

# *European Bulletin of Social Psychology*

Editors: Eddy Van Avermaet & Sibylle Classen

---

## **2 Editorial**

## **4 Article**

*A Nobel Prize for Daniel Kahneman and for the Field of Psychology*  
by Fritz Strack and Norbert Schwarz

## **15 Book Reviews**

*Attitudes and Attitude Change (2002)* by Gerd Bohner & Michaela Wänke  
Review by Derek Rutter

*Communication under the Microscope: The Theory and Practice of Microanalysis*  
by Peter Bull  
Review by Guido Peeters

## **20 New Books by Members**

*A sociocognitive approach to social norms (2003)* ed. by Nicole Dubois

*Analysing identity: Cross-cultural, societal and clinical contexts (2003)* ed. by  
Peter Weinreich & Wendy Saunderson

Psychologica Belgica, Special Issue "Social Identity and Citizenship", vol. 43,  
1/2, 2003, Guest Editors Margarita Sanchez-Mazas & Olivier Klein

## **24 Future EAESP Meetings – Calendar**

*Small Group Meeting on Social Cognition: Evolutionary and Cultural  
Perspectives*, July 15-17, 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

*Small Group Meeting on Conscious and Unconscious Attitudinal Processes*, June  
2-5, 2004, La Cristalera (Madrid), Spain

*Small Group Meeting on Social Connectionism*, June 16-19, 2004, Brussels,  
Belgium

**25 Future EAESP Meetings**

*Small Group Meeting on Conscious and Unconscious Attitudinal Processes*, June 2-5, 2004, La Cristalera (Madrid), Spain

*Small Group Meeting on Social Connectionism*, June 16-19, 2004, Brussels, Belgium

**28 EAESP Summer School 2004**

August 1-15, 2004, Groningen, The Netherlands

**30 Reports of Previous Meetings**

*Medium Size Meeting on Processes of Amelioration versus Deterioration in the Relations Between Social Groups (5<sup>th</sup> Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes)*, at Castle Kochberg, Germany, June 19-23, 2002

*Small Group Meeting on Processes of Shared Reality Construction and their Consequence for Individual and Group Phenomena*, at Kazimierz, Poland, September 22-25, 2002

**35 Grants and Grant reports**

**41 In Memoriam: Harold H. Kelley**

**48 In Memoriam: Harald G. Wallbott**

**50 Announcements**

Social Cognition: Special discount rate for EAESP members

**51 Announcements from the Executive Committee**

**55 Deadlines for Contributions**

**56 Executive Committee**

## Editorial

---

By the time this issue of the Bulletin will arrive on your desk, it will be end of June, the end of another academic year and just prior to or in the early days of a definitely deserved vacation period. This issue appears at least a month later than usual, for which we apologise, but we do hope it will live up to your expectations, and that it will make for some enjoyable summer time reading.

We open with a most interesting article by Fritz Strack and Norbert Schwarz. In an entertaining yet scholarly style they discuss the meaning and implications of the Nobel Prize awarded to our colleague Daniel Kahneman. They do so first in terms of the contributions of Kahneman's - and, of course, Tversky's as well - (social) psychological research to economics and the social sciences. Next, and this is perhaps the most intriguing argument made in Fritz's and Norb's article, they make a case that Kahneman's approach should make us believe ever more firmly in the unique contribution of a 'united' psychology, rather than a 'fragmented' psychology, or a psychology that would become 'a part of' or - even worse - 'be reduced' to neurobiology.

The remainder of this issue is devoted to the various sides of life as a member of our Association. First, books by members are reviewed and new books are being announced. Next, a calendar and specifics regarding planned meetings are listed. Amongst these we draw your attention to the first announcement of the next EAESP summer school, which will be held at Groningen (the Netherlands), August 1-15, 2004. These announcements are followed by lively reports of previous meetings and by a trio of grant reports. All these reports indicate that the Association's money is being spent well, to the scientific, personal and social enjoyment of all involved.

But there is sad news as well. This issue brings tribute to two respected members of the Association who died recently: Harold Kelley and Harald Walbott. The editors of the Bulletin are grateful to Paul van Lange and to

Klaus Scherer (and colleagues) for having written two moving in memoriams.

The issue concludes with two sets of announcements. First, we announce a special discount rate to Social cognition for EAESP members. You may want to benefit from this offer.

