

European Bulletin of Social Psychology

Editors: Dominic Abrams & Sibylle Classen

2 Editorial

4 Articles

Successes and Failures of Russian Social Psychology
by G.M. Andreeva

15 *Gender Stereotypes and the Social Perception of Leadership*
by Dagmar Stahlberg & Sabine Sczesny

30 Book Reviews

Social Construction in Context (2001) by Kenneth J. Gergen. Review by
Gabrielle Poeschl

33 New Books by Members

Prospettive multiple nella vita sociale: l'aprirsi e il chiudersi degli eventi sociali. [Multiple Perspectives in social life: The forces behind the opening and closing of social events] (March 2001) by Giuseppe Pantaleo & Robert A. Wicklund

Teorii Tresci I Form Samoswiadomosci (Contents and Forms of Self-Awareness (2000) by Zbigniew Zaborowski

35 Future EAESP Meetings – Calendar

36 Reports of Previous Meetings

Small Group Meeting on Gender Role Research, Graz (Austria), 5th-7th April 2001

40 *Small Group Meeting* on Theory and Method in Societal Psychology, Pecs (Hungary), 26th-29th April 2001

42 *Small Group Meeting* on Counterfactual Thinking, Aix-en-Provence (France), 16th-18th May 2001

45 *Small Group Meeting* on Finding Meaning in the Human Condition: Emerging Perspectives in Experimental Existential Psychology, Amsterdam (The Netherlands), 2nd-4th August 2001

50 *Medium Size Meeting* on Feelings and Emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium, Amsterdam (The Netherlands), 13th-16th June 2001

55 *Medium Size Meeting* on Cognitive and Motivational Approaches to Intergroup Relations (4th Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes), Castle Kochberg (Germany), 27th June - 1st July 2001

64 Grants and Grant reports

70 Announcements

European Journal of Social Psychology: Announcing the New Editorial Team

Election of New Executive Committee Members – 2nd Call for Nominations

Deadlines for Contributions to the Executive Committee

73 Executive Committee

Editorial

In this final issue of volume 13 of the Bulletin we continue our series of articles on gender with a contribution by Dagmar Stahlberg and Sabine Sczesny, and also in support of our aim to ensure a wider appreciation of social psychology across Europe, we have an article on Russian Social Psychology from G.M. Andreeva. We also have one review of a new book (several others are in the pipeline but just missed our deadline), information about future meetings, and a series of reports from meetings already sponsored by the Association. Between now and the new year we will be publishing the full set of abstracts from those meetings.

Also in this issue we have a brief statement from Alex Haslam, who will be taking over from Fritz Strack as the next editor of the European Journal of Social Psychology.

Please remember that there is a call for nominations for membership of the Executive Committee. Despite scurrilous rumours to the contrary, participation on the committee is a role that requires dedication, commitment and effort. But it is also a lot of fun and is an opportunity to support European Social Psychology in the company of an enthusiastic group of colleagues. There are four vacancies. Those continuing on the committee include Carmen Huici, Vincent Yzerbyt and Dominic Abrams.

Other opportunities to support EAESP are through organisation and participation in its various scientific activities. The Executive Committee wishes to stress again the importance of the participation of all categories of EAESP members in scientific activities sponsored by the EAESP. Please check the website for details of these. Small group and medium-size meetings are specifically intended to include postgraduate members. Junior members of the EAESP are thus strongly encouraged to apply. We would also like to remind postgraduate members that EAESP travel grants are available.

If you have recently moved or changed your contact details please check our on-line membership list on www.eaesp.org. Some members of the

Association have signed up to this but it is up to you to complete the form and maintain accurate details for your address..

On a more sombre note, it seems right to comment on the terrorist attack on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon on September 11th. As well as sharing in the sadness and disbelief that such an atrocity has been committed, the scale and magnitude of the attack must give social psychologists pause for thought about how we can make a useful contribution to understanding what has happened. Similar concerns are probably echoed in other social science disciplines, and experts in international relations, political sciences and sociology may be well positioned to analyse what has happened. On the face of it, terrorist outrages on this scale certainly seem a long way from the comparatively innocuous phenomena that many of us study in the laboratory or field studies. Without claiming that a social psychological perspective has better answers than others, it remains important that, as social psychologists, we are prepared to comment on the social psychological aspects of what has happened, both from the perspective of the perpetrators and the victims. Accordingly we invite contributions to the Bulletin in the form of articles or brief statements that explore just those issues. If you are considering writing something for the Bulletin on this (or other issues) please contact Dominic Abrams.

Dominic Abrams and Sibylle Classen

Article

Successes and Failures of Russian Social Psychology

by G. M. Andreeva¹⁾
University of Moscow (Russia)

This article is dedicated to the characteristics of the complicated destiny of social psychology in Russia, something that Western colleagues may be aware of to some degree, but also may be subject to misapprehensions or myths. One of these myths is connected with the belief that there exists a special “Russian” (earlier “Soviet”) social psychology. When psychology is discussed in regional terms specific countries appear in the scientific literature quite seldom, usually referring only to the “American” social psychology in the case of juxtaposition with “European”. Meanwhile the attributions “German”, “English” or “Swedish” seem not to be used in any cases (an exception concerns only “French” social psychology because of the fact that many researchers are engaged in some particular theoretical position). So first of all one has to explain the real specificity of social psychology in Russia. For these reasons (and not only because of national mentality) the narration will be rather long, in order to include some historical facts as well as a brief observations of the theoretical and methodological backgrounds. It would be quite difficult to explain the contemporary status of the discipline without that.

The main “landmarks” of the rise and development of social psychology in Russia.

In fact it is rather impossible to speak about a “unique” history of social psychology as an academic discipline in Russia before the revolution of

¹⁾ Galina Andreeva is professor of social psychology (formerly the Head of the subdepartment of social psychology) at the Moscow State University. She is the author of the first textbook of social psychology in the USSR. Her e-mail address is: gmandreeva@mtu-net.ru

1917. The problems included later in the subject-matter of social psychology were primarily elaborated within sociology (Solovjev, 1874; Sorokin, 1914) or were included into ideological conceptions of social movements and accepted by different social forces. This is the reason that traditionally social psychology was “engagiert” (affected) by ideology.

As to the academic status, one of the first systematic uses of the term “collective (social) psychology” was suggested by the sociologist M. Kovalevsky in the lectures read by V. Bekhterev’s proposition in the Psychoneurologic Institute in Petersburg (Kovalevsky, 1910). Other references to social psychology were also to be found in sociological or public literature (Petrashicky, 1908; Michailovsky, et al. 1906-1914), and then in psychological works. In this case the connection with social-political movements was expressed less strongly. The most prominent contribution within this tradition was made by V. M. Bechterevev (Bechterevev, 1903). He defined for the first time the subject-matter of social psychology (“collective reflexology”) and described one of the most important mechanism of influence – suggestion – studied both at the individual and collective level. Bechterevev also organized the first university course in sociology where the relationships between sociology and social psychology were embraced.

In summary, the development of the social-psychological ideas in pre-revolutional Russia occurred predominantly not within the *psychology* but within the wider spectrum of social sciences. And here one has to look for the roots of the transformation in the history of social psychology which took place after the revolution of 1917.

Social psychology in the USSR

The history of Soviet social psychology witnessed two stages of discussion concerning the subject-matter of the discipline: the 1920s and the late 1950-early 1960s. Both of these stages are interesting both from a historical point of view and because they help better understand the place social psychology occupies in the system of scientific knowledge and provide for a more precise definition of its content.

In the 1920s, that is in the first years of Soviet power, the discussion was stimulated by two circumstances. On the one hand, life in the newly-formed social structures required a solution to the problems relevant to social psychology. On the other hand, socio-psychological knowledge came to the orbit of the acute ideological struggle of those years. The content of this struggle was connected with a demand of reconstructing of the whole system of social sciences on the philosophical base of Marxism.

G.I.Chelpanov was among those who protested against this perspective. So he proposed the division of psychology into two parts: social and general psychology. Social psychology, in his opinion, had to be evolved within the framework of Marxism, whereas general psychology should remain an empirical science, independent of Marxism or any other world outlook. This point of view signified a formal recognition of the right of social psychology to exist as a science at the cost, however, of depriving of rest of psychology from the Marxist philosophical basis (Chelpanov,1924).

It is no surprise that Chelpanov's idea was unacceptable for those psychologists who shared the idea of reconstructing the philosophical foundation of all psychology, of including the whole of it into the system of Marxist knowledge. Objections to Chelpanov took on various forms. At first the idea was expressed that as long as psychology was interpreted from the point of view of Marxist philosophy, the whole of it had a social orientation, and there was no need to single out a special branch – social psychology. There were also another arguments but the result was the same: attempts to turn social psychology into a separate discipline (or at least a separate branch of psychology) stopped for a considerable stretch of time. The problems involved were successfully tackled, but along other lines (especially pedagogic), rather than by creation of independent social psychology. This period is referred to as the “break” in the development of social psychology, if this term is relative. Later, with the growth of ideological pressure on social sciences, social psychology shared the fate of genetics, cybernetics and some other sciences because it was portrayed as “bourgeois science”, which has no place in the socialist society.

The second stage of the discussion concerning the subject-matter of social psychology took place in the late 1950s and the early 1960s together with the political “thaw”. Two circumstances started a new debate. First, the

requirement of practical activity was expanding. Basic economic, social and political problems called for a more careful analysis of the psychological aspect of various manifestations of social life. The interaction between society and individual had to be investigated on the socio-psychological, as well as on the sociological level. Secondly, at the moment when these problems were given a significantly greater amount of attention, there occurred profound changes in psychology itself: it has turned into a mature discipline based on solid theoretical work and experimental research. The essential prerequisites were thus created for new discussion of the destiny, subject-matter, tasks, methods of social psychology as well as its place in the overall system of science. The discussion of these issues on a new level had become both urgent and possible. Two approaches were formulated around the dispute about the appropriate subject-matter of social psychology, and these approaches are near to “sociological social psychology” and “psychological social psychology” in contemporary language .

Supporters of the first approach, enjoying prevalence among sociologists, understood social psychology as a science of “mass phenomena of the psyche” and saw the object of study as research of the psychology of large social groups, of the formation of public opinion, of collective behavior and so on. The supporters of the second approach, on the contrary, considered the individual as the main object of social psychology’s research: the position of the individual in a small group, interpersonal relations, the processes of communication, interaction, interpersonal perception.

In addition, a third approach emerged, in the form of an attempt to synthesize the two. Social psychology was seen as a science involving the study both of mass mental processes and the position of the individual in a group. In this case problems of social psychology seemed to be rather broad: one can see that practically the entire set of questions examined in both psychological and sociological social psychologies was included in its domain.

In spite of the fact that both the sociologists and psychologists took part in the discussion unanimously agreed that “social psychology has right to exist”, its revival actually began within *psychology*, because here the

danger of “ideological mistakes” was weaker and the status of psychology in society as a whole became rather secure. Sociology itself made only the first steps at that time. The first laboratories and departments were created in the institutes of psychology and consequently psychological social psychology was the first to be supported.

Thus one can speak about the “beginning” of the history of social psychology in the USSR only at the boundary between the 1950s and 1960s. The falling behind in the first half of the 20th century (if we start the history of Russian social psychology from 1908) explains many facts in the following development and status of the Russian social psychology.

Theoretical and methodological background

Having received the right for independent status, social psychology demonstrated two relatively independent directions of the development. First, there began active research of its own problems, coinciding with traditional fields of investigation fixed in “two” social psychologies. Second, studies of problems accompanied by methodological discussion which tried to define the means and level of “including” Marxist philosophical principles into social psychological research.

As compared with more ideologically based sciences such as sociology and political science, in social psychology this Marxist orientation did not have the “hard science” character of psychology in general. The problem was not rooted in the straight application of Marxism to the interpretation of the social-psychological phenomena, but in the explanation of how Marxist philosophy influenced the social-psychological theory. This “mediation” was proposed, as in general psychology, by Vygotsky’s cultural-historical school and Leontyev’s (1975) and Rubinstein’s (1959) “theory of activity”, based on the former.

Two famous hypotheses of Vygotsky are very important for the development of social psychology: the mediated character of humans’ higher mental functions, and the origin of mental processes, basically “intermental” and later “intramental” (Vygotsky, 1983). These ideas led to the conclusion that the main mechanism of mental development was one

of mastering the socio-historic forms of activity. Such an interpretation of the problems of general psychology provided a solid basis for the solution of the specific social psychological problems.

As to the theory (or principle) of activity¹⁾, it has also very important meaning for social psychology. In psychology, activity is considered to be a certain subject-object relation where the individual as the subject relates in a definite way to the object as he or she masters it. In the course of activity, the individual realizes his or her interest by modifying the object-related world and satisfying his or her needs. New needs also arise through activity. Therefore, activity represents a process, in which human personality develops itself. Social psychology adapts the principle of activity with reference to the basic object of its research – the group. Therefore, the content of the principle of activity is contained here in following propositions: a) activity is understood as a joint social activity of people during which particular connections arise, for example, communicative connections; b) not only the individual but also the group acts as the subject of activity, introducing the idea of the collective subject of activity; this permits the investigation of real social groups as definite system of activity; c) it is not permissible to reduce group research only to empirical description, to the simple statement of individual actions outside the social context - the given system of social relations.

The adoption of the principle of activity stipulated the *logic* of the subject-matter of social psychology. The whole construction looks approximately as follows. Because intercourse²⁾ and interaction between people take place not in a vacuum but always in already existing society (this being the first empirical fact for researcher), the first part of social psychology – “inter-

¹⁾ There is a well-known terminological difficulty in the interpretation of the principle of activity, connected with the fact that the word “activity” in a number of languages (Russian included) means both “activities” and “activeness”. In Marx’s works, written in German, there are two terms used: “Tätigkeit” and “Aktivität”, with “Tätigkeit” used in the meaning implied here. In English “activity” covers both meanings.

