

European Bulletin of Social Psychology

Editors: Russell Spears & Sibylle Classen

2 Editorial

5 Changing the name of the EAESP into EASP - Discussion

8 New Books by Members

Social identities: Motivational, emotional and cultural influences ed. by R. Brown and Dora Capozza

Essential Social Psychology(2007) by R.J. Crisp and R.N. Turner

To be an Immigrant by K. Deaux

Intuition in Judgment and Decision Making (2007) ed. by H. Plessner, C. Betsch & T. Betsch

Le partage social des émotions (The social sharing of emotions) (2005) by B. Rimé

Identity, Morality, and Threat: Studies in Violent Conflict (2006) ed. by D. Rothbart and K.V. Korostelina

19 Future EAESP Meetings – Calendar

21 Future EAESP Meetings

Small Group Meeting on Dehumanization: Determinants and Consequences of Perceiving Others as Less Than Humans, June 1-3, 2008, Kazimierz Dolny (Poland)

Small Group Meeting on Emotions, Social Identity, and Intergroup Conflict, June 6-9, 2008, The Netherlands

24 Reports of Previous Meetings

Medium Sized Meeting on Social Developmental Perspectives on Intergroup Inclusion and Exclusion, July 18-22, 2006, University of Kent, Canterbury (UK)

28 Grants and Grant Reports

57 News about Members

In Memoriam: Mará Ros

New Members of the Association

63 Announcements

Jos Jaspars Awards – Call for Applications

Kurt Lewin Awards – Call for Nominations

Election of New Executive Committee Members – Call for Nominations

Change in the deadlines for grant applications

APS announces free subscription deal for EAESP members

International Journal of Conflict and Violence (IJVC)

70 Deadlines for Contributions

71 Executive Committee

Editorial

The current Bulletin contains all the usual evidence of the activity and productivity within the Association and the picture looks as healthy as ever. If the current issue looks a bit less overweight than normal (a healthy way to frame it) this is only because a number of issues and articles are in the pipeline as we go to press, so you can also look forward to a bumper issue later in the year!

In this issue we have further discussion on the second “E” in EAESP; as Shakespeare might have said: “Two E or not two E, that is the question”. Well actually he might not have said it, and is probably spinning in his grave right now (and would probably want to shake Spears if he were alive!). More comment on this issue (no more puns please) is welcome as we lead up to the General Meeting.

Speaking of which, the planning for the General Meeting in Opatija proceeds apace. The program committee will be finalized soon under the expert stewardship of Jens Förster and it won't be long before the website is up (linked to our own website of course) and our thoughts turn to submitting symposia and papers for the big event. So get thinking, planning and networking already! It is just amazing how quickly those three years come around! In the next issue we aim to have an article on social psychology in Croatia to get you all in the mood for the following June.

We have the usual information about new books, upcoming meetings and reports from members who have been using the grants funding. Regarding the grants we have really become victims of our success, judging by the increasing take up of this facility, especially the travel grants by our more junior members (as you may know this now covers postdoctoral as well as postgraduate members of the Association). To ensure that the prospects of funding are not exhausted prematurely in the year we are introducing a system of four quarterly deadlines to ensure the budget is healthily spread, and never *too* thin. Further details will appear soon on our website. As

usual some countries are more successful in claiming a larger slice of this cake than others, but only because more of them apply, so we encourage use of these opportunities from all the different corners of Europe.

Another interesting development concerns our links with other international associations and organizations. Members will already know of our close links with SESP, SPSP and SPSSI for example, but perhaps one link that has been neglected hitherto is with the APS. Formerly the American Psychological Society, in recent years the APS has changed its full name to the Association of Psychological Science (so it remains APS). This brings their name into line with their flagship journal, *Psychological Science*, which publishes excellent social psychological research (and some of it by our members!). More importantly, it also reflects a serious commitment by the organization to internationalize its profile. As part of this initiative the APS has offered an exciting and generous deal to members of EAESP (both full members and postgraduate members): free membership of APS for 2007 (which includes subscription to their four in-house journals) with the prospects of a reduced sub in 2008 (or a free sub in 2008 for those who are already members). We think this is a great offer (a “no brainer” as our friends in the US might say) and members can follow how to take this up in the announcement in this issue or via the letter posted on our website.

As usual we welcome (subject to confirmation) many new members, both full and postgraduate (and we expect more affiliate members as the General Meeting approaches!). With great regret, however, we note the untimely passing of one of our esteemed members, María Ros. We are grateful to Carmen Huici and Hector Grad for their obituary in these pages which reminds us so well of María’s valuable contribution to social psychology in Spain, Europe and indeed across the globe.

Although this may seem like a quiet issue and quiet time in the cycle of the Association we are constantly in a process of renewal and regeneration. Two clear examples of this are that we will need to elect new committee members, and also make awards to those who have made outstanding contributions to research and to the Association, at the General Meeting. Although this seems like a long way off, it is never too early to start thinking about who to nominate for these positions and

awards and the current issue contains a reminder of the procedures and deadlines, also posted on the website. It is with some sadness that four of us on the committee will be stepping down next summer (Fritz, Patrizia, Eddy and myself), which means (more positively) that there will be four positions on the committee available (unlike three last time). If there are people you think deserve and can best serve the Association it is never too early to think about encouraging them. On this note of renewal I bid you farewell until the next (bigger) but no less healthy bulletin in October (el gordo)!

Russell Spears

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

As one of the survivors from the period when EAESP came into existence, I may perhaps be permitted a brief note of support for Guen Semin's proposal for the dropping of 'experimental'.

At that time a good deal of social psychology in Europe remained rooted in a tradition that was largely descriptive. The founding members regarded it as insufficiently rigorous, and in order emphasize their new departure decided to include the term 'experimental' in the name of the Association. However, even at that early period membership was in practice not strictly confined to experimentalists.

Today the situation is very different and a deliberate assertion, understandable under the then prevailing circumstances, is no longer needed. As Guen Semin rightly observed, there are now a variety of approaches; and 'non-experimental' cannot be equated with 'unscientific'.

Gustav Jahoda

We should keep the second E because the experimental method is at the heart of EAESP's identity.

Gün Semin (2006) suggested in the last issue of EBSP that the name of the Association be changed into "European Association of Social Psychology". He discussed two potential benefits of dropping the term "experimental". First, it would be easier to pronounce EASP than EAESP. Second, members who do not use the experimental method may feel less identity threat

than under the current name. In my opinion, the second issue deserves to be taken more seriously than the first.

Indeed, it would be very unfortunate if members who do not randomly assign and manipulate everything they can would feel excluded by the second E in EAESP. I would immediately cancel my membership. However, I am glad to be a member of the EAESP, for the following reasons. The word “experimental” has a more basic meaning than we are accustomed to. It means ‘to test, to try’ (McGuire, 1967). Probably most members would like to cling on to a term with that meaning, because it pulls us out of our armchairs and offices and summons us to explore the empirical validity of our ideas.

And there is a more fundamental reason to be glad to be a member of the EAESP. In fact, I came across McGuire (1967) reading Henri Tajfel’s (1972) famous chapter on “Experiments in a vacuum”. In this chapter, Tajfel takes a very critical view of experiments as they were conducted at that time. It is important to note that he did not blame the method per se, but the non-social nature of the variables that were studied. I am not sure how Tajfel would comment on current European social psychology. However, if you read the latest volumes of EJSP, you will find many examples of truly social variables with great significance outside the laboratory. And the significance of these variables is uncorrelated with design features such as random assignment and experimental manipulation. I believe that this development is something to be proud of. European social psychology emerged from a near-crisis as a science capable of conducting social experiments.

If the second E in EAESP does not exclude anybody (except those who prefer not to expose their ideas to reality checks), and if it tells an important story about the past achievements of the Association, I don’t think we should abandon it. And some very common French words (including ones with three consecutive vowels) are much more difficult to pronounce than EAESP. But I think a majority of French people would take too much pride in their language to change them.

- McGuire, W.J. (1967). Some impending reorientations in social psychology. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 3, 124-139.
- Semin, G.R. (2006). Changing the name of the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology (EAESP) into European Association of Social Psychology – Discussion. *European Bulletin of Social Psychology*, 18, 5.
- Tajfel, H. (1972). Experiments in a vacuum. In J. Israel & H. Tajfel (Eds.), *The context of social psychology: A critical assessment*, (pp. 69-119). London: Academic Press.

Johannes Ullrich

New Books by Members

Social identities: Motivational, emotional and cultural influences

Edited by **Rubert Brown** and **Dora Capozza**

Psychology Press, ISBN: 1-84169-549-1, 292 pp

From publisher's book description:

The concept of social identity occupies a central position in contemporary social psychology. *Social Identities: Motivational, Emotional, Cultural Influences* reports recent developments in the analysis of motivational and affective aspects of social identity processes. The book also examines the cross-cultural generality of Social Identity Theory explanations of intergroup competition, which have strongly influenced international research in this area. An increasing stream of research is being devoted to extending the applicability of social identity concepts to intergroup relations and related fields.

The editors present a collection of contributions from leading figures in social psychology which explore the state of the art in Social Identity Theory. Central themes are:

- motivations which lead individuals to join a group and identify with it
- the role emotions have in favouring (or hindering) intergroup relations
- the effect of emotions on intergroup behaviour
- how people react to social identity threats

Shedding new light on important social problems like prejudice, bigotry, and intense conflicts around the world, this unique volume will be indispensable to students and researchers in social psychology, sociology and cultural studies.

CONTENTS***Introduction***

1. Motivational, emotional and cultural influences in social identity processes

Rupert Brown & Dora Capozza

Part I. Motivation, identification and intergroup relations

2. Self-conceptual uncertainty and the lure of belonging

Michael A. Hogg

3. A comparison of motivational theories of identification

Dora Capozza, Rupert Brown, Sabina Aharpour & Rossella Falvo

4. Extending the self in space and time: Social identification and existential concerns

Emanuele Castano, Vincent Yzerbyt, Maria-Paola Paladino & Andrea Carnaghi

5. Living on the edge: Dynamics of intragroup and intergroup rejection experiences

Jolanda Jetten, Nyla R. Branscombe & Russell Spears

6. Protecting a threatened identity through sexual harassment: A social identity interpretation

Anne Maass & Mara Cadinu

Part II. Cultural and evolutionary aspects of ingroup identification

7. Social identity motives in evolutionary perspective

Marilynn B. Brewer & Linnda R. Caporael

8. Social identity theory in cross-cultural perspective

Peter B. Smith & Karen M. Long

Part III. Emotions in intergroup relations

9. It's about time: Intergroup emotions as time-dependent phenomena

Eliot R. Smith & Diane M. Mackie

10. Connecting social identity theory and cognitive appraisal theory of emotions

Patricia Garcia-Prieto & Klaus R. Scherer

11. Intergroup contact and the promotion of intergroup harmony: The influence of intergroup emotions

Stefania Paolini, Miles Hewstone, Alberto Voci, Jake Harwood & Ed Cairns

12. Emotional antecedents and consequences of common ingroup identity

Kelly M. Johnson, Samuel L. Gaertner, John F. Dovidio, Missy A. Houlette, Blake M. Riek & Eric W. Mania

13. Intergroup contact and levels of categorization: Effects on intergroup emotions

Roberto González & Rupert Brown

Essential Social Psychology

Authored by **Richard J. Crisp**¹⁾ and **Rhiannon N. Turner**²⁾ 2007

ISBN: 9780761942153 (pb) | £22.99 GBP | 408 pages

www.sagepub.com.uk

Essential Social Psychology introduces students to the core theories, approaches, and findings that are the necessary foundations for developing an understanding of social psychology. Aimed at students taking social psychology for the first time, whether as part of a degree course in psychology or as a subsidiary option within other degree programmes, this textbook will make studying social psychology enjoyable and memorable.

¹⁾ **Richard J. Crisp** is Professor of Psychology at the University of Kent at Canterbury, UK.

²⁾ **Rhiannon N. Turner** is a Lecturer in Psychology at the University of Leeds, UK.

