

European Bulletin of Social Psychology

Editors: Russell Spears & Sibylle Classen

2 Editorial

- 4 Article:** *An outline of the history of social psychology in Croatia: people and trends* by **Dinka Corkalo Biruski**

12 New Books by Members

Social Cognition: From Brains to Culture (2008) by S.T. Fiske & S.E. Taylor

Beyond Common Sense: Psychological Science in the Courtroom (2008) ed. by E. Borgida & S.T. Fiske

Dai bisogni all'ideologia (From needs to ideology). Vol 1; I bisogni in Democrazia (The needs in a Democracy). Vol. II (2007) ed. by P. Calegari

Social Identity and Conflict.: Structures, Dynamics and Implications (2007) by K.V. Korostelina

22 Future EAESP Meetings – Calendar

23 Future EAESP Meetings

Medium Size Meeting on Affective Processes in Evaluation: The 3rd EAESP Meeting on the Psychology of Attitudes, June 6-8, 2008, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

EAESP-SPSSI Joint Meeting on Intergroup Contact: Recent Advancements in Basic and Applied Research, August 28-30, 2008, Marburg, Germany

27 Reports of Previous Meetings

EAESP-SPSSI Joint Meeting on International Perspectives on Immigration, "Immigrants and Hosts: Perceptions, Interactions and Transformations" (A Small Group Meeting in Honor of Ken Dion), May 31- June 2, 2007, Toronto, Canada

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

Small Group Meeting on Group Processes and Self-Regulation, August 29-31, 2007, Leiden, The Netherlands

Small Group Meeting on Shared Memories, Shared Beliefs: The Formation and Use of Joint Representations in Social Interaction, September 23-26, 2007, Rapallo, Italy

47 News about Members

In Memoriam: Friedrich Försterling

In Memoriam: Carl Friedrich Graumann

New Members of the Association

58 Grants and Grant Reports

76 Announcements

EAESP Summer School 2008 – Call for Applications

79 News from the Executive Committee

Modifications in our Grant Programme

Electronic Access to the EJSP for Postgraduate Members

Election of New Executive Committee Members – Call for Nominations

82 Deadlines for Contributions

83 Executive Committee

Editorial

Dear colleagues and friends,

Although it may not seem long since our last bulletin these are busy times with much happening on the Association front! Last time Dinka Corkalo, the local organizer of the upcoming General Meeting, penned the editorial, in an extra edition of the bulletin which opened the call for papers. Well, the deadline only just closed and I hear that that over 1000 submission have been made! This is almost the same number as the membership. This is truly wonderful news and promises to make Opatija a very large and memorable meeting indeed. Our thanks (and perhaps commiserations given the impending workload) go out to Jens Förster and the program committee for the difficult task of choosing between the papers and symposia.

Maintaining the Croatian theme, as our minds turn to the Adriatic next summer, in this issue Dinka presents a fascinating overview of the development of Social Psychology in her country. I was privileged to hear Dinka talk on this topic at a small but memorable meeting in Budapest a few years ago. We thought it would be a fitting and timely to spread this knowledge of social psychology in Croatia around Europe before we the rest of European social psychology spreads itself around Croatia next summer.

Looking a bit further ahead still, another important event in the life cycle of the Association is also almost on the horizon: the Summer School. If “pawns are the soul of chess” then our postgraduates are the soul of the Association – soon to be promoted no doubt (but not before the Summer School!). The Summer School is a fitting body for the soul. For my sins I am the local organizer in Cardiff next August and look forward to welcoming a new intake of postgraduates. The pages of this bulletin contain an announcement of the details and deadlines for the application procedure. I would also like to announce an exciting new collaboration between the Association and the European Social Cognition Network in

this venture. ESCON have generously agreed to sponsor the Social Cognition workshop and we hope and expect this to just be the start of a beautiful relationship.

As is often the case in the year leading up to the General Meeting we had an especially large number of new member applications. We welcome them to the Association. For those who wanted to benefit from the preferential registration rates at the General Meeting, the deadline has alas passed (joining in April will be too late to benefit). However, I would like to point out that registration for (non-member) students, for example, is no more expensive than that for full members.

Just as we welcome new members it is with great sadness that we lament the passing of two of our most esteemed members: Professor Carl Graumann, and Professor Friedrich Försterling. We publish fitting tributes to these two important figures in social psychology in Europe.

Our journal continues to go from strength to strength and the merger of Wiley (our long-time publisher) with Blackwell is certainly no cause for concern as Blackwell have much experience in publishing journals of learned societies such as ours. We were duly greatly impressed by their professionalism and support at our recent committee meeting. So we are in safe hands and the future looks secure. The sister volume of the *European Review* is also successful of course although we noted that the number of institutional subscriptions remains very low (perhaps because as members of the Association we do not need to visit our libraries, as we get it free!). On behalf of the whole committee I would like to entreat you to persuade your university libraries to subscribe to *ERSP* if they do not already do so. Increasing the profile of the review in this way will help us all and especially our students.

Russell Spears

Article

***An outline for the history of social psychology
in Croatia:
people and trends***

by Dinka Corkalo Biruski¹

In one of my earlier papers on the development of psychology in Croatia I have stated that Croatian psychology has passed through a path from “laboratory to the field, from senses to social change” (Corkalo, 2004). However, the path of Croatian social psychology has been quite the opposite. It has started modestly in theoretical work of philosophers and sociologists interested in interaction between an individual and a wider society, inspired mostly with a leftist social theory and Marxism in particular. First empirical work continued within the same worldview paradigm; however boosted with a strong influence of scientific positivism that had been practiced and nurtured by the founders of Croatian psychology - Ramiro Bujas (1879-1959) and his son Zoran (1910-2004). Looking from perspective of the impact they had, the work of the father and the son Bujas was most influential in the field of experimental psychology; neither of them showed any systematic and profound interest in social phenomena; however both of them spent their professional lives in establishing psychology in Croatia as an empirical discipline that builds its knowledge by using scientific methodology in a most rigorous way. This orientation has ensured a particular reputation represented by the name that was given to the psychology that was taught and practiced at the Department of Psychology in Zagreb – the *Zagreb psychological school*². Nevertheless, the area of social psychology was not a distinguished part of

¹ Dinka Corkalo Biruski, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, dcorkalo@ffzg.hr

² Sometimes referred to as Bujas school of psychology (see Marinkovic, 1992)

this tradition; only later on, with the work of Slavko Kljaic and his successors, the experimental paradigm was introduced by the front door to Croatian social psychology.

In the archive of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences¹ in Zagreb where the Department of psychology has been located since its establishment in 1929, there are data showing that the subject of social psychology was present in the university curriculum very early. In the academic year 1948/1949 there was a course *Social foundations of psychological phenomena*, although there is no data about who taught the subject. In 1953 there was a course in *Social Psychology*. The first teacher was Rudi Supek (1913-1993), a philosopher, sociologist and psychologist, as his biographers usually describe his occupations and interests. However, he studied psychology in Paris and earned his PhD at Sorbonne University in 1953 under a mentorship of Jean Piaget. In 1950 Supek started to teach general psychology and in 1957 was appointed a docent (lecturer) in the field of clinical and social psychology at the Chair of Psychology, University of Zagreb. Although in his earlier career he portrayed himself as *a psychologist, moreover a clinical psychologist* (Supek, 1958), his interests were clearly in social issues. The individual in society and the influences of a broader social system on the individual had remained enduring preoccupations of Supek's research and theoretical writing. He left the psychology department in 1958, went to the Belgrade Institute for Social Sciences, came back to Zagreb and in 1963 founded the Department of Sociology at the University of Zagreb. The very same year a first edition of his book *Public opinion research*, a classical piece of work in Croatian sociological literature was published. A deep concern of a clinical psychologist for individual well-being, the humanism of a former internee of the German concentration camp in Buchewald, and a liberal, anti-dogmatic spirit of a philosopher striving to enlarge horizons beyond the Marxist ideology, had instigated an engaged societal social psychology that was always concerned with a position of the individual in changing social circumstances² and later on an establishment of a left-oriented sociological thought.

¹ formerly Faculty of Philosophy

² Today we would probably call Supek a situationist. An interesting work on psychological reactions of political dissidents during brutal interrogations in the

Rudi Supek's successor was Mladen Zvonarevic (1922-1995) who earned his PhD in 1955 and in 1960 was appointed a docent in social psychology and a head of the chair for social psychology. Zvonarevic's earlier interests, including his doctoral thesis were in the area of juvenile delinquency and criminal behavior. Later on he started to work on public opinion research methodology, and published widely in this area. Together with few other psychologists and sociologists he initiated and founded the *Institute for Social and Sociological Research* at the University of Zagreb in 1964 (today the *Institute for Social Research*, Zagreb) and for some time he served as a head of the Institute. In studying social issues, Zvonarevic (1964) defined social psychology as a science that "studies psychological aspects of social phenomena and social aspects of psychological phenomena". Although ideologically firmly embedded in socialist and Marxist beliefs, Zvonarevic investigated some of the sensitive social issues of those times: socioeconomic status of university students in relation to their academic achievement, power-sharing in socialist companies, the nature of local political elections, position of the Yugoslav immigrants in the European context of labor migration, socio-political attitudes of youth, particularly the attitudes towards Marxism and so-called workers' self-management system, the nature of religiosity etc. Looking from today's perspective, some of Zvonarevic interpretations could be challenged and evaluated as being more ideological than psychological explanations should be. Having in mind that he was a leading authority in the field, there are two major points that one can conclude when exploring Croatian social psychology in socialist time, particularly during the sixties and seventies of the last century. One is that there was an opportunity for studying serious social issues that questioned the social system itself and its functioning. The other is that interpretations of findings, no matter how favorable or unfavorable for the system they were, had remained first of all politically correct, taking into account political reality and governing ideology. Of course, one can question scientific objectivity in such circumstances; however the same question is equally valid in any given system and more so when studying social problems in real settings than when studying them in an isolated environment of a social psychological laboratory.

period of the Cominform, when cleaned from the ideological phrasing, nicely corroborates this thesis (Supek, 1951).

Two years before his retirement in 1978, Mladen Zvonarevic published his seminal work: *Social psychology* (Zvonarevic, 1976), the first and the only one extensive and comprehensive handbook in social psychology in the Croatian language that informed generations of students about the field. Along with essential chapters that could be found in any general social psychology handbook, here one can also find chapters as *Social consciousness and its development*, *Types and forms of the social consciousness*, *Mass behavior*, *Psychosocial epidemics and mass movements* and *Socio-psychological aspects of self-management*¹. It's also interesting to note that the first Croatian handbook in social psychology describes community, neighborhood, nation and social class as fundamental to the concept of social groups.

With the retirement of Mladen Zvonarevic a new research trend had begun, led by Slavko Kljaic (1933-). In terms of methodology and research meticulousness Slavko Kljaic was strongly influenced by Zoran Bujas' work. With this orientation and his interest in social phenomena a new development of experimental social psychology started. As early as in 1965 Slavko Kljaic attended the First European Seminar in social psychology (Haag, 1965)², a first meeting that would later become known as the EAESP Summer School. His PhD thesis (1975) dealt with social facilitation phenomenon in relation to the anxiety and motivation level and was the first experimental dissertation in the field of social psychology in Croatia. Methodological challenges in studying complex social phenomena had

¹ Do not mix a term self-management in this context with a contemporary construct of the behavioral self-management style. In Zvonarevic's work self-management refers to the workers' self-management, as a form of workers' participation in the decision-making chain in the socialist work organizations in the former Yugoslavia.

² It's worth noting that international exchange of scientists was the most intensive in the field of social psychology. Both Mladen Zvonarevic and Slavko Kljaic spent a year of their sabbatical leave of absence abroad (in Canada and The United States). Bearing in mind that it was a period of the cold war when the exchange of ideas between East and West was difficult, dangerous and under control if not even impossible in most of the countries of the Eastern block, most researchers in former Yugoslavia enjoyed the liberty of traveling freely. This certainly contributed that modern influences and trends in psychology were absorbed and practiced in Croatian psychology.

remained his permanent preoccupation: he studied aspects of manipulation efficacy in experimental procedures and compared different research strategies and approaches in studying social issues. His education and early career in social work (before studied psychology, he had earned diploma in social work in 1956) contributed to his pioneering longitudinal research in juvenile delinquency. With his collaborators he was the first who studied early delinquent behavior patterns in predicting later criminal behavior of adults. Moreover, he thoroughly studied some of the external and internal factors in children's early environment that could contribute or serve as resilience factors in developing delinquent behavior. He also studied development of the moral reasoning in children and their pro-social behavior.

Another area of research interest of Slavko Kljaic was attitude measurement. Together with his younger colleagues and successors Radmila Prislin and Dean Ajdukovic (today he is a head of the Chair for social psychology in Zagreb) he applied a psychophysical method of magnitude estimation in measuring the attitudes. Along with a general social psychology that was mandatory in the psychology curriculum at the university level, Slavko Kljaic also introduced *Experimental social psychology* as an elective course and taught it for a couple of years. He retired in 2000, but remained active, especially as a mentor and adviser in social psychological research of the younger colleagues.

Experimental research on attitudes was given a new impetus by the work of Radmila Prislin, an member of the Zagreb psychological school and today a professor at the San Diego University, USA. Her early research interests were in attitude structure and measurement, attitude consistency and attitude change, and the attitude-behavior relationship. She left Zagreb Department in 1992 and has continued her career in the United States.

Early on it has been said that social psychology in Croatia has followed the path from being more theoretical to being a more empirical discipline. This pattern could also be followed by analyzing types of problems and issues that have been studied since the beginning until today: at the beginning Croatian social psychology was more societal and society-oriented, sharing more with sociology than with psychology. After being engaged in the

experimental study of less societal phenomena in the mid-seventies and eighties of the last century, the end of eighties brought about the interest in society again. Turbulent times of a changing social system and upcoming war brought about a new generation of social psychologist who practiced more applied approach, trying to respond to the demands of new times. Psychosocial assistance to war victims became a central applied activity for many psychologists, preparing the ground for an advancement of a branch of social psychology that was not developed before - community psychology. New perspectives on old themes of authoritarianism, nationalism and national identity, inter-ethnic relations, social justice, and minority issues have been given. Public opinion research flourished again, resulting in the establishment of a new specialized institute in Zagreb (The institute for social research *Ivo Pilar*). Research on post-war social reconstruction processes re-established the international reputation of Croatian social psychologist.

To study psychology at the University of Zagreb¹, has always meant to get a firm, solid knowledge in psychological methodology, especially experimentation and related disciplines of statistics and psychometrics. This strategy of teaching stems from a belief that gaining knowledge in any area of science is possible if one has the right tool. However it's also true that because of intensive work on improving this tool some goals in gaining more specific knowledge have been neglected. This is certainly not so in current times, when the discipline of social psychology is taught systematically. All psychology departments in their university curricula provide a solid background in general sociopsychological knowledge incorporated early on the BSc level (*Social perception and attitudes, Interpersonal and group processes, Social cognition*) and MSc level (*Social identity and inter-group processes, Social motives*). There are also a number of elective courses in the field at different universities, for example *Attitude-behavior relationship, Applied social psychology, Psychology of persuasion and propaganda, Negotiation, Self and self-management, Conflict resolution* (University of Zagreb); *Public opinion research, Social psychology of aging,*

¹ This is more or less so for the rest of psychological departments that started their activities much later (at the University of Zadar in 1978, University of Rijeka in 1979, University of Osijek in 2003.), however in the tradition of the Zagreb psychological school

Psychology of social justice, Analysis of dyadic relationship (University of Zadar). Social psychology and its various branches are taught in other university programs as well (for example at the School of Social Work, Faculty of Political Sciences, Sociology, Communication science, Police academy, teachers' colleagues etc.). At the PhD level there is only one PhD program in general psychology organized at the Department of Psychology, University of Zagreb. Although it is general, the PhD program has several tracks, and one of them is a track in social psychology, covering along with methodological courses the courses in social cognition, intergroup relations with emphasis on nationalism and postwar social reconstruction processes.

