

European Bulletin of Social Psychology

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

2 Editorial

4 Articles

The Social Psychology in Poland
by Maria Lewicka

19 *Social Psychology in Slovenia* by Janez Becaj & Velko Rus

25 Book Reviews

Why we Evaluate (2000). Gregory A. Maio & James M. Olson (Eds.).
Review by Gerd Bohner

Psychology in Organizations: The Social Identity Approach (2000) by S.
Alexander Haslam. Review by David de Cremer

Cooperation in Modern Society (2000) by van Vugt, Snyder, Tyler and
Biel. Review by Craig D. Parks

Shared Beliefs in a Society: Social Psychological Analysis (2000) by Daniel
Bar-Tal. Review by J. Francisco Morales

*Cooperation in Groups: Procedural Justice, Social identity, and
Behavioural Engagement* (2000) by Tom Tyler & Steven Blader. Review
by A. Haslam

39 New Books by Members

*Motivation gains in group (Special issue of the Zeitschrift fuer
Sozialpsychologie (2000)* Guest Editor: Guido Hertel

Psychology in Organizations. The Social Identity Approach (2000) by S.
Alexander Haslam

*Generative Mental Processes: Mental Processes and Cognitive
Resources* (2000).

Edited by Ulrich von Hecker, Stephan Dutke and Grzegorz Sedek

43 Future EAESP Meetings

13th General Meeting of the EAESP, June 26-29th 2002, San Sebastian, Spain

Small Group Meeting on Shared Reality in Individual and Group Life, September 2001, Amsterdam (The Netherlands)

Small Group Meeting on Social Identity: Motivational, Affective and Cross-Cultural Aspects, September 5-9th, Villasimius, Cagliari (Italy)

48 Reports of Previous Meetings

Medium Size Meeting on The Psychology of Domination: Social Structure, Social Reproduction, and Social Change, March, 15-17th 2000, Grenoble (France)

52 Report on the first EAESP-SPSP International Teaching Fellowship

55 Grant reports

58 Announcements

New Editorship *EJSP* – Call for Nominations

European Monographs in Social Psychology

News from the European Journal of Social Psychology

BPS: Social Psychology Section Annual Conference

Deadlines for Contributions to the Executive Committee

63 News about Members

New Addresses

Resignations

66 Executive Committee

Editorial

In this first issue of volume 13 of the Bulletin we continue our series of articles devoted to social psychology in the former Eastern Bloc countries. Maria Lewicka discusses social psychology in Poland from the 1960's until now. Janez Becaj & Velko Rus write about social psychology in Slovenia from the 1950's onward.

We announce two new meetings, and we also have reports from a medium sized meeting, the EAESP/SPSP international teaching fellowship, and two grants. Because of space limitations we have delayed publishing the report from the 2000 EAESP Summer School in Clermont-Ferrand, until the next issue.

Also in this issue are reviews of five new books. The book review section appears to be popular and we have decided to provide slightly more space so that reviews can include more evaluation and commentary. If you are about to publish a book that you think will be of interest to EAESP members please let me know so that it can be considered for review. Also, if you are burning to write a review of a book (either that you love or hate!) please feel free to contact me.

Included in this issue there is a call for nominations for the new editorship of the EJSP. The Executive Committee is seeking a new Editor of the European Journal who is willing to take over the Journal in January 2002. We have also included a brief statement from the editorial team at EJSP as well as news about the European Monographs series.

There are a couple of additional dates and developments to remind you about. First, we have decided to move the deadlines for applications for small and medium sized meetings to March 1st and September 1st. This will allow the Executive Committee time to review the applications prior to their meeting, and also to request additional information from the proposers if required. A further meeting has been approved for 2001, so the 2001 meetings now include: Small Group Meetings: On Gender Role Research (April 2001), On Theory and Method in Societal Psychology

(April 2001), On Counterfactual Thinking (May 2001), On Finding Meaning in the Human Condition (August 2001), On Shared Reality in Individual and Group Life (September 2001), and On Social Identity: Motivational, Affective and Cross-Cultural Aspects (September 2001). Medium Size Meetings: On Feelings and Emotions (June 2001), On Cognitive and Motivational Approaches to Intergroup Relations (June/July 2001) as well as the Joint EAESP/SPSSI meeting: On Prejudice and Racism (May 2001). Applications for personal grants can be received at any time. Please refer to the web page for application details: www.eaesp.org

The EAESP Website now includes new services. All conferences, EAESP-meetings and job offers will be announced there from February onwards. In addition all EAESP members are listed there. If you wish to add your address and/or e-mail address so that others can contact you easily please do so by using a form on the website.

Finally, we are very pleased to be able to announce the programme committee for the next General Meeting of the Association in San Sebastian-Donostia, 2002. An early announcement about the meeting is included in this issue of the Bulletin, and further information will follow via the Bulletin and the website.

Dominic Abrams
Editor

Article

*Social Psychology in Poland¹⁾*by Maria Lewicka²⁾**Abstract**

This article reviews theory and research in Polish social psychology. The author distinguishes three periods in the development of the discipline: the time of the founders (the 60's), the time of developing theory and basic research (the 70's and the 80's), and the last decade, characterized by application of social psychological concepts to understanding and promoting Polish economic and political transformation.

Social Psychology in Poland

Polish social psychology is largely a post-war phenomenon. A detached observer can probably slice its short existence into three relatively distinct periods: the time of the founders (the 60's), development of theory and basic studies (the 70's and the 80's), and the present (beginning with the early 90's) unprecedented boom of interest in application, both as a tool for understanding social phenomena and as a practical instrument for influencing social life.

¹⁾ Acknowledgments: When preparing the text, the author made use of the unpublished manuscript with the same title, prepared several years ago by Wojciszke and Madrzycki

²⁾ Address for correspondence: Maria Lewicka, Faculty of Psychology, University of Warsaw, Stawki 5/7, 00-183 Warsaw, Poland, e-mail: marlew@sci.psych.uw.edu.pl

Like any other, also this periodization carries a risk of drawing artificial demarcation lines. For instance, most of the founders did continue through the next period, contributing to the theory and empirical findings. The academically oriented basic research of the second period, when confronted with the impact of possible applications, did not cease to develop in the 90's. In my opinion, though, this periodization of Polish social psychology may help the reader to grasp its developmental dynamics and hence to get better insight into its essential features. This is important when - like in this report - there is not much place for an extensive discussion of separate theories and findings.

The founders

Poland has a long tradition in sociology, both pre- and post-war, as shown by a long list of great names including Florian Znaniecki, Bronisław Malinowski, Roman and Maria Ossowsky, Józef Chałasinski, Stanisław Bystron, Stefan Nowak, and many others, of which quite a number have international reputation. In contrast to sociology, Polish social psychology is much younger and its late start can be attributed to the largely introspectionist approach predominating in the pre-war Polish psychology on one hand, and to the ideological restrictions of the post-war Stalinist time, on the other.

The founders of the Polish social psychology almost uniquely come from Warsaw, which was the first Polish university to open a regular study program in psychology (1950). The first Polish textbook of social psychology was written in 1948/49 by Stefan Baley but it was first published several years after his death in 1959, when the relaxed ideological climate allowed for an independent subdiscipline of social psychology (according to Soviet ideology, social psychology, in its attempt to explain social phenomena with psychological factors, represented an "idealistic" and hence "ideologically inappropriate" approach). Baley's textbook was an - not infrequent at that time - effort to decide between the sociological and psychological roots of social psychology, and it focused mostly on the typically social issues like crowd behavior, group influence, interpersonal relationships, attitudes and prejudice.

Even though closely linked to the world state of the art (the book has an updated impressive list of references), it was not this textbook with its focus on social factors which shaped the future of Polish social psychology. What became the distinguishing feature of the years to come were cognitive approaches which permeated American research of the 60's. This was because of the first international contacts of Polish researchers with Western psychology after the political relaxation in 1956, and their visits to a number of American universities. Among them were the sociologist, Andrzej Malewski, who already in the early 60's introduced the Polish students to the concepts of authoritarianism, dogmatism, and cognitive dissonance, and who creatively contributed to development of the latter (Malewski, 1962). A psychologist, Stanisław Mika initiated research in persuasion and attitude change, largely based on the Yale tradition, and was the author of the second Polish textbook of social psychology (published in 1972). He was also one of the founding members of the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology. Janusz Reykowski popularized the role of cognitive factors in instigation of (pro)social behavior (Reykowski, 1982), and became later known as the author of a cognitive theory of personality, conceived of as a mechanism of regulation of social behavior. This approach initiated the - rather unusual in other countries - tendency to fuse research in personality and social psychology. As a consequence, the majority of Polish personality psychologists even now define themselves as social psychologists. On the other hand, the usual focus on individual differences, typical for personality research, in Poland became dominated by researchers into biologically rooted temperament.

Of other psychologists who brought new founding ideas from the New World were Janusz Grzelak whose cooperation with Harold Kelley resulted in the long lasting research program in game theory and social dilemmas (Kelley & Grzelak, 1972). One should also mention the kin concepts from the area of judgment and decision making which were brought to Poland by Józef Koziński and later developed in cooperation with Tadeusz Tyszka (Tyszka & Grzelak, 1976).

The role of the "founders" was unprecedented in the Soviet block. Whatever their political affiliation, whether they were or not members of the communist party, they succeeded in implementing within Polish social

psychology the ideologically free, matter-of fact way of teaching and doing research. This laid the ground for the next period which made ample use of this thought facilitating climate.

The theory

With the growth in the number of universities educating future social psychologists (in addition to Warsaw, universities in Poznan and Wroclaw) and hence with the increase in the number of researchers, the next two decades witnessed a boom of interest in social psychology. The 70's in Poland meant further political relaxation and opening to external influences. This soon became reflected in visits of internationally acknowledged social psychologists to Poland, as well as in participation (although still quite occasional) of Polish social psychologists in international academic life: conferences, summer schools, visits to other universities. If one adds that the ruling system at that time did not present young people with many attractive possibilities for personal development, the participation in the academic life with relatively few ideological restrictions was for many an attractive alternative to the otherwise gray reality of everyday Poland.

One may ask if the historical date of 1980, the rise of Solidarity and the later proclamation of the marshal law in our country exerted any influence on research activity of social psychologists. To this question the answer is a (qualified) "no". The time of the revolutionary unrest was probably too short to stimulate mature research on a larger scale and - perhaps first of all - the time involved revolution. It was a situation in which the great majority of social psychologists were actors rather than detached observers. And when the deadly peace came back in 1982, most of the former actors returned to their ideologically free, and hence safe, theories and research. It is a paradox then that the economically least prosperous 80's were simultaneously very fruitful for the development of Polish social psychology. Polish participation in the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology increased to 9% of the society membership (over 30 members), Poland hosted a number of small group meetings and East-West meetings, research continued and new ideas were developed. Let us then have a short summary of the latter.

Wojciszke (Wojciszke & Madrzycki, 1992) in an unpublished review of Polish social psychology mentions four main themes researched by Polish social psychologists during the 70's and the 80's: the structure of social representations and the self, processes of evaluation and the interface between emotion and cognition, attitudes and social influence, and, finally, antecedents of social behavior. They were, so to speak, "universal" themes, which at that time were researched also by Western psychologists. However, the way it was done in Poland was not a pure replication but showed clear ambitions to contribute with innovative theoretical ideas. I will mention the most representative ones.

"Cognitive representation" was for years the key term for many Polish social psychologists, particularly from Warsaw. This concept constituted the essence of the regulatory theory of personality, developed by Janusz Reykowski (semantic space with metric properties as the main regulator of social behavior) and in this or another form it became the leitmotif in works of his many students, e.g., Czapinski's (1978) work in cognitive complexity, Trzebinski's studies in flexibility of concept prototypes as determinants of creative thought (Trzebinski, 1981), conceptualization of social knowledge in terms of goal-oriented representations (Trzebinski, 1984), or a number of studies run by different authors on the perceived distance from/similarity to a target person as a determinant of prosocial behavior (e.g., Reykowski, 1984).

The research in prosocial behavior conducted by Reykowski and his group was probably the biggest research endeavour in Polish social psychology to date and it resulted in ten books (e.g., Reykowski, 1979) and over fifty papers. An original theory of prosocial behavior, referring to its exo- vs. endogenous sources, was suggested by Karyłowski (1982). The opposite of the prosocial - aggressive - behavior was studied independently by Fraczek (Feshbach & Fraczek, 1979).

"Self" was another key concept in the 70's and later. Jarymowicz and her coworkers in cooperation with Jean-Paul Codol (Jarymowicz & Codol, 1979; Codol, Jarymowicz, Kaminska-Feldman, & Szuster-Zbrojewicz, 1989) studied asymmetries in perception of self-other similarity as well as the role of perceived similarities and differences for, respectively, social and

personal identity. Self-other similarity and self-identity as related to the hemispheric asymmetry was studied by Cielecki (1983). The role of the egotistic motives in behavior (for instance self-handicapping procedures and techniques of self-presentation) was later undertaken by Dolinski and Szmajke (1994). Self-knowledge and self-presentation for many years were also studied by Dymkowski (1996).