²⁾ Here we meet again a terminological problem because the use of the term “intercourse” has special meaning in Russian psychological language. Later we will discuss this problem in detail. Now is enough to say that the term covers the meanings of communication, interaction and interpersonal perception in sum.

course and interaction” – should start with the analysis of the place that these phenomena occupy in the structure of social relations. After the general characteristics of these socio-psychological processes have been revealed, it becomes necessary to analyze their modifications in various social groups – first of all, “large” and then, “small”. Therefore, Social psychology of groups can logically be considered the second part of social psychology. The final stage is analysis pertaining to the ways in which social group determines behavior and actions of the individual within it. Thus, the third logically defined part of socio-psychological knowledge is social psychology of the individual. Only within such a structure the individual can be “attached” to the social context.

The whole traditional subject-matter of social psychology can be organized within the limits of these parts. The fact that the above proposed logics gives the opportunity to form quite a holistic and systematic picture of the discipline constitutes the specifics of that approach. Some particular principles are immediately explicit: all the problems are considered within the social context; the individual subject’s activity as well as the group subject’s activity are acknowledged; the interpretation of the empirical data within one and the same theoretical scheme is ensured.¹⁾

The attitude towards Western Social Psychology

Along with the elaboration of its own approach to the content and structure of socio-psychological knowledge, Soviet social psychology was actively mastering the western socio-psychological experience. This was the sphere mostly influenced by ideology. Recurrences of radical negative attitude towards the Western tradition – the attitude typical for the 30s - 50s when social psychology was merely denied – were still present in some publications dated back to the period of its revival. The attitude was

¹⁾ I do not pretend to present any unique opinion of all my colleagues about the structure of social psychology and I am not sure it really exists. The proposed logic was published in the first Russian textbook of social psychology written by me and many times republished later (the last edition in 2000). This textbook is used in the teaching of social psychology in the majority of the universities. Only on this base I can conclude about the acceptance of the proposed point of view.

manifested in the statement that all Western conceptions and studies were the products of Bourgeois science and so criticism of principle should be the only possible way to relate to it. Often this attitude was in contradiction with practical application of many Western empirical and theoretical results.

During the time of political “thaw” the position was shaped differently. There appeared some works that provided a more objective account of popular Western thought but there still remained some criticism concerning positivist epistemology (Andreeva, Bogomolova, Petrovskaja, 1978; Shichirev, 1979; Shichirev, 1985). The existence of controversy within American and European social psychology meant that the debate moved from being an ideological dispute and turned into scientific discussion.

The fact that a number of Soviet scientists entered the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology as well as establishing personal contacts with western colleagues stimulated the integration of Russian social psychology into the context of the world science, so that many typical problems of 60s-70s seem to be difficult to understand today.¹⁾

Meanwhile some problems still exist within the dialogue with the Western tradition. The main problem concerns some kind of “inequality” in sharing information. The works of American and European authors were rather well known even in the USSR and even more so in Russia. A majority of professionals read them in English, but also many books and articles are now translated into Russian. Unfortunately Russian work is very seldom published in the West, and as a rule such work appears as separate articles. The only source of information for Western colleagues are personal contacts or occasional presentations of Russian scientists at the international congresses, conferences and symposia. It is clear that these difficulties are based in the problem of language as well as in some other problems.

¹⁾ In this connection I can't help remembering gratitude H.Tajfel who did all his best for involvement of Russian scientists into the world scientific community.

The reason, as I see it, deals with the consequences of the fact that Soviet science was being isolated for a long time from the western scientific community. Obviously this isolation mainly concerns the social sciences. The lack of awareness about Russian work also reflects the fact that regular scientific contacts have only been happening quite recently. So many new ideas and results of studies are not yet spread in West.¹⁾ One can find many examples in which, when acute problems of contemporary polemics have been discussed among Russian colleagues long before, but were unknown in the West. All these facts are of great importance today, when the problems of the construction of the new paradigm in social psychology are discussed in the literature. Though these problems would be discussed in detail in my following articles, it is useful now to identify some examples.

The idea of uniting “two” (or may be “three”) social psychologies was presented to Russian colleagues long ago – in the late 50s - during the discussion of the destiny of social psychology in Soviet society. As mentioned above, the structure of the subject-matter of the discipline itself was interpreted from the very beginning as including both psychological and sociological aspects. The need to take into account the social context in every experimental study was absolutely natural because the interpretation of empirical data used to include the social factors of its determination. The problem of social attribution was solved the similar way: in the study of the interpersonal perception it was presupposed to take into consideration the fact that both the subject and the object of perception were belonging to the group (Andreeva, 1980).

These and other directions of the analysis were dictated by initial methodological prerequisites oriented to some principles of Marxist

¹⁾ It would be interesting to conduct an experiment in western colleagues were asked to think of the names of ten Russian social psychologists working in the field of communication, interpersonal perception, group dynamics, leadership, attitudes, socialization, intergroup relations, conflict, ethnopscyhology, organizational behaviour, etc. At the same time, I invite any of the members of EAESP to put analogous questions to my students and ask them to name the authors of theories of social attribution, social influence, frustration-aggression, social comparison, cognitive dissonance, dyadic interaction, social identity, social representations, phenomenon “group- think” or constructionism.

philosophy that helped to resist the positivist “expansion”. Nowadays most of those problems are in the focus of attention in contemporary discussions of the new horizons of social psychology among the world scientific community. Under these circumstances it is especially relevant to develop further cooperation that gives both traditions the opportunity to represent their arguments and strengthen research. More information, specifically about Russian social-psychological research and the new status of social psychology resulting from the transformations in this country is one of the preliminary conditions of this discussion.

The issues discussed in this article are closely connected with one more point concerning social psychology’s social potential, its role in the epoch of rapid social changes, and its theoretical and practical perspectives on 21st century society. From this point of view the Russian experience can be very interesting to western readers: in spite of the fact that some relevant studies were partly published in the international editions, the whole picture of contemporary Russian realities is hardly known in the world. It is intended that future articles will serve to improve this situation and encourage fruitful dialogue. But this problem would be the purpose of the following articles.

References:

- Andreeva G.M. (1980,1988). *Socialnaya psichologiya (Social psychology)*. Moscow:MGU; (1994,1996,1998,2000,2001). *Socialnaya psichologiya (Social psychology)* Moscow:Aspect-Press.
- Andreeva G.M., Bogomolova N.N., Petrovskaya L.A. (1978). *Sovremennaya socialnaya psichologiya na Zapade: teoreticheskiye orientazii (Contemporary social psychology in the West: theoretical orientations)*. Moskwa: MGU. (2001) 2nd edition. Moskwa:Aspect-Press.
- Beckterev V.M. (1994). *Kollektivnaya reflexologiya // Izbranniye raboty po sozialnoy psichologii. (Collectiv reflexology)*. Voskwa: Nauka.

- Vygotsky L.S. (1983). *Istoriya razvitiya vysshich psichicheskych processov (History of the development of the high mental processes)*. Moskva:Nauka.
- Kovalevsky M.M. (1910). *Sociologiya (Sociology)*. Sankt-Petersburg:Tip. Stasyulevicha.
- Leontyev, A.N. (1975). *Deyatelnost. Soznaniye. Lichnost. (Activity. Consciousness. Personality)*. Moskva:Politizdat.
- Michaylovsky N.K. (1906-1914) *Geroy i tolpa //Poln. Sobr.Soch (Hero and crowd)*. Moskva.
- Petrovsky A.V.(Red.) (1979). *Psychologicheskaya teoriya kollektiva (Psychological theory of collective)*. Moskva:Pedagogika.
- Rubinshtein S.L. (1959). *Prinzihiy i puti razvitiya psichologii (Principles and ways of the development of psychology)*. Moskva:Nauka.
- Solovyev V.S. (1874). *Positivizm. Teoriya Ogusta Konta o trech fazach v umstvennom razvitii chelovechestva (Positivism. Theory of August Comte...)*. Sankt-Petersburg:Pravoslavnoye obozreniye.
- Sorokin P.A. (1914). *Obzor teoriy i osnovnykh problem progressa (Survey of theories and main problems of the Progress) // Noviyе idey v sociologii*. Sankt-Petersburg:Obrasovaniye.
- Shichirev P.N. (1979). *Sovremennaya socialnaya psichologiya SShA (Contemporary social psychology of the USA)*. Moskva:Nauka.
- Shichirev P.N. (1985). *Sovremennaya socialnaya psichologiya v Zapadnoy Evrope (Contemporary social psychology in Western Europe)*. Moskva:Nauka.
- Shichirev P.N. (1999) *Sovremennaya socialnaya psichologiya (Contemporary social psychology)*. Moskva:Аkademicheskiy Proekt.

Article

Gender Stereotypes and the Social Perception of Leadership

by Dagmar Stahlberg & Sabine Sczesny¹⁾
University of Mannheim (Germany)

In previous decades the small number of women in leadership positions has remained largely unchanged in Western societies: Although the proportion of women in top management has increased within individual countries during the last decade, even optimistic estimates report proportions of only around 10% (see e.g. Bundesfrauenministerium, dpa, Sueddeutsche Zeitung 9./10. September 2000; for Germany and Europe cf. also Dienel, 1996; for the U.S.A. Powell, 1999). This phenomenon is called the “glass ceiling” which is defined as “a barrier so subtle that it is transparent, yet so strong that it prevents women and minorities from moving up in the management hierarchy” (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990, p. 200).

A glass ceiling effect seems to operate in Academia as well. In Germany, Women occupy still less than 10% of all professors at universities and less than 5% of the top level positions (Lehrstühle). Regarding our own discipline, social psychology, a gender gap regarding the distribution of women and men into different status positions was discussed by Maass and Casotti (2000) in a recent EBSP paper. They analyzed the representation of women in the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology. Their results indicated that women are under-represented in academic social psychology when compared to the sex

¹⁾ Correspondence to Prof. Dr. Dagmar Stahlberg, Universität Mannheim, Lehrstuhl fuer Sozialpsychologie, D 68131 Mannheim; Tel.: +49 621/181-2040; Fax: +49 621/181-2038; e-mail: dstahlberg@sowi.uni-mannheim.de

distribution among psychology students. In the Northern European countries the percentage of women in EAESP is consistently below 30% (in Scandinavia, Switzerland, and Austria below 20%), while the percentages in the South (currently 54%) and in the East (currently 43%) are higher than those found in the North. A closer look at the new generation of academics (from The Netherlands, Germany and UK) revealed the following pattern: After three years only 16% of the female post-graduates have become full EAESP members in 2000 compared to 64% of the male post-graduates. The vast majority of female post-graduates (67%) have dropped out of the association compared to 18% of their male counterparts. The most extreme case is Germany where the drop-out rates are 82% of female post-graduates and 9% of male post-graduates. The authors concluded that "it is difficult to ignore the existence of such powerful barriers to successful careers of female psychologists in the three target nations (and in Germany in particular)." (Maass & Casotti, 2000, p. 30).

In the literature the following explanations for such barriers were discussed (see e.g., Powell, 1999; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990): person-centered factors (e.g., sex-related differences in traits, skills, attitudes, and behaviors), situation-centered factors (e.g., group norms, lack of opportunity for mentoring or inclusion in informal networks), social-system-centered factors (e.g., structural discrimination, biases held by the dominant group, trends in the global economy), and interactions between these three factors, e.g., between experiences and internal self-evaluations. Recent research has indicated that person-centered factors, e.g., performance, are no reason for the gender gap in career success (e.g., Abele, 2000).

Our own research deals with the effect of sex-role stereotypes on the perception of leadership. Sex-role stereotypes can be conceived as a basic dimension that affects different aspects of the three factors mentioned above, e.g., attitudes and behavior of men and women as well as group norms or biases in dominant groups.

Gender stereotypes and leadership attribution

Research on gender stereotypes has consistently demonstrated that men are generally seen as more agent and more competent than women, while women are seen as more expressive and communal than men (e.g., Williams & Best, 1982). One area in which gender stereotypes manifest themselves is the attribution of achievement performance and leadership: „If women in general are believed to be less competent, for example, then a specific woman’s performance is viewed less positively and her success is less likely to be explained by assuming ability“ (Deaux, 1995, p. 13). A number of studies confirmed this hypothesis, but pertinent meta-analyses showed that the overall effect of gender varies in its strength depending on other variables (e.g., Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonski, 1992). These meta-analyses identified gender-specific context as one of the most important moderating variables, with male-dominated and/or gender-neutral domains causing more pronounced gender effects than female-dominated domains. Heilman’s lack-of-fit-model (1983) provides an explanation of such context effects. According to Heilman, „Expectations about how successful or unsuccessful an individual will be when working at a particular job are determined by the fit between the perception of an individual’s attributes and the perception of the job’s requirements in terms of skills and abilities“ (p. 278). For organizational jobs that are male-typed, there is a lack of fit between the perceived requirements of the job and the skills and abilities typically attributed to women as a group. This presumed lack of fit may increase the likelihood of sex-biased judgments or behaviors.

Assuming that leadership positions in general are perceived as requiring primarily skills and abilities that are stereotypically associated with maleness, the so-called “think manager – think male” phenomenon, some lack of fit will be perceived in the case of a female leader. In our own research project we studied

- whether the „think manager–think male” phenomenon can still be observed in a sample of future managers. A new methodological approach was chosen to study this question which takes into account several methodological limitations of past research in this area.

- the relevance of biological sex and other cues that activate gender stereotypes such as physical appearance (typically masculine vs. typically feminine) and olfactory cues (masculine and feminine perfumes) for the attribution of leadership competence.

The “think manager–think male” stereotype

Are jobs requiring leadership qualities typically male-typed jobs? Schein (1973; 1975) examined the social image of successful middle managers and found that the attributes ascribed to a „successful middle manager“ yielded a significantly higher correlation with the description of a typical man than with the description of a typical woman. Heilman (1983) concluded: „Thus, not only most managers are men, but good management is also thought to be a manly business” (p. 277). This phenomenon of “think manager–think male” was confirmed in many subsequent studies (e.g., Schein, Mueller, Lituchy, & Liu, 1996). For example, in a study of our own research group (see Buckermann & Stahlberg, 1995), the “ideal (good) manager” (no gender specification) was described with the masculine characteristics of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory by the majority of managers in our sample. Results of Deal and Stevenson (1998) indicated that male and female respondents have similar perceptions both of prototypical managers and male managers, whereas male respondents were more likely to have negative views of female managers than female respondents (using the Schein Descriptive Index, 1973): Male college students, in contrast to their female counterparts described female managers as less likely to possess traits and characteristics such as ambitiousness, competence, intelligence, objectiveness, well-informedness etc., and more likely as bitter, deceitful, easily influenced, frivolous, nervous, passive, quarrelsome, reserved, shy, having a strong need for social acceptance, timid, uncertain, vulgar etc.

