SOCIETY OF AUSTRALASIAN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGISTS

NEWSLETTER

Volume 7, No. 2, October 2001

EDITORIAL

Welcome to another edition of the SASP Newsletter published by the editorial team at Murdoch University. No one else held their hand up at the society's AGM to take over the role so we are continuing to do the job. A proposal that we seek a name change for the Newsletter was not endorsed at the AGM so we will continue to publish under the banner of SASP Newsletter. We do intend to introduce some changes to the content of the Newsletter, however. The March edition will be mostly limited to the publication of news items, dates of conferences, deadlines etc. We hope to expand the October edition to have more discussion, reviews, and reflection. There does not seem to be enough news, or gossip, within our ranks to fill two editions with extended information, so we will try to concentrate the important stuff (dates) into March and the trivia (reflection) into October.

July saw the successful mounting of the annual conference at the University of Melbourne. Thanks and congratulations go to Yoshi and Michael for their organisation of the event. Members of the Society will be aware that the abstracts of the conference are available in published form as a supplement to Volume 53 of the Australian Journal of Psychology.

Preparations are underway for the next Annual Conference to be held in Adelaide from the 25th to the 29th April. Martha Augoustinos, Robert Boeckmann, and Rina Onorato are in charge.

This is the first year of Mike Innes's incumbency of the President role. Patrick Heaven is well esconced in the role of Secretary. Nominations have been sought for the position of President-Elect. The President reports that nothing has happened of import for the internal workings of the Society since the AGM so there is no Presidential Report in this issue. There will be activity soon, however, so there will be more information available in the March edition and at the AGM.

There is one item of importance that needs to be aired. The flurry of activity that occurred on SOCPSYBULL after the 11th September attacks on the World Trade Centre was the first real active use of the bulletin that we can remember. There have been expressions within the membership, however, that while the exchange of opinions were of interest there is a case for these to be posted on a site other than the main bulletin. We include in this Newsletter an item inviting an expression of opinion on the matter and we urge members to make their opinions explicit. We have, as editors, taken the position that there is merit in the further expression of views of the social psychological issues arising from the destruction of the WTC and the invasion of Afghanistan, especially as these issues might relate to SASP. We have, therefore, solicited some views from a limited number of members, included in this issue, and we hope that these issues may be debated further on SOCPSYBULL (or some similar list), or at the next conference.

The Editorial Team
Ngaire Donaghue
Mike Innes
Iain Walker
Murdoch University

FROM THE COMMITTEE

Messages from your Secretary and Treasurer

Nominations are now due for the SASP offices of President-elect and Treasurer. The President-elect will serve on the SASP Executive

Committee in the role of Vice-President until the 2003 SASP AGM, at which time the current President, Professor Mike Innes, will step down as President. The member elected to the position of Treasurer will commence duties immediately for a term that expires at the 2003 SASP conference. This position has been vacant now for some time and it is very critical that we find a replacement soon for Julie Duck who did an excellent job for a number of years. If you would like to volunteer or nominate someone for either position, please contact me as soon as possible at the address below. Nomination forms are attached to the back of the newsletter.

Patrick Heaven
Department of Psychology
University of Wollongong
Wollongong NSW 2522

Email: Patrick_Heaven@uow.edu.au.
Telephone: 02-4221 3742

Patrick Heaven
Secretary

Postgraduate Representative's Report

Only one nomination for the position of postgraduate representative has been received prior to, or at, the AGM at the July conference. The new postgraduate representative is Tim Kurz, from the School of Psychology at Murdoch University. His contact details are:

Email: tkurz@central.murdoch.edu.au
Phone: (08) 9360 2390

CONFERENCE REPORTS

Norm Feather was an invited participant at the **2nd International Round Table Conference on Organisational Justice** held at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, Canada, 31 August-2 September. This conference involved a small number of participants (16 in total) from around the world. Papers were followed by intensive discussion around the table. Norm presented his research on the Patricks/MUA waterfront dispute and the conceptual analysis of value conflict, deservingness, and procedural justice. A report of this research will appear in next year's Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin.

Among the participants at the conference were: Tom Tyler, Gerold Mikula, Kwok Leung, Jason Colquitt, Debra Shapiro, Carol Kulik, and Kees Van den Bos. The conference covered a wide range of topics. Topics discussed included procedural justice, the group value model, the attribution of blame model, demographic congruence, social norms, fairness judgments in authority relationships, selection procedures, and management and marketing models. The focus was on relating justice research to the organisational setting. A rewarding if somewhat exhausting conference!

Norm Feather
Flinders University

EAESP Small Group Meeting on "Theory and Method in Societal Psychology".

Pécs, Hungary. 26th – 29th April, 2001.

This meeting was held in the beautiful (and warm) south of Hungary in a very, very old castle/mansion. János László and Wolfgang Wagner did the hard work preparing and running the meeting, and it was a great success. The geography of the participants was predominantly European, but dispersed. The speakers were from the UK (Sandra Jovchelovitch, Steve Reicher, Susan Condor, Wendy Stainton Rogers), Belgium (Bernard Rimé), Italy (Bruno Mazzara, Alberta Contarello, Annamaria Silvana de Rosa), Austria (Wolfgang Wagner), Israel/Holland (Daniel Bar-Tal), Finland (Klaus Helkama), Portugal (Paula Castro), Spain (Esther López-Zafra), Hungary (János László, Ferenc Erös), and (last and least) New Zealand/Australia (Bernard Guerin).

The talks were on a variety of interesting moves in theorizing the social and societal in social psychology, and the methods by which we can carry out the implications in practice.

The main *themes* revolved around: social representations, "societal" psychology, discursive and conversational analysis, pragmatisms, replacing individualisms, social constructionism and social constructivism, the role of studying people historically, and the

social sciences. Note, social identity was only a minor player in all this, which you can take in more than one way.

The main *contests* revolved around: how to adapt to the discursive and conversational approaches without being overwhelmed (although some thought we should be); whether a "societal" psychology was the way to go or whether the other social sciences had done all the hard work and we should spend time integrating with them instead of reinventing the wheel (guess which side I was on?); the theoretical status of social representation theory in the light of rapid changes in thinking in social psychology; what to do about methodologies in the light of these changes (include narratives more? What is the status of language? Are experimental design acceptable any more?); individualism can not be replaced by putting everything into the head; and how we can add context into our studies (history, language context, context from social science analyses, more natural observations, more ethnographic observations).