Another theme explored extensively was the relationship between affect and cognition. This was done in the way which anticipated the close boom of interest in the affect-cognition interface on one hand, and in the pragmatic and functional explanations of behavior, on the other. Lewicka (1977) and Wojciszke (1979) explored the preconditions of focusing on affective vs. descriptive meanings in interpersonal perception and of the ensuing affective vs. descriptive consistency principles in organization of social information. Lewicka focused mainly on its situational determinants while Wojciszke on interindividual differences in preference for one or another type of the meaning. A great deal of research in the late 70's and early 80's went into the - then little explored - issue of positive-negative asymmetry in processing of emotionally loaded information. Among others, Czapinski contributed with theoretical distinction of two types of negativity effects, affective and informational (Peeters & Czapinski, 1990). With the original onion theory of happiness (Czapinski & Peeters, 1991), Wojciszke and his group (Wojciszke & Pienskowski, 1991) investigated the asymmetry in prototypicality of positive and negative traits (Peeters & Czapinski, 1990) as well as the differential impact of positive and negative information about moral vs. competence-related traits (Wojciszke, 1994). Lewicka proposed a theoretical model which postulated asymmetrical principles of reasoning about positive and negative targets (Lewicka, 1988), which conceived of a number of cognitive biases not as errors but as pragmatically useful inference schemata (Lewicka, 1998). The issue of the functional significance of cognitive biases was examined in the common endeavour of several authors in the book entitled "Illusions which help us to live" (Kofta & Szustrowa, 1991).

Another well researched topic were attitudes and social influence. Mika (1981) studied the effects of source credibility and memory for attitude-related arguments. Madrzycki (1978) investigated attitudinal effects on syllogistic reasoning. Value-behavior consistency was studied by

Wojciszke (1987) who developed a Polish version of the self-monitoring scale (called Idealism scale).

Of other themes within this topic, Mika (1969), Grzelak (1974), and Skarzynska (1975), independently from each other, investigated the influence of rewards and punishments on behavioral change. A real boom of research in social influence, however, came in the 90's within two independent lines of study. The first, originated by Nowak (Nowak, Szamrej, & Latané, 1990), consisted in computer simulation of the processes of social influence, modeling the change of attitudes resulting from the interactive, reciprocal, and recursive operation of some rules (borrowed from Latané's social impact theory) within a population of individuals. Dolinski (Dolinski & Nawrat, 1998), within a more traditional framework, carried an impressive set of natural studies on willingness to yield to (often absurd) requests.

Considerable effort throughout the 80's went into studying the phenomenon of learned helplessness. Kofta and Sedek (Kofta & Sedek, 1989, Sedek & Kofta, 1990) proposed an original informational model of learned helplessness, an alternative to the existent egotistic explanations. Sedek developed the concept of intellectual helplessness in school (Sedek & McIntosh, 1998). In contrast to individual helplessness, Grzelak (1987) proposed and investigated the phenomenon of social helplessness. Moreover, he continued his studies in social interdependence and social orientations in solving social dilemmas.

This by no means, exhausts the research at that time. To mention a few more themes, Wojciszke (1993) reformulated Sternberg's triangular theory of love by postulating a four-stage theory of the dynamics of love. Kofta (1985) for many years explored the issue of freedom of choice and of its consequences for behaviour. In a similar vein, Dolinski and his colleagues (Dolinski, Gromski, & Szmajke (1988) studied determinants of ascription of responsibility. The concept of justice was studied independently by Grzelak (1985), Skarzynska (1989), and Dolinski (1996). Wieczorkowska explored cognitive determinants of goal-oriented behavior (Wieczorkowska & Burnstein, in print), and postulated the concept of "motivational intelligence" (Wieczorkowska-Nejtardt, 1998).

Towards social psychology in action

The year 1989 brought profound economic and political transformations to the whole Soviet block. Democratic institutions and market economy radically changed social life in Poland. Presidential, parliamentary and local elections called for public opinion pools. Advertising agencies searched specialists in advertising techniques. New work morale placed new demands before organizational psychologists. Development of the banking system, loans, credit cards, and the Warsaw stock exchange called for economic psychology. The mushrooming private schools of business and administration hunted for lecturers in social psychology. Journalists and political activists requested scientific comments from specialists familiar with social problems. Social psychology was *en vogue*. Students who in the 80's chose psychology mostly because of its clinical applications now demanded extended programs in social psychology. The time of the quiet and "disengaged" theorizing and basic academic research was clearly over.

Polish social psychology answered the demands. In 1991 The Warsaw University founded an interdisciplinary Institute of Social Sciences, affiliated with the Center for Group Dynamics of the Michigan University, Ann Arbor. The big endeavour of the Warsaw sociologists, the yearly Polish General Social Survey, among many other data bases and opinion measurements in Poland, provides materials for systematic analysis of the Polish society.

Education changed. Universities adapt to pressing demands by increasing number of courses in applied social psychology and by developing new ones. Among many others, students now take courses in personnel selection, work satisfaction, public relations, negotiations, communication within organisations, consumer behaviour, advertising practices, social marketing, economic psychology and economy, environmental psychology. Graduates with no psychological education participate in post-graduate studies in applied social psychology (consumer behaviour, organisational psychology), organised by universities.

Finally, perhaps the best sign of the huge demand for social psychological education is founding in 1994 of the first private Higher School of Social

Psychology in Warsaw. The dynamically developing School accepts hundreds of candidates every year. By now it has three institutes, Institute of Social Psychology, of Clinical Social Psychology and of Cross-Cultural Psychology. Development of the School is possible not only because of the unprecedented effort of its organizers but also because of active participation of a great number of eminent psychologists from other Polish universities.

What about research? Did it wane under the impact of pressing demands for application and of the increased teaching load? Yes and no. There is no doubt that there is less time for thought and detached academic work. There is certainly less time for group discussions and participation in conferences. On the other hand, it seems that what the Communist system with its call for "socially engaged research" did not achieve, the present situation facilitates quite naturally. Studies run on big, representative samples of the Polish population focus on well-being within the society (Czapinski, 1994), feeling of being wronged and on its relation to perception of social life through moral vs. competence-related categories (Wojciszke & Grzelak, 1996), or the specifically Polish tendency to complain (Wojciszke & Baryła, 2000). Social psychologists participate in monitoring social effects of political reforms (Czapinski, 2000), they study acceptance of different ethical codes by the Polish society (Wojciszke & Baryła, in print), or try to understand mechanisms of demanding behaviour and social protests (Lewicka, in print). Revived interest in national antagonisms and prejudices led Kofta (1995) to develop an original dynamic model of stereotypes. Skarzynska (Skarzynska, & Chmielewski, 1994) investigated attitudes of young people toward political changes. Nowak (Nowak & Vallacher, 1998), by applying the concepts borrowed from the theory of complex systems, develops dynamical social psychology.

A great deal of research combines applied and theoretical aspects. This is perhaps best seen in research on processing of implicit affect. On one hand it is the focus of growing interest of a number of basic studies (the works of Ohme, Jarymowicz, Sedek, Drogosz, and several others, see for instance: Ohme, Pochwatko, & Błaszczak, 1999, Pawłowska, Sedek, 1999, Jarymowicz, 1999). On the other hand it has very practical applications, for instance Maison (Maison, Greenwald, & Bruin, in press) combines the

methodology of IAT with investigations in the efficiency of advertising strategies, both commercial and social. With market economy and democratic transformations in our country, Polish social psychology is becoming increasingly social.

References

- Baley, S. (1959). *Wprowadzenie do Psychologii Społecznej (Introduction to Social Psychology)*. Warszawa: PWN
- Cielecki, M. (1983). Perceptual imagery and verbal-conceptual determinants of the similarity-attraction relationship. *Cahiers de Psychologie Cognitive*, **3**, 159-174.
- Codol J-P., Jarymowicz M., Kamińska-Feldman M., Szuster-Zbrojewicz A. (1989). Asymmetry in the estimation of interpersonal distance and identity affirmation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, **19**, 11-22.
- Czapinski, J. (1978). Metodologia Rep testu (Rep test methodology). In: L. Wołoszynowa (Ed.), *Materiały do Nauczania Psychologii (Materials for Teachings Psychology)*. (pp. 277-306). Warszawa: PWN.
- Czapinski, J. , & Peeters, G. (1991). The Onion theory of happiness: Basic concepts and cross-cultural test. In: N. Bliechrot & P. J. Drenth (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues on Cross-Cultural Psychology* (pp. 196-216). Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger B.V.
- Czapinski, J. (1995). Money isn't everything: On the various social costs of transformation. *Polish Sociological Review*, **112**, 289-302.
- Czapinski, J. (2000). *Diagnoza Społeczna 2000 (Social Diagnosis 2000)*. Reports available at <http://www.psych.uw.edu.pl/badania/wyniki>.
- Dolinski, D. (1996). The belief in an unjust world: An egotistic delusion. *Social Justice Research*, **9**, 213-221.
- Dolinski, D., Gromski, W., & Szmajke, A. (1988) Perpetrator's freedom of choice as a determinant of responsibility attribution. *Journal of Social Psychology*, **128**, 441-449.
- Dolinski, D., & Szmajke, A. (1994). *Samoutrudnianie (Self-handicapping)*. Olsztyn: Polskie Towarzystwo Psychologiczne.

- Dolinski, D., & Nawrat, R. (1998). Fear from relief procedure for producing compliance: Beware when the danger is over. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, **34**, 27-50.
- Feshbach, S., & Fraczek, A. (1979). *Aggression and Behavior: Biological and Social Processes*. New York: Praeger.
- Grzelak, J. (1974). *Empiryczne Przesłanki Skuteczności Karania (Empirical Premises of Punishment Effectiveness)*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Grzelak, J. (1985). Social justice and control. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, **1**, 227-233.
- Grzelak, J. (1987). O bezradności społecznej (On social helplessness) In: M. Marody, A. Sułek (ed.), *Rzeczywistość Polska i Sposoby Radzenia Sobie z Nią (Polish Reality and Ways of Coping with It)*. (pp. 242-267). Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Codol, J.P., & Jarymowicz, M. (1979). Self-others similarity perception: Striving for diversity from other people. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, **1**, 41-48.
- Dymkowski, M. (1996). *Samowiedza w okowach przywdziewanych masek (Different facets of the self-knowledge)* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Psychologii PAN
- Jarymowicz, M. (1999). O korzyściach z badań nad utajonym przetwarzaniem informacji afektywnych (On the benefits from the research on implicit processing of affective information). *Studia Psychologiczne*, **XXXVII**, 129-145.
- Jarymowicz M., Codol J-P. (1979). Self - Others similarity perception: striving for diversity from other people. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, **1**, 41-48.
- Jarymowicz, M., Codol, J.P., Kaminska Feldman, M., & Szuster-Zbrojewicz, A. (1989). Asymmetry in the estimation of interpersonal distance and identity affirmation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, **19**, 11-22.
- Kelley, H.H., & Grzelak, J. (1972). N-person conflict between individual and common interest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **20**.

- Karylowski, J. (1982). Two types of altruistic behavior: Doing good to feel good or to make the other feel good. In V. Derlega & J. Grzelak (Eds.), *Cooperation and Helping Behavior: Theories and Research* (pp. 397-413). New York: Academic Press.
- Koftera, M. (1985). Moral decision and an observer's inference of freedom: In defence of freedom as personal causation. *Cahiers de Psychologie Cognitive*, **5**, 596-608.
- Koftera, M. (1995). Stereotype of a group-as-a-whole: The role of diabolic causation schema. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, **26**, 83-96.
- Koftera, M. & Sedek, G. (1989). Repeated failure: A source of helplessness or a factor irrelevant to its emergence? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, **118**, 3-12.
- Koftera, M., & Szustrowa, T. (1991). *Złudzenia, Które Pozwalają Żyć (Illusions Which Help Us To Live)*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Lewicka, M. (1977). Evaluative and descriptive aspects of organization of cognitive structures. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, **8**, 3-12.
- Lewicka, M. (1988). On objective and subjective anchoring of cognitive acts: How behavioural valence modifies reasoning schemata. In: W. Barker & L. Moss (Eds.), *New Trends in Theoretical Psychology* (pp. 285-301), Berlin: Springer.
- Lewicka, M. (1998). Confirmation bias: cognitive error or adaptive strategy of action control? W: M. Koftera, G. Weary, & G. Sedek (Ed.), *Personal Control in Action: Cognitive and Motivational Mechanisms* (pp. 233-258). New York: Plenum.
- Lewicka, M. (in print). Psychologiczne mechanizmy zachowań roszczeniowych (Psychological mechanisms of demanding behaviour). In: D. Dolinski, & B. Weigl (Eds.), *Od Myśli i Uczuć Do Decyzji i Działan (From Thoughts and Feelings to Decisions and Actions)*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Psychologii PAN.
- Madrzycki, T. (1978). Effect of attitude towards religion on reasoning. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, **9**, 119-127.
- Maison, D., Greenwald, A., & Bruin, R. (in press). Application of the IAT to consumer research. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*.