Stereotypes concerning leadership perception in these studies were usually assessed using items consisting of general personality traits. These instruments contain global traits of the male and female stereotype (expressive vs. instrumental). A typical example is the Bem-Sex-Role-Inventory (BSRI, Bem, 1974). Its items are based on characteristics and behavior which are considered especially desirable for women and men,

respectively. For the femininity scale, characteristics were chosen, which are especially desirable in women, but not rated desirable in men. The reverse is true for the items of the masculinity scale. Using this approach can therefore overlook the fact that the socially desirable characteristics and behaviors for one sex are not necessarily the same as those which are typically ascribed to that sex. In this sense, characteristics such as ability to cooperate or to compromise could be considered as being equally desirable for both sexes (and so, would not be included in the BSRI), but could be considered to be typical for women. Moreover, various characteristics are included in the BSRI that can be supposed to be irrelevant in the context of leadership (i.e., athletic, individualistic, gentle, affectionate). And finally, characteristics proven in recent leadership research as being valid predictors in leadership success (e.g., negotiation skills, see Bass & Avolio, 1993) are not considered in the BSRI. To overcome these methodological limitations, we designed a questionnaire with forty leadership characteristics taken specifically from a leadership framework (management research, assessment centers, job advertisements, etc.; e.g., abilities of self-assertion, the ability to cooperate or to delegate) as an alternative to the more prevalent sex-role-oriented inventories.

The questions we dealt with in our own study read as follows (Sczesny, Stahlberg, & Spreemann, 1999): (1) Is the discrepancy between the masculine sex-role stereotype and the stereotype of a leader still smaller than the discrepancy between the feminine stereotype and the stereotype of a leader? (2) Is the discrepancy between the stereotype of male leaders and the stereotype of leaders in general smaller than the discrepancy between the stereotype of female leaders and leaders in general? (3) Do men and women differ in their self-description regarding leadership abilities?

The sample consisted of 216 students of economics who were selected because of their perspective as future managers. As an alternative to the more prevalent sex-role-oriented inventories in previous research, the above mentioned questionnaire with items taken specifically from a leadership framework (assessment centers, job advertisements, etc.) was designed. Participants had to evaluate forty leadership characteristics within one of six experimental conditions: "leaders in general", "women in

general", "men in general", "female leaders", "male leaders", and "self". They had to estimate what percentage of the respective characteristics each group/they possess and to rate the importance of these characteristics for the particular group/themselves.

The main findings were that women-in-general and female leaders were perceived differently from managers in general, men in general and male leaders: Social skills (e.g., consideration, ability to work in teams) were attributed more and assertiveness-related skills (e.g., competitiveness, career orientation) were attributed less to women in general and to female managers. The estimates of importance of leadership characteristics revealed hardly any significant differences. Female and male participants did not differ in their self-descriptions.

Taken together, these results support the assumption that the "think manager–think male" phenomenon is still well and alive. It is very important from our point of view that these findings proved to be significant in the context of skills and abilities which are all relevant in the business context, especially when evaluating managers. It is also very interesting because these findings are obviously discrepant to reality, at least insofar as the self-descriptions of future managers do not support these stereotypes to any extent. The "think manager–think male" phenomenon can therefore still be considered as one possible source for sex role stereotyped-driven biases in judgements and decision making in the context of leadership.

Biological sex and other cues that activate gender role stereotypes

Not only biological sex activates gender-role stereotypes, but other cues that are part of a global, multi-faceted gender-role stereotype can also activate the attribution of leadership. A multidimensional conception extends the formerly trait-based view of gender stereotypes and opens a more differentiated perspective. According to this conception, stereotypes are composed of diverse components, such as traits, role behaviors, occupations and physical appearance (e.g., Deaux & Kite, 1993). Deaux and Lewis (1984) used textual descriptions of stimulus persons in their three experiments. The stimulus persons were ascribed stereotypical

characteristics pertaining to one of the four components mentioned above. In their first experiment, for example, the authors varied the role behavior of the stimulus person, so that the description referred to either four masculine, four feminine or mixed types of role behavior. For example, in the experimental condition "masculine role behavior" the target person was described as the head of the household, as the provider, as a leader and as responsible for repairs in the house. In addition, the stimulus person was introduced as male vs female or (in experiments 2 and 3) without reference to sex. The participants were told to visualize the person as vividly as possible. After reading the description, participants estimated the likelihood of the respective stimulus person possessing various masculine or feminine characteristics from the three other stereotype components. In experiment 1, for example, participants estimated the likelihood that the stimulus person possessed the personality traits independent or emotional, the physical characteristics broad shoulders or dainty and the occupations agent of an insurance company or primary school teacher. Results of all three experiments show that information pertaining to one component (e.g., masculine personality traits) led participants to assume stereotype-congruent characteristics for the other components as well (e.g., stereotypically masculine role behavior). Information on the biological sex of the stimulus person influenced assumptions in the same way, but to a lesser degree, as shown by the effect sizes reported by Deaux and Lewis. Moreover, in all three experiments the impact of biological sex was independent of the effects of information regarding stereotype components.

Deaux and Lewis (1983; 1984) have demonstrated that gender stereotypes contain elements from all of the four components. Although none of the masculine or feminine versions of a component are exclusively associated with only one sex, they are significantly associated with men rather than women or vice versa. While the salience of a person's biological sex is often considered sufficient to activate the corresponding stereotype components, the work of Deaux and Lewis (1984) suggests that gender-stereotyped physical characteristics (e.g., broad shoulders vs. dainty physique) can outweigh sex as a basis of judgement. Their results show that the components of gender stereotypes differ in their liability to implicate other components, with physical appearance playing a dominant role.

Based on these results, a new approach to the „think manager - think male“ phenomenon was presented by our own research group. We examined whether the dominant role of physical appearance also emerged in the context of leadership perception. It was assumed that typically masculine physical characteristics would activate other components of the male stereotype. Due to the close association of typically masculine attributes with attributes of the typical successful manager, masculine features were expected to function as a leadership cue. Independent of a person's sex, a masculine physical appearance should increase the perceived fit between the presumed characteristics of the person with the presumed leadership requirements, while typically feminine attributes should decrease the perceived fit. The physical appearance consists of different components, e.g., visual or olfactory aspects, which we examined in a series of experiments:

Visual Cues

In four experiments based on a 2 (sex of participants) by 2 (sex of stimulus persons) by 2 (physical appearance of stimulus persons) factorial design, participants received descriptions (two experiments) or photographs (two experiments) of a male or female stimulus person whose physical appearance was either typically masculine or typically feminine (Spreemann, Sczesny, & Stahlberg, 1999). Dependent measures concerned leadership characteristics (e.g., ability to make decisions, dominance) and were measured either through direct ratings or indirectly via a recognition measure (false memory of leadership characteristics). An effect of biological sex consistent with „think manager-think male“ phenomenon was found only in the experiments where an indirect measure of leadership ascription had been employed. In the experiments with a direct rating of leadership ascription, there was even a reversed tendency to evaluate female stimulus persons more positively on these measures than male stimulus persons. However, there was a consistent effect of physical appearance in all four experiments in the predicted direction: Participants attributed more pronounced leadership qualities to stimulus persons with typically masculine physical characteristics than to those with typically feminine characteristics, regardless of the person's biological sex. The

effect of physical appearance was reliably stronger than that of biological sex.

These experiments show that physical appearance – here the visual component - is a strong cue that can activate sex-role stereotypes and as a consequence affect judgement and decision making in the context of leadership. Whereas effects of the biological sex of the stimulus persons were attenuated or even reversed when direct measures were used the effect of physical appearance seems to exert a more consistent and stronger influence. Moreover this latter effect seems to operate largely automatic and out of the realm of conscious decision making and is therefore not affected by response biases due to social desirability or political correctness that can be made responsible for the attenuation or reversion of the “think manager–think male” phenomenon in the direct measures condition.

Olfactory cues

Since odor can be seen as another facet of physical appearance, it seems worth looking into its influence on person perception. While „odor has been almost totally neglected by social psychologists“ (Levine & McBurney, 1986, p. 180), the few existing studies found that olfaction plays an important role in person perception. An influence of olfactory cues on social perception, particularly an influence of perfume on impression formation processes, was found in several studies conducted by Baron since the 1980s: In one of these studies, for example, fragrance had an impact on evaluations of job applicants (female confederates wearing a popular and pleasant „women’s“ fragrance or none and male confederates wearing a „men’s“ fragrance or none; 1983; 1986). Participants had to evaluate applicants on job-related and personal dimensions in simulated employment interviews. Male participants rated perfumed job applicants lower than non-perfumed applicants on these dimensions; female participants showed the opposite pattern (1983). Research on olfactory stimuli conducted by Fiore (1992) showed that specific components of fragrances influence impressions of personality in specific ways. Participants (all female in this study) were asked to imagine fictitious persons wearing three different commercial women’s fragrances (floral,

oriental or chypre) and to evaluate the personality of these persons. The three different fragrances were presented on scent strips. Compared to oriental and chypre fragrances, the floral fragrance triggered lower ratings on traditionally male traits (e.g., competent, professional, career-orientated, confident, assertive).

Based on these and similar findings, the main aim of our own research was to examine the effects of „women's“ and „men's“ perfumes on the attribution of leadership competence (Sczesny, Spreemann, & Stahlberg, under review). We intended to test whether a typically masculine perfume functions as a leadership cue, similar to visually perceivable characteristics (see above). If this is the case, again in line with the “think manager–think male” phenomenon the attribution of leadership competence should be higher when evaluating applicants associated with a typically masculine perfume than applicants associated with a typically feminine perfume. This hypothesis was tested in two experiments.

In both experiments, female and male participants were asked to assume the role of a personnel manager. In Experiment 1, they perused an application for the position of a junior manager written by a male or female job applicant. The application papers were prepared with a typically masculine perfume, a typically feminine perfume or no perfume at all (control group). In Experiment 2, the participants conducted a job interview with a female or male applicant (a confederate) who had applied the respective perfume or no perfume. In both experiments participants stated whether they would employ the applicant and how certain they felt in their decision. In addition, they rated the applicant's general leadership competence as well as more specific leadership skills.

The main findings of both experiments read as follows: (1) Compared to persons with a typically feminine perfume, persons with a typically masculine perfume were „employed“ with a higher degree of certainty. (2) In addition, male stimulus persons with a typically masculine perfume were rated higher in general leadership competence than male persons with a typically feminine perfume, but no comparable differences were found for female stimulus persons. (3) Perfume had no effect on the rating of specific leadership skills. Finally, no significant differences were found regarding the ratings of male and female job applicants, although there was a (marginally significant) tendency for female job applicants to receive

higher ratings of general leadership competence and assertiveness-related skills than male job applicants (the latter was true for male participants only).

Taken together the results of both experiments confirmed the hypothesis that feminine or masculine scents can activate gender role stereotypes and can therefore again influence judgement and decision making in the leadership context. In line with the „think manager-think male“ phenomenon, a person that was associated with a masculine scent was more likely to be selected for a leadership position, regardless of his or her biological sex.

Discussion and Conclusion

In sum, our research program confirms that the “think manager–think male” phenomenon can still be observed when methods are applied that can overcome methodological limitations of past research. It is also important to mention that the phenomenon was pronounced although no comparable differences were found between the actual self-descriptions of male and female future managers. Furthermore, our research shows that beside the biological sex of a person more subtle cues associated with sex-role stereotypes can also bias leadership perception:

First, the visual appearance of a stimulus person (typically masculine vs. typically feminine) affected the attribution of leadership skills and abilities. More pronounced leadership qualities were attributed to masculine looking stimulus persons than to feminine looking stimulus persons.

Second, masculine and feminine perfumes can bias the perception of leadership qualities accordingly.

Third, a very interesting feature of these research findings is that effects of the biological sex of a person may be attenuated by concerns about social desirability or political correctness. Today open discriminating of female managers can be regarded as highly socially undesirable or politically incorrect. People might therefore refrain from such tendencies and even show the opposite pattern (the so-called “women are wonderful effect”,

Eagly & Mladinic, 1994). Such counter-stereotypic or reverse discrimination effects in potentially stereotype prone judgements have been reported by other authors as well. For example, a reversed discrimination effect was observed by Branscombe and Smith (1990) in one of their experiments in attitudinal decisions whereas in more subtle measures the sex role stereotype consistent effects were still present. These findings are in line with our findings of a comparably strong “think manager–think male” effect of the more subtle cue “physical appearance” in all four experiments (with direct and indirect measures). Here we tend to assume that stereotyping on the basis of a masculine or feminine physical appearance is a basically automatic process, of which people are not aware and can therefore also not be expected to correct for discrimination effects. According to Devine (1989), unbiased judgements require an intentional inhibition of automatically activated stereotypes. This involves necessarily controlled processes, e.g., correctional processes, which individuals carry out in accordance with their own intuitive theories about possibly distorted judgments. Currently we are running some experiments in which we try to test some hypotheses derived from this line of thought.

Finally, although answering some open questions in the field of sex-stereotyped perceptions of leadership the present research program also leads to some new research questions. For example, up to now it is not clear whether people who use the physical appearance cue in order to predict leadership qualities actually show a bias or not. To date it cannot be excluded that people who show more masculine (or feminine) physical features also possess more masculine (or feminine) abilities. Some of our current research deals with this question of the validity of judgments based on a masculine or feminine physical appearance. Other questions we deal with in our current research concern the interaction of different cues, the weight of physical cues that are biologically given (such as height or facial structures) compared to those features of the physical appearance that are self-made (length and style of hair-do, make-up or dressing). From an evolutionary point of view, one can argue that the former cues should be more important in influencing our perceptions whereas from a social cognition perspective the latter features should be much more important because they allow for attributions of a person’s self-presentational preferences. Also the actual predictive validity of both kinds of cues might

be different. This is only a small sample of interesting questions for future research.