Contemporary researchers in the field of social psychology are mainly concentrated at the psychology departments and in few institutes. At the University of Zagreb they are: Dean Ajdukovic (social reconstruction processes after massive violence, family violence, psychosocial trauma and help), Marina Ajduković (group work, developmental psychosocial risks, family violence; *School of Social Work*), Dinka Corkalo Biruski (social reconstruction processes after massive violence, nationalism, divided society), Renata Franz (attitudes; intergroup relations; *Institute for Social Science Ivo Pilar*), Margareta Jelić (self-concept and attachment styles), Zeljka Kamenov (social cognition, attachment styles), Nina Pecnik (child abuse and resilience; *School of Social Work*), Ivan Rimac (political psychology, personality and political behavior; *Faculty of Political Science*), Ivan Siber (political psychology, voters' behavior; *Faculty of Political Science*). At the University of Zadar there is Vera Cubela Adoric (interpersonal relations, psychology of justice). At the University of Rijeka there is Jasna Hudek Knezevic (health psychology and health behavior).

References

- Corkalo, D. (2004). From the laboratory to the field, from senses to social change: Development and perspectives of Croatian psychology. *Psychology Science*, Vol. 46. Supplement I, 37-46.
- Kljaic, S. (1975). Social facilitation in relation to anxiety level and motivation. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Zagreb: Department of Psychology.

- Marinkovic, K. (1992). The history of psychology in former Yugoslavia: An overview. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 28, 340-351.
- Supek, R. (1951). Psihološka intervencija i sloboda savjesti na informbiroovskim procesima. (Psychological intervention and freedom of consciousness in political processes of the Communist Information Bureau). *Republika*, 7-9, 608-619.) (in Croatian).
- Supek, R. (1958). Letter of application for a job at the Institute for Social Sciences in Belgrade. Archive of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Zagreb.
- Zvonarevic, M. (1964). *Predmet socijalne psihologije*. (A subject of social psychology). *Gledišta*, 12, 1665-1675. (in Croatian)
- Zvonarevic, M. (1976). *Socijalna psihologija*. (Social Psychology) Zagreb: Školska knjiga. (in Croatian)

New Books by Members

Social Cognition: From Brains to Culture

Susan T. Fiske & Shelley E. Taylor (2008)

New York: McGraw-Hill

ISBN-13: 978-0-07-340552-0 (alk. paper)

ISBN-13: 978-0-07-340552-0 (alk. paper)

1. Introduction
 - a. Approaches to Studying the Social Thinker
 - b. Ebb & Flow of Cognition in Psychology & Neuroscience
 - c. What is Social Cognition?
 - d. People Are Not Things
 - e. Cultures Matter
 - f. Brains Matter
 - g. Summary

Basic Concepts in Social Cognition

2. Dual Modes in Social Cognition
 - a. Automatic Processes
 - b. Controlled Processes
 - c. Motivations Influence which Modes Operate
 - d. Models of Both Automatic and Controlled Processes
 - e. Summary
3. Attention and encoding: What gets into our heads
 - a. Salience: A Property of Stimuli in Context
 - b. Vividness: An Inherent Property of Stimuli
 - c. Accessibility: A Property of Categories in Our Heads
 - d. Direct Perception: Not Just in Our Heads
 - e. Faces: The Focus of Social Attention
 - f. Summary
4. Representation in Memory
 - a. Associative Networks: Organizing Memory
 - b. Procedural and Declarative Memory: What Memory Does
 - c. Parallel versus Serial Processing: Coordinating Memory Processes
 - d. Embodied Memory

- e. Social Memory Structures: Why Social Memory Matters
- f. Summary

Topics in Social Cognition: From Self to Society

- 5. Self in Social Cognition
 - a. Mental Representations of the Self
 - b. Self-Regulation
 - c. Motivation and Self-Regulation
 - d. The Self as a Reference Point
 - e. Summary
- 6. Causal Attribution Processes
 - a. What Is Attribution Theory?
 - b. Early Contributions to Attribution Theory
 - c. Processes Underlying Attribution
 - d. Attributional Biases
 - e. Summary
- 7. Heuristics
 - a. What Are Heuristics?
 - b. When Are Heuristics Used and When Do They Lead to Wrong Answers?
 - c. Judgments Over Time
 - d. Summary
- 8. Accuracy and Efficiency in Social Judgment
 - a. Errors and Biases as Consequential: Improving The Inference Process
 - b. Errors and Biases in Social Inference: Perhaps They Don't Matter?
 - c. Are Rapid Judgments Sometimes Better than Thoughtfully-Considered Ones?
 - d. Neuroeconomics: Back to the Future?
 - e. Summary
- 9. Cognitive Structures of Attitudes
 - a. Background
 - b. Cognitive Features of Two Consistency Theories
 - c. Lay Theories and Attitude Change
 - d. Functional Dimensions of Attitudes
 - e. Summary

10. Cognitive Processing of Attitudes
 - a. Heuristic-Systematic Model
 - b. Peripheral vs. Central Routes to Persuasion: Elaboration Likelihood Model
 - c. Motivation and Opportunity Determine Attitude Processes: MODE Model
 - d. Implicit Associations
 - e. Embodied Attitudes
 - f. Neural Correlates of Attitudes
 - g. Summary
11. Stereotyping: A Central Topic in Social Cognition
 - a. Introduction
 - b. Blatant Bias
 - c. Subtle Bias
 - d. Effects of Bias
 - e. Summary
12. Prejudice: Interplay of Cognitive and Affective Biases
 - a. Intergroup Cognition and Emotion
 - b. Racial Prejudice
 - c. Gender Prejudice
 - d. Age Prejudice
 - e. Sexual Prejudice
 - f. Summary
13. From Social Cognition to Affect
 - a. Differentiating among Affects, Preferences, Evaluations, Moods, Emotions
 - b. Early Theories
 - c. Physiological and Neuroscience Theories of Emotion
 - d. Social Cognitive Foundations of Affect
 - e. Summary
14. From Affect to Social Cognition
 - a. Affective Influences on Cognition
 - b. Individual Differences in the Affect-Cognition Interplay
 - c. Affect versus Cognition
 - d. Summary
15. Behavior and Cognition
 - a. Goal-Directed Behavior

- b. When Are Cognitions and Behavior Related?
- c. Using Behavior for Impression Management
- d. Using Behavior to Test Hypotheses about Others
- e. Summary

Beyond Common Sense: Psychological Science in the Courtroom

Eugene Borgida and Susan T. Fiske (Eds.) (2008)

Blackwell

ISBN 978-1-4051-4574-9

As described by Blackwell: *Beyond Common Sense* addresses the many important and controversial issues that arise from the use of psychological and social science in the courtroom.

- Features original chapters written by some of the leading experts in the field of psychology and law including Elizabeth Loftus, Saul Kassin, Faye Crosby, Alice Eagly, Gary Wells, Louise Fitzgerald, Craig Anderson, and Phoebe Ellsworth
- Each chapter identifies areas of scientific agreement and disagreement, and discusses how psychological science advances an understanding of human behavior beyond what is accessible by common sense
- The 14 issues addressed include eyewitness identification, gender stereotypes, repressed memories, Affirmative Action, and the death penalty -- among others
- Commentaries written by 7 leading social science and law scholars discuss key legal and scientific themes that emerge from the science chapters and illustrate how psychological science is or can be used in the courts.

Foreward: Mahzarin R. Banaji, Harvard University

Part I: Introduction to *Beyond Common Sense*: Eugene Borgida & Susan T. Fiske

II. Taking Stock: Stereotyping, Prejudice, and Discrimination*Race, Crime, and Antidiscrimination*

R. Richard Banks, Jennifer L. Eberhardt & Lee Ross, Stanford University

Discrimination in America and Legal Strategies for Reducing It

Faye J. Crosby, University of California, Santa Cruz, & John F. Dovidio,
University of Connecticut

The Young Science of Prejudice Against Older Adults: Established Answers and Open Questions About Ageism

Todd D. Nelson, California State University – Stanislaus

Gender Prejudice: On the Risks of Occupying Incongruent Roles

Alice H. Eagly & Anne M. Koenig, Northwestern University

From the Laboratory to the Bench: Gender Stereotyping Research in the Courtroom

Laurie A. Rudman, Rutgers University, Peter Glick, Lawrence University,
& Julie E. Phelan, Rutgers University

(Un)common Knowledge: The Legal Viability of Sexual Harassment Research

Louise F. Fitzgerald, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, & Linda
L. Collinsworth, Millikin University

Subjectivity in the Appraisal Process: A Facilitator of Gender Bias in Work Settings

Madeline E. Heilman & Michelle C. Haynes, New York University

III. Taking Stock: Psychological Science in Non-discrimination Contexts*Eyewitness Identification: Issues in Common Knowledge and Generalization*

Gary L. Wells & Lisa E. Hasel, Iowa State University

Repressed and Recovered Memory

Elizabeth F. Loftus, University of California, Irvine, Maryanne Garry,
Victoria University of Wellington, & Harlene Hayne, University of
Otago

Expert Testimony on the Psychology of Confessions: A Pyramidal Framework of the Relevant Science

Saul M. Kassin, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, City University of
New York

Polygraph Testing

William G. Iacono, University of Minnesota

Social Science and the Evolving Standards of Death Penalty Law

Phoebe C. Ellsworth & Samuel R. Gross, University of Michigan

Pretrial Publicity: Effects, Remedies, and Judicial Knowledge

Margaret Bull Kovera & Sarah M. Greathouse, John Jay College of
Criminal Justice, City University of New York

Media Violence, Aggression, and Public Policy

Craig A. Anderson & Douglas A. Gentile, Iowa State University

Part IV: Commentaries*The Limits of Science in the Courtroom*

David L. Faigman, Hastings College of Law, University of California

Research on Eyewitness Testimony and False Confessions

Margaret A. Berger, Brooklyn Law School

Commentary on Research Relevant to Sex Discrimination and Sexual Harassment

Barbara A. Gutek, University of Arizona

*The Tenuous Bridge Between Research and Reality: The Importance of Research Design in
Inferences Regarding Work Behavior*

Frank Landy, SHL USA, Inc.

Psychological Contributions to Evaluating Witness Testimony

Shari Seidman Diamond, Northwestern Law School

Beyond the Common Knowledge of Sex and Race Discrimination

R. Richard Banks, Stanford Law School

*Behavioral realism in law: Reframing the discussion about social science's place in
antidiscrimination law and policy*

Linda Hamilton Krieger, Boalt Law School, University of California at
Berkeley

Dai bisogni all'ideologia (From needs to ideology). Vol.1

I bisogni in Democrazia (The needs in a Democracy). Vol.II

Paolo Calegari (ed.) (2007)

Ombre Corte, Verona (It.), fax: 0039 0458301735

mail: redazione@ombrecorte.it

Within Social Psychology some important researches (K. Lewin) pointed out that the democratic behaviour is not spontaneous but it is a learned one. On the other hand, the experimental Psychology (D.N. Uznadze) indicated that the social status plays a very relevant role not only as far as the fixation of prejudices and stereotypes, but also as far as the transmission of ideologies. (**Vol. 1**)

The contribution of the A. focuses on the revival of the concept of need within the writings of various eminent scientists (among them the social psychologist J. L. Beauvois) - almost all alive - of different disciplinary origin. These Authors have underlined the connections existing between the urgency of needs satisfaction and the answers given by a democratic society.

Furthermore the A. suggests a large scale research on the cultural endowment of the citizens, on their level of awareness as far as their social placement, on their willingness to contribute in a responsible way for the common good. (**Vol. II**)

CONTENTS:

Vol. I

PART I: From needs to ideology. (D.N. Uznadze)

PART II : Can we persuade ourselves of an ideology. How? Why? (J.P. Deconchy, R. Harré and P.F. Secord, A. Touraine).

PART III : Democracy : problems and perspectives (A. Touraine, N. Chomsky, J. Kristeva)

PART IV : Democratic atmosphere and democratic personality (K. Lewin, G. Allport, Th. Adorno).

PART V : What is the social thought (M. L. Rouquette)

PART VI : Introduction to the "Psychologie historique" (I. Meyerson)

PART VII : Features of Self - Love (A travel from the egotic Self, to the pitiful Self, through the autonomous Self)

PART VIII : A method for comparing the Declarations of the human rights (a quantitative procedure to compare the contents of the Declarations of Rights).

Vol.II

PART. I: Needs and Ideologies from K. Marx to A. Heller)

PART II : Autonomy and identity. Analogies and differences among the thought of H. Arendt, C. Castoriadis, H. Maturana, J. Kristeva about the social organization, the value of cultural differences, the interpretation of "the time of insignificance", the relevance of the creative freedom.

PART III : The liberalistic illusions (J. L. Beauvois). How to regulate the globalization (D. Duclos, N. Chomsky). Society without rules (E. Hobsbawm). Processes of disembedding (A. Giddens). The limits of the westernization of the world (S. Latouche).

PART IV : Democracy: space and dialogue . Democracy as seen within a laboratory (K. Lewin). Democracy as reasoning together (G. Zagrebelsky, A. Sen). The self -respect as precondition of a democratic behaviour (J. Rawls)

Conclusions: the necessity of referring to Psychology. The needs of not autonomous persons. Redefinition of the needs of the citizens;

Addendum: A research on "general needs". (Items extracted from 13 Constitutions). The authors quoted in this book.

Social Identity and Conflict. Structures, Dynamics, and Implications

Karina V. Korostelina (2007)

Palgrave Macmillan

280 Pages, \$75.00 - Hardcover (1-4039-8375-5)

Description

This book presents the conception of a system of social identities, including the system's structure, development and dynamics, and explores the influence of cultural dimensions and identity salience on attitudes, behavior, and the structures of consciousness. The "Four C" model of identity-based conflicts provides fresh opportunities for analyses of the role of identity in conflicts and violence. Karina V. Korostelina introduces a model of dealing with identity conflicts that includes early warning, identity based training, management of multicultural communities, identity reconstruction workshops, and negotiation of identity. Every theoretical chapter in the book is followed by examples of research and

methodological tools for analyzing data on social identities and identity based conflicts.

Author Bio

Karina Korostelina is Research Professor at the Institute of Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University.

Praise for Social Identity and Conflict

"This book is a broad, interdisciplinary synthesis that addresses the question of identity as a cultural and psychological concept. Korostelina is a creative and perceptive--as well as systematic--analyst of identity and ethnic, national, and international conflict. Her work is cutting edge for this topic so crucial in the post-cold war."

