

European Bulletin of Social Psychology

Editors: Eddy Van Avermaet & Sibylle Classen

2 Editorial

3 New Books by Members

Social beings: A Core Motives Approach to Social Psychology (2004) by Susan T. Fiske

Group Creativity: Innovation through Collaboration (2003) ed. by Paul B. Paulus & Bernard A. Nijstad

7 Future EAESP Meetings – Calendar

8 Future EAESP Meetings

Medium Size Meeting on Change in Intergroup Relations (7th Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes), June 16-20, 2004, Schloss Oppurg, Germany

Small Group Meeting on Understanding the Academic Underachievement of Low Status Group Members, June 9-12, 2004, Paris, France

Small Group Meeting on Collective Remembering, Collective Emotions and Shared Representations of History: Functions and dynamics, June 16-19, 2004, Aix-en-Provence, France

Small Group Meeting on War and Peace: Social Psychological Approaches to Armed Conflicts and Humanitarian Issues, September 9-11, 2004, Geneva, Switzerland

15 Reports of Previous Meetings

Small Group Meeting on the Psychology of Minorities: Basic mechanisms and social implications, at London, UK, June 27-29, 2003

Small Group Meeting on Decision Making: Motivation and Cognition, at Amsterdam, The Netherlands, September 3rd-5th, 2003

Small Group Meeting on Minority Influence Processes, at Oxford, UK, September 22nd-26th, 2003

26 EAESP Summer School 2004

August 1-15, 2004, Groningen, The Netherlands
2nd Announcement & Call for Applications

29 Grants and Grant reports

41 New Members of the Association

44 Announcements

EJSP Special Issue on „Social Power and Group Processes“ – Call for Papers
International Social Cognition Network (ISCON)
Journal of Cultural and Evolutionary Psychology – Call for Papers

52 Announcements from the Executive Committee

Letters of Support for Applicants for Membership
Membership Fee for 2004 is due now

54 Deadlines for Contributions

55 Executive Committee

Editorial

As you are used to, this issue of the Bulletin too contains its load of announcements of new books by members and calls for participation in EAESP sponsored meetings. It also contains reports of previous meetings and grant reports. As the editors of the Bulletin we highly recommend that you read these reports. They are written 'from the heart', and not at all as 'rule requested' administrative documents.

We draw your special attention to the call for applications towards participation in the **EAESP 2004 summer school**, which will take place in Groningen (August 1-15). This call was already launched via a general email message to the membership, but it is repeated here because the application **deadline of December 15, 2003** is coming close. Unless you have already done so, may we remind you to forward this section of the Bulletin to your Ph.D. students. Groningen 2004 promises to be as exciting as Marburg 2002 and as all the summer schools before it.

Please also note a limited change in the **membership application procedure**, described in the section 'Announcements from the Executive Committee'.

December is here, a time of year to look forward to the Christmas holidays, but also a time to **renew your membership fee**. Please pay careful attention to the relevant instructions (in 'Announcements from the Executive Committee').

To end with a teaser, the prior issue of the Bulletin contained a call on members to submit articles for the Bulletin (2003, Vol. 15, No. 1, p. 52). Specifically, and amongst others, we suggested articles of the type "Here is what I experienced: anybody interested?". The editors have yet to receive the first submission. Isn't anybody interested?

Eddy Van Avermaet and Sibylle Classen

New Books by Members

Social beings: A core motives approach to social psychology

Susan T. Fiske (Princeton University, USA)

New York: Wiley, 2004 (available August, 2003)

ISBN: 0-471-14529-7, 672 pages, Paper.

Description (from the preface):

In the realm of textbook writing, what lies between the dull clones and the brilliant outliers? Into this vast space, I am launching a book that retains the familiar, safe outward structure of the standard texts, allowing professors to keep their hard-won lecture preps and retaining social psychology's intrinsic logic of intra-individual to inter-individual to group analyses.

Simultaneously, I import a point of view, a narrative flow, both across chapters and within each chapter.

Across chapters, the linkages are core social motives repeatedly identified by personality and social psychologists over the decades, so they are not idiosyncratic to this author. Granted, listing and parsing motives are risky, but this strategy buys a manageable number of organizing themes: fewer than a dozen and more than one. In any one chapter, perhaps three motives are highlighted, given the emphasis of the theories and research in a given area. The five motives overall appear and reappear throughout the book, making both intuitive and theoretical sense.

The book starts from the premise that people are adapted to live with other people and that social relations are the most relevant adaptation environment. This focuses, then, on the social psychology of people's adaptive, functional motives and goals. From a pragmatic point of view, people need other people to survive, and a few core social motives follow logically from that basic premise.

These five motives (belonging, understanding, controlling, enhancing self, and trusting) go by the mnemonic BUCET, pronounced "bucket," as in a

bucket of motives. As indicated in every chapter, they provide unity and continuity throughout the book, intellectual themes taken seriously, not merely as add-on boxes. Certainly the particular motives are debatable, but that makes them interesting to read, consider, and teach as they appear and reappear across chapters.

Within chapters, the book's aim is, first, to capture the imagination of students by relating social psychology to everyday life. Having taught introductory social psychology in large and small lectures, to honors and average students, in public and private institutions, for more than two decades, I have a sense of what engages students (and the rest of us as students for life). They care about their own lives, their relationships, and their futures, but they also care about making the world a better place. Social psychology provides a perfect forum for all these concerns. To this end, the book selectively covers the most intriguing theories within traditional chapter topics. It's easier to write enthusiastic prose when the author thinks the ideas are nifty, and I do.

Features:

- Focuses on five core social motives: belonging, understanding, controlling, enhancing self, and trusting.
- Presents a truly social approach to adaptation that is progressive, responsible, and complete.
- Integrates culture throughout, providing a realistic sense of how social psychology operates in an increasingly multi-cultural world.
- Offers a balanced view of the intellectual development of the field, featuring both classic materials that provide a historical context and cutting-edge work that demonstrates contemporary excitement.
- Cover European and Asian authors, younger and older ones, as well as current American authors
- Applications, which are integral to the chapters, demonstrate the utility of social psychology to solve real-world problems.
- Weaves coverage of gender and ethnicity into the narrative of the text.

Group Creativity: Innovation through Collaboration

Paul B. Paulus (University of Texas at Arlington) and **Bernard A. Nijstad** (University of Amsterdam) (Eds.)

New York: Oxford University Press, list price \$45, 346 pages
ISBN: 0-19-514730-8, Publication date: August, 2003
www.oup-usa.org

Description

Creativity is often defined as the development of original ideas that are useful or influential. Most research and writing on creativity has focused on individual creativity. This is unfortunate, because with the information explosion and growing necessity of specialization, the development of innovations will increasingly require group interaction at some stage of the process. Most organizations and much of the scientific process now rely on work of teams with diverse skills and knowledge. Fortunately, in recent years there has been an increasing acknowledgement of the importance of social and contextual factors in creativity. The different perspectives have been brought together in one volume in order to focus attention on this developing literature and its implication for theory and application.

The volume draws from a broad range of perspectives, such as cognition, groups, creativity, information systems, and organizational psychology. The chapters of this volume are organized into two sections. The first section deals with group processes in creative groups, and considers issues of cognitive fixation and flexibility, group diversity, minority dissent, group decision making, brainstorming, and group support systems. Special attention is devoted to the various processes that can inhibit or facilitate group creativity. The second section deals with the impact of various contextual or environmental factors on the creative group process. The chapters deal with issues of group autonomy, group socialization, mentoring, team innovation, knowledge transfer, and creativity at the level of cultures and societies. It is argued that a full understanding of group creativity cannot be accomplished without adequate attention to the group environment.

Contents

Preface; List of contributors;

Paul B. Paulus & Bernard A. Nijstad: Group creativity: An introduction

Part 1: Group process and creativity

Steven M. Smith: The constraining effects of initial ideas

Frances J. Milliken, Caroline A. Bartel, and Terri R. Kurtzberg: Diversity and creativity in work groups: A dynamic perspective on the affective and cognitive processes that link diversity and performance

Charlan Jeanne Nemeth and Brendan Nemeth-Brown: Better than individuals? The potential benefits of dissent and diversity for group creativity

Garold Stasser and Zachary Birchmeier: Group creativity and collective choice

Paul B. Paulus and Vincent R. Brown: Ideational creativity in groups: Lessons from research on brainstorming

Bernard A. Nijstad, Michael Diehl, and Wolfgang Stroebe: Cognitive stimulation and interference in idea generating groups

Alan R. Dennis and Mike L. Williams: Electronic brainstorming: Theory, research, and future directions

Part 2: Group creativity in context

Beth A. Hennessey: Is the social psychology of creativity really social? Moving beyond a focus on the individual

John M. Levine, Hoon-Seok Choi, and Richard L. Moreland: Newcomer innovation in work teams

Charles Hooker, Jeanne Nakamura, and Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi: The group as mentor: Social capital and the systems model of creativity

Michael A. West: Creativity and innovation implementation in teams

Linda Argote and Aimée Kane: Learning from direct and indirect experience in organizations: The effects of experience content, timing, and distribution

Dean Keith Simonton: Creative cultures, nations, and civilizations: Strategies and results

Bernard A. Nijstad and Paul B. Paulus: Group creativity: Common themes and future directions.

Future EAESP Meetings - Calendar

June 2-5, 2004, La Cristalera (Madrid), Spain

Small Group Meeting on Conscious and Unconscious Attitudinal Processes

Organisers: Geoff Haddock, Greg Maio, Pablo Briñol & Richard Petty

Contact: Geoff Haddock (haddockgg@cardiff.ac.uk)

June 9-12, 2004, Paris, France

Small Group Meeting on Understanding the Academic Underachievement of Low Status Group Members

Organisers : Jean-Claude Croizet, Steve Spencer & Claude Steele

Contact: Jean-Claude Croizet (croizet@srvpsy.univ-bpclermont.fr)

June 16-19, 2004, Aix-en-Provence, France

Small Group Meeting on Collective remembering, collective emotions and shared representations of history: Functions and dynamics

Organisers: Denis Hilton, James Liu, Bernard Rimé & Wolfgang Wagner

Contact: Denis Hilton (hilton@univ-tlse2.fr)

June 16-19, 2004, Brussels, Belgium

Small Group Meeting on Social Connectionism

Organisers: Frank Van Overwalle & Christophe Labiouse

Contact: Frank Van Overwalle (Frank.Van.Overwalle@vub.ac.be).

