

# SOCIETY OF AUSTRALASIAN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGISTS

## NEWSLETTER

Volume 5, No. 2, October 1999

---

### Editorial

Welcome to the latest edition of the SASP Newsletter. You will see elsewhere in this edition the normal reports from the officers of the Society and the latest news on the conference due in April 2000. There appears to be less "newsy" stuff around at the moment. This may be an opportunity to set out some thoughts about SASP in the wider national setting.

There are two things that we may need as a Society to think about. The first, and more simple one, is the fact that the APS now has a new Division, the Division of Research and Teaching (DRAT) that is dedicated to the facilitation of academic psychology within the APS. To this end there have been a number of developments. The first was the provision of several symposia at the APS National Conference in Hobart on aspects of teaching and research in psychology. These symposia were very successful, interesting and well attended, and suggested that there could be a reason for more academics coming back to the APS and seeing it as a means of being involved in the Society and its development. Of course, this may be perceived as a biased view as one of the editors of this Newsletter (JMI) is Chairperson of DRAT. But nonetheless there has been a change in the APS worth following.

The second was the development of a DRAT Newsletter which many of us should have seen as copies were circulated to departments for information. The inaugural edition was very full of news and sets a standard for how useful a newsletter can be. The third was the development of a scheme, initially suggested by Margaret Foddy, to provide travelling scholarships to postgraduate students to enable them to travel to other departments in the country to learn some technique or study with a particular person. Details will be developed and sent to HoDs, but social psychology wants as much as anyone to have students take advantage of such a scheme.

Finally, DRAT will be organising a workshop on the evaluation of the utility of IT in delivering teaching and members of this Society will no doubt be interested in contributing and/or attending. The event will be held in Sydney early-ish in 2000, so keep watching.

The second matter which we may wish to foreground is the Green Paper and forthcoming White Paper with its implications for the funding of research in the universities and the funding and retention of research students. We at SASP do not normally discuss in formal forums such political matters, but this one may have such serious implications for the future support of social psychological research and the distribution of research excellence across the system that we may wish to have some debate or discussion. Anyone interested in leading a forum or workshop or anything related at the April 2000 conference? Let any of us know.

One final point to note is that this Newsletter is now available electronically through the SASP homepage maintained by Mike Smithson at the ANU (<http://www.psy.anu.edu.au/info/sasp/>).

Please keep the news rolling in and we hope to have you join us in the West in April.

Ngaire Donaghue [ndonagh@socs.murdoch.edu.au](mailto:ndonagh@socs.murdoch.edu.au)

Mike Innes [minnes@socs.murdoch.edu.au](mailto:minnes@socs.murdoch.edu.au)

Iain Walker [walker@central.murdoch.edu.au](mailto:walker@central.murdoch.edu.au)

---

## From the committee

### Messages from your Secretary and Treasurer

Please examine your address label on this newsletter. An asterisk preceding your name indicates that we have you registered as a paid up member of SASP.

1. If there is no asterisk:

1. You will not be allowed to nominate, second, or be nominated for president-elect (see below).
  2. You will be purged from the SASP membership list if no payment has been received (or records corrected) by 30 November, 1999.
  3. You can contact the treasurer, Julie Duck, for payment or query at Department of Psychology, University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD, 4072, Australia or via email ([julied@psy.uq.edu.au](mailto:julied@psy.uq.edu.au)).
  4. And you are reading this after 30 November, 1999, rest assured that we are very lenient about allowing re-enrolment
2. If there is an asterisk and you have an email address, you should occasionally be receiving email messages. If you have not received any via socpsybull, contact Michael J. Platow [m.platow@latrobe.edu.au](mailto:m.platow@latrobe.edu.au) for help. Additionally, if you are a student and have not received any emails via the student bulletin board, contact Shari Hodgkinson [sphodgki@central.murdoch.edu.au](mailto:sphodgki@central.murdoch.edu.au) to get on that list.

Nominations are due for the office of President-elect. This person will serve on SASP's executive committee in the role of vice-president from April 2000 until the 2001 SASP conference, at which time he/she will become president for a two year term. If you wish to nominate someone's for president-elect, complete the form at the end of this Newsletter with the names and signatures of the person nominating, the person seconding the nomination, and the affirmation of the president-elect nominee to serve if elected. Send the form to the secretary at the address given below so that it reaches me by 15 December, 1999. If there is more than one nominee, ballot papers will be posted to all paid up SASP members early in 2000. Ballots must be returned to the secretary by 1 March, 2000. Results of the ballot for SASP president-elect will be reported in the March 2000 SASP Newsletter and at the April 2000 SASP conference.

Ruth Scott,

SASP Secretary

Division of Psychology

Australian National University

Canberra, ACT 0200

### Postgraduate Representative's Report

*Member news:*

- **Sue Watt** is going to Cardiff University to take up a postdoctoral fellowship with Miles Hewstone and Greg Maio. The research will be looking at attitude ambivalence and attitude function in racist attitudes. Congratulations Sue and good luck from the SASP grads!
- **Anne Pedersen** received her PhD in September. Her thesis was titled "In-group preference and self concept of urban Aboriginal children". Congratulations Dr Pedersen!
- **Natilene Bowker** from Massey University submitted her MA thesis early this year and received a distinction for her efforts! She is now finalising research proposals and filling out ethics applications for PhD research. Well done Natilene!

