

European Bulletin of Social Psychology

Editors: Russell Spears & Sibylle Classen

2 Editorial

5 Article

Social Psychology in Bulgaria: Institutionalization and Trends by Velina Topalova

14 New Books by Members

Social Comparison and Social Psychology: Understanding Cognition, Intergroup Relations and Culture (2006) ed. by S. Guimond

La catégorisation et les stéréotypes en psychologie sociale by E. Sales-Wuillemin

Stigma and Group Inequality: Social Psychological Perspectives (2006) ed. by S. Levin & C. van Laar

20 Book Reviews

Emotion in Social Relations by B. Parkinson, A.H. Fischer & A.S.R. Manstead (2005), Review by J.-M. Fernández-Dols

Contemporary Perspectives on the Psychology of Attitudes ed. by G. Haddock & G. R. Maio (2004), Review by B. Verplanken

29 Future EAESP Meetings – Calendar

30 Future EAESP Meetings

15th General Meeting, June 2008, Opatija (Croatia)

Small Group Meeting on Social Stigma and Social Disadvantage, June 21-22, 2007, Oud-Poelgeest, The Netherlands

Small Group Meeting on Fundamental Dimensions of Social Judgment: A View from Different Perspectives, Summer 2007, Belgium

34 Reports of Previous Meetings

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

Small Group Meeting on Social Justice and Intergroup Conflict, September 21-24, 2005, Lisbon, Portugal

- 40 Other Reports**
Report on the Second East-Central European Summer School in Social Psychology, August 1-15, 2005, Wrocław, Poland
- 43** European Journal of Social Psychology: Brief Editorial Statement
- 45 Grants and Grant Reports**
- 59 News about Members**
New Members of the Association
- 63 Announcements**
Revised Grant Schemes
EAESP flyer
- 69 Deadlines for Contributions**
- 70 Executive Committee**

Editorial

There is important news to report in this edition of the Bulletin. Although the last General meeting in Würzburg seems like only yesterday it is now already almost a year ago and that means that we already have to think hard about where to hold our next General meeting, especially as these events really do take 3 years in the planning (not that we want put off future volunteers!). Well your committee has not been resting and the major topic of our most recent meetings has been to consider the various possibilities. Although some details have yet to be finalized it is my great pleasure to announce that we plan to hold our next General Meeting in Opatija in Croatia in early June of 2008 (see more detail on page 30). The location is stunning, the climate wonderful, the food delicious (and very reasonably priced – remember I am an honorary Dutchman!). How do I know all this? Well we conducted our last committee meeting there! As you can see we are tireless in our efforts to serve the EAESP! We think that Opatija is a secret that has been too well-kept and we confidently predict ($p < .0001$) that European social psychologists will enjoy the location and facilities just as much as we did (our slogan: Venice -- the Opatija of Italy!). We have an excellent local organizing team lead by Dinka Corkalo from the University of Zagreb, so this meeting promises to maintain the very highest standards of the General Meeting. It gives particular pleasure that we have a team from the Eastern wing of Europe to take on this task, as it once again shows the depth and (geographical) breadth of social psychology on our continent.

The move East-wards is very much in line with our policy to extend the scope of activity in social psychology within Europe (quite literally) as widely as possible. Indeed, this exciting possibility is also partly a spin-off of our successful meeting last year of the Eastern and Central European countries within EAESP in Budapest (see last Bulletin). We also plan to follow this initiative up with a further larger meeting in this tradition (i.e. somewhere in Eastern/Central Europe) before the next General Meeting, of which more news in a later Bulletin (watch this space). In the meantime we present the first of a series of reports from the Eastern and Central European countries that came out of that meeting, and which

provide an overview of the social psychology practiced there with some historical background explaining the internal and external influences and so forth. Our first report is from Bulgaria, by Velina Topolova. We think this is a very interesting forum for raising awareness of the different strengths and profiles of social psychology around Europe. Indeed, we would ultimately like to extend this idea to include all countries in Europe. Perhaps your own country, or indeed your own department, has an interesting history or current profile about which you would like to inform the membership of the Association? If so, we would like to hear from you! If you would like more information about this do please do get in touch with myself or Sibylle Classen.

Also related to the fruits of the 'Budapest summit', I would like to draw your attention to the revised grants schemes published at the end of the Bulletin on pages 63 to 68. In addition to updating the current support schemes we have developed a new 'regional activity' grant that arose in direct response to suggestions made in Budapest. A number of people at that meeting suggested that it would be of great value in developing East-West links if funds were available to invite one or more scholars to visit a host university in regions that are relatively under-resourced to provide teaching and training in some area of social psychology. This should provide a great opportunity for bilateral exchange that should also be of great benefit to visiting scholars in extending research networks and contacts as well as exposing them to the different traditions in social psychology in different parts of Europe.

On this note, and on behalf of the whole committee, I would also like to encourage all our members to make maximum use of the different grants and research support schemes on offer. I say this because, as a perusal of the reports from people who have held travel and seedcorn grants shows (just to take this issue as an example), it is quite often the most well represented and an well-resourced countries that make most use of these schemes. This is not a criticism of those who use the schemes of course – that is precisely what they are for! We would simply like to encourage even wider usage! Even if you do not plan to use these schemes yourself, perhaps you know a research student or colleague you think would benefit from them (to visit you for example!). If so we would be very grateful if you could bring these opportunities to their attention!

Finally, I would like to draw your attention to the flyer advertising the EAESP included in this mailing of the Bulletin. This was designed and printed very recently and provides all the basic up to date information about the Association. If you would like to order a number of these to advertise us or our activities in your department or university (or indeed elsewhere!), please just email or write to our Executive Officer, the ever efficient and reliable Sibylle Classen, and she will be happy to furnish you with copies.

Russell Spears

Article***Social Psychology in Bulgaria
Institutionalization and Trends*****by Velina Topalova**

(Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria)

I. Historical Background

The modern Bulgarian state was established in 1878 after a long period of Ottoman rule. In 1944 the Bulgarian communist party came to power, in 1989 its regime collapsed, and the country entered the period of post-socialist transformation. The development of Bulgarian social psychology was substantially influenced by that context.

The institutionalization of social psychology in Bulgaria came relatively late, in the beginning of the 1970s. Ideas relevant to social psychology had been developed earlier in the neighboring disciplines of philosophy, sociology, and psychology.

The only survey of the progress of those ideas is a 1971 essay by Mincho Draganov. Adhering to the Marxist tenets, Draganov explained the emergence of Bulgarian social psychology via the class struggle mechanisms, and described the chaotic and spontaneous development of social psychological notions in Bulgarian culture from the 10th century to the establishment of the modern Bulgarian state in the late 19th c. The final chapters of the essay outlined the accumulation of social psychological knowledge in the first half of the 20th c., construing the founding fathers of Bulgarian Marxism, Dimitar Blagoev and Georgi Kirkov, as originators also of the scientific social psychology in Bulgaria.

The first studies in social psychology indeed appeared in the first half of the 20th c., and were generally concerned with Bulgarian national psychology. But the period had also witnessed debates about mass psychology and psychoanalysis, as well as some elaboration of Marxist methodology. The most distinguished social psychologist before the WWII was Ivan Hadjiiski, author of many remarkable studies on the mentality of the Bulgarian people. Analyzing a vast body of data, Hadjiiski tried to explain the structure and the features of the Bulgarian national character, the psychology of the Bulgarian peasants, along with various types of social interaction. His studies exerted crucial influence on the development of sociology and social psychology in Bulgaria.

II. Institutional functions of social psychology before 1989

After the establishment of communist regime in 1944 the Bulgarian social psychology developed in a severely ideological environment, in conform to the tenets of Marxist historical materialism. The object of social psychology was generally identified with mass psychology, considered as a lower stratum of the social consciousness. Accommodating to the decisions reached in the Soviet debate on the object and limits of social psychology (in which the contending parties held that it was a subdiscipline of sociology or psychology), the bulk of the Bulgarian sociologists defined social psychology as an autonomous science bordering on sociology and psychology, and having its own concepts and research methods.

In the socialist period the number of the researchers working in the field of social psychology significantly increased, because of the fact that their knowledge was deemed essential to social engineering and management. Most studies were organized and funded by party and state institutions. The keen interest in social psychology led to growing differentiation, which in its turn led to the emergence of subdisciplines dealing with various domains of social life, e.g. social psychology of labor (focusing on social psychological climate, labor conflicts, motivation, and values), social psychology of mass and media culture, of urbanization, religion, military discipline etc.

III. Institutionalization of social psychology

The institutionalization of Bulgarian social psychology began in 1972 with the establishment of Social psychology department, affiliated with the Institute for Sociology at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. The institute itself had been brought into existence a couple of years ago by a group of progressively thinking sociologists, having mostly philosophical background (which in turn had a considerable impact on the specific situation of the Bulgarian social psychology).

At the beginning the department had only two members, Mincho Draganov and Velina Topalova (who had recently defended her Ph.D. thesis in psychology at the Warsaw University). Today at the department work 7 fellows and 4 Ph. D. students. Since 1997 it has been headed by Tanya Nedelcheva.

The fellows of the department have collaborated on all the major studies organized by the Institute, including the studies on the religion in Bulgaria, problems of urban and rural societies, and large social groups, on the changing mentality of the Bulgarian peasants, social psychology of labor, family, lifestyles, religious communities. The members of the department have also studied the history of social psychology, as well as theoretical and methodological issues relevant to the study of public opinion, social attitudes, social knowledge, values, social representations, and identity.

By virtue of the fact that the Bulgarian members of EAESP are generally grouped around this department, it was actively involved in the international research networks, and organized two international meetings– the East-West meeting in 1983, and the General EAESP meeting in 1986 (both held in Varna).

Ten years later, in 1982, another social psychology department was set up at the Institute of psychology, BAS. The Institute of psychology itself was established in 1990 upon the foundations laid by the Psychological Laboratory at BAS (founded in 1973). Before 1973, due to the belated institutionalization of psychology, some topics relevant to social psychology were studied in various research units dealing with transport,

medicine, and sport, i.e. working in the field of the so-called applied psychology.

Since its establishment the Social psychology department at the Institute for Psychology - BAS have worked in the areas of social motivation, values, determinants of behavior, and on the problems of aggression, identity, frustration, negative emotions, social chaos, mass behavior, cognitive structuring of political strategies, choosing in situations of social change, urban dynamics, verbal and non-verbal communication. The department is currently headed by Viktor Klincharsky.

IV. Teaching social psychology

The systematic training in social psychology began with the establishment of programs in psychology in 1973, and sociology in 1976 at the University of Sofia (in fact the first course in social psychology had been organized a couple of years earlier by Gencho Pirjov; at the outset the course had been taught to students in pedagogy, and later to students in philosophy).

Today the various courses in social psychology at the university are conducted by the staff of the Psychology department. Every year the undergraduate program in psychology takes in 100 among the very best students, and about 30 students enroll for the graduate program in social psychology, taking courses in psychology of mass behavior, ethnosociology, folk psychology, public opinion, psychology of law, psychology of deviant behavior, intergroup relations etc. The department has also launched postgraduate program in psychology, which allows the students to work in the field of social psychology; the program has already been signed up by 7 students and have aroused a growing interest.

Courses in social psychology are also offered in the framework of the psychology program of the Department of cognitive sciences at the New Bulgarian University, Sofia (the first private Bulgarian university). The NBU social psychology department was founded in 1991, and it is currently headed by Elena Paspalanova. The members of the department are offering courses in social attitudes and knowledge, psychology of interpersonal behavior, folk psychology, psychology of organizations, of

small groups, intergroup relations, and social identity, annually signed up by almost 400 students.

In fact the number of the Bulgarian universities currently exceeds 40 and lectures in social psychology are being delivered in almost any department of sociology, anthropology, philosophy or cultural studies, especially in the University of National and World Economy, the universities of Plovdiv, Blagoevgrad, Veliko Tynovo, and even at the Academy of Theater and the Police Academy; the courses are generally conceived as introduction to social psychology, or as surveys of social psychological research in fields like communications, intercultural relations, labor and organizations.

There is also an increasing number of postgraduate students in social psychology lately, both at the institutes of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences and the universities. Studying social psychology has a significant appeal to the young Bulgarians notwithstanding the low chances of getting a job.

The available literature consists in two Bulgarian textbooks in social psychology by Sava Djonev and Elka Todorova, translations of the textbooks of G. Andreeva, Aaronson, Myers, Moskovici, two readers of basic European texts, edited by Elka Todorova, and two readers of basic American texts, edited by Doncho Gradev and Ljudmila Andreeva. Students can also find a significant amount of English textbooks in the relevant libraries. The European journals in social psychology are unfortunately almost lacking (in fact they turned out to be way expensive). So let me just note that only the members of EAESP have access to its journal and it would be nice if the association turned out to be able to send it to one of the major Bulgarian libraries.

