

European Bulletin of Social Psychology

Editors: Dominic Abrams & Sibylle Classen

2 Editorial

4 Article

Gender and Social Psychology in Spain
by Miguel Moya & Rosa Rodríguez-Bailón

18 Book Reviews

Handbook of Social Comparison. Theory and Research (2000) Eds: J. Suls
& L. Wheeler. Review by Vera Hoorens

*The Message Within: The Role of Subjective Experience in Social
Cognition and Behavior* (2000). Eds.: H. Bless., & J.P. Forgas. Review by
Gregory R. Maio

27 New Books by Members

*Projektgruppen in Organisationen. Praktische Erfahrungen und Erträge
der Forschung (Project Groups in Organisations. Practice and Research)*
(March 2001) Eds.: Rudolf Fisch, Dieter Beck & Birte English

Group Processes and Intergroup Relations (a special issue on "Social
Identity Processes in Organizations (July 2001) – guest edited by Daan
van Knippenberg & Michael Hogg

30 Future EAESP Meetings

13th General Meeting of the EAESP, June 26th – 29th, 2002 San Sebastian
(Spain)

Small Group Meeting on Social Differentiation within Groups, July 2002,
Porto (Portugal)

EAESP Summer School, August 18th – September 1st, 2002, Marburg
(Germany)

40 Reports of Previous Meetings

Report on the *Summer School 2000*, Clermont-Ferrand (France)

63 Grants and Grant reports

66 Announcements

Next Editor of the European Journal

Election of New Executive Committee Members – Call for Nominations

Jos Jaspars Lecture – Call for Applications

Ninth Brisbane Symposium on Social Identity, Brisbane (Australia)

Deadlines for Contributions to the Executive Committee

70 News about Members

New Members of the Association

73 Executive Committee

Editorial

In this issue of the Bulletin there is a substantial article on gender and social psychology in Spain, reviews of two books, a report from the very successful EAESP Summer School in Clermont Ferrand, announcements, and reports from meetings. In addition there are several points of information and announcements we would like you to pay particular attention to.

First, you will have noticed that, in recognition of the fact that we work together closely on the Bulletin Sibylle Classen has joined Dominic Abrams as co-editor. As the Bulletin has developed so has the scope and volume of work involved and it is keeping both of us very busy! One instance of our new activities is our decision to publish abstracts from meetings sponsored by the Association (announced in a previous issue of the Bulletin). We may also list these on the website for a period of time. Details of how to prepare these abstracts will also be posted on our website and given to meeting organisers in future. In order to keep to a standard format abstracts should be no more than 150 words, and should include the name, affiliation and email address of the first author, the names of all co-authors and the title of the paper.

Second, we are pleased to be able to announce that, with the unanimous support of the Executive Committee, Professor Alex Haslam, from Exeter University, is to be appointed as the next editor of the European Journal of Social Psychology. Alex will start his editorial duties from January 2002 and will be writing a brief article in the Bulletin nearer that time.

Third, we draw your attention to our on-line membership list. Most members of the Association have signed up to this but it is up to you to complete the form and maintain accurate details for your address. Please check it out on www.eaesp.org.

Fourth, the Executive Committee would like to stress again the importance of the participation of all categories of EAESP members in scientific activities sponsored by the EAESP. Please check the website for

details of these. Small group and medium-size meetings are specifically intended to include postgraduate members. Junior members of the EAESP are thus strongly encouraged to apply. We would also like to remind postgraduate members that EAESP travel grants are available. The EC was pleased to receive another application for an International Teaching Fellowship. Previously EAESP sponsored two SPSP members, Mark Snyder and Chick Judd, to come and give a workshop in Europe. Now SPSP is sponsoring an EAESP member to cross the ocean in the other direction - Gün Semin has been invited by Robert Arkin to give a workshop at Ohio State University. The EC is particularly excited to see this recent initiative develop, and we encourage members to submit more proposals of this kind in the future.

Fifth, at the April EC meeting in Heidelberg, Sabino Ayestaran, on behalf the General Meeting organising committee, and Eddy Van Avermaet, on behalf of the scientific committee, gave a precise outline of the exciting social and scientific program that awaits us in Basques country next year. We greatly appreciate the time and effort that have already been invested to make sure that our next General meeting will be a success. The General Meeting is certain to offer a wonderful opportunity to talk about research, meet old friends and make new ones, and discover the wonders of San Sebastian. **Please note that the only call for papers for the 13th General Meeting of the Association (June 26-29, 2002) is published simultaneously in this issue of the Bulletin and also on the web:**
<http://www.psy.kuleuven.ac.be/ssgm>

Last but not least, the EC is extremely pleased to announce that Jacques-Philippe Leyens has been selected as our next recipient of the prestigious Tajfel Lecture award. As is the tradition, Jacques-Philippe Leyens will be given the floor during the opening ceremony of General Meeting in San Sebastian.

Dominic Abrams and Sibylle Classen

Article

Gender and Social Psychology in Spain¹⁾

by Miguel Moya & Rosa Rodríguez-Bailón
(University of Granada (Spain))

Maass and Casotti's (2000) analysis of the situation of male and female members of the EAESP indicated that Eastern and Southern European countries, in which the ratio of male to female seems to be one to one, seem to be more egalitarian than Northern countries. Maass and Casotti also showed that, over the last 3 years, the proportion of female members from South and East countries had clearly increased at a faster rate than in the Northern countries. However, as we will show in the present paper, at least in the context of Spain, the picture is not as egalitarian as Maass and Casotti suggested. Firstly, we will present some statistical evidence about the situation of female psychologists, and then we offer some explanations for the pattern observed.

Students and Teachers of Psychology

Psychology is a relatively new major study in Spain. In 1968 the Faculties of Arts at the Universities of Madrid and Barcelona introduced Psychology as a specialisation. The first graduate students in Psychology finished their studies in 1971. Thus, the scientific introduction of Psychology occurred in Spain much later than in Central or North European countries. Nevertheless, Psychology in Spain experienced an extraordinary expansion

¹⁾ Authors' note: We appreciate very much the helpful comments and revision made by Dominic Abrams of an earlier version of this paper.
Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Miguel Moya or Rosa Rodríguez-Bailón, Facultad de Psicología, Campus de Cartuja, 18011, Granada (Spain); e-mail: mmoya@ugr.es; rrbailon@ugr.es.

and currently there are 26 universities that teach Psychology. Between 1982 and 1997, the increasing numbers of Psychology students (from 20.839 to 58.049) was due mainly to women students, whose numbers grew by 327%, as compared with an increase in male students of 194%. In fact, the percentage of women increased continuously in these years, until it reached asymptote at the nineties.

This relative increase in the percentage of women studying Psychology is among the highest in the rest of Spanish major studies and is higher than the average in all the other majors: Social Sciences and Humanities (147.7%), Physical Sciences and Mathematics (136.5%), Health Sciences (106.1%) and Engineering and Technology (160.1%).

In 1982, Psychology was the second major in the Spanish University ranking in women's percentage (63.7%), behind Pharmacy (68.1%) and with a similar percentage than Arts (Philosophy and Letters) (63.4%). In 1997 the percentage of women psychology students increased further (74.4%), although four other majors had a higher percentage of women than Psychology (i.e., Translation and Interpretation, Psychopedagogy, Educational Sciences and Philology).

The numerical superiority of women in Psychology is even larger, among those who finish their studies. For instance, in 1997 the 77.7 % of the students who finished the degree in Psychology were women. Thus, women were not only majority among undergraduate students but also among the graduate ones. A similar trend applies to post-graduate students. In 1984, 59% of the 306 PhD students in Psychology were female, and by 1997 this figure increased to 67.1 % (compared with 45% and 50.3% female students across all majors)¹⁾

However, the proportion of women in Psychology who finish their PhD shows a different pattern. According to the Spanish University Council, between 1976 and 1989, the 37% of Psychology dissertations were defended by women and the 63% by men. The percentage of women who completed doctoral studies increased to 56.6% by 1997. In general, the

¹⁾ Note: in the Spanish educational system after 4/5 years studying Psychology it is possible to obtain a licence to work as a Psychologist. For this reason, doctoral courses are followed only by a small number of students compared to the great number of graduate students.

data show that women are specially interested on Clinical Psychology and areas that have to do with children (for example, 50% of PhDs in Abnormal Psychology are completed by women but less than 3% of PhDs in Organizational Psychology). Regarding salaried academics, the post-doctoral picture remains similar. Table 1 shows the proportions of males and females in the areas of Methodology, Basic Psychology, Social Psychology, Psychobiology, Developmental and Educational Psychology, and Personality, Assessment and Psychological Treatment, between 1991 and 1997. Four points are noteworthy if we look at these data.

- 1) There is a negative relation between the status of the academic position and the percentage of women. Women represent 28.5% of the Professors, 41.5% of the Lecturers and 54.6% of the Teaching Fellows.
- 2) There are clear differences between topic areas. Women are better represented in Developmental and Educational Psychology, Personality, and Assessment and Psychological Treatment (approximately 50%) than in Psychobiology, Social Psychology, Methodology, and Basic Psychology (approximately 40%).
- 3) Between 1991 and 1997, the percentage of women Professors slightly increased in 4 areas and did not change in two, whereas the percentage of women Lecturers increased moderately in 5 areas and decreased in one (Psychobiology).
- 4) Social Psychology (together with Psychobiology) has the lowest percentage of women Professors (9.1%), the lowest percentage of women Lecturers (together with Methodology) and a low percentage of women Teaching Fellows (a percentage slightly higher than Psychobiology and Methodology but lower than the other 3 areas).

Conferences and Publications

Seven Social Psychology national conferences have been held since 1985. This increased number of meetings in Spain could be seen as another sign of the current development of our field. In the last conference held in Oviedo (September, 2000) an analysis of the presence of men and women in prominent positions shows that women are near non-existent among the chairs of the sessions (16 male and 1 female) or among the invited speakers (14 male and 1 female). However, their presence is relatively higher among the symposia co-ordinators (20 males and 9 females). It is important to note that the chairs of sessions and the invited speakers were arranged by the organisers (who were Social Psychologists from all the universities in Spain but usually with an over-representation of the members of the department that organise the conference). Whereas the symposia co-ordinators were proposed by themselves.

The same pattern of a more equal gender distribution among symposium co-ordinators was present in other conferences, especially in the more recent ones. This is the case, for instance, in the previous conference held in San Sebastian in 1997. In this meeting women co-ordinated 12 symposia and men 21, but only one invited speaker was a woman (compared to 14 men). Their presence as chairs of sessions was relatively high however: 8 women and 9 men.

As far as number of publications is concerned, Table 2 shows that female professors publish approximately half as much as their male counterparts. It is important to notice that this ratio could be due to the under-representation of women in the professor position (only 3 vs. 37 men). Turning to the lecturers, there is a very different trend, wherein they have a higher number of publications in Spanish than the men do. However, the number of international articles, chapters and edited books remain higher for men than for women.

Considering EAESP membership, we conducted a 2 (professor vs. lecturer) X 2 (male vs. females) X 2 (member vs. non-member) ANOVA for each kind of publication (national paper, international paper, international chapter and edited book). There were no significant differences associated with any of these factors. Thus, despite the fact that men have a higher

average of publications than women, the variability in the data means that this difference is not statistically reliable.

Some explanations for the trends observed

In general terms, we can conclude that the data describing gender differences in Psychology in Spain are not as optimistic as one conclude from Maass and Casotti's review. As in other areas of the world, the females constitute the majority of undergraduate Psychology students. However, as women climb the academic career ladder, the proportions are less favourable to women. According to our statistics, there are not clear differences between the publishing output of women and men although in general terms, and in the more prestigious positions and domains, men are still better represented. Many different kinds of explanations have been proposed about differences in career pattern among men and women. We will focus mainly on those explanations that are addressed by the available evidence.

a) The structure of opportunity

It has been argued that one reason for the low presence of women in higher academic and scientific positions is their late incorporation to labour market compared to men. In our opinion, this explanation is difficult to be applied in a straightforward way to the situation of Social Psychology in Spain: Women outnumbered men from the very beginning of the Psychology major in the University (near 60%).

When Psychology begun as an independent major in Spain almost all the university teachers were men. This factor has been found by some researchers to be related to career development of women. For instance, Cohen & Gutek (1991), in a study with members of APA divisions 35 (Psychology of Women) and 9 (Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues) found that men in the sample were more likely to have received several types of faculty support while they were in graduate school (i.e. graduate faculty were more likely to help them in finding a job, and to develop personal relationships). Moreover, Cohen and Gutek found that men were more likely to report having had a role model while they were graduate students.