- **Tim Crosier** recently participated in the 1999 Summer Institute of Political Psychology at Ohio State University. We look forward to his report!
- **Shari Hodgkinson** had an article accepted for publication in the Journal of Environmental Psychology titled "The Prediction of Ecological and Environmental Belief Systems: The Differential Contributions of Social Conservatism and Beliefs about Money". This research was also presented at the 1999 International Society for Political Psychology annual meeting in Amsterdam.

The SASP Post-grads have been throwing around a wish list for the 2000 conference in Freo. Some of the suggestions for workshops and pre-conferences include: applying for post-docs, turning your thesis into a book, what to do with a PhD in social psychology (i.e. the job market) and consultancy opportunities. People are also interested in hearing about social justice research, social values, research and political psychology.

Hopefully we'll be hearing about allowances and awards re travelling to WA soon, so we can all start thinking about coming!

Please continue to use the email list to disseminate news and information etc., and if you know of anyone who should or would like to be on the list please email me: [sphodgki@central.murdoch.edu.au](mailto:sphodgki@central.murdoch.edu.au)

Hope to see you all in April!!!

Shari Hodgkinson.

## Association news

## Conference Reports

### **Report on the 1999 Annual Meeting of the Society of Australasian Social Psychologists. Sunshine Coast, April 8-10, 1999.**

The annual meeting of SASP was held from April 8th to April 10th at the Hyatt Regency Coolum. Unfortunately the Sunshine Coast did not live up to its name but, despite the rain, the conference was a success. There were around 150 delegates and the conference program was full and varied. After welcome drinks and dinner, John Duckitt delivered a provocative keynote talk on personality and prejudice, which was followed by the main conference which comprised 11 symposia and a number of thematic paper sessions, covering a diverse range of topics including political psychology, social psychology and health, prejudice and racism, families and friends, the social psychology of justice, computers, identity, and intergroup behaviour, and affective influences on social thinking and social behaviour.

One of the social highlights was the seafood dinner with excellent entertainment provided by our very own talented members, Stephen Cox and Jeff Miller. SASP members were also seen at the Hyatt disco later that night and there were further reports of after-dinner revelry which included SASP members being spotted in the jacuzzi at midnight, some in full evening attire and others in somewhat less full attire.

As conference organisers, we would like to thank Jolanda Jetten and Jim Cameron for their excellent work on the scientific program; Mike Hogg for organising the preconference; Blake McKimmie for setting up the conference webpage; Leda Blackwood for her tireless work keeping track of accommodation requests and registrations; and Anne O'Brien, Tim Crosier, and Gabrielle O'Shea for their help with the social program. We would also like to thank the School of Psychology, University of Queensland, and the School of Psychology and Counselling, Queensland University of Technology, for their support of the conference, the SASP Executive for their valuable advice while we were planning for the conference and, last but not least, all the SASP members who attended the conference and ensured its success.

Julie Duck

Debbie Terry

Katy White

University of Queensland

**Report on the Pre-Conference of the 1999 Annual Meeting of the Society of Australasian Social Psychologists. Sunshine Coast, April 8 1999.**

The preconference comprises interactive, discussion-oriented sessions catering mainly to graduate students and recent PhDs. It is an opportunity for people to get together to exchange research ideas and perspectives, and to discuss issues to do with being or becoming an academic. This year the preconference was extremely well attended. Delegates arrived on April 7 and there was a drinks reception in the 'disco'.

The schedule the next day was relatively informal and relaxed. In the morning the whole group met to discuss "Getting Published in Social Psychology". The panel of 'experts' comprised people who are/have been journal editors: Michael Hogg (UQ), Cindy Gallois (UQ), Michael Innes (Murdoch), Patricia Noller (UQ), and Kipling Williams (UNSW). Panelists shared their inside information about the publishing business, then the group divided into smaller "round tables" each with one of the panelists. The rumour that guarantees of publications were given out is not true!

The afternoon session had two streams. Margaret Foddy (LaTrobe) chaired a session on "Social Dilemmas" which had a panel also including Michael Platow (LaTrobe), Sherry Schneider (Monash), and Michael Smithson (ANU); and Michael Hogg (UQ) chaired a session on "Prejudice and Intolerance" which had a panel also including Denise Driscoll (Purdue), John Duckit (Auckland) and Cindy Gallois (UQ). Denise Driscoll's practical demonstration of advantage will be a vivid memory, I am sure, for all of us in the prejudice session.

As the general organiser of the preconference I would like to thank Margaret Foddy for organizing the social dilemmas section, the panelists for the work and time they put into making this a success, and of course the delegates for supporting the preconference by being there.

Michael Hogg

University of Queensland

**The 11th Annual APS convention was held June 3-6, 1999, in Denver.**

At 5,280ft with clear blue skies, dry cool air, and the beautiful backdrop of the snow-capped front range of the Rocky Mountains, this was a wonderful setting. The APS emerged about 10 years ago out of dissatisfaction with the low status afforded scientific psychology in the practitioner dominated American Psychological Association (APA). Social psychology has a strong representation in the APS; past presidents include Marilyn Brewer, Kay Deaux, and Janet Spence. The APS convention is the main scientific psychological meeting in the United States. It is a big meeting, but not as overwhelming as the APA convention. It is also an excellent venue for graduate students to present their work.