The main *conclusions* revolved around: most were in favour of including methods more like ethnography in studying social situations (even if lip service only was given or if the method was not really understood); conversation and the uses of language had to be fully included but no one agrees on how to do this yet; we cannot (or would be foolish to) ignore what the other social sciences have accomplished and are accomplishing that is better than what we do; and social representation theory needs more thought and revision.

A very *interesting paper* was that by Wolfgang Wagner and Andres Mecha who looked at Arthur Miller's *The Crucible* as an example of social knowledge in a small group. This received a lot of heated debate but mainly from people trying to extend the analysis to other aspects of that play rather than decrying what had been said.

An *interesting observation* I made from the long discussions was that most of these "theoretical" speakers had other very practical areas of current research which were not part of the meeting but which kept cropping up. It seemed (I think it was true) that the speakers

were prouder and more involved in that work than any of the theoretical extensions they might have been working on. This was revealed in several of the talks. For example, both the Bernards (pronounced very differently) were doing research on refugees and other trauma victims and were working within refugee communities; and this was more interesting for them to talk about than the theories of social psychology. [Something to think about there, folks. Are we really accomplishing anything with our theories? Someone made the Lewinian comment (of course) about nothing so practical as a good theory, but of course we have no idea what makes a good theory except through circularity. And one of the Bernards made a critique based on social science data of even using general and abstract statements (such as theories) at all.]

All in all, a beautiful location with some very bright people, some absolutely beautiful weather, some wonderful scenery and historic towns, a winery tour, lengthy discussion times, and much camaraderie. A very good Small Group Meeting.

Bernard Guerin
University of Waikato
bguerin@waikato.ac.nz

Social Dilemmas Conference, Chicago, June 29 - July 4, 2001.

The Social Dilemmas Conference is held every two or three years, and attracts an international group of researchers from many disciplines (social psychology, economics, political science, philosophy, sociology, business). This year, we even had a delegate from the CIA, looking for strategic applications of social dilemmas research. The meeting was held at an old restored hotel in the heart of Chicago (The Palmer House Hilton), and was one of the largest yet. Robyn Dawes, whose 1980 Annual Review of Psychology article remains a definitive piece, gave the keynote address. Themes that emerged included: a shift by many economists to more social models of rationality that include placing utility on group outcomes; many studies of norms, exclusion, trust, group identification; more cross-cultural work, focussed on differential valuing of groups of various kinds (family vs category; size of group), and

continuing work based on simulation. Web-based studies are on the increase, as are studies that use the Web for data (e.g. analyses of E-Bay trading in the study of reputation).

Delegates from Australia to the conference included Janine Webb, Sherry Schneider, Michael Smithson, and Margaret Foddy. Non-academic highlights were a river cruise showing the terrific Chicago architecture and rejuvenation of the riverfront, great restaurants, and the fourth of July fireworks. All this was pre-September 11, and everyone was feeling pretty carefree. Abstracts from the conference are available on the Web: http://www.msu.edu./user/kerr/sdconf. For those of you who know Norb Kerr at Michigan State University--he is maintaining the website.

Margaret Foddy
La Trobe University

Society of Experimental Social Psychology, Spokane, Washington, October 18-20, 2001.

After the September 11 events in the US, people were not travelling much, and many hotels had entire conferences cancelled. It was therefore remarkable that over 220 people showed up for SESP — half the normal number, but still a substantial number (especially since it was in a hard-to-get-to location, Spokane, Washington). While people were feeling subdued, the meeting was a great success, and was characterised by a lot of in-depth papers and discussion. Highlights for me were the Groups Pre-conference (see below), Tony Greenwald giving a great critique of his own Implicit Association Test, Kruglanski arguing that dual process theories have proliferated to the point of absurdity and that he can collapse them all into a Unimodel, a very American session on how you can stop your automatic stereotyping processes (I say this is the nicest possible way), and a session on the comparison of research findings from real vs. artificial groups (apparently not as much difference as you might think). Hazel Markus gave a ripper of a keynote address on "Models of Agency", that combined videos from the Sydney Olympics, powerpoint presentations of product ads in Japan and the US, and a dazzling summary of studies that confirm that Western social psychology has been a bit limited.

The SESP annual award for contributions to social psychology went to Jerome Bruner; Hazel Markus read his acceptance speech because he could not be there. It was interesting to note that his themes included the adoption of a range of methods, not just experiments, in the study of human social behaviour and cognition. Bruner is currently employed by the Law School at New York University and publishing on jurisprudence, so this was an interesting choice indeed.

Margaret Foddy
La Trobe University

Small Groups Pre-conference to the Society of Experimental Social Psychology, October 18, 2001.

The theme of the annual Pre-Conference on small groups for 2001 was how small group research and theory relates to and enriches other domains of social psychology (and vice versa). The speakers and delegates were a mix of psychological and sociological social psychologists. This year's day-long meeting (n=50) was organised by Marty Kaplan and Margaret Foddy. The speakers represented aspects of social psychology from the micro/person-centered to the macro/social structural. Constantine Sedikides gave an interesting paper arguing (contra self-categorisation theory), that self-concept determines perceptions of groups and a range of group-related phenomena. Rupert Brown argued that social identity theory had not so far had a lot to contribute to the study of small groups, and then provided a topical discussion of the distinctions between patriotism and xenophobia. Scott Tindale gave a stimulating presentation on "shared cognition", and Wendy Wood provided an interesting alternative to the normative-informational model of influence. Karen Hegtvedt argued for more attention to the group level in the study of justice and fairness, and Bill Smith provided a framework for making social comparison theory more relevant to group processes. Lynn Smith-Lovin finished off the day with a case for how network theory can provide useful explanatory frameworks to understand things such as cohesiveness and influence. At the end of the day, the entire group went off to a Thai restaurant, where #5 on a scale of 1-5 of not hot-very hot, produced a "hot" that most Australians would regard as "not hot", but

the discussions were lively and the consensus was that the pre-conference has a good future (next year in Ohio).

Margaret Foddy
La Trobe University

FORTHCOMING CONFERENCES

Society of Australasian Social Psychologists 8th Annual Meeting

Thursday 25 April – Sunday 28 April, 2002.
Stamford Plaza Hotel, Adelaide, South Australia.

Keynote speaker: Professor Nyla Branscombe, University of Kansas

First call for abstracts will be in January 2002.