References

- Abele, A. E. (2000). Gender gaps in early career development of university graduates. Why are women less successful than men? *European Bulletin of Social Psychology*, **12**, 22-38.
- Baron, R. A. (1983). „Sweet smell of success“: The impact of pleasant artificial scents on evaluations of job applicants. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **68**, 709-713.
- Baron, R. A. (1986). Self-presentation in job interviews: When there can be „too much of a good thing“. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **16**, 16-28.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 49-80). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, **31**, 634-643.
- Branscombe, N. R., & Smith, E. R. (1990). Gender and racial stereotypes in impression formation and social decision-making processes. *Sex Roles*, **22**, 627-647.
- Buckermann, U., & Stahlberg, D. (1995). *Weibliche Führungskräfte - männliche Führungskräfte: Ein Rollenwandel im Management?* Vortrag, 5. Tagung der Fachgruppe Sozialpsychologie der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Psychologie, Potsdam.
- Deal, J. J. & Stevenson, M. A. (1998). Perceptions of Female and Male Managers in the 1990s: Plus ça change *Sex Roles*, **38**, 287-300.
- Deaux, K. (1995). How basic can you be? The evolution of research on gender stereotypes. *Journal of Social Issues*, **51**, 11-20.

- Deaux, K., & Kite, M. (1993). Gender stereotypes. In F. L. Denmark & M. A. Paludi (Eds.), *Psychology of women. A handbook of issues and theory* (p. 107-139). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Deaux, K., & Lewis, L. (1983). Components of gender stereotypes. *Psychological Documents*, **13**, 25.
- Deaux, K., & Lewis, L. (1984). Structure of gender stereotypes: Interrelationships among components and gender label. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **46**, 991-1004.
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **56**, 5-18.
- Dienel, C. (1996). *Frauen in Führungspositionen in Europa*. München: Verlag Deutsches Jugendinstitut.
- Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, **111**, 3-22.
- Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1994). Are people prejudiced against women? Some answers from research on attitudes, gender stereotypes, and judgements of competence. *European Review of Social Psychology*, **5**, 1-35.
- Fiore, A. M. (1992). Effect of composition of olfactory cues on impression of personality. *Social Behavior and Personality*, **20**, 149-162.
- Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, **5**, 269-298.
- Levine, J. M., & McBurney, D. H. (1986). The role of olfaction in social perception and behavior. In C. Herman, M. Zanna, & E. Higgins (Eds.), *Ontario Symposium: Physical Appearance, Stigma, and Social Behavior*, Vol. 3 (pp. 179-217). Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Maass, A., & Casotti, P. (2000). Gender gaps in EAESP: Numerical distribution and scientific productivity of women and men. *European Bulletin of Social Psychology*, **12**, 14-31.
- Morrison, A. M., & von Glinow, M. A. (1990). Women and Minorities in Management. *American Psychological Association*, **45**, 200-208.

- Powell, G. N. (1999). Reflections on the Glass Ceiling. Recent Trends and Future Prospects. *Handbook of Gender & Work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schein, V. E. (1973). The relationship between sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **57**, 95-100.
- Schein, V. E. (1975). Relations between sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **60**, 340-344.
- Schein, V. E., Mueller, R., Lituchy, T., & Liu, J. (1996). Think manager - think male: a global phenomenon? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **17**, 33-41.
- Sczesny, S., Spreemann, S., & Stahlberg, D. (1999). *Gender stereotypes and leadership perception*. 12th General Meeting of the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, Oxford.
- Sczesny, S., Spreemann, S., & Stahlberg, D. (under review). *The influence of gender-stereotyped perfumes on the attribution of leadership competence*.
- Spreemann, S., Sczesny, S., & Stahlberg, D. (1999). *Physical appearance, gender stereotypes and the perception of leadership*. 12th General Meeting, European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, Oxford.
- Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1982). *Measuring sex stereotypes*. A thirty nation study. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Book Reviews

Social Construction in Context, by Kenneth J. Gergen (2001)

London: Sage Publications. 223 pp. Cloth (ISBN 0761965440): £ 55.00.
Paper (ISBN 0761965459): £ 17.99.

Review by **Gabrielle Poeschl**¹⁾

This book is the last contribution to the series “Inquiries in Social Construction”, aimed to diffuse the nowadays well-known rationale of social constructionism. The volume is divided into 11 chapters, most of which revised versions of recently published texts. The stated objective of the volume is to present social constructionism as a metatheory, a social theory and a societal practice.

In the first section, “Social Construction and the Human Sciences”, Gergen dedicates five chapters to ongoing debates on social scientific knowledge. Chapter 1 reminds the antagonism between social constructionism and both positivism-empiricism and culture critique with regards to reality, rationality, and objectivity, and suggests ways to improve relationships within the scientific community. The antagonism between the psychological and the constructionist projects is the focus of Chapter 2, which presents the constructionist conception of the self and advocates for discourses that attempt to promote human welfare rather than to “tell the truth”. Chapter 3 presents a general analysis of the negative effects of critique and suggests alternatives to achieve democratic dialogue. In Chapter 4, Gergen goes on to examine traditional and contemporary forms of scientific writing, underlining their main differences and the way they favour specific forms of society. Chapter 5 analyses different views on the

¹⁾ Gabrielle Poeschl is Professor at the Faculty of Psychology, University of Porto, Portugal (email: gpoeschl@psi.up.pt). Her research interests include social representations and gender issues.

relation between history and psychology, passing from an interactionist position to a functionalist conception of psychological discourse. Moral and political implications of published work are underlined.

With four chapters, some written with collaborators and two being original papers, the second section, "Social Construction and Societal Practice", moves from academic issues to social practices. Chapter 6 analyses the assumptions, practices and objectives that differentiate traditional from constructionist positions in relation to the therapeutic process. Chapter 7 examines different conceptions of knowledge, presumed to be at the basis of pedagogical practices, while calling for an articulated, socially relevant and democratic co-construction of knowledge. In Chapter 8, Gergen examines new challenges met by the global expansion of modern organizations and proposes to elucidate processes of organizing that simultaneously benefit the organization and the society. Chapter 9 compares the assumptions that underlie the traditional and constructionist conceptions of organizational science, and more explicitly elaborates on how constructionist ideas may be applied in organizational context.

The third section, "Social Construction and Cultural Context", is an attempt to apply constructionist ideas to the understanding of two societal phenomena. Chapter 10 analyses the relation between identity politics and social constructionism. Here, Gergen presents the constructivist move "from a symbiotic to a productive" posture and develops the main aspects of his relational theory. The effect of the technologies of sociation on the individual, and of technologically mediated communities on moral action are debated in Chapter 11, which proposes relational being as a way to sustain a process of morality-making.

Overall, Gergen's book is a timely plea for tolerance, the right to difference, and the development of ethical scientific and professional practices, orientated towards the construction of a better world. Throughout the chapters, Gergen thoroughly and consistently develops constructionist thought, advocating for a plurality of approaches and practices, rather than a single "best" method; attention to situated discourse rather than reification of facts, selves and discourses; democratic rather than hierarchical relationships; acknowledgement of value-

commitment rather than neutrality of research and practices; extension of the use-value of the scientific project to relevant social issues and practices to create a better world. The text clearly reveals the beneficial impact of social constructionism as a critique on the conceptualisation of the scientific project and its success in generating valuable reflection on traditional assumptions and practices, even though a number of recent (and less recent) changes in empiricist-positivist tradition turn many of the criticisms to “the” dominant orientation somewhat outdated.

As a theory, social constructionism appears more convincing in its critique of the problems inherent to traditional practices than in its optimism relative to the outcomes of the alternatives it advocates. One could hardly deny that reality shapes everyday life, that it gives rise to multiple reconstructions that reflect individuals’ positions in the social field, that groups in power positions very subtly (and, often, less subtly) decide between what is “right” or “good” and what is “wrong” or “evil”, that voice is denied to the dominated, who have to take it, that, because social representations tend to justify and maintain the social order, specific circumstances are required to make social identities meaningful and, possibly, to trigger social change. Important alternative theoretical frameworks concerned with social issues have, besides, provided significant understanding of most of these phenomena.

Nonetheless, the relational perspective of social constructionism has the merit to invest in the identification of practices that are likely to create a better society and proposes creative tracks on how this venture could be actively pursued. For this reason, and for its great potential to generate reflection on scientific and professional practices, this text should be highly recommended to post-graduate students, scholars and social scientists, in spite of the difficulties it may present to the readers without previous notions of the history of sciences.

New Books by Members

Prospettive multiple nella vita sociale: l'aprirsi e il chiudersi degli eventi sociali. [Multiple Perspectives in social life: The forces behind the opening and closing of social events].

Giuseppe Pantaleo and Robert A. Wicklund

Padova/Bologna (March 2001): Decibel/Zanichelli.

ISBN: 88-08-08835-9, pp. 224, L. 36.000 / 18,59 €

The book depicts personal and societal functioning in terms of the participants' perspectives toward one another. Drawing on symbolic interactionism, Piaget's thinking, K. Lewin, postmodernist contributions, and some of our own concepts, we have written and assembled the following chapters, all of which bear on multiple perspectives in interpersonal functioning. An interaction can, of course, be characterized in terms of participants' definite goals, in terms of the instrumentality of contact, and in the language of the "instrumental others". A good portion of psychology bases its understanding of interaction on these principles. On the other hand, such events as imitation/internalization, enjoying multiplicity of viewpoints, and tolerance of heterogeneous perspectives, constitute a realm of social events that have little to do with definite goals or instrumentality.

The chapters center around the conditions of these alternate forms of human existence. This means: What are the conditions, the environments, the motivational states, that bring a person to enter into others' perspectives? Correspondingly, what circumstances, long-term needs, or cultural habits bring a person to focus on others through the filter of goals-to-be-reached, and other-as-instrument? The book illustrates these forms of social life, as well as the dynamics of the back-and-forth between multiple perspectives and strict goal-orientation, on three broad levels of human functioning:

- (1) The momentary psychological state: The person can be described as changing rapidly toward and away from the openness of multiple perspectives. Here we have the everyday variations in behavior as well as psychology experiments.

- (2) The process of development and pedagogy: What social influences bring a person to be attuned chronically to others as instrumental, or alternatively, as beings who have distinct perspectives?
- (3) Cultural differences: What are the psychological states and developmental factors that lead to differences among cultures in terms of strict goal-orientation vs. openness to perspectives?

Further information can be found at the Internet address:
<http://www.zanichelli.it/>

Teorii Tresci I Form Samoswiadomosci (Contents and Forms of Self-Awareness)

Zbigniew Zaborowski (Warsaw University)

ZAK: Warsaw, Poland, 2000, 198 pages

This book sets out Professor Zaborowski's general theory of the functioning of self-awareness. The first part of the book describes different theoretical perspectives on self-awareness, including the ideas of Edelman, Searle and Neisser. The second part explores how micro theories, many deriving from cognitive dissonance theory, analyse the role of the self. Zaborowski's own 'Contents and Forms' theory of self-awareness is introduced to provide a broader framework. The theory distinguishes between the internal and external contents, and the forms that activate, select, make salient and integrate these contents. Four forms are distinguished in particular: reflective, defensive, individual, and outer self-awareness. A scale that measures these forms is described. It is argued that the normal state of self-awareness is one of structural equilibrium. This may be achieved in different ways, several of which are described in the book, with reference dissonance, self-affirmation and other theories. The dynamic and holistic functioning of self-awareness is linked to research by Carver and Scheier, and Nowack and Vallacher. Within the framework of Contents and Forms theory many specific predictions can be formulated which broaden and deepen present research in personality and social psychology. The final part of the book examines how the theory can be

applied to areas such as interpersonal relations, justice, conformity, attitudes and self-control.

Future EAESP Meetings - Calendar

Small Group Meetings

July 2002 (Porto, Portugal)

Small Group Meeting on Social Differentiation within Groups

Organisers: José Marques (Portugal) & Michael A. Hogg (Australia)

Contact: José Marques, marques@psi.up.pt

General Meeting

June 26-29, 2002 (San-Sebastian, Spain)

13th GENERAL MEETING of the EAESP

Contact: Sibylle Classen: sibylle@eaesp.org (Registration)

Sabino Ayestaran: pspayets@sc.ehu.es (Local Organisation)

Eddy van Avermaet: ssgm@psy.kuleuven.ac.be (Scientific Committee)

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

Summer School

August 18th – September 1st, 2002

Marburg, Germany

Organisers: Ulrich Wagner (Germany) & Rolf van Dick (Germany)

Contact: Rolf van Dick, vandick@mail.uni-marburg.de

Reports of Previous Meetings

Small Group Meeting

On Gender Role Research

At Graz, Austria, 5th–7th April, 2001

Organized by Andrea E. Abele & Ursula Athenstaedt

The subject of gender in social psychology continues to develop and branch out into various research areas. A small group meeting on gender role research was held in the scenic outskirts of Graz, Austria, to bring together multiple perspectives on this large and rapidly changing area. The focus of the meeting was mainly to integrate views on gender roles, ranging from research focusing on the individual (e.g. gender identity and attitudes) to that focusing on cultural aspects (e.g. cross-cultural stereotyping). Researchers from nine different countries in Europe, America and Australia participated at the meeting. Fortunately, pleasant weather and peaceful atmosphere of the Castle St. Martin provided the perfect setting for in depth conversations, both formal and informal, on gender roles and related topics.

The first day focused on the topics of gender roles, social role theory, the implications of measuring gender related variables and their correlates. The discussions began with an introduction to gender role theory in Wendy Wood's presentation of her work on Bio-Social role theory with Alice Eagley, '*A cross-cultural analysis of the social roles of women and men: Implications for the origins of sex difference*'. The topic then narrowed to measuring changing gender roles with Andrea Abele's discussion, '*Dynamic Gender: The reciprocal impact of gender-related traits and career success*', where the implications of women's embracing of instrumentality in the workplace were discussed. Dorothee Alfermann continued the topic of gender identity, its measurement and correlates in her work with Jeannin Stiller on '*Gender Identity and Health*', which discussed the possible physical and mental health implications of being too high, or too low, on masculinity. The focus of gender identity in relation to health was furthered by Monika Sieverding's discussion of '*The*

meaning of the gender-role self-concept for subjective and physiological stress reactivity', which highlighted again the potential health risks of being too instrumental in one's gender role orientation.

