

European Bulletin of Social Psychology

Editors: Eddy Van Avermaet & Sibylle Classen

2 Editorial

4 The EAESP Summer School 2002, Germany

14 The First East-Central European Summer School in Social Psychology, Poland

18 Book Reviews

Psicología Social de los Valores Humanos: desarrollos teóricos, metodológicos y aplicados (Social Psychology of Human Values: theoretical, methodological, and applied developments) by María Ros & Valdiney V. Gouveia (eds.)
Review by J. Francisco Morales

20 New Books by Members

Social representations of dominant and dominated groups. Collections and aggregates (2002) by Fabio Lorenzi-Cioldi

Action theory. A primer for applied research in the social sciences (2002) by L. Valach, R.A. Young & M.J. Lynam

Human rights as social representations (2002) by Willem Doise

Narrative approaches in social psychology (2002) by Janos Laszlo & Wendy Stainton-Rogers

24 Future EAESP Meetings – Calendar

Small Group Meeting on New Directions in Leadership Research, June 18-21, 2003, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Small Group Meeting on the Psychology of Minorities: Basic Mechanisms and Social Implications, June 27-29, 2003, London, UK

Small Group Meeting on Social Cognition: Evolutionary and Cultural Perspectives, July 16-19, 2003, Buda Castle, Budapest, Hungary

Small Group Meeting on Decision Making: Motivation and Cognition, September 3-5, 2003, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Small Group Meeting on Minority Influence Processes, September 2003, Oxford, UK

Medium Size Meeting on the Social Psychological Analysis of Social Inclusion and Exclusion, September 11-14, 2003, Canterbury, UK

32 Reports of Previous Meetings

Small Group Meeting on Social Cognition, September 19-21, 2002, University of la Laguna, Tenerife, Spain

Cognitive processes in psychological states potentially impairing adaptive functioning: Depression, aging, under stereotyping and stress, International Small Group Conference, September 8-12, 2002, Warsaw, Poland

38 Grants and Grant reports

46 In Memoriam: Michael Argyle

52 Announcements

AASP 2003 in Manila

Summer Institute in Social Psychology (SISP): Applications invited to the SPSP summer school of 2003

56 Announcement from the Executive Committee

Early Career Development Grants: Regional Support Grants replace Manuscript Assistance Grants

59 Deadlines for Contributions to the Executive Committee

60 Executive Committee

Editorial

On September 6th 2002 Michael Argyle, one of the inspiring founding members of the EAESP, died at the age of 77. Michael's unique contributions to social psychology and his unicity as a person are acknowledged in this issue via an In Memoriam, prepared by Peter Robinson.

This issue of our familiar Bulletin further holds an account of two summer schools, both of which were held this past summer.

The first is our own EAESP summer school, which took place at Marburg (Germany). The famous impressionist painter Claude Monet is known for having painted the same scene over and over again, but each time from a different perspective and each time under different lighting conditions. The accounts of the Marburg summer school, painted on the canvas of this Bulletin by the organisers, the teachers and the students, are in many ways Monet-like impressions of the same scene: all different in their expression, but all alike in their appreciation for the organisational, social and scientific quality of what happened during those two weeks. The second is the first East-Central European summer school in social psychology, held at Przemyl (Poland) and co-sponsored by the EAESP. Maria Lewicka's enthusiastic description of the two week school, geared towards the specific needs of an audience from Eastern and Central European countries, clearly reveals that this school too turned out to be a great experience, for teachers and students alike.

Beyond the above the editors would like to draw your special attention to a pair of announcements.

The first concerns a call for applications by doctoral students to participate in the first American summer school, to be held in the summer of 2003 in Boulder (Colorado), and co-sponsored by SPSP and EAESP. Within the framework of an agreement between SPSP and EAESP, EAESP

will in effect sponsor the participation of five European students in this adventure.

The other announcement to which we draw your attention concerns the creation of a new grant scheme, the Regional Support Grants, set up especially to assist young EAESP members from regions with only limited funding and access to scientific information and facilities.

And of course, don't forget to also browse through a book review, an announcement of new books by members, calls for participation in upcoming meetings, the reports of past meetings and some grant reports.

The editors of the Bulletin and the Executive Committee of the EAESP take this opportunity to already extend their best wishes for a successful 2003, professionally and personally.

Eddy Van Avermaet and Sibylle Classen

**The EAESP Summer School 2002, Marburg, Germany
organised by Ulrich Wagner and Rolf van Dick**

The organisers' view

During the 12th General Meeting of the EAESP in Oxford in 1999 we were asked by the executive committee whether we would organize the 2002 Summer School. Since the enormous impact of the previous Summer Schools on academic career and personal development of the most promising academic offspring in social psychology is well known, it took us only seconds to say "yes". At some points during the three years of organizing, many of us asked themselves whether we had been crazy or drunken by agreeing to this question asked by a possibly sadistic executive committee. But now, in late September 2002, when the Summer School has been over for some two weeks now we are so happy that we had the chance to run this terrific social psychological experiment. From the very first day on we received help from so many people at various stages of planning and organizing. First of all, the organizers of previous Summer Schools in Belgium 1998 and France 2000 provided us with materials and answered all our inquiries – without this, we could have never formulated letters, applications etc. What can we briefly say about the two weeks in August 2002 that changed our and the participants (teachers and students as well) minds and – probably – their lives? The two weeks started with the arrival of participants and teachers and with a welcome reception in the inner courtyard of our department, from this moment onwards we all felt like being members of a big family. On Monday during dinner we listened to a speech of Tom Pettigrew about the past 50 years of research on American race relations and the Summer School ended with a conference where students presented their Summer School's work, Kwok Leung from Hongkong embedded the event in a cultural context and Klaus Fiedler told us a little bit on the future of social psychology. In between this beginning with the past and the ending with the future, all teachers presented their work during lunch and dinner. This provided the opportunity for all students and the other teachers to get insights into the work of ten different experts on as many different topics of social

psychological research. But the main work in during the Summer School was done, of course, in the five different workshops on Attitudes and Habits (Teachers: Bas Verplanken, Henning Plessner) Affirmative Action (Vicki Esses, Colette van Laar), Social Identity Processes in Organizations (Daan van Knippenberg, Jürgen Wegge), Aggression (Dolf Zillmann, Jeannette Schmid), and Social Dominance (Felicia Pratto, Andreas Zick). We, the organizers, saw students working all the day in their classes, forming sub-groups and sub-sub-groups working on the grounds, in the mensa (the dining room) and mostly in the inner courtyard. We saw them sitting and working in the computer lab of the department and in our own offices. We saw them conducting experiments in our lab and questionnaire studies on a meeting of Germany's Green Party, at the train station and, again, in the mensa. And we saw them presenting their work in the final conference with excellent presentation techniques, deep knowledge of the literature they had been working on, and interesting and sophisticated studies (some of them with real data and – unbelievable - some with significant results). But the Summer School was not only work. We also saw teachers and students sitting in the pubs and beer-gardens (and sometimes we joined them there for a beer, of course). Our aim was to bring students and teachers together in a pleasant atmosphere and arranged some social events (welcome reception, barbecue, guided tour through Marburg, trip to the documenta 11 in Kassel, soccer match against the faculty of the psychology department). When having the farewell dinner eventually we all had the impression that our aim was reached, at least to some degree. We are pretty sure that nobody will forget the two weeks in Marburg. We would like to express our gratefulness to all teachers, participants and, to a large extent, our student assistants. Of course EAESP and SPSP deserve our gratefulness, too. Only with their generous support, the whole event could be organized. And if somebody would ask us whether it was worth to do all this work, it would take us only seconds to repeat an unambiguous “yes”.

Uli Wagner & Rolf van Dick

*A teacher's view***A creative explosion**

Teaching at a EAESP Summerschool is more than just an experience. What happens between the moments of arrival and departure may best be described as a two-weeks explosion of creativity. It is quite something to have the opportunity to be part of that. There is no single "teacher experience". Teachers are as diverse as the other participants are, and each workshop immediately develops its own small world. So, the best I can do is to reflect on my own experiences as one of the teachers in one of the workshops. Perhaps the best of it all, and this has been shared by all of the teachers, is the experience of working with a group of very motivated, gifted, and enthusiastic students. They come from all kinds of places, have different personalities, work on different topics, and live in different cultures. And yet, there is this common spirit of eagerness to learn, of wanting to accomplish things, of being creative, which brings us all together. I was also very lucky to work with a great co-teacher. We met at the EAESP meeting in San Sebastian. Actually, we had no idea how to run a workshop at a summerschool. We decided not to lecture, but to begin by having students brainstorm ideas, and take it further from there. After telling them to forget their dissertation, they worked with a number of William McGuire's (1997) 49 heuristics to generate ideas. After two days the walls of our room were covered with ideas. At the end of the Summerschool three of these ideas had been transformed into creative experiments, and, in great awe, were we even looking at significant ps. One of the frequently asked questions amongst the teachers at breakfast was "How are things in your group". It appeared that each group worked in very different ways, some went collecting data, others into in-depth conceptual analyses. But each enjoyed this very same enthusiasm. The final presentation of all the work at the last day thus was a great show of creativity. In all, it was marvelous work, with fantastic people, at a great place.

Bas Verplanken

Reference:

McGuire, W.J. (1997). Creative hypothesis generating in psychology: Some useful heuristics. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48, 1-30.

'Once as a student, now as a teacher: a personal view'

In 1986 I have been student at the Summer School in Bologna. I loved social psychology, but I was a greenhorn in research. My supervisor, Ulrich Wagner, kicked me to Bologna. I did not want to go, because so many reasons were against it: All these native speakers; too many articles on the list of my teachers; all these experts in my class and so on. On the other hand, the opportunity to work for two weeks in a small class with these prominent teachers was very attractive. I joined the Summer School, we worked hard, and we loved it. We developed a close network of social psychologist and the experiences during the Summer School motivated us to keep on doing research. Moreover, many of my classmates became prominent social psychologists, and my classmate Vincent even became president of the EAESP. Sure, not everything of our career depends on the Summer School, but it helps a lot.

Twelve years later I was invited to teach at the Summer School in Marburg. Together with Felicia Pratto and a small group of students from four continents we worked on social dominance theory. Now it was me who sent a terrible long list of articles to the students. They worked hard and they hopefully enjoyed it. My best experience was, that the class became a team.

What did we do to shift the aggregate to a team? The most simple thing: We gave them a task. We told them to read Jim Sidanius and Felica's book on Social Dominance and they were allowed to choose four (or hopefully more) chapters and articles on interesting topics. We started our class with presentations of the teachers, and additionally we built small teams of interest. Our students – who are more colleagues than students – very early showed that they want to work on studies against the theory. It was really wise to give them maximum freedom and to stop talking too much. The first teams they built survived until the end, and we came up with three basic experiments. Accompanying the team-work we chose to have

class-meetings on specific topics (methodology, alternative theories, concepts of the theory) and we invited my colleague Beate Küpper from Wuppertal to give a talk. Additionally we met the class on affirmative action (Colette van Laar & Vicki Esses), which was a god check of our ideas and the state of our work. Felicia and I did not try to besiege our students. We defined ourselves as supervising counsellors. Sure, every group dynamic we know from small group research happened: There were phases of sensations (We got the best idea no one ever had!) and states of depression (We can't get through it. What are these teachers teaching?). We saw other classes collecting data while we were still defining the basic concepts without any consensus. It was good to have a plan, but it was great to skip it. We became ambitious, and we became tired. We finished complete studies, but we had to work on the presentation until the very last night. We bought a lot of coffee in the supermarket next door, and we swallowed several beers in the night. Somehow we came up with experimental designs. We finished with an outline of common work and a provisional timetable. We became a research-group with a particular identity.