V. Distinguishing features of Bulgarian social psychology

Distinguishing feature of the Bulgarian scientific institutions is the lack of official integration between the research units and the universities. There is a recent trend towards integration of the researchers in the process of teaching social psychology, unfortunately driven only by economic considerations. The most important research centers are the Bulgarian

Academy of Sciences and the Sofia University, although there are also numerous marginal research units at smaller institutions and private agencies.

The dominant feature of Bulgarian social psychology is its commitment to the study of real social macro-level issues, as well as the social application of its findings. That methodological orientation emerged in the socialist era, when state and party agencies funded large-scale studies, based on representative national samples and the technique of standard interviews, in order to collect the requisite social psychological information about the social structures, processes, or attitudes of large social groups (the main research topics were the sociology of urbanization and rural society, employment, the problems of the social psychology of young people, women, pensioners, and intellectuals). Of course, today the Bulgarian state cannot afford funding such large-scale studies.

In that respect Bulgarian social psychology is different from the social psychology in other European countries, e.g. from the East German discipline determined by its deep-rooted traditions in experimental psychology; or from the Polish discipline dominated by the influence of American paradigms (due to the active involvement of Polish scholars in the American research networks); or from the Russian discipline, institutionalized mainly in the framework of psychology (considered safer from ideological persecution than sociology).

One can explain the distinguishing features of the Bulgarian social psychology on one hand with the crucial influence of the Marxist historical materialism, its focus on the social context and neglect of the individual and group activity, as well as with the philosophical background of its founders. Second, at the beginning Bulgarian social psychology was dominated by sociologists, and the Bulgarian traditions in experimental and general psychology were relatively weaker (compared with the traditions in childhood and education psychology). Due to those circumstances the kind of social psychology that gained ground in Bulgaria was not the American positivist version, but the European critique of that version, focusing on the social context of social psychology, and its social and societal dimensions.

VI. Social Psychology of Change: Understanding Post-Socialism

The collapse of socialist regimes in Eastern Europe changed the course of social psychology, turning the region into a “living laboratory” for social research. The greatest challenge to the Bulgarian social psychologists turned out to be the controversial nature of the social change in Bulgaria: establishment of democratic and market economy institutions, accompanied by constantly growing rates of poverty, unemployment, crime, anomie and lack of legitimacy. The need to deal with those ambiguous changes led to the emergence of new approaches and research techniques.

The theoretical model of social psychology abruptly changed after 1989. It abandoned the Marxist affinity to social determinism, and instead started to emphasize the significance of the subject considered as an author of his/her activity. The turn from macro to microanalysis enabled the study of the traditional topics of socialization, interpersonal and intergroup relationships, arousing intense interest in the qualitative research methods (e.g. unstructured interviews, focus groups, associative tests, data mining, discourse analysis). The sudden decline of Marxist ideology was followed by no less sudden rise of various theories that shaped the Bulgarian social psychology as a polyparadigmatic but often eclectic field of study.

The institutionalization of social psychology has also changed since 1989. The new market and social demands led to the emergence of a vast range of private universities, agencies, and research units dealing exclusively with public opinion and marketing surveys. The unrestrained commercialization of the field of applied social psychology has generated a number of professional and ethical problems.

At the same time the academic research in social psychology was severely restricted. A whole group of institutions having social psychology research units have been virtually destroyed since 1989 (AONSU, ISST, the National Institute for Research on Young People). The staff of the surviving institutions was also seriously limited. In less than a decade the number of the research units in the field of social psychology decreased twice, and the number of researchers – more than six times. Severely limited was also the government funding – the budget of BAS, the basic

research center in Bulgaria, decreased twice in less than 5 years. Even publishing turned out to be a problem (now the only journals a Bulgarian social psychologist could publish in are *Psychological Studies*, *Bulgarian Psychological Journal*, *Sociological Problems*, *Psychological and Postpsychological Studies*, and *Sofia University Annual Review*).

The social change has transformed also the research topics of Bulgarian social psychology. There is currently a marked trend towards expansion of the various subdivisions of applied social psychology. Today the main fields of applied research are, of course, the social surveys, but also the marketing surveys, the analysis of political, electoral, media, economic social psychology issues, the social psychology of human resources, recruit and training, law, deviant behavior etc. Social psychologists are often hired as experts by government agencies and NGOs.

The academic social psychologists examine the social psychological determinants of the post-socialist transformation, and its influence on large-scale social structures. Notwithstanding the diversity of their research topics, one could distinguish the following dominant directions of study:

- social attitudes, their impact and dependence on the social changes;
- radical changes in social attitudes and representations, dramatic collisions of incompatible values;
- social perception and evaluation of the chaotic processes of social differentiation, the emergent social inequalities, and intergroup perceptions (focusing on ethnic perceptions and stereotypes);
- radical shift of social identities on individual, social-group and social level.

Since 1989, notwithstanding their thwarted integration in the international research community, the Bulgarian social psychologists collaborated on a number of important international studies on the concept of social justice (Inkeles), attitudes toward reforms in Eastern Europe (Evans), attitudes toward labor and market economy in Eastern Europe (Cornell), social representation of human rights (Doaz), social representation of gypsies in Eastern Europe (Perez), individual in circumstances of democracy and market economy (Markova), two large

scale studies on values (Schwarz), the European research on values (Halman), and others.

The crucial task of the contemporary Bulgarian social psychology is the development of theoretical models for conceptualization and explanation of the social effects produced by the dynamic transformation of the social context. The Bulgarian social psychologists intend to cope with that task through accumulation of research techniques and ideas, and intercultural and international orientation. The accomplishment of the task would be made easier by the integration of the Bulgarian social psychology into the European research networks, and by a more extensive international support.

New Books by Members

Social Comparison and Social Psychology: Understanding Cognition, Intergroup Relations and Culture.

Edited By **Serge Guimond** (2006).

Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 354 pages.

(for more details and excerpt, see

<http://www.cambridge.org/uk/catalogue/catalogue.asp?isbn=0521845939>

Book Description :

Much of our knowledge about ourselves, and about the world in which we live, is based on a process of social comparison. Our tendency to appraise events, objects, people, and social groups by making comparisons has captured the interest of social psychologists for over half a century.

This volume provides an up-to-date synthesis of the latest theoretical and empirical developments in social psychology through research on social comparison processes. With chapters by leading theorists and internationally renowned researchers, it provides invaluable information on the role of this process of comparison as it occurs within a single individual over time, between individuals, and between social groups. It also features an original international study testing the universality of the effects of social comparison on the self.

This book will appeal to scholars and students alike and will serve as an important reference for the study of cognition, intergroup relations, and culture.

Serge Guimond is Professor of Psychology at the Université Blaise Pascal in Clermont-Ferrand France.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of contributors

Preface

Introduction: Social comparison processes and levels of analysis

Serge Guimond

Part One – Cognition

Comparison processes within and between individuals

Chapter 1. Social Comparison Orientation: A New Perspective on Those Who Do, and Those Who Don't Compare with Others

Abraham P. Buunk and Frederick X. Gibbons

Chapter 2. The Why, Who and How of Social Comparison:
A Social-Cognition Perspective

Thomas Mussweiler, Katja Rüter and Kai Epstude

Chapter 3. Autobiographical memory, the self and comparison processes

Rasyid Bo Sanitioso, Martin A. Conway, and Sophie Brunot

Chapter 4. Comparing oneself over time: The temporal dimension in social comparison

Sandrine Redersdorff and Serge Guimond

Part Two - Intergroup relations

Comparison processes within and between groups

Chapter 5. Predicting comparison choices in intergroup settings: A new look

Hanna Zagefka and Rupert Brown

Chapter 6. The variable impact of upward and downward social comparisons on self-esteem: When the level of analysis matters

Delphine Martinot and Sandrine Redersdorff

Chapter 7. Attitudes toward redistributive social policies: The effects of social comparisons and policy experience

Donna M. Garcia, Nyla R. Branscombe, Serge Desmarais, and Stephanie S. Gee

Chapter 8. Social comparison and group-based emotions

Vincent Yzerbyt, Muriel Dumont, Bernard Mathieu, Ernestine Gordijn, and Daniel Wigboldus

Chapter 9. The counter-intuitive effects of Relative Gratification on intergroup attitudes: Ecological validity, moderators and mediators
Michaël Dambrun, Serge Guimond, and Donald M. Taylor

Chapter 10. Social comparison and the personal-group discrimination discrepancy
Muriel Dumont, Eléonore Seron, Vincent Yzerbyt, and Tom Postmes

Part Three - Culture

Comparison processes within and across cultures

Chapter 11. Stereotype content across cultures as a function of group status
Susan T. Fiske and Amy J.C. Cuddy

Chapter 12. The cultural norm of individualism and group status: Implications for social comparisons
Fabio Lorenzi-Cioldi and Armand Chatard

Chapter 13. Ambivalent sexism, power distance, and gender inequality across cultures
Peter Glick

Chapter 14. Social comparisons across cultures I: Gender stereotypes in high and low power distance cultures
Michel Désert and Jacques Philippe Leyens

Chapter 15. Social comparisons across cultures II: Change and stability in self-views - Experimental evidence
S. Guimond, A. Chatard, N. R. Branscombe, S. Brunot, A. P. Buunk, M.A. Conway, R. J. Crisp, M. Dambrun, M. Désert, D. M. Garcia, S. Haque, J.-P. Leyens, F. Lorenzi-Cioldi, D. Martinot, S. Redersdorff, and V. Yzerbyt

Author index

Subject index

La catégorisation et les stéréotypes en psychologie sociale

by **Edith Sales-Wuillemin**

number of pages: 160, Price 17,60 €

Publisher's website: <http://www.dunod.com/>

Description of the Book: <http://www.dunod.com/pages/onglet/liste.asp?th=4&struct=4.01.02.01.&idstruct=569>

Short description of the book:

This book is about categorization, stereotypes and prejudice. The aim of this book is double : first it focuses on a large variety of recent studies in social psychology and underlies the crucial role of prejudice/stereotypes and categorization in social interactions. Second it proposes different methodologies used for measuring contents and processes implied in social categorization and stereotyping.

Stigma and Group Inequality: Social Psychological Perspectives

Edited by **Shana Levin**, Claremont McKenna College, and **Colette van Laar**, Leiden University

January, 2006; Lawrence Erlbaum, 333pp.

ISBN Hb: 0-8058-4415-5; Pbk: 0-8058-4416-3

For further information and ordering the book, please see:

<https://www.erlbaum.com/shop/tek9.asp?pg=products&specific=0-8058-4415-5>

Social psychology has a long tradition of research on stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination. For a large part of its history, this research focused on the views and responses of members of dominant groups to members of minority groups. In the past 15 years, however, a new line of research has emerged that focuses on the perspective of stereotyped or stigmatized groups. Many of the authors in this book were key pioneers in this field of research. Together with more recent work, this research has led to a variety of theoretical and methodological innovations in the study

of stigma and has moved the field to a new depth of understanding of these processes. As a result, we have obtained much better knowledge of how stigma affects the stigmatized individual, his or her interaction partners, the stigmatized and non-stigmatized groups to which they belong, and relations between the groups. This wealth of ground-breaking theoretical and empirical work is captured in this book.

The volume is organized around three major sections: responses to stigma, stigma in the social context, and stigma and the social basis of the self.

The first section of the volume discusses the tradeoffs that stigmatized individuals must contend with as they weigh the benefits derived from a particular response to stigma against the costs associated with it. The chapters in this section focus particularly on the potential costs associated with confronting and not confronting discrimination. The second section of the volume discusses the ways in which environments can threaten one's intellectual performance, sense of belonging, and self-concept. In the last section of the volume, the authors argue that the experience of possessing a stigmatized identity is shaped by social interactions with others in the stigmatized ingroup as well as members of other outgroups.

