


The Greek Review of Social Research

Vol 38 (1980)

38



Socialization to conflict: A case study of the national historical ingroup-outgroup images in the educational system of Greece

Alexis Heraclides

doi: [10.12681/grsr.259](https://doi.org/10.12681/grsr.259)

Copyright © 1980, Alexis Heraclides



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Heraclides, A. (1980). Socialization to conflict: A case study of the national historical ingroup-outgroup images in the educational system of Greece. *The Greek Review of Social Research*, 38, 16–42. <https://doi.org/10.12681/grsr.259>

socialization to conflict

*a case study of the national
historical ingroup-outgroup
images in the educational system
of Greece*

by

Alexis Heraclides

*M. Sc. in International Relations
(University College, University of London)*

ingroup-outgroup image and conflict

A. Introduction: The Theoretical Framework

Conflictual relations at all levels, are determined by a combination of variables which feed into the interaction process of the individuals or groups. The issue of conflict could be a material or non-material interest or need, the tendency being, to cling to material-tangible justifications of conflict, to the neglect of the hidden non-material needs. This approach leads only to the traditional methods of conflict settlement, that is, military defeat of one party, judicial methods, and different forms of compromise through bargaining processes often with the use of a mediator or conciliator. Non-material needs on the other hand, are positive sum, the more one party has, the more the other will also have. This is the process of conflict reduction, or termination, by way of a common problem solving procedure.¹

Hostile attitudes, resulting from polarized ingroup-outgroup images, are a common feature of all acute conflicts between groups. Such images, which influence the definition of the situation, are considered as one of the three initial causes of conflict according to Galtung's «conflict triangle». Any of the three—that is, attitude, behaviour, or conflict, «as an abstract property of the action system»—can initiate the conflict process, by putting the other two in motion.² Galtung's analytical tool, appears to reconcile the two opposed theories on the nature of conflict: the «objective conflict» position, and the «subjective conflict» one. In accordance with the first, conflict is objective conflict of interest. The essence of conflict, is the «inequality resulting from exchange», or structural, resulting from «rank disequilibrium», or from the authority structure of societies, or structural violence.³ The subjective posi-

1. See for «non-material needs», «positive-sum conflict outcome», and «conflict resolution»: Burton, J.W. et al., *The Study of World Society: A London Perspective*, Occasional Paper No 1, International Studies, ISA, 1974; Burton, J. W., *Conflict and Communication*, MacMillan, London, 1969; Burton, J.W., «Resolution of Conflict», *ISQ*, March 1972; Burton, J. W., «Dynamics of Change in World Society», *LSE Millennium*, Vol. 5, No 1, 1976; Groom, A. J. R., «Peacekeeping», *Research Monograph No 4, Lehigh Univ.*, 1973.

2. Galtung, J., «Peace Thinking», in *Peace: Research, Education, Action, Essays in Peace Research*, Vol. 1, Ch. Ejlers, Copenhagen 1975, pp. 76-82.

3. See in particular the following works: Blau, P., *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, J. Wiley and Sons, New York, 1964; Homans, G. C., «Social Behavior as Exchange», *AJS*, 1958, 63, pp. 597-606; Coser, L., *The Functions of Social Conflict*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1968; Coser, L., *Continuities in the Study of Social Conflict*, The Free Press, New York, 1970; Dahrendorf, R., *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959, particularly par II, chapter V; Dahrendorf, R., «Toward a Theory of Social Conflict», *JCR*, Vol. 2.2, 1958, 170-183; Sherif, M., *Group Conflict and Cooperation*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, Lon-

tion, applies great emphasis to the perception of the situation as conflictual, which is considered as the starting-inaugurating point of the conflict process.⁴ Latent conflict is somewhat avoided as an object of conflict, in the attempt not to make value judgments. As the experiment by Burton, those of Fashoda by Doob and recent ones by Kelman and his colleagues have shown empirically, misperceptions and ingroup-outgroup imagery play no minor role in blocking free and untrammelled communication between the rival parties. Only when these false images are removed, can real communication lead to the legitimization of the adversary's position, and later on, to the gradual initiation of a problem-solving procedure rather than the traditional «bargaining» one.⁵

Nevertheless, it would seem an exaggeration to say that conflict originates from misperception, or ethnocentric ingroup-outgroup images. It suffices to consider such biased imagery as *one of the contributors of conflict*, or an element in various variables which combine, leading to the conflict outcome. Thus, in lieu of example, in Dennis Sandole's⁶ causal analysis of conflict in a multi-level, multi-dimensional framework, by way of twenty-three independent variables, ingroup and outgroup images could easily be considered as essential contributors to at least four of them: namely, «manifest distrust», «bellicosity», «dogmatism» and «systemic attack contagion».⁷

B. National Historical Ingroup-Outgroup Images

The image of a group, society (or nation) is, «the totality of attributes that a person recognizes when he

contemplates that nation», group or society.⁸ As with all images of significance in politics, such images have three analytically distinct components: (a) a cognitive component or attribute, that is, the understanding of the group or society intellectually, (b) an affective or evaluative component, which imbues the belief with value or affection, and (c) an action, or otherwise behavioural component, that is «a set of responses to stimuli».⁹

As Kenneth Boulding argues, the ingroup-outgroup image of national groups, is essentially a mass or «folk» image, transmitted initially in primary groups. It is furthermore a «historical image», in the sense of extending through time, and practically the creation of national (ingroup) historians. It is thus by definition, as Boulding puts it, «a perversion of the truth», or at least, «a potential lie».¹⁰

The ingroup-outgroup image, held by the members of group functions, in Robert Axelrod's wording, as «a cognitive map»,¹¹ to simplify the complexities of the environment external to the individual, and in particular, to cope with information overload. The «learning process» is highly difficult, once an ingroup-outgroup image is established, as it is imbued (usually) with powerful affective or evaluative components, impairing the effects of negative feedback from the environment.¹² Furthermore, as W. A. Scott has pointed out over two decades ago, these images, or attitudes, contain «a strong flavor of non-rationality...as it is virtually impossible for the average individual to test empirically their applicability».¹³ The tendency is to retain the initial ingroup image, which functions as a model, and to interpret, as Bauer remarks, «the very data which would lead... to change... (the) model, in such a way as to preserve that model».¹⁴ One could thus easily agree

don, 1966; Klineberg, O., *The Human Dimension in International Relations*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964; Shmid, «Peace Research and Politics», in *JPR*, Vol. 5, 1968; Mack, R., Snyder, R., «The Analysis of Social Conflict», *JCR*, Vol. 1, 1957.

4. See for a characteristic example of a subjective definition of Conflict, Sandole's definition of «manifest conflict processes»: a situation in which to actors try to pursue their perception of mutually incompatible interests... (in *ECPR*, 1978, Grenoble) (see Note 6).

5. Burton, J. W., op. cit; Doob, in Kelman, H., Cohen, P., «Reduction of International Conflict», forthcoming in Austin and Wonchell eds, *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*; Kelman, H., Cohen, P., *ibid.*; Burton et al., op. cit.; Deutsch, M., *The Resolution of Conflict*, Yale Univ. Press, New Haven, 1973, particularly pp. 351-400; Boulding, K. E., *A Primer on Social Dynamics*, The Free Press, New York, 1970; Groom, A. J. R., op. cit.

6. See Dennis Sandole's April 1978 presentation to the Workshop on Formal Political Analysis in 1978's Joint Sessions of the *ECPR*. «Manifest distrust», is defined «a political unit's location in a conflict-cooperation space». Bellicosity and Systemic attack contagion are only very indirectly influenced by ingroup-outgroup images in the Sandole conceptualization. Dogmatism, on the other hand is predominantly influenced by such images, (among others of course). One could also add a fifth variable influenced, «domestic instability». Domestic instability, refers to «internal challenges to a political units mechanisms of influence, control and unit-perpetuation». (See pp. 6-7, 29-33 of the paper «Mapping and Modelling of Complex Conflict Processes»).

7. Sandole, D. J. D., «Mapping and Modelling of Complex Conflict

Processes: A Report of Research in Progress», Paper delivered during the Joint Sessions of Workshops, *ECPR*, 6-12 April 1978, Grenoble, pp. 5-7, 29-33.

8. Scott, W. A., «Psychological and Social Correlates of International Images», in Kelman ed., *International Behavior*, Holt-Rinehart and Winston, 1965, p. 72.

9. Scott, W. A., *ibid.*; Deutsch, K. W., Merritt, R. L., «Effects of Events on National and International Images», in Kelman ed., op. cit., 133-4; Rokeach, M., *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values*, Jossey-Bass Publ., San-Franisco, 1975, 112-5; Kelman, H., «Social Psychological Approaches to the Study of International Relations», in Kelman ed., op. cit., 25; Scott, W. A., «Rationality and Non-Rationality of International Attitudes», *JCR*, Vol. II, 1, p. 8; Boulding, K. E., *The Image*, Univ. of Michigan Press, 1975 printing.

10. Boulding, K. E., «National Images and International Systems», *JCR*, Vol. III, 2, 1959, 121-2.

11. Axelrod, R., «Results», in Axelrod, R., *Structure of Decision* (edited vol.), Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1976, p. 222.

12. And clearly in Karl Deutsch's, or Kenneth Boulding's sense, without image change, there is no possibility of learning (see *The Nerves of Government*, and *A Primer on Social Dynamics*, in particular by Deutsch and Boulding respectively).

13. Scott, W. A., op. cit., *JCR*, p. 14.

14. Bauer, R. A., «Problems of Perception and the Relations bet-

with Boulding, that ingroup images are probably «the last great stronghold of unsophistication». They «see» the environment, only from «the viewpoint of the viewer», rather than from the point of view of many imagined positions.¹⁵

Ingroup-outgroup images are by definition polarized. They are manifestations of «ethnocentrism», the concept coined by William Graham Sumner in the beginning of this century. According to Sumner's classical definition, ethnocentrism, is «the technical name for this view of things in which one's group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it».¹⁶ The main function of this «ethnocentric syndrome», or «universal syndrome of ethnocentrism», as LeVine and Campbell call it, is its contribution to group identity and group cohesion, in accord with functional theories of conflict (Simmel, Coser, and more recently LeVine and Campbell).¹⁷

The oversimplified ingroup-outgroup images' characteristics, of being a stereotype and polarized, are well illustrated by the phrases: «black and white», and «ingroup virtues are outgroup vices». As Merton Klineberg, Frank and Ole Holsti—to mention one from each discipline of «human behavior»—have remarked, there exists a «double standard» in judging.¹⁸ The same external behavioural manifestations will be judged differently, depending on the instigator of the action.¹⁹ This oftentimes amounts to ingroup virtues being presented literally as outgroup vices, of the type: «you are stubborn, I am firm», or—borrowing from Campbell's catalogue—«we are loyal, they are clannish», «we

have pride, they are egotistical», «we are brave and progressive, they are aggressive and expansionist», «we are peaceful, loving people, hating only our vile enemies, they are hostile people who hate us», etc.²⁰ This bipolarity between «self-description» and «stereotype of the outgroup», was observed in the greek textbooks to be analysed in some detail below. This «moral alchemy», as Merton²¹ has aptly called it, is particularly striking in the following case: the same action, the killing of a large number of opponents, is characterized by at least one schooltext, as «ruthless and cruel» when the outgroup (the Turks) is the actor, and as a «heroic achievement of the outnumbered...», when the instigators are of the ingroup (Greeks). In another case, the slaughtering of civilians was justified, in view of «so many years of fierce illtreatment under the Turkish yoke», while the same action by various enemy outgroups—Turks, Bulgarians, Crusaders, Slavs, Arabs etc—was described as «virtual butchery», true to their «barbaric state of existence».

This characteristic bipolarity—which was also assessed empirically by the following social scientists: Stagner, LeVine, Campbell, W. Scott, Brofenbrenner, R. K. White, Kelman, Burton, O. Holsti, and Merton—found its probably most striking demonstration, in Muzafer Sherif's classic Robbers' Caves field experiments. The two groups of eleven or twelve year-olds, which had been formed arbitrarily by Sherif and his colleagues, soon showed strong ethnocentric tendencies, as those described above, although the two groups had no previous history as groups, neither did any individual member know any other member before the boys' camps started.²²

Finally, it should be noted that, oftentimes, stereotypes of outgroups work both ways, to give literally a «mirror image», as Brofenbrenner first discovered, followed by R. K. White and Osgood.²³

ween the United States and the Soviet Union», *JCR*, Vol. V, 3, 1961, p. 227.