June 16-20, 2004, Schloss Oppurg, Germany

Medium Size Meeting on Change in Intergroup Relations (7th Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes)

Organisers: Immo Fritsche & Amelie Mummendey

Contact: Immo Fritsche (Immo.Fritsche@uni-jena.de) or Amélie Mummendey (Amelie.Mummendey@uni-jena.de)

September 9-11, 2004, Geneva, Switzerland

Small Group Meeting on War and peace: social psychological approaches to armed conflicts and humanitarian issues

Organisers: Juan Manuel Falomir-Pichastor, Daniel Muñoz-Rojas & Xenia Chrysochoou

Contact: Juan Manuel Falomir (Juan.Falomir@pse.unige.ch)

Future EAESP Meetings

Medium Size Meeting

On Change in Intergroup Relations (7th Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes)

Schloss Oppurg, Germany, June 16-20, 2004

[Organizers: Immo Fritsche & Amelie Mummendey (University of Jena, Germany)]

During the past decades social psychology has gathered a broad knowledge on static cause-effect-relations in intergroup behaviour. Enlarging this perspective by focusing on how intergroup relations *change dynamically* is the central objective of the 7th Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes. In order to support the development of such a new perspective the workshop is aimed at including a variety of perspectives on intergroup relations, e.g. both social identity as well as interdependence approaches. It might be looked on the interrelations between the two groups of concepts in explaining *change processes*. For example, changing interdependence structures might as well influence perceptions of group boundaries and social identity as in turn also those identity perceptions may lead to an active restructuring of interdependence relations. To capture also subtle dynamics in intergroup relations, it might also be discussed whether models of automatic behaviour as well as implicit and neuropsychological measures can be assumed to make valuable contributions to the modeling of change.

Presentations of empirical papers and theoretical overviews that might contribute to a modeling of change in intergroup relations are welcome. One of the main goals is to have graduate students and young researchers present their current projects to an international audience of distinguished researchers. Therefore, submissions from postgraduate students and young researchers are especially encouraged. The meeting will have about 45 participants, including graduates, junior and senior scholars.

The conference will take place from June 16th to June 20th, 2004 at Schloss Oppurg (Germany). Schloss Oppurg is a historical baroque castle close to Jena and Weimar.

Inquiries should be directed to Immo Fritsche (Immo.Fritsche@uni-jena.de) or Amélie Mummendey (Amelie.Mummendey@uni-jena.de).

Small Group Meeting

Understanding the Academic Underachievement of Low Status Group Members

Paris, June 9-12, 2004

[Organizers : Jean-Claude Croizet (Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand), Steve Spencer (University of Waterloo) & Claude Steele (Stanford University)]

Explanations of achievement gaps in standardized test scores between social groups have constituted one of the biggest intellectual controversies of the last century. This debate has mainly been between those who argue for nature versus those who argue for nurture. In contrast, very little attention has been devoted to understanding how and to what extent the testing situation itself contributes to group differences in general cognitive ability. Emerging research on stereotype threat has shown that social psychology can uniquely contribute to this important societal debate by studying the situational predicament that disrupts the performance of stigmatized individuals (i.e., low status group members targeted by a stereotype of lower ability). In the past few years, countless studies have been published on this issue and an increasing number of researchers are investigating how standardized testing situations affects performance outcomes and contribute to academic underachievement and school dropout of minority members. The aims of this meeting will be to bring together researchers that are particularly active in the study of the social

determinants of academic performance and to provide an unique opportunity for discussion and theoretical integration (no parallel sessions). Our goal is to provide a forum for discussion that will stimulate new collaborations and directions for future research.

The meeting, co-sponsored by the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, will take in place from 9 (arrival)-13 (departure) June in Paris, in the Palais Royal neighborhood. The meeting will be held at the Louvre Museum under the glass pyramid. We plan to bring together 25 participants, including, young and senior scholars with at least 50% being EAESP members. Postgraduates students are encouraged to apply. Participants will be asked to give a 30-min presentation. Participation fee will be 250 euros (covering hotel, meals). In addition, after acceptance, each participant will send a 2000 word prospectus that will be distributed in advance to all participants so that discussions and exchanges during the meeting are maximized. Both empirical and theoretical contributions are welcomed, and the publication of a book including the most significant contributions is planned.

Researchers who are interested in participating in the meeting are invited to submit by the end of January 2004 a 1000-word summary of their proposed presentation to Jean-Claude Croizet (Laboratoire de Psychologie Sociale de la Cognition, Université Blaise Pascal, 34 avenue Carnot, 63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France) preferably by email (croizet@srvpsy.univ-bpclermont.fr).

Small Group Meeting

Collective remembering, collective emotions and shared representations of history: Functions and dynamics

Aix-en-Provence, June 16-19, 2004

[Organizers: Denis Hilton (Toulouse), James Liu (Wellington), Bernard Rimé (Louvain-la-Neuve), Wolfgang Wagner (Linz)]

First call for submissions

Shared representations of history are an important resource in positioning the identities of peoples, particularly at the level of nationality and ethnicity.

Historical representations are central for instantiating and constraining theories of intergroup relations into a specific context involving a history of prior contact between groups. They can be central to defining the «essence» of a people, and determining the relationship between identities at similar levels of inclusiveness, like nationalities, supra-nationalities, and ethnicities. Representations of history can also be used to confer legitimacy and generate collective emotions such as pride, guilt, or shame.

Research on collective remembering for traumatic political events such as Pearl Harbour, September 11th suggests that people spontaneously seek each other out to share views and information about the experience. As time goes on, representations projected through the media are also likely to be influential until a representation becomes relatively fixed and may even be treated as «received history» taught in schools and universities. One of our interests is to explore how such representations of history emerge, and to explore the dynamics of feedback between identities, shared representations and collective remembering.

We propose to organise a meeting that will bring together researchers from different perspectives in social psychology that concern groups' reactions to major events (particularly involving politics and intergroup relations).

Several perspectives seem to us to be particularly relevant. The first is the research on collective remembering which has examined how people react to collectively traumatic events and commemorate past events that are important to their group. The second is work on emotions such as collective guilt and revenge which has suggested how representations of history can be used to influence the perceived legitimacy of intergroup behaviour. The third concerns how social representations of the more distant past such as World War Two appear to fix or constrain the identity positions of different groups relative to one another, and influence public opinion about responses to international crises (such as Afghanistan and Iraq). A cognitive perspective could look at ways in which cognitive processes (e.g. analogy, hindsight biases, counterfactual reasoning) influence the utilisation of historical representations for various purposes (e.g. foreign policy decisions). Finally, the question of the dynamic construction and evolution of a social representation over time through examination of dialogue and media seems to us to merit exploration.

The meeting (maximum attendance 30 persons) will take place from 16th to 19th June 2004 at La Baume, a former seminary near Aix-en-Provence in France. We would like proposals (maximum length 500 words) to be sent by email to Denis Hilton at hilton@univ-tlse2.fr by January 15th 2004. We will aim to notify participants by February 28th whether their proposal has been accepted as a paper or a poster.

Small Group Meeting

War and Peace: social psychological approaches to armed conflicts and humanitarian issues

Geneva, Switzerland, September 9-11, 2004

[Organizers: Juan Manuel Falomir-Pichastor, University of Geneva (CH); Daniel Muñoz-Rojas, International Committee of the Red Cross, Geneva (CH); Xenia Chrysoschoou, Social Psychology European Research Institute, University of Surrey (UK) and Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences (Athens, GR) (from January 2004)]

We invite social psychologists to a meeting in order to discuss armed conflicts and associated humanitarian issues. By armed conflicts we mean conflicts between constituted nation-states and conflicts between states and national/ethnic groups looking for state recognition, independence, governance and power that intentionally cause destruction and casualties.

Priority will be given to empirical work that explicitly addresses the initiation, development and growth, the maintenance and the consequences of armed conflicts as described previously. This endeavour will be informed by the social psychological knowledge acquired on social discrimination, intergroup relations, social influence, communication and propaganda, collective violence, obedience and legitimacy.

The aim of this meeting is to present empirical work allowing the opportunity to debate and contrast social-psychological assumptions in the particular context of war and military actions. Furthermore the meeting will provide the opportunity to social psychologists to debate with members of the International Committee of the Red Cross who are invited to participate and present their experiences and concerns.

Papers are invited around the following issues:

- How groups are reaching consensus over a military intervention? (issues of leadership, power, propaganda and processes of social influence in order to gain public support)
- What are the social representations of war and humanitarian norms? (universalism or relativism of humanitarian norms, gap between adherence and application of norms, moral disengagement and humanitarian norms)
- How armed conflicts are justified and legitimated? (real or symbolic threats and identities, issues of morality, patriotism, national treason, construction of otherness, punitive conflicts)
- What are the social psychological factors that influence the behaviour of combatants and the perpetuation of inhumanities? (authority, orders and sanctions, group cohesiveness, victimisation, dehumanisation of the enemy)
- What are the social psychological factors involved in conflict resolutions and peace building? (reaching agreements, issues of trust, ceasefire and disarmament, reconciliation)

Please send a summary (1000 words) to Juan Manuel Falomir, Psychologie Sociale, FPSE, 40 Bd du Pont d'Arve, 1205 Geneva, Switzerland or by email to Juan.Falomir@pse.unige.ch by **30 April 2004**.