- Malewski, A. (1962). *Z zagadnień Psychologii Społecznej (On the Issues in Social Psychology)*. Warszawa: PWN
- Mika, S. (1972). *Wstęp do Psychologii Społecznej (Introduction to Social Psychology)*. Warszawa: PWN
- Mika, S. (1969). *Skuteczność Kar w Wychowaniu (Effectiveness of Punishments in Upbringing)*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Mika, S. (1981). Some determinants of source credibility. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, **12**, 79-86.
- Nowak, A., Szamrej, J., & Latane, B. (1990). From private attitude to private opinion: A dynamic theory of social impact. *Psychological Review*, **97**, 362-89.
- Nowak, A., & Vallacher, R. (1998). *Dynamical Social Psychology*. London: Guilford Press.
- Ohme, R., Pochwatko, G., & Błaszczak, W. (1999). Paradygmat afektywnego przetwarzania: W poszukiwaniu nowej procedury badawczej (Affective priming paradigm: seeking new experimental procedure). *Studia Psychologiczne*, **XXXVII**, 7-28.
- Pawłowska, I., & Sedek, G. (1999). Wybrane metody badań w psychopatologii poznawczej nad świadomym i nieswiadomym przetwarzaniem informacji afektywnych (The overview of research methods in cognitive psychopathology concerning conscious and unconscious processing of affective information). *Studia Psychologiczne*, **XXXVII**, 83-107.
- Peeters, G., & Czapinski, J. (1990). Positive-negative asymmetry in evaluations: The distinction between affective and informational negativity effects. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology* (vol. 1, pp. 33-60). Chichester: Wiley.
- Reykowski, J. (1979). *Motywacja, Postawy Prospołeczne a Osobowość (Motivation, Prosocial Attitudes and Personality)*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Reykowski, J. (1982). Motivation of prosocial behaviour. In V. J. Derlega, & J. Grzelak (Eds.), *Cooperation and helping behaviour: Theories and research*. New York: Academic Press.

- Reykowski, J. (1984). Spatial organization of a cognitive system and intrinsic prosocial motivation. In: E. Staub, D. Bar-Tal, J. Karylowski, & J. Reykowski (Eds.), *Development and Maintenance of Prosocial Behaviour*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Sedek, G., & Kofta, M. (1990). When cognitive exertion does not yield cognitive gain: Toward an informational explanation of learned helplessness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **58**, 729-743.
- Sedek, G., & McIntosh, D.N. (1998). Intellectual helplessness: Domain specificity, teaching styles, and school achievement. In: M. Kofta, G. Weary, & G. Sedek (Eds.), *Personal Control in Action: Cognitive and Motivational Mechanisms*. (pp. 391-418). New York: Plenum Press.
- Skarzynska, K. (1975). Effects of punishments and rewards differing in strength. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, **6**, 81-87.
- Skarzynska, K. (1989). Evaluative perspective and distributive justice. In N Eisenberg, J. Reykowski, & E. Staub. (Eds.), *Social and Moral Values. Individual and Societal Perspectives*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Skarzynska, K. , & Chmielewski, K. (1994). Are young people associated with the new political system or alienated from it? *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, **1**, 57-71.
- Trzebinski, J. (1981). *Twórczość a Struktura Pojęć (Creativity and the Structure of Concepts)*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Trzebinski, J. (1984). *O Społecznym Charakterze Reprezentacji Umysłowych (On the Social Nature of Cognitive Representations)*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Tyszka, T., & Grzelak, J. (1976). Criteria and mechanisms of choice in in-person games. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, **20**, 357-376.
- Wieczorkowska, G. , & Burnstein, E. (in print). The adaptive value of interval goal- setting strategies during social change in Poland. In: G. Kolankiewicz (Ed.), *Social Change in Poland: Adaptation and Resistance*. London: SEES Press.
- Wieczorkowska-Nejtardt, G. (1998). *Inteligencja Motywacyjna: Madrze Strategie Wyboru Celu i Sposobu Działania (Motivational Intelligence: Clever Strategies of Choosing Goals and Ways of Action)*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Studiów Społecznych.

- Wojciszke, B. (1993). *Psychologia Miłości. (Psychology of Love)*. Gdansk: Gdanskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- Wojciszke, B. (1994). Multiple meanings of behaviour: Construing actions in terms of competence or morality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **67**, 222-232.
- Wojciszke, B., & Baryła, W. (2000). *Polacy jako uczesnicy kultury narzekania. (Poles and participants of the culture of complaining)*. Paper presented at the Conference of Polish Language, Kielce, October, 2000.
- Wojciszke, B., & Baryła, W. (in print). Potoczne rozumienie moralności: badania psychologicznej rzeczywistości etyki godności i etyki produktywności. (Lay understanding of morality: Investigations in psychological reality of ethics of dignity and productivity. *Przebieg Psychologiczny*.
- Wojciszke, B., & Grzelak, J. (1996). Feelings of being wronged among Poles. *Polish Sociological Review*, **2**, 175-194.
- Wojciszke, B., & Madrzycki (1992). Social Psychology in Poland. Unpublished manuscript.
- Wojciszke, B., & Pienskowski, R. (1991). Prototypical structure of personality trait concepts and person perception. *Cahiers de Psychologie Cognitive: European Bulletin of Cognitive Psychology*, 1991, 213-228.

Article

*Social Psychology in Slovenia*¹⁾by Janez Becaj²⁾ & Velko Rus³⁾

The first contact Slovenia had with social psychology could probably be attributed to the work of G. A. Lindner. In the middle of the 19th century, this Austrian philosopher and pedagogue lived in the Slovene town Celje where he was editing some of his books. For some time, he was the director of a German gymnasium there. In 1871 his seminal work "Ideen zur Psychologie der Gesellschaft als Grundlage der Sozialwissenschaft" was published and one of the chapters was dedicated to the fundamentals of social psychology. According to certain sources, this work has been written in Celje.

The real beginning of social psychology in Slovenia is of a much later date. It coincides with the establishment of the Department of Psychology at the University of Ljubljana in 1951. The founder of the Department and the first lecturer in social psychology (among many other psychological disciplines) was Mihajlo Rostohar. His name is inseparably linked with the beginning of "official" psychology in Slovenia (he also founded the Institute of Psychology in 1950) and especially with the beginnings of social psychology. He is considered as the pioneer of this discipline in Slovenia and has written the first Slovene handbook of social psychology entitled "Fundamentals of Social Psychology" (Ljubljana, 1965). Besides

¹⁾ The authors are grateful to Marija Petric and Mirjana Ule for their help and Matej Cernigoj and Gaj Vidmar for reading the manuscript and providing valuable improvements to the language and style of the article.

²⁾ J. Becaj is Associate Professor at the Department for Psychology, University of Ljubljana.
E-mail: Janez.Becaj@guest.arnes.si

³⁾ V.S. Rus is Associate Professor at the Department for Psychology, University of Ljubljana.
E-mail: Janez.Becaj@guest.arnes.si

the popular themes of that time, a special chapter of this handbook was dedicated to the social psychology of ethnic groups, nations and "society". His research interests embraced significant elements of the areas which would nowadays be called societal psychology and psychosocial anthropology. Rostohar was also concerned with empirical research, experimental work and applied aspects of social psychology.

Rostohar's work was not important only for psychology. He was also one of the principal founders of the University of Ljubljana in 1919. Between the first and the second World War he lived and worked in Brno (now Czech Republic), where he founded the Department of Psychology at the University T. G. Masaryk, as well as the first laboratory for experimental psychology in Prague.

After Rostohar's retirement in 1959, social psychology at the University of Ljubljana had been taught by Prof. Nikola Rot as a guest professor from the University of Belgrade for some time. In 1965, the Chair of Social Psychology was founded and Prof. Bogomir Persic became the first full professor of social psychology and head of the Chair. His research interests included values, attitudes, national stereotypes and graphical semantic differential. He was succeeded by Prof. Marija Petric. Her research interests were mainly in the application of social psychology to the area of industrial and organisational psychology. More specifically, she was interested in different consequences of industrial fatigue, different aspects of work motivation and psychological and social workplace-loads. She was also active in the area of experimental social psychology, where she was particularly interested in the problems of individual and group decision making.

Marija Petric retired in 1993 and currently the Chair of Social Psychology at the Department of Psychology of the Faculty of Arts is occupied by two lecturers elected in the field of social psychology – Assoc. Prof. Dr. Velko S. Rus and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Janez Becaj – and Assistant Lecturer Matej Cernigoj. Research interests of Velko S. Rus include attitudes, social cognition, group dynamics, communication, societal and applied social psychology, cross-cultural and interdisciplinary approaches. He is the author of a series of textbooks/lecture notes titled "Social Psychology: Theory, Empirical Research, Experiments, Applications" and he has done a

lot of empirical research in the field of marketing and management. Velko S. Rus is also very active in the T. G. Masaryk Slovene Association for Philosophical Anthropology, Ethics and Collaboration Between Social Sciences and Humanities. The Association, which was founded in 1995 in Ljubljana, has sections for sociopsychology and psychosocial anthropology. Its members work in the field of experimental, societal, applied and cross-cultural social psychology. The effort is oriented towards a systematic synthesis of experimental, societal, applied and anthropological aspects of social psychology – on the level of the “new paradigm”, as well as on the level of particular phenomena. Interdisciplinary approaches are also pursued: since 1996, the T. G. Masaryk Association has organised several interdisciplinary symposia with participants from the fields of psychology, sociology, philosophy, economics, education, theology and history.

The research interests of Janez Becaj lie in the field of social motivation and social influence in general, and particularly in school culture. He published a textbook on social influence (*Foundations of Social Influence*, Ljubljana, 1997) and has written extensively on various aspects of school functioning from the perspective of social psychology. Matej Cernigoj is currently working on his PhD thesis. His research interests include social reality, the self, dynamical systems theory, cybernetics and qualitative research methods in social psychology. At the Department of Psychology there are also some professors from other Chairs who significantly contributed to the field of social psychology. Prof. Janek Musek is keenly interested in social values and Prof. Vid Pecjak in political psychology.

In Slovenia there are two universities, but it is possible to get a degree in psychology only at the University of Ljubljana, Faculty of arts. This is the main reason why the study of psychology in Slovenia is very broadly conceptualised. Specialisation in narrower and more specialised areas are possible at postgraduate level. The undergraduate study of psychology in Ljubljana consists of 4 years of lectures plus one year for thesis work. The whole programme is composed of about 3000 hours of lectures and lab-work. Social psychology is taught mainly in the second and the third year. Altogether, social psychology comprises 120 hours of lectures, 120 hours of lab-work and 90 hours of seminar. The main topics are social motivation, social influence, attitudes, social cognition, group dynamics,

communication, applied social psychology, and cross – cultural social psychology. The recommended literature includes different textbooks of social psychology in Slovene language written by Mirjana Ule (Ljubljana, 1992, 1994, 1997, 2000), Velko S. Rus (Ljubljana, 1993, 1997, 1999, 2000) and Janez Becaj (Ljubljana, 1997). Among textbooks in other languages, "Introduction to Social Psychology" by M. Hewstone, W. Stroebe and G. Stephenson (Eds., Blackwell, 2nd ed., 1996) is the most recommended. The approximate number of students who graduate from the Department of Psychology is around 40 per year. A more profound study in the area of social psychology is possible at the postgraduate level. The first step is MSc in social psychology (two years) followed by doctoral study.

A strong group of university lecturers, specialised and elected in the field of social psychology, also work at the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Ljubljana: Prof. Dr. Mirjana Ule, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nevenka Sadar, Assist. Prof. Dr. Vlado Miheljak and Assist. Mag. Metka Mencin Ceplak. Mirjana Ule is well known for her research on youngsters' life styles and values, as well as the author of more than 15 books published in Slovenia and abroad. She is the author of a popular textbook on social psychology (Fundamentals of Social Psychology, Ljubljana, 1992, 1994, 1997, 2000), and national co-ordinator of the field of the youth with the European Council. Social psychologists at the Faculty of Social Sciences are also collaborators of the Centre for Social Psychology. Their theoretical orientation is social constructionism (Mead, Goffman, Wheterell, Sampson, Gergen), deconstructionism (Shotter, Potter etc.), European cognitive social psychology, theory of social representations (Israel, Tajfel, Turner, Moscovici, Doise, Mugny), critical social psychology and feminist psychology. The topics of their research are identity studies, life styles, life courses, psychology of everyday life, feminist and gender studies, study of marginal groups and stigmatisation. The results of their quantitative empirical studies have been widely published. They collaborate with researchers in Great Britain, the Scandinavian states, Croatia and the United States.

