European Bulletin of Social Psychology

Editors: Russell Spears & Sibylle Classen

Editorial

There has been much activity within the Association since I reported in the last Bulletin. As well as the usual range of meetings supported, and reported here, the summer saw the twelfth EAESP Summer School for postgraduate students held in the beautiful city of Padova. The weather was wonderful (not always the case apparently, but Luciano Arcuri is rumoured to have the right celestial connections!). But even this and the location did not manage to distract the participants from working hard both day and night to produce a series of highly impressive presentations and research plans that I was privileged to witness myself. A large chunk of this Bulletin is devoted to reporting on the experiences of both teachers and students at the five workshops. As well as a lot of work the summer school was also a lot of fun. Although very intensive it helps the participants not only to hone their skills but also to develop networks of friends and colleagues that will remain for life, fostering international collaborations and cross-fertilization of ideas. To learn more about what went on, both academic and social, including the significance of "red light district on the beach" (less lubricious than it sounds) then read on in the reports in these pages! The reports provide a great advert for the next wave of PhD students who want to follow in their footsteps. I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the executive committee, to thank publicly the local organizers, Luciano Arcuri, Anne Maass, Andrea Carnaghi and Alberto Voci, and also the external teachers (Jolanda Jetten, Arie Kruglanski, Paula Niedenthal, Gün Semin and Daniel Wigboldus) and local teachers (Emanuele Castano, Antonietta Curci, Anne Maass, Lucia Mannetti, and Jeroen Vaes) for all the work they put in during this hectic fortnight while most of use were enjoying a holiday break. The Summer School will always be one of the central activities of the Association as our postgraduates are the future of social psychology in Europe. The torch passes to Cardiff in two years time with preparation for next one already underway (and I hope we can emulate the Padova success). If you cannot wait this long, however, then there will also be an SPSP sponsored summer school in Austin Texas next year (Summer School in Social Psychology: SISP) for which there are a small number of places allocated to European postgraduates students (just as there were to American students

at Padova) with details of applications procedure and deadline also announced in this Bulletin and on the website. Arie Kruglanski must have enjoyed the summer school in Padova because he will also be teaching in the US version at Austin!

The issue of the name of the Association, and specifically whether to drop the experimental "E", has attracted some supportive comment from Gün Semin in these pages and we also welcome any other reactions. The committee has already offered its own support to this idea as outlined in a previous Bulletin and in anticipation of any change we have secured the internet domain name rights to "EASP" if this change were to be approved at the next General Meeting. In the meantime there is plenty of time to discuss and debate this issue in these pages as well as elsewhere.

Whether or not we go EASP in two years time, we will definitely be going EAST in two years time! As we already announced in the last Bulletin, the next General Meeting will take place in Opatija, Croatia. Planning for this continues apace and is already well advanced, with further details discussed with the local organizers at our recent executive committee meeting. We hope also in the next issue to provide an overview of social psychology in Croatia to introduce those less familiar with the historical and contemporary context of social psychology in this part of Europe. The next General Meeting looks set to live up to the highest standards -- good value, a beautiful location and excellent academic and social programs -- of previous meetings. Other plans to develop and consolidate our activities in Eastern and Central Europe (as well as other parts of Europe that are less well-resourced) were discussed at our last meeting and details will be announced soon. In this vein, another important development is the introduction of the regional activity grant scheme, as well as some adjustments to the timing of grants to make them fit better with the twice yearly committee meetings and to make the choice between schemes easier where either might be chosen. Your attention is directed to the website for all the details. It just remains for me to welcome all the new members, both postgraduate and full, and to encourage members from all areas of the Association to make maximal use of the various schemes on offer.

Last but certainly not least, and again on behalf of the committee, I would like to express a word of thanks to Leonel Garcia-Marques and his editorial team at EJSP, and also the previous editorial team led by Alex Haslam. The impact factor, submission rates, and circulation are higher than ever and this thanks in no small measure to all the hard work put in by them, ably supported by Wolfgang Boban and Sibylle Classen at the Association, as well as all the people who review for the journal.

In short, the Association looks to be in great shape, thanks to the inputs and activities of you, the members.

Russell Spears

**Changing the name of the
European Association of Experimental Social Psychology (EAESP)
into European Association of Social Psychology (EASP)
- Discussion -**

The acronym EAESP is a mouthful and to articulate it as E. A. E. S. P. takes an inordinate amount of time. In contrast, EASP – not while the most inviting acronym with a somewhat unusual sound to the ear when uttered as a word - is more generous to the anatomy responsible for articulation. And, even if it is not the most inviting acronym, it will become a familiar and positive single syllable reference after repeated exposure, as we all know well enough.

That in itself may be a sufficient reason to adopt the proposed new name for *The* Association. While this reason may have to do with *Flow*, *Form*, and *Fit* and have *intuitive* appeal, there is an issue of *Function* that may have an *analytic* appeal. The proposed label has the obvious advantage of being a more inclusive representation of the constituency and its scientific practice. The membership does not consist of experimentalists alone and a number of our members use both the experimental and non-experimental ones, sometimes within the same paper. Thus, the composition of the membership while representative of Social Psychology does not consist only of experimentalists, and the same with respect to individual practices of science. Therefore, the proposed name has the functional advantage of being inclusive and representative of the entire constituency and scientific practice.

Another function argument could be the EASP would be in line with our other acronyms EJSP, ERSP, EMSP, and EBSP.

While change means taking routes that deviate from the well-trodden paths and are often perceived as unnecessary or undesirable, the proposed change of *The* Association's name appears to be to be a very welcome and timely one.

Gün R. Semin

Reports on the XII EAESP Summer School
August 20th – September 1st, 2006
University of Padova (Italy)

The XII EAESP Summer School held in Padova (Italy) from 20th of August to 1st of September 2006, organized by the Department of Developmental and Socialization Psychology in collaboration with the Department of General Psychology.

Organizers' Report

When the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology asked the Padova group to be the organizers of the XII summer school, we spent at least three days ruminating about this request. We were divided into two groups of almost equal size, one in favour, the other contrary, with both sides putting forward strong arguments. So the decision was difficult and it was taken after a lot of hesitation and changes of mind.

At the end of the story we are happy to conclude that we had taken the right decision and that the scientific and human experience we were able to live was definitely great and justified any effort. The Summer School represented an extraordinary opportunity to share our research interests with so many teachers and young researchers coming from different European countries and from the United States. At the same time, we were proud to be, for a moment, at the very centre of the social psychology community, being the organizers of this important teaching project of the EAESP. From our perspective, and listening to the opinions and evaluations of the students and teachers, the Summer School appeared a rich and fruitful experience for everybody: the reports from the teachers and students which are presented below are a direct proof of the success of the event, as perceived by the main actors of this scientific enterprise.

We want to express an enthusiastic "grazie!!" to all the teachers who decided to invest a lot of time and to mobilize their scientific skills and professional motivation in planning, organizing and managing the

activities of the 5 workshops. Paula Niedenthal, Jolanda Jetten, Gün Semin, Arie Kruglanski, Daniel Wigboldus, as "external" teachers, were able to lead and guide the groups of students with competence, professionalism and a strong capacity of involvement. Similarly, Antonella Curci, Emanuele Castano, Anne Maass, Lucia Mannetti and Jeroen Vaes, as "internal" teachers, had a crucial role in making this complex but fascinating teaching enterprise.

But a critical role in establishing the success of an event like the Summer School is played by the students. When we formulated the call for applications a year before the beginning of the School, we predicted about 100 requests for 55 slots. At the end of the procedure, 240 applications had arrived from everywhere. The first serious problem was the selection of the candidates, practically all of whom were PhD students with strong interests, motivation, and skills. The final list of accepted people was the result of a (sometimes difficult) balance between different factors, like English competence, scientific performance during the studies, evaluation of the tutors, etc.

Looking at the final list of the PhD students selected for the Summer School we are able to appreciate the variety and the affluence of different cultures, scientific backgrounds, and languages of the participants as evidenced by the great number of nations represented, including Austria, Australia, Belgium, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Finland, Greece, Germany, France, Hungary, Italy, Israel, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, and the United Kingdom. According to a special agreement and cooperation with the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, there were also 5 PhD students from the United States who participated in the workshops of the School.

In selecting the participants and in shaping the workshops we decided to promote, as far as possible, an international atmosphere, putting together, in each workshop, different experiences and cultural traditions, in order to enhance the opportunity for all the participants to share and combine their abilities, skills, interests and expertise. At the end of the event we were impressed with the ease of interaction and the high degree of active participation and integration of the students, both within the each workshop and across the entire Summer School group.

The achievement of the Summer School was possible thanks to the financial contribution of different institutions. We are happy to thank the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology for its crucial support and patronage. Our gratitude is addressed to the Italian Ministry of the University, to the Cassa di Risparmio di Padova e Rovigo Foundation, to the International Relations Office, to the Faculty of Psychology, to the Department of General Psychology and, finally, to the Department of Developmental and Socialization Psychology of the University of Padova.

Below please find the acknowledgement and the impressions of the teachers and of the representatives of the students who participated in the activities of the five workshops of the School.

Luciano Arcuri (on behalf of the organizers)

Workshop 1 (Emotion and Cognition): Teachers

The Emotion and Cognition workshop was taught by Paula Niedenthal and Antonietta Curci. The first session of the workshop was spent presenting ourselves to the other members of the workshop, both in terms of university affiliations and graduate advisors, and also with regard to our research interests. In addition, we discussed goals and expectations for the workshop. The students clearly expressed a desire to spend the first week of the summer school meeting as a large group in order to come to terms with the complexities of defining and researching emotion. Therefore, Paula dutifully delivered two very long lectures during the week, one on theories of emotion and the other on methods for assessing the effects of emotion on cognitive processes. Equally dutifully, Anonietta delivered two lectures, one on self-regulation processes in emotion and the other on emotion and memory, with a particular emphasis on flashbulb memories. We also read a number of general papers on emotion and emotion-cognition interaction. In the middle of that first week, Paula also assigned an article by William McGuire from the 1970s that discusses certain issues and crises that have characterized research in Social Psychology (both in the 70s and also now). For the most part the student members of the

workshop were put off by the way in which McGuire expressed his ideas. And many emotions, notably anger and disgust, were expressed in discussion. Several students even asked Paula why she assigned the paper at all. But after expressing these strong emotions, a very important discussion ensued that helped to define good and productive research topics and also to lay to rest, at least for the week, existential crises about their careers and contributions that tend to plague graduate students at some point in their training. By the end of the first week, certain themes and common vocabulary and beliefs had emerged. And so had four research teams. Three of these teams worked on problems that were inspired by applications of recent theories of embodied cognition to the study of emotional information processing, which Paula had discussed in her plenary session early in the summer school. Those teams were called the Embodiment, Emotion and Memory, and Emotion Regulation teams. Last team, not uninterested by this approach, was named the Emotion and Social Categorization team.

Over the course of the second week the teams worked together to design a clear research project. This involved reading in the library, having discussions with leaders of other workshops, e-mailing researchers in the field for their help, collecting some pilot data, lengthy interactions with Paula and Antonietta, and some heaving drinking at the beach. Meetings with Paula sometimes involved walking her to the train station so that she could catch her train for Venice. Sometimes we even called or SMS-ed each other on cell phones. All forms of communication were permitted if it facilitated learning. All four teams after much work conceived of and designed excellent research projects. The Embodiment team generated a fascinating hypothesis about how certain sensory modalities are favored during different emotional states and how that might have consequences for information processing. The Emotion and Memory group devised a project that wedded Anne Maass' research on left-to-right processing and the role of gesture in spatial memory. The Emotion Regulation group attacked the problem of how individuals in different emotional states transmit (or not) their states to each other through processes of imitation, and the Emotion and Social Categorization group conceived of a way to organize the very messy literature on emotion and stereotyping, and then to test it. Paula and Antonietta were thoroughly impressed with these

projects and expressed repeated hope that the full program would be conducted in the future.

The day before the last, presentation, day of the summer school, the Emotion and Cognition workshop was in a frenzied (some would say foul-mooded) state. We had decided not to merely present our ideas, but to present, through photos, animation, and extractions from our discussions and lectures, the work we had done throughout the summer school. At 11 p.m. the night before the presentation we were still sweating with the work, and changing the font to be used in order that the aesthetics be perfect. The French word for fonts is "police" and we all got a much-needed laugh when Paula, mixing French and English said "Tonight we'll have to continue to meet in order to mess around with the police and get it right."

Paula and Antonietta were truly enchanted with their workshop students. To a person, they were exciting and excited, exceptionally intelligent, and most of all generous to and supportive of each other. The fortnight, then, was a great success and we all hope that the European Association will see the fruits of our labor in the journals someday.

Paula Niedenthal & Antonella (Antonietta) Curci

Workshop 1 (Emotion and Cognition): Participants

Every student came to the EAESP Summer School in Padua driven by different goals, with different expectations, and different fields of expertise. The challenge for those whose undertaking it had become to combine this diversity into a functional learning and research environment where these diverse expectations could all be satisfied. Needless to say this could be a daunting task. This very task was left to all the faculty and organizers at the summer school, and the results can be analyzed if the specific case of the Emotion and Cognition workshop was explored further.

The participants in this workshop, as mentioned above, came with differing hopes. Among these a desire to learn more about the role of

embodiment theory in emotion, the effect of emotion on different cognitive functions, and the effect of these cognitive functions on emotions; three diverse goals requiring seemingly disparate directions. Paula Niedenthal and Antonella (Antonietta) Curci decided to approach this class by finding out what these diverse expectations were. Based on the range, we decided to spend a week, at the gracious offer of Paula, learning more about the experimental methodologies involved in emotion measurement, as well as ways to construct theory in the field of emotion and psychology in broadly. Once you have posed a question, properly operationalized it in a specific manner, both with an eye to the field, then irrespective of the specific field of enquiry within emotion, you were now armed with a strategy for pursuing interesting research. Specific research within the field of emotion research was then used to illustrate this strategy. This experience gave each of us a chance, as colleagues in smaller subgroups, to apply this strategy to the complex areas of categorizing, embodiment, memory, and mood. However, large pasta packed lunches, the allure of "the beach", the call of spritz and, the beauty of Padua ensured that it was indeed a pleasant week, and that the lecture portion of the workshop would continue into the next week.

Antonella also graciously agreed to discuss the role of memory in emotion: an important cognitive component. This began the following week just in the morning sessions for the first two days. The rest of that week belonged to the subgroups and their attempts to create a research project out of the literature. The emotion and memory group, inspired by work from Anne Maass asked the question does embodiment facilitate the recall of spatial information when attempting to communicate with another. The emotion and categorization group used simple experimental rules to sort out the mess of the literature on emotion and stereotyping, proposing a research study that differentiated emotion along their functional dimensions. The affective state group found in the literature competing predictions to the effect of and actor's emotional state on an existing perceiver's complimentary or conversely valenced emotional state; they thus proposed a study that pitted these hypotheses again each other. And the embodiment group wondered if different sensory modalities we predisposed for the expression of different specific emotions, consistent with the terminology used in culture refer to the emotions.

In the end, most students from the Summer School will remember the wonderful time spent making new friends and future colleagues while learning about the details of an interesting area of research within social psychology in the north of Italy. Both types of experiences, the academic and the social, are now intertwined as we prepare to enter the academic field of social psychology as the next group of scientific researchers on the social animal.

Loran Nordgren & Lasana Harris (for Workshop 1 participants)

Workshop 2 (Group Processes and Intergroup Relations): Teachers

We didn't hesitate long when approached by Luciano Arcuri about whether we would like to teach the "intergroup relations" workshop at the 2006 EAESP summer school in Padova. We had both attended an EAESP summer school ourselves (Jolanda in Warsaw in 1994, and Emanuele in Leuven in 1999) and we knew what a unique and wonderful experience it can be. We both felt that it would be great to again take part in it, even if it meant having to sacrifice part of our summer holiday to do more teaching! Looking back on it, it was all worth it and we both have great memories of it. The summer school was amazing, exhausting, overwhelming, and great in so many ways. Let us just highlight a few factors that made it such a great experience.

The most important contributing factor is probably the wonderful students in our group - Alexa, Joke, Nadira, Lean, Justin, Rui, Loris, Chiara, Stefan, Hanna, Sofia, Anke, Natalie and Ilona. The students came from very different backgrounds and schools of thought. Their PhD topics included acculturation and migrant identity, the contact hypothesis, gender and diversity, justice, emotions and devalued group membership. This diversity enriched the discussions and it proved to be beneficial to bring together these different expertises. Most students were well prepared, motivated and their contributions were thoughtful and insightful.

Because the students came from different backgrounds, and were at different stages in their PhD, we started with an overview of the different

approaches to the study of group processes. The readings the students were given in advance included core papers on two of the theories that are at the core of the reasoning on group processes: Realistic Group Conflict and the Social Identity Approach. We also focused on approaches focusing on individual differences (e.g., social dominance theory) and on recent theorizing emphasizing the interaction of individual differences and contextual factors to examine intergroup relations (Duckitt, 2001).

After this general introduction, we focused on particular topics and we spent most of the first week reading and discussing issues relating to these topics. The topics were: (1) intergroup conflict and its reduction, (2) intragroup processes, (3) the origins and functions of social identification, (4) group characteristics, content of identity and group norms, and (5) intergroup emotions. Students were assigned to subgroups and they presented a brief summary of the readings for that topic. In the discussions that followed, there was an emphasis on identifying and developing research questions. Students were asked to reflect critically on current research on group processes and to think of ways to take ideas forward. The students were also given the chance to present their own PhD work to the group and all of them took advantage of this opportunity. The days were very full and we ran out of time most days. Some of the discussions therefore continued over dinner and even afterwards at "the beach", typically facilitated by a "spritz".

