

# ISJR - International Society for Justice Research

---

[Return to Home](#)



## ISJR-Newsletter

***3rd Issue; February 2003, edited by Dahlia Moore***

**1st Issue; June 2001, edited by Ron Cohen**

**2nd Issue; November 2001, edited by Ron Cohen**

---

## Contents

- [Editor's Column](#) by *Dahlia Moore*
- [President's Column](#) by *Faye Crosby*
- [Former-President's summation](#) by *Leo Montada*
- [Applications](#)
- [Members Research Interests](#)
- [ISJR Members](#)
- [New Books about and around Justice](#)  
will be published in the next Newsletter in June

---

### Editor's Column

Dear Friends.

Long overdue maybe, but here it is – our newsletter is back!

As the executive board has changed, this issue presents a few words from both Leo Montada (the former President) and Faye Crosby (the current President).

Most of this issue is dedicated to introducing the current research and justice-related activities of many of our members. Knowing what others are doing may lead to some

interesting collaborations. In any case, it seems that shared interests may increase familiarity and our ability to contribute to each other's work.

The newsletter was meant to include additional segments as well: A paper by Louise H. Kidder of Temple University, which I hope will begin a debate/discussion, and information about relevant and recent books and publications. The list was prepared by Ron Cohen. However, the remarkable response rate from our members seems to indicate a clear interest in describing members research and learning about what others are doing.

Including all the information would have led to a sizable (probably oversized) newsletter. Therefore, the next issue (hopefully, May 2003) will include the omitted segments as well as information about our 2004 conference in Canada.

We will be happy to include your comments, suggestions and replies in the next issue of the newsletter. Please let me know if there is any other segment/topic/issue you would like to see included in our newsletter.

**Please send all suggestions, comments or material you want to include to [dmoore@colman.ac.il](mailto:dmoore@colman.ac.il) and we'll do our best to include it.**

*[Dahlia Moore](#)*

[Back](#)

---

### **President's Column**

Dear Colleagues.

Those of us who have spent time around young children have probably all noticed an interesting phenomenon: the growth spurt. Some mornings the child appears to be 500 –600 millimeters taller than the night before. Oddly, according to medical experts, the apparent leap in size is real and not an illusion.

For the International Society for Justice Research (ISJR), too, growth contains many small discontinuities. With ISJR there are moments when we accomplish the analogue of gaining a half an inch overnight. One could think of our growth as a step-function rather than a smooth curve.

Right now, we are experiencing a little leap. In a matter of months, we hope to make the beginning of a shift into a more bureaucratized or automatic way of doing business than has been true of our society in the past. In quite short order, we are attempting to stabilize our continuing membership, to add new members, and to regularize the journal subscriptions. Once we have achieved these goals, we hope to bring some changes to the journal. Specifically, we are dedicated to getting Social Justice Research (SJR) into the ISI databases for the social sciences so that our research may have the appropriate impact on scholars in many different disciplines who are not (yet) members of ISJR.

To motivate our publisher, Kluwer, in investing the energy and resources necessary for our listing in ISI databases, we need to take several steps. First, we need to have a stable membership of about 125 to 150 members. Second, we need to keep to a strict production schedule, making sure that each issue of the journal is ready on time. We are hard at work on the first task and we are beginning our work on the

second task.

For both tasks, we need your help. When you receive the request from Sibylle Clausen or Karen Hegtvedt to pay the annual membership fee, we hope you will send your fees as soon as convenient. Concerning the journal, we hope that you will consider Social Justice Research as an outlet for your work, will ask your libraries to order it, and will tell your colleagues about it. If anyone has in mind to edit a special issue, please get in touch with Leo Montada or with me.

As President of ISJR, I find that this is an extremely exciting time for the society. About ten years ago Mel Lerner had the vision to start a society of justice researchers and to sign the contract for SJR with Plenum Press. In collaboration with several colleagues like Riel Vermunt and Ron Cohen, Mel also inaugurated the biennial conferences which have been such a huge success. In recent years, other comrades-in-arms like Ron Dillehay, Kjell Tornblom, and especially ISJR President Leo Montada have taken up the baton and carried forward the inspirational work of Mel. After pouring much of his courtly soul in ISJR, Leo – with the blessings of his colleagues – arranged for ISJR to achieve existence as a formal not-for-profit organization, registered in Germany, complete with a set of by-laws. Leo also created a website ( <http://www.isjr.org> ); established the mechanism for us to collect dues via credit card payment; and arranged for the first formal vote for the President of the organization.