At the Faculty of Social Sciences social psychology is taught within all programmes (communicology, cultural studies, political science and sociology) and during the final years of undergraduate study some special fields of social psychology are added (e.g., psychology of communication,

ecological psychology and organisational psychology). Since 1996 it is also possible to enter postgraduate study in social psychology there.

In addition to the aforementioned university staff, many other psychologists are involved in research in areas which are usually labelled as applied social psychology. These include group work, mental health and health care, social work, consumer behaviour, marketing and advertising, drug prevention programmes, mass communication, education and many other fields. But only few of them have an advanced degree or have been habilitated in social psychology. Mostly they work in teams with specialists from other domains (social workers, education specialists, physicians, psychiatrists, economists etc.). Particularly strong groups of psychologists who partly work in the field of (applied) social psychology reside at the Faculty of Education in Maribor (University of Maribor), at the Faculty of Education in Ljubljana (University of Ljubljana), at the School for Social Work (University of Ljubljana) and at the Educational Research Institute in Ljubljana.

Presently, there are not many social psychologists with the highest academic titles in Slovenia, which is hardly surprising for a country of only two million inhabitants. We hope that this picture will change soon, but for the time being we only have one active full professor and 3 associate professors. It is encouraging that interest for social psychology is increasing at the Faculty of Arts, as well as at the Faculty of Social Sciences. We already have a substantial number of colleagues with MSc in social psychology and some with PhD. Unfortunately, the number of research institutions in Slovenia where basic research in social psychology can be done is very limited. Thus, the vast majority of social psychologists are employed in the applied field and this is not likely to change very soon. We can therefore expect social psychology in Slovenia to expand mostly in the area of applied social psychology and not so much in the area of basic research. There are some attempts at the Department of Psychology of the Faculty of Arts to study fundamental theoretical issues (e.g., social motivation and social reality), but generally a more practical orientation is prevailing.

All in all, the history of social psychology in Slovenia is not very long. The present situation could perhaps be more rosy, but with increasing interest

in social psychology, wider opportunities for international collaboration and the young generations who are more proficient in foreign languages, we may hope for notable progress in the future.

Book Reviews

Why we Evaluate (2000). Gregory A. Maio & James M. Olson (Eds.)

Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 466 pages. UK list price £79.95, ISBN 0-8058-2770-6

Review by **Gerd Bohner** (University of Kent at Canterbury, UK)¹⁾

Taxonomies of attitude function have been basic textbook material for almost half a century, yet systematic research programmes based on a functional approach to attitudes have developed only recently. Greg Maio and Jim Olson present an excellent selection of chapters that document these developments. Written by many of the leading scholars in the field, these contributions provide a state-of-the-art overview of theory and research on attitude functions.

Some chapters deal in depth with *one particular attitude function*. Fazio (ch. 1) reviews his extensive research programme on the adaptive benefits (and costs) of accessible attitudes for the most basic function of object appraisal. Shavitt and Nelson (ch. 2) examine the social-identity function of attitudes toward consumer products, showing that our product preferences may profoundly influence how we are perceived by others. Starting from the classic notion of a value-expressive function, Maio and Olson (ch. 9) provide suggestive evidence for the idea that attitudes may serve to attain a variety of value-related goals.

Attitude functions in persuasion are featured in four chapters. In the context of their unimodel of persuasion, Kruglanski, Thompson and Spiegel (ch. 3) discuss how attitude functions may affect the accessibility and perceived relevance of persuasive evidence. The classic notion of

¹⁾ Gerd Bohner is Senior Lecturer at the Department of Psychology, University of Kent at Canterbury, UK (e-mail: G.Bohner@ukc.ac.uk). His research interests include attitudes and persuasion, social judgment, and gender-related attitudes and behaviour.

functional matching effects is reframed in terms of active message processing by Lavine and Snyder (ch. 4) as well as Petty, Wheeler, and Bizer (ch. 5). Mediators of persuasion identified by these authors are the biased perception and processing, as well as enhanced elaboration, of function-congruent arguments. Finally, Levin, Nichols, and Johnson (ch. 6) review literature on the motivational implications of three types of involvement for persuasion processes.

Individual differences in attitude functions are the focus of another couple of chapters. DeBono (ch. 7) reviews a series of studies showing how a particular individual difference variable shapes attitude functions: High self-monitors, who generally emphasize social-adjustive concerns, evaluate products mainly based on cues to their image (e.g. prestige of the store selling them), whereas low self-monitors, who are more concerned with value-expression, base their evaluations more on the products' actual performance. A different perspective is taken by Prentice and Carlsmith (ch. 8), who treat attitude functions as indicators of personality: Drawing an analogy between attitudes and material possessions, they find evidence for individual consistency in the functions that these objects serve.

Are effects of attitude functions truly motivational in nature, rather than the result of different belief content? This problem is confronted by Maio and Olson (ch. 9), who experimentally prime values instead of object-related functions. Similarly, Marsh and Julka (ch. 10) try to avoid confounding motivation and cognitive content by arousing motivational needs. Their approach nicely illustrates the intricacies of manipulating attitude functions, as strong arousal of motives may be found to induce negative affect or provoke reactions of defensive avoidance.

Research on *practical applications* is reviewed in four chapters. Reeder and Pryor (ch. 11) provide a link to social cognition theorizing with their two-stage model of evaluative reactions to persons with AIDS: Initial automatic reactions based on symbolic associations (e.g. linking AIDS to homosexuality) may subsequently be adjusted in a more controlled fashion, based on instrumental concerns. Herek (ch. 12) presents survey data confirming that attitudes in the AIDS domain serve both instrumental and symbolic functions, and discusses the implications for AIDS education programmes. In chapter 13, Snyder, Clary, and Stukas

explore the functions of attitude and behaviour in the domain of volunteering, identifying six functions that are meaningfully related to measures of behaviour and satisfaction. In a final chapter on applications, Ennis and Zanna (ch. 14) show that attitudes toward different types of automobile typically serve different functions.

In the final chapter 15, Maio and Olson identify emerging themes of attitude functions research and point to some open issues. They also propose a function-structure model of attitudes in which they distinguish between two types of attitude function: those of *forming attitudes per se* and those of *forming a particular evaluation*. The latter functions depend on functionally relevant information contained in the attitude structure that are activated by salient motivations.

Overall, this book provides a rich source of information for researchers in social and personality psychology. It offers a variety of theoretical perspectives, integrating theorizing on structure and process, which has long predominated in attitude research, with a renewed interest in motivational principles. The methodological approaches featured in these chapters are just as varied, and many chapters present intriguing and stimulating research findings. The only minor reservation I have concerns the lack of any reference to the concept of implicit attitudes. Given recent theoretical developments, a chapter or two on the functional significance of implicit attitudes would have been a valuable addition. The book is suitable for adoption in postgraduate and advanced undergraduate courses, although its high price makes it almost unaffordable for many students.

Psychology in Organizations: The Social Identity Approach, S. Alexander Haslam

Sage Publications: London (2001); ISBN 0 7619 6157 7, 411pp.

Review by **David De Cremer**, Associate Professor, Section Organization Studies, Maastricht University, The Netherlands.¹⁾

Social identity theory (SIT) has been around for about three decades and has proven to be one of the most profound and well-elaborated social psychology theories available. Most research on this intergroup relations theory has been conducted in the laboratory and made extensive use of ad-hoc groups. Recently, however, many among us have realised that the usefulness of SIT in predicting group behaviour may be strengthened immensely if it can be tested in and applied to real-life groups (see for example a recent book by Capozza & Brown, 2000). The present book represents such an attempt by translating SIT-principles and predictions into the life of a very much existing and salient real-life group, that is, organisations. I hasten to say, however, that Alex Haslam's book is not just a translation of experimental work into real-life settings, it also provides the reader with an excellent overview about what organisations are all about and what topics are of special interest to organisational citizens. Moreover, each chapter introduces the reader to specific research findings and insights from the organisational field before applying SIT-principles. The book is as such centred around the question "how we should understand the contribution that groups make both to the psychology of individuals within organisations and to the functioning of organisations as a whole" (p. 1).

The book includes 11 chapters each addressing a specific organisational topic. The first chapter introduces important intellectual and research paradigms applied to the field of organisations over the last 100 years. The author makes clear that by using SIT he hopes to outline a new and integrative approach to organisations. In chapter two a truly outstanding

¹⁾ David De Cremer, e-mail: d.decremer@mw.unimaas.nl

Research interests: social dilemmas, social justice, leadership, identity and pro-social behavior in general (helping, volunteering, cooperation etc.)

explanation is provided concerning the principles underlying SIT and self-categorisation theory and obvious links to organisational behaviour are already highlighted (before explaining them in detail in the subsequent chapters). Chapter three focuses on a first important organisational topic, that is, leadership. The author convincingly argues and demonstrates that leadership does not constitute an individual activity, but is clearly a feature of groups and therefore is influenced by processes associated to one's group membership. The chapter about motivation shows in an elegant and compelling way where the relevance of SIT lies. More specifically, it is proposed that a full understanding of motivation must be based on an adequate model of self Work motivation derives from ... their collective self (pp. 87-88). In the following chapter, the (probably) less familiar topic (to social psychologists) of communication illustrates that what we talk about is often an expression of our self, both at an individual or collective level (depending on the type of identity salient). Chapter 6 uses the phenomenon of 'groupthink' to demonstrate that in such group-decision making consequences are often a function of rational processes associated to one's group membership. The chapter about intergroup negotiation and conflict management does more than just show that group processes play a role. In effect, it paves the path to realise that we need to focus more on the functions of conflict (rather than perceiving conflict as purely negative) and that SIT can contribute to this awareness. In addition to understanding conflict management the author discusses the relevance of power and points out that the meaning of power depends on the fit between the perceiver and power holder group membership. In the chapter on group productivity and performance, both 'social loafing' and 'social facilitation' are used to emphasise that groups have the potential to be more productive than the sum of their parts and that the fit between task features and people's self-categorisation plays a fundamental role in this. Before closing, Haslam touches upon a topic that has not received much research attention yet, namely, collective action and industrial protest, as such suggesting an interesting and relatively unexplored avenue for SIT. Finally, the author summarises his claims made throughout the book that in contrast to organisational theories and paradigms groups do not have to be considered as something bad, but rather constitute a profound base to provide an integrated treatment of diverse organisational topics.

The book thus shows us in an elegant way that social psychologists have the potential to make a big impact in the organisational field; a task that seems worthwhile pursuing once one acknowledges contemporary organisational 'human' problems like employee satisfaction and well-being. Some useful assets as well are the suggestions for further readings and the included examples of social/organisational identification measures and manipulations. Therefore, it is very useful and informative reading for post-graduate students and the serious social or organisational psychologist researcher. For undergraduate students it is advised to complement this book with general introductions to organisational and social behaviour. To conclude, a minor point may be that for the general oriented readers and experts from other related fields (e.g., economists, organisational structure theorists) the book may appear to be focusing too much on a SIT-approach without acknowledging its obvious limitations. Nevertheless, the present book is a beautiful example of integration and shows a new direction in the social psychology of groups.

Cooperation in Modern Society by van Vugt, Snyder, Tyler and Biel (2000)

Routledge, 2000. Part of the Routledge Research International Series in Social Psychology. 245 pp.

Review by **Craig D. Parks**¹⁾ (Washington State University)

Cooperation is one of the topics in social psychology that lends itself to ready application to real-world problems. Unfortunately, while the use of real problems as sources for research is often identified as important by interdependence theorists, actual studies of such problems, or even laboratory analogues of real problems, are scarce. Cooperation in modern society takes a big step toward rectifying this. Mark van Vugt (a devoted

¹⁾ Associate Professor, Dept. of Psychology, Washington State University, Pullman, WA. email: <parkscd@mail.wsu.edu>. My research interests are cooperative, vengeful, and reciprocal behavior in settings of interdependence.

scholar of real situations of interdependence-transportation decisions is his milieu), Mark Snyder, Tom Tyler, and Anders Biel have prepared an edited volume of papers devoted to explaining why and how citizens cooperate for some greater common good. The volume stems from a 1998 workshop on the solution of social problems held at the University of Southampton. The contributors are 20 scholars, a mix of psychologists, economists, and policy analysts, all of whom have written in the past on some aspect of cooperation and real-world issues.