Reports of Previous Meetings

Small Group Meeting On the Psychology of Minorities: Basic Mechanisms and Social Implications

At London, June 27th-29th, 2003

Organisers: Ana Guinote & Yaacov Trope

The meeting took place in Marble Arch in the center of London. Participants in the meeting were: Gerd Bohner, Alain Bonacossa, Richard Bourhis, Marilynn Brewer, Rupert Brown, Angelina Davis, Ana Guinote, Matthew Hornsey, Jolanda Jetten, John Jost, Johannes Keller, Jared Kenworthy, Geoffrey Leonardelli, Michael Lovaglia, Brian Mullen, Dawn Robinson, Carey Ryan, Charles Stangor, Yaacov Trope, Linda Tropp, Tom Tyler, Jan Pieter van Oudenhoven.

There was a reception on the 26th with drinks and a buffet. The reception provided an excellent opportunity for informal interaction and discussion among the participants. The meeting started on June the 27th with an introduction by Ana Guinote focusing on past and current tendencies in minority research. Talks during this day focused on the individual in the group. The first speaker was Geoff Leonardelli (Leonardelli & Brewer). His talk focused on minority affirmation as a function of identity needs. The links between minority membership and social identity needs were further discussed in the second talk by Marilynn Brewer. She analyzed the relationship between minority identification and superordinate identification (for example, nation-state identification). Brian Mullen's talk concerned the phenomenology of being a group member. He emphasized the social distinctiveness of the minority membership and the consequences for several group phenomena. Jared Kenworthy talk was about minority status and attitude consensus estimation for own attitude position (Kenworthy & Miller). Minority's consensus overestimation was interpreted as an identity buttressing response to intergroup threat. Gerd Bohner focused on the size of the influence group and persuasion (Bohner, Tindale, Dykema-Engblade, & Meisenhelder). More specifically, he

explored the conditions under which information about source consensus serves as a message validity cue or a social comparison cue.

After the morning sessions we had lunch at the hotel.

Ana Guinote gave the first afternoon talk (Guinote & Trope). She presented studies on the effects of power and group size on objective group variability following a cross-situational perspective. Accordingly, in a series of studies powerful and majority individuals responded more to primary and less to secondary affordances of situations, changing therefore more behavior across situations than powerless and minority individuals. Yaacov Trope presented a Construal Level Theory of power-driven information processing (Trope, Guinote, & Smith). He argued that powerful people feel psychologically distant from others, which, in turn, predisposes them to forming abstract (high-level) construals of information in terms of superordinate, central dimensions. Michael Lovaglia presented studies that supported three accounts of group differences in mental ability test scores: Stereotype threat, differential expected consequences, and identity maintenance (Lovaglia & Robinson). The last talk of the day was given by Johannes Keller (Keller & Bless). He argued that promotion vs. prevention regulatory focus moderates stereotype threat.

Talks on Saturday focused on intergroup relations. Chuck Stangor gave the first talk focusing on minorities' perception and responsiveness to discrimination. He presented a three-stage model that predicts detection, interpretation and reporting discrimination. Linda Tropp discussed minority and majorities' responses to intergroup contact on the basis of a recent meta-analysis. She discussed reasons for the magnitude of the contact-prejudice relationship being weaker for minority than majority group members. Jolanda Jetten's talk concerned the maintenance of group identification under conditions of devaluation (Jetten, Schmitt, Branscombe, & McKimmie). In particular, intergroup differentiation and intragroup respect were pointed out as social creativity responses designed to suppress the negative impact of threat to the ingroup value on group identification.

Matthew Hornsey's talk focused on the role of legitimacy in relations between high and low power groups (Hornsey & Spears). He presented

studies supporting the hypothesis that when intergroup relations are perceived as illegitimate members of powerful and powerless group exhibit both more ingroup bias. Carey Ryan gave a talk on race-related experiences and group perceptions among Black and White college students (Ryan, Willis, Peterson, & Weible). Multicultural vs. colorblind preferences, ethnocentrism, and perceived group variability were discussed. The next talk was given by Richard Bourhis on the effects of power on discriminatory behaviour (Bourhis & Gagnon). He presented results showing that power moderates group polarization.

On Sunday the 29th there were talks during the morning. The topics of the day were related to the societal context. Angelina Davis gave a talk on the factors that shape the engagement of minority group members into society (Davis & Tyler). She explored how patterns of identification of minority members shape engagement into society. John Jost gave the next talk. He presented implicit associations findings revealing outgroup favoritism in several minority groups. Jan Pieter van Oudenhoven's talk concerned personality, acculturation, identity management and well-being of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands. In particular, he focused on five strategies to maintain or improve social identity. Alain Bonacossa gave a talk on majority's acculturation orientations focusing on cognitive processes, intergroup emotions, and identification.

Chuck Stangor was the discussant. The meeting finished with a discussion around the understanding of minorities, and their basic mechanisms. Needs, cognitive processes, and self-regulatory mechanisms that affect several domains of minorities' everyday life were discussed, as well as future perspectives in minority research.

In addition to the talks, and the discussions generated by a participative audience, there were several opportunities for communication and enjoyment in informal contexts. A small group of us went to Covent Garden on Friday night. On Saturday we had a group activity that started with a flight on British Airways London Eye from which we appreciated panoramic views over London. The flight was followed by a boat trip where we learned about the history of some buildings in the Thames valley. We then went to a restaurant in South Bank and enjoyed a meal together.

Small Group Meeting On Decision Making: Motivation and Cognition

At Amsterdam, September 3rd-5th, 2003

Organisers: Bernard Nijstad, Bianca Beersma, Carsten de Dreu & Daan van Knippenberg

Amsterdam was the location of an EAESP sponsored small group meeting that took place on September 3 to 5. The topic of the meeting was the role of motivation and cognition in small group decision making. A total of 29 talks were given in three days, exploring the relation between cognition, motivation, and group processes in a decision making context. Participants came from the USA, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, and The Netherlands, and included senior researchers, junior faculty, and PhD students, many of whom are EAESP members.

The participants all agreed that the meeting was a big success. Of course, one reason is that Amsterdam is a great location to visit. Several of our participants were able to see some of the Amsterdam highlights, and took canal tours, visited one of the museums, or simply strolled around. Our evening dinners were also a great success, due to great Indonesian and Belgian food, and the lively discussions at the dinner table.

More importantly, the talks were inspiring, the discussions were vivid, and some interesting developments in the area of small group research were discussed. Indeed, to answer the question Ivan Steiner posed in 1974 "Whatever happened to the group in social psychology?" in September 2003 small group research was very much alive in Amsterdam.

The goal of the meeting was to explore the interrelations between motivation and cognition in a small group decision making context. As the world settles into the information age, groups are often required to perform complex decision making tasks, such as planning, problem solving, idea generation, and negotiation. Groups that perform these cognitive tasks can be conceptualized as information processing systems. Group level information processing refers to the degree to which

information is shared prior to group discussion and is being shared during group discussion. In part, group information processing is driven by the motivation of group members, for example through the processing objectives of individual group members. Effective group decision making requires that group members are motivated to retrieve information from memory and share it during the group discussion, are motivated to process the information that is entered into the group discussion, and are motivated to reach certain outcomes (for themselves or for the group as a whole).

Many of the talks (though not all) could be classified in three different areas of research. The first area may be labeled as group creativity. Before a group can make a decision, it is often necessary to first identify possible alternatives. This requires some creativity from group members, and several talks addressed the issue of group creativity in relation to group decision making. Antonio Chirumbolo (University of Rome, La Sapienza) reported studies showing that group member motivation, operationalized through need for cognitive closure, affects a number of key processes of groups trying to be creative. Eric Rietzschel (University of Amsterdam) discussed the role of group heterogeneity, and found that heterogeneity does not necessarily improve group creativity, but may also limit it. Paul Paulus (University of Texas) and Bernard Nijstad (University of Amsterdam) drew attention to the fact that after group idea generation, groups need to select their best ideas. Unfortunately, the evidence suggested that groups were not very effective when it came to idea selection, which seems to represent an important area for future study. A second theme was information exchange in small groups and its relation with effective group decision making. Previous research has shown that groups tend to mainly discuss information that all group members had in common before the meeting, at the expense of information that was only held by one group member. A number of speakers addressed this issue: Gwen Wittenbaum (Michigan State University), Barbara Schauenburg (University of Goettingen), Lotte Scholten (University of Amsterdam), Felix Brodbeck (Aston University), James Larson (University of Illinois at Chicago), Garold Stasser (Miami University), Wendy van Ginkel (Erasmus University of Rotterdam) and Stefan Schulz-Hardt (University of Dresden). Interestingly, in many talks the information sharing paradigm was expanded in new and interesting ways. For example, both Gwen

Wittenbaum and Barbara Schauenburg argued that the original paradigm has some limitations, and that it is interesting to broaden the scope, and look at the functions of information sharing for the individual group members. Members may have strategic considerations, and this may affect what information they share in the way in which they share it (e.g., downplay it or boost the importance). As another example, Wendy van Ginkel presented a study that investigated the role of shared mental models and showed that a shared mental model has beneficial effects on information exchange and decision quality.

The third research area was conflict and group negotiation. This topic was discussed in the talks of Laurie Weingart (Carnegie Mellon University), Carsten de Dreu (University of Amsterdam), Fieke Harinck (Leiden University), Roderick Swaab (University of Amsterdam), Gerben van Kleef (University of Amsterdam), Hanneke de Bode (Erasmus University of Rotterdam), and Rudolf Kerschreiter (University of Munich). Several new approaches to group negotiation were suggested, including taking a more dynamic approach, taking emotions into account, and looking at the role of identification with the group.

Not all talks fit within one of these three research fields. For example, in a number of talks the issue of group diversity was discussed, sometimes in relation to one of the three mentioned areas (e.g., preference diversity and information sharing; cognitive diversity and creativity), sometimes in relation to group decision making more generally. Floor Rink (Leiden University) showed that diversity may have negative effects when it is counter to expectations, Daan van Knippenberg (Erasmus University of Rotterdam) proposed a new integrative model of the (positive and negative) effects of diversity, and Oleg Chvyrkov (Tilburg University) studied the effects of team composition in internationalizing firms. Another theme that cuts across different research areas was that of 'sharedness.' Scott Tindale (Loyola University) and Norbert Kerr (Michigan State University) discussed the role of shared representations in group decision making. Talks by Verlin Hinsz (North Dakota State University) and Guido Hertel (University of Kiel) more directly looked at motivation in groups, discussing group goal setting and the Koehler motivation gain effect, respectively. Susanne Abele (Erasmus University of Rotterdam) presented some intriguing work on mixed motive decision

making, and last but not least, Randall Peterson (London Business School) talked about leadership and group decision making.