For further information, please contact:

Martha Augoustinos
Department of Psychology
Adelaide University
Adelaide, SA, 5000
Australia

Tel: +61 (08) 8303 4627
Fax: +61 (08) 8303 3770
Email: martha@psychology.adelaide.edu.au

The **8th International Conference on Language and Social Psychology** will be held in Hong Kong, July 10-14, 2002. Members are most welcome to participate.   For further information,   please   visit   the   webpage: http://personal.cityu.edu.hk/~ssiclasp/

Sik Hung
Chinese University of Hong Kong

Second Meeting of Personality and Individual Differences Interest Group

Newcastle, early February 2002

INVITATION   FOR   EXPRESSIONS   OF INTEREST

This is an initial circular to those who participated in the first meeting on personality and individual differences run by Patrick Heaven in Wollongong in February 2000, copied to heads of psychology departments for forwarding to staff and postgraduate students who may be interested, and others.

The proposal is that we hold another meeting in Newcastle in early February 2002. By agreement at the last meeting, early in February is optimal as it avoids the grant-writing rush of later in the month.

Provided there are sufficient papers to support it, we could hold a **two-day meeting**, probably starting mid-morning on a Thursday and finishing at a reasonable hour on Friday afternoon.

Possible dates. The possible dates are the 31st January-1st February and 7th-8th February, with the earlier date being preferred at this stage. However, you are asked to **express a preference on the form below**.

Venue. We have considered meeting places at the University of Newcastle and at an hotel in central Newcastle. From the point of view of cost, the University meeting place seems preferable at this stage.

Accommodation. We can have accommodation in a new building close to some of the university buildings which provide meeting places. The bedrooms are spacious and air-conditioned and have complete self-catering facilities, TV and video, and either twin or queen-sized beds. There is a swimming pool close by, plus barbecue areas, and the building is within 5 minutes walking distance of university facilities. The only disadvantage is that the closest restaurants would require driving to nearby centres (5-10 minutes). The distance to the beaches is about the same as in Wollongong, and there is public transport from the campus to the city centre and beaches.

The cost per room would be $120 for one night, shared or otherwise.

To make it worthwhile for the University to lay on staff for this building, we need to book a minimum of 20 rooms. If the demand is lower than that, we would probably have to use the hotel option, but the fee for the use of conference facilities would be more expensive there.

Travel: Newcastle can be reached by road (about 2 hours by Pacific Highway and then F3 Freeway from Sydney Harbour Bridge), train (about 2.5 hours from Sydney Central to Broadmeadow or Newcastle, then taxi or bus to the campus), or by air (Quantas to Williamtown or (at present!) Aeropelican to Belmont - about 30 minutes from Sydney in each case; there are some direct flights to Williamtown from Melbourne, Brisbane, and Canberra). [The airports are about equidistant from the campus; sharing taxis to the campus would be the best option, but we may be able to lay on a minibus for a group arriving together]

Topics. The original desire was to open a single forum for topics related to personality, which before 2000 were presented at a variety of conferences on social, organisational, clinical and experimental psychology. However, in the first meeting in Wollongong, a range of topics similar to those covered by the International Association for the Study of Individual Differences (ISSID) were presented, and so we intend to continue with that range. Thus topics would be:
• Personality (and motivation, values, etc)
• Abilities
• Individual differences
• Psychometric issues
• and other topics related to the above

Presentations. Unless the number of papers is large or there are separate symposia which would appeal to distinctly different groups, we would prefer to have all papers presented in a single session. Posters would also be welcome, and would probably be displayed for the duration of the conference, with opportunities for discussion with the authors.

Number of presentations. While it may be possible to accommodate all papers offered, we would prefer each person to initially offer only one topic for oral presentation, with no limit on poster presentations. This would of course allow multiple-author projects to have more than one oral presentation.

Registration. It is intended to keep the cost of registration to a minimum sufficient to safely cover the following:
• Copies of abstracts and program
• Charge for use of University facilities

• Tea/Coffee for morning and afternoon sessions
• Sandwich/snack lunches
• Publication of abstracts in Australian Psychologist*
• Minor incidental costs
• GST on the above

*The possibility of publishing the abstracts from the Wollongong meeting in 2001 was raised during that meeting. On enquiry, it emerged that a charge is levied for publication of abstracts in the annual issue of the Australian Psychologist; since no money had been raised for this purpose it was not possible to proceed with the plan this year. It is planned to publish both the 2001 and 2002 abstracts in 2002, and the cost of this will be included in the registration fee. For 2001 abstracts etc, see the temporary web site at http://homepage.mac.com/martync/index.html

Submission of abstracts. In order to allow time for scheduling of sessions, preliminary abstracts would be submitted by **January 4th 2002**. Presenters can submit an updated version for publication in Australian Psychologist at the time of the meeting.

EXPRESSION OF INTEREST IN PARTICIPATING

Please return the following form ASAP to indicate an interest in participating. An outline of the arrangements based on the expressions of interest will be sent out by the end of October.

1. Title and name:

2. Institution and department:

3. Email address (preferably) and/or mailing address for correspondence:

4. Preferred dates: 31st January-1st February OR 7th-8th February 2002

5. If you intend to present a paper at an oral session OR submit a poster OR organise a symposium, please provide brief details of the topic(s) and preferred method(s) of presentation:

5. Please indicate your accommodation preferences:

Twin beds or queen size?

Single or shared?
OR Accommodation not required

7. If shared, please indicate if you plan to share with another person who is submitting an expression of interest, or if you would be willing to be allocated a room-mate from among others who wish to share:

8. Any other comments:

PLEASE SEND TO DON MUNRO BY RETURN EMAIL OR BY POST TO:

School of Behaviour Sciences (Psychology)
University of Newcastle
NSW 2308
Australia

The Fifth Sydney Symposium of Social Psychology, March 19-21, 2002

In continuing with this highly successful series, The Fifth Annual Sydney Symposium of Social Psychology will be held again next year in the Coogee Bay Hotel, on Coogee Beach, between March 19-21, 2002. The theme of next year's symposium is:

RESPONDING TO THE SOCIAL WORLD: IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT PROCESSES IN SOCIAL JUDGMENTS AND DECISIONS

Convened by:

Joseph P. Forgas, UNSW
Kipling D. Williams, Macquarie University, and
William von Hippel, UNSW

Invited contributors and topics:

Herbert Bless (University of Mannheim, Germany): Assimilation and Contrast in Social Judgment
Marilynn Brewer (Ohio State University): Implicit and explicit processes in social judgments and decisions: An integration
Tanya Chartrand (Ohio State University): The effects of nonconscious goals on social judgments and decisions.
Klaus Fiedler (University of Heidelberg): Pseudo-Contingencies in social judgments – An Overlooked Phenomenon