To get this identity and to keep it you need a certain context. I had to give a talk on regional identity. My argument was, that the place where we are living and working is a highly relevant category for our identity. The Summer School changed Marburg to a category of identification as social psychologists. The Marburg-Team did a great job. They managed, they supported, they copied (too much) and they arranged our live for fourteen big days on social psychology. If you will have the chance to join a Summer School, as student or teacher – take it. Thank's the EAESP for this great contribution for European social psychology.

Andreas Zick

The students' view

Workshop on Affirmative Action

When Rolf asked me about writing half a page on behalf of the "Affirmative Action's participants", I was a bit worried of being in charge of that duty. This means that I was unsure if this "report" would rather be

a personal point of view instead of being a collective one. This situation has stressed me for about one minute only! Why? On one hand, because all the members of our group, for sure, will share the following positive comments and, on the other hand, the last Friday night, we dealt altogether, including Vicki and Colette, with our main impressions concerning this summer school. Thus, I will try to summarize as precisely as possible, the different comments that arose during that night, somewhere, in a Marburg's pub...

After having read the first paragraph, you can guess that this experience was very constructive. The way Vicki and Colette managed the functioning of the workshop was rather intelligent and thus, efficient. During the first week, we had to work by peers. Indeed, Vicki and Colette proposed to work on a specific topic everyday and then, to present our reflections in front of the rest of the group the morning after. Then, each morning was devoted to a collective debate, which was very instructive. Furthermore, we had to create a new peer and work on another problematic each day - during the first week -. At the beginning, this way of working appeared a bit confusing, in a way we did not see the final issue according to the aims of the summer school. However, after having thought about this method, this was really effective, because we had the opportunity to discuss and exchange in a private way with a majority of the participants. By this way, we have discovered the interests, the perspectives and the approaches of the different members of the group and then, were able to form the final subgroups in a proper way, according to these criteria. The second week consisted of elaborating a research project and to find the related bibliography. Indeed, Vicki and Colette have never decided on which topic we had to focus on. They gave us an entire freedom on that point, which was great and thus, reinforced our motivation to go on with our respective project. Then, even if the majority of our three subgroups did not have any concrete data to present at the end of the summer school, we all have worked deeply on a concrete and definite project to realize. The interesting point is that it will be conducted in a cross cultural way, and thus, it includes some collaborative works. As such we have thought, in a long run, to meet again for presenting our results, somewhere, someday...together. For sure, we are all looking forward to this meeting.

To conclude concerning the comments on this workshop, I would say on behalf of the group our gratefulness towards Vicki and Colette. Gratefulness for the time spent with us, the things we have learnt thanks to them and especially, the way they managed the workshop through a very pleasant atmosphere, meaning without time pressure. In short, I would keep in mind this wonderful experience. Also it is time to thank all the organizing committee, because without all of them, this summer school would not have been what it was: brilliant!

Marie-Aude Depuiset

Workshop on Aggression

Before the summer school started, the teachers of the Aggression Workshop –Dolf Zillmann and Jeannette Schmid- gave us literature to read. At our first day this literature was discussed, with an accent on the unexplored issues within aggression research. After this first day, we divided in small subgroups to discuss our own research ideas. At the end of the day a lot of interesting ideas were presented, which could roughly be divided in two subjects: the cognitive deficits when being aggressive and vengeance: harming an aggressor in order to restore the balance of suffering. Every person of the workshop chose the subject of his/her main interest and the remaining time of the summer school we worked in two subgroups. Every subgroup developed one or two complete studies, and when possible, data were collected. At the final day the designed studies and data were presented to the other workshops. For now, the challenge to accept is the further execution of the designed studies. Overall it can be said that the summer school was a very inspiring experience. The organizational committee did a great job, and it was really very nice to work closely with people from so many different countries.

Catherine Evers

Social Identity in Organizations

Our workshop was an exceptionally industrious and productive one, affording each participant the opportunity to generate and conduct original research within the short time span of the summer school. Our workshop began by “hitting the ground running” – after a morning of reviewing the key issues of our area of interest, subgroups were formed that began to conceptualize the research projects each group would develop (and run) over the next few weeks. Dr. Wegge’s research domain on goal setting in organizations was especially useful for each group, as were instructed to create realizable “milestone plans” which established specific deadlines for the subtasks of running a study during the course of the summer school. These milestone plans were essential for each group to both stay on track and assess their progress throughout the two weeks. In general, given the focused and ambitious urgings of our instructors, the milestone plans were also ambitious – all of the six subgroups actually collected data and analyzed their results during the two week period.

Varied areas of focus (e.g., the role of diversity in organizational identity, the effects of leader prototypicality) were explored by the six subgroups in our workshop. Short discussion meetings at the end of most days of the workshop provided each group the opportunity to gain feedback about their progress, background theory and design. Outside of those short meetings, subgroups were “left to their own devices” to work collaboratively to formulate and carry out their projects. The instructors were available throughout each day to discuss problems and challenges, as well as to suggest ways to refine or improve each group’s project. The instructors demonstrated exceptional knowledge of the topic areas under study, and really improved many of the original ideas and designs of each study.

On the whole, students in the workshop were surprised with the focused and self-determined nature of this workshop; many students wished that we had spent more time discussing and understanding the nuances and limitations of the theories under study. Moreover, increased whole-workshop contact was also seen to be lacking – subgroups seemed to wish that they could have gained even more feedback from other students about their studies. On the other hand, though, the workshop as a whole

was, again, exceptionally productive, giving students the experience of capably and efficiently generating original research.

All this being said, I know all of us students were extremely grateful for the time and energy that our instructors, the organizers at Marburg, as well as the EAESP organization took in affording us this wonderful experience. The intercultural contact, exchange of ideas, establishment of cross-national research teams, as well as the forming of wonderful friendships truly enriched our professional and personal lives. The experience has fostered fond memories, as well as strong professional alliances that are sure to add to our psychological knowledge base.

Michael Tragakis

Workshop on Attitudes and Habits

The first pressing advice that the organizers of the Attitudes & Habits workshop offered the 12 participants of 8 different countries was: "For the coming two weeks, forget about your dissertation". Although some of us planned to finish their dissertations shortly after, or even during the Summerschool, we managed to forget about our personal goals quite capably. This was probably due to the active role we got in this workshop. We started out with two days of brainstorm-sessions. After this, our room was filled with posters with a large number of wild ideas written on them. Then the difficult task of choosing which of these ideas to pursue followed. We ended up with three groups working on three separate experiments.

After a relaxed weekend, we managed to execute and present our experiments the second week. To our delight, all three experiments resulted in findings that –significantly- confirmed our predictions. Furthermore, the three groups plan to continue working together in the near future to confirm and expand their findings. Thus, this Summerschool was very successful and stimulated joined experiments from social psychology students all over Europe and beyond.

We would like to end with thanking our teachers, Bas & Henning, not only for their advice and implicit steering of our experiments in the proper direction, but especially for creating an atmosphere where we could work with such enthusiasm. We also want to thank the organisers (all of them) at Marburg: anything was possible! Finally, we want to thank the EAESP, for providing us with the opportunity to meet and work together.

Helma van den Berg

Workshop on Social Dominance

The workshop on social dominance theory was led by Felicia Pratto and Andreas Zick. PhD-students from all over the world participated: From Australia to South-Africa. Also, the group counted many different specialisms: From social identity to social cognition. This diversity contributed to the abundance of insights and new ideas developed in this workshop. Teachers and students cooperated as one team discussing the fundamentals and undiscovered areas of the theory. And these fundamentals were not taken for granted. Rather, they were confronted with many different viewpoints. Out of the many ideas discussed, three subjects were chosen to be studied in detail. The main focus of these issues was the relation between social dominance theory and the social context people live in. For example, what happens when people perceive social change to be possible? And what happens when people start to disbelieve the socially shared myths that justify social inequality presumed by social dominance theory? Theory was scrutinized, studies were planned and ideas were shared with other workshops of the summer school. Maybe, the workshop will lead to sparkling publications. The workshop and especially the inspiration that radiated from Felicia and Andreas will certainly have a long-lasting effect on all participants.

Jaap Ham

The First East-Central European Summer School in Social Psychology: "Understanding Social Phenomena" Przemysl, Poland, 1-15 August 2002

The Faculty of Psychology in cooperation with the Centre for Studies on the Classical Tradition in Poland and East Central Europe (OBTA), both at the University of Warsaw, and the Department of Psychology, University of Lviv, Ukraine, organized in August 2002 the First East-Central Summer School in Social Psychology "Understanding Social Phenomena". The Summer School was sponsored by the Foundation Institute Artes Liberales and the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology. The school was organized by Maria Lewicka and Tytus Sosnowski, both from the Faculty of Psychology, University of Warsaw, in cooperation with Barbara Weigl, University of Opole (Poland) and Sofia Hrabovska, University of Lviv (Ukraine).

The School was intended as part of a larger project, called East-Central European School in the Humanities, coordinated by the Centre for Studies on the Classical Tradition in Poland and East Central Europe (OBTA), headed by professor Jerzy Axer. The project started in 1996 and it develops very successfully. It is a sort of a "flying university", with lectures, symposia, seminars and workshops organized successively in different cities and different countries of the East-Central Europe. The participants of the School as well as lecturers are recruited from own universities over the East-Central Europe. The main core of the organization are two universities from Poland and Ukraine (Warsaw and Lviv) but the attending students come from other cities and countries as well, and the long-term aim is to include all East-Central European countries, like Baltic Countries, Bielorrussia, Slovakia, Bulgaria etc.. The School by definition has an interdisciplinary character and its major aim is to train the future public intellectuals of these countries in the largely conceived humanities, ranging from history and classic studies, through languages, to social and political sciences.

So far the School did not have a psychological module. The Summer School in Social Psychology was thus intended to fill the gap, by including students of psychology and providing the psychological perspective on a

number of social topics. The idea of the Summer School in social psychology for this part of Europe, came to us, its organizers, as a natural product of our close cooperation with the Department of Psychology, Lviv University, ongoing since 1997. Social psychology in the countries east of Poland is one of the psychological disciplines which suffered most during the communist time. Social psychology by definition was considered non-marxist (accounting for social behaviors with psychological and not macro-social factors) and hence the proper education in the majority of social psychological approaches was sadly lacking. On the other hand the challenges of today make social psychology a valuable tool in analyzing transformations of our countries and a valuable instrument in applied research. Hence the interest in social psychology among psychology students of our countries is enormous and growing. The Summer School was meant to answer this growing demand.

The initiative was announced through different channels, including internet, and all applications were carefully scrutinized, with the final 32 candidates selected by an international, Polish-Ukrainian committee from a much larger number of candidates. We accepted 14 Polish, 14 Ukrainian, and 4 Bielorrussian students, both PhD and MA.. The Polish students came from several Polish Universities (Warsaw, Opole, Wroclaw, Poznan), the Ukrainian students from Lviv and Drohobycz, the Bielorrussian students from Grodno and Mohylev.