15. Boulding, K. E., op. cit., pp. 130-1.

16. Sumner W. G., cited in LeVine, R., Campbell, D. T., *Ethnocentrism*, J. Wiley and Sons, New York, 1972, p. 8.

17. LeVine, R., Campbell, D. T., op. cit., p. 8, chapter 1; Also see, LeVine, R., «Socialization, Social Structure and Intersocietal Images», in Kelman ed., op. cit., p. 45; Campbell, D. T., «Stereotypes and the Perception of Group Differences», in Hollander, E. P., Hunt, G. H., *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology* (edited volume), Oxford Univ. Press, 1976, pp. 358 ff; On the «functional theory of conflict», see Coser, L., two volumes cited in Note 3 supra; Deutsch, M., op. cit., pp. 68-70, 72-77.

18. Another variation of this «moral alchemy», is what Ralph White dubbed «black top enemy image», accepting the outgroup people as «goods», but accusing their leaders, probably in an attempt to avoid dissonance, or intra-psychic tension, when contrary information is perceived (see Note 22). As Holsti's showed, this was precisely the case with Secretary Dulles cognitive system in appraising the Soviets. (Note 23). See also, Deutsch, M., *The Resolution of Conflict*, 1973, p. 355.

19. Merton, R. K., «The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy», in Hollander, Hunt eds, *Classic Contributions to Social Psychology*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1972, pp. 260-6; Klineberg, O., op. cit., pp. 46 ff; Frank, J., *Sanity and Survival*, The Cresset Press, London, 1967, chapter 7; Holsti, O., «Cognitive Dynamics and Images of the Enemy», in Farrell, eds, *Image and Reality in World Politics*, Columbia Univ. Press, New York, 1967, pp. 16-22, 24 ff.

20. Merton, R. K., op. cit.; Klineberg, O., op. cit.; Campbell, D. T., op. cit.

21. Merton, R. K., op. cit., p. 265.

22. LeVine, R., op. cit.; LeVine, R., Campbell, D. T., op. cit.; Merton, R. K., op. cit.; Campbell, D. T., op. cit.; Scott, W. A., op. cit. in Kelman ed.; Holsti, O., op. cit.; Frank, J., op. cit.; Deutsch, M., op. cit., pp. 67-71, 352-9; Burton, J. W., *Conflict and Communication*; Kelman, H., in Austin and Wenzel eds, op. cit.; Brofenbrenner, U., «The Mirror Image in Soviet-American Relations», *Journal of Social Issues*, 17, 1961, pp. 46-56; Stagner, R., «Personality Dynamics and Social Conflicts», in Zawodny, ed. *Man and International Relations*, Vol. I, Chandler Publ. Co, San Francisco, 1966, pp. 588-93; White, R. K., «Misperception as a Cause of Two World Wars», in Hollander, Hunt eds, op. cit., 1976, pp. 456, 460; Sherif, M., op. cit., pp. 69ff.

23. Brofenbrenner, op. cit.; R. K. White and Osgood, C., mentioned in White, R. K., «Images in the Context of International Conflict», in Kelman ed., op. cit. pp. 255ff. On Dulles cognitive image, see: Holsti, O. R., «The Belief System and National Images», Rosenau ed., 1969, pp. 545-50.

a case study: the national historical ingroup and outgroup images in the primary and secondary educational system of Greece

A. *The Present Educational System and Curriculum (1977-1979)*

Primary and secondary education in Greece, consists of twelve grades. The first six constitute the so called Demotikon, the next three the Gymnasion and the last three the Lykeion. Demotikon and Gymnasion, are compulsory.

The curriculum is specified in all detail by the Ministry for Education, and the textbooks assigned, are published by the so called «Organization of School Book Publications». The change of an assigned textbook is fairly rare, thus some schoolbooks have succeeded in surviving for several decades unaltered.

The whole curriculum, could be broadly divided into arts and sciences, or «classical» and «applied» lessons as they call them in Greece. The textbooks that seem to generate ingroup and outgroup images, are in the area of the arts and are those of the following subjects: Ancient Greek texts, or their translation, modern greek, religion, geography, mythology, «political education», philosophy, and by definition, history.

History, is taught from the 3rd Demotikon onwards, the Classics in the Gymnasion and Lykeion, modern greek in all the grades, religion in the same grades as history, geography from the 3rd Demotikon to the 6th, and then again in the 2nd and 3rd Gymnasion and 2nd Lykeion. Mythology, in the 3rd Demotikon, «political education», in the 3rd Gymnasion and 3rd Lykeion, and philosophy in the 3rd Lykeion.

B. *Brief Review of the Textbooks with «Indirect» National Ingroup, and Outgroup Images*

1. The Classics, Religion, Geography Mythology, Political Education, Philosophy

Apart from the history textbooks, which contain historical ingroup-outgroup images «par excellence», and thus potentially generate them to schoolchildren, a brief survey will be made of the other texts—particularly of the «Reading Books»—which could contribute to the shaping of national images less directly.

The Classics need no special reference, apart from the fact that great emphasis is given to them and are considered among the major subjects. Religion, follows the following sequence, beginning with the 4th Demotikon: the Old and New Testaments, the history of Christianity, the norms of Christian Faith (the Greek Orthodox Dogma), religious sermons and rituals, and christian ethics. The corresponding titles of the textbooks are: The Old Testament, The New Testament,

Religious History, The Word of God, The Word of God (again), Christian Truth, Religious History, Orthodox Faith and Cult, and Christian Ethics. The books are centered on the greek contribution to Christianity and the Greek Orthodox Dogma and Church, and there are a number of bitter remarks on the Catholic Church.²⁴

Geography, from the 3rd to the 5th Demotikon, is concerned exclusively with Greece, and only in the 6th Demotikon Europe appears.²⁵ In the 2nd Gymnasion, European Geography is again taught with World Geography appearing only in the 3rd Gymnasion. In the 2nd Lykeion the textbook is entitled «World Economic Geography».

Mythology, taught only in the 3rd Demotikon is consecrated to ancient greek mythology exclusively.

Political Education in the 3rd Gymnasion, deals with human rights based, according to the text, «initially on the greek ancient tradition». The 3rd Lykeion's attempt at political socialization includes a great number of political themes and is more sophisticated. As for philosophy, a subject added to the curriculum very recently, it is not so greek-centered, as it includes a fair amount of European philosophers as well, among whom some modern ones.

2. The Reading Textbooks

The Reading Textbook, is considered by both educationalists and governmental officials, as the most important single textbook of the curriculum, and has been repeatedly characterized, as «the point of convergence of all the educational system», and as «based predominantly on the current political ideology».²⁶ The Reading Book is thus not merely a text for greek literature, or for learning greek grammar and syntax. Reading books are comprised of poems, short stories or extracts, from larger works of various well known greek writers. Ingroup and outgroup national images are particularly striking beginning with the 5th Demotikon, and ending with the 1st Lykeion. Beyond, or below these, the texts are either too sophisticated, or too simplified to generate such images (at least in the same outright manner).

—The 5th Demotikon

The various texts are grouped on the basis of the

24. The blame for the Schism between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches, is put squarely on the Pope's shoulders (his «arrogance and personal ambitions»). The Orthodox Dogma is furthermore repeatedly heralded, as «the only true Christian dogma».

25. At the end of European Geography, one reads the following remarks, under the title of «Elements of Anthropogeography to Remember»: «the most important ancient civilization is that of the Greeks, others existed as well, but they are of minor significance».

26. In greek daily *BHMA*, in two issues: 8-11-1973, and 4-6-1978.

following five headlines:²⁷ (1) «From religious life», nine articles; (2) «From national life and history», twenty-four articles; (3) «From greek work, life and the natural environment», twenty-three articles; (4) «From family and social life», fourteen articles; (5) «From inventions and Civilization», seven chapters.

The twenty-four articles of «national life and history», consist of: the Greek National Anthem, six articles referring to armed confrontation with the Turks—where the Greeks are invariably praised and the Turks consistently downgraded—an article on Cyprus, which is characterized «greek soil»; two articles on the Greek-Cypriot war «with the Turks», one of which deals with the 1974 Turkish invasion, and the resulting, as the article puts it, «slaughtering of unarmed women and children, the burning of houses and plunderings of the Turks... resulting in 200,000 refugees; four on wars with the Arabs during the Byzantine era; one about a confrontation with the Bulgarians during Byzantium; one concerning a siege of Constantinople by the Slavs, where the city was «saved by the will of God, and Greek bravery»; one on the «greek victory» over the Italians in World War II; four general articles on the flag, «the heroic greek character», «the greek race», and other relevant themes, and three more general neutral articles on greek history.

—The 6th Demotikon

The headings are the same as in the previous grade with the exception of the last category of articles which is non-existent. There are: eleven for «religious life», thirty-five for national history, twenty-one for «family and social life», and twenty for «greek life, work and natural environment». The national history section consists of: fifteen articles on different aspects of the greek-turkish conflicts («heroic Greeks», «Turkish tyranny» theme throughout); eight on the «virtues» of the Greeks, the most prominent of which, according to the selection, being «devotion to the fatherland», and «exceptional heroism» and manliness (sic); nine on virtues again, but in a considerably less pronounced manner; one on «greek heroism» in the II World War against Italy; one on the Greek-Cypriots' struggle against the British rule in the fifties, and of course the National Anthem.²⁸

—The 1st Gymnasium

The texts selected are divided into the following sixteen sections: «Religious Faith», twelve articles; «Man and Nature», twelve articles; «The German Occupation», four articles; «Love for one's fellow-man», three articles; «Friendly relationships», five articles; «The Hardships of Life», six; «Individual's impetus to succeed or win», four; «On National Redemption», nine

articles, all on the Greeks' struggle for independence against the Ottoman Empire in the 1820s; «Older Forms of Life», four articles; «On immigration», four articles; «Family Relationships», seven; «Knowledge of our country and of other countries», nine; «The Hardships of Cyprus», three articles (the most extended being on Afxendiou, Grivas' second in command, «who fought the British to the death rather than surrendering»); the remaining are, three articles on athletics, seven on folk culture, and two from the greek folk theatre.²⁹

—The 2nd Gymnasium

The articles selected are put under the following subtitles: Religious Life, with elements of national history (nineteen articles); National Life and History (forty-five); Family and Social Life (thirty-six); Greek Nature (in the sense of the natural environment), twenty-eight articles; and Stories and Proverbs, five.

The National Life section contains seventeen articles on Ancient Greece, sixteen on various struggles with the Turks, one on war against Bulgaria, six on «greek virtues», one on a «greek vice», namely «discord when it is least needed», the National Anthem, and some other somewhat less emotional articles on Greek History.

—The 3rd Gymnasium

The sections are the following: «Recent historic past», six articles on the Greeks in World War II; in «religious life», twelve articles; in «family life», sixteen; ancient history, eleven; modern greek history, twenty-one, all referring to struggles with Turkey; in the «social life» twelve; in «State and Governmental Institutions», four; in «Biographies», two articles; in «works of art and civilization», two; in «proverbs and traditions», two; in «natural environment», ten articles, and last of all «on animals and birds», five articles.

—The First Lykeion

The sections are the following: Religious Life, twelve; Social Life, twenty-one; Greek Natural Environment, twenty-six; Individual Character Types (or Personality Types), twelve articles; and, forty articles on national history themes. In this last section, there are eight articles on the struggle against the Turks, one on war against Bulgaria, six on World War II, and the remaining are various less emotionally tinged selections on Ancient Greece, the Byzantium and «greek virtues».

The sum total of the above articles is quite illustrative: Out of a total of 587 in the six Reading Books of the above six grades, 198 concern greek national history—the ingroup's history. This amounts to roughly 1/4 of all the articles, 77 of which refer to the greek-turkish conflict (that is roughly 8/20 of all the articles on national history). The greek national image is

27. Note how traditional and uninspiring are the headlines.

28. The National Anthem refers to the Greek Struggle for Independence against the «Turkish yoke».

29. The translation of the subtitles in this grade created some problems, in the attempt not to lose completely the characteristic greek «flavour».

to a greater or lesser degree enhanced in all the selections, while those of the outgroups deemed as «enemy», are invariably downgraded, Turkey in particular (at least as far as quantity is concerned, but also in qualitative terms).³⁰

C. Content Analysis of the History Textbooks

1. Objective and Hypotheses

The objective of this content analysis is to assert the existence of the dichotomy of ingroup from outgroup, manifested by the formal socialization agent (namely the school), and in particular, the degree of deviation—in qualitative and quantitative terms—from the ideal of objectivity, which a scientific universal historical narrative should have, in order to promote «understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations». (art. 26, par. 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights). Such an ideal writing of history, would either contain no evaluative or affective elements of a high degree at all, or will balance the negative assertions by the positive ones, and thus when added up, would lead to zero, or almost zero, in a quantitative content analysis as the one below.