--James Peacock, Co-Director, Rotary Peace and Conflict Center, Duke-UNC

"Korostelina's *Social Identity and Conflict* is unique in several ways. First, it is a virtual encyclopedia of the literature on large group identity, with original contributions of her own. Also, it applies conflict analysis theory and provides concrete examples of Korostelina's successful conflict resolution work with adversarial ethnic groups. I especially appreciate the way the author respectfully and effectively employs psycho-dynamic insights, a rare gift among social scientists."

--Joseph V. Montville, Chair, Center for World Religions, Diplomacy and Conflict Resolution, George Mason University

"Most of our wars today are identity wars in which ethnicity, religion, or cultural identity have become the markers for difference and violence. Korostelina's book is a significant and opportune work for those of us who want to understand why group and individual identity can become such a strong motivator in conflict situations, and who also need to comprehend the policy and practice implications of identity salience--and its possible transformation--in conflicted societies."

--Mari Fitzduff, Professor of Politics, Director of the Master's Program in Intercommunal Coexistence, Brandeis University

Table of contents

Introduction * PART I: UNDERSTANDING SOCIAL IDENTITY * Social Identity as Social Phenomenon and Scientific Concept * PART II: SOCIAL

IDENTITY AS A SYSTEM * Social Identity in the System of Identity *
Social Identity as a System * Components of the System of Social Identity
* Dynamics of the System of Social Identities * SOCIAL IDENTITY AND
CONFLICT * The Factors that Influence Conflict Dynamics * The
Dynamics of Identity Conflict * Formation of National Identity and
Conflict Intentions of Minorities * Identity and Conflict: Implications for
Identity Conflict Management

Future EAESP Meetings - Calendar

June 6-9, 2008, Kazimierz Dolny, Poland

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

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

Contact: Michal Bilewicz (bilewicz@psych.uw.edu.pl)

June 6-8, 2008, Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Medium Size Meeting on Affective Processes in Evaluation: The 3rd EAESP meeting on the Psychology of Attitudes

Organisers: Pablo Briñol, Geoff Haddock, Rob Holland, Greg Maio, Rich Petty

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

June 6-9, 2008, The Netherlands

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

Organisers: Sabine Otten & Ernestine Gordijn

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

June 10-14, 2008, Opatija, Croatia

15th General Meeting of the EAESP

Organisers: Dinka Corkalo Biruski & Dean Ajdukovic

Contact: www.eaesp2008.com

August 28-30, 2008, Marburg, Germany

EAESP-SPSSI Joint Meeting on Intergroup Contact: Recent Advancements in Basic and Applied Research

Organisers: Oliver Christ, Miles, Linda Tropp, Ulrich Wagner

Contact: Oliver Christ (christ@staff.uni-marburg.de)

Future EAESP Meetings

Medium Size Meeting

On Affective Processes in Evaluation: The 3rd EAESP Meeting on the Psychology of Attitudes

June 6-8, 2008, Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands

[Organisers: Pablo Briñol, Geoff Haddock, Rob Holland, Greg Maio, Rich Petty

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

Since the beginning of the last century, many influential social psychologists have argued that the attitude concept is an indispensable construct within social psychology. Much recent research within the attitudes literature emphasizes the role of affective processes, and there have been several recent developments in the theories of emotion. For instance, various studies have focused on the contribution of affect to implicit and explicit measures of attitude. Furthermore, abundant recent evidence has focused on the roles of mood and affective orientation in attitude formation and change. At the same time, there have been developments in theories of emotion. In particular, prototype views of emotion are challenging traditional, dimensional conceptions, and showing how divergent processes can be elicited by seemingly “similar” positive emotions or “similar” negative emotions. In addition, there is increasing knowledge and sophistication in the assessment of emotion over time and at conscious and non-conscious levels (e.g., with implicit measures). Also, there is more knowledge about relevant individual differences in affective and evaluative experience and about relevant biological and sociological factors. All of these developments point to a pressing need to begin focused discussions of how affective processes are integrated within attitudes, attitude change, and relations between attitudes and behavior. The aim of the proposed meeting is to facilitate this integration.

The meeting will take place from June 6 to June 8, 2008, at Radboud University Nijmegen, immediately prior to the EAESP General Meeting in Opatija (Croatia). We plan to include 40-50 participants, with at least 50% being EAESP members. In addition to some keynote talks, up to 20 participants will be asked to give a 30-min presentation. The remaining participants will present posters. During the poster session, there will be several opportunities for informal interaction and discussion. A roundtable discussion on contemporary issues with respect to emotion and evaluation will also take place. If you are interested in attending this meeting, please send an abstract (between 100-200 words) to Geoff Haddock (haddockgg@cardiff.ac.uk) before **December 14th, 2007**.

CONFERENCE ORGANIZERS

Pablo Briñol, Department of Psychology, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Ciudad Universitaria de Cantoblanco. 28049 Madrid, Spain.
Email: pablo.brinnol@uam.es

Geoff Haddock, School of Psychology, Park Place, Cardiff University, Cardiff, Wales CF10 3AT (Tel: +44 2920 874 007; email: haddockgg@cardiff.ac.uk)

Rob Holland, Behavioral Science Institute, Department of Social Psychology, Radboud University Nijmegen, P.O. Box 9104, 6500 HE Nijmegen, The Netherlands. Email: r.holland@psych.ru.nl

Greg Maio, School of Psychology, Park Place, Cardiff University, Cardiff, Wales CF10 3AT (Tel: +44 2920 874 007; email: maio@cardiff.ac.uk)

Rich Petty, Department of Psychology, Ohio State University, 1835 Neil Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210. email: petty.1@osu.edu

EAESP-SPSSI Joint Meeting**On Intergroup Contact: Recent Advancements in Basic and Applied Research****August 28-30, 2008, Marburg, Germany**

[Organisers: Oliver Christ (christ@staff.uni-marburg.de), Miles Hewstone (miles.hewstone@psy.ox.ac.uk), Linda Tropp (tropp@psych.umass.edu), Ulrich Wagner (wagner1@staff.uni-marburg.de)
Contact: Oliver Christ (christ@staff.uni-marburg.de)]

This small-group meeting aims to bring together international scholars on the topic of intergroup contact, including those with basic and applied interest and expertise. In recent years, academic interest in intergroup contact has intensified, leading to a number of theoretical advances and modifications of intergroup contact theory. Contact remains one of the most powerful approaches in the social sciences for improving intergroup relations and reducing intergroup conflict. This positive effect has been shown in carefully-controlled laboratory experiments, cross-sectional and longitudinal surveys, and in a number of applied fields and interventions. Contact is a proven intervention in cases of deeply-rooted societal conflict, such as Northern Ireland or South Africa, but also in local organizations and schools. The central aim of the meeting is to bring together researchers who explore basic approaches with those who try to apply this knowledge in cases of real intergroup conflict. We are focused on advancing both theory and research, so we would particularly welcome papers offering: novel theoretical understanding of how contact works, integration with other theories in social psychology, cross-fertilization across disciplines beyond social psychology, and new research techniques and methods.

The meeting will be held at the Department of Psychology in Marburg, Germany. Marburg is a beautiful small university town in the centre of Germany. Philipps-University Marburg is the oldest university in the world that was founded as a Protestant institution and has been a place of research and teaching for nearly five centuries. The city of Marburg is

located 80 km to the North of Frankfurt and thus is easily reached by plain and/or train. No fees will be charged for the meeting and most meal expenses will be covered. Participants will be responsible for their transportation and their hotel costs. Some additional support may be available especially for young researchers and those without access to research support.

The meeting will have a maximum of 30 participants. We hope to have a mix of senior and junior scholars (including graduate students), and joint applications to present work by senior and junior scholars are welcome. We plan to have approximately equal representation of SPSSI and EAESP members. Those interested in participating should submit a one-page summary of the work they would present at the meeting. In addition, please send a brief abstract (100 words or less) that could be included in the conference program, as well as a cover page indicating your name, affiliation, contact information, and membership status in SPSSI and/or EAESP. Depending on the number of promising applications we are keeping open the option of having some presentations in one or more poster sessions. Applications should be sent to Oliver Christ, christ@staff.uni-marburg.de before **February 29, 2008**.

Reports of Previous Meetings

SPSSI-EAESP Joint Meeting on International Perspectives on Immigration, “Immigrants and Hosts: Perceptions, Interactions, and Transformations”

A Small Group Meeting in Honor of Kenneth Dion

At Toronto, Ontario Canada, May 31- June 2, 2007

Organisers: V. Esses, K. Deaux, R. LaLonde, R. Brown, U. Wagner

The aim of this meeting was to develop a psychological agenda for collaborative, cross-national work on immigration. The current movement of people from one country to another is almost unprecedented, with consequences for both host nations and for the immigrants themselves. Host nations and immigrants both face challenges of acculturation and incorporation in an increasingly diverse society. Issues of ethnic and national identity, attitudes and stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination, and interpersonal and intergroup interaction are relevant for host and immigrant alike. Both sides of the equation were addressed in a meeting which brought together investigators from four continents (Australia, Europe, North and South America). Through this diverse representation, we hoped that we could both identify processes common to the immigration experiences across countries as well as to recognize unique social and historical circumstances that might characterize and shape immigration in a particular country.

This small group meeting was dedicated to the late Kenneth Dion, who was an active member of both EAESP and SPSSI. (At the time of his death, Ken was an Associate Editor of the *European Journal of Social Psychology*.) Moreover, relevant to this conference in particular, Ken was an early entrant into the world of immigration research within social psychology.

In addition to the funds provided by EAESP and by SPSSI, support also came from *Metropolis Canada* (a network of researchers and immigration policy makers, supported by federal departments) and from the University of Toronto, the University of Western Ontario, and York University. We are grateful to all of these funders, whose generosity contributed to the overall success of this conference.

Interest in attending this conference was somewhat overwhelming to the organizers, as more than 60 proposals were submitted for consideration. On the one hand, this level of interest was encouraging as it testifies to the growing interest on the part of psychologists in the topic of immigration. At the same time, we needed to limit the number of participants, for practical and logistic reasons (e.g., the size of our budget and the size of the selected hotel) and for intellectual reasons (to foster the kind of interchange and discussion that only a small group meeting can provide). In selecting the papers for the conference, we tried to strike a balance between perspectives (host societies and immigrants), experience (seasoned and junior researchers), and the country in which the research was done. After much deliberation and often painful choices, we settled on a group of 26 presenters from 10 different countries. Because of size restrictions, we also had to set a policy that only the senior author on a paper could attend the conference.

The conference was held during a balmy Toronto spring in the Madison Manor Boutique Hotel, a small and charming hotel in the centre of Toronto. Imagine a conference being held in an old Victorian style pub, consisting of several multi-level rooms and spaces, and you will have captured the image of our setting. The meeting room was in fact a room that served as a conference room by day and a pub by night. Prudently, the bar in our pub was closed during conference hours, but numerous discussions took place over numerous pints when the official conference was not in session.

The conference began informally with a welcoming reception on Wednesday evening, May 30 at the hotel. After an early breakfast on Thursday morning, the formal program began, opening with a presentation of work on the Canadian Ethnic Diversity Survey in which Ken Dion had been deeply involved. Several of his collaborators on this

project, including Karen Kisiel Dion, Jeffrey Reitz, Mai Phon, and Ray Breton, described work that covered topics including discrimination, ethnic identity and well-being; racial inequality and social integration; and inequality and patterns of social attachment. In much of this work, critical comparisons were made between visible and non-visible minorities, a critical point of distinction in many of the outcomes studied.

For most of the conference, we used a format in which two or three thematically related papers were presented, followed by some discussion and then a short break that enhanced the opportunities for discussion and interchange of ideas. In the second session on Thursday morning, Carolin Hagelskamp used an ecological model to frame her studies of work-family dynamics in immigrant families in New York City, showing how different parental motivations (e.g., education versus work orientation) produce different outcomes in children's educational attainment. In the second paper in this session, the global focus shifted to Rotterdam, where Karen Phalet described patterns of socio-political integration among Muslim immigrants. In both of these papers, the value to immigration researchers of considering the social context in which individuals act was made clear.

The presentations on Thursday afternoon dealt primarily with acculturation attitudes. Richard Bourhis used his Interactive Acculturation Model as a frame for a comparative analysis of attitudes in North American and Western Europe, illustrating the variations that can occur between countries that have different histories and policies toward immigration. Roberto Gonzalez introduced the interesting case of immigration from Peru to Chile where, despite many common cultural traditions, numerous intergroup issues arise that can be analyzed in terms of prejudice, intergroup anxiety and identity threat. A third presentation on Thursday afternoon was by Dennis Nigbur, using the Berry acculturation model to analyze the experience of South Asian immigrant children in Britain. This work introduced an important longitudinal perspective, one which is unquestionably needed in tracking the immigrant experience. Overall, the first day of the conference was highly stimulating, and discussions continued throughout the dinner at Madigan's Covered Patio, on the premises of the hotel, and in numerous conversations thereafter.

On Friday morning the focus was on attitudes held by members of the host country toward immigrants. Tom Pettigrew opened the morning session with a comparative analysis of German and U.S. predictors of anti-immigrant attitudes. In this impressive data set and in a more general review of the literature, Tom and his collaborators find that cultural threat is more important than economic and political threat in shaping anti-immigrant attitudes, and that personal threat tends to be mediated by collective threat. Further, in a stepwise analysis of various possible determinants, both authoritarianism and social dominance exert a strong influence. Katherine Fennelly introduced the concept of fractionalization in her presentation of a study of adolescents' attitudes toward immigrants in 28 countries, a demographic index of the probability that any two individuals will be from different groups.

In the second morning session, Monika Stelzl presented work done with Vicki Esses that explores the willingness of Canadian citizen to emigrate on either a short or long-term basis, and the relation between emigration tendencies and receptivity to immigrants and immigration in one's home country. Sam Pehrson and Rupert Brown presented survey data from a British sample, exploring the basis of anti-immigrant attitudes. They find that stronger national identity predicts level of anti-immigrant prejudice, but only for those who have strong essentialist beliefs.

Following a lunch break, our attention turned to policy issues, with presentations by two Canadian government representatives: Marc Willis, from Citizenship and Immigration Canada, and Kamal Dib, from Canadian Heritage. For some of us, the relatively close link between policy makers and the academic community that seems to exist in Canada was a source of envy. While the content of these talks was based on the Canadian experience, many of the issues have implications for research and policy in the various countries represented by conference participants.

In the last session on Friday, the focus on attitudes toward immigrants continued. Winnifred Louis presented data on attitudes toward asylum seekers in Australia, showing differences in attitudes as a function of people's endorsement of a superordinate (human) identity versus an Australian identity, with more prejudice evident in the latter case. Greg Maio used theories from the attitude area, specifically dealing with the

instrumental and symbolic functions of attitudes, to analyze reactions to ads produced by government agencies. Finally, Thomas Kessler presented data from Germany, Belgium and the UK relevant to ingroup projection and outgroup acceptance, building on theoretical and empirical work that he and Amelie Mummendey have done. Thoroughly fed by intellectual offerings during the day, we were on our own for the evening, giving many the opportunity to explore Toronto. The city was particularly hospitable that night, offering a dramatic light show in the night sky in conjunction with the opening of a spectacular new wing in the Royal Ontario Museum, just up the street from our hotel!