The language of the school was either Polish or Ukrainian. Our languages are sufficiently similar to prevent major communication problems. Additionally, this "mix" of languages adds to the colourful picture of this, once naturally multicultural and now sadly homogenous, part of Europe.

The program was built from three large thematic blocks. The first dealt with the "dangerous remains of the past", so to speak, national identity and mutual stereotypes in our three countries, historical, sociological and psychological roots of mutual conflicts, and mechanisms of overcoming animosities. The block consisting of lectures and workshops was coordinated by a social psychologist from the University of Opole, Barbara Weigl.

The second block had a title "premises of civil activity" and it covered topics like, mechanisms of corruption, social dilemmas and conflict resolution, political attitudes and ways of understanding democracy, regional and local identities, environmental and urban psychology. Also this block consisted of both lectures and workshops. The block was coordinated by Maria Lewicka, University of Warsaw and Sofia Hrabovska, University of Lviv. Both blocks offered an overall number of more than 80 teaching hours, of which students were supposed to attend 60 hours in order to obtain 8 credit points.

The third block consisted of methodological training. The art of professional research report writing is sadly lacking in many post-communist countries. Hence we have decided to incorporate this very practical topic. Since two weeks is too short a period to collect own data, we decided to use ready data, available at the Warsaw University. The students were introduced to the database PGSS (Polish General Social Survey), developed within the Institute of Social Studies, Warsaw University, which is a longitudinal survey carried on a representative sample of over 1000 adult Poles, and covering the majority of important social issues. Since 1992 the survey is repeated every two years. During a number of practical meetings the students became acquainted with the database itself, methods of multivariate analysis, and basic principles of writing research reports. Groups of 3-4 students picked up research topics, analyzed them with the available data, and prepared written research reports. Additionally, on the last day of the school each group presented their findings orally. The acknowledged research report amounted to 4 credit points. This block was organized by Tytus Sosnowski, University of Warsaw.

Three round tables devoted to issues of, respectively, stereotyping, civil society, and local identity, complemented the teaching. The final piece of the educational program was a field trip to the places where Polish and Ukrainian history meets.

Overall about 25 teachers lectured during the school, with the four organizers and block coordinators (Maria Lewicka, Tytus Sosnowski, Barbara Weigl and Sofia Hrabovska) present all the time and the remaining teachers visiting the school for the periods of several days. The teachers

were well known psychologists, sociologists, historians, political scientists, journalists, philosophers etc. from numerous Polish and Ukrainian universities.

The place of the school was Przemysl, Poland which is a city located almost exactly at the Polish-Ukrainian border, 80 km from Lviv (mini-buses are circulating between the border and Lviv). Since most of the School participants came from the Western Ukraine, this location greatly minimized travel costs. Additionally, Przemysl is a city tightly intertwined with the complicated Polish-Ukrainian history which made it an ideal place for our first school.

The classes were held in a newly built and very modern building of a secondary school (Liceum no 2), very well equipped with all teaching facilities (overhead projectors, and a permanently open computer room with 15 computers attached to internet). Adjoining the school building was a new building of an elegant student bursa, which easily accommodated both students and teachers. Both the organizers and the students found the conditions to be very satisfactory.

The school was clearly a success both from the scientific and the social point of view. In the evaluation questionnaire the students positively evaluated the variety of topics and theoretical perspectives, quality of lectures and workshops, available advice, supply of facilities (writing materials, access to computers etc.), perfect organization of the school, very good living conditions, informal climate and democratic relations between students and lecturers. The "official" program was made considerably less formal by organization of sport events (volleyball match), group singing contests (Ukrainian vs. Polish songs), and last but not least - frequent trips of the whole group to the beer pub in the downtown Przemysl. The school had own flag: a combination of all national colours (white, red, yellow and blue and of course a large Psi sign) which aroused quite an interest among the local population. The success of the school will hopefully be repeated in two years with the Second East-Central Summer School in Social Psychology.

Maria Lewicka (University of Warsaw, Poland)

Book Reviews

Psicología Social de los Valores Humanos: desarrollos teóricos, metodológicos y aplicados (Social Psychology of Human Values: theoretical, methodological, and applied developments) by María Ros & Valdiney V. Gouveia (eds.)
(Complutense University, Madrid & Federal University of Paraíba, Brazil)

Madrid, Biblioteca Nueva, 2001, pp. 412,

Review by **J. Francisco Morales** (UNED, Madrid, Spain)

The 14 chapters of this volume, put together by Ros and Gouveia, are the outcome of an international collaborative effort of 22 authors from 9 different countries around a unifying theme, i.e. “values”, and, more specifically, Schwartz’s value model, presented by Schwartz himself (2nd chapter). The volume is aimed at connecting theoretical and research developments based on Schwartz’s model with several areas of interest for the discipline of Social Psychology in general.

Ros (1st and 3rd chapters), after a review of the evolution of the “value” concept in the social sciences, with special attention to its psychosocial treatment, discusses its relations with other constructs (e.g. attitudes). She emphasizes the crucial role played by values in the development of cross-cultural Social Psychology, as illustrated by the work of Hofstede, Triandis, Schwartz, Trompenaars, Smith and Bond, and Inglehart, among others. At the cultural level, values are used to characterize society as a whole, and they may act as Independent or Dependent variables. At the individual level, they tap personal preferences. Ros, adopting an interactionist perspective, postulates a complex interplay between the two levels, with groups acting as the connecting link. A figure in page 46, along with the discussion of two relevant examples, is proposed as a framework for the rest of the chapters.

Ros and Gouveia (7th chapter) distinguish among three kinds of studies, intracultural, pancultural, and ecological, each of which has to meet its own methodological standards (such as the minimum number of

participants required to reach valid conclusions and the use of adequate central tendency measures). Convergent and discriminant validity combination, as one of the keys to identify culture peculiarities, is emphasized, and construct validity problems are dealt with as well, insofar their solution is a condition to obtain the conceptual, functional, and metric equivalence needed in cross-cultural studies. Gouveia (4th chapter) focuses on individualism and compares Schwartz's and (later) Triandis' approach (which adds a "vertical vs horizontal" dimension the original I-C dimension). Based on data specifically generated for this purpose, he provides an insightful analysis of the complexities of individualism. Páez and Zubieta (12th chapter) offer evidence of the convergence between psychological and macrosocial indicators and national value scores.

Values predict social behavior. They do it, not only in isolation, but combined in different profiles, as shown by Gómez and Huici (8th chapter). They find that group antagonism is better predicted by beliefs about the basic values of the other group than by stereotypes, the profile of equality, friendship, and justice being associated to a more tolerant perception of the outgroup.

Grad (9th chapter) looks at national identity from a value vantage point and draws an important distinction between national identities based on their degree of crystallization. In fact, emergent nationalisms, that is, those that still have to struggle for a full political acknowledgment, are functionally different from the old, consolidated ones and present different value profiles.

Tamayo and Borges (13th chapter) apply Schwartz's value model to the areas of work and of organizations, to show that values apply differently to each of them. Smith and colls. (14th chapter), in their empirical study on a sample of 1050 managers from Spain, Portugal, and five Latin-american countries (Mexico, Colombia, Brazil, Chile, and Argentina) demonstrate the importance of Hofstede's approach to understand leadership in all its complexity.

To a certain extent, all the chapters contribute to the main aim of the volume of providing an updated state of the art in the important value domain. It is true that Schwartz's value model is the reference mark, but

the authors display a lot of creativity in building bridges from it to other areas of Social Psychology. There are some loose ends, though. The interactionist framework proposed by Ros remains an open question: it is clearly a desirable goal, but something still in need of further elaboration and hopefully to be accomplished in the future.

Social psychologists are the main audience of the book, which will be useful for Social Psychology students at all levels. Its applied focus make it commendable for organizational psychologists, educators and political scientists.

New Books by Members

Social representations of dominant and dominated groups. Collections and aggregates

Fabio Lorenzi-Cioldi (University of Geneva, Switzerland)

Grenoble, Presses Universitaires de Grenoble, France (2002). 360 pp.

Language: French. ISBN pbk: 2-7061-1047-3. 21.35 Euros.

www.pug.fr

What do "blue-collar workers", "women" or "foreign workers" have in common? What makes them different from "bosses", "men" or "local workers"? The central idea behind this work is that everyday representations propagate two distinct perceptions of groups. A homogenous group consisting of depersonalised and anonymous members, the aggregate, would include any individual of low social status. Towards the upper end of the social hierarchy, another type of group, the collection, brings together individuals who emphasise their uniqueness to the point of sometimes obscuring any link with a common group membership. In this book, the author carries out a systematic investigation in order to conduct a thorough critique of the origins, use and social functions of the homogenous dominated group and the more fragmented and elusive

dominant group. He presents numerous examples taken from social science and society at large, and uses them to put forward a theory concerning psychological mechanisms which play a fundamental role in how we perceive people on a day-to-day basis.

Action theory. A primer for applied research in the social sciences.

L. Valach, R.A. Young & M.J. Lynam (2002)¹⁾

Westport, CT: Praeger, List Price: \$67.95

ISBN: 0-275-97086-8 · Pages: 288 · Publication Date: July 30, 2002

www.greenwood.com

Description:

The authors describe a view that our short, medium, and long term behavior, interactions and relationships—whether planned or spontaneous, purposeful or playful—can be understood in terms of goal-directed systems. An understanding of action theory and research methods used in applied settings is provided. It leads to the conclusion that individual processes are joint processes and the joint construction of lives should be monitored to understand ongoing personal and social involvements.

The unique contribution of this book lies in its bringing together and extending of basic features of the theory of goal-directed action systems previously published in a range of scattered research and conceptual articles in the literature. Professionals including clinicians, counselors, social workers, researchers, doctors, nurses, and physical or occupational therapists will find in this book an accessible means to understand, act on,

¹⁾ Author Information:

LADISLAV VALACH is an Oberassistent of Psychology at the University of Zurich, Switzerland. He is also a psychotherapist at the Rehabilitation Centre of the Medical Clinic at Buerger Hospital in Solothurn, Switzerland.

RICHARD A. YOUNG is a Professor of Counselling Psychology at the University of British Columbia. His earlier books include *Interpreting Career: Hermeneutical Studies of Lives in Context* (Praeger, 1992) and *Methodological Approaches to the Study of Career* (Praeger, 1990).

M. JUDITH LYNAM is an Associate Professor of Nursing at the University of British Columbia. She is Co-Director of the School of Nursing Cultural Studies and Health Research Unit.

research, and intervene in the behavioral processes they encounter in everyday work.

Table of Contents:

Preface · Action: Problem, Concepts, Explanation, Methods, and Theory
Research Procedures for Using Action Theory in Applied Research ·
Action Theory Research · Application of Action Theory: Research Reports
Empowerment, Praxis, and Action Theory in Health Promotion Research
by Judith M. Lynam and Richard A. Young ·
The Reasoning of Parents and Children in Conversation about Marital
Transitions by Deanna Bader and Richard A.
Young · Attempted Suicide Stories: Suicide Career, Suicide Project, and
Suicide Action by Ladislav Valach, et al. ·
Action Theoretical Perspective in Rehabilitation by Ladislav Valach and
Jaye Wald · Conclusion · Reference ·
Appendix: The Family Health Promotion Project Research Manual

Human rights as social representations. London, Routledge

Willem Doise (2002)

Droits de l'homme et force des idées, the French version of this book was published in 2001 (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France), and an Italian and Portuguese version was published in 2002 (Bologna, Il Mulino / Lisbon, Livros Horizonte).

Nowadays historical, philosophical, political and juridical studies on human rights abound. However, a thorough social psychological analysis of their intervention in social relations extending across national and cultural boundaries is yet to be found. After having studied for many years the social psychology of relations between groups, often characterized by mistrust, prejudice and discrimination, the author of this book considered it necessary to study the foundations of human rights principles, the sources of their universality and their limitations. Using the tools of social representation theory, Willem Doise looks upon human rights as guiding ideas providing institutionalised standards for evaluating relationships of individuals with authorities and between themselves.

Research discussed in this book confirms that the Universal Declaration of Human rights serves as an important landmark orienting shared normative social representations across different national contexts. It is also evidenced that individuals position themselves in relation to human rights according to the possible impact they attribute to themselves and to governmental institutions for having these rights respected. Such positioning is clearly related to value choices of individuals, to their experience of social discrimination and injustice, and to the actual enforcement of respect of these rights respect in their countries.

Narrative Approaches in Social Psychology

Janos Laszlo and Wendy Stainton-Rogers (eds.)

Budapest: New Mandate. 188 pp. Published in 2002 August.

Price: 20 EURs

New Mandate Publishing House, H-1145, Budapest, Hungary, Torontál str.24. e-mail: mandatum@elender.hu, Contact person: Laszlo Kelecsenyi

Narratives are one of the main forms of discourse. Recently, in the social sciences and humanities, there has been a growing recognition of the distinctively narrative character of social knowledge or social thought. Social psychology has not remained intact from the narrative movement. Traditional social psychological construct, such as social representation or social identity are revisited in the light of the narrative approach. It is not merely a theoretical work. The present book shows also by empirical studies the close connection between the telling of stories and the forging of social representations on the one hand, and constructing and maintaining group and individual identity, on the other. By this, it suggests a new – narrative psychological – path for doing empirical research in social psychology.

Future EAESP Meetings - Calendar

June 18-21, 2003, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Small Group Meeting on New Directions in Leadership Research

Organisers: Barbara van Knippenberg, David de Cremer, Daan van Knippenberg, & Michael A. Hogg

Contact: Barbara van Knippenberg (BM.van.Knippenberg@psy.vu.nl) or David de Cremer (d.decremer@psychology.unimaas.nl)

June 26-28, 2003, London, UK

Small Group Meeting on the Psychology of Minorities: Basic Mechanisms and Social Implications

Organisers: Ana Guinote & Yacoov Trope

Contact: Ana Guinote (aguinote@essex.ac.uk)

July 15-17, 2003, Buda Castle, Budapest, Hungary

Small Group Meeting on Social Cognition: Evolutionary and Cultural Perspectives

Organisers: Joseph Forgas, Janos Laszlo & Csaba Pleh

Contact: Janos Laszlo (laszlo@btk.ptt.hu)

September, 3-5, 2003, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Small Group Meeting on Decision Making: Motivation and Cognition

Organisers: Bernard Nijstad, Bianca Beersma, Carsten de Dreu, & Daan van Knippenberg

Contact: Bernard Nijstad (nijstad@psy.uva.nl)

September, 2003, Oxford, UK

Small Group Meeting on Minority Influence Processes

Organisers: Miles Hewstone & Robin Martin

Contact: Robin Martin (r.martin@psy.uq.edu.au)

September 11-14, 2003, Canterbury, UK

Medium Size Meeting on the Social Psychological Analysis of Social Inclusion and Exclusion

Organisers: Dominic Abrams & Miles Hewstone

Contact: Dominic Abrams (D.Abrams@ukc.ac.uk) or Miles Hewstone (miles.hewstone@psy.ox.ac.uk).

Future EAESP Meetings

Small Group Meeting**On New Directions in Leadership Research****June, 18-21, 2003, Amsterdam, The Netherlands**

[Organizers: Barbara van Knippenberg (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam), David de Cremer (Maastricht University), Daan van Knippenberg (University of Amsterdam), & Michael A. Hogg, University of Queensland)]

June 18 - 21, 2003 an EAESP Small Group Meeting on new directions in leadership research will be held in Amsterdam, The Netherlands. The meeting aims to bring together a group of active researchers in this rapidly re-emerging field in social psychology. We intend to provide a forum for the presentation of research and at the same time provide an opportunity for discussion and collaboration. We hope to amass a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches to leadership research and are interested in broad range of topics associated with leadership (i.e., charismatic/transformational leadership, the social identity perspective of leadership, LMX, effects and determinants of leadership styles or behavior, perceptions of leadership, leadership in social dilemmas, etc., etc.). Researchers interested in participating in the meeting are invited to submit a 250 word summary of their proposed presentation to Barbara van Knippenberg (BM.van.Knippenberg@psy.vu.nl) or David de Cremer (d.decremer@psychology.unimaas.nl).

Small Group Meeting

The Psychology of Minorities: Basic Mechanisms and Social Implications

June, 27th-29th 2003, London, UK

[Organizers: Ana Guinote (University of Essex) & Yaacov Trope (New York University)]

Increased knowledge in social psychology and advances in methods facilitated the emergence of several areas in minority research during the last decades. Examples are false consensus, perceived group variability, stereotype threat, collective action, the self, perceptions of justice, system justification mechanisms, and coping with stigma. Findings in these domains have been supported not only by research with natural minorities, but also by experimental research aiming to separate the relative effects of power, status, and group size. Several, often competing, explanatory models emerged in each domain. However, the different domains of minority research have been operating independently with little communication among them.

Oftentimes research characterizes first the normal, majority functioning, and minority research appears at a later stage, as a moderation case for the general law. Examples are the findings that people normally favour their ingroup over the outgroup (ingroup favoritism) but low status groups don't (Mullen, Brown, & Smith, 1992), and that people normally perceive the outgroup in a more differentiated and complex way than the ingroup (outgroup homogeneity effect) but minorities don't (Simon & Brown, 1987). Minority research is, therefore, strongly associated with majority research, which encourages minority researchers to stay enclosed in the knowledge and tools driven by majority research in a particular domain.

The purpose of the current small group meeting is to contribute to the integration of knowledge in minority research. Furthermore, it aims to foster the development of a non-reactive minority research: Research that

aims to understand minorities' cognitive, affective, and self-regulatory mechanisms from which predictions can be derived.

We are currently inviting 20-25 top researchers on minority, power, and status issues. Examples of relevant domains are: Majority and minority social influence, performance, stereotype threat, the self, perceived group variability, ingroup favouritism, coping mechanisms, and well-being. To submit an application please send a 250 abstract to Ana Guinote (aguinote@essex.ac.uk) by end of January, 2003.

Small Group Meeting

Social Cognition: Evolutionary and Cultural Perspectives

July, 16th-19th 2003, Buda Castle, Budapest, Hungary

[Organizers in alphabetical order: Joseph P. Forgas (University of New South Wales, Sydney), Janos Laszlo (Institute of Psychology, Hungarian Academy of Sciences) & Csaba Pleh (Budapest Technical University)]

This small group meeting, to be held in a beautiful location in historic Buda Castle in the center of Budapest, aims to explore the relevance of recent developments in evolutionary and cultural psychology to the study of social cognition. Social cognition has become one of the dominant paradigms within experimental social psychology during the past two decades. In the early 1980s, the emergence of the social cognitive approach was strongly influenced by the application of research methods and approaches borrowed from cognitive psychology to the social domain. The initial impact of the social cognitive approach was somewhat limited by the fact that it was widely perceived to be insensitive to the social and cultural context within which social thinking occurs, and also failed to encompass more fundamental and evolutionarily determined aspects of human behaviour. We believe that the last few years saw a significant expansion of the social cognitive framework. One emerging influence has

been the increasing acceptance of evolutionary principles as having an important influence on social thinking and behaviour. The second major extension is the result of incorporating ideas from research on language and culture into the social cognitive paradigm.

The objective of this small group meeting is to bring together leading researchers from these fields, in order to produce a comprehensive overview and integration of the cultural and evolutionary approaches to social cognition. We hope that contributions will be published in a book form.

The meeting will be held in the heart of Budapest, in a beautiful and romantic setting in Buda Castle overlooking the Danube. Free accommodation will be provided within the Castle precinct to invited participants. Researchers interested in participating are asked to submit a 250 word abstract of their proposed contribution and a recent cv as soon as possible, and not later than the 1st February 2003 to Joseph Forgas (jp.forgas@unsw.edu.au), and to Janos Laszlo (laszlo@mtapi.hu). We look forward to hearing from you!

Small Group Meeting

Decision Making: Motivation and Cognition

September, 3rd - 5th 2003, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

[Organizers: Bernard Nijstad, Bianca Beersma, Carsten de Dreu, and Daan van Knippenberg (University of Amsterdam)]

September 3-5, 2003, an EAESP Small Group Meeting on small group decision making will be held in Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Recent years have seen an upsurge in activity in the area of small group research, and research has mainly concentrated on small groups performing cognitive tasks such as decision making, idea generation, problem solving, and negotiation. The aim of the meeting is to bring together researchers who study the interface between cognition, motivation, and group

processes in a decision making context. The meeting will provide a forum for the presentation of recent research and will provide opportunities for discussion and collaboration. Researchers who are interested in participating in this meeting are invited to submit a 250 words summary of their proposed presentation to Bernard Nijstad (nijstad@psy.uva.nl).

Small Group Meeting

On Minority Influence Processes

September 2003, Oxford, UK

[Organisers: Miles Hewstone (University of Oxford, UK) & Robin Martin (University of Queensland, Australia)]

An EAESP Small Group Meeting on Minority influence processes will be held in New College, Oxford (UK). The meeting aims to bring together a group of active researchers in this area and to provide a forum for the presentation of research and an opportunity for discussion and collaboration. We are also keen to include scholars who may not be active researchers in this area, but who can bring new perspectives in understanding minority influence processes. The meeting will cover a range of issues, such as theoretical development, new methodologies and practical applications. Potential participants in the meeting are invited to submit a 250-word summary of their proposed presentation to Robin Martin (r.martin@psy.uq.edu.au) by date to be arranged.

Medium Size Meeting

The Social Psychological Analysis of Social Inclusion and Exclusion

September 11-14, 2003, Canterbury, UK

[Organisers: Dominic Abrams and Miles Hewstone]

This medium sized meeting will survey the present and potential contribution of social psychology to policy formulation in the sphere of social inclusion and exclusion. In Europe, problems of racism, intergroup and intercultural conflict, and migrant populations have become increasingly salient, but it is unclear whether policy makers heed the existing social psychological evidence within Europe or internationally. In North America there are different models for involving social psychologists in policy formulation, with more active involvement in the multicultural context of Canada. Because the problems of social integration are becoming global in nature (e.g. because cultural groups may be defined by religion or language as strongly as by skin colour or nationality) it is becoming more necessary to provide a coherent social psychological analysis of relevant processes, and to be able to communicate this to policy makers. The meeting will therefore aim to bring together social psychologists whose work is orientated towards these policy issues, and policy makers that are interested in learning more about such work. The location, in England, reflects that there is a European/North American axis that captures these research interests. The programme includes papers and discussion sessions as well as time to talk informally and share ideas in the context of appropriate British hostels.

Both empirical and theoretical perspectives are encouraged. The number of presentations will be limited to a maximum of 20 in order to allow a maximum of time for theoretical and empirical discussions, debates and plans for collaboration.

The meeting will have a maximum of 40 residential participants. It is intended that there should be a mix of senior academics, early career

academics and postgraduate researchers. We would welcome applications through the new Regional Support Fund. We encourage affiliate members of the Association to apply, particularly if they are also members of SPSSI. Participants who wish to present a paper are asked to send a 150 word abstract and further relevant information. Participants who are willing not to present a paper are welcome to present a poster.

Further details will be posted on the EAESP website during the next few months. Inquiries from potential participants should be directed to Dominic Abrams or Miles Hewstone by email (D.Abrams@ukc.ac.uk or miles.hewstone@psy.ox.ac.uk).

Reports of Previous Meetings

Small Group Meeting On Social Cognition

At Puerto de la Cruz, Tenerife (Spain), 19th-21st, September, 2002
Organizer: Armando Rodriguez, University of La Laguna, Tenerife,
Scientific Committee: Armando Rodriguez; Ramon Rodriguez;
Jacques-Philippe Leyens

It was the mayor of Puerto de la Cruz, Tenerife, who reminded us - the participants in the Social Cognition Small Meeting convened in this beautiful coastal hillside town - of the pioneering role that Puerto de la Cruz played in the history of psychology. Here, Gestalt Psychologist Wolfgang Kohler made his famous "flash of insight" observations during WW I. This is one good reason to select Puerto de la Cruz as the site for an insightful meeting on social-social cognition. However, the mayor also remarked that Kohler's local collaborator in those "insight" studies from the turn of the twentieth century only relatively recently passed away in that peaceful little town. Thus, the atmosphere conducive to research and longevity is another good reason to entertain the idea of staying in Tenerife even after the meeting.

The organizers defined the organizing theme for the meeting as follows: "Many social psychologists are speaking now of a cognitive monster, which is said to be non-dangerous, although it is still under chains. With the present meeting, we suggest to complement these perspectives and to conduct a social-social cognition meeting rather than a social cognition-cognition one. Some would speak of 'soft' cognition. We prefer to speak of the role of affective and motivational variables upon cognitions (and behaviors as well since 'thinking is for doing'). We have in mind the role of goals, intentions, expectancies, group-threat, self-threat, and controllability. At a time of wars, increased gap between wealthy and poor, waves of immigration, and creeping racism, the meeting should also emphasize the theoretical advances that can be made by looking directly at societal problems".

Although the exact meanings of social-social cognition are, probably, still open to several interpretations, the thirteen oral presentations presented at the meeting and discussed by the entire body of participants indicated that the gist of the concept coined by the organizers was sufficiently understood: It is social cognition enriched 'livened up' by affect, motivations, and goals, and one which is sensitive to personal, group and societal issues.

It is important to note that although the organizers of the meeting from La Laguna University laid down the rule that only the visitors to the Island would make the formal presentations, the meeting was cordially hosted and actively attended by an enthusiastic and dynamic group of Social Psychology faculty members and students from La Laguna headed by Armando Rodriguez. The high impact of this group and the beneficial procedural aspect that each presentation was allocated one hour, a major portion of which was devoted to an open discussion with the entire group, added to the lively atmosphere that characterized the meeting.

The first morning was devoted to social cognition in the group context. Sabine Otten opened this session with a paper on the role of motivational determinants, such as the need for cognitive structure, and contextual determinants, such as group reality in shaping the use of self-anchoring ingroup judgments. Her talk was followed by a paper by Enmanuelle Dupont (with Jacques-Philippe Leyens and Bernard Rimé) on the role of perceived pervasiveness of discrimination among members of low-status groups in determining the emotional consequences of exposure to a single case of discrimination against the group. Finally, in this morning session, Anne-Marie de la Haye argued that stereotyping research is almost exclusively centered on how outgroup (rather than ingroup) members are perceived. She presented data on ingroup and out-group judgments, as affected by the awareness of the prevailing cultural knowledge about the judged groups (ingroup and outgroup). That is, the cultural dimension of stereotypes is accentuated.

The afternoon session started with an interpersonal paper by Roos Vonk on the effects of ingratiation during dyadic interaction. This research on "slimy" behaviors demonstrates that ingratiation certainly works well for the ingratiating person, even when the target has been cued to the

possibility of such behavior. This talk was followed by a connectionist presentation by Frank Van Overwalle (with Tim Vanhooymissen) on illusory correlations in a majority- minority context. The model simulates several previously found judgmental phenomena such as increased liking for majority groups as well as better memory for minority group information.

The next morning brought us into non-conventional altitudes. Basking in our social role as “scientists” (and Armando Rodriguez’ local connections) we were all provided with the opportunity of climbing (by bus of course) to the heights of the Teida Mountains, to visit the imposing volcano, which reigns over the Island of Tenerife. After passing through all the broad range of the island’s typical vegetation, as shaped by different altitudes, we arrived at Del Teida Observatory, a major astrophysical observatory shared by several European countries, at a height of 2400 meters above sea level (it is generally but not on the day we visited well above the clouds). We were able to marvel at the sophisticated equipment and learn that an aspiring astronomer needs to make a major career decision: whether he or she is a night person (destined to study the stars) or a day person (who would better concentrate on the astrophysical study of the sun). Lunch was ready for at a state hotel near a magnificent geological park. The moon-like setting around us, so we were told, was used in the “Planet of the Apes” film (no direct link to Kohler’s work). As we went down the mountain, we got a second glimpse in reverse order of the lush, variegated landscapes until we reached our seaside resort once again.

This mountains excursion obviously presented a challenge to the participants’ abilities, which was met effectively by the afternoon speakers. Kai Assenter, back in the conference room, combined two unrelated lines of research on thought suppression and on idea generation to show that activating creativity leads to cognitive procedures that help overcome the limitations of intentional cognition. Bogdan Wojciszke took the affective angle, to show how self-esteem maintenance motives become activated when power-related information (related to gender roles) is being processed.

The third day focused more on societal issues. Sociologist Douglas Massey (with Mary J. Fischer) presented data from a national longitudinal survey of minority freshmen in 28 American colleges and universities in the US bearing on the effects of stereotype threat on academic achievements among minority students. Susan Fiske (with Cara Talaska and Shelly Chaiken) presented an argument for a more affective (focusing on emotional prejudice) and less cognitive (focusing on stereotypes) approach to the prediction of discriminatory behaviors. This was illustrated, with data on reactions to gay men showing the advantage of former over the latter in accounting for past behavior and predicting future behavior. Yechiel Klar (with Sonia Roccas and Ido Liviatan) presented a study conducted among Jewish-Israeli students related to moral symmetry and asymmetry in evaluations of wrongdoings perpetrated by the ingroup (Israelis) towards the outgroup (Palestinians) and vice versa, as well as by two external groups. Muriel Dumont (with Vincent Yzerbyt, Daniel Wigboldus and Ernestine H. Gordijn) presented a study conducted one week after September 11, 2001 in which European respondents' reported fear was affected by a social categorization manipulation (whether they were defined as Westerners or Europeans). Finally, a paper by Stephanie Demoulin, Jacques-Philippe Leyens, Michel Desert, Magali Michotte, van den Berck, and Jeroen Vaes) presented by J.-P. Leyens, distinguished between two kinds of social norms addressing intergroup and interracial contact: color-blind and color-conscious. The latter was found in the presented studies to be more effective. These two orientations were successfully linked to prevention and the promoting of greater contact.

A farewell cocktail party and elegant dinner accompanied by a musical quartet (connected with the members of the La Laguna Psychology department) and a group chorus on making-social-cognition-more-social conducted by Anne-Marie de la Haye and performed by the entire group of happy participants were the official concluding notes of this very friendly, enjoyable and successful meeting. The La Laguna people deserve many cheers.

Yechiel Klar

Cognitive processes in psychological states potentially impairing adaptive functioning: Depression, aging, under stereotyping and stress.

International small group conference, Warsaw / Kazimierz Dolny, Poland, September 8-12, 2002.

Much has been achieved in almost seven years, since Warsaw School of Social Psychology had been founded. This was clearly to be seen for all contributors at a small group conference on cognitive processes in different psychological states, who were warmly received on the sunny restaurant patio on Sunday afternoon by Grzegorz Sedek and his marvelous team of organizers, Izabela Krejtz, Kinga Piber-Dabrowska, Aneta Brzezicka-Rotkiewicz, and Sylwia Bedynska. Since last year, the school occupies a new building, a remodeled factory, to host approximately 6000 students mostly in psychology (social, clinical, cross-culture, media) but also sociology, philosophy and English philology. Laboratory and teaching facilities are at the newest standard, and there really is a thriving spirit of innovation and initiative, which nowadays makes the school one of the most attractive places to study psychology and other social sciences in Poland. After an introductory reception at the school, some of us took the opportunity to explore the picturesque old town of Warsaw in the mild late-summer afternoon, before the whole group of 20 participants from the USA, Germany, the United Kingdom and the USA left Warsaw by coach, to travel to the small town of Kazimierz, ancient merchant town situated at the upper Vistula river. Kazimierz has been left undamaged in World War 2, and much of the original architecture from the 17. century is still preserved. The Vistula riverside is still in natural condition, which creates an atmosphere of pristine beauty and remoteness, ideally suited for some days of scientific retreat, such as we had in mind.

The contributors' came from different backgrounds with substantial overlap, such as the emotion-cognition link (Elaine Fox, Jutta Joormann, Edward Necka, Grzegorz Sedek), working memory (Randall Engle, Akira Miyake, Klaus Oberauer, James Waltz), social cognition (Miroslaw Kofta, Daniel McIntosh, Ulrich von Hecker), and aging (Elizabeth Maylor, Ralf Krampe, Paul Verhaeghen, Patrick Rabbitt). The aim of the conference had

been to bring together scholars from those different fields, to engender mutual dialogue and advancement in the understanding of common problems in intersecting areas. Cognitive functioning and adaptation is being addressed in research on working memory as well as in various attempts to understand specific psychological states. Anxiety, depression, older age, or the experience of social stigmatization, to name just a few examples, can change the way we memorize, reason, or make judgments. Knowledge about these functional changes might again inform theories about working memory and social cognition in general. Speakers focused on the relation between allocated amount of attentional resources and certain modes of processing, as well as on how patterns of executive functioning may characterize certain states, such as anxiety, depression (dysphoria), or stereotype threat. They also talked about different candidate functions within current models of working memory, such as attention, maintenance, or inhibition, in order to better understand how those psychological states might affect thinking and judgment. Three days of intense dialogue and exchange were supplemented by many occasions and opportunities to just take in the flavor and spirit of the place. The beer and Slivovica taverns around the old market place were frequented by disputing psychologists until very, very late, and there was more than one good restaurant serving tasty Jewish recipes. Max Bielecki, accomplished pianist and at the same time master degree student at Warsaw School of Social Psychology, organized a concert in Naleczow, a small spa town in the area, where we all went on Tuesday late afternoon to enjoy an evening of musical variety between Baroque and Rachmaninov. On Thursday morning, the bus brought back to Warsaw a group of people who had received intriguing new impressions and ideas. Much to think about, lots of e-mails to exchange with one another in the future, and even a book project on the horizon. High praises go to all who were involved in organizing this stimulating and wonderful event, but first and foremost to Greg Sedek and his crew of ingenious young ladies!

Ulrich von Hecker

Grants

Nathalie Dalle (postgraduate travel grant)

GRANT REPORTS

Christine Stich, Free University of Berlin, Germany
postgraduate travel grant

Thanks to the EAESP travel grant I visited the Department of Psychology at McGill University in Montreal, Canada, from August 16 until September 31 of this year. The reason of my visit was to work with Prof. Dr. Bärbel Knäuper on the development of a psychometric scale measuring individual differences in "aesthetic sensitivity." Aesthetic sensitivity is defined as a person's tendency to be influenced by aesthetic elements in his or her surrounding. We propose that individuals differ in the degree to which they are affected by the way things around them "look and feel," and that it differently affects their subjective well-being or even their physical health. The scale development is part of my dissertation project and the scale will allow testing a variety of competing hypotheses about the impact of aesthetic elements on preference judgments and subjective well-being.

Dr. Knäuper and her graduate and undergraduate students at McGill University gave me a very warm welcome to Montreal. After a few days at McGill University I felt as if I were a regular member of the Psychology Department. I participated in lab meetings and went to different talks and presentations given by graduate students as well as invited speakers from other universities. Since the start of the Fall term fell into the middle of my stay I was also invited to social events like, for example, a softball game between graduate students, faculty and staff, which is organized each year to welcome the new graduate students to the department. Beside these "official" social events the members of the Department, Dr. Knäuper and her students made me feel at home not only in the

Department but also in Montreal by showing me the many beautiful sites in the city and by taking me to many interesting events.

As mentioned above, the purpose of my stay at the Department of Psychology, McGill University, was to increase the knowledge and skills necessary to develop a psychometric scale measuring individual differences in aesthetic sensitivity. I brought an initial item pool, which I had developed in the past few months before my stay at McGill, and which I had already administered to a sample of experts who rated the items in terms of their aesthetic values. I also brought data from a first Internet study conducted with the initial item pool. I met with Dr. Knäuper several times each week to talk about the work I had done on the initial item pool, the item analysis and item selection, and the evaluation of the psychometric properties of this first scale version. In our meetings I learned a lot about the further steps in the scale development. Dr. Knäuper helped me to get a better understanding of the theoretical and practical steps involved in designing a psychometric scale and testing its psychometric properties. She helped me with the final item selection and getting a more precise idea how the final scale should look like in terms of item structure and response format. Moreover, she helped me to keep the big picture of my dissertation project in mind while working on the various steps concerning the scale development. At the end of my stay at McGill University, thanks to Dr. Knäuper, I had not only finished a main part of the scale development, but had also developed a concrete, detailed plan laying out the remaining work on the scale development, including its validation with a large sample of novices and experts, planned for the near future.

Furthermore, Dr. Knäuper and I designed a questionnaire experiment which is the last of a series of three studies investigating the effects of stretching the numeric values on the top or bottom of ratings scales on response reliability and validity. I conducted this experiment upon my return to the Free University of Berlin with a sample of undergraduate students, and we are currently in the process of analyzing the data.

Teaching research methods and statistics at the Free University of Berlin I was also given the opportunity to do some co-teaching at McGill

University in a class of honours students, which marked the first time for me to teach in English.

In summary, my stay in Montreal was extremely motivating and inspiring for me. I made a lot of progress in my current work, got very much inspiration for the further steps in my dissertation project and am highly motivated to also continue the collaboration with Dr. Knäuper on other projects. Moreover, I learned once more that visiting a foreign University and doing research with people in other countries is extremely valuable and most stimulating. Finally I would recommend visiting a foreign University to all postgraduate students mainly in order to benefit from a stimulating environment but also to visit cities like Montreal, which is one of the most beautiful and most friendly cities I have ever been to. I am very thankful to Dr. Knäuper and to her graduate students for the great time I had at McGill University and in Montreal, and I also thank the EAESP for providing me with the necessary funding for this trip.

Patricia M. Rodriguez Mosquera (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

postdoctoral seedcorn grant

I visited the Department of Psychology at UC Berkeley during the period April-June 2002. The main goal of my visit was to do research together with Prof. dr. Dacher Keltner and his research group. When I went to UC Berkeley I was working as a post-doctoral researcher at the Social Psychology Program at the University of Amsterdam. I am currently assistant professor at the same department. My research activities focus primarily on the cultural shaping of emotion. Prof. Keltner's research group is specialized in the experimental and field study of emotion in social processes, such as group conflict and negotiation, teasing, prejudice, and bereavement. Moreover, this research group is also specialized in the measurement and coding of facial expressions of emotions using the Facial Action Coding System (FACS). The FACS is widely recognized as the most comprehensive tool to analyze facial expressions of emotions. An additional aim of my research visit was to learn the FACS.

Prof. Keltner and his research group gave me a very warm welcome when I arrived at UC Berkeley. I was given office space as well as full access to departmental and university facilities from the beginning of my visit, and I felt integrated in the 'research life' of the group quite fast. I immediately could take part of the weekly research meetings on emotion and social processes the group had. I was impressed by the theoretical and methodological sophistication of the research this group carries out, what I found very inspiring for my own research on culture and emotion. I could also participate in other activities of the department, such as weekly colloquia. I gave a talk at the department about my own research. Moreover, I started working with Prof. Keltner on a common project on culture and emotion already during my first week at UC Berkeley, and we kept on having research meetings quite regularly. When I left Berkeley I felt I had accomplished the research goals I had when I arrived, and my collaborative work with Prof. Keltner and his group still continues.

My research visit to the Psychology Department at UC Berkeley was on the whole a very inspiring, productive and useful professional experience to me. I am very thankful to the EAESP for the financial aid provided by the seedcorn grant and for making my visit to UC Berkeley possible.

René Ziegler, Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen, Germany
postdoctoral seedcorn grant

Information utility and the multiple source effect revisited: The moderating role of source group valence

I have conducted three studies aimed at replicating and extending a series of studies conducted by Harkins and Petty (1981, 1987). In this series of studies, Harkins and Petty tested the effects of multiple sources on attitude change. They did so based on the observation that previous research had confounded actual exposure to persons or arguments with the mere knowledge about how many other persons or arguments existed in support of an advocacy. That is, participants had been exposed to one or multiple sources or to one or multiple arguments, but participants in the one-source or one-argument condition had not been told explicitly

that multiple sources or arguments in favor of the advocated position existed and that they might be presented with these sources or arguments. For this reason, in these prior studies, it could not be determined whether higher levels of attitude change in the case of multiple sources or arguments resulted from actual exposure to these multiple sources or arguments or from the mere information about the existence of multiple sources or arguments (cf. Harkins & Petty, 1981).

For this reason, Harkins and Petty (1981) held constant background information concerning the number of sources and the number of arguments supporting the position that might be presented to the recipients. In an initial study (Harkins & Petty, 1981; Experiment 1), one or three arguments were presented by one or three sources. In the case of three sources presenting three different arguments, one argument was ascribed to source A, a second argument to source B, and a third argument to source C. In the one source / three arguments condition, all arguments were introduced as coming from the same source (either A, or B, or C). In the one argument / one source condition, only one of the three arguments was presented by only one of the three sources. Finally, in the one argument / three sources condition, the three sources presented three different versions of one of the three arguments. Importantly, in order to hold background information about the number of sources and arguments constant, participants in all conditions were explicitly informed about the overall existence of three sources each of whom had favored the same position. Further, participants were told that each source had generated three arguments to support this advocacy. The results on attitudes and favorable message-related thoughts showed that multiple arguments provided by multiple sources led to more agreement with the counterattitudinal advocacy than multiple arguments provided by one source or one argument presented by either one or multiple sources. In a further study (Harkins & Petty, 1981, Experiment 3) evidence was found consistent with the hypothesis that multiple sources presenting multiple arguments lead to heightened message elaboration. Three sources presenting three strong arguments led to more agreement than one source presenting these arguments. In contrast, three sources presenting three weak arguments led to less agreement than one source presenting these arguments.

Extending their prior work, Harkins and Petty (1987) addressed the question of why multiple sources enhance processing. In their first study, extensive message processing was found when multiple sources were presented as individuals who had reported their views independently. In comparison, message scrutiny was reduced when the three sources were introduced as members of a committee who worked together to research and write their report as well as when the arguments were presented by a single source. In a final study (Harkins & Petty, 1987; Experiment 3) it was shown that arguments presented by a committee consisting of three sources selected to represent many different perspectives so as to generate a diversity of viewpoints on the committee were scrutinized more effortfully than message arguments from a committee whose three sources were selected to be as similar as possible so as to promote a congenial atmosphere among the committee members.

Thus, the studies conducted by Harkins and Petty show that (a) multiple sources lead to more message scrutiny than one source (Harkins & Petty, 1981; Experiment 3), (b) multiple sources who are seen as being independent of each other lead to more message scrutiny than multiple (non-independent) sources constituting a committee (Harkins & Petty, 1987; Experiment 1), and (c) multiple sources constituting a committee lead to more message scrutiny when the committee members are perceived as providing diverse perspectives on the attitude topic as compared to when the committee members are perceived as providing similar perspectives on the attitude topic (Harkins & Petty, 1987; Experiment 3). On the basis of these findings, Harkins and Petty (1987) concluded that multiple sources may lead to heightened message scrutiny when it can be assumed that these sources provide independent viewpoints. In other words, the effect of enhanced message processing in the case of multiple sources is due to the fact that recipients may perceive the information from multiple sources to be based on different perspectives and independent pools of knowledge and, thus, to be more worthy of careful consideration.

Based on a conceptual reanalysis of existing research on the role of source factors for attitude change processes (Heesacker, Petty, & Cacioppo, 1983; Priester & Petty, 1995; Puckett, Petty, Cacioppo, & Fisher, 1983; Ziegler, Diehl & Ruther, 2002), I argue that message elaboration is contingent on

the valence congruency of multiple persuasion-relevant source characteristics. In particular, it has been shown that recipients elaborate a message more effortfully in the case of a dislikable expert and a likable nonexpert as compared to a likable expert and a dislikable nonexpert (Ziegler et al., 2002). In the former two cases, one source characteristic is of positive valence (e.g., expert) and one is of negative valence (e.g. dislikable). In contrast, in the latter two cases, both characteristics are of the same valence.

Regarding the multiple source effect, this suggests that message elaboration may be contingent not only on information utility but on information utility in combination with another source characteristic. More specifically, from this perspective high (versus low) information utility represents a positively valenced source characteristic similar to, for instance, high (versus low) expertise or likability. Accordingly, the multiple source effect identified by Harkins and Petty (1981, 1987) should hold only given a second negatively valenced source characteristic but should be reversed given a second positively valenced characteristic. For example, high (versus low) information utility in the case of multiple sources providing diverse (versus non-diverse) perspectives should lead to higher message scrutiny when the group to which multiple sources belong is low in trustworthiness. More importantly, high (versus low) information utility should lead to less message elaboration when multiple sources belong to a group high in trustworthiness.

The three experiments that I conducted, in fact, replicate the multiple source effect in the case of a negatively valenced source group but show that all three elaboration effects are reversed in the case of a positively valenced source group. That is, a positive source group leads to less message elaboration when (a) the arguments are presented by multiple sources (versus one source), (b) multiple sources are independent (versus non-independent) of each other, and (c) non-independent sources have diverse (versus non-diverse) perspectives. Thus, the conclusion offered by Harkins and Petty (1987) regarding the multiple source effect appears to be in need of revision. From a valence congruency perspective, the arguments presented by multiple sources who are perceived to provide independent viewpoints are processed more extensively only when these sources possess another negative persuasion-relevant characteristic. In contrast,

the arguments presented by multiple sources providing independent pools of knowledge seem to be considered to be less worthy of careful consideration when these sources possess a further positive characteristic.

Furthermore, taken together with previous research (Priester & Petty, 1995; Ziegler et al., 2002), a rather general function of multiple source characteristics for persuasion seems to emerge. In the case of two source characteristics, the extent of recipients' message elaboration may be determined by the valence congruency of these source characteristics. More extensive processing seems likely to occur in the case of incongruent as compared to congruent valence. Quite generally, then, it seems a worthwhile endeavor for future attitude change research to look into the role of different combinations of the various source characteristics that have so far been researched one at a time.

References:

- Harkins, S. G., & Petty, R. E. (1981). Effects of source magnification of cognitive effort on attitudes: An information-processing view. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 401-413.
- Harkins, S. G., & Petty, R. E. (1987). Information utility and the multiple source effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 260-268.
- Heesacker, M. H., Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1983). Field dependence and attitude change: Source credibility can alter persuasion by affecting message-relevant thinking. *Journal of Personality*, 51, 653-666.
- Priester, J. R., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Source attributions and persuasion: Perceived honesty as a determinant of message scrutiny. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 637-654.
- Puckett, J. M., Petty, R. E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Fisher, D. L. (1983). The relative impact of age and attractiveness stereotypes on persuasion. *Journal of Gerontology*, 38, 340-343.
- Ziegler, R., Diehl, M., & Ruther, A. (2002). Multiple source characteristics and persuasion: Source inconsistency as a determinant of message scrutiny. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 496-508.

News about Members

In Memoriam: Michael Argyle

When Michael Argyle died on September 6th 2002 at the age of 77, he was still writing and teaching at Oxford Brookes University, where he had been Professor Emeritus since being retired from the other local university further down Headington Hill. He had arrived at the University of Oxford in 1952 as the foundation Lecturer in Social Psychology after gaining a First in Experimental Psychology in Cambridge two years earlier. His first office was above a high class bootmaker close by the converted Infant School and huts that served as the main base for the recently established Institute of Experimental Psychology. The Institute staff had little more than some brass instruments, home-made electrical devices, and mazes for the rats to support their research; social psychology had a one-way mirror and a cine-camera. Data were processed with slide rules and log tables. Elsewhere in the UK, only LSE had a department of social psychology. What was taught was almost entirely American in origin. The initial national development of social psychology in the UK rested in the hands of Michael and a small group of refugees who had escaped from the Holocaust.

At a public level, Michael was the most visibly energetic of this group. He lectured frequently around the universities, at BPS conferences, and to diverse professional groups and the wider public. He broadcast. As demand for social psychology grew, his graduating D.Phil. students became a prime source of foundation lecturers around and beyond the UK. He wrote. In addition to the many research articles, there were many books. The first of the 25+ of these was essentially a guide to the doing of social psychology, the first of its kind in the UK. He was the joint founder of the British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology. He initiated and established the Social Psychology Section of the British Social Psychological Society with its annual conferences. The efficient use of energy was not confined to the United Kingdom.

Michael was an early evangelist for social psychology in Europe and was a founder member of the EAESP. He directed the 1976 Summer School of the association held in Oxford. As well as being a regular speaker at the biennial conferences, he engaged in lecture tours that included all the European Community countries before that community was invented. At Oxford, both short- and long-term visitors from across the channel were always welcome.

As his research became internationally recognized, so Michael rose rapidly to become a favoured speaker for conferences and lecture tours around most of the other continents. He was an early recipient of a Fellowship at the Institute of Advanced Study at Palo Alto, and was awarded a succession of other fellowships and visiting professorships. Oxford activities were not neglected, and Michael was delighted to be involved in the foundation of Wolfson College, where he served subsequently as Vicegerent (not a misprint!), as well being a committed and continuously serving Fellow.

Regrettably, it needs to be noted that being a pioneer is seldom popular with any pre-existing Establishment, and that for Michael the promotion of social psychology was not simply a matter of doing research, publishing, and talking. There was, and still is, opposition to the subject as a legitimate and necessary perspective in the pursuit of describing and explaining human experience and behaviour. Especially in the early days, there were vocal psychologists who were dismissive and derogatory about any psychological levels of explanation that could not be reduced to brain functioning, and Michael was a remarkably resilient and amiable butt of such attitudes. I never saw him fazed by insulting questions; on the contrary he invariably treated them seriously and answered them with good humour. Even the British Psychological Society was reluctant to treat social psychology on a par with what were then labelled as comparative, physiological, and experimental psychology. During this time, experimental methods were idealized, and hypothetico-deductive theories with falsifiable predictions were treated as the Holy Grail of explanations. These points are mentioned, not to gain sympathy, but to suggest reasons why Michael himself was so committed to laboratory-situated experimental methods in his early research and even later was

inclined to a positivism that worried younger and more phenomenological and constructivist colleagues.

Michael's earliest research ranged across a variety of fields: socialization, religious behaviour, industrial psychology, delinquency, and social problems generally. His first sustained and substantial research contribution was in the relatively uncharted area of non-verbal communication. Beginning with the study of the roles of gaze in exchanging turns during speaking and listening in face-to-face encounters, he moved on to ask how changes in eye-contact varied as function of changes in the value of other variables such as distance and social intimacy. From these initial experimental studies, Michael expanded the investigations to the full range of non-verbal cues and their functions, charting and explaining their significance in behaviour. He offered explanations as to how profiles of NVC were interpreted, and in this work he pitted their operation against features of the verbal channel. In public demonstrations he was prone to show that results could still be obtained with bizarre manipulations, such as having people talk to portraits and the departmental bust of McDougall. Alas, the underlying seriousness of these presentations was missed and helped to support prejudices against social psychology – a consequence that is no surprise to any social psychologist! Having established which values of which cues were relevant to behaviour and judgments in relatively static contexts, it was necessary to incorporate the temporal dimension so as to be able to comment on the dynamics of social interaction, as it operates in the real world.

Adopting and adapting the model of sensori-motor skills that was popular at the time, Michael coined the term “social skills” and studied how social performances and particularly strange performances were evaluated both by the performers themselves and by other people. Training programs were constructed and run for persons who could be shown to need to change, if they were to behave in ways more acceptable to other people. The first applications were for mental health patients and managers, but the principles and practices were quickly generalized to other categories of people and other contexts. These programs are now standard components in the institutions of our society. Training in social skills is a feature of schools' curricula, vocational courses for teachers, doctors, nurses, and other care workers, and in courses for personnel management in commerce

and industry. Both Michael and his colleagues were in great demand for running these courses.

Being able to exercise the appropriate social skills at the right time is crucial to the formation and maintenance of all social relationships, and the study of the integration of skills into relationships constituted the next research phase. This required an appreciation of the anatomy and dynamics of relationships, and it was necessary to investigate and codify the rules which people believed needed to be followed in sustaining both their informal and formal social relationships.

It should be added that these extended projects were very much products of teamwork in their devising, in the data collection and processing, and in the interpretation of the results. That I do not name names of collaborators is only because there were so many, and I would not know how to operate a cut-off point even between those who obviously merit naming and those who could be mentioned. Suffice it to say that the teams met frequently and regularly, and Michael always paid tribute in his lectures and writings to those who had contributed to the research.

Two further points should be made about all this research. The first is that although committed to the generation and testing of theory and to grounding conclusions firmly upon empirically sound evidence, Michael was equally concerned that the research should inform policies and practice. As noted already, this bore particular fruit with social skills training, but it was equally true of all his enterprises that he endeavoured to show how they could be used to improve the human condition.

The second point is related to the first. In addition to the research being published in the relevant academic journals and scholarly books, it was also disseminated widely in professional and popular media, and especially through readily readable books. In writing the latter, Michael displayed a competence for expressing ideas clearly and simply. Wherever possible he used sections and generated lists that minimized the load on the reader. He had the advantage that the subject matter was intrinsically interesting and that what he had to say was informative, but this does not detract from his talent for avoiding pedantry and unnecessary complexity. His

best-selling "Psychology of Interpersonal Behaviour" is reputed to have sold almost half a million copies and is still in print.

Following his contributions to the study of social relationships, there was an appropriate switch in his main methodology as he began to wrestle with what people were trying to achieve with their social skills, both in their relationships and beyond. How can happiness be promoted. His text on religious behaviour was revised and re-published. He examined the roles of sociability, cooperation, and money in the pursuit of human happiness at work and in leisure. Books on each of these topics were written and published. These enterprises were based on the premiss that happiness is not simply the absence of unhappiness. As pronounced in the bible, it is hazardous just to cast out devils because even worse devils may come to replace them. Witness the states of some elderly people who "have everything done for them". If clinicians can relieve depression, are their ex-patients to be left to be bored or frustrated, or should they be offered help in adopting satisfying behaviour? The resultant studies were clear in their import that if people are to be happy, they need to engage whole-heartedly in a variety of activities. The profile and potential recipes emerging were well-grounded in the empirical research he conducted and they included: engaging in energetic activities, preferably with like-minded others, and being sociable and co-operative in a network that included stable social relationships. Religious experience and behaviour were beneficial. Satisfying work was as important as satisfying leisure. An excess of wealth or income was not a positive benefit.

Certainly he practiced what his data implied. His own daily and weekly timetable was adhered to quite firmly, with specific times allotted to the various components of his life. What critics might have interpreted as regimentation, friends could view as a means of fitting as much as possible into each day. It is true that under pressure, a stylized manner could appear, sometimes leading to jests that others reacted to badly, and who interpreted his comments as insulting when they were in fact intended to diffuse tension. Having de-briefed Michael about such matters on more than one such occasion, I can say that he was puzzled and upset that his intentions had been misconstrued. I would try to persuade him that his Gricean presuppositions and implicatures were not always interpreted easily or correctly beyond English cities with a surfeit of spires. In fact, I

cannot recall Michael ever having been intentionally offensive; on the contrary he appeared to be invariably cheerful and good-willed. It was in my last conversation with him that he said that until his final stay in hospital he had never experienced serious depression and certainly not despair, and how awful it must be for people who do so habitually.

My impression is that his work on happiness has not as yet captured the research interest of colleagues to the nearly the same extent as his contributions to social interaction and social relationships. This is regrettable but at least one possible reason for this has an ironic twist. The very success of the social psychology that Michael Argyle helped to establish has resulted in an orthodoxy of degree syllabuses and most of the American texts that feed these. New topics, such as happiness have not gained inclusion among or managed supplanted the now established traditional curricula and book sections. This did not upset Michael, who retained his own optimism until his death. He devoted his personal life to a purposeful but fun-loving exercise of what he saw as the implications of his Christian faith. He devoted his working life to the development of a social psychology as significant discipline in its own right and as a source of implications for the betterment of human beings as persons and of society.

