of creativity and freedom but was not reductionist in approach and searched for the best causal factors. A scientific endeavour doesn't mean to be eliminativist or reductivist and limited to certain methods; it can go beyond its rigidity. This was misunderstood by the formal psychologists who had the impression that they were doing science by exploring the cause-effect relationship, which corresponds to the abstract nature of the phenomenon under the guise of observable behavior (see also Parker, 2015).

Recently, Hibberd (2014) called off the prevailing metaphysics of the psychological process in terms of its epistemology. She pointed towards the debates between science and pseudoscience by showing that the psychological process doesn't have additive properties as it happens in quantitative domains and thus any effort acknowledging the quantitative derivation of the abstract concept of psychology is actually a pseudoscience. Accordingly, to limit to the domain of science and neglecting the issues which look unscientific seems to be a denial of the historical and social situation. The creation of the myth of utopia of equality in the social-psychological reality of India was the underdetermination of reality under the dominant framework by denying that scientific phenomenon is socially constructed and cannot be completely mind-independent (Harker, 2015). For example, from some research, it became evident that the current Indian social-psychological reality is the result of colonization and westernization and questioning the western psychological constructs and method explicates the Indian reality (Gergen, Gulerce, Locke, & Misra, 1996).

The placing of social psychology in India within the continuum of two antinomies of western and the indigenous neglected the other complexities which occupy the psychological space of people more dominantly. It was observed that the basic essence of

any phenomenon, which has a direct impact on the humanity, was categorized in scientific term. Martin-Baro (1994) called this way of understanding psychology as young science beholding the problem child who committed all kinds of problems and needs to be understood in the embedded social structure. The discipline of psychology, as observed by Baro (1994),

'had become infatuated with methods and measurements and blind to many of the structural determinants of individual group life, including its idiosyncratic allegiances to the privileged and powerful' (P. 3).

The role of psychology to help people in understanding their personal realities through a reflection of their social experience had never become reality (e.g. Baro, 1994) in an academic psychology of India. Taking the recourse from the Baro's work in El Salvadorian context, it is important to recognize that liberation social psychology was the need to emancipate people from the politically motivated endemic poverty, dependent and neo-colonial nature of their economies and severe internal inequalities (Sánchez & Wiesenfeld, 1991), lack of unity among the social scientist against the oppressive status quo (Burton & Kagan, 2005) and the differences in the intellectual traditions of psychologists on the basis of languages portraying the major gap in the proper movement for liberation.

The above characteristics found very much in similarity with the Indian social context which has complementary interrelation of the rigid caste system, social class, religion, and patriarchy. The questions which many times get faded in the mainstream explorations of the facts are the questions to be mostly worked upon. For example, why the history of psychology in India highlights the normative value system and issues which form the basic structure of Indian psychology is not critically looked at? Also, despite the efforts made by social reformers and leaders such as B. R. Ambedkar, questioning the social problems such as untouchability (1936) in India, these questions were neglected and reframed under the essentialist values embedded in the traditional culture under the garb of modern scientific approaches. However, there are other questions, which are unresolved, and it can be inferred that either the social context of doing psychology considers it as non-relevant issues within the framework of universality and neutrality or it becomes embarrassing for social psychologists to take these issues into consideration because of academic conformity and compliance. The bold effort on the part of psychologists to go beyond the existing boundaries of 'to be nonconforming to natural scientific norms' and 'as not value loaded and unbiased' is the effort to create empty hope of utopia denying the whole concept of social engineering and social change. As an illustration, some of the highlighted and debatable work in social psychology talked about poverty, languages, achievement, intelligence, etc. highlighting its causal factors within the individuals asking for the change in the individuals itself without mentioning the social norms. Some of the studies discussed the effects of social structure and contexts (e.g. discrete or omnibus), but the penetration

into the inner layers of these issues becomes the necessity, as the seriousness of the issues may fade away under the superficiality of dominant societal culture without taking into account the genuine concerns. As Guru (2002) emphasized theorizing from the identity perspective, but most of the studies done in understanding important social issues are from the biased observers' perspectives. Therefore, the status of psychology in India as a mainstream discipline also seems to face three quandaries (see Burton & Kagan, 2005 in Latin American context, such as a) its socially relevant and irrelevant stance, b) its parochial and non-parochial structure and c) its scientific neutrality and value loaded constructions. Mainstream social psychology in India seems to be perplexed in the above dilemmas where its intentionality and actual stance mismatch.