Institutional control in Psychology in Spain has been traditionally held by men, as illustrated by the percentage of professors (the highest academic position) presented in Table 1. It is possible that (consciously or not) men in high status positions have tended to promote men rather than women, at least during the first years of the development of our discipline in Spain. The gender imbalance in session chairs and invited speakers in Spanish Social Psychology conferences may reflect this process. However, in the last few years a slight change is seen regarding this social situation, and women seem to behave in a more active way, as it is reflected by the number of their proposals of symposia in national conferences.

b) Ideology, stereotypes and socialization.

Social-psychological explanations of career salience and educational and occupational choices have focused on how cultural norms and other social factors influence career aspirations and vocational choices (Eccles, 1994). For instance, in their comprehensive summary of the existent research on the women career on psychology, Betz and Fitzgerald (1987) suggest two categories of facilitative factors: the individual and the background. Background factors that facilitate the career development of women include a working mother, a supportive father, highly educated parents, female role models and work experience. The individual factors that Betz and Fitzgerald identify as facilitative include instrumentality, an androgynous personality, high self-esteem, strong academic self-concept, high ability and liberated gender-role values.

Let us consider two of these factors: instrumentality and egalitarian gender ideology. Research has consistently and convincingly shown the importance of instrumentality regarding women's career development (Abele, 2000; Betz, 1994). Moya, Expósito & Ruiz (2000) found in a Spanish sample that instrumentality was highly related to career salience among men ($r = .26$, $p < .01$) and among women ($r = .20$, $p < .05$).

Concerning gender ideology or gender role attitudes, the results of several studies show that only women with a traditional gender ideology have lower educational and professional aspirations and give less importance to their career (Phillips & Imhoff, 1997). Moya et al (2000) found that egalitarian gender ideology was positively related with career salience among women ($r = .31$, $p < .001$) but negatively related among men

($r = -.19$, $p < .05$); that is, those women with more egalitarian values about male-female interpersonal relationships were those who had highest career aspirations. However, the reverse pattern was found for men. In their case, those who had less egalitarian values were the ones who scored highest in career aspirations.

A possible explanation for the pattern found concerning Social Psychology and gender, may be that female Spanish Psychology students usually score lower than their male peers on instrumentality, and these differences could be related to lower professional aspirations of women. Empirical support for this explanation can be found in a study of gender identity conducted by Moya & Gómez (1996) involving 666 female and 221 male Psychology students from different Spanish Universities. Men scored significantly higher than women on instrumental traits whereas women scored higher than men on expressive attributes.

Regarding gender ideology, Frese, Moya and Megías (2000) found no significant differences between male and female Psychology students on a measure of gender ideology. In another study, Moya and Peplau (2001) used a short version of Peplau et al.'s (1993) Sex Role ideology scale with students of Psychology at the University of Granada and at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). Women in both countries were more feminist than men, but this difference was significantly greater among the American students. Another study (Expósito, Moya & Glick, 1998) revealed that male students scored higher on hostile sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996) although females scored non-significantly higher on benevolent sexism. Given these rather small differences it does not seem that gender ideology is mainly responsible for differences in career progression among male and female psychology students in Spain.

c) Interpersonal relationships

Research regarding gender influences on vocational behaviour pay special attention to two separate lines. On the one hand, some studies are conducted in order to understand women's career development as an internal process (e.g., the woman's gender-role orientation). On the other hand, others studies focus on understanding women's career development within the social context of work environments and relationships (Brooks & Forrest, 1994). In this second line, the most important finding involving

work and family is that a husband and/or children are handicaps for women's work progress (Gutek, 1988). Thus, although men may take on increasing responsibility for both child care and household tasks, women continue to bear primary responsibility for care giving at home despite their employment status or the presence of children (Shelton & Firestone, 1988). Moreover, women with careers, or women who aspire to them, also have to contend with problems arising from conflicts with their husbands' careers. Thus, the involvement of wives in their husbands' careers is common (Miller & Garrison, 1982) and this is reflected in geographical mobility, contributions to their husbands' central work activities, economic support and postponement of their own career and career adjunct roles (Kotkin, 1983). There is a strong inverse relation between being married and the number of children on one side, and measurable criteria of career involvement and achievement on the other (see Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987, for a comprehensive review). For instance, Cohen & Gutek (1991) found male members of the American Psychological Association were more likely than females to have moved when they enrolled in graduate school (75.9% vs. 63.5%), to have moved since obtaining their PhD (82.6 vs. 69.9%), and to have made more moves since obtaining the PhD (2.79 vs. 2.07). Among the males who relocated to advance in their career, in 96.3% of cases their partners moved with them. In contrast, almost one third (32.7%) of females stated that their partners did not agree to follow them.

In addition employers may see marriage and children as a burden or hindrance for a woman's career (Bronstein et al., 1987). Thus, although there have been considerable changes in attitudes towards gender roles, research suggests that employed mothers tend to be seen as less devoted to their families, less sensitive to the needs of others, less affectionate, and more selfish than mothers who stay at home (Etaugh & Nekolny, 1990).

Moya, Expósito and Ruiz' (2000), study of 148 Spanish couples revealed that factors such as having children and being dependent in their relationship were related to lower career salience in women. However, these factors did not affect career salience in men. Their results also indicate how women's career salience was related to some attributes of their partners (for instance, their equalitarian gender ideology, high educational attainment, the fact of not having a job and their

expressiveness). However, men's career salience was unrelated to their partner personal attributes.

In this line, Barberá, Lafuente, & Sarrió (1998) found that 70% of male university lecturers from the University of Valencia (Spain) lived with a partner and 74% of these partners worked full time (in occupations with similar status to university lecturers). Nevertheless, the percentage of women with a stable relationship was significantly lower than men. Women academics also had a lower number of children than men, and women's partners were more likely to have an occupational status similar to theirs than were men's. Finally, focusing just on professors, 90% of men (versus 60% of women) had a stable close relationship.

Conclusions

This review of the situation of male and female social psychologists in Spain is not completely in line with the picture reported by Maass and Casotti (2000). The situation in Southern European countries such as Spain may not be as optimistic as one might imagine taking into account only the EAESP members. Fortunately, however, the trends suggest a slow change favouring an egalitarian position for women.

References

- Abele, A.E. (2000). Gender gaps in early career development of university graduates. Why are women less successful than men?. *European Bulletin of Social Psychology*, *12*(3), 22-38.
- Barberá, E., Lafuente, M.J. y Sarrió, M. (1998). *La promoción profesional de las mujeres en la Universidad*. Valencia: Promolibro.
- Betz, N. E. (1994). Basic issues and concepts in career counselling for women. In W. B. Walsh & S. H. Osipow (Eds.), *Career counselling for women* (pp. 1-41). Hillsdale, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publ.
- Betz, N. E. & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1987). *The career psychology of women*. New York: Academic.
- Bronstein, P., Black, L., Pfening, J. L. & White, A. (1987). Stepping onto the academic ladder: Comparison of women and men applicants for junior faculty positions. In B. A. Gutek & L. Larwood (Eds.), *Women's career development* (pp. 110-128). Newbury Park: Sage.

- Brooks, L. & Forrest, L. (1994). Feminism and career counselling. In W. B. Walsh & S. H. Osipow (Eds.), *Career counselling for women* (pp. 87-134). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publ.
- Cohen, A.G. & Gutek, B.A. (1991). Sex differences in the career experiences of members of two APA divisions. *American Psychologist*, **46**,(12), 1292-1298.
- Eccles, J. S. (1994). Understanding women's educational and occupational choices. Applying the Eccles et al. model of achievement-related choices. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, **18**, 585-609.
- Etaugh, C. & Nekolny, K. (1990). Effects of employment status and marital status on perceptions of mothers. *Sex Roles*, **23**, 273-280.
- Expósito, F., Moya, M. y Glick, P. (1998). Sexismo ambivalente: medición y correlatos. *Revista de Psicología Social*, **13**, 2, 159-169.
- Frese, B., Moya, M. & Megías, J.L. (2000). *Actitudes hacia las víctimas de agresiones sexuales y probabilidad de actuar como los agresores*. Paper presented at the Congreso Nacional de Psicología Social, Oviedo, Spain.
- Glick, P. & Fiske, T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **70**, 3, 491-512.
- Gutek, B. A. (1988). Sex segregation and women at work: a selective review. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, **37**, 103-120.
- Kotkin, M. (1983). Sex role among married and unmarried couples. *Sex Roles*, **9**, 975-985.
- Maass, A. & Casotti, P. (2000). Gender gaps in EAESP: Numerical distribution and scientific productivity of woman and men. *European Bulletin of Social Psychology*, **12**(2), 14-31.
- Miller, J. & Garrison, H. H. (1982). Sex roles: The division of labor at home and in the workplace. *Annual Review of Sociology*, **8**, 237-262.
- Moya Morales, M. y Gómez Berrocal, C. (1996). *Psicología y género: un análisis de la profesión*. Granada: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Granada.
- Moya, M. & Peplau L.A. (2001). *Comparing the career aspirations of women and men in Spain and the United States*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Moya, M., Expósito, F. y Ruiz, J. (2000). Close Relationships, Gender, and Career Salience. *Sex Roles*, **42** (9/10), 825-846.
- Phillips, S. D. & Imhoff, A. R. (1997). Women and career development: A decade of research. *Annual Review of Psychology*, **48**, 31-59.
- Shelton, B. A. & Firestone, J. (1988). Time constraints of men and women: Linking household labor to paid labor. *Sociology and Social Research*, **72**, 102-105.

Book Reviews

Handbook of social comparison. Theory and Research (2000) Jerry Suls & Ladd Wheeler (Eds.)

New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers. 504 pages. List price USD 125, GBP 87 NLG 290, ISBN 0306463415
Publisher's website: www.wkap.nl

Review by **Vera Hoorens** (Leuven University, Belgium)¹⁾

Ever since Leon Festinger published his 'Social Comparison Theory', hundreds of research projects have been conducted and thousands of articles and chapters have been written on social comparison. Therefore, the title 'Handbook of Social Comparison' of this big volume – no less than 22 chapters on, covering every aspect of social comparison imaginable – elicits high expectations. One might expect a volume entitled 'Handbook' to systematically introduce the reader to the main concepts and research questions of the domain, perhaps including some historical background on their development, that it continues to present and to critically compare the theories being developed and the various research methods being used, and that it summarizes the state of the art in an integrative fashion. The present volume however, appears to have a different goal.

In fact, the book was not really designed to be a handbook in the traditional sense. As noted in the Preface, the book arose from a double background: first, a desire to collect and to publish more widely the contributions presented to a Nags Head Social Comparison Conference, and, second, to expand this endeavour by inviting some leading scholars in the domain to contribute a chapter to what became to be meant a comprehensive overview of classical and contemporary issues in the

¹⁾ Vera Hoorens is Professor of Social Psychology, Katholieke Universiteit te Leuven, Belgium (e-mail: Vera.Hoorens@psy.kuleuven.ac.be). Her research interests include self-favoring biases in social comparison, person perception and risk communication.

domain of social comparison. This feature underlies what may be considered both the book's main strength and its main weakness. By having no less than 33 social comparison scientists – among whom various highly acclaimed specialists in the field – present their own approach, view, theory, and/or research, the book is a roller coaster confronting the reader with a fascinating mosaic of views on the domain of social comparison. After finishing it, the reader is left with about the same experience that s/he may have right after visiting a place like the British Museum or the Louvre: the certainty that one has seen a tremendous number of – *mutatis mutandis* - highly valuable pieces of art crafted by some of the most knowledgeable and skilful masters in the field (along with some seemingly less valuable artefacts) accompanied by the feeling that one will have lots of work to do in order to turn this adventure into an articulated and integrated experience and to separate the highlights from the not-so-crucial artefacts.

Like most edited books, indeed, the volume is characterized by a lack of integration – the manifold cross-references between chapters cannot remedy this – the large number of chapters are extremely heterogeneous in scope, goal and nature. They take the form of literature reviews, reports of empirical research, conceptual and theoretical considerations, as well as presentations of full-blown theoretical formulations and refinements to Festinger's original social comparison theory. In doing so, they focus on either the antecedents, the consequences, or the nature of social comparison processes in the domain of abilities, opinions, behaviors (both present and anticipated), and/or affect, or any combination of these. It should also be noted that the chapters are not really grouped in transparent manner. This leaves the burden of integrating the contributions on the reader's shoulders to a higher degree than may be considered desirable. Just to name one instance, the section of the book devoted to 'Foundations of Social Comparison' includes overviews of classical social comparison research as well as recent theoretical refinements and chapters on selected topics such as how social comparison may be integrated with basic approaches of judgement. At the same time, however, the section on 'related social phenomena' also includes a chapter on social judgement. Similarly, the book contains two chapters on assimilation and contrast effects in social comparison (one in the domain of affect and one with a more general scope, also including affective

reactions). To my taste, however, exactly how these chapters relate to each other is not being made sufficiently clear. In a certain regard, this lack of integration may be unavoidable in edited works. Still, it could have been remedied to some degree by including a much more elaborate subject index and to include a general author index. Perhaps even more important, a greater effort to integrate the chapters contentwise would have spared the reader from being confronted with the same information over and over again (e.g. the main elements of the social comparison theory, now-classic refinements of the theory, and descriptions of well-known phenomena like the above-average effect and the false consensus phenomenon). It would also have helped the reader to form a more coherent view of how the various research traditions that have emerged from the field actually relate to each other. The editors do try to achieve this coherence by locating the various chapters in an overview of classic and neo-social comparison theory and by including a commentary by two other authors (Buunk and Gibbons) on past and present trends in the field. One element that struck me in the latter chapter (entitled, ".....") is that Buunk and Gibbons suggest that the evolutionary perspective has the potential to provide a badly needed overarching focus for the manifold theoretical perspectives on social comparison. However this perspective has been developed in the present volume by just a few contributors and within the context of just a few aspects of social comparison (Smith on emotional reactions, and Beach and Tesser on self-esteem maintenance).

