



DIALOGUE

Volume 16, No. 1

DIALOGUE

Spring, 2001

The Official Newsletter of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology

Chris Crandall &
Monica Biernat,
Co-Editors

The Straight Skinny on the State of SPSP: News of the Society

The Winter SPSP Executive Committee meeting was held on Sunday, February 4, 2001, the day after the close of the 2nd Annual SPSP Conference in San Antonio.

The meeting opened with congratulations to Todd Heatherton for the second successful conference in a row, a great program, and overwhelming support among the membership, with more than 1,100 people attending!

State of the Society

Treasurer's Report. The fiscal state of the society is very good. The Society received more income than was budgeted this past year, mostly from new memberships. This income was offset by some unexpected expenses, but there was a modest surplus.

PSPB is profitable enough

that it currently subsidizes the society's various other activities.

The Society has assets that correspond fairly closely to one year's operating budget. Several years ago, when the state of the Society's coffers was not as good, a goal was set to bank a year's worth of expenses for safety margin, unexpected expenses, and surprise opportunities—the surplus in the bank indicates that the Society has now met this goal.

Some members of the Society can still help the budget at no cost to themselves. If they are members of APA, they can check off one divisional membership that will allocate \$2 to the division, at no extra cost to the member. Many joint APA-SPSP members do not check off any divisions at

all, and this (no-cost) \$2 stays with APA.

Membership. The Society has 3,493 members, of which about 1069 are currently listed as students. Because the Society does not police its membership, a few dilatory post-Ph.D. members are still paying the lesser students dues. People eligible for full membership are encouraged to update their dues statements in next year's round.

SPSP picks up a substantial number of new memberships at the Conference (this year about 200 people joined the Society in San Antonio), and there is some hope that these people will stay in SPSP. There is a substantial cost associated with adding new members that makes one-year members more

(Continued on page 13)

Inside the Current Issue:

Training Committee on Grad Students, Diversity 2

Status of SPSP Publications 3

Todd Heatherton on the 2001 Convention 4

Jack Block, Auke Tellegen Win Personality Awards 5

SPSP Online Discussion List 6

International Fellows Program With EAESP and SASP 9

June Tangney Reports on APA Council of Reps 10

President's Column By Ed Diener 11

APA Program report; NSF Funding Opportunity 12

Letters to the (Past) Editors 14

Interview with President George W. Bush 15

Review of "Changing Patterns of Prejudice" (1962) by A.J. Marrow 17

Announcements of General Interest 18

New Editors for Dialogue

SPSP extends its thanks to Roy Baumeister and Dianne Tice for more than 10 years of service to Dialogue. With this issue, Chris Crandall and Monica Biernat begin a 4-year term as Co-Editors.

Members of SPSP may wonder what qualifications

and skills are sought after in Dialogue Editors. Both Co-Editors are long-time members of the Society, with research/teaching interests in personality and social psychology. The Co-Editors were identified as candidates for the Dialogue

job by the Publication Committee, and these deliberations were secret.

We suspect that one essential qualification for editing Dialogue is being married to another social psychologist. ■

Diversity Issues, Grad Students Top Training Committee Agenda

By Janet Swim

The training committee (Janet Swim, chair; Kim Bartholomew; and Lisa Aspinwall) would like to alert students and faculty members of SPSP to our current activities, including several under development.

Increasing Graduate Student Involvement

The training and executive committee have been pleased about the excitement that graduate students have brought to the SPSP conferences and would like to assist graduate students in becoming further involved in the conferences and SPSP. At SPSP in San Antonio we facilitated a graduate student committee to formalize graduate student involvement in SPSP. This committee includes Heidi Eyre (Kentucky), Cami Johnson (Ohio State), Debra J. Mashek, (SUNY—Stony Brook), Cynthia Moss (Connecticut) and Jo Korchmaros (Connecticut). Heidi Eyre will serve as president and the graduate student representative on the training committee.

The committee discussed several ways that students could contribute to SPSP including forming a listserv specifically for graduate students, suggesting and organizing programming of specific interest to graduate students for SPSP and APA conferences, and contributing to Dialogue. If you would like to get

involved, have feedback or suggestions relevant to graduate training or simply wish to express your support, please contact Heidi Eyre at hleyre0@pop.uky.edu

At SPSP in San Antonio we facilitated a graduate student committee to formalize graduate student involvement in SPSP.

Diversity Programs

SPSP is committed to supporting diversity within our field thereby enriching research, teaching, and advising, and better preparing the field for a world in which globalization, multiculturalism, and diversity play a central role. To support this, we have developed two programs (see <http://www.spsp.org/divprog.htm>).

First, we have a mentorship web page targeted at undergraduate students to provide information regarding social and personality psychology graduate programs and to provide contacts with faculty who have expressed a willingness to address students' questions. This program is now more than two years old and has received much positive

feedback from faculty and students alike, with over 100 faculty volunteer mentors. To find out more about this program, please go to <http://www.spsp.org/mentor.htm>

We have also established a diversity travel fund (<http://www.spsp.org/divfund.htm>) with the assistance of a joint gift of McGraw-Hill Higher Education and the David and Carol Myers Foundation, Worth Publishers, Psychology Press, Guilford Publications, and Houghton Mifflin. This fund assisted underrepresented students in attending this years SPSP conference in San Antonio. Based on an extremely strong pool of 95 applications, we were able to support nine winners and 27 honorable mentions. We enjoyed meeting them at a reception in San Antonio (see <http://www.spsp.org/divwin.htm> for a description of these students).

Diversity Committee

The training committee initiated a new Diversity Committee that will report to the Executive Committee. This committee will maintain and broaden the training committee's efforts to address diversity issues in SPSP. For example, this committee will be able to consider issues faced by faculty and graduate students, and may consider how SPSP might promote inclusion and professional support to LGBT people. Members of the committee

are Ann Bettencourt, Greg Herek, and Floyd Sloan.

Graduate Admissions Survey

The training committee is gathering information to help us better understand trends in graduate applications to social and personality programs. According to data gathered by NSF, most doctoral-level science programs have experienced a drop in student applications over the last few years. We are assessing the extent and possible consequences of this trend for social and personality psychology programs. We will be posting a survey the week of April 25 on the web that asks faculty in charge of graduate admissions to provide information about the

We will be posting a survey the week of April 25 on the web that asks faculty in charge of graduate admissions to provide information about their new students . . .

number of students who have applied to and have been admitted to their program over the last five years, the gender and ethnic composition of these students, their GRE scores, and the types of offers they have been given. If your program has not completed the survey and/or you cannot access it on the web, please contact, Lisa Aspinwall at: lisa.aspinwall@psych.utah.edu.

For further information about the training committee, please feel free to contact Janet K. Swim (JKS4@psu.edu).■

Society Publications: Good, Cheap, but Slow

The SPSP Publication Committee, the group that oversees the three major publications of the society, met in San Antonio this February. The committee consists of Fred Rhodewalt, Jack Dovidio, and Brenda Major, who serves as Chair. The Senior Editors of PSPB, Jerry Suls, PSPR, Eliot Smith, and the Co-Editors of Dialogue joined the meeting. The immediate past chair, Peggy Clark, was also present.

The PSPB backlog is still about 13 months, which is to say, too long. Despite all efforts from the Editor and Associate Editors at speeding things up, there's no relief in sight—expect any article accepted for publication to appear more than a year after the final acceptance letter. Furthermore, with the rejection rate continuing around 80%, expect that most submissions won't be

accepted for publication in the first place.

The review turnaround time has improved, and the median is now about 4 months. While this is still much longer than authors would like, it's somewhat better than in the past. The lower limit on review time is still set more by reviewers than by editors. PSPB seeks

The PSPB backlog is still about 13 months, which is to say, too long. Despite all efforts from the Editor and Associate Editors at speeding things up, there's no relief in sight.

at least two reviewers, plus the judgment of the Editor or Associate Editor. To speed things up, the editors now seek to assess

willingness to review a manuscript prior to actually sending it out; this has cut down substantially on returned reviews.

