

European Bulletin of Social Psychology

Editor: Dominic Abrams, University of Kent at Canterbury, UK

2 Editorial

4 Articles

Italian Race Psychology During Fascism
by Chiara Volpato

- 14 *Gender Gaps in EAESP: Numerical distribution and scientific productivity of women and men*
by Anne Maass & Paola Casotti

32 Book Reviews

Self-Theories: Their Role in Motivation, Personality, and Development (1999). Carol S. Dweck. Reviewed by Constantine Sedikides

Categorization in Social Psychology (1999). Craig MacGarty. Reviewed by Karl-Christoph Klauer

Group Processes (2000, 2nd edn.). Rupert Brown. Reviewed by Michael A. Hogg

38 Future EAESP Meetings

Medium Size Meeting: Feelings and Emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium, June ,13th-16th, 2001, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Medium Size Meeting on Cognitive and Motivational Approaches to Intergroup Relations (4th Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes), June, 27th-July 1st, 2001, Schloss Kochberg, Germany

Small Group Meeting on Gender Role Research, April, 5th-7th, 2001, Graz Austria

Small Group Meeting. Theory and Method in Societal Psychology, April, 26th-29th, 2001, Pecs, Hungary

Joint EAESP/SPSSI Meeting. Prejudice and Racism, May, 22nd-27th, 2001, Granada, Spain

Small Group Meeting. Finding Meaning in the Human Condition: Emerging Perspectives in Experimental Existential Psychology, August, 2nd-4th, 2001, Free University Amsterdam, The Netherlands

48 Grants

50 Announcements

Request for Intergroup Contact and Prejudice Studies

The Research Center for Group Dynamics – Summer Workshops 2000

Invitation to join the ISSI

Next Executive Committee Meeting

53 News about Members

New Addresses

New Members of the Association

Resignations

58 Executive Committee

Editorial

This is the second issue of the new format of the Bulletin. We aim to publish 3 issues per year, shortly after the Executive Committee meetings. Bulletins should appear in January, May and October. We have received some very nice messages about the changes, and we aim to continue to develop the Bulletin as an interesting and useful reference source. We would be interested to hear if, in principle, your library would like copies of the Bulletin. Please contact Sibylle Classen if you would like to comment on this possibility. The Executive Committee will consider any feedback we receive during a future discussion about whether and how to provide the Bulletin to academic institutions.

The current issue includes two articles. Both explore some uncomfortable facts about social psychology. The first, by Chiara Volpato explores Italian Race Psychology during the fascist period, and reminds us that psychologists are as likely as anyone else to ask their research questions within a framework of a dominant ideology. The second, by Anne Maass and Paola Casotti, presents evidence that gender inequality pervades the career structure for European social psychologists. This inequality is not evenly distributed. In some parts of Europe women progress far less well, and the differences between areas depart surprisingly from our stereotypes about different cultures. If you would like to contribute an article on these or other topics please contact me, or another member of the Executive Committee.

Also in this issue we have three more book reviews, and there are several more in progress for the next issue. Our aim is to publish reviews of new books as quickly as possible after publication. The book reviews seem to be a popular feature. Many thanks go to the reviewers for their enthusiasm and promptness in providing the reviews. If you are publishing a book this year please be sure to send details to me or Sibylle Classen so that we can announce it in the next Bulletin. Also, please ensure your publisher contacts me if they would like to have the opportunity for the book to be reviewed in the Bulletin. Finally, if there is a particular new book that you would like to review for the Bulletin please let me know.

The Executive Committee met in Amsterdam on May 13th and discussed a number of issues including ways to maximise the support we can provide for members' academic activities. Please remember to visit the EAESP web site, which contains information about many of the schemes. The first EAESP/SPSP International Teaching Fellowship has been awarded for a proposal from Bernd Simon and Mark Snyder. We are also pleased to be able to announce support for two medium sized meetings, three small group meetings and for our first joint EAESP/SPSSI meeting. The content of these meetings should be of interest to the whole membership of the Association. To widen the availability of the content, we will publish the abstracts from papers from all EAESP sponsored meetings.

I hope you enjoy this issue of the Bulletin. If you have any suggestions or contributions for future issues please feel free to contact me.

Dominic Abrams
May 19th 2000

Article

*Italian Race Psychology During Fascism¹*by Chiara Volpato²

The present article is intended to describe how Italian psychology contributed to, and distanced itself from, racist ideology during the fascist period in Europe. I consider Italian Race Psychology in the context of the discipline as a whole, and then describe the theories of Mario Canella and Nicola Pende, and argue that their ideas were shaped by the complex structure of intergroup relations in addition to available psychological theory.

In Italy, as elsewhere in Europe, racist ideology began to take root in the early years of the twentieth century, not as a popular mass movement but as an academic and intellectual one. Even at the height of its development shortly before the Second World War, rather than actively participating, the majority of the population showed indifference towards the racist laws and anti-Semitic persecution invoked by the Fascist regime in accordance with their alliance with Nazi Germany. By contrast, the intellectuals took a leading role in constructing a racist ideology, thus providing a 'scientific' justification for state racism. Particularly prominent in this activity were such disciplines as biology, anthropology, eugenics and demography. But psychology also made a contribution by focusing attention on the psychic differences among the races and emphasizing the

¹ I thank the editor, Dominic Abrams, for his constructive comments on a first draft of the paper.

² Chiara Volpato is associate professor of social psychology at University of Trieste. Research interests are: intergroup relations, prejudice and minority influence.
Address: Dipartimento di Psicologia, via Sant'Anastasio, 12, 34100 Trieste - Italy
e-mail: cvolpato@ux1.unipd.it

need to defend the Italian race from dangerous contamination in psychological and cultural as well as physical terms.

In the post-war period, the more embarrassing discourses were totally repressed. They were tacitly put aside, leaving no trace in the historical memory of the discipline, so that today any attempt to reconstruct the interest of Italian psychologists in social psychology on a historical basis encounters a kind of hiatus. There seems to be an enormous gap between the pioneering studies on mass behaviour in the early twentieth century, on the one hand, and the main psycho-social themes of the period after the Second World War, on the other. There is no trace of an Italian 'race psychology' in the collective memory. In fact, however, during the thirties and the early forties a specific sector developed in Italy and was known as *psicologia razziale*. In the same period in Britain and the United States, scholars were consolidating the radical change of perspective which led them to abandon studies on inter-racial differences for those on prejudicial attitudes towards ethnic minorities. The process of change whereby prejudice, formerly the lens with which to observe reality, became itself the focus of observation, is well-documented in the bibliography of social psychology (Samelson, 1978; for an approach which emphasizes the persistence of prejudice in social psychology, see Howitt & Owusa-Bempah, 1994; see also Hopkins, Reicher & Levine, 1997). Italian psychology preferred to abandon race matters painlessly and, above all, silently, rather than undertake a re-thinking of this nature. Those who had been involved with race psychology continued to teach and carry out research, shifting their attention to less controversial subjects, without feeling the need to re-examine the positions they had previously adopted. This repression was assisted by a change in terminology: the label *race psychology* meant that the studies of the past could be kept separate from the new perspectives through which Italian social psychology was establishing its identity. But in the history of the discipline, the psychological study of racial differences should not be considered as a mere historical aberration. It constitutes a central research theme, appearing in the work of pioneers (Mc Dougall, 1920, 1934; Ross, 1914) as well as - albeit with a different approach - in the first Handbook of the discipline (Murchison, 1935) (cf.: Farr, 1996, Lemaine & Matalon, 1985; Mazzara, 1996). For these reasons, it forms part and parcel of the history of psychology and should be analysed if we hope to achieve in Samelson's

words "a critical examination of the past leading to a better understanding of the present" (Samelson, 1974).

THE THEORIES OF MARIO CANELLA AND NICOLA PENDE: *PSICOLOGIA RAZZIALE* AND *PSICOLOGIA DELLA STIRPE*

During the thirties, two separate approaches to the study of inter-racial psychic differences developed. One claimed its roots in the intellectual rigour of traditional science, while the other mixed concepts from biology, history and culture in a rather cavalier fashion. Both contributed to form an extremely hierarchical social representation (Moscovici, 1976) of human races and their psychic characteristics. This representation gained wide diffusion through the institutions of the state and certainly affected public opinion, although the extent and 'quality' of its diffusion is open to debate (Burgio, 2000; Volpato, in press, b).

Mario Canella, who held posts at the Universities of Bologna and Ferrara as well as being editor-in-chief of the most influential Italian journal of psychology, *Rivista di Psicologia*, was the leading exponent of the first approach. In Canella's view, psychic characteristics were of central importance for the study of human races. They could establish a racial hierarchy and classify even physically non-homogeneous groups such as the Jews, with more certainty than physical traits. In *Principi di psicologia razziale* (1941), his major contribution on the subject, Canella stressed his 'realist' position in polemical contrast to the 'egalitarians' (among them Klineberg and many authors in the French school). According to Canella, inter-racial differences constitute an objective phenomenon which 'compels' scientists to distinguish between superior and inferior races.