On Saturday the presentations shifted to the perspective of the immigrant with a series of talks on ethnic and national identity. Maykel Verkuyten led off with an analysis of ethnic, religious and national identity among Turkish Muslims in the Netherlands. This presentation included attention to often unrecognized distinctions between Sunni and Alevi Muslims, reminding us of the importance of considering subgroup differences within larger demographic categories. Oliver Christ followed with a longitudinal study of nationalism and patriotism in Germany. After a coffee break, Bernd Simon presented data on identity and politicization among Turkish immigrants in Germany, showing how the concept of dual identification is related to politicization. Kimberly Noels is working on issues of language and ethnic identity in Canada and presented results of two studies that explored differences between first- and second-generation immigrants and, echoing some of the Verkuyten work, differences between different groups of Muslim immigrants. She offered the concept of situated ethnic identity to capture some of the variability that can be observed among immigrants across time and place. Another perspective on Canadian immigration was offered by Peter Grant, who is studying the emergence of a Canadian identity (as assessed on five dimensions in a scale he has developed) among Asian and African immigrants. Interviews with leaders within immigrant communities were also part of the work he presented.

After lunch, provided at the hotel as it was on Friday, the theme of the next session was perceptions of threat. Eva Green presented data from 20 nations in the European Social Survey and explored the concomitants of perceived and material threat as they influence conceptions of the “good”

immigrant. Chris Cohrs considered the role of individual differences, specifically authoritarianism and social dominance orientation, on prejudicial attitudes toward immigrants (generally finding a stronger influence of authoritarianism than SDO). The last research paper of the day was presented by Jorge Vala, who also used European Social Survey data to study the role of threat in anti-immigrant attitudes. He usefully parsed the concept of threat into economic, symbolic and security forms, and found that threats to security ranked highest in his sample of European respondents.

The final session of the conference was a round table discussion of the relationship between policy and research. This often-lively discussion highlighted a variety of stances and various routes by which psychologists might become a more active voice in the policy debates that are on many national agenda. The final conference dinner was held that night at the hotel, again in the multi-level outdoor space that provided many areas for conversation and camaraderie. Toasts were numerous, as we celebrated 3 days of stimulating papers on an important topic, all taking place in an environment that facilitated discussion and debate.

From a research perspective, one of the goals of this conference was to bring together investigators from a number of countries in order to establish some multinational research initiatives. In that respect we can say that the conference was a success, as the seeds of many future collaborations appeared to have been sown. Another goal that the conference achieved was to give some attention to the policy implications of our research and to encourage communication and collaboration between researchers and policy-makers. Judging from the quality of the presentations and the comments that we received before and after the conference, we believe that this small group meeting was a significant occasion for the continuing development of immigration research in the social psychological community. The organizers of the conference, however, are not resting on their laurels; we are now in the process of proposing a volume of the *Journal of Social Issues* that would be based on a number of the presentations from the conference. We hope that issue will be accepted and so that some portion of the conference can be shared with a larger audience.

Kay Deaux & Richard LaLonde

Small Group Meeting on Social Stigma and Social Disadvantage

At Oud-Poelgeest Castle, Leiden, The Netherlands, June 21-22 2007

Organisers: M. Barreto & N. Ellemers

Prejudice and discrimination have long been key issues of interest to social psychologists. But much of the research has tended to focus on those from advantaged groups – examining the individual predictors of prejudice and the social structural factors that moderate discrimination. In contrast, this small group meeting brought together a group of researchers whose work takes the perspective of the stigmatised. The meeting was an opportunity to share up-to-date knowledge of how social disadvantage is perceived and experienced, the strategies available to the stigmatised to deal with social disadvantage, their use and relative success, and the ways in which the stigmatised may unwittingly promote their own disadvantage.

The meeting was held at Oud-Poelgeest Castle on the outskirts of Leiden, The Netherlands. Thirty-six researchers met over two days. Speakers brought their colleagues and, together with graduate students from Leiden, there was a good mix of junior and senior researchers. Moreover, there was also a good mix of European as well as non-European researchers, with a North America perspective being particularly well represented. There was a full program of 20 speakers. As is traditional with EAESP small group meetings, the program provided plenty of opportunity for discussion and debate. Such a structure enabled us to identify where our approaches intersected, where they diverged, and what future research and theoretical development might hold.

The first morning session examined the effects of stigma on the self. The first speaker, *Andrew Jahoda* (University of Glasgow), shared with us a clinical perspective on people with mild intellectual disabilities. This ethnographic work revealed much about the anxiety and depression faced by these individuals and the way in which they maintained a positive

sense of self by defining themselves in terms of similarity to, rather than difference from, non-stigmatised others. The use of video footage was particularly enlightening for the audience. *David Bourguignon* (Université Catholique de Louvain) then presented research examining the rejection-identification model and the distinct effects of group and personal discrimination on self-esteem. For African immigrants, women, and the unemployed, self-esteem was negatively related to personal discrimination, but positively related to group discrimination. However, identification played a different moderating across the groups, suggesting that the perceived permeability of group boundaries plays an important role. *Manuela Barreto* then presented an overview of a research program examining the differential effects of blatant and subtle discrimination, demonstrating that both have negative but quite distinct emotional consequences for targets. While the negative emotions elicited by blatant discrimination may facilitate social change, the same does not occur with subtle discrimination. After the coffee break *Leslie Ashburn-Nardo* (Purdue University) argued for the importance of implicit measures for understanding targets' attitudes and beliefs. Four studies indicated that almost half of African Americans implicitly favour Whites, which can result in reduced psychological well-being and choices that may unwittingly promote disadvantage. In the final talk for the morning session *Colette van Laar* (Leiden University) presenting research examining the effects of protecting a stigmatised identity. Against a backdrop of Islamic identity within Western Europe, giving value to identities was shown to improve well-being, as well as motivation and performance on important domains such as education and work, and identification with the higher status outgroup and society more generally.

The afternoon session on the first day examined identification and the effects of stigma. The session was started off by *Daan Scheepers* (Leiden University) who examined physiological responses to threatened social identities, demonstrating that identification not only buffers against maladaptive physiological responses (such as anger) but can also lead to more benign and constructive cardiovascular processes related to efficient energy mobilization and effort. *Ann Bettencourt* (University of Missouri) examined the role of psychological empowerment and identification in predicting well-being. Longitudinal evidence from ethnic minorities in the US demonstrated that feelings of empowerment mediated the relationship

between group identification and psychological well-being. *Cheryl Kaiser* (University of Washington) argued that strongly identified members of stigmatised groups actually experience more prejudice than those who are weakly identified. Cheryl presented research using innovative methodologies to demonstrate that majority group members (particularly those endorsing status legitimizing beliefs) expressed more negative attitudes toward strongly identified minority group members. After the coffee break *Michael Inzlicht* (University of Toronto) examined the way in which expectations of prejudice (stigma consciousness) shape perceptions of facial affect. Using computer-generated animated faces, research demonstrated that expectations of prejudice led minority group members to interpret out-group faces as more rejecting than in-group faces. In the final talk for the day, *Nicole Shelton* (Princeton University) examined misunderstandings in interethnic interactions that result from concerns about the application of group stereotypes. While White Americans avoid interracial interactions due to anxiety about appearing prejudiced, African Americans avoid such interactions due to concerns about being the target of prejudice.

The second day began with a session on coping with stigma, opened by *Janet Swim* (Pennsylvania State University). Janet examined the role of relationship motives in women's decisions to confront sexist behaviour and silence themselves. Research from diary data demonstrated that motivations to avoid conflict and present the self in line with expectations are associated with women's tendency not to respond to sexism. *Patricia Rodriguez Mosquera* (Brunel University) then discussed emotions related to disrespect and devaluation of one's group. Using real life instances of disrespect, two studies found that intense emotional responses from ethnic minority groups (e.g., anger, outrage, humiliation) led to appraisals of the treatment as unfair and wrong, and a willingness to confront such mistreatment. *Michelle Ryan* (University of Exeter) examined how members of stigmatised groups respond to their disadvantage in terms of individual mobility, social creativity, and social competition. Two studies argued for the independent role of three factors of identity (centrality, affect, and ingroup ties) and suggested that identifying with a stigmatised group is potentially very different from identifying with one that is high-status. *Daniel Miller* (Indiana University - Purdue University) then discussed collective action as a response to social stigma. Two studies

demonstrated that when a situation is viewed as changeable, problem-focused coping and more effortful collective action is more likely. In contrast, stable situations result in emotion-focused coping and expressions of discontent. *Mikki Hebl* (Rice University) examined a range of strategies that can be adopted to reduce subtle, interpersonal discrimination. At an individual level, acknowledgement, compensation, and individuation were found to have some degree of success. At an organisational-level, identity-blind policies tended to result in increased discrimination but structured interviews mitigated the effect.

After lunch, the afternoon session began with *P.J. Henry* (DePaul University) discussing group-based asymmetries in the importance placed on procedural justice versus distributive justice. Research using the Justice Preference Scale demonstrated that lower status group members consistently prefer procedural over distributive justice compared to higher status group members. *José Fuster* (CESIDA) and *Fernando Molero* (UNED) examined the impact of hiding stigmatised identities. In a sample of HIV positive individuals, for those who hid their identity, perceptions of discrimination did not affect identification or willingness to engage in collective action, but instead increased feelings of responsibility for one's own stigma. When individuals reveal their stigma, support was found for predictions derived from the rejection-identification model. Then, *Diane Quinn* (University of Connecticut) presented a general model of concealed stigma. Data from individuals with concealed stigmatized identities (mental illness, eating disorders, substance abuse) highlight the critical role of identity centrality and concerns with social devaluation in predicting psychological distress. *Tamar Saguy* (University of Connecticut) examined the objectification of women as a form of stigma. Research found that, when objectified, women (but not men) were less focused on their own subjective experience relative to the partner's and were less self-assertive. These effects were particularly pronounced when women expected to interact with men. The final talk of the symposium was given by ***Sonia Kang*** (University of Toronto) who presented a neuropsychological perspective on stigma and self-control. Using electroencephalography techniques and a stereotype threat paradigm, her research demonstrated the neural mechanism through which stigma depletes self-control. Coping with stereotype threat not only disrupted test performance, but also depleted self-control resources.

Taken together, the symposium was a thorough success. While there was clearly a common theme throughout the symposium, the talks were also characterised by great variability in theoretical perspectives, samples, and methodologies. As such there was room for much debate, including discussions about the very definition of identity and identification and the role of politics in 'objective' science. Collectively the research gave great insight into the targets' perspective, whilst avoiding blaming the victim.

Michelle Ryan

Small Group Meeting on Group Processes and Self-Regulation

At Oud-Poelgeest Castle, Leiden, The Netherlands, August 29-31 2007

Organisers: K. Jonas, K. Sassenberg & D. Scheepers

The EAESP small group meeting on Group Processes and Self-Regulation aimed to bring together both early-career and well established researchers to exchange ideas and perspectives. This meeting comes at a time when self-regulation processes are a very active research topic in social psychology, at both an individual and group level. Three broad areas of motivation were addressed: developments in Regulatory Focus theory (e.g. Higgins 1997), how varying types of threats (both in terms of motivation and identity threat) affect behaviour, and recent developments in automatic self-regulation.

The aim of the meeting was to combine breadth and focus: Talks on a variety of areas were followed by lengthy discussion. The format (30 minute talks followed by up to twenty minutes of discussion) worked well, allowing in-depth feedback and, at times, wide-ranging discussion. A total of 15 delegates from universities in five countries on both sides of the Atlantic met to present their recent research. The meeting which had 25 participants in total took place in Oud Poelgeest Castle in Leiden.

Although only five minutes from Leiden city centre, the 10 hectares of woodland it is situated in made it feel a million miles from the bustle of the 15th century town. The name of the meeting room – the ‘weapons room’ – provoked some speculation to the fate of those giving poor presentations, but fortunately this was not a problem!

The first day of the meeting focussed upon regulatory focus theory. Steven Stroessner gave the opening talk, discussing how prevention focussed individuals, often presumed to be more conservative than those in promotion focus, can actually engage in more risky behaviour – if it fulfils the prevention strategy of vigilance. Geoffrey Leonardelli’s talk on regulatory focus and social comparisons both introduced methods not regularly utilised by social psychologists (the ‘ring-test of social value orientation’; Liebrand, 1984) and presented a new slant on group interdependence. Krispijn Faddegon continued the discussion of regulatory focus by exploring how the nature of tasks (conjunctive or disjunctive) affected focus, presenting data suggesting disjunctive tasks lead to promotion focus, and conjunctive to prevention. Naomi Ellemers discussed how regulatory focus could be applied to group level phenomena – particularly in the context of organisations.

The following two talks both addressed how regulatory focus affected intra-group processes. Both Christina Matschke & Floor Rink discussed reactions to newcomers in groups. Christina discussed how new group members respond when they fail to be accepted – arguing that newcomers with an approach orientation respond to failure with increased behavioural engagement. Floor presented data suggesting group members in a promotion focus were more receptive to information presented by newcomers than those in a prevention focus, but those in a promotion focus accepted newcomers less willingly.

The final session of the first day comprised of presentations by Andy Woltin and Russell Spears. Andy argued that group members with high group identity showed adaptive group control. Russell discussed group-based emotions, focussing on situations in which high levels of ingroup identity were, somewhat counterintuitively, linked to lower group based feelings of guilt and other emotions.

On day two of the meeting, Martijn van Zomeren opened by discussing how state orientation increases observers' identifications with victims of random violence. The following two talks focussed upon threat – Natascha de Hoog discussed how identity threat affect perceptions, presenting data suggesting that group members who face identity threat process information in a biased manner. An interesting discussion about one of Natascha's findings – that some groups did not prefer to be distinctive - developed as a result of this. Daniel Frings outlined how motivational states of challenge and threat affected response to ingroup deviance, arguing that effective social support could lead to a challenge response, and high task demands to threat. Roger Giner-Sorolla outlined research investigating the effects of subliminal priming of self-conscious emotions on prejudice reduction – showing that priming of guilt led to higher implicit and explicit self-regulation of bias.

The final three talks of the meeting presented research on the automaticity of behaviours and evaluations related to groups and self-regulation. Kai Jonas presented compelling data arguing that different motivational goals (such as security or justice) could activate different behaviours (such as neglect or punishment). Jeff Sherman then discussed the relationship between early attentional control and internal motivation to control prejudice. Finally, Frank Wieber presented data suggesting that implementation intentions can over-generalise in a group setting, creating both positive and negative behaviours.

Overall the meeting provided an excellent forum for discussion and the chance for researchers in the broad area of self-regulation and motivation to meet and exchange ideas. The limited number of talks and delegates allowed plenty of time for discussion both during presentation sessions and during breaks. Thanks to (in no particular order) Kai J. Jonas, Kai Sassenberg & Daan Scheepers for organising the meeting, and the *EAESP* for funding it!