PSPB faces two challenges in the near future. The first is that the term of Jerry Suls is about to end—his tenure as editor concludes December of 2001. (At press time, the Publication Committee had not yet selected a new Editor.)

The second is that although finding Editors is tough, finding Associate Editors is even tougher. The pay associated with serving in either role is fairly small, and the commitment in time, energy, and hassle is large. According to a recent informal survey, in psychology the standard stipend for an editor is about \$120 per manuscript. PSPB pays substantially less than half of that, and it

pays substantially less than APA. This is an issue of concern and debate—the Publication Committee and

... although finding Editors is tough, finding Associate Editors is even tougher. The pay for being an editor is fairly small, and the commitment in time, energy, and hassle is large.

the Executive Committee have discussed raising stipends, but there was no commitment at press time. ■



Society for Personality and Social Psychology

Get Your Colleagues and Students to Join SPSP

Join SPSP!! All regular and student members receive the *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, the *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, and *Dialogue* as part of their membership. To join the Society, fill this out coupon and send it, along with a check for US \$28 (students, \$18) to "SPSP Membership," Harry Reis, Department of Psychology, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, 14627. Make check out to the Society for Personality and Social Psychology. US funds only.

Name: _____ Address: _____

Highest degree earned _____ Year: _____

Institution earned from: _____

Things Really Are Bigger in Texas: 2nd Annual SPSP Meeting an Overwhelming Success

By Todd Heatherton

Nearly 1200 social and personality psychologists converged on San Antonio, Texas in early February for the 2nd annual SPSP meeting. While organizers were pleasantly surprised by the large turnout for the first meeting, held last year in Nashville, the 50% increase in attendance caught everyone by surprise. On the one hand, there is much to be happy about. The huge turnout and enthusiastic level of participation provides compelling evidence for the strength and vitality of social and personality psychology.

As with the first meeting, the sessions were full, the conversations lively, and the overall atmosphere was genuinely stimulating. On the other hand, the meeting, originally planned for fewer than half the number of attendees, taxed the resources of the hotel and meeting staff. Indeed, for a brief period on Friday afternoon registration was closed down to avoid violation of occupancy regulations (and a threatened shutdown by the fire marshal). Those with an entrepreneurial spirit might have paid for their travel expenses by auctioning off their badge or program to the highest bidder.

In spite of some crowding problems, most attendees appeared to have a great time at the meeting. Numerous colleagues were overheard commenting that it was among

the best conferences they had attended, and that they planned to attend again in the future. A big part of the success of the meeting was the superb program put together by David Armor, Mahzarin Banaji, and Geoffrey Cohen. They

The huge turnout and enthusiastic level of participation provides compelling evidence for the strength and vitality of social and personality psychology

faced the difficult task of selecting 20 symposia from the more than 70 proposals that were submitted.

Although no one likes to have their submissions rejected, the pay-off for those attending the talks was that the quality of nearly every session was very high, causing many of us to be torn about which session to attend. People quickly learned that you had to show up early to make sure you had a seat, or even a good section of floor!

There were many social highlights during the meeting. The Jam Session, organized again by Mark Baldwin, revealed that SPSP members enjoy a good party, but also exposed the fact that a shocking number of psychologists may be tone deaf. But lacking talent, at least many were willing to conquer their stage fright and join in

the fun. The hotel also informs us that they were pleasantly surprised by the sales as the cash bar both before and during the event. Perhaps the two phenomena are related. It needs to be documented, as well, that there were plenty of opportunities for field research on “cultural” differences between academics and cattle herders, since we had the good fortune to hold our meeting in concert with approximately 6000 or so of Texas’ famed ranchers (you just don’t hear those sort of pick-up lines in the halls of academia, I swear this one is true: “If I had my rope, I’d lasso you for a date in no time”).

... a shocking number of psychologists may be tone deaf. But lacking talent, at least many were willing to conquer their stage fright and join in the fun. The hotel also informs us that they were pleasantly surprised by the sales as the cash bar both before and during the event. Perhaps the two phenomena are related.

So, what about next year? The meeting will be held at the Westin Savannah Harbor Resort in Savannah

Georgia, January 31 – February 2, 2002. This is a beautiful new resort that is located next to Savannah’s new convention and trade center on an island facing the historic district. You should know that we booked this facility when we anticipated that approximately 600 people might attend the meeting. The problem is that space needs to be booked years in advance, and the society has to guarantee a certain number of room nights. Being overly optimistic about attendance places the society at risk for losing a great deal of money. Even if we occupy the entire hotel, it will not accommodate 1200 people. We are currently planning for alternative hotels at a variety of price levels, and the good news is that there are plenty close by. You might be wondering about the meeting center being located on an island (the good news is that we can hold a nightly meeting and vote people off the island!). The International Trade and Convention Center, next to the hotel on the island, can accommodate several thousand people, and we have every reason to believe they are experienced with transporting large groups of people across the river. There will be a water taxi service that will run continuously to the island and be available late into the night (and it will be free).

(Continued on page 5)

SPSP 2nd Annual Convention
(Continued from page 4)

For those who don't like water, we are investigating regular bus service to travel the slightly longer trip over a nearby bridge. We remain optimistic that the Savannah meeting will be as successful as the past two meetings.

In terms of future plans, we are investigating larger sites for 2003. Currently we are considering the West Coast or New Orleans (it turns out that the timing of Mardi Gras works in our favor in 2003). Your opinions on the location for the 2003 meeting will be sought shortly. I am pleased to announce that Dan Wegner and Lisa Feldman Barrett have agreed to serve as program chairs for the 2002 meeting, and that Dan Cervone will serve as the convention chair. As for me, I'm warming up my stage act for next year's Jam Session and looking forward to serenading you in Savannah. ■

Give SPSP to your students!!!

Have a student completing a dissertation or master's thesis? A promising young undergraduate about to go off to graduate school? Membership in SPSP makes a great gift to your students. Welcome them into personality and social psychology with a gift membership. Your check for \$18 brings them two top social/personality journals and *Dialogue* for a year. Send their name and address and a check to Harry Reis, Department of Psychology, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, 14627.

Jack Block Wins Personality Researcher Award: Renamed "Jack Block Award for Distinguished Research in Personality," Second Award Goes to Auke Tellegen

For the first time in the history of SPSP, an award was given to the outstanding researcher in the field of personality. A committee, composed of David Funder, Mark Snyder, and Ed Diener (Chair), choose the award winner for the year 2001.

Jack Block from UC-Berkeley was the unanimous favorite to receive the award. Jack Block is a pioneer in the theoretical and empirical study of personality. His rich theoretical conception is based on a Lewinian concept of impulse expression and control, from which he derives two fundamental individual differences—ego control and ego resiliency—as the cornerstones of personality. His central empirical contribution stems from an epic longitudinal study of personality, still ongoing, that has followed participants from age 3 into young adulthood. Block's study, conducted in collaboration with his wife, Jeanne Block, is unique in assessing the participants across various settings (home and school) with a variety of measurement methods (including behavioral observations and reports by parents and teachers). Thus, his conclusions are substantiated by a variety of methodologies.

Block studied the consistency and stability of personality from early childhood to young adulthood, and assessed the influence of parenting and other environmental factors on the developing person. Ego-control (the ability to contain impulses) and ego-resiliency (the adaptive ability to moderate ego-control in response to stresses and opportunities) were related to many outcomes over the first two decades of life. In addition to these two core concepts, Block used his longitudinal data set to study diverse topics ranging from creativity to intelligence to defense mechanisms, and an intensive study of sex differences. For instance, Block found that girls who later became depressed were oversocialized and intropunitive as children, but that boys who later became depressed were likely to be undercontrolled and aggressive at age 7. In addition to his empirical work on personality development, Block has been a tireless critic, offering challenges and insights to many of the reigning paradigms in personality psychology. In insightful and rigorous terms, he offered published critiques of the Five Factor Model, the Act-Frequency approach, depressive realism, and response sets. However, Block's most important

contribution always will be the greater understanding he provided of personality consistency and stability from early childhood into adulthood.