Joseph P. Forgas (University of New South Wales) : Affective influences on social judgments and decisions : Informational and processing effects
David C. Funder (University of California, Riverside): Implications of a Realistic Approach to Personality Judgement: Judgemental Ability and Self-Knowledge
Adam D. Galinsky (University of Utah): To control or not to control stereotypes: Separating the implicit and explicit processes of perspective-taking and suppression
Martie G. Haselton (University of California, Los Angeles) & David M. Buss (University of Texas, Austin): Errors in Design or By Design? An Evolutionary Perspective on Biases in Social Judgment and Decision Making
Lucy Johnston and Lynden Miles (University of Canterbury, New Zealand): Responding to the social world: Explicit and implicit processes in stereotype-based judgments.
Arie W. Kruglanski (University of Maryland): A Parametric Unimodel of Human Judgment: An Alternative to Dual-Process Frameworks
Matthew D. Lieberman (University of California, Los Angeles): Controlling the uncontrollable without even trying: A social cognitive neuroscience approach to social judgment and decision making
Phillip R. Shaver (University of California, Davis, USA) & Mario Mikulincer (Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel): The Psychodynamics of Social Judgment and Decision-Making: An Attachment Theory Perspective
Diederik A. Stapel (University of Groningen, Netherlands): Making sense of hot cognition:Why and when description influences our feelings and judgments
Jerry Suls (University of Iowa): The Proxy, the Corroborator and the Similar Expert: On the Assessment of Opinions and Abilities via Social Comparison
Michael A. Zarate (University of Texas): Person and group perception as distinct neurological processes.
Bill von Hippel (UNSW), Denise Sekaquaptewa and Penelope Espinoza (University of Michigan): The role of implicit stereotyping in social judgment and behavior

Kipling D. Williams, Trevor Case, and Cassandra Govan (Macquarie University): Impact of Ostracism on Social Judgments and Decisions: Explicit and Implicit Responses

As in previous years, there will be a limited number of places for non-presenting participants to attend this meeting. Non-presenting participants will be asked to pay a registration fee of $250 for staff, $200 for postgraduate students as a contribution towards the costs of staging the Symposium.

If you are interested in attending, please contact Joe Forgas (jp.forgas@unsw.edu.au) as soon as possible. As the number of places is now very limited, and as there is also considerable interest from overseas colleagues to attend as observers, we will need to know the number of SASP collegues wishing to attend as soon as possible. For further information on the Sydney symposium series please consult our website at www.sydneysymposium.unsw.edu.au .

_____

NEWS OF MEMBERS

Robbie Sutton and **Karen Douglas** (formerly of Massey University in Auckland, New Zealand) have recently taken up lectureships at Keele University in the United Kingdom.

The APS Interest Group on Personal Relationships has announced that **Pat Noller** (University of Queensland) is the recipient of their first research award, and, **and Grania Sheehan** (erstwhile Ph.D student at the University of Queensland) is the recipient of the student award.

_____

NOTICES

The **SASP-SPSP Workshop on Virtual Reality Research in Social Psychology**, which was scheduled for early December at Macquarie University, has been postponed due to concerns about flying between the US and Australia. The workshop will be rescheduled, perhaps for April or June of 2002.

Australian Society for the Study of Individual Differences
At last year's conference Patrick Heaven and I decided that the time had come to do something about the fact that personality studies were relatively sidelined in existing conferences - not just SASP but also the experimental, clinical, and organisational ones. So we advertised and ran a trial one-day conference hosted by Patrick at Wollongong in February. This was quite successful, and a decision has been made to do it again next year, perhaps in Newcastle and perhaps for two days. We will avoid tagging on to other conferences as our attendees and potential attendees are from very diverse fields, and early February seems to be a time that most people find acceptable.

There is a temporary name attached to the group - ASSID, for Australian Society for the Study of Individual Differences, suggested by the International version of the same, ISSID. Since we have already had quite a variety of topics, including abilities etc., it is possible that we will stick with Individual Differences rather than just Personality. In other respects the group is rather like the Social Psych group in its early days - no formal structure, just run by whoever is running the conference. And in fact many of our decisions have been explicitly influenced by the way the Social conferences were organised, so we are a child of SASP in more than one sense - and you didn't even know there was a pregnancy!

The abstracts from the first conference are on a web site put up by Martyn Churcher at UWA (though it may have to be moved from there, possibly to Newcastle). The URL pro tem is http://www.psy.uwa.edu.au/user/martyn/assid/

Anybody who is interested in being kept informed of our plans for next year, just email me as above or Patrick Heaven <p.heaven@uow.edu.au>.

Regards

Don Munro
University of Newcastle

_____

BOOKS BY MEMBERS

Noller, P., Feeney, J. A., & Peterson, C. (2001). *Personal relationships across the lifespan*. **Hove, UK: Psychology Press**

TABLE OF CONTENTS
Chapter 1: Introduction
Chapter 2: Infancy and childhood
Chapter 3: Relationships during adolescence
Chapter 4: Early adulthood
Chapter 5: Relationships in middle-age
Chapter 6: Personal relationships and the elderly
Chapter 7: Relationships across the lifespan: Key themes and concepts.

Feeney, J. A., Hohaus, L., Noller, P., & Alexander, R. (2001). *Becoming parents: Exploring the bonds between mothers, fathers and their infants*. **New York: Cambridge University Press.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS
Chapter 1. The transition to parenthood
Chapter 2. Attachment in childhood and beyond
Chapter 3. The study
Chapter 4. The couples
Chapter 5. Pregnancy and plans for birth
Chapter 6. Couples' experiences of birth and new parenthood
Chapter 7. How does new parenthood affect couples?
Chapter 8. Dealing with depression
Chapter 9. Men, women, and household work: The diaries
Chapter 10. Couples' changing attachment relationships
Chapter 11. Six months into parenting
Chapter 12. New parenthood in perspective

Williams, K. D. (2001). *Ostracism: The power of silence*. **New York, NY: Guilford Publications. (Available on amazon.com and in Australia from Astam books (www.astambooks.com.au).**

TABLE OF CONTENTS:
1. Ostracism: Ubiquitous and Powerful
2. Forty Years of Solitude: Cases of Ostracism
3. A Model of Ostracism
4. Forty Minutes of Silence: Narratives of Short-Term Episodes of the Silent Treatment
5. The Scarlet Letter Study: Five Days of Ostracism
6. Laboratory Experiments: The Ball-Tossing Paradigm
7. More Laboratory Experiments: The Train Ride
8. Cyberostracism: Getting Silenced on the Internet
9. Ostracism in and by Organizations
10. Everday Ostracism over Days, Months, and Years
11. Reflections and Future Aims

BRIEF DESCRIPTION
Ostracism is among the most powerful means of social influence. From schoolroom time-outs or the "silent treatment" from a family member or friend, to governmental acts of banishment or exile, ostracism is practiced in many contexts, by individuals and groups. This illuminating book provides a comprehensive examination of this pervasive phenomenon, exploring the short- and long-term consequences for targets as well as the functions served for those who exclude or ignore. Within a cogent theoretical framework, an exemplary research program is presented that makes use of such diverse methods as laboratory experiments, surveys, narrative accounts, interviews, Internet-based research, brief role-plays, and week-long simulations. The resulting data shed new light on how ostracism affects the individual's coping responses, self-esteem, and sense of belonging and control.