By Daniel Frings

Small Group Meeting on Shared Memories, Shared Beliefs: The Formation and Use of Joint Representations in Social Interaction

At Hotel Astoria, Rapallo, Italy, September 23-26, 2007

Organisers: G. Echterhoff, A.E. Clark, A. Memon, G.R. Semin

In recent years, interest in the joint or socially shared nature of individuals' representations has surged in experimental social psychology (e.g., Clark & Kashima, in press; Echterhoff, Higgins, Kopietz & Groll, in press; Hardin & Higgins, 1996; Lyons & Kashima, 2003; Sinclair, Huntsinger, Skorinko, & Hardin, 2005; Smith & Semin, 2007); and other related fields, such as memory (Cuc, Koppel & Hirst, 2007; Gabbert, Memon, & Allan, 2003; Hirst & Manier, 2002), cognition (e.g., Barsalou et al., 2003; Prinz, 2002; Sebanz, Bekkering & Knoblich, 2006), psycholinguistics (e.g., Pickering & Garrod, 2004, and social neuroscience (e.g., Cacioppo & Berntson, 2004; Gallese, Keysers, & Rizzolatti, 2003). Across these domains, there is an increasing body of evidence on how people are influenced by interaction and communication with others or by the broader social context when they form their own views and beliefs about the world and themselves, and when they remember past experiences. Clearly, these interests resonate with accounts emphasizing the role of interpersonal processes in how people form and construe their perceptions, beliefs, judgments, and impressions that have been foundational themes throughout the history of social psychology (e.g., Asch, 1952; Festinger, 1950; Heider, 1958; Mead, 1934; Moscovici, 1981; Schachter, 1959; Sherif, 1936). The more recent approaches can be seen as continuing these traditional trajectories, with new methodologies, novel conceptual tools, and discipline-specific goals.

The small group meeting brought together 26 participants from different European countries, the United States and Australia, among them senior scientists, early career researchers, and doctoral students, with curiosity and expertise in this field to exchange ideas and to work towards an integrated outlook from a primarily social-psychological perspective. The presentations at the meeting focused on shared processes in social cognition (e.g., forming beliefs and judgments about others and oneself;

construing information in communication) and on the shared character of memory and remembering. A chief goal was to improve the understanding of antecedents, processes, pathways and consequences of sharing representations, beliefs, and memories. The discussions revealed lines of enquiry, which dovetail social-psychological research with approaches in the neighbouring areas, inspiring new collaborations between the participants.

The meeting started with an informal reception at the Hotel Astoria on late Sunday afternoon. Most participants joined this reception to catch up with old colleagues or to get to know some new ones. Afterwards, the group went to a nearby cosy Italian restaurant to savor the local food and drinks. The opening of the scientific part of the meeting took place at Monday morning with Gerald Echterhoff providing an introduction to the topic and suggesting some distinctions to organize the different approaches conceptually, such as different meanings of sharing, different pathways to shared representations, and online vs. offline processes through which shared representations can be achieved. After a short review of existing literature, he summarized the goals of the meeting and provided some examples of pertinent phenomena and approaches.

In the first individual presentation, Bill Hirst (New School for Social Research, New York) showed how a speaker can shape a listener's memory, not only by adding but also by omitting information in a conversation. Gerald Echterhoff continued by giving an overview over recent findings on shared reality in communication effects on memory. After the first coffee break, Alison Ledgerwood (New York University) presented recent research done with Yacoov Trope on attitude alignment as a function of construing information in abstract versus concrete ways. Providing another stimulating perspective on construal processes, Anna Clark (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam) argued that construal level should be examined in the context in which it is functional and adaptive. She presented work conducted with Gün Semin showing that construal level depends on the conversational relevance, which is determined jointly by communicator and recipient. As on the next three days, the group had lunch at a nice nearby restaurant with the opportunity to continuing discussion about the shared research interests. Some of us had to learn the

hard way that Italians always serve a first course containing (almost too much) delicious pasta.

In the second afternoon session of the first day, Giovanna Leone (University of Rome "La Sapienza") presented results of experiments in which she applied classical conformity paradigms (e.g., Asch, 1951) to explore the social construction of subjective confidence about true and false memories. Eva Walther (University of Trier) further pursued the processes underlying memory conformity. She presented studies that examine the role of mortality salience, surprise, and attributional focus, specifically whether the surprising violation of an expectation often inherent in the observation of a criminal act increases the need to explain the event which in turn enhances social influence. In the following talk, Torun Lindholm (Stockholm University) presented findings from recent studies investigating whether conformity effects in eyewitness memory are moderated by knowledge of the effects of a crime and stereotypical appearance of a suspect.

In the last session of the day, Antonietta Curci (University of Bari) presented studies on the pathways leading to flashbulb memories, focusing on emotional and social processes. Findings from experimental and correlational studies, including latent variable models, revealed significant connections between individual and social dimensions of memory. The last speaker of Day 1, Hartmut Blank (University of Portsmouth), presented an integrative model on social memory, which is designed to bridge the gap between approaches to individual and collective memory and allow social psychological analysis of remembering. After this first long day, it was a pleasure to take a walk to a nearby Trattoria and enjoy Ligurian cuisine for dinner in a relaxed atmosphere.

The first talk on the second day was given by Simone Schütz-Bosbach (Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Leipzig), focusing on shared representations of actions and bodies and the consequences for self-recognition from a neuropsychological perspective. Continuing along these lines, Anne Springer (Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Leipzig) talked about action simulation and presented research disentangling semantic and non-semantic functions in simulating other's behavior. After a short coffee

break, Kim Peters (University of Exeter) reported some of her findings on shaping the social triad of narrator, audience, and the social target with emotion sharing. She argued that emotional sharing can strengthen relationships and can have far reaching social consequences. Terri Conley (University of Missouri) spoke about how cognitive accessibility of the O.J. Simpson trial regulates interpersonal and inter-ethnic relationships and provided data from three experiments that were conducted within the period of ten years showing the stability of her findings.

After the lunch break Lucia Mannetti (University of Rome La Sapienza) talked about group members' reactions toward defection. She showed that confidence in the group and a high shared reality with group members can compensate the threat that defectors pose to the group. Mirosław Kofta (Warsaw University) completed Tuesday's speaker list with his view of what happens when belief is questioned. He put emphasis to the impact of low consensus information on judgments about social groups. For Tuesday's dinner we rented three minibus-taxis to get up to a restaurant called *U Giancu*. It was truly remarkable place with world famous cartoonists' original drawings all over the walls and extraordinary food, wine, and grappa.

On the third day, Tory Higgins (Columbia University) joined the ranks and chaired the first three presentations. René Kopietz (University of Bielefeld) drew attention to how communication goals determine audience tuning biases memory, arguing that the findings of two studies rule out self-inference processes as a potential alternative to a shared-reality account of saying-is-believing effects on memory. Jens Hellmann (University of Aberdeen) continued with data from two experiments highlighting the role of uncertainty as a precondition for audience tuning effects on memory. Boyka Bratanova (University of Melbourne) presented her findings on the role of shared reality and perceived consensus according to audience tuning effects on memory and subsequent communication. In her studies she investigated the Saying is Believing effect and implemented a second audience.

Starting the second session of the third day, Adrian Bangerter (University of Neuchâtel) talked about his research on vertical vs. horizontal transitions and linked them to his perspective on how shared

representations are created, updated and used in the coordination of task-related conversations. Following that, Per Hedberg (Columbia University, relocating to Stockholm) shifted the focus back to the saying-is-believing Paradigm and presented work he has previously conducted with Tory Higgins that treated effects of social verification on memory and social coordination.

After Wednesday's shorter lunch – due to the extended discussion following the previous talks – Olivier Klein (Université Libre de Bruxelles) started off and gave his definition of common ground as shared reality minus social verification. He specified the role of personal common ground in stereotype communication. Given the honour of being the last speaker of the meeting, Yoshi Kashima (University of Melbourne) provided the small group with illuminating perspectives on relations between speech act, social structuration, and cultural dynamics.

The formal part of the meeting ended with a general discussion. The participants talked about the meeting's topic of shared memories and shared beliefs and made strides at integrating different approaches. Differences and similarities between *shared reality* and *common ground* were discussed. Participants came to the conclusion that common ground is an agreement about a *referent* of a target whereas shared reality is an agreement about the *reference* of a target.

After the concluding session we seamlessly switched from a formal to an informal setting, working on our appetite with some rounds of table soccer and, finally, ending the day at another fine Trattoria. The general resonance was that the meeting has been intellectually stimulating, productive in terms of exchange and fostering collaborations, and greatly enjoyable. All this would not have been possible without the generous funding from the EAESP that was much appreciated by both organizers and the participants.

Jens H. Hellmann, René Kopietz & Gerald Echterhoff

References

- Asch, S. E. (1951). Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgements. In H. S. Guetzkow (Ed.), *Groups, leadership and men*. Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Press.

- Asch, S. E. (1952). *Social psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Barsalou, L. W., Niedenthal, P. M., Barbey, A., & Ruppert, J. (2003). Social embodiment. In B. Ross (Ed.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 43, pp. 43-92). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Cacioppo, J. T., & Berntson, G. G. (Eds.). (2004). *Key readings in social neuroscience*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Clark, A. E., & Kashima, Y. (in press). Stereotypes help people connect with others in the community: A situated functional analysis of the stereotype consistency bias in communication. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
- Cuc, A., Koppel, J., & Hirst, W. (2007). Silence is not golden: A case for socially-shared retrieval induced forgetting. *Psychological Science, 18*, 727-733.
- Echterhoff, G., Higgins, E. T., Kopietz, R., & Groll, S. (in press). How communication goals determine when audience tuning biases memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*.
- Festinger, L. (1950). Informal social communication. *Psychological Review, 57*, 271-282.
- Forgas, J. P., & Williams, K. D. (Eds.). (2001). *Social influence: Direct and indirect processes*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Gabbert, F., Memon, A. & Allan, K. (2003). Memory Conformity: Can eyewitnesses influence each other's memories for an event? *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 17*, 533-544.
- Gallese, V., Keysers, C., & Rizzolatti, G. (2004). A unifying view of the basis of social cognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 8*, 396-403.
- Hardin, C. D. & Higgins, E. T. (1996). Shared reality: How social verification makes the subjective objective. In R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition: The interpersonal context* (Vol. 3, pp. 28-84). New York: Guilford Press.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hirst, W., & Manier, D. (2002). The diverse forms of collective memory. In G. Echterhoff & M. Saar (Eds.), *Kontexte und Kulturen des Erinnerns [Contexts and cultures of remembering]* (pp. 37-58). Constance, Germany: UVK.

- Lyons, A., & Kashima, Y. (2003). How are stereotypes maintained through communication? The influence of stereotype sharedness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 989-1005.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Moscovici, S. (1981). On social representations. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.), *Social cognition: Perspectives on everyday understanding* (pp. 181-210). London: Academic Press.
- Pickering, M. J., & Garrod, S. (2004) Toward a mechanistic psychology of dialogue. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 27*, 169-225.
- Prinz, W. (2002). Experimental approaches to imitation. In A. N. Meltzoff & W. Prinz (Eds.), *The imitative mind: Development, evolution, and brain bases* (pp. 143-162). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schachter, S. (1959). *The psychology of affiliation: Experimental studies of the sources of gregariousness*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Sebanz, N., Bekkering, H., & Knoblich, G. (2006). Joint action: Bodies and minds moving together. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 10*, 70-76.
- Sherif, M. (1936). *The psychology of social norms*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Sinclair, S., Huntsinger, J., Skorinko, J. & Hardin, C.D. (2005). Social tuning of the self: Consequences for the self-evaluations of stereotype targets, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*, 160 – 175.
- Smith, E. R., & Semin, G. R. (2007). Situated social cognition. *Current Directions on Psychological Science, 16*, 132-135.

News about Members**In Memoriam: Friedrich Försterling**

Yet again it has been shown that personal decency, dignity, and integrity do not prevent the call of early death. On August 6, 2007, at the age of only 54 years, Friedrich W. Försterling, our friend of personal decency, dignity, and integrity, lost his life to the cancer he had been bravely fighting for almost two years -- so bravely that only his closest confidants were aware of his physical suffering, which was fought by psychological acceptance and a focus on the positive. Few also recognized his final celebrations of life, or knew of his careful planning with his wife, Beate Schuster, to care for their beloved children, Marlene, age 9, and Hannah, age 7.

Friedrich was born in Braunschweig, Germany on January 25, 1953. There he attended the Martino Katharineum Gymnasium. He was then trained in psychology at the Universities of Graz and Salzburg in Austria, receiving his Ph.D. from the University of Salzburg in 1977. During this academic period, Friedrich developed his interests in attribution theory and cognitive behavior modification. To further his expertise in these areas, he pursued advanced training as a Postdoctoral Scholar for two years, first in 1977 at the University of California, Los Angeles, where he studied with Bernard Weiner, as well as with Harold Kelley, and subsequently at the Institute for Rational Emotive Therapy in New York, where he received clinical supervision under the direction of Albert Ellis. These experiences provided the foundation for Friedrich's conviction that attribution theory could be a key element in cognitive behavior modification. In many of his later publications, Friedrich documented the close relation between these two areas of psychology in his insightful clinical formulation of attribution retraining.

When Friedrich returned to Germany in 1979, he acquired a position as "Wissenschaftlicher Assistent" (Lecturer) in the Department of Psychology at the University of Bielefeld, under the direction of Wulf-Uwe Meyer.

This eventuated in the completion of the “Habilitation” degree in psychology in 1986 from the University of Bielefeld. His academic pursuits eventually lead him to accept a Professorship of Social and Organizational Psychology at the Pädagogische Hochschule Erfurt, Germany. Finally, three years later, in 1996, his academic search was completed as he moved to the Department of Psychology at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Germany, where he held the position of a Professor of General Psychology. This proved to be the ideal appointment, for Friedrich loved his job, the social excitement in Munich, and the melding of family and academic life.

Friedrich’s research career was exemplary in that he extensively, published in the best American and German journals, including the *American Psychologist*, *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, the *Psychological Bulletin*, and others. Among his nearly 80 publications, Friedrich leaves many contributions to clinical, cognitive, and social psychology. This broad focus included advances in our understanding of covariation-based inferences, the role of realism and rationality in attribution-guided change programs, and the functionality of emotional reactions. At the time of his death, he was branching still further, extending his research to incorporate ideas from evolutionary psychology. Friedrich had the knack of doing the right research study at the right time.

Friedrich will be deeply missed by his family, which includes his mother and sister as well as Beate and his two children, and by his colleagues and students. He also has left a void in the lives of these two writers, who remember his kindness, creativity, and good humor.

Wulf-Uwe Meyer, Bernard Weiner

In Memoriam: Carl Friedrich Graumann

The loss of the great scholar Carl Friedrich Graumann, who passed away this year in his home near Heidelberg, has left an enormous gap in European social psychology. There was hardly another researcher in his generation who surveyed, reflected, considered, and was able in his publications, lectures, speeches and statements to analytically argue the history of his subject, the various problem perspectives that it addresses, as well as its methods and theoretical approaches, thereby at all times being able to access this body and to build up his own ideas and thoughts on the foundation that it provided.