Next, you will find a host of announcements and calls for assistance coming directly from the Executive Committee. To prove that the new Executive Committee (we have been at work less than a year) is taking its task seriously, we are commenting on a list of topics discussed at the Committee's most recent meeting. But as the Executive Committee also believes in distribution of labour, nearly every entry in this announcement section also contains a call for assistance (editors' note: as we have learned from our own research, don't count on others to do the work: "we want you"- see the finger pointing at you?).

Finally, as an early reminder, the dates and place of the next General Meeting have been set. Please mark these dates in red on your 2005 calendar:

*July 19-23, 2005 at Würzburg (Germany).*

The editors of the Bulletin and the entire Executive Committee wish you and your families a relaxing summer.

*Eddy Van Avermaet and Sibylle Classen, editors*

**Article**

*A Nobel Prize for Daniel Kahneman  
and for the Field of Psychology<sup>1)</sup>*

**by Fritz Strack<sup>2)</sup> (Universität Würzburg) and Norbert  
Schwarz (University of Michigan)**

**Abstract**

The following article pays tribute to the work of Daniel Kahneman and deals with the significance of last year's Nobel prize awarded for his work in the field of psychology. The important role of psychological insights within economics and the social sciences will be discussed in light of this achievement. Additionally addressed will be criticisms of certain positions within psychology which try to fragment the field, thereby threatening its acknowledgement within the sciences, as well as arguments supporting the case that last year's Nobel prize for work in a more social science and cognitively oriented psychology along with the recognition in neighboring sciences which this brought with it, could only have been achieved because of the work's unique positioning within the spectrum between natural and social sciences.

---

<sup>1)</sup> A slightly different version of this article was recently published in *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie* (2003), 34, 3-8.

<sup>2)</sup> Correspondent address: Prof. Dr. Fritz Strack, Lehrstuhl für Psychologie II, Universität Würzburg, Röntgenring 10, D-97070 Würzburg, Germany  
[strack@psychologie.uni-wuerzburg.de](mailto:strack@psychologie.uni-wuerzburg.de)

### Historical perspectives

To date there has been no Nobel prize specifically assigned to the field of psychology. However, the insights from Psychology have continually extended into numerous other fields, and Daniel Kahneman is the second psychologist to have been honored with the Nobel prize in “economic sciences”. The first was Herbert Simon in 1978, who was presented with the award for his research in decision making processes in economic organizations. Now, in 2002, Daniel Kahneman has been honored “for having integrated insights from psychological research into economic science, especially concerning human judgment and decision making under uncertainty.” This outstanding acknowledgment not only is a recognized accomplishment within social psychology, it also provides us with the opportunity to reflect on the current position of psychology within the world of science.

Looking at psychology historically, it was not long ago that research within the field of decision making and resulting judgment was based solely around the then prominent “rational model” theory. This was a theory developed within economics and which had been strongly reinforced by its constant use throughout the years. By computing measures of value and probability, the decision maker is able to rationally optimize his actions. It was commonly known that errors were to be found in complicated operations. There was general agreement in the assumption, however, that these errors were not based on any systematic psychological process. It was more commonly believed that the laws of objective probability judgments carried over into the generation of subjective expectations.

The majority of social psychologists tended to be more skeptical when examining error within the rational model. From the perspective of the consistency theory, already in the 1950s, man was seen less as “rational” and more as “rationalizing”. The focus was not so much on the motivation to make rational decisions, but rather on justifying, rationally, a decision after it was made. Research within this tradition stressed common distortions in opinion formation, perception, and memory. It also showed that information which may have contradicted a previously

made decision would be devalued and underestimated in its true significance (Abelson et al., 1968).

Herbert Simon is known as well for his expressed doubt of the rational model (1957, 1982). The first psychologist to be honored with the Nobel prize, Simon held the opinion that a person does not consciously try to optimize every decision he or she makes. The degree of accuracy depends much more on the specific demands of the task at hand. Simon was responsible for confronting the previously held "complete rationality" with the concept of "bounded rationality" which is useful in most every day decisions and leads to acceptable results.

Even though the psychological processes in judgment and decision making within limited-rationality conditions were not yet addressed, Simon managed to lay the groundwork for Kahneman and Tversky's later exploration of decision making processes in realistic conditions. Sub-optimal conditions for making a decision were no longer seen as the exception to the rule which then lead to unsystematic error, but as the norm. While uncertainty was already known to be a factor in most decision making situations, it was seen as necessary to include these important limitations when further investigating the underlying processes of decision making.