Canella's book describes the psychic traits of the basic races: primitives, Negroes, yellows, and whites¹. The very definition of racial groups reveals conceptual problems which threaten the supposedly scientific nature of the work. Whites, 'yellows' and Negroes are defined on the basis of their physical traits, in particular, the colour of their skin. The label 'primitives',

¹ We considered it appropriate to keep the terminology used by the authors themselves to denominate the groups.

on the other hand, is applied to groups which are both physically and culturally different: Australians, Melanesians, Africans, Amerinds, Asiatics and Europoids. The author points out that this grouping together is not based on similarities among the groups, but on the contrast between 'primitives' and 'groups which have created great civilisations, especially the whites' (Canella, 1941). Moreover, whites are the only race to be divided into sub-groups, which are then dealt with separately. The representation is clearly asymmetrical: 'coloured' races are lumped together in one group whose uniformity is stressed, while the whites are subdivided into smaller groups and form a many-sided, complex figure whose every minimal difference is given appreciative consideration. Canella's work gives us a different representation of the ingroup and the outgroup. The non-European groups are defined by the *outgroup homogeneity effect* (Jones, Wood & Quattrone, 1981; Devos, Comby & Deschamps, 1996; Voci, in press), whereas the ingroup is subdivided into sub-groups, along the lines of Judd & Park (1988). This representation recalls the model put forward by Lorenzi-Cioldi (1988), in which dominant groups are perceived as sets of distinct individuals, whereas the dominated groups are looked upon as aggregates of undifferentiated elements. The reference literature also changes according to the groups considered. When dealing with the psychology of Negroes, Canella mainly cites English-speaking authors (Bardin, Davenport, Ferguson, Graham, Lambeth, Lanier, Mayo Peterson, Pyle, Stanley Hall, Yerkes, and Young) and devotes considerable space to comparative studies on intelligence. His preference is mainly for German research into *Rassenpsychologie* and *Anthropologische Psychologie*, when dealing with the psychology of whites. Authors cited include Ammon, Chamberlain, Clauss, Closson, Fischer, Günther, Jaensch, Lapouge, and Lenz.

What emerges from Canella's work is a totally eurocentric representation. The white race constitutes the prototype for humankind, a paragon to which other races are compared. Whites outstrip other groups at all levels, cognitive, affective, moral and social. Negroes and 'primitives', by contrast, bear the hallmark of indisputable inferiority. Canella is especially disparaging toward Negroes. He notes that their affective traits (psychic instability, predominance of the emotions, unbridled sexuality), their mental capacity (inability to think critically and reason logically, weakened powers of generalization and abstraction), and their behavioural

characteristics (extroversion, horror of solitude, and slavish imitation) make it impossible for them to approach the spiritual and intellectual values achieved by whites. A different treatment is reserved for 'yellows'. Following the work of Granet (1929; 1934), Canella points out their ability to control their emotions, their hypo-emotivity, the slow, but constant, rhythm of mental activity which gives them reasonable power of concentration.

It is possible to consider Canella's this characterisation of racial differences might reflect aspects of intergroup relations, particularly within the framework of social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981). According to social identity theory, groups strive to maintain positive distinctiveness, and therefore respond in different ways to potential threats from other groups, depending on the perceived legitimacy and stability of the relationship (its 'security'). When the differences between groups seem both legitimate and stable, it is secure because it is not feasible for lower status groups to challenge the status quo. To the extent that differences become less secure, groups may adopt strategies to differentiate themselves in different ways, either through conflict or through more subtle means, such as "social creativity" strategies that may involve finding new dimensions for social comparison, or valuing of particular (ingroup) attributes more highly. During the fascist period, status and power relations between whites, on the one hand, and Negroes and 'primitives', on the other, were seen as secure. However, the relationship between whites and 'yellows' would appear to have been more complex, with elements of 'insecurity' due to the Asiatics' ability to adapt and their prolific nature. It is noteworthy in Canella's work although there is some allusion to instability, there is never any doubt about the biological basis for the legitimacy of white supremacy.

A twofold identification process emerges from the text. On the one hand, the superiority of the white group assures its members a winning social identity. The negative stereotypes of the 'coloured' races perform the roles noted by Tajfel (1981): to maintain and strengthen the differences in the whites' favour and justify colonial expansion. On the other hand, the internal divisions in the white ingroup and the prototypical position held by the Nordic race raise the problem of the relative status of the other European groups, hence the need to distinguish Italians in a positive light.

Canella rose to the occasion using strategies of social creativity, and accentuating the similarities between Nordic and Mediterranean peoples.

As regards the Jews, Canella disagreed with the more extreme view, held by many Germans and set out in Hitler's *Mein Kampf* (Capozza & Volpato, in preparation), and denied the existence of a separate Jewish race. The Jews, he argued, are a heterogeneous mixture from the biological point of view. However, psychologically speaking, they are homogeneous, sharing a set of mostly hereditary mental and psychic traits which delineate a precise 'psychic constitution' according to Weininger's definition (1903). His description of the Jews is full of ambivalence and recapitulates the traditional stereotype: sly, avaricious, and incapable of heroism, but at the same time proud, loyal to the ingroup and possessing a remarkable intellectual capacity (Volpato, in press, a).

A very different position on the relationship between race and psychology was that held by Nicola Pende, a leading exponent of the Fascist regime and authority on 'spiritual racism' or 'national racism', the dominant school of thought in Italian racist ideology (De Felice, 1988; Raspanti, 1994). Pende was the promoter of a moderate eugenic project and strongly disagreed with German scholars who upheld the existence of pure races. In his view, modern nations were racial hybrids; in Europe, for example, the physical and psychic characteristics of the five original races (Mediterranean, Nordic, Alpine, Dinaric, and Baltic) were mixed but still distinguishable. Pende's main concept was that of *stirpe* (stock); over the centuries, historical and cultural factors had brought about the formation of various different stocks. In his view, the concept of stock determines the unity of a people. It is based not only on biological but also spiritual and environmental origins, fixed and passed on from generation to generation (Pende, 1939). Stock is, therefore, a mixture of ethnic elements, shaped by historical and environmental factors, and represented by the legacy of ancient Rome in the case of Italy. He was thus able to distinguish, for example, Italic stock from those of North Africa or Asia Minor. Pende's views received wide support among psychologists and were applied in various domains, e.g. forensic psychology, differential psychology, and military psychology (for a review see Volpato, in press, b).

CONCLUSION

Although apparently in sharp contrast, the two positions have many facets in common. The authors share a belief in the existence of an unquestioned and unquestionable biologically legitimised racial hierarchy. Along with most Italian intellectuals of the time, they held that the biological and cultural superiority of whites was a self-evident axiom. Dissenting voices were very few and far between. The two authors also share a preoccupation with presenting a positive image of the Italian group, with a view to strengthening national identity. Here, however, their tactics differ. Canella accentuates the similarities between the Nordic and Mediterranean races, putting the differences down to environmental factors, whereas Pende used the concept of stock to demonstrate Italian superiority, founded on the legendary Roman Empire. In this way, Italian race psychology used the two main components of Fascist racism. It appropriated biological racism to explain the psychic differences between whites and 'coloureds', warning of the dangers of interbreeding for white superiority. By contrast, it resorted to the more subtle distinctions of national racism when dealing with European groups; here the ethnic melting pot, strictly limited to whites, was interpreted as a hotbed of genius.

The debate was set against the backdrop of colonial expansion with the spectre of crossbreeding with non-European races. As far as the Jews were concerned, Italian psychologists made only sporadic, ambivalent and confused interventions. As we have seen, Canella's writings contain antiquated stereotypes dressed up as scientific assertions, but do not conform to the Nazi thesis. Other examples in psychological literature would be difficult to find. On the whole, Italian psychologists preferred to remain silent on the Jewish question, one exception being Agostino Gemelli, a highly influential figure of the time (Cosmacini, 1985). Since his stand was not camouflaged by any pseudo-scientific trappings, it lies outside the scope of the present analysis.

The present article serves to illustrate that some of Italian psychologists, like other in Europe, were enmeshed in the fascist ideology. Their ideas and research were influential both at cultural and political level. It reminds us that, even when psychologists believe they are working scientifically,

they may incorporate unfounded ideological assumptions into their theorising.

REFERENCES

- Burgio A. (Ed.) (2000). *Nel nome della razza. Il razzismo nella storia d'Italia 1870-1945*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Canella M. F. (1941). *Principi di psicologia razziale*. Firenze: Sansoni.
- Capozza D. & Volpato C. (in preparation). *Mein Kampf. A socio-psychological analysis*.
- Cosmacini G. (1985). *Gemelli*. Milano: Rizzoli.
- De Felice R. (1988). *Storia degli ebrei italiani sotto il fascismo*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Devos T., Comby L. & Deschamps J.C. (1996). Asymmetries in judgements of ingroup and outgroup variability. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds), *European Review of Social Psychology* (Vol. 7). Chichester: Wiley.
- Farr R.M. (1996). *The Roots of Modern Social Psychology 1872-1954*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Granet M. (1929). *La civilisation chinoise*. Paris: La renaissance du livre.
- Granet M. (1934). *La pensée chinoise*. Paris: La renaissance du livre.
- Hopkins N., Reicher S. & Levine M. (1997). On the parallels between social cognition and the 'new racism'. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, **36**, 305-329.
- Howitt D. & Owusu-Bempah J. (1994). *The Racism of Psychology. Time for change*. New York: Harvester.

- Jones E.E., Wood G.C. & Quattrone G.A. (1981). Perceived variability of personal characteristics of ingroups and outgroups: The role of knowledge and evaluation. *Personal and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *7*, 523-528.
- Judd C.M. & Park B. (1988). Out-group homogeneity: Judgments of variability at the individual and group levels. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 778-788.
- Lemaine G. & Matalon B. (1985). Hommes supérieurs, hommes inférieurs? La controverse sur l'hérédité de l'intelligence. Paris: Colin.
- Lorenzi-Cioldi F. (1988). Individus dominants et groupes dominés. Grenoble: Presses Universitaires.
- Mazzara B. (1996). Appartenenza e pregiudizio. Psicologia sociale delle relazioni interetniche. Roma: La Nuova Italia Scientifica.
- Mc Dougall W. (1920). The Group Mind. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mc Dougall W. (1934). The Frontiers of Psychology. London: Nisbet.
- Moscovici S. (1976). La psychanalyse, son image et son public. Paris: P.U.F..
- Murchison C.A. (Ed.) (1935). Handbook of Social Psychology. Worcester: Clark University Press.
- Pende N. (1939). Trattato di Biotipologia umana. Milano: Vallardi.
- Raspanti M. (1994). I razzismi del fascismo. In: La menzogna della razza. Documenti e immagini del razzismo e dell'antisemitismo fascista. A cura del Centro Furio Jesi. Bologna: Grafis.
- Ross E. A. (1914). The Old World in the New. New York: The Century.