DOES INDIAN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY LIBERATE?

James Berline (1988) discussed the ways knowledge came into existence through the generations of discourses. He pointed out that knowledge is a historically bounded process, a social fabrication, instead of being as an eternal and invariable phenomenon. Knowledge is the construction whose authenticity is in the eyes of beholders, where the objects in the external reality superimpose its varieties of perceptions in the representations. The problem with the established knowledge is its imposed legitimacy, which was very much evident in the disciplinary programs, their methods, and metatheory. The rhetorical stance adopted by mainstream social psychology in India seems to be linked to the rhetoric of cognitive psychology and positivism (see also Berlin, 1986) where 'real is the rational' (p. 482). The reality of objects underlies its properties which the social psychologist in India took for granted by the name of observation. The nature of reality, thus, for social psychologists becomes dependent upon two facets only, that is, the reality of the object which is observable, and since it is observable, it is logical and rational, a universal form of reasoning. The questions which were directed at the nature of reality, which is simply of one kind and legitimized accordingly by the dominant identities, got underneath the more materialistic orientations. As a result, social psychology in India was driven by the tendency to understand the real human nature which was never deciphered, due to the use of the wrong questions and inappropriate methodological stance.

The perspective which was utilized in understanding and universalizing the human nature in the Indian cultural context was simply token in nature without deeper understanding and ability to take a risk and transcend the boundary for real understanding and social change. Nandy (1974) reflected upon the non-paradigmatic status of psychology in India and found that the struggle is all about sticking to the paradigm of being a good scientist. The doing of psychology was more attuned to the processes of doing science rather than falling into the reflexivity of criticality about the psychology of doing the particular kind of social psychology. The struggle was mostly about the aligning of subjective concepts with numerals and feeling good about it. Social psychologists in India felt isolated in placing the

psychological concepts in appropriate metatheory. The risk was immense in crossing the boundary, at least in perception, in terms of being isolated, mocked and embarrassed. So, the question which can be raised is about the social change that social psychology in India has brought.

The Indian context is the combination of worldviews aligned with different social categories and thus, the emergence of social identity in the plural sense. The dilemma about the authenticity of social change brought by the social psychology in the modern times, individually or in interdisciplinary collaboration, has not been yet resolved. The political strategy of social psychologists in India was being apolitical, neutral and rudimentary. The chances are immense where social psychologists can initiate the rising of grand theories in the future, but it was limited due to lack of criticality and urges to take risk and cross the scientific boundaries, that is, to be interdisciplinary in outlook and understanding the issues involved more closely (see also Cohen, 2001; Dewsbery, 2009; Koch, 1993; Kagan, 2009; Snow, 1961). The risk was the promotion of alternative and diverse voices, exploration of different methodology, raising critical questions and being humble to the minority viewpoints. Therefore, there are important things to look into the initial process of understanding 'social psychology' and 'way of doing social psychology' which can be placed in at least three major domains, that is, hegemony of social psychology, poverty of social psychology and space of social psychology