I think I was probably the only SASP member at the meeting this year - I searched but did not stumble across anyone. There were 270 presentations and about 900 posters, with an excellent book and journals display by publishers. The conference was preceded by a one-day pre-conference meeting of the Society of Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP, Division 8 of the APA - and sponsors of the journals Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, and Personality and Social Psychology Review). The SPSP pre-conference had the theme "New developments in social psychology: Toward the year 2000", and had sessions on social cognition (Tesser, Banaji, Devine, Nowak, Vallacher, Reid), health psychology/social neuroscience (S. Taylor, Dunkel-Schetter, Isen, Ryff), and culture and evolution (Nisbett, Markus, Page-Fiske, Sidanius). The main APS conference had Claude Steele give an excellent keynote address on how stereotypes shape identity and performance. Generally, social psychology was very well represented at the meeting - a scan of the conference index of topics showed that the topic with most papers was social cognition, followed by social/interpersonal relations, and personality, and then social attitudes, social groups, emotion, and gender/sex roles. I really enjoyed the session on diversity arranged and chaired by Tom Tyler, with talks by Marilyn Brewer, Sam Gaertner, Jim Sidanius, and Tom Tyler.

Upcoming APS conventions are Miami on June 8-11, 2000, Toronto in 2001, and New Orleans in 2002. However, it may be the case that in subsequent years social psychology will be less well represented. This is because, starting in 2000, SPSP will run its own independent annual conference. In 2000 it is in February in Nashville, and it plans always

to hold it at that time in warmer places in the United States. The SPSP meeting is designed to provide a national non-elite social psychology meeting to draw in junior faculty and graduate students who are unable to attend the SESP meeting which will remain small and elite and be held as usual in October each year.

Michael Hogg

University of Queensland

### **Striving for a new era of Asian social psychology: The Third Conference of the Asian Association of Social Psychology in Taipei, Taiwan.**

After only its third conference, held in Taipei, Taiwan, August 4-7, 1999, the Asian Association of Social Psychology (AASP) has moved from organizational infancy to robust adolescence. The first conference, held in Hong Kong in 1995, was an entrepreneurial effort that demonstrated that it was possible for Chinese, Koreans, Japanese, and other Asians to come together in an atmosphere of cooperation and harmony (Liu & Kashima, 1995). The second conference in Kyoto, 1997, showcased the contributions of Japanese social psychology and increased the group's international profile (Liu, 1998). The third conference signaled the beginning of a more professional era: the keynote speakers were internationally recognized figures from both Asia and the West, the facilities and materials for the conference were sparkling, and the overall size and quality of presentations continued to increase. The AASP meetings have rapidly established themselves as one of the premiere forums for culture-oriented psychology in the world.

After three meetings, certain patterns have become apparent in conference attendance. There were 344 participants from 23 countries and societies in Taipei who presented 155 papers and 147 posters, compared to 306 participants at Kyoto and 70 at Hong Kong. In Taipei as in Kyoto, Japanese scholars were the single largest contingent, with 121 participants, followed by Taiwan with 78, Korea with 30, USA with 27, Hong Kong with 19, mainland China with 15, Thailand and Singapore with 8 and 7 respectively. These patterns are consistent with international structures of scholarship and economic power, with Japan and the various contingents of Chinese numerically outnumbering other Asian groups. The organization will have to continue to promote membership in Southeast Asia and the Indian subcontinent through free memberships and travel awards, but these alone appear insufficient to compensate for economic gradients. AASP will have to consider other proactive measures to accord Southeast Asia and the Indian subcontinent greater salience at its future meetings. Otherwise, there is a danger of it becoming an "East Asian Association of Social Psychology". In terms of demographics, it was also striking the predominance of men in higher ranking positions and women in lower ranking positions. Again, this is probably a reflection of naturalistic factors outside the organization, but something AASP should be aware of in the future.

In contrast to Kyoto, where the author was staggered by the diversity of research interests, in Taipei there was again diversity but there were also three clear themes. The first, overarching theme was provided by Professor K.S. Yang and the organizers of the conference, who asked 6 eminent psychologists to provide keynote speeches addressing what was similar and what was unique about cultural, cross-cultural, and indigenous psychology. These talks, by Triandis, Greenfield, Berry, Shweder, Kim, and Yang offered a remarkable clarity about the positioning of terms in the field. Indigenous and cultural psychology are closely aligned, differing primarily in who does it and for what audience. Cross-cultural psychology stands a bit apart because of its more universalistic epistemology. However, proponents of all three views were united in calling for synergy and cooperation in challenging the culture-free assumptions of mainstream psychology. The term "North American indigenous psychology" was heard more than once, and this author even overheard a few comments about too much emphasis on culture at AASP. Be that as it may, developing a culture-oriented social psychology is clearly one of the major goals and themes that defines Asian social psychology.

The second theme was more circumscribed, as its adherents hailed mostly from Japan, and to a lesser extent the United States. This is the issue of how well individualism-collectivism (IND-COL) and the independent/interdependent self describe differences between Asians and Westerners, or more precisely, Japanese and Americans. The work of Markus and Kitayama, following in the footsteps of such scholars as Triandis, Hofstede, and Bond has provided the primary beach-head from which culture-oriented psychologists have made forays into the mainstream. But there is dissent among this group as to how well these constructs capture differences in behavior, and to what extent they are a gloss over complex issues of social construction. These issues encouraged some controversial debate.

Opinions in this group appear to be approaching some sort of compromise that the "beach head" metaphor used previously can continue to describe. If culture-oriented psychology is to make in-roads into mainstream psychology as called for by the "Big 6", it needs to do so from a variety of directions. The general consensus seems to be that the IND-COL paradigm involves some simplification. But to tear down the beach-head before the in-roads have been firmly established appears to be self-defeating. Fighting over a few meters of sand next to the Pacific Ocean should be undertaken only if this will serve to carve out new territory in the heartland of both shores. If so, the value of this

debate will be judged by the extent to which it provides stimulus to perfect existent paradigms, and forge ahead along inroads that have already been made.