- Samelson F. (1974). History, origin, myth and ideology: 'discovery of social psychology'. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, **4**, 217-231.
- Samelson F. (1978). From "race psychology" to "studies in prejudice": Some observations on the thematic reversal in social psychology. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, **14**, 265-278
- Tajfel H. (1981). Human groups and social categories. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Voci A. (in press). Perceived group variability and the salience of personal and social identity. In M. Hewstone & W. Stroebe (Eds) *European Review of Social Psychology* (Vol. 11). Chichester: Wiley.
- Volpato C. (in press, a). Un caso di rimozione scientifica: La psicologia razziale di Mario Canella. *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia*.
- Volpato C. (in press, b). Psicologia e razza nel dibattito degli anni Trenta e Quaranta. *Rivista di Psicologia*.
- Weininger O. (1903). *Geschlecht und Charakter*. Wien und Leipzig: Braumuller.

Article

*Gender Gaps in EAESP:
Numerical distribution and scientific productivity of
Woman and men¹*

by Anne Maass and Paola Casotti²

Remember that the difference in creative deed between a man and a woman is the following: There always is a woman locking the door so that the male talent can express itself..... To a woman nobody will do the favor of locking the door.

(Marcela Serrano, El arbergue de las mujeres tristes, 1997)

Before investigating the numerical distribution and the scientific productivity of male and female social psychologists in academic Europe, it may be useful to speculate on what one may expect and why. As far as the expected numerical distribution is concerned, the answer is straightforward. If career opportunities are equal, the male to female ratio

¹ Address of first author: Anne Maass, D.P.S.S., Università di Padova, Via Venezia 8, 35139 Padova, Italy. We would like to thank Sibylle Classen for making the relevant statistics of the association available to us (moreover in real time).

² Anne Maass is associate professor of social psychology at Padova University. Her main research interests are stereotyping, and in particular the link between language and stereotyping. E-mail: maass@psico.unipd.it
Paola Casotti got her degree in psychology from Padua University in 1997 and is now teaching communication strategies and public speaking in both public and private institutions; she also works in the area of vocational guidance. E-mail: essepd@box4.tin.it

among scientists should roughly resemble the ratio present among students of the same field. Since in most European countries, the percentage of women among psychology students is about 70 to 80%, we should expect a similar ratio among scientists.

Things are a little more complicated for scientific productivity for which different hypotheses can be advanced. The most obvious hypothesis is that there should be no difference in productivity if one assumes (a) equal training, (b) equal motivation, and (c) equal opportunities. This should probably be the normative null hypothesis against which results should be compared.

However, two alternative working hypotheses may also be considered. First of all, in many countries, females have been shown to outperform males academically throughout schooling, including university training. If women perform better academically throughout university, they may also be expected to outperform males in subsequent scientific production.

Alternatively, one may derive opposite predictions from the fact that women probably do not face equal career opportunities. As the above citation states, women, especially during those stages of their careers that coincide with raising children, may carry a disproportionate burden of extra-university commitments. The easiest way to envisage this striking difference is to imagine a dual career family with small children and ask the following question: Professionally speaking, what is the least fortunate position the man may find himself in? The answer is probably a 50:50 share -- assuming the rare case of a perfectly egalitarian couple. Interestingly, this also is the most fortunate situation a woman can hope for. If this is true (the reader may wish to search for (dis-)confirming evidence among his or her colleagues), then it would be surprising if women reached the same level of productivity as their male colleagues.

In this paper we will first look at the sheer numerical distribution of men and women in the European Association of Social Psychology, by many colleagues considered the most important organization of academic social psychology in Europe. Subsequently we will report data on differential scientific productivity in three macro-areas of Europe: Northern, Southern, and Eastern Europe. We will also ask who holds the influential positions

within the organization and, finally, we will speculate about the future development of gender gaps within the European Association.

THE RELATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF MALES AND FEMALES IN EAESP

As a first step, it may be interesting to investigate how males and females are currently distributed within the Association and whether any changes have occurred over the last few years. Table 1 shows the sex distribution for each member state, based on the membership lists of January 1997 and 2000. In a few cases, two or three nations were merged into a common category because the number of EAESP members in these countries was so limited that national statistics would be misleading. As in our previous study (Casotti & Maass, 1998), we divided the member states into three macro-areas. The Scandinavian countries (Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark) were considered together due to their small numbers of members, UK, Holland, Germany, Belgium, France, Switzerland and Austria were considered one geographical area that will be labeled North. The second macro-area, labeled East, includes Poland, Russia together with Lithuania and Ukraine (due to limited number of members in Lithuania and Ukraine), Bulgaria together with Romania, Hungary, Slovakia, Czech Republic, and Yugoslavia together with Slovenia and Croatia (again, collapsed due to limited number of members). The third macro-area is labeled South and includes Spain, Portugal, Italy, and Greece.

Table 1:
Distribution of males and females among EAESP members in 1997 and 2000.

	1997			2000		
	Males	Females	% Fem.	Males	Females	% Fem.
NORTH						
Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark	15	4	21%	19	2	10%
UK	53	16	23%	54	17	24%
Netherlands	53	17	24%	51	18	26%
Belgium	13	2	13%	14	3	18%
Germany	60	21	26%	64	24	27%
France	28	13	32%	32	16	33%
Switzerland	9	3	25%	11	2	15%
Austria	7	1	13%	8	2	20%
Total North	238	77	24%	253	84	25%
EAST						
Poland	21	14	40%	16	11	41%
Russia/Lithuania/ Ukraine	6	3	33%	3	3	50%
Bulgaria, Romania	3	9	75%	2	6	67%
Hungary	10	6	38%	9	3	25%
Slovakia	4	4	50%	4	4	50%
Czech Republic	6	2	25%	4	1	20%
Slovenia/Croatia/ Yugoslavia	4	1	20%	2	2	50%
Total EAST	54	39	42%	40	30	43%
SOUTH						
Spain	22	15	41%	24	19	44%
Portugal	8	5	38%	7	5	42%
Italy	17	27	61%	18	29	62%
Greece	3	2	40%	1	5	83%
Total South	50	49	49%	50	58	54%
TOTAL (N, S, E)	342	165	32%	343	172	33%

Even a superficial look at Table 1 makes it quite clear that women are unequally distributed across countries and across macro areas. Particularly striking is the fact that in the Eastern- and Southern-European countries women are, on the average, about half of the total EAESP population, while there is only about 1 woman for every 3 males among the Northern members. The percentage of women is consistently low across Northern European countries (currently ranging from a minimum of 10% to a maximum of 33%). Under-representation of women is particularly marked in Scandinavia, Switzerland and Austria (all below 20%) but the three countries with the largest number of EAESP members (UK, Netherlands and Germany) do not fare much better (all well below 30%). These percentages are strikingly lower than those found in the South (currently 54%) and in the East (currently 43%).

Turning to variations over time, a look at Table 1 suggests that the percentage of women has remained perfectly stable during the three year period considered in this study. Across the three macro-areas, the relative increase of women in the Association was less than 1%. The only exception was the South where women now represent 54% (compared to 49% three years earlier).

Taken together, women are clearly underrepresented in all three macro-areas when compared to the sex distribution among psychology students, but the relative distribution varies greatly across geographical areas. Ironically, under-representation is particularly pronounced in that region of Europe (North) that is often considered the most “advanced” and least sexist. For example, Scandinavian countries and The Netherlands tend to have a much larger percentage of women in their parliaments (between 30 and 40 percent) than any of the Southern countries (in order: Spain, Portugal, Italy, and Greece – see Wagner & Schmermund, 1999). Yet, women are greatly underrepresented in academic social psychology in exactly those countries where they appear to have the strongest political representation.

Although we are unable to offer an explanation for this fact, our data are quite in line with general statistics showing that countries with a more recent development in science (such as Spain, Turkey and possibly Portugal) tend to give considerably more opportunities to women. In

contrast, in countries like Sweden and Denmark (where women are well above 1/3 of all representatives in Parliament) only 4-6% of full professorships are held by women (see *Le Scienze*, 1998, n. 361, p. 1215). In other words, the pattern observed in EAESP seems to match what has been observed in science in general.

DIFFERENTIAL SCIENTIFIC PRODUCTION

More interesting is the question of who is most active in the field. We have advanced two competing hypotheses that can be tested against a normative null hypothesis. In order to test these predictions, full members of EAESP listed in the 1997 directory of the association were considered in this study. All full members of the South (N= 99) and all full members from the East (N= 96) were included in the present research. For the North, a randomly selected sub-sample of members was considered, representative of the member states of that region with the exception of the UK. As in our previous study (Casotti & Maass, 1999), the U.K was excluded because of its distinct language advantage in international publications that makes comparisons with other European countries difficult.

We estimated the scientific productivity in three different ways. First, for each EAESP member involved in this study (98 from the North, 99 from the South, and 96 from the East), we counted the total number of publications appearing in the database "PsychLit" during the time period from 1988 to 1999. The second index corrected individual publication rates for the relative prestige of the journal since it is conceivable that some colleagues publish few articles but in high-prestige journals. Each entry was weighted for the impact of the journal in which the article had appeared, using the Social Science Impact Factor which is generally considered a fairly reliable index of journal prestige (if the journal was not indexed, the publication automatically took the value 0). The third index was intended to control for possible age differences and consisted of the total number of publications, divided by the number of years since first publication resulting in an average publication rate per year. All three indices were analyzed as a function of macro-area as well as gender. Thus,

for each index, a 3 (North, South, East) x 2 (male vs. female) ANOVA was run. Results are presented in Tables 2 through 4.