In further honor of Block's contributions, this award has now been named "The Jack Block Award for Distinguished Research in Personality." ■

Auke Tellegen Receives 2nd Annual Block Award for Distinguished Research in Personality

The committee to select the second winner of the Jack Block Award (for the year 2002) included David Funder, Julie Norem, and David Watson.

The 2002 winner is Professor Auke Tellegen of the University of Minnesota, who has made seminal contributions to the study of hypnotic susceptibility, affect and temperament, personality assessment, and behavioral genetics. As part of this award, Prof. Tellegen will present an invited address at next year's SPSP meeting in Savannah. ■

Contribute to the Jack Block Award

The Association for Research in Personality, a new psychological research association that holds its meetings as a preconference to SPSP's annual meeting, has made a significant donation to the Jack Block award. Other donations by Charles Carver, Kenneth Craik, Phebe Cramer, Ed Diener, David Funder, Lewis Goldberg, Samuel Gosling, Robert Hogan, Edwin Megargee, Daniel Mroczek, Maureen O'Sullivan, Daniel Ozer, Delroy Paulhus, Richard Robins, Michael Shopshire, Mark Snyder, and Lawrence Stricker are also gratefully acknowledged. Individual (tax deductible) donations may be sent to SPSP c/o Harry Reis earmarked for the "Block Award." ■

SPSP Online E-mail Discussion Begins Fifth Year

By Chuck Huff

The SPSP e-mail list has now been running for four years. The first two messages on the list were a call for papers, issued by Norbert Schwarz, and a question on interpersonal influence by Bertram Raven. Both of these appeared Tuesday, 1 April, 1997. Thus, the list was born on April Fool's day.

In 1998, the list split into two lists: SPSP-discuss and SPSP-announce. SPSP-announce only carries official announcements (job ads, conference announcements, SPSP memos, obituaries, NSF & NIH announcements, etc.). SPSP-discuss carries the announcements plus other discussion messages. There are 1,220 members of the SPSP-discuss list, and 66 members of the SPSP-announce list. The main additional traffic on SPSP-discuss consists of requests for information and summaries of the replies to the requests.

I moderate both lists to maintain a high signal-to-noise ratio. Most folks I talk to at conferences and over email maintain that the list is a valuable resource. Most of these comments focus on the list as a resource for "lab-lore" in the community (how do I manipulate or measure this, what studies have been done on that). The summaries keep list traffic low (a busy day will see 7-10 messages). No digest version is available.

Joining the List

If you are receiving this

newsletter, you can become a member of the list. Simply send email to spsp@stolaf.edu. In your mail say which list you want to join, and that you are a member of SPSP. I will add your email address to the list.

Similarly, if you want to join the announcement only list, send mail to spsp@stolaf.edu. If you are having technical trouble with the list, send email to spsp@stolaf.edu. You get the idea. There is only one address, and since it all goes to me, you do not have to worry about your message going out to the list (unless that is clearly its destination).

You Have Been Removed

I have now heard from a number of people who have received the dreaded "you have been removed..." email from the list software. The software sends me error messages from the list (I get about 20 a day) and I move through them rapidly to remove addresses that are not working for what seems a likely permanent reason. Permanent reasons are errors like "no such user" or "no such host." I make these decisions rapidly, so I can keep the time devoted to running the list down to about 15 minutes a day. Sometimes this doesn't work, and I delete an address that was simply unavailable for a short time. If you send me mail, I will reinstate your address.

Coming Soon

I am working with the computing center here to

resolve the issue that attachments pose for the list. Right now, they go out to the list reasonably well (except for folks whose mail systems don't receive attachments). But in the archive (<http://www.stolaf.edu/people/huff/SPSP/SPSPsearch.html>) they simply appear as large blocks of what appear to be random characters. You can actually convert these blocks of characters back into an attachment if you have the right software and a bit of patience. But I hope that instead, we will be able to establish an archive of them that can be

If you receive this newsletter, you can join the list by sending an email to spsp@stolaf.edu. In your mail say which list you want to join, and that you are a member of SPSP.

downloaded from a web page. This will make the archive a more useful tool.

In addition, I have been threatening for some time now to write software to check the email address on the list against a database of SPSP members. When that day comes, be sure there will be an announcement before anyone receives the dreaded "you have been removed..." ■

APA Council 2000/2001

(Continued from page 10)

- Council approved a Bylaws change in the APA Mission Statement adding "health" to its mission. The new statement, if approved by the membership, will read, "The objects of the American Psychological Association shall be to advance psychology as a science and profession and as a means promoting **health** and human welfare...."
- Council approved permanent status for Division 53, Clinical Child Psychology and Division 54, Society of Pediatric Psychology.

A Resolution on Assisted Suicide was hotly debated throughout the three-day meeting. The resolution states that APA "takes a position that neither endorses nor opposes assisted suicide at this time", but APA will "assist in preparing the profession to address the issue of assisted suicide" and will "encourage psychologists to involve themselves in assisted suicide cases". After much debate, the resolution narrowly passed.

It was an interesting meeting. We encourage members of Division 8 to become actively involved in APA affairs, many of which bear directly on matters of concern to Personality and Social Psychology. ■

Joint Teaching Fellowship Scheme: SPSP Co-Sponsors International Graduate Teaching Exchanges with the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology and the Society of Australasian Social Psychologists

SPSP is pleased to announce two separate but similar programs designed to promote teaching and intercontinental contact among social psychologists. The European Association of Experimental Social Psychology (EAESP) and Australasian Society of Social Psychologists (SASP) each join the Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) in announcing their decision to co-sponsor a series of International Teaching Fellowships. The scheme supports one-week expert-led graduate schools in Europe, Australia, and North America. The EAESP/SPSP program and the SASP/SPSP program are quite similar, and the aims of the scheme are:

- a) to foster international cooperation between members of the various organizations;
- b) to provide an opportunity for groups of graduate students to receive intensive specialist education from an academic expert from overseas;
- c) to provide an opportunity to build links between groups of researchers and institutions within a geographical region.

Both schemes will operate on a trial basis for the first two years. Two EAESP/SPSP Fellowships will be awarded each year, one to be hosted in Europe, the other in North America. Likewise two SASP/SPSP Fellowships will be awarded each year, one hosted in North America, one in Australia.

The scheme operates as follows. A host institution (e.g., a university psychology department in North America) arranges an invitation to a distinguished scholar from overseas (e.g., Europe or Australia) to provide one week of tuition and supervision for a group of graduate students. The host institution and other participating departments must cover all the costs of accommodation, meals and entertainment.

EAESP, SASP and SPSP will provide official backing and coordination for the scheme, as well as financial and material support. Each Fellow will receive a stipend from the two relevant organizations amounting to US \$2000. This may be used to cover travel or other expenses.

The host institution need only have a few graduate students who participate, but must arrange that students from other neighboring institutions also participate for the full week. At least one, and preferably 2 or more other institutions should send graduate students to participate. The total number of students should be between 8 and 16. The organization of the week's activities is flexible but should ensure that as many graduate students as possible are able to gain from a mixture of large and small-group or one-on-one interaction with the Fellow. The week should include social as well as academic activity, and should include ways of ensuring that links and communications are set up on a longer term basis among the participants.

Procedure for Applications

One EAESP/SPSP Fellowship will be awarded to an institution in Europe and the other to an institution in North America, and one SASP/SPSP Fellowship will be awarded to an institution in Australia, and the other in North America.

The host institution organizer must be a member of SPSP, EAESP, or SASP, respectively. The Fellow visiting North America must be a member of overseas organization, the Fellow visiting overseas must be a member of SPSP.

The host organizer should prepare a 2 page application that provides an explanation of how the expertise offered by the Fellow will provide education in an aspect or area that is not normally covered by faculty already working

among the host-site group of departments. The application should describe how many students will participate, and from which departments or institutions. In addition there should be a summary of the type of social and extra-curricular activities that will be arranged around the Fellow's visit (e.g. the visit could be attached to the end or start of a conference, there could be other academic events linked to the visit, and there might be a trip to a regional tourist attraction, museum, exhibition), and what steps will be taken to ensure that the network of participating graduate students is sustained after the conclusion of the visit. The application must include a copy of the proposed Fellow's vita, and a letter stating that, if the Fellowship is granted, the proposed Fellow will accept.