I read the book from cover to cover over a relatively short period of time. It is possible that the lack of integration of the volume is more annoying under these circumstances than it would be if one were to read just one chapter at a time, allowing one to enjoy the gems that are definitely present among the various chapters. I greatly enjoyed Dunning's refreshing chapter in which he contrasts egocentric tendencies in social judgement with social comparison processes in self-judgement. His chapter, along with the one by Kulik and Mahler, is among the few to actually explore the limits of the social comparison approach rather than to articulate it or to demonstrate its applicability to a seemingly ever-increasing wealth of social situations. I also enjoyed the chapters in which the relationship between social comparison and other theories of social behavior were explicitly explored, such as the one by on social identity (by Hogg) and on counterfactual thinking (by Olson, Buhrmann, and Roesse),

and the chapters aiming at creating some systematic order in seemingly inconsistent findings, such as the one on affective responses to upward and downward comparison (by Smith).

Visiting a top-range museum may be quite a rewarding experience. Further elaborating on the parallel I drew before, reading this book may be quite rewarding, too. However, those who expect a systematic and coherent introduction to classic and recent developments in the domain of social comparison may be greatly disappointed, just like those who are relative beginners in the field. Both categories of potential readers may be put off by the lack of integration, the density of the information, and the partial repetitions of theoretical statements that are sometimes quite confusing. Once these hurdles are overcome, it becomes clear that the book contains a treasure of albeit sometimes hidden - thought-provoking and inspiring ideas.

Contents and Contributors

Contributors. Preface. Part I: Introduction. 1. A Selective History of Classic and Neo Social Comparison Theory; J. Suls, L. Wheeler. Part II: Foundations of Social Comparison. 2. Interpreting and Inventing Social Reality: Attributional and Constructive Elements in Social Comparison; G.R. Goethals, W.M. Klein. 3. Stability of Related Attributes and the Inference of Ability through Social Comparison; W.P. Smith, G.B. Arkelsson. 4. 'Can I Do X?' Using the Proxy Comparison Model to Predict Performance; R. Martin. 5. Social Comparison and Influence in Groups; D.R. Forsyth. 6. Opinion Comparison: The Role of the Corroborator, Expert and Proxy in Social Influence; J. Suls. 7. Self-Evaluation Maintenance and Evolution; S.R.H. Beach, A. Tesser. 8. Individual Differences in Social Comparison; L. Wheeler. 9. Among the Better Ones: Upward Assimilation in Social Comparison; R.L. Collins. 10. Assimilative and Contrastive Emotional Reactions to Upward and Downward Social Comparison; R.H. Smith. 11. Examining Social Comparisons with the Test Selection Measure: Opportunities for the Researcher and the Research Participant; J.V. Wood. 12. Social Comparison: Lessons from Basic Research on Judgment; D.H. Wedell, A. Parducci. 13. Consequences of Social Comparison: Selective Accessibility, Assimilation, and Contrast; T. Mussweiler, F. Strack. 14. Evaluating Social Comparison Targets; M.D. Alicke. 15. Social Comparison, Affiliation, and Emotional Contagion Under Threat; J.A. Kulik, H.I.M. Mahler. Part III: Related Social Phenomena. 16. The Projective Perception of the Social World: A Building Block of Social Comparison Processes; J. Krueger. 17. Social Judgment as Implicit Social Comparison; D. Dunning. 18. Comparing Comparisons: An Integrative Perspective on Social Comparisons and Counterfactual Thinking; J.M. Olson, et al. Part IV: Applications. 19. Social Identity and Social Comparison; M.A. Hogg. 20. Social Comparison and Fairness: A Counterfactual Simulations Perspective; R. Folger, E.E. Kass. 21. Social Comparison Processes in Health and Illness; H. Tennen, et al. Part V: Commentary. 22. Toward an Enlightenment in Social Comparison Theory: Moving Beyond Classic and Renaissance Approaches; F.X. Gibbons, B.P. Buunk. Author Index. Subject Index.

The Message Within: The Role of Subjective Experience in Social Cognition and Behavior (2000) H. Bless & J.P. Forgas (Eds.)

Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press. 402 pages. ISBN 0-86377-690-6

Review by **Gregory R. Maio**¹⁾

Psychologists have long been fascinated by the mental events that intervene between exposure to information in the environment and responses to this information. Because environmental information occasionally elicits strange behavioural responses, we believe that something interesting must be happening between people's ears. In fact, on some occasions, people's subjective experience of these internal events seems crucial to understanding the information-behaviour process. Yet, on other occasions, people seem unaware of these internal events, or people seem to have little understanding of these internal events. These potentialities and failings of subjective experience make it an interesting topic, and this is particularly true in social contexts.

Bless and Forgas's (2000) volume inspires even more interest in the role of subjective events. Their volume collects ideas and evidence from many respected social psychologists from around the world. The researchers' theories and evidence are reported in 20 interesting and enjoyable chapters.

Content of the Volume

In the first chapter, Wegner and Gilbert advance the provocative argument that social psychology has become the study of subjective experience. They suggest that classic research in social psychology examined contexts that elicit interesting subjective experiences in the social actors. Wegener and Gilbert also claim that contemporary research examines interesting

¹⁾ Greg Maio is Reader at the School of Psychology, PO Box 901, Cardiff University, Cardiff, Wales, UK CF10 3YG (email: maio@cardiff.ac.uk). His research interests include values, attitudes, affective processes, and ambivalence.

subjective experiences, but these experiences often have only indirect social connections.

The next five chapters examine the intricate ways in which subjective experiences are important for judgments and behaviour. Fiedler begins this section by empirically examining psychological mechanisms that explain people's frequent tendency to assume that particular information is true, even after the information was previously presented as being false. Dijksterhuis, Bargh, and Miedema then discuss the automatic influences of stereotypes on stereotype-relevant behaviour, while presenting evidence that these automatic effects disappear when people's behaviour becomes the focus of their attention. Neumann and Strack also consider automatic influences on behaviour, but their attention is directed at affect-relevant behaviours, which range from directly induced smiling to simple arm flexion. These authors propose the interesting hypothesis that some behaviours automatically elicit subjectively experienced affect, whereas other behaviours elicit biases in information processing that do not directly involve subjective affect. Next, Brendl considers the role of subjective experiences in the well-known sample size effect, arguing that the subjective difficulty of mental simulations mediate this effect. To conclude this section, Martin and Whitaker describe evidence that the subjective difficulty of memory retrieval affects subsequent evaluations, and the direction of these effects depends on the context of retrieval. Together, these chapters make clear that subjective experiences play an important role in judgments and behaviour.

The second section focuses exclusively on the role of subjective experiences in memory. Smith's chapter provides a nice beginning to the section by discussing the potential role of the subjective experience of familiarity in memory systems. He indicates that the subjective experience of familiarity is necessary to enable memory systems to retain old information, while learning new information. The subsequent chapters by Haddock and by Wänke and Bless examine the mechanisms through which the subjective ease of retrieval of attitude-relevant beliefs influences subsequent attitudinal judgments. Interestingly, Haddock's data indicate that ease-of-retrieval effects are strongest when the motivation to contemplate the attitude is low, whereas Wänke and Bless's data indicate that ease-of-retrieval effects are strongest when the

motivation to contemplate the attitude is high. All three authors note differences in their paradigms and the need for future research in this rich area. In the final chapter of this section, Skurnik, Schwarz, and Winkielman summarize evidence that the effects of subjectively experienced affect (e.g., happy memories, feelings of familiarity) on judgments depend on implicit beliefs about the relation between the subjective experience and the judgement in question.

The third section focuses precisely on the role of emotions and mood in subjective experience. First, Forgas, Ciarocchi, and Moylan suggest that people regulate their emotions using affect infusion and affect control mechanisms, which are key components of Forgas's Affect Infusion Model. Next, Sedikides and Green highlight evidence supporting their distinction between reflective emotions (e.g., sadness, contentment), which elicit self-focus, and social emotions (e.g., happiness, anger), which decrease self-focus. Bohner and Weinerth then discuss the effects of mood on the processing of persuasive messages, while describing evidence that the effects of negative mood depend on whether the message recipients' initially view the message as being legitimate or propaganda. Garcia-Marques and Mackie continue examining the effect of mood on information processing, but they describe experiments indicating that the effects of affect on processing may occasionally be mediated by the subjective experience of familiarity. To close this section, Reisenzein decomposes the experience of surprise, revealing that surprise occurs when people perceive an interruption in the flow of mental events; this chapter nicely complements the preceding chapters on the experience of familiarity.

The fourth section focuses on the role of subjective experiences in stereotyping and intergroup behaviour. Bodenhausen and Moreno describe three factors that determine whether people are successful at inhibiting the effects of negative affect that is elicited by an outgroup: awareness of the affect, internal motivation to control the affect, and the attentional resources to control the affect. In addition, Dardenne, Yzerbyt, and Grégoire discuss the subjective experience of control and its role in the formation of stereotype-congruent versus stereotype-incongruent impressions. Abele then discusses abundant research examining the impact of positive moods on judgments of in- and out-

group members, highlighting evidence that the impact of positive mood depends on the presence of group labels and the importance of the group judgment. Dovidio, Gaertner, and Loux also examine the role of positive affect; their evidence indicates that positive affect can inhibit or increase intergroup bias and the formation of superordinate group representations can mediate the inhibition effects.

Finally, Bless and Forgas provide a concise and elegant summation of the volume. These authors describe the historical importance of subjective experiences in social psychology; they summarize the conceptualisation of subjective experiences and their consequences; and they highlight important goals for future research.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Undoubtedly, the chief strength of this volume is that it is provocative. The volume encourages researchers to think about how social psychological phenomena may arise through the limits and capacities of subjective experience, and it stimulates thinking about the social context of subjective experience. Put simply, this volume provides interesting intellectual exercise.

Another strength of the volume is its breadth. Topics range from information processing and statistical reasoning to stereotyping and intergroup behaviour. Sometimes, such a broad range makes it difficult for a volume to achieve conceptual coherence. In this case, however, the book's organisation permits an orderly mastery of the content and ideas, and it yields a sense of progression and coherence.

Most importantly, the chapters themselves are very good, often presenting a large amount of new data and provocative ideas in a clear manner. I am particularly impressed by the concise nature of the chapters. In most volumes, the pleasant freedom from tight journal space requirements leads authors to wax eloquently about minor points. Readers of this volume will be pleasantly surprised by how quickly they can progress from one chapter to another, almost like reading chapters from a fast-paced novel.

The volume's weaknesses are not staggering. As with any edited volume, there is some variation in style, clarity, and density across chapters – but such variation makes life interesting. Also, as with any edited volume, readers will find some chapters more interesting than other chapters. Nonetheless, readers can freely chose to read what they wish because the chapters can stand as individual units.

In sum, if you think that you are not interested in the study of subjective experiences, this volume might convince you that you actually are interested in subjective experiences. You will not know the answer until you turn on some pleasant music, grab a glass of your favourite wine, and read the volume from cover to cover. You may find the (subjective) experience to be seductively appealing.

New Books by Members

Projektgruppen in Organisationen. Praktische Erfahrungen und Erträge der Forschung. (Project groups in Organizations. Practice and research)

Rudolf Fisch, Dieter Beck, Birte Englich (Hrsg.)

Göttingen (March 2001): Verlag für Angewandte Psychologie.

ISBN: 3-8017-1311-3 X/378 S. 89 DM / 45.50 €

Project work, project management and team work become of increasing importance in modern organizations. What factors are influencing the performance and the effectiveness of project groups? How can such groups be embedded effectively in organizations? Which methodological and practical problems are arising in working in and with project groups? To what extent the cooperation of different people is influencing teamwork and team development? What are typical advantages and shortcomings in project work?

This book is beginning with practical experiences of project group from business and public administration. In the second part it gives a thorough presentation of the social psychology of project groups. Thus the reader is given both practical and scientifically based advice for the organization of effective work in project groups.

