Abstract Van Bavel and Gaskell's (2004) analysis of laypeople's and economics experts' discourse in Chile is complemented by a look at expert-talk-based colonization of the social realities of Russia. It is demonstrated that resistance by laypeople to the acceptance of expert discourses is a buffering mechanism in a society to balance the import of deductively derived economic models from other countries. A dialogical approach is suggested for making sense of economic processes in any society.

Key Words colonization, economy, 'evil intent', expert knowledge, laypeople's thinking, resistance, Russia

Alexander Poddiakov
State University—Higher School of Economics, Russia

Teaching Economic Thought: Landscapes After Battles

In 'Narrative and Systemic Modes of Economic Thinking' (van Bavel & Gaskell, 2004), relations between modes of economic thought after a military upheaval are analyzed, as is the subsequent violent change of a society's political and economic system. The authors, René van Bavel and George Gaskell, combine Habermas's distinction between system and lifeworld, and Bruner's distinction between narrative and paradigmatic modes of thought.

Van Bavel and Gaskell introduce opposition between systemic and narrative modes of economic thought. They reveal features of lay narrative thought and experts' system thought, and show colonization of lay thought by expert thought—as well as demonstrating lay resistance to such colonizing education. Qualitative methods, including informal communication (focus groups and interviews) with Chilean economists and laypeople, were used to obtain these results.

The authors prove that public understanding of economic science is not a profane counterpart to expert knowledge, and dialogue is necessary to bridge the gap between systemic and narrative thinking. In the article, problems with the thinking of experts themselves look no less significant than the problems of the public's understanding of the experts. In particular, the authors show that experts are relatively insensitive to empirical data and do not see important shortcomings of economic policies in everyday life.

Vol. 10(4): 441–453 [DOI: 10.1177/1354067X04045745]

There are a number of reasons for such discrepancies between expert and laypeople's thought: people's beliefs about what must be seen as 'figure' and 'ground' in economics and society; relations between experts' and laypeople's values; consideration of linkages between elements of the economy and society in terms either of causal nets or of isolated causal chains; opposition of deductive and inductive reasoning; and the use of metaphors.

I agree with the main statements of the article and share the values presented in it. I am going to complement the statements, including them in the context of another society and some other approaches.

I will try to show that interactions between systemic and narrative modes of thought after upheavals have features that differentiate them from interactions in other conditions. In contrast with van Bavel and Gaskell, whose main focus is the opposition between people's systemic and narrative thought revealed by means of interviews, I will concentrate on opposition between people themselves, who try to reach their aims and defend their interests by different means. I will consider people's real actions towards one another and combine analyses of modes of thought with analyses of behavior. Such combination may provide us with additional dimensions of analysis, and broaden the context of the problems set.

Chile and Russia

All elements are interconnected, and everything is related to everything. The idea of interconnectivity seems central in van Bavell and Gaskell's reasoning. This idea has one more essential confirmation. Events and interactions in Chile have a significant influence on events and processes in Russia.

In 1993, after Russian *perestroika* and the firing by army tanks at the Russian parliament, which had refused to be dissolved, the situation in the country was described by many Russian experts in expressions similar to van Bavel's and Gaskell's: neoliberal reforms were swiftly implemented by the government, advised by a generation of Russian economists, who followed the paradigm elaborated 'at the University of Chicago, the home of the neoclassical revolution' (van Bavel & Gaskell, p. 424). As a result, the scope of the colonization by expert ideology is on the increase (Zinoviev, 2004).

The Chilean experience is actively discussed in Russia from different points of view. It is assimilated by experts, who write dissertations, monographs, textbooks, articles for the lay public, and so on, about the applicability or non-applicability of the experience to Russia (Arbatov,

1999; Borisov, 2000; Kvasov, 1998; Simonova, 2002; Tarasov, 1998, and many others). In addition, reforms of the Russian pension system have included elements of the Chilean system, as a result of a decision by influential Russian economic experts.