### **Judgment under Uncertainty**

"Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases" was the description of Tversky and Kahneman's research program, as well as the title for the 1974 article in the journal *Science* in which they summarized their most important principles. Completely in following with the concept of "bounded rationality," Kahneman and Tversky were convinced that judgments were most commonly made with the use of simplified rules of thumb which they called "heuristics". In situations when neither motivation nor cognitive capacity is sufficient to go about making a decision in a rational-systematic manner (which seems to be the case the majority of the time), a plan of action using heuristics is preferred. That means that not all necessary information is used for the judgment. Only certain distinctive features, those found to be adequate or what Simon

refers to as “satisficing” (1957, 1982) are used in forming the basis of a decision.

The advantages of low requirements in terms of motivation and cognitive effort can, however, be outweighed by costs in the form of occasional systematic mis-judgments. Just as in the case of perception-error, these mistakes are informative in terms of the idiosyncrasies within judgment processes. By having shown that determinants which are irrelevant to a judgment still influence the ease of recall, the “availability heuristic” was identified as a rule of thumb used in solving certain judgment tasks. In addition, the concept of the “representivity heuristic” was formed after observing not only the fact that insignificant aspects of similarity become relevant to the judgment, but that at the same time, abstract but highly-diagnostic information on distribution is hardly given notice. The same type of evidence has been found for the “anchoring and adjustment heuristic” (see Kahneman, Slovic & Tversky, 1982, and Gilovich, Griffin, & Kahneman, 2002).

The research of Kahneman and Tversky had great influence not only on psychology but on neighboring sciences as well, e.g. consumer studies, political science, law and philosophy. The research on “heuristics and biases” lead, especially in the social sciences, to a greater understanding of social judgments and behavior. The evidence that error in judgment could not be satisfactorily explained by motivational influences alone, as was indicated in the consistency theory, fell on fertile ground in the field of social psychology. In writing their influential book on the inaccessibility of social judgment formation, Nisbett and Ross (1980) in particular, made the names “Tversky and Kahneman” as popular in social psychology as “Festinger and Carlsmith” or “Fishbein and Ajzen” had been in previous years. Errors in causal attribution (i.e.: “fundamental attribution error”) or the use of stereotypes and biases were suddenly being interpreted in a whole new light. Together with the onset of the paradigm of information processing, the “heuristics and biases” program triggered a major new development termed “social cognition” which has remained a big part of what we think of today as social psychology. The influence of this research program, however, reaches much farther than the boundaries of psychology itself.



### **The re-conceptualization of “utility”**

While the judgment heuristics were aimed in the direction of the psychological processes which played a role in decision making, a second research program was being developed which specifically had judgments of utility in their sights. With their prospect theory, Kahneman and Tversky made available a descriptive alternative to the economic value-expectation model's normative starting point (see Kahneman and Tversky 2000).

Consistent with this value-expectation model, the theory assumes that decisions to act in a certain way are a function of the perceived outcome (“utility”) and the expected probability of its actual occurrence. There is, of course, consideration that the decisions made in this manner have a good probability of systematic error. The innovative contribution of this theory is its re-conceptualization of both the object to be judged and the utility function itself. Economic models after the tradition of Bernoulli begin with the assumption that a person only evaluates the utility of the newly created condition after the action which created it has occurred. The prospect theory postulates, however, that judgments of value have to do with insights which the newly created condition brings along with it. This change in perspective from the utility of the new condition to the utility of change relative to a reference value has far reaching implications. For example, a \$300 raise is not enough to compensate for a rent increase of \$300 even though the total financial balance is, according to Bernoulli's logic, neutral. The subjective profit relative to the previous salary is considerably small compared to the loss relative to the previous rent. The second innovation is the assumption of a utility function which is concave for profit but convex for loss. This means that losses (decline compared to a the reference value) carry more weight than do gains (increase compared to the reference value).

These innovations have made possible, the explanation of numerous phenomena which were regarded as anomalies in the context of traditional economic models (see Thaler, 1991). They have also resulted in the discovery of further phenomena which can not be explained by the normative models (see related articles in Kahneman and Tversky, 2000). In particular, it has been found that reference points used in judgments of value are, for the most part, quite flexible and that the formulation of a

question using the concept of gain, for example, leads to quite opposite preferences in terms of plans of action than when the same question is formulated in terms of loss (see Kahneman and Tversky 2000).