Contents: S. Levin, C. van Laar, *Stigma and Group Inequality: Social Psychological Perspectives*

1. The Experience of Stigma: Individual, Interpersonal, and Situational Influences

Colette Van Laar and Shana Levin

**PART I: CONFRONTING, CONCEALING AND COPING:
RESPONSES TO STIGMA**

2. Social Psychological Perspectives on Coping with Stressors Related to Stigma

Carol T. Miller

3. Dominant Ideology Threat and the Interpersonal Consequences of Attributions to Discrimination

Cheryl R. Kaiser

4. Silence is Not Golden: The Intrapersonal Consequences of Not Confronting Prejudice

J. Nicole Shelton, Jennifer A. Richeson, Jessica Salvatore, and Diana M. Hill

5. Concealable versus Conspicuous Stigmatized Identities

Diane M. Quinn

6. Responding to Everyday Discrimination: A Synthesis of Research on Goal Directed, Self-regulatory Coping Behaviors
Janet K. Swim and Margaret A. Thomas

PART II: STIGMA IN THE SOCIAL CONTEXT: COPING WITH THREATENING ENVIRONMENTS

7. How Environments Can Threaten Academic Performance, Self-knowledge, and Sense of Belonging
Michael Inzlicht and Catherine Good
8. Mechanisms for Coping with Status-based Rejection Expectations
Rodolfo Mendoza-Denton, Elizabeth Page-Gould, and Janina Pietrzak
9. Stigma and Intergroup Contact among Members of Minority and Majority Status Groups
Linda R. Tropp
10. New Perspectives on Stigma and Psychological Well-being
Brenda Major

PART III: STIGMA AND THE SOCIAL BASIS OF THE SELF

11. The Self Expansion Model: Extensions to Ingroup Identification
Tracy McLaughlin-Volpe
12. The Interpersonal Basis of Self-Stereotyping
Stacey Sinclair and Jeff Huntsinger
13. Stigma and Shame: Emotional Responses to the Stereotypic Actions of One's Ethnic Ingroup
Toni Schmader and Brian Lickel
14. Stigma and the Social Basis of the Self: A Synthesis
Jennifer Crocker and Julie A. Garcia

Book Reviews

Emotion in Social Relations by **B. Parkinson, A.H. Fischer** and **A.S.R. Manstead**

New York: Psychology Press, 2005

Review by **José-Miguel Fernández-Dols** (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid)

This book is barely three hundred pages long, but it is a dense and extremely informative discussion of some of the most fascinating issues in the field of emotion, and certainly covers most of the questions social psychologists should bear in mind when studying affect or emotion. The book has eight chapters. The first two (Emotions' Place in the Social World, and Emotion Meaning Across Cultures) deal with the basic scientific vocabulary of emotion, and the interactions between scientific language about emotion, everyday concepts of emotion, and culture.

The next five chapters convey, quite powerfully, how emotion can have different meanings depending on the level of analysis. Chapter 3 (Cultural Variation in Emotion) discusses the theoretical debates on the universality of emotions and the interaction between culture and emotion. Chapter 4 (Group Emotion) deals with a set of findings that are rather heterogeneous (e.g., organizational culture, family expressivity), but always explaining emotions as collective phenomena. Chapter 5 (Intergroup Emotion) describes a series of well-known and important lines of research that are finally connecting traditional social cognitive problems (such as self-categorization and stereotypes) with theoretical approaches on individual and collective emotions, particularly moral emotions such as guilt. Chapter 6 (Moving Faces in Interpersonal Life) approaches expressions as virtuoso social performances with more in common with duets, trios or quartets than solo performances. Chapter 7 also deals with the interpersonal dimension, arguing that emotions—even apparently non-social emotions such as sadness—are a complex social business, in which our experience and its consequences cannot be understood without taking

into account those persons physically or symbolically around us. Finally, Chapter 8 (Interconnecting Contexts) provides a theoretical approach that depicts emotion as a multifaceted process oriented to the physical and social world in complex ways from early life onwards. No object or event is a univocal elicitor of emotion: emotions are determined, in a fundamental way, by social relationships, since emotions are constitutive, key elements of those relationships.

I would recommend different ways of reading the book, depending on the reader's circumstances.

The book can be consulted as one would consult a dictionary, with each chapter considered as a self-contained review of a relevant issue in the social psychology of emotion.

The book can also, of course, be read in a traditional linear way, but newcomers to the field should be aware that the authors make no attempt to protect the reader from some of the thorny issues that make emotion research so difficult. For example, in the first two chapters the authors raise serious doubts about the feasibility of cross-cultural univocal translations of emotion words, or the logical and evolutionary consistency of concepts such as basic emotion and display rules. Nevertheless, Chapters 3 to 7 do, most of the time, take for granted the feasibility of the translation of emotion words across languages, and the existence of basic and not-so-basic emotions, as well as display rules. These contradictions do no more than reflect the prevalent and worrying limitations of this field. Had the authors not incurred in these kinds of contradiction they would have been unable to give an account of the literature, and the book would have consisted of no more than the first two chapters.

But the book can also be read as a theoretical proposal. In this case the reader should begin with the final chapter, and then read the previous chapters in the light of the theoretical framework outlined there. This theoretical framework provides the key to an understanding of most of the findings reviewed in the other chapters as pieces of a puzzle that hint at the multifaceted character of all emotional phenomena and their radical situational nature. The authors do not make much mention of Lewin, but his influence is implicit, as emotion is considered as a field composed of

conflicting affective and motivational forces that shape the context at the same time as the context shapes them. Emotions are dynamic systems that can be connected to other systems, building up collective emotions. And emotions become even more complex when people combine the experiences of affective and motivational forces with their cognitive representations.

Last, but not least, the book is also worth a browse for all those researchers who, while not primarily concerned with emotion, still circumstantially use concepts such as emotion, valence or affect in their research on issues such as attitudes, social categorization, prejudice or cognitive priming. The book provides a good deal of potentially useful warnings about problematic conceptual or procedural approaches to emotion, such as using prototypical facial expressions as natural representations of emotion, approaching translation of emotions terms across languages as univocal, and confounding affect and emotion, as well as pointing out many other traps that threaten social psychologists when they wander into the territory of emotion.

In conclusion, it must be said that Parkinson, Fischer and Manstead's book is, in many ways, a singular work. It seems to be intended for a fairly general audience, but appears reluctant to indulge in popular issues such as emotional intelligence or well-being. It could be an excellent introductory textbook on emotion, but from time to time it raises disturbing questions that many teachers of introductory courses on the subject do not dare mention to their students. It is in many ways a theoretical work, though the theory is not presented as an a priori framework into which all the data are fitted, but rather as a conclusion that seems more like an invitation to further intellectual toil on the part of the reader. To employ a metaphor more often used for novels, this is a river-book, with a white-water beginning, a raft-ride of apparently insoluble problems and tantalizing questions, an apparently placid and calmly navigable middle course in which readers can cruise in a superficial but nevertheless profitable way through the chapters as mere reviews of most of the relevant literature in the field, and finally, a theoretical estuary that some readers might see as the end, even though, like the end of a river, it is more like a beginning full of promise.

An excellent starting point, then, given the influential role of Parkinson, Fischer and Manstead, for a possible renaissance of some old situationist European thinking, such as that of Vygotsky (and the early Lewin), in the study of emotion. The challenge will consist in confronting these “new” old traditions with some of the log-jams in current research, and in developing scientifically testable hypotheses within this potential new paradigm.

Contemporary Perspectives on the Psychology of Attitudes, edited by **Geoffrey Haddock** and **Gregory R. Maio**
New York: Psychology Press, 2004, ISBN 1-84169-326-X
Review by **Bas Verplanken** (University of Tromsø, Norway / from September 1, 2006: University of Bath, UK)

In 1932, Gordon Allport reviewed a book entitled *Students' attitudes*, which was written by Daniel Katz and Gordon Allport's older brother, Floyd Allport, and was published a year earlier. That book presented a comprehensive study on a wide range of issues related to being a student. In his review, Gordon Allport writes: “Quite correctly some critics feel that the linearity and continuity required by Thurstone's psychophysical methods tend to distort the essential nature of attitudes. On the question of cheating in examinations, for example, the psychophysical methods would be limited to a continuous gradation of affect, ranging from attitudes favorable to cribbing to attitudes opposed to the practice. Such a procedure overlooks certain qualitative issues raised in a “discontinuous” but more representative and natural series of questions.” (p.356). This quote suggests that already in the very early days of attitude research, the conceptualization of an attitude simply as ‘a position on a favorable-unfavorable dimension’ has been questioned and discussed. The two Allport brothers would have loved *Contemporary Perspectives on the Psychology of Attitudes*. Although we may use different terms and concepts than was done in the nineteen thirties, this book convincingly

demonstrates that the attitude construct is rich, interesting, and very much “discontinuous”. The book brings together a set of fine chapters written by top researchers in the attitude domain. It is the result of a meeting jointly sponsored by the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology and the University of Wales, which took place in July 2000. We should be very grateful to the organizers that they have accomplished to share the intellectual richness that was concentrated in that meeting with others who are working on or interested in attitude research.

The book is organized into two main parts and ends with an integrating and future-directed chapter by the editors. The first part contains eight chapters, which focus on structural and behavioral properties of attitudes. In the first chapter, Gregory Maio, Victoria Esses, Karin Arnold, and James Olson take up the three-component (cognitions, feelings, and past behavior) model of attitudes, and use this as the basis of the function-structure model of attitudes. The innovation lies in adding motivations to the three-component model, i.e., the proposition that salient goals affect the weight of the cognitive, affective, and conative components on the overall attitude. These authors then focus in more detail on the role of one particular motivation, the need for affect. They use the function-structure model to examine effects of the need for affect on phenomena such as the formation of extreme attitudes, responses to fear appeals, and effects of affective versus cognitive persuasive messages. Geoffrey Haddock and Thomas Huskinson, in Chapter 2, focus on individual differences in attitude structure. In particular, they demonstrate the validity of individual differences in the consistency of cognitive versus affective attitude components. Using a within-participant methodology, four basic types of individuals emerge, Thinkers, who have attitudes that are primarily based on cognitions, Feelers, who develop attitudes primarily on feelings associated with the attitude object, Dual-Consistents, who maintain attitudes that are equally strongly associated with cognitions and feelings, and Dual-Inconsistent, whose attitudes are neither consistent with beliefs and feelings. In Chapter 3, David Trafimow and Paschal Sheeran posit the intriguing thesis that affect is what makes an attitude “work”, which thus includes the assumption that cognition guides behavior through a translation into affect. Speculative as this theory may seem, it is in line with developments in brain research as well

as with evolutionary reasoning. The next three chapters investigate the issue of attitude ambivalence, which is a topic that has attracted growing attention over the past years. In Chapter 4, Steven Breckler presents a useful overview of issues related to the assessment of ambivalence. He extends the traditional bidimensional view on ambivalence (the idea that one may distinguish an attitude in the positive and an attitude in the negative domain with respect to the attitude object) to a multi-dimensional view, i.e., the idea that with regard to an attitude object, one may possess attitudes in multiple domains, which not necessarily are in opposition with each other, such as in the case of a bidimensional view. Breckler also provides an elegant variant of Thurstone's equal-appearing intervals methodology by using a dispersion measure, instead of a central tendency measure, to assess attitude multivalence. Howard Lavine, in Chapter 5, examines the ambivalence construct in the political arena. He shows that ambivalence is a significant factor in electoral decision making. In the second part of his chapter, Levine introduces the concept of group ambivalence, i.e., the idea that people may hold consistent or conflicting attitudes towards ideologically associated social groups. He also presents a variation on a classic ambivalence index to measure group ambivalence. In Chapter 6, Christopher Armitage and Mark Conner focus on the role of ambivalence in the attitude-behavior relationship. They discuss a number of important details, such as the role of the homogeneity of underlying beliefs and attitude stability, and present a comprehensive summary of studies on effects of attitude ambivalence on attitude-intention, attitude-behaviour, and intention-behaviour relations. In Chapter 7, Sheina Orbell approaches the intention-behaviour relation from a self-regulation perspective. She first analyses intention-behaviour consistency by decomposing the sources of inconsistency, leading to the conclusion that inclined abstainers are the main source of inconsistency. Orbell continues to present an overview of the impressive effects of implementation intentions and discusses underlying mechanisms, the relationships between implementation intentions and habits, and Julius Kuhl's intriguing personality systems interactions theory. In the final Chapter 8 of Part I, Marco Perugini and Richard Bagozzi take the distinction between automatic and deliberate processes into the attitude-behaviour relation discussion. Together with affective and motivational factors, this culminates into the integrative model of goal-directed behaviour and the extended version of this model. In both models, desires form a core

construct as antecedent of intention. These models provide a rich and comprehensive account of goal-directed behaviour and decision making, including both deliberate and automatic aspects, and has now begun to be empirically validated.