Unfortunately, we do not have the space to discuss all these interesting talks in more depth, but we hope that this short summary conveys the idea that the meeting was a succession of highlights, with one talk being even more interesting and stimulating than the other. Indeed, after the meeting, while having dinner on Friday night, some of the participants discussed the idea that we should have more of these meetings, and how that could be accomplished.

To conclude, the meeting was a memorable experience. In particular because small group research is scattered across different disciplines (e.g., social psychology, organizational behavior, communication studies, sociology), it was worthwhile to bring these perspectives together. We would like to thank EAESP for their support, and hope that the meeting has contributed to our understanding of small group decision making.

Small Group Meeting On Minority Influence Processes

At New College, Oxford, UK, September 22nd-26th, 2003

Organisers: Robin Martin (University of Queensland, Australia) & Miles Hewstone (University of Oxford. UK)

After a record-breaking summer of extreme heat in England (of all places), delegates gathered in Oxford in familiar driving rain. But we woke up the next morning to glorious weather, which turned out to be our constant companion and was a good omen for a hugely enjoyable gathering of scholars in the area, some closely associated with the topic of minority influence throughout their careers, others drawn by the opportunity to learn more about an area that they had not (yet) researched in . . . or was it the lure of Oxford's reputed wine cellars?

We welcomed guests with a reception, followed by Dinner in the College's imposing Hall (under the watchful eyes of a portrait of former Fellow and Warden of the College, William Spooner, whose verbal slips coined the term 'spoonerism'). The majority of participants declared themselves well satisfied with the food and drink (a lone minority *connoisseur* complaining about the quality of the white wine *and* the port!).

The conference opened in the stunning surroundings of the McGregor-Matthews Room, with sweeping views across Oxford's spires to the West and East. The sweep was equally broad, albeit philosophical and historical, in the address by Warden of New College, distinguished political theorist Professor Alan Ryan. Speaking on 'John Stuart Mill and majority-minority relations', Warden Ryan convinced us that Mill was really an incipient social psychologist, deeply concerned about the potential 'tyranny of the majority' and aware that it was painful for people to be at odds with their fellows (cf. sorry Deutsch and Gerard, he got there first).

Our theme for Day 1 of the meeting (Tuesday) was 'Process and theoretical issues' and we heard from Bill Crano (on the 'Leniency Contract'), Juan Falomir-Pichastor et al. (on the effect of regulatory focus), Jared Kenworthy et al. (on minority status and argument generation), and Christine Smith (on minority status and divergent thinking). The day was rounded off with talks by Robin Martin et al. (on resistance to minority vs majority persuasive messages), and Hans Peter Erb et al. (on risk as a factor increasing minority influence).

At periodic intervals we repaired to the 'Undercroft' for lengthy disputation over coffee and tea (undercroft > **noun** the crypt of a church - ORIGIN late Middle English: from UNDER + the rare term *croft* 'crypt', from Middle Dutch *crofte* 'cave', from Latin *crypta*), and we took time out for a group photograph (for Robin Martin's grandchildren). The high note of the first day, however, was a recital by New College's internationally renowned boy choristers. Even here social influence was at hand, as Miles Hewstone explained how each year four new choristers were socialized into, and replaced four outgoing members of, the choir in a fashion reminiscent of Jacobs and Campbell's (1961) classic study on the transmission of social norms. For their hard work and enthusiastic participation delegates were rewarded with a dinner of England's new

'national dish' (well, the *majority's* choice) – *chicken tikka massala*. Unfortunately, the restaurant staff, though warned in advance of the invasion of 23 hungry and thirsty social psychologists, were totally overwhelmed; we waited patiently, and broke the world record for consumption of *poppadums*, satisfied at least that we now all knew what was meant by 'delayed influence'.

Day 2 (Wednesday) saw an enforced change of location to the slightly less grandiose setting of 'Lecture Room 4', but the quality of talks moved seamlessly from our old to our new location. The first five talks focused on 'Factors affecting majority and minority influence'. The morning session included papers by Angelica Mucchi-Faina et al. (on the distinction between divergence and ambivalence), Antonis Gardikiotis et al. (on consensus attributes and percentage information as moderators of majority and minority influence), Hiroshi Nonami (on belief majorities within a categorical minority), and Gerd Bohner et al. (on inferences about the validity of majority vs minority messages versus social comparison). The fact that we had already heard 12 presentations (and the sun was still shining) led 18 intrepid 'climbers' to scale the College's Bell Tower for a fantastic 360 degree view of the City and its surroundings. This view of *the outside* was then followed by 'A view *from the outside*', as Wolfgang Stroebe offered 'Some methodological and theoretical comments on the present state of minority research'. His critique was well received, especially his point that additional controls were needed in the vast majority of studies, and his agreement to undertake the necessary 2 x 3 x 4 x 5 x 6 (between subjects) design in Utrecht! The second day ended with a fascinating session on 'Applications of minority influence to work settings'. Carsten de Dreu took us 'From the laboratory to the field, and back' to look at 'Minority dissent and work team innovation', and Mike West explored 'Dissent in teams and organizations: Creativity and empowerment' (he also showed us how to do the 'Fosbury Flop' version of the high jump). In the evening delegates formed their own teams and spread out in search of their preferred food and drink, at which task they seemed remarkably creative!

Day 3 (Thursday) began with a session on 'The role of norms and motives on majority and minority influence'. Fabrizio Butera first taught us how to spell cryptomnesia, then explained it, then illustrated how negative

attitudes towards minorities could be weakened through collective guilt; Scott Tindale explored 'Minority influence and the discontinuity effect'.

The final session of the conference explored 'Majority and minority relations in groups', with an emphasis on interacting units. Papers were presented by John Levine (who reported a series of studies on 'Newcomers as sources of influence'), Russell Clark (who used the '12 Angry Men' paradigm to study 'Minority influence: From radical dissent to the mainstream'), Radmila Prislin ('Social change through social influence: On the effects of successful minorities'), and Bibb Latané ('The role of minorities in the evolution of culture').

We then embarked on a walking tour of Oxford, taking in a little of the history that had surrounded us all week, and ended the meeting with a banquet. Prizes were awarded for, among other things, 'the most expensive design' (R. Prislin), 'the best PowerPoint presentation' (H. Nonami), 'the study that would have been most fun to participate in' (J. Levine), and the 'worst excuse for a missing overhead' (A. Gardikiotis). It was all great fun, especially if you were choosing the recipients!

Where does the field of minority influence stand at the end of this meeting? To borrow a phrase from one of Mike West's papers, is it a 'sparkling fountain' or a 'stagnant pond'? Let us look back at the conclusions drawn by Serge Moscovici in his 1985 Handbook chapter. (1) "...social influence became the central problem to be solved by social psychology". This is surely (now) overstated. Most of the delegates also work in other areas, some in several, and would not want to argue their or anyone else's work in this area is more 'central' than work on, e.g., intergroup relations, other group processes, or social cognition. (2) "Europe has been particularly prolific in the field of social influence and related areas". While this was certainly true historically, we believe the success of Serge's consistently-expressed minority-influence position is precisely the fact that these phenomena are now well *beyond Europe* (of the 23 delegates to a meeting held in Europe 7 were from the U.S.A., and 1 each from Japan and Australia). (3) "...what amounts to a paradigmatic reversal has taken place. We now look at social relations not exclusively from the vantage point of majorities but from the minority perspective as well." This is most certainly true! Although our meeting was on 'minority influence', of

course we spent much of the time discussing minority *versus* majority influence, but the value of this perspective, and the richness of theoretical and methodological contributions seen this week is testimony to an enduring ferment in this field.

Did we change any one's minds? Was there any true *tergiversation*? We misheard Radmila Prislina on one occasion and thought she had said "*heretical* developments", but in fact she (only) said "*theoretical* developments". Of the latter there were many, and for the former there is no place in a field of theory and research that is, appropriately in our view, characterized by diversity. There is, and should be, no orthodoxy against which there can be heresy; there is a multiplicity of theoretical perspectives and they have contributed to a stimulating, engaging, and most enjoyable meeting.

Finally, we extend our thanks to both EAESP and to the School of Psychology, University of Queensland for co-sponsorship of this meeting. Organizing it has been hard work, but great fun, and we look forward to enjoying someone else's hospitality at the *next* meeting on minority influence. Just after the last delegates left, the heavens opened and it poured with rain as it can only do in England. We realized just how privileged we had been this week, but not just with the weather!

EAESP Summer School 2004

2nd announcement & call for applications

August 1 – August 15, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

The EAESP Summer School 2004 will take place from August 1 to August 15 in Groningen, a medium-sized, pretty and lively city in the North of the Netherlands. Following the great tradition of the previous EAESP summer schools, two major goals will be pursued: First, the intention is to familiarize Ph.D. students with the latest theoretical, methodological and empirical developments in various fields in experimental social psychology. This, in turn, should contribute to the participants' dissertation projects. Second, the summer school will aim at facilitating contacts between young scholars from different European and non-European countries, encouraging friendships and collaborative research.

At the heart of the summer school is the **teaching program**, which will consist of five workgroups covering five main domains of research in current experimental social psychology. Each participant will participate in one of these workgroups. There will be 12 students per workgroup and two teachers, both experts in their respective field. Typically, there will be one teacher from a Dutch university, and one teacher from another European or American university.