While the prospect theory found little opposition within social psychology, it was exactly what was needed to spark further innovative research in the field of economics. Through the work of Richard Thaler and his colleagues (Thaler, 1991, 1992) the relevance of the prospect theory for economic decision making became crystal clear, as did the insights from the heuristics and biases program. It became especially clear in the area of financial decision that deviations which seemed quite irrational from the standpoint of the economic model were actually quite explainable when considering the principles of Tversky and Kahneman. For example the fact that, in the purchasing of stocks, the initial buying price is given much weight in estimating the stock's value when in reality, it is completely insignificant. The simple fact that one realizes profit much faster than loss could also be explained using these new principles.

Just as important for the advances in economy as these very concrete contributions, however, are the more subtle changes in scientific thinking which were stimulated by this research. These changes have made clear the ever increasingly significant role of psychology within the sciences. This has not gone without notice as, previously, the fields of economics and psychology had a very ambivalent relationship to one another. "Psychology" was, for the experienced scientist, considered to be a synonym for "irrationality", that is, a way of thinking which was not even approachable in terms of rational explanation. Tversky and Kahneman made very clear, however, that deviations from the rational model were not the exception, but the norm and that they actually follow systematic rules. An economic theory which claims to explain behavior must then ask the question of how the subject actually manages to make business-like judgments regarding value and expectation. It simply is not enough to use either the normative models of probability theory, or the Bayes Theorem, when preconditions for materials (in terms of available information) and functions (in terms of computation-capacity) are not fulfilled. It has much more to do with identifying the fundamental principles of psychology which make it possible for a person to reach a decision *under realistic conditions*. Consequently, economics will become

more and more a working-science which will contribute to laying the micro-foundation of economic behavior.

Particularly in the United States, new branches of economic science are being established using the catchphrases “behavioral finance” or “behavioral economics”. They are based on the insights of psychological studies and backed-up by research in other fields like political science (see Sunstein, 2000). Recently in the German speaking community, there have also been research centers established which base their work around insights from psychology, social psychology in particular. It is becoming clear that the significance of social psychology for economic science is not limited to our newfound knowledge on judgment under uncertainty. Studies in psychology on cooperation and conflict, intrinsic motivation, reward delay, willpower, conformity and social influence, willingness to help, and life-satisfaction have been similarly incorporated into theory formation within economics. At the same time, topics which were traditionally the domain of psychology have been increasingly addressed within economic science: from the influence of objective living conditions on subjective well-being to the dynamics of adaptation processes (see Kahneman, Diener, & Schwarz, 1999).

For psychology in general and social psychology in specific, these developments have proven to be an inspiring challenge as well as an important chance to take on a more central role in the social sciences. Just as in past years the rational choice model, oriented around the paradigm of “homo oeconomicus,” was the reigning force in any standardized behavior theory, today, the most important element in any explanation of behavior has become psychological process. Economists and psychologists are in the same business. And in this way, the distinction in psychology can be understood as encouragement to continue on in forming a unified theory of behavior.

### **Implications within psychology**

Daniel Kahneman’s Nobel prize is an outstanding achievement which reflects positively on all of psychology. At the same time it provides the impetus to step back and examine those developments within the field

which create inconsistencies with this kind of acknowledgement by neighboring social sciences.

During the last decade, technical advances in the development of high-resolution processes have made it possible to comprehend brain-activity with only a very slight time-delay. This enabled many psychological phenomena to be anatomically localized within the brain for the first time. In related developments, the once-held belief of infinite brain plasticity was being replaced by an empirically founded neo-phrenology. While psychology benefited without a doubt from advances in neuro-anatomy, neuro-physiology and neuro-biochemistry, the advances triggered scientific and political tendencies which proved problematic for the welfare of the field of psychology and its spreading into neighboring disciplines.

While the consensual definition of psychology once simply included the study of set patterns of thought, feeling and behavior in their *biological and social* contexts, the demand has recently arisen that this neuro-scientific perspective be obligatorily included. The awarding of the Nobel prize for Daniel Kahneman's work shows clearly the short-sightedness of this demand. Psychology's trademark is its position as a connecting link between the social and natural sciences which allows it not only to benefit from numerous other disciplines but also to contribute to them. The future of psychology lies not in its dominance in any certain perspective but in the development of an integrative model which makes human thought, feeling and behavior understandable within their *biological and social* contexts. This unity within diversification has turned psychology into an attractive science which embraces a broad spectrum of pure research, attracts many students, opens numerous fields of application and, as last years Nobel prize has shown, inspires other disciplines with its insights. These very politically charged ways of thinking which seem to strive for a segmentation within psychology unfortunately stand in the way of this extremely successful integrative positioning.

In Germany, Frank Rösler very recently made the recommendation (2003) of distributing the present psychological specializations amongst different departments within the educational system. Accordingly, application-oriented specializations (like industrial psychology, traffic psychology,

pedagogical psychology, etc.) would be assigned to the appropriate departments (business management, education, etc.) while social science research, that is, all empirical (not in the narrow sense of *apparative-experimental*) research disciplines like social psychology as well as a few areas of general, differential and developmental psychology would be put together with other social science subjects in appropriate institutions in order to create special fields of education. What would then be left over is the area of experimental research psychology which, according to Rösler, belongs to both the grouping of biological oriented disciplines which do not include research in psycho-physiological, pharmacological, neuro-psychological or physiological areas and the grouping of disciplines which work within the realms of behavior-research using *apparative-experimental* methods. Rösler acknowledges that these few remaining areas would no longer be enough to form an independent field of study in psychology. He therefore recommends that they should be assigned to biomedical areas of study to train neuroscientists (MA and Ph.D. of Neuroscience) (pp. 124).

That which at first glance seems to be a complete destruction of the field of psychology as we know it today, is actually meant to promote general acknowledgement within the field. Rösler explained, “only if we succeed in integrating experimental psychology with genuine natural science and medical departments, will we reach the point where this type of psychological research will be taken seriously and, consequently, financially fostered. It is also the only way to convince colleagues in other disciplines that psychology, as an experimental science, can be just as exact as Neurobiology or Neurophysiology” (2003, p.124).

Whether psychology can really only win the recognition of neighboring sciences through this kind of fragmentation remains questionable in light of Kahneman’s Nobel prize. In his recent articles, Robert J. Sternberg, president of the American Psychological Association, warned against just such a fragmentation (2002) and instead promoted structural changes which would strengthen the unity of psychology (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2001). Perhaps, through the incorporation of fragments in biomedicine, the psychologists who had chosen this path would acquire a good reputation as supposed “hard-core” scientists. It is unclear, however, to what extent the insights from such an “integrated” psychology in its

diminished form could still be fruitful to other neighboring natural sciences. Historically, appeals for integration were rarely beneficial in terms of the originality of the work (see Root-Bernstein, 1989). There is, on the other hand, much which speaks for the proposition that the methodological and conceptual collaboration of varying psychological approaches contributes quite significantly in the advances of science. Research in the area of memory is often cited as an example here, as profound insights in this area were made by using both cognitive psychology's models of memory and social psychology's constructivist approaches along with research findings on brain anatomy in neuropsychology. Only someone who really believed that any one of these three areas alone could have given final answers to questions regarding how memory really works, could demand exclusive concentration on one sub-discipline. The resulting theoretical impoverishment of the field would go hand in hand with the deterioration of the field's importance as a science. If one were to reduce psychology to a "cognitive science" or "cognitive neuroscience" and combine it with the supposedly "hard-core" sciences and disciplines, they would thereby jeopardize the potential for recognition of a field which has been continually acknowledged and increasingly respected over the past 100 years. "United we stand, divided we fall!", originally a motto of the American revolutionaries, is now a fitting motto used by Sternberg to characterize the future of psychology. Fragmentation would lead to insignificance for various reasons: internal arguments would aggravate work climate and morale, internal dispute would lead to wasting of the field's resources, and finally, divided opinions would actually lead to a lessening of credibility and recognition from other fields. Sternberg eloquently stated: "to the extent that psychology, as a field, speaks with conflicting voices, it is less likely to be listened to by others" (2002).

Daniel Kahneman's 2002 Nobel prize is an example for recognition and respect from fields outside of psychology. The future of the field lies neither in its integration of psychology with biology or medicine, nor in its integration with the social sciences. It also does not depend upon a fragmentation into separate disciplines. The roots of its success lie much more in the ability to productively combine social, cognitive and biological perspectives in a way that other fields are not able to. This unique

competence should not be called into question without great and founded reason.