The issues discussed during the first week formed the basis of the research subgroups developed during the second week. Most students felt this was the best part of the summerschool as it allowed them to take their ideas forward and to plan actual research. The four projects the students developed were of a very high quality. The groups came up with some original and interesting questions and thought of ways to test their hypotheses. We hope the students will take these ideas forward and conduct the research. We would welcome that not only because the ideas are worth pursuing, it would also be a good way to maintain and develop the friendships that began at the summer school.

The fact that the summer school was being hosted by Padova was the other factor that made it such a good experience. What an amazing and beautiful city! The food is incredible, the shopping is great, and the sun

seems to shine all the time. It was wonderful to just wander around at night and to take in the atmosphere.

Last but certainly not least, the summer school was a big success thanks to the hard work of the organising committee and the hospitality of the University of Padova. A big thank you to you all!! Everything went very smoothly and all events were very well organised. The social events were fun and memorable and we were thoroughly spoiled. We are privileged to have been part of it and we hope that the EAESP will continue to run summer schools in the decades to come. In our view, this is the best way to develop young talent in Europe and to bring PhD students from different countries together.

Jolanda Jetten & Emanuele Castano

Workshop 2 (Group Processes and Intergroup Relations): Participants

Before attending the 2006 EAESP Summer School I was informed that it would be an experience of lifetime, that I would make lasting connections, and that I would have a lot of fun. In fact, this summary of my experience at the Summer School was given to me by others many many times before I even arrived, so much so that when I hopped off the bus in Padova (with 33 articles of reading) I had a little speck of scepticism about whether the next two weeks could really meet my highly inflated expectations.

I was in the Group Processes and Intergroup Relations stream, led by Jolanda Jetten and Emanuele Castano. The first thing I noticed about our group leaders was that they both had curly hair. Actually, that's not true. The first thing I noticed was that Emanuele Castano was not female (Summer-schoolers may refer here to the "Mattia Taroni" false hypothesis formed by many of us before we actually met our pre-summer school administrative correspondent). But with these basics sorted out, our group quickly got down to a discussion about how to structure our work over the next two weeks.

In the first week our group critically discussed a wide range of topics pertaining to group processes. Among other subjects, we considered intergroup conflict and its reduction, normative intragroup processes, the origins and functions of social identification, terror management, entitativity, and intergroup emotions. Theoretical strengths and weaknesses were probed, and empirical possibilities were discussed. For each topic, discussion was led by a small subgroup of students. Jolanda and Emanuele actively participated in, and helped guide, these discussions, however the atmosphere we created placed emphasis on student-directed learning. In addition to the set topics, we also presented and discussed each other's research. Throughout the Summer School, discussion was stimulated by the fact that our group comprised of 14 Ph.D. students from a variety of different theoretical backgrounds, as well as 2 experienced academics who didn't always agree. I found the discussion we generated between us to be highly analytical and highly invigorating.

In the middle of these discussions, I was dimly aware that people in other streams were discussing completely different issues. The large group lectures given by visiting academics, and by academics leading different streams provided good exposure to a wide range of different issues in social psychology. Here the debate was also lively, and it was pleasantly noticeable that, even in these large group lectures, students were confident to question and engage with the material being presented. This was particularly impressive given that the large group lectures were delivered after lunch - when it would have been easier to surrender to the siesta.

By the end of the first week I experienced a certain degree of sensory overload. We were discussing psychology for approximately 10 hours a day, and by the time we finished, moving on to a drink by the river (sorry, I mean " The Beach") seemed much more sensible than going to bed. I suddenly knew and joked with a lot more people than I had before, I was reading a lot more articles in a short space of time than I had before, and I was sampling a lot more delicious ice cream than I had before (though not as much as Ilona and Joke). Somehow, the best way to deal with this sensory overload was to spend the weekend break in Venice. Since this piece is supposed to be about the Summer School, I will summarise Venice in three words: Close and Pretty!! Oh, wait a minute, everybody always says nice things about Venice, therefore in the scholarly spirit of balanced

reporting, I will add a point that Justin Lehmiller noted: "some of the canals are a little smelly".

In the second week of the summer school we considered a series of theoretical questions raised by our previous discussions. The aim was to design experiments to address a selection of these theoretical questions, and after some consideration we split into four subgroups, with each subgroup tackling a different issue. Cumulatively, we considered the utility of irritating group members, the utility of complex identity for the development of good relationships within the EU, the relationship between anxiety and mortality salience, and, the nature emotion in threatening intergroup encounters. In each subgroup, the feverish need to comprehend all the relevant issues, and to design an appropriate series of practical experiments was aided by the resources provided by the University of Padova and by frequent consulting with Jolanda and Emanuele who turned into a kind of roving good cop/bad cop team. They moved among the subgroups dispensing constructive advice, and constantly swapping roles.

Extracurricular activities continued in the second week. Talking, eating, drinking, shopping, eating-icecreaming - these were essential components of the summer school experience. There were a series of popular bars open each night along the river, and summer schoolers from all streams adopted the cheapest, most nicely decorated one of them all. While enjoying all this, however, I did occasionally wonder why everyone back home hadn't mentioned how exhausting it would be to get up the next morning and keep working hard.

On the final day of the summer School, academics and students from all streams convened to discuss the work they had been doing in their time at Padova. One by one, we all got to see the issues that each stream in the summer school had identified for exploration, and the experiments that they had designed to explore those issues. It was a good way to draw the summer school to a close. And as it drew to a close, I was happy to admit that I had indeed had an experience of lifetime, made lasting connections, and had a lot of fun.

Léan Obrien, The Australian National University

I was fortunate enough to be selected to attend the most recent EAESP summer school that took place in the warm Mediterranean setting of Padova.

I was assigned to the Group processes and Intergroup relations workshop which was led by Emanuele Castano and Jolanda Jetten. This workshop like most of the others was broadly split in to two halves. The first half was spent reviewing theory so that all members of the group, despite their different academic backgrounds would share a common platform. Initially general theorising on group processing and intergroup group relations were discussed such as Social Identity and Self-categorization theory, Social dominance theory, and a dual process theory of ideology and prejudice. For the remainder of the week we were split into five small subgroups and each given the task of organising coverage of one of the subtopics. The subtopics included Intergroup conflict and it's reduction, intragroup processes, the origins and functions of social identification, group characteristics, content of identity and group norms and finally intergroup emotions.

Alongside Ilona I was responsible for the intergroup emotions subgroup, with our different backgrounds, Ilona's research falls more in the area of emotion and cognition and my own studies are more based in intergroup relations, this proved to be a very fruitful working relationship as we both came at things from a very different direction. As my own experience demonstrates I believe that this first week of the workshop was very useful as it provided a rare opportunity to sit down and discuss theory in detail with a group of individuals from diverse social psychology backgrounds all bringing their insight from their own area of social psychology.

The remaining time of the Summer school was spent working in small subgroups to develop research proposals that would be presented to the whole summer school at the end of the second week. Our workshop groups split in to four subgroups that each pursued different research projects. One group focused on Terror Management theory, one group focused on European Identity a further research group focused on Intergroup emotions in particular guilt and finally the group I was

involved in looked at the potentially useful role a deviant serves for their group.

It was at this point that the teachers experience and expertise was really useful. Their knowledge of the areas that we investigated allowed them to critically evaluate our plans and force us to re-evaluate and improve our ideas as we advanced through the second week of the summer school.

Overall I think that the Summer school provided a very interesting a worthwhile opportunity. The workshop that I attended gave everyone despite our diverse backgrounds a very good grounding in the theory relating to intergroup relations and group process. Personally, I found this very useful, as coming through the British PhD system can mean that you finish your PhD with a very narrow focus I think that this experience has prevented this from occurring. Perhaps most important Summer school provided us all with an International network of colleagues but more importantly friends and I'm sure that many of us will stay in touch and collaborate in the future.

Natalie Hall

Workshop 3 (Language, Cognition and Culture): Teachers

As the title suggests, Workshop 3 was intended to explore the complex interaction between language and cognition, with particular emphasis on how language affects our thinking in the social realm, while keeping in mind possible cross-cultural variations in the language-cognition link.

We were very lucky to find an exceptional group of highly competent and motivated doctoral students from nine different countries, namely Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and USA. Communication was very easy because all of our students spoke very good English and everybody got actively involved in discussions from the very first day. Indeed, our idea was to take the students' own research interests as the point of departure and to develop group projects from there.

During the first week, we met every morning as an entire group for lectures and discussions on different themes central to the course (*Foundations of communication and social cognition: Synchrony and entrainment; Whorfian Look at language and cognition; Linguistic Category Model: A research tool for studying the language-cognition interface; Language and stereotyping*). For the rest of the day, we split into two groups for discussion of readings and generation of research ideas. As is usually the case in this kind of experience, the discussion initially took off into many different directions, but eventually became focused on two major research questions, one concerning the attention-focusing function of language, the other concerning the role of language abstraction in relations between nations. The latter project also took advantage of the unique composition of the group, by planning to investigate differences in language (including 6 highly diverse languages), thus taking a Whorfian perspective on the language-social cognition interface (see report below).

In both cases, the students – in great autonomy - developed an entire line of research, rather than focusing on a single experiment. They also developed the experimental material for the first two Experiments while delaying the detailed design of the remaining studies to a later point in time. At the last day of the Summer School, the projects were presented under the titles "Language abstraction, ingroup bias and national essentialism" and "Zooming in – zooming out? The attention-focusing function of language". The next step will be the realization of the experiments, which we hope shall lead to the establishment of long-term collaboration between our participants that will continue well beyond their Summer School experience.

From our perspective as teachers, this was probably the most exciting, satisfying, and enjoyable teaching experience of a lifetime. We simply felt very lucky to have such a great group of young researchers which such diverse cultural, linguistic, and scientific backgrounds, but with the common motivation to jointly create an innovative line of research. For us, it was not only interesting but also great fun!

Anne Maass and Gün R. Semin

Workshop 3 (Language, Cognition and Culture): Participants

Group 1
Our experience as participants in the 2006 EAESP Summer School, and particularly as members of Workshop 3 ("Language, Cognition, and Culture"), proved to be a thoroughly worthwhile – and pleasurable – one, not just for the intellectual stimulation and inspiration it provided, but also for the burgeoning social bonds and collaborative partnerships it allowed us to forge with each other and our peerless advisors, Anne Maass and Gün Semin. The informal atmosphere created by Anne and Gün during our workshop meetings afforded us the opportunity to express our individual viewpoints freely, ensuring that our very diverse backgrounds, experiences, and perspectives all had equal voice. Furthermore, their student-centered approach to leading our workshop meant that we were able to form our research subgroups organically, on the basis of shared interests and insights; consequently, our two weeks in Padova were even more productive than we ever could have imagined they would be. The unyielding support provided by Gün and Anne, coupled with their demand for excellence, gave us the confidence to think "outside the box" of our own individual research endeavors and inspired us to develop a set of studies that we are genuinely excited about and committed to implementing.

In the evenings, after the workday (and the library!) had closed, another joy of the Summer School experience unfolded: the chance to socialize with our fellow participants and mentors in informal, and often mirthful, settings. These interactions let us appreciate our common ground as fellow researchers, while, at the same time, expanding our minds and outlooks through the discovery of our national, cultural, and linguistic diversity. Such dividends were an immensely rewarding added bonus to the intellectual growth the Summer School fostered.

Janine Bosak, Èva Fülöp, Geoff Kaufman, Milena Marzano,
Michela Menegatti, Tamara Rakić, Ursula Szillis

Group 2

If one tries to write a report of the 2006 EAESP summer school recently held in Padua (Italy), three aspects should be underlined above all: the excellence in teaching, the multicultural mixture of participants with diverging scientific backgrounds resulting in mental openness and lots of fun, and most importantly the outcomes: new and fresh ideas for all of us. In fact, both the summer school in general, and the Workshop 3 "Language, Cognition and Culture" (guided by Anne Maass and Gün Semin) in particular, can been characterized by all of these three features.

During the fifteen days of the summer school students had the opportunity to take part in several outstanding seminars given by a number internationally renowned teachers and researchers. Furthermore, participants took advantage from the encounters with the other students, sharing knowledge and experiences, to say nothing about the socially cheerful evenings spent together.

Workshop 3 provided us with a very inspiring frame that stimulated our scientific creativity. Maass and Semin's approach to teaching was highly "student oriented" from the start. This nondirective method enabled each of us to introduce our specific knowledge and interests. In this frame, we started off with several brainstorming sessions, some of which were pretty turbulent. After further elaborations of our ideas we ended up with a theoretically well-founded and feasible research project. Finally, we "creatively" presented this project to all of the participants during the last plenary session of the summer school.

Our project builds on the language abstraction model (Arcuri, Maass, Portelli, 1993; Semin & Fiedler, 1991) and its recent developments (Carnaghi, Maass, Gresta, Bianchi, Arcuri, & Cadinu, submitted) and tries to link it with intergroup attitudes. We will examine whether the use of nouns versus adjectives for national labels has effects on ingroup bias. Our hypothesis is that the use of more abstract language in description of a target person (e.g. a Pole) leads to stronger ingroup bias than the use of less abstract language (e.g. a Polish). Based on Carnaghi et colleagues' idea (Carnaghi et al., submitted) we suppose that this link between more language abstraction and stronger bias is mediated via the process of ascribing more essentialist characteristics to a target person (Haslam,

Rothschild, & Ernst, 2002; Keller, 2005). Essentialism in the context of our research is defined as a belief system that is based on different components of nationalism – ethnos and demos (Habermas, 2000). For testing our hypotheses we have designed three experiments that we are going to run in six different languages.

To conclude, it's worth noting that the Department of Developmental Psychology and Socialization (DPSS) of the University of Padua offered all the students and teachers excellent support in terms of accommodation, well arranged social events, and also a close attention to personal needs (e.g. food constraints, powerlessness towards "tiger mosquito's assaults", etc.). Most importantly, full access to classrooms, library and computer equipment was granted, without which it would not have been possible to finalize the research projects. In sum, what we experienced leaves us highly inspired and satisfied, and we would like to conclude with special thanks to the organisers and our teachers.

Michal Bilewicz, Annalisa Casini, Eerika Finell, Daniel Geschke, Nicolas Kervyn, and Sylva Kourilova

References

Arcuri, L., Maass, A., & Portelli, G. (1993). Linguistic intergroup bias and implicit attributions. *British journal of social psychology, 32,* 277-285.

Carnaghi, A., Maass, A., Gresta, S., Bianchi, M., Arcuri, L., & Cadinu, M. (submitted). Nomina sunt omina: on the inductive potential of nouns and adjectives in person perception.

Habermas, J. (2000). *The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory*: MIT Press.

Haslam, N., Rothschild, L., & Ernst, D. (2002). Are essentialist beliefs associated with prejudice? *British Journal of Social Psychology, 41,* 87-100.

Keller, J. (2005). In genes we trust: The biological component of psychological essentialism and its relationship to mechanisms of motivated social cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88,* 686–702.

Semin, G., & Fiedler, K. (1991). The linguistic category model, its bases, applications and range. *European Review of Social Psychology, 203,* 1-30.

Workshop 4 (Motivation and Behavior): Teachers

The theme of our workshop was motivation and cognition and our task was to introduce this topic against the background of what good social psychological science consists of, including the wisdom of impactful experimentation, compelling theorizing and communicative skills required in order to convey one's message to scientific and lay audiences. Our approach consisted of several elements. First, we put together a reading list for the participants and requested them to answer in writing questions about each of the readings. This was intended to provide a general background regarding materials that we would cover during the summer school, and to focus our students' attention on issues that we regarded as important. The second element consisted of the students' active involvement in all phases of the workshop. Rather than exposing them to extensive lectures we engaged them in a series of exercises and projects in which they were continually challenged to come up with ideas and solutions that could be then discussed in class. The third element was feedback. Though we weren't particularly critical of the students' endeavors, we didn't refrain from making constructive comments on their work. We tried to convey the idea that criticism is important and that it is not about evaluation as much as about useful reactions to one's work that actually enrich it and allow it to touch base with notions and topics that would not have been otherwise included. The fourth element was expertise. We designed the workshop around topics that interest us personally as investigators and in which we have a fair degree of background. This, we thought, would allow us to highlight important remaining problem and research foci that only someone immersed in the research enterprise on a particular issue is able to provide. Accordingly, the topics we covered included motivated closed mindedness, regulatory mode (locomotion and assessment), and goal systems theory, all themes that have constituted an integral part of our joint research programs.

In addition to addressing these substantive topics, we attempted to impart to our students some general notions and convey our own "philosophy of science" as it relates to social psychological research. In doing so, we attempted to get away to the extent possible from abstract philosophical notions that one can find in the textbooks, and to focus on practical concerns including a need to be aware (and to participate) in current

cutting edge developments in one's field as well as avoiding jumping on bandwagons and skipping from one topic to another in accordance with its popularity. We talked about the kind of things that can help get one's paper published, and one's grant funded, we talked about a way of constructing an interesting narrative for one's audiences, and we talked about the importance of implications of one's work for real world concerns.

To the best of our ability to discern, this approach seems to have worked quite well. In large part this was due to the enthusiasm, talent and creativity of our excellent students. They differed considerably in their background, their approach and their personality, yet each contributed substantially to the group efforts and brought to bear their unique abilities and perspectives on the overall discussion. The participative atmosphere also allowed us to get to know each of the students and identify their unique scientific (and non scientific) personalities. A large part of the excitement that science generates has to do with sharing one's ideas with others and developing strong social bonds that overcome defensiveness, and allow one to feel comfortable to express the most outlandish thoughts and ideas. The times our group had on the famous "Beach", sipping endless glasses of Spritz, or munching on enormous pizza slices helped not only to forge bonds of friendship and camaraderie between students and instructors, but also fueled the enthusiasm of the participants and motivated them to be the best they could be, which ended up being quite excellent indeed.

Arie Kruglanski and Lucia Mannetti

Workshop 4 (Motivation and Behavior): Participants

Facing a task of sharing impressions of the EAESP summer school, one wonders whether one should start with the « work » or with the « fun » part, or if the two were actually intertwined all the way… Whatever part we start with, one will have the benefit of primacy and the other the benefit of a recency effect, so it shouldn't make a big difference. However, given the vocation of the summer school, namely, expanding knowledge,

skills and horizons in social psychology, let us first describe what we worked on and what we learned, that is, our daily activities.