The book is part of a research project about the use of project groups in German public administration which was conducted at the Forschungsinstitut fuer oeffentliche Verwaltung bei der Deutschen Hochschule fuer Verwaltungswissenschaften Speyer (Research Institute for Public Administration at the German Postgraduate School for Administrative Sciences Speyer). In this context an international meeting was organized by the editors in October 1998 at the Forschungsinstitut fuer oeffentliche Verwaltung. With a grant of the Fritz Thyssen Stiftung both practitioners and researcher in the field came together for an intensive exchange.

Further information can be found under: www.hogrefe.de and www.dhv-speyer.de/rfisch/publik.htm

Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, [a special issue on "*Social Identity Processes in Organizations*" (July 2001)] - guest edited by **Daan van Knippenberg** (University of Amsterdam) and **Michael A. Hogg** (University of Queensland)

<http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/j0215.html>

Recent years have witnessed an upsurge in the study of social identity processes in organizations, both within social psychology and the organizational sciences. To capture this growing interest, this special issue brings together a number of researchers in this rapidly developing area, covering a diverse, but representative range of topics: charismatic/transformational leadership, communication and commitment, identity and prosocial behaviour, interdepartmental negotiations, and intergroup relations in organizational mergers. In so doing, this special issue provides a valuable cross-section of research for anyone interested in the role played by social and organizational identifications in organizational life. The special issue is based on a very successful EAESP small group meeting organized by Daan van Knippenberg and Michael Hogg in Amsterdam in July 2000.

The contents of the special issue are:

- Editorial: Social Identity Processes in Organizations. (Daan van Knippenberg & Michael A. Hogg)
- Social identity and the romance of leadership: The importance of being seen to be "doing it for us". (Alexander Haslam et al.)
- Identity and cooperative behavior in groups. (Tom Tyler & Steven Blader)
- Communication and commitment in organizations: A social identity approach. (Tom Postmes & Martin Tanis)
- Role of organizational identification on implicit leadership theories (ILTs), transformational leadership and work attitudes. (Robin Martin & Olga Epitropaki)
- Power and biased perceptions of interdepartmental negotiations. (Aukje Nauta, Jan de Vries, & Jacob Wijngaard)
- Status, legitimacy, and ingroup bias in the context of an organizational merger. (Deborah Terry & Anne O'Brien)

Launched in 1998 *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* is a mainstream social psychology journal dedicated to social psychological research into group processes and intergroup relations. It is targeted at social psychologists and researchers in intersecting disciplines to meet the need for a single focus and forum for this research. If you are interested in finding out more about the special issue, and about the journal, you can go to the journal home page:

<http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/j0215.html>

Future EAESP Meetings**13th General Meeting of the EAESP****June, 26th – 29th 2002, San Sebastian (Spain)****First and only call for papers!****The website is open!****<http://www.psy.kuleuven.ac.be/ssgm>****Introduction**

As already announced in the first issue of this year's Bulletin, the next General Meeting will take place in San Sebastián from June 26th to 29th, 2002. San Sebastián 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 conference building, situated on the beach and close to the heart of the city. Hotels and hostels in different categories are available nearby or within a twenty minutes bus ride and a short walk.

Everything you may want to know about the General Meeting will be available via the Meeting's website (see below). Still, in the present article you will find the most essential information, along with a copy of the registration and payment form and the hotel registration form.

Although you can also download these two forms from the website, you may want to use these two enclosed versions. Other relevant forms (e.g. towards submitting proposals) are available for on line use on the website only. To facilitate the work of the people involved, **PLEASE USE THE ON LINE WEBSITE MATERIALS AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE!**

The Website

The website of the General Meeting, constructed by the able hands of Jos Feys and Eddy De Greef from Leuven, can from now on be accessed directly at the following address:

<http://www.psy.kuleuven.ac.be/ssgm>

It can also be reached via a link in the Association's own website

<http://www.eaesp.org>

Following a word of welcome by Sabino Ayestarán, local organiser, it first provides some general information about San Sebastián and its beaches, and about the Kursaal, the site of all our meetings. A next section should tell you everything you need to know towards submitting Paper and Symposium Proposals. It then describes the outline/timetable of the programme of the General Meeting. It informs you of how you can register to participate and how you can book accommodations. Essential contact addresses are listed as well as some useful or interesting web links. Some information about travel is also included. And some information about financial assistance is added.

Please check this website regularly, because more and updated information will be added as the meeting approaches.

Submitting proposals

deadline for receipt: November 15, 2001

Scientific Committee

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

(Lisbon). Eddy Van Avermaet chairs and co-ordinates the activities of the Scientific Committee.

General instructions

1. We invite submissions of proposals for symposia and for individual contributions (poster and oral).
2. Submissions can be made, beginning in May, exclusively through the website.
3. Submissions for symposia should include, aside from the co-ordinates 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 thirty-minutes individual slots (one of which can be allocated to an identified, appointed discussant).
4. Participants in symposia themselves 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 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. The poster meetings will be organised as parallel thematic sessions, as will the individual oral sessions.
8. **The deadline for submissions will be November 15, 2001.**
9. Judgements 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).
11. Hence, for symposia we will need a filled out "Symposium Convenor Form" as well as a separate "Individual Paper Form" for each participant in the symposium. We leave it up to the convenors to submit all the forms of their participants themselves or to have their participants each submit their own form.

Submitting your proposal

Make your submissions exclusively on line through the website. You will be notified by email that your submission has been received by the Scientific Committee.

Any questions you might have concerning the scientific programme can be put to Eddy Van Avermaet, chair of the Scientific Committee at: ssgm@psy.kuleuven.ac.be

The Programme of the Meeting

Participants are expected to arrive on Tuesday, June 25, in the afternoon, and to register at the Kursaal (15:00 - 20:00). There will be a welcoming reception beginning at 19:00.

The Meeting itself runs from Wednesday, June 26 until Saturday, June 29. The Tajfel lecture will be held following the opening session on Wednesday morning. The Jaspars lecture and the business meeting are scheduled late Thursday afternoon. The other time slots will be taken up by symposia, poster sessions, and individual paper sessions. On Friday afternoon, beginning at 17:00, an optional visit to a museum, dedicated to the sculptor Chillida, is planned.

The meeting ends with a farewell banquet on Saturday evening.

Registration

To register for the meeting, you will have to fill out two forms, both available on the website. The first website form (A: registration) should be used for on line registration. The second website form (B: registration and

payment) should be downloaded and transmitted directly to Sibylle Classen. Because this second form contains private information (credit card number) we don't want this second form transferred on line via the web, for security reasons. A copy of this 'B: registration and payment' form is also enclosed with this issue of the Bulletin.

As always, the registration fee differs as a function of category of participant and time of registration. The enclosed form gives specific information about what is and what is not covered by your registration fee. Please note that payments must be made in Euro (the year is 2002!) If you have any questions regarding your registration, please contact Sibylle Classen via sibylle@eaesp.org

Accommodation

Sabino Ayestarán and his local organisers reserved a sufficient number of rooms in various price categories in the San Sebastián area to accommodate all the participants, but participants are themselves responsible for booking the rooms and for payment.

It is impossible to list the detailed information regarding the accommodations in this issue. We therefore refer you to the website which lists for each of the 14 hotels/hostels the number of rooms, the price per night, phone and fax number, address, email and website (when available), and distance from the Kursaal.

We recommend that you read all this information carefully, as well as the general instructions that come with it, and that you then proceed to download and fill out the hotel registration form. Please send this form directly to the hotel/hostel of your choice. A sample hotel registration form is also enclosed with this issue.

Do note that all hotel reservations must be made before April 30, 2002 (exception: the deadline for Hotel De Londres is December 31, 2001). If you have any questions regarding accommodations, please get in touch with the local organiser, Sabino Ayestarán, via pspayets@ss.ehu.es

Travel

Aside from being reachable by train (the Paris - Madrid line) and car, San Sebastián can also be reached by air. There is a domestic airport at San Sebastián itself (18 km from the centre), with direct connections from and to Madrid and Barcelona. The two nearest international airports are Biarritz in France (45 km away) and Bilbao in Spain (110 km away).

The website tells you how you can get from these airports to San Sebastián "on your own", but it is good to know that the local organisers will provide a bus shuttle from Bilbao and Biarritz on Tuesday, June 25 and to these airports on Sunday, June 30. The timetable for this shuttle service will be communicated later.

Contact persons

For questions regarding travel and accommodation:

Sabino Ayestarán
Departamento de Psicología Social
Universidad del País Vasco
Apartado 726
E-20080 San Sebastián, Spain
Telephone: +34-943-448000 x5648
Fax: +34-943-311056
Email: pspayets@ss.ehu.es

For questions regarding the scientific programme:

Eddy Van Avermaet
L.E.S.P.
K.U.Leuven
Tiensestraat 102
B-3000 Leuven, Belgium
Telephone: +32-16-326098
Fax: +32-16-325923
Email: ssgm@psy.kuleuven.ac.be

For questions regarding registration:

Sibylle Classen, Administrative Secretary EAESP
P.O. Box 420 143
D-48068 Muenster, Germany
Fax: +49-2533-281144
Email: sibylle@eaesp.org

In concluding

The Executive Committee, the Scientific Committee and the local organisers sincerely hope that the website (and the above information) will be helpful towards guiding you through the preparations for your participation in the 13th General Meeting. They are looking forward to receiving your proposals and your registrations, but above all to welcoming you at San Sebastián.

From your end, the greatest assistance you can offer at this stage consists of showing respect for the instructions and the deadlines... which of course you will!

Naomi Ellemers, President EAESP
Sibylle Classen, Administrative Secretary EAESP
Sabino Ayestarán, Organiser SSGM
Eddy Van Avermaet, Scientific Committee SSGM

Small Group Meeting

On Social Differentiation within Groups

July 2002, Porto, Portugal

[Organizer: Jose Marques (University of Porto) & Michael A. Hogg (University of Queensland)]

An EAESP Small Group Meeting on differentiation within groups will be held in Porto, Portugal. The meeting aims to bring together a group of active researchers in this growing field in social psychology to provide a forum for the presentation of research and an opportunity for discussion and collaboration. The meeting will address the full range of topics to do with how groups and categories are internally differentiated - including such diverse issues as leadership, power and status differentials, deviance and marginal membership, diversity, role differentiation, subgroup structure, nested categories, multiculturalism.

Researchers who are interested in participating in the meeting are invited to submit a 250-word summary of their proposed presentation to Jose Marques (marques@psi.up.pt).

EAESP Summer School 2002

August, 18th – September 1st 2002, Marburg, Germany

The EAESP Summer School of 2002 will take place from August 18 to September 1 in Marburg, Germany. Marburg is a relatively small city with 75.000 inhabitants and 18.000 students studying at the Philipps-University. Founded in 1527 as the first Protestant university in the world, the "Philipps-Universität in Marburg an der Lahn" will celebrate its jubilee in 2002. With its 18,000 students and 7,500 staff members, it currently ranks among the medium-size German universities. In accordance with its

official mission, the Philipps-Universität strives to further the attainment of knowledge and meet its responsibility of science and scholarship to society. You can get more information about university and town at the university's homepage (<http://www.uni-marburg.de>) which is partly available in English, more information about the social psychology working unit can be found at:
http://staff-www.uni-marburg.de/~wagner1/ag_soiz.html.

The Summer Schools are a tradition in the EAESP and they are organized every two to three years. Their main goal is to familiarize students with the latest theoretical, methodological and empirical developments in various fields of social psychological research, and in this in turn should help them to plan and execute their own research projects in the future. An equally important function is to facilitate contacts between young scholars from different countries in Europe, encouraging friendships and collaborative research. Summer Schools in the past have been a success in both these respects.

Five parallel workshops are planned, each with about 12 students working with two staff members. Both staff members will be distinguished social psychologists from Europe, Canada, and the US. The topics of the workshops and names of the teachers are listed below:

Workshop 1: Attitudes & Habits

Teachers: Bas Verplanken (Norway), Tilmann Betsch (Germany)

Workshop 2: Affirmative Actions

Teachers: Vici Esses (Canada), Colette van Laar (Netherlands)

Workshop 3: Social Identity Processes in Organizations

Teachers: Daan van Knippenberg (Netherlands), Jürgen Wegge (Germany)

Workshop 4: Aggression

Teachers: Dolf Zillmann (USA), Jeanette Schmid (Germany)

Workshop 5: Social Dominance

Teachers: Felicia Pratto (USA), Andreas Zick (Germany)

As in the previous Summer School in Clermont-Ferrand, the Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP), the largest organisation of social psychology in North America, will participate in funding the Summer School.

Those eligible to apply are doctoral students in social psychology currently enrolled in a PhD program in Europe and who have not previously participated in an EAESP Summer School. Some places are available to students working outside Europe. The official language will be English.