HEGEMONY OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Aristotle in ancient Greek philosophy talked about the final cause behind any phenomenon which is termed as teleological. This final cause of the phenomenon became legitimized in the church for many years, for example, the debate between heliocentric and geocentric, unless the hidden thesis of Copernicus made its impact. This is one example of the processes through which the legitimate perspective goes into the transformation and reformed. However, the condition of psychology as pointed by Parker (1989) in his "The crisis in modern social psychology and how to end it" and Wexler's (1983) "Critical Social Psychology" is the same reductionist and asocial. Reductionism as the metatheoretical assumption of positivism is still prevalent because it has its own politics of status quo, and it also reflects the crisis in social psychology in its inability to deal with larger social contexts (see also Dewsbery, 2009). Problems moreover lie in the inapplicability of findings to the larger social context but still the alternative procedures to deal with social context are not happening at the global level. This directly reflects that social psychology's need of diverse tools of inquiry. One has to rethink on the methods and its precisions to capture the real data and progress in this direction at interdisciplinary levels. However, social-psychological inquiry often falls on the same trends seeking method, which is reductionist and dominant. Processes of research start with the research question and then comes the next proceedings, but the whole agenda fails when the research questions are

not answered in its appropriateness. This was pointed in many earlier critics regarding the loss of rich data to the reductionism of tools itself and not the process of research inquiry. Why the attempt to hegemonize one kind of doing psychology is so rampant in the third-world country like India? Why straight away most of the research findings published in major journal become inapplicable in large populations? Is this the sophistication of methods? It is imperative to join the new movement of reflection and activism towards the current role of psychology and its linkage with Eurocentrism and Brahmanism (Nandy, 1974; see also Naidoo, 1996). Social psychological researches in India have shown the need for new scientific explorations but to develop a critical outlook by embracing better metatheory and make their stand obvious in interdisciplinary interrogations, hold better promise for the future of social psychology in India. In other words, the Baconian stance of empiricism and assumption about the inductive logical reasoning in the form of experimentation should be utilized carefully. We should also see why psychology is related to everyone's life on the humanitarian ground. It is counterfeit and duplicity to call psychology as a science if it follows the inappropriate logical stance (see Hibberd, 2013) and its roots lie in the delusion of progressivism, developmentalism and status quo (Chomsky, 2008; Nandy, 2003).

Western psychological science up to the beginning of World War II was parochial in its interests and limited in its influence (Pickren, 2007). So, there is a need for action research on the egalitarian front with diverse tools of inquiry. It is worth noting that when a word or phrase becomes normative, it passes out of conscious reflection so that people no longer examine it critically (Pickren, 2009, p. 88). The reception and influence of Western psychology in non-western countries, such as India, had a powerful impact due to a complex array of factors having to do with post-colonialism, poverty, and local politics and social customs. However, by the 1960s in some countries, and only a few years later in other locations, resistance to the western hegemony in psychology began to grow. This resistance was central to the emergence of a psychology in India that reflects Indian cultural values (Pickren, 2009, p.90). Recently, Pickren (2009) linked indigenous with liberation psychology, where many indigenous psychologies were found to have the revolutionary potential. However, all indigenous psychology or movement towards indigenous psychology didn't give the positive message about the social change when it comes to traditionally overloaded contents such as casteism or classism in Marxist sense (see Cotterill, Sidanius, Bhardwaj & Vivek Kumar, 2014; see also Mather, 2003) in an Indian context. Furthermore, the work of Shah (2004) highlighted the middle-class movement in various social reformations in India, without critically handling the social structure. In the domain of social psychology, the efforts to curb micro social issues were immense, but there were no intentions evident in terms of long-term social change. As social psychologists were mostly belonging to middle class educated background, except few, the reality was different for them and the scientific methods which were available were very

much corresponding to the limitations of the boundaries of their experiential realities. So, according to Heimsath (1964) (as cited in Shah, 2004; p. 224-225), the effort on the part of social scientists was to infuse into the existing social structure, the new way of life (may be taken from western culture) and thoughts only, in order to transform the members and at the same time preserving the basic structure of the society.