Part II is entitled "Attitude awareness, attitude representations, and change". It starts with adding a new perspective to persuasion and attitude change theory, i.e., the role of meta-cognitive processes, which is described in Pablo Briñol and Richard Petty's Chapter 9. The authors pose self-validation, in particular the confidence one has in his or her thoughts elicited by a persuasive message, as a crucial aspect of the persuasion process. Applying this notion to various persuasion phenomena, a convincing case is made for adding thought confidence as a new construct in addition to the extent and direction of cognitive responding. In Chapter 10, Yaacov Schul explores how people cope with invalid persuasive messages. While people are poor in unmasking deception in the first place, Schul demonstrates that people can respond by enhanced or decreased complexity of information processing. Integrative encoding, which determines the degree to which associative links between pieces of information are established, and past experiences of coping with invalidity, play crucial roles. Tilmann Betsch, Henning Plessner, and Elke Schallies, in Chapter 11, present the value-account model of attitude formation. This dual-process model describes implicit and explicit attitude formation and related information integration processes. The former has been demonstrated as a summation-driven process, whereas the latter as an averaging process. Each process has its own properties (e.g., implicit processes are not constrained by processing capacities, but do not take account of sample size; explicit processes do incorporate sample size, but are restricted by processing capacities), which thus affect resulting attitudes. Also Chapter 12, by Patrick Vargas, addresses the implicit-explicit distinction in attitudes, in this case focusing on the attitude-behaviour relationship. This chapter provides a thorough and useful overview of relationships between implicit versus explicit structures and measures, spontaneous versus deliberate processing, and spontaneous versus deliberate behaviours. In Chapter 13, Charles Lord discusses attitude stability, and proposes and demonstrates that exemplar stability, i.e., the degree to which a person holds a stable representation of the attitude object, may cause variances in attitudes and may thus play a

major role in attitude stability. Charles Lord is one of the few writers who provides an accurate account of the classic LaPiere (1934) study, which is often cited as the first study to demonstrate attitude-behaviour inconsistency; LaPiere did not question the predictive value of attitudes per se, but blamed the attitude-behaviour inconsistency to the use of questionnaires, which provides a symbolic response to a symbolic situation, and may thus be very different from the actual behavioural situation. Chapter 14 and 15, by Richard Eiser and by Karen Jordens and Frank van Overwalle, respectively, provide interesting contributions by introducing the connectionist perspective. One of the important differences with traditional approaches is that contrary to our well-known “boxes-and-arrows” type of models, connectionist models provide a dynamic and flexible environment, which seem much better suited to describe the complex processes of attitude formation and change. Importantly, connectionist models and simulations can also be used to generate and test novel hypotheses, such as Jordens and van Overwalle show with respect to extensions of the affect-priming and affect-as-information models. In Chapter 16, Etsuko Hoshino-Browne, Adam Zanna, Steven Spencer, and Mark Zanna take cognitive dissonance as the focus of a cross-cultural approach. An important message of this chapter is that, rather than looking for cross-cultural similarities and differences, a new and exciting approach in cross-cultural research is to investigate how culture influences the manifestation of fundamental phenomena, such as post-decision rationalisations or self-affirmation. Persuasion and attitude change is the topic of Chapter 17. In this chapter, Arie Kruglanski, Ayelet Fishbach, Hans-Peter Erb, Antonio Pierro, and Lucia Mannetti discuss and present evidence for the unimodel of persuasion. The unimodel describes persuasion processes at a higher abstraction level than is the case in current dual-process models, i.e., in terms of drawing conclusions from evidence, which then forms the basis of a judgement. “Evidence” may stem from a large variety of sources, and the model thus avoids the traditional distinction between message arguments and source information variables.

In the final Chapter 18, which forms Part II of the book, Gregory Maio and Geoffrey Haddock take a seat high up in the stadium, and view the attitude field in terms of content, structure, and function. The authors continue to present an integrative and compelling vision on future

challenges and developments, and use the content, structure, and function aspects and the contributions in this book as building stones. They propose that progression can be made by integrating the existing theories on attitude content, structure, and function into comprehensive and thus more powerful theories.

The mere description of the enormous variety of topics presented in this book already demonstrates that attitude theory continues to be a healthy, lively, and very interesting arena in psychology. This book contributes to bringing this message out. It is therefore not only important as a summary of cutting edge research, but also as a source of inspiration, both for new students in this field, as well as for those who have been engaged in attitude research for a longer time. The recently published handbook of attitudes by Albarracín, Johnson, and Zanna's (2005) and Haddock and Maio's book thus are two recent jewels on the social psychologist's bookshelves.

References

- Albarracín, D., Johnson, B.T., & Zanna, M.P. (Eds.) (2005). *The handbook of attitudes*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Allport, G.W. (1932). Students' attitudes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 29, 356-358.

Future EAESP Meetings - Calendar

July 6-8, 2006, Canterbury, UK

Small Group Meeting on Evolution and Group Processes: Understanding the Human Social Animal

Organisers: Mark Van Vugt & Mark Schaller

Contact: Mark Van Vugt (mvv@kent.ac.uk)

July 10-12, 2006, Sussex, UK

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

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

Contact: Paul Sparks (p.sparks@sussex.ac.uk) or Peter Harris (p.harris@sheffield.ac.uk)

July 18-22, 2006, Kent, UK

Medium Size Meeting on Social Developmental Perspectives on Intergroup Inclusion and Exclusion

Organisers: Dominic Abrams & Adam Rutland

Contact: Dominic Abrams (D.Abrams@kent.ac.uk) or Adam Rutland (A.Rutland@kent.ac.uk)

October 4-6, 2006, Kiel, Germany

Small Group Meeting on Group-Level Perspectives on Giving and Receiving Help

Organisers: Stefan Stuermer & Mark Snyder

Contact: Stefan Stuermer (stuermer@psychologie.uni-kiel.de)

Summer 2007

Small Group Meeting on Fundamental Dimensions of Social Judgment: A View from Different Perspectives

Organisers: Vincent Yzerbyt & Andrea Abele, Co-organisers: Amy Cuddy & Charles Judd

Contact: Vincent Yzerbyt (vincent.yzerbyt@psp.ucl.ac.be)

June 21-22, 2007, Oud-Poelgeest, The Netherlands

Small Group Meeting on Social Stigma and Social Disadvantage

Organisers: Manuela Barreto & Naomi Ellemers

Contact: Manuela Barreto (Barreto@fsw.leidenuniv.nl)

June 2008, Opatija, Croatia

15th General Meeting of the EAESP

Future EAESP Meetings**15th General Meeting
Opatija (Croatia), first part of June 2008****Organisers: Dinka Corkalo Biruski with
Dean Ajdukovic****(Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities and
Social Sciences, University of Zagreb)**

Opatija Riviera, an attractive tourist destination located on the beautiful Adriatic coastline. It is the pearl of the northern Adriatic and renowned for its pleasant climate, crystal clean sea, gastronomic delicacies and excellent wine. The town is also known as the "Old Lady of Adriatic" because two centuries ago the European nobility discovered this picturesque place and started building villas to enjoy the sun and the sea. Opatija is also known as the favorite location for organizing international conferences. Today, the Riviera is less than two hours by road from airports in Zagreb (Croatia), Ljubljana (Slovenia) and Trieste (Italy). It is within driving distance from Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Italy, and Hungary.

The Hotel Ambassador and the Grand Hotel Four Flowers, which are only five minutes walking distance apart, will serve as the conference venue. Both hotels are located on the seafront, with private beaches and a short walk from the town's main attractions. They have full conference facilities.

The next issue of the Bulletin will provide you with further information.

Small Group Meeting**On Social Stigma and Social Disadvantage****June, 21-22, 2007, Oud-Poelgeest, The Netherlands****<http://www.oudpoelgeest.nl>**

[Organisers: Manuela Barreto & Naomi Ellemers]
Contact: Barreto@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

This meeting will focus on recent developments in the examination of social stigma and social disadvantage and hopes to bring together researchers from Europe as well as non-European researchers. Taking the perspective of the stigmatized, the meeting aims at sharing updated knowledge of how social disadvantage is perceived and experienced. In addition, the research discussed in this meeting will examine the strategies available to the stigmatized to deal with social disadvantage, their use and relative success, and the ways in which the stigmatized may unwittingly promote their own disadvantage.

The program will include 14-16 presentations of high profile work in this area. The program will provide ample opportunity for structured discussion and debate to establish a common perspective on the current state of the art, and outline directions for future research and theoretical development. Some non-European researchers who have already expressed interest in participating are (in alphabetical order): Faye Crosby, Toni Schmader, Michael Schmitt, Nicole Shelton, and Janet Swim.

Call for presentations:

Applications are invited for presentations in this meeting. We encourage junior researchers and Ph.D. students in particular to apply. Please submit an abstract (max. 300 words) with contact details before November 15 to: Manuela Barreto at barreto@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

Applicants who wish to participate in this meeting but do not wish to deliver a presentation are requested to send a short letter in which they describe their main research topic and expertise.

Practical details of the meeting:

The meeting will be held between 21 and 22 June 2007, at the Oud-Poelgeest Castle, a beautiful seventeenth century estate, with easy access from the airport and by train. Besides the conference venue, bar, terrace, sauna, pool and tennis field, the estate comprises a 25 acre park and four-star hotel accommodation.

Small Group Meeting**On Fundamental Dimensions of Social Judgment: A View from Different Perspectives
Summer 2007**

[Organisers: Vincent Yzerbyt & Andrea Abele, Co-organisers: Amy Cuddy & Charles Judd]

Half a century of research in psychology reveals that the same two dimensions underlie most judgments of traits, people, groups, and cultures. Although the definitions vary, the first dimension makes reference to attributes such as competence, agency, and individualism, and the second to warmth, communion, and collectivism. It is interesting to note that these dimensions have not only attracted the attention of a number of social psychologists (Asch, 1956; Brown, 1965; Rosenber, Sedlak & Vivekananthan, 1968; Reeder & Brewer, 1979; for more recent examples, see Abele, 2003; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick & Xu, 2002; Judd, James-Hawkins, Yzerbyt, & Kashima, 2005; Phalet & Poppe, 1997; Wojciszke, 2005) but they have also figured largely on the research agendas of personality and cross-cultural psychologists. It is our opinion that, beyond these perspectives, various strands of research both in social psychology (social comparison, stereotypes, self-concept, social neuropsychology, etc) and also in neighbouring fields such as personality psychology, organizational psychology, decision-making, anthropology, sociology and even linguistics are increasingly turning their attention to the antecedents,

processes, and consequences associated with these dimensions. We think that a small group meeting stimulating research, debate, and integration about this topic is thus both timely and needed. EAESP support would serve three purposes: first, provide a venue to meet our goals of debate, integration, and collaboration; second, stimulate (experimental) studies and ultimately publications on this topic; finally, provide a networking opportunity for EAESP members and other scientists working on and/or interested in this topic.

We plan sessions on the self, person perception and social judgement, as well as group perception and stereotypes. We also would like to have presentations on applied topics like consequences of agency/competence/power or communion/warmth on various outcomes in the areas of organizational psychology or health psychology. Furthermore, we are interested in theoretical contributions.

You will be provided with further information (exact date, location, deadline) in the next issue of the Bulletin and by e-mail.

Reports of Previous Meetings

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

Paris (France), 9th - 12th June 2004

Organisers: Jean-Claude Croizet (University of Poitiers), Steve Spencer (University of Waterloo), Claude Steele (Stanford University) & Fabrizio Butera (University of Grenoble)

Few sites in the world are more exquisite and spectacular than the Louvre, the setting of the Small Group Meeting on "Understanding the Academic Underachievement of Low Status Group Members", held June 9-12, 2004 in Paris. Each morning of the conference, we descended through the glass pyramid, made our way through an international throng of museum-goers, and walked past halls filled with masterpieces. With art in view and sometimes a copy of *The Da Vinci Code* in our briefcase, we then climbed the stairs to the conference room and turned our attention to the scholarly interests that had brought us together.

Approximately 30 psychologists from Europe and the United States who study the social determinants of academic performance participated in the meeting. The presentations given over the three days investigated many ways in which testing conditions and situational contingencies affect the performance of members of stigmatized groups. After a welcoming reception and dinner at the Louvre on Wednesday night, the conference began in earnest on Thursday morning. The first day featured a set of talks measuring the influence of stereotype and situational threat on academic performance and scholastic ambitions. Barbara Muzzatti, Pascal Huguet, Virginie Bonnot, and Steve Spencer presented talks examining the role of threat as a contributor to lowered academic performance among women and girls. Colette van Laar, Jennifer Randall Crosby, and Toni Schmader discussed diminished performance in ethnic minorities as a function of situational threat. Among the theoretical issues raised and discussed were distinctions between personal experience and cultural knowledge as a

source of stereotype threat, and the role of working memory as a mediator of stereotype threat.