The "we" in this report refers to participants of Workshop 4, "Motivation and behavior", directed by Arie Kruglanski and Lucia Mannetti. No doubt, every workshop had its own little specificities, but Arie and Lucia really had the gift of inspiring us to work well and hard without feeling any pressure.

The contents we reflected on were, on one side, of a general interest, such as the lack of "big theories" in current social psychology, the main explicative factors of social psychological phenomena, the design of an "ideal experiment", or what should a social psychological theory be like. We also discussed some practical issues and concerns of every Ph.D. student, like how to get published, or the necessity of decentring from one's current work from time to time, in order to see "the big picture".

On the other side, we elaborated on several subjects specifically related to the topic of our workshop. This included some specific tasks for us, but also talks given by Arie and Lucia. We started with the broad concept of closed-mindedness and its manifestations in everyday life. Indeed, through an apparently simple task of outlining a book about "Closed-mindedness in everyday life", we were faced not only with the difficulties of outlining a book, but also with the vast area and numerous domains of potential application of the concept of closed-mindedness. Another very interesting aspect of this task was realizing how broad can be the consequences of being closed-minded, but also that closed-mindedness can be both "good" and "bad", depending on the circumstances.

Apart from this practical introduction, we got a theoretical one – a talk by Arie on lay epistemics, emphasizing the cognitive side of motivation. As the first week of the summer school went by, we focalised on more specific issues, mainly related to regulatory mode (i.e., locomotion and assessment orientation) and need for closure. The concept of regulatory mode had great success in our workshop – 3 out of 4 research projects were focused on this variable. The 4th one, no less interesting, was focused on need for closure. Everyone seemed happy with being in precisely this workshop, concerning its topic.

The main task of the summer school, designing an experiment (or a series of experiments) was indeed a challenging one. In our workshop, we worked on this task during the second week of the summer school. We were free to manage our mornings as we thought it was best, a part from showing up at 9:30 and before lunch for briefings. In the afternoon, we collectively discussed each project in progress in turn, which was extremely helpful. It was not easy showing up one Friday September 1st morning with a neat research project, and presenting it to an audience of around 100 persons, all pretty knowledgeable in the domain… But everyone did, and it went on just fine. As every research project development, the process involved getting stuck with theoretical issues, which, once (temporarily) resolved, were replaced by methodological ones. We faced them courageously one by one, to end up with not exactly ideal, but good and well-grounded studies. As Arie once put it, "Are you stuck? (– Yeah.) – Get unstuck." So we did.

As briefly mentioned above, working with Arie and Lucia was a real pleasure. Their motivation, expertise and availability for us was truly inspiring. On top of that, we all agree to say that we were a "good group" – we appreciated each other and had a certain sense of being "the workshop 4". The collective scientific discussions that we had were very interesting and motivating. It is always useful to realize other ways of conceiving the same phenomenon, to benefit from others' specific expertise, and to be faced with relevant reflections that one never had. Perhaps less enjoyable, but as useful, being chilled by a few extremely pertinent questions that cast doubt on everything you worked on for a past few days, helps improving research projects on a daily basis. These are indeed some aspects of scientific work that we do not always have the chance to benefit from in our own departments, or at least not as often.

Let us now share just a few words about less scientific activities… One fine day, we realized that other workshops spent much more time on official "getting to know each other" than we did. This provoked a brief discussion about whether we want to do something about it or not, and how and what. Finally, Arie and Lucia came up with the ideal solution: go and have a drink all together after the workshop, before dinner. We did it one first time, talking about what made each of us do psychology. It was interesting to see how different the stories that led us all to the same place

are… A few days later, we all went for a drink after the workshop one second time, but this time we skipped dinner at the "menza" and ended up in a restaurant serving huge pizzas, which we had a hard time to manage.

All that to say that the summer school was a very enriching experience in every respect.

Anna Rabinovic, Claudia Toma, Dustin Thoman, Guido van Koningsbruggen,
Ilan Roziner, Jennifer Fehr, Karl Andrew Woltin, Leila Selimbegovic,
Lotte F. van Dillen, Louisa Pavey, Marianne Holler,
Silvia Mari, Silvia Galdi, Adrian Wojcik

Workshop 5 (Social Perception and Cognition): Teachers

Our two weeks together literally started with a "Crash" and ended with many big bangs that will hopefully contribute to our knowledge in social psychology. In this workshop the main focus lay on the study and especially the discussion of recent developments in research on stereotypes. Initially, we identified four main themes that we considered to be hot topics at this moment. The first related to the malleability versus uncontrollability of stereotypes. Students read various articles and were arbitrarily put in one of the two opposing schools of thought, are stereotypes truly malleable or are they rather uncontrollable and inevitable? At the end of the day, the two groups were put against each other and had to defend their side's point of view for the sake of argument. Afterwards, students were given the possibility to change camps according to their personal beliefs. As dissonance experiments would predict apart from two students all others stuck to the group from which perspective they had been discussing throughout the day. This first day introduced what would come next, namely a thorough discussion of some of the current themes in stereotyping research. Feature-based stereotyping was among these. Again through the introduction and discussion of various articles, we tried to answer the question whether inter-group categorization was a necessary condition for stereotyping to occur. Various theoretical models that aimed to integrate feature-based

and category-based stereotyping were the result of more than a day of discussion.

The third theme that was given to students framed stereotypes as biased language use, focusing on the Linguistic Inter-group bias and the Linguistic Expectancy Bias. Within this theme, students were asked to phrase several critical questions on the basis of articles that either highlighted biased language use as an effect of communication goals and expectancies or as a consequence of encoding biases. Departing from these questions several converging points of discussion were found, including the awareness and controllability of biased language use, the possibility of recoding or stereotype change, effects on the audience of language abstraction...

Finally, the first intensive week ended with a discussion on the role of emotions and stereotypes and the introduction of research on infra-humanization. Within this theme various theoretical models on inter-group emotions were introduced and students' task was to try to integrate them into a singular theory.

Discussions on the various themes often ended with some concrete research questions. In the beginning of the second week, these ideas were collected and different sub-groups were made according to students' preference to prepare a concrete line of research on any of these general research topics. Three groups were formed: one on feature-based infra-humanization, another on infrahumanization and closeness to the self, and finally a third group worked on feature-based stereotyping and categorization. These groups remained together throughout the second week. At the end of every day, however, the sub-groups reported their progress, open questions, and difficulties to the bigger group. The work in smaller sub-groups ended on Friday with a big congress with a host of new research ideas.

All in all, these two weeks have been amazingly intense, and amazingly interesting. We thought it to be a great experience from which we also learned a lot. The nice thing about a Summer School is that it never stops. During dinner, the evenings at the "beach" (the nick name of the bar district in Padova), breakfast early in the morning, the Summer School, its participants, its content, it was always there. This is definitely the

EAESP's most intensive, stimulating, interesting, group-forming initiative that exists.

Jeroen Vaes & Daniel Wigboldus

Workshop 5 (Social Perception and Cognition): Participants

So you want me to tell you about Padova؟

I would not be able to tell you much about it! I have the feeling that it is a beautiful city, quiet in summer and busy once the academic year starts. Apparently it never gets windy and it has some extraordinary thunder storms… Apart from that, I only remember Giotto's paintings and the auditorium where Copernicus used to give his lectures. I do remember these few things because the first day of Summer School included some nice visits to Padova's most famous places. (If you ask me about Venice that is a whole other story which includes a thrilling videogame experience and "virtual reality" through the maze that constitutes the streets and canals of Venice!).

So what made me so busy during those two weeks in one of the most beautiful countries in Europe, that I didn't explore it properly؟ Especially considering that I love travelling and sightseeing, and that my father is an art lecturer, so I was sure he would expect a whole description of the city and its monuments once I was back home in Granada. The answer is "the 2006 EAESP Summer School". I was part of the Workshop 5, "Social Perception and Cognition: Current Themes in Stereotyping Research", conducted by Daniël Wigboldus and Jeroen Vaes.

For me, the Summer School was an intensive, highly productive, and most of all motivating experience for several reasons. Though the first impression for the members of other groups was that "we were the 'jammy'[1] ones who were watching movies in the afternoon and arriving late for dinner" (*Crash* was responsible for our initial reputation), I think

---

[1] Jammy refers to being lucky or fortunate – imagine a nice bumble bee in a big jar of sweet jam

that during the first week, our workshop increasingly became associated with "the ones who always work really late". (A special mention here and thanks to Jeroen, and his ability to negotiate with the security guards of the University building so we could stay a bit longer over the "official" closing time!). However, behind our "hardcore working exterior" was the fact that the workshop had become an intellectually amazing setting in which discussion of hot topics, brain storming, and critical thought happened as a completely natural process. We found ourselves engaged in debates that lasted until dinner time, sometimes "losing ourselves" along the way, but going back to the same research questions once again. The first week was exhausting and tremendously fruitful, with lots of papers reviewed and discussed with the group, leading to some clear ideas and interesting lines of research that could be followed up during the second week within subgroups. By Friday, a bit of rest and fresh air was needed, so using Daniël and Jeroen's good predisposition to listen to our requests we changed the plans for the workshop accordingly and decided not to have extra readings for the weekend and use the next Monday as a "summing up" of the topics discussed. This discussion was subsequently used as a platform for the research proposals that we were assigned during the second half of the Summer School. The second week was equally encouraging as the first, and the work in subgroups evolved with the same interest and motivation that had been developed within the workshop as a whole. As a result, three research projects were designed and presented at the last day of the Summer School to the rest of the participants. And despite being the last group we did manage to get a few cheers and we finished of in Copernico's garden with very big beers.

As I am entering my last year of my Ph.D. program, the biggest goal I achieved throughout this experience was to feel much more motivated to go on, to enjoy science and to believe that if you have good ideas it is worthy to study and develop them. Personally, I especially enjoyed the "egalitarian atmosphere" that predominated during this time, the opportunity to share with other students and professors from all around Europe, America and Australia, the variety of languages and cultures… People were willing to share experiences, talk and listen, especially after a long day of work, either while filling up on the wonderful selection of wholesome Italian food at the "school canteen" where homemade pasta was on the menu everyday and red wine and beer were on tap next to the

fizzy drinks, or while enjoying a beer or a lethal "spritz" (or two for the price of one during happy hour) at the *"Red Light District"* (so-called by Daniel, not to remind him of Amsterdam but because of the red lanterns!). We had a truly fruitful and exciting stay in Padova which we will take with us as a very fond memory from our time as Ph.D. students, both academically and socially speaking. We can only encourage EAESP to continue this fantastic tradition and encourage all Ph.D. students to apply in the future.

Soledad De Lemus with contributions from Mette Hersby

New Books by Members

Arguing to better conclusions: A human odyssey
By **W. Peter Robinson** (2006).
Erlbaum: Mahwah, N.J.

If sound beliefs founded on strong arguments are crucial to the decisions for sensible living, why do we know so little about the best ways to check the veridicality of our beliefs? Part 1 opens with just three examples of many recent dramatic changes to people's lives which would not have happened if arguments had not been sustained to abandon false beliefs, and to implement the advances in knowledge made. The case is then made for distinguishing between true and false claims, and between inadequate and adequate arguments. Confusion in society continues for many reasons: different methods of evaluation of claims are needed in different domains, human demands for certainty still exceed what is possible, there is a multitude of logical and psychological errors that can be made.

In Part 2 the focus shifts to questions of who and why biases and errors are endemic in public discourse, and finally a socio-political perspective is adopted to identify the vested interests, which have acted from time immemorial to prevent and counter the widespread diffusion of true beliefs, sound knowledge, and strong arguments about society and its functioning.

The volume could serve as a key text on innovative advanced courses in communication, language studies, social psychology and other human sciences. The arguments articulate the various perspectives into the multi-disciplinary manifold necessary for a comprehensive understanding of how language functions at a societal level.

Stereotypes and Prejudice in Conflict: Representations of Arabs in Israeli Jewish Society

By **Daniel Bar-Tal & Yona Teichman** (2006).

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Available from: www.cambridge.org

On the basis of knowledge accumulated in social, developmental, and political psychology, sociology, political science, cultural and communication studies, the book presents a systematic, comprehensive and coherent analysis of evolvement, institutionalization, maintenance, functions and consequences of stereotypes and prejudice developed in a society (i.e., Israeli Jewish society) involved in intractable conflict with Arabs.

The book got the **2006 Alexander George Book Award** for the best book in Political Psychology by the International Society of Political Psychology.

Understanding World Jury Systems through Social Psychological Research

Ed. by **Martin F. Kaplan** & **Ana M. Martin** (2006).

Psychology Press, 240 pp., HB: 1841694215 • $75.00 •CAN $97.50

Call toll-free: 1-800-634-7064

www.psychpress.com

Understanding World Jury Systems through Social Psychological Research examines diverse jury systems in nations around the world. These systems are marked by unique features having critical implications for jury selection, composition, functioning, processes, and ultimately, trial outcomes. These unique features are examined by applying relevant social

psychological research, models and concepts to the central issues and characteristics of jury systems in those nations using a wide variety of jury procedures. Traditionally, the research conducted on juries has almost exclusively targeted the North-American jury. Psychologically-based research on European, Asian and Australian juries has been almost non-existent in the past decade or more. Yet, the incidence of jury trials outside of North America has been steadily increasing as more nations (e.g., Japan, Spain, Russia, and Poland) adopt, revise, or expand their use of juries in their legal system. Accordingly, research has been appearing in the scientific literature on new developments in world juries.

This volume fulfills the dual purpose of understanding the diverse practices in world juries in light of existing social psychological knowledge and applied research on juries in each nation, and outlining new research in the context of
the issues raised by jury practices beyond those of North America.

MARTIN F. KAPLAN received his Ph.D. at the University of Iowa (1965). He is Distinguished Research Professor Emeritus at Northern Illinois University, where he founded the social psychology Ph.D. program. Visiting Professorships were spent at the University of California San Diego, University of North Carolina, Melbourne University, and Leiden University. He is Director of the Osher Institute at California State University Channel Islands. He has published on Social Judgment, Small Group Processes, and Jury Decision Making. He is a Fellow of the American Psychology-Law Society, APS, and APA, and a member of SESP and EAESP.

ANA M. MARTIN received her PhD from the Universidad de La Laguna (Spain) in 1986, where she is now Professor of Social Psychology. She has been a Fulbright Research Fellow at Northern Illinois University and a Research Visitor at California State University Channel Islands. She is a member of the European Association of Psychology and Law, the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology and the American Psychology-Law Society. She has published widely on Psychology and Law, on topics such as decision making by mixed juries, psychosocial features of Spanish juries, evaluation of programs for offenders, and social perception of ordinary and environmental offences.

REVIEWS

"This book not just describes the—sometimes unexpected—differences between jury-systems in the world, but also eloquently explains the consequences. This is a must for any student of legal decision making and the jury."
— P.J. van Koppen, Professor of Psychology and Law, Department of Law, Maastricht University
and Free University Amsterdam (The Netherlands)

"This book is an important addition to the growing literature on lay participation in trials throughout the world. Each contribution is from an expert in the area. The book is readable for non-psychologists, and will be of interest to
anyone interested in the jury and jury reform."
— Sally Lloyd-Bostock, Professor of Law and Psychology, School of Law, University of Birmingham (UK)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Social Psychology and Economics

Edited by **David de Cremer, Marcel Zeelenberg** (Tilburg University) **& J. Keith Murnighan** (Northwestern University) (2006).

Lawrence Erlbaum Asscociates, June 15, 2006, 400 pages

The Society for Judgment and Decision-Making Series

This book combines chapters written by leading social psychologists and economists, illuminating the developing trends in explaining and understanding economic behavior in a social world. It provides insights from both fields, communicated by eloquent scholars, and demonstrates through recent research and theory how economic behaviors may be more effectively examined using a combination of both fields.

Social Psychology and Economics comes at a particularly fitting time, as a psychological approach to economics has begun to flourish, and papers exploring the intersection of these two disciplines have appeared in peer-reviewed journals, opening a dynamic dialogue between previously separated fields. It addresses a variety of economic phenomena within a social context, such as scarcity and materialism, emphasizing the importance of integrating social psychology and economics.

Social Psychology and Economics is arranged in seven parts that discuss:
• an introduction to the topic;
• preferences, utility, and choice;
• emotions;

- reciprocity, cooperation, and fairness;
- social distance;
- challenges to social psychology and economics; and
- collaborative reflections and projections.

The market for this book is students, researchers, and professionals in the disciplines of economics, psychology, business, and behavioral decision making. Graduate students and upper-level undergraduate students will consider it a useful supplemental text.

Contents:
Preface
Part I: *Introduction*
1. D. De Cremer, M. Zeelenberg, J.K. Murnighan, Social Animals and Economic Beings: On Unifying Social Psychology and Economics

Part II: *Preferences, Utility, and Choice*
2. D.M. Messick, Utility and the Psychology of Preference
3. A. Schotter, Conventional Behavior
4. C.K.W. de Dreu, W. Steinel, Social Decision-Making in Fuzzy Situations: Motivated Information-Processing and Strategic Choice
5. T. Higgins, How Regulatory Fit Creates Value

Part III: *Emotions*
6. T. Ketelaar, The Role of Moral Sentiments in Economic Decision Making
7. M. Zeelenberg, R. Pieters, Feeling is for Doing: A Pragmatic Approach to the Study of Emotions in Economic Behavior

Part IV: *Reciprocity, Cooperation, and Fairness*
8. E. van Dijk, D. De Cremer, Tacit Coordination and Social Dilemmas: On the Importance of Self-Interest and Fairness
9. T.R. Tyler, D. De Cremer, How Do We Promote Cooperation in Groups, Organizations, and Societies?
10. K. McCabe, The Neuroeconomics of Personal and Interpersonal Decision Making

Part V: *Social Distance*
11. K. Fujita, Y. Trope, N. Liberman, The Role of Mental Construal in Self-Control
12. I. Bohnet, How Institutions Affect Behavior: Insights From Research on Trust
13. l. Babcock, M. Gelfand, D. Small, H. Stayn, Gender Differences in the Propensity to Initiate Negotiations

---

The Making of Modern Social Psychology: The Hidden Story of How International Social Science was Created

By **Serge Moscovici & Ivana Markova**

Cambridge: Polity, 0-7456-2966-0(pb), £ 17.99, 296 pp.