Priority will be given to proposals that best meet the criteria of bringing international social psychological expertise to a wider group of graduate students. Applications from institutions with limited resources or access to such expertise will receive higher priority.

European—North American Applications.

The application should be submitted by email to the EAESP administrative secretary, Sibylle Classen (classen@uni-muenster.de), or to the SPSP office (spsp@scp.rochester.edu). Applications are considered by representatives of the Executive Committee of EAESP and SPSP.

Australian—North American Applications.

The application should be submitted by email to the SASP administrative secretary, Ruth Scott at ANU (Ruth.Scott@anu.edu.au) or to the SPSP office (spsp@scp.rochester.edu). Applications are considered jointly by representatives of the Executive Committee of SASP and SPSP.

(Continued on page 20)

What APA Council of Representatives Is Doing: August 2000 and February 2001

By June Tangney

Sharon Brehm and I represented Division 8 at the August, 2000 APA Council of Representatives meetings, and it was a good year for science.

Two new science initiatives were enthusiastically supported by scientists and practitioners alike. Council approved funds to expand APA's scientific press releases. Currently, the APA Media Relations Office generates about 4-5 press releases a month describing psychological research published in APA journals. With the addition of \$25,000 in 2000 and \$100,000 per year thereafter, APA hopes to prepare releases on roughly 10% of the 240 articles published each month by APA. The press releases should increase the visibility and impact of psychological science, and enhance the prestige of our publications.

Second, Council approved funding (\$150,000 for 2001, and \$350,000 thereafter) for the Academic Enhancement Initiative to strengthen science membership. It includes:

- Advanced Training Institutes—intensive, hands-on training to enhance the technological, theoretical, or practical skills of scientists.
- Early Career Awards for Ethnic Minorities—providing stipends to 10 new Minority Faculty preparing research grant proposals and an annual mentoring conference
- Summer Science Institute—annual week-long intensive experience for 32 science-oriented undergraduates
- Preparing Future Faculty Program—for new academics
- Research Development Conference- to foster research collaboration and development of

new faculty

- Academic Career Workshop for advanced graduate students and post-docs planning a career in academia

APA adopted a policy on the freedom of scientific inquiry and presentation of results, in part in response to last year's debate on Dr. Laura's charge of "junk science" and the suggestion of censorship. The statement reads:

"The APA is committed to fostering a vigorous science of psychology through the open exchange of ideas and data. A productive and healthy science requires freedom of inquiry and freedom of expression. Researchers must be free to pursue their scientific investigations within the constraints of the ethical principles, scientific principles, and guidelines of the discipline. Editors, too, after seeking appropriate peer review, must be free to publish that science in their journals even when findings are surprising, disappointing, or controversial."

The publication of a scientific article by a journal of the APA does not constitute its endorsement. The Association will not condone any attempt to censor the reporting or discussion of science within its journals so long as it has been conducted ethically and meets the scientific standards of the profession. Further, the Association will neither retract a published paper nor censure authors or editors for ethical scientific activities that yield potentially controversial findings. Scientific investigation is an evolving process: The ultimate evaluation of scientific results depends on a continuous exchange of ideas and reexamination of ideas and findings."

Council had a full agenda, debating and adopting a long-term budget/investment strategy, instituting a dues increase of \$4, and authorizing continuing support of the Practice Directorate's Public Education Campaign (\$1 million per year). August was Sharon Brehm's last council meeting. Members of the Coalition of Academic, Scientific, and Applied Psychology (CASAP) offered their deep thanks to Sharon for her extensive contributions to psychological science, as chair of CASAP, and to APA more generally. She's been a driving force in our association, enhancing

science and building strong collaborative relationships with Education, Public Interest, and Practice.

In February, the Council met in Washington, with Monica Biernat joining as the new Div. 8 representative. Issues most relevant to science included:

- Changes in the APA Chicago (2002) convention, in response to diminishing attendance and attendee feedback. The convention will be shortened by a day. The program will be organized in three "levels": (1) Plenary sessions with no conflicting sessions; (2) Collaborative sessions across divisions; and (3) Division sessions including posters. Poster sessions will be clustered in small groups by topic and will include either coffee (morning) or cash bar (evening).
- A draft revision of APA's Code of Ethics (last revised 1992) was presented for discussion. The draft is in the February Monitor and the Ethics Committee is actively soliciting our input. One easy way to become involved in the process is to visit APA's web site, at: www.apa.org/ethics, where members can make comments and suggest amendments on-line. The comments are transmitted immediately to the Task Force.
- The Ethics Committee is proposing changes to streamline the ethics adjudication process. Proposals include streamlining the process when a member has been seriously disciplined by their state board and agrees to accept expulsion or resign "under ethics investigation". The volume of adjudication could also be reduced by dealing only with serious complaints that could lead to expulsion. Discussion and debate will continue at the August 2001 meeting.

(Continued on page 6)

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

By Ed Diener

I am the offspring of the marriage of Social Psychology (SO) and Personality Psychology (PP). I usually address them as Mom and Pop because my parents have neither gender nor sex, but it is clear which parent is the boss. Before their marriage PP flirted briefly with CP (Clinical Psychology), but my parent's marriage took place in 1965, the year JPSP began. In the 1970's my parents threatened to divorce, but finally they called a truce and decided to stay married for the sake of the kids. This article is my report to you on my parents' most recent marital checkup.

It appears that the union is in its second honeymoon (although I'm not sure there ever was a first honeymoon). The official society, SPSP, is doing wonderfully, with gazoodles of members and a terrific annual conference. The three journals that represent the marriage, PSPB, PSPR, and JPSP, contain great articles, which represent the intellectual diversity of the field, and it is often hard to tell if they are authored by PP or SO. At the SPSP conference, so ably managed by Todd Heatherton during the first two years, my parents spend several wonderful days together. I look forward to another fun family outing in Savannah in 2002. Under the outstanding leadership of Harry Reis as Executive Director of SPSP, we have grown in diversity and in the many activities the Society sponsors.

Like all parents, mine bicker occasionally. My Dad occasionally forgets that PP exists, and sometimes exhibits

an arrogant attitude of superiority. At times PP is a bit feisty and sensitive, and occasionally downright distrustful. Sometimes my parents are simply bored with one another—so much Big Five, so much Stereotyping. Perhaps my parents need a life coach to tell them how to live a fulfilled life together, and learn from each other. So here is my try at life-coaching, although you should be warned that I am not licensed to practice.

To Dad (SO):

1. Hey SO, not everything that people do is stupid, biased, or irrational! You seem captivated with phenomena related to people's shortcomings. Do you somehow get feelings of superiority by knowing people's faults? It almost seems like you are the clinicians of the social world. Hey "Dad," people also have strengths, skills, and the ability to learn. Sometimes people exhibit surprising accuracy and expertise. Positive Psychology might seem like a touchy-feely endeavor to some, but then I notice that SO often needs a dose of it.

2. Hey SO, look within your experimental groups—there is a lot of interesting variation hiding in there. Some of it might be due to personality! If X causes Y, then how come not everyone manifests Y?

3. Dad, the model of decontextualized laws that apply everywhere, which you borrowed from physics, is helpful some of the time, but not always. Physics is not our only role model; look to biology too—some interesting things happen out there in the jungle, and some of them can only be seen in context.

Take some time to test the ecological validity of your findings. And whatever happened to the ambitious field studies that were conducted during my childhood? Get out of the lab more, Dad. And one more thing: Some of the principles you discovered in the past appear to be most germane to people in western culture. So get out of the lab more, and get out of your culture more, too!

To Mom (PP):

1. Please, Mom, enough already with these global self-reports—can't you use some additional measures! Maybe even behaviors besides surveys. Sometimes you seem a little lazy, with the continuing use of more and more self-report measures. Sure, these measures have some validity and are a good starting point. But we have started now, so it is time to move on and get more diverse measures.