The organisers will provide full board and lodging for all participants. However, we are asking that the applicants' institution contribute 150 Euro per participant. Applicants are responsible for arranging and paying for their own travel to Marburg.

Applications must be accompanied by a letter of recommendation from a member of EAESP (preferably the applicant's own supervisor). The completed **application form** (see extra page enclosed with this sending) must be returned, with the applicant's curriculum vitae by **November, 15, 2001**. Each applicant should indicate which workshop team he or she would like to work in, rank ordering preferences. The final assignments to workshop groups will be made early in 2002. Detailed information about the schedule of academic and social events will be sent to participants at a later stage.

The organising committee,
Ulrich Wagner & Rolf van Dick
Working Unit of Social Psychology,
Philipps-University Marburg, Germany

Reports of Previous Meetings

Report on the EAESP Summer School 2000

organized by the Laboratoire de Psychologie Sociale de la Cognition, associated with the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand, France

Undertaking the organization of the summer school of EAESP is quite a challenge, a fair amount of work and most of all, an extremely stimulating experience. We are happy to report that everybody, external teachers, students, internal teachers, and local students and assistants, did a tremendous job insuring that the Summer School 2000 was a great success from the beginning to the end. From the point of view of the organizing committee, this success truly stems from a collective effort on the part of all those involved. For this reason, we would like to say first of all a very, very big "Merci" to Gerd Bohner, Brenda Major, Constantine Sedikides, Patricia Devine and Dominic Abrams for their work during these two weeks as leaders of a workshop, and to each of the students in the workshops for their astonishing intelligence, humor, seriousness, commitment, and friendship (see the reports below from members of each of the workshops).

Second, the Clermont-Ferrand Summer School was the first one to be organized in collaboration with SPSP. Patricia Devine was selected by SPSP to lead one of the workshop and five American students were sent by SPSP to participate in the summer school. We wish to thank SPSP for its input and professionalism. We suggest that this collaboration should be maintained in the future.

Third, as part of the summer school, we have put together English language classes, one week prior to the summer school itself, for students

who did not have the required English skills. This initiative proved to be very beneficial. Indeed, we suggest that the language issue should not be forgotten in the future. Given that one of the major goal of EAESP summer schools is to provide access to top level training in social psychology to those who may not already benefit from such training as much as others, it must be recognized that language may be one critical barrier in this process. We have tried to deal with this issue but other initiatives might prove useful so that people who don't speak English are not completely left out.

Fourth, we would not want to end this report without mentioning a few words about the social program of the Clermont-Ferrand Summer School. As social psychologists, we believe that people can work productively together to the extent that they feel good and have fun. To this end, a series of social events were planned, and scheduled at various critical points during the two weeks. We are happy to report that these events were well attended and instrumental in making of the 2000 Summer School a constructive and memorable experience (please see below, after the reports from each workshops, some reports on these social events by a random selection of participants).

Finally, it is also important to note that the EAESP Summer School 2000 has been rated as one of the best projects (#1 on several criteria) by the French government among 26 other European Schools (including those in Math, Biology, etc.) which took place in France last summer. As a consequence, our summer school received financial support as well as the official and very prestigious label of " Université Européenne d'été " from the national department of education (directed by Mr. Jack Lang).

So, here are first, reports on the significant events that occurred within each of the five workshops, followed by more informal impressions volunteered by four students whom we thank for their efforts.

Reports by teachers and participants of each workshop

Workshop #1 on Attitudes: Summary of Activities

Gerd Bohner (external teacher) and Patrick Chambres (internal teacher)

The aim of this workshop was to advance students' understanding of theoretical developments in attitudes and persuasion. During week#1, presentations alternated with reading and discussion sessions. The topics and some questions addressed were:

- A brief overview of persuasion research.
- The heuristic-systematic model (HSM) and the unimodel of persuasion: Critical issues and avenues for further research. What constitutes a psychological process? Is a "cue vs argument" distinction ecologically valid?
- Applying the unimodel's concept of syllogistic reasoning to cue and argument processing. Here we discussed syllogistic and correspondent inferences in two-sided persuasion.
- Is there a link between source cues and processing motives? In this section we talked about the HSM's interplay of processing modes, and the conditions for bias correction.
- Applying a dual-process approach to subjective experiences as a basis of attitudinal processing. This discussion focused on ease of retrieval versus amount of information retrieved as determinants of judgment.
- Implications of Wilson et al.'s model of dual attitudes for persuasion research. Various issues were addressed, including implicit measurement in persuasion research.

During week#2, groups of students worked on specific issues of interest and designed their own studies (see the groups' reports below). Several students also made use of the opportunity for individual consultation with the teachers.

Group A:

Re-mapping the dual processing view (Roland Deutsch, Melissa Ferguson, Andres Haye, Angélique Pannetier, René Ziegler)

Our group focused on the current debate on single versus dual processing in persuasion. Specifically, we tried to pinpoint the HSM's process assumptions (Chen & Chaiken, 1999) against those of the unimodel (UM, Kruglanski & Thompson, 1999). This resulted in a mapping of the processes described in both models along two basic dimensions: (A) the complexity of the information used and the corresponding processing; (B) the degree of automaticity with which information is encoded and processed. Moreover, both models imply that information processing depends on the accessibility of judgment-relevant knowledge. We therefore concluded that a two-step framework of persuasion processes might be useful. In the first step, knowledge can be activated by the message, the context, and states of the perceiver. In the second step, activated knowledge is processed by the application of judgmental rules, which may differ in complexity and automaticity. We also discussed whether heuristic processing might be understood as an associative process, and systematic processing as a rule-based process (see Smith & DeCoster, 1999). To further explore the first part of this idea, a study was designed in which heuristic cues will be presented subliminally.

Group B:

The subliminal activation of heuristic cues (Olga Gulevich, Izabela Krejtz, Grzegorz Pochwatko)

The HSM claims that there are two different modes of information processing, which can interact with each other. However, the relation between heuristic and systematic processing has not been clearly established. The activation of heuristics may be automatic and not depend on cognitive resources whereas systematic processing is based on elaboration and requires cognitive capacity. The conditions necessary for heuristic activation have not been fully tested. In our study we aim to determine whether heuristics such as "experts' statements are valid" may be automatically activated at very early stages of information processing at an unconscious level. To test the hypothesis of preconscious activation of heuristics a study based on Chaiken and Maheswaran (1994) was planned.

Instead of providing explicit information about the message source, in the experimental condition a series of keywords associated with the 'expert' heuristic (e.g. doctor, expert) will be presented subliminally while participants read about a product. In the control condition participants will be presented with nonsense words. We predict that perception of an ambiguous message should be biased by unconsciously activated heuristic information. Thus, ratings of product favourability and source credibility will be higher when participants elaborate the ambiguous message while being exposed to the 'expert' primes than in the control condition.

Group C:

Combining an intergroup perspective with a dual processing approach to persuasion (Jean-Christophe Giger, Diniz Lopes, Anne Taillandier, Florence Terrade)

We focused on relations between the HSM and social identity / self-categorisation theory. Although some studies have examined the consequences of ingroup / outgroup differentiation on attitude change, HSM predictions have not been tested in the context of intergroup relations. Thus, we outlined designs that integrate the ingroup / outgroup differentiation in the HSM. We wanted to analyse the impact of ingroup / outgroup differentiation and its interplay with motivational factors on information processing and ultimately attitude change. Two experiments were outlined: a 2 (argument quality: strong vs weak) x 2 (group differentiation: ingroup vs. outgroup), and a 2 (motivation to process information: high vs. low) x 2 (group differentiation: ingroup vs. outgroup), both between-subjects designs. The main dependent variables proposed were: time spent reading the message, thoughts listed, and attitude judgments. For the first design, we predicted that participants in the ingroup condition would process systematically, whereas participants in the outgroup condition would process more heuristically. Concerning our second design (in which only strong arguments will be used), we hypothesised an interaction effect between motivation and group differentiation, i.e., under low motivation the ingroup (vs outgroup) message leads to more attitude change, whereas under high motivation both ingroup and outgroup message lead to a similar degree of attitude change.

Group D:

The influence of cognitive capacity and ease of retrieval on attitude judgments (Karine Grenier, Eva Jonas, Karen Jordens, Francesca Paleari)

Generating few (many) pieces of information is accompanied by a feeling of ease (difficulty), but also provides a small (large) amount of judgment-relevant content. In previous research, individuals to whom a certain risk was personally relevant judged this risk according to the amount of risk-related items they had generated, whereas individuals to whom the risk was less relevant relied on experienced ease of retrieval (e.g., Rothman & Schwarz, 1998). Schwarz and colleagues aligned these strategies with systematic and heuristic processing, respectively. However, as these authors indirectly measured (rather than manipulated) relevance, its causal role remained unclear. To overcome this problem, we manipulated cognitive effort, a factor known to affect processing mode, at the time of forming an attitude judgment. Summer school students were asked to retrieve 4 (easy condition) or 20 (difficult condition) animal names in their second language. Later participants were given 4's (low capacity) or unlimited time (high capacity) to rate their proficiency in this language. We predicted and found that high capacity participants exhibit systematic processing, giving higher judgments when the number of names generated was high rather than low. An opposite pattern was predicted for participants in the low capacity condition, who were expected to rely on ease of recall; here, no difference between easy and difficult conditions emerged. Thus, the results partially supported predictions.

References

- Chaiken, S., & Maheswaran, D. (1994). Heuristic processing can bias systematic processing: Effects of source credibility, argument ambiguity, and task importance on attitude judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **66**, 460-473.
- Chen, S., & Chaiken, S. (1999). The heuristic-systematic model in its broader context. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology* (pp. 73-96). New York: Guilford.
- Kruglanski, A. W., & Thompson, E. P. (1999). Persuasion by a single route: A view from the unimodel. *Psychological Inquiry*, **10**, 83-109.

- Rothman, A. J., & Schwarz, N. (1998). Constructing perceptions of vulnerability: Personal relevance and the use of experiential information in health judgments. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *24*, 1053-1064.
- Smith, E. R., & DeCoster, J. (1998). Knowledge acquisition, accessibility, and use in person perception and stereotyping: Simulation with a recurrent connectionist network. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 21-35.

**Workshop #2 on Stigma and Discrimination: Summary of Activities
Brenda Major (external teacher) and Jean-Claude Croizet (internal teacher)**

Our goals were to provide a broad overview of classic and contemporary theory and research on stigma, to explore in depth a core set of emerging and unresolved issues in the study of stigma, and to generate testable research hypotheses and designs. We focused on the psychological predicaments of those who are targets of negative stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination, and the implications of these predicaments. We considered in depth the emerging literatures on “stereotype threat”, “attributional ambiguity”, the antecedents and consequences of perceiving oneself as a target of prejudice, and the influence of perceived control and legitimacy on coping strategies employed by the stigmatized.

We sought to facilitate interaction and sharing of ideas among participants, provide a strong foundation for future collaborative research, and have fun. We met daily as an entire group, but also frequently divided into smaller groups for discussion of readings and generation of research ideas. This format allowed students more of an opportunity to speak and get to know each other, and circumvented some language difficulties. One consequence of this approach, however, was that we did not cover as much material as we had planned, and found ourselves continually revising our reading assignments and agenda. Hence the adoption of our group motto, Be flexible! Near the end of the second week of the workshop, students selected three research hypotheses to pursue and divided into groups, each of which designed an experiment. We look forward to conducting these experiments in the future.

Report from students in workshop#2:

Cinzia Albanesi, Sophie Berjot, Vera Cubela, Stéphane Dif, Florence Dumas, Marion Dutrévis, Anja Eller, Gabriella Gonçalves, Frédéric Grouzet, Federica Invernizzi, Larissa Myaskovsky, Sandrine Redersdorff, Anette Rohmann, Despina Rothi, Daan Scheepers and Pascal Wagner-Egger.

The workshop was a very enriching experience for all of us. We were sixteen people coming from nine different countries, speaking seven different languages, each with a different theoretical background but all with the same aim: sharing our different viewpoints to reach a common understanding about stigmatization, led by Brenda and Jean-Claude. Participating in the workshop provided us with many new ideas for future research, a basis for future scientific collaborations, and, most importantly, new lasting friendships.

Frequently, our workshop studied as one large group; however, smaller subgroups allowed us to discuss and critically evaluate various topics. We quickly learned to BE FLEXIBLE - which became our motto - both in terms of timetable and group organization.

Overall, we felt very privileged to have had the opportunity to work with Brenda and Jean-Claude. We believe that our careers as researchers have been enriched by this experience; and we look forward to sharing our research results with you in conferences to come!

The following outline will give an overview of the topics we discussed, followed by the research ideas we generated.