The third theme was more diffuse. This theme related less to the heady intellectual issues of the day but was a consistent zeitgeist in the poster sessions and in a few symposia. This is that Asian social psychology is intimately concerned with application: health, social issues, justice, the family, aging, education for children, academic achievement, identifying bullies, and managing disasters. It is concerned with the epistemology and practice of doing psychology to make a difference. In the social psychology that is emerging in Asia, applied work that is now on the periphery should eventually make its way into the center. The development of IND-COL and indigenous psychology should furnish theory capable of enriching and uniting effective practices.

The three themes described above all resonate with the question, "What is Asian about Asian Social Psychology?" Outgoing President Kwok Leung remarked that such soul-searching is characteristic of adolescence, so it may be that after only 6 years AASP has already moved on beyond its entrepreneurial beginnings. To achieve this, a synergetic and evolving relationship between AASP and the Japanese Group Dynamics Association (JGDA) has been essential. From Kyoto to Taipei, Japanese social psychology has proven itself to be one of the pillars of Asian social psychology. President-elect Susumu Yamaguchi will be the first Japanese President of AASP beginning in 2001.

The mighty efforts of current President Kuo-Shu Yang and his colleagues at the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica and the Department of Psychology, National Taiwan University produced a truly first class conference at Taipei. The next conference, in Melbourne, Australia in 2001 (July 10-13), and in part a joint meeting between AASP and the Society of Australasian Social Psychologists (SASP, July 12-15) will have a hard act to follow. Having said that, the contributions of Taiwanese social psychologists to AASP have been, outside the massive efforts of a few familiar leaders, less salient than what might be desired.

Many Japanese and Korean scholars were initially shy about presenting their work in an international forum because of language reasons, but over time they have recognized that in AASP, English is a second language for the majority of participants, and this alone should not constitute a barrier. From the perspective of this writer, one of the major goals of AASP should be to extend the reach of indigenous Chinese psychology beyond the realms of Taiwan and China. Taiwanese social psychology is probably the strongest indigenous psychology in the world. It can serve as the focal organizing point for using cross-indigenous methods proposed by Enriquez and Yang to link the indigenous psychologies of Chinese, Koreans, Pilipinos, Malays, Japanese, Indians, and even Maori or Aboriginal Australians. Collectively, cross-indigenous research on such concepts as the relationalism implied by Chinese "guanxi" and Philipino "kapua" could provide a second focal point for Asian social psychology fully as potent as IND-COL, and far less dependent on Western concepts and theories. However, the organizational hurdles involved in developing truly cross-indigenous work are huge, and must begin now if there is to be any progress made by Melbourne in 2001. The Melbourne conference will surely be less lavish than Taipei, but it could be very useful for stimulating cross-cultural exchange in a number of directions.

As AASP moves from adolescence into adulthood, it will need to become more financially secure, by increasing membership and institutional subscriptions to its flagship journal, the Asian Journal of Social Psychology (AJSP). The second volume of its conference proceedings, Progress in Asian Social Psychology (Sugiman, Karasawa, Ward, & Liu, 1999) was launched in Taipei. AASP offers a multi-cultural editorial process for both these publications: for Progress, papers are submitted in English but the editors provide support to ensure that the final manuscript meets international standards in English. For AJSP, papers can be submitted in English, Chinese, Korean, or Japanese, and will be translated into English if accepted. With these two outlets for publication, AASP has established itself as a voice in the field. The potency of this voice depends on the quality of the work and citations they generate. As a first step in this direction, AASP and JGDA announced the Misumi Award for the best paper published in AJSP, awarded to Susumu Yamaguchi (1998) for his paper on biased risk perceptions.

The Third Conference of the Asian Association of Social Psychology was a quantum leap forward in terms of the professionalism of the conference (in all respects except money, where there were no facilities for using checks or credit cards, and collecting money was in general complicated for the organizers). The idea of getting six top scholars to comment about relationships between indigenous, cultural, and cross-cultural psychology was a masterstroke, providing an intellectual focal point for an otherwise diverse selection of papers. The thematic organization of both the papers and the posters also facilitated coherence. AASP should accept that it has moved from being a small, intimate conference into a strong mid-sized conference and act accordingly; for instance, restricting each participant to one verbal presentation as first author might slow the proliferation of symposia streams, which expanded to six in Taipei. It has also regained a focus that was less easy to find at Kyoto compared to the first conference in Hong Kong: the three themes of culture-oriented psychology, evaluating the goodness-of-fit provided by IND-COL, and a concern for practical application all provided satisfying answers to the question: What is Asian about Asian Social Psychology?

The cultural and methodological pluralism of the founding members of AASP has been reflected in each of the three conferences having a unique flavor and unique achievement. We can only look forward to what Melbourne will bring in 2001.

#### References

Liu, J.H. (1998). Consolidating for the new millenium: The second meeting of the Asian Association of Social Psychology (Kyoto, Japan), American Asian Review, 16(1), 169-173.

Liu, J.H. & Kashima, Y. (1995). Asian social psychology awakes: The inaugural conference of the Asian Association of Social Psychology in Hong Kong. American Asian Review, 13(4), 125-131.

Sugiman, T., Karasawa, M., Liu, J.H., & Ward, C. (1999)(Eds.) Progress in Asian Social Psychology (Volume 2). Kyoyoo-kwahak-sa Publishing: Seoul, Korea.

Yamaguchi, S. (1998). Biased risk perceptions. Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 1(2), 117-131.