POVERTY OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

The poverty of social psychology is reflected in its set definitions as it reaches the point where the interaction of people happens. Recent trends placed this definition in the social and cultural context without losing its essence of individuality. If the definition presupposes its authenticity and social psychologists are in agreement, it can be inferred that it is taking a majoritarian viewpoint as compared with the minority viewpoint. This shows the lack of juxtapositioning of individual and social in actuality, which is evident through the available rhetorical definitions (see also Billig, 1988). However, social-psychological research in India attempted to address the cultural issues by fitting into the worldview of the western way of doing social psychology (e.g. Nandy, 1974). Interestingly, it was the empirical attempt to understand social psychology in India but seems to be conformist to the cultural and sociopolitical context. It seems that whole gamut of social psychological research in India was based on the posthoc tyranny where the argumentations were made in order to appropriate the dominant cultural system with the help of non-corresponding methods. The doing of social psychology showed the poverty in terms of lack of effort to raises critical issues, engaging in movements and proper conceptualization of the context. The evidence where the de-ideologization of the oppressing cultural processes which possibly regulated the doing of social psychology and, which created inequality and divides in the history, portrays an inadequate picture. The publication of some literature in India, such as, microaggression towards North Easterner (Sohi & Singh, 2015), caste-based humiliation (Jogdand, 2015) and the role of the leader in transforming humiliation into creative force (Jogdand & Sinha, 2015), Musahar's identity and representations (Kumar, Mishra, Narayan & Ahmed, 2010) etc. tried to understand relevant social issues such as caste and race from fresh perspective. However, it was also noticed that some of the research focused on the tribal (Mishra & Berry, 2008) and caste (Paranjape, 1970) issues earlier, and had reported the context with fair evidence from the field study, but it was found to be conformist missing out the local representations of history and identity. It can be inferred that social psychology in India tried to represent the majoritarian positivistic paradigm where the issues of self and identity consciousness such as experiences of gender, caste, social class, regionality, religion, and marginalization were less pictured.

The role played by psychologists in third-world countries in legitimizing the psychology of indifference is immense. Could this be our moral stand? Psychology is very much related to

every social issue. It is considered to be a field of future, but in what way? In this context, social psychology in India may have a broader perspective to identify with the debates in philosophy of sciences and social sciences. For the present purpose, it is a necessary thing to understand the way sciences were done from a diverse perspective. It was not always supportive of one way of doing science, starting with prominent scholars like Alberti, Muller, Wundt, Helmholtz, Michelson, Buhler, Schlick, Popper, Bloch, Adorno, Feyerabend, Dahrendorf, Soros, Laudan and much more in the west. Whatever is the way of thinking in the collaborations of dominants and dispersions of weak, one thing becomes important that psychology is distinctive for different groups but the capacity in which a particular kind of psychology is dominating another is a matter of legitimacy. Pickren (2009) emphasized the development of a historical perspective to understand indigenization in psychology. However, the way indigenization of psychology is shaped by the history of oppression should also be problematized. Historical perspectives can be manifold, and the shaping of tradition is the matter of hegemonic tendency of the dominant classes. Definition of psychology lies in the processes of information but it has its own political originations, which shape the way information is processed. Indigenization takes many forms, from the incorporation of Western norms that are then refigured with local content to the rejection of Western approaches in favor of methods and subject matter that are native to the culture at hand (Pickren, 2009, p. 87). The missing link between psychologies as derived from a western perspective and realization through subjective exploration created the illusory effect of doing real sciences in psychology. According to Gough and Madill (2012), the reflexive scientific attitude can be utilized as a resource to eliminate the poverty of psychology in terms of missing contextual links. Furthermore, the subjective aspect despite its importance may lead to the overpowering of others' subjectivity by the name of objectivity and legitimacy. For example, Danziger (2006; see also Pickren, 2009) located two categories of intellectual geographies in the process of historical understanding of psychology, that is, at the center and at the periphery. The knowledge which was authenticated in the frame of reference of the dominant western value system, that is the center, was considered as at the periphery.