The Chilean experience has also been assimilated in narrative ways by writers and ordinary people. The Russian Internet search system Yandex (http://www.yandex.ru) gave me references to 3,995 Russian web pages containing the key word *Pinochet* (on 28 February 2004), and informed me that 959 requests for this key word had been made in the last month. In Russia there are few people bearing that name, and most of the web pages are not of experts in economics. Certainly, one can say that there are very active narratives of the Chilean experience in Russia. Different and contradictory representations of the Chilean experience have become a cultural phenomenon in Russia over the last decade. This is because the experience of Chile is closely related and resonates with the history of Russia as well as its contemporary experience, and its choice of directions for further development. Russia experienced several military upheavals and acts of destroying previous social systems in the 20th century. A variety of differing narratives and systemic approaches—including economic ones—are being created to describe and explain these situations, to try to cope with them, and to be used to 'fight against enemies'.

Variety of Systems and Narratives

René van Bavel and George Gaskell consider relations between the dominant system mode of thought represented by only one winning system (neoliberalism), and the colonized narrative mode represented by only one group of narratives (or perhaps, more exactly, counter-narratives, because they are opposed to the dominant economic doctrine). Systemic economic thought seems free of morals and remorse to ordinary people, and, in turn, the narrative thought of laypeople seems stupid and profane to economic experts.

Yet usually there are many different narratives and many (or, at least, a few) systemic approaches in a society. People are different and, respectively, their narratives are different too. These narratives and counter-narratives can present contradictory human values, needs and modes of behavior. In particular, there can be narratives of brotherhood/sisterhood, generosity and mutual support, narratives of egoistic self-serving behavior and defense of an individual's interests by any means, including murder, and so on.

Similarly, thought systems created by experts are different too. They can include systems free of morality, and systems in which morality is the cornerstone (Benson, 2001; Bratus', 1997; Lefebvre, 2001). One should emphasize that if the variety of systemic approaches and narratives is rich, different relations between them are possible, not only the opposition of 'one system–one narrative'. There can be mutual support among systems which are compatible with one another, struggle between several antagonistic systems, and many narratives and counter-narratives in society (Bamberg, 2002).

Murders of Thinkers as Knowledge Management

What are the most radical means to achieve 'one system–one narrative'?

Some system doctrines and supporting narratives allow and use for practical application a metaphorical rule: 'not a person, not a problem' (if a person does not exist, problems caused by him or her do not exist either). Repressions, arrests, expulsions and murders of thinkers become ways of thought control and knowledge management, means to fight against opponents. Thus, some important part of systemic and narrative thought is violently destroyed, 'cut off'. For example, after the Socialist Revolution in October 1917, Lenin's government dissolving the parliament began to fight not only against military enemies, but also against those thinkers whose ideas appeared to contradict Lenin's political and economic doctrine. One of the most expressive examples of this fight was the action named the 'philosophers' ship'. In 1922 a number of famous and not so famous Russian philosophers, sociologists, economists, writers and other intellectuals were arrested and expelled from Russia on several ships and trains (Edelman, 2004; Zolotov, 2002). In fact, the expulsion saved them, because many other thinkers remaining in the country were killed between 1933 and 1937. (Concerning the fate of economic systems, one of the most famous economists, Alexander Chayanov, was killed in that period.) These expulsions and murders stopped the development of many directions of narrative and systemic thought, and very important technical inventions.

Subsequent Colonization

After its victory, the Communist Party of the USSR organized total compulsory teaching of Marxist-Leninist political economy, presented as the most advanced and powerful economic doctrine, in all Soviet

colleges and universities, including non-economic ones, like schools of art, and at senior levels of all secondary schools. This work was supported by officially sanctioned narratives presented in many films, books, and so on. Often they presented ordinary people's biographies, in which a key point was mastery of the doctrine. A person's life was presented as cardinally changed after inspiring insight led to an understanding of the essence of economic, social and political processes. System approaches and narratives that were opposed to the dominant ones were censured and repressed. Thus, the victory of one economic and political system over others in society was closely related with cruel and pitiless struggles against opposing systems, influential narratives, and their authors or defenders.

All that has been said above is a necessary precondition to supplement van Bavel and Gaskell's discussion of possible causes of the resistance to colonization by economic system thought.

Why Would Laypeople Resist Economic Education?

Martin Bauer (1995) shows that resistance in social processes is functional. It is 'an alarm signal that things are going wrong' (p. 412), analogous to a pain in the body.