Dr. James H. Liu

Victoria University of Wellington

---

## **Forthcoming conferences**

### **SASP Conference 2000**

Arrangements for the Annual Conference in 2000 are proceeding. The dates are confirmed as the 27 – 30 April with the postgraduate pre-conference on the 27<sup>th</sup>. Full details of contacts etc are provided on the flyer enclosed with this Newsletter.

We are trying a few new things this year. First we are trying to engage a keynote speaker who will be invited to give a public address prior to the conference. We are doing this for two reasons. The first is to celebrate the first meeting of SASP on the west coast and raise the profile of social psychology in the community. The second, and perhaps mendacious reason, is that 2000 will be the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary year of the foundation of Murdoch University and the University is very keen to celebrate in as many ways as possible. They are therefore making our conference a highlight event and will provide funds for the expenses of inviting a guest speaker, provided that that person will have appeal to the community.

Second, we plan to run a couple of workshops within the conference itself. One definitely scheduled that should appeal to several social psychologists, and we hope especially graduate students, is a session on program evaluation. This will be run by a very eminent researcher in the field, Ralph Straton of Murdoch, and should be of value to anyone who is already in or contemplating being in a field of applied psychology. A second workshop is being negotiated, but we are hoping for one on discourse analysis or a variant thereof.

In connection with these workshops, in an attempt to attract people in the community other than social psychologists to register for the conference, we are applying to the APS for Professional Development points status for the workshops. This will enable psychologists in the local community to add to their PD status by attendance. This may attract to the conference people who would not normally think of going to a social psychology event. This should not be regarded, we believe, as a dilution of the strengths of the conference, but rather a widening of the appeal of our wonderfully diverse discipline to people on the margins of it.

Third, we have taken the pre-emptive action of asking the President of the Society, Graham Vaughan, to give a Society Presidential Address. Graham has agreed to do this and we hope that this will set a precedent for future meetings of the

Society. We hope that members of the Society and the members of the Committee will forgive us for our temerity and see it as the rash actions of some small outside sect far out on the western boundaries of the nation trying to do the right thing.

One of the things which is beginning to emerge in the planning for the conference is that there are a number of themes developing. In particular two to draw attention to are, first a concern with issues of time and the social psychology of time and second, a retrospective analysis combined with a look to the future based on the retrospective. This is not simply looking back in nostalgia, but a looking forward based on a contemporary understanding of the past. Not that the contemporary understanding is correct or better than past understandings, but merely that we need to see, perhaps, how our future as a society (both professional and civil) can be seen for the next decade in light of how we see where we have come from.

The year 2000 is the anniversary of a number of significant events in the history of (mainstream) social psychology, including the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the publication of Adorno et al.'s Authoritarian Personality, Festinger's Psychological Review paper on "Informal social communication", and the fourth volume of The American Soldier (on Measurement and Prediction) (we have already missed the anniversary of the first three volumes, but what the hell!). It is also the 65<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the publication of the Murchison Handbook and of R.A. Fisher's Design of Experiments. With a bit of creative licence we can make it the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the major publications of the Lewin et al. group studies on authoritarian and democratic leadership and it is the genuine 60th birthday of the speculations of Whorf's linguistic relativity hypothesis. So with the help of historical almanac and some knowledge of social psychological history anything can be included from the past to illuminate the present.

We will keep you posted by SOCPSYBULL of further developments and there will be a mail out requesting registrations and paper abstracts later this year. We all here hope to see you in Fremantle in 2000.

The 2000 Conference Organising Team

**The International Society for the Study of Personal Relationships (ISSPR)** is pleased to announce that the International Conference on Personal Relationships 2000 will be held at the University of Queensland from 27th June until 2nd July. The conference will bring together an international cast of relationship researchers from a broad range of disciplines, and promises to be an exciting five days of papers, posters, symposia, and socializing. The deadline for paper, poster, or symposium proposals is 21st January 2000. For more information, see <http://www.isspr.org/> or contact the Program Chair, Dr. Barry Fallon, at [b.fallon@psych.unimelb.edu.au](mailto:b.fallon@psych.unimelb.edu.au).

**8th Annual Brisbane Symposium on Social Identity. Centre for Research on Group Processes, University of Queensland, Brisbane.** The 8th annual Brisbane symposium on social identity is being held on Saturday November 27 at the Centre for Research on Group Processes (CRGP) at the University of Queensland, Brisbane. This year it is being organized by Paul Grieve and Mike Hogg. As usual, it is a one-day event, attended by around 40 to 50 delegates. There will be five or six presentations and plenary panel. The theme this year is "Discrimination: Concealed and Revealed". The symposium is a core function of CRGP. It brings together faculty and graduate students from South East Queensland, Australia, and overseas, around the topic of social identity. It is intended to be a broad-based, integrative forum for social psychologists and social psychologically oriented researchers including sociologists, political scientists, organizational psychologists, and so forth. Attendance is by invitation, but if anyone is interested in attending or in further details, please contact Paul Grieve ([p.grieve@gu.edu.au](mailto:p.grieve@gu.edu.au)). CRGP, which hosts the conference, has as its core University of Queensland faculty members Julie Duck, Cindy Gallois, Michael Hogg, Matthew Hornsey, Jolanda Jetten, Barbara Masser, and Deborah Terry, with Prashant Bordia and Robin Martin joining from our organizational psychology group in 2000. For further details about CRGP contact Michael Hogg ([m.hogg@psy.uq.edu.au](mailto:m.hogg@psy.uq.edu.au)).