SPACE OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Above two headings related to politics of psychology, which is very broad and major discipline in itself. These politics of psychology are a two way around. One is we and other is you. That is, it is in the ingroup and outgroup subjectivities. Does this mean in any way that everyone is well represented? Physics, chemistry, and any other natural sciences have different agendas. Fixing agendas of psychology are politics of psychologists and lie in the institutes and state where there is a consensus among people (see Bartal, 2001). But people belonging to which social category? Is there any evidence where people from disadvantaged tribal background make us fill in a questionnaire to know our psychology?

Why, if psychology is such a meticulous discipline does it not come up with its egalitarian concerns in practice, despite its extra sophisticated tools and models?

Now, if it is highlighted that some issues of the world are seen as common for some in India, which requires different ways of proceedings, it doesn't mean putting the cart before the horse, but this is a process of justifying listening to horse and changing the world the way it is illusioned in the prism of psychological snobbishness or Weirdness (see also Henrich, Heine & Norenzayan, 2010). That's why the issues of social psychology in India were only those which were thought to be in the worldviews of some social psychologists, where the struggle was in theory but not in actions. Therefore, the ongoing critical psychology is not satisfied with the previous way of doing psychology and stated this as a crisis of psychology because it was only associated with some social categories (based on religion, caste, and gender), that is, not with the diverse worldviews but with dominant values. It is a kind of snobbism from the perpetrator side to ignore issues of unintelligent, lazy and undeserving people (as in the theories of those who are trying to bondage horse before the cart on the right side). It becomes, therefore, our responsibility to intentionally place the cart before the horse which was carrying an incorrect and problematic way of thinking. It is imperative to involve ourselves in collective thinking, out from the treachery of silence.

As history is a process of social change for which having critical reflection and direction makes sense as compared to the unscientific glorification of the constructed past. Thus, in conclusion, the approach in which social psychology molded its self and identity in India created a space in which social psychologists were found to be engaged in one metatheory of meaning-generating activity. Graham Richard (2009) in his book putting psychology in its place raised an important question that 'how are we able to talk about the psychological phenomenon' (p. 8)? This question saw its prospects in the subfields of psychology such as social psychology, where the reflexive discourses embedded in the present-centered history (see Smith, 1988) of western culture with some antagonism mixed with the anxiety to revive indigenous culture, decided the scientific status of social psychology in India (see Brock, 2015; Chung & Hyland, 2012; Sundararajan & Raina, 2015). The neglect of social, economic and political processes in psychological researchers and presentists' craving to include them hastily without the churning for social change shows the urge for status identity rather than the movement for emancipation.

REFERENCES

Ambedkar, B. R. (1936). *Annihilation of caste.* New Delhi: Navayana

Adams, G., Dobles, I., Gomez, L. H., Kurtis, T., & Molina, L. (2015). Decolonizing psychological science: Introduction to the special thematic section. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 3* (1), 213-238.

Bar-Tal, D. (2001). Foreword: Meanings of "Psychology as Politics". *Political Psychology, 22* (2), 219-226.

Berline, J. (1988). Rhetoric and ideology in the writing class. *College English, 50* (5), 477-494.

Billig, M. (1988). *Arguing and thinking*. UK: Cambridge University Press

Brock, A. C. (2015). Presentism and diversity in the history of psychology. *Psychological Studies.* DOI 10.1007/s12646-015-0315-9

Burman, E. (1997). Minding the gap: Positivism, psychology, and the politics of qualitative methods. *Journal of Social Issues, 53* (4), 785-801.

Burton, M., & Carolyn, K. (2005). Liberation social psychology: learning from Latin America. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 15* (1), 63-78.

Chomsky, N. (2008). *The essential Chomsky*. New Delhi: Penguin.

Chung, M. C., & Hyland, M. E. (2012). *History and philosophy of psychology.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Cohen, B. R. (2001). Science and humanities: Across two cultures and into science studies. *Endeavour, 25* (1), 8-12.