Let me enrich the metaphor by differentiating between pain caused by actions necessary to save a life; pain caused by non-competent actions, but made with good intent; and pain caused by actions intending to kill. Functions of resistance in these three cases are different. In the first two cases a function may be to show a person, playing the role of doctor, that things are going wrong. In the third case a function of the resistance is not communicative and demonstrative, but immediately aimed to save the victim's life.

Economic experts use metaphors of 'hard medicine', an 'ill or healthy body', and so on. But who are the doctors? 'Doctors' treating Soviet economics in the 1930s had created 'Gulag islands' as a powerful and integral part of economics, in which millions of innocent victims of arrests were working as slaves till their death. It was a continuation of the policy of the upheaval of 1917.

How can ordinary men or women believe that those who gave the order to dissolve a parliament and initiated a civil war with mass murders will, after that, invite doctors, advisors and educators with a humanistic orientation? Such behavior would look very strange and paradoxical. So educational colonization can seem to people as a modified continuation of the same policy by transition from direct violence to cultural violence, in Galtung's terms (Galtung, 1990;

Sytyh, 2003), or as a premeditated disorientation, in Benson's (2001) terms.

Does it mean that the laypeople who resist colonization do not understand the economic educators? The responses of the laypeople presented by van Bavel and Gaskell confirm that the laypeople do not understand specific economic arguments. Yet the arguments are means to achieve some aims, and a question about lay understanding of experts' main aims seems without explicit answers. Based on the Russian discussions of colonization mentioned above, it may be that some laypeople think that they understand real, but hidden, aims of economic experts very well. They explain the difficulties of understanding the experts' arguments by citing the experts' intention to make things appear unduly complicated.

As a matter of fact, such situations are considered in one economic theory, namely the theory of agency. If an advisor (an agent) and a client have conflicting goals, the agent can display self-serving behavior. The advisor can deliberately conceal information from the client to stimulate him or her to make a decision, which is not good for the client, but good for the advisor (Jonas & Frey, 2003).

The phenomenon is named moral hazard. It concerns informal situations as well. Concerning economic and educational expertise, I have not found publications on the applicability of agency theory to relations between laypeople and educational experts. Yet I think this approach is possible and can be fruitful in some conditions. Naturally, most ordinary people know neither agency theory nor Lefebvre's (1977) theory that '[t]he opponent's doctrine is imposed on the opponent by teaching him' (p. 118), nor other theories working with this phenomenon in other terms.

Certainly ordinary people can master cultural tools, differing from the system's ones, to understand some real situations (modeled by the theories) and cope with situations: for example, by resistance to educators. These tools can be narratives. Let me now consider narratives which defend the narrative mode of thought from educational colonization.

Narratives of Teaching with 'Evil Intent'

Many situations of teaching with 'evil intent' are presented in such cultural forms of narration of social experience as myths, fairy tales, proverbs, and so on. They describe aims, means and results of counteraction to others' learning and the use of such situations to do damage. Many tales contain situations in which a master, magician or god

prevents his underling from learning the secrets of his trade. Often, the characters teach each other to do things which are dangerous or disadvantageous to them. Similar topics can be found throughout literature and in films as well (Poddiakov, 2001). Learning these narratives can help in recognizing such situations in real life.

A negative aspect of such learning is a person's readiness to see potential 'enemies' in areas of education if these narratives are too strong and dominating. Recently that readiness has increased in the context of emerging new conflicts and can be supported by new stories spread by the mass media: for example, stories about rivalry in economics, high technology and military industry. One most intricate but interesting story is as follows. The United States applied some punitive sanctions against Russian universities which were suspected of teaching nuclear technology to students from countries with 'dangerous regimes'. These universities resented this, and one of them dismissed several American teachers who were teaching at it. After the subsequent intervention of the Russian Ministry of Education, the American teachers were reinstated in their positions, and some of the foreign students were dismissed (Sanctions . . ., 2000; Sanktsii . . ., 1999). Such stories, becoming narratives, can stimulate mutual distrust and suspicion in education.

Beliefs about Teaching with 'Evil Intent' and Implicit Theories of Education

Based on an original survey (Poddiakov, 2004), I, in cooperation with Silvia von Kluge from Eastern Michigan University, have elaborated and administered a survey concerning adults' beliefs about counteraction to others' learning and teaching 'with evil intent'. The survey contains eleven questions like the following.