**European Association of Experimental Social Psychology Small Group Meeting on Social Identity Processes in Organizations. July 6-8 2000, Amsterdam.** Daan van Knippenberg (University of Amsterdam) and Michael Hogg (University of Queensland) are organizing a conference on social identity processes in organizations, in Amsterdam, July 6-8 2000 (arrival on 5 July and departure on 9 July). The conference is sponsored by the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology under its 'small group meeting' scheme. Papers are being given by: Tom Tyler (New York University), Naomi Ellemers (Leiden University), Michael Pratt (University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign), Robin Martin (University of Cardiff/University of Queensland), Michael Hogg (University of Queensland), Richard Moreland (University of Pittsburgh), Marilyn Brewer (Ohio State University), Alex Haslam (Australian National University), Tom Postmes (University of Amsterdam), Daan van Knippenberg (University of Amsterdam), Dominic Abrams (University of Kent), Nyla Branscombe (University of Kansas), Samuel Gaertner (University of Delaware), Michael Platow (LaTrobe University), Deborah Terry (University of Queensland), and Esther van Leeuwen (University of Leiden).

This conference underlines the recent growth in interest in social identity theory among organizational psychologists and the recent development of social identity notions into organizational contexts. Associated with the conference is a special issue of the journal "Group Processes and Intergroup Relations" (guest edited by van Knippenberg and Hogg). For those of you who are interested, there is also a forthcoming book edited by Michael Hogg and Deborah Terry entitled "Social identity processes in organizational contexts" (published by Psychology Press), and possibly another edited book more focused on social identity aspects by Alex Haslam, Daan van Knippenberg, Michael Platow and Naomi Ellemers (possibly to be published by Psychology Press).

The EAESP small group meeting scheme places an upper limit of 25 presentations, and likes to keep the number of delegates small - thus we have to restrict numbers. For further information please contact Daan van Knippenberg (ao\_vanknippenberg@macmail.psy.uva.nl).

Michael Hogg

Centre for Research on Group Processes

University of Queensland

**Second International Conference on Emotions and Organizational life.** Researchers interested in studying emotions in organizational settings are invited to submit papers for the Second Conference on Emotions and Organizational Life, to be held at Ryerson Polytechnic University, Toronto, August 10-11, 2000 (immediately following the 2000 Academy Meeting). The conference is being organized by the Emonet e-mail discussion group, an international network of scholars working in this field, established in January, 1997.

The primary aim of the conference is to bring together scholars who study emotions in organizational life, and to provide a forum for presentation of some of the significant advances that have been made in our understanding of this important area. It is intended that the conference papers will be considered for inclusion in a second edited book of papers which, like the first, to be published in 2000 by Quorum Books, will help to define this emerging field.

Papers are invited on any topic of relevance to the study of emotions at work, including the determinants of emotion; the nature and description of emotion; processes and effects of emotion at the organizational, team, and individual levels. Both theoretical and empirical papers are welcome. Interdisciplinary papers are especially welcome.

The deadline for receipt of papers is April 30, 2000. Papers should be sent to the addresses indicated below, and will be subject to blind review. The format is to follow the submission guidelines for the *Academy of Management Journal*. We encourage innovative submissions, but all must satisfy the requirements of rigorous scholarly discourse. Submission of papers should also be accompanied by a brief statement of preferences for presentation format. It is anticipated that a wide variety of delivery styles will be used, including panel discussion, workshops, and traditional presentations.

Authors who will be unable to attend the conference are also invited to submit their papers to be considered for inclusion in the book. These papers will be available for workshoping at the conference, and will be subject to the same review process as the conference papers.

Intending contributors should send three copies of their paper to one of the following addresses. Papers should be set out according to the Style Manual of the *Academy of Management Journal*. Papers from the US and Canada should be sent to Wilfred J. Zerbe, Faculty of Management, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, T2N 1N4. Papers from elsewhere should be sent to Neal M. Ashkanasy, The Graduate School of Management, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Qld, 4072, Australia. For further information about the conference, please contact Neal Ashkanasy <n.ashkanasy@gsm.uq.edu.au>.

Neal M. Ashkanasy

Conference Chair

**7<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Language and Social Psychology (ICLASP7). June 30<sup>th</sup> – July 4<sup>th</sup> Cardiff University, Cardiff, Wales.** This is the major conference for people working in language and social psychology, sponsored by the International Association for Language and Social Psychology. The keynote speakers at Cardiff will be Bella De Paulo, Nikolas Coupland, Janet Holmes, Ray Baumeister, Peter Robinson, and Cindy Gallois. There will also be a set of special symposia covering the whole area. For information, look at the ICLASP web page (below) or contact the organisers - Peter Garrett (not that one), Angie Williams, and Crispin Thurlow on iclasp.cardiff.ac.uk.

Proposals for additional symposia are due by November 1, 1999, or shortly thereafter, and paper submissions (abstracts) will be due in January next year.

<http://www.cf.ac.uk/uwcc/graduate/pgsrc/iclasp7/index.html>,

**International Communication Association 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Conference. Acapulco, Mexico. June 1-5, 2000.** This is the annual conference of the major research association in communication, based in the US. The theme of the conference in 2000 is **50 years of research in culture, communication, and cognition**. You can get information from their web page at <http://www.icahdq.org>, or contact them by email on [ICAHDO@UTS.CC.UTEXAS.EDU](mailto:ICAHDO@UTS.CC.UTEXAS.EDU). Submissions for papers and symposia (panels) must be postmarked by November 1, 1999.