Following a leisurely lunch break we continued to examine gender role measurement with Ursula Athenstaedt's talk on *'Gender role self-concept: Definition, measurement and implications'*. Here, links were drawn between gender role self-concept and gender role attitudes emphasising the importance of context in these domains. The final discussion on the measurement of gender roles was Mercedes López-Sáez and Esther López-Zafra's talk, *'Femininity and masculinity as measure of gender identity'*, which again used a multi-faceted approach to build an adequate measure of global gender identity (and explore relationships with gender stereotypes). The final topic of the day shifted to discussions on gender identity construction in work environments. Joe McGrath presented his work with Jennifer Berdahl on *'Gender and interaction norm in work groups over time'* where he also highlighted the importance of context (such as the demographics of the work group) in gender interactions. Concluding the discussions for the day was Sabine Koch's presentation of her work with Lenelis Kruse on *'Gender construction in team talks at the work place'* which continued to emphasise gender and context in communication, namely differences and similarities in communicative situations, preferences, objectives and styles of coping with conflict.

The summary for the first day, led by Alice Eagley, concluded that there were new outcomes for the multi-faceted measurement of gender identity and the self-concept (including a lack of sex differences between men and women on masculine/ instrumental measures). There were new implications for the health and biological effects of these measures, and implications for gender typed communication and behaviours. A common theme in the discussion focused on the role of context and environment in gender interactions (namely the make-up of a group as same sex or mixed sex). Emphasis was placed on the need to examine the broader context, to examine factors such as changes in interaction over time and changes in overarching social structure, without losing sight of the details of social interaction (e.g. centralisation of power and individual construction of gender).

The second day's central topic focused on gender stereotyping and followed on from the previous day with a focus on the workplace. Alice Eagley began with a broader theoretical approach in a presentation of a *'Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders'* which examined the relationship between gender roles and leadership roles and the implications of this for the 'glass-ceiling' effect, (again highlighting the importance of context). Agneta Fischer and Patricia Rodriguez Mosquera's *'Masked masculinity in management'* argued that both sexes develop different skills over time in accordance with gender roles, and found that masculinity plays a greater role in ambition to reach the top for both sexes (while feminine attributes are seen as of secondary importance). Dagmar Stahlberg and Sabine Sczesny's presentation, *'Think male think manager: The impact of physical appearance'*, took the view that a physically masculine appearance (even scent) is a cue to leadership which can trigger automatic stereotyping processes. Christa Rodler then presented her work with Erich Kirchler *'Stereotypes of men and women in management'*, which used archival data to show that evaluations of female and male managers have become more similar in recent years; with women described as more task oriented and all individuals as more person oriented.

The focus then changed to views on gender internationally with María José Sotelo's *'Researching connections between racial attitudes and gender roles internationally'*, which found links between sexism and blatant racism, as well as with economic development. Miguel Moya presented his work with Francisca Expósito on *'New forms of sexism in Spain'*, and found that neosexism was mediated for men through a threat to their collective interests (and in part by their domestic interest), and for women through their perception of in-group discrimination. The topic then shifted towards a broader view of gender stereotyping not as differences in sex, but rather as status differences assigned to the sexes, in a presentation by Michael Conway on *'The implications of a status model for understanding gender stereotypes on status processes in small groups'*. Margaret Foddy concluded with a comprehensive analysis on *'The impact of automatic and controlled gender stereotypes on status processes in small groups'* which found that beliefs about gender differences contributed to status differences in behaviour in small groups, (but automatic processes were unrelated).

The summary for the day, led by Joachim Krüger noted firstly a lack of male participation in the area of gender research in general, but highlighted the methodological diversity of the current research (from archival data, to physical and olfactory cues, to controlled laboratory methods). The risks and benefits of the masculinisation of women, that is occurring given the continued emphasis on masculinity for competence and success in the workplace, was discussed. It was suggested that there was a greater need for coherence in cultural research on gender roles. Social role theory and the status theory of gender were widely debated, as was the notion that gender and status may be independent variables. The day concluded with a friendly reception at the mayor's offices in the city of Graz, and was followed by an outing to a jazz club (not a *chess* club as was first understood by some of the presenters).

The third and final day concluded with two additional talks on the topic of gender stereotyping. Joachim Krüger discussed his work with Paola Villano, '*Accentuation and projection in perceptions of men's and women's stereotypes*', which concluded that there was accentuation of gender stereotypes in estimated percentage of men and women who possess certain traits, as well as projection of personal beliefs onto perceived cultural stereotypes. Finally, the day concluded with a presentation by Catherine Lido on the '*Cognitive and behavioural effects of priming and controlling gender stereotypes*' which found that non-gender typed, egalitarian individuals reversed the stereotype of female targets (pairing women with masculine hobbies and occupations).

The summary for the day, led by Andrea Abele and Ursula Athenstaedt, commented on the diversity of the research, as well as the common themes, such as the dynamic changes in gender in social psychology (e.g. embracing of masculinity/instrumentality by women) and indicators of stability in gender roles. It was suggested that future collaboration could focus on international and cultural conceptions of gender roles, and an effort to compile measures, which better get at the actual components of gender roles. Lastly, it was suggested that future research needs to focus on the question of whether only female gender roles are changing cross-culturally, and if so what are the implications for the values of traditionally 'feminine/expressive/communal' traits. The thoroughly

enjoyable conference concluded with a bus tour of the city of Graz, including taking the Schlossbergbahn to the top of the Schlossberg for wonderful views of the city, followed by a guided walking tour of the city and a final goodbye dinner. Many collaborative links were established through this conference, and everyone would like to thank the amazing efforts of Ursula Athenstaedt and Andrea Abele in organising this extremely productive meeting.

Catherine Lido

Small Group Meeting

On Theory and Method in Societal Psychology

At Pecs, Hungary, 26th–29th April, 2001

Organized by Janosz Laszlò & Wolfgang Wagner

The Small Group Meeting "Theory and Method in Societal Psychology" took place in the lovely south-Hungarian city of Pecs from April 26th through 29th, 2001. It was held in the impressive historical housing of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences overlooking the city. It was motivated by our (i.e. the organisers': J. Laszlò & W. Wagner) impression that a number of theoretical approaches have emerged in European social psychology during the past decades which complement the prevalent social psychology towards encompassing more societal processes and wider social phenomena. Such approaches are discursive psychology and constructivism, rhetorical psychology, narrative psychology, social representation and social identity theory. Despite their inherently similar goals the representatives of these approaches have rarely entered in a constructive dialogue to investigate commonalities and differences, limits and methodological implications. The meeting was intended to give a forum to a dialogue and open-minded discussion among scholars of these theories. The seventeen participants were selected from twenty nine applicants. After a cancellation, sixteen colleagues took part at the meeting, which was also attended by several students and psychologists of the University of Pecs.

During the three days of the meeting sixteen European and overseas social psychologists investigated commonalities and divergences of the approaches as well as how the approaches complement each other in their theoretical assumptions and methods. It was planned and executed as a meeting with heavy emphasis on discussion and less on extended presentations. For each paper we scheduled one hour including 15 to 30 minutes presentation and extensive discussion. At the end the participants agreed that this format was better suited for the task than the usual format of 20 minutes presentation and short discussion.

In the first section P. Castro (Dialogues in social psychology or how new are new ideas), S. Jovchelovitch (Social representations: Re-thinking knowledge through community), A. de Rosa (The boomerang effect of the radicalism in discourse analysis) and W. Wagner (Social representations, discursive structures and institutions - An example from literature) presented ideas about the relationship between social representations, social construction and discursive phenomena. Although the discussion did not converge on a shared opinion it became clear that for a societal psychology it was highly desirable to attempt an integration of these phenomena.

D. Bar-Tal (Social psychological basis for political psychology), K. Helkama (Steps toward a social psychology of moral development), E. López-Zafra (W.A.B.A. as a methodological tool for societal psychology) and B. Rimé (Reality-as-such, the virtual world, and the experience of emotion) discussed specific fields of application in societal psychology. The discussion focused on promises and limits of experimental research in this field and suggested alternative approaches. Many participants agreed that for a societal psychology to be helpful in social affairs, methodology should be amended to allow for originally social processes to be captured in psychological research.

A large section was devoted to social identity and its ramifications and covered by S. Condor (Imagining the flexibility of social identity: The role of research technologies in the construction of 'context'), A. Contarello (Social constructionism, social constructivism and the study of the person in context), F. Erös (Narrative reconstruction and identity strategies after the holocaust), J. Laszlo (Societal psychology, history, and identity) and S.

Reicher (Towards a historical and interactive subject of psychology). It was agreed that social identity was a key issue in any attempt of socialising psychology because it is the conceptual point where the individual is intrinsically bound to social structure and political dynamics.

B. Guerin (Societal materiality without naïvity: Putting social (sciences) into social psychology), B. Mazzara (Taking the social seriously: A bunch of social psychologies or a better idea of the individual-society relationship) and W. Stainton-Rogers (Risky business) concluded the series of presentations by putting their fingers on shortcomings and lacunas in societal psychology as well as in psychology in general. The ensuing discussion was lively and thought provoking. Although a meeting such as the present one can, of course, not solve the big questions haunting social psychology, the open-minded discussions and the critical sympathy among the participants created a temporary forum from which answers to complex questions can emerge in the long run.

Wolfgang Wagner (University of Linz) & Janos Laszlo (Pecs University)

Small Group Meeting

On Counterfactual Thinking

At Aix-en-Provence, France, 16th–18th May, 2001

Organized by David Mandel, Denis Hilton, and Patrizia Catellani

The past 15 years have witnessed an increasing number of studies on counterfactual thinking, that is thinking of how past events might have happened differently. Counterfactuals are often generated in everyday life, especially to undo negative outcomes, but they are also frequent in more specialised fields, such as legal reasoning. Research on this issue has contributed to several traditional topics of social psychology, such as attributional thinking, judgment, and decision making. Recently, it has been extended to various areas of interdisciplinary concern, such as politics, history and economics.

The aim of the Small Group Meeting at Aix-en-Provence was to integrate the advances in recent research on counterfactual thinking, by bringing together a significant representative of researchers interested in the issue. Some 25 researchers from Europe, United States and Australia attended the meeting, and worked together for three days in the inspiring framework of La Baume, a former Jesuit seminary on the outskirts of Aix.

Day One was devoted to basic theoretical and empirical issues in the study of counterfactual thinking (Barbara Spellman, Denis Hilton, John McClure, Clare Walsh, David Mandel, Ben Slugoski, and Chuck Tate). Relationships with causal thinking were especially considered, showing on the one hand how generating or being presented with a counterfactual alternative to an outcome may affect causal attributions and, on the other hand, how counterfactual and causal judgment do not always overlap. The various talks differed as regards their theoretical approach, spanning from "pure" cognition to wide consideration of intentional and motivational factors. Thanks to this, and to the large time space allotted to each talk, discussion turned out to be especially alive and fruitful. A further opportunity of discussion was offered by the poster session held in the afternoon, including Donatella Ferrante, Sergio Moreno and Mirela Bogdana.

Day Two featured two sets of presentations. The first set dealt with counterfactuals in interpersonal contexts, with Dale Miller presenting interesting data on how availability of counterfactual scenarios may affect person perception judgments, Adam Galinsky highlighting the role of counterfactuals in negotiations, and Susana Segura and Michael Morris focusing on linguistic formulation of counterfactual statements. The second set of presentations focused on counterfactuals in business, history, politics, and literature (Martin Goerke, Phil Tetlock, Ned Lebow, Patrizia Catellani, and Neal Roese). Consideration of possible alternatives is a common reasoning strategy in all these knowledge domains and may serve different functions: preparing future individual and collective action in organizational and political contexts, explaining and arguing in relation to historical events, raising involvement and fun in readers of narratives. The lively atmosphere of Aix, with its pleasant open-air bars in horsechestnut-lined squares, concluded the day in the best possible way.

Day Three included a set of talks on the affective correlates and consequences of counterfactual thinking (Marcel Zeelenberg, Karl Teigen, Christopher Fraser, and Sharif El Leithy). The conditions under which counterfactuals may generate more or less strong emotional reactions were examined in detail, considering both negative emotions following simulation of better outcomes (regret, disappointment, worry), and positive emotions and perceptions following simulation of worse outcomes (gratefulness, perception of luck). The meeting concluded with a round-table and a sight-seeing trip to Cassis, a delightful seaside port where the group stayed over for dinner in a restaurant with a magnificent view of the harbour.

In brief, the meeting attained its main goal of offering an articulate and updated image of current research in the field of counterfactual thinking. The peaceful and green environment of the ancient La Baume seminary favoured conversation and exchanges among all the participants who, in many cases, were meeting each other for the first time. Comparing different perspectives, making comments on each other's research, and suggesting developments for future research were activities in which all participants took part, offering a confirmation of the liveliness of this research field and laying the foundations for future meetings of a similar kind to be held in the future.

Patrizia Catellani

Small Group Meeting

On Finding Meaning in the Human Condition: Emerging Perspectives in Experimental Existential Psychology

At Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2nd -4th August, 2001

Organized by Sander Koole and Tom Pyszczynski

The human quest for meaning has captured the imagination of poets, prophets, and philosophers across the centuries. More recently, the generation and transmission of meanings has attracted the attention of social psychologists. Social psychology presents the ideal disciplinary niche that links the analysis of micro-level processes that last milliseconds (e.g., priming) to the broader context of socially driven processes (e.g., rules, norms) within which meanings are constructed. Thus, it seems only fitting that social psychologists have been at the forefront of a newly developing "experimental existential psychology" that studies existential psychological issues through rigorous experimentation. We organized a three-day small group meeting in Amsterdam which gathered a number of researchers who have been key contributors in this newly emerging discipline.

The meeting provided researchers with a platform to discuss the latest advances in experimental existential psychology. Because this was the first international gathering in this field, many researchers were able to interact with each other face to face for the first time. The program consisted of 28 presentations that were loosely organized around the four existential themes that were outlined by Yalom (1980), the renowned existential therapist: death, relatedness, meaning, and the will.