Augoustinos, M., & Reynolds, K. J. (Eds.), (2001). *Understanding prejudice, racism, and social conflict*. **London: Sage.**

A range of international events have recently focused attention on issues of prejudice, racism and social conflict: increasing tensions in former Eastern bloc countries, political conflict in Northern Ireland and the United States, as well as racial conflict in the Baltic States, Middle East, Africa, and Australasia. In light of these events, Understanding Prejudice, Racism and Social Conflict presents a timely and important update to the literature, and makes a fascinating textbook for all students who need to study the subject.

A variety of theoretical and conceptual approaches are necessary to fully understand the themes of prejudice and racism. This textbook successfully presents these, uniquely, by examining how these themes manifest

themselves at different levels - at the individual, interpersonal, intergroup and institutional levels. It aims to integrate the different approaches to understanding racism and prejudice and to suggest new ways to study these complex issues. This integrated, international focus should make it key reading for students in many countries.

With contributions from world-leading figures, *Understanding Prejudice, Racism and Social Conflict* should prove to be an invaluable teaching resource, and an accessible volume for students in social psychology, as well as some neighbouring disciplines.

PART ONE: PREJUDICE AND RACISM: DEFINING THE PROBLEM `KNOWING' THE EXPERIENCE \
1. Martha Augoustinos and Katherine J Reynolds: *Prejudice, Racism and Social Psychology*
2. Iain Walker: *The Changing Nature of Racism: From Old to New?*
3. Darren Garvey: *Boongs, Bigots, and Bystanders: Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Experiences of Racism and Prejudice and their Implications for Psychology in Australia*

PART TWO: DEVELOPMENT, SOCIALIZATION AND PERSONALITY \
4. Drew Nesdale: *Development of Prejudice in Children*
5. Julie Robinson, Rivka Witenberg and Ann Sanson: *The Socialization of Tolerance*
6. Patrick C L Heaven Prejudice and Personality: *The Case of the Authoritarian and Social Dominator*

PART THREE: SOCIAL COGNITION, MOOD AND ATTITUDES
7. Vance Locke and Lucy Johnston: *Stereotyping and Prejudice: A Cognitive Approach*
8. Leith S Baird and Julie M Duck: *Affect, Prejudice, and Discrimination: In the Politics of `Gut-Feeling', Feeling Better is What Counts*
9. Deborah J Terry, Michael A Hogg and Leda Blackwood: *Prejudiced Attitudes, Group Norms, and Discriminatory Behaviour*

PART FOUR: PREJUDICE AND GROUP LIFE
10. Katherine J Reynolds and John C Turner: *Prejudice as a Group Process: The Role of Social Identity*
11. Penelope J Oakes and S Alexander Haslam: *Distortion V. Meaning: Categorization on Trial for Inciting Intergroup Hatred*

12. Michael J Platow and John A Hunter: *Realistic Intergroup Conflict: Prejudice, Power, and Protest*

PART FIVE: THE LANGUAGE AND RHETORIC OF RACISM
13. Amanda LeCouteur and Martha Augoustinos: *The Language of Prejudice and Racism*
14. Mark Rapley: `*How to Do X without Doing Y': Accomplishing Discrimination without `Being Racist' - `Doing Equity'*

PART SIX: FUTURE DIRECTIONS
15. John Duckitt: *Reducing Prejudice: An Historical and Multi-Level Approach*
16. Stephen Reicher: *Studying Psychology, Studying Racism*

Walker, I., & Smith, H. J. (Eds.), (2002). *Relative deprivation: Specification, development, integration.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

The relative deprivation construct has been widely used in the social sciences to explain phenomena from experiencing psychosomatic stress to participating in urban riots. It is currently a hot topic for research, being used especially to understand processes of social identity and responses to disadvantage by both disadvantaged minorities and privileged majorities. This book assembles chapters by the world's leading relative deprivation researchers in order to present a synthesis of current knowledge. Featuring cutting-edge integrative theoretical and empirical work from social psychology, sociology, and psychology, the book will be a standard reference work for relative deprivation researchers for years to come. It is relevant to researchers in intergroup relations, prejudice, racism, social identity, group processes, social comparison, collective behavior, and social movements. The book is suited for use as a text in graduate-level and advanced undergraduate-level courses.

Contents
1. Iain Walker and Heather Smith: *Fifty years of relative deprivation research*

Part I. Specification:
2. Marylee C. Taylor: *Group deprivation, collective threat, and racial resentment: perspectives on white racism*

3. Tom R. Tyler and E. Allan Lind: *Understanding the nature of group deprivation: does group-based deprivation involve fair outcomes or fair treatment?*
4. John Duckitt and Thobi Mputhing: *Relative deprivation and intergroup attitudes: South Africa before and after the transition*
5. Heather J. Smith and Daniel J. Ortiz: *Is it just me? The different consequences of personal and group relative deprivation*

Part II. Development:
6. Francine Tougas and Ann M. Beaton: *Personal and group relative deprivation: connecting the 'I' to the 'we'.*
7. Colin Wayne Leach, Nastia Snider, and Aarti Iyer: *'Poisoning the consciences of the fortunate': the experience of relative advantage and support.*
8. C. David Gartrell: *The embeddedness of social comparison*
9. Matthew Crosby, Kazuho Ozawa and Faye Crosby: *Japanese and American reactions to gender discrimination*
10. Stephen C. Wright and Linda R. Tropp: *Collective action in response to disadvantage: intergroup perceptions, social identification, and social change*