2. PP, do you think a bit more experimentation might be possible? Sure, most social psychologists don't really understand what they mean by causality. But this is no excuse for you to shun our old family friend, the experimental method. Do more experiments!

3. Could you measure processes a bit more, Mom, and not just traits? And by the way, do we really need more traits? Even in the New Millennium, traits continue to multiply. How about a decade-long moratorium on new traits until we understand the ones we already have?

And to Both of You:

I know parents don't like to be lectured to by their children, but could a dutiful son shout a little advice?

A. Do you think we could use a bit more developmental

emphasis—looking at where things come from and how they unfold over time? Could we do a few more long-term big studies, like in the good old days when I was a kid?

B. You can learn from each other, and not keep arguing about who has bigger muscles. For example, genetic predisposition can and does influence behavior, especially over the long-run. And culture and situational factors at times can have large influences. I still see the silliness of those who want to deny the importance of the other's facts. You had this fight too many times. Get over it; you are both right. But the devil of "interactionism" is in the details, so discover them now.

Gee, Mom and Dad, you're really OK. But next time you start fighting, remember that you could each improve a bit. And please never get a divorce; NEVER break up JPSP, or PSPB, or SPSP! I will fight tooth-and-nail to make sure you never separate. I see those with a strong allegiance to PP, and very many with loyalty to SO, but my commitment is to the marriage. All things considered, you do make very good parents, but I wish I had more siblings.

We need a larger family—so let's educate more Social-Personality psychologists and capitalize on the hybrid vigor of scientists who are trained in several specialties. At my department in Illinois we now have a Social-Organizational-Personality program, and I am confident that students who are trained in these multiple traditions will be the science of the future. ■

APA 2001 in San Francisco: Focus on the Interface between Social, Personality, and Clinical Science

By Mark Alicke & Richard Smith
APA Program Chairs

This year's APA convention will take place in San Francisco, August 24-28. Some of the highlights of the SPSP program are listed below. The program covers a variety of topics that should interest SPSP members. One deliberate theme of the program is the interface of social, personality, and clinical science. This submission focus was encouraged in an effort to show the relevance of research done by SPSP members to the many clinicians attending the conference and to increase the attendance at SPSP sponsored events by the general membership of APA. Events range from an address by Albert Ellis on the social psychology of rational emotive therapy to the role of terror management in mental health. In addition to the many posters, symposia, and invited addresses reflecting this theme, there will also be a joint social hour with Division 12, Clinical Psychology. A complete listing may be found at www.spsp.org/spsp/apa2001.htm. Some program highlights:

Presidential Address, Ed Diener,
The Benefits of Positive Emotions

Murray Award Symposium:
Stephen West, Towards Finding the Person in the Data of Personality

Master Lecture:
Elliot Aronson

Invited Addresses

David Funder, Personality: Judging and Assessing It

Bella DePaulo, Singles in Society and Social Life: Staring Down Stigma and Affirming Identity in a Coupled and Clueless World

June Tangney, The Moral Emotions for Better or Worse: Shame, Guilt and Moral Behavior Across the Lifespan

Albert Ellis, The Social Psychology of Rational Emotive Therapy

Symposia (First Name is Chair)
- *The Dark Triad: Narcissism, Machiavellianism and Psychopathy*: John, Hart, McHos-

key, Paulhus, Hogan
- *Forgiveness as Positive Science: Theory, Research and Clinical Applications*: Hill, Sandage, Co-Chairs; Tsang, McCollough, Exline, Tangney, Snyder
- *Terror Management and Mental Health: Concerns About Death in Psychological Problems*: Greenberg, Solomon, Goldenberg, Salzman, Pyszczynski, Abramson
- *Cultural Models: Implicating Content in Psychological Process*: Markus, Cross, Oyserman, Plaut, Peng, Ames, Knowles, Fryberg, Kitayama
- *Positive Emotion in the Mind, Relationships and Life Course*: Keltner, Fredrickson, Bachorowski, Shaver, Mikulincer, Moskowitz, Folkman
- *Gratitude and Positive Emotionality: Links Between Social and Clinical Science*: Emmons, McCullough, Watkins, McCraty, Park, Folkman
- *Emotion Experience, Expression, and Regulation Across Adulthood*: Gross, John, Co-Chairs; Paluck, Gross, Srivastava, Klohnen, Jay, John, Shaver
- *Advances in Autobiographical Memory: Implications for Personality and Developmental Psychology*: Woike, Thorne, Pasupathi, Singer, Lavezzay, McAdams
- *Research on Implicit Motives: Connections to Attachment, Emotions, and Health*: Zurbriggen, Sturman, Hartman, Engleberg
- *Multicultural Identities: Socio-Cognitive and Individual Difference Perspective*: Benet-Martinez, Lee, Huo, Morris
- *Deep or Superficial? Experimental Manipulation and the Study of Culture*: Adams, Suh, Chairs; Parker Tapias, Benet-Martinez, Adams, Aaker, Lee, Gardner, Markus
- *Social Emotions: Feelings in Interpersonal and Intergroup Relations*: Smith, Leach, CoChairs; Leach, Iyer, Spears, Pettigrew
- *New Perspectives on Social Power*: Raven, Schwarzwald, Gold, Singh-Sengupta, Nesler, Quigley, Frieze
- *Ageism: Current Theory and Research on Prejudice Against Older Persons*: Nelson, Levy, Banaji, Kite, Greenberg, Lockenhöff

The wide range of topics and issues, and the list of excellent scientists makes the 2001 APA Convention promising for social and personality psychologists. ■

New Funding Opportunity from the National Science Foundation

By Steve Breckler

Social psychology is an active and vibrant discipline, indicated in part by the rapid proliferation of new methodologies, statistical procedures, and other tools that support research. Advances have been made in statistics and research methods that were not taught (or even known) when the established scientists completed their formal graduate training, and it is difficult to acquire these new skills. One solution is to establish a network of advanced training institutes where researchers can spend time to acquire basic skills and knowledge in new techniques.

In a new initiative, Advanced Training Institutes in Social Psychology (ATISP) will provide quality training in new methodologies, statistical procedures, and other tools that support and enhance social psychological research. Funding will be provided by the NSF Social Psychology Program to establish training institutes where researchers can spend time acquiring basic skills and knowledge. At this point, the NSF Social Psychology Program is seeking hosts for the training institutes—people who will run an intensive training program in a specific skill area for established social psychologists. The goal is to award contracts or small grants to pay for the costs of hosting a training institute (costs associated with instructor's time and resources, and the travel and lodging expenses of participants).

If you have any interest in serving as the host for such an institute, please read the Program Announcement posted on the NSF website:

<http://www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?nsf0188>.

For further information, please contact Steve Breckler at the Social Psychology Program of the NSF (sbreckle@nsf.gov).

■



More Straight Skinny: News of the Society Continued

(Continued from page 1)

expensive to maintain than what they pay in dues. It's too early to tell whether or not having the option to join SPSP at the conference (which represents an overall savings on the participant's registration costs) is a good idea for SPSP, and these costs will be tracked in the future.

Convention. News from the convention is reported more fully elsewhere in *Dialogue* (see p. 4), but here's some basic figures reported at the meeting. There were some logistical problems with the convention, associated with the unexpectedly high rate of attendance. There were 1160 attendees, of which only 877 registered in advance. At one point, the meetings were so popular that the Fire Marshal closed down registration. Because 283 people (nearly 25%!) registered onsite, programs were not available to many registrants. Although it represents a fairly large cost, the 50 people who registered on-site and requested programs will get them.

The rejection rate of symposia was an unanticipated 60-70%, many of these rejected symposia were accepted as poster presentations; over 600 posters were presented. There was a higher than usual percentage of poster "no-shows," and punishments for failure to show up were considered (e.g., barring from presenting at SPSP the next year), but no action was taken. Because of the size and quality of the conference, SPSP is considering requiring keywords for posters, and perhaps creating a searchable website available before the conference.