Publisher's website: http://www.polity.co.uk/book.asp?ref=0745629652

Publisher's book description:
This fascinating book makes an important contribution to the history of the social sciences. It tells the largely hidden story of how social psychology became an international social science, vividly documenting the micropolitics of a virtually forgotten committee, the Committee on Transnational Social Psychology, whose work took place against the backdrop of some of the most momentous events of the twentieth century. Overcoming intellectual, institutional and political obstacles, including the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, and the military coups in Chile or Argentine, the committee struggled to bring social psychology to global recognition, not as part of a programme of intellectual imperialism, but motivated by a mixture of intellectual philanthropy and self-interest. Few authors could tell this unique story. Serge Moscovici is undoubtedly the best-placed insider to do so, together with Ivana Markova providing a lucid, erudite and carefully documented account of the work of this remarkable group.

This book will be an essential resource for any scholar interested in the history of social psychology, as well as upper-level students studying the history of the social sciences.

CONTENTS
List of Figures
Preface
Acknowledgements
List of Abbreviations

I THE QUEST FOR A SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY OF HUMAN BEINGS
1 The Birth of a New Science
2 Two Sources of Social Psychology

II THE WEST EUROPEAN EXPERIMENT
3 Americans and Europeans
4 The Transnational Committee: from New York to Rome
5 The European Map of Social Psychology in the Mid-1960s
6 The Second Milestone for European Social Psychology
7 The Louvain Summer School
8 The Ford Foundation and Fundraising for Europe

III THE EAST EUROPEAN EXPERIMENT
 9 The First Encounter of a Small Science with Big History
10 A Strange Animal ⸮

IV THE LATIN AMERICAN EXPERIMENT
11 Latin American Odyssey
12 A Second Encounter with History
13 An 'Invisible College'

                   V CROSSING THE ATLANTIC
14 A Crisis Delayed
15 Crossing the Atlantic
16 Pilgrims' Progress
17 Rays and Shadows above the Transnational Committee

Appendix
References

Book Reviews

Social Groups in Action and Interaction by **C. Stangor**
New York: Psychology Press, 2004, 426 pp.
ISBN 184169407X (Paperback), Price £ 22,50

Review by **Sabine Otten (**University of Groningen)

Charles Stangor, the author of "Social Groups in Action and Interaction" designed this textbook for both undergraduate and graduate courses. In the preface to the book he states that his goal was to write succinctly and engagingly enough for undergraduate students, and thoroughly enough for graduate students. Undoubtedly, he managed to meet both goals. The book is very well written, clearly structured, and easy to comprehend; due to nice examples and very comprehensible descriptions of relevant experiments, chances are high that more junior students are convinced that group research is interesting and worthwhile. For more advanced students, the book offers new perspectives and links between thematic domains that they might already have heard of in their early training. The latter, though, should indeed use this textbook rather as a starting point or as supplement to other, more in depth readings.

From a teacher's perspective this book not only provides students with a very readable and engaging text, but it also facilitates lecturing by providing a list of review and discussion question at the end of each chapter, and, more importantly, a CD-Rom with supplementary material (power point lecture slides, multiple choice and essay questions, suggestions for classroom activities).

I read this textbook with very much interest and pleasure. In research on social groups, only recently the interplay between intra- and the intergroup processes has been acknowledged and become target of theorizing and research (see Sedikides & Brewer, 2001). Charles Stangor has committed himself to an integrative view on intra- and intergroup processes, and herewith offers a very modern, and in my view very

adequate perspective on social groups. But the book not only provides an integration between the intra- and intergroup level of analysis in group research, but also a good balance between classical theories and experiments, for example on social influence and social comparison, and current research in the respective domains. Moreover, a chapter on research methods is added at the beginning of the book, in order to help interpret the subsequently presented research. All in all, this very broad approach made me think that this textbook, though specifically focusing on group processes, can, to a large extent, also be seen as a more general introductory textbook on Social Psychology. This is certainly not a drawback, but a plus, as the classical theories are presented and integrated within a new context, thereby opening new perspectives on possibly already acquired knowledge from other courses in Social Psychology.

The book starts with a very helpful part on the definition of social groups and related concepts such as social identity, group cohesion, and entitativity. Second, as already mentioned, there is a chapter introducing typical research methods based on examples from intra- and intergroup research in inter- and intragroup research. At least for undergraduates, this chapter will certainly be very helpful. The only point of criticism is that too little attention is paid to implicit research methods. The following chapters move from more general topics such as 'Groups and Their Functions', 'Social Influence', or 'Social Categorization', to more specific themes such as 'Effective Work Groups', and 'Group Performance and Productivity'. The book concludes with two chapters on cooperation and conflict within and between groups.

In general, the selection of topics from both intra- and intergroup research is convincing. Nonetheless, I got the impression that the intragroup domain was covered somewhat more completely and got more attention than the intergroup domain. When it comes to the more specific themes (chapter 6 ff.), the number of chapters mainly focusing on intragroup processes clearly outnumbers those mainly dealing with the intergroup side. Due to the attempt to integrate theories on intragroup processes with those on intergroup processes, the book deviates in its structure from classical textbooks in this domain. Quite often, I found myself wondering whether a certain theory was missing only to find it a few pages (or even a chapter) later in the text. Obviously and necessarily, when giving an

integrative survey of two rather than just one domain of research, this should also, at least to a certain extent, change the sequence of the narrative. There were, though, also several themes that did not just get a new position within the overall framework, but were not considered at all. Partly, here I agree with the author's reasoning in the introduction, this is a necessary consequence of the attempt to integrate two very broad domains of social-psychological theorizing and research. Yet, at least for the intergroup domain (my personal area of expertise) I noticed a couple of theoretical and empirical topics that might have deserved to be included in the textbook's survey of relevant research on social groups. Examples are the distinction between ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation, the critical debate about the link between self-esteem and ingroup-favoritism, research on intergroup emotions, research on acculturation (which might fit the culture and social change chapter), and, in the chapter on improving interactions between groups (chapter 13), more recent models on dual identities and their possible merits and problems. To my opinion, possible future editions of this book could profit from including such topics. But, until then, supplementary readings can easily do the job.

To sum up: Charles Stangor has written a textbook that offers an exciting and fresh perspective on the thriving field of research on interaction within and between social groups. It invites students and teachers to get aware of the possible interplay between intra- and intergroup processes. To date, this interplay itself is not yet topic of a lot of research (see Sedikides & Brewer, 2001, for exceptions), but books encouraging to acquire thorough knowledge about both domains do definitely offer an excellent starting point for such endeavor.

The Psychology of Group Perception: Perceived Variability, Entitativity, and Essentialism, ed. **by V. Yzerbyt, C.M. Judd, & O. Corneille**

Review by **Fabio Sani (**University of Dundee)

This book – which includes 22 chapters coming from leading European, Australian, and North American researchers - is about the way in which people understand, represent, and perceive both the groups to which they belong and relevant outgroups. However, the book is not a mere survey of the social psychological literature on group perception. It is much more than that. It constitutes a serious attempt to elucidate the meaning of three core dimensions of group perception, namely variability, entitativity, and essentialism, which to date have been investigated within different research traditions, and to discuss their interrelationships, antecedents, and consequences.

The definition of the three constructs and the exploration of their links are addressed in the first section of the book. Here, all researchers agree about the fact that the three perceptual phenomena under consideration are independent constructs, and that they are causally related to one another in a reciprocal and non-recursive fashion. However, the different authors propose different structural relations among the constructs. For instance, Yzerbyt, Estrada, Corneille, Seron, and Demoulin see the essentialisation of a group (the view of a group as 'natural kind') as an important pre-condition for both entitativity and similarity. Instead, Rothbart and Park propose that variability is a crucial predictor of entitativity together with perceived agency (the sense that the group members share common goals and purpose), and that essentialised groups are a subset of entitative groups. For these authors, the specific characteristic of essentialised groups is that of having both low levels of perceived variability and high levels of perceived agency. A further possible structural model is proposed by Haslam, Rothschild, and Ernst, who believe that the degree of homogeneity determines the level of entitativity, which in turn is an important predictor of essentialism.

The second section of the book is devoted to the antecedents and consequences of perceived variability, entitativity and essentialism.

Concerning the antecedents, it is interesting to note that the research presented in this book, contrary to general trends in the literature on group perception, tend to focus on the perceiver rather than on the object of perception (i.e., the group). So for instance, with regard to the antecedents of perceived group entitativity, the contributors devote much more attention to factors related to the perceiver, such as his or her lay theories about groups, involvement in communication processes, and group-based motivations, than to the inherent characteristics of the group that is judged, such as its size and duration, or the proximity and common fate of its members.

Particular emphasis on lay theories about individuals and groups is put by Plaks, Levy, Dweck, and Stroessner. They argue that people may be either 'entiteists', and see personal characteristics as fixed and unlikely to change over time, or 'incrementalists', and view personal characteristics as open to modifications and likely to be affected by external circumstances. These lay theories have strong effects on the way groups are perceived. For example, 'entiteists' are more likely to see group members' characteristics as based on some shared nature, rather than on similar environmental experience, than 'incrementalists'. Brauer, Judd, and Thompson, instead, stress the role played by the perceiver's involvement in processes of interaction and communication. These researchers discuss a fascinating study - based on a rumour transmission paradigm - showing that people end up perceiving a target group as less variable when they learn about the group only from other people than when they judge the group entirely on the basis of first-hand observations of the group behaviour. While both Plaks and his colleagues and Brauer and his associates pay attention to the relatively involuntary effects of the perceiver on group perception, others focus on the perceiver as deliberately and instrumentally constructing the group as being more or less homogeneous and coherent. For instance, Spears, Scheepers, Jetten, Doosje, Ellemers, and Postmes point to the importance of group-based motives, and propose that the existence of specific group goals and projects may raise the group members' willingness to stress the cohesiveness and coherence of the group.

The consequences of perceived homogeneity, entitativity and essentialism have more limited coverage than the antecedents in this book. However, interesting proposals are put forward about this issue too. For instance,

Abrams, Marques, Randsley de Moura, Hutchison, and Bown contend that a perceived lack of group entitativity may lead some group members to derogate those members who appear to deviate from group norms. This is because preventing and controlling anti-norm deviancy allows group members to re-establish the cohesiveness and unity of the group and, as a consequence, its subjective reality. While this contribution is specifically concerned with the consequences of *in*group entitativity, Wildschut, Insko, and Pinter focus their attention on the consequences of *out*group entitativity. They argue that when an aggregate is seen as highly entitativity there will be an accentuation of the so-called 'discontinuity effect' - whereby intergroup interactions are expected to be more abrasive and competitive than interindividual interactions. This will activate a negative schema of the outgroup, which as a consequence will be seen as particularly competitive, deceitful, and aggressive. Interestingly, research by Abrams and colleagues and that conducted by Wildschut and colleagues imply that the perception of group entitativity may have both negative and positive social consequences (i.e., they can foster group identification but also prompt outgroup derogation). This points to the important fact, emphasised by Yzerbyt, Judd, and Corneille in their introductory chapter, that perceptions of variability, entitativity, and essentialism are not intrinsically desirable or undesirable, and that "it is the content and interpretation that are put upon these perceptions by the social world that have evaluative implications" (p. 22). Clearly, the issue of how and when perceived ingroup or outgroup variability, entitativity, and essentialism are either sought out or feared and denied is an important one, and hopefully it will constitute the object of further social psychological investigation.

To conclude, I think this is a very interesting, stimulating, and thought-provoking book, which will be extremely useful for any researcher or student with a general interest in group processes and intergroup relations, and which will be indispensable for anybody working on lay theories of groups, and on group stereotyping, variability, entitativity, and essentialism.

It has to be said that the reader of this book will not find a single, cohesive, overarching view on group perception. The different authors present different, and to some extent competing perspectives on the interplay between variability, entitativity, and essentialism, as well as on

the antecedents and consequences of these perceptions. However, this is not at all a weakness of the book. On the contrary, this is one of its major strengths. Differences in perspectives give a clear idea of the livelihood and vivacity of the debate on group perception, and stimulate the reader both to think and to do further readings on this fascinating and socially relevant subject.

Future EAESP Meetings - Calendar

May 31 - June 2, 2007, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
SPSSI-EAESP Small Group Meeting: International Perspectives on Immigration.
Immigrants and Hosts: Perceptions, Interactions, and Transformations
A Small Group Meeting in Honor of Kenneth Dion
Organizers: Victoria Esses (vesses@uwo.ca), Kay Deaux (kdeaux@gc.cuny.edu), Ulrich
Wagner (wagner1@staff.uni-marburg.de), Rupert Brown (r.brown@sussex.ac.uk), and
Richard Lalonde (lalonde@yorku.ca).
Contact: Kay Deaux (kdeaux@gc.cuny.edu)

June 7-9, 2007, Namur (Belgium)
Small Group Meeting on Fundamental Dimensions of Social Judgment: A View
from Different Perspectives
Organisers: Vincent Yzerbyt & Andrea Abele, Amy Cuddy & Charles Judd
Contact: nicolas.kervyn@psp.ucl.ac.be

June 21-22, 2007, Oud-Poelgeest, The Netherlands
Small Group Meeting on Social Stigma and Social Disadvantage
Organisers: Manuela Barreto & Naomi Ellemers
Contact: Manuela Barreto (Barreto@fsw.leidenuniv.nl)

late August or early September 2007, Germany or The Netherlands (to be announced
later)
Small Group Meeting on Group Processes and Self-regulation
Organisers: Kai J. Jonas, Kai Sassenberg & Daan Scheepers
Contact: scheepersdt@fsw.LeidenUniv.nl

September 23-27, 2007, Rapallo, Italy (30 kms from Genoa); Hotel Astoria
Small Group Meeting on Shared Memories, Shared Beliefs: The Formation and
Use of Joint Representations in Social Interaction
Organisers: Gerald Echterhoff, Anna E. Clark, Amina Memon & Gün R. Semin
Contact: gerald.echterhoff@uni-bielefeld.de

June 10-14, 2008, Opatija, Croatia
15th General Meeting of the EAESP
Organisers: Dinka Corkalo Biruski & Dean Ajdukovic

Future EAESP Meetings

15th General Meeting
Opatija (Croatia), June 10-14, 2008

**Organisers: Dinka Corkalo Biruski with
Dean Ajdukovic**

**(Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities and
Social Sciences, University of Zagreb)**

The preparation of the next General Meeting is making good progress. Please find here some dates and deadlines:

Conference dates: June 10-14, 2008

Conference webpage with call for submissions: From June 2007

Announcements on EAESP-website and email to membership list at this date also, and link to conference site established.

Deadline for submissions: November 15, 2007

Scientific Committee meets with Local organisers in Opatija at end January, 2008

Confirmation of accepted papers (and changes of format) announced February 15, 2008.

Early(bird) registration up to March 15, 2008.

Standard registration window March 16-April 30, 2008.

Late registration: May 1 to May 20, 2008.

On-site registration: May 21- June 14, 2008.

The final program will be confirmed at end of March.

We are pleased to announce the **Chair of the Scientific Committee Jens Förster** (International University Bremen, Germany).

Small Group Meeting

On Group Processes and Self-regulation
Late August/Beginning of September 2007

[Organisers: Kai J. Jonas, Kai Sassenberg & Daan Scheepers]
Contact: scheepersdt@fsw.LeidenUniv.nl

For a long time theorizing on motivational approaches in intergroup contexts has mainly focused on specific motives like optimal distinctiveness, self-esteem or reduction of uncertainty. Meanwhile research on motivation abandoned from this focus on the content of motivation. Recently, self-regulation theories stressed the importance of motivational processes instead (e.g., regulatory focus theory, the impact of internal vs. external motivation, behavioral approach system vs. behavioral inhibition system, goal systems theory etc.). Current handbooks summarize self-regulation models and their application in developmental, learning, interpersonal, clinical and health domains. However, apart from initial endeavors, in the area of intergroup phenomena there is clearly a lack of research making use of this development in research of motivational processes.

The current meeting aims to bring together researchers who apply theorizing about self/regulatory processes to intergroup phenomena such as prejudice, stereotyping, or intergroup conflict. The desired scope of the meeting should comprise, but is not limited to the following topics: (a) self regulation in the context of prejudice and discrimination (b) the ingroup as a source of individual self regulation, (c) goal conflicts in intergroup contexts, (d) the impact of self-regulatory strategies on the development intergroup relations. Furthermore we welcome submissions on self-regulatory research in other domains that can impact on the intergroup self regulation perspective. The format of the meeting is single session, with a strong focus on discussion to be reflected in the schedule. We believe that this meeting should provide a fruitful means to bring existing research accounts together. We are asking for indication of interest and/or submissions from both junior and senior researchers.

We are planning to host the meeting in late August or early September 2007 in the Netherlands or in Germany. The exact date time and place will be announced in second call for papers via e-mail.

Please send an email to Daan Scheepers (scheepersdt@fsw.LeidenUniv.nl) indicating your participation interest until 15th of February 2007.