The standards he set for psychology were high and, indeed, practically extreme, because he expected the subject to be the academic discipline that combines the assumption of an intentional – person-environment relationship with the various modalities involved in having a position on anything. As he saw it, these modalities incorporated purely intellectual, cognitive, and emotional states and processes as well as practical activities and actions of a subject incarnately understood in its social and historical dimension. This view of psychology was unable to assert itself, and was and still is, after all, only shared by very few of us, thus remaining unfulfilled to this very day. Carl Graumann repeatedly bemoaned the constrictions he found in object definitions. He would scoff and taunt that a blinkered view, particularly apparent in the historical representation of social psychology, was the rule, that mutual ignorance was the characteristic feature of the representatives of various directions and schools. In many of his articles, he critically analysed and appraised what he considered to be unacceptable constraints imposed even on questions of a theoretical nature, and especially so in social psychology. "The individualization of the social and the desocialization of the individual," "Die Scheu des Psychologen von der Interaktion – Ein Schisma und seine Geschichte," or "Psychology: Humanistic or human?" are all works that give expression to this conflict.

Carl Graumann was, as he himself stated, nobody's pupil. Nor had he, for that matter, founded any school. He chose to call himself a maverick, an outsider, who did not bear the mark of any school of thought. He refused

to allow himself to be monopolised, nor did he seek to monopolise others. His intention was to see psychology in a critical comparison between competing schools, to neither understand them as dedicated to the scientific paradigm nor to the humanistic tradition, that was the agenda, and the establishment of true human science was his goal. He considered scholarship, humanity and political steadfastness to be the desirable and central virtues of psychologists in academia. And he understood these characteristics to be closely connected with a commitment to theoretical and methodological pluralism. His path into psychology was just as unconventional as it was enlightening for those wishing to grasp the positions that he later took on questions relating to the philosophy of science and methodology. As a member of the German Africa Corps, he was, at the age of 19, taken prisoner in El Alamein. Later, in 1942/1943, he found himself in a prisoner of war camp in Canada, where he took up the opportunity to study psychology in a correspondence course. It is possible to follow how he sought to understand human experience and behaviour and, consequently, developed the need for systematic behavioural observation and appraisal, as well as the need to pursue psychology from various theoretical standpoints in order to even only approximately do justice to the complexity of the subject.

After returning to Germany, he continued his studies in psychology, began his career in academia, and was, in 1963, appointed to the first Chair of Psychology in Heidelberg, the only such one at the time, where he engaged in research and teaching until 1991. He turned down various offers of appointments, and concentrated on establishing and expanding the Institute of Psychology and on developing the research programme that he had established on the foundation of four core topics: perspectivity in cognition and communication, the role that language plays for psychology, the ecology of human experience and behaviour, and the historicity of human experience and psychological perception. Often working together with his staff, he carried out his own research on these chief topics and developed many contacts within the field of psychology as well as with philosophers, linguists and sociologists, always with the intention of adequately considering the differing perspectives of the subject that he sought to explain and understand. His linguistic-psychological studies, which were mainly undertaken in the research group and in the later Collaborative Research Centre on "Language and

Situation", served as an expression of his willingness and, yes, even of his passion for debate and collaboration with others.

His critical attitude and his dislike of any kind of monopolisation did not prevent him from campaigning for strengthening the position of social psychology as an independent discipline within psychology. In 1970, he founded the "Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie" together with Hubert Feger, Martin Irle and Klaus Holzkamp, and was later one of the founders of the Wilhelm-Wundt-Gesellschaft. His work on interaction and communication, on trait, on the perception and appraisal of people are standard texts that generations of students have read and learnt from.

Sooner than others, he recognised the significance of international contacts, certainly inspired by his work at the New School for Social Research in New York or as Directeur d'Etudes at the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme in Paris. In 2004, the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Psychologie awarded him a prize for his life work in science and research.

The secret of his effect on others and on all of his surroundings was, as far as those who knew him more closely are concerned, associated with three outstanding characteristics. One of these was his joie de vivre, his zest for life, his Lebensfreude.

With an irrepressible joy of things, of the beautiful, the absurd, the comical and the witty, of the inconspicuous and unobtrusive things, he absorbed reality, always open, always willing for new experiences and adventures. Over many years, he would, every Friday, buy flowers from the market woman on Heidelberg's Ebertplatz. Masses of flowers, in most cases more than he could actually carry, which is why he often had go three or four times, or had to recruit the assistance of his wife; flowers in the brightest colours and wonderful, beautiful arrangements. Indeed, he would be as pleased as Punch with his flowers. It is with this joy of life that he also addressed psychological questions. He was interested, wanted to know what others had thought and said about these, and wanted to continue carrying this knowledge and insight forward.

Always making personally sure that diverging theories on the same data fit and that a theoretical approach could be variously interpreted. The world

had not been completely catalogued and made generally accessible in some kind of absolute knowledge, of that he was sure. Lebensfreude and inquisitiveness, liking to glance across the fence, a practically inexhaustible passion of and joy for grasping and comprehending the complexity of the psychical. He combined and incorporated this passion with an impressive workload. His never-ending capacity for work seems to me to be the second characteristic that distinguished his work and vocation. It was with great persistency that he addressed the questions that preoccupied him so fully. Intensive concept analysis and extensive reading helped him to prepare his own perspective of the problem.

And the third characteristic was his tolerance. All who worked with and for him know what is meant here. Graumann never raised the quasi divine claim that his pupils and disciples wanted to create after his image. He let his staff develop their own perspectives, did not lead them into the "mainstream", and found a real and absolute and pleasure in unusual topics and exotic questions.

His tolerance towards others, his abhorrence of any kind dogmatism did not mean that he accepted everything. No, it was once again a pleasure, passion and joy for him to rattle the sabres in a debate and to compete for the best reasons and the better justification of his own conception and outlook, and, as far as possible, to win the day, as well. We are grateful to him for everything that we were able to learn from him.

We will miss him!

Margaret Wintermantel

New Members of the Association

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

Full Membership

Dr. Giulio BOCCATO

Verona, Italy

(D. Capozza, J.-P. Leyens)

Dr. Martin BRUDER

Cardiff, UK

(G. Haddock, T. Manstead)

Dr. Christopher COHRS

Jena, Germany

(K. Jonas, A. Mummendey)

Dr. Juliane DEGNER

Saarbrücken, Germany

(T. Meiser, D. Wentura)

Dr. Markus DENZLER

Bremen, Germany

(J. Förster, U. Kühnen)

Dr. Belle DERKS

Amsterdam, The Netherlands

(N. Ellemers, C. van Laar)

Dr. Miguel FARIAS

Oxford, UK

(M. Lalljee, B. Parkinson)

Dr. Adam GRABOWSKI

Olsztyn, Poland

(M. Diehl, P. Brömer)

Dr. Ronni GREENWOOD

Dundee, UK

(N. Hopkins, R. Spears)

Dr. Tobias GREITEMEYER

Munich, Germany

(R. Kerschreiter, D. Frey)

Dr. Natalie HALL

Reading, UK

(R. Hutter, R. Crisp)

Dr. Jochim HANSEN

Basel, Switzerland

(A. Florak, M. Wänke)

Dr. Wilhelm HOFMANN,

Würzburg, Germany

(F. Strack, M. Schmitt)

Dr. Inga JASINSKAJA-LAHTI
Helsinki, Finland
(K. Liebkind, K. Helkama)

Dr. Nils JOSTMANN
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(G. Semin, S. Koole)

Franciska KRINGS
Lausanne, Switzerland
(E. Green, L.-E. Petersen)

Dr. Jean-Baptiste LÉGAL
Nanterre, France
(A. Mignon, D. Muller)

Dr. Angela MAITNER
Canterbury, UK
(T. Garcia-Marques, R. Crisp)

Dr. Katja MIERKE
Köln, Germany
(K.C. Klauer, R. Spears)

Dr. Loran NORDGREN
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(J. van der Pligt, F. van
Harreveld)

Dr. Katharina SCHMID
Oxford, UK
(M. Lalljee, M. Hewstone)

Dr. Beate SEIBT
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(F. Strack, T. Schubert)

Dr. Maciek SEKERDEJ
Krakow, Poland
(M. Kossowska, J. Valencia)

Dr. Alexa SPENCE
Cardiff, UK
(G. Maio, R. Eiser)

Dr. Ayse USKUL
Essex, UK
(J. Keller, N. Geeraert)

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

Affiliate Membership

Dr. Aarti IYER
Queensland, Australia
(A. Haslam, R. Spears)

Ruth MAYO
Jerusalem, Israel
(F. Strack, C. de Dreu)

Postgraduate Membership

Alexios ARVANITIS
Athens, Greece
(A. Hantzi, F. Kokkinaki)

Edwin J. BOEZEMAN
Leiden, The Netherlands
(E. van Dijk, N. Ellemers)

Mhairi BOWE
Dundee, UK
(F. Sani, N. Hopkins)

Julien CHAPPÉ
Nanterre, France
(P. Chekroun, B. Sanitioso)

Jan CRUSIUS
Kölm, Germany
(T. Mussweiler, K. Corcoran)

Andrea DAY
Exeter, UK
(T. Morton, T. Postmes)

Susanne DE WIT
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(K. van den Bos, R. Spears)

Tracy EPTON
Sheffield, UK
(T. Webb, P. Harris)

Jennifer FEHR
Groningen, The Netherlands
(K. Sassenberg, S. Otten)

Ophélie GILLIÉRON
Lausanne, Switzerland
(F. Butera, E. Green)

Anne-Sophie HAYEK
Lausanne, Switzerland
(F. Butera, P. Chekroun)

Atilla HÖFLING
Würzburg, Germany
(R. Deutsch, F. Strack)

Ludivine HUDAVERDIAN
Boulogne, France
(S. Krauth-Gruber, E. Drozda-Senkowska)

Robert KORDTS
Würzburg, Germany
(R. Deutsch, F. Strack)

Regina KRIEGLMEYER
Würzburg, Germany
(R. Deutsch, F. Strack)

Toon KUPPENS
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
(V. Yzerbyt, S. Demoulin)

Gerben LANGENDIJK
Heerlen, The Netherlands
(M. van Dijke, J. Syroit)

Tuuli Anna MÄHÖNEN
Helsinki, Finland
(K. Liebkind, K. Helkama)

Petra MARKEL
Würzburg, Germany
(F. Strack, K. Epstude)

Jessanne MASTOP
Leiden, The Netherlands
(M. Stel, E. van Dijk)

Christina MATSCHKE
Groningen, The Netherlands
(K. Sassenberg, S. Otten)

Jennifer MAYER
Köln, Germany
(T. Mussweiler, L. Werth)

Fergus NEVILLE
St. Andrews, UK
(M. Farr, S. Reicher)

David NOVELLI
Brighton, UK
(J. Drury, C.W. Leach)

Mujde PEKER
Kent, UK
(R. Turner, R. Crisp)

Linh Lan PHAN
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(W. van Dijk, M. van Zomeren)

Caroline PULFREY
Lausanne, Switzerland
(F. Butera, C. Buchs)

Tania RAMOS
Lisbon, Portugal
(L. Garcia-Marques, T. Garcia-
Marques)

Tamar SAGUY
Connecticut, USA
(M. van Zomeren, N. Tausch)

Régis SCHEIDEGGER
Lausanne, Switzerland
(F. Butera, A. Clémence)

Iryna SEMKIV
Lviv, Ukraine
(M. Lewicka, B. Wojciszke)

Nelly SÉNAC
Lausanne, Switzerland
(E. Green, A. Clémence)

Aukje SJOERDSMA
Nijmegen, The Netherlands
(R. van Baaren, A. Dijksterhuis)

Anna STEIDLE
Chemnitz, Germany
(L. Werth, F. Strack)

Bapstite SUBRA
Grenoble, France
(D. Muller, C. Darnon)

Tinatin SURGULADZE
Tbilisi, Georgia
(M. Kossowska, M. Jarymowicz)

Nadzeya SVIRYDZENKA
Dundee, UK
(F. Sani, N. Hopkins)

Joseph SWEETMAN
Cardiff, UK
(R. Spears, T. Manstead)

Monika SZYSZKO
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Drogosz, J. Trzebinski)

Catia TEIXEIRA
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
(S. Demoulin, V. Yzerbyt)

Sascha TOPOLINSKI
Würzburg, Germany
(R. Deutsch, F. Strack)

Philippe TÜRK-PEREIRA
Würzburg, Germany
(R. Deutsch, F. Strack)

Inmaculada VALOR-SEGURA
Granada, Spain
(F. Expósito, M. Moya)

Juliet WAKEFIELD
Dundee, UK
(R. Spears, N. Hopkins)

Guillermo WILLIS
Granada, Spain
(M. Moya, R. Rodriguez Bailón)

Karl-Andrew WOLTIN
Jena, Germany
(K. Sassenberg, K. Jonas)

Oksana ZAKHARKO
Lviv, Ukraine
(M. Lewicka, B. Wojciszke)

Grants

Benôit Dompnier (postdoctoral travel grant)
Russell Hutter (seedcorn grant)
Krispijn Faddegon (postgraduate travel grant)
Suzanne Pieterma (postgraduate travel grant)
Martijn van Zomeren (postdoctoral travel grant)
Christina Zogmaister (seedcorn grant)

GRANT REPORTS**Virginie Bonnot**

(University René Descartes, Paris 5, France)

seedcorn grant

Relationships between men and women are still characterized by social, economical, and political inequalities. Data from diverse sources (e.g., Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, National French Institute of Statistical and Economical Studies) indicate, for instance, that women are underrepresented compared to men in scientific and technological fields, and that they are restricted to professional occupations requiring supposed feminine attributes (e.g., nurse). For these reasons, women are usually considered as a low status group compared to men. However, high status groups and low status groups both fail to recognize the arbitrary features of such discrimination founded on group belonging. System justification theories explain that such blindness results from the fact that people are motivated to “justify and rationalize the way things are, so that existing social arrangements are perceived as fair and legitimate, perhaps even natural and inevitable” (Jost & Hunyady, 2002, p.119). System justification may be defined as a “psychological process by which an individual perceive, understand and explain an existing situation or arrangement and whose result is this situation or arrangement maintenance” (Jost & Banaji, 1994). In system justification theory, the role of stereotypes is largely acknowledged. Indeed, stereotypes function like

essentialist instruments allowing inequalities justification and reinforcement (Jost & Banaji, 1994).

Stereotypes concerning competencies are equally susceptible to affect stereotyped individuals' performance and consequently to perpetuate social inequalities. Two theoretical perspectives may explain stereotypes' impact on performance. Traditionally, stereotype internalization hypothesis proposes that stigmatized individuals construe their self-concept of capacity based on competencies society requests them to have (e.g., Bonnot & Croizet, 2007; Eccles, Adler, Futterman, Goff, Kaczala, Meece, & Midgley, 1983). Those perceptions biased in a stereotyped way are likely to influence stigmatized individuals' performance. Consequently, performance differences between groups are no more considered as the expression of innate capabilities but as reflecting social constructions of self-representations in accordance with the stereotype. For instance, for women suffering from a stereotype supposing their relative incompetence in math domains compared to men, a situation in which their math performance is evaluated may lead to the activation of those negative stereotyped representations, and to women's underperformance (e.g., Bonnot & Croizet, 2007; Eccles et al., 1983). Recent studies acknowledge more specifically the very importance of evaluative situations in performance production. Stereotype threat hypothesis (Steele, 1997) postulates that evaluative situation activates interfering thoughts related to the stereotype (e.g., Iserman, Spencer, Davies, & Quinn, 2005) creating additional cognitive load undermining performance. Consequently, when placed in an evaluative situation in math, women underperform compared to men whereas they perform as well as men in non-evaluative situations (e.g., Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1999). Contrary to the traditional hypothesis, it is not necessary for women to internalize the math stereotype: the mere knowledge of the group's reputation is sufficient for the stereotype to deteriorate performance.