Table 2:
Mean number of publications as a function of macro-area and sex of EAESP member

	North	East	South	TOTAL
MALES	6.73 (n = 77)	3.07 (n = 55)	3.32 (n = 50)	4.37 (n = 182)
Females	4.19 (n = 21)	2.07 (n = 41)	2.80 (n = 49)	3.02 (n = 111)
RATIO (F / M)	.62 (n = 98)	.67 (n = 96)	.84 (n = 99)	

As far as total number of publications listed in PsyLit are concerned, main effects emerged for both sex ($F = 3.55$, $p < .06$) and macro-area ($F = 5.46$, $p < .005$). Across all areas, women publish about 7 papers for every 10 papers published by their male colleagues. Also, as already noted in our previous paper, publication rates are considerably higher in Northern Europe than in the remaining regions. Although there was no significant interaction between the two variables, it is quite evident that female to male ratios in number of publications are most favorable in the South and least favorable in the North. Female colleagues from the South publish about 85% of their male counterparts whereas females in the North publish less than two thirds of the male colleagues. Not surprisingly, publication rates of males and females differ reliably in the North, but neither in the East nor in the South do these differences reach conventional levels of significance.

Turning to publications weighted for impact of journal, an interesting shift occurs. While the effect for geographical area remains strong and reliable ($F = 6.37, p < .005$), the sex difference is considerably weakened and indeed is far from being significant ($F = .65, p = .42$).

Table 3:
Number of publications weighted for impact as a function of macro-area and sex of EAESP member

	North	East	South	TOTAL
MALES	2.91 (n = 77)	.59 (n = 55)	.82 (n = 50)	1.43 (n = 182)
Females	2.11 (n = 21)	.41 (n = 41)	.66 (n = 49)	1.06 (n = 111)
RATIO (F / M)	.72 (n = 98)	.69 (n = 96)	.80 (n = 99)	

The same is true, when publication rates (weighted for impact) are calculated per year, thereby taking potential age differences into account. This is important, as a considerable portion of women may have entered their academic careers only recently. Again, a strong difference emerges between macro-areas ($F = 6.20, p < .005$) while neither the main effect for sex nor the interaction are significant. Interestingly, using this index, there remains a certain (though weakened) gender gap in the Northern European countries; in contrast, the difference becomes very small in the East (8 to 10 ratio) and almost entirely disappears in the South.

Table 4:

Number publications weighted for impact per year as a function of macro-area and sex of EAESP member

	North	East	South	TOTAL
MALES	.46 (n = 77)	.10 (n = 55)	.12 (n = 50)	.37 (n = 182)
Females	.32 (n = 21)	.08 (n = 41)	.11 (n = 49)	.02 (n = 111)
RATIO (F / M)	.69 (n = 98)	.80 (n = 96)	.92 (n = 99)	

Taken together, these data suggest that men publish considerably more, but they outperform women mainly on measures of quantity. When publications are weighted for quality of journal and calculated per year, the gender gap is strongly reduced, and, in the case of the Southern countries, practically disappears.

Two more general conclusions may be drawn from these data: On one side, sex differences in publications seem to be more a matter of quantity than of quality. Men write more, but their per-year production weighted for journal prestige is only slightly higher than that of women. Second, the publication gap is least pronounced in those countries (especially the South) where the percentage of women in the field is highest. Thus, the higher the rate of women in the field in a given country, the closer their publication rate seems to become to that of their male colleagues.

At the same time, it should be mentioned that in no case did we ever find higher publication rates for women. To many readers familiar with statistics on differential home- and childcare related workload, this may not come as a surprise. Unfortunately, our data do not offer any insights into the processes that may be responsible for differential publication rates nor are we able to account for regional differences in gender gaps.

Indeed, somewhat surprising is the findings that women seem to do better (in relative terms) in those areas that contribute less to the advancement of social psychology and that have the highest percentage of women in experimental social psychology, namely the East and the South. Female and male publication rates are consistently more similar in scientifically less developed areas of Europe. There are at least four explanations that may be offered for this fact. First, the most obvious explanation is that these areas are scientifically less developed because they have more women. Considering that women tend to have lower publication rates (at least quantitatively speaking), their greater number may account for lower average publication rates in those geographical areas. What argues against this explanation is that men in those areas do even worse (when compared to same-sex colleagues from the North).

The second possibility is that scientific standards (as well as the standing of university professors within society) are lower in the East and the South. If true, women may have better possibilities to compete with males despite their lower publication rates.

The third possibility is that the relative standing of women in terms of scientific production is a direct function of their relative numbers. For example, as long as women represent a token minority, they may find it difficult to impose rules within the university that take their needs into account (such as scheduling research or administrative meetings during school hours). Thus, scientific production may be a consequence rather than a cause of the greater percentage of women in academia.

Finally, the fourth, and we believe, most likely explanation is that the same underlying factors that contribute to the greater relative number of female scientists also accounts for their relative success compared to their male counterparts. For example, the fact that many countries in Eastern and Southern Europe offer reasonable public childcare may contribute to both, likelihood of female employment and possibility to dedicate relevant portions of one's time to science. At this moment, we are unable to untangle the processes that are responsible for the differential underrepresentation and underachievement of women in different geographical areas. An answer to this question will need to await more profound and detailed investigation.

DIFFERENTIAL ACCESS TO LEADING POSITIONS WITHIN THE ASSOCIATION?

The next question to be asked is who holds the decisional power within the association. In other words, what is the distribution of men and women among the leading figures in the association? The association is headed by the executive committee (consisting of 7 full members and the secretary) and has two major publications: the *European Journal of Social Psychology* and the *European Monograph* series (both since 1971).

Let us first look at the executive committee which may, indeed, be a source of optimism. Until very recently, women had practically no decisional power in the association; during the history of the association, women were either completely absent or a distinct minority in the executive committee (EC). The first woman to serve on the committee (in the function of treasurer) was Claudine Herzlich from 1972 until 1975. Almost a decade passed, before the second woman, Amelie Mummendey, was elected who served on the committee from 1984 to 1990 (the last three years as treasurer). Things changed radically in 1996, when three women (Naomi Ellemers, Maria Jarymowicz, Anne Maass) were elected; for the first time women (including the secretary Sibylle Classen) constituted 50% of the committee.

In 1999, Naomi Ellemers became the first female President of the Association; this was also the very first time in which – with the additional election of Carmen Huici into the EC -- women actually became the majority of the committee. At the moment, it is too early to say whether this recent trend reflects a short-lived fluctuation or whether it signals a more profound and possibly lasting change in impact of women within the Association.

Table 5:

Distribution of men and women among EJSP editors (editor plus associate editors)

Period	N. of Males	N. of Females	% of Females
1971-1972	4	0	0%
1973-1977	4	0	0%
1978-1981	4	0	0%
1982-1985	5	0	0%
1986-1989	4	1	20%
1990-1993	3	2	40%
1994-1997	5	1	17%
1998-2001	6	1	14%
Total	35	5	13%

The situation is less promising if we look at the major publication of the association: the *European Journal of Social Psychology*, a truly international and widely read journal of considerable impact. Founded almost 30 years ago, this journal has never had a female editor. As shown in Table 5, even the associate editors have been predominantly male throughout the history of the journal. If you look at the current editorial board you will find that women represent one out of 7 editors (14%) and 8 out of 40 (20%) consulting editors.¹ These figures contrast with the steady increase in female editorship in APA journals during the 80ies and 90ies. For example, in 1995, 14% of the main editors, 32% of the associate editors, and 32% of the editorial board members of APA journals were women (Clay, 2000).

The under-representation of women among EJSP editors becomes even more surprising if we consider that women tend to contribute to the work published in EJSP to a relevant degree. For example, looking at the articles

¹ The situation is currently more promising for the *European Monographs* where women are 30% of the editors.

published in last year's volume (1999, which counted over 1000 pages), approximately 37% had female first authors.¹ Thus, despite the remarkable contribution of female authors to the journal, it continues to be run by males. Even the start into the new millennium has not been all that promising on the equal opportunity front: Among the 6 eminent scholars asked to comment on the future development of the field, only one was a woman.

Again, we can only describe the situation without being able to offer convincing arguments of how the disparity came about. Even an attentive and well-intentioned editor may find it difficult to find competent women willing to serve as associate editors for a journal like EJSF. There may objectively be fewer women than men willing to run a major journal or to head an important international organization like EAESP. Also, the fact that women continue to be in the minority may lead to the strange phenomenon that the same few women are approached repeatedly whenever positions need to be filled. Whatever the underlying reason, it is quite clear that women continue to be underrepresented in the main publication of this organization, although they appear to have gained considerable influence in the executive committee over the past few years.

WHAT HOPE FOR THE FUTURE?

Considering the strong under-representation of women in EAESP, it comes natural to ask what the future development might be. Although it is impossible to make reliable projections into the future, we feel justified to speculate about future developments based on two sources of information. The first is the trends in membership over the past years. As mentioned early, the three-year period considered in this study is not encouraging as it shows practically no improvement over the last few years.

Another valuable source of information are the post-graduate members of the organization (which were not considered in our analysis of scientific production for the obvious reason that they have not yet completed training). If a European Ph.D. student decides to join EAESP, s/he probably

¹ We can not exclude with certainty the possibility to have misidentified the sex of the first authors in a few instances due to ambiguous first names.

has the intention to pursue an academic career in social psychology. Almost certainly s/he envisages a future as an experimental social psychologist. It therefore would be reasonable to suspect that, at some time within the subsequent four years, the majority of these young scientists will evolve into full members of the association. If this assumption is correct, then the distribution of males and females among post-graduate members may give us some hint about the future development of the association.

Table 6:
Percentage of female EAESP members in the three
macro-area in 1997 and in 2000

YEAR	STATUS	North	East	South	TOTAL
1997	Full Members	24%	42%	49%	32%
	Post-Graduate	58%	70%	75%	60%
2000	Full Members	25%	43%	54%	33%
	Post-Graduate	54%	100%	80%	60%

We therefore looked at the distribution of male and female post-graduate members in the three macro-areas in 1997 and 2000 (see Table 6). A look at the 1997 figures suggests that women at that time accounted for a considerable portion of the young members. While they were a clear minority among full members, they represented 60% of all post-graduates!! Wouldn't this be reason for optimism? If the majority of young members continued their careers, gender gaps within the association should, in the long run, disappear.