> In a Russian tale, a fox teaches a wolf how to catch fish in an ice-hole, using the wolf's own tail as a rod. As a result, the wolf freezes to the ice and is beaten up by humans because the fox betrays him to the humans. In your opinion: are there similar situations of 'instruction with evil intent' in real life? Has anyone tried to conduct teaching or instruction with 'evil intent' towards yourself? Have you conducted teaching or instruction with 'evil intent' towards anyone?

Participants were 105 Americans aged 18–51 years (74 females, 31 males) and 112 Russians aged 19–58 years (59 females, 53 males). Ninety-nine percent of the Russians and 95% of the Americans believe that 'instruction with evil intent' does exist; 44% of the Russians and 52% of the Americans have been taught with 'evil intent'; 16% of the

Russians and 16% of the Americans have conducted teaching or instruction with 'evil intent' towards anyone *rarely* or *from time to time*, and so on (Poddiakov, 2004). In another study we showed that Russian adults who had become experts in a game demonstrated abilities to plan such teaching with a potential rival playing the game, which would provide the expert's win in case of competition. They were able to accept the aim and solve the problem (Poddiakov, 2002).

Results of these and other studies (Poddiakov, 2000, 2001, 2003) show that the metaphoric rule 'to give a rod, not a fish', often declared a main principle in economic education, can be understood and applied in different ways, depending on a person's attitude to another person and the competition between them. Beliefs about teaching with 'evil intent' are a part of implicit theories of education, and perhaps, from to time, a part of the image of the world.

'Christ in Pinochet's Uniform' and Other Metaphors

Metaphors of physical violence and destruction seem dominant in military upheavals, wars, and so on. Often these metaphors work with images of enemies' bodies, presented as ugly, terrible, and so on. A main slogan in Russia in 1917–1924 was 'To squash the hydra of the Counter-Revolution!' A situation with metaphors of this kind was repeated in the 1990s—in reverse. I encountered a metaphorical slogan 'To break the backbone of communist economics!' as the title of an article in the Moscow newspaper *Kuranty*. Some actions of the government in 2003 were also presented as able 'to break the backbone of Russian economic growth' (Yasin, 2003).

A most strange and contradictory metaphor comes from Sviatoslav Fyodorov, who said that 'we need Christ in Pinochet's uniform'. It is interesting in light of the fact that Fyodorov was a well-known oculist and very successful businessman who set up his own private hospital. In other words, it was a declaration of an ex-layperson, who had made himself an expert in the area of practical economic thought. (The demonstrative paradox contained in this metaphor from the 1990s resonates with an image of Christ leading a section of communist soldiers in Alexander Blok's poem *The Twelve,* written in honor of the October revolution of 1917. It signifies deep cultural roots for this narrative—cf. the old concept of the army of Christ.) Although Fyodorov's declaration was oral, it became known and caused many negative reactions. An ironic reaction, expressed in the same metaphorical way, was that—in spite of his being an eye doctor himself—

he did not see that an icon of Christ in Pinochet's uniform is impossible (Krotov, 1998).

Expertise in Complex Problem Solving: Deductive and Inductive Reasoning

Experts should reason in terms of causal nets, not isolated chains (Frensch & Funke, 1995). The economic experts interviewed by René van Bavel and George Gaskell do so, thinking all elements within a system to be interconnected. Yet an interesting feature of these experts' thinking is the domination of deductive over inductive reasoning. It has been shown in the approach to complex problem solving that the domination of deductive reasoning is usually a feature of less successful complex problem solvers. By contrast, successful solvers are sensitive to new data and actively use inductive reasoning and abduction (i.e. 'the sequential comprehension and integration of data into a single situation model that represents the current best explanation of the data') (Krems, 1995, p. 206). Dietrich Dörner (1997) showed that belief in a general model and algorithms guaranteeing right decisions leads to failures in solving complex problems, including economic ones. It is amusing, if not dark and grotesque, when problem solvers in his experiments, having such a belief, work with scenarios of complex economic situations. They begin from good intentions, but end up by accusing 'the people' of 'behaving wrongly'—not accepting their rough authoritarian decisions. Such accusations may escalate when the utilization of their 'unshakable' models becomes shaky.