It was through the vote that, to my great delight and deep honor, I became the current President of ISJR. At the excellent meetings last summer in Skovde, Sweden, Leo and I asked various members to run for the offices of Secretary and Treasurer. Several people volunteered to have their names put forward. In written ballots in Skovde, Kees van den Bos was elected Secretary and Karen Hegtvedt was elected Treasurer.

As soon as Kees and Karen were elected, the new Executive Committee held meetings to decide on several matters. We asked Dahlia Moore to serve as Newsletter editor, and she accepted. We also decided where to hold the 2004 conference – in Calgary, Canada. Jeff Pfeifer and his colleagues at the University of Regina in Saskatchewan had presented plans for the conference at the business meeting of the Society. Another excellent plan had been presented for a conference in Banf. The executive committee selected Regina over Banf because of our desire to keep expenses low for attendees. The organizing committee for the 2004 conference includes: Romona Bobocel, John Ellard, Carolyn Hafer, Murray Knuttila, Ken Leyton-Brown. Jeff Pfeifer is conference chair and will be in charge of the local arrangements.

If you have any suggestions for ISJR, please send them to me at [fcrosby@cats.ucsc.edu](mailto:fcrosby@cats.ucsc.edu) , and I will bring them forward to the executive committee. If you would like to nominate someone (including yourself) please tell us about the nominee, mentioning his or her professional affiliation and some of his or her publications. As of last June, we have a new category of membership – the student member. Student membership costs \$30 (US) per year and brings with it a subscription to SJR, whereas full membership costs \$60 (US), also including a subscription.

In closing, let me say again how honored I am to serve as your President. I hope to help the Society take steps towards regularization of function and also hope to help keep alive the spirit of the founders. It would be vainglorious to imagine that our small International Society can do much to help promote justice in the world; but it is not too much to expect that we can do a little. We scholars must keep open the lines

of communication among ourselves, and we must continue to work hard to understand the complexities of how people think, feel, and act with regard to social justice.

[Faye Crosby](#)

**[Back](#)**

---

### **Former-President's summation:**

#### ***(1) ISJR- Its stepwise development***

It has been at the Biannual Meeting in Potsdam 1997 when a couple of people thought about the idea to transform the loose network of justice researchers – knitted mainly by Melvin Lerner in the nineteen-eighties – to a regular scientific society. Soon after the registration of ISJR some of the founding members have plead for a moratorium to reflect whether a legal organization would really have advantages compared to an informal network. Therefore, ISJR had not more than nine members between 1997 and 1999. During this time, we explored the opinions within the broader network, and we got a lot of encouragement to start an expansion.

This was realized early in 2000 with a good resonance: The first hundred scholars joined ISJR. The bylaws have been revised and adapted to international standards at the Meeting in Israel. With Plenum Press, thereafter Kluwer Academic / Plenum, a special subscription rate of Social Justice Research was negotiated for ISJR members. Ron Cohen, to whom we are indebted for this service, started to edit an electronic Newsletter. A homepage of ISJR was established. The first presidential elections by mail ballot were carried out in 2001. Faye Crosby received the majority of votes. At the General Meeting in Skoevde / Schweden 2002 – by this occasion: we are greatful to Kjell Törnblom, Riel Vermunt and Invar Karlsson who have been great hosts – Karen Hegdvedt and Kees van den Bos were elected as treasurer and secretary, Dahlia Moore was co-opted to the Executive Board as editor of the Newsletter, and some amendments to the bylaws were decided. So, the main structural advantages of a legal society are now introduced: the allocation of responsibilities and duties.

This does, of course, not yet guarantee that the members form an active network with lively exchanges of information and news, with fruitful cooperation, with fertilization across disciplines. The officers can provide some facilities, organize meetings, promote some ideas but it is only the enthusiasm of the members, which makes a community alive.

The members shall learn more about each other – links to the individual homepages are available, short descriptions of current research and recent publications should be made available. The membership list can be used to spread questions and information. The communication platform of the ISJR homepage can be used, for scientific debates, for a quick exchange of opinions about various topics, e.g., for comments of current political problems and events from various perspectives based on justice theory and research. Calls for international cooperation can be spread. Much more can be done.