Part III. Integration:
11. Naomi Ellemers: *Social identity and relative deprivation*
12. James M. Olson and Neal J. Roese: *Relative deprivation and counterfactual thinking*
13. Iain Walker, Ngai Kin Wong and Kerry Kretzschmar: *Relative deprivation and attribution: from grievance to action*
14. Anne Wilson, Etsuko Hoshino-Browne and Michael Ross: *Spontaneous temporal and social comparisons in children's conflict narratives*
15. Eliot R. Smith and Colin Ho: *Prejudice as intergroup emotion: integrating relative deprivation and social comparison*

Part IV. Conclusion:
16. Thomas F. Pettigrew: *Summing up: Relative deprivation as a key social psychological concept.*

OBITUARIES

DR STEPHANIE MOYLAN, 1960 - 2001

It is with great sadness that we have to announce the recent death of Stephanie Moylan after a losing battle with cancer. Stephanie has been a close friend, colleague, and collaborator to many of us for over twenty years at the University of New South Wales. I have known her since she has been an undergraduate at UNSW. Subsequently we collaborated for several years, while she completed a Masters degree here, and just last year she completed her PhD with me. She has been a much admired and accomplished teacher, and a successful researcher with a bright academic career ahead of her. After completing her doctorate she was offered a Lectureship at Macquarie University but was not able to take up the position because of her advancing illness.

Stephanie made a critically important contribution to our research investigating the role of affect in social cognition, judgments and behaviour, and has been co-author of a number of joint articles we published. Her PhD explored the influence of cognitive strategies on personnel appraisal judgments, and some of her experiments were ready for publication when her work was interrupted by her rapidly advancing illness.

Stephanie was a unique person; she infused an element of fun, gentleness, and caring into everything she did. Academics are typically ambitious and care most about achievements and outcomes. For Stephanie, how she did things – even small things – was often more important.

She had a special kind of spirituality – one that manifests itself in how small, mundane, everyday things are done. The way she did everything somehow made one think about greater questions of life. In the busy, bustling, ambitious life of academics, Stephanie with her whole being, was like a gentle question mark, reminding us that there is more to life than just getting things done. She had grace in the true sense of the word.

She would devote her time and attention selflessly and with dedication to everyone who asked for her help, students, colleagues and strangers alike. Our field lost a great teacher in

her. In over twenty years of working with her on a daily basis, I have never seen her angry, or lose her temper, or treat anybody with anything less than complete kindness and respect. As a country girl, she had many endearing phrases and turns of speech; the worst she could ever say about anybody was 'he is a great big wally, fair dink'. When something bad happened, she would cheerily remark 'just offer it up'!

She had a fantastic sense of humour: mischievous, gentle and ironic but never mean or crude. She had perfect social graces – poised, skilled and at home in any social situation. She had strong principles and a quirky sense of propriety; she would regularly mail people a little 'thank you' notes in the post after our social get-togethers. Not surprisingly, she was extremely popular with everybody who knew her. It was a real privilege to have had her as a friend and a collaborator for over twenty years.

Stephanie has left a deep and lasting influence on all of us, and our discipline is poorer for her passing. She will be remembered as a wonderful colleague and friend, and a thoroughly good, kind, warm and helpful person who touched the lives of all who knew her. Her death leaves a void that will be impossible to fill; we will miss her in a hundred ways every day.

Joe Forgas
UNSW

LEE CRONBACH

Members may have heard that Lee Cronbach died recently at the age of 85. The seminal figure in methodology for many years, Cronbach made many and varied contributions to the development of methods which were of great importance in the growth of social psychology. There are almost too many to mention, but we can try a few. Everybody now automatically obtains (I shall not say calculates) an alpha coefficient of internal consistency. This was first developed by Cronbach and published in Psychometrica in 1951. Cronbach also wrote the definitive papers on response sets and test design way back in 1946. Cronbach was also a persuasive figure in the debate about the experimental versus survey approaches to social psychology, maintaining the importance of including individual difference variables in all of our analyses of social conditions. His paper in the American Psychologist in 1975 demonstrated the importance of higher order interactions between manipulated variables and individual difference variables that exceeded in magnitude the variance accounted for by the main effect factors in all cases except variables such as gender. The conclusion that we risk understanding process by ignoring such data has, of course, been ignored. Three other contributions cannot be omitted. The first is the paper on construct validity in the Psychological Bulletin with Meehl. Like lots of things of Cronbach's, the issues and methodological import of such discussion has not been properly absorbed in our understanding of what it is that we attempt to measure and manipulate. Even though it is a citation classic it is cited more in the breach than the observance. The second is the major debate with the Campbellian tradition in experimental and quasi-experimental design concerned with program evaluation. While Don Campbell was concerned from 1957 onwards with the priority of internal validity over external validity, Cronbach's deep insights into the nature of external validity and its priority had a profound effect upon the way we continue to think about these matters. The fact that his book appeared in 1982 and has had little observable effect upon the day-to-day thinking of psychologists remains to me a mystery. The third contribution is my favourite. In 1953 he published a paper with Glaser on the assessment of the similarity of profiles. Not what you would think would cause any profound stir. But of course this analysis revealed the need to assess the contribution of various factors which affected the magnitude of similarity that is measured by a crude correlation coefficient. This was followed by a very profound paper in the Psychological Bulletin in 1955 (Processes affecting scores on "understanding others" and "assumed similarity"), concerned with the many separate processes which may affect the judgements made in person perception. Largely uncited, this was followed by a more accessible piece in a book edited by Renato Taguiri in 1958, but again not very visible. These papers were so important in the demonstration of just what biases and unrecognised weights that we bring to any judgement, including the judgement of others. Very technical and so to a degree unaccessible. But the kind of contribution that can be made by a psychologist that should make the discipline advance.

The importance of Cronbach in some ways was the provision of insight into conceptual ways to understand processes of analysis. The bitterness is the degree to which we do not seem to have learned the lessons. Except of course for the alpha coefficient function in SPSS.

Mike Innes
Murdoch University

DISCUSSION FORUM

SOCPSYBULL saw an unprecedented flurry of activity and debate in the weeks following the September 11 attacks in the US. Several streams of opinion seemed to underlie the debates, including apparent differences in possible roles for SASP, in relation both to the attacks and to social issues, interventions, and activism more generally. The editors took the liberty of inviting three members to contribute to this issue of the newsletter on the general theme of the role of SASP in relation to social action. These contributions appear here in alphabetical order. We suggest that some of the issues raised in these contributions should be debated, perhaps in future issues of the newsletter, perhaps on SOCPSYBULL (or some other list that SASP may wish to create to cater for debate rather than news), or perhaps at the next conference.