The consequence of such debilitating mechanisms from a system justification point of view is that underperformance obtained because of the stereotype existence allows, by a vicious circle, confirmation of the stereotype in others' and one's own eyes. Acknowledging the social consequences of stereotyping's influence on performance in terms of status quo maintenance, these two theoretical models (i.e., internalization

model and stereotype threat theory) do not however, take into account more global institutional influences such as legitimizing ideologies on performance (Deaux & LaFrance, 1998). We propose that stereotyping's effects on performance may be explained in a larger framework by the need people have to legitimate unequal social arrangements. Thus, the purpose of the research project conducted in collaboration with Dr. John Jost from New York University was to test the general hypothesis that stereotypes of incompetence influence identity construction and performance of stigmatized groups' members because of the need people have to justify existing social hierarchies and to maintain the status quo.

Results of one study show that legitimizing needs affect people's construction of their social and personal identity (i.e., their self-concept of capacity in the stereotyped domains and their perceptions of their social group's competencies), as well as their autobiographical memories. Indeed, when legitimizing needs were previously activated, women were found to report lower self-perceptions of competence in math than men but higher self-perceptions in verbal domains. Moreover, participants recalled SAT scores in math in accordance with the stereotype (i.e., women recalled lower scores than men) only when legitimizing needs were previously activated. It is also important to note that those results were obtained whatever people's legitimizing beliefs were (i.e., even if those individuals tended to justify the system rather weakly).

Another study was designed to test the hypothesis that stereotype threat effects would be revealed only when and because people need to legitimize the system. To this end, we used Kay, Jost & Young (2005)'s paradigm in which the status quo is threatened, leading to system justification. Results showed that math performance under stereotype threat could indeed vary depending on the salience of system justification needs in the situation. However, contrary to our expectations, stigmatized group members achieved higher performance in the stereotyped domain when the situation was threatening for their personal and group identity if the social arrangements were threatened (and consequently required to be legitimized). Thus, stereotype threat effects emerged when the system did not need to be justified (i.e., women underperformed when placed in a stereotype threatening condition compared to a non stereotype threatening condition) but disappeared when the system needed to be

justify (i.e., women in the stereotype threat condition performed better than when the system did not need to be justified). A potential explanation is that, when the status quo is threatened women grant more effort in the stereotype threat condition in order to demonstrate that the system in which they live is not as bad as it seems. Those results along with results of other studies which did not work out as expected, raised interesting discussion and new hypotheses which are going to be tested soon.

Nevertheless, our research shows the potential influence of structural phenomenon on a great array of cognitive processes. People's cognitive processing is not only conditioned by the knowledge they possess about themselves, their social group, or about the risk some situations create for their self- and group-image. It is also conditioned by larger social structures and by the necessity to legitimize their existence.

I would like to conclude by giving thanks to Dr. John Jost and his graduate students who gave me a very warm welcome at NYU. Those nine months working in his lab have been a great and inspiring experience. I also want to thank the EAESP for having contributed to this very important stage of my professional improvement.

References

- Bonnot, V., & Croizet, J.-C. (2007). Stereotype internalization and women's math performance: The role of interference in working memory. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43(6), 857-866.
- Deaux, K., & LaFrance, M. (1998). Gender. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.). *The handbook of social psychology*. (pp. 788-827). McGraw-Hill.
- Eccles-Parsons, J., Adler, T., Futterman, R., Goff, S. B., Kaczala, C. M., Meece, J. L., & Midgley, J. L. (1983). Expectations, values, and academic behaviors. In J. T. Spence (Ed.), *Perspective on achievement and achievement motivation* (pp. 75-146). San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- Iserman, E. C., Spencer, S. J., Davies, P. G., & Quinn, D.M. (2005). The perils of avoiding negative thoughts: thought suppression as a

mediator of stereotype threat. Manuscript submitted for publication.

- Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994): The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness, *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 1-27.
- Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2002). The psychology of system justification and the palliative function of ideology. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 13, 111-153.
- Kay, A. C., Jost, J.T., & Young, S. (2005). Victim derogation and victim enhancement as alternate routes to system justification. *Psychological Science*, 16(3), 240-246.
- Spencer, S. J., Steele, C. M., & Quinn, D. M. (1999). Stereotype threat and women's math performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35, 4-28.
- Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, 52(6), 613-629.

Martin Bruder

(Cardiff University, UK)

'Seedcorn Grant'

An EAESP postdoctoral 'seedcorn' research grant allowed me to spend two months at the School of Psychology at the University of Southampton during May and June 2007. The main goal of the visit was to run initial studies exploring the relationship between feelings of nostalgia and group-related variables such as ingroup identification, collective self-esteem, and ingroup bias. These preliminary findings will inform the formulation of larger grant proposals.

At the individual level, research by Wildschut, Sedikides, Arndt, and Routledge (2006) has demonstrated positive consequences of waxing nostalgic: Nostalgic participants reported increased positive self-regard and higher levels of positive affect. They also indicated a more secure attachment style and higher interpersonal competence. These latter findings hint at a buttressing and invigorating of social connectedness that

might also affect variables that characterise the relationship between individuals and their social groups. In close collaboration with Tim Wildschut and Constantine Sedikides, I conducted one experimental and one correlational study to clarify the effect of nostalgia on such group-related variables.

In our first experiment, 168 students at the University of Southampton reported either a nostalgic or a non-emotional event that they either had experienced in the company of other university students or in the context of people that had no connection to the university (e.g., family, hometown friends). Participants then indicated their level of identification with the university, their collective self-esteem, their loyalty to the group, and completed a measure assessing whether their attitudes towards the group were positively biased. For all dependent variables, a significant interaction between the two experimental factors (nostalgic vs. non-emotional memory, group-related vs. not group-related event) emerged, such that those in the group-related nostalgia condition showed the highest and those in the not group-related nostalgia condition showed the lowest levels of ingroup identification, collective self-esteem, loyalty, and positive ingroup bias. These findings suggest that nostalgia increases the identification of individuals with their social groups, but only if group-related memories are invoked.

In a second study, 172 teachers completed a questionnaire assessing their nostalgia proneness and their identification with their school. In addition, participants reported the job-related stress they experienced, their levels of burnout, their job satisfaction, and their physical and psychological fitness for the job. The results showed no relationship between the tendency to engage in nostalgic thought and group identification. Also, in contrast to our hypotheses, the data revealed positive correlations between nostalgia proneness and teachers' experiences of stress and burnout. However, nostalgia proneness had some positive effect in that it predicted increased self-reported fitness for the job over and above the contribution of the other variables. This study demonstrated that the effects of (chronic) nostalgia proneness might be quite different from those of a discrete nostalgic episode. More research is needed to disentangle the causes and consequences of nostalgia in such an occupational setting.

Apart from producing interesting results in their own right, the studies will substantiate a proposal for a larger grant that we are planning to compile. In addition, further studies investigating the relationship between nostalgia and group-related variables are in preparation. I am very much looking forward to continuing the collaboration with Tim and Constantine whom I would like to thank for all their input to the common project.

The inaugural session of the Southampton Symposium of Self and Identity (SSSI) concluded my visit in Southampton. Antony Manstead gave the keynote speech on "Language, social identity, and political attitudes." Other speakers included Helga Dittmar, Matthew Hornsey, Colin Leach, Patricia Rodriguez Mosquera, Adam Rutland, Michelle Ryan, Simine Vazire, and myself. As intended by the organisers the symposium was characterised by a relaxed and personal atmosphere and helpful feedback from the audience.

This visit has been an exciting encounter with what must be one of the most stimulating and friendly social psychology research groups far and wide. The projects and collaborations, and, I hope, the friendships that we have developed will last beyond the visit itself. I am grateful to the EAESP for providing financial support for this learning opportunity and to Sibylle Classen for her friendly assistance and patience throughout. Also, I would like to very much thank everyone in Southampton who was involved in my visit.

Reference

- Wildschut, T., Sedikides, C., Arndt, J., & Routledge, C. (2006). Nostalgia: Content, triggers, functions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*(5), 975-993.

Marcin Bukowski

(Jagellonian University Krakow, Poland)

*seedcorn grant*¹

Project title: Selective Gender Stereotype Activation as Determined by Task Context and Interpersonal Goals

Thanks to the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology I received a Seedcorn Grant and could carry out a research project on selective activation of gender stereotypical information. The research was carried out between February and May 2007 in cooperation with Professor Miguel Moya at the University of Granada.

The inspiration for our research was the current state of art in the debate on conditional and malleable nature of stereotype activation processes. We can observe that on the one hand, a wide range of social motives and interpersonal goals efficiently constrain the automatic activation of stereotypical traits (Kunda & Spencer, 2003). Whereas on the other hand, contextual variables, such as processing objectives or background information from the picture on which a stereotyped target is presented, also successfully prevented the activation of stereotypical associations (for a review: Blair, 2002). Although the pool of proof for conditional stereotype activation is still growing, not many attempts have been done to draw links between motivational and contextual factors, and to study how they function together in a more complex social interaction setting. We assumed that a joint impact of interpersonal goals (such as cooperation or competition) and task context (performance on an analytical or emotional skills task) might manifest itself in different activation patterns of traits, which are stereotypically prescribed to a target person. We assumed further on that this type of goal and context dependency of stereotypical representations would be in line with theories that emphasise a greater flexibility of the trait activation processes (Smith & Zarate, 1990; Kunda & Thagard, 1996).

¹ a wrong version of the seedcorn grant report had been published by error in the last issue of the Bulletin (19,2)

In order to test these general assumptions, we designed and run a set of two studies, in which a multiple categorizable person (female computer science student) was said to be the co-operator or competitor of the participant, while performing an analytical reasoning skills task. In a second study, we kept the same type of goal manipulations but placed the participants in a different, emotional skills task context. In line with research that shows motivated activation of trait information depending on the current motivational state of the target person (Sinclair, & Kunda, 1999), we predicted a selective pattern of activation vs. inhibition of traits, stereotypical for the female computer scientist.

In the first study we assumed, that when the participants are asked to perform a task that requires analytical reasoning skills, in cooperation with a female computer scientist, then the computer scientist traits should be activated (increasing this way the chances to perform well) and the female stereotype inhibited as irrelevant for the successful task completion. The reverse pattern was expected in the competition condition (inhibition for computer scientist and activation for traditionally female traits).

The participants were told that they would perform a test in groups of two persons and their goal was to beat the other group by performing well on a higher number of tasks. The groups were chosen randomly and they were not able to see the cooperator or the competitor because they performed the task beforehand. Following this instruction the participants were given 5 minutes to solve an analytical reasoning test. After completing the test subjects were shown a description of their virtual partner or competitor. The target person was a female computer science student, so two different kinds of stereotypes could be activated: either the warmth-related, traditional female stereotype or alternatively, the more competence-related computer scientist stereotype. Two groups of traits were pre-tested and selected as word material for the Lexical Decision Test (LDT). The participants were asked to perform a LDT which was used as a measure of the relative activation for both types of stereotypical traits. The main dependent measure in this study was the mean reaction time taken by the participants to classify the computer scientist vs. female stereotypical traits as words or non-words.

In line with our assumptions, we found significantly faster RTs for female traits than computer scientist traits in competition condition. In other words, when the participants competed on the analytical task with a female computer scientist, they tended to perceive her more in terms of her female attributes. However, we did not find the reverse pattern in the cooperation condition, that is, faster RTs for computer scientist traits than female attributes. Still, when we compare the activation level of female stereotypic traits between the cooperation and competition condition, we can observe a much lower activation level in the cooperation settings for this type of traits. In sum, we found a partial confirmation of the hypothesis that assumed a selective activation of computer scientist or female traits within goal conditions, because only the competition setting facilitated the female stereotypic characteristics of the target person.

In the second study we introduced a different type of task context in which the participants were asked to perform an emotional skills task in cooperation or competition with a female computer science student. We assumed here, that the emotional context should lead to a reversal of the predictions outlined for the analytical context, i.e. in the cooperation condition more female related traits should be activated, whereas in the competition condition the computer scientist attributes should be more accessible. This assumption is also consistent with the strategic logic of person perception - increasing one's probability of success and decreasing the other's chances to succeed.

What we found was only a main effect of a default stronger activation of the female traits than computer scientist traits in both goal conditions. It seems that these results simply show a generalized stronger context effect, performing an emotional skills task activated the female attributes, not allowing the strategic activation of computer scientist traits in the competition condition to occur.

A possible explanation for these results might also refer to the type of sample that we studied, which consisted only of female psychology students, so the female category was preliminary the more salient one, and also, the representation of a computer science student might have been not enough vivid and clear because of the lack of familiarity with the

category. We tried to take into consideration these factors in the planning of next studies.

In these studies we intended to test the assumption that the way of categorizing another person depends strongly on the cooperation vs. competition relation with that person, which is embedded in a particular situational context. The hypothesis that female stereotypical traits are activated in a competition goal setting gained strong support. The priority of this double category aspect in competition might be explained referring to the research that shows more attention guided on the unique aspects of the competitor (Ruscher & Fiske, 1990). In our case, the traits prioritized by the analytical context should be the computer scientist ones, but when the participant was competing against that person, a processing mode was activated that focused perceivers' attention more on context incongruent trait information (here, female traits), which might have been ultimately more relevant and useful in the current situation of the perceiver. On a more applied level, this outcomes show us how gender stereotypical information can be strategically activated for the sake of a more successful competition. They also lead further to inspiring questions, such as under what contextual and motivational constraints the automatic activation of gender stereotypical traits is inhibited or substituted by other, pragmatically more relevant, types of traits.

This research emphasizes the importance of studying the influence of contextual and motivational on gender stereotype activation in mutual interaction. We obtained some promising results, designed further studies and developed a fruitful collaboration. I am very grateful to the EAESP for supporting this research project. Additionally I would like to thank professor Miguel Moya for his helping attitude during my stay at the University of Granada.

References

- Blair, I. V. (2002). The malleability of automatic stereotypes and prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 6*, 242–261.
- Kunda, Z., & Spencer, S. J. (2003). When do stereotypes come to mind and when do they color judgment? A goal-based theoretical framework for stereotype activation and application. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 522–544.

- Kunda, Z., & Thagard, P. (1996). Forming impressions from stereotypes, traits and behaviors: A parallel-constraint-satisfaction theory. *Psychological Review*, *103*, 284–308.
- Ruscher, J. B., & Fiske, S. T. (1990). Interpersonal competition can cause individuating impression formation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*, 832–842.
- Sinclair, L., & Kunda, Z. (1999). Reactions to a Black professional: Motivated inhibition and activation of conflicting stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*, 885–904.
- Smith, E. R., & Zárate, M. A. (1992). Exemplar-based model of social judgment. *Psychological Review*, *99*, 3–21.