## References

- Abelson, R.P., Aronson, E., McGuire, W.J., Newcomb, T.M., Rosenberg, M.J., & Tannenbaum, P.H. (Eds.) (1968). Theories of cognitive consistency: A sourcebook. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Gilovich, T., Griffin, D., & Kahneman, D. (Eds.) (2002). Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kahneman, D., Diener, E., & Schwarz, N. (Eds.) (1999). Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology. New York: Russell-Sage.
- Kahneman, D., Slovic, P., & Tversky, A. (Eds.) (1982). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (Eds.) (2000). Choices, values, and frames. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Nisbett, R.E., & Ross, L.D. (1980). Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgment. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rösler, F. (2003). Biologische Psychologie 2010. Visionen zur Zukunft des Faches in der Psychologie. Psychologische Rundschau, *54*, 123-124.
- Root-Bernstein, R. S. (1989). Discovering, inventing and solving problems at the frontiers of scientific knowledge. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Simon, H.A. (1957). Models of man: Social and rational. New York: Wiley.
- Simon, H.A. (1982). Models of bounded rationality. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Sunstein, C.R. (Ed.) (2000). Behavioral law and economics. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2002). In search of a unified field of psychology. *APS Observer*, *15*.
- Sternberg, R.J., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2001). Unified psychology. American Psychologist, *56*, 1069-1079.
- Thaler, R.H. (1991). Quasi rational economics. New York: Russell Sage.
- Thaler, R.H. (1992). The winner's curse: Paradoxes and anomalies of economic life. New York: Free Press.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. Science, *185*, 1124-1131.

## Book Reviews

*Attitudes and Attitude Change* by Gerd Bohner & Michaela Wänke

Hove, East Sussex, UK: Psychology Press 2002, Pp xi + 295, Paper £14.95  
ISBN 0- 86377-779-1

Review by **Derek Rutter** (University of Kent at Canterbury)

This is an excellent addition to the series, *Social Psychology: A Modular Course*. The preface says of the series that it 'aims to provide undergraduates with stimulating, readable, affordable, and brief texts by leading experts committed to presenting a fair and accurate view of the work in each field, sharing their enthusiasm with students, and presenting their work in an approachable way'. This latest volume meets those aims admirably.

The book is divided into three sections, 'Basic issues in attitude research', 'Where do attitudes come from?', and 'The consequences of attitudes' – followed by a two-page Postscript. The first section consists of a chapter each on the concept of attitude and why attitudes are important, how attitudes are measured, and the structure and strength of attitudes. The meat comes in the second section, with chapters on nature and nurture as sources of attitudes, attitudes as temporary constructions, persuasion (two chapters), and the influences of behaviour on attitudes. The third section examines the influence of attitudes on information processing and behaviour, and the postscript asks 'What's left?', an essentially rhetorical question that nevertheless allows the authors to speculate a little on future directions.

The book has two great strengths, I think. The first is the balanced, accomplished way in which the authors review the 'classic' literature in sufficient detail to allow the reader to understand the origins of today's theories and research, whilst leaving space for a thorough, scholarly exploration of the latest work. One striking example is the account of the Yale Program of research, which the authors call the 'message-learning



approach'. In the majority of texts the program is described in great detail or is dismissed in a paragraph or two. Here it is outlined precisely and succinctly, in just enough detail to demonstrate the conceptual and empirical links into what developed next, the dual process approaches – which are then examined in a full chapter of their own. I have not seen this done so well before, and indeed the chapters on persuasion are among the most impressive in the book.

The second strength of the book is the accessibility of its format and style. The student is addressed directly throughout – 'we' and 'you' are used regularly – and the prose is clear and elegant. The chapters are structured carefully, with sensible headings and sub-headings, and each ends with a page-long summary, a set of exercises (some of which I shall use), endnotes, a brief, well-chosen bibliography of further reading, and a full list of references. There is nothing 'dumbed-down' or 'showy' – just scholarly text, and well-chosen black and white figures. The book will be adopted widely as a key text for intermediate to advanced undergraduates – masters students and teachers too – and its structure will make for easy updating and revision in subsequent editions. I am delighted to recommend it.

*Communication under the Microscope: The Theory and Practice of Microanalysis*  
by Peter Bull

Hove: Routledge (2002). Hardback: ISBN 0-415-04687-4; Paperback:  
ISBN 0-415-04688-2

Review by **Guido Peeters** (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium)

Communication is a most pervasive concept. It pops up across a wide variety of disciplines ranging from hard-core physics and engineering to soft-core philosophical reflection. This variety reappears within psychology where communication has been dealt with in terms of Shannon and Weaver's mathematical theory as well as in terms of Martin Buber's personalistic concepts regarding the I-Thou relationship. Hence, it may not surprise that a review of communication research and theory is

selective. In that way, the scope of the present book is limited to, what the author calls, the microanalysis of interpersonal communication. This term refers in the first place to a relatively novel methodology, being the detailed analysis of communicative behaviour using film, audiotape and videotape recordings. In addition, it refers to specific research questions and related theories that have been addressed by the novel methodology. In this respect, the theme of the book intersects with many other themes in social and psychological sciences, including not only gender issues and politics, to which separate chapters are devoted, but also themes such as organisational behaviour, health communication intergroup relations and others that are not a central focus of attention. The book makes a cross-section of social sciences following an itinerary that does not claim to be exhaustive but that reflects the author's interests and expertise.