Please send news and information, e.g., about relevant conferences – calls for contributions, programs, etc. to our Webmaster: [Anette Weidler](#) is ready to serve as such ([weidler@uni-trier.de](mailto:weidler@uni-trier.de)).

Don't hesitate to inform the membership about your forthcoming publications which can be distributed electronically to those who are requesting them. We shall provide a category in our homepage where new publications are listed before they are available in printed form.

Don't hesitate to communicate any idea and measure, which could enhance the exchange within the network.

Good luck to all of you and good luck to ISJR!

***(2) How to raise the impact of Social Justice Research:  
An appeal to the ISJR membership***

The journal Social Justice Research is a resource for ISJR. This resource needs care. Quite sure, it can be improved. As the current editor of SJR let me share how the ISJR membership can take care of its journal.

Currently, the ranking of journals is mainly defined by the impact factors ascribed by the citation databases of ISI. How the impact factor is calculated? The citations of every article during a fixed period of time after the publication are counted. The impact factor is the mean number of citations summed up for the articles of a journal.

The fact whether a journal is recorded in a citation database is most important. This raises its visibility within the scientific community. The expected reception of an article within the scientific community varies within the impact factor of a journal. Of course, all authors are interested in publishing their article in journals with high impact factors. Many institutions use this criterion for rating the publication success of authors.

SJR is not yet recorded in Social Science Citation Index. ISJR has to apply for that. The success of such an application will mainly depend on the answers to two criteria: (1) Does the journal appear regularly? (2) How frequent articles in SJR are cited in those journals which are already recorded by ISI.

What can ISJR members do to improve the future status of SJR? They can take care of their journal in two ways:

- (1) More members should submit good manuscripts for publication in SJR.
- (2) All members should cite every citable article published in SJR in every manuscript wherever they publish it, especially when they publish in journals, which are already recorded by ISI.

If all members follow these two requests, SJR will be recorded by ISI within the near future and it will have an impact factor which will be adequate for a small scientific community as we are. Of course, the impact factor depends on the number of readers who are also citing authors.

These two requests may mean a social dilemma for ISJR members. The second one should, however, not pose a justice problem because the quality of articles in SJR is equivalent to that of articles in high-ranking journals.

[Leo Montada](#)

**[Back](#)**

---

## Applications

Applications to join ISJR are very welcome and may be addressed by e-mail to [Leo Montada](mailto:Leo.Montada@uni-trier.de) ([montada@uni-trier.de](mailto:montada@uni-trier.de)) including your curriculum vitae and a list of publications.

## [Back](#)

---

### Members Research Interests

#### ***Anders Biel and Daniel Eek*** ( [Anders.Biel@psy.gu.se](mailto:Anders.Biel@psy.gu.se) )

Our work has been an attempt to integrate research on social dilemmas and distributive justice. In particular, we studied how perceived fairness of resource distribution affects cooperation in public-goods dilemmas. In a survey of the general public, as well as in experimental studies employing students, a positive effect of perceived fairness of the distribution of the good on willingness to contribute to the public good was established. These studies were confined to situations where equality was perceived as the fairest principle for distribution. Later experiments extended this finding to situations where equity was perceived as a fair principle for distribution. Our present line of research includes how concern for efficient resource use can counteract greed and increase cooperation rates, but also neutralizes effects of perceived fairness.

#### ***Günter Bierbrauer , Dan Bar-On, Cordula Henke, & Michael Jaeger***

Since 1989, more than 750,000 Russian Jews (In the following, we use the simplifying term "Russian Jews" for all Jewish people who live in or emigrated from one of the GUS-countries .) have emigrated from the countries of the former Soviet Union to Israel. In the same period, more than 100.000 Russian Jews have emigrated from Israel to Germany. The immigrant's adaptation into the host societies is not without social and ethnic tensions. For example, in the German host society the Jews are a minority group. Moreover, because of historical background ambivalent relations between immigrant Jews and the German host society emerge. Frequently, therefore, conflicts arise both between the Russian-Jewish immigrants and the indigenous people (e.g. within the Jewish communities in Germany) and within the immigrant's reference group (e.g. family conflicts). The main issue of the research project is to investigate how immigrants handle these conflicts in different situations.