*Prepared by Peter Robinson
and improved thanks to Peter Collett, Mary Joshi-Sissons,
Mansur Lalljee, Roger Lamb, and Ann McKendry*

Announcements**AASP 2003 in Manila**

The Fifth Biennial Conference of Asian Association of Social Psychology will be in Manila, the Philippines, July 29 to August 1, 2003. The conference theme will be "The Application of Social Psychology in Asian Cultures."

The 2003 Manila Conference represents the AASP's continuing efforts to develop and promote social psychological research in Asia. The conference will highlight the rich variety of approaches in studying, practicing, and applying social psychology in Asian cultures. The conference shall also provide a venue for surfacing theoretical, methodological, and applied issues that may facilitate or hinder the growth of social psychology in Asia.

The conference will feature invited addresses by the following prominent psychologists who are leaders in the study and application of psychology in Asian cultures: Dr. Toshei Yamagishi (Hokkaido University), Dr. Kwok Leung (City University of Hong Kong), Dr. Sang-Chin Choi (Chung-Ang University, Korea), Dr. Chang Weining Chu (National University of Singapore), Dr. Sarlito Wirawan Sarwono (University of Indonesia), and Dr. Noraini Noor (International Islamic University, Malaysia). AASP President-Elect Dr. Kwang-Kuo Hwang (National Taiwan University) will deliver the Presidential Address.

The conference will serve as a venue for sharing research on the various fields and aspects of social psychological phenomena. There will be oral paper presentations, symposia, and poster presentations in a wide range of fields in basic and applied social psychology, and also other subfields of psychology that deal with the social dimension of the human experience. The official language of the conference will be English.

The conference will be jointly hosted by three universities in Metro Manila: the Ateneo de Manila University (ADMU), De La Salle University-Manila (DLSU), and the University of the Philippines, Diliman (UP).

The call for abstracts can be found in the Conference website and the deadline for submission of abstracts is on January 30, 2003. For more information on the AASP 2003 Conference in Manila please check the conference website at URL: <http://www.dlsu.edu.ph/conferences/aasp> or send e-mail to Dr. Allan B. I. Bernardo at bernardoa@dlsu.edu.ph or aasp@dlsu.edu.ph.

Summer Institute in Social Psychology (SISP): Applications invited to the SPSP summer school of 2003

A new initiative.

Modeled on the bi-annual EAESP summer schools, which are held in even-numbered years, the Society of Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) has decided to offer comparable two-week intensive summer schools for US/Canadian doctoral students, to be held in the United States in odd-numbered years, beginning in 2003. **The first Summer Institute in Social Psychology (SISP) will be held at the University of Colorado, Boulder, July 13-26, 2003.**

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

Format of SISP.

Each student will enroll in one of five full-length courses, each taught by two prominent instructors. For 2003, the instructors and courses are:

- Mahzarin Banaji and Irene Blair, with Brian Nosek: Methods of assessing implicit cognition.'

- Margaret Clark and Jean-Philippe Laurenceau: Relationship processes.
- Eddie Harmon-Jones and Tiffany Ito: Social neuroscience.
- Amélie Mummendey and Stephen Wright: Discrimination versus tolerance: social identity and intergroup relations'.
- Tom Pyszczynski and Jeff Greenberg: Terror management theory and research: where should we go from here?

Students will also take one of two special methodological workshops held on the middle weekend of the two-week course period. The weekend workshop and instructors are:

- Dacher Keltner: Methods of assessing emotion.
- David Mackinnon: Mediation analysis.

SISP website.

More and detailed information on the full-length courses, on the weekend workshops and on SISP in general can be found at

<http://www.spsp.org/sisp/> This website also lists a set of eligibility criteria and it contains information on the cost and on the application procedure, but this information should be disregarded by interested European students. **Because the five European students will be selected and sponsored by EAESP, they should follow the instructions listed below (and not those described on the website).**

Application procedure for European students.

1. Interested European students should submit a Curriculum Vitae and they should fill out an application form. The application form can be found on the website of EAESP (<http://www.eaesp.org>) by clicking 'Activities' first, followed by clicking 'SISP application' in the left field. The form can then be filled out on line and be submitted directly (it gets sent automatically to Sibylle Classen). The Curriculum Vitae however should be sent separately via email to Sibylle (Sibylle@eaesp.org)
2. The application should be supported by the student's Ph.D. supervisor. Supervisors are therefore asked to write a **letter of support**, explaining why they feel their student could benefit from and add to this summer school. Supervisors are asked to email their

letter directly to Sibylle Classen, mentioning the name of the applicant supported.

3. The deadline for applications (and the support letters) is **January 31 2003**. Applications and letters of support received after January 31 2003 will not be considered.

The selection procedure.

1. Among the candidates five students will be selected for participation by the Executive Committee of EAESP.
2. In making this selection the Executive Committee will rely on the following criteria:
 - at least in the second year of the Ph.D. programme;
 - a sufficient level of (self espoused) proficiency at English;
 - - active in an area sufficiently close to a topic of SISP;
 - - strength of the supervisor's letter of support;
 - - not having participated in an EAESP summer school
 - - definitely not more than one student per institution;
 - - a reasonable distribution over countries.
3. **Decisions** will be made and communicated to those selected and not selected **by February 28 2003**.

Cost and sponsoring.

1. EAESP will sponsor **travel expenses** to Boulder (and back) for the five selected students, for a maximum of **600 Euro** per student. Selected students will be informed regarding the details of payment.
2. Each student is expected to **contribute 200 Euro** towards local expenses at Boulder. This fee covers tuition, housing in shared dorm-style rooms and meals. The Executive Committee hopes that the selected students' home departments will assist in paying this fee. Details about mode of payment will be communicated to selected students.

In concluding.

The Executive Committee hopes that many full members will encourage their doctoral students to submit an application to participate. The participation of US-students in our summer schools has in the past always turned out to be an enriching experience for them as well as for their now European friends. We have every reason to believe that the same will be true for the summer schools on the other side of the Atlantic.

Eddy Van Avermaet, secretary EAESP

Announcement from the Executive Committee**Early Career Development Grants:
Regional Support Grants to replace Manuscript
Assistance Grants****An evaluation of the Early Career Development Grants Scheme
(1999-2002).**

Starting in 1999, EAESP has added an Early Career Development (ECD) scheme to its initiatives designed to promote postgraduates and young members of EAESP through three grant schemes:

- a. postgraduate travel bursaries (up to 1350 Euro per grant);*
- b. postdoctoral 'seedcorn' research grants (up to 2250 Euro per grant);*
- c. manuscript assistance or translation grants (up to 4500 Euro per grant).*

The aim of these bursaries was to promote young scientists in academic and financial need with particular preference for postgraduates from countries which have only limited access to funding and whose infra-

structure or training facilities are less well developed than elsewhere. The criterion of need was stressed in particular for grant schemes (a) and (c).

At the request of the previous Executive Committee Anne Maass undertook a careful evaluation of the effectiveness of these schemes: had they attracted the attention of young EAESP members, as intended, and in particular had they served the prime target applicants, i.e. young scientists from less privileged parts of Europe?

The analysis showed first that ten travel grants and five seedcorn grants had been applied for (they were all funded), but over the course of the three year period not a single application for the manuscript assistance (translation) grants had been submitted. The analysis also showed that only a small minority of the grant applications came from members of less privileged countries. It appears therefore that the ECD grants fail to serve at least a portion of the targets they were designed for.

Therefore, as already communicated during the last General Meeting (see the President's report in the second issue of this year's volume of the Bulletin), it was decided to discontinue the manuscript assistance grants (the other two grant schemes are being maintained). The budget set aside for the translation scheme will be transferred to a new scheme, the Regional Support Grants (RSG). As should be obvious from the description below, the Executive Committee is confident that this new scheme may be more successful at achieving the goal of reaching young members from less privileged countries in Europe.

The Executive Committee encourages organisers of summer schools, small or medium size meetings or of any other initiatives to remind applicants from less privileged regions that they are eligible to apply for a RSG.

The Regional Support Grants scheme.

Purpose:

Regional Support Grants are intended to promote any initiative that specifically serves young EAESP members from regions where access to scientific information, facilities and/or funding is scarce compared to European standards. Under this scheme, support may be granted for a

wide range of initiatives involving either single researchers or groups. Regional support grants may provide support for (a) short visits of postgraduate or post-doctoral students to departments elsewhere in the world in order to conduct research or to undergo training, (b) participation of post-graduate or post-doctoral students at meetings, conferences or summer schools (co)sponsored by EAESP, (c) organization of workshops or any other initiatives specifically developed to serve post-graduate students from less privileged areas.

Eligibility:

a) Individual postgraduate members or full members who have completed their PhD within 36 months prior to their application coming from less privileged regions of Europe. b) Full members who are organizing workshops or other initiatives aimed at post-graduates from less privileged regions.

Amount:

a) Funding for short visits per year: two 3 month long visits (average amount per person: 1.500 €) and up to 6 short visits (e.g. two weeks) of post-graduates students to departments elsewhere in the world in order to conduct research or to undergo training (average amount per person: 650 €).

b) Fundings for participation in meetings conferences or summer schools (co) sponsored by EAESP: up to five students (a maximum of 1000 €per person)

c) Organization of workshops or other initiatives for post-graduate students from less privileged areas : (5000 €available).

Application Procedure:

Individual applicants should submit a brief (around 1000 words) proposal outlining the purpose and duration of the visit or of the conference/ workshop participation together with a travel budget. In the case of visits at a department elsewhere, a brief letter of support from the applicant's current supervisor and from the proposed collaborator in the host institution should be added.

In the case of workshops or other initiatives, the organizer needs to present a proposal outlining (a) the purpose of the workshop, (b) the participant group at which it is addressed, (c) a detailed budget, (d) a statement documenting academic and financial need of the institution hosting the workshop.

Deadlines:

There is no deadline for individual submissions and decisions will usually be made within 1 month from receipt of the application. Deadlines for applications for workshops and other initiatives serving post-graduate students should be presented either by March 31st or by September 30th. Decisions will be made during the meeting of the EC that usually take place in April and October.

All applications should be submitted to Sibylle@eaesp.org

Criteria for allocating Regional Support Grants:

Academic and financial need with particular preference for postgraduates from department which have only limited access to funds and whose infrastructure or training facilities are less well developed than elsewhere. Proposals should also indicate the likelihood /availability of obtaining alternative sources of financial support.

Deadlines for Contributions to the Executive Committee

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Administrative Secretary by **March, 1st, 2003** latest. Applications for personal grants and for the International Teaching Fellowship Scheme can be received at any time. The deadline for the next issue of the Bulletin is **February, 15th 2002**.

Executive Committee

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

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

Carmen Huici, Facultad de Psicología, Universidad Nacional de Educación, P.O. Box 60148, E-28040 Madrid, Spain
e-mail: mhuici@psi.uned.es

Russell Spears, Department of Social Psychology, University of Amsterdam, Roetersstraat 15, NL-1018 WB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
e-mail: sp_spears@macmail.psy.uva.nl

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

Vincent Yzerbyt (President), Université Catholique de Louvain, Faculté de Psychologie, 10 Place Cardinal Mercier, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
e-mail: vincent.yzerbyt@psp.ucl.ac.be

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

Administrative Secretary:
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>