More specifically, we will offer the following workgroups:

<i>Automaticity and goals</i>	Ap Dijksterhuis (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands) & Henk Aarts (Utrecht University, The Netherlands)
<i>Stereotyping</i>	Bernd Wittenbrink (University of Chicago, USA) & Olivier Corneille (Catholic University of Louvain, Belgium)
<i>Intergroup relations</i>	Russell Spears (University of Cardiff, United Kingdom) & Sabine Otten (University of Groningen, The Netherlands)
<i>Emotions, motivation, and decision making</i>	Nira Liberman (Tel Aviv University, Israel) & Marcel Zeelenberg (Tilburg University, The Netherlands)
<i>Self</i>	Brett Pelham (University at Buffalo, USA) & Diederik Stapel (University of Groningen, The Netherlands)

In addition to the workgroups, all teachers will present their current work in plenary sessions. Moreover, we invited some guest speakers whose work represents social-psychological research domains that are not (or not strongly) covered by the five workgroups. We are very lucky that Kees van den Bos (justice; University of Utrecht), Catrin Finkenauer (interpersonal relations; Free University, Amsterdam), Rob Holland (attitudes; Nijmegen University) and Karen van der Zee-van Oudenhoven (cultural psychology; University of Groningen) agreed to give talks about their field of expertise. After their talks, they will be available for further discussion and individual questions. Finally, we are happy to announce that Marcello Galucci (Free University, Amsterdam) agreed to give an afternoon methods workshop.

The official language during the summer school will be English.

Students' accommodations will be in international student dormitories (2-person rooms). The dormitories are equipped with kitchens, but most of the time students will be provided with breakfast, lunch and dinner.

The main sponsor of the Summer School is the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology. Moreover, the Society of Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP), the University of Groningen, and local organizations will support the event. In addition, each participating student is expected to contribute to the expenses by paying a fee of 200 Euro. We strongly encourage students to ask their home department to provide a reimbursement for this fee and to help them with their travel expenses.

Eligible participants must be doctoral students in social psychology who are currently enrolled in a Ph.D. program, and who have not previously participated in an EAESP-Summer School or a summer school organized by the Society for Personality and Social Psychology. A total of 60 Ph.D. students will be selected to participate in the Summer School. Five students from the US and Canada will be chosen by SPSP, whereas the remaining 55 students will be selected by the organizing committee in Groningen. As in the past, there is also the option for some students from outside Europe to participate in the Summer School.

Applications need to be received by Dec. 15, 2003. Only timely and complete applications can be accepted.

You can download the application form via the following link:

<http://www.rug.nl/psy/onderzoek/summerschool/>

On this site you will also find further information about the Groningen Summer School. The website will be updated during further preparations for the Summer School.

We would like the students to submit their applications via regular mail. If accessing the application form via internet is not possible, or if there are any other questions, please contact the local organizers via email at summerschool@ppsw.rug.nl, via phone: +31 50 363 6395 (Ernestine Gordijn), +31 50 363 7903 (Sabine Otten), via fax: +31 50 363 4581, or by regular mail to:

EAESP Summer School 2004, c/o Dr. Ernestine Gordijn, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, 9712 TS Groningen, The Netherlands.

Grants

Sophie Berjot (seedcorn grant)
Bruno Chappe (travel grant)
Catharine Evers (travel grant)
Antonis Gardikiotis (regional support grant)
Elena Morales (travel grant)
Kirsten Ruys (travel grant)
Nicole Tausch (travel grant)
Rachel Taylor (seedcorn grant)
Rob Thomson (seedcorn grant)
Helma van den Berg (travel grant)

GRANT REPORTS**Maria Augustinova**

Université René Descartes – Paris 5, France

Postgraduate travel grant

I am very grateful to the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology for the financial support that made my stay of almost three weeks (28th May to 16th June 2003) at Miami University, Ohio, USA possible. I also wish to acknowledge the helpfulness and efficiency of EAESP secretary Sibylle Classen during the grant application process.

Not only was it wonderful to see some (now old!) friends, but to once again be able to benefit from the highly creative working environment. I truly appreciate the effort that Dr. Gary Stasser (my host professor) and Dr. Karen Schilling (the head of the Psychology department) both put into making my visit very worthwhile and pleasant. I would also like to thank all graduate students from Group Processes and Performance Lab for numerous interesting discussions and also for great leisure-time ideas!

The first aim of my visit was to complete the data analysis of studies that are part of the ongoing research project that Dr. Stasser and I started in 2001 when I first visited MU. A portion of this project addresses the question of how differential access to task-relevant information among group members affects collective performance on reasoning tasks. Thanks to extensive collaborative work we completed the data analysis and interpretation of the studies which were run in the Laboratoire de Psychologie Sociale at the University René Descartes – Paris 5. A portion of this work was presented at EAESP small group meeting on Small group decision making : Motivation and Cognition in Amsterdam (3-5th of September, 2003). Furthermore, Dr. Stasser and I outlined a paper based on these data and designed a follow-up study. During the visit, we were also able to prepare materials for the latter study and it is currently at the stage of data collection at MU.

Whereas the studies I refer to above focus on the group-level processes, the earlier part of our research project investigated some motivational and cognitive consequences of inequities in access to collectively available information on individual reasoning prior to the group discussion (Augustinova, Oberlé & Stasser, submitted manuscript). Within the perspective of possible articulation, my visit at MU was also aimed at outlining a new research project that would combine these rather distinct levels of analysis. Throughout numerous discussions we designed several studies addressing this point.

To summarize, thanks to the postgraduate travel grant I was able to finish part of an ongoing research project, outline a follow-up research project and also acquire some additional statistical skills. On the whole, my visit at MU was extremely beneficial and provided a great impetus for dissertation writing process. Thus I fully recommend similar experience to other postgraduate EAESP members and doctoral students in general.

Nathalie Dalle

Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand, France

Postgraduate Travel Grant

Thanks to a *EAESP postgraduate travel grant* I visited the Department of Psychology at the University of Denver (Co), from April 3rd to July 16th 2003. The general aim of this three-months trip was to work with Piotr Winkielman (Assistant Professor and Co-Director in the Emotion and Cognition Lab) to conduct an experiment that required the use of Electromyographic (EMG) recording methods, a technique with which I was not familiar. Supported by a *NSF Funding grant*, this research is a collaboration with Dr. Paula Niedenthal at Blaise Pascal University (Clermont-Ferrand), and Dr. Jamin Halberstadt at University of Otago, New Zealand.

Dr. Winkielman and his graduate and undergraduate students gave me a very warm welcome to Denver. I was immediately given my own office, and had access to the whole Department so that I rapidly met most people working there and felt very comfortable. I was also invited to many social events organized by the members of the Department. I participated in weekly lab meetings, and attended very interesting talks and presentations given by graduate students, post-doctorates, as well as faculties or other staff, and some invited speakers. I even had the chance to visit the University of Colorado at Boulder, which was a real pleasure. I also took the opportunity to attend sessions of several undergraduate and graduate classes during the Spring quarter (e.g., "*Cognitive Neuroscience*" taught by Catherine L. Reed, "*Emotion and Motivation*" taught by Piotr Winkielman, and "*Behavioral Neurology*" taught by Valerie Stone in the Graduate Program. I went to Atlanta (Georgia) to attend the 15th Annual A.P.S. conference, where I met some distinguished American researchers who gave talks of great interest to me (e.g., Lawrence Barsalou, John Cacioppo, Susan Fiske, Jamin Halberstadt, Robert Levenson, Elizabeth Loftus, Robert Zajonc). I particularly liked the talk given by Zajonc. I also participated in different poster sessions, and went to the Tea with Champions, a very enriching meeting with students.

After the first 2 weeks, Piotr Winkielman and I had many interesting and useful discussions to start our research project and to decide the design of

the experiment. I was also paired with several of his graduate students, who taught me specific skills. For example, two students trained me on the use of EMG recording technique, and another one on the use of the E-prime software which I had never used before. I even participated in a graduate students' workshop, and soon became able to built my own program.

The mimicry study we conducted in the laboratory is a quasi-replication of the *conceptual bias* observed in a recent study (i.e., Halberstadt and Niedenthal, 2001). In the original study, participants were presented with faces expressing static blends of happiness and anger, and were led to categorize the expressions in terms of one or the other of the categories. Specifically, participants had to create short stories in their head, trying to explain why the target people were expressing the emotion provided by the experimenter. Thus, the ambiguous faces presented for one minute each, were encoding during the first phase of the experiment, according to the emotional concept, which finally biased the recognition for a face in the last part of the experiment. When participants played with computer movies to identify the facial expressions they saw at the very beginning of the experiment, they remembered as significantly angrier the facial expressions explained in term of anger than the same facial expressions explained in term of happiness. The conceptual biases always depended on whether a face was explained in terms of the available concept. Thus, the use of an emotion concept to interpret an ambiguous facial expression biases *perceptual* memory for the face in the direction of that concept.

In Denver, we wished to test whether this phenomenon can be accounted for by the embodiment-simulation approach recently proposed by Niedenthal and her colleagues (e.g., Niedenthal, Ric, & Krauth-Gruber, 2001; Barsalou, Niedenthal, Barbey, & Ruppert, in press). According to that approach, perceptual memory for a facial expression involves the simulation (or mimicry) of that expression by the viewer. Conceptualizing the face in terms of the given category (angry/happy) shifts that simulation towards the given category and, as a result, biases memory. Of course, the extent of simulation and the resulting memory bias can vary – explaining why the face looks happy or angry involves “deep” processing and more simulation than just labeling the face as happy or angry. Three specific experimental predictions followed from this idea. First,

conceptualization should change the viewer's initial facial response to the blended face. The degree of that change should depend on the extent of the simulation. Second, viewing a blended facial expression that was *previously* conceptualized in terms of one category of emotional expression (e.g., anger), the perceiver's facial muscles will respond to the face in a way that is biased to that category. Third, the extent of memory bias toward a particular emotion category will be positively related to the degree of muscular involvement.