Many, but not all, of the contributors (and all of the editors except Snyder) are known at least in part for taking a social dilemma perspective on the problems that they study. As a result, the first reaction the reader may have is dismay at the prospect of yet another summary of social dilemma research. The past decade was glutted with such works, with psychology alone contributing two chapters in the Annual Review of Psychology and at least six books, and major reviews appearing in economics, sociology, and political science. However, the book's focus on actual situations of interdependence steers it away from that territory. Indeed, social dilemma-oriented readers will confront a host of problems that are unusual to their literature (e.g., taxpaying, organizational citizenship, social health care provision), and that have, for the most part, been studied outside of the laboratory. Further, while the social dilemma paradigm is predominant, it is by no means the only perspective. Justice theory and decision theory each inform many of the problems under study. (In fact, I wish the editors would have played this up more – I came away believing that both perspectives have the potential to make major contributions to the study of cooperation.) In terms of paradigms and problems, then, this book acts as a complement to, rather than an imitator of, the many existing social dilemma review works.

The stated goal of the book is to address the questions of why people cooperate to promote a better society, how they cooperate, and how cooperation can be sustained and encouraged (p. 4). The book is divided into three parts. The first consists of two chapters that layout the philosophy of the book (authored by the editors) and selectively review the literature on cooperation under resource dilemmas and public goods situations (Biel). The latter chapter serves as a decent introduction for newcomers, but experienced readers will find the review quite selective

– I was surprised at the number of alternate explanations for phenomena that were not mentioned – and dated. Part II contains four chapters on behavior in resource dilemma situations: van Lange, van Vugt, and De Cremer on carpooling; Tyler on willingness to let authorities make decision about resource consumption; Hatcher, Thebaud, and Jaffry discussing catch limits among fishermen; and Schlager reviewing economist Elinor Ostrom’s program of research on resource consumption. The section is nicely balanced between psychology and economics, and the papers form a cohesive unit that I found very stimulating, though a number of readers may find Hatcher and colleagues’ mathematical modeling approach a bit daunting. Those willing to work through the logic of the equations (familiarity with probit analysis is a necessity) will find it rewarding, though.

The third section of the book contains six chapters on public good-type situations. Like the second section, neither psychology nor economics dominates; unlike the second section, the set of papers is not as cohesive. We have Snyder and Omoto on volunteerism; Cropanzano and Byrne discussing organizational citizenship behaviors, defined as pro-organizational behaviors that are exterior to one’s job duties; Klandermans on social identity and participation in political protest; Elffers discussing why taxpayers do not do the individually rational thing and evade taxes; and Eek, Biel, and Gärling and Rothstein with two chapters on state provision of services that the private sector might normally provide, like health care, education, and income insurance. It was difficult to tell how Snyder and Omoto’s, and especially Klandermans’, papers fit into the overall scheme of the book. I came away from the former paper thinking of volunteerism as a distinct form of helping, rather than as an instance of cooperation, primarily because I did not see the interdependence component that the editors argue is a key feature of cooperation (p. 5). With the latter paper, it was not clear to me how participation in a political protest as a result of experiencing seemingly unjust treatment is an instance of cooperation for the betterment of society, unless one argues that the protestor always knows what’s best for society, and assumption I’m not willing to make. The book concludes with a postscript by Messick in which he emphasizes the need for an organizing framework for the study of cooperation, an emphasis with which I could not agree more.

While there is much for the reader to take away from this book, for me there were three key points. First, a sense of fair treatment is essential for the induction of cooperation. Tyler deals with this directly, and Cropanzano and Byrne, Eek and colleagues, and Rothstein all provide support for this with their phenomena (performance of organizational citizenship behaviors, acceptance of state services policies). Second, potential noncooperators undertake a mental calculus of the probability of being caught, and the costs associated with detection. These are primary components of Hatcher et al.'s and Elffers' models and suggested in van Lange et al.'s model. The final key is stated directly by Elffers: Real social dilemmas are often solved without application of a severe enforcement system. If we can figure out this occurs with one particular dilemma, we might gain insight into the solution of others.

Overall, this book is a welcome contribution to the burgeoning literature on cooperation. Beyond a simple summary of field-based studies, it highlights some potentially fruitful lines of inquiry that can be pursued by either laboratory- or field-based researchers. Students of cooperative choice will almost certainly come away with some new ideas for research.

Shared Beliefs in a Society: Social Psychological Analysis by Daniel Bar-Tal (2000)

Thousand Oaks, Ca., Sage, August 2000, pp. 232, cloth £ 35, paper £ 16,99
ISBN 0-7619-0659-2 (paperback \$29/ £16.99) 0-7619-0658-4 (hardcover,
\$52/ £35), www.sagepub.com

Review by **J. Francisco Morales**, UNED, Madrid, Spain

Beliefs have been studied by social psychologists in many different ways, but mostly from an individual perspective. To bring the sharing of beliefs by people in society into focus, introducing the concept of 'societal' beliefs, is the main contribution of this book. 'Societal' beliefs have a peculiarly 'wide and inclusive' content and serve to characterize societies

and large social systems. Among the many examples provided by the author, the Serbian belief in their 'victimhood' is perhaps one of the clearest. Four of the ten chapters of the book present and discuss at length other societal beliefs, specifically, patriotism, security, siege and delegitimization.

Beyond the important function of the maintenance of society, societal beliefs fulfil four specific functions. By helping people to gain a deeper and more efficient knowledge of their own society, shared beliefs fulfil an 'epistemic' function. Sharing the same beliefs generates internal cohesiveness and a feeling of belonging, an 'identity'. It also serves 'preservation' purposes by contributing to the stability and continuation of society and societal order. Finally, shared beliefs offer 'action guidance', in that societal beliefs are typically resorted to when members are looking for ways of rationalizing and justifying societal actions.

Corresponding to the internal structure of society is the particular configuration of societal beliefs. The same dominant and central societal belief may appear in very different societies. However, in combination with other dominant societal beliefs, each society is characterised by a particular structure. A unique structure of dominant societal beliefs, in turn, generates an 'ethos': a kind of societal summary of the issues subjectively experienced by members of society, past as well as present, and an epitome of their hopes and expectations.

Chapters two and ten, taken together, show the viability of a sociopsychological analysis of social systems larger than just the small group. Chapter two summarizes past and current work done by social psychologists on societal issues while chapter ten outlines recent work done by Billig, Staub, Reykowski, Sidanius and Worchel. They can be considered representatives of 'societal psychology', a subdiscipline of social psychology in which the sociopsychological perspective is to be applied to the study of societal and cultural contexts.

The book describes two methods of testing empirical propositions about societal beliefs. First, examination of answers to questionnaires and polls provides information about the content of societal beliefs, their prevalence in society, and their functions. A second method is content analysis of

cultural products. The author provides a convincing example of this in his analysis of school textbooks, described in chapter nine.

This book is a scholarly work and is well written. Using social cognition as its point of departure, it deals in addition with practical concerns and empirical problems, develops new concepts, and questions certain metatheoretical assumptions: a societal psychology, or macro approach, is rarely considered by mainstream social psychology. The book invites us to extend our view of the discipline. I found it so illuminating and challenging as to recommend it to anybody interested in the current state and the future of the discipline. It will be useful for graduate courses in social and cross-cultural psychology as well as for courses in intergroup relations and political psychology.

Cooperation in groups: Procedural Justice, Social identity, and behavioural engagement (2000). Tom Tyler & Steven Blader.

Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press. ISBN 1-84169-006-0

Review by **Alex Haslam** (University of Exeter, UK)¹⁾

Rethinking organizational co-operation: From personal resources to social respect

From the time that principles of equity and social exchange were formalized in theories of cooperation and collective behaviour by Adams (1965) and Thibaut and Kelly (1959), they have exerted a massive — and largely unchallenged — influence over the interpretation of a range of key social and organizational phenomena. In that work the dominant view has been that individuals engage willingly in collaborative enterprise only when the personal benefits outweigh the personal costs and when the

¹⁾ Alex Haslam is a Reader in Psychology at the Australian National University (moving to the University of Exeter in March 2001). His research examines the contribution of social identity and self-categorization processes to a broad range of social and organizational behaviours - from stereotyping and prejudice to leadership and industrial protest.

relative benefits are on a par with those received by other people with whom they compare themselves. Under this view, humans are construed as cognitive accountants whose behaviour is shaped by eternal vigilance to the personal bottom line.

This analysis is consistent with an ideology which understands the world in dog-eat dog terms, and where it is the person who makes the most of opportunities for personal advancement who is supposed to end up the winner. There are a range of contexts in which this analysis holds true. Fortunately though, it is not the whole story. And for those who persist in believing that it is, Tyler and Blader's book is seriously bad news. In the baldest terms, this is because the book carefully and systematically disabuses readers of the view that higher forms of social and organizational behaviour are the product of large agglomerations of individuals perpetually asking themselves "What's in this for me"?

At a theoretical level this case is pressed home by thorough literature reviews and an analysis inspired by Tyler and colleagues' previous elaboration of social identity principles as they pertain to issues of procedural and distributive justice (e.g., Tyler & Lind, 1992; Tyler & Smith, 1999). These ideas are also synthesised in a group engagement model which specifies links between the experience of organizational justice and behaviour. A core idea here is that productive forms of group behaviour are motivated by a concern for pride and respect. Put simply, people want to be associated with groups that enhance their collective self-esteem (pride) and, at the same time, they want those groups to make them feel good about themselves as individuals (respect).

Collaborative endeavour is therefore made possible not because people are worried about answers to the questions "What can this group do for me?" or "What do I think about this group?". Instead, it occurs because they ask themselves "What can I do for this group?" and "What does this group think about me?". As the book also explains, the latter questions are promoted when a group focuses on dispensing procedural rather than distributive justice to its members — thereby communicating a sense of fairness, inclusiveness and belongingness. For co-operation to be promoted and for organizational and social citizenship to flourish a concern for issues of social identity must therefore pre-figure personal interest (cf.

Turner, 1982). People 'go the extra mile' not when this gives them more personal resources but when it enhances their group-based sense of worth.

In the opening chapters of the book the authors mount a strong theoretical case for these arguments and for the need to pursue them. They then go on to provide details of multiple large-scale organizational studies — each addressed to a slightly different question — that competitively test between exchange- and identity-based models. In every case the rationale is clear and the results provide accessible and compelling support for the group engagement model. Indeed, a real and distinctive strength of the book lies in its attention to empirical detail, for as the weight of evidence mounts the author's case gathers considerable intellectual momentum.

In short, Tyler and Blader's volume is a consummate piece of scholarship. In the tradition of the extended essay — which is excellently revived in Banaji and Hewstone's series as a whole — it constructs a solid, important and timely argument that all readers will benefit from, and enjoy, reading. This is especially true for researchers in the organizational domain, where equity and exchange theories have actually been enfeebled by a lack of substantive opposition. So, even for those who will disagree with the authors' main premise (and there are certainly many of them; e.g., see Locke et al., 2001) the book's contribution is important and very valuable.

If I were to identify one lacuna in the book, it would be that the authors do not make much of the ideological implications of their analysis and neglect to reflect either on the political forces which have made the social identity message so unwelcome, or on the mischievous uses to which it too can easily be put. Exchange-based organizational systems sit more comfortably with a conservative agenda than those that promote shared identity, but, at the same time, cooperation is not always to be preferred to conflict, and workers cannot live on procedural justice alone. What is the appropriate and sustainable balance between, on the one hand, a world in which a concern for the personal self militates against co-operation and, on the other, a world in which procedural appeals to an all-consuming social identity encourage harder labour in return for fewer resources? This is not an easy question to answer, but it pertains to some of the big issues in contemporary management science (e.g., see Ghoshal & Bartlett, 1997;

Haslam, 2001; Sennett, 1998; Thompson & Warhurst, 1997). It relates too to the age-old contest between the individualism of Taylorism and the collectivism of the human-relations school, and so it would be informative to know how the group engagement model might contribute to this debate (something it has the clear potential to do).

In many ways, though, the authors were prudent to leave these thorny issues unaddressed — at least for now. For in the process of paradigm change to which this book contributes it is sensible to start by taking the reader on an invigorating and refreshing walk rather than on a more perplexing run. As it stands, then, the real success of the book is that it will encourage a broad readership to rethink some of the core assumptions in the mainstream psychological literature and to embark on an important and stimulating intellectual journey — one that will undoubtedly have a major impact on the discipline as a whole.

References:

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *2*, 267-296.
- Ghoshal, S. & Bartlett, C. A. (1997). *The individualized corporation: A fundamentally new approach to management*. New York: Harper Collins Business.
- Haslam, S. A. (2001). *Psychology in organizations: The social identity approach*. London: Sage
- Locke, E. A., Tirnauer, D., Roberson, O., Goldman, B., Latham, M. E. & Weldon, E. (2000). The importance of the individual in an age of groupism. In M. E. Turner (Ed.), *Groups at work: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 501-528). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sennett, R. (1998). *The corrosion of character: The personal consequences of work in the new capitalism*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Thibaut, J. & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley.
- Thompson, P. & Warhurst, C. (Eds.) (1998). *Workplaces of the future*. Houndmills: Macmillan.