---

## News of members

**Sik Hung Ng** and his research team at Victoria University of Wellington have obtained funding of nearly NZ\$1m (over 4 years) from the Public Good Science Fund (Foundation for Research, Science & Technology) to continue their research on Positive Ageing and Inter-generational Relations. Other team members are Jim Liu, Ann Weatherall, Te Ripowai Higgins, and Susan Gee.

**Neal Ashkanasy** has been appointed Professor of Management in the Graduate School of Management. At the moment he is visiting with the Krannert Graduate School of Management, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana. He is also the 2000 Program Chair for the Managerial and Organizational Cognitions of the Academy of Management. The Academy meeting will be held in 2000 August 4-9 in Toronto. Anyone wanting to know more about the conference should look up the Academy web site <http://www.aom.pace.edu>. Finally, he is running the Second Conference on Emotions and Organizational life in Toronto next year, right after the Academy meeting (see the call for papers in the Forthcoming Conferences section of the newsletter).

**Norm Feather's** new book, "Values, Achievement, and Justice: Studies in the Psychology of Deservingness", was recently published by Kluwer Academic/ Plenum Press in New York. The book is the latest in the Critical Issues in Social Justice Series. The book examines the concept of deservingness and variables that affect the degree to which a person is seen to deserve or not to deserve a positive or negative outcome. Feather reviews the literature concerned with questions of deservingness, responsibility, and values. He presents a structural model that uses the Heiderian balance principle and that relates judgements of deservingness to perceived responsibility, positively or negatively valued actions and outcomes, ingroup/outgroup relations, and like/dislike relations. He also considers the concept of moral character.

He reviews research that is consistent with the model from studies of 'tall poppies' or high achievers. He then integrates deservingness into a social-cognitive process model of retributive justice and he reviews research that is consistent with this model.

Finally, Feather shows how research can be extended in a number of ways and he proposes new directions for theory and research that bring values and justice variables to centre stage.

Norm Feather described his structural model of deservingness and recent research that relates to it in his keynote address at the Annual Conference of the Australian Psychological Society held in Hobart recently, where he was also presented with the Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award of the Society.

**Bruce Findlay** (Swinburne University of Technology) reports that he has finally heard about his PhD - minor adjustments to the satisfaction of the supervisor are all that are needed. The topic of the thesis was "The salience of social identities". Congratulations Bruce.

**Madeline Fernbach** recently received her PhD from the University of Melbourne. She now works at the Victorian Anti-Cancer Council.

---

## COMMENTARY

### If Not Significance Testing, What Should We Teach in Introductory Statistics Courses for Psychology and the Social Sciences?

Michael J. Smithson, Division of Psychology, A.N.U.

Many SASP members will be aware that psychology is moving away from traditional Neyman-Pearson-Fisherian null-hypothesis significance testing. A long time in coming, this trend raises questions about what we should be teaching instead, especially at the undergraduate level, and whether we need new textbooks or other materials to revamp our curricula.

I should state straight away that I have taken a position and written an introductory textbook, *Statistics with Confidence* (to be published by Sage, U.K., due out in November this year). The main options I considered in formulating my approach are listed below. Cutting straight to the chase, I elected to say "No" to 1, "Not at the introductory level" for 6, 7, and 8 and "Yes" to 2-5.

1. Ban significance tests
2. Model comparison framework
3. Exploratory data analysis
4. Effect size measures
5. Confidence intervals
6. Monte-Carlo techniques (e.g., bootstrap and other resampling techniques)
7. Bayesian approaches
8. Inference and estimation based on generalized probability theories

From the book's title, it is clear that confidence intervals figure largely in my approach, so I should offer a few remarks concerning my reasons for adopting a confidence interval framework. First and foremost, on all counts it seems clearly superior to the traditional significance testing approach. Persuasive arguments to this effect have been offered for many years in psychology. Early examples include Rozeboom (1960) and Meehl (1967). The groundswell of authoritative opinion against significance testing and in favor of confidence intervals mounted to a tidal wave by the 1980's and early 1990's (e.g., Oakes, 1986 and Hunter & Schmidt, 1990).

And still, instructional practice and editorial policies largely clung to significance testing. Frustrated commentators such as Oakes (1986: 68) asked why it had not been abandoned long ago, and yet a large-scale survey of American graduate psychology programs around that time (Aiken et al., 1990) found little evidence of change. Recently, calls for banning significance testing altogether have appeared in high-profile journals (e.g., Hunter, 1997 and Schmidt, 1996).

The task-force on this topic in the American Psychological Association (APA) published its report on the APA website in 1996, recommending substantial reforms in statistical analysis, but stopping short of stipulating a ban on significance tests. Wilkinson's recent (1999) article in the *American Psychologist* summarizes their recommendations to researchers and editors. Their chief recommendations have been taken up in my book:

- More extensive descriptions of data (i.e., means, standard deviations, sample sizes, five-point summaries, box-and-whisker plots, other graphics, and descriptions related to missing data as appropriate); and
- Although power calculations may be used in the design of a study, once the study is analysed confidence intervals supplant power calculations.
- Routine reporting both direction and size of effects for principal outcomes as well as their confidence intervals. Where meaningful units of measurement are used, nonstandardized effect-size measures are preferred to standardized ones.

Banning significance testing seems unlikely to do much other than alienating both students and colleagues, who must still read and work with the traditional research literature. I think a healthier approach involves teaching confidence intervals and model comparisons, while presenting significance testing as a special case so that students can read the older literature. Even from a hypothesis-testing viewpoint, there are advantages to a confidence interval based approach. Confidence intervals alert us to all the null hypotheses we can and cannot reject. Power is much more easily taught with confidence intervals. That said, there is also clearly a need for statistical methods instruction to move away from significance testing so that the next generation will not repeat and perpetuate our errors. Confidence intervals seem likely to assist us in doing just that.