Key features of this book include:

- Theory and basic level empirical demonstrations of social psychological phenomena, to ensure that important concepts are as accessible as possible
- Extensive pedagogy – chapter overviews; textboxes summarising research studies; ‘mental maps’ to help reinforce understanding; key concepts highlighted in the text and glossary
- A Companion Website delivering a range of lecturer and student-friendly features. The URL for this website is www.sagepub.co.uk/crispandturner

Table of contents

Chapter 1: The Self

Chapter 2: Social Cognition

Chapter 3: Attitudes

Chapter 4: Group Processes

Chapter 5: Social Influence

Chapter 6: Prejudice

Chapter 7: Aggression

Chapter 8: Prosocial Behaviour

Chapter 9: Affiliation and Attraction

Chapter 10: Friendship and Love

Reviews

'Essential Social Psychology is an engagingly written text that is inclusive in its coverage of the field. The book is scholarly and comprehensive, yet written in an accessible and interesting style. Instructors will be impressed by the substance of the book, and students will appreciate its clear prose, examples, and organization. Crisp and Turner offer fresh perspectives and succeed in producing a text that will speak effectively to students taking a first course in social psychology and excite them with the field's insights and relevance in their lives.'

Professor Jack Dovidio, Yale University, USA

'The approach makes social psychology relevant, exciting and accessible...I thought it was a bit of a page turner!'

Dr Fenja Ziegler, University of Nottingham UK

To Be an Immigrant

By **Kay Deaux**

Russell Sage Foundation

For information on ordering the book, see:

<http://www.russellsage.org/publications/books/060712.429956>

Immigration is one of the major social and political phenomena of our day, affecting millions of people in countries throughout the world. Although most often discussed in broad demographic terms with an emphasis on labor markets and social services, immigration is also a story of people and social process. In *To Be an Immigrant*, Kay Deaux brings a social psychological perspective to this conceptually rich area, considering how immigrants are defined, shaped, and challenged by the sociocultural environments that they encounter. Theories and research on topics such as attitudes, stereotypes and prejudice, ethnic and national identity, and

social representations are discussed. Further, these processes are embedded in the political and demographic realities of social policy and population movement. This “penetrating psychological treatment” (Douglas S. Massey) is “essential reading for all who care about this critical issue” (Thomas Pettigrew).

Intuition in Judgment and Decision Making

Edited by **Henning Plessner, Cornelia Betsch & Tilmann Betsch**

(2007)

Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 340 pages

ISBN 0-8058-5741-9, publisher's website www.erlbaum.com

A main goal of the book is to bring a learning perspective into the discussion about intuition in judgment and decision making. Therefore, the book gathers recent work on intuitive decision making that goes beyond the current dominant heuristic processing perspective. However, that does not mean that the book will strictly oppose this perspective. On the contrary, the unique perspective of the book helps to tie together different conceptualizations of intuition and develop an integrative approach to the psychological understanding of intuition in judgment and decision making. Accordingly, some of the chapters reflect prior research from the heuristic processing perspective in the new light of a learning perspective. In sum, the book provides a representative overview of what we currently know about intuition in judgment and decision making. The authors provide latest theoretical developments, integrative frameworks and state-of-the-art reviews of research in the laboratory and in the field. Moreover, some chapters deal with applied topics. Therefore, it aims not only at the interest of students and researchers from psychology, but also at scholars from neighboring social and behavioral sciences such as economy, sociology, political sciences, and neurosciences.

Contents

Henning Plessner, Cornelia Betsch, and Tilmann Betsch: Preface

Part I: The Nature of Intuition

1. *Tilmann Betsch: The Nature of Intuition and its Neglect in Research of Judgment and Decision Making*
2. *Seymour Epstein: Intuition from the Perspective of Cognitive-Experiential Self-Theory*
3. *Roland Deutsch and Fritz Strack: Variants of Judgment and Decision-Making: The Perspective of the Reflective-Impulsive Model*
4. *Robert M. Hamm: Cue by Hypothesis Interactions in Descriptive Modeling of Unconscious Use of Multiple Intuitive Judgment Strategies*
5. *Kirsten G. Volz and D. Yves von Cramon: Can Neuroscience Tell a Story About Intuition?*

Part II: Learning and Intuition

6. *Robin M. Hogarth: On the Learning of Intuition*
7. *Henning Plessner, Tilmann Betsch, Elke Schallies, and Christiane Schwier: Automatic Online-Formation of Implicit Attitudes Towards Politicians as a Basis for Intuitive Voting Behavior*
8. *Markus Raab and Joseph G. Johnson: Implicit Learning as a Means to Intuitive Decision Making in Sports*
9. *Ido Erev, Dvorit Shimonowitch, Amos Schurr, and Ralph Hertwig: Base Rates: How to Make the Intuitive Mind Appreciate or Neglect Them*
10. *Klaus Fiedler and Yaakov Kareev: Implications and Ramifications of a Sample-Size Approach to Intuition*

Part III: Emotion and Intuition

11. *Marcel Zeelenberg, Rob Nelissen, and Rik Pieters: Emotion, Motivation, and Decision Making: A Feeling-Is-for-Doing Approach*
12. *Elke U. Weber and Patricia Lindemann: From Intuition to Analysis: Making Decisions with Your Head, Your Heart, or by the Book*
13. *Jonathan Haidt and Selin Kesebir: In the Forest of Value: Why Moral Intuitions are Different from Other Kinds*
14. *Cornelia Betsch: Chronic Preferences for Intuition and Deliberation in Decision Making: Lessons Learned About Intuition from an Individual Differences Approach*

Part IV: The Assets and Deficits of Intuition

15. *Henning Plessner and Sabine Czenna*: The Benefits of Intuition
16. *Susanne Haberstroh*: Intuitive and Deliberate Strategies in Frequency Estimation
17. *Christian Unkelbach and Henning Plessner*: The Sampling Trap of Intuitive Judgments: Can Reflection Reach Beyond Sampling Constraints?
18. *Steve Catty and Jamin Halberstadt*: The Use and Disruption of Familiarity in Intuitive Judgments
19. *Andreas Gloeckner*: Does Intuition Beat Fast and Frugal Heuristics? A Systematic Empirical Analysis.

Testimonials

"Psychology and decision sciences have for too long been out of the mainstream of the other natural sciences, mainly evolutionary biology and neuroscience, by putting the conscious cart before the unconscious horse. Finally, a collection of essays by leading experts in human reasoning and decision making that takes the unconscious seriously as a force in producing important decisions. This book provides a much needed counterweight to the dominant 'conscious and rational' model of human decision making. Hats off to the editors for gathering just those authors who are doing the cutting edge research in this area, as well as for the original idea to produce this much needed collection."

John A. Bargh (Yale University)

"This volume examines in depth 'intuition', one of the most often mentioned and yet least systematically investigated concepts of lay psychology. It provides a well rounded discussion that covers the manifold aspects of this fascinating phenomenon. The book is successful in bringing together ample cutting edge insights into what intuitive judgment might entail. It is timely, thought provoking and comprehensive. A must read for anyone interested in the intricacies of human judgment and impression formation."

Arie W. Kruglanski (University of Maryland)

Le partage social des émotions (The social sharing of emotions)

Bernard Rimé (University of Louvain at Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium)

Foreword by Serge Moscovici

Paris: Presses Universitaires de France (2005)

Price 29 €, 420 pages, ISBN 2 13 050993 2

Summary

In the Western culture, emotion is traditionally conceived as a temporary disorganization of human adaptation and is thus expected to fade away completely as soon mental and behavioral control would resume. Scientific theories accentuated homeostatic views in which emotion is also bound to clear up quickly once its evolutionary-rooted adaptational role is completed. Contrasting with these views, studies upon which this book relies abundantly documented the fact that emotional experiences are the starting place of important social behaviors. Data from a broad variety of cultures indeed showed that those who experienced an emotion systematically share it with several close persons. The latter being generally affected by what they heard, they later share it with their own close persons. Again, the latter often evidence a similar inclination. A collective propagation thus results from what initially affected a single member of a community.

What are the motives underlying such a marked proclivity to socially share emotions? Common sense generally endorses a cathartic view of emotional expression, thus assuming that sharing an experience can purge its emotional impact. However, empirical tests of this assumption yielded unsupportive conclusions. Despite stereotypes, sharing an emotion does not bring emotional recovery. Mere sharing cannot wipe out an emotional memory. Yet, those who shared generally report important benefits from such interpersonal interactions.

The book examines questions raised by the social sharing of emotion in the light of a broad number relevant social and cognitive concepts: e.g., attachment, interpersonal dynamic, empathy, emotional fusion, social integration, impact of emotion on knowledge bases and worldviews,

search for meaning, transformation of representation, social rituals and collective expression of emotion.

Content

Foreword, by Serge Moscovici

Introduction

Part 1 Emotion and expression: an introduction

Chapter 1 The emotions. A look at history

Chapter 2 What is an emotion?

Chapter 3 Understanding emotions

Chapter 4 The social sharing of emotions

Part 2 Expression of emotions: social aspects

Chapter 5 On the listener side

Chapter 6 To whom do we tell our emotions?

Chapter 7 The social propagation of emotional information

Part 3 Expression of negative emotional experiences

Chapter 8 Welcome and unwelcome responses

Chapter 9 When emotional episodes are kept secret

Chapter 10 Emotion, expression, liberation? Deeply-rooted popular beliefs...

Part 4 Lessons from the study of traumatic emotional experiences

Chapter 11 Traumatic emotions: A look at history

Chapter 12 Understanding traumatic emotions

Chapter 13 The impact of traumatic emotions

Part 5 Emotional experiences, their impact and their regulation

Chapter 14 Emotion and the production of meaning

Chapter 15 Emotion and expression: Beyond simplism

Chapter 16 The social matrix of emotional experiences

Identity, Morality, and Threat: Studies in Violent Conflict

Ed. by **Daniel Rothbart**¹⁾ and **Karina V. Korostelina**²⁾ (2006).

Lexington Books, Discounted Price \$ 76,50 (15% off), List Price \$ 90,00

Cloth 0-7391-1618-5 Nov 28, 2006 420pp

Identity, Morality, and Threat: Studies in Violent Conflict offers a critical examination of the social psychological processes that generate outgroup devaluation and ingroup glorification as the source of conflict. Dr. Daniel Rothbart and Dr. Karyna Korostelina bring together essays analyzing the causal relationship between escalating violence and opposing images of the Self and Other. The essays confront the practice of demonizing the Other as a justification for violent conflict and the conditions that enable these distorted images to shape future decisions. The authors provide insight into the possibilities for transforming threat-narratives into collaboration-narratives, and for changing past opposition into mutual understanding. *Identity, Morality, and Threat* is a strong contribution to the study of identity-based conflict and psychological defenses.

¹⁾ Daniel Rothbart is associate professor of philosophy and conflict analysis at George Mason University.

²⁾ Karina Korostelina is a research professor at the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University.

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

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 1-3, 2008, Kazimierz Dolny, Poland

Small Group Meeting on Dehumanization: Determinants and Consequences of Perceiving Others as Less Than Humans

Organisers: Mirosław Kofta, Jacques-Philippe Leyens, Emanuela Castano, Michał Bilewicz

Contact: Mirosław Kofta (kofta@psych.uw.edu.pl)

June 6-9, 2008, The Netherlands

Small Group Meeting on Emotions, social identity, and intergroup conflict

Organisers: Sabine Otten & Ernestine Gordijn

Contact: Sabine Otten (s.otten@rug.nl)

June 10-14, 2008, Opatija, Croatia

15th General Meeting of the EAESP

Organisers: Dinka Corkalo Biruski & Dean Ajdukovic

Future EAESP Meetings

Small Group Meeting

On Dehumanization: Determinants and Consequences of Perceiving Others as Less Than Humans

June 1-3, 2008, Kazimierz Dolny, Poland

[Organisers: Miroslaw Kofta, Jacques-Philippe Leyens, Emanuela Castano, Michal Bilewicz

Contact: kofta@psych.uw.edu.pl]

In recent years, research concerning various forms of dehumanization (e.g., infra-humanization, mechanistic dehumanization, moral exclusion) has flourished. Publications, presentations and posters at the Würzburg EAESP general meeting, several symposia at SESP annual meeting, at SPSP General Conference and Pre-conference, and a soon-to appear special issue of Social Cognition are all events that witness the centrality of this topic in social psychology research.