In the experiment we conducted, 18 static blends of angry and happy expressions were selected to be presented, especially because these expressions are associated with easily identifiable patterns of facial muscle. Specifically, viewing happy expressions is primarily associated with the activity over the region of the zygomaticus and orbicularis oculi, whereas viewing angry expressions is primarily associated with the activity over the region of the corrugator supercilli and the frontalis. For this reason, we first placed 4 sensors on the participants face, and asked them to perform a 5-phase session, wearing the sensors during the whole experiment. In the first "*Encoding phase*", the 18 faces were displayed on the computer screen with the instruction written below as follow, "Try to explain why this person is *angry vs. happy*". In order to test if people simulate the single emotional concept provided simultaneously, we added a set of 18 Chinese ideographs and asked individuals to complete the same task. For each picture, participants had 30 seconds to create their own stories in their head. After a 15 minute break, during which they took part in a non-related task, they ran through a "*Just look*" phase, in which the stimuli were presented alone, for 3 seconds. Participants just had to watch the screen while responses from their facial muscles were recorded. Then, they completed the "*Recognition phase*", where they had to play movies to identify the faces they saw at the very beginning of the experiment. The order of the two "*Just look*" and "*Recognition*" phases were counterbalanced across the participants. We finally added a fifth phase named "*Forced-recognition*", in which participants used the keyboard to recall the concept that was paired with each picture in the very first phase. The experiment took approximately 2 hours per person, and the 28 participants recruited were paid \$20. The data collected fill very large files, both on the neuroscan and the E-prime ones. We will be soon in the process of analyzing them.

This trip was a very nice personal and professional experience, that I cannot end this report without thanking again the EAESP, for giving me the opportunity to visit Denver. I learned a lot, I met many people, and this reinforced my motivation to conduct research and to develop other collaborations. I really encourage graduate students to visit a foreign country during their training in a Ph.D Program.

Jaap Ham

University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

Postgraduate Travel Grant

Visit to: John Skowronski, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois, January 16 till March 29, 2003.

One of the things I learned while visiting John Skowronski at Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois, is that 0 degrees Fahrenheit equals minus 17 Celsius. Such was the temperature when I arrived there half January. Luckily, I was installed in a small but warm office of my own. And with temperatures so low, there's not much else to do but work.

Collaboration with John Skowronski had been the main target of my visit. The subject of my dissertation research is spontaneous trait inferences. These are inferences people draw spontaneously about trait of others when they perceive their behaviour. For example, the behaviour description "Cory asks for his third pizza" might make you draw the spontaneous trait inference "hungry". John Skowronski is one of the leading scientists in this field. Also, one of the measurement paradigms I use to detect activation of these inferences is based on a paradigm developed by John (in collaboration with Don Carlston). I had aimed at discussing various specific subjects, and to perform a study in the local lab.

Our discussions were very interesting and frequent: John was able to make time for a meeting almost every day. Next to that, we discussed my first

paper which gave me a lot of ideas for paper number two. Our discussions led us to design two lines of research, both consisting of several studies.

In the second half of my visit, I designed one of these studies in more detail and ran it in the departments' lab. Getting my feet in the local experimental dirt taught me a lot. About the strict procedures concerning lab use. About the efficiency of running your subjects using a schedule. About making my experiment interesting enough for American participant. (The experiment contained a task that may have been a bit boring; at least one participant fell asleep.) The results of this study were very promising. We found evidence for the assumption that it is possible to disentangle associative processes from real inferential processes. After analyzing the data in more detail, we might conduct additional studies both in my Nijmegen lab as in DeKalb.

All in all, the EAESP travel grant has allowed me to make an important step in my career as a young scientist. To collaborate with a leading scientist and gain international experience will certainly have a big influence on the development of my research.

Sandrine Redersdorff

Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand, France

Postgraduate Seedcorn Grant

Thanks to the *EAESP seedcorn grant*. I visited the Department of Psychology at the University of Kansas (Lawrence, Kansas), from January 29th to April 29th 2003.

The general aim of this trip was to benefit from the expertise of Nyla Branscombe on identification domain and to conduct an experiment at KU.

Dr. Branscombe gave me a very warm welcome to Lawrence (Kansas). I was immediately given my own office, and had access to the whole Department so that I rapidly met most people working there and felt very comfortable. I was also invited to many social events organized by the

members of the Department. I participated in weekly lab meetings, and attended very interesting talks and presentations given by graduate students, as well as faculties or other staff, and some invited speakers. Every Friday, the psychology department organizes a talk with a happy hour after. These privileged moments gave me the opportunity to talk with everybody (professors and students). I also gave a talk in front of the social psychology department which was a very enriching moment for me.

I also went to Los Angeles to attend the SPSP annual meeting in February. I didn't give a talk but it occasioned some informal great discussion.

My main interest research concerns the role of the group membership during strategies of personal improvement. What happens, for subordinated group members, when they personally succeed on a dimension valued by the society? Do they cut definitively psychological links with their group? Will they try to be accepted and recognized by the dominant group members and after make use of some strategies to elevate their group? What is the role of perceived legitimacy? Nyla spent a lot of time with me to talk about her research on collective guilt and about disadvantaged group members. Her very well knowledge on this area was very helpful for me.

I participated in one of collaborative research projects we have a manuscript that is sufficiently complete that it is almost ready for submission now (Garcia, Horstman, Amo, Redersdorff, & Branscombe). That work concerns the reasons why there are *social costs* incurred when group members claim their outcomes are due to social discrimination. In this work we employed French-based theorizing concerning the 'norm of internality' by Beauvois and DuBois (i.e., expectations that people will accept responsibility for their own failures) to examine under what conditions this norm is most likely to be applied—to ingroup versus outgroup members. We found that, as expected, ingroup members who claim their negative outcomes were due to discrimination were seen as violating this norm more strongly than outgroup members and as a result ingroup members were evaluated more negatively compared to outgroup members who attributed their outcomes to prejudice.

I also conducted an experiment of my own development while at Kansas concerning the conditions under which personal success will prevent or promote group level consciousness development. I think the results thus far seem promising, and I believe with a follow-up study it will also be publishable in an experimental social psychology journal. Unlike some theoretical views, we find that personal success does not always lead to disidentification with the ingroup and individual social mobility. Rather, whether social mobility is selected as an option or not depends on perceptions of the existing social structure.

This trip was a very nice personal and professional experience, that I cannot end this report without thanking again the EAESP, for giving me the opportunity to visit Nyla Branscombe during 3 months. I learned a lot, I met many people, and this reinforced my motivation to conduct research and to develop other collaborations. I really encourage graduate students to visit a foreign country during their training in a Ph.D Program or following their Ph.D Program.

Pavel Kobylnski

University of Warsaw, Poland

Postgraduate Travel Grant

Thanks to the EAESP postgraduate travel bursary I had the opportunity to attend the New York Academy of Sciences International Conference titled: "The Self: From Soul to Brain" which was held on September 26-28, 2002 in New York City. The conference was organised by Joseph LeDoux. He invited many scientists from all over the world who are interested in different aspects and perspectives of Self. The conference was aimed at presenting the current understanding and future directions for scientific research on the self and its relation to the brain. As it said in the conference programme, it was particularly important for the organiser "that neuroscientific research on the self be based on a broader understanding of the self, as reflected through philosophical, theological and social scientific perspectives".

I decided to go to New York firstly because Self is one of my scientific interests, and secondly, because LeDoux's findings on the neural mechanisms of emotions serve as a main background knowledge in my research on implicit emotion. I found the conference very interesting and it really made me think of some general ideas for research that would combine the neurobiological and psychological perspectives (that is what my doctoral thesis is going to present). My own main area of research is implicit affect and affect-cognition interactions. I do research in affective priming paradigm. But what I am really interested in, together with the research group I am a member of, lead by Professor Maria Jarymowicz, is what are the mechanisms that can minimize the unconscious influence of affect on thinking and behavior. The Self structure seems to play an important part, as the first findings show.

It was a great experience to listen to (and sometimes talk to) the world famous specialists (to mention only some of them: M.R. Banaji, P.S. Churchland, A.R. Damasio, D.C. Dennett, M.S. Gazzaniga, E.R. Kandel, D.M. Wegner). The conference was organized in VI sessions: Perspectives of the Self part I and II; Psycho-social aspects of the Self, part I and II; Self and brain, part I and II. The presentations met the high standards, in my opinion, and the speakers seemed to be fascinated by the topic.

Additionally, I had the opportunity to buy some books that were presented during the conference.

To sum up I can say that attending the conference was very inspiring. I would like to thank the EAESP for providing the funds that made that trip possible.

Magdalena Smieja

Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland

Regional Support Grant

Emotional intelligence was popularized in recent years by the best-selling book by Daniel Goleman (1995), but the research in this domain began in the early 1990s. The scientist who invented that term (with Jack Mayer) and developed coherent and elegant theory of emotional intelligence is Professor Peter Salovey. Among different approaches, model offered by Salovey and Mayer, stating that emotional intelligence is the ability to a) perceive emotions, b) integrate emotion to facilitate thought, c) understand emotions, and d) regulate emotions to promote personal growth (Mayer, Salovey, 1997) seems to be the most accurate and refined. The research done by Peter Salovey determined my way of thinking of both emotional and social intelligence, I have been working on for six years. Thanks to Regional Support Grant sponsored by EAESP I could visit Professor Peter Salovey and his research group at Yale University.

I arrived to New Haven at the beginning of September. Professor Salovey gave me a very warm welcome – he turned out to be not only an exceptional scientist but also an exceptional person. I was given an office space and full access to the lab and department facilities.

The main goal of my visit was to learn how the research on emotional intelligence is being done in Health, Emotion and Behavior Laboratory. Each Friday I took part in lab meetings and listened carefully while successive speakers described their results. At one of those meetings I gave a talk about my last experimental study.