A first chapter deals with the conceptual and historical setting of the microanalysis of communication. Early influences are pointed to in symbolic interactionism, cybernetics and structural linguistics. Various (sociological, psychological, etc.) approaches to the analysis of communication are discussed and compared, which results in a map of the main features of the microanalytic approach. I presume that not every reader may agree with the author's conclusion that microanalysis represents a distinctive and novel way of thinking about communication. However, I expect that many readers will admit that the microanalytic approach can function as a sort of catalyst combining together various ways of thinking by relating them to a common perspective.

The second chapter deals with nonverbal communication. After a section on conceptual and methodological issues, the main body is devoted to nonverbal communication in social interaction. Issues most extensively treated are respectively Ekman's neurocultural model of emotional expression and the relationship between nonverbal communication and speech. Other issues concern interindividual differences in the encoding and decoding of nonverbal cues and the role of nonverbal cues in interpersonal relationships.

In the third chapter, microanalysis of communication is extended to speech. First of all, speech involves nonverbal cues that contribute to the organisation of conversation, for instance by moderating turn-taking. Also,

speech style is largely a matter of nonverbal features of speech such as accent, pauses, and speech rates, but also of verbal content features such as the use of technical language. As to speech style, a large section is devoted to Speech Accommodation Theory, which deals with the ways and conditions in which speakers adjust their speech styles to each other or just contrast them against each other. Finally content is central in more than half of the pages, which treat on content analysis. Leading themes are the analysis of questions and replies (or nonreplies), equivocation as a way of coping with avoidance-avoidance conflicts, the dynamics of saving and losing face, and the Linguistic Category Model that connects apparently neutral aspects of word choice with attitudes and prejudices. Extending the concept of microanalysis to speech content, the author moves beyond the limited scope of analysis of film, audiotape and videotape recordings. Particularly the Linguistic Category Model has been applied to written communication as well. In this way, the range of potential topics is considerably enlarged, which urged the author to be selective. Considering that the chapter focuses on conversation in the first place, the reader may miss particular contributions from the communication game literature such as the classic maxims of Grice's logic of conversation and related social psychological research.

Two fascinating chapters review and discuss microanalytic research regarding gender and political communication respectively. Finally the last chapter offers some practical applications of the research reviewed in the previous chapters, including a large review section on communication skills training.

Considering that the book is primarily conceived as a literature review, its main merit may reside in the clear and concise exposition of a wide variety of contributions. Another main merit is that the author provides a fair account of contesting approaches and schools. Evidence pro and con is reviewed, and sometimes, in concluding sections, a synthesis is suggested: cautiously and never forced. For these reasons, the book will not only appeal to scholars and practitioners, but also to students who may be pleased to find it included in the reading lists attached to their courses.

The book fills 184 pages including references, author and subject indexes, and a brief content table preceding each chapter.

Taking also the positive qualities into account, it would be unfair to expect a degree of exhaustiveness that was not intended by the author. Nevertheless, there may be some lacunas that, if completed, might add considerably to the author's argument. For instance, I think of the pioneering research achieved by the late Roger Brown and colleagues on the use of pronouns and other forms of address (e.g., Brown and Gilman, 1960), of which an elaborate synthesis has been included in the first edition of Brown's (1965) classic textbook of social psychology. Brown identified two presumably universal dimensions of interpersonal relationship. They have been referred to as "status" and "solidarity" and, although they represent two functionally distinct realms, they are implemented with the same overt behaviour. In this way, people express high solidarity using the same cues as they use to stress the lower status of an addressee (e.g.: addressing by first name). Alternatively people express low solidarity using the same cues as they use to express acceptance of the higher status of an addressee (e.g.: addressing by title). Taking into account that the terms "solidarity" and "status" carry a conceptual load of intimacy and power that reaches far beyond their literal meanings, Brown's concepts may not only provide a common denominator connecting various contributions scattered across the chapters of the book. In addition they may shed additional light on some confusions and controversies, particularly on those reported in the chapter on gender and communication.