Aleksandra Cislak

(Warsaw School of Social Psychology, Warsaw, Poland)
Postdoctoral travel grant

Small Group Meeting on Fundamental dimensions of social judgment : a view from different perspectives

Thanks to the generous postdoctoral travel grant from EAESP I had an opportunity to participate in EAESP Small Group Meeting on Fundamental dimensions of social judgment in June 2007. The conference, held in Namur, Belgium, was organized as the venue to meet European psychologists dealing with the question of multidimensionality of social perception with their American and Canadian colleagues. The Organizers (Andrea Abele, Amy Cuddy, Charles Judd, Vincent Yzerbyt), both of American and European origin, did their best to provide participants with 'a view from different perspectives' by arranging the meeting of a multinational group of researchers, interested in various subfields of social cognition, and using various research methods.

The conference was a three-day event, that enabled participants to reflect both on the theoretical models and empirical research on the problem of major dimensions of social judgments. The existence and universality of two fundamental dimensions of social perception, that is Warmth and

Competence or Communitality and Agency, was revealed and confirmed thanks to the multitude of approaches: research on group stereotypes, perception of others and self-perception, decision making, and cross-cultural research.

For me the meeting was a unique opportunity first to present the results I have obtained on the role of interests in morality and competence judgments, and more importantly to discuss them with the world-known researchers interested in that topic. On the other hand, participating in the conference was also a great chance to get acquainted with the recent results in the domain, obtained by other researchers from other perspectives.

And last but not least, the conference was organized in the beautiful Chateau de Namur, most charming place in itself, with the wonderful view on the surrounding country. What is more, the local Organizers Vincent Yzerbyt and Nicholas Kervyn did a really great job to make us all feel really comfortable. And to enjoy the excellent cuisine. I really would like to thank EAESP for making this meeting and my trip possible.

Rudolf Kerschreiter

(Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich, Germany)

Seedcorn grant

Do we Become More Biased in Communication Because Others Disagree or Because we Revealed our own Decision Preference?

When making decisions in groups, people tend to communicate more information that supports their own decision preference (preference-consistent information) at the expense of information that contradicts their own decision preference (preference-inconsistent information). This dominance of preference-consistent communication turned out to be more pronounced with partners whose decision preference deviates from the senders' decision preference (Kerschreiter, 2003). In further studies this

phenomenon could be replicated with bogus partners as well as with dyads interacting face to face.

However, in all these studies the sender of the information not only was informed of the decision preference of the partner but at the same time also revealed his or her own decision preference. Therefore, the increase in the preference-consistent communication observed with a disagreeing partner on the one hand could be interpreted as an attempt of the sender to convince the partner of his or her own decision preference. On the other hand, the increase in the preference-consistent communication could also mean that when confronted with a disagreeing partner, the sender sees his or her task in the process of decision making in explaining the own preference to the receiver of the information. The aim of this study generously supported by a EAESP seedcorn grant was to determine whether the increase in preference-consistent communication observed in communication with a disagreeing partner is dependent on revealing one's own preference or not. The results of this study are critical for a better understanding of the underlying psychological process. In addition, the results have important consequences for developing interventions trying to contribute to a more balanced information exchange in groups (cf. Brodbeck, Kerschreiter, Mojzisch & Schulz-Hardt, 2007; De Dreu, Nijstad & van Knippenberg, in press).

Method

In the present study, $N = 113$ participants worked on a personnel selection task with two alternatives. Participants were told that they would form a personnel selection committee with a participant in the room next door. They read information about the two job candidates, expected to discuss this information, and make a decision with their partner. To measure the information exchange, participants received a prepared form and were instructed to write down six pieces of information they wanted to share with their partner for decision making. However, all participants in fact work on the task independent of the participants in the room next door. All handwritten material that the participants received from their bogus partners had been prepared in advance by the experimenters. Dependent on experimental condition, participants wrote down their own decision preference for their partner or not and received a prepared sheet with the partner's congruent or

incongruent decision preference or not, before they decided which information they wanted to share with the partner. In the experimental conditions with congruent partner preference feedback, the participants were informed that their dyad partner has a preference for the same candidate. In the experimental conditions with incongruent partner preference feedback, the participants learned that the dyad partner favours the other candidate. The central dependent variable was the amount of preference-consistent and preference-inconsistent information contained in the handwritten lists the participants sent to their dyad partner. It was hypothesized that participants in all six experimental conditions would communicate more of their preference-consistent than of their preference-inconsistent information. Furthermore, it was predicted that the bias toward preference-consistent information would be more pronounced when participants learn that their partner disagrees, irrespective of whether participants revealed their own preference to their partner or not.

Results and Discussion

Two coders that were unaware of the hypotheses determined for every piece of information that the participants communicated to their partner whether this piece of information was consistent or inconsistent with the decision preference of the participant (i.e. the sender). Results showed that participants communicated more preference-consistent than preference-inconsistent information. This replicated earlier findings. As predicted, this bias toward preference-consistent information was more pronounced when participants learned that their partner disagreed. Most importantly, neither the preference-consistency main effect nor the interaction effect of preference-consistency of communicated information and partner preference feedback was qualified by participants' preference disclosure: Irrespective of whether or not participants had revealed their own decision preference to their dyad partner, they showed a communication bias toward preference-consistent information and this bias was stronger when the partner disagreed.

These findings indicate that the amplification in preference-consistent communication found when people discuss a decision case with a disagreeing partner results from the knowledge about the deviating decision preference of the partner, and not from the fact that the communicator had revealed his or her own decision preference. When

trying to come up with psychological explanations for the amplification of preference-consistent communication with disagreeing partners, these findings lend support to the idea that this discussion pattern results from a strategic decision as to which information to share with a disagreeing partner and not so much from the attempt to explain the own decision preference to the partner or appear consistent in communication with one's own decision preference, as obviously it is impossible for the partner to judge such behavioral consistency in those conditions in which the participants did not disclose their own decision preference to the partner. In addition, the results suggest that it is necessary to take participants' knowledge of their partners' decision preferences into account when developing interventions intended to facilitate balanced information sharing in groups. Clearly, further research is called for to more fully understand the factors that motivate preference-consistent communication in groups (cf. Brodbeck, Kerschreiter, Mojzisch & Schulz-Hardt, 2007; De Dreu, Nijstad & van Knippenberg, in press).

I would like to thank the EAESP for providing the funding that allowed me to carry out this research. In the meantime, a larger research project on preference-consistent communication funded by the German Science Foundation (DFG) emerged from this research.

References

- Brodbeck, F. C., Kerschreiter, R., Mojzisch, A., & Schulz-Hardt, S. (2007). Improving group decision making under conditions of distributed knowledge: The information asymmetries model. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 459-479.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Nijstad, B. A., & van Knippenberg, D. (in press). Motivated information processing in group judgement and decision making. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*.
- Kerschreiter, R. (2003). *Soziale Informationsvalidierung und Informationsbewertung als Ursachen für den Diskussionsvorteil geteilter und präferenzkonsistenter Informationen in Gruppen: Eine kritische Überprüfung und Revision des „Mutual enhancement“-Modells*. [Social information validation and information evaluation as reasons for the discussion advantage of shared and preference-consistent information in groups: A critical test and revision of the "mutual enhancement" model] Unveröffentlichte Dissertationsschrift, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.

Dorota Kobylińska

(Faculty of Psychology, University of Warsaw)

Postdoctoral travel grant

Thanks to EAESP postdoctoral travel grant I spent 2 weeks at University of Michigan, Ann Arbor in August 2007. I went there to participate in summer course on neuroimaging organized by Functional MRI Laboratory, University of Michigan. I was encouraged to participate by prof. Richard Gonzalez from University of Michigan who visited University of Warsaw and with whom I talked about my research.

The purpose of this intensive two-week course, as described by the organizers, was to introduce participants to fMRI in a way that will allow them to use this technique in their own research and to critically appreciate fMRI data gathered by others. The course covered lectures (given by distinguished professors) on neuroanatomy and neuropathology, the BOLD response theory, physics of magnetic resonance, experimental design (temporal and spatial modeling of data, group modeling of data) and data analyses. Apart from lectures we took part in workshops on designing experiments using E-prime and fMRI data acquisition, pre-processing and analyses using Matlab and Spm programs.

The course participants were PhD students and post docs, most of them from University of Michigan but also from and other places all around the world.

My area of research is implicit social cognition, specifically implicit affect, and the possibilities of reducing the influence of affect on judgment and behavior by automatic activation of control processes. I try to use neurobiological data to support my theoretical model and form hypotheses. One of important independent variables in my research is visual field in which affective primes are exposed. I expected and found some results indicating that implicit affective stimuli have different influence when they are directed to the right or to the left cerebral hemisphere. My results also suggest that processes of emotional control (that inhibits the influence of implicit stimuli) are connected to the activity of left cerebral hemisphere.

So far I did not have opportunity to test my hypotheses using neuroimaging techniques, but in my theoretical model I often referred to findings of cognitive neuroscience.

Thanks to participation in the course I learned what are the main advantages and challenges concerning research in which functional neuroimaging is applied. I am ready to plan my own research and to start analysing fMRI data on my own. I met people from US and Europe who are very interested in brain research and I could also learn from their experience – I am still in contact with some of them.

Summing up, all of that helped me prepare the program of experiments that would test my hypotheses referring to the inhibiting function of the left hemisphere in controlling implicit affect. I hope that I will soon start the research and that I will be able to include the results into my habilitation book.

I am very grateful to the Association for enabling my journey to Ann Arbor. Without the postgraduate travel grant I wouldn't have been able to participate in this inspiring course.

Announcements**EAESP Summer School 2008
August 17 – August 31, Cardiff, Wales, UK
Call for Applications**

The EAESP Summer School of 2008 will take place from Sunday August 17 (arrival day) to August 31 (departure day) in Cardiff Wales, UK at the School of Psychology, Cardiff University.

Cardiff has a population of 300,000 and as the capital of Wales, is home to the Welsh Assembly Government. It boasts many interesting old buildings (such as the castle) and equally interesting and iconic new ones (such as the millennium stadium, the opera house and the assembly building itself). It has a buzzing centre and a lively bay area with many pubs, bars, and restaurants throughout the city. It is also close to beautiful countryside and coastline with the Brecon Beacons and Gower peninsular within a short distance. Cardiff University is home to one of the leading and also largest psychology departments in the UK, with 60 full time lecturing staff and many more postgraduate students.

The EAESP Summer School is currently organized every two years and is a central activity of the Association, and one that has a long and illustrious history – many members have benefited over the years from this unique chance to work with up-and-coming and established scholars from around Europe and indeed the globe (see below). It provides an ideal educational opportunity where much can be learnt about theory, methodology, and research design in social psychology, whilst also honing communication and presentational skills. It stimulates the cross fertilization of ideas and approaches between countries, continents and cultures as well as individuals. The close working in small groups provides a uniquely intense “hothouse” environment with the teaching more interactive than didactic. It is also “fun”. The social networks that emerge often lead to lifelong collaborations and friendships and those attending will be encouraged to

design and develop collaborative research projects that continue afterwards.

For the Cardiff Summer School we have been lucky to recruit a very dynamic set of leading scholars to teach five workshops covering some classic topics but also some new ones. The topics and teachers are as follows:

- Attitudes (Greg Maio & Geoff Haddock)
- Gender and Sexuality (Michelle Ryan & Peter Hegarty)
- Intergroup Relations (Thomas Kessler & Stéphanie Demoulin)
- The Self (Aiden Gregg & Claire Hart)
- Social Cognition (Luigi Castelli & Wilhelm Hofmann)

This year, for the first time, the Social Cognition workshop will be sponsored by the European Social Cognition Network (ESCON), starting a collaborative link that both organizations are keen to continue in the future.

The Summer School will accommodate 12 students per workshop making 60 in all (with a small number of local students helping with the organization also taking part). The limited number of places means that with great regret we already anticipate that we will not be able to take many students who apply.

PhD students who are currently eligible for a PhD programs in Europe and who have not previously participated in a previous summer school are eligible (see Association website for further details of criteria). The Association also has an arrangement with SPSP to admit 5 students from the USA (with a reciprocal agreement to send a similar number of European postgraduates to the US equivalent of the Summer school held in alternate years: the Summer Institute in Social Psychology). A limited/discretionary number of places will be open to applications from other parts of the globe making the summer school truly international enterprise.

Students will be accommodated in self-catering university housing for the two weeks of the Summer School. Their own institution will however be expected to cover their travel to and from Cardiff and a registration fee of €200.

In order to apply visit the EAESP website (www.easp.org) where you can find additional information and the application form which will also allow you to rank the workshops you would like to attend and which contains more details of selection criteria. The official language of the Summer school is English with proficiency therein as one of the selection criteria. A standardized reference letter (typically) to be completed by the applicant's supervisor and sent directly to the summer school organizer by the supervisor can also be downloaded at the EAESP website. The closing date for applications is **January 15, 2008**. Application for and reference form as well as the cv should be sent as attachments (word files) to the summer school organizers in Cardiff at: eaesp.summerschool@cardiff.ac.uk

If you do not receive an acknowledgement of receipt of your application within a week of submission, feel free to contact the local organizer at this email address or else at SpearsR@Cardiff.ac.uk. The final selection of students, and assignment to workshops will be made in early 2008 and more detailed information about the Summer school will be provided in due course.

More information about the School of Psychology at Cardiff University can be found at:
www.cf.ac.uk/psych/

A summer school website hosted at Cardiff with information about all aspects of the Summer School will come on line in due course.

Russell Spears
Local organizer, On behalf of the organizing committee

News from the Executive Committee

Modifications in our Grant Programme

In recent years, our grant programme has become more and more successful, with an increasing amount of applications by postgraduate and full members from several countries. While this confirms the vitality of our Association, it has also created the need of introducing some small variations in the application rules for the travel and the 'seedcorn' grants.

As to **travel grants**, from now on the amount of money assigned for each grant is likely not to exceed 800 Euro, in order to permit an equitable distribution of the funds.

As to the '**seedcorn**' grants, from now on, the maximum grant will be limited to 2000 Euro. Besides, all applications for this kind of grant will be sent for advice to two independent reviewers, and **only one grant per deadline will be accepted**. This modification in the procedure aims at guaranteeing the opportunity of offering a consistent support to research projects that have been evaluated as highly promising.

The complete application procedure for each type of grant may be found on the website at the following address:
<http://www.eaesp.org/activities/own/grants.htm>

Electronic Access to the EJSP for Postgraduate Members

As you may know, subscribers to the European Journal of Social Psychology have meanwhile access to the electronic version of the journal. This enables not only effective search strategies but also an unlimited access to issues going back to 1971.

As the result of recent discussions with representatives from the publisher, we have decided to **reduce the access to the journal for postgraduate members to its electronic version**. This will result in substantial savings because the costs of the paper version were not even covered by the reduced membership fee.

Postgraduate members can continue to receive the paper version at an additional fee of €30,- per year.

Election of New Executive Committee Members - Call for Nominations-

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

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

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

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

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

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

Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Administrative Secretary by **March, 15th, 2008** latest. Applications for grants and for the International Teaching Fellowship Scheme can be received by the deadlines end of March, June, September, and December. The deadline for the next issue of the Bulletin is **March, 15th, 2008**.

The next Executive Committee Meeting will take place from March 28-30, 2008.

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>