The process of dehumanization, and its links to intergroup violence, has attracted the interest of psychologists and social scientists in general for decades. However, with few exceptions, its discussion has mostly been theoretical or characterized by the consideration of limited and anecdotal empirical evidence. On the contrary, the new interest innovates by a more systematic effort to test experimentally the hypotheses deriving from various theoretical models and to develop measures of dehumanization. Its detection mobilizes techniques as diverse as content analyses, questionnaires, implicit measures, or neuro-imaging. In other words, research on dehumanization is now akin to, although it greatly expands upon, traditional research in stereotyping, prejudice, and intergroup bias.

Dehumanization is a complex process. It takes different forms in strong, protracted conflicts than in milder ones. It seems to differ depending on the relationship between the ingroup and the outgroup, sometimes being akin to animalization of the other, while at other times equating the

target to an emotionless machine. And while it occurs in subtle forms in everyday life, it can be used to prepare for intergroup violence, or to justify past violence against another group. We are also interested in the opposite process: How people humanize themselves, ingroups or (sometimes) outgroups? When one thinks about how to combat dehumanization, it is very natural to focus on the processes allowing to perceive others - also outgroupers - as full-scale human beings.

Recognizing the complexity of this phenomenon, the aim of the small group meeting is to bring together researchers representing this great variety in situations, theories, and techniques to assess it, with the goal of drawing a map of the existing research, and to facilitate exchange and cross-fertilization among researchers.

If you are interested in participating in this meeting, please send an email with an abstract to Miroslaw Kofta (kofta@psych.uw.edu.pl) until March 15, 2008.

Small Group Meeting

On Emotions, Social Identity, and Intergroup Conflict

June 6-9, The Netherlands, exact place will be announced later

[Organisers: Sabine Otten & Ernestine Gordijn, University of Groningen
Contact: s.otten@rug.nl]

Suicide bombings in Irak or Israel or violent protests against globalization are illustrative examples of how social identifications and a pronounced categorization in "us" versus "them" can seriously intensify conflict situations. But also in less spectacular daily encounters, ingroup and outgroup distinctions substantially determine emotional reactions and subsequent behavioral intentions, such as the intention to retaliate or to

punish. Memberships in social groups and structural and functional aspects of intergroup relations, such as power relations or interdependence, affect the probability of escalation and deescalation in social conflicts, and group-based emotions are relevant mediators in this process. Conversely, collective shame or guilt can help instigate conflict resolution and reparation. Undoubtedly, group-based emotions are relevant for our understanding of intergroup conflict. Therefore, 15 years after Intergroup Emotions Theory (IET) was published by Eliot Smith in 1993, we would like to instigate a meeting providing a survey and possibly integration of the rich body of empirical evidence collected since then, and inspiring a reflection on future perspectives in this field.

The current meeting aims at bringing together postgraduate, junior and senior researchers in the field. Besides submissions focussing directly on intergroup emotions and conflict, we also welcome contributions from other domains that can be applied in this field. The format of the meeting will be single session (no parallel tracks), and we will pay specific attention that the schedule will provide ample space for discussion. We believe that this meeting will be successful in bringing existing lines of research together, and in inspiring future cooperations. We explicitly ask for indications of interest and submissions by both junior and senior researchers.

If you are interested in participating in this meeting, please send an email with an abstract (max. 250 words) to Sabine Otten (s.otten@rug.nl) until November 1, 2007.

Reports of Previous Meetings

Medium Sized Meeting On Social Developmental Perspectives on Intergroup Inclusion and Exclusion

At the Centre for the Study of Group Processes, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK, 18th – 22nd July 2006

Organisers: Dominic Abrams & Adam Rutland

The ground breaking work of Aboud (1988), focusing on children's prejudice has spawned a number of cross-disciplinary lines of work in social and developmental psychology but researchers from different backgrounds publish largely only to their own sub-discipline audiences. Recently the distinct lines of theory and research in developmental and social psychology have become more closely integrated. Thus it was timely to bring this work into focus in a single event with development of intergroup relationships in childhood and adolescence as the central theme.

The meeting brought together over 30 researchers from 10 different countries, and evenly spread between social and developmental psychology to share the latest theory, research and methods in studying intergroup inclusion and exclusion from a social-developmental perspective. We aimed to foster a more strongly shared perspective for researchers in this area to exchange ideas and findings as well as informal opportunities to consider collaborative research, to establish a network and possibilities for mentoring and collaboration for the next generations of researchers in this area.

The meeting included oral presentations, posters with orally presented synopses, and a debate/discussion session with a key witness panel. Details are available from the website, <http://www.kent.ac.uk/psychology/conferences/eaesp>. (For the not too squeamish there is a photo of the delegates, <http://www.kent.ac.uk/psychology/conferences/eaesp/photos.htm>)

We started with an all important contextual orientation and jet lag recovery phase, in the form of a Canterbury River Tour, during which delegates risked their lives in flat-bottomed boats while learning the history of Canterbury. This included a diversionary conversation with a local Friar and a reminder that even in mediaeval times social categorization was fundamental (The White Friars, Black Friars and the Grey Friars each with their own territory).

The meeting was constructed around several themes. Firstly, talks considered the relationship between implicit and societal influences on children's intergroup perceptions. Presentations by Ileana Enesco, Andrew Scott Baron, Stephanie Davies, Juliane Degner and Yarrow Dunham considered implicit intergroup bias in children. In particular, the extent to which prejudice may emerge from basic categorisation processes or may be acquired and embedded early in social perception. Other talks within this theme addressed the influence of societal and group processes on intergroup relations. Yona Teichman considered the role of conflict in children's interethnic attitudes, while Maria Monteiro focuses on normative processes in prejudice control. Diana Grace considered how differences in gender prejudice can be seen to reflect power, status and normative differences, while Peter Noack examined how identification and relative prototypicality influenced intergroup attitudes in East German adolescents.

On the theme of the dynamics of social exclusion, Melanie Killen, Nick Emler, Dominic Abrams and Drew Nesdales' presentations considered how group based exclusion develops and how intragroup processes, norms, conventions and morality each come to influence the development of children's use, and understanding, of social exclusion.

A third theme was how intergroup contact may improve social inclusion. Lindsey Cameron, Roberto Gonzalez, and Allard Feddes each presented experimental and longitudinal evidence that direct and extended contact can improve children's intergroup attitudes, suggesting effective strategies for use in educational and other settings. Michelle Wittig and Adam Rutland considered how developmental models of acculturation and intergroup contact can be used to reduce children's and adolescent's

prejudice, and also promote social integration and psychological adaptation.

The meeting also had two poster sessions both of which included excellent posters preceded by 5 minute presentations in a mini symposium format. These focused on the development of prejudice in school children (Tina Farhan), children's emotional responses to intergroup threat (Leyla De Amicis), gender ingroup favouritism in middle childhood (Kim Powlishta, presenting on behalf of Thi Tran Miller), social hierarchy and inequality in reasoning about peer harassment (Stacy Horn), moderation of prejudice through social accountability (Ricardo Rodrigues), the role of parents in conveying outgroup derogation (Margareta Jelić) and multi-modal social cognitive training as a means of reducing prejudice in primary school children (Andreas Beelmann, Diana Schulz) .

The meeting held three thematic workshops to identify current questions for theory and research. These focused on the link between implicit and societal processes, exclusion processes and intergroup contact. The plenary session was then followed by a much needed banquet at The Goods Shed a former railway building now the site of a farmers market and excellent restaurant.

The next morning, perhaps slightly later than originally planned but with maximum gusto, the meeting convened to consider practical implications of this work for schools, and implications for policy at local and national levels. The meeting concluded with a lively and entertaining panel discussion at which questions plucked somewhat randomly from the audience were answered by Melanie Killen, Drew Nesdale, Andrew Scott Baron, Michelle Wittig and Peter Noack. This revealed both interesting differences and convergences in perspectives across the panel. After an open discussion to consider future plans, the meeting was closed and delegates enjoyed lunch outdoors at the Dolphin pub, and a tour of Canterbury Cathedral.

Throughout the meeting the weather was exceptionally hot, so we were grateful for the air conditioning and unlimited supplies of cold water. The meeting was also supported by the secretarial and technical team at the department, particularly Lisa Price and Keith Franklin who organised the

practical aspects, and website, and to Joe Pelletier, Alison Benbow, Sarah Fitzroy who greeted delegates and helped with registration. Most of all though, the meeting was intellectually and socially invigorating for all the participants, many of who wrote to express their appreciation and enthusiasm for the event. Some of the material presented at the conference will also be appearing in a special issue of the International Journal of Behavioral Development, edited by Adam Rutland, Sheri Levy and Dominic Abrams in 2007.

At various stages of the meeting and afterwards all the participants expressed their gratitude to EAESP for supporting this event which was intensive, productive and enjoyable. We hope and anticipate that further activities will follow both within and outside EAESP.

Dominic Abrams and Adam Rutland

Grants

Katarzyna Aluchna (postgraduate travel grant)
Martin Bruder (seedcorn grant)
Antonio Bustillos (postgraduate travel grant)
Aleksandra Cislak (postdoctoral travel grant)
Oliver Christ (postdoctoral travel grant)
Marieke de Vries (postgraduate travel grant)
Natalie Hall (postdoctoral travel grant)
Michel Handgraaf (postdoctoral travel grant)
Nicolas Kervyn (postgraduate travel grant)
Dorota Kobylinska (postdoctoral travel grant)
Armelle Nugier (postgraduate travel grant)
Stefano Pagliaro (postgraduate travel grant)
Sjoerd Pennekamp (postgraduate travel grant)
Nicole Tausch (postgraduate travel grant)

GRANT REPORTS**Theodore Alexopoulos**

(University of Paris Descartes, France)

postgraduate travel grant

During the month of June 2006, I visited Prof. Paula Niedenthal at the LAPSCO, University of Clermont-Ferrand, France. Despite the short length of my stay, it has been a very stimulating and inspiring experience for the continuation of my research. I am grateful to the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology that helped me realize this trip.

The aim of my visit was to work in close collaboration with Paula Niedenthal, to exchange ideas concerning research results, to learn new methodologies and to expand my knowledge to different areas of research.

I was given a warm welcome at Clermont-Ferrand. As soon as I arrived, I was invited to participate in various activities inside the laboratory (seminars and meetings) as well as outside the laboratory: It might seem anecdotic but I still remember this interesting debate on the reliability of psychoanalytic therapies in a bar that was organized by Prof. Markus Brauer on the second day after my arrival.

At the time of my visit, I had come to a crucial point of my PhD where I had to decide the directions for my future research and where suggestions from other researchers were welcome. Paula gave me a unique opportunity to give a talk to the members of the laboratory. I seized this opportunity and presented a large body of research that I had undertaken for the past two years. We had a fruitful debate on the theories I presented, the possible alternative interpretations of the data and we came up with ideas for next studies.

My main research hypotheses are partly based on embodiment theories. This justified the choice for visiting Paula and her team who are currently investigating new ideas in this domain (e.g., Niedenthal, Barsalou, Winkielman, Krauth-Gruber, & Ric; 2005). I had weekly discussions with Paula about some important theoretical questions. I feel privileged that I had the opportunity to learn from her. I'm fond of her enthusiastic and charismatic way of doing research. I tried to beneficiate as much as I could from her ingenuity and experience.

During my stay I was also interested in EMG measures. Paula allowed me to spend some time in the experimental room where I had the opportunity to get familiar with the equipment. At the same time, I learned a lot on the EMG technique (e.g., Fridlund & Cacioppo, 1986).

Together with Paula, we came up with several ideas for future experiments. One of these concerns the embodied representation of affective stimuli. In a study we would like to compare different types of simulation instructions of emotional stimuli and their physiological concomitants such as facial, visceral or behavioral reactions. We discussed another study that would deal with the neural mechanisms of imitation of different basic emotions. These experiments will be realized in the near future.