The general hypothesis to be tested, is that greek school history books are ethnocentric, not only as to the relative amount devoted to national history, but in particular—and this is the object of the whole exercise—as to the ingroup and outgroup images they propagate.

The specific hypotheses put explicitly to the test are the following:

(a) More pages devoted to greek national history than all the other nations put together (over 50% of the text).

(b) Greater sophistication in the higher grades than in the lower ones: that is lesser frequency and intensity of evaluative-affective assertions (relatively to the lower grades).

(c) Discrepancy between ingroup and outgroup historical images: over 50% of the total assertions favourable for the ingroups, over 50% unfavourable for the outgroups.

(d) Conspicuous predominance of unfavourable assertions for Turkey, acclaimed today as the number one «enemy» (the outgroup «par excellence» that is).

30. At this point, an interesting finding by a Greek educationalist is noteworthy: Ann Frangoudakis discovered in her comparative content analysis of Greek Reading Books of the mid-war period and of today, that the older schooltexts were considerably more progressive and less authoritarian than those of the seventies, in all domains (religion, family relationships, society, national level), a finding which led her to conclude, that there seems to be some kind of regression in the greek educational system, «as if history went backwards», as she puts it. Of course, it should be noted, that Frangoudakis examined only the Demotikon books. (Greek daily *BHMA*, June 4th, 1978).

(e) And a highly tentative hypothesis of minor importance: that negative-unfavourable assertion on Greeks and greek actions are reserved for actions of Greek to Greek, rather than Greek to outgroup member (over 50% of the negative assertions).

2. Research Technique

The Content Analysis chosen, is an Evaluative Assertion type of content analysis, in accordance with the Charles Osgood formulation, with some minor alterations of small significance.

The «universe of analysis» is taken on the basis of at least 30 evaluations for a nation, and the appearance of that nation in at least three schooltexts. On this basis the following met the requirements: Greece/Greeks, Turkey/Turks, Bulgaria/Bulgarians, Arabs, Persia or Iran, and the Medieval Crusaders of Western Europe.³¹

The variables—that is the greek school images of these nationalities—are operationally defined as follows:

(a) The sum total frequency count of evaluative assertions for each pair of polar opposite adjectives.

(b) The total intensity score for each pair of polar adjectives.

(c) The mean intensity for each direction of the pairs, that is the «grand average» evaluation:

$$\frac{\text{total intensity}}{\text{total frequency}}$$

On the basis of this operational definition, (a) + (b) lead to three positive or negative adjectives, which constitute the «image» of that nation which is allegedly conveyed to the pupils. The third component of the operational definition added, is not to be considered as basic as the above two, as it tends to obscure unacceptably the differences, as will be seen below.

Data collection and data processing is based on the Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum «Semantic Differential Technique». Indicators of the variables are all the adjectives, adverbs, nouns and even verbs that contain «an inherent evaluation». ³² In an attempt to combine «thematic» with «word» content analysis, all «signs» are translated to the following form (always according to Osgood and his colleagues): Attitude Object/Verbal Connector/Attitude Object, or Attitude Object/Verbal Connector/Common Meaning Term.

31. The following outgroup images of nations were not included, as they did not meet the minimum requirements set: Britain, Italy, Germany, The Slavs, the Romans, Russia, and various other medieval or ancient peoples.

32. Osgood, C., «The Representational Model», in Pool, D. S., ed., *Trends in Content Analysis*. Univ. of Illinois Press, 1959, pp. 42-52; Osgood, C., Suci, G. I., Tannenbaum, P. H., «The Measurement of Meaning», in Snider, J., Atherton, Chicago/New York, 1972, pp. 56-79; Carroll, J., «The Measurement of Meaning by Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum», in Snider, Osgood, eds, op. cit., pp. 100-9; See also, Gurr, T.D., *Politimetrics*, Prentice-Hall, Jersey, 1972; and Holsti, O., *Content Analysis*, 1969.

Measurement takes place at the ordinal level, indicators being ranked on the basis of an arbitrary seven-step evaluative ratio scale, ranging from +3 (most favourable) to -3 (most unfavourable). The pairs of polar opposites used are only three: good-bad, brave-cowardly, creative (intelligent)-non creative (non intelligent). The use of only three pairs of polar opposites, to simplify things, created problems, as it inevitably often worked as a kind of strait-jacket. Nevertheless, it is hoped that if other researchers participated, (as is usually done in content analyses), variations would appear as to the attribution of intensity score to the assertions, rather than as to the direction of the assertion, as positive or negative. Furthermore, other researchers would be more or less Procrustean in fitting assertions to one of the six adjectives. Variations would probably appear in the +1, and -1 scores' assertions, as some would not qualify them as evaluative assertions at all. The problems were minor as far as the basic affective-

evaluative assertions were concerned, that is those of the «good-bad» category.

Once the indicators are identified and ranked accordingly, the procedure is additive for both the total frequency and intensity scores for each of the six polar adjectives. Intensity, e.g. +3, equals three +1.

The final image of each nation, according to the Geek Educational System, results from the subtraction of one polar opposite from the other, leading to one total frequency and one total intensity figure for each pair of polar opposites which is either negative, positive or zero (equilibrated: the ideal).

3. Content Analysis Results

a: The number of pages dedicated to the Greek historical image and of the outgroup historical images follows this pattern, from the 4th Demotikon to the 3rd Lykeion:

Grade	Title of Book	Total No of pp.	No of pp. for Greece	No of pp. to other nations and themes
4 th D:	«Ancient Greece» -146 B.C.	169	154 91.124%	Persians:2 On «history»:5 On «prehistory»:8
5th D:	«Roman and Byzantine» History, 8th century B.C.-1453 A.D., plus small section on the Renaissance	181	83 45.856%	Romans:34 Roman Byzantium: (330 A.D.-610 A.D) 39 Arabs:4 Bulgarians:1 Turks:4 Europe:12 On «history»:4
6th D:	«History of the Recent Years» 1453-1945	121	115 95.04%	Turks:3 France:2 Europe:1
1st G:	«History of the Ancient World» -146 B.C.	Total: 471 pages 400	352,74.734% 302 75.5%	Near East Ancient Civilizations:50 Persians:8 Romans:23 The rest on history. Romans:108 Byzantine Romans: 34 Arabs:10 Turks:2 Bulgarians:1 England:2 France:2 Italians:1
2nd G:	«Creco-Roman Byzantine and European Medieval History», 146 B.C.-1453 A.D.	352	168 47.727%	
3rd G:	«Recent European History» 15th century-today	342	113 33.04%	Europe (England, France, Germany, Italy, U.S.A. and to lesser degree other nations): 206
		Total:	1094	583, 53.29%

(continued)

Grade	Title of Book	Total No of pp.	No of pp. for Greece	No of pp. to other nations and themes
1st L: The same textbook as in the first gymnasion is used (results see 1st Gymnasion)				
2nd L:	«Roman and Byzantine History» 146 B.C.-1453 A.D.	404	155 38.366%	Romans:136 Byzantine Romans:55 Arabs:10 Europe:42 Bulgarians:2 Turks:4
3rd L:	«Modern Greek and European History» 15th century-1914	354	142 40.112%	Europe:200 Turkey:10 Bulgaria:2
Total:		1158	599, 51.727%	

Hypothesis (a) was confirmed, as more than 50% of the historical narrative is devoted to Greek history: out of a sum total of 2723 pp., 1534 are on Greeks and Greece, that is 56.334% of the total. Of course, as can be seen, not all textbooks have 50% or more devoted to Greece. The most greek oriented are the 4th and 6th Demotikon, and the least, the third Gymnasion and 2nd Lykeion textbooks (see Diagram A).

b: Hypothesis (b) was not totally confirmed. It was confirmed as to the frequency of the evaluative assertions in Demotikon, Gymnasion and Lykeion: in Demotikon, 438 positive and 308 negative, that is a total of 743 evaluative assertions; in Gymnasion, 202 positive and 137 negative, a total of 339 evaluative assertions; in Lykeion, 164 positive and 170 negative, a total of 335. The margin between Gymnasion and Lykeion is at the minimum, and thus, when it comes to the intensity of the evaluative assertions, the Lykeion surpasses the Gymnasion, particularly due to the great number of negative evaluative assertions of the 3rd Lykeion textbook.

Demotikon has +856, -670, Gymnasion +446,

-325, and Lykeion +389, -432. Demotikon comes first in both negative and positive evaluative assertion intensity total.

c: Hypotheses (c) and (d) were confirmed as concerns the ingroup and outgroup images with the exception of the Arabs. The same applies as to the total frequency and intensity figure of positive and negative assertions. Thus:

	Total positive:	Total negative:	Percentage of positive:
Greece:	729.	105	87.41%
Turkey:	Total intensity(+):1555(-):185	Total positive:39. Total negative:386	9.176%
Bulgaria:	Total positive: 2. Total negative:33	Total intensity: +4, -77	5.714%
Persia:	Total positive: 4. Total negative:44	Total intensity: +7, -94	8.333%
Crusaders:	Total positive:4. Total negative:33	Total intensity: +5, -95	10. 81%
Arabs:	Total positive: 26 negative:11	Total intensity: +57, -26.	70. 27%

More analytically the percentage in each category of polar opposites to each grade is as follows (see also Diagrams B, Bi, Bii, Biii): as concerns the «frequency»:

«Good-Bads» (percentage for «good»)

Greece	Turkey	Bulgaria	Persia	Crusaders	Arabs
4th D: 59.649%	—	—	0%(100% bad)	—	—
5th D: 68%	7.142%	0%(100% bad)	0%	18.181%	0%
6th D: 81.538%	3.825%	0%(100 %bad)	—	—	—
Demotikon: 70.748%	4.347%	0%(100 %bad)	0%(100% bad)	18.181%	0%(100% bad)
1st G: 70.588%	—	—	0%	—	—
2nd G: 53.846%	9.09%	0%(100% bad)	0%	0%(100% bad)	36.363%
3rd G: 63:157%	0%(100% bad)	0%(100% bad)	—	—	—
Gymnasion: 55.357%	1.754%	0%(100% bad)	0%(100% bad)	0% (100% bad)	36.363%
1st L: 70.588%	—	—	0%	—	—
2nd L: 37.5%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3rd L: 38.095%	0.934%	0%	—	—	—
Lykeion:50%	2.777%	0%(100% bad)	0%(100% bad)	0%(100% bad)	0%(100% bad)

Totals: Greece: 63.453% «good» and 36.547% «bad».
 Turkey: 3.217% «good» and 96.783% «bad»
 Bulgaria: 100% «bad»
 Persia: 100% «bad»
 Crusaders: 5.714% «good» and 94.286% «bad»
 Arabs: 36.666% «good» and 73.334% «bad»

«Brave-Cowardly» (percentage for «brave»)

Greece	Turkey	Bulgaria	Persia	Crusaders	Arabs
4th D: 100%	—	—	18.181%	—	—
5th D: 96.296%	100%	0%	—	—	100%
6th D: 93.095%	50%	—	—	—	—
Demotikon: 98.453%	52.631%	0%(100% cowardly)	18.181%	—	100%
Ist G: 100%	—	—	—	—	—
2nd G: 100%	100%	—	—	100%	100%
3rd G: 95%	100%	—	—	—	—
Cymnasion: 97.872%	100%	—	—	100%	100%
Ist L: 100%	—	—	—	—	—
2nd L: 100%	—	100%	—	—	100%
3rd L: 98.484%	0%(100% cowardly)	—	—	—	—
Lykeion: 98.979%	0% (cowardly)	100%	—	—	100%
Totals: Greece: 98.445% «brave» and 1.555% «cowardly» Turkey: 58.333% «brave» and 41.667 «cowardly» Bulgaria: 50% «brave» and 50% «cowardly» Persia: 18.181% «brave» and 81.819% «cowardly» Crusaders: 100% «brave» Arabs: 100% «brave»					

«Intelligent, Creative-Non Creative» (Percentage for «creative»)