On the second day, presenters reported research on the mechanisms underlying stereotype threat effects, and the relationship of the theory to non-academic domains. The mechanisms suggested as mediators and moderators of stereotype threat's effects on performance were varied: Johannes Keller and Beate Seibt discussed the role of regulatory focus, Fabrice Gabarro measured the effect of gender identification, Harriet Rosenthal assessed the influence of perceived overlap between genders, and Sylwia Bedynska measured the role of cognitive impairments in working memory. Donna Garcia examined the distinction between stereotype threat and social identity threat. Jeff Stone presented findings measuring the influence of stereotype threat among athletes.

The final day of the conference included presentations measuring the influence of other people on performance, the role of identity safety (i.e., perceptions of one's social identity being valued) on outcomes, and the influence of situational threat among black immigrants. Issues of subjective identification with the target category, raised in some of the earlier talks, continued to be a sub-theme in several of the talks. David Marx and Alain Quiamzade presented findings measuring the influence of social comparison under conditions of stereotype threat. Denise Sekaquaptewa examined the role of solo status on performance. Paul Davies presented research measuring the role of identity safety on academic and professional aspirations, and situational trust. Both Kay Deaux and Teceta Thomas discussed the role of threat on performance, expectancy for success, and perceptions of prejudice among first- and second-generation black immigrants.

Late on Saturday afternoon, Claude Steele was called upon to offer his reflections on the issues that he has been so instrumental in placing on the social psychological agenda. He focused on the question of how we can make settings work for diverse groups, discussing the contingencies of social identity and the ways in which cues in the environment can be either threatening or reassuring to one's social identity. A final discussion, after three days of stimulating presentations and enriching discussions, left us with the satisfaction of knowing that some real progress in this area has been made. At the same time, most of us recognized the real

work that needs to be done, particularly in terms of translating the theoretical and empirical work to the ongoing educational settings that often discourage and deflect academic accomplishment.

We would be remiss in omitting the other dimension that made this conference especially enjoyable--the food, bien sur! Each day we were treated to sumptuous four-course lunches at the *Restaurant le Grand Louvre*, accompanied by at least two wonderful French wines (a challenge to afternoon concentration, but one that was handled adroitly by all participants). The evenings were also filled with rich food and intense conversation, increasingly rewarding as we came to know one another over the course of the conference. We are grateful to Jean-Claude Croizet in particular for organizing lunches and dinners of phenomenal savor, depth, and general merriment. By our final dinner at *Ambassade D'Auvergne*, the group had come together, and a good time was thoroughly had by all. From the quality of the presentations and the import of the subject matter to the glorious setting at the Louvre, this truly was a conference to remember.

Teceta Thomas and Kay Deaux
(Graduate Center, City University of New York)

Small Group Meeting On Social Justice and Intergroup Conflict

Lisbon (Portugal), 21st - 24th September 2005

Organisers: Jorge Vala & Isabel Correia

Research on social justice and on intergroup conflict has a long history within social psychology. However, research relating social justice concerns and intergroup conflict has been scarce until now. One major goal of this meeting was to systematically explore how people's desire for justice appears in the creation and possible reduction of intergroup conflict and how to articulate the justice motive in interpersonal and intergroup

contexts. If justice matters deeply to people, addressing justice issues might help to understand different types of intergroup conflict (for instance, ethnic, gender, religious, regional or organizational conflicts involving realistic or symbolic resources) and their “mild” and strong expressions, like dehumanization and aggression. During three days, 25 researchers from Europe, United States and Canada, discussed these topics and contributed to a more integrated approach of social justice and of social relations.

The meeting started with a welcoming reception and dinner where participants, social psychologists from Lisbon and PhD students socialized and had the opportunity to taste the wonderful Portuguese food while listening to baroque music.

The contributions of participants covered a wide range of problems and theoretical perspectives: justice and the experience of war; identity, stereotyping and justice concerns; belief in a just world and reactions to victims and to discrimination; reactions towards immigration and feelings of justice; justice and gender relations; organizations, cultures and justice. Addressing the war experiences and dilemmas, José-Miguel Fernández-Dols discussed how moral rigorism and war can lead people into morally illegible courses of action. Susan Opatow focused on justice and intergroup conflict during the post-conflict transition. Laurent Licata analysed the reconciliation processes in post civil war in Lebanon. Michael Ross presented a theoretical and empirical analysis of how contemporary members of victim and perpetrator groups respond to historical injustices. Dario Spini presented data that indicates that the more a community has suffered from acts of violence, the more there is a collective refusal of violations of humanitarian law.

Within the context of group identity, John Dovidio tested the hypothesis that perceptions of injustice will motivate compensatory action more strongly when people share a common identity with victims of injustice than when they do not. Russell Spears reported research that shows that status-based stereotypes suppress feelings of injustice and unjust feelings. The theory on the belief in a just world was also used as a framework. Within this theoretical context, Carolyn Hafer presented an investigation of psychological motives underlying the denial of discrimination. John

Ellard focused on the belief in a just world and immanent justice reasoning in adults. Isabel Correia addressed the perceptions of descriptive and injunctive norms regarding secondary victimization, and Jorge Vala analysed the threat to BJW from ingroup or outgroup victims, showing that reactions to ingroup victims are function of justice concerns whereas reactions to outgroup victims are function of prejudice beliefs.

Stereotyping and justice concerns were analysed by Susan Fiske and Jeroen Vaes. Susan Fiske discussed how private ambivalence moderates modern stereotypes as a function of newfound social-justice concerns. Jeroen Vaes presented research that evidenced that ingroup stereotypes are generally seen as more human than outgroup stereotypes.

The questions of immigration and racism were addressed by Rosa Cabecinhas that showed that perceptions of how unfair is social discrimination are a function of social categorization and social status. Also Victoria Esses discussed how hostility against refugees can be explained by the fact that some members of host nations view individuals seeking refugee status as people making illegitimate claims. Margarita Sanchez-Mazas argued that racism and xenophobia are instances of different denials of recognition serving both functional and symbolic purposes in a given society.

The presentation of Gerold Mikula focused on the division of family work between the sexes, perceived justice, relationship satisfaction, and well-being, and Gabrielle Poeschl discussed the impact of social norms on the feeling of justice regarding traditional family practices. Fabio Lorenzi-Cioldi presented evidence on the impact of essentialist beliefs about women on the favourability towards affirmative action policies. Serge Guimond presented results that suggest that theories of intergroup relations dealing with issues of social justice and legitimacy should consider the role of social comparison as an important intervening mechanism.

Kees Van den Bos presented cross-cultural data on the moderating effects of performance state self-esteem and goal orientation on voice and procedural justice. Francisco Morales examined how in organizations the psychological contract breach is associated with perceived justice.

Finally some presentations addressed a broader perspective trying to put together social psychological theories and philosophical conceptions.

Willem Doise discussed the universalism and communitarianism beliefs in intergroup relations studies, and Assad Azzi focused on the psychological processes and contextual constraints on individual and group level justice. Nicholas Emler critically examined how social justice in intergroup relations presents a moral challenge for leadership.

The meeting attained its main goals and offered a unique opportunity to address new emergent topics in social justice and intergroup conflict research. Following the goals of the meeting, the amount of time devoted to collective discussion was approximately the same as the time dedicated to individual presentations and each day ended with a one hour time for discussion. These discussions allowed the identification of some emergent topics, problems and challenges. In the first day the discussion was lead by Assad Azzi, in the second day by Vicky Esses and in the third day by Russel Spears .

The meeting was not only a success at the level of the academic debate. The atmosphere was warm and the warm weather contributed to that. It was in this warm atmosphere that the second day ended with a tour in a traditional electric tram on the old part of Lisbon followed by a dinner in a charming restaurant in front of the river. The third day ended with a dinner in the Terreiro do Paço Restaurant. A memorable food designed by Vitor Sobral was accompanied by white and red wines from the Douro. The meal finished (calm and silently!) with a Porto vintage. The wines were introduced by J.P.Martins, a famous wine expert, and were a generous gift of Isabel Albuquerque from the Lavradores de Feitoria Company and of Dirk Niepoort from the Niepoort Company.

We would like to thank the EAESP and the Portuguese institutions that supported the Meeting. Finally, we would like to thank all participants for their presentations and for their contributions to lively discussions during the meeting.

Other Reports

Report on the Second East-Central European Summer School in Social Psychology 'Psychological Problems of Societies under Transformation' Wrocław, Poland, 1-15 August 2005

The Second East-Central European Summer School in Social Psychology on the much relevant topic "Psychological problems of societies under transformation" was organized jointly by four academic centers: Faculty of Psychology, Warsaw University (Poland), Institute of Psychology, University of Wrocław (Poland), Ivan Franko University in Lviv, (Ukraine), and Higher School of Social Psychology, branch in Wrocław, (Poland). The school was sponsored by the above mentioned institutes, European Association of Experimental Social Psychology and the city of Wrocław. The main organizers of the school were Tytus Sosnowski and Maria Lewicka, both from the Faculty of Psychology, Warsaw University, Bogusława Błoch (Institute of Psychology, University of Wrocław), Sofia Hrabovska and Ina Haletska (both University of Lviv, Ukraine). The location was Wrocław – a vibrant city in Western Poland, with a complex history analogous to the history of Lviv in Western Ukraine (German Breslau became Polish Wrocław after World War II while Polish Lwów became Ukrainian Lviv at the same time).

24 students and PhD students participated in the school, including 13 participants from Ukraine (two cities: Lviv and Luck), 4 participants came from Belarus and 5 were Polish PhD students. Also teachers were recruited from several universities in Poland (Warsaw, Wrocław) and Ukraine (Lviv). The language of the school was either Polish or Ukrainian. Our languages are sufficiently similar to prevent major communication problems, even for participants from Belarus. Additionally, this "mix" of languages adds to the colorful picture of this, once naturally multicultural and now sadly homogenous, part of Europe. In fact, at end of the school most of the non-Polish participants either spoke fluent Polish or at least understood it very

well. Poles are usually less skilled in understanding Ukrainian but they coped with the problem very well.

The program was built from three large thematic blocks: two psychological and one methodological. The first block concerned social clinical psychology and included topics like juvenile aggression, women and child prostitution, HIV, drug addiction, and religious sects, i.e., these forms of pathology that became particularly salient in our countries after the police controlled system collapsed in 1989. The second block dealt with positive forms of social behavior and focused mostly on social and psychological mechanisms of civic behavior. Lectures and workshops covered areas like the relationship between values and civic behavior, attitudes of entitlement, role of social and cultural capital in triggering civic behavior, conflict resolution etc. The topic was again highly relevant considering that the Summer School took place half a year after the Orange Revolution in Ukraine.

The third block was methodological and its purpose - apart from lectures in selected statistical methods - was to provide training in professional oral presentations of own research. Since two weeks is too short a period to collect own data, we decided to use ready data, available at the Warsaw University. The students were introduced to two data bases. One was the database PGSS (Polish General Social Survey), developed within the Institute of Social Studies, Warsaw University, which is a longitudinal survey carried every two years on a representative sample of over 1000 adult Poles, and covering the majority of important social issues. The other one consisted of two large representative samples collected in Poland and Ukraine in 2003 and providing data on a lot of different topics e.g., socio-political attitudes, civic activity, social and cultural capital, place attachment, national identity, perceived relationships with other nations and many others. The data were collected within a research project directed by Maria Lewicka in 2003. Probably because of the comparative character of this data base, all school participants preferred it to the other one. During a number of practical meetings the students became acquainted with the database itself, methods of multivariate analysis, and principles of preparing research reports (in the form of Power Point presentations). Groups of 2-3 students, of mixed national composition, picked up research topics, analyzed them with the available data, and

prepared research reports. At a small “conference” during the last day of the school the students presented their reports orally. The best presentations (as pointed by the students themselves) were awarded prizes (books). Books on diverse psychological topics were also offered to all students during the final ceremony closing the school.

The site of the summer school was Wrocław, the capital of Lower Silesia, a vibrant city with lots of possibilities for entertainment. These were of course amply used by the school participants. However, Wrocław was chosen as the conference place also for another reason. As the pre-war German Breslau, it belongs to the chain of cities in the Eastern-Central Europe that underwent “blood transfusion” after the WWII, i.e., due to post-war politically enforced migrations, it almost entirely changed its national composition. Lviv (the pre-war Polish Lwów), from where most of our school participants were recruited, is another city in this chain, and Grodno (now in Belarus) is still another. Moreover, Wrocław is the city where the majority of institutions residing in the pre-war Lviv were moved to (University, Technical University, major Library, a number of pieces of art). Wrocław then is a “heir” of the pre-war Lwów. Since most of the students participating in the Summer School did not have this historical knowledge, we organized a number of trips and presentations to introduce them to the history of the lands, to the fate of their former inhabitants, with particular emphasis placed on the collective memory of the places. The school was obviously a success, both from the social and the scientific point of view. The students positively evaluated the quality of lectures and workshops, available advice, supply of facilities, unlimited access to computers, perfect organization of the school, very good living conditions, informal climate and democratic relations between students and lecturers. A number of students stated that they have learned more during the two weeks than during their whole PhD program at home. It is perhaps worth noting that these are not short-term effects. Two of the Ukrainian students from Lviv will now enter PhD study programs in Warsaw, and two others (from Łuck University) are planning to organize an analogous summer school in Ukraine this summer.