Unfortunately, this interpretation may be too optimistic as it assumes equal chances for males and females to continue their professional careers beyond their post-graduate studies. Indeed, a closer look at Table 4 suggests that despite the high number of post-graduate women in 1997, their percentage among full members three years later did not change. Apparently, many of the women who were post-graduate members in 1997 failed to become full members within the subsequent three years.

In order to investigate this possibility in more detail, we decided to conduct an in-depth analysis of those three countries which account for the greatest number of full as well as post-graduate members: Netherlands, UK, and Germany. In 1997, these three countries alone accounted for over two-thirds of all post-graduate members (79 out of 117 post-graduates, 41 from the Netherlands, 22 from Germany, and 16 from the UK). Importantly, a remarkable proportion of these young British, Dutch and German members were women (65%).

For each of them, we checked whether they were still members of the association three years later (either in the role of post-graduate or full members) or whether their membership had terminated. The data, presented in Table 7, are impressive. The percentage of those who were still post-graduates after three years is exactly the same for males and females as would be expected by chance. However, looking at those who are no longer post-graduate members, a striking gender gap becomes evident. The great majority of males (64%) have meanwhile become full members and only 18% do no longer figure among the members of the association. In contrast, only 16% of the female post-graduates have become full members while the vast majority (67%) have dropped out of the association at some point during the three-year period. The most extreme case is Germany where approximately two third of male post-graduates have become full members during the three-year period, while over 80% of their female counterparts have dropped out of the association (and probably out of their academic careers).

Table 7:
Membership status of male and female post-graduate members from The Netherlands, Germany and UK after three years

SEX	Status in 2000	NL (n = 41)	Germany (n = 22)	UK (n = 16)	TOTAL (n = 79)
M	Post-Graduate	18%	27%	0%	18%
	Full	64%	64%	67%	64%
	Drop-out	18%	9%	33%	18%
F	Post-Graduate	17%	9%	30%	18%
	Full	17%	9%	20%	16%
	Drop-out	67%	82%	50%	67%

Although we do not know the individual reasons for why former post-graduate members may have terminated their membership, it is striking to see that most males apparently were successful in pursuing what we believe must have been their original goal: to become an academic experimental social psychologist. Most women apparently failed or were motivated to reconsider their original plans. Although they must have been quite successful during their graduate studies (considering that they were part of a doctoral program at the time they became members), their professional perspectives apparently changed during or immediately following their doctoral training. Unless our interpretation is wrong, these

data show how many young women must have intended to pursue an academic career at some point during their training (otherwise they would not have joined an academic association such as EAESP), but apparently encountered internal or external barriers that discouraged them from carrying their plans through.

To understand what exactly these barriers are, is beyond the scope of this paper. However, in face of the above data it is difficult to ignore the existence of such powerful barriers to successful careers of female social psychologists in the three target nations (and in Germany in particular).

CONCLUSIONS

Although some readers may find the data reported here depressing, it was not the purpose of this paper to depict a desolate picture of the role of women in European Social Psychology. Indeed, we do believe that progress has made and, in particular, that there are some geographical areas in Europe in which women fare relatively well (although definitely less well than in the U.S.). Interestingly, these are not the areas which are generally considered most advanced or least sexist. Unfortunately, they also don't seem to be the areas that contribute most to the advancement of experimental social psychology.

Northern Europe, that has a disproportionate weight in the advancement of scientific social psychology, fares strikingly poorly when it comes to equal opportunities. It is beyond the scope of this paper to analyze the reasons for this discrepancy. We can only speculate about factors that may contribute to the extreme gender gap found in the North. For example, higher average wages (enabling families to survive on single salaries), higher reproduction rates, poor public childcare (for example in Germany¹ and the Netherlands), and maternity laws that force or encourage women to leave the job market for years, may all contribute to

¹ Again, Germany is a particularly striking example of institutional sexism; not only is public childcare for age-group 1-3 an exception, but in many *Bunderslaendern* even full-time schools are practically non-existent. Even more bizarre are time schedules during first elementary grade where lectures during the first months are limited to few hours per day which is clearly incompatible even with a part-time job.

the phenomenon. Also, the limited number of female role models among (full) professors may discourage female students from considering an academic career although our statistics on post-graduate membership argues against this interpretation. Obviously, the condition of women varies greatly from country to country which makes it difficult to identify any single cause able to account for the under-representation of women in such a large geographical area. We can only encourage colleagues from every single country to reflect about the causes that may discourage women from undertaking (or from succeeding in) an academic career in social psychology.

REFERENCES

- Casotti, P. & Maass, A. (1998). The current state of experimental social psychology: A survey among EAESP members in Northern, Eastern, and Southern Europe. *European Bulletin of Social Psychology*, **11**, 1.
- Clay, R. A. (2000). Why aren't there more women serving as APA journal editors? *APA Monitor*, April 1998, pages 28-29.
- Wagner, U. & Schermund, A. (1999). Women and men in German universities: Differences in qualifications and academic positions. Paper presented at the 12th General Meeting of the European Association of Social Psychology, Oxford, U.K., July 1999.

Book Reviews

Self-Theories: Their Role in Motivation, Personality, and Development (1999).

Carol S. Dweck¹

Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press (155; References; Appendix; Index)

ISBN: 1-84169-024-4 (paper). Price in GBP 29.95

Publisher's web site: www.psypress.com or www.psypress.co.uk

Review by **Constantine Sedikides** (University of Southampton, UK)

Few programs of research have had the scope, vigour, vision, durability, and yet eternal youth, of Carol Dweck's research on self-theories. In this monograph (19 chapters, plus a useful Appendix of instrumentation), the author integrates her empirical findings of the past 25 years into a coherent, impactful, and occasionally passionate statement about the importance of self-theories in generating thought, inducing affect, and guiding behaviour – particularly academic performance.

Dweck's thesis is elegant in its provocativeness. Children (of all ages) may have one of two implicit theories about the nature of the self (i.e., the attributes, skills or abilities that they have). One theory views the self as fixed, if not invariant or even genetically determined. Consequently, little in the self can be changed. Individuals with this conviction are entity theorists. The second theory holds that the self is malleable and thus modifiable. Individuals who carry this view are incremental theorists.

Dweck's research documents that being an incremental theorist pays off. These individuals adopt a mastery-oriented (versus helpless) response to challenges in the classroom and beyond. They want to learn (rather than look good), because learning is fun. They work harder. They can take a blow to their self-esteem, and they persist in the face of adversity instead

¹ Carol S. Dweck is Professor of Psychology at Columbia University, USA.

of crumbling in depressive cycles. Naturally, they outperform entity theorists.

There are more goodies to be amassed by being an incremental theorist. These are social rather than performance goodies. Incremental theorists hold more flexible views about other persons, as they shy away from a direct attributional link between behaviour and disposition, thus giving misbehaving others a second chance. The suspicion toward permanence of disposition serves incremental theorists right when it comes to stereotyping: They are less likely to form a monolithic and negative impression of the outgroup. Being an incremental theorist also matters when it comes to dating and mating: Incremental theorists adopt a growth orientation toward intimate relationships, hence they are likely to put more effort in making relationships work.

If it is so good to be an incremental theorist, how can we breed them? Dweck has an answer in the final chapters (14-17) of her book. It all begins at home and in the classroom. Parents and teachers should target the child's behaviour when they give praise or need to deliver criticism. The feedback ought to focus on children's effort, strategy of learning, or tactic of behaving. It is a mistake for the feedback to be phrased in terms of permanent qualities that children presumably have (e.g., „you are incredibly clever“, „you are really good in math“, „you are so popular“).

Dweck's book is artfully organized and beautifully written. It is an impressive example of high quality basic research having powerful implications and applications. The book will be accessible to undergraduates students, a useful supplement to post-graduate students, and an informative reading for the general educated public. The first 25 years of Professor Dweck's research have been prolific and profound. We are looking forward to the next 25 years!

Categorization in Social Psychology (1999). Craig McGarty¹

Sage, ISBN 0-7619-594-8, Cloth GBP 59.95, Paper GBP 16.99

Publisher's web site: <http://www.sagepub.co.uk>

Review by **Karl-Christoph Klauer** (University of Bonn, Germany)

This book provides a critical review and assessment of different lines of research and theorizing about social categorization. The treatment is organized around a triangle of three concepts, background knowledge, perceived equivalence of stimuli, and category use. Different chapters focus on different subsets of these concepts and their mutual relationships.

The book is organized in two parts. The first part comprises seven chapters and reviews current cognitive and social psychological approaches and debates relating to categorization. This part contains chapters about category function, structure, and representation, about category formation and use, about biased stimulus processing and category activation, about self-categorization theory and other sense-making approaches. The first part closes with discussions of a number of currently controversial issues: What is the role of limits of cognitive capacity in categorization? Does categorization lead to error and biases, and are there such things as stored categories?

The second part comprises four chapters in which McGarty analyzes a set of related problems for which he develops partly new solutions. The problems addressed are the issues of group variability and entitativity, social influences on the categorization process, and the relationship between causal explanation, perceived covariation and categorization. The discussion converges on an overarching conceptualization of categories as socially shared explanations. From this principle, new answers to the above questions are derived.

¹ Craig McGarty is Senior Lecturer in Psychology at the Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

The strength of this book is its well-argued, integrative approach. It is attempted to explain many phenomena that are discussed in connection with social categorization using only a small number of unifying concepts. This leads to more rigorous and deeper theoretical analyses than are often found in a typical journal article, but requires sometimes careful reading. Another strength of the book is that the theoretical developments draw from a number of different literatures such as from the cognitive psychology of concept formation, categorization, analogical thinking, and causal perception and explanation.