The psychological confrontation with death is one of the central themes in existential psychology. Thus, it should not be surprising that understanding of terror management processes has become a key concern of experimentally oriented researchers. Kicking off on the first day, Sheldon Solomon's keynote address led us through the dozens of ingenious experiments that were inspired by Terror Management Theory (TMT). While reviewing this impressive body of evidence, it became clear how the

TMT approach has developed into a leading paradigm in experimental existential psychology. Next, Jamie Arndt illuminated some of the cognitive dynamics that underlie terror management processes. In a series of clever experiments, Arndt was able to show that worldview defenses in response to mortality salience may be activated implicitly and outside of awareness. Mark Dechesne presented further evidence for implicit terror management defenses, by showing that mortality salience leads to improved pattern recognition. According to Mark, these findings suggest that mortality salience instigates a powerful need to impose cognitive structure on seemingly disorderly patterns of stimuli. An analogous point was made by Sander Koole and Agnes van den Berg, whose research showed that mortality salience leads to an increased preference for orderly, cultivated nature, and a decreased preference for unstructured, wild nature. Jamie Goldenberg's presentation extended TMT to the analysis of human sexuality. Her findings indicate that existential concerns may lead people to regard their sexuality, and, indeed, their own body as more problematic. The topic of death was also approached from some perspectives other than TMT. Specifically, Rich Wenzlaff provided an analysis of chronic individual differences in the tendency to think about death. Finally, Dan Gilbert offered us a brilliant philosophical analysis of the irrationality of the fear of death. One of the thought-provoking conclusions of Dan's line of reasoning was that, although there is no sound logical basis to fear death (at least according to theories of rational decision making), people clearly do exhibit intense fear of death. Although Dan did not provide empirical support for his claims, his talk caused many of us to reflect on the reasons why we should (or should not) be afraid of not being.

Human relatedness was the second major theme of the meeting, a theme of obvious relevance for social psychologists. In their keynote address, Mario Mikulincer and Victor Florian presented an impressive body of research that has been collected by their Israeli group over the past few years. The evidence persuasively argued that social relationships may act as an anxiety-buffering mechanism, in addition to the classic self-esteem and worldview defense mechanisms that have been postulated by TMT. In further support of an anxiety-buffering role of social relations, Emanuele Castano provided evidence that ingroup favoritism and identification with groups may be driven by existential concerns. Gilad

Hirschberger and Victor Florian demonstrated how the relationship buffer may play itself out in a rather complex way when people are confronted with physically disabled people, who simultaneously arouse feelings of pity and feelings of personal vulnerability. Orit Taubman Ben-Ari and Liora Findler showed that the relationship buffer may paradoxically promote risk-taking behavior when people's existential concerns have been made salient. In their research, mortality salience led to an increase in risky sexual behavior, apparently because such behavior entailed the promise of greater interpersonal closeness. Besides providing a buffer against existential angst, human relatedness is an important existential topic in its own right. Liz Pinel provided a provocative analysis of how the self is involved in the construction of relatedness. Specifically, she argued that the sharing of the subjective self ("I-sharing") plays a key role in this process of promoting feelings of intense interpersonal closeness. Finally, in his keynote address, Bob Wicklund painted the fragile beauty of coordinating one's actions with others that takes place during perspective taking and social interaction.

The third major theme of the meeting was concerned with the questions how and why people construct meaning to cope with existential realities. Starting from a broad level of analysis, Mike Halloran addressed the importance of cultural meanings in the context of the intergroup relations between Aborigines and Anglo-Australians. Relatedly, Mike Salzman discussed the trauma that results when one culture is forced to shed its belief system as it becomes colonized by another culture. Turning to an important source of cultural trauma within the Western culture, Tomi-Ann Roberts addressed the adverse psychological consequences of the cultural objectification of the female body. June Tangney discussed different ways in which people may find meaning when they fall short of moral standards. As her findings showed, moderately painful feelings of guilt about specific behaviors motivate people to behave in a socially responsible manner. By contrast, intensely painful feelings of shame often motivate denial, defensive, anger and aggression. Ian McGregor discussed the quest for meaning as a central task in maintaining one's sense of personal identity. Accordingly, feelings of uncertainty may play a crucial role in the unfolding of ego defenses. In a related vein, Kees van den Bos provided compelling evidence that people's concern with fairness is motivated by an underlying concern to reduce uncertainty. Lenny Martin

sought to link the existential level of analysis to the inner workings of the brain, by presenting evidence that threats to meaning cause the right hemisphere of the brain to become more dominant. Constantine Sedikides and Tim Wildschut called attention to the ways in which people make sense of the past, and how this may give rise to nostalgic emotions. Last, in an unusually broad and integrative keynote address, Roy Baumeister outlined a set of basic principles that seem to underlie the structure of social reality.

Finally, the fourth major theme of the meeting was concerned with the will. In his keynote address, Julius Kuhl sketched the outlines of his Personality Systems Interactions (PSI) Theory. As an integrative theory of human action control, PSI theory enables the functional analysis of a wide range of existential-psychological phenomena such as alienation, rumination, and volition. Tim Kasser presented evidence that excessive adherence to materialistic values produces alienation from one's own organismic needs and is hence detrimental to psychological well-being. Jeff Greenberg presented a recent extension of TMT, which specifies the dynamic interplay between defense and growth needs. Defense needs are directed towards maximizing security, and explain the defensive processes of the kind discussed by classic TMT. By contrast, growth needs are directed towards maximizing positive affect, and are essential in the analysis of creativity and exploration. Dan Wegner, in his keynote address, provided a severe challenge for phenomenological approaches to the will. In particular, his program of research has shown that the experience of volition is a mental illusion, an artifact produced by the inner workings of our mind. Taking this approach one step further, Ap Dijksterhuis argued that the experience of volition is a mental construct that can be primed unconsciously like any other mental construct. In harmony with this argument, Brett Pelham presented provocative evidence that many of people's major life decisions are influenced by implicit, unconscious egotism. Specifically, his research has shown that people's implicit preference for own name letters leads them to choose professions, cities, partners, and universities that resemble their own names. Collectively, the findings by Wegner, Dijksterhuis, and Pelham argued forcefully that our traditional ways of thinking about the will seem to be in need of substantive revision.

Judging from the comments and reactions we received from various participants, the conference was a tremendous success. We all benefited from a large number of important research presentations and experienced extensive fruitful theoretical exchanges. The meeting has established a number of new collaborative research links and will produce a Handbook of experimental existential psychology. It was also a very enjoyable meeting in the comfortable VIP conference room of the Free University Amsterdam, with many opportunities for informal interaction in the nearby cafés and restaurants. Moreover, many of us have fond memories of our barbecue dinner by the North Sea coast, in Bloemendaal aan Zee. As a result of our positive experiences, everyone agreed that a meeting on experimental existential psychology should become a regular event. Indeed, several participants have volunteered to host a next meeting of this kind. The details regarding the precise location and timing of this event will be announced in the near future.

We would like to thank the EAESP, the Dutch Science Foundation, and the Free University Amsterdam for their support for the meeting.

Sander Koole
Free University Amsterdam

Tom Pyszczynski
University of Colorado

Medium Size Meeting

On “Feelings and Emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium”

University of Amsterdam, NL, June 13th– 16th, 2001

Organized by Tony Manstead, Nico Frijda & Agneta Fischer

Between June 13 and June 16, 2001, a medium-size meeting partly sponsored by the Association was held under the title “Feelings and Emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium”. The central purpose of the symposium was to evaluate the current status of general theories of emotion from a multidisciplinary perspective.

The idea of the symposium was inspired by earlier endeavors of the same nature, and the name of the symposium was borrowed from those predecessors. A meeting with the title “Feelings and Emotions: The Wittenberg Symposium” was held in 1927. In 1948 a meeting was held at the University of Chicago, called “Feelings and Emotions: The Mooseheart Symposium”. In 1969 “Feelings and Emotions: The Loyola Symposium” took place at Loyola University. In each of these three symposia the invited participants were leading authorities from the various disciplines involved: psychology, psychiatry, neurophysiology, and philosophy. The published accounts have served as benchmarks and reference works to which researchers in the field have repeatedly returned as an index of the “state of the art” of emotion research at that time.

In the spirit of these previous meetings, the goal of the Amsterdam meeting was to invite leading scholars in a range of relevant disciplines to consider how the research of the past three decades is reflected in general theories of emotion. At the time of the 1969 Loyola Symposium a pronounced revival of the study of emotions had just begun, after a long period of neglect in all of the disciplines concerned. The three decades since then have witnessed intense activity in the study of emotions in those disciplines, notably in psychology, neuroscience and philosophy, but also in disciplines that were absent in the earlier Feelings and Emotion symposia, for example sociology, biology, and computer science.

The core of the Amsterdam symposium consisted of 24 invited keynote speakers from the disciplines of biology, cultural anthropology, economics, neuroscience, philosophy, psychology, and sociology. The invited speakers are all prominent representatives of their domain of interest in the study of emotions. The symposium lasted four days. The four days were divided into 8 half-day sessions. Three keynote papers were presented in each session. Each speaker was allotted 45 minutes of speaking time, followed by 5 minutes for questions of fact or clarification. At the end of each session a 45-minute discussion was held. This enabled members of the audience to pose questions of a more general nature to the three speakers. Because each session had a common theme, it was often the case that a given question was put to more than one of the three speakers.

Session 1:

Paul Ekman, University of California at San Francisco: *What do we become emotional about?*

Robert Solomon, University of Texas: *On the passivity of the passions*

Richard A. Shweder, University of Chicago: *Deconstructing the emotions for the sake of comparative research*

Session 2:

John Cacioppo, Kyle Smith, & Jeff Larsen, University of Chicago: *Component processes underlying affective space*

Raymond Dolan, University of London: *Feeling states in emotion*

Barbara Mellers, Ohio State University: *Emotions and decision making*

Session 3:

Candace Clark, Montclair State University: *Emotional gifts: The socioemotional economy and micropolitics*

Robert Frank, Cornell University: *Forging relationships that sustain commitments*

Frans de Waal, Emory University: *The possibility of empathy in other animals*

Session 4:

Alice M. Isen, Cornell University: *Positive affect facilitates thinking and problem solving*

Robert Zajonc, Stanford University: *Explaining the mere exposure effect -- finally*

Jaak Panksepp, Bowling Green State University: *The affective side of brain emotional systems: The case of happiness and sadness*

Session 5:

Klaus R. Scherer, University of Geneva: *Appraisal processes in emotion: Theories and research*

Judy Dunn, University of London: *Emotion and cognition: A developmentalist's perspective*

Antonio Damasio, University of Iowa: *A neurobiology for emotion and feeling*

Session 6:

Kent Berridge, University of Michigan: *Does the brain have unconscious 'likes' and 'wants'?*

Nico Frijda, University of Amsterdam: *Emotions and action*

Nancy Sherman, Georgetown University: *Virtue And Emotional Demeanor*

Session 7:

Batja Mesquita, Wake Forest University, and Hazel Rose Markus, Stanford University: *Culture and emotion: Models of agency and relationship as sources of cultural variation in emotion*

Peggy Thoits, Vanderbilt University: *Emotion norms, emotion work, and social order*

Peter Salovey, Yale University: *Emotional intelligence*

Session 8:

Jon Elster, Columbia University: *Emotions and rationality*

Arne Öhman and Stefan Wiens, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm: *The concept of an evolved fear module as a challenge to cognitive theories of anxiety*

Keith Oatley, Ontario Institute for the Study of Education: *From the emotions of conversation to the passions of fiction*

In addition to the keynote presentations, posters were presented in two separate poster sessions. About 150 posters were accepted by the program

committee, and they were evenly divided between the two sessions. Poster presentations were organised thematically such that posters addressing a common theme were scheduled for the same session and were physically adjacent to each other. The posters enabled the presenters (many of whom were Ph.D. students or postdoctoral researchers) to present their work and interests to others, including of course the keynote speakers and other established researchers who attended the meeting. Both poster sessions were well-attended.

The symposium was attended by the keynote speakers, most of whom were present for the entire four days, and an audience of about 300 further persons. The latter included about 45 young researchers from 15 different countries who received bursaries via a grant from the European Commission. All those who received bursaries presented a poster at one of the poster sessions. The rest of the audience participated on a conference fee basis, and consisted of interested researchers from various European and non-European countries, many of whom also contributed to the poster sessions.

The keynote papers provided a representative coverage of the major problem domains in the study of emotions. These include the nature of basic emotional mechanisms, from a psychological as well as from a neuroscience point of view (Berridge, Cacioppo, Isen, Öhman, Panksepp, Zajonc); the neural correlates of emotional processes (Damasio, Dolan, Panksepp); the nature of emotional feelings (Cacioppo, Damasio, Dolan, Frijda, Panksepp); the relationships of emotions to action, rationality, and decisions (Elster, Frijda, Isen, Mellers); the nature of the processes leading to, as well as constituting, emotions (Dunn, Ekman, Scherer); and critical issues surrounding the very concept of emotions, such as those of its presumed passivity, or its distinction from rationality (Elster, Oatley, Shweder, Solomon). Many contributions investigated the fundamental role of emotions in social interaction and in moral issues (Clark, De Waal, Frank, Salovey, Sherman), and the complex ways in which emotional experience and behavior relate to the social and cultural context (Clark, Mesquita, Shweder).

The contributions clearly reflected the diversity of current approaches to the study of emotions: neuroscience investigations (Berridge, Damasio,

Dolan, Panksepp), experimental psychological approaches (Cacioppo, Isen, Öhman, Mellers, Scherer, Zajonc); questionnaire research in experimental or interview contexts (Mesquita, Salovey); ethologically-inspired observations of humans (Dunn) and infra-humans (De Waal); sociological and anthropological analyses (Clark, Shweder, Thoits); the analysis of fiction (Oatley); and theoretical reflection (Ekman, Elster, Frank, Frijda, Sherman, Solomon).

The keynote papers were of considerable range, scope, and sophistication. These papers demonstrated the areas of focal interest in the domain of emotions: the role played by cognitive factors in emotional experience and behavior; the study of the neural bases of emotional sensitivities and response; the major roles of social structure in emotions and of emotions in social interaction; the interplay of biologically-based emotional dispositions and cultural and social norms and contexts; and the importance of bodily awareness in emotional experience.