Greece	Turkey	Bulgaria	Persia	Crusaders	Arabs
4th D: 96.296%	—	—	0%	—	—
5th D: 100%	33.333%	0%	—	100%	100%
5th D: 100%	28.571%	—	—	—	—
Demotikon: 97.391%	30%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Ist G: 100%	—	—	50%	—	—
2nd G: 88.461%	50%	—	—	—	100%
3rd G: 80%	100%	—	—	—	—
Gymnasion: 92.452%	87.5%	—	50%	—	100%
Ist L: 100%	—	—	50%	—	—
2nd L: 100%	—	100%	0%	—	100%
3rd L: 100%	30%	—	—	—	—
Lykeion: 100%	30%	100%	33.333%	—	100%
Totals: Greece: 96% «creative», and 3.636% «non-creative» Turkey: 44.827% «creative», and 55.173 «non-creative» Bulgaria: 50% «creative», and 50% «non-creative» Persia: 28.571% «creative», and 71.429 «non-creative» Crusaders: 100% «creative» Arabs: 100% «creative»					

The total intensity figure for each direction of the three pairs of polar opposites is the following:

	«good-bad»	«brave-cowardly»	«creative-non creative»
Greece:	+ 227, - 152	+ 922, - 12	+ 406, - 9
Turkey:	+ 18, - 907	+ 23, - 16	+ 24, - 25
Bulgaria:	- 73	+ 2, - 1	+ 2, - 3
Persia:	- 69	+ 3, - 15	+ 4, - 10
Crusaders:	+ 2, - 95	+ 2,	+ 1
Arabs:	+ 6, - 26	+ 13,	+ 38

The end result is the following: (see Diagrams C and D)

Greece: «goods» 67(frequency), + 75(intensity)
«brave» 374(frequency), + 910(intensity)
«creative» 184(frequency), + 397(intensity)
Turkey: «bad» 348(frequency), - 889(intensity)
«brave» 4(frequency), + 7(intensity)
«non-creative» 2(frequency), - 1(intensity)

Bulgaria: «bad» 31(frequency), -73(intensity)
 «brave» 0(frequency), +1(intensity)
 «non-creative» 2(frequency), -1(intensity)
 Persia: «bad» 30(frequency), -69(intensity)
 «cowardly» 7(frequency), -12(intensity)
 «non-creative» 3(frequency), -6(intensity)
 Crusaders: «bad» 3(frequency), -93(intensity)
 «brave» 1(frequency), +2(intensity)
 «creative» 1(frequency), +1(intensity)
 Arabs: «bad» 5(frequency), -20(intensity)
 «brave» 6(frequency), +38(intensity)
 «creative» 16(frequency), +38(intensity)

d: The mean intensity for each direction did not follow the above pattern, but obscures somewhat the above results, not only due to the Robinson «ecological fallacy», in which case the smaller aggregates were consistently taken, but mostly as a result of the fact that e.g. a great number of unfavourable assertions could have a grand average of possibly less than -2, while simply one favourable assertion alone could be +3, giving the impression, that in general the image of that nation is positive (as frequency is cancelled out), at least in some respects compared to «Greece».

Thus the average intensity score for each of the six adjectives was found to be the following: (see also Diagrams Ei, Eii, Eiii).

Greece: +1.436(good)	+2.426(brave)	+2.125(creative)
-1.67(bad)	-2(cowardly)	-1.285(non-creative)
Turkey: +1.5(good)	+1.642(brave)	+1.846(creative)
-2.519(bad)	-1.6(cowardly)	-1.666(non-creative)
Bulgaria:	-(good)	+2(brave)
	+2(good)	+2(creative)
	-1(cowardly)	-3(non-creative)
Persia:	-(good)	+1.5(brave)
	+2(good)	+2(creative)
	-1.666(cowardly)	-2(non-creative)
Crusaders: +1(good)	+2(brave)	+1(creative)
	-2.878(bad)	-(non-creative)
Arabs: +1.5(good)	+2.1666(brave)	+2.375(creative)
	-2.363(bad)	-(non-creative)

e: Hypothesis (e) was totally confirmed concerning the negative assertions of the first pair of polar opposite adjectives (that is «bad»). Thus, out of all the negative assertions, 60.952% refer to actions of Greek against Greek; this is due mainly to the fact that in the «bad» category 70.329% of the frequency total are reserved for actions of ingroup members to ingroup members. As concerns the intensity total score the percentage is the following: 64.324% of the negative assertions, and 72.56% of the intensity of «bad». ³³

33. The sequence of the above for Demotikon, Gymnasium and Lykeion is the following:

Frequency Negative: 76%(Demotikon)
45.161%(Gymnasium)
50%(Lykeion)
Frequency «bad»: 88.372%(Demotikon)
56%(Gymnasium)
52%(Lykeion)

Note the higher results in Demotikon, where «bad» actions of ingroup members to outgroups are only a mere 11.628% of the assertions. Note also the effects of the Ecological Fallacy in obscuring the extent of this in the aggregate.

f: Summary of the Results and Conclusion:

Hypothesis (a) was confirmed, as 56.334% of the narrative is devoted to Greek National History. Hypothesis (b) was only partially confirmed. Hypothesis (c) was confirmed for the first polar adjectives in particular, and only partially for the other pairs, with the Arabs being the main exception (bad-brave-creative) to the finding that all outgroups had at least two out of three adjectives negative (Turkey, Bulgaria, Persia). The Crusaders, which of course can hardly qualify as one outgroup, succeeded in failing marginally in the category with the Arabs. Hypothesis (d) was confirmed, though it was not as to the average intensity, which was considered of minor importance. Hypothesis (e) was confirmed.

One could thus accept the basic hypothesis, that greek history-books taught in primary and secondary schools, are ethnocentric to a considerable degree. Only the Greek historical image, was found to be positive: good-brave-creative, and greek history was devoted more than half the pages.

According to Levine and Campbell, «the more ethnocentric the ingroup, the more it would perceive outgroups as strong, aggressive and effective, rather than cowardly, weak, stupid and lazy». The fact, that of the five outgroups, the four were found to be both «bad and brave» (Turkey, Arabs, Crusaders, Bulgaria) is indicative in this respect.

At this point, having assessed the ingroup-outgroup images of one school curriculum and found it in accord with the theories on ethnocentrism and group interaction, one inevitably feels tempted to answer some of the problems posed. Among those are: «why», and «what». That is, why are these false images of the curriculum accepted by individuals, and what are the results of this acceptance? These two questions will be narrowed down to the following two:


(1) What factors contribute from the point of view of the receiving end—that is the individual—to acceptance? This, will inevitably lead us to the precarious realms of the «nature of man», to his peculiarities and to his limitations.

(2) What are the effects of the socialization to conflict process on actual decision-making concerning outgroups? Here one is led to the equally precarious territory of foreign policy analysis, and to its dilemmas and contradictions.

The first question, will be examined tentatively on purely theoretical grounds, in an attempt at a conceptual integration of various findings of psychology and social psychology, and to a smaller extent communication's theory. The second question will only be touched briefly on the basis of International Relations' theory, but will also be illustrated by a limited content analysis.

Before proceeding, it should be noted, that from the methodological point of view, the procedure to follow is

DIAGRAM A. Analogy of Greek History per Grade



on rather weak grounds. The process is that of a theoretical—and to minor extend empirical—justification, or verification of the hypothesis that national images are significant, rather than a rigid attempt to give the whole picture and even falsify the hypothesis. Furthermore the first question, is definitely answered by way of a one-sided psychological-reductionist approach. This was done in part deliberately, in the belief that despite those facts, it is a worth while exercise.

the acceptance potential of socialization to conflict

Acceptance, will not be considered in a Skinnerian sense, as «covert», or «incipient-inchoate-behaviour»,³⁴ but within the Kelman model, as one of these three:

34. On the Skinnerian behaviorist thesis see e.g., Skinner, B. F., *About Behaviorism*, Vintage Books, 1974, particularly chapters 1, 3, 4, 7 (10-13), 15; and Skinner, B. F., *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*, Penguin Books, 1971.

internalization, identification, compliance.³⁵ That is, as a resultant of a cognitively mediated process.

Socialization to conflict by way of national images, as Katz argues, owes its considerable influence to its emotional and behavioural conditioning of depth, where no deviations are tolerated, and there is «a unanimity of social reinforcement», which is lacking in most of the other learnign processes.³⁶

It should be added, before proceeding to the study of

35. Kelman, H., «Compliance, Identification, and Internalization, Three Processes of Attitude Change», *JCR*, Vol. II, 1, pp. 51ff; Kelman H., «Patterns of Personal Involvement in the National System», Rosenau ed., *International Politics and Foreign Policy*, The Free Press, New York, 1969, pp. 279-288.

36. Boulding, K. E., «National Images and International Systems», *JCR*, Vol. III, 2, 1959, p. 122; Katz, D., «Nationalism and Strategies of International Conflict Resolution», in Kelman ed. *International Behavior*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965, p. 365; Kelman, H., «Education for the Concept of a Global Society», *Social Education*, Vol. 32.2, 1968; Bandura, A., *Social Learning Theory*, Prentice-Hall Inc., New Jersey, 1977.

DIAGRAM Bi. «Good-Bad» Frequency Percentage per Grade




DIAGRAM Bii. «Brave-Cowardly» Frequency Percentage per Grade




DIAGRAM Biii.«Creative-Non-creative» Frequency Percentage per Grade




Diagram C. Total Intensity Score in Each Nation






DIAGRAM D. The «Images» of the 6 Nations on the Basis of the Intensity Score



the «organism»—that is the individual—which receives information concerning the ingroup and outgroup, that one could avoid all further discussion, by accepting that socialization to conflict, owes its success, to the fact that human beings are receptive to such indoctrination because it presents them with an outlet to their innate tendency for aggressiveness. This Lorenzian position would not be accepted, as it has been repudiated by a

rising number of scholars from various fields of research, ranging from ethology stricto sensu, to anthropology and social psychology. On the other hand, neither will a purely behaviorist stimulus-response model be considered appropriate. Neither «nature nor nurture» will be considered predominant, as it has been characterized by more and more scholars as a meaningless controversy. Learning takes place within a pro-

DIAGRAMS Ei, Eii, Eiii. Mean Intensity for Each Adjective



G: Greece T: Turkey A: Arabs B: Bulgaria C: Crusaders P: Persia

cess of «reciprocal determinism», as Albert Bandura argues, in his «social learning theory», approach. Aggression, according to Bandura, is not innate, but the result of the exposure of children to «aggressive modeling», which in our case are the conflict-prone ingroup and outgroup images, and the presentation of ingroup aggressive stances as successful and instrumental. As John Paul Scott remarks: one of the major causes of violent conflict is its «usefulness or apparent usefulness in attaining certain ends». And children are indoctrinated to believe precisely that.³⁷

The study of the peculiarities of human nature, which enhance the potential success of socialization, will be examined in the following sequence: perception, cognitive dynamics, social or group dynamics, and psychological functions and needs. Before starting, one qualification is indispensable, as we are dealing with 9 to 18 years old. We are, according to Piagetian developmental psychology, dealing with children in the fifth and six stages of their development.³⁸ And in the fifth stage—ages from 7 to 11—children are completely insensitive to their nation as a reality, being, in contrast to the next stage, able to make only intellectual operations on «concrete or manipulable object».³⁹

Perception

From the literature on perception, one could deduce the following very general statements, which seem to corroborate the hypothesis that the school national ingroup-outgroup image is perceived as such:

- (1) There exists a perceptual tendency to perceive unambiguous, simplified and familiar messages.
- (2) For the acceptance of information on outgroups, an anchoring framework is essential.
- (3) Perception of information on actions of the ingroup or the outgroups (as a whole), is qualitatively

37. On aggression see e.g., Montagu, A. (ed.), *Man and Aggression*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1973 (in particular the articles by: Montagu, Berkowitz, L., Barnett, Helmut, Scott, J. P., Crook, J. H.); Lorenz, K., *On Aggression*, Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1966; for the Dollard, Doob et al «frustration-aggression» hypothesis see comments and analysis by Bandura and Fromm in their works mentioned under this Note; Bandura, A., «Social Learning Theory of Aggression», in Hollander, Hunt eds *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1976; Fromm, E., *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*, A Fawcett Crest Book, 1975 printing; On Skinner's position on «aggression» see, *About Behaviorism*, op. cit., pp. 40, 47-8, and for critical remarks see the above mentioned works of Bandura and Fromm among others; Scott, J. P., article in Montagu ed., op. cit., «The Old-Time Aggression», Bandura, A., *Social Learning Theory*, Prentice-Hall, 1977.