In the last part of my stay, I took advantage of the scientifically stimulating environment to write an article on bodily feedback and stereotype use with data that was previously collected. This article is currently on his way for publication.

By the end of June, while I was preparing to go back home with a lot of new ideas and some great scientific as well as human experiences in my bag, Paula proposed me to stay one more week to attend to a seminar by Liz Phelps on the role of the amygdala in the processing of information. I was delighted with that proposition and stayed some more in the laboratory, I was obviously becoming part of the group.

I would like to thank Paula Niedenthal for inviting me in her lab, for all the stimulating discussions we had and for all the great moments I shared with her and her team. On the first occasion, I will return to Clermont-Ferrand for another instructive and fulfilling stay. I also take the opportunity to thank once more the Association that made all this become possible.

References:

- Fridlund, A. J., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). Guidelines for electromyographic research. *Psychophysiology*, 23, 567-589.
- Niedenthal, P. M., Barsalou, L. W., Winkielman, P., Kraut-Gruber, S., & Ric, F. (2005). Embodiment in attitudes, social perception, and emotion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9, 184-211.

Constantina Badea

(Universite Paris 5, France)
postdoctoral travel grant

The postdoctoral travel grant enabled me to visit the School of Psychology, University of Exeter (United Kingdom), from October to December 2006. My PhD examined how self-stereotyping might be used as a strategy for balancing the needs for assimilation and differentiation in inter-group context. The purpose of this visit was to develop new research

projects in this area with Profesor Jolanda Jetten and other members of this school, who are internationally, recognized experts in intra-group dynamics and intergroup distinctiveness.

One of my postdoctoral studies proposes that assimilation and distinctiveness needs might interact with social identity concerns (i.e., threat). Based on optimal distinctiveness theory, we predict that, under no threat conditions, levels of distinctiveness and assimilation would be most optimal for members of the moderately sized group which should lead them to identify most strongly with their group. Levels of identification should be lower for members of very small and very large groups. Furthermore, we predict that when people face a threat to their identity, dealing with this threat would override optimal distinctiveness concerns. Very small groups will be more likely to respond collectively to identity threat than groups of moderate size or very large groups.

We also examined whether the group's representation as collection of individuals versus its representation as an undifferentiated mass depends on changes in in-group status. As a function of intergroup comparison, in-group social status might be higher or lower. The question is whether in-group representations become more variable or more homogenous across different intergroup contexts.

Another one of my postdoctoral projects is about acculturation strategies of Romanian people in France. This research is carried out in collaboration with Professor Jolanda Jetten, Professor Tom Postmes, and Dr Aarti Iyer. Previous studies of acculturation strategies have taken into account the relationship between immigrants and the host society. Building on this research we also examine the relationship between immigrants, their own community and their country of origin.

During my stay at University of Exeter, I was able to attend many talks hosted by the Social, Economic and Organisational Psychology Research Group. In this context I had the pleasure to meet Professor Karen Dion from the University of Toronto who talked about her research on "Ethnic identity in a multicultural society". I have the opportunity to present myself studies developed with Professor Françoise Askevis-Leherpeux during my PhD.

I also attended workshops on analytic issues and on questionnaire design on the internet as well as other formal and informal meetings. I would like to thank Professor Alex Haslam for his useful suggestions on group representation research.

I am very grateful for the kindness and the hospitality of this extraordinary team.

Ganze Baray

(University of Exeter, UK)

postgraduate travel grant

In September 2006, I visited Prof Bill Swann at the University of Texas (UT) at Austin for three months. This research visit was an invaluable learning experience for which I would like to thank EAESP for the financial support.

The aims of my visit to Austin were threefold. Firstly I was willing to find out the differences between European and American social psychological research. Secondly collaborating with Prof Swann and benefit from his vast knowledge and experience was a worthwhile opportunity by itself. And thirdly the overlap between my PhD project and Prof Swann and his colleagues' interest in the psychology of extremism could pave the way for a future collaboration as well as for novel ideas that I could further examine in my PhD.

When I arrived at UT Austin psychology department, I was mesmerized and slightly puzzled because of the huge department building. While both trying to find my way and pretending I was not lost at all, I was already welcomed by the students who were going to be my colleagues for the next three months. Certainly the friendly environment had helped me a lot to adapt to the new department, to the new city and to the new country.

Throughout our initial meetings with Prof Swann and his PhD student Conor Seyle, we elaborated and specified the various issues that we would like to work on. Our main aim was to scrutinize the reasons why people tend to endorse extremist beliefs and attitudes about the group(s) they feel connected to. This question was very much related to my PhD project; in our previous research undertaken in collaboration with and under supervision of Prof Tom Postmes and Prof Jolanda Jetten, we have proposed that some social identities – such as religious, political or ethnic affiliation – have a ‘self-defining’ power the power to inform both social *and personal identity* and consequent individual attitudes and behaviour through their normative frameworks. Prof. Swann and his colleagues, on the other hand, have investigated psychology of extremism with a specific focus on the individual level variables. They suggest that identity fusion – a complete overlap between social and personal self-views – is an important predictor of willingness to self-sacrifice for the group. This proposition, thus, was very much in agreement with the main idea of our previous research. Bringing together the two different but complimentary foci on extremism– self-defining power of social identities and the perceived overlap between social and personal self-views – we designed an online study where we examined the relation between American identity and the tendency to endorse extremist beliefs and attitudes. Preliminary results showed that there is indeed a relation between perceived overlap between social and personal self-descriptions (identity fusion) and willingness to self-sacrifice for the ingroup Americans. Moreover we found a strong relationship between the self-defining potential of American identity and the tendency to endorse extremist beliefs. In the light of these findings we further discussed alternative ways to operationalise the topic in question and related issues that could be investigated in the future.

Along with our research, Prof Swann kindly invited me to attend his weekly graduate lecture on social psychology. This experience was certainly very inspiring. The fierce discussions during these lectures enabled me to think critically on a wide variety of topics and classical studies that I have not questioned before. I also had a chance to attend weekly lab meetings of Prof Swann’s research group where each student had an opportunity to present their ideas and get feedback from other colleagues. During these meetings I also got helpful feedback about my own PhD project.

My visit to UT Austin psychology department not only broadened my knowledge and understanding of social psychology, but also it provided me with a broader perspective for my future academic career. Moreover it was a great opportunity to meet other postgraduates and compare notes on a variety of issues such as our research, unbearable lightness of being a postgraduate and alternative ways to sustain our inspiration. We certainly came up with fruitful and promising ideas about all of these issues.

Along with very friendly members of the UT Austin psychology department, I would like to thank specifically to: Prof Swann for this wonderful learning experience and his fine hospitality; Conor Seyle, Scott Liening and Amy Gonzales for being great colleagues and friends; and EAESP for the postgraduate travel award which supported this valuable experience.

Joris Lammers

(Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, The Netherlands)

postgraduate travel grant

From September until December 2006, I visited the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois, to work with Adam Galinsky. Thanks to a generous financial contribution of the EAESP I was able to spend three wonderful months at this wonderful research university at the bank of Lake Michigan.

The purpose of my visit was to collaborate with Adam Galinsky on a project I had started in Groningen, in which I aimed to show the moderating effect of legitimacy on the effect of power on approach and inhibition. Adam Galinsky is a leading figure in the experimental psychological research on power. Together we were able to attain this goal and run a very interesting line of five studies, that have been submitted for publication. After completing this line of research, Adam Galinsky and I are continuing our collaboration on several other lines of research.

During my stay I also had many interesting discussions about the nature and effects of power, from a broader perspective. The people working at

Kellogg are as intelligent and erudite as they are warm and friendly. In particular I would like to mention Amy Cudy and Roderick Swaab who made me feel very welcome.

Perhaps even more important, while at the other side of the ocean I also discovered the many differences between American and European research practice. The disinhibited way of doing research that I discovered has also influenced my own style of doing research.

Finally, I would like to mention what a great city Chicago is. I can recommend anyone to visit that wonderful city and experience its architecture, parks, museums, and people. I sincerely thank the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology for making my trip possible.

Andreas Mojzisch

(Georg-August-University of Goettingen, Germany)

seedcorn grant

Is the Failure of Groups to Solve Hidden Profiles due to Process Losses or due to Non-Realized Process Gains?

Hidden profiles are group decision tasks in which the superior choice option is hidden from group members when considering their prediscussion information owing to the distribution of unshared information across group members (Stasser, 1988). In a hidden profile, groups can only detect the correct decision by pooling their members' unshared information during discussion. As a consequence, hidden profiles represent an opportunity for group decisions to be superior in quality to those of individual members or the social combinations of the members' individual votes.

However, research from the past two decades has shown that groups frequently fail to solve hidden profiles (cf. Brodbeck, Kerschreiter, Mojzisch, & Schulz-Hardt, in press; Mojzisch & Schulz-Hardt, 2006). In this respect the research on hidden profiles seems to fit perfectly with the

research on group performance which has provided impressive evidence that groups frequently fall short of their potential productivity (cf. Kerr & Tindale, 2004; Schulz-Hardt & Brodbeck, in press). To determine whether groups fall short of, achieve or exceed their potential productivity, group performance researchers typically compute a baseline that predicts the level of productivity one would expect if group interaction neither facilitated nor inhibited group productivity. In other words, group performance researchers want to know what performance would have occurred if the same members had worked independently of each other (i.e., not as a group). This latter performance is called *group potential* and contrasts with how the group actually performs, which is called *real group performance*. If real group performance falls short of the group potential, process losses are said to occur. If, in contrast, real group performance exceeds group potential, process gains must have occurred.

Surprisingly, so far the group potential for hidden profiles has not been determined. This may be due to the fact that the measurement of the group potential is somewhat difficult for hidden profiles. However, without a potential productivity baseline, it is premature to conclude that the failure of groups to solve hidden profiles is due to process losses (because it could also be due to the failure to realize process gains). The present study sought to determine the group potential for hidden profiles and to compare it with the real group performance.

Method

In the present study, 60 three-person groups and 30 individuals ($N = 210$) worked on a personnel selection case with three alternatives. Decision quality was measured on a 6-point scale (developed by McLeod, Baron, Marti, & Yoon, 1997) based on the rank order among the alternatives. To measure the real group performance, the standard hidden profile procedure was used: Each participant first received a subset of the total information set. Participants were asked to study the information individually and to indicate which candidate they preferred. Prior to discussion, they had to hand in their information lists. Thereafter, they were asked to discuss the decision case from memory and to reach a unanimous decision. In the control condition, individual decision makers were asked to make a decision based on the full candidate information.

We distinguished between four alternatives for determining the group potential for hidden profiles:

Alternative 1: According to the classic typology of Steiner (1972), hidden profiles are disjunctive tasks (in a disjunctive task, a group has to choose exactly one among several choice options). Hence, the group potential could be determined by the *best* member's individual decision quality *prior* to group discussion.

Alternative 2: Because hidden profiles are not tasks of the eureka type (i.e., the correct solution is neither evident nor demonstrable for individual group members prior to discussion), it can be argued that it is more appropriate to determine the group potential for hidden profiles by *averaging* the individual group members' decision quality prior to discussion.

Alternative 3: In a hidden profile group members are not able to detect the correct solution based on the information they receive prior to discussion. Hence, it can be argued that determining the group potential by the members' individual decision quality *prior* to discussion (i.e. alternative 1 and 2) results in an underestimation of the group potential. Thus, it may be more appropriate to determine the group potential by the best member's decision quality on the basis of a nominal information exchange. This represents the nominal equivalent to information exchange in a real group. The procedure parallels the one typically used in brainstorming research (i.e., the same number of persons as in the interactive groups generate ideas individually, and the non-redundant ideas are summed up). More specifically, the standard hidden profile procedure was modified as follows: Instead of discussing the decision case with other participants, each of three nominal group members received a recall questionnaire on which she was asked to privately write down all the items of information that she could remember. The experimenter then collected the recall questionnaires from the three nominal group members and immediately created a new information sheet by combining the information recalled by the three participants, eliminating any redundant information. Thereafter, the members of the nominal groups were asked to individually make a final decision after having analyzed the information contained in the new information sheet. The group potential was then

computed as the *best* member's decision quality after the nominal information exchange.