Interpersonal conflict handling depends (among other things) largely on the cultural orientations of the opponents. The cultural orientations of the immigrants are subject to changes and adaptation processes, called acculturation. Hence, relationships between conflict handling behavior of immigrants and acculturation processes can be expected. Thus, this study additionally examines to what extent the conflict behavior of Russian-Jewish immigrants in Germany and Israel differs depending on their cultural orientations and the acculturation processes they experience.

Acculturation doesn't proceed at random but reflects individual evaluations of behavioral goals, normative beliefs and perceived acculturation barriers. The relative importance of these determinants must be seen relative to the host society's context, which consists of historical and social determinants, e.g. the immigration policies of the host societies. In order to investigate the influence of these determinants on the acculturation processes of Russian-Jewish immigrants, a second immigration country

besides Germany will be considered in the research project which differs clearly from Germany with regard to the historical framework and its immigration policy. Since Israel meets these conditions particularly well and is one of the main immigration countries for Russian Jews as well, a comparative study in Germany and Israel will be conducted.

Taken together, the research project addresses three issues:

- Which conflict styles and conflict regulation procedures do Russian-Jewish immigrants in Germany and Israel prefer in different conflict situations?
- To what extent is the immigrants' conflict behavior related to their cultural orientations and how does it change during the integration process?
- Which context factors result in different acculturation processes? Do the acculturation processes of Russian-Jews immigrating to Germany and Israel show systematic dissimilarities? Which indirect relations do exist between the context determinants of the host society and the conflict behavior of the Russian-Jewish immigrants?

**Hilde Bojer** ( [hilde.bojer@econ.uio.no](mailto:hilde.bojer@econ.uio.no) )

My position is associate professor at the Department of Economics, University of Oslo. I have just finished a book called "Distributional Justice: Theory and Measurement" to be published by Routledge in the course of 2003. It is an introduction to theories of justice and to methods of measurement, particularly the measurement of income and wealth, and inequality measures, and is aimed at social scientists in general, not only economists. In the future, I aim to work on 1. The capability approach to measuring income, and 2. Family policies in the welfare state. I also wonder if you know about the egalitarian web site organized by [marc.fleurbaey@univ-pau.fr](mailto:marc.fleurbaey@univ-pau.fr). The web address is [aran.univ-pau.fr/ee/page6.asp](http://aran.univ-pau.fr/ee/page6.asp). It lists new papers in the field of social justice, and its members may well be interested in joining our society.

**Serge Desmarais** ( [sdesmara@uoguelph.ca](mailto:sdesmara@uoguelph.ca) )

In my current research, I continue to examine the variables that contribute to women's reported perceptions of lower entitlement to pay than their male counterparts. I have argued that women's own lower pay history places them in a disadvantaged position when they assess their pay entitlement. My studies have considered these issues in the laboratory and in samples of workers, with similar results. Overall, women report lower pay and pay entitlement than men but the gender difference in pay entitlement is most often eliminated when the effects of earned pay are covaried. I am currently expanding this program of research in several ways. For instance, I am comparing directly the effects of an internal source social comparison (i.e., task relevant pay history) to that of an external social comparison standard (i.e., pay received by similar others). Another avenue of research considers what variables influence people's perception of how much they deserve above and beyond their current income. My research indicates that roughly 50% of participants perceive what they earn as what they deserve whereas the other 50% feels entitled to more money. I am assessing what variables predict these two different perspectives. Of the fifteen variables considered so far in my models, none have been good predictors of who feels they deserve the same, or more, than they earn. Finally, my other studies examine the ethical ramifications of asking people to indicate their expected salary when they apply for a new job. My argument is that doing so is a direct form of wage discrimination against women because we know, on the basis of past research, that women are more likely to ask for a lower wage. These issues will be investigated in work organizations.

**Daniel Eek** ( [daniel.eek@psy.gu.se](mailto:daniel.eek@psy.gu.se) )

I'm currently working on two projects. The first project studies Deutsch's (1975) proposals on the effects of distribution goal on choices of fair distributive principles. For various resources, I try to manipulate the goal of the distribution to see whether choices of distributive principles vary accordingly. When there is uncertainty about the goal and goal, therefore, cannot serve as the basis for choices of a distributive principle, the hypothesis is that people instead will use information about the positions of others as the basis for their choices. This project also aims at extending our previous research combining distributive justice and social dilemmas research by studying the effects of people's perceptions of fairness on their willingness to cooperate.