Stigmatization is the possession of some attribute or characteristic that conveys a social identity that is devalued in a particular social context (Crocker, Major & Steele, 1998). We focused on the target's perspective with an emphasis on stigmatized groups in Western society (e.g., women, ethnic minorities, and the obese). Such groups are often confronted with prevailing cultural stereotypes directed against them, which may lead to conformity to the stereotype (e.g. women's poorer performance in science). This situation was formalized by C. Steele and colleagues in their

stereotype threat theory. Stereotype threat is thus a situational threat that can affect the members of any group about whom a negative stereotype exists and leads to impaired performance (Steele, 1997).

Stigmatized group members use coping strategies, defined as attempts to eliminate or minimize the impact of prejudice by using cognitive, emotional, and behavioral responses (Stangor & Swim, 1998). One example is disengagement, the detachment of self-esteem from external feedback or outcomes in a particular domain, such that feelings of self-worth are not dependent on success or failure in that domain (Major, Spencer et al., 1998).

Another strategy to protect self-esteem is that of attributing negative outcomes to prejudice instead of internal causes (cf. Crocker and Major, 1994).

Sometimes, disadvantaged groups accept the discrimination and stereotypes directed against them by endorsing their legitimacy. Status-legitimizing ideologies are consensually held attitudes, beliefs, and values within society that help to sustain the idea that the social system is fair (Major et al., under review).

Small-group research ideas

Private Threat Or Public Pressure? Stereotype Threat Revisited
Drawing on the literature on sex differences in math performance and stereotype threat (ST), we integrated recent findings that indicate that people do not need to have a history of stigmatization to experience threat. Instead, existing situational pressures can create apprehension about meeting the high expectations of others. We thus propose the notion of stereotype pressure (SP) to demonstrate that in particular situations positive stereotypes can hinder performance. Accordingly, our study focuses on the difference between being at risk of disconfirming a positive stereotype (i.e. SP) versus that of confirming a negative stereotype (i.e. ST). These two dynamics will be studied by examining the moderating effects of public and private contexts in the domain of mathematics among male students. To further differentiate the two

concepts, the specific mediators between ST, and performance and SP and performance will also be investigated.

The Role of Perceived Controllability in Coping With Stigma

Our research aims to investigate the role of perceived controllability on coping with negative outcomes. The literature shows that negative outcomes are especially likely for the stigmatized. Moreover it suggests that different coping strategies are available to face such stressful, resource-consuming experiences. We are particularly interested in understanding how perceived control over future outcomes (Testa and Major, 1990) can affect the choice of coping strategies after a negative outcome on intellectual performance. We predict that increasing control over future outcomes would lead to a problem-focused strategy (i.e., increased effort) than to a withdrawal-oriented strategy (e.g., disengagement), especially when performance is related to a highly valued domain in society.

Ideology in the air: How what we should be shape what we are
We propose to study Status-Legitimizing Ideologies (SLI) within a "stereotype threat" paradigm. Will people who endorse a Protestant Ethic Ideology (i.e., individual responsibility, hard work, and self-discipline) be affected differently than those who do not endorse it? According to social justice theories, low status people often accept and justify existing status hierarchies, even when these hierarchies are disadvantageous to themselves or to their groups. They believe they deserve their lesser outcomes. Thus, for people highly identified with the domain in which they are tested, the fear of confirming the stereotype would be enhanced when SLI is made salient.

Workshop # 3: THE SELF

Constantine Sedikides (external teacher) and Pascal Huguet (internal teacher)

Students: V. Brenninkmeyer, M. Chalard, S. Corsini, G. Delelis, M. Luke, T. Gauthier, K. Jonas, O. Hunyady, B. Monin, N. Pylat, J. Pietrzak, I. Regner, M. Ryan, F. Siebler, J. Smith.

General introduction

This workshop introduced students to the area of the self through discussion and debate of selected issues. We started by considering general questions, such as how the constructs of self and self-esteem are defined, how the self is cognitively represented, and what the content and functions of the self are. We also placed the self in evolutionary, historical, and cultural context.

We proceeded with debating and discussing three major topics. To begin, we considered whether the self-concept is relatively stable or malleable. We looked at classic and contemporary experiments on the topic, examined the situational and life-stage circumstances under which the self-concept is likely to be stable or malleable, and discussed mechanisms of malleability or stability. One mechanism of self-concept stability is positive illusions. We detailed the illusions that individuals use to maintain a positive self-concept, discussed the link between illusions and psychological health, asked whether modesty and illusions can co-exist, and explored how close relationships may keep illusions in check while maintaining psychological health.

However, as powerful as they may be, relationship closeness does not seem to affect substantially the self-concept of narcissists. We defined narcissism, attempted to enter the enigmatic world of narcissists, and discussed narcissistic cognitive and emotional responses to negative feedback, narcissistic partner selection, and narcissistic strategies for the maintenance of a highly positive self-concept.

A brief overview of selected topics among others

The stable and malleable self

How is the self construed? One of the most central debates in research on the self is whether the self-concept is relatively stable or malleable. This question has been explicitly addressed in much research and is implicitly assumed in many other areas of psychological research. The self workshop focused much discussion on a number of mechanisms that can bring about self-concept change. Self-concept change can arise through internal and long-term mechanisms such as the development of personality. In addition, change can arise through external, situational factors such as the impact of other persons and groups on the self. Guided by symbolic interactionism theory, much research has focused on the impact of other individuals on our self-concept. This influence manifests itself in the acceptance of such mechanisms as reflected appraisals, sculpting of the ideal self, and self-fulfilling prophecy. However, more recently, research interest has concentrated on the active role that the self takes in interpreting how others see us. This active role is carried out through such processes as projected appraisal and the self-serving bias. While it is obvious that other individuals have a great deal of impact on our selves, the impact of group membership on self-concept change needs to be emphasized. While a flexible self-concept is an underlying assumption in the social identity and self-categorization perspectives, there has not been much empirical testing of how group membership affects self-concept change. One useful way of investigating this impact is by looking at how group variables such as salience, identification, normative behavior and identifiability impact on the self using social cognition and self-evaluation perspectives.

Positive illusions

Research on self-evaluation has uncovered three types of positive illusions: inflated positive views of self, exaggerated perceptions of control, and unrealistic optimism. These positive illusions are pervasive. Also, despite some evidence to the contrary, these illusions are related to greater happiness, higher self-esteem, ability to care for others and ability for creative and productive work. Social context may aid us in counteracting these tendencies. Close relationships lead to more modest self-

presentations (i.e. individuals present themselves less favorably to friends than to strangers) and to the reduction of the self-serving bias (i.e. when working with friends, individuals do not take more responsibility for dyadic success and less blame for dyadic failure than their partner). On the other hand, closely related others may contribute to the maintenance of an individual's positive self-image by presenting the individual to others in a positive light and by helping the individual to pursue his or her ideal self. Several unresolved issues remain. First, can individuals function effectively in the relative absence of positive illusions? Can individuals be both realistic and happy? Second, to what extent do close relationships foster positive illusions versus dispel them? Finally, to what extent can positive illusions about the self foster close relationships?

The enigmatic world of narcissists

What does narcissism mean? Narcissism is often conceptualized as a personality disorder characterized by feelings of grandiosity, eagerness for admiration, hypersensitivity to rejection, lack of empathy, and exploitativeness. In non-clinical populations narcissism is treated as a continuous variable. A well-established measure of narcissism is the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) that contains seven components: authority, exhibitionism, superiority, entitlement exploitativeness, self-sufficiency, and vanity. Compared to individuals who score lower on the NPI (LNPI), research suggests that those who score higher (HNPI) are less likely to accept negative feedback. That is, HNPI respond to negative feedback with anger, aggression and anxiety, and select admiring and perfect persons as romantic partners. Individuals higher in narcissism appear to have a special talent in maintaining their highly positive self-concept. How do they accomplish this endeavour? One mechanism worth exploring is comparison processes. Individuals may compare with their past self (temporal comparison) or with others (social comparison). Temporal comparisons may provide less threatening information and may have greater self-enhancing potential compared to social comparisons, because they allow the HNPI to relish in their own sense of superiority, or allow the HNPI to select dimensions on which they are certain that they have improved. In contrast, social comparisons are likely to include greater threat potential because they force the HNPI to consider that they are not

as 'superior' as they thought. Hence, HNPI will be likely to engage in temporal comparison rather than social comparison.

Workshop #4 on Group perceptions and social cognition

Patricia Devine (external teacher) and Markus Brauer (internal teacher)

Our goals for the workshop were to create an context in which the participants had the opportunity to read extensively on issues related to prejudice and stereotypes, and to explore together the theoretical and empirical implications of our reading. We focused on the dual themes of automaticity and control in the study of prejudice and stereotyping, with a core emphasis on the distinction between implicit and explicit expressions of prejudice. Identifying relevant readings and outlining the content to be covered was the easy part of the process. The primary challenge was to develop a format that would enable the participants to learn a great deal, get to know each other, circumvent potential language barriers, and enjoy themselves in the process. We believe we succeeded on all fronts. During the first week, we spent most of our time reading and discussing relevant literature. To encourage contact among the students, part of our time was devoted to student presentations of relevant readings. We divided students into small groups (size 3), but each time the small groups they were comprised of different individuals. This strategy provided students with an opportunity to interact with all other participants in the workshop and created a cooperative context. The second week, we continued our reading, but also generated empirical implications of the issues raised through our reading. (We also took some time to have students share with each other their ongoing research activities.) Our specific agenda was to develop four clear, testable hypotheses and to design experiments to test the hypotheses, as well as set up time tables for the completion of the projects. Students selected the topics for this process and sorted themselves into work groups based on their interests. The product of these work groups resulted in four projects that we all look forward to completing.

Report from students in workshop#4:

Summer school opened with welcoming drinks and finding out who is who and more specifically who is in your workshop and who is not. On Monday, we got started by introducing ourselves and showing on the map of Europe where we all come from. Our group consisted of people from all corners, Spain (Susana Puertas and Esther Lopez-Zafra), Poland (Slawek Spiewak and Marek Drogosz), Hungary (Paszkal Kiss), Italy (Antonello Chirumbolo), Germany (Thomas Schubert and Katja Ehrenberg), the Netherlands (Boukje Keijzer and Wendy Van Rijswijk), Belgium (Jeroen Vaes) and, of course, France (Nathalie Dalle, Juliette Richetin, Anne-Claire Rattat, and Peggy Chekroun); we also had Shannon (McCoy) from the USA, but that was not on the map. Trish advised us to keep a personal journal and write down all those great research ideas that were to emerge. We had discussions about what is prejudice and what are stereotypes and concluded that even these seemingly basic concepts are rather fuzzy and many different definitions exist. Furthermore, we were given an outline of what to expect from the days to come and were provided with just some more readings, articles, manuscripts and book chapters.

As a consequence, the next day, we went straight into the more scientific program. During the first week, we would be reading and discussing and discussing and reading heaps of papers. After struggling with the existence and appropriateness of their definitions, we visualized the interplay of such central concepts as the availability, accessibility, activation, applicability and judged usability of stereotypic knowledge. Also, a great number of possible mediating and moderating factors were considered. After that, the blackboard was full of arrows and our brains full of confusion. We also got deep into the issue of implicit and explicit ways to measure stereotyping and prejudice and exchanged on their respective internal reliability and predictive validity. On Friday, we had the opportunity to have an illustrative look at diverse computer tasks designed as implicit stereotype measures, including sequential priming and, of course, the IAT (although not sure what that actually measures). Furthermore, we learnt that "most women are secretaries" (Markus) and that juggling with coffee and water during the break requires special motor skills (Trish).

On Friday evening, we all went into town to celebrate France's national holiday and enjoyed the fireworks in honour of the values of liberté, égalité and fraternité. Strangely enough, most of us ended up in an Irish pub for the rest of the night. On the weekend, we had some time to rest our brains and to remember that we also had a body. After a Saturday off, we went to the Puy de Dôme, one of the Auvergne's top sights to see and climb - no matter how wet the weather is and the day ended with a very nice dinner in the middle of a cloud. The following day, we toured the countryside to see some small villages and to do a beautiful hike through the mountains. Afterwards, we restored ourselves on the probably chilliest pique-nique ever held.

Thus relaxed, on Monday 9 o'clock sharp we were back to explore our cognitive volcanoes again. After a hot debate on the controllability of stereotypic judgments and behaviors as well as the role of values and motivation in taming The Cognitive Monster, scrutinizing different sources and aspects of peoples motivation not to appear prejudiced. Furthermore, some participants took the opportunity to present their PhD research projects. On Wednesday morning, following an interesting system of choosing from 28 research questions, we split up into four subgroups to work out hypotheses and derive concrete experimental designs. Those 28 topics of investigation had been updated online during all the discussions and presentations we had, and if the blackboard had offered some more square meters, there would have probably been many more. These studies are ready to be conducted as international cooperations once we are back home. Friday we spend listening to the interesting presentations all the groups gave about there work. At night, the summerschool was concluded with little dinner and lots of dancing in a beautiful castle.