38. Stage 6, is that of abstract intellectual operations (age of adolescence) (see Note 39).

39. Piaget, J., *Six Psychological Studies*, A Vintage Book, New York, 1968, pp. 38-70; Inhelder, B., Piaget, J., «Adolescent Thinking», in Santis, Butcher, eds, *Developmental Psychology. Selected Readings*, Penguin Books, 1975, pp. 325-338, in particular page 337.

similar to that of informations on activities of human beings.

In accordance with the «intolerance for ambiguity» thesis, perception is relatively more accurate, when incoming messages are unambiguous, simplified and polarized; on the other hand, ambiguous messages tend to be dichotomized (or, otherwise not accepted with the same accuracy). As it was seen above, the ingroup-outgroup national images were precisely images of the first category. Familiarity with the message is also important, as shown by the well known Bruner and Postman conception of the «prevailing set», whereby the unfamiliar or unexpected is «warded off».⁴⁰ In our case, the ingroup image, in particular, is familiar, as a result of socialization in primary groups before school.

The ingroup image can function as «will», or «consciousness» (in Karl Deutsch's cybernetic model),⁴¹ or in simpler terms, as «a model» in orienting the ingroup members to the inter-group environment, and in coping with the unmanageable—and usually ambiguous—amount of incoming information thus, avoiding overload. It is, as Musafier Sherif has aptly put it, «the standard (that) anchors our appraisal» of outgroups, and by «clinging» more on it, «the fewer categories we need to sort out and appraise the myriad other persons, groups and views».⁴²

Furthermore, the fact that ingroup-outgroup images are heavily imbued with evaluative-affective components and appear as individuals, will render them more easily perceptible, as we tend to perceive outgroups as if they are individuals.⁴³

Once the ingroup image functions as the perceptual «gatekeeper», then contrary information—«anomalies» in the Kuhnian sense—will be detected with considerable difficulty «in the background» of the national image or «group paradigm».⁴⁴ To use a dramatic phrase by Karl Deutsch: «the radically unique... could neither be observed, nor recorded, nor could it be known... no knowable object can be completely unique».⁴⁵ And in a less dramatic tone: «people perceive only what is rele-

40. For the «intolerance of ambiguity» thesis, see Frenkel-Brunwik, E., «Intolerance of Ambiguity as an Emotional and Perceptual Personality Variable», in Bruner, J., Krech, D., eds, *Perception and Personality*, Durnham, N. C., Duke University Press, 1950, p. 65 in particular. For the Bruner-Postman conception see: Bruner, J. S., Postman, L., «On the Perception of Incongruity: A Paradigm», in Bruner, Krech op. cit., pp. 207, 208 and 222 in particular.

41. For Karl Deutsch cybernetic information model see: Deutsch, K. W., *The Nerves of Government*, The Free Press, New York, 1966, pp. 99, 105, and; Deutsch, K. W., *Nationalism and Social Communication*, The MIT Press, 2nd ed., 1966, p. 170 in particular.

42. Sherif, M., *Group Conflict and Cooperation*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1966, pp. 40-1.

43. Stagner, R., «Personality Dynamics and Social Conflicts», in Zawodny ed. *Man and International Relations*, 1966, Vol. I, p. 593.

44. Kuhn, T., *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press, 1970, p. 65.

45. Deutsch, K. W., *The Nerves of Government*, op. cit., p. 14.

vant to their purpose».⁴⁶ Perception, is by definition, selective.

Cognitive Dynamics

The literature on cognitive or belief systems, can give an interesting—though somewhat difficult to assess empirically—theoretical justification for the acceptance of the black and white ingroup-outgroup images by the schoolchildren.

The overall premise of all these theories—of which, Heider's «balance theory», Osgood and Tannenbaum's «congruity theory», Festinger's «cognitive dissonance theory», Abelson and Rosenberg's «psycho-logic» approach, seem the most prominent—is that there exists a strain for consistency, congruity, consonance or harmony in the total belief system, as well as in its subparts, namely: (1) among the cognitive, affective (or evaluative) and behaviour (or action) components of an image, belief or attitude; (2) among two or more images, beliefs or attitudes; (3) among all the images in an attitude organization; (4) among all the images, beliefs or attitudes entering the total system. Lack of such harmony, creates a psychologically uncomfortable situation, which is avoided or reduced to the minimum or resolved.⁴⁷

The ingroup-outgroup image is precisely an image that would seem easily acceptable, as it is «cognitively comfortable», as the feelings and beliefs are congruent—the cognitive and evaluative elements⁴⁸—and reinforce each other, rather than being differentiated, conflicting and thus open to change. And, such images are literally «black and white». They conform to what Abelson and Rosenberg call: a balanced cognitive structure in its simplest form.⁴⁹ Once the ingroup-outgroup image is established, contrary information, if perceived

at all, will create imbalance, or cognitive dissonance of considerable magnitude—as the national ingroup image is normally inclusive of the self—concept of individuals.⁵¹ The cognitive tendency would be, to either reject the threatening message altogether, or to accept it in an altered harmless form.⁵² Probably the affective or evaluative component of ingroup national images—«the value scales» of the individual—is the most decisive single element determining the fate of messages received, as at least one author maintains, and this component can hardly be absent in the case of these images.⁵³

To conclude, there is a cognitive tendency to accept simplified black and white images, as well as a tendency to preserve them with only limited alterations. It is thus considered essential for «image change», to create an unbalanced-dissonant belief first by way of side-attacks, and then to transmit the glaring contrary information.⁵⁴

Social or Group Dynamics

A more thorough justification of the hypothesis, can be given by the findings on social or group dynamics.

Under the continuous pressure of the ingroup, members find it intolerable to maintain contrary beliefs. Almost by definition, membership within a group limits «idiosyncratic» attitudes, or «idiosyncratic behavior», placing limits to the extent of diversity, as pointed out

50. Abelson, R. P., Rosenberg, M. J., op. cit., p. 5. See also, Scott, W. A., «Psychological and Social Correlates of International Images», in Kelman ed., 1965, pp. 72-84,86; Deutsch, K.W.; Merritt, R.L., «Effects of Events on National and International Images», in Kelman ed; 1965, pp. 147-159.

51. According to Leon Festinger: «two elements are in dissonant relation, if considering these two alone, the obverse of one element would follow from the other». (See reference Note 54). According to Abelson a balanced cognitive structure exists when: two positively valued objects are related associatively, or, one positively and one negatively valued, are related dissociatively, or two negatively valued are related associatively (see reference, Note 54). See Aronson for problems with this concept.

52. Dissonance is resolved: (1) by changing a behavioral cognitive component, (2) by changing an environmental cognitive component, (3) by adding cognitive elements which reconcile the dissonant elements (see Festinger, Note 54). According to Abelson, four modes of belief dilemma reduction exist: denial, bolstering, differentiation and transcendence. (See Note 54). Note that in all cases the initial belief is retained in some form.

53. See note 14, and also: Festinger, op. cit., pp. 18-24; Abelson, R. P., «Modes of Resolution of Belief Dilemmas», *JCR*, Vol. III, 4, pp. 344-6. For values in attitudes see: Rokeach, op. cit.; and Boulding, *The Image*.

54. Janis, I., Smith, M. B., «Effects of Education and Persuasion on National and International Images», in Kelman ed., *International Behavior*, 1965, pp. 212ff; Deutsch, K. W., Merritt, R. L., op. cit., p. 159; McGuire, W. J., «Attitude Change and the Information-Processing Paradigm», in Hollander, Hunt eds, 1976, op. cit., pp. 308-309; Rokeach, M., op. cit., pp. 136ff.

46. Cantril, H., «The Human Design», in Hollander-Hunt, ed/s, op. cit., 1976, p. 55.

47. See in particular for the summary of the results on cognitive dynamics mentioned in the text: Rokeach, M., *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values*, Josey-Bass Publ., San Francisco, 1975, p. 114; and Holsti, O., «Cognitive Dynamics and Images of the Enemy», in Farrell, Smith ed., *Image and Reality in World Politics*, Columbia University Press, 1967, p. 19. Also, for more details: Abelson, Rosenberg, M. J., «Symbolic Psycho-Logic: a Model of Attitudinal Cognition», *Behavioral Science*, 3, Jan. 1958, pp. 1ff; Festinger, L., *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 1957, particularly up to p. 31; Aronson, E., «Dissonance Theory: Progress and Problems», in Abelson, R. P., Aronson, E., McGuire, W. J., Newcomb, T. M., Rosenberg, M. J., Tannenbaum, P. H., ed/s, *Theories of Cognitive Consistency: A Source Book*, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1968, chapter 1 (this volume is the authoritative text on cognitive theories).

48. In the case of the ingroup, that was found to be the case («good-brave-creative»). For the outgroups it was as regards the affective-evaluative component par excellence, namely «bad».

49. As Abelson and Rosenberg put it: «in common sense terms, a balanced cognitive structure represents a black and white attitude». (See note 50).

by Edwin Hollander.⁵⁵ In this sense, in the case of ingroup and outgroup national images, «idiosyncrasy credit» will probably oscillate around zero point, in periods of national crisis in particular. In ethnic or national groups, as Daniel Katz has aptly put it, «there is an all or none quality about the matter», one is either a loyal citizen, in this case an individual accepting the national image conveyed by the educational system, or appears to be «rejecting» the ingroup as a whole, and thereby suffering virtual «ostracism» from his group.⁵⁶

Classic experiments in group dynamics, as those of Asch with the length of lines, Sherif with the autokinetic effect, as well as more recent ones—among others by Latané and Darley, on «bystander apathy»—have shown that judgement, (or in Skinnerian wording «covert non-verbal behaviour»), as well as behaviour («external behaviour»), are strikingly effected by the dynamics of the group. Field studies and field experiments, have also shown that within a group beliefs tend to converge,⁵⁷ showing what Newcomb called «a strain for consensus» among the members of the group. Role-enacting and situational determinants, are also particularly conducive to conformity, as shown among others by the astonishing experiments by Stanley Milgram on «obedience to authority», and by Haney and Zimbardo on «social roles and role-playing» in the Stanford Prison experiments.⁵⁸

This strain toward consensus would lead, in the case of the socialized—or indoctrinated—schoolchildren, to the acceptance of the group image in either of the three ways pointed out by Kelman: internalization, identification or compliance. The need for acceptance by

the group, will result to a deliberate eschewing of information capable of altering the ingroup image. Such messages, if accepted by the ingroup member, will render social adjustment and relationships precarious, a tendency dubbed aptly by Robert Lane as «socializing ignorance».⁵⁹ The *raison d'être* of the tendency of children and adults to be seen as conforming—and thus be viewed as «regular chaps» or «good boys»—which occurs automatically at times, is probably due to the fact, that as Peter Blau has put it, «most 'human pleasures have their root in social life... (as) gratifications experienced are contingent on actions of others».⁶⁰

It appears safe to conclude, that the dynamics resulting from the authoritative quality of the textbooks, corroborated by the legitimized authority of the teacher, as well as the dynamics of group membership (the small group in class, as well as the primary group ties and those of the larger national group) and other forms of social pressure, would render resistance minimal and the ingroup-outgroup image internalized.

Psychological Functions and Needs

The above discussed justifications for the acceptance of the hypothesis could be somewhat linked together, at a higher level of abstraction, by way of a functional or needs' approach.

Functional explanations of the resistance of individuals to alter their ethnocentric images have been discussed tentatively by Irving Janis and M. Brewster Smith, on the basis of the Katz «functional approach to the study of attitudes».

Attitudes or images, according to Daniel Katz, have one of the following—or more than one—functions: (1) An instrumental, adaptive, or utilitarian function, (2) an ego-defensive function, (3) a value-expressive function, and (4) a knowledge function.⁶¹

On the basis of this approach, Janis and Katz argue, that ingroup-outgroup national images (or national-international images, as they are better known in International Relations), perform more than one function. Such «multidetermined» images, will probably have a greater potential to resist change.⁶² As for the acquisition of the transmitted images, it is reasonable to assume, that the greater potential to perform over one—and possibly all the functions—an image has, the more easily it will be internalized, if it is not contrary to

55. Hollander, E.P., «Conformity, Status and Idiosyncrasy Credit», in Hollander, Hunt, eds, *Classic Contributions to Social Psychology*, 1972, pp. 362-6.