The second project aims at studying the (causal) relationship between people's vertical trust (trust in authorities etc.) and their horizontal trust (trust in others). Previous research has found high and positive correlations between these two forms of trust, and there is a debate of whether it is a causal relationship, and, if so, in what direction it goes. However, no attempt has yet been made in order to experimentally test the causal relationship. The project aims at doing this.

**Niklas Fransson** ( [niklas.fransson@psy.gu.se](mailto:niklas.fransson@psy.gu.se) )

Traditionally, the majority of moral theories have assumed that the evaluation of potentially immoral events relies on elaborate reasoning, and that people consciously refer to values in order to justify the selected judgment or course of action. In collaboration with Karl Ask my present and planned future research tries to place the moral judgment process in a dual-process context. More specifically, we suggest that an alternative, direct route to moral reactions may develop, disengaged from extensive reasoning, accounting for intuitive moral reactions. In two experiments, using a recent model of moral-value representation (Biel, Fransson, & Dahlstrand, 1997) as a theoretical framework, this notion has been tested. In the first experiment, the idea that intuitive moral reactions are mediated by the activation of prototypical representations of immoral events was evaluated using reaction-time measures (Ask & Fransson, 2001). A second experiment tested the idea that events violating the same moral value are coherently organized in memory, thus forming distinct categories of events. Results from the two experiments support the assumptions that moral judgments do not rely exclusively on extensive elaboration, and that immoral events pertinent to the same moral value are organized within the same superordinate category.

**Carolyn Hafer** ( [Carolyn.Lee.Hafer@brocku.ca](mailto:Carolyn.Lee.Hafer@brocku.ca) )

Currently, I am involved in a number of research projects related to the justice motive. First, I am studying reactions to victims whose situation threatens the belief in a just world in an attempt to expand the array of just-world maintenance strategies that have been empirically studied, as well as to look at predictors of these various strategies and the implications of these strategies for how victims of injustice are ultimately treated. Along with Laurent Begue, I am working on a comprehensive review of the just world literature since 1980. Mel Lerner and I are also working on an updated version of his 1980 book, "The Belief in a Just World: A Fundamental Delusion". Finally, Jim Olson and I are investigating the conceptualization of the "scope of justice", as well as conducting experiments designed to test some alternative explanations for past findings in this area.

**Karen Hegtvedt** ( [khegtve@emory.edu](mailto:khegtve@emory.edu) )

Karen A. Hegtvedt is Associate Professor at Emory University. She and her collaborator, Cathryn Johnson, are currently developing a series of experiments to test their predictions regarding the impact of collective sources of legitimacy on perceptions of and reactions to distributive injustice. Recent work published in *Social Psychology Quarterly* (63:298-311, 2000) provides the theoretical argument for the

first experiment, which moves justice analysis beyond the individual level. That work focuses on how support by subordinates and support by superiors for an unfair distribution, under varying conditions of group identity, differentially affects emotional, cognitive, and behavioral reactions to injustice. And, in a paper presented at the International Sociological Association this past summer, Hegtvedt, Johnson, and Clay-Warner extend their argument to analyze the effects of collective sources of the legitimacy of the allocator and his or her use of fair/unfair procedures on reactions to distributive injustice. In addition to the justice/legitimacy project, Hegtvedt and Clay-Warner are working on a series of papers examining various issues about procedural and distributive justice in the workplace. The first paper (*Social Psychology Quarterly* 65:386-400, 2002), examines resentment toward work-family policies as a question of injustice. The other two papers (both in progress) look at the relative importance of procedural and distributive justice on organizational commitment and on job satisfaction, respectively, among workers differentially affected by downsizing (survivors, victims, and unaffected workers). Finally, Hegtvedt is preparing a review piece on the multifaceted roles of justice in-group processes and in other areas of Sociology.