Many real mistakes of economic management are simulated in this approach. Yet, naturally, any modeling and simulation, including simulations of complex problem solving, have different shortcomings and can encounter refuting examples. Estimations of economic growth made by the experts in van Bavel and Gaskell's study are optimistic. Taking the estimations for granted, one can give several explanations of contradictions between, on the one hand, domination of deductive reasoning, insensitivity to empirical data, and so on, and, on the other, the success of solving economic problems faced by the real country. The first and simplest explanation is that the experts interviewed are involved in solving theoretical economic problems, rather than practical ones. The second explanation might be that the experts demonstrate the deductive style mainly in communications with other people, but they do not use this style to the same extent when solving real economic problems. In other words, in interviews they can look more deductive (and didactic) than they really are.

The third explanation might be that complex problem solving in a given country, under specific conditions, and so on, is a special case, for which means of deductive reasoning and exact conclusions from some models are most appropriate. Inductive and abductive reasoning are surplus. As a result, the experts have found a general method to solve complex problems (with the exception of a way to explain it to the resisting laypeople).

Values and Mutual Understanding

From the viewpoint of the issues discussed, a good illustration of the public's understanding of science is presented in a fragment of Stanislav Lem's (1990, pp. 243–247) narrative, 'The Eyewitness Account'. This is a dialogue between a virtual Russell, Popper, and some other philosophers and scientists, and a lawyer, Finkelstein, an ex-prisoner of a Nazi concentration camp, who had survived by luck. Finkelstein says, approximately, the following, describing different models for building happiness.

First, the consequences of humanistic systems were zero, in contrast to the consequences of other systems. Among the others, the Nietzschean model led to terrible results. Even programs for building the Garden of Eden on Earth were turned into mass graves. So he is sure that some actions should not be taken in the name of abstractions like 'the national interest', 'total happiness after two decades', and so on. One can prove any statement, and this is unhappiness of mind (Lem, 1990, pp. 243–247).

Dostoevsky's existential question—can one build the happiness of the world on the basis of children's tears?—finds a modern operationalization in Kahneman and Tversky's (1984) studies of people's beliefs about the possible cost of human lives measured by other humans' deaths. In many such situations, problems of rational choice of behavior and formation of attitudes are too hard. Teaching following murders can be included within these ambiguous cases, but one should know the real aims and values of educators. Otherwise, recommendations to experts—to speak with people in lay terms—can be used for more advanced manipulation and colonization.

The issue raised by van Bavel and Gaskell is very basic to human lives. It is about relations of aims and means, relations between different and contradictory human values, which can be 'figure' and 'ground' in relation to one another. Are people tools and materials for economic development of a country? Or is the economy a tool for the development of human beings? Are the experts tools of a society, or is

society a tool for the experts? Different people have different answers to these questions. Dialogue is necessary to bridge the gap between values.

References

Arbatov, A.G. (1999). *Bezopasnost': Rossiysky vybor* [Security: Russia's choice]. Moscow: Epicenter.

Bamberg, M. (Ed.). (2002). *Narrative Inquiry*, *12*(1).

Bauer, M. (1995). Towards a functional analysis of resistance. In M. Bauer (Ed.), *Resistance to new technology* (pp. 393–417). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Benson, C. (2001). *The cultural psychology of self: Place, morality and art in human worlds*. London: Routledge.

Borisov, E.F. (2000). *Hrestomatia po economicheskoy teorii* [Reader on economic theory]. Moscow: Jurist.

Bratus', B.S. (1997). K probleme cheloveka v psikhologii [On a problem of human being in psychology]. *Voprosy psychologii*, *5*, 3–19.

Dörner, D. (1997). *Logica neudachi: Strategicheskoye myshlenie v slozhnyh situatsiah* [Logic of failure: Strategic thinking in complex situations]. Moscow: Smysl.

Edelman, O. (2004). 'Philosophsky parokhod' [The 'philosophers' ship']. *Znanie—sila*, *1*, 88–94. Also available at: http://www.znanie-sila.ru/online/issue_2549.html

Frensch, P.A., & Funke, J. (Eds.). (1995). *Complex problem solving: The European perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, *27*(3), 291–305.

Jonas, E., & Frey, D. (2003). Information search and presentation in advisor–client interactions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *91*(2), 154–168.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1984). Choices, values and frames. *American Psychologist*, *39*, 341–350.