Next year's conference in Savannah is anticipated to be even larger than San Antonio (although we hope that the hype associated with Savannah based on *Midnight in the Garden of Good and Evil*, will have died down, and if people watched Clint Eastwood's movie, it will have). The organizers are anticipating something between 1000-1400 attendees. The smart participant will pre-register and arrange hotel accommodations early.

Publications. The new editors for

Dialogue are Chris Crandall and Monica Biernat of the University of Kansas. There was no Fall 2000 issue of *Dialogue*, due to the changeover in editors.

Eliot Smith, editor of *PSPR*, said that the submission rate for the journal has gone down slightly, although this is offset by an upcoming special issue on dynamical system theories. The quality of manuscripts is still quite good, and the acceptance rate has not changed. Authors are encouraged to consider *PSPR* as an outlet for their theoretical contributions and reviews.

PSPB will add another 8 pages per issue as a way to shrink the publication lag, and possibly include more papers. This change will not affect cost of the journal to SPSP or individual subscribers (although it will slightly increase institutional subscription rates). Editor Jerry Suls has tried to shorten *PSPB* articles, in part by instituting a 35-page total manuscript limit, but this policy has not yet shown an effect. There is serious consideration of adopting a policy that denies review of articles that are too long. Authors may resubmit a shorter version.

A new, as yet unselected senior editor will face several difficult problems, including the long publication lag and the difficulty of effectively managing a team of 10 or so associate editors. One of the most difficult jobs of the editor is finding qualified and experienced scientists willing to take on the job of Associate Editor. SPSP is considering reducing the hassle of handling manuscripts by centralizing the secretarial aspects of the job, either by increasing the subsidy for the Editor's home institution, or by handling manuscripts in the SPSP main offices at the University of Rochester. Plans are currently being discussed. Both Suls and Smith pointed out that *PSPB* is a source of profit for SPSP, and sought more investment in the infrastructure of the journals (e.g., secretarial costs).

Given the size and increased complexity of *PSPB*, there was some discussion of

breaking the journal into subsections with autonomous editors, along the lines of *JPSP*. The advantages of such a proposal would be a reduced load for editors, and as a result, an easier time finding people willing to take on the task. There was not much support for the proposal at the meeting, although the idea remains on the table.

APA Report. Although SPSP is an autonomous society, we work closely with Division 8 of APA. June Tangney, APA Council Representative, reported that having a social psychologist and SPSP Member as President-Elect, Phil Zimbardo, is a great thing for science and for social psychology. Although much of the infrastructure and the majority of members of APA are guild-oriented clinicians, when well-known and respected scientists run for APA President, they often win, and can represent sciences interest in the APA, to Congress, and the general public. (See the APA report on p. 10.)

Fellows. New Fellows of Div. 8 are: Monica Biernat, Ed Deiner, Dave Dunning, Margo Monteith, Neil Macrae.

Training Committee. Graduate students at the San Antonio meeting created a committee to represent their needs and interests (see story, p. 2). They desire representation on the Executive Committee meeting as a non-voting member, they are interested in having dedicated space in *Dialogue*, and some modest budget monies for the purposes of the organization. The Executive Committee voted to provide the new organization with \$500 plus funds to underwrite one officer to attend the SPSP meeting.

Diversity issues are part of the Training Committee's purview (also reported on p. 2), and there are now plans to create a Diversity Committee with its own budget.

Student Travel Awards. There were 97 applicants for travel awards, and the committee stressed that there were many, many worthy applicants. There were funds

(Continued on page 20)

Letters to the (past) editors:

Dear Editors:

I am happy to see the issue of increasing diversity gaining attention in the SPSP leadership. Recent discussions with Scott Plous, former chair of the SPSP training committee, affirm the desire to take affirmative steps to recruit ethnic and racial minorities into SPSP (I use this generically for both the Society and the field). The editorial "Pursuing Diverse Minorities" (*Dialogue*, Autumn 1999) affirms this goal but offers some provocative thoughts about who should be targeted for outreach. It is my view that "naming names" undermines the most valid and justifiable reasons for affirmative diversity.

The editorial names African Americans as the primary diversity target, and bemoans the apparent "failure" to successfully recruit them to SPSP. Against this failure, the editors propose that we expand our efforts beyond African Americans to other "minorities." It goes on to name these other minorities – Asians, Jews, and homosexuals. I believe naming names brings us to a slippery slope (Seinfeldians and scholars of McCarthyism well know this). Why?

The premise of naming names is to somehow justify what we might think of as "special efforts" to identify and include specific groups in SPSP. Why are special efforts appropriate? Two reasons are given: Altruism – helping others to overcome disadvantages that may have hindered their entry to SPSP, and self-interest – strengthening the field of SPSP through inclusion of members of relevant social groups. The editorial focuses on the second of these reasons, but in doing so, builds its argument on the first. That is, the reason these groups would be useful to SPSP is because of their experiences of discrimination, oppression, or disadvantage. While there is certainly truth to this claim, this approach, in my view, takes the low road to scientific truth.

The entry fee for inclusion in "minority" by this analysis is to be a victim of

discrimination and prejudice. But why stop with ethnic groups? Fat people are discriminated against, short people, ugly people, beautiful people (for), poor people. SPSP has developed interesting theoretical and empirical analyses of these phenomena. But to understand the problems and processes engendered by the interaction of individuals in society, we must not be limited to "reactive" analysis of victimization, but must also consider proactive analysis of human growth and development. To be sure, some of that is contingent on the social forms of discrimination this thesis postulates. But most of the time spent in these social groups is not in dealing with discrimination. What we can learn about the nature and capacity of human beings in social context by including a broad range

"We must not be limited to "reactive" analysis of victimization, but must also consider proactive analysis of human growth and development."

of those human beings from diverse cultural backgrounds is to me the vital question.

Naming names diminishes the scope of our inquiry, and rationalizes inclusion on inadequate theoretical or even self-interest grounds. Even though the editorial argues for recruiting Asians, Jews and homosexuals "in addition" to African Americans, it fails to mention Latinos, or bi-racial or multiethnic people or "immigrants" of varying cultural backgrounds. If we have a theoretical template for the diversity of the human experience and the contributions that culture makes to it, then our efforts to recruit "representative" members of the human experience will be broad and meaningful. Opening access to people and groups who have been denied it is always a valid and worthwhile goal. But as for the pragmatics or self-interest, cast a wide net and do not limit your task by naming names.

-James Jones

Congratulations on your editorial in the Spring 2000 *Dialogue*. As the chair of the department at the time Rushton's book was published (i.e., the book on which the little mass distributed book was based), I appreciate your support for the great traditions of academic freedom and free debate. These as you note are especially important when we are confronted with ideas or findings we don't like. The scientific arena is the best and only appropriate place to determine the goodness of ideas and data.

I was shocked to see how many of my colleagues at my university would have been quite happy to see Rushton either stifled or even fired. As the cliché states, the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. Too many of our colleagues believe in free speech up to the point where they hear something they don't like. Like you, I hope Rushton is wrong; indeed, there have been a number of excellent critiques of his work. Yet, for most people, including the chair of the APA task force created to make a statement about what is known about intelligence (published in the *American Psychologist* a few years ago), personal animus drives their science.

"I was shocked to see how many of my colleagues at my university would have been quite happy to see Rushton either stifled or even fired . . . Too many of our colleagues believe in free speech up to the point where they hear something they don't like."

For example, in that *AP* article on intelligence, a description of Rushton's work was prefaced with words to the effect "I don't have the stomach to spend too much time on Rushton's views." This is a shocking comment from the chair of a committee of an institutionally powerful organization regarding the character and integrity of a single researcher. Rushton may well be very wrong, but we are all in

(Continued on page 15)

(Continued from page 14)
 danger when unpopular views are attacked by the psychology establishment—as opposed to science—as much as when they are attacked by Congress, as was the case with Rind. Don't be surprised if you get some angry mail from some SPSP members. I hope you don't, but for what it is worth, your position is the healthy scientific one, and

also a necessary one for our science to contribute to citizenship.
 -Clive Seligman

I received (the Spring 2000) Dialogue this afternoon, and just finished reading your editorial. I just want to congratulate you on a wonderfully lucid, well argued and timely piece that was sorely needed. The kind

of self-righteous, ill-informed, and close-minded response to Rushton's book was totally inconsistent with how rational scientists should behave. I'm afraid your lawyer friend had a point: Much of the intolerance and attempts to suppress unpalatable truths comes from the politically correct "liberals" as you call them in the U.S.