What about the more "radical" (and certainly more modern) alternatives (6-8)? These are the directions that statistical methods are taking, and with their incorporation into computer applications, their usage seems likely to become far more widespread. There is much to be said for introducing these at a more advanced undergraduate and post-graduate level. At the present time, however, I do not think that it would be feasible to bundle them along with a confidence interval approach for an introductory course. Doing so would overload students (and possibly teachers as well!) without providing sufficient immediate reward for the effort required to assimilate it all. The more revolutionary alternative of abandoning the Neyman-Pearson tradition altogether (in favour of, say, a Bayesian approach) is not viable at the present time because, again, students still need to read the older literature. However, for a dissenting view see Rouanet et al. (1998).

The end result is an attempt at a reformation, rather than a call to revolution. Interested readers may wish to visit the website for [Statistics with Confidence](#).

### References.

Aiken, L.S., West, S.G., Sechrest, L., & Reno, R.R. (1990). Graduate training in statistics, methodology, and measurement in psychology: A survey of PhD programs in North America. *American Psychologist*, 45, 721-734.

Hunter, J.E. (1997). Needed: A ban on the significance test. *Psychological Science*, 8, 3-7.

Hunter, J.E., & Schmidt, F.L. (1990). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Meehl, P.E. (1967). Theory testing in psychology and physics: A methodological paradox. *Philosophy of Science*, 34, 103-115.

Oakes, M.L. (1986). *Statistical inference: A commentary for the social and behavioral sciences*. New York: Wiley.

Rouanet, H., Bernard, J.-M., Bert, M.-C., LeCoutre, B., Lecoutre, M.-P., and Le Roux, B. (Eds.) (1998). *New ways in statistical methodology: from significance tests to Bayesian inference*. Berne: Peter Lang.

Rozeboom, W.W. (1960). The fallacy of the null hypothesis significant test. *Psychological Bulletin*, 57, 416-428.

Schmidt, F.L. (1996). Statistical significance testing and cumulative knowledge in psychology: Implications for training of researchers. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 115-129.

Wilkinson, L. (1999). Statistical methods in psychology journals: guidelines and explanations. *American Psychologist*, 54, 594-604.

---

## **BOOK REVIEW**

Rodrigues, A., & Levine, R.V. (1999). *Reflections on 100 years of experimental social psychology*. New York: Basic Books.

Just when one thought that the mock centenary of the foundation of the discipline of experimental social psychology had passed there emerges another marker of such an event. This volume is the report of a conference held in 1997 in Yosemite National Park where a group of eminent older social psychologists were gathered together to reflect on the

past century of their discipline. The group comprised Morton Deutsch, Hal Gerard, Al Pepitone, Hal Kelley, Bert Raven, Len Berkowitz, Elliot Aronson, Phil Zimbardo and Bob Zajonc.

Apart from their obvious eminence in the field three demographic features stand out. They are all relatively old, something which is an attribute probably necessary for reflecting. But they are all also white and male. Falling into such a double category does, of course, make them representative of the population of social psychologists of the time of which they speak, but it does speak volumes of what changes have occurred in social psychology in the last twenty years. When the next artificial anniversary is celebrated and another group of eminent persons is gathered it is doubtful if the male gender would even constitute a majority let alone an unanimity. The publisher's blurb compounds this feature, however, in what could be seen as an unfortunate way. The three commentators are all white eminent male social psychologists. Surely someone could have done better than that.

The contributions are varied in content. Deutsch, Gerard and Zimbardo give strong autobiographically linked accounts of the development of the field. Berkowitz, Pepitone and Aronson give more broadly based accounts. Zajonc is vintage Zajonc. He analyses the conflict between the accounts of social behaviour based upon the assumption of rational versus irrational processes. There is nothing about himself, no reference to his seminal work across this divide, no autobiography. Just the usual scientific analysis.

As one might expect from such men, the accounts are interesting, particularly if you are interested in the history of the discipline from the middle of the century. But inevitably they are whiggish in method and content. Nowhere can one find a really insightful link to social and technical changes in society that can help us to understand why certain things were studied in the ways that they were while other topics, and other methods, were eschewed. They are naturally male in perspective. Nowhere could one get the kind of view that one can derive from Frances Cherry's (1995) account.

If you are going to try to educate graduate and undergraduate students you really need to refer them to Rob Farr's (1996) book or to Danziger (1990) or Koch (Koch & Leary, 1985). It seems a shame that we still look to personal accounts to help us to try to understand how we got where we are at present when there is all that knowledge out there from other disciplines to help us to a better analysis.

The book is worth a look, but there are better sources of history. The moment chosen was an illusion, but given the opportunity it could have been seized better.

#### References

Cherry, F. (1995). The stubborn particulars of social psychology. London: Routledge.

Danzinger, K. (1990). Constructing the subject: Historical origins of psychological research. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Farr, R. (1996). The roots of modern social psychology. Oxford: Blackwell.

Koch, S., & Leary, D.E. (1985). A century of psychology as a science. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mike Innes

Murdoch University

---

(Please detach and return to Ruth Scott by 15 December, 1999.)

**Nomination for President-elect of the Society of Australasian Social Psychologists (SASP)**

Date \_\_\_\_\_

We nominate \_\_\_\_\_ for President-elect of SASP, to become  
President

at the Annual General Meeting, 2001.

Name of Nominator \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Seconder \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Nominee \_\_\_\_\_