56. Katz, D., «Nationalism and Strategies of International Conflict Resolution», in Kelman ed., op. cit., p. 368.

57. See e.g. the classic field experiments in Robbers' Caves by Sherif, and Newcomb's field study in an american college of liberal tendencies. Also experiments on reference group theory (for an overview of reference group theory and experiments see articles by Shibutani, and by Hyman and Singer) (see reference Note 58) (and Bibliography).

58. Asch, S. E., «Effects of Group Pressure upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgments», in Cartwright, Zander eds, *Group Dynamics*, Harper and Row, New York, 1953, pp. 189-99; Sherif, M., «Experiments on Norm Formation», in Hollander, Hunt, op. cit., 1972, pp. 319-29; Latané, B., Darley, J. M., «Bystander Apathy», in Hollander, Hunt, eds, op. cit., 1976, pp. 140-52; Newcomb, in Lane, R. E., *Political Life*, The Free Press, New York, 1959, p. 108; Lane, R. E., *ibid.*, pp. 108-110; Deutsch, M., Gerard, «A Study of Normative and Informational Social Influences upon Individual Judgment», in Cartwright, Zander eds, op. cit., pp. 201-3; Cartwright, D., Zander, A., «Origins of Group Dynamics», in Cartwright, Zander, op. cit., pp. 24-5; Siegel, A. E., Siegel, S., «Reference Groups, Membership Groups and Attitude Change», in Cartwright, Zander, op. cit., pp. 98ff; Milgram, S., *Obedience to Authority*, Tavistock, 1974; Haney, C., Zimbardo, P. G., «Social Roles and Role-Playing: Observations from the Stanford Prison Study», in Hollander, Hunt, eds, 1976, op. cit., pp. 266-274.

59. Lane, R. E., op. cit., p. 114.

60. Blau, P., *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, Wiley and Sons, New York, 1964, pp. 14-5; See also: Lane, R. E., op. cit., pp. 108-110; Fromm, E., *The Sane Society*, Fawcett Publ., 1955, pp. 62-4, 138-147; Fromm, E., *The Fear of Freedom*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1975; Fromm, E., *Man for Himself*, Fawcett Publ., 1947, pp. 70-2, 148-161.

61. Katz, D., in Janis, I., Smith, M. B., op. cit., pp. 206-7.

62. Janis, I., Smith, M. B., *ibid.*, pp. 206-8.

a previous similar multidetermined image of the individual.

Another justification for the position that ingroup-outgroup images will be accepted as such, could be discerned, always at abstract levels, by examining some of the psychological vital needs of individuals, that ingroup images can potentially fulfill. A very quick survey of needs could identify—possibly—the following: the need to understand or the need for meaning, the need for certainty, or constancy, or a need for a stable environment. Social needs, as relatedness, social adjustment or belongingness, and probably the most important of all: the need for identity.⁶³

One basic reason for accepting such images is in Rokeach's words, «the need to understand the world insofar as possible, and to defend against it insofar as necessary».⁶⁴ The need for order, constancy or «craiving for certainty» in each of us—to use Cantril's expression in his «human genetically built—in design» approach—could also be contributing to the acceptance and maintenance of the historical ingroup image, and the upgrading of the nation, which is its striking characteristic. Such a robust and ethical ingroup image, is in accord with man's needs for «security», and confidence in the survival capacity of the society of which he is part.⁶⁵ Of the social needs, one should particularly note «belongingness».⁶⁶

Of all the needs mentioned probably the most significant, by virtue of being more direct, is that of self-identity. By accepting—internalizing or identifying with—the historical ingroup and outgroup images, men can «extend themselves backward into the past, forward into the future», and identify themselves with others. The sense of identity—«the ability to say I» as Erich Fromm puts it—is powerfully linked with ethnic or national identity. In fact, according to Daniel Katz, among others: «the formation of the self-concept (is) inclusive of national identity», as the developing child establishes his self-identity simultaneously as «a unique personality», and as «an individual belonging to an ingroup in contrast to foreign outgroups». In other

words, «national identity is an anchoring frame for the individual's conception of himself».⁶⁷

That is, to conclude, for lack of any other alternative available, these images provided by the socialization agent, will tend to be accepted, as they fulfill psychological needs and functions of man and child, as he interacts with himself and his environment.

ingroup-outgroup national images in decision-making

The potential effects of the internalization or identification with ingroup and outgroup images of the national group, or otherwise the effects of a successful socialization to conflict, could be considered analytically under two headings:

(a) The potential influence it has on the definition of the situation by decision-makers, as a result of their own previous socialization to conflict modelling in primary groups, and particularly during their primary and secondary school education.

(b) The influence of the ingroup-outgroup image, expressed via public opinion, on decision-making.

The first issue could be viewed on the basis of literature on «personality and politics». On the basis of this literature, the potential effects of the actions of a nationalist decision-maker on inter-group relations, will depend on what Greenstein calls, his «action dispensability». That is, the circumstances under which his actions are likely to have a greater or lesser effect on the course of events. In this respect, according to Greenstein, three variables are of significance: (1) The impact of the decision maker's personality is greater, to the degree that the environment admits restructuring. Such environments, or situations are—according to Lane, Sherif, Budner, Dahrendorf, O. Holsti, Greenstein and others—those that are perceived as «ambiguous», «complex», «unstructured» and «contradictory».⁶⁸ And it should be noted, that in international relations in particular, incoming information is almost by definition ambiguous.^{69,70} (2) Personality's impact, varies also on the basis of the decision-maker's position in the environment, or otherwise his role. In accordance with

63. Maslow, A., *Toward a Psychology of Being*, Van Nostrand, 1968, pp. 60-72; Maslow, A., *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature*, Esalen-Penguin Book, 1976; Fromm, *The Sane Society*, pp. 35-8, 62; Cantril, H., «The Human Design», op. cit., pp. 52-8; Scott, W., op. cit., pp. 87-8; Lane, R. E., op. cit., pp. 108-11; Sites, P., *Control, the Basis of Social Order*, Univ. Press of Cambridge, Mass., 1973, pp. 42-3; Enloe, C., *Ethnic Conflict and Political Development*, Little, Brown and Co, Boston, 1973, pp. 268-274; White, R., K., op. cit., pp. 262-3; Gardner, J. W., «Individuality, Commitment and Meaning», in Hollander, Hunt, eds, 1976, pp. 62-3; Burton, J. W., «Dynamics of Change in World Society», *LSE Millennium*, Vol 5, No 1, 1976, pp. 66-77.

64. Rokeach, M., op. cit., p. 130. Also on meaning see: Gardner, J. W., op. cit.

65. Cantril, H., op. cit., p. 56.

66. On «belongingness», see Enloe, op. cit., pp. 268-74.

67. Katz, D., op. cit., p. 366.

68. Lane, R. E., *Political Life*, The Free Press, New York, 1959, pp. 99-100; Greenstein, F., *Personality and Politics*, Chicago, 1970, pp. 41-6; Budner, Sherif, in Greenstein, *ibid*; Holsti, O., «Foreign Policy Formation Viewed Cognitively», in Axelrod, R., ed., *Structure of Decision*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton New Jersey, 1976, p. 30;

69. See for misperceptions and for the ambiguity of information in International Relations, in particular, two works by Jervis (in Note 70). This ambiguity is also shown admirably in Allison's, *Essence of Decision*, 1971.

70. Jervis, R., *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*, 1976. Jervis, R., «Hypotheses on Misperception», in Rosenau ed., *International Politics and Foreign Policy*, The Free Press, New York, 1969, pp. 239-54.

role theory, «idiosyncrasy credit» varies and there are usually no rigid absolute standards of performance, but rather a range of tolerable behaviour. The rule is usually for top decision-makers to have a wider range of flexibility, thereby enhancing the potential of their personalities involvement in the decisional output.^{71,72} (3) The third variable, is that of the actors personal strength or weakness, or otherwise the extent of his determination in pursuing his personal views, in our case, his nationalistic biased views.

The second issue on the influence of public opinion in ingroup-outgroup relations, places the internalized historical image in the position of an external element to the decision-makers, that is in their environment.

Although it has been noted that public opinion concerning inter-group, inter-societal (and international), relations is manipulated to a considerable degree by the decision-makers of the group or society, to the extent that «today's friends are practically yesterday's foes», nevertheless, this process is not as one-sided as it appears. As Raymond Bauer has pointed out,⁷³ communication is a transactional process and not a one-sided process as the classic communication's paradigm tends to imply. In the case of the upholding of the national image, the extent of manipulation from above, will probably be within limits, as not to endanger the decision-makers legitimacy. And legitimacy, according to Kelman, results from two factors: (a) if the decision-makers are perceived as reflecting the ethnic and cultural identity of the group or society, and (b) when they meet their needs and interests. As Kelman point out, the first factor in particular is decisive; it can compensate temporarily for lack of effectiveness in meeting needs and interests.⁷⁴ This kind of legitimacy, based on

national identity and the values of the particular society—which Apter⁷⁵ calls «consumatory legitimacy»—is the sine qua non of national integration and the concept of the nation-state, as opposed to so called state-nations with multiple ethnic identities.

It is precisely this type of legitimacy—consumatory legitimacy—which decision makers endanger, by deviating markedly from the expected group or national behaviour. In conflicts with outgroups, the model in process between the public and the official decision-makers is that of an interaction process type, at least in pluralistic systems, where decision-makers are risking their very positions when so called «national issues» are at stake, which is precisely the case in «manifest conflicts» with outgroups. Initial decisions reached at for electoral, or other types of domestic reasons—see e.g. Allison's Model III in decision making⁷⁶—or possibly, at the spur of the moment, as a result of «standard operational procedures» by particular official institutions—see e.g. Allison's Model II—together with the dread of losing «legitimized»⁷⁷ status, may gradually lead decision-making into a «social trap»,⁷⁸ or «situational entrapment».⁷⁹ Misperception of incoming cues, should also not be underestimated, as Jervis and others have shown in international relations,⁸⁰ although, of course, decision-makers will usually tend to be more sophisticated than the mass of the people. As Boulding has put it very eloquently: the images of decision-makers, are «a melange of narrative history, memories of past events, stories and conversations, etc., plus an enormous amount of usually ill-digested and carelessly collected current information... when we add to this the fact that the system produces strong hates, loyalties, disloyalties, and so on, it would be surprising if any images were formed that even remotely resembled the most loosely defined realities of the case». He names such images «literary

71. A classic case in empirical investigation being that of O. Holsti's analysis of Dulles. See also the works of Axelrod and Bonham and Shapiro (in Note 72). For literature on «role theory» see also Note 72.

72. Dahrendorf, R., *Homo Sociologicus*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1973, pp. 18-25, 30-40; Greenstein, F., op. cit. passim; Hollander, E. P., «Conformity, Status and Idiosyncrasy Credits», in Hollander, E. P., Hunt, G. H., *Classic Contributions to Social Psychology*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1976, 365-7; Apter, D. E., *The Politics of Modernization*, The Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1965, p. 124; Newcomb, T. M., «Social Psychological Theory: Integrating Individual and Social Approaches», in Hollander, Hunt, eds., op. cit., p. 86ff; On empirical research on top decision-makers see. Holsti, O., «The Belief System and National Images: A Case Study», in Rosenau ed. *International Politics and Foreign Policy*. The Free Press, New York, 1969, 543-550; Axelrod, R., *Structure of Decision*, op. cit. (ed. volume), see in particular articles by Axelrod, Holsti, Bonham and Shapiro; Holsti, O., «Individual Differences in Definition of the Situation», *JCR*, Vol. XIV, 3, pp. 303-309; Moore, W., in Johnson, C., *Revolutionary Change*, Little Brown and Co, Boston, 1966, p. 42; Johnson, C., op. cit., pp. 41-2.

73. Bauer, R. A., «The Obstinate Audience», in Hollander, Hunt eds., *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, op. cit., pp. 335-344, partic. pp. 336-41.

74. Kelman, H., «Education for the Concept of a Global Society», *Social Education*, Vol. 32, No 2; Kelman, H., «Patterns of Personal

Involvement in the National System», Rosenau ed., op. cit., 1969, pp. 278-9; On «legitimacy» see also Burton, J.W., in Bibliography. Also, Blau, P., *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, J. Wiley and Sons, New York, 1964, pp. 205ff. Lipset, S.m., *Political Man*, Doubledan and Co, 1960, pp. 77-83.