Alternative 4: Finally, it is also plausible to determine the group potential by the *average* group members' performance after the nominal information exchange (see alternative 3).

Results and Discussion

In a first step, we compared the real group performance with the performance of individuals in the control group who received the full candidate information. As predicted, participants in the control condition were more accurate than the real groups. Hence, our decision material successfully induced a hidden profile. Next, we compared the real group performance with the group potential, as measured by each of the four alternative procedures described above. If the group potential was measured by the best group member's or the average nominal group members' performance (i.e. alternative 3 and 4), then the real group performances fell short of the group potential. In other words, the use of the nominal group baseline led to an indication of process losses. In contrast, if the group potential was conceptualized as the best real group member's performance prior to a real group discussion (i.e., alternative 1), there was no significant difference between the real group performance and the group potential. If the group potential was measured as the average real group members' performance prior to a real group discussion (i.e. alternative 2), then the real group performance even significantly exceeded group potential. In other words, the use of this type of group potential led to an indication of process gains.

In sum, the results of the present study show that there is no unequivocal answer to the question whether the failure of groups to solve hidden profiles is due to process losses or due to non-realized process gains. Rather, this answer depends on how the group potential is determined. On the one hand, determining the group potential for hidden profiles in terms of the best group member's or average real group members' performance prior to discussion – as suggested by Steiner (1972) - results in an underestimation of the group potential because in a hidden profile group members are by definition not able to detect the correct solution prior to discussion. On the other hand, determining the group potential

for hidden profiles by employing a nominal group baseline (as described above) seems to overestimate the group potential because it implies a structuring of the decision-making process (into an information collection phase and an information evaluation/decision making phase) which is absent in real groups. Nonetheless, we propose that measuring the group potential for hidden profiles by using a nominal group baseline represents a useful starting point for future research.

More generally, the present study points to a largely neglected issue in small group research: Determining the group potential is not as straightforward as suggested by the work of Steiner (1972) – particularly with regard to disjunctive tasks of the non-eureka type. Clearly, further research is called for to shed light on this intriguing issue.

References

- Brodbeck, F. C., Kerschreiter, R., Mojzisch, A. & Schulz-Hardt, S. (in press). Improving group decision making under conditions of distributed knowledge: The information asymmetries model. *Academy of Management Review*.
- Kerr, N. & Tindale, R. S. (2004). Group performance and decision making. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55*, 623-655.
- Mojzisch, A. & Schulz-Hardt, S. (2006). Information sampling in group decision making: Sampling biases and their consequences. In K. Fiedler & P. Juslin (eds.), *Information Sampling and Adaptive Cognition* (pp. 299–326). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schulz-Hardt, S. & Brodbeck, F. C. (in press). Group performance and leadership. To appear in M. Hewstone, K. Jonas, & W. Stroebe (Eds.), *Introduction to Social Psychology* (4th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Stasser, G. (1988). Computer simulation as a research tool: The DISCUSS model of group decision making. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 24*, 393–422.
- Steiner, I. D. (1972). *Group processes and productivity*. New York: Academic Press.

Daniela Niesta

(University of Rochester, USA)

postgraduate travel grant

A big *Thank You* to the Grant Committee of the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology: you made my visit to Europe in the summer of 2006 happen!

Traveling to Europe in July and August 2006 yielded a combined project of doing research in the Department of Psychology at the University of Munich, Germany and of consolidating the intended collaboration with the Department of Psychology at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Marseille, France.

As for the research project in Munich, I was closely collaborating with a group of three former colleagues of mine, Dr. Greitemeyer, Dr. Fischer, and Professor Frey on the project "Differences between help-giving behavior and moral courage". This project has accumulated in a manuscript in the past, of which the editor invited us to resubmit a revised manuscript. In two previous studies we investigated the question why mood promotes help-giving but not moral courage and discussed the role of norm salience. Previous research has yielded considerable evidence of greater helping by participants in positive and negative moods than by those in a neutral mood. However, this research was mainly conducted in the context of non-dangerous emergencies. The present research aimed to test whether a low cost type of prosocial behavior requiring every-day helping and a high cost type of prosocial behavior requiring moral courage were differently affected by this classic mood effect. In two studies, we found the predicted interaction: In situations requiring help-giving, more help was given in the positive and negative mood condition than in the neutral mood condition; in situations requiring moral courage, however, participants were comparably likely to help in each of the three mood conditions. Moreover, results of Study 2 shed light on the underlying mechanism of this interaction. Salience of moral norms mediated the interaction between type of pro-social behavior and mood. Yet, we did not know what if not mood and norm salience leads to morally courageous behavior – a request for additional data made by the editor. Thus, the study that we developed

together following up on the results of Study 1 and 2 aimed at closing this gap.

Besides creating the research design and completing the data collection of the new study, my visit in Munich paid off as a chance to watch some soccer world cup games at first hand while sitting together with my colleagues in my much beloved Bavarian beer gardens!

To summarize the results, Study 3 found that the predictors injustice sensitivity self, moral mandate, civil disobedience, resistance to group pressure, and anger, were reliably associated with moral courage. This finding indicates that processes beyond momentary mood states and transitory norm salience influence morally courageous behavior. Rather, behavior that requires taking risks, which might lead to verbal or physical harm, is likely to be motivated by the “internal” appeal to conscience, values, or standards of integrity than by momentary moods or transitory norm salience. Although this consideration is not new in the moral psychology literature (e.g., Gibbs, 1996; Walker & Hennig, 2004), to our knowledge, these studies provide the first direct experimental evidence of such an “internal” appeal to moral standards of integrity in shaping costly prosocial behavior.

Currently, the paper is in the final revision stage. Additionally, it was accepted for a paper presentation at the Psychology of Social Justice Conference in New York, April 21, 2007.

As for the visit at Marseille in August 2006, the meeting with Professor Francois Cury and Professor Patrick Hugué succeeded in a joint grant proposal between the Department of Psychology at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Marseille and the Department of Psychology at the University of Rochester. The grant proposal was directed to the French Scientific Research Foundation ‘Fyssen’ in Paris, and the deadline was October 31, 2006. Although the grant proposal was denied by the Grant Committee of the Foundation, we started to work on the intended research topic, namely the combination of the approach and avoidance goal construct and the reactance theory in explaining resistance to changes in the achievement domain. We designed an online study that has recently exceeded a sample size of 100 participants and we are about

to analyze the data. The stage of this research project is still in its baby shoes. However, we hope that the collaboration between the two departments will be still strengthened in the future.

All in all, traveling back to Europe for the summer was just fantastic and I am very happy about sharing this invaluable experience with collaborators in two such rich research environments!

Stefano Pagliaro

(University of Chieti-Pescara, Italy)

postgraduate travel grant

In March 2007, I visited the Faculty of Social Sciences -- Unit of Social and Organizational Psychology -- at the University of Leiden (The Netherlands). I received a postgraduate travel grant from the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology which allowed me to continue a very fruitful cooperation with Prof. dr. Naomi Ellemers and Dr. Manuela Barreto. The aim of my visit to Leiden was twofold. On the one hand, I aimed at concluding my ongoing PhD project, by discussing with Naomi and Manuela the results of the experiments I had already carried out in Italy, as well as completing a paper to be submitted. On the other hand, my visit to Leiden aimed at planning future experiments, to carry out in cooperation with Prof. Ellemers' research group.

With regards to the first aim, the period I spent in Leiden was very fruitful. I have cooperated with Naomi and Manuela on a research project about the role of individual profitability and group norms in guiding group members' choices of strategies to improve social identity since January 2006. At that time, we planned four experiments to be carried out in Italy, in the Laboratory of Social Psychology at the University of Chieti-Pescara. In the first experiment, we found that both self-related and group-related concerns affect group members' behavior. In particular, by looking at the time taken to make a particular decision, we found that the divergence between individual profitability and ingroup norms creates a dilemma that needs to be resolved. In the second and third experiment we focused on

the role of normative dimensions in this process. We found evidence that morality-based ingroup norms is more effective in guiding group members' behavior than competence-based ingroup norms. In particular, we found that a morality-based ingroup norm more clearly and strongly guides pro-group behavior than competence-based ingroup norms. Finally, in the fourth experiment we confirmed the preminence of morality (vs. competence) in guiding pro-group behaviors, and found evidence that morality and competence constraints also affect the subjective perception of the dilemma. During my staying in Leiden, I had the possibility to directly discuss these results with Naomi and Manuela and to complete the paper I was writing.

After completing this work in progress, the rest of the time in Leiden was spent planning new experiments that I am carrying out at the moment. This was a nice opportunity for me to continue a very formative and fruitful international cooperation.

There are a lot of people and institutions that I would like to thank for giving me the possibility of going to Leiden University. The European Association of Experimental Social Psychology for financial support, as well as Sibylle Classen for her precious assistance at all stages. Naomi and Manuela, for making my staying in Leiden unforgettable. From the moment I arrived in Leiden, they did everything to make my life abroad easier. Thanks also to all the people in the Department, for sharing nice research discussions as well as very funny coffee-breaks! Finally, a special thanks to my Italian supervisors – Prof. Angelica Mucchi-Faina and dr. Francesca Romana Alparone. They make my research and life project possible, supporting me both personally and professionally.

Magdalena Smieja

(Institute of Psychology, Jagiellonian University, Poland)

seedcorn grant

Cognitive mechanisms of emotional intelligence

Thanks to the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology I received the postdoctoral seedcorn grant in July 2005. The goal of the grant was to support my research project on cognitive mechanism of emotional intelligence. In the last few years emotional intelligence has been the object of wide scientific and popular interest. That kind of wide-ranging attention rarely comes along with scientific reliability, therefore the domain of EI needs more in-depth analyses and systematic examinations. One of the most important questions and controversies is whether IE has the right to be called "intelligence". To be legitimate "intelligence", it should correspond to the understanding of that concept already existing in the scientific literature. The correlation between emotional and academic intelligences has been already proved (e.g., Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 1999), however up-to-now no one tried to explore the nature of that relationship. The aim of the present research was to conduct a series of experimental studies exploring shared (or separate) mechanisms of emotional intelligence and academic intelligence. The basic premise of the research stated that the shared starting point for emotional and academic intelligences is the efficacy of the cognitive system on the elementary level of information processing.

As for the traditional research on intelligence, the correlations between mental ability and attention or memory have been the subject of investigation for many years. There is considerable evidence documenting these strong and positive relationships. Most studies show that elementary cognitive processes are formal and non-specific in nature: their work does not depend on the content of processing. Hence, if the efficacy of elementary cognitive processes is correlated with psychometric intelligence, it could be also related to emotional intelligence – when fulfilled with "emotional content". In other words, it is possible that there exists a "formal" cognitive mechanism operating for both types of intelligence. The present series of three studies systematically addressed this issue.

Emotional intelligence and its relation to academic intelligence

The present research project was based on the hierarchical model of emotional intelligence formulated by John Mayer and Peter Salovey (1990, 1993). According to this theory, emotional intelligence refers to an ability to recognize the meaning of emotions and their relationships, and to reason and solve problems on their basis. Mayer and Salovey's model encompasses four interrelated abilities: perceiving, using, understanding, and managing emotions. The first ability involves identifying emotions conveyed by facial expressions, tone of voice, gestures, body posture in oneself and others, as well as in objects of art and other stimuli. It also comprises the capacity to express emotions effectively using such cues. The ability to decode emotional information helps one to appraise important situations, whereas the ability to express emotions contributes to effective communication. The second ability involves using emotions to facilitate thinking. This branch includes capacity to generate, use and feel emotions in order to focus attention, reason, and communicate. It involves the ability to associate mental images and emotions, and knowing how emotions influence cognitive processes such as deductive reasoning, problem solving, creativity, and communication. This ability may contribute to the quality of decision making. The third ability covers understanding emotional processes. This entails understanding what events are likely to trigger different emotions, how emotions combine to form complex blends of feelings, and how emotions progress over time. The fourth and last ability consists in managing emotions in oneself and in emotionally challenging interpersonal situations.