The book is written at an advanced level and is probably most profitably read by graduate students and researchers working in the field of social categorization or related fields. Its possible use in teaching advanced courses is supported by a list of supplementary readings and by glossaries of key terms that accompany each chapter of the first part.

Although the book draws heavily from social identity theory and self-categorization theory, it goes far beyond merely summarizing and reviewing these theories. Rather, the approach taken is to build sound conceptual foundations for the major concepts and explanations that are used in the field, and to move on from there to derive original theoretical answers to a number of current debates and open questions. Perhaps this book will have its major impact not so much by having proposed new theoretical developments, but by having introduced a new standard of conceptual rigor to the field.

Group Processes (2000, 2nd edn.). Rupert Brown¹

Oxford, UK: Blackwell. 417 pages. Price in UKP £ 50.00 hardback, ISBN 0-631-21852-1, £ 15.99 paperback., ISBN 0-631-18496-1. Publisher's web site: <http://www.blackwellpublishers.co.uk>

Review by **Michael A. Hogg** (University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia)

This is a beautifully written book. It manages to be both scholarly and comprehensive, as well as clear and engaging. It fulfilled all my expectations from the excellent first edition published in 1988. Brown very successfully manages to integrate American and European work on group processes, as well as cognitive, small group and intergroup perspectives. As such, he accurately captures the new integrative approach to the study of groups that is helping to reinvigorate this core topic of social psychology. However, Brown does not shy away from metatheoretical debates. He discusses issues of reductionism, levels of analysis, and the nature of the group, and quite clearly organizes his approach around his belief that the analysis of groups requires a clear articulation of different levels of explanation and that collective self-construal and intergroup relations are critical aspects of group life.

The text is traditionally organized, starting with definitions of the group and basic group processes such as cohesion and interdependence, moving on to group structure and social influence, and then to large scale groups and intergroup phenomena. This traditional organization is a sensible choice as it suits the book to the way group processes courses are taught in most universities.

¹ Rupert Brown is Professor of Social Psychology in the Centre for the Study of Group Processes at the University of Kent at Canterbury, England. (<http://www.ukc.ac.uk/psychology/research/csgp>). His research interests include intergroup relations, group processes and social identity. His books also include *Prejudice: Its Social Psychology* (1995, Blackwell) *Social Identity Processes: Trends in Theory and Research* (D. Capozza & R. Brown, 2000, Sage publications).

The book is an excellent resource for social psychology and related discipline research into group and intergroup processes. It is also invaluable as a text for graduate and senior undergraduate specialist courses on group and intergroup processes. The coverage is broad and inclusive, though I was not able to find work on collective remembering and transactive memory, nor on social dilemmas. I also wonder whether applied contexts like health, and organizational decision making could have been given a higher profile? The only other reservations I have are relatively small - the author index did not always correspond with the text citations, and I really would have liked a much more finely grained subject index.

Future EAESP Meetings

Medium Size Meeting

Feelings and Emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium
June 13th –16th 2001, University of Amsterdam

(Organizers: A.S.R. Manstead, A.H. Fischer & N.H. Frijda, Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

This symposium is the fourth in a series of Feelings and Emotions symposia, started in 1927 under the title "Feelings and Emotions". The current project is inspired by these previous efforts. In 1927 a meeting was held under the title "Feelings and Emotions: The Wittenberg Symposium". It was attended by prominent researchers from various countries (including the US, the then Soviet Union, Germany, and Great Britain) and diverse disciplines. In 1948 "Feelings and Emotions: The Mooseheart Symposium" was held in Chicago; and in 1969 "Feelings and Emotions: The Loyola Symposium" took place at Loyola University, again in Chicago. The books resulting from these three previous symposia became standard reference works in the ensuing years. They set the research agendas for the study of emotion in the periods that followed. We expect the same to occur in the case of the current project.

The goal of this international symposium is to review from a multidisciplinary perspective the state of the art of scientific research on emotions. Prominent researchers from the various disciplines in which emotions are an important subject of investigation and concern will present their views on the nature of emotions and the role of emotions in individual and social behaviour. These disciplines include psychology, neuroscience, biology, sociology, anthropology, philosophy, economics, psychiatry, and computer science. In addition, an overview of current research will be provided in the form of poster presentations, primarily by young researchers.

The symposium is being organized by the Department of Psychology of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences at the University of Amsterdam, in collaboration with the Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences, which has awarded the organizers a STAR subsidy. The initiative to the symposium was taken by Prof. Nico H. Frijda, Prof. Antony S.R. Manstead, and Prof. Agneta H. Fischer, professors of psychology at the University of Amsterdam.

About 25 speakers will be invited. Each speaker will be allotted 45 minutes to present his or her views, to be followed by 15 minutes of general discussion. During the symposium poster sessions will also be organized in order to give younger researchers the opportunity to attend the symposium.

Programme

The core of the symposium will be formed by a sequence of presentations made by approximately 25 invited speakers, distributed over four days. Each speaker will give a 45-minute presentation, followed by 15 minutes of general discussion. The speakers are leading scholars from the various disciplines mentioned above. In addition, there will be several poster sessions. These will allow participants to present their own ideas and findings. The poster sessions are meant primarily for young researchers.

The programme will be organized in terms of four themes:

1. Neuroscience, biological, and evolutionary perspectives on emotions. Under the neuroscience perspectives, research will be discussed on brain circuits and neurohumoral agents involved in various forms of emotional behaviour and experience.

2. General psychological processes. A major task for emotion investigators concerns the analysis of the processes and dispositions that must be assumed to explain emotional phenomena in experience and behaviour. The aim is to understand emotions in terms of basic or general capabilities, processes and dispositions of the human and animal systems.

3. Social processes and emotions. Current developments in emotion psychology include the role of emotions in forming and regulating interpersonal relationships. Topics are the function of love, attraction, and empathy in the forming of intimate relationships, but also

the role of emotions in interpersonal and intergroup violence; and the value of emotional intelligence in social relations.

4. Emotions and culture. The relationships between biological dispositions and the formative role of culture form one of the recurrent issues in the study of emotions. Considerable research has been devoted to this area over the last 20 years, indicating, on the one hand, the culture-bound variability in emotions and, on the other hand, the universal role of culture in shaping human emotions, as opposed to non-human emotions.

Applications or further inquiries can be sent to one of the organizers:

Tony Manstead <sp_Manstead@macmail.psy.uva.nl>

Nico Frijda <pn_Frijda@macmail.psy.uva.nl>

Agneta Fischer <sp_Fischer@macmail.psy.uva.nl>

Telephone: +31-20-525-6893 (Fischer) 6743 (Frijda) 6892 (Manstead)

FAX number: +31-20-639-1896

Mail address:

Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam

Roetersstraat 15, 1018 WB Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Medium Size Meeting

on Cognitive and Motivational Approaches to Intergroup Relations

(4th Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes)

June 27th to July 1st 2001, Schloss Kochberg, Germany

(Organizers: Amélie Mummendey & Thorsten Meiser, Department of Psychology, University of Jena, Germany)

The analysis of intergroup relations has lain at the heart of social psychological research for many decades. Apart from its theoretical interest in the effects of intergroup relations on individual behaviour, this

research domain has dealt with everyday problems, such as stereotype formation, intergroup discrimination, ethnic conflict, etc. Thus, for both scientific and societal reasons, the analysis of intergroup relations has attracted remarkable research efforts. Moreover, different approaches to explain intergroup processes have developed. Whereas some researchers focus on motivational sources of intergroup behaviour, such as striving for positive distinctness of one's ingroup or maintaining relative group status, other researchers emphasize cognitive determinants of social categorization and discrimination, such as mental representations of social groups or memory processes and biases.

The main objective of the Medium Size Meeting is to discuss in depth cognitive and motivational approaches to the analysis of intergroup relations and to show potential integrations in theory development and experimental research. Thereby, the meeting may bridge the gap between as yet separate fields of research. For instance, the interplay between cognitive processes of category acquisition and motivational processes of ingroup favouritism may provide an intriguing field of research to enhance our understanding of the formation and maintenance of intergroup discrimination and conflict.

The meeting will take place from 27 June until 1 July 2001 at Schloß Kochberg (Germany). Schloß Kochberg is a picturesque historical castle close to Jena and Weimar. As one of the main goals is to have postgraduate students and young researchers present their current projects to an international audience of distinguished researchers, submissions from postgraduate students and young researchers are especially encouraged. The meeting aims at bringing together about 40 researchers, including postgraduates, young and senior scholars.

Inquiries should be directed to
Amélie Mummendey (amelie.mummendey@uni-jena.de) or
Thorsten Meiser (thorsten.meiser@uni-jena.de).

Small Group Meeting

On Gender Role Research

April 5th – 7th 2001, Graz, Austria

(Organizers: Andrea E. Abele [University of Erlangen, Germany] and Ursula Athenstaedt [University of Graz, Austria])

Social psychological gender research is a heterogeneous area. A common aspect is the conceptualization of gender as an important social role, or even broader as a social category. Individuals become aware of their own gender at a very early age and it is an important aspect of socialization to learn the expectations society holds towards women and men. On a level of individuals gender role research deals with topics like gender role identity, gender role attitudes, and gender stereotypes. Thus, people have a self-concept about being a women or a men, they hold attitudes about the social roles occupied by women and men, and they have their own beliefs about typical characteristics of women and men. Research on gender related behavior must include this individual level as well as cultural and contextual aspects.

The planned small group meeting is meant to bring together about 20–25 researchers from both Europe and the US, who are doing research on gender roles. We want to emphasize conceptual and measurement issues of gender role identity (i.e. femininity and masculinity), issues of cultural and societal changes in gender roles, preconditions and consequences of variability and change in femininity or masculinity in the course of a person's life span, and the interrelationship of gender role identity, gender role attitudes and gender stereotypes.