Prospects for SASP: If it ain't broke…

Joseph P. Forgas
University of New South Wales

When Iain asked me to write a few words about what, if anything, else SASP should be doing, my initial reaction was: why, is there a problem? Worrying about SASP has not given me many sleepless nights lately. Nevertheless, I think there is value in considering this issue. After some reflection, I think SASP is fine pretty much the way it is. In fact, I see no real reason or justification for trying to change and expand our functions, and doing so carries significant risks and problems.

Scientific associations usually have one main function: to provide a forum for communication, exchange and personal contact among like-minded researchers in a discipline. SASP has done this very successfully ever since I attended my first meeting in 1972. The email bulletin board now provides an additional and much appreciated forum of communication among members. This is a broad, informal organisation and its very success owes much to its open, inclusive character. So what else should we, or could we be doing?

One suggestion is that we could fashion ourselves after EAESP and undertake more, and more costly activities to support our discipline such as summer schools, scholarships and the like. Personally, I think such a move would carry significant risks, and is not justified in our circumstances. EAESP attempts to 'level' the very unequal opportunities and achievements of social psychology in different European countries; this need is far less pressing in the more or less homogenous academic environment we have. EAESP also has huge financial resources due to its very high membership fees, and its income from the journal. Decisions about spending this huge collective wealth are in reality made by a small executive, and accountability is weak as general meetings are very infrequent.

If we went down that road, we would have to raise significant funds from the membership to finance our expanded activities. Spending decisions would then either be subject to intense lobbying and attendant disagreements, or else would have to be made by the executive committee with only limited member input. EAESP has very strong views on the need to support 'European' social psychology against what they consider the 'American' variety, an identity distinction that is important to them but is pretty incomprehensible to the rest of the world. The possibility that we might find ourselves arguing what kind of social psychology we should be promoting with our scarce funds is very real.

Another recent suggestion for SASP is that we might become more vocal in promoting what our discipline can contribute to public discourse, even acting as a lobby group on current social issues. Frankly, I think neither of these options is desirable. Our expertise on social issues is essentially individual expertise, and not collective expertise. What we do know we know as individual researchers, experts in our fields. We do not need to, nor should we tolerate an organisation claiming to speak in our name. Even if we had perfect agreement on any issue

(most unlikely), collective pronouncements by organisations claiming to speak for an entire field are fundamentally antithetical to the pluralistic, multifaceted nature of scientific inquiry. When scientific organisations do attempt to take such collective positions, they often become objects of ridicule. (This happened to the American Anthropological Society when it consensually declared that Margaret Mead was right, and Derek Freeman wrong in their interpretations of Samoan sexuality).

The idea that SASP should somehow become a conduit of social activism is even more objectionable, and I hope nobody is seriously advocating this option. Obviously, there are many opinions among us on any one issue, so the Society cannot, and should not be allowed to speak in our name. We are smart enough, and vocal enough to argue our divergent views and to make a public contribution. The need for plurality and each individual's right to divergent views is of paramount importance, and public positions taken by the Society on any issue would fundamentally violate that right.

So where does this leave us? Pretty much where we are now, I think. I am concerned that any attempt to make the Society more activist runs the serious risk of alienating sections of our membership. Our society fulfills an important function, and does it admirably. It ain't broke, and it doesn't need fixing. Attempts to push it in directions it cannot, and should not, go run the risk of unraveling the present loose coalition of shared interests that is all that bind us.

Terror and a new paradigm?

Leon Mann
Melbourne Business School
University of Melbourne

It is too early to say whether September 11 will begin a paradigm shift in the way we in the west see the rest of the world. Most of the columnists and social scientists offering opinions on what caused the terror attack and how we in the west should respond tend to treat it within the old paradigm of a conflict between nation states with competing values, interests and long-standing grievances.

So the terror attack is more or less explained as a gross overreaction by people and groups who harbour a grievance or resentment. Presumably life will get back to normal once the rogue groups and the countries who are in sympathy with them have made their point and presumably once the west (especially the US) begins to behave more agreeably.

Reality will become clearer in the next few months as western governments respond to the September 11 attack. We will then know whether it was an aberrant event it whether it was the first devastating blow in a string of terrorist attacks against the most powerful western nations to create climate of fear, social and economic breakdown and demoralisation.

If the latter there will be a paradigm shift with western countries becoming suspicions, closed, and tough in their view of the world and how they treat foreigners and to some extent their own citizens.

The defining evil of the 20th century was the Holocaust and the phenomenon of destructive obedience in which ordinary citizens were caught up as perpetrators and accomplices in the targeted genocide of a people.

The defining evil of the 21st century may well be shadowy bands of suicidal terrorists who are able to strike across borders to take the lives of large numbers of innocent people and create massive chaos in towns and cities.

This really is a new kind of threat which will certainly shake the west's 'global paradigm' of international relations and the long held belief that it is possible with goodwill to deal with ideological differences and resolve conflict constructively.

'Wish lists' must now include the hope that the ingenuity and creativity of our best minds will be directed to the riddle of unmitigated evil, how to understand it and what can be done to prevent and combat it.

The social sciences together with the humanities have a special role to play in this respect, especially to ensure that opinion about the causes of extremism and terrorism and the way to respond are grounded in fact and reality and not dominated by hysteria, ignorance and prejudice.

*This article was written by Leon Mann in his role of President of the Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia,

Do not adjust SASP, the faults are in reality.

Craig McGarty
Australian National University

Our Society is a scholarly community that exists to exchange ideas on matters of interest to its members in order to advance the scientific study of those ideas. In one very real sense it should do what it wants to do and be what it wants to be (yeah!). It should be nothing other than what its members desire it to be, and it should do what its members decide it should do (following the agreed decision making processes of the body). The body can take a stand on any issue, express any view that it likes, take any action that it wants to, providing that it follows the formal and informal processes that govern its decision-making and is prepared to live with having disgruntled members drop out. Having said that, the organization exists in a culture that has laws, norms, rules and values which influence the way we act. None of those things, however, take away the right of individuals to have an opinion, or for a group to arrive at some collectively agreed opinion, on any issue (which is not to say that we necessarily have a right to express our opinions in a way that harms others). When somebody tells you that you can't have a view on some matter then they are really telling you that they don't want to run the risk that the view you arrive at disagrees with their view, or runs counter to some vested interest they protect.