In relation to broader conceptions of EI encompassing personality traits and motivational factors (Goleman, Bar-On), the ability model has two advantages. First, it can be adopted for the research aimed at understanding the information processing skills that underlie EI. Second, it allows assessing EI through performance tests that measure people's actual rather than self-perceived abilities.

Mayer, Caruso and Salovey (1999) demonstrated that emotional intelligence relates to general intelligence (the correlation between IE and verbal intelligence was $r = 0,36, p < 0,001$). Davies, Stankov and Roberts did not replicate that finding – they have not found (1998, study 1) significant correlation between the ability to perceive emotions and

analytic intelligence. Still, significant but low correlations between self-report test of IE and test of fluid intelligence have been obtained by Derksen, Kramer & Katzko, (2002). Recently, in the study conveyed by Lopes, Salovey & Straus (2003) verbal intelligence measured with *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale* correlated significantly with "understanding emotions" ($r = 0,39$), whereas Brackett and Mayer (2003) discovered moderated correlation between emotional intelligence and SAT scores ($r = 0,25$ to $0,32$).

Summing up, emotional intelligence correlates with the academic ability positively but low. These relations are stronger when ability test are employed and weaker when self-report methods are engaged.

Research project

The core assumption underlying this research project stated that both academic and emotional intelligences are based on similar cognitive processes. In the case of academic abilities, those elementary mechanisms are driven by neutral stimuli, in the case of emotional intelligence – by emotional ones. To test that supposition we needed to design a number of isomorphic tasks, identical in structure but fulfilled with different content, specific to each of the intelligences. With these tasks we have explored three elementary cognitive processes related to intelligence: inspection time, attention, and working memory.

Study I: Intelligence and inspection time

Nettelbeck and colleagues (1987, Nettelbeck & Rabbitt, 1992) have suggested a speed-related indicator of intelligence, concerning the encoding of visual information for brief storage in short-term memory. It was called "inspection time". From the theoretical perspective, inspection time mirrors the speed with which human perception system perceives changes in the environment. Experimental studies (Nettelbeck, 1987; Caryl, 1994; Deary et al., 1989; Nettelbeck et al., 1986;) systematically show that shorter inspection times correlate with higher scores on intelligence tests. It means that people gaining higher scores in intelligence tests may be characterized by more effective information-processing system, measured by speed of elementary cognitive processes.

The aim of the first experiment was to find out whether elementary cognitive processes associated with inspection time could be one of those engaged in emotionally intelligent behavior. We assumed that when talking about EI, efficient emotion differentiation is a base for the accurate perception of emotions (first branch in Mayer & Salovey's model). According to the theoretical models applied in the present study, we used classic cognitive tasks (Spatial Inspection Time), and tasks in which neutral stimuli have been replaced by emotional ones (Emotional Inspection Time). As a measure of fluid intelligence Raven's Advanced Progressive Matrices have been administered. To measure emotional intelligence we employed KREQ (Smieja, Orzechowski & Beauvale, in preparation), which is a paper-and-pencil test based on a Mayer & Salovey's model of IE (1990, 1993) and SIE-T, a non-verbal scale tapping ability to perceive facial emotions (Maczak, Piekarska & Studniarek, 2005).

103 participants took part in the first study. The results did not confirm our predictions concerning perceptual mechanisms of emotional intelligence. We have found no correlation between EI (measured by KREQ and SIE-T) and emotional inspection time. Only correlation between Raven Progressive Matrices (general fluid intelligence) and spatial inspection time was obtained (the latter result is not novel, however it proves reliability of the research.) Our data suggest therefore that such elementary cognitive process as those underlying inspection time may not be an important component of emotional information processing.

Study II: Intelligence and attention

The concept of attention refers to the ability to select relevant stimuli and to ignore irrelevant ones (e.g. Broadbent, 1958). Attention means also the ability to maintain mental effort during a substantial period of time (Neuchterlein, Parasuraman, & Jiang, 1983). Finally, it represents the ability to employ cognitive control over the task at hand, particularly, over competing tasks performed simultaneously (Kahneman, 1973). The last aspect has proved to matter for intelligence: psychometrically assessed intelligence correlates with efficiency of dual task performance (Hunt & Lansman, 1982). From this theoretical perspective, higher level of intelligence is determined by an increased amount of cognitive resources.

The process of reasoning and problem-solving usually requires an effective and complex selection of information. First, we have to differentiate between noise and important signals; moreover, we must control potential distractors. Second, we need to select some elements in order to incorporate them into problem-solving process. An intelligent behavior during complex cognitive tasks is based on both types of selection (Nęcka & Orzechowski, 2004). We assumed that the efficacy of attentional processes is essential for perception and facilitation emotions. Hence, the aim of the second experiment was to find out whether academic and emotional intelligence similarly depend on attentional processes concerning selection of stimulation. In the second study we used two computerized cognitive tasks: Verbal Divided Attention Task (DIVA) (Nęcka, 1994; 1996), which is an integrated attention test designed in the dual task paradigm (Kahneman, 1973) and its emotional adaptation – Emotional Divided Attention Task, where neutral stimuli have been replaced with pictures depicting different emotions. Raven's Advanced Progressive Matrices and Horn verbal ability test served as a measure of fluid intelligence, KREQ and SIE-T were measures of Emotional intelligence again.

In the second experiment strong relationship between both kinds of intelligence (EI and "g") and attentional functioning was found. Average variance shared between "g" and attention measures was about 44% for Verbal (emotionally neutral) and 40% for Emotional Divided Attention Task. Average variance shared between measures of EI and attention was 34% for both Verbal and Emotional Divided Attention Task. The results obtained in Study II did not match perfectly our predictions, for the reason that the difference between attentional processing of emotional versus neutral stimuli did not appear considerable. However, it has been proved that attention is an important component concurrently of academic and emotional intelligence. Hence, we can conclude that academic and emotional intelligence similarly depend on attentional processes concerning selection of stimulation.

Study III: Intelligence and working memory

Many experiments provided evidence that performance in working memory tasks correlates with psychometric intelligence (e.g., Kyllonen & Christal, 1990; Vernon, Nador & Kantor, 1985; Colom et al., 2004).

Subjects scoring high on IQ tests are quicker and more accurate in working memory tasks. Such data are usually interpreted in terms of the limited capacity theory of working memory. If the human capacity to store relevant information for a short time is severely limited, individual differences in such capacity may determine success or failure in complex cognitive tasks. What is interesting, deficits in working memory capacity influence not only memory tasks but also complex cognitive tasks, such as problem solving, text comprehension, or discourse processing (Miyake & Shah, 1999). Thus, working memory not only serves for information storing but also facilitates complex cognitive processes. From this theoretical perspective, working memory appears more as a central mechanism of current information processing than a store (Baddeley, 1986).

There is no evidence that the capacity of short-term memory is a correlate of EI, nevertheless one could expect that it plays a crucial role in the processes of facilitation, understanding and managing emotions. Each of these abilities seems to engage working memory by incorporating emotions into reasoning, identifying one's own or others emotions, and regulating emotions. In the context of emotional abilities, one function of WM called "updating" appears particularly interesting (Miyake & Shah, 1999). "Updating" works by elimination of unimportant pieces of information in order to introduce important ones. In Study III two procedures concerning this function were used. In one of them, subjects were sequentially shown two pictures featuring commonly known objects (WM-Update) or photos of human faces (Emotional WM-Update) and asked to memorize those stimuli in a selective way. In the second task, designed in the n-back paradigm (Cohen et al. 1994, 1997, Dobbs & Rule 1989, McElree 2001, Smith & Jonides 1997), the stimuli were displayed in series, each coming into view two times in precisely planned intervals. The participants' task was to answer whether the specified figure (HORIZON (Nęcka, 2000) or human face demonstrating particular emotion (Emotional HORIZON) appeared previously in the series. Raven's Advanced Progressive Matrices, Horn verbal ability test, KREQ and SIE-T were used as measures of fluid and emotional intelligence, respectively. The last experiment revealed strong relations between measures of intelligence and working memory tasks performance. Average variance shared between "g" and WM measures was about 25% for Non-verbal

(emotionally neutral) and 31% for Emotional WM tasks (calculate for both computerized tasks). The same indicators of variance shared between measures of EI and attention were 10% for Non-verbal and 14% for both Emotional HORIZON and WM-Update tasks. An unexpected dominance of "g" could be explain in terms of different complexity of neutral and emotional tasks. Generally speaking, faces as stimuli were more complex, therefore tasks with this sort of material were stronger "g" loaded than their neutral version.

Taken together the results of these three studies do not provide clear support for the hypotheses. Among three elementary cognitive processes, one (connected with inspection time) appeared to be unrelated to EI, whereas two (attention and working memory) showed strong significant relations. What is puzzling – we have failed to find assumed link between task specificity (neutral or emotional) and kind of intelligence. Contrary to our suppositions, there were no substantially stronger relationships between general intelligence and performance on tasks fulfilled with neutral stimuli, as opposed to emotional stimuli, and vice versa. Last but not least, our data proved that emotional intelligence is related to general intelligence (both fluid and verbal), as predicted by Mayer & Salovey model (1990, 1993). In all three experiments the measure of verbal intelligence was significantly correlated with EI tests, in two of the them (experiment II and III) Raven Progressive Matrices scores (an index of fluid intelligence) were strongly correlated with EI measures.

I would like to thank dr Jaroslaw Orzechowski from Jagiellonian University for his invaluable cooperation on this research project.

Sofia Stathi

(University of Kent, UK)

postgraduate travel grant

The process of a PhD is undoubtedly a remarkable experience, which allows all of us to gain significant knowledge about our chosen field of research. This process can be difficult, tiring, intriguing, fulfilling, exciting or frustrating, in most case all the above. I strongly believe that EAESP offers a great deal of support to PhD students thanks to the travel grants, summer schools and conferences and helps them develop an --even-- more pleasant attitude towards postgraduate studies. This is exactly what happened in my case. With my PhD, I aimed at examining whether, when and how intergroup contact between different ethnic and national groups can reduce intergroup bias and prejudice.

One of my main concerns when I started my postgraduate studies was to carry out research of high quality that could be applied in issues of every day life. In other words, I wanted to do something that would benefit people, something useful for the society, which I guess is a desire (or as a matter of fact a need) that most of us have. I was lucky enough to be a student at the University of Birmingham, which offered me excellent opportunities in terms of research quality and, also, quite crucially, way of life. I focused on designing and carrying out studies with various target groups like International and British students and English and French nationals; this series of studies provided me with very interesting results. When I found out that EAESP offered a travel grant for conducting research abroad, I immediately thought that it could help me make a step further. For quite a while I had been thinking how to conduct studies with target groups that had not been vastly investigated by social psychologists. Despite the fact that having a large pool of undergraduate Psychology students is very helpful, I wanted to look into real groups in a different, more intriguing social and cultural setting.

Thanks to the travel grant that I obtained from EAESP and some connections with Mexican Universities, I organised a research project in Mexico. The Universities that I collaborated with were Universidad Autonoma Tlaxcala, Universidad Pedagogica Nacional, Campus Puebla and Benemerita Universidad Autonoma Puebla; the project lasted from

June to August 2006. The focus of the research was on contact between two quite distinct ethnic groups in Mexico: Indigenous people and Mestizos. After having lived in Mexico for a while on 2004 and 2005, I had developed an interest on the interaction between these two groups. A Mestizo is “a person of mixed European (esp. Spanish or Portuguese) and non-European parentage; *spec.* (originally) a man with a Spanish father and an American Indian mother; (later) a person of mixed American Spanish and American Indian descent” (Oxford Online English Dictionary, 2007). Indigenous people of Mexico come from an Amerindian (or American Indian) ethnic background and comprise up to 10% of the population. The main official criterion for defining indigenous identity is the use of indigenous language. The differences in status between the two groups are substantial. The national commission for the development of the indigenous towns (2004) published some striking statistics: a large proportion of Indigenous people live in the countryside and 57% of the total Indigenous population work as farmers, 31% are analphabetic, 29% have not completed primary school and 21% are monolinguals (they don't speak the Spanish, the official language of Mexico) and 13% have no access to piped water, drainage and electric energy. Therefore, their interaction with the majority group took place in a very intriguing social context. In line with the literature that has shown that the responses in contact and prejudice differ between majority and minority status groups (Bobo, 1999; Monteith & Spicer, 2000; for review see Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005b), this project demonstrated that there are important differences between Indigenous people and Mestizos in how they perceive and respond to positive contact. Indigenous people, an ethnic minority with substantial cultural, linguistic, and status differences from the dominant group (Mestizos) is generally more “sceptical” towards interventions to reduce the social distance between the two groups. The research project was overall quite successful and the theoretical and practical implications of the findings are and are now being drafted for publication. The results have also been presented in the latest SPSP conference in Memphis.