Maria Lewicka

European Journal of Social Psychology **Brief Editorial Statement**

Following my appointment as editor of the journal a few months ago and now that the papers handled by the new editorial team will soon be reaching the journal, I am pleased to present some good news and a brief editorial statement. As already announced in a previous number of the European Bulletin of Social Psychology, the new line-up of associate editors is as follows:

Luigi Castelli (University of Padua, Italy)
Jamie DeCoster (University of Alabama, USA)
Pascal Huguet (University of Marseille, France)
Lucy Johnston (University of Canterbury, New Zealand)
Michaela Wänke (University of Basel, Switzerland)
Sven Waldzus (ISCTE Lisbon, Portugal)

It is my hope that the new team will not only reflect editorial coherence but also the international diversity of the European Association and of the Social Psychology research community in general. As such, the new editors are drawn from different European countries as well as from North America and Oceania. I am also proud to say that the new editorial team is composed of excellent researchers who excel in an appropriate variety of theoretical approaches and methodologies.

The continuous increase in the number of submissions and their international diversity attest that more and more researchers are taking the European Journal of Social Psychology as an appropriate outlet for their research. This success is, in no small measure, due to the insight, competence and effort put forth by former editors, their editorial teams and the long list of reviewers that has helped us over the years. I would like to thank in particular Alex Haslam and his team. Their excellent work raised the expectancies about our own performance and our subsequent responsibility but the collaboration of Alex and his editorial team smoothed enormously the transition into our new editorial shoes.

To maintain a successful and steady course, some improvements are always necessary and I am pleased to announce that from now on the submission process to the European Journal of Social Psychology will be fully electronic. All manuscripts and their correspondent reviews will be submitted on-line to the renewed website of the European Journal of Social Psychology (<http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ejsp>). It is our hope that this improvement will not only ease everybody's work (authors, editors and reviewers alike) but it will also make us faster and more efficient.

However, to maintain a successful and steady course, continuous effort is always indispensable. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the permanent contributions of a great number of cooperative reviewers from inside but also from outside our editorial board. In fact, a good measure of the success and quality of a scientific publication is the rate of positive responses to review requests from leading and expert researchers. Judging from this measure, the European Journal of Social Psychology is an outstanding journal. But as I thank the collaboration of our former reviewers and board members, I want also to make a plea for perseverance. The participation in the review process is, as always, one of the best means to support the scientific advance of European Social Psychology.

A more detailed statement of editorial policy will be provided later on in the European Journal of Social Psychology. For now it suffices to say that the new editorial team feels honoured to be called to pursue the splendid work of previous editorial teams and that we acknowledge the increased responsibility in measuring up to such high standards. Only the certainty of support from our peers makes us optimistic towards meeting them.

Leonel Garcia-Marques, editor EJSPP

Grants

Theodore Alexopoulos (postgraduate travel grant)
Nadine Chaurand (postgraduate travel grant)
Gayanéé Kedia (postgraduate travel grant)
Rudolf Kerschreiter (postdoctoral seedcorn grant)
Maciek Sekerdej (postgraduate travel grant)
Sophia Stathi (postgraduate travel grant)
Arne van den Bos (postgraduate travel grant)

GRANT REPORTS**Judith D.M. Grob**

(University of Groningen, The Netherlands)

postgraduate travel grant

Getting off the plane, I am greeted by a clear blue sky, palm trees, and my new roommate, Mandy. We get in her huge van, American style, and drive off. My home away from home turns out to be a friendly house with a pool in the back, inhabited by three long-haired cats, which reluctantly make some room for me on the bed. After months of worrying about visas, accommodation, and ethical committees, my visit to San Diego has finally turned reality.

The first time I learn about social exclusion research, is at the SPSP conference in New Orleans. I become fascinated by just how strong the human need to belong is. So strong indeed, that being excluded from a silly virtual ballgame, sends activity to the same brain regions as the ones that light up when experiencing physical pain. Theoretically speaking, social exclusion might result in more social and friendly behavior, as to regain acceptance. However, research shows again and again, that exclusion actually leads people to become more aggressive and anti-social.

When I prepare for a workshop in Amsterdam by Jean Twenge, one of the main experts in the field of social exclusion, I discover that her research

also concerns emotion regulation, my own field of study. Jean's research shows, that becoming more positive is one way of countering the negative feelings that accompany social exclusion. I wonder whether positivity boosting is the only way people deal with exclusion. Might some suppress their negative feelings as well? And what determines the strategy they adopt? After presenting my ideas at the workshop, I am honored and pleasantly surprised when Jean invites me to come to San Diego and work on those ideas with her.

From the end of August till halfway December 2005, I am a visiting scholar at San Diego State University. During this time I become an excellent liar. At first, I feel horrible at telling my participants that their (fake) lab partner does not want to meet with them. But after a while, even bad news becomes routine. And by interviewing my participants, I get a feel for what makes American students tick. Besides running two studies in the lab, I partake in a Masters course on controversies in social psychology. Thierry Devos inspires us to some great discussions, and it is nice to get to know the other students. I volunteer at the SESP conference, where I see some very interesting talks, and am proud to welcome colleagues to 'my city'.

Working with Jean is great. We do not meet each other that regularly, because I spend most of my time in the lab. But when we do, we have great talks about science and life. With social psychology still being dominated by men, it is inspirational to collaborate with a person like Jean. She is not just a wonderful researcher, but a wonderful person as well. You can never have too many role models, or friends, for that matter. I share the lab with Jenny Crowhurst, one of the Masters students. She shows me around California, and come Thanksgiving, her family welcomes me as one of their own. My own family comes to visit as well. Together we stare in awe at the wonders of Zion, Bryce and the Grand Canyon.

Thank you EAESP for ridding me of my narrow views of the States. For giving me the opportunity to collaborate with inspiring people and research a fascinating topic, while falling in love with the Californian way of life while doing so. Part of me is still flip-flopping around campus, admiring a humming bird on my way to yoga class.

Marcus Maringer

(University of Groningen, The Netherlands)

postgraduate travel grant

The reason why I applied for the EAESP postgraduate travel grant was that Prof. Norbert Schwarz gave me the opportunity to spend 3 months in his research group at the University of Michigan. Prof. Schwarz is one of the leading experts in research on affective influences on social judgments and since some of his work is closely related to the project I am working on with Prof. Diederik Stapel, at the University of Groningen, it was a great opportunity for me to visit him in Ann Arbor. The aim of my visit was to elaborate on the work I have done so far and to address some questions that it generated. Since Norbert is not only a very stimulating scientific advisor, but also a very friendly and welcoming person, my visit was as inspiring as it was pleasant. I want to use this opportunity to thank Norbert for his support and hospitality and for his exquisite knowledge about Ann Arbor's food scene. I also want to thank the members of EAESP for making this visit possible.

In our research, we are interested in the influence of affect on people's evaluations of other people. The idea behind this research is that people sometimes evaluate another person as relatively positive or negative for reasons that are unrelated to this person's features. For example, when people feel happy (e.g., due to the nice weather, or because they are listening to cheerful music) they tend to rate other people as more likeable (Forgas, 1995; Schwarz, 1990), as more attractive (Clark & Waddell, 1983), as more happy (Stapel, Koomen, & Ruys, 2002; Innes-Ker & Niedenthal, 2002), and as more intelligent (Forgas & Bower, 1987) relative to people who feel sad.

However, although it has often been indicated that accessible affect influences various evaluative judgments (I named only a few), the underlying processes might vary depending on the kind of impressions people form. For example, finding an answer to the question "How much do you like Mary?" might be answered by asking oneself "How do I feel about Mary?" (see Schwarz, 1990). But would people use the same strategy when asked "How intelligent is Mary?" We believe this might not be the case.

When seeing another person makes people feel good, they usually infer that they like that person (e.g., “I feel happy about Mary; I think I like her”). In other words, people’s feelings provide them with direct and useful information about their affective relationship with a target (see Schwarz & Clore, 1996). People who use this heuristic do not engage in an analysis of the evaluative implication of the target information given, but rather consult their current feelings to determine whether the target is likeable or not (see Schwarz, 1990).

We believe, however, that the same strategy should unlikely be helpful when asked “How intelligent is Mary?”. That is, because an evaluation about a person’s intelligence does not refer to people’s affective relationship with the target, it should be less likely to instigate an impression formation strategy that is directly based on people’s feelings. In such evaluations, the target information is more likely to get colored by the evaluative implications of people’s current feelings during the encoding process (see Wyer & Srull, 1989). People will typically retrieve and use this “biased” knowledge about the target as a basis for subsequent judgments.

In line with these assumptions, in previous research we have demonstrated that in evaluations that are more like to trigger a feeling-based impression formation strategy, accessible affect biased participant’s evaluations independent of whether it was made accessible before or after participants received and encoded the target information (Maringer, Stapel & Otten, 2005). In contrast, in evaluations that are more likely to trigger a knowledge-based impression formation strategy, accessible affect biased participant’s evaluations only if it was made accessible before participants received and encoded the target information. Affect that was activated after participants had already formed the initial representation of the target had no influence on subsequent evaluations.

We interpreted these findings as a first step in demonstrating that the question determines the answer. Our findings suggest that in knowledge-based evaluations people rely on what they know about the target (people retrieve the target representation they have formed based on the target information and biased by accessible affective information), whereas in feeling-based evaluation people are more likely to rely on how they feel in the presents of the target (without retrieval of the initially formed target

representation).

Our plan for the following step was to more directly distinguish feeling-based and knowledgebased impression formation processes. Norbert and I had the idea that we could simultaneously activate feelings and evaluation relevant knowledge and investigate which information is more likely to be used in subsequent evaluations. Our hypothesis was that in feeling-based evaluations (e.g., about a person's likeability) people rely on their feelings (e.g., sad) even in the presents of accessible evaluation relevant knowledge (e.g., likable). In contrast, in knowledge-based inferences (e.g., about a person's intelligence) people rely on their feelings only in the absence of accessible evaluation relevant knowledge (e.g., stupid).

Procedure:

In order to prime knowledge, we developed a sentence unscrambling task related to the concepts intelligence and likeability. In such a task participants are asked to construct grammatically correct sentences out of a series of scrambled word strings (see Srull & Wyer, 1979). This task was introduced as examining the development of people's grammatical understanding. For the induction of a happy and sad mood, we used a mood-self induction task (see Schwarz & Clore, 1983). In this task, people are asked to write about a recent sad or happy event. We instructed participants that the purpose of this task is to develop a life-event inventory that will eventually assist in the field of psychological counseling.

The target of evaluation consisted of two pictures depicting two different female faces. Both faces displayed a neutral facial expression. Participants were asked to rate the intelligence of one person and the likeability of the other person. Both stimuli have proven to be a reliable target for measuring affective priming effects (see Stapel, et al., 2002). This last impression formation task was introduced as a short pilot study, in which we wanted to sort out experimental material for the use in future studies.

Unfortunately, I am not able to provide you with any conclusive results yet. It took me quite some time before I received an ethical approval for this study from the Institutional Review Board (IRB). By the time I was

running our experiment, only 3 weeks remained until the end of my visit, and unfortunately, the signing up of subject-pool students turned out to be very slow. A second problem was that almost half of the students that did participate somehow guessed the real purpose of our experiment. This makes it likely that those participants corrected for the influence of the prime episode on their judgments, which would render this data useless. So I decided to translate (and refine) all the material we had into Dutch, and at the moment I am running the experiment in Groningen, using students from disciplines other than psychology. I am expecting to have all the data collected within the next 3 weeks.

References:

- Clark, M. S. & Waddell, B. A. (1983). Effects of moods on thoughts about helping, attraction and information acquisition. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 46, 31-35.
- Forgas, J. P. (1995). Mood and judgment: The affect infusion model (AIM). *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 39-66.
- Forgas, J. P. & Bower, G. H. (1987). Mood effects on person-perception judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 53-60.
- Innes-Ker, A. & Niedenthal, P. M. (2002). Emotion concepts and emotional states in social judgment and categorization. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 83, 804-816.
- Maringer, M., Stapel, D.A., & Otten, S. (2005). The question determines the answer: Affective information effects on judgments of likeability and judgments of happiness. (Manuscript under review).
- Schwarz, N. (1990). Feelings as information: Informational and motivational functions of affective states. In E.T.Higgins & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior*, Vol. 2 (pp. 527-561). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Schwarz, N. & Clore, G. L. (1996). Feelings and phenomenal experiences. In E.T.Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 433-465). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Stapel, D. A., Koomen, W., & Ruys, K. I. (2002). The effects of diffuse and distinct affect. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 83, 60-74.

Srull, T. K. & Wyer, R. S. (1989). Person memory and judgment.
Psychological Review, 96, 58-83.

Hilbrand Oldenhuis

(University of Groningen, The Netherlands)

postgraduate travel grant

During the months September, October and November of the year 2005 I visited the Department of Psychology at the University of Manitoba in Winnipeg (Canada). Thanks to the financial aid of the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology I was able to spend these three months in Winnipeg collaborating with dr. Jacquie Vorauer.

The goal of my visit was threefold. First, I wanted to take advantage from Jacquie Vorauer's widely acknowledged expertise in the field of evaluative concerns in intergroup contexts and meta-stereotypes (beliefs regarding the stereotypes that outgroup members hold about the ingroup), because meta-stereotyping is the topic of my dissertation. Second, I wanted to combine Jacquie Vorauer's work on evaluative concerns in intergroup contexts and my work on meta-stereotypes in an experiment to be conducted during my stay in Winnipeg. Third, my visit was an excellent opportunity to discuss our collaborative research on the relation between prejudice and meta-prejudice. We started this line of research together with Ernestine Gordijn, Sabine Otten, Joris Lammers (all affiliated with the University of Groningen) and Yumi Sakamoto (University of Manitoba) when Jacquie Vorauer visited our department in Groningen during the winter of 2004.

With regard to the first goal, I profited greatly from Jacquie Vorauer's excellent knowledge of the literature and research conducted in the field of meta-stereotypes, prejudice and evaluative concerns. We had many lively discussions about my previous studies that gave me more insight into the process and functions of meta-stereotyping as well as new ideas to test my presumptions about the consequences of meta-stereotypes. In short, my research project profited greatly from the insights I gained during the conversations and discussions with the expert in the field, Jacquie Vorauer.

Besides that, I learnt to know Jacquie Vorauer as a friendly, always interested and extremely competent person, who kept making time for me, no matter how busy she was.

With regard to the second goal, Jacquie Vorauer and I conducted an experiment while I was in Winnipeg in which we combined my work on the consequences of meta-stereotypes and Jacquie Vorauer's work on evaluative concerns within intergroup contexts. This experiment was a valuable first step to explore some, at first sight, inconsistencies between my work and Jacquie Vorauer's work. Whereas I found that low prejudiced participants have the tendency to present themselves in less negative ways when negative meta-stereotypes are activated (Oldenhuis, Gordijn, & Otten, 2006), Jacquie Vorauer found that low prejudiced participants do not succeed to show their lower levels of prejudice towards outgroup members, especially when evaluative concerns are high and they expect to be seen as highly prejudiced (that is, when a negative meta-stereotype is activated; Vorauer & Turpie, 2004). We proposed that it can have something to do with the complexity of the behaviors under consideration. In Jacquie Vorauer's study the dependent variable was intimacy building behavior, which can be considered complex behavior, while in my study the dependent variable was the response to a questionnaire, which can be considered less complex behavior. We made progress to resolve this issue by conducting an experiment in which we combined Jacquie Vorauer's manipulation concerning evaluative concerns and my (less complex) depending variables and gained more insight into the basic motivations involved for higher and lower prejudiced people. Results gave us more ideas about how to continue this line of research.

With regard to the third goal, Jacquie Vorauer, Yumi Sakamoto and I had some discussions about our results of the experiments that we conducted in Canada as well as in the Netherlands concerning the relation between prejudice and meta-prejudice. This relation can be either negative or positive, depending on levels of experienced guilt towards the outgroup. We generated new ideas for testing our hypotheses and benefited greatly from talking to each other face to face, instead of communicating by e-mail.

Furthermore, it was very enriching for me to be at an university in a different country in a different part of the world. I realised that I had quite a narrow view on how life at an university is. Things can be quite different elsewhere, which made me extremely aware of the positive sides of working at an university in the Netherlands at the one hand, and the positive sides of working at an university in North America at the other hand. I believe that this knowledge can help me to become an independent researcher, no matter where I end up.

Winnipeg provided me with plenty cultural and interpersonal experiences as well. I enjoyed the outstanding quality of the Winnipegian restaurants, the ballet, the opera, celebrating Thanksgiving, attending a hockey game, struggling through 40 centimeters of snow, to name just a few of the cultural highlights. Furthermore, I really enjoyed the hospitable company of many undergraduate and graduate students at the University of Manitoba. Also thanks to them my visit to Winnipeg became a wonderful experience.

References

- Oldenhuis, H., Gordijn, E., & Otten, S. (2006). The consequences of the activation of meta-stereotypes. Manuscript in preparation.
- Vorauer, J.D., & Turpie, C.A. (2004). Disruptive effects of vigilance on dominant group members' treatment of outgroup members: Choking versus shining under pressure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 384-399.

G. Tendayi Viki

(University of Kent, UK)

Seedcorn Grant

The role of perceived threat in the infrahumanization of outgroups

Thanks to the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology I received the postdoctoral seedcorn grant in October, 2005. The goal of the grant was to support my proposed research project. The aim of the project was to examine the role of perceived threat in the infrahumanization of economic migrants. The recent expansion of the European Union to

include new member countries formed the backdrop for this research. I examined whether perceived threat from migrants from the new EU member states would lead to an increase in inhumanization. In a recent series of studies, Leyens and colleagues (e.g. Leyens et al., 2001) demonstrated the pervasive nature of inhumanization. They distinguished between *primary emotions* that are experienced by both humans and animals and *secondary emotions* that are unique to human beings. In their studies, Leyens and colleagues examined whether people are equally willing to attribute uniquely human emotions to both the ingroup and the outgroup. Their studies demonstrated that people are less willing to attribute uniquely human emotions to the outgroup in comparison to the ingroup (e.g. Leyens et al., 2001). These findings suggest that ingroup members may perceive outgroup members as less human than themselves (Leyens et al., 2001).

Several intergroup relations researchers have highlighted the role of fear or perceived threat in the development of prejudice (e.g. Stephan & Stephan, 1996). Members of the host populations often feel threatened by members of immigrant populations (Stephan & Stephan, 1996). For example, research by Stephan and colleagues (e.g. Stephan and Stephan, 1996) has shown that both perceived realistic (economic) and symbolic (cultural) threats can result in prejudice towards outgroups. The target groups have included immigrants to several countries (e.g. United States and Spain), AIDS victims, and women.

In the research program that was funded by the seedcorn grant, I examined the role of perceived symbolic and realistic group threats in the inhumanization of outgroups. Of the two types of threat, I expected that symbolic threat, but not realistic threat, would be related to the inhumanization of outgroups. This is because symbolic threats refer to concerns about values, culture and language. Research has shown that lay people feel that values, culture and language are some of the factors that distinguish humans from animals (Demoulin et al., 2004). Ingroup bias may result in perceived symbolic threat because the in-group's 'superior' culture or language is perceived as being under threat from an undesirable 'inferior' outgroup culture or language. As such, it is possible that asylum seekers may be viewed as less human in comparison to the ingroup;

especially by those individuals who score high (vs. low) on perceived symbolic group threat.

Realistic group threats, on the other hand, refer to the basic physical survival and wellbeing of the group. Most people would agree that even animals have a survival instinct. As such, outgroup members may be seen as similar to the ingroup on issues concerning the need for survival. Indeed, recent research has shown that perceived similarity with an outgroup on work-related traits led to more perceived realistic threat and prejudice, whereas less similarity on interpersonal traits led to more perceived symbolic threat and prejudice (Zarate, Garcia, Garza & Hitlan, 2003). As such, it appears to be the case that realistic threat may result from perceived similarity on the relevant traits (e.g. work ability), while symbolic threat results from perceived differences on the relevant traits (e.g. values). We, therefore, predicted that symbolic threat, but not realistic threat, would predict the infrahumanisation of asylum-seeking immigrants.

The funding we received from the EAESP permitted us to run three studies. Data for all three studies was collected simultaneously. A total of 266 participants took part across all three studies.

Study 1, 2 & 3: Perceived threat and the infrahumanisation of Eastern Europeans.

In Study 1, we used an individual differences approach to assess the role of perceived threat in the infrahumanisation of Eastern Europeans. Participants were obtained from the student population at the University of Kent in the UK. Participants completed a questionnaire containing a measure of perceived threat (adapted from Stephan et al., 1998). Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with statements such as “With the expansion of the EU, British culture is under threat from Eastern European cultures.” After completing this measure participants were then asked to attribute uniquely human emotions to the ingroup (British citizens) and outgroup (Eastern Europeans). Study 2 and Study 3 replicated Study 1 by focusing on the infrahumanization of economic migrants from specific Eastern European countries that are joining the EU due to expansion. These countries were Hungary and

Poland. The methodology and participant population was the same as in Study 1 but different target outgroups were used.

The Results

Across all three studies, the results showed an infrahumanization effect. This effect reached significance for the studies that focused on Eastern European and Hungary. For the Poland sample, the means showed an infrahumanization trend but this effect failed to reach significance. What was rather interesting about the findings was that the infrahumanization effect across all three studies was located among the primary emotions, rather than secondary emotion. Previous research by Leyens and colleagues has found that people attribute more secondary emotions to the ingroup rather than the outgroup. This research has shown no differential attribution of emotions with regards to primary emotions. Interestingly, in my studies I found the opposite. My results showed that people attributed more primary emotions to the outgroup rather than the ingroup. Although people also tended to attribute more secondary emotions to the ingroup (vs. outgroup), this effect did not reach significance. This pattern was obtained across all three studies. It appears to be the case that people infrahumanize economic migrants in a different way to the other groups that have been previously studied. It is also important to note that, similar to Leyens and colleagues findings, the valence of the emotions did not moderate that above noted infrahumanization effect.

Unexpectedly, across all three samples both symbolic and realistic threat were not related to infrahumanization. All three studies revealed no significant relationships between threat and the differential attribution of emotions to ingroups versus outgroups. Thus, it appears to be the case that the infrahumanization of economic migrants may be independent of perceive threat.

I would like to thank the EAESP for providing the funding that allowed me to do this research. I would also like to thank Tadios Chisango and Tuuliki Sutinen who assisted in the data collection and entry for the current project.

References

- Demoulin, S., Leyens, J.-P., Paladino, M.-P., Rodriguez, R. T., Rodriguez, A. P., & Dovidio, J. F. (2004). Dimensions of "uniquely" and "non-uniquely" human emotions. *Cognition and Emotion, 18*(1), 71-96.
- Leyens, J. Ph., Rodriguez, A. P., Rodriguez, R. T., Gaunt, R., Paladino, M. P., & Vaes, J., Demoulin S. (2001). Psychological essentialism and the differential attribution of uniquely human emotions to ingroups and outgroups. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 31*, 395-411.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1996). Predicting prejudice. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20*, 409-426.
- Zarate, M.A., Garcia, B., Garza, A.A., & Hitlan, R.T. (2004). Cultural threat and perceived realistic group conflict as dual predictors of prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*, 99-105.

Anja Zimmermann

(University of Kent at Canterbury, UK)

Postgraduate travel grant

Thanks to the EAESP Travel Grant, I had the opportunity to spend five months at the University of Amsterdam (UvA) from May until September 2005.

Despite being located in the "Venice of Europe's North", staying at the UvA means much more than social and cultural delight. In the attempt to fully integrate a German into the Dutch life style, the new colleagues led by Bertjan Doosje and Sven Zebel, introduced me to the UvA everyday life and made sure that from day one I could fully go with the "fiets" (bike) flow. Thanks to the caring spirit of the Dutch I adjusted faster than I'd ever expected to the biking rush hour, the labyrinth of Amsterdam's canals and one-way streets and the first survival rule: "Never find yourself *walking* on a bike path".

But most importantly, from the very beginning I was so warmly integrated in several working groups related to my own research that I just had to act accordingly to make this stay as valuable, inspiring and motivating as it turned out to be.

My PhD compares and contrasts the role of group-based responsibility and group-based guilt (personal feelings of responsibility and guilt on behalf of your ingroup's misdeeds) in different contexts. Therefore, discussing and working together with Bertjan Doosje and Sven Zebel who belong to the key researchers on group-based guilt was a great contribution in improving my understanding of alternative perspectives and evaluating my own point of view in more depth.

Furthermore, I took part in three additional projects investigating emotions in and about groups, the role of inhumanisation and the dynamic functions of intergroup schadenfreude which are all relevant in the broader context of my PhD topic, but at the same time unravel new directions for future collaborative research. Moreover, during my stay it was also possible to generate additional cooperation between Kent University and the UvA including researchers like Tendayi Viki (University of Kent) and Sjoerd Pennekamp (UvA). Thus, my stay at the UvA was not only valuable and helpful for my current PhD research, but also for future collaborative research with common interests on both sides of the channel.

There are a number of people and institutions that I'd like to thank particularly for making this experience possible, but also precious and unforgettable: Sven Zebel, who introduced me to Bertjan before my time at the UvA and became a cherished colleague and friend; the EAESP for financial support and, in particular, Sibylle Classen for assistance whenever needed; Bertjan Doosje who was a great and very thoughtful and caring supervisor, Agneta Fischer and Bertjan who made the visit of Tendayi Viki possible, Dominic Abrams, my supervisor at Kent who was willing to keep up supervision over distance for an extended period of time, Sjoerd and Clemens for being great office mates at any hour of the day, and all the other colleagues including Daphne, Diane, Michael, Helma, and Luuk for being really more than very nice colleagues!

News about Members**New Members of the Association**

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

Full Membership

Dr. Inmaculada ADARVES-YORNO
Exeter, UK
(A. Haslam, T. Postmes)

Dr. Nazar AKRAMI
Uppsala, Sweden
(B. Ekehammar, T. Lindholm)

Dr. David BOURGUIGNON
Charleroi, Belgium
(V. Yzerbyt, G. Herman)

Dr. Miguel CAMEIRA
Porto, Portugal
(J. Marques, J. Vala)

Dr. Andrea CARNAGHI
Padova, Italy
(L. Castelli, A. Maass)

Dr. Lavinia CICERO
Rome, Italy
(L. Mannetti, D. van Knippenberg)

Dr. Ruud CUSTERS
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(H. Aarts, K. van den Boos)

Dr. Marion DUTREVIS
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(M. Désert, S. Redersdorff)

Dr. Gerald ECHTERHOFF
Bielefeld, Germany
(E. Walther, G. Bohner)

Dr. Matt FARR
Loughborough, UK
(R. Crisp, K. Quinn)

Dr. Francesco FORONI
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(G. Semin. A. Maass)

Dr. Tom FRIJNS
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(P.A.M. van Lange, C. Finkenauer)

Dr. Zira HICHY
Catania, Italy
(R. Brown, D. Capozza)

Dr. Astrid HOMAN
Leiden, The Netherlands
(N. Ellemers, E. van Dijk)

Dr. Maya LAVIE-AJAYI
London, UK
(W. Stainton-Rogers, P. Stenner)

Dr. Thomas MORTON
Exeter, UK
(T. Postmes, A. Haslam)

Dr. Karin MOSER
Zurich, Switzerland
(M. Boos, U. Gabriel)

Dr. Daniela NIESTA
Rochester, UK
(D. Frey, E. Jonas)

Dr. Floor RINK
Leiden, The Netherlands
(N. Ellemers, E. van Dijk)

Dr. Klaus ROTHERMUND
Jena, Germany
(T. Meiser, D. Wentura)

Dr. Caryl RUSBULT,
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(P.A.M. van Lange, C. Sedikides)

Dr. Mariëlle STEL
Nijmegen, The Netherlands
(R. Vonk, E. van Dijk)

Dr. Catriona H. STONE
Exeter, UK
(R. Crisp, J. Jetten)

Affiliate Membership

./.

Postgraduate Membership

Matthijs BAAS
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(C. de Dreu, B. Nijstad)

Max BOEHLING
Kent, UK
(R. Giner-Sorolla, D. Abrams)

Clémentine BRY
Nanterre, France
(B. Sanitioso, D. Oberlé)

Luciana CARRARO
Padova, Italy
(L. Arcuri, L. Castelli)

Aleksandra CISLAK
Warsaw, Poland
(I Kreijtz, B. Wojciszke)

Rui COSTA LOPEZ
Lisbon, Portugal
(M.B. Monteiro, J. Vala)

Alice DECHÊNE
Basel, Switzerland
(M. Wänke, A. Florack)

- Naira DELGADO RODRÍGUEZ
La Laguna, Spain
Rodriguez Pérez, M. Moya)
- Margriet EKKER
Groningen, The Netherlands
(S. Otten, D. Stapel)
- Arnauld FOUQUET
Amiens, France
(L. Bagnat, J. Valencia)
- Maria Carmen HERRERA ENRIQUEZ
Granada, Spain
(M. Moya, F. Exposito)
- Wilhelm HOFMANN
Koblenz-Landau, Germany
(M. Schmitt, L. Castelli)
- Elanor KAMANS
Groningen, The Netherlands
(S. Otten, D. Stapel)
- Wojciecj KULESZA
Warsaw, Poland
(B. Wojciszke, D. Dolinski)
- Sandie MAUDUIT
Nanterre, France
(D. Oberlé, D. Muller)
- Alessio NENCINI
Padova, Italy
(J. Laszlo, A. Contarello)
- Suzanne OOSTERWIJK
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(A. Fischer, J. van der Pliigt)
- Stefano PAGLIARO
Chieti, Italy
(M. Barreto, A. Mucchi-Faina)
- Michal PARZUCHOWSKI
Gdansk, Poland
(B. Wojciszke, A. Kolanczyk)
- Samuel PEHRSON
Sussex, UK
(J. Drury, R. Brown)
- Maria-Antoneta POPA-ROCH
Grenoble, France
(F. Butera, D. Muller)
- Timothy POTTER
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
(O. Corneille, V. Yzerbyt)
- Laura SMITH
Exeter, UK
(A. Haslam, T. Postmes)
- Rui SOAREZ COSTA
Lisbon, Portugal
(T. Garcia-Marques, L. Garcia-Marques)
- Caterina SUITNER
Padova, Italy
(A. Maass, M. Cadinu)
- Guido VAN KONINGSBRUGGEN
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(J.W. Ouwkerk, S. Utz)
- Martijn VELTKAMP
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(H. Aarts, K. van den Bos)

Laurent WAROQUIER
Brussels, Belgium
(O. Klein, V. Yzerbyt)

Maarten WUBBEN
Tilburg, The Netherlands
(D. de Cremer, E. van Dijk)

Yoka WESSELING
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(J.W. Ouwerkerk, W.W. van Dijk)

Michal ZAWADZKI
Wroclaw, Poland
(D. Dolinski, K. Lachowicz-
Tabaczek)

Announcements

Revised Grant Schemes

The EAESP has recently updated its various grant schemes which are designed to support postgraduate and full members of the association in three ways:

- (a) **postgraduate and postdoctoral travel grants**
- (b) **postdoctoral 'seedcorn' research grants**
- (c) **regional activity grants.**

POSTGRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL TRAVEL GRANTS

Purpose

These bursaries are intended to support:

- short visits of postgraduate or postdoctoral students to departments elsewhere in the world in order to conduct new research, complete ongoing projects, or undergo training in a particular methodology or technology;
- participation of postgraduate or postdoctoral students in meetings, conferences or summer schools (co)sponsored by EAESP.

Eligibility

- Postgraduate members of the Association currently registered for a PhD at a European university.
- Full members who have completed their PhD within 36 months prior to their application.
- Any person may be awarded a maximum of one bursary during the duration of their doctoral studies and one bursary during the postdoctoral period.

Criteria

- Academic and financial need with particular preference for postgraduates from countries/departments which have only limited access to travel funds and whose infrastructure or training facilities are less well developed than elsewhere.
- Scientific merit of proposal. Enough details should be provided in the proposal to allow some judgement of the quality of the work envisaged.
- Before making a decision, the EC reserves the right to seek the confidential advice of other members of the Association regarding any particular application. Its decision is final.

Amount

The maximum grant to any one individual is not fixed but, in order to permit an equitable distribution of the funds, it is unlikely that any single award will exceed €1800.

Application Procedure

Applicants should submit:

- a) A brief (around 1000 words) proposal outlining the purpose and duration of the visit and its anticipated outcomes;
- b) A short letter of support from the applicant's current supervisor explaining the importance and timeliness of the visit;
- c) A brief letter from the proposed collaborator in the host institution, agreeing to the visit and to providing access to the necessary facilities (not needed for participation in meetings and conferences);
- d) A travel budget, including the likelihood/availability of obtaining alternative sources of financial support.

Deadlines

There is no deadline for submissions and decisions will usually be made within one month from receipt of application.

Successful applicants will be required to provide a brief (around 1000 words) report within three months of completion of the visit, outlining the activities engaged in and outcomes achieved (not needed for participation in meetings and conferences).

POSTDOCTORAL 'SEEDCORN' GRANTS

Purpose

The aim of the 'seedcorn' research grants is to assist researchers in developing new research projects during the immediate postdoctoral period. In particular, 'seedcorn' grants intend to support preliminary research which may facilitate the holder to subsequently obtain larger scale funding from other sources.

Eligibility

Grants are restricted to full members of the Association who have completed their PhD within 36 months prior to the application deadline.

Criteria

- Academic and financial need with particular preference for postdoctoral students from countries/departments which have only limited access to research funds.
- Scientific merit of proposal. Enough detail should be provided to allow an evaluation of the appropriateness of the theoretical rationale, the soundness of the proposed methods, and the feasibility of the project.
- Before making a decision, the EC reserves the right to seek the confidential advice of other members of the Association regarding any particular application. Its decision is final.

Amount

The maximum grant to any one individual is not fixed but ideally should not exceed €2250.

Application Procedure

Applicants should submit:

- a) A proposal (approximately 1500 words) outlining the nature, objectives and duration of research and its intended outcomes;
- b) A letter from the head of the institute/department where the research is to be conducted confirming that access to the necessary facilities will be provided;

- c) A justified budget, including the likelihood/availability of alternative sources of financial support.

Deadlines

To be considered during the (biannual) executive committee meetings (generally held in April and October) applications should be submitted by mid-March or mid-September (please consult website for more specific deadlines if necessary). A decision will usually be made within two months after that date.

Successful applicants will be required to provide a brief (i.e. around 1500 words) report within three months of the completion of the work, outlining the research conducted and the outcomes achieved.

REGIONAL ACTIVITY GRANTS

Purpose

The regional activity grants are intended to promote any initiative that specifically serves EAESP members from regions where access to scientific information, facilities and/or funding is scarce compared to European standards. Under this scheme, support may be granted for initiatives involving visits from either single researchers or groups. Funding would support the visit of the scholar(s), which would involve some form of teaching, interaction or development activities (e.g., lectures, workshops, skills training, consultation meetings) directed at local social psychologists at any career stage, but in which involvement of junior and postgraduate researchers would be encouraged where possible. Given the nature of this scheme, and the focus on teaching, training and development, the period of stay would be expected to run over several days (i.e. it would constitute more than a single colloquium on the visitors' research, although this could form a welcome part of, or addition to the program for the visit).

Eligibility

Full members of the Association who are organizing the above initiatives aimed at social psychologists from specific regions.

Criteria

- Academic and financial need of the region or regions from which the applicant comes or in favour of which the initiative is organized (to be evaluated by the Executive Committee).
- Scientific and organizational merits of proposal. Enough details of the proposed program of activities should be provided to allow an evaluation of the scientific and educational merits of the proposal and its capacity to realize the intended aims.

Amount

The grant will vary according to the characteristics of the proposed initiative, but is unlikely to exceed €3500.

Application procedure

Applicants should submit a proposal outlining:

- a) The nature, objectives, and duration of the initiative and its intended outcomes;
- b) The participant group at which it is addressed;
- c) A detailed budget, including the likelihood/availability of obtaining alternative sources of financial support.

Deadlines

To be considered during the (biannual) executive committee meetings (generally held in April and October) applications should be submitted by mid-March or mid-September (consult website for more specific deadlines if necessary).

Successful applicants will be required to provide a brief (i.e. around 1000 words) report within three months of the completion of the initiative, describing the outcomes achieved.

All applications should be submitted preferably by e-mail to:
sibylle@eaesp.org

The application should state clearly which scheme is being applied for.

EAESP Flyer

Enclosed with the mailing of the Bulletin you find an EAESP flyer. This was designed and printed very recently and provides all the basic up to date information about the Association. If you would like to order a number of these to advertise us or our activities in your department or university (or at meetings or conferences), please just email to Sibylle Classen (sibylle@eaesp.org)

Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership and grants are received by the Administrative Secretary by **September, 15th, 2006** latest. Applications for travel grants and for the International Teaching Fellowship Scheme can be received at any time. The deadline for the next issue of the Bulletin is **September, 15th, 2006**.

Executive Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Executive Officer:

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

web site of the EAESP:

<http://www.eaesp.org>