- Turner, J. C. (1982). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations* (pp. 15-40). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tyler, T. & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. *Advances in Experimental social Psychology*, **25**, 115-191.
- Tyler, T. R. & Smith, H. J. (1999). Justice, social identity, and group processes. In T. R. Tyler, R. Kramer, & O. P. John (Eds.) *The psychology of the social self* (pp. 223-264). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

New Books by Members

Motivation gains in groups (Special issue of the *Zeitschrift fuer Sozialpsychologie*)

Guest Editor: **Guido Hertel** (Kiel)

Bern: Huber, 2000, 72 pages, DM 55.-- / Fr. 51.50 / öS 402.- / €28.12

ISBN: 3-456-83549-3

The growing popularity of team-work and the frequent notion of "synergy" effects in applied fields of economics and sports expresses the hope that persons could be higher motivated and more productive when they work in groups compared to individual working conditions (motivation gains). However, social-psychological research of the last decades has mainly provided evidence that persons' performance motivation decreases as soon as they work together with others (motivation losses). And although first sightings of motivation gains in groups have been documented recently, little is known yet about the preconditions to produce such effects, and much less about the psychological processes that mediate them.

This special issue comprises a first review of available research and conceptual models on motivation gains in groups in order to provide guidelines and suggestions for further research, and helpful heuristics for practitioners interested in optimizing team performance. The different contributions of the various international experts develop a comprehensive "state of the art" picture and illustrate the diverse relevant research perspectives. Some of these contributions primarily outline theoretical models that explain documented motivation gain effects and provide concrete predictions for further effects. Other contributions, however, contain new empirical reports of motivation gains, along with first explorations of the mediating psychological processes. Together, this special issue provides the first international review of current approaches on motivation gains in groups.

Psychology in Organizations. The Social Identity Approach by

S. Alexander Haslam

Sage (2000), 411 pages, 48 figures, 16 tables, 1019 references, UK price: £18.95 (pbk) £49.95 (hbk)¹⁾

The book provides:

- * Reviews and critiques of mainstream approaches to a range of key organizational topics including, leadership, motivation, communication, decision-making, negotiation, power, productivity, conflict and organizational change.
- * Comprehensive and up-to-date summaries of social identity and self-categorization theories and of the organizational research they have inspired.
- * A new and integrated approach to the psychology of organizational behaviour that has international and interdisciplinary appeal.

¹⁾ To purchase direct (or obtain inspection copies), contact <http://www.sagepub.co.uk> (in UK or USA) <http://www.astambooks.com.au> (in Australia)

* A thought-provoking and highly readable analysis of psychology in organizations that shows how all facets of organizational life – from leadership and communication to conflict management and organizational change - are affected by people's social ties and group affiliations.

* Suggestions for further reading at the end of each chapter; comprehensive glossaries of social identity, social psychological and organizational terms; details and evaluation of social identity measures and manipulations.

Generative Mental Processes: Mental Processes and Cognitive Resources.

Edited by **Ulrich von Hecker** (Cardiff University), **Stephan Dutke** (University of Kaiserslautern) and **Grzegorz Sedek** (Warsaw School of Advanced Social Psychology)

Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, Hardbound, ISBN 0-7923-6562-3, September 2000, 400 pp, NLG 270.00, / USD 143.00 / GBP 89.00, For more information and commentary statements on this book see <http://kapis.www.wkap.nl/book.htm/0-7923-6562-3>

This volume presents contributions of European and North American researchers sharing an interest in generative forms of thinking and in deployable mental resources. The special emphasis of this book is highlighting the close links that exist between apparently heterogeneous psychological domains such as basic research on memory and reasoning strategies, social cognition studies on knowledge activation and use, and research on cognitive processes in aging, depression, and anxiety. These integrative chapters not only deal with many intriguing topics concerning generative mental processes and their situational and individual constraints but also inform the reader about a variety of modern methodological instruments (to mention just a few – multinomial modelling, dual task paradigm, priming procedures, and time-accuracy functions). The book is directed to advanced students and to active researchers in many psychological disciplines (cognitive, social, and

clinical) who will appreciate this sourcebook for a deeper understanding of how higher order mental strategies may serve adaptive functions.

Chapters are contributed by

M. Conway; K. C. Klauer, T. Meiser & B. Naumer; S. Dutke; E. Necka; T. Hess; M. L. Hummert; F. Blanchard-Fields & C. Hertzog; M. G. Calvo; J. Stöber; U. von Hecker, G. Sedek & D. McIntosh; P. Hertel & T. Meiser; H. Feger; R. Kliegl, U. Mayr & K. Oberauer

Future EAESP Meetings

Please note that all forthcoming meetings are announced on the EAESP website (news). You can find there the titles, dates, and contact addresses.

13th General Meeting of the EAESP

June, 26th – 29th 2002, San Sebastian (Spain)

We are happy to announce that the next General Meeting will take place in San Sebastian from June 26th to 29th, 2002. San Sebastian is located at the coast of Northern Spain, in the Basque Country. The scientific programme will be held in the Kursaal, a very unique and modern location which is located directly on the beautiful beach and in the heart of the city. Hotels and hostels will be available in different categories, more information as well as registration and accommodation forms will follow in the next issue of the Bulletin.

Scientific Programme

The responsibility for the scientific program of the General Meeting rests with a Scientific Committee, appointed by the Executive Committee. It consists of Sabino Ayestaran (San Sebastian), Rupert Brown (Kent), Dario Paez (San Sebastian), Eddy Van Avermaet (Leuven), and Jorge Vala (Lisbon). Eddy Van Avermaet will chair and coordinate the activities of the Scientific Committee.

An official call for papers will not be launched until the May issue of the Bulletin, but we already take this early opportunity to invite you to begin and consider submissions of proposals. Below are a few points that can already be kept in mind in this regard.

1. We invite submissions of proposals for symposia and for individual contributions (poster and oral).
2. Submissions can be made, beginning in May, through a website. This website is currently under construction. It will definitely be in

operation in May. Alternative modes of making submissions will be accepted, but - to keep our administrative costs down - they are being discouraged.

3. Submissions for symposia should include, aside from the coordinates of the convenor/chair and the other contributors, a summary (about 250 words) explaining the rationale for the symposium theme as well as an indication of how the contributions will fit within this theme. Symposia will be limited to a half a day in the program, with a maximum of 7 individual slots (one of which can be allocated to an identified, appointed discussant).
4. Participants in symposia will have to submit an abstract (150 words) and a summary (250 words) of their presentation. The former will appear in the Book of Abstracts, the latter will be used as a basis for making decisions about the submission.
5. Submissions for individual contributions (poster/oral) will likewise be accompanied by an abstract and a somewhat more extensive summary.
6. When submitting an individual contribution, participants can indicate whether they prefer an oral or a poster presentation. If the number of submissions for oral presentations would exceed the number of time slots available, some submitters will be asked to gracefully agree to present their contribution as a poster instead.
7. Plans are being made to organise also the poster meetings as thematic sessions (with an opportunity for a brief presentation and a general discussion).
8. The deadline for submissions will be November 15, 2001.
9. Judgments about the inclusion of papers in the programme will be made by the Scientific Committee in December 2001. By January members will learn whether their proposals have been accepted.
10. Each participant can only be a first author for one oral presentation at the Meeting (discounting the role of discussant in a symposium).

We are looking forward to receiving your proposals later this year. Any questions you might have at this early stage concerning the scientific program can be put to Eddy.VanAvermaet@psy.kuleuven.ac.be

The Scientific Committee

Small Goup Meeting

Shared Reality in Individual and Group Life

September 2001, University of Amsterdam

[Organizers: Miroslaw Kofta (Poland) & Arie Kruglanski (USA)]

The aim of the meeting is to discuss whereby shared social reality constructed in the course of social interaction and the implications this has for the way persons function as individuals and as group members. The meeting will take place in Poland in the last week of September, 2001.

In recent years, there has been growing interest in the phenomenon of social reality construction and the role it plays in individual functioning and social interaction. The quality of our psychological existence (e.g., the way we construct our individual and social selves) may depend on the perception that we share world views with others (e.g. family, peers, ethnic group). Perception of social consensus may also account for the collective construction of the group as “entity” and for group identification. Moreover, there are reasons to assume that the forging of social realities is more intense under some circumstances than others, for some individuals more than for others, and in some groups more than in others. It is thus important to explore the conditions that augment the tendencies toward social reality construction and to investigate the kinds of groups that develop where firm social realities and consensual social environments are desired. Equally interesting seems to explore how people respond to the experience that some of their world views are not shared by others (e.g., peers, compatriots etc.).

Our meeting will center around the following problems: the processes whereby social reality is forged and maintained in the course of social interaction, the function of social reality in maintaining personal and social identities, its impact on group formation, leadership, and the decision making structures on groups, and its influence on intergroup relations (e.g., stereotyping and prejudice). Other related topics are welcome.

Colleagues interested should contact Miroslaw Kofta, Warsaw University, Faculty of Psychology, Stawki 5/7 Str., 00-183 Warsaw, email: kofta@sci.psych.uw.edu.pl

Small Goup Meeting

Social Identity: Motivational, Affective and Cross-Cultural Aspects

September, 5-9 2001, Villasimius, Cagliari (Italy)

[Organizers: Dora Capozza (Italy) & Rupert Brown (UK)]

Tajfel and Turner's Social Identity Theory (SIT) continues to be a major focus of theoretical and empirical analysis. Just in the last three years no less than four edited books (Abrams & Hogg, 1999; Capozza & Brown, 2000; Ellemers et al, 1999; Worchel et al, 1998) and one major review article (Brown, 2000) have been devoted to examining and extending the utility and applicability of social identity concepts in intergroup relations and related fields. The objectives of the Small Group Meeting are to reflect some of these developments and stimulate new ones by considering especially *motivational* and *affective* aspects of social identity processes, and by discussing the *cross-cultural* generality of some of the key concepts of SIT. Our deliberations concerning these issues may shed new light on important social problems like prejudice, bigotry and intense social conflicts around the world. Arguably, SIT, while initially promising to shed much light on these questions, has yet to live up to that potential. Also, there is no doubt that research inspired by SIT has been very occidento-centric, leaving open the important questions about the cultural generality and specificity of some of its findings.

The meeting will take place from 5 (arrival in the morning or afternoon) until 9 September (departure in the morning) at Villasimius, Cagliari (Sardegna, Italy). Villasimius is a small town near Cagliari, known for the beautiful sea and its uncontaminated nature. The meeting will be

organized by Dora Capozza (University of Padova) and Rupert Brown (University of Kent). The aim is to bring together about 22 researchers, whose current work is contributing to debates on the issues of the meeting. All the accommodation and living costs for the conference will be covered. Participants will thus have only to find their own travel expenses.

GUIDELINES FOR ABSTRACT SUBMISSIONS

Please send abstracts of one page (300 words at maximum) electronically to: capozza@psico.unipd.it or falvo@mail.psy.unipd.it

Together with your abstract, please provide us with the full postal address and the email address of the presenter. Deadline for abstract submissions is 30 April 2001.

Inquiries concerning the meeting or abstract submissions should be directed to Dora Capozza (capozza@psico.unipd.it) or Rossella Falvo (falvo@mail.psy.unipd.it).

Reports of Previous Meetings

Medium Size Meeting

The Psychology of Domination: Social Structure, Social Reproduction, and Social Change

At Grenoble, France, 15th-17th March 2000

Organized by E. Dépret, S. Reicher, F. Butera & R. Spears

Under the impetus of Henry Tajfel, Serge Moscovici and many others, European social psychology originally grew out of a concern for societal issues, calling for a more 'social' social psychology and a closer integration of psychological and sociological levels of analysis. This implied an interest for the interaction between social structural and psychological variables and a concern for the twin issues of social reproduction and social change. As time has gone by, however, this original focus has arguably lost its priority and the analysis of cognitive processes has often been divorced from the analysis of the wider social context, as if people behaved in a 'social vacuum'. Hoping to explore new directions for research and develop new collaborations, our meeting aimed at gathering an international group of social psychologists who had been working on issues of social structure, social reproduction and social change. More specifically, because as soon as one considers the wider social context in which people behave one immediately confronts the power dimension, we were interested in discussing the psychological correlates of social domination as well as the social psychological processes involved in social reproduction and social change.