Small Group Meeting

On Shared Memories, Shared Beliefs: The Formation and Use of Joint Representations in Social Interaction
September 23-27 2007, Rapallo (Italy), Hotel Astoria

[Organisers: Gerald Echterhoff, Anna E. Clark, Amina Memon & Gün R. Semin]
Contact: gerald.echterhoff@uni-bielefeld.de

Interest in the joint or socially shared nature of individuals' perceptions and representations has soared in experimental social psychology (e.g.; Hardin & Higgins, 1996) and other related fields, such as memory (Gabbert, Memon, & Allan, 2003; Hirst & Manier, 2002), cognition (Barsalou, 2003; Smith & Semin, 2004), psycholinguistics (Pickering & Garrod, 2004), communication (Higgins & Semin, 2001), and social neuroscience (e.g., Gallese, Keysers, & Rizzolatti, 2003). In diverse subdomains, there is increasing evidence on how people are influenced by interaction and communication with others or by the broader social context when they form their own views and beliefs and when they remember past experiences.

Contributions to the meeting are expected to focus on shared processes in social cognition (e.g., forming beliefs and judgments about others and oneself; construing information in communication) and on the shared character of memory. We will further distinguish between shared representations as (a) dependent and (b) independent variables, regarding questions such as: (a) How are joint representations formed and attained

on-line (as in joint, physically co-present encoding or retrieval) or off-line (as in priming with social stimuli)؟ And what are the factors (e.g., cognitive or neural mechanisms; affiliative or self-serving motives; linguistic tools; conversational relevance; existing stereotypes) that shape the formation of these shared representations؟ (b) What are the effects (benefits or functions) of joint representations؟ For example, the joint nature of representations can foster interpersonal trust and empathy, facilitate conversation, allow the coordination of action across individuals, guide the abstraction level of information in conversation (Clark & Semin, 2006), or grant epistemic confidence or closure (Echterhoff, Higgins, & Groll, 2005; Kruglanski, Pierro, Manetti, & De Grada, 2006). The meeting is designed to build bridges across research areas and reveal new lines of enquiry which dovetail social-psychological research with approaches in related areas.

Applications for participation, including an abstract for a contribution (up to 250 words) and contact information, can be sent as electronic attachments to Gerald Echterhoff (gerald.echterhoff@uni-bielefeld.de). Deadline for applications is April 30, 2007.

Reports of Previous Meetings

Small Group Meeting on Current Research on Group Perception and Intergroup Behavior: The Role of Motivatioal Processes

Castle Oppurg (Germany), 29th June – 2nd July 2006

Organisers: Kai J. Jonas (Jena)

Our purpose in organizing this meeting was to document and discuss a broad range of motivational approaches in intergroup relations that have developed in this area. The potential of benefits from this exchange seems promising, since the motivational perspectives cover automatic and controlled aspects, motives and goals, in a broad range of applications and themes. Participants of the meeting reflected our aim to bring younger and older scientists from various national academic backgrounds together. Seventeen doctoral students and five post-docs comprised more than a half regarding academic seniority. This young conference population benefited greatly from the input of junior and senior faculty attending the meeting. Although the majority of participants came from European institutions (Belgium, Finland, Spain, The Netherlands, United Kingdom, besides Germany), we had two participants from the US and one Japanese colleague who traveled to Thuringia.

The meeting took place at the remote castle Oppurg in Thuringia, Germany. A welcoming barbecue, of course including the famous Thuringian sausages, was held outside, given excellent weather conditions that remained stable during the whole time of the meeting. Due to the fact that the meeting coincided with the soccer world championships quarterfinals, the academic schedule had to reflect the actual intergroup dynamics resulting from the fact that many participant's national team was playing against each other. Luckily, gains and losses were dealt with in a sportsmanlike manner, and no intergroup conflict spilt over into the academic realm. Of course the schedule of the meeting also reflected ample

time for individual discussions mostly held outside under the shady trees of the castle's park.

On the first day, Felicia Pratto used her key note talk to introduce a game paradigm for real players, to measure the bases and dynamics of power relations. In the fruitful discussion both theoretical implications as well as detailed aspects of the paradigm where analyzed, setting a great role-model for the productive discussion style of the meeting.
The following presentation by Krispijn Faddegon addressed in how far different group tasks fit with different regulatory focus strategies. The results, using conjuctive and disjunctive tasks showed clear implications for group based self regulation. Karl-Andrew Woltin's presentation, the first of two talks addressing aspects of control, focused on self-control strategies during the pursuit of group goals. The data presented speaks to similar processes of self-control to be active during group goal pursuit as in individual goals. Following this talk, Immo Fritsche presented his alternative explanation of mortality salience effects by means of group-based control restoration. Then, Christopher Cohrs presented empirical evidence for aspects of his proposed integrative model of prejudice. The last two speakers before the first quarterfinal game where Ilka Gleibs and Thomas Morton. Ilka Gleibs talk was on differences between perceived and desired merger patterns and their potential to predict merger support. Longitudinal data from an academic merger context gave insights into these processes. Thomas Morton's talk on group norm change showed evidence for the complexity of group-based success achievement, i.e. that deviation from group norm can be judged as functional to become a successful group. After the quarterfinal, Kai Sassenberg brought us back to the scientific realm with his talk on competition. His data spoke to the hypothesis that a competition mindset can be the basis for prejudice towards out-groups that are actually not involved in the competitive context. The final talk for the first day was by Susanne Täuber, who presented her longitudinal study on goal adjustment within the context of a women soccer team.

The second day of the conference commenced with Dominic Abrams key-note talk on ageism in which he presented a comprehensive model covering this core social problem and outlined potential paths of interventions. John Chambers presented a paper on potential

misperceptions intergroup conflict due to variability of core value perception. On a similar topic, Dora Bernardes' paper addressed the question of the impact of the perception of overlapping group attributes. Andrew Livingstone focused on the use of language as a marker for intergroup relations. After lunch, Elena Morales-Marente gave her paper on power and group variability and addressed the question whether legitimacy impacts on the relationship of the two. Daan Scheepers' talk on intergroup status differences revealed the potential to perceive these differences as challenge or threat to be dependent on stability and legitimacy issues regarding the constitution of the group. The last two talks for the day where by Rene Kopietz who presented data speaking to the question that audience tuning effects are relative to in vs. outgroup audiences. Olivier Klein's talk showed the impact of grounding processes on intergroup perception. The evening was filled by the possibility to further discuss aspects of one's own academic work during a charming barbecue, which was interspersed by soccer news coming in from those who enjoyed watched the two remaining quarterfinals.

Sunday was the final day of the small group meeting and was thematically devoted to the topics of forgiving, fairness and helping. Jolanda Jetten started off the day with her talk on the evaluation of deviants, which is dependent on the moral background used to evaluate the misdeeds. Following her talk, Tomohiro Kumagai presented his studies on determinants of the perception of third party aggression, such as procedural fairness. After the break Birte Siem discussed whether empathy can be a determinant to outgroup helping. Daniela Ruhs' talk was the final presentation of the meeting and her topic of the politicization of collective identities analyzed the question whether superordinate identity identification is necessary to prevent radicalization.

In sum, the papers presented at the meeting documented a broad range of research in the intergroup domain that reflects motivational aspects. It was specifically this diversity of motivational approaches that instigated fruitful discussions and suggested new perspectives to almost all participants.

Small Group Meeting on Gender and Career Advancement: Social Psychological Perspectives

June 14-16, 2006, The Netherlands

Organisers: Marloes van Engen & Claartje Vinkenburg

At the Small Group Meeting on *Gender and Career Advancement: Social Psychological Perspectives* 20 international experts on gender and organizations gathered in a lovely small hotel near the gates of the famous Dutch National Park *De Hoge Veluwe* to further theory, research and practice on careers of women and men in and between organizations. The meeting was sponsored by the European Association of Experimental and Social Psychology (EAESP), the ESF fund 'Sustainable Development: Diversity in/at Work', the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (Faculty of Economics and Business Administration) and the Oldendorff Research Institute of Tilburg University.

It proved to be an inspiring event, with a wealth of perspectives. We saw challenges to the established notion of the *glass ceiling* concept, replaced by new metaphors for understanding (gendered) organizational careers: the labyrinth (Alice Eagly[*]); the glass cliff (Michelle Ryan[*] & Alex Haslam); and the arena (Paul Jansen and ClaartjeVinkenburg[*]). Empirical research in progress was presented that ranged from intricate lab-studies on gender identity (Esther López-Zafra & Rocio Garcia-Retamero[*]), mentoring (Mette Hersby[*], Michelle Ryan[*] & Jolanda Jetten) and task-allocation (Irene de Pater[*] & Annelies van Vianen), survey studies on identity aspects of leadership in relation to performance (Janka Stoker[*] & Mandy van der Velde[*]; Hanna Stillström[*]), work-family facilitation (Elianne van Steenbergen[*] & Naomi Ellemers), cross-cultural studies on stereotypes (Janine Bosak[*], Sabine Sczesny[*] & Amanda Diekman), to long-term longitudinal research following the careers of male and female university graduates (Andrea Abele[*]; Monika Sieverding[*]). There were studies with detailed camera observations of communication in teams (Sabine Koch[*]), field studies of female partners in a consulting firm "opting out" (Susan

---

[*] participant

Vinnicombe[*], Deirdre Anderson[*] & Val Singh), mentoring and ambition
(Ruth Sealy[*] & Val Singh), and narrative analyses of career making
practices (Marianne Ekonen[*]; Anneke Sools, Marloes van Engen[*], & Cor
Baerveldt). At the end of three days of presentations and discussions the
meeting was rounded up with a workshop on guiding a future research
agenda and thinking of evidence-based intervention programs in
organizations.

The sessions replenished our scientific spirits, but the social events proved
to be equally exciting. On our first day, a taxibus with most of our
participants got stuck in a sand dune, so getting (re-)acquainted took place
in a hilarious setting (was it indeed a social psychological experiment?).
Being in the Netherlands, we went for a stereotypical bike ride in the
national park and a wonderful guided tour through the *Kröller Müller
museum,* which turned out to be a vivid event to remember. On top of that
our meals were very pleasant as the hotel's cuisine was marvellous. The
meeting was what we hoped for, allowing for a bridge between business
scholars, social psychologists and organizational psychologists, between
novices and established experts, and with a promise for more meetings to
follow in the near future.

Marloes van Engen & Claartje Vinkenburg (Oganizers)

Promotions into higher organizational levels are important events in
people's work lives, and "going up in the world" is more and more
considered to be an absolute value of Western society. Individuals differ in
their career attainments, however, which renders career success a popular
and important subject in management research and literature. One of the
most striking examples of such differences is the disparity in career success
between men and women, with women experiencing much less
progression than men.

Research on gender and career advancement has focused on al large variety
of determinants, correlates, and consequences of the gender gap in career
success. As researchers in this field often follow their own line of research,

---

[*] particpant

one of the main goals of this small group meeting on gender and career advancement was to illuminate evidenced gender differences in career attainments from various social psychological perspectives.

On Wednesday June 14, 21 psychologists from Europe and the United States travelled to Otterlo, a tiny village in the centre of the Netherlands, for participating in the meeting. After an exciting bus tour and being towed out of the sand by a forester, we were welcomed in Hotel Sterrenberg, with a fantastic lunch buffet. The meeting began in earnest after lunch. The presentations given during the three days covered many areas of research on gender and career.

Wednesday afternoon, two presenters reported research and theorizing around new metaphors for describing the position of women on the labour market. Alice Eagly proposed that introduced the labyrinth as a metaphor for women's difficult route to top management positions. The labyrinth may provide a more accurate metaphor than the glass ceiling, as a substantial proportion of women have reached positions at the highest levels. In reaching these levels, women have to overcome hazards not faced by men. Michelle Ryan introduced the glass cliff metaphor to describe the phenomenon that women entering senior management tend to be in positions that are more precarious and associated with greater risk of failure and criticism than those occupied by men. Thereafter, Marianne Ekonen presented us her study on the career advancement of men and women in high technology industry. Marloes van Engen showed that 'doing ambition' is a kind of competence describing promotional success in a multinational, but which results in a double bind for women when accurately showing this competence.

Thursday morning evolved around the theme role congruity and stereotypes. Rocio Garcia-Retamero presented findings of her research on the strength of gender stereotypes on social judgments of female leaders. Janka Stoker talked about gender and leadership congruity in relation to organizational outcomes. Hanna Stillström investigated requisite management characteristics and the support for role congruity theory in a context where strong norms of gender equality prevail. Janine Bosak presented a study investigating the perception of leadership traits in Australia, Germany, and India. After lunch, we undertook a bike ride to

the National Park Hoge Veluwe, and visited the fabulous Kröller-Müller Museum. The earnest program continued later afternoon, with four presentations around the theme organizational behavior, gender, and career. Ruth Sealy opened with an exploration of the relationship between the lack of close female role models and the career ambitions of female managers. Sabine Koch continued with a presentation on gender differences in communication patterns. Irene de Pater presented her work on gender differences in job challenge as antecedent of the gender gap in career progression. Claartje Vinkenburg concluded this session with a presentation on promotion decisions and criteria in the career arena that may partly explain the relative small numbers of women advancing into higher hierarchical levels.

Friday morning evolved around the theme career development. Andrea Abele's research tested an integrative social-cognitive model that states that expectations and goals together with environmental factors are central in influencing a person's objective and subjective career success. Susan Vinnicombe explored why women who achieve senior positions are increasingly leaving their lofty positions. Monika Sieverding presented a longitudinal study on psychological determinants of vocational and familiar development. Elianne van Steenbergen shed light upon the distinct types of work-family facilitation and its outcomes for women and men. Mette Hersby, last but not least, presented research that examined the way in which gender may impact attitudes towards, and the experience of, mentoring.

After lunch, this inspiring meeting ended with a workshop, in which issues, future research directions, and opportunities for collaboration were discussed. After three stimulating and inspiring days, we all felt this meeting was a success. Not onlywas the meeting's content great. The accommodation, the surroundings, and the food are worth mentioning as well. The atmosphere was warm, encouraging, open, supportive, and enriching. We had the opportunity to get acquainted with other researchers, other insights, and other types of research in our own research area. We learned each other and from each other. We would like to thank the EAESP, the Tilburg University, the European Social Fund and the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam for their support for this small group meeting.

Finally, we thank the organizers and all participants for their presentations and contributions that made this meeting a great success.

Irene de Pater

Small Group Meeting on Evolution and Group Processes: Understanding the Human Social Animal
July 6-8, 2006, Canterbury, UK
Organisers: Mark Van Vugt & Mark Schaller

Can there be such a thing as an integrative social science? Can we link the multitude of isolated research topics within social psychology to each other and to related fields? These are some of the fundamental questions in our field. Social psychology has long been characterized as a field that is fragmented, a field that lacks a central framework to unite it and connect it other disciplines. Recently, evolutionary theory has been proposed as such a framework. Evolutionary theory can unite seemingly isolated topics within psychology, and can build bridges to related fields like sociology, anthropology, biology, and genetics.

The workshop 'Evolution and group processes' sought to bring together social scientists who were interested in evolutionary theory, and who wanted to learn more about its applications in research on group processes. On the basis of presentations by experts from various fields, we would discuss the implications of evolutionary theory for the study of groups, and attempt to connect the evolutionary perspective to social psychological theory on groups.

With a billing like that, the workshop was sure to generate interest from a multitude of backgrounds, and so it proved as sociologists, anthropologists, biologists, primatologists, and of course social psychologists descended on a sunny and very picturesque Canterbury in early July. With a group this diverse, there were sure to be lots of different approaches to group interaction, and so it proved as the workshop kicked

off with the theme of intragroup processes on the first day. First to take the floor were the primatologists. Nick Newton-Fisher gave an extensive overview of social relations and evolutionary adaptations among primates. Sarah Brosnan presented intriguing findings on fairness and cooperation among capuchin monkeys and chimpanzees. The next two presenters were evolutionary biologists, and they discussed social complexity and its consequences for selection pressures. David Sloan Wilson explained multi-level selection theory, and linked it to the emergence of morality and culture in his rousing presentation. Dominic Johnson tackled the enigmatic question of why humans cooperate and punish excessively, despite the associated costs in fitness. He identified the evolution of the conscience and self-interested vigilantism as potential origins of these phenomena. The first day concluded with small-group discussions, in which presenters described evolutionary approaches to topics in three parallel sessions: a session on status, power and leadership; a session on conformity, social norms, and kinship; and a session on altruism and prosocial behavior.

The theme of day two was intergroup processes. Mark Schaller took the stage first, and gave a compelling example of how evolutionary theory can provide novel explanations in psychological research. In his presentation, Mark linked an evolutionary explanation of threat perception to findings on stereotyping and segregation in the double-minority conflict between Tamils and Sinhalese in Sri Lanka. Next, Margaret Foddy discussed the role of trust in interactions between members of the same group and members of different groups, and linked her findings to exclusion and rejection of outgroups. The next presenter was Holly Arrow, who presented data from computer simulations on war between groups and on the evolution of heroism in that context. The final presentation of the second day was given by John Levine, who discussed disloyalty and treason of group members during intergroup conflict, and the factors which determine how a group responds to disloyalty.

With the scientific programme for day two completed, we were in for a treat of a different kind. Kent is famous for its beautiful countryside and its dramatic white cliffs, but less well-known is that Kent holds the cradle of evolutionary theory: Down House, former residence of Charles Darwin and the place where he wrote On the Origin of Species. After an eventful

trip (which saw our company moored on the hard shoulder of the motorway after the bus broke down!) we arrived at this charming country-house, which has been restored to its appearance during Darwin's life. It was inspiring to walk around in the surroundings where Darwin worked on his great theory, and to learn more about the man behind the work. A pleasant walk in Darwin's beautiful garden was the perfect way to finish the second day.

Continuing the theme of the second day, day three started with small-group discussions on evolutionary approaches to intergroup processes, with sessions on social identity and stereotyping, on intergroup conflict and emotions, and on mate choice issues. After fruitful discussions in all three sessions, the group reconvened for the final session of the conference, the panel discussion. A panel consisting of David Sloan Wilson, John Levine, Oliver Curry, Dominic Johnson, and Holly Arrow (and aided by Sarah Brosnan) answered questions from the floor. A number of issues were raised, including how evolutionary approaches might be applied to social issues like pollution. There were also more fundamental questions about the benefits that evolutionary theory and research on primates would provide for social scientists. In their answers, the panel re-emphasized what had been demonstrated over the course of the three days: that the pressures under which humans evolved would have shaped their psychological makeup, and that thinking of the function of psychological mechanisms in that context could lead to surprising new insights for social scientists.