Dalal, A. K., & Misra, G. (2001). Social psychology in India: Evolution and emerging trends. In A.K. Dalal & G. Misra (Eds*.), New directions in Indian psychology, vol. 1: Social psychology* (pp. 19-52)*.* New Delhi: Sage.

Danziger, K. (2006). Universalism and indigenization in the history of modern psychology. In A. C. Brock (Ed.), *Internationalizing the history of psychology* (pp. 208-225). New York: New York University Press

Dewsberry, D. A. (2009). Is psychology losing its foundations? *Review of General Psychology, 13* (4), 281-289.

Fuster, J, M. (2013). *The neuroscience of freedom and creativity: Our predictive brain*. U K: Cambridge University Press.

Gergen, K. J., Gulerce, A., Lock, A., & Misra, G. (1996). Psychological science in cultural context. *American Psychologist, 51*, 496–503.

Guru, G. (2002). How egalitarian are the social sciences in India? *EPW, XXXVII* (50).

Guru, G. (2009) (Ed.). *Humiliation: Claims and context*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Harker, D. (2015). *Creating scientific controversies: Uncertainty and bias in science and society*. UK: Cambridge University Press

Heimsath, C. H. (1964). *Indian nationalism and Hindu social reforms*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hibberd, F. J. (2014). The metaphysics of process psychology. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology, 34* (3), 161-186.

Hopkins, N. (2015). Psychology and culture: back to the future. *Psychological Studies.* DOI 10.1007/s12646-015-0312-z.

Jogdand, Y. (2015). *Humiliation: Understanding its nature, experience and consequences* (unpublished PhD thesis). University of St Andrews, St Andrews, England.

Jogdand, Y and Sinha, C. (2015). Can leaders transform humiliation into a creative force? *Journal of Leadership Studies, 9* (3), 75-77.

Johansson, T. (2000). *Social psychology and modernity*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Kumar, M. (2006). Rethinking psychology in India: Debating past and futures. *Annual Review of Critical Psychology, 5*, 236-256.

Kumar, S., Mishra, A. K., Narayan, B., & Ahmed, R. (2010). Representation, Resistance, and Identity: The Musahards of the Middle Gangetic Plain. In F. A. Marglin., S. Kumar., A. Mishra (Eds.), *Interrogating Development: Insights from the Margins*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Lindorfer, S. (2009). Liberation Psychology: An approach to the reality of traumatism in east Africa. *The Way, 48* (4), 37-51.

Maslow, A. (1966). *Psychology of science: A reconnaissance*. New York: Harper & Row.

Mather, R. (2003). Hegemony and Marxist psychology. *Theory & Psychology, 13* (4), 469-487.

Misra, G., & Gergen, K. J. (1993). On the place of culture in psychological science. *International Journal of Psychology, 28* (2), 225-243.

Misra, G., & Kumar, M. (2009). Psychology in India: Retrospect and prospect. In G. Misra (Ed.), *Psychology in India: Theoretical and methodological developments (Vol. 4)* (pp. 339-376). Delhi: Pearson.

Mishra, A.K., Akoijam, B., & Misra, G. (2009). Social psychological perspectives on self and identity. In G. Mishra (Ed.,), *Psychology in India: Social and organizational processes (ICSSR survey of advances in research*), *(Vol. 2)* (pp. 52-103). New Delhi: Pearson.

Mishra, R. C., & Berry, J. W. (2008). Cultural adaptations and cognitive style in Adivasi children in chotanagpur. In N. Srinivasan, A. Gupta and J. Pandey (Eds.), *Advances in cognitive science* (pp. 287-299). New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Moscovici, S. (1972) Theory and society in social psychology. In J. Isreal & H. Tajfel (Eds), *The Context of Social Psychology: A Critical Assessment* (pp. 17-68)*.* London: Academic Press.

Mukherjee, R. K., & Sengupta, N. N. (1928). *Introduction to social psychology*. London: Heath.

Naidoo, A.V. (1996). Challenging the hegemony of Eurocentric psychology. *Journal of Community and Health Sciences, 2* (2), 9-16.