The organizers consider that the symposium clearly achieved its central purposes, namely to provide a multidisciplinary overview of current research and theory of emotions, to highlight current empirical and theoretical approaches, and to debate current controversies. The organizers base their evaluation not merely on their subjective impressions, but also on comments they received from the keynote speakers and many other participants, during and since the symposium. Furthermore, those participants who received bursaries had to complete an evaluation form as a condition of the EC grant, and their evaluations of the content and organization of the meeting were uniformly positive.

With respect to the format of the symposium, both the organizers and (we believe) the audience were satisfied with certain key features: the fact that there were no more than three papers per session; the way in which papers within a given session usually addressed a common theme but from different disciplinary or theoretical perspectives; the fact that different disciplines were represented; and the availability of 45 minutes for extended discussion after each set of three keynote papers.

Chapters based on the keynote papers will be published as an edited volume by Cambridge University Press. Publication is expected in late

2002. Efforts will be made to incorporate the major points raised during the general discussions at the end of each session. Abstracts of the keynote speeches are listed at the end of this report.

In addition to the generous support provided by the EAESP, the symposium was made possible by grants from:

- the Royal Netherlands Academy of Science (KNAW);
- the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO);
- the Netherlands Convention Bureau;
- the European Commission;
- the University of Amsterdam;
- the Department of Psychology at the University of Amsterdam and the Experimental and Social Psychology Programs within that Department.

Tony Manstead, Nico Frijda, and Agneta Fischer
Conference Organizers

Medium Size Meeting

On Cognitive and Motivational Approaches to Intergroup Relations (4th Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes)

At Castle Kochberg, Germany, June 27th – July 1st, 2001

Organized by Thorsten Meiser & Amélie Mummendey

Report by the Organizers

The Medium Size Meeting on *Cognitive and Motivational Approaches to Intergroup Relations* (4th Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes) was held at Castle Kochberg in Thuringia/ Germany from 27th June to 1st July 2001. Researchers from numerous European countries, Australia, and the United States of America contributed to the scientific programme, with approximately equal proportions of postgraduate students and senior

scholars in the domain of intergroup research. We are particularly happy that Michael Hogg and Jeffrey Sherman followed our invitation to present invited talks, and that Marilynn Brewer agreed to summarize and extend a thematic session on social categorization and group identification as a discussant. Other thematic sessions focused on aversive aspects of intergroup processes (i.e., discrimination and intergroup conflict), on primarily theoretical issues (i.e., models of motivational, cognitive and automatic intergroup processes), and on the representation of social groups (i.e., group perception and stereotype change).

The major goals of the Meeting were (a) to bring together postgraduate students and senior researchers and (b) to bring together researchers with a social-cognitive orientation and those working in the tradition of motivational approaches to intergroup relations. As the heterogeneity of academic levels and research topics of the participants demonstrated, our goals were largely met - thanks to all those who came to Castle Kochberg, presented their current work and joined in the lively discussions.

Thorsten Meiser & Amélie Mummendey
University of Jena

Reports by Participants of the Meeting

The regularity of the Jena meetings has endowed them with an atmosphere of family gatherings, an atmosphere to which the setting and cosiness of Castle Kochberg, where they are held, undoubtedly contributes. Set in a bucolic village, its upper-story rooms were made into a museum and restored to its eighteenth-century state with the original period furniture that bears witness to frequent visitor Goethe. In a conference room in the same style as the upper floors, the organisation managed - if we are allowed the stereotype - a most Germanic strict timetable to which participants obediently kept. Strictness notwithstanding, the large time slots for discussions allowed for very open and productive argument.

Day one of the meeting was dedicated to a thematic session on social categorisation and group identification. Presentations ranged from shifting

identity strategies (T. Mussweiler) to the role of prototypicality in the definition of a group's identity (S. Waldzus) to the influence of categorisation on basic social cognitive processes (S. Lambert). It was preceded by a guest talk by Michael Hogg on the role of group prototypicality in leadership processes and rounded off just before dinner with a discussion by Marilyn Brewer. She focused on two paths, a social cognitive one and a group-based emotional one, to inter-group discrimination. After a heavy programme and a dinner, Tom Postmes still managed to keep us awake with his presentation on the personal-group discrimination discrepancy and with his deadpan humour.

Day two was planned as shorter to allow for a social programme and presentations tended to focus more on variables closer to actual discrimination or intergroup conflict, with studies more clearly anchored in specific intergroup situations. Dan Sheepers' examples of soccer team supporters' aggressive songs (towards an outgroup team) were a definite standout, as were Greg Maio's anti-racism persuasive messages tested on participants with varying inter-group attitudes. A bus was ready mid-afternoon to take us on a guided (foot) visit to Weimar, replete with historic architecture and the memories of Goethe, Schiller, and the now revived Bauhaus School. One building of this School was so fascinating that some of the visitors chose to delve into it and lose the guide for a few minutes... Of the dinner in Weimar that ensued we can say nothing, as we were kidnapped by Sven Waldzus to a wonderful midsummer candlelit garden party in Jena (thank you Sven and Sylke).

Day three's session focused on motivation, cognition and automaticity in intergroup processes, and was preceded by a talk where Jeff Sherman argued for efficiency-driven information processing. A string of ideas mostly on the influence of different motivations (such as different regulatory focuses - K. Sassenberg) on the automatic processing of group-related information was presented and discussed. Most notably, independent research is under way in Jena (T. Schubert) and Amsterdam (R. Spears) that links typically social cognition priming research with self-categorisation theory. The day ended with what started as an overly optimistic attempt at a barbecue outside. Both the grill and a discussion on whether social identity theory is apart *from* (though building bridges with) or a part *of* social cognition were interrupted by a thunderstorm and

almost-tropical rain, and the barbecue ended up as a buffet dinner in the castle dining room. This dinner prolonged itself into the night with wine, beer, and much merriment. As the party got merrier and in the dim light outside, and primed perhaps by the Ebbinghaus illusion, the group discovered a new optical illusion, to which we might refer as the 'moon-on-top-of-German-castle-effect'. This usually occurs at night when someone mistakes the round cupola on top of a castle roof for the moon. Attempting to convince the victim that the moon was elsewhere was even more hilarious than the effect itself... On Sunday, a partly hung-over audience managed to concentrate on the morning session with the outgroup homogeneity effect in highlight before lunch and warm (often hugging) farewells.

It was probably no coincidence that the relation between social identity and social cognition was discussed over the aborted barbecue, as social identity and social cognition were the two major underlying themes throughout the meeting. The problem seems to be the need to achieve integration without reduction. Some other marginal but interesting issues seemed implicated in a variety of talks. The idea of groups based on dynamic interaction and the question of justice concerns in inter-group relations spring to mind. On a more prosaic note, we (who ourselves brought transparencies) surrendered completely to the advantages of powerpoint-based presentation. True, it doesn't make the contents of presentations any better, but it does help make them clearer, especially for those non-anglophones members of the audience who are relying on visual support to understand them. Finally, the meeting was quite an interesting mix of young and senior researchers from around Europe, the US and Australia. Paradoxically, we had to go all the way to East Germany to spend time with other colleagues from Belgium... But this is just another positive sign that we do things more as Europeans (with a welcoming inclusion of others from further afield), and less as separate nationalities.

*Rodrigo Brito & Sophie Lambert
Université Libre de Bruxelles*

Located in one of Goethe's favorite places -Castle Kochberg-, the 4th Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes has been, as the years before, a great success. This medium size meeting included invited addresses, long talks

and short presentations of a remarkably high quality level. Also, Marilyn Brewer provided us with a very complete and interesting discussion on the first thematic session, acknowledging the contribution of all speakers. A special award should be given to Tom Postmes who managed to keep the participants all awake for a late evening session.

Scientifically, the joint contributions of social psychologists from two different, yet related, backgrounds (SIT and Social Cognition theorists), made this meeting quite unique. It especially pointed out how important the overlap is between the two perspectives. Moreover, it clearly put in advance the necessity to work jointly on topics such as intergroup processes. Socially, participants had the opportunity to discover Grosskochberg's famous industry, to barbecue in the rain, to visit beautiful Weimar, to congratulate a bride, and so on. Undoubtedly however, the climax of the meeting was on the last night when we all got the chance to observe The Famous Orange Moon. We should not conclude this report without noting the incredibly good organization of Thorsten Meiser. Thanks to him, the workshop was perfect from the first day to the last one.

Stéphanie Demoulin & Muriel Dumont
Université Catholique de Louvain

Grosskochberg is a tranquil little village in Thuringen, a 16th century castle amidst gorgeous surroundings, a friendly landlady, a charming park, lots and lots of solid German food, but above all Grosskochberg is the site where for the third year in a row the workshop in intergroup processes was held.

As its prior editions this year's workshop too was successful on all counts: high quality presentations by the young and not so young, lively and constructive discussions, and friendship all around. As always, Amélie Mummendey and her dog were charming hosts. This year's organiser, Thorsten Meiser, did a super job at organising the event, pleasantly ordering us about, collecting dues, and gently forcing us time and again to choose between non-vegetarian and semi-vegetarian dishes. The meeting was work (whoever thought of having post-dinner sessions?), but it was also relaxation ... more for some than others.

Where is the key to the success of these Kochberg meetings? Yes, there is the setting and the food and the weather and the organisation, but more importantly there is the 'concentrated focus' of like-minded social psychologists, and there is the valued resource of 'time' to present one's ideas and 'time' to discuss them. Our Jena-friends should do everything possible to preserve these treasured features that render the Kochberg meetings so unique.

Thorsten, on behalf of all the participants, thank you so much!

Eddy Van Avermaet
K.U. Leuven

Frankfurt airport welcomed us to German soil. The method of transport from Frankfurt to Weimar was the Deutsche Bahn AG. The stereotype of an extremely efficient railway service was sadly disconfirmed. However, Thomas Schubert was soon driving us through the glorious Thuringian countryside to the majestic Castle Kochberg and the final stage of our journey.

A warm welcome awaited us and was followed by an evening buffet overlooking the castle gardens designed and planted by Carl von Stein in the early 19th century. The evening was the perfect opportunity to catch up with our hosts from Jena and to meet the conference delegates. A novel system of shared room keys was quickly installed. All delegates placed their room keys into a large bowl!!!

Day one of the conference began with a swift re-confirmation of German efficiency. Rather than being content with an illusory correlation, Thorsten Meiser required a perfect association between names on the meal list and delegates enrolled, and also between fees paid and delegates attending! Mike Hogg had the honour of 'kicking off' the conference. Delegates presenting day one talks were from Europe and Australia. Before dinner, Marilyn Brewer pulled together the themes and the topics from the day's talks. Tom Postmes cleverly retained the attention of the post-dinner talk audience with the promise of large steins of German beer in return for an hour more of attention.

Day two began with Beate Seibt presenting data showing that stereotype activation can lead to either performance enhancement or deterioration. Dan Scheepers provided us with a plethora of Dutch football lyrics to expose both the instrumental and the identity function of discrimination. Greg Maio ended the session with an exploration of the effects of anti-racism messages on attitudes. Day two continued with a tour of the Bauhaus architecture of Weimar followed by traditional fare served at the conference dinner in Weimar's picturesque square.

Day three began with Jeff Sherman demonstrating that depletion of cognitive resources determines the manner in which a chosen motive will be pursued rather than determining the processing motive per se. Russell Spears intrigued Thorsten Meiser with the revolutionary illusory colouration task!! The day ended with a vibrant discussion following Stephanie Demoulin's findings that a colour-blind perspective can lead to the repression of strong negative affect that, in turn, leads to task deficits. The day's talks were to be followed by a barbecue in the castle grounds. However, despite the group's strong prevention focus, the dark clouds gathered and outdoor dining was cut short by the loud claps of thunder signalling the storms ahead. Whilst the gallant bar tender continued to barbecue the Thuringian sausages, dining continued in the castle. The sausages were delicious for all but perfectly modelled to the palate of the honourable attendee, Tobi.

Day four saw the discussion of the influence of the self in inter-group processes before the group disbanded to begin the journey home. Some of us had the pleasure of enjoying, again, the delights of the Deutsche Bahn AG!!!

Overall the conference provided a relaxed, medium sized arena for graduate students to discuss, in depth, their own work, the work of their contemporaries and the work of senior researchers. Further, the arena facilitated the cross-pollination of ideas from graduate students and their contemporaries. Thanks must go to Amelie Mummendey and Thorsten Meiser and the whole team at Jena for a well-organised, thoroughly stimulating conference that leaves us looking forward to our next opportunity to visit Jena.

*Hazel Willis
Cardiff University*

Between the Bauhaus and Buchenwald

Nearly forty social psychologists convened at Schloss Kochberg for the 4th Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes. Participants were primarily from Germany, but included social psychologists working in Australia, Belgium, France, the U.K., the Netherlands, Italy, Switzerland, and Spain, as well as the U.S. Thorsten Meiser and his organizing committee at the University of Jena maintained the Jena Workshop tradition, originated by Amelie Mummendey, of a rather intensive schedule of highly engaging presentations and discussions, interwoven with several social events.

For the last several years, Jena workshop participants have been given the opportunity to take a guided walk around nearby Weimar. This year's tour emphasized the development of the Bauhaus art and architectural movement, launched by a largely Jewish group of Weimar residents in 1919. The school's philosophy emphasized that design should not merely reflect society, but could help improve it. However, it was subjected to harassment and persecution by the local government to the point of relocating twice to other cities in Germany until it was closed by the Nazi government in 1933.

About halfway into our walking tour, our group stood on a quiet residential street in Weimar overlooking a large valley. Immediately behind us was a small, one-story house -- the only remaining Bauhaus structure in the city. In front of us and clearly visible on the horizon eight kilometers to the north, a tower in the village of Ettersburg commemorates those who died at the Buchenwald concentration camp there during World War II.