We had a great time and feel that what we take home from this workshop in terms of ideas and ways of thinking about issues is to last for years. We not only gained a lot of knowledge on the scientific field but also learned about social psychology in other countries. We wish to thank Trish and Markus for raising questions instead of pretending that there were clear answers. We also wish to thank the local organizing committee for doing a tremendous job in making sure that the social part did not fade next to the

psychological one as well as, in the second week, the summer part did not fade next to the school one who ever might be held responsible for this.

On behalf of the whole group, Katja Ehrenberg and Wendy van Rijswijk.

Workshop#5 on Intergroup Relations: Summary of activities
Dominic Abrams (external teacher) and Serge Guimond (internal teacher)

We started by conducting an informal questionnaire survey, revealing that participants' interests spanned four themes. On the basis of self-assigned interests this gave us four 4-person work teams' a good start for any experiment! Throughout the workshop all the teams shared information and reported back to the larger group. We also assembled a common literature list and a list of measures. In the first week we decided to review the relevant literature and set out a conceptual framework for analyzing each theme. In the second week we aimed to design and pilot an empirical study for each theme. We also took time out to discuss issues of common interest (measurement of identification, social dominance orientation, social identity and self-categorisation theories, where to get the best coffee).

Some people thought our aims were crazily ambitious, others merely thought we were crazy. Both perceptions may contain a kernel of truth. Contrary to rumours, we all worked frenetically, despite hangovers, dehydration, heat exhaustion, essential excursions and various other excesses that we are too polite to mention here. And (at least for the workshop leaders) it was a truly intellectually rewarding and fun experience. Well, the four thematic groups can describe for themselves what they actually did:

Ideology, Legitimacy and Minorities

Sandra Duarte, Christina Mosso, Mark Nolan, Jean-Pierre Vernet

Our subgroup focused specifically on the processes by which a low-status group justifies the system (the status quo). In reviewing the literature, at

least two theories seemed relevant for explaining this phenomenon: Social Justification Theory and Social Identity theory.

We developed a questionnaire for a study with a 2 x 2 design involving In-group Status (high level vs. low level) and Stability of Inter-group Status Differences (stable vs. unstable). The stability factor will be used as a manipulation of the history of intergroup status differences. We derived predictions from both SJT and SIT. We are currently preparing to conduct a cross-national study in which a European Union decision (common EU level of national spending on public hospital systems) will be presented. In order to manipulate status, the in-group country will be depicted as needing to spend more (or less) than the out-group country to meet the EU target. The history of relative spending on hospitals for 2 EU member countries will be presented graphically to manipulate the stability variable. We will measure perceived legitimacy of the EU, identification with the nation, identification with the EU, and nationalism. In addition, social dominance orientation, and system justification will be measured. Data will now be collected in several countries including France and Italy.

Categorisation and Differentiation Within and Between Groups: The Likeable Rogue

Florence Loose, Isabel Pinto, Ian Schembrucker & Hazel Willis

According to Social Identity Theory, in-group members should generally be evaluated more positively than equivalent out-group members. However, Marques and colleagues have demonstrated that an unlikable out-group member is in fact more positively evaluated than an unlikable in-group member. They have also demonstrated that a deviant out-group member may be preferred over a deviant in-group member. It is suggested that the less positive evaluation of the in-group deviant or unlikable members may both operate to maintain the positive social identity of the group.

Previous research has not closely examined whether responses to variations in likeability and deviance affect the same (social identity maintenance) processes. The two factors have sometimes been implicitly confounded. A normative in-group member may be perceived as likeable,

likewise a likeable in-group member may be perceived as normative. The reverse may also be true for out-group members. Our group reviewed the literature and designed a study to disentangle the effects of likeability and deviance by manipulating likeability and deviance independently. Therefore, we hope to see how people judge a 'Black Sheep' as compared as a 'Likeable Rogue'. While at the Summer School we pilot tested the materials for this study, and are hoping to conduct the full study this year.

Disappearance of groups and identity maintenance: Life after death?

Christelle Maisonneuve, Cristina Palli, Pavel Tcherkassov, Anat Zafran

Relationships of power and domination often constitute a threat for members of minority groups. According to Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and Relative Deprivation Theory (Crosby, 1976, 1982; Folger, 1986; Gurr, 1970), such unfavourable situation may lead members of these groups to develop a negative identity, that they may try to restore using collective or individual strategies (Berry, 1980, Bourhis, Morse, Perreault & Senecal, 1997; Ellemers, 1993; Lalonde & Cameron, 1993; Mummendey and al., 1999).

These theories implicitly regard the group's existence as not challenged. But in a transforming world, national (e.g. USSR), organizational (e.g. hi-tech companies), religious (e.g. Catharism) or small groups (e.g. a summer school) may disappear or be under threat of disappearance (e.g. the Tibetan case). Can identification persist even if the structural group has disappeared? If the answer is yes, a question arises concerning the mechanisms and variables involved in maintaining the identity of a disappearing group.

This question was be approached regarding the EAESP Summer School group, which was due to disappear in two weeks. The aim was to measure, with a longitudinal perspective, those variables (identification, cohesiveness, entitativity, distinctiveness, interdependence, group efficacy, group expectancies) involved in the maintenance or disappearance of the identity of its members, which could also mediate the commitment to collective or individual strategies.

The Threat of Low-Status Power Gain on High Status Identity

Michael Dambrun, Lucie Kocum, David Marx, Marius Van Dijke

The impact of social threat on high-status group identity was assessed in light of social identity theory (SIT) and social dominance orientation (SDO). Consistent with these theories, we reasoned that power/status gains by low-status group members may have the potential to threaten high-status group identity in terms of value and distinctiveness. In other words, endorsing a power/status stratified view of the world, and being a member of a high-status group, should result in strategies to maintain the current state of affairs. In the face of social threat, however, reactions are also contingent upon the strength of identification with the in-group. Accordingly, high identifiers may react with increased in-group association and solidarity, whereas low identifiers may distance themselves from the in-group.

We designed and conducted a present study in which (non Summer School) male participants were asked to imagine a situation in which a woman became the new president of France. It was predicted that high SDO participants would view this low-status power gain as more threatening than would low SDO participants. Furthermore, high SDO participants, who are also highly identified with their in-group, would show more minimization of in-group differences and maximization of between group differences. Low identifiers, on the other hand, would show decreased identification with their in-group. To the amazement of all, including ourselves, we obtained significant support for some of these predictions.

Informal Reports on the social program by a random selection of students who volunteered comments:

1. 'Summer delight' by Kai J. Jonas

In one of the informational mailings previous to the summer school, Clermont-Ferrand, Central France was promised to us as pleasant warm summer temperatures in a surrounding that has been inhabited since prehistoric times. Upon our arrival, the city had taken a spontaneous 180

degrees swing and turned itself into a cold and rainy place with delicate seventies housing projects in one of which we were doomed to live in. There, La salle de musculation turned out to be an anabolic dungeon and stressed the fact that we were here merely to train our brain. Knowing these sudden profile swings of their city the organizing committee had done an outstanding job to reduce our suffering. Food was the primary choice to nurture our bruised and dented motivational states during the first week, although we sometimes even had to work for it, i.e. climb mountains during stormy rain (Puy de Dôme) or cover beside a bus and nimble on our lunch after a stressful walk, yet the delights of the French kitchen made up for all obstacles. In the second week, with the weather, food and social events got even better than the week before and all our ingenious thinking was rewarded more than we deserved with feasts and dance in romantic chateaus. May we come back and do it all again, please?

2. 'Untitled' by *Gérald Delelis*

It seems to me that this EAESP summer school in Clermont-Ferrand was a real success. Regardless of the pure activities of a summer school (a lot of work - too much, note it if you are one of the organizers of the next summer school - even during the evenings, and interesting professional encounters and debates), the extra-activities were as pleasant as expected, and maybe more!

Members had individual rooms in a nice residence, the doors of this residence were never closed (even at 4 am...). We had all the meals at this same place and I think we ate too much ! Actually, it wasn't unpleasant.

After we read the papers (late in the evenings) we often went out for some drinks. Summer school are also done to discover other students around a table full of drinks, no ? There were great moments of incomprehension and subsequent laughs and as well great discussions about life in Germany, North Ireland, Netherlands, and so on.

Concerning special diners (especially the one which took place in a wonderful castle), parties and the marvellous walk on the country side of Auvergne are things I'll never forget and not solely because of a cold and headache. The sky was never blue but the staff of clermontois provided us

with smiles and good advices related to how not to be bored in Clermont-Ferrand after days plenty of reflexions using a language which is not my native one.

Keep in mind these two weeks of July 2000, hello to all and each of you, summer school 2000 members and at last thank you to the organizers.

3. 'Sincerely' by Jessi L Smith

I particularly valued the events that allowed all the students to interact socially. From the simple occasions, like eating most of our meals together, to the highly organized events such as the site-seeing trips through the region - having the opportunity to get to know all of the participants really facilitated a sense of partnership and friendship that extended beyond the bounds of the individual workshops. For instance, I would have to say that living in such close quarters was highly advantageous because it allowed us to meet to discuss topics of research, the state of the science, and the like in an "easygoing" and neutral atmosphere while also providing a more informal setting to enjoy a cup of tea or devour a scoop of ice cream among friends. I very much treasure the people that I met during the Summer School, and I look forward to calling on each and every one of them to share in, and put to work, their enthusiasm for social psychological research.

4. 'Embracing the Black Sheep' by Lucie Kocum

Free from the practical worries that often ground us in daily life, our only preoccupations as students and teachers of the Clermont-Ferrand Summer School were academic and social activities. Most of our waking hours were spent together in work and play and, as such, a great sense of intimacy was fostered.

Although we all connected very closely, many of us felt marginal in terms of our research interests, as though our own research was too particular, too philosophical, or too applied to be appropriate for a summer school in experimental social psychology. It is my feeling, however, that our own feelings as "black sheep", which rendered the endeavour challenging, also

functioned to be more didactically interesting than would have been an exercise in theoretical and methodological consensus. The summer school experience emphasized the importance of not only being aware of research other than our own, but of recognizing the utility of gathering tools outside of the theoretically and methodologically insular settings of our laboratories. It is through our differences that we will learn the most, form the strongest and most lasting of collaborations and, in the long-term, generate the most epistemologically valuable knowledge.

Concluding thoughts

We hope this report was able to convey the scientific, and perhaps also the psychological and social significance of the events that took place in the Laboratoire de Psychologie Sociale de la Cognition in Clermont-Ferrand. In closing, we would like to thank the organizers of the previous Summer School, held in Leuven in 1998 for providing us with invaluable help in our undertakings. Without all the information and useful tips that Jacques-Philippe Leyens and Eddy van Avermaet shared with us, the 2000 Summer School would not have led to the positive effects noted above. Finally, we would like to thank Sibylle Classen for her usual efficiency and devotion from which we have greatly benefited, and the members of the Executive Committee of EAESP for their support.

We wish all the best to the organizers of the next summer school and hope that we can also provide them, in return, with any help that they might need.

The organizing committee of the Summer School 2000,
Markus Brauer, Jean-Claude Croizet
Serge Guimond, Pascal Huguet
Laboratoire de Psychologie Sociale de la Cognition, Clermont-Ferrand
<http://wwwpsy.univ-bpclermont.fr/school2000/>

Grants

Georgios Abakoumkin (travel grant)
Angel Gomez Jimenez (seedcorn grant)
Cristina Zogmaister (travel grant)

GRANT REPORTS**Mirjam Tazelaar, Free University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(postgraduate travel grant)**

For a long period of time, the Department of Social Psychology of The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) and the Department of Social Psychology at the Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam (VU) are working together in a very pleasant and productive way. Within the scope of this co-operation, I visited the University of North Carolina from August till December 2000; a visit which the EAESP postgraduate travel grant made possible. Apart from deepening and extending the existing co-operation, the main goal of this visit was to exchange theoretical and methodological knowledge and to develop research together with Prof. dr. Caryl Rusbult and members of her research group; Tim Wildschut, Eli Finkel, and Michael Coolson.

My PhD. research centres on the question of how to overcome misunderstandings, or 'noise' in social dilemma's, that is, situations characterised by a conflict between self-interest and collective interest. Noise can have detrimental effects in everyday life. When co-operative intentions are misperceived as non-co-operation, and others react to this with selfish or even antisocial behaviour, to 'punish' or take revenge, this can cause the ending of relationships or provoke fights, and even war. From everyday experiences and early studies at the VU, we expected that, besides situational and personal characteristics, features of the relationship between people might influence people's behaviour in noisy situations to a great extent. For this reason, I was very interested in learning about research on relationships, as done in Chapel Hill. At the same time, the

research group at Chapel Hill was very interested in the topic of noise and in learning to work with the experimental paradigm we use at the VU. Working together formed an ideal opportunity to combine the different topics and learn from each other's research experiences.