So where there is a range of views in some organization where do you draw the line on expressing and acting on these views? If a majority of SASP members favour the bombing of Afghanistan in order to defend liberal values should we take a vote to donate a portion of the Society's funds to buy bombs? Given the moral imperative to defend Western democracy and culture (which includes social psychology) should we not spend our professional time crafting social influence strategies to convince terrorists to stand still while they are being bombed? The answer is that we certainly could attempt such things, but the process of reaching agreement would be highly disruptive to the process of exchanging ideas that is the Society's central business. I expect many members would

resign from an organization that devoted itself to war-fighting in such a way. By the same token, and given the diversity of views at this time I would not ask the Society to donate funds to the peace movement or to work towards non-violent resolution of the conflict. I will nevertheless ask members to evaluate the social psychological merits of the ideas I have in that regard, or to use it as a contact point to recruit thinkers to the peace effort. I wouldn't expect the proponents of war to help me, but I don't think they are going to expect me to tell them how to fight a war either.

What sort of aspirations would I prefer an organization like SASP to have? Well for a start I believe it is essential to retain a diversity of views. I find certain types of disagreement to be intellectually stimulating and other types to be very positively affirming. If we agree that the Society exists above all to be a vehicle for exchanging ideas about social psychology then this means that it should facilitate communication methods. SASP has a conference, a discussion list and a newsletter. People use those methods as they see fit and, generally speaking, they use them well. Am I disappointed that few social psychologists appear to be yet using their talents in the cause of non-violent conflict resolution? Well somewhat, but my disappointment only stems from the fact that the Society boasts so many people who have enormous talents and knowledge that are relevant to the stark choices that the world confronts. I confess to being nonplussed by those who doubt that social psychology has anything to offer on these matters, but I am buoyed by a range of recent interactions that I have had with members of the Society on these matters (perhaps most with people who have very different theoretical perspectives to my own).

Now is the time?

Meg Rohan
University of New South Wales

From an early age, I was taught that politics and religion were not topics suitable for discussion in "polite society" (i.e., where harmonious social relationships are desired). As a social psychologist, I can explain why. When people discuss either politics or religion, they reveal "the kind of person they really are." More

---

specifically (see Rokeach, 1973), they reveal what are their value priorities. Although, as Schwartz (e.g., 1996) has shown, there is a set of values that are universally relevant, people differ in terms of which of these are more and less important to them—though all of the values are important to some extent. Thus, as a function of the shared nature of values in general, in "polite society," people can assume similarity. When people reveal their prioritization of these values, they are reflecting their beliefs about the world—and humans need to believe that what they see is what is actually reality. So, to the extent people can see others with different value priorities, their confidence in their view of reality is challenged. Similarity forgotten, people then tend to see others in terms of "right" (their way of seeing the world) and "wrong." Not a recipe for social harmony.

Observers of the SPSP discussion (and early comments on the SASP bulletin board) concerning the terrorist-caused New York and Washington disasters surely noted that voicing opinions that betray personal politics (and thus value priorities) created friction among discussants. Unless saint-like, people naturally made dispositional attributions about those airing their opinions, as a function of classifying their opinions as, for example "fascist" or "bleeding heart liberal." Discussants gave their "educated opinions"—is this all that social psychologists can offer when societies are faced with people-related difficulties? I think not. It is time, I think, to find the way out of the minefield that already has caused at least some divisiveness in our social psychology groups.

I believe that the way out is to remain within the bounds of our field, which, according to Vaughan and Hogg (1998) is about "constructing and testing theories of human social behaviour" (p. 13). That is, we do not use SASP email to voice our "educated opinions" on social issues. Instead, armed with at least a century of theory and research within our reach, we can ask "How can this theory and research be applied to the current situation?" Rather than needing to develop brand new theory, it is likely that the old theories will need tweaking and perhaps some additions to be applicable to current concerns. Put simply, I believe social psychologists have a lot to offer—and we should do this with full knowledge of the minefield associated with revealing personal opinion. To do this, we need

to understand our own perspectives clearly. I believe that one way of doing this is to consider the structure of the value system, and to locate where our highest (and lowest) value priorities lie, and understand what worldview beliefs underlie our opinions. This self-revelation will provide a map of potential blow-up areas, the "right" vs. "wrong" thinking can be avoided, and the shared nature of values can be highlighted. Right vs. wrong thinking leads to the perception that others have "different" values. The evidence says that they do not. I am currently testing the hypothesis that at the heart of prejudice is the failure to see value similarity.

Madeline Fernbach and I have already done the groundwork for setting up a network of social psychologists—separate from SASP—who are interested in applying social psychological principles to social issues. Tentatively, this network is the "Social Concerns Cooperative." We have these aims (open to revision):

1. Provide communication links for people with practical and theoretical expertise concerning current social issues.
2. Develop issues-focused databases. Cooperative members will be asked to contribute useful articles (especially review articles) and other materials.
3. Provide cross-discipline contacts and research collaboration opportunities. Cooperative members can declare their interest in particular research activities and link up with those who have expertise or access to relevant populations.
4. Consider the policy implications of theory and practice and provide information to policy-makers.

In summary, I believe now is the time to stand up and show how much social psychology has learned about interpersonal behaviour. Time to share this information—by applying (and revising if necessary) the theories that social psychologists have put so much time and energy into developing and testing.

*For more information about the Social Concerns Cooperative, contact Meg Rohan at: m.rohan@unsw.edu.au.

Nominations for President-elect of SASP

Nominations are being called for the office of President-elect of SASP. This person will serve on SASP's executive committee in the role of Vice-President until the 2003 SASP conference. At that time the current President, Professor Mike Innes, will step down as President. If you wish to nominate someone for President-elect please complete the form below and return to me by email. If responding by email, the nominee will also have to confirm the nomination. The closing date is 31 December, 2001. If there is more than one nominee, ballot papers will be mailed to all paid up SASP members.

Patrick Heaven
Secretary, SASP
Dept of Psychology
University of Wollongong
Wollongong, NSW, 2522

Return by 31 December 2001:

We nominate   for President-elect of SASP, to become President at the 2003 SASP meeting.

Name of nominator: Signature:

Seconder: Signature:

Signature of nominee:

Nominations for Treasurer of SASP

Nominations are being called for the office of Treasurer of SASP. This person will commence duties immediately for a term that expires at the 2003 SASP AGM. If you wish to nominate someone, please complete the form below and return to Patrick Heaven. If responding by email, the nominee will also have to confirm the nomination. The closing date is 31 December, 2001. If there is more than one nominee, ballot papers will be mailed to all paid up SASP members.

Patrick Heaven
Secretary, SASP
Dept of Psychology
University of Wollongong
Wollongong, NSW, 2522

Return by 31 December 2001:

We nominate ___ for the position of Treasurer of SASP.

Name of nominator: Signature:

Seconder: Signature:

Signature of nominee: