



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Parochial and universal cooperation in intergroup conflicts

Aaldering, H.

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Aaldering, H. (2014). *Parochial and universal cooperation in intergroup conflicts*.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

References

REFERENCES

- Aaldering, H., Van Kleef, G. A., Greer, L. L., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2014). In intergroup conflict pro-social individuals condition self-sacrifice on in-group emotion signals more than pro-selves. *Unpublished Manuscript*.
- Aaldering, H., Greer, L. L., Van Kleef, G. A., & De Dreu, C. K. (2013). Interest (mis) alignments in representative negotiations: Do pro-social agents fuel or reduce inter- group conflict? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *120*, 240-250.
- Aaldering, H., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2012). Why hawks fly higher than doves: Intragroup conflict in representative negotiations. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *15*, 713-724.
- Abbink, K., Brandts, J., Herrmann, B., & Orzen, H. (2012). Parochial altruism in inter-group conflicts. *Economic Letters*, *117*, 45-48.
- Aksoy, O., & Weesie, J. (2012). Beliefs about the social orientations of others: A parametric test of the triangle, false consensus, and cone hypotheses. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(1), 45-54.
- Allcock, D., & Filatotchev, I. (2010). Executive incentive schemes in initial public offerings: The effects of multiple-agency conflicts and corporate governance. *Journal of Management*, *36*, 663-686.
- Arrow, H. (2007). The sharp end of altruism. *Science*, *318*, 581-582.
- Au, W. T., & Kwong, Y. Y. (2004). Measurements and effects of social value orientation in social dilemmas: A review. In R. Suleiman, D. V. Budescu, I. Fischer, & D. M. Messick (Eds.), *Contemporary Research on Social Dilemmas* (pp. 71 – 98). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Averill, J. R. (1982). *Anger and aggression*. New York: Springer.
- Axelrod, R. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bacharach, S. B., & Lawler, E. J. (1981). *Bargaining: Power, tactics and outcomes*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Balliet, D., Parks, C., & Joireman, J. (2009). Social value orientation and cooperation in social dilemmas: A meta-analysis. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *12*, 533-547.
- Balliet, D., Wu, J., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2014). *In-group favoritism in cooperative decision making: A meta-analysis*. VU University, Amsterdam, NL. Unpublished manuscript.
- Batson, C. D. (1998). Altruism and prosocial behavior. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 282 – 316). New York: McGraw-Hill.

REFERENCES

- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of personality and social psychology, 74*, 1252-1265.
- Bazerman, M., Neale, M. A., Valley, K. L., Zajac, E. J., & Kim, Y. M. (1992). The effects of agents and mediators on negotiation outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 53*, 55-73.
- Bazerman, M., Curhan, J. R., Moore, D. A., & Valley, K. L. (2000). Negotiation. *Annual Review of Psychology, 51*, 279-314.
- Beersma, B., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (1999). Negotiation processes and outcomes in prosocially and egoistically motivated groups. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 10*, 385-402.
- Benton, A.A., & Druckman, D. (1973). Salient solutions and the bargaining behavior of representatives and non-representatives. *International Journal of Group Tensions, 3*, 28-39.
- Benton, A. A., & Druckman, D. (1974). Constituents' bargaining orientation and intergroup negotiation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 4*, 141-150.
- Ben-Yoav, O., & Pruitt, D. (1984). Resistance to yielding and the expectation of cooperative future interaction in negotiation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 34*, 323-335.
- Berger, J., Cohen, B. P., & Zelditch, M., Jr. (1972). Status characteristics and social interaction. *American Sociological Review, 37*, 241-255.
- Berger, J., Fisek, M. H., Norman, R. Z., & Zelditch, M. Jr. (1977). *Status characteristics and social interaction: An expectation-states approach*. New York: Elsevier.
- Bernhard, H., Fischbacher, U., & Fehr, E. (2006). Parochial altruism in humans. *Nature, 442*(7105), 912-915.
- Bogaert, S., Boone, C., & Declerck, C. (2008). Social value orientation and cooperation in social dilemmas: A review and conceptual model. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 47*, 453-480.
- Bonner, B. L., Okhuysen, G. A., & Sondak, H. (2011). Intragroup decision making in intergroup negotiation: Majority/ minority effects and hawkishness of member preferences. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 15*, 246-257.
- Bornstein, G. (1992). The free-rider problem in intergroup conflicts over step-level and continuous public goods. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 597-606.

REFERENCES

- Bornstein, G. (2003). Intergroup conflict: Individual, group, and collective interests. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 129-145.
- Bottom, W. P., Holloway, J., Miller, G. J., Mislin, A., & Whitford, A. (2006). Building a pathway to cooperation: Negotiation and social exchange between principal and agent. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51, 29-58.
- Bowles, S. (2008). Being human: Conflict: Altruism's midwife. *Nature*, 456(7220), 326-327.
- Bowles, S. (2009). Did warfare among ancestral hunter-gatherers affect the evolution of human social behaviors? *Science*, 324(5932), 1293-1298.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (2011). *A cooperative species: Human reciprocity and its evolution*. Princeton University Press.
- Boyd, R. T., & Richerson, P. J. (2009). Culture and the evolution of human cooperation. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society B*, 364, 3281-3288.
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(3), 429-444.
- Brewer, M. B., Manzi, J. M., & Shaw, J. S. (1993). In-Group Identification as a Function of Depersonalization, Distinctiveness, and Status. *Psychological Science*, 4, 88-92.
- Böhm, R., Bornstein, G., & Koppel, H. (2014). Between-group conflict and other regarding preferences in nested social dilemmas. *Jena Economic Research Papers*, 2014-11.
- Camerer, C. F. & Fehr, E. (2006). When does 'economic man' dominate social behavior? *Science*, 311, 47-52.
- Carnevale, P. J. D., & Lawler, E. J. (1986). Time pressure and the development of integrative agreements in bilateral negotiations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 30, 636-659.
- Carnevale, P. J., & Pruitt, D. G. (1992). Negotiation and mediation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 43, 531-582.
- Carnevale, P. J. D., Pruitt, D. G., & Seilheimer, S. D. (1981). Looking and competing: Accountability and visual access in integrative bargaining. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 111-120.
- Carnevale, P. J. D., Pruitt, D. G., & Britton, S. D. (1979). Looking Tough: The Negotiator Under Constituent Surveillance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 5, 118-121.

REFERENCES

- Choi, J-K., & Bowles, S. (2007). The coevolution of parochial altruism and war. *Science*, *318*, 636-640.
- Colman, A.M. (2003). Cooperation, psychological game theory, and limitations of rationality in social interaction. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *26*, 139-198.
- Cornelissen, G., Dewitte, S., & Warlop, L. (2011). Are social value orientations expressed automatically? Decision making in the dictator game. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *37*, 1080-1090.
- Dalton, D. R., Hitt, M. A., Certo, S. T., & Dalton, C. M. (2007). Chapter 1: The fundamental agency problem and its mitigation. *Academy of Management Annals*, *1*, 1-64.
- Darwin, C. (1873). *The Descent of Man*. New York: Appleton.
- De Bruin, E. N., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2000). What people look for in others: Influences of the perceiver and the perceived on information selection. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*, 206-219.
- De Cremer, D., & Van Dijk, E. (2002). Reactions to group success and failure as a function of group identification: A test of the goal-transformation hypothesis in social dilemmas. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *38*, 435-442.
- De Cremer, D., Van Knippenberg, D., Van Dijk, E., & Van Leeuwen, E. (2008). Cooperating if one's goals are collective-based: Social identification effects in social dilemmas as a function of goal transformation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *38*, 1562-1579.
- De Cremer, D., & Van Lange, P. A. (2001). Why prosocials exhibit greater cooperation than proselves: The roles of social responsibility and reciprocity. *European Journal of Personality*, *15*, 5-18.
- De Dreu, C. K. W. (2007). Cooperative outcome interdependence, task reflexivity, and team effectiveness: A motivated information processing perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 628-638.
- De Dreu, C. K. W. (2010a). Social conflict: The emergence and consequences of struggle and negotiation. In: Fiske, S. T., Gilbert, D. T., & Lindzey, G. (Eds). *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 5th edition, *2*, 983-1023. New York: Wiley.
- De Dreu, C. K. W. (2010b). Social value orientation moderates ingroup love but not outgroup hate in competitive intergroup conflict. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *13*, 701-713.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Aaldering, H., & Saygi, Ö. (2013). Conflict and Negotiation Within and Between Groups. In J. Dovidio & J. Simpson (Eds.), *Handbook*

REFERENCES

- on Interpersonal Relations and Group Processes*. Washington DC: APA press.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Balliet, D., & Halevy, N. (2014). *Parochial cooperation in humans: Forms and functions of self-sacrifice in intergroup conflict*. University of Amsterdam, Unpublished manuscript.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Beersma, B., Stroebe, K., & Euwema, M. C. (2006). The interaction between social motives and epistemic motives in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*, 927-943.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Beersma, B., Steinel, W., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2007). The psychology of negotiation: Principles and basic processes. In Kruglanski, A. W., & Higgins, E. T. (Eds). *Handbook of basic principles in social psychology*, 2nd edition, 608-629. New York: Guilford.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., & Boles, T. (1998). Share and share alike or winner take all? The influence of social value orientation upon choice and recall of negotiation heuristics. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *76*, 253-267.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., & Carnevale, P. J. (2003). Motivational bases of information processing and strategy in conflict negotiation. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *35*, 235-291.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Giebels, E., & Van de Vliert, E. (1998). Social motives and trust in integrative negotiation: The disruptive effects of punitive capability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*, 408-422.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Greer, L. L., Handgraaf, M. J. J., Shalvi, S., Van Kleef, G. A., Baas, M., Ten Velden, F. S., Van Dijk, E., & Feith, S. W. W. (2010). The neuropeptide oxytocin regulates parochial altruism in intergroup conflict among humans. *Science*, *328*, 1408-1411.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Greer, L. L., Van Kleef, G. A., Shalvi, S., & Handgraaf, M. J. J. (2011). Oxytocin promotes human ethnocentrism. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences U.S.A.*, *108*, 1262-1266.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2004). The influence of power on the information search, impression formation, and demands in negotiation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*, 303-319.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (1995). The impact of social value orientations on negotiator cognition and behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *21*, 1178-1188.

REFERENCES

- De Dreu, C. K., Weingart, L. R., & Kwon, S. (2000). Influence of social motives on integrative negotiation: a meta-analytic review and test of two theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 889-905.
- Demoulin, S., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2010). Introduction: Negotiation in intergroup conflict. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 13*, 675-683.
- De Pauw, A. S., Wit, A. P., & Van Den Broeck, H. (2013). Group composition and social value orientation in crossed-groups social dilemmas. *Vlerick Business School, Unpublished Manuscript*.
- Devers, C. E., Canella, A. A., Reilly, G. P., & Yoder, M. E. (2007). Executive compensation: A multidisciplinary review of recent developments. *Journal of Management, 33*, 1016-1072.
- Doosje, B., Ellemers, N., & Spears, R. (1995). Perceived intragroup variability as a function of group status and identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 31*, 410-436.
- Dovidio, J.F. & Gaertner S.L. (2010). Intergroup bias. In S.T. Fiske et al. (Eds.). *Handbook of Social Psychology* (5th edition, vol. 2, pp. 1084-1123). New York: Wiley.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Validzic, A. (1998). Intergroup bias: Status, differentiation, and a common in-group identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 109-120.
- Druckman, D. (1977). Boundary role conflict negotiation as dual responsiveness. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 21*(4), 639-662.
- Druckman, D. (1994). Determinants of compromising behavior in negotiation: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 38*, 507-556.
- Druckman, D. (2004). Departures in negotiation: Extensions and new directions. *Negotiation Journal, 20*, 185-204.
- Efferson, C., Lalive, R., & Fehr, E. (2008). The coevolution of cultural groups and ingroup favoritism. *Science, 321*(5897), 1844-1849.
- Eisenberger, R., Kuhlman, D. M., & Cotterell, N. (1992). Effects of social values, effort training, and goal structure on task persistence. *Journal of Research in Personality, 26*, 258-272.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 57-74.
- Ellemers, N., & Haslam, S. A. (2012). Social identity theory. *Handbook of theories of social psychology, 2*, 379-398.

REFERENCES

- Enzle, M. E., Harvey, N. D., & Wright, E. F. (1992). Implicit role obligations versus social responsibility in constituency representation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 238-245.
- Erev, I., Bornstein, G., & Galili, R. (1993). Constructive intergroup competition as a solution to the free rider problem: A field experiment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 29*, 463-478.
- Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2004). Third-party punishment and social norms. *Evolution and human behavior, 25*, 63-87.
- Friedman, J. (1994). *Cultural Identity and Global Process*. London: Sage.
- Frijda, N. H., Kuipers, P., & Ter Schure, E. (1989). Relations among emotion, appraisal, and emotional action readiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 212-228.
- Fu, F., Tarnita, C. E., Christakis, N. A., Wang, L., Rand, D. G., & Nowak, M. A. (2012). Evolution of in-group favoritism. *Scientific reports, 2*.
- Gelfand, M. J., & Realo, A. (1999). Individualism – collectivism and accountability in intergroup negotiations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 721-736.
- Giacomantonio, M., De Dreu, C. K. W., Shalvi, S., Sligte, D., & Leder, S. (2010). Psychological distance boosts value-behavior correspondence in ultimatum bargaining and integrative negotiation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46*, 824-829.
- Gillespie, J. J., Brett, J. M., & Weingart, L. R. (2000). Interdependency, social motives, and outcome satisfaction in multiparty negotiation. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 779-797.
- Gintis, H., Bowles, S., Boyd, R., & Fehr, E. (2003). Explaining altruistic behavior in humans. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 24*, 153-172.
- Gneezy, A., & Fessler, D. M. (2012). Conflict, sticks and carrots: War increases prosocial punishments and rewards. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 279*(1727), 219-223.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2014). With malice towards none and charity for some: Ingroup favoritism enables discrimination. *American Psychologist, 24*.
- Gunnthorsdottir, A., & Rapoport, A. (2006). Embedding social dilemmas in intergroup competition reduces free-riding. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 101*(2), 184-199.

REFERENCES

- Hagger, M. S., Wood, C., Stiff, C., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. (2010). Ego depletion and the strength model of self-control: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 136*, 495- 525.
- Halali, E., Bereby-Meyer, Y., & Meiran, N. (2013). Between self-interest and reciprocity: The social bright side of self-control failure. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 143*, 745-754.
- Halali, E., Bereby-Meyer, Y., & Ockenfels, A. (2013). Is it all about the self? The effect of self-control depletion on ultimatum game proposers. *Frontiers in human neuroscience, 7*, 1-8.
- Halevy, N. (2008). Team negotiation: Social, epistemic, economic, and psychological consequences of subgroup conflict. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 1687-1702.
- Halevy, N., Bornstein, G., & Sagiv, L. (2008). “In-group love” and “out-group hate” as motives for individual participation in intergroup conflict: A new game paradigm. *Psychological Science, 19*, 405-411.
- Halevy, N., Chou, E. Y., Cohen, T. R., & Livingston, R. W. (2012). Status conferral in intergroup social dilemmas: behavioral antecedents and consequences of prestige and dominance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*, 351-366.
- Halevy, N., Weisel, O., & Bornstein, G. (2012). “In-group love” and “Out-group hate” in repeated interaction between groups. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 25*, 188-195.
- Hammond, R. A., & Axelrod, R. (2006). The evolution of ethnocentrism. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 50*, 926-936.
- Haruno, M., & Frith, C. D. (2010). Activity in the amygdala elicited by unfair divisions predicts social value orientation. *Nature Neuroscience, 13*, 160-161.
- Henrich, J., Boyd, R., Bowles, S., Camerer, C., Fehr, E., Gintis, H., & McElreath, R. (2001). In search of homo economicus: behavioral experiments in 15 small-scale societies. *American Economic Review, 73*-78.
- Henrich, N., & Henrich, J. (2007). *Why humans cooperate: A cultural and evolutionary explanation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual review of psychology, 53*, 575-604.
- Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*, 204-222.

REFERENCES

- Hunton, J. E., Mauldin, E. G., & Wheeler, P. R. (2008). Potential functional and dysfunctional effects of continuous monitoring. *Accounting Review*, *83*, 1551- 1569.
- Hüffmeier, J., Freund, P. A., Zerres, A., Backhaus, K., & Hertel, G. (2014). Being tough or being nice? A meta-analysis on the impact of hard-and softline strategies in distributive negotiations. *Journal of Management*, *3*, 866-892..
- Iedema, J. (1993). The perceived consensus of one's social value orientation. *Doctoral dissertation*.
- Iedema, J., & Poppe, M. (1994). Effects of social value orientation on expecting and learning others' orientations. *European journal of social psychology*, *24*, 565-579.
- Iedema, J., & Poppe, M. (1995). Perceived consensus of one's social value orientation in different populations in public and private circumstances. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *25*, 497-507.
- Insko, C. A., Schopler, J., Hoyle, R. H., Dardis, G. J., & Graetz, K. A. (1990). Individual -group discontinuity as a function of fear and greed. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*, 68-79.
- Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *3*, 305-360.
- Julian, J. W., Hollander, E. P., & Regula, C. R. (1969). Endorsement of the group spokesman as a function of his source of authority, competence, and success. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *11*, 42-49.
- Kamans, E., Otten, S., Gordijn, E.H., & Spears, R. (2010). How groups contest depends on group power and the likelihood that power determines victory and defeat. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *13*, 715-724.
- Kanouse, D.E., Hanson, L.R., Jr (1971). *Negativity in evaluations*. In Jones, E. E., Kanouse, D. E., Kelley, H. H., Nisbett, R. E., Valins, S., & Weiner, B. (Eds). *Attribution: Perceiving the Causes of Behavior*, 47 – 62. Morristown: General Learning Press.
- Kelley, H. H., & Stahelski, A. J. (1970). Social interaction basis of cooperators' and competitors' beliefs about others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *16*, 66-91.
- Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. W. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence*, New York: Wiley.

REFERENCES

- Kelman, H. C. (2006). Interests, relationships, identities: Three central issues for individuals and groups in negotiating their social environment. *Annual Review of Psychology, 57*, 1-26.
- Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. (1999). Social functions of emotions at four levels of analysis. *Cognition & Emotion, 13*, 505-521.
- Kenny, D. A., & LaVoie, L. (1985). Separating individual and group effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*, 339-348.
- Kesner, I. F., Shapiro, D. L., & Sharma, A. (1994). Brokering mergers: An agency theory perspective on the role of representatives. *The Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 703-721.
- Kimmel, M. J., Pruitt, D. G., Magenau, J. M., Konar-Golband, E., & Carnevale, P. J. D. (1980). Effects of trust, aspiration, and gender on negotiation tactics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*, 9-22.
- Kiyonari, T., & Yamagishi, T. (2004). Ingroup cooperation and the social exchange heuristic. *Contemporary psychological research on social dilemmas*, 269-286.
- Klimoski, R. J., & Breaugh, J. A. (1977). When performance doesn't count: A constituency looks at its spokesman. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 20*, 301-311.
- Kuhlman, D. M., Camac, C. R., & Cunha, D. A. (1986). Individual differences in social value orientation. In H. A. M. Wilke, & D. M. Messick (Eds.), *Experimental social dilemmas*, New York: Lang.
- Leary, M. R., Kelly, K. M., Cottrell, C. A., & Schreindorfer, L. S. (2001). Individual differences in the need to belong. *Unpublished manuscript*. Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC.
- Lehmann, L., & Feldman, M. W. (2008). War and the evolution of belligerence and bravery. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 275*, 2877-2885.
- Lelieveld, G.-J., Van Dijk, E., Van Beest, I., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2013). Does communicating disappointment in negotiations help or hurt? Solving an apparent inconsistency in the social-functional approach to emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105*, 605-620.
- Lewis, S. A., & Fry, W. R. (1977). Effects of visual access and orientation on the discovery of integrative bargaining alternatives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 20*, 75-92.

REFERENCES

- Liebrand, W. B. G. (1984). The effect of social motives, communication and group size on behaviour in a N-person multi-stage mixed-motive game. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 14*, 239-264.
- Liebrand, W. B., Jansen, R. W., Rijken, V. M., & Suhre, C. J. (1986). Might over morality: Social values and the perception of other players in experimental games. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 22*(3), 203-215.
- Liebrand, W. B. G., & Van Run, G. J. (1985). The effects of social motives on behaviour in social dilemmas in two cultures. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 21*, 86- 102.
- Lowery, B. S., Unzueta, M. M., Knowles, E. D., & Goff, P. A. (2006). Concern for the in-group and opposition to affirmative action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 961-974.
- Luce, D. R., & Raiffa, H. (1957). *Games and decisions: Introduction and critical survey*. Oxford, UK: Wiley.
- Malhotra, D., & Ginges, J. (2010). Preferring balanced vs. advantageous peace agreements: A study of Israeli attitudes towards a two state solution. *Judgment and Decision Making, 5*, 420-427.
- Masicampo, E. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (2008). Toward a physiology of dual-process reasoning and judgment: Lemonade, willpower, and expensive rule-based analysis. *Psychological Science, 19*, 255-260.
- McClintock, C. G. (1972). Social motivation—A set of propositions. *Behavioral Science, 17*, 438-454.
- McClintock, C. (1977). Social motives in settings of outcome interdependence. In D. Druckman (Ed.), *Negotiations: Social psychological perspective* (pp. 49-77). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- McClintock, C. G., & Liebrand, W. B. G. (1988). The role of interdependence structure, individual value orientation and others' strategy in social decision making: A transformational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 396-409.
- McLean Parks, J., & Conlon, E. J. (1995). Do agency theory assumptions predict negotiated agreements? *The Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 821-838.
- Mead, N. L., Baumeister, R. F., Gino, F., Schweitzer, M. E., & Ariely, D. (2009). Too tired to tell the truth: Self-control resource depletion and dishonesty. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 594-597.

REFERENCES

- Meier, B. P., & Hinsz, V. B. (2004). A comparison of human aggression committed by groups and individuals: An interindividual–intergroup discontinuity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*(4), 551-559.
- Meyer, R. D., Dalal, R. S., & Hermida, R. (2010). A review and synthesis of situational strength in the organizational sciences. *Journal of Management, 36*, 121-140.
- Messick, D. M., & McClintock, C. G. (1968). Motivational bases of choice in experimental games. *Journal of experimental social psychology, 4*, 1-25.
- Milinski, M., Semmann, D., Bakker, T. C., & Krambeck, H. J. (2001). Cooperation through indirect reciprocity: image scoring or standing strategy? *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences, 268*, 2495-2501.
- Mnookin, R. H., & Susskind, L. E. (1999). *Negotiating on behalf of others: Advice to lawyers, business executives, sports agents, diplomats, politicians, and everyone else*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mosterd, I., & Rutte, C. G. (2000). Effects of Time Pressure and Accountability to Constituents on Negotiation. *The International Journal of Conflict Management, 3*, 227-247.
- Mulder, L. B., Van Dijk, E., De Cremer, D., & Wilke, H. A. M. (2006). Undermining trust and cooperation: The paradox of sanctioning systems in social dilemmas. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 42*, 147-162.
- Nauta, A., De Dreu, C. K., & Van Der Vaart, T. (2002). Social value orientation, organizational goal concerns and interdepartmental problem-solving behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 199-213.
- Nowak, M. A., & Sigmund, K. (1998). Evolution of indirect reciprocity by image scoring. *Nature, 393*(6685), 573-577.
- Olekalns, M., & Smith, P. L. (2003). Social motives in negotiation: The relationships between dyad composition, negotiation processes, and outcomes. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 14*, 233-254.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Main, B. G. M. (2010). Economic and psychological perspectives on CEO compensation: A review and synthesis. *Industrial and Corporate Change, 19*, 675- 712.
- Osgood, C. E. (1962). *An alternative to war or surrender*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

REFERENCES

- Parks, C. D. (1994). The predictive ability of social values in resource dilemmas and public goods games. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *20*, 431-438.
- Parks, C. D., & Rumble, A. C. (2001). Elements of reciprocity and social value orientation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*, 1301-1309.
- Parrott, W. G. (1993). Beyond hedonism: Motives for inhibiting good moods and for maintaining bad moods. In J. W. Pennebaker & D. M. Wegner (Eds.), *Handbook of mental control* (pp. 278-305). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Peeters, G., & Czapinski, J. (1990). Positive-negative asymmetry in evaluations: The distinction between affective and informational negativity effects. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *1*, 33-60.
- Pohl, R. F., Erdfelder, E., Hilbig, B. E., Liebke, L., & Stahlberg, D. (2013). Effort reduction after self-control depletion: The role of cognitive resources in use of simple heuristics. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, *25*, 267-276.
- Polzer, J. T. (2004). How subgroup interests and reputations moderate the effect of organizational identification on cooperation. *Journal of Management*, *30*, 71-96.
- Polzer, J. T., Stewart, K. J., & Simmons, J. L. (1999). A social categorization explanation for framing effects in nested social dilemmas. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *79*, 154-178.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior research methods*, *40*, 879-891.
- Pruitt, D. G. (1981). *Negotiation Behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Pruitt, D. G. (2007). Readiness theory and the Northern Ireland conflict. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *50*, 1520-1541.
- Pruitt, D. G., & Carnevale, P. J. (1993). *Negotiation and mediation*. London: Open University Press.
- Pruitt, D. G., & Lewis, S. A. (1975). Development of integrative solutions in bilateral negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *31*, 621-633.
- Pruitt, D. G., & Rubin, J. Z. (1986). *Social conflict: escalation, stalemate, and settlement*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rand, D. G., Greene, J. D., & Nowak, M. A. (2012). Spontaneous giving and calculated greed. *Nature*, *489*(7416), 427-430.

REFERENCES

- Rand, D. G., & Nowak, M. A. (2013). Human cooperation. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 8, 413-426.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. (1985). *Contrast analysis: Focused comparisons in the analysis of variance*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, L., Greene, D., & House, P. (1977). The “false consensus effect”: An egocentric bias in social perception and attribution processes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 13, 279-301.
- Rubin, J. Z., Pruitt, D. G., & Kim, S. H. (1994). *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate, and settlement*. McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Rusbult, C. E., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2003). Interdependence, interaction and relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 351-375.
- Sachdev, I., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1991). Power and Status Differentials in Minority and Majority Group Relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 21, 1-24.
- Saygi, Ö., Greer, L. L., Van Kleef, G. A., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2014). Competitive representative negotiations worsen intergroup relations. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 17, 143-160.
- Schei, V., & Rognes, J. K. (2003). Knowing me, knowing you: Own orientation and information about the opponent’s orientation in negotiation. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 14, 43-59.
- Schulz, J. F., Fischbacher, U., Thöni, C., & Utikal, V. (2012). Affect and fairness: Dictator games under cognitive load. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 41, 77-87.
- Schei, V., Rognes, J. K., & De Dreu, C. K. (2008). Are individualistic orientations collectively valuable in group negotiations? *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 11, 371-385.
- Schopler, J., Insko, C. A., Graetz, K. A., Drigotas, S., Smith, V. A., & Dahl, K. (1993). Individual-group discontinuity: Further evidence for mediation by fear and greed. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 419-431.
- Simunovic, D., Mifune, N., & Yamagishi, T. (2013). Preemptive strike: An experimental study of fear-based aggression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 1120-1123.
- Sinaceur, M., & Tiedens, L. Z. (2006). Get mad and get more than even: When and why anger expression is effective in negotiations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42, 314-322.
- Spanovic, M., Lickel, B., Denson, T. F., & Petrovic, N. (2010). Fear and anger as predictors of motivation for intergroup aggression: Evidence from Serbia

REFERENCES

- and Republika Srpska. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 13, 725-739.
- Steinel, W., & De Dreu, C. K. (2004). Social motives and strategic misrepresentation in social decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3, 419-434.
- Steinel, W., De Dreu, C. K. W., Ouwehand, E., & Ramírez-Marín, J. Y. (2009). When constituencies speak in multiple tongues: The relative persuasiveness of hawkish minorities in representative negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 109, 67-78.
- Steinel, W., Van Kleef, G. A., Van Knippenberg, D., Hogg, M. A., Homan, A. C., & Moffit, G. (2010) How intragroup dynamics affect behavior in intergroup conflict: The role of Group norms, prototypicality, and need to belong. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 1-16.
- Stouten, J., De Cremer, D., & Van Dijk, E. (2005). All is well that ends well, at least for pro-selfs: Emotional reactions to equality violation as a function of social value orientation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 767-783.
- Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American*, 223, 96-102.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations*. Chicago: Nelson- Hall.
- Taylor, S. E. (1991). Asymmetrical Effects of Positive and Negative Events: The Mobilization- Minimization Hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110, 67-85.
- Thompson, L. L. (1991). Information exchange in negotiation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 27, 161-179.
- Thompson, L., & Hrebec, D. (1996). Lose-lose agreements in interdependent decision making. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120, 396-409.
- Trötschel, R., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (2007). Implementation intentions and the willful pursuit of prosocial goals in negotiations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 579-598.
- Trötschel, R., Hüffmeier, J., & Loschelder, D. D. (2010). When yielding pieces of the pie is not a piece of cake: Identity-based intergroup effects in negotiations. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 13, 741-763.

REFERENCES

- Tzafrir, S. S., Sanchez, R. J., & Tirosh-Unger, K. (2012). Social motives and trust: implications for joint gains in negotiations. *Group Decision and Negotiation, 21*, 839-862.
- Valley, K. L., White, S. B., Neale, M. A., & Bazerman, M. H. (1992). Agents as information brokers: The effects of information disclosure on negotiated outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 51*, 220-236.
- Van Beest, I., Wilke, H. A. M., & Van Dijk, E. (2003). The excluded player in coalition formation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 237-247.
- Van Dijk, E., De Cremer, D., & Handgraaf, M. J. J. (2004). Social value orientations and the strategic use of fairness in ultimatum bargaining. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*, 697-707.
- Van Dijk, E., & Vermunt, R. (2000). Strategy and fairness in social decision making: Sometimes it pays to be powerless. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 1-25.
- Van Kleef, G. A. (2009). How emotions regulate social life the emotions as social information (EASI) model. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 18*, 184-188.
- Van Kleef, G. A., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2002). Social value orientation and impression formation: A test of two competing hypotheses about information search in negotiation. *The International Journal of Conflict Management, 1*, 59-77.
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2004a). The interpersonal effects of anger and happiness in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*, 57-76.
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2004b). The interpersonal effects of emotions in negotiations: A motivated information processing approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 510-528.
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2006). Supplication and appeasement in conflict and negotiation: The interpersonal effects of disappointment, worry, guilt, and regret. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*, 124-142.
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K., & Manstead, A. S. (2010). An interpersonal approach to emotion in social decision making: The emotions as social

REFERENCES

- information model. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 42, 45-96.
- Van Kleef, G. A., Steinel, W., & Homan, A. C. (2013). On being peripheral and paying attention: Social information processing in intergroup conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98, 63-79.
- Van Kleef, G. A., Steinel, W., Van Knippenberg, D., Hogg, M., & Svensson, A. (2007). Group member prototypicality and intergroup negotiation: How one's standing in the group affects negotiation behaviour. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46, 129-154.
- Van Kleef, G. A., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2008). What other's disappointment may do to selfish people: Emotion and social value orientation in a negotiation context. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34, 1084-1095.
- Van Lange, P. A. M. (1992). Confidence in expectations: A test of the triangle hypothesis. *European Journal of Personality*, 6, 371-379.
- Van Lange, P. A. M. (1999). The pursuit of joint outcomes and equality in outcomes: An integrative model of social value orientation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 337-349.
- Van Lange, P. A. M. (2000). Beyond self-interest: A set of propositions relevant to interpersonal orientations. In M. Hewstone and W. Stroebe (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology* (Vol. 11, pp. 297-330). London: Wiley.
- Van Lange, P. A., Agnew, C. R., Harinck, F., & Steemers, G. E. (1997). From game theory to real life: How social value orientation affects willingness to sacrifice in ongoing close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1330-1344.
- Van Lange, P. A. M., De Cremer, D., Van Dijk, E., & Van Vugt, M. (2007) Self-interest and beyond: Basic principles of social interaction. In A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social Psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 540 – 561). New York: Guilford Press.
- Van Lange, P. A., & Kuhlman, M. D. (1994). Social value orientations and impressions of partner's honesty and intelligence: A test of the might versus morality effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 126-126.
- Van Lange, P. A., & Liebrand, W. B. (1989). On perceiving morality and potency: Social values and the effects of person perception in a give-some dilemma. *European Journal of Personality*, 3, 209-225.

REFERENCES

- Van Lange, P. A. M., Liebrand, W. B. G., & Kuhlman, D. M. (1990). Causal attribution of choice behavior in three n-person prisoner's dilemmas. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 26*, 34-48.
- Van Lange, P. A. M., Otten, W., De Bruin, E. M. N., & Joireman, J. A. (1997). Development of prosocial, individualistic and competitive orientations: Theory and preliminary evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 733-74
- Van Lange, P. A. M., & Van Doesum, N. J. (2012). The psychology of interaction goals comes as a package. *Psychological Inquiry, 23*, 75-79.
- Van Lange, P. A. M., & Visser, K. (1999). Locomotion in social dilemmas: How people adapt to cooperative, tit-for-tat, and noncooperative partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 762-773.
- Walton, R. E., & McKersie, R. (1965). *A behavioral theory of labor negotiations: An analysis of a social interaction system*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Warneken, F., & Tomasello, M. (2006). Altruistic helping in human infants and young chimpanzees. *Science, 311*(5765), 1301-1303.
- Webster, D. M., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1994). Individual differences in need for cognitive closure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 1049-1062.
- Weingart, L. R., Bennett, R. J., & Brett, J. M. (1993). The impact of consideration of issues and motivational orientation on group negotiation process and outcome. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 504-517.
- Weingart, L. R., Brett, J. M., Olekalns, M., & Smith, P. L. (2007). Conflicting Social Motives in Negotiating Groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6*, 994-1010.
- Wildschut, T., & Insko, C. A. (2007). Explanations of interindividual-intergroup discontinuity: A review of the evidence. *European Review of Social Psychology, 18*, 175-211.
- Wildschut, T., Insko, C. A., & Gaertner, L. (2002). Intragroup social influence and intergroup competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 975-992.
- Wildschut, T., Pinter, B., Vevea, J., Insko, C. A., & Schopler, J. (2003). Beyond the group mind: A qualitative review of the interindividual-intergroup discontinuity effect. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 698-722.

REFERENCES

- Wit, A. P., & Kerr, N. L. (2002). "Me versus just us versus us all". Categorization and cooperation in nested social dilemmas. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 616-637.
- Yamagishi, T., Jin, N., & Kiyonari, T. (1999). Bounded generalized reciprocity: Ingroup favoritism and ingroup boasting. *Advances in Group Processes, 16*, 161-197.
- Yamagishi, T., & Mifune, N. (2008). Does shared group membership promote altruism? Fear, greed, and reputation. *Rationality and Society, 20*, 5-30.
- Yamagishi, T., & Mifune, N. (2009). Social exchange and solidarity: in-group love or out-group hate?. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 30*, 229-237.
- Yamagishi, T., Mifune, N., Liu, J. H., & Pauling, J. (2008). Exchanges of group-based favours: Ingroup bias in the prisoner's dilemma game with minimal groups in Japan and New Zealand. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 11*, 196-207.
- Zaki, J., & Mitchell, J. P. (2013). Intuitive Prosociality. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 22*, 466-470.

Summary

Intergroup conflicts are deeply rooted in our society, and to understand when and why parties decide to cooperate is pivotal to understand and potentially resolve these conflicts. The current dissertation distinguished between two functions of cooperation. One, parochial cooperation, is cooperation and possibly self-sacrifice to help strengthening the own group in the conflict and win over the other group. Despite helping the own group, this form of cooperation has a dark side: If both parties increase in strength as a result of such cooperation, the conflict might intensify and even escalate. The other function of cooperation (universal cooperation) is to mitigate the conflict by cooperation with and between the two parties, such that a satisfying outcome for both parties is obtained.

This dissertation invokes different theoretical perspectives on parochial cooperation and investigates in four empirical chapters when and why individuals resort to each form of cooperation. Predictors of cooperation are investigated on the intrapersonal level (social value orientation; individuals' initial inclination to cooperate), the intragroup level (constituency preferences in the form of explicit feedback regarding cooperation preferences or more implicit emotion feedback after a first negotiation offer) and the intergroup level (interest (mis) alignment and degree of conflict between representatives and the represented groups as well as between the conflicting parties).

Throughout the chapters, intergroup conflicts are studied in two different forms. The first form we investigate consists of negotiations as a way to solve the conflict. We investigated representatives' cooperative behavior during negotiations. Representatives need to strike a balance between serving their constituency (parochial cooperation) and reaching a (mutually beneficial) agreement with the other party (universal cooperation). We studied when and why representatives would direct their cooperation efforts either way during the negotiations. The second form construes intergroup conflict as a social dilemma. In such a dilemma, interests of the individual are at odds with those of the group (s)he belongs to and the larger collective in which the groups take place. In these intergroup settings, one needs to choose whether to invest personal resources in the own group (parochial cooperation), in the collective of both groups combined (universal cooperation) or to withhold investments altogether and focus on personal profit. Both forms of intergroup conflict are studied with different experimental paradigms, each addressing other predictors of cooperation.

Main findings

Our results show that individuals' cooperative behavior is influenced by factors on several levels. On an intragroup level, the composition and communication of group members matters. A majority of group members is needed to communicate a preference for cooperation with the other party to direct a representative towards a mutually beneficial agreement with the other party (universal cooperation) in a dyadic negotiation (Chapter 2). A minority member with a high status is enough to lead the representative towards a more competitive form of negotiations with lower quality outcomes for both parties (parochial cooperation). Only when the minority member has low status does the representative follow the preferences of the cooperative majority in his constituency.

We furthermore find that representatives will extend their cooperation towards the other party (universal cooperation) when their own group communicates happiness about a previous cooperative negotiation proposal. However, upon communicated anger, representatives will turn their cooperation to their own party (parochial cooperation; Chapter 3). This adaptation in behavior depending on constituencies' emotion communication occurs more strongly among pro-social than pro-self representatives, indicating that the intrapersonal factor of individuals' social value orientation plays a pivotal role in eliciting and directing cooperation.

The last two chapters focus on intergroup factors or the level of (mis)alignment and competition between groups (and their representatives). Especially pro-social representatives are willing to self-sacrifice their own interests to a large extent when this can benefit their own group. They sacrifice personal interests when this helps both groups (universal cooperation). However, they even and especially do so when this helps only their own group, while simultaneously hurting the other group in a negotiation (parochial cooperation; Chapter 4). We subsequently qualify these findings by showing that the availability of a mutually beneficial option matters. Humans in general and especially pro-socials are inclined towards parochial cooperation. However, when there is an option available that renders high outcomes for both parties, and when parochial cooperation causes significant harm to the other group, they will shift towards universal cooperation. This universal cooperation is a calculated strategy and decreases under cognitive depletion (Chapter 5). Pro-socials thus seem parochial, but harm-averse. When helping their own group hurts the other party, they consciously look

for other, indirect ways to serve their group without harming the other group. Finally, Chapter 5 shows that more pro-socials within a collective increases joint outcomes, indicating that groups are better able to resolve a conflict and generate high outcomes for both parties when there are more pro-social members.

In sum, these results suggest that individuals, and especially pro-socials, are inclined to show parochial cooperation. However, they are sensitive to situational factors such as constituencies' preferences and approval, as well as to the accessibility of a mutually beneficial option that can redirect their cooperation efforts to potentially value creating outcomes.

Conclusions and implications

The findings obtained in this dissertation shed a first light on factors promoting parochial and universal cooperation. This dissertation thus provides useful knowledge on when individuals will show parochial versus universal cooperation, and which factors can increase the mutually beneficial form of universal cooperation that paves the way for conflict resolution. Findings of this dissertation have several implications for related areas of research, as well as for practice. Firstly, these findings contribute to a richer understanding of the dilemma representatives face when they have to negotiate on behalf of one party with another party. We have uncovered important factors within their own personality, as well as within the constituency and between the two parties that may, at least partially, determine the representative's negotiation tactics and the quality of the negotiation outcome. We furthermore have identified social value orientation as an important predictor of both parochial and universal cooperation. We have solved the conundrum regarding the direction of pro-socials' cooperation by showing that pro-socials are parochial, yet willing to extend their cooperation to the other party as well when i) there is a clear mutually beneficial option available and ii) parochialism is harmful to the other party.

An interesting challenge with these findings is to put them into practice. We delineate practical implications for negotiations (both for representatives and for the constituency) and emphasize the need for representatives to focus on identifying a mutually beneficial negotiation agreement, that will result in higher acceptance of the agreement as well as improved intergroup relations. Our findings also indicate when and why both parties can (and cannot) benefit from a pro-social person making decisions on their behalf. We demonstrate when pro-socials will display parochial or universal cooperation and how the goal of the negotiation as

Summary

well as the compatibility of interests between the representative and the two parties are important in determining pro-socials' direction of cooperation. Finally, we suggest a number of future research directions regarding social value orientation, parochial cooperation and negotiations. Our findings are an important first step in discovering when and why individuals display parochial or universal cooperation. More research however is needed to investigate further important factors and underlying mechanisms, to corroborate our findings in a more naturalistic environment, for example through archival analyses or case studies, and to determine the long term implications for each form of cooperation.

In sum, the current dissertation highlights the important role of social value orientation for cooperation in intergroup conflicts. We show how pro-social representatives and decision makers are affected by different factors to display either parochial, or universal cooperation. Overall, despite the potentially dark side when parochial cooperation comes at a cost of the other party and may intensify the conflict, pro-socials are better able and more willing than pro-selves in serving the interests of as many people as possible involved. Despite their tendency to protect their own group, even -if unavoidable- at the cost of the other party, the chance on better outcomes and improved relations in an intergroup conflict increases when more pro-socials are present.

Intergroepsconflicten zijn diep geworteld in onze maatschappij. Om dergelijke conflicten op te kunnen lossen is het cruciaal om te begrijpen wanneer en waarom partijen besluiten met elkaar samen te werken. Dit proefschrift maakt een onderscheid tussen twee functies van coöperatie. De ene, parochiale coöperatie, bestaat uit coöperatie en mogelijk zelf-opoffering om te helpen de eigen groep sterker te maken in het conflict en zo te winnen van de andere groep. Hoewel dit de eigen groep helpt, heeft deze vorm van coöperatie een duistere kant: wanneer beide partijen sterker worden door deze vorm van coöperatie, zal het conflict erger worden en zelfs kunnen escaleren. De andere functie van coöperatie (universele coöperatie) is om het conflict af te zwakken door partijen met elkaar te laten samenwerken, zodat er een uitkomst kan worden behaald die voor beide partijen bevredigend is.

Dit proefschrift beroept zich op verschillende theoretische invalshoeken over parochiale coöperatie en onderzoekt in vier empirische hoofdstukken wanneer en waarom personen tot elke vorm van coöperatie overgaan. Voorspellers van coöperatie worden onderzocht op intrapersoonlijk niveau (sociale waarde-oriëntatie; iemands' oorspronkelijke neiging tot coöperatie), intragroeps-niveau (voorkeuren van de achterban in de vorm van expliciete feedback over coöperatie-voorkeuren of meer impliciete emotiefeedback na een eerste onderhandelingsbod) en intergroeps-niveau (de mate waarin belangen wel of niet overeenkomen en de ernst van het conflict, zowel tussen een vertegenwoordiger en de te vertegenwoordigen groep als tussen de conflicterende groepen).

Door de hoofdstukken heen worden twee vormen van intergroepsconflicten onderzocht. De eerste is onderhandelingen als een manier om conflicten op te lossen. We hebben het coöperatiegedrag van vertegenwoordigers tijdens een onderhandeling onderzocht. Vertegenwoordigers moeten een balans vinden tussen enerzijds het dienen van hun achterban (parochiale coöperatie) en anderzijds het bereiken van een (wederzijds voordelige) overeenkomst met de andere partij (universele coöperatie). We hebben onderzocht wanneer en waarom vertegenwoordigers hun coöperatiepogingen naar welke kant richten. De tweede vorm is intergroepsconflict als een sociaal dilemma, waar de belangen van elke persoon niet overeenkomen met de belangen van de groep waar hij/ zij bij hoort en het grotere collectief waarin de groepen zich bevinden. In dergelijke intergroepsconflicten moet men kiezen of men persoonlijke bronnen wil investeren in de eigen groep (parochiale coöperatie), in het collectief van beide partijen samen (universele coöperatie) of om investeringen voor zichzelf te houden en zich te

concentreren op persoonlijk gewin. Beide vormen van intergroepsconflict zijn onderzocht aan de hand van verschillende experimentele paradigma's, die elk een andere voorspeller van coöperatie onder de loep nemen.

Belangrijkste bevindingen

Onze resultaten laten zien dat coöperatie van individuen wordt beïnvloed door factoren op verschillende niveaus. Op intra-groepsniveau spelen de samenstelling en communicatie van groepsleden een belangrijke rol. Een meerderheid van de groepsleden moet een voorkeur voor coöperatie met de andere partij communiceren om ervoor te zorgen dat een vertegenwoordiger zich richt op het behalen van een wederzijds voordelige overeenkomst met de andere partij (universele coöperatie) in een onderhandeling tussen twee personen (Hoofdstuk 2). Eén minderheidslid met een hoge status is al genoeg om de vertegenwoordiger zich te doen richten op een meer competitieve vorm van onderhandelen met lagere uitkomsten voor beide partijen (parochiale coöperatie). Alleen wanneer het minderheidslid een lage status heeft zal de vertegenwoordiger de voorkeuren van de coöperatieve meerderheid in zijn achterban opvolgen.

We hebben verder ontdekt dat vertegenwoordigers hun coöperatie zullen uitbreiden naar de andere partij (universele coöperatie) wanneer hun eigen groep blijdschap communiceert over een eerder, coöperatief, onderhandelingsbod. Wanneer hun groep echter boosheid communiceert, zullen vertegenwoordigers hun coöperatie richten op de eigen groep (parochiale coöperatie, Hoofdstuk 3). Deze aanpassing van gedrag afhankelijk van de emotie gecommuniceerd door de achterban is sterker bij pro-sociale dan bij pro-zelf vertegenwoordigers, wat suggereert dat de intrapersoonlijke factor sociale waarde-oriëntatie een cruciale rol speelt bij het oproepen en sturen van coöperatie.

De laatste twee hoofdstukken richten zich op de intergroepsfactoren van de mate waarin belangen wel of niet overeenkomen en de mate van competitie tussen groepen (en hun vertegenwoordigers). Vooral pro-sociale vertegenwoordigers zijn bereid hun eigenbelang voor een groot deel op te offeren wanneer dit hun groep ten goede kan komen. Zij tonen deze zelf-opoffering wanneer het beide groepen helpt (universele coöperatie). Ze doen dit echter zelfs en vooral wanneer het alleen hun eigen groep helpt en de andere groep schaadt in een onderhandeling (parochiale coöperatie, Hoofdstuk 4). We nuanceren deze bevindingen vervolgens door aan te tonen dat de toegankelijkheid van een optie die gunstig is voor beide partijen belangrijk is. Mensen in het algemeen, vooral pro-sociale personen, neigen naar

parochiale coöperatie. Wanneer er echter een optie beschikbaar is die voor beide partijen hoge uitkomsten genereert, én wanneer parochiale coöperatie beduidend schade berokkent aan de andere groep, zullen ze zich aanpassen richting universele coöperatie. Deze universele coöperatie is echter geen intuïtieve strategie maar berekend, en neemt af onder cognitieve vermoeidheid (Hoofdstuk 5). Pro-socialen zijn dus parochiaal, maar niet bereid om de andere partij schade toe te brengen. Wanneer het helpen van de eigen groep de andere partij schaadt, zullen ze bewust op zoek gaan naar andere, meer indirecte manieren om hun groep te helpen zonder de andere groep te schaden. Ten slotte laat Hoofdstuk 5 zien dat een hoger aantal pro-socialen in een collectief de uitkomsten op collectief niveau verhoogt, wat suggereert dat groepen beter in staat zijn om een conflict op te lossen en hoge uitkomsten te behalen voor beide partijen wanneer er meer pro-socialen aanwezig zijn.

Al met al suggereren deze resultaten dat personen, en met name pro-socialen, een neiging hebben tot parochiale coöperatie. Ze zijn echter gevoelig voor situationele factoren zoals de voorkeuren en goedkeuring van de achterban, alsook de toegankelijkheid van een collectief gunstige optie. Dergelijke factoren kunnen hun coöperatie inspanningen richten op wederzijds gunstige, mogelijk waarde creërende uitkomsten.

Conclusies en implicaties

De bevindingen van dit proefschrift tonen factoren aan die ofwel parochiale, ofwel universele coöperatie bevorderen. Dit proefschrift biedt dus nuttige kennis over de omstandigheden waarin personen parochiale vs. universele coöperatie laten zien, en welke factoren de wederzijds gunstige vorm van universele coöperatie, die de weg legt naar conflictoplossing, kunnen doen toenemen. De bevindingen van dit proefschrift hebben een aantal implicaties voor zowel gerelateerde onderzoeksgebieden, als voor de praktijk. Ten eerste dragen deze bevindingen bij aan een rijker begrip van het dilemma waaraan vertegenwoordigers het hoofd moeten bieden wanneer zij namens de ene partij met een andere partij moeten onderhandelen. We hebben belangrijke factoren ontdekt binnen hun eigen persoonlijkheid, alsook binnen de achterban en tussen de twee partijen die, tenminste gedeeltelijk, de onderhandelingstactieken van de vertegenwoordiger en de kwaliteit van de onderhandelingsuitkomst bepalen. Daarnaast hebben we sociale waarde-oriëntatie geïdentificeerd als een belangrijke voorspeller van zowel parochiale als universele coöperatie. We hebben het raadsel betreffende de richting

van de coöperatie van pro-sociale personen in elk geval gedeeltelijk opgelost door te laten zien dat pro-socialen parochiaal zijn, maar bereid hun coöperatie uit te breiden naar de andere partij wanneer i) er een duidelijke collectief gunstige optie beschikbaar is en ii) parochialisme schade toebrengt aan de andere partij.

Een interessante uitdaging voor deze bevindingen is ze in de praktijk toe te passen. We noemen praktische implicaties voor onderhandelingen (zowel voor de vertegenwoordiger als voor de achterban) en benadrukken de noodzaak voor vertegenwoordigers om zich te richten op het ontdekken en sluiten van een collectief gunstige onderhandelingsovereenkomst, die zal resulteren in betere acceptatie van de overeenkomst door beide partijen en betere intergroepsrelaties. Onze bevindingen geven ook aan wanneer en waarom beide partijen wel en niet kunnen profiteren van een pro-sociaal persoon die namens hen beslissingen maakt. We tonen aan wanneer pro-socialen parochiale of universele coöperatie laten zien en hoe zowel het doel van de onderhandeling als de mate waarin de belangen tussen de vertegenwoordiger en de twee partijen verenigbaar zijn, belangrijk zijn voor het bepalen van de richting van de coöperatie van pro-socialen. Ten slotte stellen we een aantal richtingen voor vervolgonderzoek voor met betrekking tot sociale waarde-oriëntatie, parochiale coöperatie en onderhandelingen. Onze bevindingen zijn een belangrijke eerste stap voor het ontdekken van wanneer en waarom personen parochiale of collectieve coöperatie vertonen. Er is echter meer onderzoek nodig om andere belangrijke mechanismen en onderliggende factoren te onderzoeken, om onze bevindingen te staven in een meer natuurlijke omgeving- bijvoorbeeld door archiefanalyse of casestudies-, en om de implicaties van elke vorm van coöperatie op de lange termijn te bepalen.

Kortom, het huidige proefschrift benadrukt de belangrijke rol van sociale waarde oriëntatie voor coöperatie in intergroepsconflicten. We laten zien hoe pro-sociale vertegenwoordigers en besluitvormers worden beïnvloed door verschillende factoren om ofwel parochiale, ofwel collectieve coöperatie te laten zien. Over het algemeen zijn pro-socialen, ondanks hun potentieel duistere kant wanneer parochiale coöperatie schade toebrengt aan de andere partij en het conflict kan verergeren, beter dan pro-zelfs in het dienen van de belangen van zo veel mogelijk betrokkenen. Ondanks hun neiging om de eigen groep te beschermen, wat soms onvermijdelijk ten koste gaat van de andere partij, wordt de kans op betere uitkomsten en betere relaties in een intergroepsconflict verhoogd wanneer er meer pro-socialen aanwezig zijn.

Dankwoord

De komende pagina's worden waarschijnlijk de meest gelezen pagina's van het hele boekje. En, cliché of niet, dat is ook terecht- In mijn eentje had ik het echt niet kunnen doen. Er zijn heel veel mensen die mij de afgelopen vier jaar direct of indirect met de totstandkoming van dit proefschrift hebben geholpen en die wil ik graag bedanken. Komt ie.

Om te beginnen natuurlijk Carsten. Een van de meest briljante onderzoekers die ik ken en daarnaast een geweldig docent. Je hebt me in de afgelopen jaren ontzettend veel waardevolle dingen geleerd (voornamelijk, maar zeker niet alleen, over onderzoek). Zonder jou was ik niet de onderzoeker geworden die ik nu ben (en dit is nog maar het begin)! Dank je wel. Ik ben er trots op een van je academic 'grant'daughters te mogen zijn. En ik ben heel erg blij dat ik de kans heb gekregen om hier nog even te blijven en verder met je te kunnen samenwerken. Zoals je me kent wil ik graag snel beginnen met het volgende experiment- Het lab heb ik alvast gereserveerd voor volgende week!

Gerben, dankjewel voor je begeleiding, voor je optimisme en je vertrouwen, je rust én enthousiasme (ja dat gaat dus samen), en voor je humor en relativiseringsvermogen. Ik heb heel veel aan je gehad in de afgelopen jaren. En ik hoop nog vaak naar je te zullen luisteren- Naar je wijze advies, interessante onderzoekspraatjes, of je fantastische muziek!

Lindy, thanks for being such a great supervisor. I learnt a lot from you and highly valued our conversations- Not only those about research, but also about academia in general. And about horses. And men. Thank you for your never-fading enthusiasm and convincing me that everything is possible. I still miss you here!

Naomi, bedankt voor je bijdrage aan mijn project, voor het meedenken en je waardevolle inzichten.

Aukje, bedankt voor de interessante gesprekken en de kansen die je me hebt gegeven om de 'echte wereld' der onderhandelaars te leren kennen. Ik bewonder jouw kwaliteiten om de wetenschap en praktijk met elkaar te kunnen combineren enorm en hoop in de toekomst nog meer met je op het raakvlak van deze gebieden samen te kunnen werken.

Naar werk gaan is nooit vervelend geweest dankzij al mijn geweldige (ex-)collega's: Angelique, Anouk, Annebel, Annelies, Arne, Astrid, Barbara, Brigitte, Edwin, Gosia, Jessie, Katharina, Machteld, Marije, Mariska, Melvyn, Seval, Ute, Yujie. Dank jullie allen voor de positieve sfeer, werk- en niet werkgerelateerde gesprekken en gezellige borrels en etentjes. Speciale dank naar mijn kamergenootjes door de jaren heen: Özüm, thank you for all the great times and

Dankwoord

fun we've had; Daniel, Marieke, Nathalie en Tim W- Gezelligheid én productiviteit gegarandeerd met jullie op kantoor. Joke, dankjewel voor al je hulp en geduld met me de afgelopen jaren en ik hoop op nog veel gezellige gesprekken bij de printer. Matthijs, zonder jou als docent in het tweede jaar had ik misschien wel nooit voor de onderzoeksrichting gekozen. Dank- En het maakt echt niet uit hoe oud je bent. Bianca, jou wil ik bedanken voor al je hulp en advies de afgelopen jaren, mede dankzij jou ben ik in 2009 bij de vakgroep komen werken en ik hoop er voorlopig nog niet weg te gaan. Michel, voordat je echt vader werd had je het al in je- Dank voor alle begeleiding en gezelligheid die je me hebt gegeven toen ik bij A&O ben komen werken. Femke, dank voor je humor, het vele meedenken en je wijze raad- zowel qua onderwijs als qua onderzoek. Tim F, veel dank voor je hulp en creativiteit bij het ontwerpen van de omslag. Ik ben er heel blij mee. Freddy- Je was er natuurlijk eigenlijk veel te weinig om een goede kamergenoot te zijn maar ik ben blij dat je nog in de buurt bent!

Tim! We zijn praktisch samen begonnen en ondanks totaal verschillende richtingen altijd goed van elkaars doen en laten op de hoogte gebleven. Dank voor je luisterend oor en het voorbeeld dat je me geeft met je mooie job crafting initiatieven. Ik ben heel blij dat je mijn paranimf wil zijn en hoop stiekem in de toekomst ook weer je kamergenoot te worden! Hagar, dat ik jou als paranimf zou vragen wist ik al toen ik aan het AiO traject begon- Dank voor je goede vriendschap in de afgelopen jaren. Samen de master, samen AiO (met begeleiders die elkaar wel heel goed kennen) en hopelijk nog heel veel meer samen in de toekomst. Laura, zo fijn dat jij ook naast me staat. Je bent een fantastische vriendin en een briljante onderzoekster. Van jouw ambities en doorzettingsvermogen kan ik nog veel leren. Dankjewel.

Was dat alles? Zeker niet. Ik heb nog zoveel meer onderzoekers ontmoet in de afgelopen jaren waar ik veel aan heb gehad: Goede gesprekken over onderzoek, uitwisseling van ideeën en ervaringen als AiO en natuurlijk ook heel veel lol. De deelnemers van de Conflict & Security meetings, met name Bart, Hedy en Said. Het was super om elkaar zo te volgen tijdens onze projecten en ik hoop dat we elkaar niet uit het oog zullen verliezen. Iedereen van KLI- bedankt voor de leuke meetings, de congressen en de feedback tijdens de presentaties. Wolfgang, bedankt voor al je wijze commentaar en een leuke onderzoekssamenwerking. Nicol, thanks for the great conversations and the fun. Marco- Uit een vliegtuig in Zuid-Afrika springen was niet hetzelfde geweest zonder jou.

Dankwoord

The EASP summer school was a wonderful experience that taught me so much. It broadened my horizon regarding research fields and opportunities, but also made me realize what it really means to be in academia. Thank you all for sharing this experience with me and special thanks to Thijs and Wiebren for keeping me (sort of) sane.

The IACM conference has been a highlight each year. The friendly environment combined with great talks and inspiring meetings always made me leave the conference eager to do more, interesting and relevant research- Next to making me leave exhausted from all the great partying. Special thanks to Dan Druckman for being such a great guru, to the Leuven guys for all the fun, to ze Germans and to so many others. Thank you!

Last but not least- More special thanks go out to those with whom I have regularly debated the value(s) of science: Bram, Brian, Daniel, David, Martin, Sander, Roderik, Tim, Warren. You helped me more than you think and made me a better scholar (scientist?). Thank you.

Genoeg onderzoekers bedankt nu. Mijn ouders wil ik bedanken voor hun steun in de afgelopen jaren en het vertrouwen dat het me allemaal wel zou lukken. Ze hebben gelijk gehad- Zie hier het resultaat!

Dankzij Banjer en later Stör heb ik kunnen genieten van frisse wind door en om mijn hoofd- hard nodige ontspanning die mijn efficiëntie op werk alleen maar ten goede is gekomen. André, Annelies, Marlies, Anneke, Simone, Jan, Loek en sinds kort Katja, Eric, Mirjam en Astrid- Dank voor jullie goede zorgen en gezelligheid rond de paarden. Ik hoop dat het nog lang zo zal blijven. En tenslotte: Ik ben rijk. Waar zou ik zijn zonder mijn goede vrienden om mee te ontspannen en heel veel mee te lachen? Adina, Hagar, Iris, Katha, Kathrin, Laura, Lisanne, Marianne, Olga, Parel, Suzanne, Yasemin- Dank jullie wel dat jullie er altijd voor me zijn, naar me willen luisteren en altijd in me geloven, ook als ik dat zelf even niet meer doe. En dit proefschrift schrijven is me alvast gelukt- Jeuh!

KURT LEWIN DISSERTATION SERIES

The “Kurt Lewin Institute Dissertation Series” started in 1997. Since 2012 the following dissertations have been published in this series:

- 2012-1: Roos Pals: *Zoo-ming in on restoration: Physical features and restorativeness of environments*
- 2012-2: Stephanie Welten: *Concerning Shame*
- 2012-3: Gerben Langendijk: *Power, Procedural Fairness & Prosocial Behavior*
- 2012-4: Janina Marguc: *Stepping Back While Staying Engaged: On the Cognitive Effects of Obstacles*
- 2012-5: Erik Bijleveld: *The unconscious and conscious foundations of human reward pursuit*
- 2012-6: Maarten Zaal: *Collective action: A regulatory focus perspective*
- 2012-7: Floor Kroese: *Tricky treats: How and when temptations boost self-control*
- 2012-8: Koen Dijkstra: *Intuition Versus Deliberation: the Role of Information Processing in Judgment and Decision Making*
- 2012-9: Marjette Slijkhuis: *A Structured Approach to Need for Structure at Work*
- 2012-10: Monica Blaga: *Performance attainment and intrinsic motivation: An achievement goal approach*
- 2012-11: Anita de Vries: *Specificity in Personality Measurement*
- 2012-12: Bastiaan Rutjens: *Start making sense: Compensatory responses to control- and meaning threats*
- 2012-13: Marleen Gillebaart: *When people favor novelty over familiarity and how novelty affects creative processes*
- 2012-14: Marije de Goede: *Searching for a match: The formation of Person-Organization fit perceptions*
- 2012-15: Liga Klavina: *They steal our women: Outgroup Members as Romantic Rivals*
- 2012-16: Jessanne Mastop: *On postural reactions: Contextual effects on perceptions of and reactions to postures*
- 2012-17: Joep Hofhuis: *Dealing with Differences: Managing the Benefits and Threats of Cultural Diversity in the Workplace*
- 2012-18: Jessie de Witt Huberts: *License to Sin: A justification-based account of self-regulation failure*
- 2012-19: Yvette van Osch: *Show or hide your pride*
- 2012-20: Laura Dannenberg: *Fooling the feeling of doing: A goal perspective on illusions of agency*
- 2012-21: Marleen Redeker: *Around Leadership: Using the Leadership Circumplex to Study the Impact of Individual Characteristics on Perceptions of Leadership*
- 2013-1: Annemarie Hiemstra: *Fairness in Paper and Video Resume Screening*

KURT LEWIN DISSERTATION SERIES

- 2013-2: Gert-Jan Lelieveld: *Emotions in Negotiations: The Role of Communicated Anger and Disappointment*
- 2013-3 Saar Mollen: *Fitting in or Breaking Free? On Health Behavior, Social Norms and Conformity*
- 2013-4: Karin Menninga: *Exploring Learning Abstinence Theory: A new theoretical perspective on continued abstinence in smoking cessation*
- 2013-5: Jessie Koen: *Prepare and Pursue: Routes to suitable (re-)employment*
- 2013-6: Marieke Roskes: *Motivated creativity: A conservation of energy approach*
- 2013-7: Claire Marie Zedelius: *Investigating Consciousness in Reward Pursuit*
- 2013-8: Anouk van der Weiden: *When You Think You Know What You're Doing: Experiencing Self-Agency Over Intended and Unintended Outcomes*
- 2013-9: Gert Stulp: *Sex, Stature and Status: Natural Selection on Height in Contemporary Human Populations*
- 2013-10: Evert-Jan van Doorn: *Emotion Affords Social Influence: Responding to Others' Emotions In Context*
- 2013-11: Frank de Wit: *The paradox of intragroup conflict*
- 2013-12: Iris Schneider: *The dynamics of ambivalence: Cognitive, affective and physical consequences of evaluative conflict*
- 2013-13: Jana Niemann: *Feedback Is the Breakfast of Champions, but It Can Be Hard to Digest: A Psychological Perspective on Feedback Seeking and Receiving*
- 2013-14: Serena Does: *At the heart of egalitarianism: How morality framing shapes Whites' responses to social inequality*
- 2013-15: Romy van der Lee: *Moral Motivation Within Groups*
- 2013-16: Melvyn Hamstra: *Self-Regulation in a Social Environment*
- 2013-17: Chantal den Daas: *In the heat of the moment: The effect of impulsive and reflective states on sexual risk decisions*
- 2013-18: Kelly Cobey: *Female Physiology Meets Psychology: Menstrual Cycle and Contraceptive Pill Effects*
- 2013-19: Ellen van der Werff: *Growing environmental self-identity*
- 2013-20: Lise Jans: *Reconciling individuality with social solidarity: Forming social identity from the bottom up*
- 2013-21: Ruth van Veelen: *Integrating I and We: Cognitive Routes to Social Identification*
- 2013-22: Lottie Bullens: *Having second thoughts: consequences of decision reversibility*
- 2013-23: Daniel Sligte: *The functionality of creativity*
- 2014-01: Marijn Stok: *Eating by the Norm: The Influence of Social Norms on Young People's Eating Behavior*

KURT LEWIN DISSERTATION SERIES

- 2014-02: Michèle Bal: *Making Sense of Injustice: Benign and Derogatory Reactions to Innocent Victims*
- 2014-03: Nicoletta Dimitrova: *Rethinking errors: How error-handling strategy affects our thoughts and others' thoughts about us*
- 2014-04: Namkje Koudenburg: *Conversational Flow: The Emergence and Regulation of Solidarity through social interaction*
- 2014-05: Thomas Sitser: *Predicting sales performance: Strengthening the personality – job performance linkage*
- 2014-06: Goda Perlaviciute: *Goal-driven evaluations of sustainable products*
- 2014-07: Said Shafa: *In the eyes of others: The role of honor concerns in explaining and preventing insult-elicited aggression*
- 2014-08: Felice van Nunspeet: *Neural correlates of the motivation to be moral*
- 2014-09: Anne Fetsje Sluis: *Towards a virtuous society: Virtues as potential instruments to enhance*
- 2014-10: Gardien de Vries: *Pitfalls in the Communication about CO₂ Capture and Storage*
- 2014-11: Thecla Brakel: *The effects of social comparison information on cancer survivors' quality of life: A field-experimental intervention approach*
- 2014-12: Hans Marien: *Understanding and Motivating Human Control: Outcome and Reward Information in Action*
- 2014-13: Daniel Alink: *Public Trust: Expectancies, Beliefs, and Behavior*
- 2014-14: Linda Daphne Muusses: *How Internet use may affect our relationships: Characteristics of Internet use and personal and relational wellbeing*
- 2014-15: Hillie Aaldering: *Parochial and universal cooperation in intergroup conflicts*