75. Apter, D. E., op. cit., 236-7.

76. Allison Model II, is the Organizational Process Model (with the SOPs), and Model III, is the Governmental or Bureaucratic Politics Model.

77. The finding that decision-makers judge «causally» by way of this method, could probably be attacked on methodological grounds, by virtue of the fact that the method (causal cognitive maps), entails the conclusion of the empirical findings.

78. Allison, *The Essence of Decision*, Little Brown and Co, Boston, 1971; Allison, G.T., Halperin, M.H., «Bureaucratic Politics: A Paradigm and Some Policy Implications», in Tanter, R., Ullman, R. H., *Theory and Policy in International Relations*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1972, pp. 40-79.

79. On «social trap» see: Platt, J., «Social Traps», in Hollander, Hunt, op. cit., 1976, pp. 30-41.

80. On «situational entrapment», see: Deutsch, M., *The Resolution of Conflict*, Haven, Yale University Press, 1973, p. 358.

images», in between «folk images» and scientific images.⁸¹ Boulding's position on decision-makers should not be considered as too exaggerated, if one is reminded of Jervis «hypotheses in misperception», and the conclusions of among others, Bauer, Bonham and Shapiro. As Jervis points out, among other things, the fact that evidence available concerning the international environment is almost always somewhat ambiguous, renders the perception of the situation problematic, and bases it, as with individual perception, on the pre-existing model, or image, or the dominant «paradigm» (in international relations: the «power politics zero-sum paradigm»). Another relevant finding enhancing misapprehensions, is a tendency for causal attribution on events even where it is inappropriate (as with laymen's judgments), demonstrated empirically by Bonham, Shapiro and Axelrod, in their «cognitive mapping approach» to decision making.^{82,83} This among other reasons is probably due the fact that as Bauer puts it, in foreign policy «accident is alien to the enterprise of understanding», as decision-makers feel impaled to give structure to any incoming information.⁸⁴

The above mentioned tendency of decision-makers to abide with the folk ingroup image, so as not to endanger their position in cases of conflicts with outgroups, at least as far as their manifest «verbal behaviour» is concerned, is illustrated by a content analysis made of two speeches delivered in the Greek Parliament on the 16th of January 1979. The spokesmen are Greek Prime Minister Karamanlis, and the opposition leader Papandreou. The subject was the Greek admission in the EEC, but the greek-turkish relations and the general greek foreign policy were also discussed.

The content analysis followed the same technique and procedure as the one on the greek history texts, with the addition of a fourth pair of polar opposite adjectives, «firm-not firm», to make the results more meaningful, and to test one of Jervis's hypotheses,

which was also touched by Levine and Campbell (from the point of view of ethnocentrism, rather than misperception) namely: the fact that there is an overall tendency to perceive other states, which are considered hostile, as more centralized and organized than «our» nation-state.

The findings, limited only to the ingroup image (Greece) and to the principal outgroup (Turkey) are the following:

- Greece (from the Government): 5 «good», 5 «firm»
- Greece (from the Opposition): 2 «non-creative» (at -1 each)
- Turkey (Government and Opposition): 10 «bad» (one at -2, the others at -1), 2 «creative», 1 «non-creative», 1 «firm», 1 «not-firm» (all at -1, or +1 respectfully).

It is obvious, that the speeches are by far more sober and less emotional than the schoolbooks, as the intensity scores clearly indicate. The Jervis hypothesis, indicated by «firm-not firm», and also by «creative-intelligent», was found in the Opposition's speech (Turkey: 2 «creative-intelligent», 1 «firm»), but not in the Government's (Turkey: 1 «non-creative» «not firm»). This was also the case with the ingroup national image (5 «firm», as opposed to 2 «non-creative» on the part of the critical Opposition).⁸⁵

The content analysis results however, do not of course mean that actual «perception of the situation» amounts to this, or that the resulting action will be consistent with the public ingroup-outgroup image of the educational system.⁸⁶ They indicate rather, that the public image is part of the operational environment of the decision-makers, and will effect the definition of the situation not to endanger the Government's or the Opposition's legitimacy, as the guarantors of national integrity and identity. It seems that, as Kelman has pointed out, there is a kind of circular process leading to a vicious circle: the decision makers officially put in force the educational system's socialization process and can manipulate public opinion, but this very school curriculum puts limits to their options. The school curriculum could thus be a force—if changed—in enhancing a global society point of view, and thereby breaking the vicious circle.⁸⁷

81. Jervis, R., «Hypotheses on Misperception», in *International Politics and Foreign Policy* (ed: Rosenau). The Free Press, New York, pp. 239-254. White, R. K., «Misperception as a Cause of Two World Wars», in Hollander, Hunt, op. cit., 1976, pp. 448-461. See also articles in Farrell, Smith eds., *Image and Reality in World Politics*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1967.

82. Boulding, K. E., «The Learning and Reality-Testing Process in the International System», Farrell, Smith, eds, op. cit., pp. 8-9; See also, Boulding, K. E., «The Spotted Reality», in Kariel ed., *The Political Order*, Basic Books Inc., New York, 1970, pp. 59-67; Boulding, K. E., «The Pathological State of the International System», in Kariel, op. cit., pp. 78-83.

83. On causal attributions by men see, Kelley, H. H., «Processes of Causal Attribution» (see Supplementary Bibliography).

84. Axelrod, R., «The Cognitive Mapping Approach to Decision Making», and the «Analysis of Cognitive Maps», and «Decision for Neomperialism», in Axelrod ed., op. cit.; Bonham, G. M., Shapiro, M., «Explanation of the Unexpected», in Axelrod, ed., op. cit., Bauer, R. A., «Problems of Perception and the Relations between the United States and the Soviet Union», *JCR*, Vol. V., 3, p.

85. It should be also added, that Government mentioned 9 times that its overall policy is based on national interest.

86. On the definition of the situation and action see: Pruitt, D., «Definition of the Situation as a Determinant of International Actions», in Kelman, ed., *International Behavior*, 1965, pp. 393ff; Snyder, R. C., Bruck, H. W., Sapin, *Foreign Policy Decision-Making*, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962, pp. 60-74, 103; Sprout, M., «Environmental Factors in the Study of International Politics», Rosenau, op. cit., pp. 41-6 (on «operational environment»).

87. Kelman, H., op. cit., Social Education; Merton, R. K., «The Self-Fulfilling prophesy», Hollander, Hunt, op. cit., 1972, pp. 260-2.

an attempt at a conclusion

The basic problem which seems to dominate at the end of this paper, is the extend of change that ingroup-outgroup images must undergo to render conflict termination, by way of a problem-solving approach on the part of the two adversaries, forseesible. The hidden hypothesis, is that false ingroup-outgroup images, can by definition not be able to alleviate the dangers of self-fulfilling prophecies leading oftentimes to «situational entrapment». This bipolar framework, within a «power politics paradigm», for decision-makers as well as political scientists, contributes little to the understanding of a World Society. This is not to imply that conflict is dysfunctional or deviant, and must be disposed of, as Parsonian sociology tends to. Conflict is truly «ubiquitous»,⁸⁸ and we have to live with it, furthermore it often proves highly constructive, in cases of «structural violence», or other forms of «asymmetrical conflict», where there exist «difficulties of entry» into a conflict process on equal basis with the «topdog». Conflict cannot, and should not be underrated, but it could be purified from all elements which are not pragmatic at all, and which obstruct change and resolution on the basis of costing.⁸⁹

88. To use Dahrendorf's expression from his «coercion model of society».

89. On a conflict or coercion model of society see: Dahrendorf, R. *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1959, pp. 157-165. On critique of the Parsonian model of «values and integration», see e.g., Dahrendorf, *ibid*; Coser, L., *The Functions of Social Conflict*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1968 edition, pp. 20-7; Coser, L., *Continuities in the Study of Social Conflict*, The Free Press, New York, 1967; On self-fulfilling prophecies, see works of the following in the Bibliography: Merton, R. K., Jervis, R., White, R. K., Burton, J. W., Deutsch, M., Kelman, H.; On «structural violence», Galtung, J., «Violence, Peace and Peace Research», *JPR*, Vol. 6, 1969, pp. 170ff; Schmid, H., «Peace Research and Politics», *JPR*, Vol. 5, 1968; Burton, J. W., Groom, A. J. R., Mitchell, A. V. S., De Reuck, A. V. S., «The Study of World Society; A London Perspective», Occasional Paper No 1, *International Studies*, ISA, pp. 73-4; On «symmetrical-asymmetrical conflict», see: Galtung, J., «Peace Thinking», in Galtung, J., *Peace Research, Education Action*, Essays in Peace Research, Vol. I, Christian Eijkers, Copenhagen, 1975, pp. 79-82., Schmid H., op. cit. On «productive conflicts», and «having to live with conflicts», see e.g.: Boulding, K. E., «The Spotted Reality», in Kariel, H. S., *The Political Order*, Basic Books inc., New York (edited vol.), pp. 59-67, particularly, p. 66.; Burton, J.W., «Dynamics of Change in World Society», *LSE Millenium* Vol. 5, No 1, 1976. Deutsch, M., *The*

Only if the «rigid-closed» minds of men and women are changed could a cooperative, problem-solving position be adopted in the «prisoner's dilemma» situation groups or societies find themselves into. And this could take place by way of actual experience—a macro learning process of continuous adjustment to negative feedback from the environment. In violent conflict such adjustment, if it takes place, in view of the rigidity of the two parties (by way of a costs approach or non material needs one in the Burton sense, or a «superordinate goal» approach in the Sherif sense), would be precarious and delicate a matter, and the damage would have already being done. Socialization to problem-solving, on the other hand, as opposed to socialization to conflict in the sense of violent conflict, would deal with the problem at its roots, by way of non-aggressive modeling learning processes during the crucial developmental stages of the child, for it has been adequately demonstrated by social learning theory that modeling alone, without actual experiencing of the negative reinforcers—«observational learning»—is possible (of course), always, in accordance with the child's mental stage of development. Of course, in this learning process to «creative modelling» the needs of man, his peculiarities and limitations, should not be underrated. Man adjusts to his environment by way of assimilation and accomodation, as Piaget has shown, in search of an equilibrium.⁹⁰ The new models should not in any way threaten his need for identity, security, stability, belongingness, but rather to show that they are by far more adequate to serve his survival needs.

And these «changed minds» will feed into the decision-making environment enhancing options and making conflict resolution less of a chimera.

Resolution of Conflict, N. Haven, Yale University Press, 1973, pp. 359-65.

90. On «problem-solving» and conflict resolution, see works by Burton, J. W., Kelman, H., and Deutsch, M., in Bibliography; On socialization and social learning without experience, see Bandura's three works cited in the Bibliography, in particular, Bandura, «Behavior Theory and the Models of Man», in Hollander, Hunt, eds, 1976, op. cit., p. 22; On the present prisoner's dilemma situation of decision-makers, see in particular, Boulding, K. E., «The Learning and Reality Testing Process in the International System», in Farrell, Smith eds, *Image and Reality in World Politics*, Columbia Univ., Press, 1967. For an admirable attempt of socialization to a global society, see Burton, J. W., *World Society*, Cambridge University Press, 1972, which was designed for secondary form adolescents. Piaget, J., *Six Psychological Studies*, Vintage Books, 1968.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abelson, R. P., «Modes of Resolution of Belief Dilemmas», *JCR*, III, 4, 1959.
- Abelson, R. P., Rosenberg, M. J., «Symbolic Psycho-Logic: A Mode of Attitudinal Cognition», *Behavioral Science*, 3, 1958.
- Allison, G. T., *The Essence of Decision*, Little, Brown and Co, Boston, 1971.
- Allison G. T., Halperin, M. H., «Bureaucratic Politics: A Paradigm and Some Policy Implications», Tanter, R., Ullman, R. H., eds, *Theory and Policy in International Relations*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1972.
- Apter, D. E., *The Politics of Modernization*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1965.
- Aronson, E., «Dissonance Theory: Progress and Problems», Abelson, R. P., Aronson, E., McGuire, W. J., Newcomb, T. M., Rosenberg, M. J., Tannenbaum, P. H., eds, *Theories of Cognitive Dissonance: A Source Book*, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1968.
- Asch, S. E., «Effects of Group Pressure upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgment», Cartwright, Zander, eds, *Group Dynamics*, Harper and Row, New York, 1953.
- Axelrod, R., «The Cognitive Mapping Approach to Decision Making», Axelrod ed., *Structure of Decision*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1976.
- Axelrod, R., «The Analysis of Cognitive Maps», Axelrod, ed., *Structure of Decision*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1976.
- Axelrod, R., «Decision for Neoinperialism», Axelrod ed. *Structure of Decision*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1976.
- Bandura, A., «*Social Learning Theory*», Prentice Hall, 1977.
- Bandura, A., «Behavior Theory and the Models of Man», Hollander, E. P., Hunt, R. G., eds, *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Bandura, A., «Social Learning Theory of Aggression», Hollander, Hunt, eds, *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Bauer, R. A., «Problems of Perception and the Relations between the United State and the Soviet Union», *JCR*, V, 3, 1961.
- Bauer, R. A., «The Obstinate Audience», Hollander, Hunt, eds, *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Blau, P., *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, J, Wiley and Sons, New York, 1964.
- Bonham, G. M., Shapiro, M., «Explanation of the Unexpected», Axelrod, R., ed., *Structure of Decision*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1976.
- Boulding, K. E., *The Image*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1956.
- Boulding, K. E., «National Images and International Systems», *JCR*, III, 2, 1959.
- Boulding, K. E., *A primer in Social Dynamics*, The Free Press, New York, 1970.
- Boulding, K. E., «The Learning and Reality-Testing Process in the International System», Farrell, Smith, eds, *Image and Reality in World Politics*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1967.
- Boulding, K. E., «The Spotted Reality», Kariel, H., ed., *The Political Order*, Basic Books Inc., New York, 1970
- Brofenbrenner, U., «The Mirror Image in Soviet-American Relations», *Journal of Social Issues*, 17, 1961.
- Bruner, J. S., Postman, L., «On the Perception of Incongruity: A Paradigm», Bruner, Krech, eds, *Perception and Personality*, Durnham N. C., Duke University Press, 1950.
- Burton, J. W., *Conflict and Communication*, Macmillan, London, 1969.
- Burton, J. W., *World Society*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1972.
- Burton, J. W., «Resolution of Conflict», *ISQ*, March 1972.
- Burton, J. W., «Dynamics of Change in World Society», *LSE Millennium*, 5, 1, 1976.
- Burton, J. W., Groom, A. J. R., Mitchell, C. R., De Reuck, A. V. S., «The Study of World Society: A London Perspective», *International Studies Occasional Paper* No 1, ISA.
- Campbell, D. T., «Stereotypes and the Perception of Group Differences», Hollander, Hunt, eds, *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1976.
- Cantril, H., «The Human Design», Hollander, Hunt, eds, *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1976.
- Carroll, J., «The Measurement of Meaning by Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum», Snider, Osgood, eds, *Semantic Differential Technique: A Sourcebook*, Aldine, Atherton, Chicago, 1972.
- Cartwright, D., Zander, A., «Origins of Group Dynamics», in Cartwright, Zander, eds, *Group Dynamics*, Harper and Row, 1953.
- Coser, L., *The Functions of Social Conflict*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1968, printing.
- Coser, L., *Continuities in the Study of Social Conflict*, The Free Press, New York, 1967.
- Dahrendorf, R., *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1959.
- Dahrendorf, R., «Toward a Theory of Social Conflict», *JCR*, II, 2, 1958.
- Dahrendorf, R., *Homo Sociologicus*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1973.
- Deutsch, K. W., *The Nerves of Government*, The Free Press, New York, 1966.
- Deutsch, K. W., *Nationalism and Social Communication*, M. I. T. Press, 1968.
- Deutsch, K. W., Merritt, R. L., «Effects of Events on National and International Images», Kelman ed, *International Behavior*, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Deutsch, M., *The Resolution of Conflict*, Yale University Press, N. Haven, 1973.
- Deutsch, M., Gerard, «A Study of Normative and Informational Social Influences upon Individual Judgement», Cartwright, Zander, eds, *Group Dynamics*, Harper and Row, New York, 1953.
- Enloe, C. H., *Ethnic Conflict and Political Development*, Little, Brown and Co, Boston, 1973.
- Festinger, L., *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*, Stanford University Press, California, 1957.
- Frank, J., *Sanity and Survival*, The Cresset Press, London, 1957.
- Frenkel-Brunswik, E., «Intolerance of Ambiguity as an Emotional and Perceptual Personality Variable», Bruner, Krech, eds, *Perception and Personality*, Dunham, N. C., Duke University Press, 1950.
- Fromm, E., *The Sane Society*, Fawcett Publ., 1955.
- Fromm, E., *Man for Himself*, Fawcett Publ., 1947.
- Fromm, E., *The Fear of Freedom*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1975.
- Fromm, E., *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*, A Fawcett Crest Book, 1975.
- Galtung, J., *Peace: Research, Education, Action*, C. Ejlers, Copenhagen, 1975.
- Galtung, J., «Violence, Peace and Peace Research», *JPR*, 6, 1969.
- Galtung, J., «A Structural Theory of Aggression», *JPR*, 1, 2, 1964.

- Gardner, J. W., «Individuality, Commitment and Meaning», Hollander, Hunt eds, *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1976.
- Greenstein, F., *Personality and Politics*, Chicago, 1970.
- Groom, A. J. R., «Peacekeeping», Research Monograph No 4, *Lehigh University*, 1973.
- Gurr, T. R., *Politimetrics*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New Jersey, 1972.
- Hollander, E. P., «Conformity, Status and Idiosyncrasy Credit», Hollander, Hunt, eds, *Classic Contributions to Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1972.
- Holsti, O. R., «The Belief System and National Images: A Case Study», Rosenau ed., *International Politics and Foreign Policy*, The Free Press, New York, 1969.
- Haney, C., Zimbardo, P. G., «Social Roles and Role-Playing: Observations from the Stanford Prison Study», Hollander, Hunt, eds, *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1976.
- Holsti, O. R., «Cognitive Dynamics and Images of the Enemy», Farrell, Smith, eds, *Image and Reality in World Politics*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1967.
- Holsti, O. R., «Foreign Policy Formation Viewed Cognitively», Axelrod ed., *Essence of Decision*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1976.
- Holsti, O. R., «Individual Differences in Definition of the Situation», *JCR*, XIV, 3, 1970.
- Holsti, O. R., *Content Analysis*, 1969.
- Homans, G. C., «Social Behavior as Exchange», *American Journal of Sociology* 63, 1958.
- Inhelder, B., Piaget, J., «Adolescent Thinking», Sants, Butcher eds, *Developmental Psychology*, Selected Readings, Penguin Books, 1975.
- Janis, I. L., «Groupthink», Hollander, Hunt, eds, *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1976.
- Janis, I. L., Smith, M. B., «Effects of Education and Persuasion on National and International Images», Kelman ed., *International Behavior*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Jervis, R., «Hypotheses on Misperception», Rosenau ed., *International Politics and Foreign Policy*, The Free Press, New York, 1969.
- Jervis, R., *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1976.
- Johnson, C., *Revolutionary Change*, Little, Brown and Co, Boston, 1966.
- Katz, D., «Nationalism and Strategies of International Conflict Resolution», Kelman ed., *International Behavior*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Kelman, H., «Social-Psychological Approaches to the Study of International Politics», Kelman ed., *International Behavior*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Kelman, H., «Compliance, Identification and Internalization: three Processes of Attitude Change», *JCR*, II, 1, 1958.
- Kelman H., «Education for the Context of a Global Society», *Social Education*, 32, 1968.
- Kelman, H., «Patterns of Personal Involvement in the National System», Rosenau, ed., *International Politics and Foreign Policy*, The Free Press, 1969.
- Kelman, H., Cohen, P., «Reduction of International Conflict», in forthcoming Austin, Wonchel eds, *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*.
- Klineberg, O., *The Human Dimension in International Relations*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Kuhn, T., *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1970.
- Lane, R.E. *Political Life*, The Free Press, New York, 1959.
- Latane, B., Darley, J. M., «Bystander Apathy», Hollander, Hunt, eds, *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1976.
- LeVine, R., «Socialization, Social Structure and Intersocietal Images», Kelman ed., *International Behavior*, Holt-Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- LeVine R., Campbell, D. T., *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes and Group Behavior*, J. Wiley and Sons Inc., New York, 1972.
- Lipset, S. M., *Political Man*, Doubledan and Co, 1960.
- Lorenz, K., *On Aggression*, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1966.
- Mack, R., Snyder, R. C., «The Analysis of Social Conflict», *JCR*, I, 1957.
- Maslow, A., *Towara a Psychology of Being*, Van Nostrand, 1968.
- Maslow, A., *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature*, Esalen-Penguin Book, 1976.
- McGuire, W. J., «Attitude Change and the Information-Processing Model», Hollander, Hunt, eds, *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1976.
- Merton, R. K., «The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy», Hollander, Hunt, eds, *Classic Contributions to Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1972.
- Milgram, S., *Obedience to Authority*, Tavistock Publ., 1974.
- Montagu, A., ed., *Man and Aggression*, Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Newcomb, T. M., «Social Psychological Theory: Integrating Individual and Social Approaches», Hollander, Hunt, eds, *Classic Contributions to Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1972.
- Osgood, C., «The Representational Model», Pool, D. S., ed., *Trends in Content Analysis*, University of Illinois Press, 1959.
- Osgood, C., Suci, G. J., Tannenbaum, P. H., «The Measurement of Meaning», Snider Osgood, eds, *Semantic Differential Technique: A Sourcebook*, Aldine, Atherton, Chicago, 1972.
- Piaget, J., *Six Psychological Studies*, A Vintage Book, New York, 1968.
- Platt, J., «Social Traps», Hollander, Hunt, eds, *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1976.
- Pruitt, D., «Definition of the Situation as a Determinant of International Action», Kelman ed., *International Behavior*, Holt-Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Rokeach, M., *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values*, Jossey-Bass Publ., San Francisco 1975.
- Sandole, D. J. D., «Mapping and Modelling of Complex Conflict Processes: A Report on Research in Progress», Paper delivered at the Workshop for Formal Political Analysis, *European Consortium for Political Research*, Grenoble, April 1978.
- Schmid, H., «Peace Research and Politics», *JPR*, 5, 1968.
- Scott, J. P., «That old-time Aggression», in Montagu, A., ed., *Man and Aggression*, Oxford University Press, London, 1973.
- Scott, W. A., «Rationality and Non-Rationality of International Attitudes», *JCR*, II, 1, 1958.
- Scott, W. A., «Psychological and Social Correlates of International Attitudes», Kelman ed., *International Behavior*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Siegel, A. E., Siegel, S., «Reference Groups, Membership Groups and Attitude Change», Catwright, Zander, eds, *Group Dynamics*, Harper and Row, New York, 1953.
- Sherif, M., *Group Conflict and Co-operation*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1966.
- Sherif, M., «Experiments on Norm Formation», Hollander, Hunt, eds, *Classic Contributions to Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1972.
- Sites, P., *Control the Basis of Social Order*, University Press of Cambridge, Mass., 1973.
- Skinner, B. F., *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*, Penguin Books, 1973.
- Skinner, B. F., *About Behaviorism*, Vintage Books, New York, 1976.

- Snyder, R. C., Bruck, H. W., Sapin, B., *Foreign Policy Decision-Making: An Approach to the Study of International Politics*, Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.
- Sprout, H., Sprout, M., «Environmental Factors in the Study of Foreign Policy», Rosenau ed., *International Politics and Foreign Policy*, The Free Press, New York, 1969.
- Stagner, R., «Personality Dynamics and Social Conflict», Zawodny ed., *Man and International Relations*, Voll., Chandler Publ., San Francisco, 1966.
- White, R. K., «Misperception as a Cause of Two World Wars», Hollander, Hunt, eds., *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1976.
- White, R. K., «Images in the Context of International Conflict», Kelman ed., *International Behavior*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Complementary Bibliography

- Shibutani, T., «Reference Groups as Perspectives», Hollander, Hunt, eds., *Classic Contributions to Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Hyman, H. H., Singer, E., «An Introduction to Reference Group Theory and Research», Hollander, Hunt, eds., *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, 1976.
- Hunt, J. McV., «Traditional Personality Theory in the Light of Recent Evidence», Hollander, Hunt, eds., *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Kelley, H. H., «Processes of Causal Attribution», Hollander, Hunt, eds., *Current Perspectives in Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1976.

* *JCR*: Journal of Conflict Resolution. *JPR*: Journal of Peace Research. *ISQ*: International Studies Quarterly. *AJS*: American Journal of Sociology.