During those five weeks in New Haven either in time of official gatherings or during informal discussions I witnessed the processes of creating new research ideas and designing new projects. I took part in a discussion on Marc Brackett's curriculum invented to teach emotional intelligence to children at school. I had the chance to consult my own research on social intelligence (special thanks to Paulo Lopes). My Yale colleagues provided me also with a set of their newest, unpublished papers on the topic. Moreover, I participated in other scientific activities of the department. I have attended weekly meetings called "Current Work in Social

Psychology”, where I had the opportunity to listen to very interesting talks about the experience of emotions (by Lisa Feldman-Barret), measuring the life space (by Marc Brackett) or expression and suppression of emotions (by George Bonnano). Taking advantage of being at Yale I was also attending to the “Current Work in Cognitive Psychology” and weekly meetings at PACE center run by Professor Robert Sternberg. Fortunately for me, this autumn Yale University was visited by series of outstanding psychologists. I was given the chance to enjoy the lectures given by Steven Pinker, Janet Shibley Hyde and Martin Seligman. Being a teacher at my home University I was also interested in the way the psychology students are being taught at Yale, therefore, I visited some of the regular undergraduate courses.

Thanks to Professor Salovey’s generosity I attended Positive Psychology Conference held this year in Washington D.C. The conference began with Nobel Price Winner’s lecture (Daniel Kahneman) and what happened next kept that incredible standard. I have never heard so many inspiring talks in less than three days and I have never seen so many psychology “stars” in one place.

My visit at Yale University was, as I expected, a milestone in my professional career. I have seen some of the best researchers working in one of the best scientific environments. I have learned a lot, I have met wonderful people. It was an inspiring, unforgettable professional experience. I am very thankful to EAESP for giving me that opportunity.

News about Members**NEW MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION**

The following applications for membership were approved by the Executive Committee at its meeting in October, 2003. Names of members providing letters of support are in parentheses:

Full Membership

Dr. Sophie **BERJOT**
Paris V, France
(S. Krauth-Gruber, E. Drozda-Senkowska)

Dr. Pablo **BRINOL**
Madrid, Spain
(G. Maio, G. Haddock)

Dr. Rosa **CABECINHAS**
Braga, Portugal
(L. Amancio, F. Lorenzi-Cioldi)

Dr. Matt **CRAWFORD**
Bristol, UK
(G.R. Maio, C. Sedikides)

Dr. Bertram **GAWRONSKI**
Wuerzburg, Germany
(F. Strack, T. Mussweiler)

Dr. Karine **GRENIER**
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(M. Brauer, P. Niedenthal)

Dr. Rob **HOLLAND**
Nijmegen, The Netherlands
(B. Verplanken, A. van Knippenberg)

Dr. Esther **KLUWER**
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(K. van den Bos, W. Stroebe)

Dr. Michelle **LUKE**
Southampton, UK
(C. Sedikides, G.R. Maio)

Dr. David **MARX**
Groningen, The Netherlands
(D. Stapel, E. Gordijn)

Dr. Roland **NEUMANN**
Wuerzburg, Germany
(F. Strack, T. Mussweiler)

Dr. Sabine **PAHL**
Erlangen-Nuernberg, Germany
(J.R. Eiser, P. Harris)

Dr. Sandrine **REDERSDORF**
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(R. Crisp, S. Guimond)

Dr. Dorota **RUTKOWSKA**
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Jarymowicz, A. Szuster)

Dr. Marianne **SCHMID MAST**
Lengwil, Switzerland
(G. Trommsdorff, K. Scherer)

Dr. Jan-Willem **VAN PROOIJEN**
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(P.A.M. Van Lange, G. Semin)

Affiliate Membership

Dr. Macus E. **LIMA**
Aracaju, Brazil
(J. Vala, M.B. Monteiro)

Dr. Batja **MESQUITA**
Winston-Salem, USA
(P. Niedenthal, A.S.R. Manstead)

Postgraduate Membership

Constantina **BADEA**
Paris, France
(F. Askevis-Leherpeux, F.
Lorenzi-Cioldi)

Tomek **BARAN**
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Kofta, M. Kaminska-
Feldman)

Virginie **BONNOT**
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(J.-C. Croizet, R. Brown)

Giel **DIK**
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(H. Aarts, K. van den Bos)

Marie-Eve **GAUZINS**
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(J.-C. Croizet, M. Désert)

Judith **GROB**
Groningen, The Netherlands
(D. Stapel, E. Gordijn)

Catalina **KOPETZ**
Maryland, USA
(F. Butera, E. Dépret)

Joris **LAMMERS**
Groningen, The Netherlands
(D. Stapel, E. Gordijn)

Renata **MAKSYMIUK**
Warsaw, Poland
(D. Maison, M. Kofta)

Norbert **MALISZEWSKI**
Warsaw, Poland
(D. Maison, M. Kofta)

Laurie **MONDILLON**
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(P. Niedenthal, M. Brauer)

Charis **PSALTIS**
Cambridge, UK
(T. Manstead, G. Duveen)

Tania **TAM**
Maryland, Oxford, UK
(B. Parkinson, M. Hewstone)

Debra **TRAMPE**
Groningen, The Netherlands
(D. Stapel, E. Gordijn)

Arne **VAN DEN BOS**
Groningen, The Netherlands
(D. Stapel, E. Gordijn)

Sytske **VAN DER VELDE**
Groningen, The Netherlands
(D. Stapel, E. Gordijn)

Nickie **VAN DER WULP**
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(G. Semin, W. van Dijk)

Margreet **VAN ROOIJEN**
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(G. Semin, D. Daamen)

Michael **VLIEK**
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(D. Wigboldus, R. Spears)

Carine **WIEKENS**
Groningen, The Netherlands
(D. Stapel, E. Gordijn)

Announcements**EJSP Special Issue on "Social Power and Group Processes"
Call for Papers**

The editorial team of the European Journal of Social Psychology has decided to publish a special issue on "Social Power and Group Processes". The special issue will be guest-edited by Markus Brauer (University of Clermont-Ferrand, France) and Richard Bourhis (Université du Québec à Montréal, Canada). Information about the content of the special issue will be given below.

The timetable for the special issue is as follows:

- June 2003: First call for papers.
- March 2004: Second call for papers.
- June 30, 2004: Final date for submissions.
- March 31, 2005: Final date for revisions.
- November 2005: Expected publication date.

Manuscripts can be submitted between January and June 2004. Authors should send their manuscripts to the EJSP Editorial Office (similar to regular submissions) but should indicate in the cover letter that they wish the manuscript to be considered for the special issue on "Social Power and Group Processes". Although this is not mandatory, the guest editors would greatly appreciate receiving a short message of intention from authors who plan to submit a manuscript to the special issue.

If you have questions please address them to Markus Brauer (brauer@srvpsy.univ-bpclermont.fr) or to Richard Bourhis (bourhis.richard@uqam.ca)

Information about the content of the special issue:

The concept of "Social Power" and its impact on group processes has been of enduring interest to social psychologists (e.g., French & Raven, 1959; Kipnis, 1976; Ng, 1980, Tajfel, 1982). In recent years, there has been a revival of interest in theoretical questions related to Social Power and Group Processes (see Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003, for a review).

As the literature suggests, social power affects interpersonal and intergroup processes in a variety of ways. As perceivers, members of powerful groups are characterized by heuristic information processing and stereotypic perceptions of others compared to members of powerless groups (at least under certain circumstances). As targets, powerful groups are generally seen as competent and hardworking, but also as cold and superficial. Given that members of powerful groups tend to attract perceivers' attention, they are perceived in terms of individual characteristics and are perceived as more heterogeneous than members of powerless groups. As actors, members of powerful groups tend to behave in a more disinhibited and approach-related manner than members of powerless groups. They are more prone to take action, to display explicit verbal and non-verbal behaviors, to transgress social norms, and, more generally, to act in idiosyncratic ways. As a result, their behavior is objectively more variable, and this further enhances the perceived difference in heterogeneity. Given that perceptual biases and reality constraints cause perceivers to view powerful groups as more heterogeneous, stereotypes are less readily applied to members of powerful groups than to members of powerless groups. When behaving as group members in stable intergroup settings, dominant groups tend to discriminate more against outgroup members than subordinate groups. Powerless group members do not discriminate at all given that without usable power, individuals cannot actualize their ingroup favoring attitudes.

The purpose of the special issue is to further explore the different effects of social power within interpersonal and intergroup settings. What psychological processes underlie the above mentioned effects? Why do powerful individuals tend to perceive others more stereotypically and why are they less often the target of stereotypes? What are moderators of the

observed effects? How do dominant and subordinate group members behave towards each other within intergroup situations that are more or less stable, legitimate and permeable? Are there other effects of power that are relevant for sociopsychological theorizing on group processes?

Of course, there are no limitations concerning the theoretical approaches adopted by authors. The guest editors' goal is to put together a series of papers that vary in their theoretical grounding, experimental and field procedures. Also, a wide definition of social power will be adopted for the issue, including expert, referent, legitimate, reward and coercive power (Raven, 1993). Being able to determine others' outcomes, controlling resources, and being the winner of a competitive encounter may also be related to social power. It may also be of interest to examine how social power relates to other socio-structural variables such as social status, social stratification, and minority/majority group position.

Although there is no "brief report" section in the EJSP, the guest editors will consider the ratio of contribution and length of the manuscripts. The guest editors are interested in receiving submissions of single-study papers in which the authors describe an interesting effect even if the authors have not yet fully identified the underlying psychological mechanism. However, these papers should be no longer than 5000 words. Longer papers necessarily have to provide a more significant contribution and may contain a series of studies in which the same phenomenon is demonstrated with a variety of manipulations/measures/settings.

International Social Cognition Network (ISCON)

We are pleased to announce the formation of the International Social Cognition Network (ISCON). This organization was formed as a joint enterprise between the European Social Cognition Network and the Person Memory Interest Group to act as an umbrella society to advance the international study of social cognition. Among the objectives of ISCON are to advance the understanding of social cognition by

encouraging research and the preparation of papers and reports, holding meetings for the presentation of scientific papers, possibly sponsoring or issuing publications containing scientific papers and other material pertinent to the furtherance of the Network's goals, establishing professional honors and awards to recognize excellence in social cognition research, and cooperating with other scientific and professional societies.