***Elisabeth Kals*** ([kals@uni-trier.de](mailto:kals@uni-trier.de))

Intercultural justice project on local environmental conflicts - The intercultural research project is aiming at the inquiry of concurrent viewpoints and attitudes concerning the willingness to act in local environmental conflicts. On the base of this inquiry, it should be possible to deduce and evaluate community measures for mediation. The model contrasts distributive, procedural and interactional justice - as universal as well as contextual justice appraisals - with generalized and contextual variables of interest to explain (A) the overall fairness of the concurring political decisions and measures, (B) the willingness to promote these measures, and (C) the willingness to promote a constructive solution of the conflict. The central hypothesis says that - inconsistent with the declaration of the rational-choice-models - acting in local environmental conflicts is not only motivated by self-interest but also by justice motives. It is assumed that feedback to the community on these expected results within an experimental design (written feedback by a brochure versus workshops) will evoke a change in justice perceptions, it will minimize self-interest, and it will promote the willingness to support a constructive solution of the conflict. A comparison of this study's results with those of a parallel Australian study by Dr. Geoff Syme and Blair Nancarrow (CSIRO, Perth) is aiming at the discovery of cultural similarities as well as the differences. (See also the contribution of Dr. G. Syme and B. Nancarrow in this newsletter). The study is supported by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Bonn). The project is in cooperation with Dr. Geoff Syme and Blair Nancarrow, CSIRO Perth, Australia. Staff members: Dr. Heidi Ittner, Markus Müller. Cooperation partners: Prof. Dr. Leo Montada, Dr. Jürgen Maes

***Jane Mansbridge*** ([jane\\_mansbridge@Harvard.edu](mailto:jane_mansbridge@Harvard.edu))

Jane Mansbridge recently edited, with Aldon Morris, a volume of empirical studies entitled *Oppositional Consciousness* (University of Chicago Press, 2001, paperback). The volume contains her own dissection of the concept of oppositional consciousness (that is, the generic form of race consciousness, class consciousness, gender consciousness, etc.) in a chapter called "Complicating Oppositional Consciousness," a chapter by Aldon Morris situating the concept in social movement theory, and highly readable empirical chapters that open up previously unexplored angles on Black consciousness based in the Black church; disability consciousness based in both segregated schools for deaf and blind people and "borrowed" consciousness among the mobility-impaired; gender consciousness based in the plaintiffs and lawyers in the earliest American sexual harassment suits; Chicano consciousness based in migrant patterns from Texas to Wisconsin and

Minnesota; divided consciousness based in struggles among African Americans during the Reverend Martin Luther King Jr.'s 1966 Chicago Freedom Movement; and multidimensional oppositional consciousness based in AIDS activism.

She has also produced two analyses in the normative theory of democratic representation: "Should Women Represent Women and Blacks Represent Blacks? A Contingent `Yes,'" *Journal of Politics*, vol. 61:3, August 1999, and "The Many Faces of Representation," on the website <http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/prg/mansb/faces.htm>

Currently she is working on *Everyday Feminism*, a study of the way ordinary people, not active in politics, play significant roles in shaping and furthering some social movements. The book is based on in-depth interviews with about fifty low-income women (approximately one-third Black, two-thirds White), supplemented by survey data. A key chapter explores how the widespread practice of calling someone a "male chauvinist" helped change conceptions of gender justice.

**Gerold Mikula** ([gerold.mikula@uni-graz.at](mailto:gerold.mikula@uni-graz.at))

*(1) Testing an attribution-of-blame model of judgments of injustice*

The attribution-of-blame model of judgments of injustice (Mikula, 1993, in press) depicts judgments of injustice as blaming of an actor who is seen as responsible for the violation of entitlement of somebody else without sufficient justifications. A recent series of correlational and experimental studies (Mikula, in press) lend support to most of the propositions of the model and show that attributions of responsibility and blame, and the respective constituent components (attributions of causality and intention, and perceived lack of justification), contribute to perceptions of injustice beyond violation of entitlement. Studies in progress and planning analyze the conditions under which judgments of injustice do and do not correspond to the model. Similar to recent dual-process-theories of information processing, I assume that situational and individual difference variables moderate the way in which judgments of injustice are made.

*(2) Division of household labor and evaluations of (in)justice*

Division of family work, and household labor in particular, has become a popular topic of research in social sciences. However, perceptions and evaluation of the division, and the consequences resulting thereof, received much less attention (Mikula, 1998; Kluwer & Mikula, in press). Our studies analyze variables which contribute to the evaluation of (in)justice. Results show that cognitions about the household labor and its division, and social comparisons in particular, account for the largest amount of variance of justice evaluations (Mikula & Freudenthaler, 2002). More detailed analyses reveal that it is the outcomes of social comparisons which directly affect the justice evaluations. The extent or frequency of making different kinds of comparisons operates as a moderator that determines the weight of the various comparison outcomes for the evaluations of justice. Women differ in their predominant kinds of social comparison and, consequently, also differ in their judgments of justice. The topic of evaluations of justice of the division of household labor will be further pursued in 2003–2005 as part of an international EC-project on "Family life and professional work: Conflict and synergy".