It occurred to me during that walk that this year's Jena Workshop implicitly explored the psychological terrain between the Bauhaus and Buchenwald. Workshop presentations examined the psychological processes that are involved in intergroup stereotyping and prejudice, their causes, consequences, and solutions. The focus was on cognitive and motivational approaches to intergroup relations, with an eye toward their

integration, both in theory development and in experimental work. Marilyn Brewer filled the role of discussant, not only by integrating the papers in the thematic session devoted to social categorization and group identification, but by participating in the lively group discussion following each presentation. Jeffrey Sherman gave an invited talk in which he provided evidence that cognitive load enhances certain types of individuating processes and that low-prejudiced individuals tend to engage in even-handed and thorough processing (i.e., individuation), rather than to seek stereotype disconfirmation.

Partial funding from EAESP made the participation of a high proportion of pre- and post-doctoral students possible. Abstracts of the workshop presentations are scheduled to appear in the first Proceedings of the EAESP due to be published in 2002.

*Michele A. Wittig
California State University, Northridge*

Grants

Rick van Baaren (travel grant)

GRANT REPORTS

**Georgios Abakoumkin, Panteion University, Athens, Greece
(postgraduate travel grant)**

From mid-June until mid-July 2001 I visited the Department of Social and Organisational Psychology at Leiden University in The Netherlands for four weeks. The main purpose of this visit was to develop plans for joint research with Dr. Manuela Barreto, and to discuss issues relevant to my work with Prof. Naomi Ellemers, whose work has greatly inspired my own. A further, more general goal, was to have a learning experience by participating at the life of a department that, no doubt, has an advanced working setting, at least in the sense that I hardly could think of something similar in my home country.

The idea of this visit was born when Manuela Barreto and I met last year at the, traditional by now, Jena Workshop on Intergroup Relations. We found some common ground in our research and we thought of elaborating this further and of possibly turning it into joint research. This is a plausible background for a visit. However, the perhaps triggering element for the whole idea was that during our conversations in Jena it soon became apparent that, comparatively, I have very poor opportunities to discuss issues relevant to intergroup relations with other researchers in my home country. Therefore, when the time for the visit has come, I arrived in Leiden with a feeling of impatience to exchange ideas and work in this setting, and to learn from it, too.

The central part of my stay in Leiden concerned the development of plans for collaboration. With this prospect, Manuela Barreto and I had extensive and intensive meetings. First, we got acquainted in detail with each other's work. Then, on the basis of our mutual interests we formulated a

research question and composed a design for a first study, which we are planning to conduct, with a line up of possible follow-ups. This research will focus on the clarification of how perceptions of permeability of boundaries between groups affect the behaviour of members of low status groups.

An important part of my visit comprised several meetings that I had with Naomi Ellemers. In these meetings we discussed both her research, which was one of the starting points for my own work, as well as the work that I have developed. We focused mainly on my work on coping with low ingroup status, since it was in that area that I looked forward to discussions and comments.

The more general part of the visit regarded participating at the life of the Department. Already the first day Manuela Barreto introduced me to a large portion of the staff members. She took care that I feel comfortable and as a part of the setting. I was involved in a number of activities. Just to name a few, I presented some of my work to a reading group of the Kurt Lewin Institute, an institute that includes the social and organisational psychology departments of various Dutch universities. This specific group focuses on reading and discussing work on intergroup relations. In addition, at Leiden University, I met with Dr. Eric van Dijk and Dr. Colette van Laar to discuss research, attended other research meetings, and attended one staff meeting on procedural issues.

I emphasised above one aspect of the importance of this visit to me in relative terms. I related namely anticipations regarding this visit with opportunities that I usually lack in my home country. Indeed, I estimate as a substantial outcome of my stay in Leiden that, besides the accomplishment of specific goals, I got exactly what I commonly miss the most: Lots of stimulation and inspiration. The challenge for me now is to keep it going. Apart from the collaborative part, which has a continuation prospect, I'm more than grateful to Manuela Barreto for her unbelievable hospitality and to Naomi Ellemers for her generous support. Of course, I am thankful to the EAESP as well for providing the most silent, yet necessary part of this locomotion, i.e. the funds.

Angel Gómez Jiménez, UNED, Madrid, Spain

I visited the Department of Social and Organisational Psychology of the University of Leiden, in the Netherlands, during two weeks in March. The purpose of this visit was to work on an ongoing research project which is the product of co-operation between myself and Dr. Manuela Barreto (University of Leiden), as well as to discuss my work and develop new research plans with Prof. Naomi Ellemers (University of Leiden). The co-operation with Dr. Manuela Barreto has resulted from our acquaintance in the Leuven-Louvain Summer School (1998), funded by the EAESP. The specific research we are currently working on focuses on processes that we have both researched in our Ph.D. dissertations, although in quite different ways. My thesis focused on how group stereotypes can be affected by meta-stereotype information. Meta-stereotypes are the beliefs that members of one group have about how other group sees or evaluates them. In my thesis I demonstrated that if we provide a group with positive meta-stereotype information, this group will improve the stereotype it has about the other group. Because of my visit, I had the opportunity to present my work in a lab-meeting. Manuela Barreto studied how people react to how they are categorised by others, for example, to being designated by others to group A while they themselves identify with group B. In this way, both of our work involves the simultaneous consideration of identity processes and of meta-perceptions, examining with different approaches how people react to the way their identity is portrayed by others.

The work we developed at the UNED (Madrid) aims at investigating how meta-stereotype information (information about how the other group thinks of my group) interacts with social fairness (how the other group actually treats my group in reward allocations) to determine group stereotyping and reward allocations. We have conducted this study with a high status group as the ingroup and a low status group as the outgroup. With this design we are able to investigate whether meta-stereotype information is so powerful that it can improve stereotyping even when the outgroup favours itself in reward allocation (e.g. because the outgroup is given the benefit of the doubt). The results of this collaboration has been presented in the 4th Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes (Jena, 27th June to 1st July, 2001), and it is actually under preparation to be

published. Actually we are conducting a second part of this study taking into account a low status group as the ingroup and a high status group as the outgroup.

We also prepared a different study, to be conducted at the University of Leiden, in which we examine whether meta-stereotype information has different effects depending on the alleged source from which it stems (ingroup, outgroup or neutral source). At this time, a replication of this study is being conducted in Madrid (Spain).

In addition, I have discussed my work with Prof. Naomi Ellemers, whose own work focuses on social identity, stereotyping and intergroup relations. My work has greatly benefited from her insights.

I am very grateful for the financial support of the EAESP because my research would have been impossible without their help. The Association has made possible to enjoy an excellent experience as a scientist and as a person.

**Cristina Zogmaister, Università di Padova, Italy
(postgraduate travel grant)**

The aim of my visit to Professor Kofta at the Warsaw University was to further develop our contacts, which had begun some months earlier at the University of Padova.

Professor Mirosław Kofta had visited the University of Padova in February 2001 together with Władysław Narkiewicz-Jodko. During their visit I was able to attend three talks about their research activity and we had also more informal talks about other research that was being developed by him and his research group at the University of Warsaw. During these interactions, we discovered to share many research interests in the area of implicit social cognition, and particularly on the topic of automatic activation of stereotypes and of the consequences of this activation process.

We planned to further develop this research contact, and we felt that the next logical step should have been my visit to the University of Warsaw. We decided to let my visit to the University of Warsaw coincide with the Warsaw Workshop on “Social Cognition and Intergroup Relation” (organised by Mirek Kofta of University of Warsaw, and by Anne Maass of University of Padova), which was indeed held at the University of Warsaw in June 26th – 27th. This gave me the opportunity to get in touch not only with the research group of Professor Mirosław Kofta, but also with many Polish and Ukrainian PhD students that attended the Workshop.

Thanks to the postgraduate travel grant that EAESP accorded to me, I was able to be at the Warsaw University from June 24th to June 27th. This gave me the opportunity not only to attend the Workshop but also to spend some days visiting the research laboratories of Professor Kofta and his research group, and learning about their research methodologies and results, particularly in the area of physiological measures related to mental states and of negative priming. This visit has been very important for me, since this gave us the opportunity to exchange theoretical and methodological knowledge, which was the main goal of this visit.

Another significant moment of my visit has been the participation in the workshop. I found this workshop very interesting and tightly related to my core research interests, which are principally in the area of stereotype activation and its moderators: Many contributions to the meeting addressed theoretical and methodological issues related to implicit social-cognitive processes, particularly implicit attitudes and implicit stereotyping, and to some widely used measurement paradigms: *priming* and *the implicit association task*.

During the workshop I presented a paper describing the main results of a research project that has been developed at the University of Padova by our research group on the cognitive processes, moderators and consequences of “stereotype threat”. I received very useful feedback from the other participants of the meeting and some stimulating suggestions regarding further developments of this research. For example, Sylwia Bedynska in her talk addressed the same topic, so I also was able to learn more about her research and the methodologies she used.

Informal discussions with the other participants of the meeting have been at least as significant as the more formal interventions, since this allowed me to get in touch with many PhD students from Poland as well as Ukraine who share the same research interests.

Last but not least, another reason that made this workshop particularly attractive to me was that it allowed me to attend to a very interesting talk by Robert B. Zajonc on the topic of the minimal origins of affect, which has been very stimulating, given the obvious relation of this issue to the problem of the origin of prejudice and ingroup favouritism.

In synthesis, my visit to the University of Warsaw has been a valuable occasion to learn more about the research and methods that are being developed in the area of automatic attitudes and automatic stereotyping. Furthermore, this visit has been important for the development of my scientific contacts with Prof. Mirosław Kofta and his research group, and more generally with other PhD students of the Polish area .

Taken together, this visit has been intellectually stimulating for me not only as a psychologist, but more in general as a person, since it enabled me not only to learn about new research and methodologies, and get acquainted with PhD students and researchers from another country, but also, and maybe even more importantly, get a grasp of the culture and society of Poland.

Announcements

European Journal of Social Psychology: Announcing the New Editorial Team

Following my appointment as editor of the journal a few months ago, I am pleased to report that the composition of next editorial team of EJSP has now been finalized. I am therefore very happy to announce that the new line-up of associate editors will be as follows:

Fabrizio Butera, Université Pierre Mendès, Grenoble, France

Mara Cadinu, University of Padua, Italy

Ap Dijksterhuis, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Kenneth Dion, University of Toronto, Canada

Thomas Mussweiler, University of Würzburg, Germany

Sabine Otten, University of Jena, Germany

Dario Paez, University of the Basque Country, San Sebastian, Spain

Deborah Terry, University of Queensland, Australia

Bogdan Wojciszke, University of Gdansk, Poland

A detailed statement of editorial policy will be provided early in 2002 after Fritz Strack's term as editor has reached its conclusion. However, a few points are worth mentioning at this time. First, although Fritz, Leonel, Yechiel, Paul, Bernd, Chuck and Roos will continue handling papers until the end of December, it is appropriate, on behalf of the incoming team, to thank them now for all their very hard work over the past four years and for handing over the journal in such great shape.

One (albeit limited) mark of this success is provided by recent journal impact ratings. These indicate that EJSP is now very much on a par with other international journals against which it tends naturally to be compared (i.e., JESP, BJSP, PSPB). A second indication of the journal's continued success is provided by the fact that submission rates have increased by around 50% over the past few years (an increase which has been compounding steadily over time). This has contributed to a decision to increase the number of handling editors in the next term in order to make editorial workloads more manageable.

Happily, though, this expansion has provided greater scope for the incoming team to reflect the geographical and theoretical breadth of the European Association and of the international research community of which it is part. Amongst other things, this means that the new handling editors are drawn not only from a greater range of European countries than ever before but also from North America and (for the first time) Australasia. Consistent with the European association's pluralistic profile, the team also includes scholars who are versed in (and respected for their mastery of) a range of theoretical approaches and methodologies.

The result, we hope, is a team that will serve the journal, the association and the scholarly community well. Certainly, we will strive to uphold the reputation for integrity and intellectual challenge that EJSP has enjoyed for the last thirty years. However, as in the past, we will continue to rely heavily on members of the association to serve as readers, reviewers and contributors and to promote the journal and its aims as broadly as possible. We look forward to this collaboration immensely.

Alex Haslam, editor-elect, EJSP

Election of New Executive Committee Members - 2nd Call for Nominations-

Four members of the current Executive Committee will have to be replaced on the General Meeting next year in San Sebastian.

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

- (1) At least four months before the election, full members are asked for nominations.
- (2) Each nomination must be supported by two full members and addressed to the Secretary Dominic Abrams, at least three months before the members' meeting. Thus, the deadline is **March, 27, 2002**.
- (3) Each nomination packet has to contain:
 - A letter of the nominee, agreeing to serve on the Executive Committee, if elected
 - Letters of support from two full members of the Association
 - Brief background information from the nominee (max. half an A4 sheet), with a summary on academic positions, administrative experience, representative publications, and current research interests.

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

Deadlines for Contributions to the Executive Committee

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Administrative Secretary by **March, 1st, 2002** latest. Applications for personal grants and for the International Teaching Fellowship Scheme can be received at any time. The deadline for the next issue of the Bulletin is **January, 15th 2002**.

Executive Committee

Dominic Abrams (Secretary), Centre for the Study of Group Processes,
Department of Psychology, University of Kent at Canterbury, KENT CT2 7NP,
UK
email: D.Abrams@ukc.ac.uk

Naomi Ellemers (President), Social and Organizational Psychology, Leiden
University, P.O. Box 9555, NL-2300 RB Leiden, The Netherlands
email: Ellemers@fsw.leidenUniv.nl

Klaus Fiedler, Psychologisches Institut der Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg,
Hauptstr. 47-51, D-69117 Heidelberg, Germany
email: kf@psi-sv2.psi.uni-heidelberg.de

Carmen Huici, Facultad de Psicología, Universidad Nacional de Educación, P.O.
Box 60148, E-28040 Madrid, Spain
email: chuici@cu.uned.es

Maria Jarymowicz, Institute of Psychology, University of Warsaw, ul. Stawki 5/7,
PL-00-183 Warsaw, Poland
email: Mariaj@sci.psych.uw.edu.pl

Anne Maass, Dipartimento di Psicologia DPSS, Università di Padova, Via Venezia
8, I-35131 Padova, Italy
email: Maass@psico.unipd.it

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

Administrative Secretary:

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

web site of the EAESP:

<http://www.eaesp.org>