Having been offered this travel grant by EAESP was extremely important for me. I have now finished my PhD and I can definitely say that this experience helped me develop my skills as a researcher, feel more confident about my work and broaden the way I see research and academia. Above all, it helped me be positive that, under certain conditions, research can be

helpful and practically useful, it can help to improve intergroup relations even in settings where stigma and prejudice are deeply rooted. Therefore, I would like to thank the EAESP board for offering me this grant, Ms Sibylle Classen for her patience and kindness in answering all my persistent questions before, during and after the grant, my supervisor, Professor Richard Crisp for his unwavering support during this project, as well as Dr Alonso Corona Chavez, Eleazar Correa González and Leticia Rivermar who helped me conduct the project in Mexico.

References

- Bobo, L.D. (1999). Prejudice as group position: Microfoundations of a sociological approach to racism and intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 445–472.
- Monteith, M.J., & Spicer, C.V. (2000). Contents and correlates of Whites' and Blacks' racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 125–154.
- National commission for the development of the indigenous towns (2004). *Indicadores socioeconómicos de los pueblos indígenas*. Retrieved July 2004 from http://cdi.gob.mx/index.php?id_seccion=91.
- Oxford Online English Dictionary (2007). Term: *Mestizo*. Retrieved January 2007 from http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/00306943?single=1&query_type=word&queryword=Mestizo&first=1&max_to_show=10.
- Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice between majority and minority groups. *Psychological Research, 16* (12), 951-957.

Katherine Stroebe

(Leiden University, The Netherlands)
postgraduate travel grant

The past fall I spent four months at the University of Connecticut (UConn) with prof.dr. John Dovidio. During this stay we designed 3 experiments, which are described in more detail below. I also participated

in the labgroup that Dr. Dovidio and Dr. Pratto held every week. This labgroup is a great opportunity for graduate students to present research ideas or results and get good and critical feedback. I presented my research ideas during one of these meetings. Furthermore, I was able to follow 2 classes, one being 'professional development' by Dr. Diane Quinn (offering advice on various aspects of young academic life + bringing in speakers to talk about their careers and topics such as "how to negotiate in a new job", "networking" etc.), the other a 'Structural Equation Modelling' class by Dr. David Kenny. Both classes were/will be very useful to me. I also attended the SESP conference in Philadelphia, travelled to Yale to listen to a talk of Dr. Laurie Rudman and attended the weekly brownbag meetings at Uconn.

During this period I designed three studies, all of which focused on the influence of pervasiveness of discrimination on targets' reactions to instances of subtle discrimination. We see subtle discrimination as situations of seeming personal failure that can in fact be attributed to group membership. Pervasiveness is the extent to which targets believe they will be discriminated against in the future. We were interested in showing that two different processes may be taking place when targets perceptions of pervasiveness differ. Under low pervasiveness, we predicted that, in accordance with prior research by Major, Kaiser and McCoy (2003), targets would be able to use discrimination to avert self blame for personal failure, and therefore experience relatively positive consequences for well-being when making attributions to discrimination. When on the other hand pervasiveness is high, we believed making attributions to discrimination would not be self protective anymore, as the negative implications of possible future discrimination would outweigh the benefits of being able to avert self blame for failure (in accordance with Schmitt, & Branscombe, 2002). While pervasiveness has been studied in prior research (Schmitt, Branscombe, & Postmes, 2003), these 2 underlying processes have as of yet not been shown simultaneously. Studies 1 and 2 therefore focused on the consequences of pervasiveness for targets' well-being. Study 2 also tested an implicit measure of discrimination that we developed. The second question we wanted to study was the process underlying the negative consequences of high pervasiveness on targets well-being: Why is pervasive discrimination harmful for its targets? Study

3 focused on this question. Studies 1 and 2 were run while I was at Uconn (although data collection still proceeds), Study 3 is to be run this month. The social psychology group at Uconn provided a stimulating research environment. I learned a lot, did a lot of research, and met many nice people. But of all the things I did and experienced at Uconn, most memorable and valuable to me were the discussions I had with Dr. Dovidio about my research area, how to design our studies and about research in general. I profited greatly from these discussions and am very grateful to EAESP for providing me with the funds to enable this trip.

References

- Major, B., Kaiser, C.R., & McCoy, S.K. (2003). It's not my fault: when and why attributions to prejudice protect self-esteem. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(6), 772-781.
- Schmitt, M.T. & Branscombe, N.R. (2002). The internal and external causal loci of attributions to prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(5), 620-628.
- Schmitt, M.T.M., Branscombe, N.R., & Postmes, T. (2003). Women's Emotional Responses to the Pervasiveness of Gender Discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 297-312.

Dimitrios Tsivrikos

(University of Exeter, United Kingdom)
postgraduate travel grant

I am ever so grateful to the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology for the financial assistance that made my visit at the University of Queensland (UQ) in Australia possible. During my stay at UQ I was able to discuss my research endeavours with Dr Matthew Hornsey and Prof Peter Earl.

My research work is very much in line with the research being conducted at UQ. My doctoral research work is concerned with examining students' choices regarding higher education (HE). In this line of research we suggest that in order to understand people's HE choices, we need to take into account not only broader societal and economic factors, but also recognise

that university selection involves issues relating to identity negotiation. Furthermore, in support of a model of adjustment to identity change in which identity factors, economic factors and socio-structural factors are all predicted to play a central role in students' decision-making process we have conducted a large-scale longitudinal study (N=968). Our results meet our expected hypothesis and we discuss further the practical implications of various social and economic psychological models concerning students' career choices and well-being.

However, the above findings were based on a homogenous student population in the UK and further research must be conducted to examine whether the findings can be generalised across different student populations such as international students or those more diverse in terms of social capital and class. Hence, my visit to UQ did not only allowed me to work with Dr Hornsey, who is an expert in social identity, power, and intergroup relations, but also allowed me to design a study with the UQ student population, which accommodates the above criteria.

Moreover, on this trip I was able to collaborate with Prof Peter Earl who is also a member of staff at the University of Queensland. Prof Earl conducts research in the area of Economic psychology, an area strongly related to my research interests. My meeting with Prof. Earle helped to further my understanding on how we can intergrate a social psychological analysis with some of the behavioural economics literature.

My visit to UQ has resulted in new insights into the topic of my research topic, that is identity change. My collaboration with all members of the Centre for Research on Group Processes (CRGP) and Prof. Earl will be continued in the future. The EAESP travel grant has helped immensely to make this possible.

News about Members

In Memoriam: María Ros

On December first 2006 our dear friend and colleague María Ros died in Madrid after an acute and brief illness, at 56 years of age. She was a very dedicated and outstanding social psychologist in Spain who had a leading role in the building of social psychological research in this country and also in establishing links and research networks with Israel, and Latin American countries in the area of cross-cultural psychology.

Her work extended from her early interest on attitudes toward language variation within the perspective of Linguistic Accommodation Theory and from the study of attitudes and perception of different linguistic groups in Spain to her recent research on values from a cross cultural perspective.

The research on perception of linguistic groups and attitudes and attributions about language use in Spain took into account identification with categories at different levels (regional and national), which led to the notion of comparative identity. This in turn gave rise to the studies on comparative identity and favouritism, which showed the advantages of the simultaneous consideration of identifications at different levels (labelled as “comparative identity”) for the prediction of ingroup favouritism. This work expanded beyond relations between regions in Spain to other regions in Europe and it involved the collaboration with different research groups.

The second area of María Ros’s work had to do with values and their relationship to behaviour. This work started in 1987 with her participation in the research project for the intercultural study of value structure led by Shalom Schwartz. She participated in studies for the application of this model in Spain and Latin America. Within this framework, she studied the relations between values and behaviour and focused on specific values as that of work, she also widened the scope of her work in this area through her studies on relationships between socio-structural variables and value

orientations at the cultural level (for instance, reflected in the value convergence in Western Europe) in collaboration with Schwartz.

As a bridge between her work on comparative identity and the latter work on values she conducted research on identities at different levels (regional, national and European) and personal values.

As professor of Social Psychology at the Universidad Complutense of Madrid, she stood out in terms of her academic commitment to her department and university, as well as by her enthusiastic involvement in the training of social psychology students, reaching a level of academic excellence that was widely acknowledged.

Her untimely death represents a very significant loss for Spanish social psychology because she was a very intelligent, competent and considerate person, able to establish productive and friendly networks of collaboration in the field. Those of us who had the privilege of closer collaboration and contact with her will deeply miss her enthusiasm, vitality and warmth.

On January 22, 2007 an act of homage was held at the Faculty of Political Science and Sociology of the Complutense University of Madrid. Also in the next regional meeting of the IACCC in Mexico in July 2007 a symposium on her contribution to cross-cultural psychology will take place. Other initiatives to honour her contribution to social psychology are being proposed at present as an award for young researchers and a special issue of the *Revista de Psicología Social* on her work and on research developments stemming from it.

Carmen Huici & Hector Grad

New Members of the Association

The following applications for membership were approved by the Executive Committee at its meeting in April, 2007. Names of members providing letters of support are in parentheses:

Full Membership

Dr. Frederik BJÖRKLUND
Lund, Sweden
(A. Biel, T. Lindholm)

Dr. Laurent CAMBON
Nice, France
(G. Schadron, N. Dubois)

Dr. Aleksandra CISLAK
Warsaw, Poland
(B. Wojciszke, R. Ohme)

Dr. Szymon CZAPLINSKI
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Kossowska, M. Smieja)

Dr. Benoit DOMPNIER
Grenoble, France
(D. Muller, F. Butera)

Dr. Nina HANSEN
Jena, Germany
(K. Sassenberg, K. Jonas)

Dr. Johan JACOBY
Bern, Switzerland
(K. Sassenberg, T. Schubert)

Dr. Ewa KALECINSKA-ADAMCZYK
Wroclaw, Poland
(K. Lachowicz-Tabaczek, D.
Dolinski)

Dr. Dorota KARWOWSKA
Warsaw, Poland
(D. Rutkowska, M. Kaminska-
Feldman)

Dr. Andrew LIVINGSTONE
Cardiff, UK
(T. Manstead, R. Spears)

Dr. Renata MAKSYMIAK
Lublin, Poland
(M. Kofta, D. Maison)

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

Dr. Claudia MANZI
Milano, Italy
(V. Vignoles, R. Brown)

Dr. Astrid MIGNON
Lille, France
(N. Dubois, F. Askevis-Leherpeux)

Dr. Armelle NUGIER
Sussex, UK
(P. Niedenthal, B. Sanitioso)

Dr. Harriet ROSENTHAL
Birmingham, UK
(K. Quinn, R. Crisp)

Dr. Josefa RUIZ ROMERO
Granada, Spain
(M. Moya, F. Morales)

Dr. Kerstin SCHÜTTE
Kiel, Germany
(A. Mummendey, T. Kessler)

Dr. Joanna SWEKLEJ
Warsaw, Poland
(B. Wojciszke, G. Sedek)

Dr. Aleksandra SZYMKOW-
SUDZIARSKA
Warsaw, Poland
(B. Wojciszke, A. Kolanczyk)

Dr. Nicole TAUSCH
Oxford, UK
(M. Lalljee, M. Hewstone)

Dr. Christian UNKELBACH
Heidelberg, Germany
(K. Fiedler, H. Plessner)

Dr. Hanna ZAGEFKA
Egham, UK
(R. Brown, T. Kessler)

Dr. Sven ZEBEL
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(R. Spears, A. Fischer)

Affiliate Membership

./.