Our call for papers was very successful; we received over 40 proposals whereas we had originally planned to keep the number of participants down to 30 in order to have no parallel sessions and secure enough time for plenary discussion. What a painful task it was to select participants! Narrowing the field to five coherent sessions helped us in our task: *Power, Hierarchies and Social Structure* (day 1, morning: S.H. Ng, J-L. Beauvois,

R. Bourhis, F. Lorenzi-Cioldi, E. Dépret), *Stereotypes, Prejudice and Social reproduction* (day 1, afternoon: M. Kemmelmeier, S. Guimond, A. Rutland, C. Staerklé, G. Poeschl, J-C. Croizet, R. Spears), *Acting for Social Change* (day 2, morning: M. Snyder, G. Maio, M. Van Vugt, B. Simon, I. Rodriguez, S. Reicher), *Social Change and Political Processes* (day 2, afternoon: X. Chryssochoou, B. Klandermans, J. Laszlo, F. Colucci, S. Condor), *Social Influence and Social Change- General Conclusion* (day 3, morning: G. Mugny, R. Prislín, W. Crano, F. Butera, S. Reicher).

On the first morning we discussed general issues of power, how power is reflected in language, how a liberal exercise of power can produce rationalization and interiorization in subordinates, how power differentials between groups affect intergroup behavior and perceptions. We quickly realized that the food and wines served for lunch at the university restaurant were so tasty and plentiful that much coffee would be needed for the afternoon sessions... In the afternoon we essentially discussed stereotyping as an ideological device serving to justify and legitimize inequalities between groups, countries, classes, genders, as well as some implications of social dominance theory for the production and reproduction of hierarchies. The weather outside was fantastic and the participants enjoyed the beautiful views of the snowy mountains surrounding the city on the tram ride bringing them back from the campus to the hotels located in down-town Grenoble. In the evening we had planned a social event: having dinner together at a scenic restaurant on the top of the mountain right above Grenoble. This implied, however, that, in order to reach the reward of sublime food, participants had to get into the cabins of a teleferic lifting them up from down-town Grenoble to the restaurant. This was a fascinating experience in itself. Imagine a bunch of social psychologists, many of them not that familiar with each other, waiting in line for the teleferic: they look serious and professional and discuss professional matters quietly. Now, as soon as they enter the cabins, the atmosphere changes radically. Everyone feel tense, and in order to cope, and maybe also in order not to look stressed, people start joking and laughing: «Anybody got a parachute?...», «Is there a life insurance included in our membership fee to the association?...», «What is the status of an affiliate member in case of an accident?...» etc... Teleferic management theory was invented that day. What started with a group of well-behaved professionals ended 10 minutes later with a warm, cheerful

and friendly crowd. From that moment on, we knew the meeting would be a success, although some of our graduate students still regret that they did not have a questionnaire ready to complete before and after the teleferic lift! What a nice illustration of some personal attraction (misattribution of arousal, personal disclosure?) and group cohesion processes (sharing a dangerous fate?). The dinner was excellent and the view of the city lights down in the valley, through the panoramic windows of the restaurant, was truly amazing. The lift down to Grenoble was even more scary although, at that time of the night, the wines had produced their appeasing effects...

On the second day of the meeting we started discussing social change processes. Some approached social change in terms of the individual mechanisms leading a person to act for change (the psychology of volunteerism, the role of values in prosocial behavior, exit and voice in exchange relations) while others focused on social movements participation (calculation and identification, actor-networks) and others adopted a still a broader perspective by discussing the representation of identities in political discourses and the changes in identities and subjectivity occurring before, during and after political changes. At this point, however, significant disagreements between participants emerged: can collective action be reduced to a sum of individual decisions? Can social change be reduced to participation in, say, recycling programs? These disagreements suggested that it seem easier for social psychologists to conceive social domination and its reproduction rather than social change. They may also suggest that there was no underlying consensus with regard to what is there to be changed, and what is the nature of the social order. At this point, while we were engaged in intense intellectual debate about social change, external social reality imposed itself on us with a certain irony: a national strike had been called for that day in order to demand better funding for public education. In concrete terms, this meant that many of the university restaurant staff were on strike. We were informed that although the restaurant was closed students and university employees that day, it was opened to us and our lunch was ready. A debate immediately arose among us: what to do, to eat or not to eat, to support the strikers and waste the food or to enjoy a meal served by non-strikers? After a long discussion, we ultimately decided that it was a matter of individual consciousness: a small majority of us then decided to

get a sandwich somewhere in town while the rest of us had the scheduled lunch.

In terms of group dynamics, and taking into account both the topic of our discussions (social domination and reproduction on day one, social change on day two) and some powerful situational factors (the teleferic on day one, the strike on day two), it seemed that we felt like a good, cohesive group at the end of day one, and a not-so-good, divided group at the end of day two. Fortunately, the third, and last, day was there to gather the group together again around a lively discussion of social change in terms of minority/majority influence and intragroup processes such as group maintenance. The group carefully avoided any self-analysis on the topic of the 'restaurant dilemma', despite the fact that we were informed that the strike had been successful in getting the French government to find more money for public education... We concluded the meeting with a great lunch, all together at the university restaurant! Everybody agreed that the local organizers had done a remarkable job, planning everything to the finest details in order to make everyone feel at home, and the participants warmly thanked Eric, Fabrizio and their graduate students, who looked both delighted and exhausted. Everybody also agreed that the meeting had been both intellectually stimulating and an unforgettable human experience: what a good group we had been! As difficult as it was to separate, people parted with promises of closer contacts, new research collaborations, the publication of a book together, and the organization of another meeting.

From the deepest of our heart, we want to thank all the participants for coming to Grenoble and sharing with us, especially those who came from very far away. We also want to thank the EAESP and its executive committee for making such unique intellectual and human events possible. Meeting such as this one certainly make up for the reading of many books and articles for the most enriching exchanges occur often late at night, in front of a glass of wine and away from the day to day preoccupations, when people feel free to develop their arguments to their logical extreme and feel free to fully uncover the meta-theoretical and political views which underly much of their thinking (those who spent several sleepless nights arguing will recognize themselves...).

A last word from the organizers to the participants: No, the teleferic lift was not part of an experiment; No, the restaurant strike was not planned, and No, in line with ethical standards, we won't use the data without your consent...

The organisers: Eric Dépret
Steve Reicher
Fabrizio Butera
Russel Spears

Report on the first EAESP-SPSP International Teaching Fellowship

awarded to Mark Snyder (University of Minnesota,
Minneapolis, USA) and Bernd Simon (University of Kiel,
Germany)

Sponsored by a joint fellowship from the EAESP and SPSP, Professor Mark Snyder spent one week as a Fellow of the Institute of Psychology at the University of Kiel from September 3-9, 2000. During that week Mark Snyder and Bernd Simon provided instruction and supervision for a group of 10 graduate students in psychology. The participating students were Wieslaw Baryla (University of Gdansk, Poland), Claudia Kampmeier (University of Kiel, Germany), Ludger Klein (University of Kiel, Germany), Markus Lücken (University of Kiel, Germany), Liisa Myyry (University of Helsinki, Finland), Kinga Fieber-Dabrowska (University of Warsaw, Poland), Iris Six-Materna (University of Kiel, Germany), Stefan Stürmer (University of Kiel, Germany) Chris von Borgstede (University of Göteborg, Sweden), and Marco Waage (University of Greifswald, Germany). The event was organized in form of a one-week workshop around the topic "**Working for the Community: Prosocial Behavior and Volunteerism.**"

On a general level, the aim of the workshop was to explore the contributions of psychological theory and basic research to the solution of a pressing social or societal problem. More specifically, in most modern (but not only modern) societies, state expenditures for welfare and other community services have recently been, and continue to be, drastically reduced. As a consequence, a great many of these services become increasingly dependent on the contributions, work and lasting commitment of volunteers. Psychology, and especially social and personality psychology, has much to offer for a better understanding of the individual and social determinants, dynamics, and processes that underlie people's willingness or unwillingness to take individual and collective action on behalf of causes that transcend their own egoistic interests. Moreover, the study of individual and collective action provides an exciting opportunity to develop and test psychological theories in the context of socially significant phenomena and processes.

The workshop provided students with the theoretical and methodological knowledge that is necessary to further develop and refine psychology's contribution to ensuring community services and volunteer work in times of reduced public funding. In addition, by emphasizing the role of theory and basic research in this problem solving process, it was illustrated that the strict separation of basic and applied research is rather artificial and counterproductive and that, to the contrary, the state of both basic and applied research is enhanced by building mutually supportive bridges and connections between the two enterprises.

The workshop included lectures by Mark Snyder, presentations of theoretical and methodological ideas as well as of planned or ongoing doctoral research by the graduate students, small group and one-on-one supervision and instruction of the students by Mark Snyder, and, last but not least, social and tourist events (e.g., reception at the social psychology laboratory, boat trip, visit to the Buddenbrooks-House in Lübeck, farewell dinner in a fine local restaurant). The workshop was co-sponsored by the University of Kiel and the State Ministry of Education.

The workshop participants are eager to continue their scientific collaboration beyond the actual workshop. Specifically, two collaborative research projects were prepared during the workshop that will further be

developed and conducted in the near future. A formal evaluation questionnaire as well as several narrative reports by participating students confirmed that the workshop was a great success, both intellectually and socially. The following excerpts from three different reports illustrate this very nicely:

"...The introduction lecture by Prof. Mark Snyder was very inspiring for our further discussion in sub-group meetings. In his exciting presentation Mark argued for a functional approach in studying reasons for which people volunteer. Presentations of individual projects by the postgraduate participants varied substantially in form and content, some presentations were more data driven, others were more conceptual in nature; some were closely connected to the workshop topic, others were, well, not so close. However, all presentations were interesting, well-prepared and in the course of discussion we were able to find their connection to the workshop main topic. In the first two days we prepared for hard work in sub-groups. (...) We discussed such topics as prevalence of prosocial behavior motivations across different countries, egoistic motivations of helping, power relations between the helper and helpee, and dependence of volunteering on social group memberships. Two projects of experimental studies resulted from these hours of debate, as well as our conviction that we wanted to stay in touch and to conduct these studies..." (Wieslaw Baryla)

"...Before the workshop I was a little bit sceptical about participating because I am at the very beginning of my research and so I was not sure what I could contribute to the workshop - but now I think it was just the right time for me. I learned a lot from all participants and of course from Mark Snyder and Bernd Simon. It was an excellent atmosphere to invent new ideas for future research and to get additional motivation and crucial hints for ongoing projects..." (Marco Waage)

"...The sub-group I belonged to (...) consisted of members with quiet different scientific approaches (e.g. a 'cognitivist' from Poland, a more quantitative researcher from Kiel, and me with a more qualitative approach, supported by a colleague from Greifswald). Hence it was challenging, and even exciting to stand for your own position. And finally

this happened in a very friendly, patient, and effective atmosphere, and resulted in fruitful discussions..." (Ludger Klein)

Grants

GRANT REPORTS

**Anja Eller, University of Kent at Canterbury, UK
(postgraduate travel grant)**

The EAESP postgraduate travel grant has allowed me to spend four months at the Institute of Social Research of the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) in Mexico City. This has proven to be an invaluable experience, enabling me not only to collect the Time 2 data of my longitudinal study of Mexican employees of international corporations, but also to acquire an in-depth understanding of the cultural context within which my doctoral research is taking place.

My Ph.D. research involves testing Pettigrew's (1998) model of Allport's (1954) original intergroup contact hypothesis by virtue of longitudinal field studies in Mexico, using real-life, naturalistic settings. Having collected the Time 1 data in 1999, I conducted the second wave of this study during this year's stay in Mexico. This survey study assesses the quantity and the quality of contact between Mexicans and their American co-workers, the various posited mediating variables, and levels of intergroup bias.

Results from the first time point are generally corroborative of Pettigrew's model, pointing to the importance of quality, as opposed to mere quantity, of contact, and showing that three of the four postulated mediating variables did indeed have mediating effects. Time 2 data are currently being analysed, and it is expected that outgroup bias will decrease as contact becomes more intimate, and that relationships between variables will become stronger over time.

During my stay in Mexico, I also participated in an intensive summer course at the Centro de Enseñanza para Extranjeros (CEPE), which is affiliated to the UNAM. This course comprised the subjects of *Mexican-American relations*, *The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA): Recent developments in the Mexican economic and political situation* and *Ethnicity and nationality*. This course, together with the frequent academic discussions I had with Dr. Luna and her colleague Julia Flores, a specialist on cultural values, as well as a more general witnessing of current events (while I was in Mexico, the first democratic presidential elections in some 70 years took place), has allowed me to gain a profound insight into the politico-economic framework of Mexican-American relations and into the complexity of Mexican cultural and national identity.

I feel that my stay in Mexico has been very beneficial for me, in personal as well as academic terms. There, I have been confronted with different methods of conducting research and a different culture and way of life, which has broadened my horizon in many ways. I would like to express my sincere thanks to the EAESP for supporting my visit.

Daan Scheepers, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(postgraduate travel grant)

I visited the University of Kansas during a beautiful autumn, from September till December 2000. The main goal for this visit was to develop research together with Prof. Nyla Branscombe. After extensive discussions on a variety of topics, our collaboration became somewhat more specific by means of an experiment on the Black Sheep phenomenon.