I don't think I have ever written an unsolicited response like this before, but I just wanted to let you know that I think this was really stimulating and important.

-Joe Forgas



**Society for Personality
and Social Psychology**

The Beauty of Conservative Statistics: Dialogue Interviews President George W. Bush

Shortly after he became President, the Editors had the opportunity, as new journalists, to interview George W. Bush. Instead of discussing funding for science or policy issues related to social and personality psychology, the new President turned discussion to a topic for which he is well-known—his admiration for conservative statistical practices. Mr. Bush was occasionally enthusiastic about the topic, and made it clear that, although he disagrees with much of what social and personality psychologists do, think, and value, he is "110% behind" the prevailing endorsement of current conservative statistical practice in psychological research.

Editors: So you favor conservative statistical practice?

Bush: Absolutely. My favorite conservative statistic is "5-4". But in general, I like conservative statistics whenever I can find them. I demand briefing summaries that are one page long or shorter. I understand that some of your research articles are longer than that.

Editors: Yes, a bit.

Bush: Well, I wouldn't read them.

Editors: Neither do most of us.

Bush: Hmm. Might be some room for budget cuts.

Editors: Uh, Mr. President, before we get sidetracked, can you tell us why you like conservative statistical practices?

Bush: Conservative statistics is just like conservative politics

and conservative sex education. Going conservative is a value judgment, and one that suits me, and people like me, just fine. Conservatives prefer the status quo unless hit over the head by the need for something different. When you have conservative statistics, then the probability of finding an effect in your research shrinks dramatically, and we don't have to change our ideas. The Bush family has supported the status quo for generations—y'all remember "No new taxes?". Poppy recommend one change, and it didn't turn out so good for him.

Editors: So being conservative with post hoc t-tests makes you comfortable?

Bush: That's exactly it! It's painful and downright costly to have to change what you know. The more conservative the statistical practice, the

more we can stick with what's already been written down. There's nothing more conservative than not publishing a result because you think that the statistics might be too liberal—I hear that's going on in social/personality psychology; I approve.

Editors: Who benefits from conservative statistical practice?

Bush: Well, it's a meritocracy. And people who've already succeeded are people with merit, so it benefits us.

Editors: So, conservative statistics tends to favor ideas that are already out there, as compared to new ideas trying to get a foothold. It favors what's been published over what's trying to be published?

Bush: Yes, that's what Dick Cheney says.

Editors: Would anyone benefit from liberalizing statistical practice?

Bush: Oh, probably too many people. New and dangerously different ideas have a better chance to take hold when we liberalize standards. Liberal statistical practice could lead to all sorts of new theories and ideas, some of which would almost certainly be wrong. Gandhi favored liberalization, and look what happened to India.

Editors: You mean democracy, social change, rising expectations, economic development?

Bush: You see? Got Ben Kingston an Oscar, though.

Editors: Thank you, Mr. President. ■

"Classic" Book Review**Fighting Prejudice in 1950–1960's New York**

Editors' Note: Here we begin what we hope will be a series of brief reviews of older books in personality/social psychology that may be forgotten by the current generation of scholars, but that deserve remembering. If you know an older book that deserves to be read, discussed, or taught, and might serve as a wellspring for theory, research, or application, consider writing a brief review of the book. Make sure that your review includes description of the book, its availability, and information about the author(s).

Changing Patterns of Prejudice: A New Look at Today's Racial, Religious, and Cultural Tensions,

By Alfred Marrow. Published in 1962, Philadelphia, PA, by Chilton.

Review by Chris Crandall

Alfred Marrow was the CEO of a large manufacturing firm based in midtown Manhattan, who held a Ph.D. in social psychology from Iowa, working under Kurt Lewin, and the author of several books. Marrow's best-known volume among social and personality psychologists is *The Practical Theorist*, a personal and intellectual biography of Kurt Lewin, useful to historians and psychologists for its tracing of the intellectual history of Lewin and his students in Germany and the USA.

Changing Patterns of Prejudice has quite a different audience in mind. From 1956 through 1960 Marrow was chairman of the Commission on Intergroup Relations (COIR) of New York City, an official arm of the NYC government charged with reducing bigotry and intergroup conflict. This book is a mixture of a review of psychological theory of prejudice and intergroup relations, some of the lessons learned from COIR, and a brief report of some of COIR's successes in defusing tension in racial and religious conflict. Aimed at the educated layperson, with a foreword by one of the Menningers and without footnotes or references, *Changing Patterns of Prejudice* is

still a remarkable review of the social psychology of prejudice in 1962.

This book owes a lot to Allport's (1954) *The Nature of Prejudice*, as does virtually every book on the subject since it appeared. But what surprises the modern reader is just how balanced and complex Marrow's view of the problem is—if this book did not include examples, photos, and the cost of housing in Manhattan in 1962, it would hardly be distinguishable from books written in the last two decades. Current theories of prejudice often compare the "modern" form of prejudice (subtle, suppressed, with overt friendliness and a denial of prejudice) with the more blatant, hostile, and unsuppressed prejudice of the 1950's and 60's. Marrow's book makes plain that the outline, if not the entire form of modern racial, ethnic, and religious prejudice not only existed, but was rapidly becoming the dominant form of prejudice and discrimination in the Northern USA.

The chapters in his book take on topics with surprising relevance today. One looks at the tension between free expression and suppression of prejudicial speech on college campuses. Others look at funding equity for urban versus suburban schools, subtle factors in housing discrimination, the rejection of mainstream culture and values by stigmatized groups, and the relative responsibility for the problem vs. the solution by dominant and minority groups. Where Marrow comes down on these issues is not much different from where psychologists, educators, and other professionals stand in 2001.

What's clear from this book is that neither New York nor the nation has come very far in the last 40 years. There's no doubt that some of the problems that Marrow describes have been mostly solved, for example, African U.N. delegates have little difficulty being seated at restaurants near the United

Nations, and tennis lessons are usually made available without regard to race or religion.

So lunch counters are now open to all, although one thinks that this progress is due more to economic incentive than changing hearts and minds. Some problems reviewed by Marrow have improved but little or even worsened—teenage gangs, Jewish cemetery and synagogue desecrations by swastikas, inequality in financing public education between the urban core and the affluent suburbs, and many other problems.

Still, Marrow could claim some successes. Applying the communication and negotiation tactics learned from group dynamics, COIR settled several disputes and kept some conflicts from escalating. They used their expertise to help shape anti-discrimination laws, and brought public notice to the subtlety and prevalence of prejudice and discrimination.

This book has what most current textbooks in social psychology lack—a dedicated heart combined with practical experience. Most textbooks in social and personality psychology now focus on theories and research, and this is what instructors look for. But I'm not sure that it's what students need. I wish that this book were still in print and the examples and photos (some by Henri Cartier-Bresson) would not make undergraduates laugh. It's a marvelous book for the historical collection, but it can also serve as the foundation of many substantive lectures in a prejudice class.

In his role as director of COIR, Marrow showed a very real concern for getting fair and just results using fair and just means. I found it impossible not to like him, and impossible not to admire the book.

Changing Patterns of Prejudice is no longer in print, but is available in used bookstores and on the Internet. My own copy was deaccessioned from the El Segundo, California Public Library, and cost about \$15. ■

Announcements

Stephen G. West Wins Henry A. Murray Award: Call for Nominations for 2001

Stephen G. West, of Arizona State University, won the most recent Henry A. Murray Award. He will be honored at the American Psychological Association meetings this August. Other recent winners include Robert W. White and David C. McClelland.

Nominations are being sought for the 2001 Henry A. Murray Award. The Award, established in 1978, is made annually to recognize and encourage those working in the demanding and difficult tradition pioneered by Professor Murray. The awardee receives \$1,000 and is asked to present a Murray Award Address at the meeting of the APA the following year.