There will be no costs for registration or accommodation. In exceptional cases, we will be able to provide financial aid to travel costs. Submissions may be send to Ursula Athenstaedt at ursula.athenstaedt@kfunigraz.ac.at. and to Andrea Abele-Brehm at abele@phil.uni-erlangen.de. Please send your name, affiliation, contact information (e-mail, postal address, phone number) and a summary of your proposed talk (max. 300 words). For inquiries, please contact any one of the organizers.

Small Group Meeting

Theory and Method in Societal Psychology

April 26th – 29th 2001, Pecs, Hungary

(Organizers: Janos Laszlo, University of Pecs and Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary, and Wolfgang Wagner, University of Linz, Austria)

During the past ten to fifteen years a number of theoretical approaches have emerged in European social psychology, which complemented the then prevalent social psychology towards encompassing more societal processes and wider social phenomena. Such approaches are discursive psychology and constructivism, rhetorical psychology, narrative psychology, social representation theory and others. Despite their inherently similar goals the representatives of these approaches have rarely entered in a constructive dialogue to investigate commonalities and differences, boundaries and methodological implications.

Whatever the reasons for this lack of communication, it is high time to start a dialogue and open-minded discussion among these theoretical approaches. For a beginning, we are organizing a small group meeting about the respective theoretical and methodological concerns. The topic is to investigate commonalities and divergences in the theoretical foundation of such approaches as well as how the approaches complement each other in their approaches and methods. We expect that all participants can learn from how others look at the processes that anchor an individual in his or her social world and, vice versa, how group and individual activity constitute the social.

The meeting is planned as a discussion event allowing only for brief statements. The number of participants is limited to 20 persons.

Colleagues interested in participating are invited to send a 300 word abstract of their intended paper, their name, affiliation, and postal address to:

Wolfgang Wagner
Institut für Psychologie
Johannes-Kepler-Universität

4040 Linz / Austria-EU
fax: +43 732 24689315
e-mail: w.wagner@jk.uni-linz.ac.at

Deadline for submission of abstracts is October 1st 2000. Authors will be informed about the outcome of the selection process until December 1st 2000. Participants are expected to submit their full contribution not exceeding 3000 words as attachment (RTF) until **January 31st 2001** to allow all others to study the text well before the event.

Joint EAESP/SPSSI Meeting

Prejudice and Racism

May 22nd – 27th 2001, Granada, Spain

(Organizers: Miguel Moya, University of Granada, Spain; Armando Rodriguez, University de la Laguna, Spain; Jacques-Philippe Leyens, University of Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium; Jack Dovidio, Colgate University, USA)

This small group meeting has the aim to survey the present views on prejudice and racism from both the majority and the minority points of view. At least in Europe, racism has been somewhat neglected to the benefit of stereotyping research. Both in Europe and in North-America, research has tended to mainly focus on the majority point of view. It is only recently that voice was given to "victims". This conjunction of elements makes the topic of the meeting timely. The location, in Granada, is more than symbolic with testimonies of Arabic, Jewish, and Christian influences. An excursion to the Alhambra and the different ethnic quarters is obviously part of the program.

Both empirical and theoretical perspectives are encouraged. Number of

presentations will be limited to 17 in order to allow a maximum of time to theoretical and empirical discussions, confrontations, and plans of collaboration.

Number of participants (with or without presentation) is limited to 30.

Participants who wish to present a paper are asked to send a detailed abstract. Participants who are willing not to present a paper are welcome to present a poster. All the information (abstract and poster summary) is to be sent to the organizers.

Local organizer:

Miguel Moya, Facultad de Psicología, 18011 Granada (Spain)
tel.: +34-958-246271 or +34-958-243165, fax: +34-958-243774
mmoya@platon.ugr.es

Additional organizers:

Armando Rodriguez, Universidad de la Laguna, Santa Cruz de Tenerife,
Canary Islands, Spain
arguez@ull.es

Jacques-Philippe Leyens, University of Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
leyens@upso.ucl.ac.be

Jack Dovidio, Colgate University, USA
Jdovidio@mail.colgate.edu

Small Group Meeting

Finding Meaning in the Human Condition: Emerging Perspectives in Experimental Existential Psychology
August 2-4, 2001, Free University Amsterdam

(Organizers: Sander Koole, Free University Amsterdam; Tom Pyszczynski, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs).

The human quest for meaning has captured the imagination of poets, prophets, and philosophers across the centuries. More recently, the generation and transmission of meanings has attracted the attention of social psychologists. Social psychology presents the ideal disciplinary niche that connects the analysis of micro-level processes that last milliseconds (e.g., priming) to the broader context of socially driven processes (e.g., rules, norms) within which meanings are constructed. Indeed, social psychologists have been at the forefront of the emerging discipline of "experimental existential psychology" that studies existential issues through rigorous experimentation. This perspective has been successfully applied in many areas in experimental social psychology, including the self, culture, interpersonal relations, and motivation.

Our small group meeting will gather a number of researchers who have been active contributors in experimental existential psychology. As the first meeting of its kind, it will provide researchers with a new platform to discuss the latest advances in the study of the human quest for meaning across a variety of domains. The format allows for active participation and discussion, and is intended to facilitate new initiatives for subsequent research. Our aim is to attract around 25-30 participants. To allow for in-depth discussion of ideas, 5 key papers will each receive 2 hours of presentation time. The remaining program will consist of 30 minute talks. There is no registration fee, and accomodation will be provided by the organization.

We are currently inviting submissions for proposed talks, and particularly encourage the participation of interested EAESP members. To submit a

proposal, please send your name, affiliation, contact information (e-mail and postal address, phone number) and a 200-250 word summary of your proposed talk (with a few key words) to Sander Koole at SL.Koole@psy.vu.nl by **November 1, 2000**. For inquiries, please contact either of the organizers (email Tom Pyszczynski at tpyszczy@mail.uccs.edu).

Grants**GRANTS AWARDED**

Patricia Milesi (postgraduate travel grant)

Daan Scheepers (postgraduate travel grant)

GRANT REPORTS

Boukje Keijzer, University of Amsterdam (postgraduate travel grant)

August 1999 I took a plane to Chicago for a four month stay at Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois. There I collaborated with Professor Jeffrey Sherman and graduate student Carla Groom on several research projects. During my stay we conducted a few studies together that assessed the effects of exemplars on stereotypes in different ways. The aim of this visit and the collaboration with Prof. Sherman was to better understand when exemplars from a group affect the group stereotype and what processes cause these effects. We have tried to find the boundaries of these effects of exemplars on stereotypes, by determining when exemplars stop having relevance or applicability to the stereotype of the group. The collaboration has been very successful in the sense that we were able to develop hypotheses that combined our previous insights and findings. This made it possible to meet our goal of better understanding the effects of exemplars on group stereotypes by integrating the knowledge we had developed before. The collaboration will definitely continue now that I have returned to Amsterdam. Several future meetings and research projects have already been planned.

Besides this, I participated in a graduate course by Professor Doug Medin on Culture, Language and Categorization. This class was very interesting and forced me to explore research areas that I did not know very well. The discussions with other graduate students were very stimulating as well. As

part of the Department of Psychology I attended many colloquia by distinguished researchers and I participated in the weekly lab meetings of the department. This provided me with a lot of opportunities to compare European and American research traditions and customs and to learn from this.

My visit at Northwestern University has broadened my horizon in many ways by showing me different ways of conducting research, different fields of literature and different ways of thinking. I think this will affect my future research endeavors in a very positive way. I thoroughly enjoyed my stay at Northwestern, both intellectually and socially. The department was very welcoming and supportive. Chicago is a beautiful city and the apartment that Prof. Sherman arranged for me and my husband provided us with a breathtaking view of the city. We also enjoyed visiting many great museums, eating and drinking in many wonderful restaurants and bars and watching many theatre shows and movies. The whole four months have been an inspiring and stimulating experience. I sincerely want to thank the EAESP for its support of my visit.

Announcements**REQUEST FOR INTERGROUP CONTACT
AND PREJUDICE STUDIES**

For the past several years, I have been conducting a meta-analytic study of the effect of intergroup contact upon intergroup prejudice. I now have 376 studies – both published and unpublished. But I would like very much to increase my subset of studies from Europe. Hence, I would very much appreciate your sending me copies of any such studies (or the references to them) to the following address:

Thomas F. Pettigrew
Philipps-Universität Marburg
Fachbereich Psychology
Sozialpsychologie
Gutenbergstr. 18
D-35032 Marburg

Thank you in advance for any help you can give me.

**THE RESEARCH CENTER FOR GROUP DYNAMICS
SUMMER WORKSHOPS - 2000**

We are pleased to announce 3 courses during our Summer Workshop Program. The fee for each course is \$750.

Course #1:
Workshop on Diary Methods
June 12-15, 2000
Instructor: Niall Bolger, New York University

Course #2

Analysis of Dyad and Group Data

June 19-23, 2000

Instructor: Richard Gonzalez, University of Michigan

Course #3

Methods in Cultural Psychology

August 7-10, 2000

Instructor: Shinobu Kitayama, Kyoto University, Japan

Visiting Associate Professor, University of Chicago

For course description and registration information, please visit our website: <http://www.isr.umich.edu/rcgd/summer> or contact Laura Reynolds; laureyn@umich.edu <<mailto:laureyn@umich.edu>>

INVITATION TO JOIN THE ISSI

The International Society for Self and Identity (ISSI) invites researchers with an interest in self and identity to join ISSI. With nearly 350 members from more than 16 countries, ISSI is a scholarly, multidisciplinary association dedicated to the promotion of the scientific study of the human self and identity-seeking. Members of the society study a diversity of topics related to the self, such as the structure of the self-concept, self-consciousness, self-evaluation, self-regulation, self-esteem and self-conscious emotions, the role of self in influencing perceptions of other persons and in guiding behavior, as well as the dynamic interplay between the self and relational, group, and cultural context.

The ISSI encourages the study of self and identity from a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives, a variety of areas within psychology (e.g., social/personality, developmental, clinical), and a variety of disciplines (e.g., psychology, sociology, medical sciences).