Over the course of the workshop, it had indeed become clear that evolutionary thinking can be applied to a substantial amount of psychological research. As such, evolutionary theory might indeed provide social psychologists with a framework with which to link isolated research topics within the field, and with which to link research in social psychology to research in other fields. However, the workshop has also made clear that a lot of work remains to be done before evolutionary theory can live up to its full potential, and before an 'integrative social science' can be realized. The interest in and enthusiasm for collaboration that participants of this workshop exhibited, however, certainly bodes well for the future.

This inspiring workshop would not have been possible without the generous support of the EAESP and the British Academy. But it also would not have been possible without the considerable efforts of the organizers: Mark van Vugt, Mark Schaller, Charlie Hardy, Wendy Iredale, and of course the tireless Rick O'Gorman. Thank you all for organizing a splendid meeting!

Chris Reinders Folmer (Free University Amsterdam)

Small Group Meeting On Social Psychological Perspectives on Integrity and Self-Integrity

July 10-12, 2006, University of Sussex, UK

Organisers: Paul Sparks, Verena Graupmann, Tom Farsides, Peter Harris

On the Sunday, Italy's World Cup win was overshadowed by the actions of, and consequences for, one of the world's greatest footballers. On the Wednesday, Zinedine Zidane gave a television interview in which his apology was accompanied by a clear insistence that he did not regret his actions. At the time of writing, the details of the interchange between Zidane and Materazzi are not entirely clear, although the speculations at the time – like Zidane's action – came fast and furious!

In the intervening period, 19 researchers came together over two days at the Department of Psychology, University of Sussex for a Small Group Meeting on 'Social Psychological Perspectives on Integrity and Self-Integrity'. There were 12 research presentations during the meeting, two Discussant slots and a general discussion on the final day. Each speaker was allocated 45 minutes: a maximum of 25 minutes for their presentation, plus at least 20 minutes for open debate, discussion and questions.

As was expected, the notion of integrity was addressed from a wide range of perspectives. Some presentations were more concerned with integrity as adherence to certain (moral) principles; others were more concerned with integrity as a sense of completeness / coherence. Some presenters emphasized integrity as a value or a goal, others focussed more on the ascription of integrity to others, and /or respect for the integrity of others. Some brief allusions were made to the rather extensive philosophical literature on this topic in the hope that this might provide some help with finding our bearings and some 'food for thought'. The paucity of conceptual attention paid to the notion within the psychological literature was commented upon and apparently viewed with a mix of concern, indifference and ambivalence!

The meeting commenced with an examination of the notion of respect and how it linked with – both psychological and physical - integrity (Mansur Lalljee), moved on to a consideration of the implications of the notion of integrity for people's ability to tolerate inconsistencies (Giuseppe Pantaleo) and to the relationship of integrity to the violation of human rights (Guy Elcheroth), before an argument was made to explore links between integrity – particularly within self-affirmation theory perspectives - and the notion of coherence (Viv Vignoles). The second day kicked off with a consideration of the impact of external sanctions on moral judgements (Laetitia Mulder), and of the role of judgements of morality and competence in self and others (Bogdan Wojciszke). The importance to the notion of integrity of actions being congruent with people's values was emphasized (Greg Maio). The afternoon of the second day was dominated by self-affirmation theory: how it has resulted in empirical findings that have attracted a huge amount of interest in the area of health-related issues (Peter Harris), even though level of threat was argued to be an important factor influencing information processing under conditions of affirmation (Guido van Koningsbruggen) and the nature of the threat was argued likewise to be likely to influence the direction of affirmation effects (Paul Sparks). Relating integrity to the importance of the development of a sense of meaning, it was also proposed that nostalgia can serve to protect the integrity of the self through its contribution to a sense of meaning (Clay Routledge). Congruent with many views of self-affirmation effects were some recent findings addressing the influence of

self-esteem as a moderating factor in memory biases in the context of central attitudes (Daphne Wiersema)

Tom Farsides and Dale Griffin made excellent contributions in their roles as discussants at different stages of the meeting. Both provided insightful and refreshingly provocative reflections on the presentations and on the broader issues that these involved.

Throughout the meeting, there was a frank and fruitful exchange of opinions and ideas. Some of the discussions addressed the broader issues of how to best conceptualize the notion of integrity, others honed in on specific methodological issues raised by individual pieces of empirical work. Ironically, perhaps, at the end of the meeting there was no overarching integration of themes but rather an extensive series of issues and questions left open for reflection and empirical investigation.
We would like to express our thanks to all those who took part in the stimulating and thought-provoking sharing of views and to the EAESP and to Jonathan Bacon, Dean of Life Sciences at the University of Sussex for the financial support which enabled the meeting to take place.

Paul Sparks, Verena Graupmann, Tom Farsides, Peter Harris

Other Reports

**Report on the 2nd Workshop on
Cognitive and Social Perspectives on (Un-)Consciousness
Intuitive Information Processing
July 11-14th 2006, Kazimierz Dolny (Poland)
Supported by EAESP Regional Support Grant and the
Polish Scientific Research Committe**

Some history

Workshop on intuitive information processing was the second of the series of events that we organize in the framework of the Workshop on Cognitive and Social Perspectives on (Un)Consciousness. The idea was born in the year 2005, when Joanna Sweklej and Robert Balas decided to organise the first meeting entitled Methods of Modelling in Psychology. They managed to gather a strong team of workshop tutors and keynote speakers with prof. Axel Cleremans, prof. Frank Van Overwalle, and prof. Andrzej Nowak among them as well as a team of young scientists eager to present their own results, discuss and learn more about application methods of modelling in cognitive and social psychology. The 1st workshop was a success and the organizers gathered positive feedback and questions about plans for the next meeting from participants. In wider group, Joanna Sweklej and Robert Balas together with me Grzegorz Pochwatko, Michał Wierzchow and Małgorzata Godlewska, we decided to organise the second meeting. Because of our interests we decided it to be aimed to the issue of intuitive information processing.

The Topic

The scientific scope of the 2nd Workshop covered the issues of intuitive information processing viewed from social, cognitive and neuroscience perspectives. The event was again designed to engage young scientists in sharing and discussing ideas concerning investigation of nonconscious processes. Participants were encouraged to submit talks and posters presenting their own research. Along with regular conference activities

they also actively participated in small group tutorials guided by more experienced scientists.

The workshops
Participants were able to choose one of two parallel workshops. Prof. Piotr Winkielman (University of California, San Diego, USA) tried to explore various ways of studying the interaction between affect, cognition, and awareness. The goal of his workshop was to demonstrate and discuss various theoretical and methodological approaches to questions like (i) how do people perceive affective information?, (ii) how does affect influences cognition, behaviour, and decisions?, (iii) how does cognition influence affective responses?, and finally (iv) when and how are people conscious of affective states? Participants were provided with an overview of various techniques of affect induction and measurement, including classic self-report and RT measures as well as basic tools of psychophysiology and neuroscience, with emphasis on relatively easy and cost-effective techniques such as EMG and GSR. Than they were working in subgroups and discussing the possibilities of developing new research projects on the basis of problems and proposals provided by the tutor. Some of the procedures will be probably further developed and will effect in international cooperation (workshop participants are in contact with each other and prof. Winkielman).

Prof. Ap Dijksterhuis (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands) challenged the idea of effectiveness of "smart" and rational conscious decision making. Participants were comparing classical view with the new idea of "unconscious thought" (i.e., as prof. Dijksterhuis puts it, chewing on a problem without directed conscious thought) can lead to very sound decisions. First they got familiar with the theory of unconscious thought and paradigms used to measure it, than they worked in subgroups on designing their own study projects. Also in this case we believe that cooperation will continue. Up to now the workshop resulted in one grant application for the series of eight studies challenging the idea of unconscious thought.

The Keynote Lectures
Prof. Winkielman in his keynote lecture entitled *"Preferences With and Without Inferences"* discussed two lines of his research on psychological and

biological underpinnings of preferences and decisions. He focused on how liking can emerge from the dynamics of basic perceptual and conceptual processes, specifically how fluent (easy) processing elicits positive affective responses, as reflected in judgments and physiology. With this mechanism he tried to explain classic psychological phenomena, such as mere-exposure and beauty-in-averages effect, and predict several new interesting phenomena, such as affective consequence of perceptual and conceptual priming. The relation between affect and memory systems was also discussed. In the second part he explored a number of studies showing how preferences are guided by low-level affective and motivational processes (e.g. how emotional facial expressions presented subliminally influence a variety of evaluative judgments and behaviors in some consequential domains, including consumption and risk taking). Both lines of this research highlight the intricate interplay of affect, cognition and awareness in construction and expression of preferences.

Prof. Dijksterhuis deliberated *"On the benefits of unconscious thought"*. He challenged the widely held belief that people should consciously think about the decisions they make. Even for such serious choices as whether to buy a house or not or whether to switch jobs or it seem better to use "unconscious thought instead of conscious contemplation, partly because the limited capacity of consciousness. This means that when making decisions about rather complex, multifaceted issues, conscious thought can be maladaptive and lead to poor decisions. "Unconscious thought" in contrary can lead to very effective choices in this case.

Prof. Axel Cleeremans (Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium) focused on the notion that *"Consciousness takes time"*. He explored the differences between conscious and unconscious cognition. He presented his point of view on the limitations of unconscious cognition. Participants received an overview of recent relevant findings, and discovered a novel conceptual framework in which conscious and unconscious cognition is rooted in the same set of learning and processing mechanisms. On this view, the extent to which a representation is conscious depends in a graded manner on properties such as its stability in time or its strength.

According to Cleeremans consciousness takes time, the main function of consciousness is to make flexible, adaptive control over behavior possible,

and finally we learn to be conscious. The possibility of deliberation without attention was also discussed.

Prof. Bogdan Wojciszke (Warsaw School of Social Psychology, Poland) presented his studies on the *"Consequences of thinking on persons in terms of agency or communion"*. Previous research shows that agentic content dominates self-perception while communal content dominates impressions of others. But this is not the case for close others. According to his research results, thinking on a target person in agentic terms increased closeness felt toward this person, but only in cognitive load condition. It is concluded that agentic thinking on a person may serve as a heuristic cue for closeness.

The Town
The Workshop took place in a lovely town of Kazimierz Dolny. This charming palce with both medieval and renaissance spirit is situated on the Lublin plateau, lies on the right bank of the river Vistula on its way to the Baltic. Because of its attractive position, its rich history, its picturesque medieval houses, wonderful architecture and kind climate, Kazimierz is known not only in Poland but also abroad as a sought after tourist center where guests can relax and enjoy their holidays. It's been also recognized by scientists and artists that gather there to rest, work and create. Participants of our workshop had opportunity to get familiar with the town, it's history and local traditions.

The event
The workshop was addressed mainly to young scientists (post graduate students, PhD students, and young scientists who have completed their PhD within 3 years prior to the event) whose particular interests lay in the scope of social cognition, cognitive psychology and neuroscience of nonconscious information processing. In this edition we had 56 participants from a number of European countries (Germany, UK, Poland, Switzerland, Spain, The Netherlands) as well as Australia. They presented 25 talks and 17 posters. Program and abstracts are available on the website of the Workshop. We plan to organize the 3rd workshop next year.
For more information visit our website
http://www.swps.edu.pl/new_www/workshop/
or write to: workshopcspu@swps.edu.pl.

Summer Institute in Social Psychology (SISP) 2007

Modelled on the bi-annual EAESP summer schools, which are held in even-numbered years, the Society of Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) offers comparable two-week intensive summer schools for US/Canadian doctoral students, to be held in the United States in odd-numbered years, beginning in 2003. The first Summer Institute in Social Psychology (SISP) took place at the University of Colorado, Boulder, July 13-26, 2003, the second SISP was be held at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, on July 24-August 6, 2005.

EAESP schools are set up primarily for European students, but the organisers also always accept five US-students, selected and sponsored by SPSP. The SPSP schools are similarly set up primarily for USA/Canadian students, but the organisers will also accept five European students, selected and sponsored by the EAESP.

The third SISP will be held at the University of Texas at Austin (http://www.utexas.edu/) and will be hosted by the Psychology Department (http://www.psy.utexas.edu/)

The dates will be: July 15, 2007 (check-in Sunday) through July 28, 2007 (check-out Saturday).

The teachers and courses are not known by now. You will be informed by e-mail (and the website) as soon as you can apply for the SISP.

Grants

Constantina Badea (postgraduate travel grant)
Gamze Baray (postgraduate travel grant)
Virginie Bonnot (postgraduate travel grant)
Marcin Bukowski (seedcorn grant)
Ulrich Klocke (seedcorn grant)
Sabine Koch (postdoctoral travel grant)
Joris Lammers (postgraduate travel grant)
Daniela Niesta (postgraduate travel grant)
Catherine Stroebe (postgraduate travel grant)
Marijke van Putten (postgraduate travel grant)

GRANT REPORTS

Nadine Chaurand
(University Blaise Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand, France)
Postgraduate travel grant

Thanks to the postgraduate grant I received from the European Association of Social Psychology, I spent three months in the psychology department at the Arizona State University in Tempe, Arizona. The main aims of my stay were to benefit from the worldly acknowledged expertise of Pr. Robert Cialdini in the domain of social norms, and to start a program of studies integrating my interest, social control, to his research topics. A secondary aim was, of course, to discover the differences between psychology research in the US and in France, and to integrate to my future practice the main strengths of US research.

Robert Cialdini and his graduate students gave me a very warm welcome, and I felt fully integrated to the laboratory in a very short time. I had discussions with a number of researchers, and was thus able to collect new theoretical ideas for my future studies and methodological advices for improving them.

The study we decided to conduct dealt with people's reaction to social control threat. Social control refers to any kind of reaction that is addressed to the author of an uncivil or deviant behavior by a mere witness of this behavior (Chekroun & Brauer, 2002). For example, we can tell someone smoking in a place where it is forbidden, that such a behavior is not correct. Social control can thus be linked to research on social norm enforcement. However, the effects of social control on the behavior of the target (the author of the uncivil behavior) have never been investigated. Although, it is possible that receiving social control diminishes the likelihood that the target will commit the uncivil behavior afterwards.

We were primarily interested not by the behavior after receiving real social control, but by the behavior under a threat of social control. For the threat to occur, a person has to know that his/her behavior is being observed and that the observer will be able to express a reaction. We hypothesized that if someone thought he/she was going to meet a peer who had observed his/her behavior, this person would restrain from adopting an otherwise very likely uncivil behavior.

Procedure
The experimenter asked each potential participant if they would volunteer to participate in a study that would take about 5 minutes and consist of taste-tasting water. If the students accepted, they were led by the experimenter through a corridor toward a rarely used staircase, which was quite littered (paper cups, wrappings, paper towels…). Once inside the staircase, the experimenter told the participant that the study consisted of tasting water. The experimenter added that, given that the participant had to be alone during the study, that the study was very short, and that space was lacking, it had to be conducted in the staircase. Finally the experimenter gave the participant a small paper cup to taste the water, and left the staircase.

An instructions sheet asked the participant to pour water from the bottle to the cup, drink it, and rate the water on a questionnaire. The instructions then instructed participants to go down the stairs and exit by the door at the bottom.

The variables were manipulated through additional instructions stated by the experimenter and on the instructions sheet. The participants (n=32) in the observed condition were told by the experimenter that they would be monitored by the next participant via a set of security cameras in the staircase to be sure that they had left before the following participant entered. The other half (n=37) were not told anything regarding security cameras.

Within each of these conditions, half of the participants (n=35) were instructed via the instruction sheet that at the end of the experiment they would have to wait for the student who would complete the study just after them. For those who also believed they were being watched, these instructions also served as a reminder, asking them to wait "for the next participant who is currently watching you". The other half (n=34) were not asked to wait for anyone.

The dependant variable was whether the participant threw the paper cup in the stairs or not (there were no trash bins or tables to put the cup on, in the stairs).

At the bottom of the stairs, a second experimenter approached the participant, explaining that the study was finished and debriefing the participant. Finally, the experimenter noted if the participant had littered the paper cup.

Results
We computed the percentage of participants who littered in each condition.

A chi-square analysis showed no main effect of the camera ($X^2=1.11$, p=.291 nor one of the interaction ($X^2=2.15$, p=.143). However, a planned contrast showed a significant difference between the "no camera-no interaction" condition (42,1% of littering) and the three other conditions combined (no camera – interaction: 16,7%; camera – no interaction: 20%, camera – interaction: 17,6%), $X^2=4.31$, p=.038.

It appears thus that the mere activation of the presence of someone (be it physical or not) is sufficient to restrain people to commit uncivil

behaviors. More than the threat of real physical social control (that occurs only in the condition camera + interaction), it could be the automatic activation of others' reaction to uncivil behavior and the consequences for our social image, that hold back our adoption of such behavior.

If these results are replicated they could present an important interest in terms of applications for institutions, in their programs for the diminution of uncivil behaviors. I plan to use them in an applied project I have with the town hall of my city. Moreover, a study aimed to explore further this result and another on the determinants of social control are in project with Pr. Cialdini.

As a conclusion I cannot express enough gratefulness toward EAESP for allowing me to realize this travel, that was as rewarding on a professional plan than on a personal one.

Bibliography

Brauer, M. & Chekroun, P. (2005). The relationship between perceived violation of social norms and social control : situational factors influencing the reaction to deviance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35, 7, 1519-1539.*

Gayannée Kedia
(University Toulouse Le Mirail, France)
Postgraduate travel grant

My visit to Professor Richard Smith at the University of Kentucky was aimed at running a study on the differences and commonalties between the various kinds of self-conscious emotions. Self-conscious emotions are feelings that agents develop on their own character or actions, helping them to regulate their behaviour (Haidt, 2003). This family of emotions gathers guilt, shame, embarrassment and humiliation, and to a large extent regret and disappointment. Social psychologists have showed that self-conscious emotions are difficult to be distinguished one from the others and often confounded in everyday language (Tangney & Fisher, 1995). If disappointment have been compared to regret (Zeelenberg et al.,

1998), regret to guilt (Berndsen et al., 2004), guilt to shame (Smith &
Ellsworth, 1985; Roseman, Wiest & Swartz, 1994 ; Tangney, Miller,
Flicker & Hill Barlow, 1996 ; Smith, Webster, Parrott, & Eyre, 2002), or
shame to humiliation, as far as we are aware no previous work has ever
investigated the whole family at the same time. Thus we designed a study
in order to examine the cognitive antecedents, emotional components and
behavioural consequences of these six self-conscious emotions. Before my
arrival, Pr. Smith had collected a set of fulfilled questionnaires, which we
had previously elaborated together, pre-testing the study. The following
section depicts the results of this pre-test.

140 undergraduates at the University of Kentucky (40 males and 100
females) volunteered their efforts for this study in return for partial credit
toward a course requirement. Participants were asked to recall an event
from their own life for which they had felt either intense disappointment,
or regret, or guilt, or embarrassment or humiliation (five experimental
conditions with each the same number of participants). We also had
planned to test a shame condition but problems of coordination prevented
us from collecting it. After having been reminded of this emotional event
participants had to rate on seven-point Likert scales to what extent this
event made them feel 42 emotions (including disappointment, regret,
guilt, shame, embarrassment and humiliation items), 7 cognitive variables
known to be relevant socio-emotional dimensions (Smith et al., 1985)
(publicity, negative self-evaluation, internal and external attributions,
responsibility, morality), and to indicate, on seven-point Likert scales,
what were their action tendencies at this moment (escape the situation,
repair the situation or revenge). Moreover we asked them what kind of
counterfactual thoughts come to their minds when rethinking to this
event, i.e. whether they would mutate their behaviour, their personality,
someone else's behaviour or the situation in order to undo the undesirable
outcome.

As there were few students in each condition (around twenty) and as we
did not run a shame condition, we chose to perform, on the whole sample,
correlation analyses between emotional ratings on the one hand and
cognitive variables and action tendencies on the other hand (140
participants) and to compare these correlation coefficients (comparisons
between correlation coefficients were performed using a statistical test

available on line on
http://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/Service/Statistics/Two_Correlations.html).

Comparisons between correlation coefficients indicated that regret, guilt
and shame were more correlated to responsibility and internal attributions
than embarrassment and humiliation ($p < .05$). Moreover guilt and shame
were more correlated to immorality judgement than disappointment,
embarrassment and humiliation ($p < .05$). On the contrary
embarrassment and humiliation ratings were more correlated to
attribution to somebody else and publicity than guilt and regret, and
embarrassment, shame and humiliation were more correlated to negative
self-evaluation ratings than disappointment, regret and guilt ($p < .05$).
Comparisons between correlation coefficients of the different emotional
and action tendencies ratings showed that disappointment, regret and
guilt were more correlated to the desire to repair the wrong done than
embarrassment and humiliation. On the contrary shame, embarrassment
and humiliation tended to be more correlated to the willingness to escape
the unpleasant situation than disappointment, guilt and regret ($p < .10$)
and embarrassment and humiliation were more correlated to a desire of
revenge than shame, guilt, regret and disappointment ($p < .10$). A chi-
square analysis testing whether the various experimental conditions
elicited different types of counterfactual thoughts did not reveal any
significant differences ($\chi^2 = 19.75$, ns).

Results of these pre-test suggest that regret and guilt would be associated
with internal attribution, responsibility and a repair action tendency
whereas embarrassment and humiliation would be rather associated to
personal external attributions, negative self-evaluation, publicity as well as
escape and revenge action tendencies. Shame was also associated with
internal attributions and responsibility but at the same time was highly
correlated to negative self-evaluation and a desire to escape. Thus it seems
that shame would have intermediary characteristics between guilt and
embarrassment. This lead us to notice that self-conscious emotions seems
to be organized like a spectrum, similar to a colour spectrum, going from
disappointment/sadness to humiliation/anger, at both ends, including in
order regret, guilt, shame and embarrassment. Indeed, the cognitive
variables and action tendencies measured in this pre-test seemed to vary
according to the different self-conscious emotions like along a continuum.

Morality judgements, for example, were poorly correlated to disappointment, but this correlation seems to increase for regret, reaches a maximum with guilt and then decreases progressively for shame, embarrassment and humiliation. Similar variation curves were observed for all the dependant variables measured in the pre-test. This spectrum metaphor might explain why some self-conscious emotions are closer than others, why regret, for example, has been compared to disappointment and guilt (Zeelenberg et al., 1998; Berndsen et al., 2004) but never, to our knowledge, to shame, humiliation or embarrassment.

Based on these first results we intend to test with structural equation modelling a more general model of self-conscious emotions depicting the basic ingredients, i.e. the basic colours (cognitive antecedents, emotional components and action tendencies) that would make a particular self-conscious emotion salient. We plan to test a larger panel of emotions, i.e. sadness, disappointment, inaction regrets, action regrets, guilt, shame, embarrassment, humiliation, anger and indignation.
We notably hypothesize that:

- The left side of this spectrum, i.e. sadness, disappointment and inaction regret would be associated with attribution to the situation (not a person),
- The middle of the spectrum, that figures the actual self-conscious emotions, i.e. action regret, guilt, shame, embarrassment and humiliation, would be associated to internal attributions. Previous studies suggest that action regret and guilt are elicited by specific and unstable internal attribution whereas shame, embarrassment and humiliation are triggered by global and stable attributions to the self (Tracy and Robins, 2004) and that embarrassment and humiliation are elicited by both attributions to the self and to others (Campbell et al. 2006);
- And finally the right side of the spectrum, i.e. anger and indignation to attributions to others.

This model might be useful to illustrate in what self-conscious emotions are both similar and different.

References

Berndsen, M., Pligt J.van der Doosje, B., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2004). Guilt and regret: The determining role of interpersonal and intrapersonal harm. *Cognition and Emotion, 18 (1),* 55-70.

Campbell, G., Jackson, M. & Smith, R.H. (2005). The effects of public condemnation on people's reactions to their wrongful actions: ascending hostility and descending guilt. Manucsript in preparation.

Haidt, J. (2003). The moral emotions. In R.J. Davidson, K.R. Scherer & H.H. Goldsmith (Eds.), *Handbook of affective sciences* (pp. 852-870). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roseman, I. J., Wiest, C., & Swartz, T. S. (1994). Phenomenology, behaviors, and goals differentiate discrete emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67 (2),* 206-221.

Smith, C. A. & Ellsworth, P. B. (1985). Patterns of cognitive appraisal in emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48,* 813-838.

Smith, R. H., M., W. J., Parrott, W. G., & Eyre, H. L. (2002). The role of public exposure in moral and nonmoral shame and guilt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83 (1),* 138-159.

Tangney, J. P., Miller, R. S., Flicker, L., & Hill Barlow, D. (1996). Are shame, guilt and embarrassment distinct emotions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70 (6),* 1256-1269.

Tangney, J. P. & Fischer, K. W. (1995). *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride.* New York: Guilford.

Tracy, J. L. & Robins, R. W. (2004). Putting the self into self-conscious emotions: A theoretical model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 103-125.

Zeelenberg, M., van Dijk, W. W., Manstead, A. S. R., & van der Pligt, J. (1998). The experience of regret and disappointment. *Cognition and Emotion, 12,* 221-230.

Sabine Pahl[*]

(University of Erlangen-Nürnberg, Germany)
Seedcorn grant

Kruglanski and Mayseless (1990) define social comparisons as "comparative judgements of social stimuli on particular content dimensions" (p. 196). They suggest different levels of analysis including the juxtaposition of stimuli and the content of comparison. For example, Jim may be compared with Bob, or Bob may be compared with Jim

[*] now at the University of Plymouth, UK, sabine.pahl@plymouth.ac.uk

(juxtaposition or *comparison focus*), and Bob and Jim may be compared in terms of their friendliness, or their ambitiousness (content).

Comparison focus has been shown to affect systematically the outcome of comparison. While many previous studies have found a self-positivity bias when asking participants to "*compare yourself with others*" *(self->other focus)* im terms of trait characteristics or future prospects, more recent studies have reversed the question format to "*compare others with yourself*"*(other->self focus)*. In the reversed format, the self-other difference becomes significantly smaller. In other words, reversing the comparison focus significantly reduces comparative self-positivity (*focus effect*, Eiser, Pahl & Prins, 2001; Hoorens, 1995; Otten & van der Pligt, 1996).

The EAESP seedcorn grant gave me the opportunity to study this focus effect in more depth. Specifically, the main aim was to explore a linguistic-pragmatic approach to explaining the focus effect. Additional research aimed to test different contents and the potential interaction of comparison focus and content.

I Linguistic-pragmatic approach. Several studies have shown that differences between the two comparison foci are due to differences in the consideration of self and comparison others. For example, under self->other focus people reported thinking more about the self than about others, and this triggered more positive statements about the self, even when participants were merely asked to evaluate similarities and differences (Pahl & Eiser, 2006). An additional explanation may be that linguistic norms influence the processing of comparative sentences and that these linguistic norm differences may lead to different outcomes in judgement (Roese, Sherman & Hur, 1998). A series of five studies compared self->other and other->self focus with regard to sentence formation, sentence completion, ratings of clarity and judgement latencies using sentences about similarity, difference, and positive and negative traits (Pahl, 2006).

First, using a scrambled sentence task I found that when either type of comparison focus was feasible, participants formed more self->other sentences than other->self sentences. Second, participants used more comparative terms (e.g., friendlier rather than friendly) when they completed sentences starting with "Compared to me, others are..." (other->self focus) than when they completed sentences starting with

"Compared to others, I am..." (self->other focus). Moreover, sentences completed under self->other focus were more positive for the self. Third, when asked to decide between grammatically correct and incorrect sentences, sentences under self->other focus were recognised more quickly. Fourth, self->other sentences were rated as being clearer, more usual and more normal, with the exception of similarity sentences. Participants also rated self->other sentences more quickly than the reverse and indicated that they were more likely to use self->other sentences. Fifth, I found evidence that the difference in own usage of self->other and other->self sentences was attenuated when clarity was controlled for. These studies suggest that a linguistic-pragmatic approach may be a useful addition to previous explanations. The seedcorn grant paid for a visit to a workshop on conversational pragmatics in reasoning and decision making in Toulouse, France, where I presented a poster on these findings.

II Comparisons and content. Previous research has tested characteristics of trait items such as desirability and controllability, but has not compared different *content* domains such as interdependence and independence or agency and communion. The second part of my research examined whether the content of traits affected the resulting comparative self-positivity and whether this further depended on comparison focus. This research was done in collaboration with Andrea Abele-Brehm and Bogdan Wojciszke.

In Study 1, four groups of participants made absolute judgements of either self or others with regard to either independent, interdependent, agentic or communal traits. Overall participants ascribed more communal and interdependent traits than agentic and independent traits to themselves *and* to others. The difference between self and others was greatest for communal traits. In Study 2, participants made direct comparative judgements of both communal and agentic traits under either self->other or under other->self focus. Again we found more comparative self-positivity for communal traits than for agentic traits. In line with previous research we found more comparative self-positivity under self->other focus than under other->self focus, but comparison focus did not interact with trait type. In sum, trait content affected the extent to which traits were ascribed: It seemed to be easier to say that one has communal traits than agentic traits, and this generalises to one's peers. Additional data suggests that this is linked to the greater perceived desirability of

communal traits as compared to agentic traits. Perceived ambiguity does not seem to explain this finding as agentic traits were perceived as more difficult to deduce and as broader. The seedcorn grant included a visit to Bogdan Wojciszke at the Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw, Poland, where I presented a talk on these results.

The seedcorn grant has really helped me lay the groundwork for a systematic investigation of these approaches, to gather initial data and initiate contact with other researchers through presentations of this work. I am very grateful to the EAESP for giving me this opportunity.

References

Eiser, J. R., Pahl, S., Prins, Y. R. A. (2001). Optimism, pessimism and the direction of self-other comparisons. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37,* 77-84.

Hoorens, V. (1995). Self-favoring biases, self-presentation, and the self-other asymmetry in social comparison. *Journal of Personality*, 63, 793-817.

Kruglanski, A. & Mayseless, O. (1990). Classic and current social comparison research: Expanding the perspective. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 195-208.

Otten, W. & van der Pligt, J. (1996). Context effects in the measurement of comparative optimism in probability judgments. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 15*, 80-101.

Pahl, S. (2006). *Linguistic norms and the focus effect in self-other comparisons*. Manuscript in preparation.

Pahl, S. & Eiser, J. R. (2006). The focus effect and self-positivity in ratings of self-other similarity and difference. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 45,* 107-116.

Roese, N. J., Sherman, J. W. & Hur, T. (1998). Direction of comparison asymmetries in relational judgment: The role of linguistic norms. *Social Cognition, 16,* 353-362.

Dorota Rutkowska
(Warsaw University, Poland)
Seedcorn grant

Thanks to European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, I received postdoctoral seedcorn grant in July 2005.

The seedcorn grant has been strong financial support for my research project focused on processing cognitive standards of evaluation. It

provided the experimental studies which were planned with all of the necessary technical support (the equipment and the development of essential software applications).

The project started in September 2005 and finished in June 2006. Several experiments were conducted with the research team consisting of undergraduate students in psychology. Most of the obtained results are conclusive. The general scope of the project as well as the most interesting results of the studies are presented below.

The project was aimed at exploring the consequences of activation of automatic vs reflective evaluation and dispositional (personality) characteristics on processing cognitive criteria of evaluation (i.e. evaluation standards). The recent experimental findings indicate the range and the importance of the automatic and impulsive psychological processes which are contrasted with more systematic and reflective information processing. The contrasted types of regulation can also be found in the area of evaluation. Automatic evaluation is based on affect and reaction patterns which have been automated as a result of subjective experience. Reflective evaluation is based on articulated cognitive evaluation standards, derived from knowledge and reasoning. Although the standards are typical of reflective evaluation, they may be processed in various ways. Systematic and controlled processing is consistent with their nature. However, as they are cognitive representations, they may also be activated and operated automatically - particularly when affect and automatic evaluation are induced. Individual differences in susceptibility to the influence of automatic and affective reactions are observed as well. Therefore, the main objective of research project was further exploration of the situational and dispositional conditions characteristics which may influence and modify operating cognitive standards. In general we expected that
- the activation of automatic vs reflective evaluation influences operating cognitive standards of various types;
- individual characteristics modify the cognitive standards processing when automatic vs. reflective evaluation are activated.

In the experimental studies we found some evidence for these prediction.

In one of the experiments these predictions were tested with regard to operating other-focused standards (i.e. evaluation criteria representations which, the content of which is the point of reference for judgments concerning what is good or bad for other people). We found that the subjective ratings of importance of other-focused standards depend on the type of activated evaluation as well as the self-representation. The other-focused standards become of less importance in humans with a strong self-identity but only when the automatic evaluation is induced. Considering the fact that well developed self-representation should result in more standards focused on the self, these findings imply may be activated automatically and diminish the importance of standards which are focused on other people needs, feelings or views.

In another study, we examined operating self-focused standards (i.e. evaluation criteria representations, the contents of which is the basis for judgments concerning what is good or bad for an individual herself or himself). The subjective rating of their importance turned out to be dependent on the type of activated evaluation and the characteristics of individual standard system. When the system is dominated with self-focused standards, these standards are of the same importance regardless the type of evaluation induced. When other-focused standards dominate in the system, the standards focused on the self are of higher importance when the reflective evaluation is induced than in the condition of activating automatic evaluation. These results may suggest the dominating type of standards (such as other-focused) may become automatically operated. When it occurs, the importance of other criteria of evaluation (even as strong as self-focused standards) is diminished. However, the increase of unautomatized standards importance may be increased when reflective evaluation is activated.

In the third experiment the processing of self-other comparison dimensions was examined. It has been proved that the sense of similarity to other people may be both attractive and aversive. This may lead to inaccuracy in assessing (usually underestimation) the similarity, particularly when it includes dimensions of comparison which are recognized by an individual as specific for him or her. In our study the accuracy of perceived self - other similarity was modified by the type of activated evaluation and the development of self-representation.

Individuals with poor self-identity overestimated their self - other similarity when automatic evaluation was activated in contrast to all of the others whose perceived similarity was underestimated (regardless of the self-identity development and the induced type of evaluation). This result may indicate that self – other similarity underestimation occurs regardless of the situational circumstances as far as human self-identity is strong. When it is poor, the perceiving self –other similarity is susceptible to the situational conditions and occurs only when the reflective evaluation is induced. This would imply that the tendency to search for confirmation of individual uniqueness is reflective and connected with mature self-representation process.

In the last experiment our predictions were tested regarding operating abstract, ethical values. It was assumed that the latency of value ratings may indicate if they are processed automatically (lower latency) or reflectively (higher latency). We found that values processing depends on the type of activated evaluation only in humans with representations of low complexity. They operate values more impulsively and mindlessly when automatic evaluation is induced. The reflective evaluation, when induced, does not influence operating values. In individuals with complex cognitive structures the value processing is independent of the situational conditions. These findings indicate that those whose evaluative standards are represented in a simplified structures are more susceptible to the situation influence in making evaluation, ethical judgments.

The results of all of the studies together indicate the promising future directions for further research and I would like to express my gratitude to Association for sponsoring the project.

Maciej Sekerdej
(Institute of Psychology, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland)
Postgraduate Travel Grant

In May 2006 I visited the University of the Basque Country in Donostia-San Sebastian. Thanks to the generosity of the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology and the invitation from Professor Jose

Valencia, I had the opportunity to work and participate in the academic life of the Faculty of Psicología Social y Metodología de las Ciencias del Comportamiento. My stay in the Basque Country turned out to be fruitful and was of great help in advancing my PhD project, especially in its final stage.

Above all, it was not my first visit in San Sebastian. Professor Valencia was the person with whom I had begun my PhD project in its current shape in 2004 throughout my stay at the Basque Country University as a Fellow of Marie Curie Foundation. Our close collaboration, during which the essential theoretical concepts for the future research were coined, lasted one year. In short words, my research was aimed at investigating the content and valence of nationality stereotypes, which, according to the subjects, are "agreed" in their society and compare them with their individual, "personal" stereotypes, in order to reveal to what extent individuals share the stereotype, which is widespread in their society. Likewise, I examined, employing experimental manipulation, what is the inter-impact between cultural stereotype and individual beliefs. In brief, drawing on Tversky's contrast model of similarity judgments and Codol's asymmetry effect it is presupposed that activation of the individual stereotype will produce its greater convergence with the cultural one. In the opposite condition, the two sorts of stereotypes will tend to be more different. Moreover, the auto-stereotype of Poles is evaluated and juxtaposed with cultural and individual beliefs towards other nationalities. In this case, bearing in mind that individual stereotype is compound of personal opinions of the subjects about members of other groups, and the cultural stereotype consists in assessing of beliefs agreed in the society, it was assumed that drawing on Heider's balance theory and his postulate that people prefer affective, cognitive and behavioural consistency in themselves and others, it is possible to predict valences of particular stereotypes (the unit is a triad: the subject – the Poles – other nationality).

During my last visit in Donostia-San Sebastian I planned to discuss the findings with Prof. Valencia, i.e. the person who is *au courant* with methodological and conceptual assumptions of the research project, but at the same time is someone who may have a fresh, extrinsic (not connected with the Polish reality, to which, in fact, the outcomes are referred) view on the data. Likewise, I wanted to consult Professor Valencia on certain

technical issues concerning the processing of the data, especially the problems regarding for instance the linguistic analysis of the collected information, on which Prof. Valencia had a considerable expertise.

I must admit that the stay in San Sebastian turn out to be a great experience. Meetings with Prof. Valencia and the Faculty staff enabled me to revise the core issues of the project as well as discuss its possible theoretical, methodological and practical implications. I had a lot of inspiring talks with people working on related (well, sometimes not quite related) topics. I am truly grateful to PhD students Nerea Marqués Arteaga, Maider Larrañaga Egilegor, Edurne Elgorriaga Astondoa, Silbia Ruiz Guerra, to name but a few, not only for academic brainwaves but for a really warm reception and providing me with any assistance I needed.

During my visit in San Sebastian I managed to complete the data analysis and write the discussion and conclusions of my pilot and first study. That work, in turn, contributed to a better comprehension and clarification of the assumptions of the second study as well as pointed out some details, which had to be thought over once again and highlighted in the follow-up analysis. Moreover, I have nearly finished the report of the second study and collected a bunch of new ideas, which, I am sure, will be useful when it comes to the final discussion and drawing ultimate conclusions from the whole project.

EAESP Postgraduate Travel Grant also enabled me to catch the unique opportunity to get acquainted with the specialist literature I was looking for, as the University in San Sebastian has a well-stocked library (especially as for French and, certainly, Spanish language publications, which in Krakow are virtually inaccessible, and, regarding recent research in my topic, highly relevant) and a good many databases.

All in all, I really enjoyed my stay in the Basqueland. I have made good progress with my current work and, also, I have got interested in some new ideas I would like to develop in the future. Moreover, I was delighted with a friendly and creative atmosphere over there and I hope it was not the last visit to San Sebastian, especially as, with a few people from the Faculty, we have already commenced talks, which may lead to the application for the joint project next year. I would like once again to

express my thanks to Professor Valencia for the invitation and to the Association for the necessary financial support that allowed me to accept it.

Arne van den Bos
(Utrecht University, The Netherlands)
postgraduate travel grant

From March to June 2006, I went to the University of New South Wales in Sydney, Australia, to visit prof.dr. Bill von Hippel and collaborate with him. I met Bill a year ago and our conversations about stereotyping, goals, and psychology in general were very stimulating and encouraged me to look into the possibilities of going abroad for a longer period of time. This was made possible by the travel grant I received from the European Association of Experimental Psychology.

The goal of my trip in general was to expand my knowledge about stereotyping behavior and to do research on the motivational underpinnings of stereotyping and prejudice. When I arrived in Sydney and found my way to the university, I was struck by the hospitality and laid back mentality of Bill. Effordless I was installed in a room with all research facilities available to me. Because of our mutual interests, Bill and I decided to do several experiments on the question how people manage multitasking situations: Some people seem to effortlessly switch attention from one task to the other, while others seem to struggle with this. We wanted to look closer at the processes underlying the activation and inhibition of current goals and examine how people manage to keep goals activated in the face of distraction. With regard to the goal not to stereotype, it is interesting to know what determines the activation and inhibition of this goal in the context of other goals. From a functional perspective, it has been hypothesized that for efficient functioning it is helpful to inhibit a goal as soon as it is completed, thereby freeing cognitive capacity for other goals that are not completed. We wondered whether people's working memory capacity could predict how well goals were inhibited after completion. We hypothesized that the better one's working memory capacity is, the more efficient one's goal inhibition after

completion is. Therefore, we measured participants' working memory capacity and activation levels of a certain goal before and after its fulfillment. Because it is known that working memory is impaired among the elderly, we aimed to compare results of students with results of elderly participants. Unfortunately, we did not find any differences of goal activation level before and after a certain goal was completed. Therefore we decided to finetune this measure before introducing elderly people in the study. Unfortunately, our time-schedule did not allow for this during my stay. We did get results on a explicit questionnaire concerning multitasking abilities indicating that the better one's multitasking abilities are, the more people activate a goal. These results encouraged us to continue collaborating on this line of research after my stay in Sydney.

Besides this research, my stay with Bill has been very stimulating for me. I was able to participate in a conference about evolution and cognition and had many conversations with other members of The UNSW Social Psychology department. Bill was very hospitable and very easy to talk to. If anyone has mastered the art of multi-tasking, he has. The rest of the Psychology department of the UNSW was also very openminded and easy approachable. Besides the experimenting, this was probably the most valuable part of my trip: to be able to share thoughts and have fruitful discussings with so many people who all have the same passion to understand human behavior, but all have a different approach to achieve this. The weekly labmeetings we had were also very stimulating and led to many research ideas. In particular I'd like to thank Carrie Wyland, Rebekah East and Richard Ronay for being very nice colleagues and teaching me the nuances of fMRI-scanning and risk-taking behavior. All in all it was a wonderful experience and I do not think I have ever learned more in three months time.

News about Members

The Man Who Did (Not) Retire – Wolfgang Stroebe

A large crowd was gathered in the Academy Building of Utrecht University on June 7, 2006. Besides many locals, social psychologists and other people from all over the world, including Europeans, Americans, and Asians, had come to the historic Dom Square of Utrecht to celebrate something. One thing, however, became very clear: they did not come to celebrate Wolfgang Stroebe's retirement.

Wolfgang Stroebe did reach the age of 65 this year, which would give him the right to retire. He also did give his public "retirement lecture" that day, and a number of people did come to honour him *as if* he were retiring. However, in his lecture Wolfgang made it absolutely clear that he had no intention of retiring. Further, the university made it clear that it had no intention of letting him go.

So, what was there to celebrate in Utrecht, last June 7, if it was not Wolfgang's retirement? Quite a bit, as it appeared.

The chairperson of Utrecht University, Yvonne van Rooy, praised Wolfgang for the decades in which he had dedicated himself to teaching and research at seven universities across the globe. And she did not come empty-handed: Wolfgang received a royal decoration, and was appointed Ridder in de Orde van de Nederlandse Leeuw. After that, the dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Willem Koops, came with the second surprise. Wolfgang had already made it clear that he was not going to retire; Koops made it clear that Utrecht University did not want to lose him. Wolfgang was given an Honorary Professorship at Utrecht University. The third person to speak, if I remember the order correctly, was Fritz Strack. On behalf of EAESP, he thanked Wolfgang for his contributions to the society. EAESP had honoured Wolfgang last year, by giving him the Tajfel lifetime achievement. So, in the end, there was quite a bit to celebrate.

And indeed, there are many reasons why Wolfgang should be honoured. He has been an extremely productive writer, authoring many journal articles, book chapters, and books. He has also been of great importance to European social psychology, by co-editing the *European Review* series (with Miles Hewstone) and the European textbook of social psychology, and by functioning in the board and as president of EAESP. One of the things that never ceases to amaze me is the scope of his work. If you look up Wolfgang in PsychInfo, you will come across references to work about AIDS prevention, attitudes, bereavement, brainstorming, obesity, and fear appeals (and I am definitely missing a few areas). And the most amazing thing is that in all those literatures he has made important contributions.

The breadth of Wolfang's interests was also reflected in his retirement lecture, in which he discussed three of his areas of research: bereavement, brainstorming, and eating. I do not have the room to go deeply into these different topics, so let me mention just one, and that one topic has to be eating. Wolfgang's name is attached to the Utrecht Goal Conflict Model of eating behaviour. That model has one assumption that is quite typical for Wolfgang; it is the assumption that *people like eating tasty food*. Wolfgang is a person who would not hesitate to drive 200 kilometres extra to be able to eat tasty food in a nice restaurant, preferably with a nice bottle of wine. The Utrecht Goal Conflict Model therefore seems largely based on introspection. It will also come as no surprise that after the retirement ceremony, guests were invited to have dinner in a nice restaurant in the Dom square area, and dinner included some very nice wines.

There is one final thing that I should mention. There was one more official speech in the Academy Building, given by Kees van den Bos and Miles Hewstone. They presented Wolfgang the first edition of a book, entitled *The Scope of Social Psychology: Theory and Applications*, to which many of Wolfgang's friends and collaborators had contributed a chapter. This book, edited by Kees van den Bos, Miles Hewstone, John de Wit, Henk Schut, and Margaret Stroebe, will appear with Psychology Press in 2007. The scope of the book clearly reflects the breadth and depth of Wolfgang Stroebe's contributions to social psychology. That is, up to now, because surely, there are many more to come from the man who did not retire.

Bernard Nijstad

New Members of the Association

The following applications for membership were approved by the
Executive Committee at its meeting in October, 2006. Names of members
providing letters of support are in parentheses:

Full Membership

Dr. Constantina BADEA
Paris, France
(D. Muller, F. Askevis-Leherpeux)

Dr. Hartmut BLANK
Portsmouth, UK
(D. Stahlberg, E. Walther)

Dr. Hanna BRYCZ
Gdansk, Poland
(B. Wojciszke, M. Jarymowicz)

Dr. Marcin BUKOWSKI
Krakow, Poland
(M. Kossowska, M. Kofta)

Dr. Fabrice BUSCHINI
Geneve, Switzerland
(F. Lorenzi-Cioldi, F. Butera)

Dr. Jesus M. CANTO
Malaga, Spain
(M. Barreto, M. Moya)

Dr. Armand CHATARD
Geneve, Switzerland
(G. Mugny, F. Lorenzi-Cioldi)

Dr. Claudia CHIAROLANZA
Rome, Italy
(S. Livi, P. Milesi)

Dr. Anna CLARK
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(G. Semin, S. Koole)

Dr. Sylvain DÉLOUVEE
Amiens, France
(D. Muller, M. Dambrun)

Dr. Roland DEUTSCH
Wuerzburg, Germany
(F. Strack, G. Bohner)

Dr. Katarzyna GUSZTYLA
Lublin, Poland
(D. Maison, D. Dolinski)

Dr. Anna KAROLCZAK
Wroclaw, Poland
(D. Dolinski, D. Bochenska)

Dr. Maya MACHUNSKY
Jena, Germany
(A. Mummendey, T. Meiser)

Dr. Silvia MARI
Padova, Italy
(D. Capozza, R. Spears)

Dr. Amina MEMON
Aberdeen, UK
(T. Lindholm, G. Echterhoff)

Dr. Félix MORAL
Malaga, Spain
(M. Barreto, M. Moya)

Dr. Randall PETERSON
London, UK
(C. de Dreu, M. van Vugt)

Dr. Clay ROUTLEDGE
Southampton, UK
(T. Wildschut, C. Sedikides)

Dr. Nathalie SGRO
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(S. Guimond, S. Redersdorff)

Dr. Christoph STAHL
Freiburg, Germany
(C. Klauer, T. Meiser)

Dr. Tomas STÅHL
Skövde, Sweden
(N. Ellemers, R. Vermunt)

Dr. Jeroen STOUTEN
Leuven, Belgium
(E. van Dijk, D. de Cremer)

Dr. Rhiannon TURNER
Birmingham, UK
(R. Crisp, K. Quinn)

Dr. Joaquim Pires VALENTIM
Coimbra, Portugal
(W. Doise, J. Vala)

Dr. Martijn VAN ZOMEREN
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(R. Spears, C.W. Leach)

Affiliate Membership

Dr. Linnda CAPORAEL
New York, USA
(E. van Avermaet, D. Capozza)

Dr. Sue WATT
Armidale, Australia
(R. Spears, G. Maio)

Postgraduate Membership

Stefan AGRIGOROAEI
Chambery, France
(D. Spini, D. Muller)

Flavia ALBARELLO
Bologna, Italy
(M. Barreto, M. Rubini)

Maja BECKER
Bordeaux, France
(G. Moser, X. Chryssochoou)

Magdalena BUDZISZEWSKA
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Lewicka, J. Pietrzak)

Sabina CEHAJIC
Sussex, UK
(R. Brown. R. Spears)

Pasquale COLLOCA
Trento, Italy
(S. Costarelli, M.-P. Paladino)

Francesca CORNA
Boulogne, France
(S. Krauth-Gruber, E. Drozda-Senkowska)

Venusia COVELLI
Milano, Italy
(P. Catellani, P. Milesi)

Silvia GALDI
Padova, Italy
(L. Arcuri, L. Castelli)

Gabriela-Maria JIGA
Grenoble, France
(D. Muller, C. Darnon)

Katarzyna KUBACKA
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(C. Finkenauer, C. Rusbult)

Tirza LEADER
Canterbury, UK
(D. Abrams, G.T. Viki)

Milena MARZANO
Bari, Italy
(G. Semin, C. Serino)

Ilona MCNEILL
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(C. de Dreu, B. Nijstad)

Marret NOORDEWIER
Tilburg, The Netherlands
(D. Stapel, S. Otten)

Cécile NURRA
Chambery, France
(D. Muller, F. Ric)

Sjoerd F. PENNEKAMP
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(A. Fischer, G. van Kleef)

Suzanne PIETERSMA
Groningen, The Netherlands
(E. Gordijn, A.P. Buunk)

Thomas POLLET
Newcastle, UK
(R. Spears, M. van Vugt)

Ricardo RODRIGUES
Lisbon, Portugal
(M.B. Monteiro, J. Vala)

Melanie SHARP
Oxford, UK
(M. Hewstone, B. Parkinson)

Sebastian STEGMANN
Frankfurt, Germany
(R. van Dick, O. Christ)

Elze G. UFKES
Groningen, The Netherlands
(J.-P. van Oudenhoven, S. Otten)

Ingrid WAHL
Wien, Austria
(E. Kirchler, E. Hölzl)

Adriana WYROBKOVÁ
Brno, Czech Republic
(P. Macek, M. Tyrlik)

Announcements

European Social Cognition Network (ESCON)
Best Paper Award 2006

The ESCON Best Paper Award is presented each year at the annual Transfer of Knowledge Conference for the best paper presented by a junior (PhD) researcher.

This year the 'Best Paper' was awarded to Mario Weick (University of Kent) for his paper entitled "When subjective experience Matters: Power Increases Reliance on the Ease of Retrieval", co-authored by Ana Guinote (see below for the full reference and abstract).

ESCON is dedicated to providing a collaborative and interactive platform for cutting edge social cognition research. The annual Transfer of Knowledge Conferences are aimed at promoting and networking young social cognition researchers. For more information see the ESCON website: www.social-cognition.org

ESCON Best Paper – 2006

Weick, M., & Guinote, A. (submitted). When Subjective Experience Matters: Power Increases Reliance on the Ease of Retrieval.

Abstract
Researchers have argued that power increases the use of heuristics and stereotypes. However, past research focused exclusively on declarative knowledge while the role of subjective experiences has been neglected. Using the ease-of-retrieval paradigm (Schwarz et al., 1991) five studies tested the assumption that elevated power increases reliance on the experienced ease or difficulty that accompanies thought generation. Across a variety of targets such as attitudes, spare-time satisfaction, and stereotyping, and using different operationalizations of power including

priming, trait-dominance, and actual power in managerial contexts, power consistently increased reliance on the ease of retrieval. These effects were not mediated by mood, quality of the retrieved information, or number of counter-attitudinal thoughts. Furthermore, one study demonstrated that ease of retrieval effects can be permanent, affecting judgments made later. Theoretical and practical implications for the presented findings are discussed. For example, we found that power increased the tendency to use stereotypes when retrieval of stereotypic information was easy. However, when participants encountered difficulties in retrieving stereotypic information from memory power decreased the use of stereotypes. These results qualify the notion that power promotes the expression of core attitudes and dispositions of a person and contribute to the understanding of inconsistencies in prior research.

Membership fee for 2007 is due now

Last not least it is time to renew your EAESP membership. Please pay your membership fee for 2007 before December, 31st, 2006. 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 account 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 2007 will automatically be charged in December 2006 (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 2007 will be cancelled, if we don't receive your fee or your credit card authorisation by **December 31st, 2006**.

Thank you in advance for your friendly cooperation.

Sibylle Classen

Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Administrative Secretary by **March, 15th, 2007** latest. Applications for 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, 15th, 2007**.

The next Executive Committee Meeting will take place from April 13-15, 2007.

Executive Committee