The Murray tradition is characterized as follows: (a) Receptiveness to the value of bringing together a variety of disciplines, theoretical viewpoints, and research techniques; (b) Conceptual tools that lend themselves to the integration of the tough and tender in personality research; (c) A theoretical outlook that recognizes intrapsychic structure and the thematic unity of individual lives in the midst of phenotypic diversity; (d) Interest in imagination and in biography, literature, and myth as psychological data; (e) Interest in the biological, social, and cultural contexts of personality; and (f) A style of intellectual leadership that has contributed to outstanding work that exhibits several of these characteristics.

Nominating materials should be sent to Professor Avril Thorne, Chair, Henry A. Murray Award Committee, Department of Psychology, 277 Social Sciences 2, University of California, Santa Cruz, 95064 (email: avril@cats.ucsc.edu; phone: 831-459-3613). Nominations should include three letters of recommendation that describe how the candidate meets the award criteria, a copy of the nominee's CV, and reprints of his/her relevant work. Nominations are due May 1, 2001.

Personality and Social Psychology Review Announces New Associate Editor

Diane M. Mackie (University of California, Santa Barbara) now serves as Associate Editor of *PSPR*, replacing Wendy Wood. Robert R. McCrae (National Institute on Aging) continues as Associate Editor; Eliot R. Smith (Purdue University) is Editor. The journal seeks "to publish original theoretical papers and conceptual review articles in personality and social psychology. *PSPR* is intended as a forum for conceptual pieces that initiate new lines of research and theory or provide a coherent framework for existing theory and programs of research. The journal emphasizes theory-based reviews of empirical contributions to a substantive area of research and offers integrative theoretical formulations concerning work in a given area of personality and/or social psychology." *PSPR* offers authors a quick turnaround (currently averaging just 10 weeks, compared with the 5 months or more that *Psychological Review* tells authors to expect) and a large and appreciative audience for accepted papers (all the Society's 3300+ members automatically receive the journal). If you have papers that fall within *PSPR*'s charter, please submit them! Specific submission instructions can be found in any issue of the journal.

Special issue and free on-line sample copy of GPIR

Theory and research in the areas of group processes and intergroup relations have burgeoned over the past twenty years and has been distributed among a variety of journals whose traditions are more oriented towards interpersonal processes, individual differences, social cognition, applied psychology, cross-cultural psychology, organizational behavior and sociology. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* is a mainstream social psychology journal that provides a focus and forum for researchers from these intersecting areas who share an interest in understanding group and intergroup processes.

Special Issue for July 2001! Recent years have witnessed an upsurge in the study of social identity processes in organizations, both within social psychology and the organizational

sciences. This special issue brings together a number of researchers in this rapidly developing area, covering a diverse, but representative range of topics: communication and commitment, identity and prosocial behavior, charismatic/transformational leadership, interdepartmental negotiations, and intergroup relations in organizational mergers. In so doing, this special issue provides a valuable cross-section of research for anyone interested in the role social and organizational identity play in organizational life.

If you are interested in a subscription to *GPIR*, and would like to review a free sample issue, go to <http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/j0215v02i04.html> for a free on-line sample. For more information about the journal, including up to date contents and abstracts, visit <http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/j0215.html>. To receive forthcoming contents of this journal emailed to you, subscribe to Sage Contents Alerting Service—a free service from <http://www.sagepub.co.uk/>.

Correction on web address for Instructors of Social Psychology

The correct address for Jonathan Mueller's web site for instructors of social psychology is: <http://www.noctrl.edu/~ajomuel/crow>.

Bar-Tal Book

Bar-Tal, D. (2000). *Shared beliefs in a society: Social psychological analysis*. Sage.

What kind of shared beliefs in a society are of importance to social systems? What functions do they fulfill? How are they disseminated? What are the societal consequences? These questions are addressed in this book, in which Bar-Tal develops the notion of societal psychology, which, can fulfill the promise of early social psychologists by directing attention to the societal and cultural contexts in which individuals live and by examining the reciprocal influence between these contexts and individuals.

Carducci Book Translations

Bernardo J. Carducci, professor of psychology and director of the Indiana
(Continued on page 20)

Published at:
Department of Psychology
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045

Phone: 785-864-9807
Fax: 785-864-5696
Email: crandall@ku.edu or
biernat@ku.edu

News of the Society Since ,Well,
At Least 1986! (*We're not sure*)



**Society for Personality
and Social Psychology**

VISIT SPSP AT:
WWW.SPSP.ORG.

VISIT DIALOGUE AT:
WWW.PSYCH.UKANS.EDU/DIALOGUE

News of the Society, Continued.

(Continued from page 13)
to grant some 30 awards;
the Society will fund 40 for
next year. As a side note,
student award winners must
be paid-up dues members
when they apply. ■

Announcements, Cont.

(Continued from page 18)

University Southeast Shyness
Research Institute, has had
his recent book titled
"*Shyness: A bold new
approach*" (2000; New York:
HarperPerennial) translated
into German: "Erfolgreich
schuchtern: Der Weg zu
einem neuen
Selbstwertgefühl" (2000;
Frankfurt: WolfgangKruger
Verlag), Spanish: "El libro de
la anti timidez" (2000;
Buenos Aires: Editorial
Atlantida) and Dutch:

SPSP Officers and Committee Members, 2001

*The current officers and committee members of the
Society for Personality and Social Psychology are:*

Ed Diener	President
Claude Steele	President-Elect
Abraham Tesser	Past President
Harry Reis	Executive Officer
Sharon Brehm	Co-Secretary-Treasurer
Leslie Zebrowitz	Co-Secretary-Treasurer
Jerry Suls	Editor, PSPB
Eliot Smith	Editor, PSPR
Chris Crandall	Co-Editor, Dialogue
Monica Biernat	Co-Editor, Dialogue
Todd Heatherton	SPSP Convention Committee, Chair
Dan Cervone	SPSP Convention Committee
Peter Salovey	SPSP Convention Committee
Mark Alicke	APA Program Committee, Co-Chair
Richard Smith	APA Program Committee, Co-Chair
Michael Kernis	APA Program Committee
Brenda Major	Publication Committee, Chair
John Dovidio	Publication Committee
Fred Rhodewalt	Publication Committee
Janet Swim	Training Committee, Chair
Kim Bartholomew	Training Committee
Lisa Aspinwall	Training Committee
Susan Andersen	Member at Large
David Funder	Member at Large
Patricia Devine	Member at Large
Monica Biernat	APA Council Rep
June Tangney	APA Council Rep
Gina Reisinger	Executive Assistant

International Fellowships

(Continued from page 9)

For both Fellowships,
proposals must be for
meetings to be held at least
6 months later. This allows
time for the meetings to be
publicized in EAESP, SASP
and SPSP newsletters, and
to ensure that participation
is as full as possible.

Deadlines for applications
are March 15th and
September 15th. After the
Fellowship, the organizer
provides a brief report
summarizing the week's
activities and the list of
participants, for publication
in the EAESP Bulletin or
SASP Bulletin, and
Dialogue. ■

Who Writes These Articles, Anyway?

Who writes *Dialogue*?

Certainly not professional
journalists. Many of the
articles in *Dialogue* appear
with a byline—that's the
author. Some of the articles
appear without a byline—
who writes these?

If the article appears to
come from a committee,
then someone from the
committee probably wrote
it. Announcements are
written by the individual or
group making the
announcement. If the article
appears to come out of
nowhere, then probably the
Editors wrote it. If explicitly
labeled "Editorial" then one

or both of the Editors wrote
it.

The Editors edit for length
only, to make things fit the
space available. You may
notice that this one is lightly
padded to fit the space.

Dialogue is not a refereed
journal. The Editors print
virtually everything that is
sent to us. All letters to the
editor, humor, opinion
pieces, and announcements
make it in. You have to
make your own judgment as
to what's important. To
make *Dialogue* worthwhile,
send us the things you think
are important. ■