*(3) Justice and the distribution of tasks and duties*

Social psychological research on distributive justice has focused on the distribution of positively valued goods, outcomes and conditions, and largely neglected the distribution of tasks, duties and responsibilities. We study the arrangements and rules of task distribution and factors that determine their choice and evaluation. The theoretical framework underlying this line of research (Mikula, 2002) considers three sets of variables: the arrangements and rules, the nature of tasks to be distributed,

and the nature of the respective social system.

#### *(4) Justice and social conflict*

Together with Michael Wenzel (Mikula & Wenzel, 2000), I analyze possible effects of ideas of justice, perceptions of injustice, and the use of justice arguments in the emergence, course and resolution of social conflicts. We argue that justice plays multiple roles in the dynamic of social conflicts: a trigger that elicits conflict, an argument in the course and resolution of conflicts, and a basis for commitment to the resolution. In our most recent analysis (Wenzel and Mikula, under review) social identity theory and self categorization theory serve as the background to discuss these functions with respect to three key areas of diplomacy of prevention of international conflicts: early warning and early action, mediation, and reconciliation. James M. Olson, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada.

#### **Dahlia Moore** ([msdmoore@huji.ac.il](mailto:msdmoore@huji.ac.il))

My main current project is writing a book with a Palestinian partner, Salem Aweiss, of Bir Zeit University in the Palestinian Authority. The book tells the story of Jews, Arabs and Palestinians. It looks at the life experiences of the three social categories, their beliefs, attitudes, and interactions, and their views of the future. Many and diverse voices within each group are represented, showing how the conflict between the groups tears at the societies themselves. Our intense collaboration reveals that truth, fact, and righteousness are relative. Moreover, each fact has many facets and interpretations. Thus, building bridges among the three groups will necessitate increasing their understanding of the different meanings each group attaches to each issue. The book's unconventional approach to the Arab-Israeli conflict is its relation to the three distinct societies. Previous research focused either on the conflict within Israeli society (i.e., Jews versus Arabs, dissociating it from the broader conflict and excluding the Palestinians) or on the conflict between Israeli and Palestinian societies (excluding or ignoring the Arab citizens of Israel). Perceptions of justice, relative deprivation, and discrimination are discussed, as are their implications for intolerance of others and willingness to assume social responsibility.

My other project is creating an apolitical **Social Justice Center** In Israel. The Mission of the center is to expand the knowledge of civic society and the relations among social categories in Israel in order to: (1) Increase understanding between the diverse segments of Israeli society. (2) Provide tools that will enable the creation of just social policy that will strengthen social integration. The Center's activities will focus on research, dissemination of knowledge, development of academic programs, and contribution to the community. The Center's goals are to reduce injustice and inequality in order to minimize hostility, alienation, and fragmentation that have been strengthening in Israeli society as in many other societies. The Social Justice Center, which is an interdisciplinary endeavor, brings together people from diverse disciplines (Economics, Sociology, Psychology, Education, Communication, Business and Law) to create innovative approaches to both analyzing and managing justice problems.

#### **Jim Olson** ([jolson@julian.uwo.ca](mailto:jolson@julian.uwo.ca))

My longest-standing interest in justice research has been relative deprivation (the feeling that one has been treated unfairly). I have been interested in the determinants of relative deprivation, as well as the issue of why people who are deprived often tolerate their situation quietly rather than protesting. I am also interested in the role of self-presentation processes in reports of negative emotions including relative deprivation: people sometimes exaggerate their discontent and sometimes understate their discontent for strategic reasons.

Another, more recent interest is the psychology of dehumanisation, exclusion, or

demonizing. I am working with Carolyn Hafer to try to understand the psychological mechanisms that can produce extremely negative treatment of an individual or group. I have also collaborated with John Ellard on this topic, focussing specifically on the relation between Beliefs in a Just World and reactions to perpetrators of evil acts.

Finally, I have been doing some research with Kimberly Quinn on the relation between regulatory focus (promotion focus versus prevention focus) and people's willingness to engage in collective action. We have found that a prevention focus is associated with greater willingness to protest or perform assertive actions, perhaps because collective behavior is designed to remove a negative state (e.g., unfair treatment, poverty, discrimination).