Postgraduate Membership

Luca ANDRICHETTO
Padova, Italy
(D. Capozza, R. Spears)

Frederique AUTIN
Poitiers, France
(M. Dambrun, J.-C. Croizet)

Nailah AYUB
Leiden, The Netherlands
(E. van Dijk, D. Daamen)

Emma BAECK
Stockholm, Sweden
(N. Akrami, T. Lindholm)

Tomasz BESTA
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Kofta, M. Kossowska)

Rachel CALOGERO
Canterbury, UK
(A. Guinote, D. Abrams)

Stéphanie DELROISSE
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
(G. Herman, B. Rimé)

Pieter DESMET
Tilburg, The Netherlands
(D. de Cremer, E. van Dijk)

Kamila DOBRENKO
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Jarymowicz, D. Kobylińska)

Eerika FINELL
Helsinki, Finland
(K. Helkama, A.-M. Pirttilä-
Backman)

Malte FRIESE
Basel, Switzerland
(M. Wänke, A. Florack)

Lavinia GIANETTONI
Lausanne, Switzerland
(C. Staerklé, A. Clémence)

Ingrid GILLES
Lausanne, Switzerland
(A. Clémence, E. Green)

Anna GLUCHOWSKA
Lublin, Poland
(W. Blaszczyk, M. Jarymowicz)

Kirsten HEITLAND
Bielefeld, Germany
(G. Bohner, U. Wagner)

Niek HOOGERVORST
Tilburg, The Netherlands
(D. de Cremer, A. van Hiel)

Craig KNIGHT
Exeter, UK
(T. Morton, M. Ryan)

Florian KUTZNER
Heidelberg, Germany
(K. Fiedler, P. Freytag)

Dominique LEROY
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(M. Brauer, P. Niedenthal)

Monika MIROSLAWSKA
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Kofta, M. Stysko)

Faris NADHMI
Skarholmen, Sweden
(A. Maass, N. Akrami)

Aisling O'DONNELL
Exeter, UK
(M. Ryan, J. Jetten)

Sabrina PIERUCCI
Bruxelles, Belgium
(O. Klein, L. Licata)

Tila PRONK
Nijmegen, The Netherlands
(J. Karremans, D. Wigboldus)

Ananthi Al. RAMIAH
Oxford, UK
(M. Hewstone, M. Lalljee)

Ulrike RANGEL
Mannheim, Germany
(H. Bless, J. Keller)

Joanna ROSZAK
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Kofta, A. Kwiatkowska)

Verónica SEVILLANO
Madrid, Spain
(A. Rodriguez, C. Huici)

Helen SOTERIOU
London, UK
(F. Strack, C. de Dreu)

Chiara STORARI
Lausanne, Switzerland
(F. Butera, J.-C. Deschamps)

Manuela THOMAE
Canterbury, UK
(G.T. Viki, A. Rutland)

Elena TRIFILETTI
Padova, Italy
(D. Capozza, R. Spears)

Mirjam UCHRONSKI
Erlangen, Germany
(A. Abele-Brehm, S. Pahl)

Niels VAN DE VEN
Tilburg, The Netherlands
(M. Zeelenberg, D. Stapel)

Maarten ZAAL
Leiden, The Netherlands
(N. Ellemers, C. van Laar)

Joanna ZIAJA
Krakow, Poland
(D. Dolinski, M. Smieja)

Announcements

Jos Jaspars Awards - Call for Applications

Criteria and application procedure for the Jos Jaspars Awards for early career contribution

Candidates for the Jos Jaspars Awards either should have obtained their PhD not earlier than January 1st of the previous General Meeting (January 1st, 2005) or, if their PhD was obtained before that date, they should have been under the age of 30 on January 1st of the year of the previous General Meeting (January 1st, 2005). There will be 3 Jos Jaspars awards.

They need not to be members of the Association.

Candidates are asked to submit their curriculum vitae, naming two referees, one of whom should be a member of the Association. These items should be sent to the Executive Officer, before **October, 1st, 2007** who will forward it to the selection committee.

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

As a tribute to Jaspars' influential editorship of the European Journal of Social Psychology, the publishers of the Journal are sponsoring the Awards financially. This funding will cover the registration fees of the awardees for the General Meeting in Opatija.

Recipients of the Jos Jaspars Award will be decided by a four-person panel comprising one member of the Executive Committee and 3 external members [Miguel Moya, Fabrizio Butera, Naomi Ellemers, and Paula Niedenthal]

Address for correspondence:

Sibylle Classen, P.O. Box 420 143, D-48161 Muenster, Germany, e-mail: sibylle@eaesp.org

Kurt Lewin Awards – Call for Nominations

Criteria and application procedure for the Kurt Lewin Awards for a significant research contribution.

The Kurt Lewin awards are designed to recognize significant research contributions made by any full member of the Association who has passed beyond the age/time criteria of the Jos Jaspars award. This can be seen as similar to mid-career contribution awards in other associations although no age-limit is placed on the recipient: it is their contribution to the field through a particular research program or area of research that is being recognized.

The procedure for this award is that candidates are nominated by two full members of the Association, who motivate in their letters why, in their view, the candidate deserves this award. Nominators should inform the proposed candidate of their intention to nominate in order to coordinate the procedure (e.g., ensure a minimum of two nominations being proffered). Both nominators should state in writing that they have permission of the candidates as their official nominators (i.e. to ensure that no more than two “official” nominations are considered per candidate by the panel). These nominations including the curriculum vitae of the candidate should be received by the Executive Officer, before **October, 1st, 2007** who will forward it to the selection committee

Recipients of the Kurt Lewin Award will be decided by a four-person panel comprising one member of the Executive Committee and 3 external members [Miguel Moya, Miles Hewstone, Anne Maass, and Ad van Knippenberg]

Address for correspondence:

Sibylle Classen, P.O. Box 420 143, D-48161 Muenster, Germany, e-mail: sibylle@eaesp.org

Election of New Executive Committee Members - Call for Nominations-

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

Patrizia Catellani (Italy), Russell Spears (UK), Fritz Strack (Germany), and Eddy van Avermaet (Belgium) will leave the Executive Committee in June 2008.

Carsten de Dreu (The Netherlands), Miguel Moya (Spain), and Bogdan Wojciszke (Poland) will stay for another 3-year term.

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

- (1) At least four months before the election, full members are asked for nominations.
- (2) Each nomination must be supported by two full members and addressed to the Secretary Russell Spears at least three months before the members' meeting. Thus, the deadline for receiving nominations is **March, 10th, 2008**.
- (3) Each nomination packet has to contain:
 - A letter from the nominee, agreeing to serve on the Executive Committee, if elected
 - Letters of support from two full members of the Association
 - Brief background information from the nominee (max. half an A4 page maximum), with a summary of academic positions, administrative experience, representative publications, and current research interests.

Please check the Standing Orders the EAESP website (Articles and Standing Orders) for more detailed information.

Change in the deadlines for grant applications

At the Executive Committee Meeting in October it was stated that grant applications can no longer be decided at any time. To allow a better comparison between applications, there are 4 deadlines now: end of March, end of June, end of September and end of December. Grant applications can be sent at any time but will be decided after the respective deadline.

APS announces free subscription deal for EAESP members

Many people will know that in the APS has changed its name from the American Psychological Society to the Association of Psychological Science. This move is part of a policy of emphasizing the international and research based character of the organization. As part of this initiative the APS is now offering our members (both full and postgraduate members of EAESP) a very attractive deal of free membership for 2007 (with discounted terms for 2008 to follow). See below the text of the open letter from APS Executive Director Alan Kraut with details of how to join.

Dear colleague,

The Association for Psychological Science would like to offer you a free year of membership. Extending membership benefits to the international community of scientific and academic psychologists is a high priority for APS. To take advantage of this offer follow the simple instructions below, or keep reading to find out more.

- How to Join APS for Free!
 - Visit www.psychologicalscience.org/join
 - Click on the link that says "Apply for Membership"

- Fill out your contact information
- Enter **INT005** in the box labeled "Promotional Code"
- Verify that your total due will then read "\$0," and enjoy your free membership!

APS is a leading member-supported organization dedicated solely to the science of psychology. This offer is being extended to you because we feel a kinship with the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology. Giving access to cutting edge research to psychologists around the globe allows APS to help to advance the science of psychology.

Some of the benefits that you will enjoy with your APS membership include:

- Subscriptions (including online access to in-press articles) to our **four journals**:
 - *Psychological Science*: Our flagship journal, published monthly, is rated among the top 10 journals for impact in the field of psychology, and is a premiere forum for research, theory and application.
 - *Current Directions in Psychological Science*: This highly regarded journal, rated among the top 20 psychology journals for impact, presents concise reviews spanning all of scientific psychology and its applications. *Current Directions* is published bi-monthly.
 - *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*: This unique journal, published three times a year, features in-depth reports of what psychological science research has to say about issues of public concern.
 - *Perspectives on Psychological Science*: This quarterly journal, new in 2006, publishes an interesting and intellectually lively mix of theoretical statements, literature reviews, viewpoints or opinions, research presentations, and scholarship.
- The monthly *Observer*, featuring news and commentary.
- Member-only discounts for the APS Annual Convention (The 19th Annual Convention will be held May 24th-27th, 2007 in Washington, DC; 2008 will be in Chicago, Ill. Think about coming.)

- Access to the members-only section of the APS Web site which includes access to in-press journal articles, as well as an archive of all APS journals, and an online member directory.
 - Discounted subscriptions to almost 60 psychology journals from major publishers.

Please visit the APS Web site at <http://www.psychologicalscience.org> for more information about APS. If you like what you see, simply use the link to join APS for FREE! Your membership will be good through December 2007. No commitment to renew in 08, but we also will be offering a discount then, too.

Sincerely,



Alan G. Kraut, Executive Director
Association for Psychological Science

International Journal of Conflict and Violence (IJVC)

The International Journal of Conflict and Violence (IJCV) is a new peer-reviewed periodical for scientific exchange and public dissemination of the latest academic research on conflict and violence. The subjects on which the IJCV concentrates have always been the subject of interest in many different areas of academic life. Consequently, the journal encompasses contributions from a wide range of disciplines including sociology, political science, education, social psychology, criminology, ethnology, history, political philosophy, urban studies, and the study of religions. The IJCV is open-access: all articles are available to all on the internet, free of charge and without restriction.

The IJCV is edited by Wilhelm Heitmeyer (University of Bielefeld), Douglas S. Massey (Princeton University), Steven Messner (University of Albany, NY), James Sidanius (Harvard University), and Michel Wieviorka (École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris).

The IJCV is published twice a year, in spring and in fall. Each issue will focus on one specific topic while also including articles on other issues.

Fall 2007: Terrorism

(submission deadline: March 31, 2007)

Spring 2008: Youth and Violence

(submission deadline: August 31, 2007)

Fall 2008: Anomie/Anomia and Violence

(submission deadline: January 1, 2008)

You can download the respective calls for papers from the IJCV website: www.ijcv.org.

Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Administrative Secretary by **September, 15th, 2007** latest. Applications for grants and for the International Teaching Fellowship Scheme can be received by the deadlines March 31, June 31, September 30, and December 30. The deadline for the next issue of the Bulletin is **September, 15th, 2007**.

The next Executive Committee Meeting will take place from October 12-14, 2007.

Executive Committee

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

Carsten K.W. De Dreu (Treasurer), Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, Roetersstraat 15, NL-1018 WB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
email c.k.w.dedreu@uva.nl

Miguel Moya, Faculty of Psychology, University of Granada, Campus de Cartuja, E-18011, Granada, Spain
e-mail: mmoya@ugr.es

Russell Spears (Secretary), School of Psychology, Cardiff University, Tower Building, Park Place, Cardiff, Wales CF10 3AT, UK
e-mail: SpearsR@Cardiff.ac.uk

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

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

Bogdan Wojciszke, Institute of Psychology, Polish Academy of Science, Chodakowska 19/31, PL-03-815 Warsaw, Poland
e-mail: bogdan@psychpan.waw.pl

Executive Officer:

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

web site of the EAESP:

<http://www.eaesp.org>