We seek to represent social cognition, broadly defined. We view social cognition not as a content area, but rather as an approach to understanding a wide variety of social psychological phenomena pertaining to many content areas. To borrow from the journal *Social Cognition*, the major concerns of the approach are the processes underlying the perception, memory, and judgment of social stimuli; the effects of social, cultural, and affective factors on the processing of information; and the behavioral and interpersonal consequences of cognitive processes.

ISCON is governed by a steering committee that currently consists of:

Irene Blair, University of Colorado
Tanya Chartrand, Duke University
Olivier Corneille, Catholic University of Louvain
Ap Dijksterhuis, University of Amsterdam
Thomas Mussweiler, University of Wuerzburg
Jeff Sherman, Northwestern University
Eliot Smith, Indiana University
Fritz Strack, University of Wuerzburg

As for concrete objectives and purposes, ISCON will now act as official sponsor of the Social Cognition pre-conference that precedes the annual SPSP conference. It will also sponsor a similar pre-conference to precede the tri-annual meeting of the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, beginning summer 2005 in Wuerzburg. ISCON also is now official sponsor of the Person Memory Interest Group (PMIG) conference that precedes the annual SESP conference.

Other objectives and purposes of ISCON will be developed in the coming months. We encourage you to share your ideas for its development.

Membership in ISCON is free. Anyone with an interest in social cognition, broadly defined, is encouraged to join. To join, simply send an email to Jeff Sherman: sherm@northwestern.edu. You will be placed on the group's email list.

Jeff Sherman

**Journal of Cultural and Evolutionary Psychology
Call for Papers**

Two major scientific enterprise evolved around the turn of the millennium within the broad domain of psychology: evolutionary psychology (EP) and cultural psychology (CP). Each has its predecessors, neither of them emerged anew. EP is a refined a broadened version of sociobiology. As opposed to sociobiology, however, EP is not preoccupied with general fitness or biological adaptation. Rather it acknowledges the ontological reality of the psychological level in the organisation of behavior (Buss, 1995). The object of the study is the psychological mechanism, which is evolved in the evolutionary process. Although the theoretical framework of evolutionary psychology is open to overcome traditional false dichotomies in psychology, e.g., nature versus nurture, biological versus cultural, or universal versus culturally relative, most research in the domain has so far been focused on specific issues of sexual selection, reproduction, child rearing, etc. Nevertheless, some authors, e.g. Cosmides (1992), Tomasello (1993, 1998) made substantial efforts to outline an evolutionary psychological foundation of culture.

Evolutionary psychology has not established its own journal as yet (to my knowledge). Journal articles appear in periodicals e.g., Evolutionary Biology, Evolutionary Ethology and Human Behavior. Beyond the proliferation of textbooks, a comprehensive handbook was also published: C.B. Crawford and D.Krebs (eds.) Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology: Ideas, Issues and Applications. Hillsdale, N.J: Erlbaum, 1998.

As EP has its roots in the Darwinian theory, CP goes back to Vygotsky and his school. Basic tenet of CP inherited from the Vygotsky school is that psychological mechanisms evolve in interdependence with the activity the individual exerts in interaction with her physical and social environment. In the past decades, CP's interest encompasses broader issues of development, dispersion and maintenance of cultural and social representations in groups. However, the linkage of the individual and the social-cultural levels is far from being elaborated. CP, as a theory driven field, where empirical research is conducted to test specific hypotheses, should be distinguished from the popular area of cross-cultural psychology where data generation frequently leads to non-interpreted results.

CP has its Journal Cultural Psychology, founded in 1991. It is edited at the Clark University, which is, besides California, the headquarter of CP in the US. The most prominent textbook of the field is Michael Cole's Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline. Cambridge, MA., Harvard University Press, 1996.

The proposed journal with its expressive title aims to solicit and attract articles, which will in the near future very likely approximate or integrate evolutionary and cultural-social perspectives. This potential integration is assured by the Hungarian editorial board. Editors are internationally renowned, leading figures of the respective fields, each representing an integrative perspective in his own field: Professor János László of the Institute for Psychology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and of the University of Pécs in social representations and communication, Professor Csaba Pléh of the Technical University of Budapest in cognitive science, and Professor Tamás Bereczkei of the University of Pécs in evolutionary psychology. Professor János László is willing to assume the responsibility of the general editor for the next three years.

The international editorial board consists of 8-10 world wide acknowledged scholars, who already agreed to participate.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Two major scientific enterprises evolved around the turn of the millennium within the broad domain of psychology: evolutionary psychology (EP) and cultural psychology (CP). Each has its predecessors, neither of them emerged anew. EP is a refined and broadened version of sociobiology. As opposed to sociobiology, however, EP is not preoccupied with general fitness or biological adaptation. Rather it acknowledges the ontological reality of the psychological level in the organisation of behavior.

As EP has its roots in the Darwinian theory, CP goes back to Vygotsky and his school. The basic tenet of CP inherited from the Vygotsky school is that psychological mechanisms evolve in interdependence with the activity the individual exerts in interaction with her physical and social environment. In the past decades, CP's interest encompasses broader issues of development, dispersion and maintenance of cultural and social representations in groups. However, the linkage of the individual and the social-cultural levels is far from being elaborated.

Besides accommodating classical cultural and evolutionary psychological studies, the journal, as it is expressed in its title, aims to solicit and attract articles, which strive to approximate or integrate evolutionary and cultural-social perspectives. In other words, studies which enlighten the regularities of cultural stability and change.

Manuscripts should be submitted electronically in word or rtf format to the address anita@btk.pte.hu. Figures should be in JPEG format. Manuscripts should follow the APA style. All figures and tables should be numbered. Table and figure captions should be written on separate page(s) and should appropriately be numbered. Their place should be indicated in the text.

References in the text should be quoted by giving the author's name(s), followed by the year, e.g., Tooby and Cosmides (1992). For more than two authors, all names are given when first cited, but when subsequently referred to, the name of the first author is given followed by „et al.” References to books should include the author's name followed by initials, year, chapter title, editors, book title, page numbers, place of publication,

and publisher. References to journals should include the author's name followed by initials, year, paper title, journal title, volume number and page number. Please, follow the examples below:

Sperber, D. (1996): *Explaining culture: A naturalistic approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tooby, J., and Cosmides, L. (1992): The psychological foundations of culture. In J. H. Barkow, L. Cosmides, and J. Tooby (eds.), *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture* (pp. 20-135). New York: Oxford University Press.

Dennett, D. (1995): Overworking the hippocampus, *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 18, 677-78.

Announcements from the Executive Committee

Letters of support for applicants for membership

At its October 2003 meeting the Executive Committee decided on a limited change in the membership application procedure. The present procedure has the applicant submit an application form together with two letters of support written by Full Members.

Observing that, as a standard and for obvious reasons, most application procedures have letters of support submitted directly by the supporters themselves and not by the applicant, the Executive Committee decided to adopt this standard procedure. In addition, to ensure that the supporting letters will cover all the elements relevant for a decision by the Executive Committee, in the future supporters will be asked to use a standard format for these letters.

Hence, from now on the application procedure is as follows:

- (1) The applicant submits an application form (downloadable from the EAESP website) to the administrative secretary. The applicant sends his/her curriculum vitae and the publication list and also submits the names of two Full Members who are willing to write a letter of support.
- (2) The administrative secretary contacts the supporters and asks them to write a letter of support, using a form (soon) downloadable from the EAESP website. The supporters submit their letters directly to the administrative secretary.

Membership fee for 2004 is due now

Last not least it is time to renew your EAESP membership. Please pay your membership fee for 2004 **until December, 31st, 2003**. Only timely renewal will assure uninterrupted receipt of the *European Journal of Social Psychology* and will save administration costs.

For details regarding modes of payment we refer you to our website www.eaesp.org (Membership / Fees). You can submit (or print) a credit card authorisation form directly from the website. Alternatively, the website provides information about the accounts of the Association should you prefer to pay by bank transfer. If you choose the latter option, please make sure that no bank charges are involved for the receiver.

Payment by credit card is the easiest and cheapest way for both sides.

If you already submitted your credit card authorisation and your card number and expiration date are still valid and unchanged, dues for 2004 will automatically be charged in December 2003 (on your credit card statement you will find the amount in Euro charged by Adm. Office Classen).

In all the above mentioned cases, **you will receive a receipt** of your payment **by regular mail** within two weeks.

Please note that your subscription of the *European Journal of Social Psychology* for 2004 will be cancelled, if we don't receive your fee or your credit card authorisation by December 31st, 2003.

We thank you in advance for your friendly cooperation.

Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Administrative Secretary by **March, 15th, 2004** 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 **March, 1st, 2004**.

Executive Committee

Dominic Abrams, Centre for the Study of Group Processes, Department of Psychology, University of Kent at Canterbury, KENT CT2 7NP, UK
e-mail: D.Abrams@kent.ac.uk

Patrizia Catellani, Department of Psychology, Catholic University Milano, Largo A. Gemelli 1, I-20123 Milano, Italy
e-mail: catellan@mi.unicatt.it

Carmen Huici, Facultad de Psicología, Universidad Nacional de Educación, P.O. Box 60148, E-28040 Madrid, Spain
e-mail: mhuici@psi.uned.es

Russell Spears, School of Psychology, Cardiff University, PO Box 901, Cardiff, Wales CF10 3YG, UK
e-mail: SpearsR@Cardiff.ac.uk

Fritz Strack (Treasurer), Lehrstuhl fuer Psychologie II, University of Wuerzburg, Roentgenring 10, D-97070 Wuerzburg, Germany
e-mail: strack@psychologie.uni-wuerzburg.de

Eddy Van Avermaet (Secretary), Laboratory of Experimental Social Psychology, University of Leuven, Tiensestraat 102, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium
e-mail: Eddy.VanAvermaet@psy.kuleuven.ac.be

Vincent Yzerbyt (President), Université Catholique de Louvain, Faculté de Psychologie, 10 Place Cardinal Mercier, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
e-mail: vincent.yzerbyt@psp.ucl.ac.be

Administrative Secretary:

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

web site of the EAESP:

<http://www.eaesp.org>