***Linda J. Skitka*** ([lskitka@uic.edu](mailto:lskitka@uic.edu))

A considerable amount of my current research is focused on the role that moral values and convictions play in how people think about fairness. Although many justice researchers and theorists argue that people care about fairness primarily because being fair maximizes their long term self-interests (the material self-interest, or instrumental, perspective), or because fair procedural treatment communicates important information about the individual's standing within important groups (the social identity perspective), some of my recent research has explored a third possibility, specifically, that people sometimes care about justice because of a need to express and defend deeply held moral values and convictions. In support of the notion that moral values can be an important foundation of justice reasoning, my recent work indicates that procedural fairness becomes a less relevant concern if people have a moral investment in an outcome (e.g., policy outcomes like legal abortion, or a specific verdict in a trial because of moral certainty about a defendant's guilt or innocence). When outcomes are morally mandated, people see even egregious violations of procedural fairness (e.g., vigilantism) as nonetheless just, so long as the morally mandated outcome is achieved.

My most recent efforts in this area have been directed toward (a) demonstrating that moral mandates-- i.e., strong attitudes that have the added component of moral conviction--have qualities that distinguish them from other kinds of strong attitudes (i.e., extreme, important, and certain attitudes, that are not held with moral conviction), (b) exploring the underlying cognitive processes that lead people to disregard procedural information when they have a moral mandate about outcomes (do actively revise their appraisal of procedural fairness when procedures fail to produce the mandated outcome, or do they simply attend less to procedural information in morally-loaded contexts?), (c) testing whether people have more difficulty deciding on procedures to resolve conflict about morally vested as compared to non-morally vested issues, and (d) developing a more comprehensive theory of justice that can account for when people's justice reasoning will be primarily shaped or defined by material, social, or personal/moral needs and goals. This comprehensive model is premised on the notion that how people define fairness depends on which aspect of identity (and thus which values and goals) currently dominates their working self-concept.

***Geoffrey J. Syme , Blair E. Nancarrow***

**Justice in Water Allocation Decision Making** Australian Research Centre for Water in Society (ARCWIS), CSIRO Land and Water, Australia

ARCWIS is a team of social scientists within CSIRO (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization for Australia) with a community psychology and natural resources planning background. Research activities are mainly focused on the community's viewpoints of water resource management and allocation of water.

Since the late eighties, this research program has applied social psychological theories of equity, justice and fairness to the implementation and evaluation of water allocation decisions in real situations. Qualitative and quantitative research of the past twelve years in diverse application and government policy contexts showed that justice concerns are highly salient in decision-making processes in the allocation of water and that decision making is not only motivated by self-interest but also by justice motives. Initial studies in the context of water allocation revealed universal fairness principles as key variables in people's perceptions in decision-making processes. These principles were derived from a range of theoretical bases including Virtue Theory; Libertarianism; philosophies of human, animal & environmental rights; Cost Benefit philosophies as well as Procedural and Distributive Justice. Following studies, when irrigation communities were faced with possible decreased allocations to provide for environmental sustainability, showed the significance of situational fairness perceptions besides universal fairness principles. The impact of both universal and situational fairness principles could be confirmed in three most recent studies in the context of groundwater re-allocation for environmental sustainability. The latest social justice research project is a cross-cultural, collaborative study with the University of Trier in Germany that aimed to examine a cross-cultural model on community perceptions of fairness and justice in environmental management (see the contribution of [PD Dr. E. Kals](#) in this newsletter).

[Back](#)

---

## ISJR Members

### Latest List - Word Document

The list is adapted from the one appearing on ISJR website.

---

## New Books about and around Justice

will be published in the next Newsletter in June

[Back](#)

---

The End

---

[Contact Us](#)

© 2003 Last updated Januar, 2003 by [Anette Weidler](#) .

**Referrals and links:** The author is not responsible for any contents linked or referred to from his pages - unless he has full

knowledge of illegal contents and would be able to prevent the visitors of his site from viewing those pages. If any damage occurs by the use of information presented there, only the author of the respective pages might be liable, not the one who has linked to these pages. Furthermore the author is not liable for any postings or messages published by users of discussion boards, guestbooks or mailinglists provided on his page.