We brought the two lines of research (on close relationships and on noise) together in an experiment on trust. Based on the knowledge of relationship maintenance strategies, we expected that trust in the partner in an interaction would be of great importance in situations with noise. Whenever a person trusts his/her partner it would be easier to attribute outcomes which are more negative than expected to situational factors instead of to bad intentions of the partner. Hence, we hypothesised that people who interacted with a trustworthy partner would exhibit high levels of co-operation in a social dilemma even under conditions of noise, while people interacting with an untrustworthy partner would exhibit lower levels of co-operation, especially in a condition with noise. Furthermore, we expected that besides impressions on the trustworthiness of a partner, the behaviour of this partner during the interaction would be very important to maintain trust in a partner or to overcome a bad first impression. From earlier research, we know that a partner who behaves in a reciprocal way elicits high levels of co-operation in an interaction without noise, but not in a situation with noise. In a situation with noise, it is better to be more generous in order to prevent cycles of mutual non-co-operation. The results of a study in which we varied the impression of trustworthiness of the partner (high vs. low) and the strategy of the partner (strictly reciprocal, i.e. Tit-For-Tat vs. more generous, i.e. Tit-For-Tat-plus-one) in two conditions of a give-some dilemma (without noise vs. with noise), partly confirmed our hypotheses. In an interaction with noise, people exhibited lower levels of co-operation than in a situation without noise. This effect was stronger when the partner acted in a strictly reciprocal manner than in a more generous manner, i.e., a more generous strategy was able to overcome the detrimental effects of noise on co-operation. Co-operation was highest with a trustworthy partner, especially in the first part of the interaction. However, we did not find interactions of the impressions of trustworthiness of the partner with the strategy of the partner, nor with the condition of the interaction (with or without noise). We concluded from these results, that a first impression of trustworthiness of a (strange) partner can be important for starting co-

operation with this partner, but does not seem to be strong enough to overcome detrimental effects of noise when behaviour is not adjusted to a noisy situation.

Besides conducting this research, I was involved in discussing and planning future research at UNC on the topic of noise and I helped writing research proposals for some of these studies. In weekly meetings, both my own (present and past) research as the research of the other group members were discussed. These discussions were not only very interesting, but also a great deal of fun. I found it a very useful experience to have discussions with people at UNC, not only from my research group, but also with others. By discussing different topics in social psychology, my knowledge has been broadened and I got new ideas for future research. I also gave a presentation about the results of the study in Chapel Hill and some former studies, which turned out to be a nice experience, both for me as for members of the department. Furthermore, I supervised three third-year students in a course on research skills.

My stay at UNC was a very worthy experience, both in a scientific as in a personal way. I have learned a lot of new things, had the feeling that my knowledge and help were appreciated to a large extend by the people at UNC, and besides I enjoyed staying at beautiful Chapel Hill and getting to know the people of the department. To my enlightenment, the co-operation with Prof. dr. Caryl Rusbult and her group are continued. I am very glad I could spent these months at UNC and I am grateful that the EAESP supported this visit so generously.

Announcements

Next Editor of the European Journal

The Executive Committee is pleased to announce that Alex Haslam (University of Exeter, UK) will be the next editor of the European Journal of Social Psychology. His term will begin in January 2002. His editorial statement as well as the presentation of his editorial team will be published in the next issue of the Bulletin

Election of New Executive Committee Members - Call for Nominations-

Four members of the current Executive Committee will have served their term of office and are due to be replaced on the General Meeting next year in San Sebastian.

According to the Standing Orders of the Association, the nomination procedure is as follows:

- (1) At least four months before the election, full members are asked for nominations.
- (2) Each nomination must be supported by two full members and addressed to the Secretary Dominic Abrams (Centre for the Study of Group Processes, Department of Psychology, University of Kent at Canterbury, KENT CT2 7NP, UK) at least three months before the members' meeting. Thus, the deadline for receiving nominations is March, 27, 2002.
- (3) Each nomination packet has to contain:
 - A letter of the nominee, agreeing to serve on the Executive Committee, if elected
 - Letters of support from two full members of the Association

- Brief background information from the nominee (max. half an A4 sheet), with a summary on academic positions, administrative experience, representative publications, and current research interests.

See EAESP *Profile* (p. 63) for more detailed information.

Jos Jaspars Lecture - Call for Applications -

The Jaspars Lecture was established by the Association in recognition of Jos Jaspars' outstanding contribution to the life of the EAESP. The purpose of the lecture is to encourage and publicise early scholastic achievement in European Social Psychology.

The fifth Jaspars lecture will be given at the next General Meeting of the Association in San Sebastian, June 2002.

Candidates for the Jaspars lectureship either should have obtained their PhD no earlier than January 1st of the previous General Meeting (i.e. January 1st 1999) or, if their PhD was obtained before that date, they should have been under the age of 30 on January 1st of the year of the previous General Meeting (i.e. January 1st, 1999).

They need not to be members of the Association.

To enable the Committee (Vincent Yzerbyt, Maria Lewicka & Markus Brauer) to select the Jaspars lecturer, candidates for the lectureship are asked to submit their curriculum vitae, naming two referees, one of whom should be a member of the Association. Candidates should also submit a 1000-word abstract of the proposed lecture. These items should be sent directly to the Chair of the selection committee at the address shown below, **before October, 1st, 2001**.

Members of the Association are asked to encourage suitable candidates to apply at the appropriate time.

As a tribute to Jaspars' influential editorship of the European Journal of Social Psychology, the publishers of the Journal are sponsoring the lectureship financially by endowing a Jos Jaspars Lecture Fund. This fund will cover the travel costs of the lecturer, translation costs of abstracts submitted in languages other than English, as well as translation costs of the lecture itself (in case where this is needed). This fund will also enable the committee to award a prize in book tokens to the successful candidate.

Address for correspondence:

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

**Ninth Brisbane Symposium on Social Identity
Brisbane, Australia. 16-17 March 2001.**

This year's Brisbane Symposium on Social Identity, the Ninth in the annual series that first started in 1992, was held over two days, March 16 and 17. BSSI is one of the most significant activities of the Centre for Research on Group Processes (CRGP) at the University of Queensland - this year the meeting was jointly sponsored by CRGP and the University of Queensland's Centre for Organisational Psychology. The conference organisers were Joanne Smith, Michael Hogg, and Robin Martin - Blake McKimmie was our powerpoint guru.

The venue was Customs House, the University of Queensland's downtown riverside location - allowing people to come and go by CityCat and to gain sustenance at the many cafe's, bars and restaurants overlooking the Brisbane river and the Storey Bridge.

There was a diverse group of 49 delegates, which included many EAESP members from the Netherlands, Germany, Australia, and the United States. There were 14 presentations. The speakers were Marilyn Brewer (Ohio State), Sabine Otten (University of Jena), Stephen Wright (University of California, Santa Cruz), Joel Cooper (Princeton University),

Scott Reid, Brendan McAuliffe, Blake McKimmie, Anne O'Brien, Bernd Irmer, Matthew Hornsey (all University of Queensland), Margaret, Foddy, Michael Platow, Melissa Lehman (all LaTrobe University), and Ken Mavor (University of Southern Queensland). There was particularly lively discussion this year, and some of the themes that kept coming up related to motivational aspects of social identity processes (dissonance, optimal distinctiveness, uncertainty reduction), self-extension processes and the inclusion of the group in the self, trust and reputation, and intergroup contact.

The traditional conference party was held at Michael Hogg's house, where we observed the established convention of eating sushi, pizza and timtams - washed down with lashings of wine and beer. On this occasion the late stayers were the Australian National University and LaTrobe University crowd who only left when Scott Reid embarked on yet another very scary tale of his boyhood in New Zealand.

For further information about this BSSI, future BSSIs, and other CRGP activities please contact Michael Hogg or Joanne Smith. For information about the Centre for Organizational Psychology contact Robin Martin

Michael Hogg, Joanne Smith, and Robin Martin
University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
m.hogg@psy.uq.edu.au
joannes@psy.uq.edu.au
r.martin@psy.uq.edu.au

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 **September, 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 September, 15th 2001.

News about Members

NEW MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

The following applications for membership were approved by the Executive Committee at its meeting in April, 2001. If the Secretary does not receive objections from any member within one month of publication of this issue of the Bulletin, these persons will become members of the Association in the grades indicated. Names of members providing letters of support are in parentheses:

Full Membership

Dr. Georgios **ABAKOUMKIN**
Patras, Greece
(A. Hantzi, W. Stroebe)

Dr. Muriel **DUMONT**
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
(J.-P. Leyens, V. Yzerbyt)

Dr. Danuta **BOCHENSKA**
Opole, Poland
(D. Dolinski, M. Dymkowski)

Dr. Erik **HÖLZL**
Vienna, Austria
(A. Palmonari, E. Kirchler)

Dr. Luigi **CASTELLI**
Padova, Italy
(A. Maass, L. Arcuri)

Dr. Thomas **KESSLER**
Jena, Germany
(T. Meiser, A. Mummendey)

Dr. Caroline **CORNELIUS**
Göttingen, Germany
(M. Boos, U. Wagner)

Dr. Sander **KOOLE**
Amsterdam, NL
(G. Semin, P. van Lange)

Dr. Sandro **COSTARELLI**
Trento, Italy
(A. Mucchi-Faina, D. Giovannini)

Dr. Jenny **MAGGI**
Geneva, Switzerland
(W. Doise, G. Mugny)

Dr. Partizia **MILESI**
Milan, Italy
(D. Hilton, P. Catellani)

Dr. Dominique **OBERLE**
Paris, France
(V. Aebischer, F. Askevis-
Leherpeux)

Dr. Henning **PLESSNER**
Heidelberg, Germany
(K. Fiedler, M. Wänke)

Dr. Rob **RUITER**
Maastricht, NL
(N. de Vries, D. de Cremer)

Dr. Kai **SASSENBERG**
Jena, Germany
(A. Mummendey, S. Otten)

Dr. Maria Jose **SOTELO**
Porto, Portugal
J. Marques, F. Morales

Dr. Clifford **STOTT**
Liverpool, UK
F. Sani, S. Reicher

Dr. Stefan **STÜRMER**
Kiel, Germany
(B. Simon, P.G. Klandermans)

Dr. Anna **SZUSTER-
KOWALEWICZ**
Warsaw, Poland
(A. Jarymowicz, R. Ohme)

Dr. Aart **VELTHUIJSEN**
Amsterdam, NL
(W. Koomen, D.A. Stapel)

Dr. Vivian L. **VIGNOLES**
Surrey, UK
(G. Breakwell, C. Fife-Shaw)

Dr. Alberto **VOCI**
Padova, Italy
(M. Hewstone, D. Capozza)

Dr. Emanuelle **ZECH**
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
(W. Stroebe, B. Rimé)

Dr. René **ZIEGLER**
Tübingen, Germany
(K. Jonas, N. Diehl)

Affiliate Membership

Don E. **CARLSTON**
Purdue, USA
(G. Semin, P. van Lange)

Dr. Roberto **GONZÁLEZ**
Santiago, Chile
(D. Abrams, R. Brown)

Postgraduate Membership

Wojciech **BLASZCZAK** Warsaw,
Poland
(M. Jarymowicz, R.K. Ohme)

Miguel **CAMEIRA**
Porto, Portugal
(M. Hogg, J. Marques)

Jakob **HÅKANSSON** Stockholm,
Sweden
(O. Svenson, T. Lindholm)

Dorota **KOBYLINSKA** Warsaw,
Poland
(M. Jarymowicz, R. Ohme)

Pawel **KOBYLINSKI**
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Jarymowicz, M. Kaminska-
Feldman)

Stefano **LIVI**
Rome, Italy
(F. Butera, M. Bonaiuto)

Beatriz **MONTES BERGES**
Granada, Spain
(J.-P. Leyens, M. Moya)

Tina **NEBE**
Firenze, Italy
(J. Correia Jesuino, A. de Rosa)

Ingrid **OLSSON**
Uppsala, Sweden
(B. Ekehammar, D. Hilton)

Julie **PAÔLE**
Paris, France
(R. Sanitioso, F. Ric)

Susanne **PETERS**
Amsterdam, NL
(K. van den Bos, J.F. Ybema)

Grzegorz **POCHWATKO**
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Jarymowicz, R. Ohme)

Susana **PUERTAS**
Jaen, Spain
(M. Moya, M. Brauer)

Rebecca **SMITH**
Dundee, UK
(F. Sani, S. Reicher)

Wolfgang **STEINEL**
Amsterdam, NL
(C.K.W. de Dreu, D. van
Knippenberg)

Christine **STICH**
Berlin, Germany
(B. Knäuper, D. Hilton)

Garcia Tendayi **VIKI**
Canterbury, UK
(D. Abrams, R. Brown)

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, P.O. Box 420 143, D-48068 Muenster, Germany
fax: +49-2533-281144
email: sibylle@eaesp.org

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