We hypothesised that black sheeps might emerge in groups for different reasons as a function of the status differentials between groups, and the legitimacy of these differences. Drawing from social identity principles, we predicted that ingroup members in a low status group who claim that the status is legitimate, and those in a high status group who claim that the

status of the group is illegitimate will be viewed as being negative for the group. In the former case because he/ she blocks social change tendencies, in the latter case, because he/ she forms a direct threat to the value of the group.

We tested these two predictions using a modified minimal group paradigm in which we manipulated the status differentials between the groups and the il(legitimacy) of these differences by means of an ingroup member who claimed the (un)fairness of the differences. The results confirmed our predictions. A person who in the high status group claimed that the status was illegitimate and a person who claimed in the low status group that the status was legitimate was seen as being less valuable for the group. Moreover, it appeared that these "black sheeps" undermined the perceived cohesiveness of the group. Finally, we also included a voting procedure in which the participant had to vote for an ingroup member to become leader on a group task (we started running this experiment on November 7-th, the day of the now famous presidential election). It appeared that black sheeps were avoided to be leader on this task. In sum, these results provide insight in the circumstances under which people become black sheeps, and the implications for intragroup (leadership) as well as intergroup (perceived cohesion) processes.

Besides conducting this research, I also presented some of my other research during the weekly lab-meeting. I attended the other meetings as well, and had nice discussions with other people at KU. It was interesting and informative to see and discuss the different angles from which intergroup relations are studied in Northern America and Europe. Integration of different perspectives on intergroup discrimination is part of the research I am doing for my PhD.-project and in that sense, apart from the experiment we conducted, my visit was a fruitful one. Finally, I also did some reading and writing while at KU.

All in all, my time in Kansas was a good experience for me as a scientist and more in general as a person. Another example of this is that my stay in the US improved, I think, my command of the English language. I look forward to continue collaboration in the future. For this moment, I look back at a productive and intellectually stimulating time at KU. I'm very grateful for the financial support of the EAESP that made this possible.

Announcements

New Editorship EJSP - Call for Nominations

The four-year term of the current editors of the European Journal of Social Psychology will end by end of the year 2001. Fritz Strack (Editor) and his Associate Editors Leonel Garcia-Marques, Yechiel Klar, Bernd Simon, Charles Stangor, Paul van Lange, and Roos Vonk have succeeded in further increasing the reputation of the journal, the number of submissions, and the overall quality of the reviewing process and resulting contributions. So the development of EJSP is certainly a story of continuing success.

As you may know, nomination and appointment of editors is within our Association's responsibility. Of course, the EAESP is interested in maintaining and fostering standards and quality of its journal. With this goal in mind, the Executive Committee is seeking for a new panel of editors who are willing and able to take over the Journal in January 2002.

Your proposal, which should be addressed to the Secretary of EAESP, Dominic Abrams, should only nominate a Chief Editor. It is customary that the Editor himself or herself chooses his or her Associate Editors. Apart from the organisational and logistic preconditions that are necessary to edit an international journal like EJSP, nominees should themselves be respected for their own scientific contributions and their own experience in the peer-reviewing process.

Nominations should only be made with the written consent of the nominee, and should include:

- a letter of support from the nominator
- the curriculum vitae of the nominee
- a 1-page statement of the nominee of his/her perspective on the editorial process and his/her objectives for the journal.

The secretary will ask for the advice of expert consultants before the Executive Committee will make a final decision. Note that current members of the Executive Committee will not be permitted to be nominators or nominees.

Needless to say that nominations will be treated confidentially until a decision has been made around April or May. Only the name of the new Chief Editor will then be published but not the names of other nominees.

European Monographs in Social Psychology

As many members will be aware, amongst its several activities in the dissemination of social psychological knowledge, the Association sponsors the *European Monographs in Social Psychology*. This Series is published internationally by Psychology Press. Since its inception in 1971, the Series has acquired a considerable reputation for publishing and promoting the highest quality writing in European Social Psychology.

The aim is to provide an outlet for sustained programmes of theoretical, empirical or applied research, some of which may have been published elsewhere but never before integrated into a coherent corpus of work. The editor and his advisory board have no preconceptions as to the subject matter or theoretical orientation of potential manuscripts; the only consideration is quality: does the work make an interesting, substantial and original contribution to its domain? This eclectic editorial policy is clearly evident in the volumes which have appeared since the Series' re-launch in 1993: Doise, Clemence & Lorenzi-Cioldi (1993) *The quantitative analysis of social representations*; Beauvois & Joule (1996) *A radical dissonance theory*; Kelly & Breinlinger (1996) *Social psychology of collective action*; Monteil & Huguet (1996) *Social context and cognitive performance*; Kirchler, Rodler, Hölzl & Meier (2001) *Conflict and decision-making in close relationships*; Hagendoorn, Linssen & Tumanov (in press) *Intergroup relations in States of the former Soviet Union*.

The Series editor, Rupert Brown, welcomes informal or formal approaches from colleagues who think they may have a potential project for The Series. The only requirement is that the principal author's main institutional affiliation should be in a country that would qualify that person for full (and not affiliate) membership of the Association. Further details on submission procedures are available from the Members' Profile handbook or from the Series Editor.

For more information about published and forthcoming titles in the series, please visit the Psychology Press website at www.psypress.co.uk. You can order books using your credit card either online using the secure server, or by phone at +44 (0)8700 768853.

News from the European Journal of Social Psychology

The editors of the European Journal have been trying continuously to increase the attractiveness of the Journal to readers and to authors. As an outward sign, the format of the Journal has changed to what has now become an international standard. More important is that we have been able to reduce the backlog and the turnaround time for articles submitted to EJSP. In the year 2000 we received 205 manuscripts. The average time taken between their receipt and the first decision was 99 days. At present, the publication lag is between six and eight months.

Fritz Strack, Editor

The British Psychological Society
SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY SECTION ANNUAL CONFERENCE
Social Psychology European Research Institute
University of Surrey, 18 - 20 July 2001

FIRST CALL FOR PAPERS:

This year the Social Psychology Section aims to organise an Annual Conference which will make a significant contribution to the British Psychological Society's centenary celebrations. We hope to attract submissions from both established and younger researchers in the discipline and to organise other satellite events such as an exhibition of books and artefacts reflecting the history of social psychology. We have invited speakers not only from Europe and Britain but also from the United States as well.

Submissions are being sought from both British and international researchers working in any area of social psychology. We are especially keen to include contributions which address CURRENT THEORETICAL DEBATES IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY and/or highlight the RELEVANCE OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY TO SOCIAL ISSUES. We welcome submissions for individual papers, posters and symposia, as well as suggestions for roundtable discussions/debates or workshops

Keynote speakers include Rom Harré (Linacre College, Oxford, UK) and Jacques-Philippe Leyens (Université Catholique de Louvain, Belgium).

Please note the dates of this year's conference. The conference will take place in July rather than the usual time of September.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION

Individual papers will be of 30 minutes duration (including questions). Symposia will normally include four papers organised around a common theme. Submissions should be in the following format: Individual papers and posters: title, author(s), affiliation(s), address for correspondence, 200 word abstract, 1000 word structured summary. Symposia: symposium title, convenor(s), affiliation(s), address for correspondence, 1000 word summary justifying the symposium theme and explaining the

contribution of each paper, plus title, author(s), affiliation(s) and 200 word abstract of each paper.

The DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSIONS is 5 p.m. on Wednesday 28 February 2001.

Please submit three paper copies of each submission and a diskette with the submission saved in RICH TEXT FORMAT (rtf). Send all submissions to Dr Julie Barnett, Social Psychology Section Annual Conference, Social Psychology European Research Institute, School of Human Sciences, University of Surrey, Guildford, GU2 7XH, UK.

All enquiries should be addressed to Patricia Yehia, Social Psychology Section Annual Conference, Social Psychology European Research Institute, School of Human Sciences, University of Surrey, Guildford, GU2 7XH, UK, tel: ++44 (0)1483 879436, fax ++44 (0) 1483 , e-mail: P.Yehia@surrey.ac.uk.

Please check the conference web site at <http://www.surrey.ac.uk/Psychology/SPS2001/> for registration forms and further details of speakers and symposia as they become available.

DEADLINES FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Administrative Secretary by **March, 1st, 2001** latest. Applications for personal grants and for the International Teaching Fellowship Scheme can be received at any time. The deadline for the next issue of the Bulletin is April 10th 2001.

News about Members**NEW ADDRESSES**

Please note the new service on the EAESP website. You can find all members' names in the membership list. If you wish to add your address and/or e-mail address so that others can contact you easily please do so by using a form on the website.

Arjan BOS
Department of Social Sciences
Open University
P.O. Box 2960
6401 DL Heerlen
The Netherlands
off: +31-45-5762172
fax: +31-45-5762939
Arjan.Bos@ou.nl

Dr. Anne-Marie COSTALAT
anne-marie.costalat@univ-
montp3.fr

Dr. David DE CREMER
Department of Experimental
Psychology
P.O. Box 616
6200 MD Maastricht
The Netherlands
fax: + 31-43-3884196
D.deCremer@mw.unimaas.nl

Dr. Claude FLAMENT
flamentclaude@wanadoo.fr

Lorena GIL DE MONTES
Department of social psychology
and methodology
University of the Basque
Country
Tolosa hiribidea, 70
20018 San Sebastian
Spain
psbgietl@ss.ehu.es

Dr. Roberto GONZÁLEZ
Escuela de Psicología
Facultad de Ciencias Sociales.
P. Universidad Católica de Chile
Campus San Joaquín
San Joaquín
Santiago
Chile
off: +56-2-6864856
fax : +56-2-6864844
rgonzale@puc.cl

Dr. Geoffrey HADDOCK
G.Haddock@bristol.ac.uk

Dr. Alex HASLAM
School of Psychology
University of Exeter
Exeter EX4 4QG
UK
off: +44 1392 264618
fax: +44 1392 264600
A.Haslam@exeter.ac.uk

Dr. Miles HEWSTONE
School of Psychology
Cardiff University
PO Box 901 Cardiff
CF10 3YG Wales
UK
off: +44-2920-874568
fax: +44-2920-874858
Hewstone@cardiff.ac.uk

Dr. Sik Hung NG
Dept. of Applied Social Studies
City University of Hong Kong
83, Tat Chee Avenue
Kowloon
Hong Kong
off: +852-2788-8989
fax: +852-2788-8960
sikhung.ng@cityu.edu.hk

Dr. Velko S. RUS
Department of Psychology
Faculty of Arts
Aškerceva 2
1000 Ljubljana
Slovenia
off: +386-01-2411166
fax: +386-01-1259337
velko.rus@ff.uni-lj.si

home: Rasiska 6, 1000 Ljubljana
Slovenia
Velko.Rus@guest.arnes.si

Frank SIEBLER
Wiesenstr. 52
D-76706 Dettenheim
Germany
siebler@gmx.net

Dr. Stephen SUTTON
Professor of Behavioural Science
Institute of Public Health
University of Cambridge
Robinson Way
Cambridge CB2 2SR
UK

Dr. Giancarlo TANUCCI
Dip. Psicologia dei Processi di
Sviluppo e Socializzazione
Univ. di Roma "La Sapienza"
via dei Marsi, 78
I-00185 Roma
Italy
off: +39-06-49917721
fax: +39-06-49917652
priv: +39-06-5812194
giancarlo.tanucci@uniroma1.it

Yanélia Caroline YABAR
Post-doctoral fellowship
University of Québec in
Montréal
P.O. Box 888, Station "centre-
ville"
Montréal, QC H3C3P8
Canada
off: +1-514-9873000 # 0297
yanelia_yabar@hotmail.com

Marcel ZEELENBERG
Department of Economic and
Social Psychology
Tilburg University
PO Box 90153
5000-LE Tilburg
The Netherlands
off: +31-13-4668276
fax: +31-13-4662370
M.Zeelenberg@kub.nl

The office address of the Administrative Secretary will change soon. From March 1st onwards it will be:

Sibylle Classen
von-Schonebeck-Ring 77
D-48161 Muenster
Germany
fax: +49-2533-281144
e-mail address will stay unchanged: sibylle@eaesp.org

RESIGNATIONS

Alexia ANDREOPOULOU, Ptolemaida, Greece
Dr. Elisabeth ARDEL, Salzburg, Austria
Karen JORDENS, Brussels, Belgium
Dr. Mariet HAAGEDORN, Groningen, The Netherlands
Paul HARLAND, Leiden, The Netherlands
Dr. Peter PETZOLD, Giessen, Germany

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, von-Schönebeck-Ring 77, D-48161 Münster, Germany
fax: +49-2533-281144
email: sibylle@eaesp.org

web site of the EAESP:

<http://www.eaesp.org>