The ISSI (1) has began a new journal titled "Self and Identity", (2) has commissioned a bi-annual volume ("Psychological Perspectives on the Self"), (3) has commissioned the "Handbook on Self and Identity," and (4) sponsors annual pre-conferences at SESP and SPSP.

The ISSI maintains a web site with abstracts of unpublished papers <http://www.soton.ac.uk/~psyweb/ISSI/>. There are currently no membership dues. To join ISSI, please send your name, mailing address, e-mail address, and phone number to the society's web manager, Dr. Richard Gramzow, at <gramzow@psy.soton.ac.uk>.

Constantine Sedikides (University of Southampton, England), for the ISSI EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Mark Alicke, Ohio University, USA <alicke@ohio.edu>

Bram P. Buunk, University of Groningen, The Netherlands
<A.P.Buunk@ppsw.rug.nl>

Steven Fein, Williams College, USA

Todd F. Heatherton, Dartmouth College, USA

Brenda N. Major, University of California at Santa Barbara, USA

Deborah A. Prentice, Princeton University, USA

Diane M. Tice, Case Western University, USA

Gifford Weary, Ohio State University, USA

NEXT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

The next Executive Committee Meeting will take place in Madrid on October, 6th – 8th, 2000. Please make sure that all contributions to the EC (applications for meetings, applications for membership, etc.) are received by the Administrative Secretary by **September, 8th, 2000** latest

News about Members**NEW ADDRESSES**

Dr. Henk **AARTS**
Section of Social and
Organizational Psychology
Leiden University
P.O. Box 9555
NL-2300 RB Leiden
The Netherlands
off: +31-71-5273787
aarts@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

Dr Alastair **COULL**
chemin de la Pralay, 14c
CH-1294 Genthod
Switzerland
alastair.coull@swissonline.ch

Dr. Nanne **DE VRIES**
Health Education and Promotion
Maastricht University
P.O. Box 616
NL-6200 MD Maastricht
The Netherlands
off: +31-43-3882423
fax: +31-42-3671032
n.devries@gvo.unimaas.nl

Dr. J. Richard **EISER**
Professor of Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Sheffield
Western Bank
Sheffield S10 2TP
UK
off: +44-114-2226622
fax: +44-114-2766515
j.r.eiser@shef.ac.uk

Eric R. **IGOU**
SFB 504
Universität Mannheim
L 13,15
D-68131 Mannheim
Germany
eric@sfb504.uni-mannheim.de

Dr. Klaus **JONAS**
TU Chemnitz, Philosophische
Fakultät,
Wirtschafts-, Organisations- und
Sozialpsychologie
D-09107 Chemnitz
Germany
off: +49-371-5316396
fax: +49-371-531-6409
priv: +49-741-9422640 /41 (fax)
klaus.jonas@phil.tu-chemnitz.de

Dr. Carolien **MARTIJN**
Faculty of Psychology
Department of Experimental
Psychology
Postbox 616
NL-6200 MD Maastricht
The Netherlands
off: +31-43-3881908
c.martijn@psychology.unimaas.nl

Dr. Robin **MARTIN**
School of Psychology
University of Queensland
Brisbane, 4072
Australia
robin@psy.uq.edu.au

Dr. Jostein **RISE**
Department of Disease
Prevention
National Institute of Public
Health
POBox 1044 Torshov
N-0403 Oslo
Norway
off: +47-2-2042380
priv: +47-2-2557338
jostein.rise@folkehelsa.no

Dr. Peter **SCHÖNBACH** has an
e-mail address now:
Peter.Schoenbach@ruhr-uni-
bochum.de

Dr. Diederik A. **STAPEL**
Social Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Groningen
Grote Kruisstraat 2/1
9712 TS Groningen
The Netherlands
off: +31-50-3636196 /6386
fax: +31-50-3634581
d.a.stapel@ppsw.rug.nl

Dr Paul **STENNER**
Department of Psychology
University College London
Gower Street
London WC1E 6BT, UK
off: +44-207-5045391
fax: +44-207-4364276
P.Stenner@ucl.ac.uk

Kees **VAN DEN BOS**
Department of Social Psychology
Free University Amsterdam
Van der Boechorststraat 1
1081 BT Amsterdam
The Netherlands
off: +31-20-4448865
fax: +31-20-4448921
K.van.den.Bos@psy.vu.nl

Dr. Theresa **VESCIO**
Department of Psychology
Penn State University
University Park, PA 16802
USA
tkv1@psu.edu

Dr. Hugh **WAGNER**
Principal Lecturer
Department of Psychology
University of Lancashire
Preston
Lancs. PR1 2HE
UK

Dr. Michael **WENZEL**
Research School of Social
Sciences
Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200
Australia
off: +61-2-62490537
fax +61-2-62798503
Michael.Wenzel@anu.edu.au

NEW MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

The following applications for membership were approved by the Executive Committee at its meeting in May, 2000. If the Secretary does not receive objections from any member within one month of publication of this issue of the Bulletin, these persons will become members of the Association in the grades indicated. Names of members providing letters of support are in parentheses:

FULL MEMBERSHIP

Dr. Emanuele **CASTANO**
Ohio State University, USA
(S. Reicher, V. Yzerbyt)

Dr. Alastair **COULL**
Genthod, Switzerland
(V. Yzerbyt, J.-P. Leyens)

Dr. David **DE CREMER**
University of Maastricht, The
Netherlands
(M. van Vugt, C. Sedikides)

Dr. Tatiana **FOLOMEEVA**
Moscow State University, Russia
(O. Solovyova, A. Dontsov)

Dr. Olivier **KLEIN**
University of Brussels, Belgium
(S. Reicher, M. Sanchez-Mazas)

Dr. Torun **LINDHOLM**
Stockholm University, Sweden
(O. Svenson, B. Ekehammar)

Dr. Gillian **MARKS**
Keynes College, Canterbury, UK
(T. Manstead, D. Houston)

Dr. Luis V. **OCEJA-FERNÁNDEZ**
University of Madrid, Spain
(J.-M. Fernández-Dols, C. Huici)

Dr. Patricia **RODRIGUEZ MOSQUERA**
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(T. Manstead, A. Fischer)

Dr. Jeremy Mark **RUBIN**
Cardiff University, UK
(M. Hewstone, R. Crisp)

Dr. Rolf **VAN DICK**
University of Marburg, Germany
(U. Piontkowski, U. Wagner)

Dr. Sven **WALDZUS**
University of Jena, Germany
(A. Mummendey, S. Otten)

AFFILIATE MEMBERSHIP

Dr. Scott **TINDALE**
Loyola University of Chicago,
USA
(R. Brown, D. Abrams)

POSTGRADUATE MEMBERSHIP

Céline **BUCHS**
University Pierre Mendés
Grenoble, France
(F. Butera, E. Dépret)

Annetje **BRUNNER**
University of Tilburg, The Netherlands
(A. Fischer, T. Willemsen)

Stéphanie **DEMOULIN**
Catholic University of Louvain,
Belgium
(J.-P. Leyens, V. Yzerbyt)

Marie-Aude **DEPUISET**
University Pierre Mendés
Grenoble, France
(F. Butera, R. Ommundsen)

Hinke **GROOTHOF**
University of Groningen, The Netherlands
(F.W. Siero, J.P. van Oudenhoven)

Andrés **HAYE**
University of Sheffield, UK
(J.R. Eiser, G. Haddock)

Dominique **MULLER**
University Pierre Mendés
Grenoble, France
(F. Butera, E. Dépret)

Sabine **PAHL**

University of Exeter, UK
(J.R. Eiser, G. Haddock)

Valérie **PROVOST**
Catholic University of Louvain,
Belgium
(V. Yzerbyt, O. Corneille)

Georgina **RANDSLEY DE
MOURA**
Keynes College, Kent, UK
(R. Brown, D. Abrams)

Roksolana **SIRKO**
University of Lviv, Ukraine
(M. Lewicka, M. Jarymowicz)

Jeroen **VAES**
Catholic University of Louvain,
Belgium
(J.-P. Leyens, V. Yzerbyt)

Jean-Pierre **VERNET**
University Pierre Mendés
Grenoble, France
(F. Butera, E. Dépret)

Hazel **WILLIS**
Cardiff University, UK
(M. Hewstone, G. Maio)

RESIGNATIONS

Dr. Teresa Cabruja, Girona, Italy
Dr. Robin Goodwin, London, UK
Anouk Rogier, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

Executive Committee

Dominic Abrams (Secretary), Centre for the Study of Group Processes,
Department of Psychology, University of Kent at Canterbury, KENT CT2 7NP,
UK
email: D.Abrams@ukc.ac.uk

Naomi Ellemers (President), Social and Organizational Psychology, Leiden
University, P.O. Box 9555, NL-2300 RB Leiden, The Netherlands
email: Ellemers@fsw.leidenUniv.nl

Klaus Fiedler, Psychologisches Institut der Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg,
Hauptstr. 47-51, D-69117 Heidelberg, Germany
email: kf@psi-sv2.psi.uni-heidelberg.de

Carmen Huici, Facultad de Psicología, Universidad Nacional de Educación, P.O.
Box 60148, E-28040 Madrid, Spain
email: chuici@cu.uned.es

Maria Jarymowicz, Institute of Psychology, University of Warsaw, ul. Stawki 5/7,
PL-00-183 Warsaw, Poland
email: Mariaj@sci.psych.uw.edu.pl

Anne Maass, Dipartimento di Psicologia DPSS, Università di Padova, Via Venezia
8, I-35131 Padova, Italy
email: Maass@psico.unipd.it

Vincent Yzerbyt (Treasurer), Université Catholique de Louvain, Faculté de
Psychologie, 10 Place Cardinal Mercier, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
email: yzerbyt@upso.ucl.ac.be

Administrative Secretary:

Sibylle Classen, Hollandtstrasse 61, D-48161 Muenster, Germany
fax: +49-251-869933, email: sibylle@eaesp.org

web site of the EAESP
<http://www.eaesp.org>