Krems, J.F. (1995). Cognitive flexibility and complex problem solving. In P.A. Frensch & J. Funke (Eds.), *Complex problem solving: The European perspective* (pp. 201–218). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Krotov, Ia. (1998). *Dnevnik literatora* [The writer's journal]. Available at: http://www.krotov.org/yakov/dnevnik/1998/19980925.html

Kvasov, A. (1998). *Chiliyskie economicheskie reformy: Practichesky opyt i ego actual'nost dlya Rossii* [Chilean economic reforms: Practical experience and its actuality for Russia]. Moscow: Moskovsky obschestvenny nauchny fond.

Lefebvre, V.A. (1977). *The structure of awareness: Toward a symbolic language of human reflexion*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lefebvre, V.A. (2001). *Algebra of conscience* (2nd enlarged ed.). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Lem, S. (1990). *Iz vospominaniy Iyona Tihogo* [From the memoirs of Iyon Tihy]. Moscow: Knizhnaya palata.

Poddiakov, A.N. (2000). *Issledovatel'skoe povedenie: Strategii poznania, pomosch', protivodeistvie, konflikt* [Exploratory behavior: Cognitive strategies, help,

counteraction, and conflict]. Moscow: Educational Internet portal 'Obrazovanie: issledovano v mire': http://www.oim.ru/reader.asp?nomer=50
Poddiakov, A.N. (2001). Counteraction as a crucial factor of learning, education and development: Opposition to help. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 2*(3). [Available at: http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqs-eng.htm]
Poddiakov, A.N. (2002). *Orientirovochnaya i desorientiruiuschaya osnovy deyatelnosti: Hierarhii tseley obuchenia v confliktuiuschih structurah* [Orienting and disorienting foundations of activity: Hierarchies of instruction aims in conflicting structures]. *Voprosy Psychologii*, *4*, 79–88.
Poddiakov A.N. (2003). The philosophy of education: The problem of counteraction. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, *41*(6), 37–52.
Poddiakov, A.N. (2004). Konfrontatzionnost' v obraze mira uchastnikov obrazovatel'nogo processa [Confrontations in the image of the world of participants of educational process]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta*. *Seria 14*. *Psychologia*, *1*, 15–22.
Sanctions Imposed Against Russian (2000, 25 April). *Washington Times*, p. 11. Available at: http://www.nti.org/e_research/e1_russia_missile.html
Sanktsii v otnoshenii rossiyskih organizatsiy [Sanctions imposed against Russian organizations]. (1999, 4 March). *Russky Perepliot: Internet Journal*, *71.* Available at: http://www.pereplet.ru/space/hotnews/04.03.99.html
Simonova, L.N. (2002). *Opyt reformirovania kredinoy systemi Chili* [The experience of reforms of the credit system in Chile]. Doctoral dissertation on economics, Institute of Studies of Latin American Countries of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow.
Sytyh, E.L. (2003). Vzaimootnoshenie kultur v svete problemy nasilia [Mutual relations of cultures in light of the problem of violence]. Available at: http://www.trinitas.ru/rus/doc/0225/002a/02250017.htm
Tarasov, A. (1998). Chudo, kotorogo ne bylo [The miracle that has not happened]. *Duel*, *37*(84). Available at: http://www.duel.ru/199837/?37_4_2
van Bavel, R., & Gaskell, G. (2004). Narrative and systemic modes of economic thinking. *Culture & Psychology*, *10*(4), 417–439.
Yasin E.G. (2003). Positsia prezidenta odnoznachnaya i nepokolebima [The position of the President is straight and unshakable]. Available at: http://www.ria-arbitr.ru/preview.php?id=4791&table=arbi_news
Zinoviev, A.A. (2004). *Na puti k sverhobschestvy* [Towards supersociety.] Moscow: Neva.
Zolotov, A. (2002). Top secret files tell story of expulsion. *Global Vision News Network*. Available at: http://www.gvnews.net/html/DailyNews/alert2350.html.

Biography

ALEXANDER PODDIAKOV is a Professor of the State University—Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. He received his doctorates from Moscow University and from the Psychological Institute of the Russian

Academy of Education. His areas of scientific interest are the development of exploratory behavior, thinking, creativity and strategies of social interactions. ADDRESS: Alexander Poddiakov, Sadovnicheskaya St. 27–30, 115035 Moscow, Russia. [email: alpod@gol.ru]