Nandy, A. (1974). The nonparadigmatic crisis in Indian Psychology: Reflection on a recipient culture of science. *Indian Journal of Psychology, 49*, 1-20.

Nandy, A. (1983). Towards an alternative politics of psychology. *International Social Science Journal, 35*, 323-338.

Nandy, A. (2003). *The Romance of the state and the fate of dissent in the tropics*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Nola, R., & Sankey, H. (2007). *Theories of scientific method*. Stocksfield: Acumen Publishing Limited.

Pal, S., & Sinha, C. (2016). *Religious fundamentalism, right wing authoritarianism and homophobia among Hindus* (Unpublished Masters Thesis). Christ University, Bengaluru, India.

Pandey, J., & Singh, P. (2005). Social psychology in India: Social roots and development. *International Journal of Psychology, 40*, 239-253.

Pandey, K., Stevenson, C., Shankar, S., Hopkins, N., Reicher, S. (2014). Cold comfort at the MaghMela: Social identity processes and physical hardship. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 53,* 675-90 doi: 10.1111/bjso.12054.

Paranjpe, A. C. (1970). *Caste, prejudice and individual.* Bombay: Lalwani.

Paranjpe, A. C. (2006). From tradition through colonialism to globalization: Reflections on the history of psychology in India. In A. C. Brock (Ed.), *Internationalizing the history of psychology* (pp. 56-74). New York and London: New York University Press.

Parker, I. (1989). *The crisis in modern social psychology and how to end it.* New York: Routledge.

Parker, I. (2005). *Qualitative psychology: Introducing radical research.* New York: Open University Press.

Parker, I. (2015). Politics and applied psychology? Theoretical concepts that question the disciplinary community. *Theory & Psychology, 25* (6), 719-734

Pickren, W. E. (2007). Tension and opportunity in post World War II American psychology. *History of Psychology, 10*, 279-299.

Pickren, W. E. (2009). Indigenization and the history of psychology. *Psychological Studies, 54*, 87-95. DOI: 10.1007/s12646-009-0012-7.

Sanchez, E., & Wiesenfeld, E. (1991). Special Issue: Community Social Psychology in Latin America. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 40* (2), 111-236.

Sarah Cotterill, James Sidanius, Arjun Bhardwaj, Vivek Kumar. (2014). Ideological support for the Indian caste system: Social dominance orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, and karma. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 2* (1), 98-116.

Shah, G. (2004). *Social movements in India: A review of literature.* New Delhi: Sage.

Shankar, S., Stevenson, C., Pandey, K. Tewari, S. Hopkins, N. &Reicher, S.D. (2013). A calming cacophony: Social identity can shape the experience of loud noise. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 36,* 87-95.

Sinha, D. (1986). *Psychology in a third world country: The Indian experience.* Delhi: Sage.

Sinha, D. (1994). Origins and development of psychology in India: Outgrowing the alien framework. *International Journal of Psychology, 29* (6), 695-705.

Sinha, D. (1998). Changing perspectives in social psychology in India: A journey towards indigenization. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 1*, 17-31.

Singh, P. (2009).Understanding the social world: Issues and challenges. In G. Mishra (Ed.,), *Psychology in India: Social and organizational processes (ICSSR survey of advances in research) (Vol. 2*), (pp. 1-53). New Delhi: Pearson.

Snow, C. P. (1961). *The two cultures and the scientific revolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sohi, K. K., & Singh, P. (2015). Collective action in response to microaggresion: Implications for social well-being. *Race and Social Problems, 7* (4). DOI 10.1007/s12552-015-9156-3.

Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Sundararajan, L., & Raina, M. K. (2015). Revolutionary creativity, east and west: A critique from indigenous psychology. *Journal of theoretical and philosophical psychology, 35* (1), 3-19.

Tajfel, H., Billig, M., Bundy, R., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 1*, 149-177.

Wexler, P. (1983). *Critical social psychology*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.