### References

- Brown, J. (1965). *Social Psychology*. New York: The Free Press.
- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in Language*. Cambridge: Technology Press.

## New Books by Members

*A sociocognitive approach to social norms*

**Nicole Dubois (ed.)** (University of Geneva, Switzerland)

London: Routledge 2003, ISBN: 0-415-25726-3. Pages: 261,  
Language: English

### **Description:**

As an investigation of how behaviors are socially regulated, the study of social norms has been one of the most exciting areas of social psychology during the past decades. Norms not only affect what we do, but also how we think and the judgments we make. It is the reason why his book is concerned by judgment norms.

Beginning with an examination of the norm of internality, followed by essays which explore a range of related concepts, this collection demonstrates that the social judgment norm construct and the sociocognitive approach in which it is embedded offers a clear understanding of social thinking at school, at work and everywhere that evaluative practices are concerned. Individual essays draw upon numerous laboratory studies and wide-ranging case studies to provide a comprehensive representation of not only conceptual ideas but also methodological and applied issues. Topics explored include : the concept of norm, conformity and deviance, individualism, internality, normativity and evaluative knowledge, and the application of such social norm theory to organizations and education.

*A Sociocognitive Approach to Social Norms* makes this under-exposed area of research available to an English-speaking audience for the first time, and as such will be invaluable to reserachers and advanced students interested in the fiels of social psychology, sociology, education and social work, as well as to the practitioner of social evaluation and to those with an interest in the practical application of these normative ideas.

### Table of Contents

J. M. Jellison, Foreword. N. Dubois, Introduction : The concept of norm.  
 B. Testé Conformity and deviance. D. Gilibert and L. Cambon, Paradigms  
 of the sociocognitive approach. S. Jouffre, The procedures of measure :  
 Questionnaires and scales. N. Dubois, F. Loose, M-C Matteucci and P.  
 Selleri, Sociocognitive development: Acquisition of the normativeness of  
 internality. J.-L. Beauvois, Judgment norms, social utility, and  
 individualism. V. Le Floch and A. Somat, Norm of internality, social utility  
 of internal explanations and cognitive functioning. J. Py and A. Ginet,  
 Knowledge of general social norms : Normative clear-sightedness. C.  
 Tarquinio, T. Leonova, P. Robert and G. Guingouain, Normativity and  
 evaluative knowledge. P. Pansu, P. Bressoux and C. Louche, Theory of the  
 social norm of internality applied to education and organizations. N.  
 Dubois and J.-L. Beauvois, Conclusion : Some bases for a sociocognitive  
 approach to judgment norms. J-L Beauvois, Glossary.

*Analysing identity: Cross-cultural, societal and clinical contexts*  
**Peter Weinreich and Wendy Saunderson** (Eds.) (2003)

London: Routledge & Psychology Press (Taylor & Francis)  
 ISBN 0-415-29897-0 416pp. £35.00 hbk

*"This volume provides a coherent and interesting exposition of Identity Structure Analysis, a research procedure developed over the past several decades. To my knowledge, there is no existing publication that explores this procedure in anything like the depth that is presented here."* Peter B. Smith, University of Sussex

*"This grand project is both helpful and enlightening. Congratulations to all concerned on a mighty piece of work."* Rom Harré, University of Oxford/University of Georgetown, Washington DC

*"I am confident that ISA provides an extraordinary and powerful resource for the field [of traumatology] that will force a paradigm shift in the way we understand,*

*assess, and treat the traumatized.*" Charles Figley, Florida State University, and Editor of *Traumatology*

People's identities are addressed and brought into being by interaction with others.

Identity processes encompass biographical experiences, historical eras and cultural norms in which the self's autonomy varies according to the flux of power relationships with others.

Identity Structure Analysis (ISA) draws upon psychological, sociological and social anthropological theory and evidence to formulate a system of concepts that help explain the notion of identity. ISA can be applied to the practical investigations of identity structure and identity development – at individual level and/or group level – in a number of clinical, societal and cross-cultural settings. The book includes studies of national and ethnic identification in multi-cultural contexts and gender identity relating to social context and the urban environment. Clinical applications that describe identity processes associated with psychological distress are also examined. These include anorexia nervosa and vicarious traumatisation of counselors in the aftermath of atrocity. *Analysing Identity* is unique in its development of this integrative conceptualisation of self and identity and the subsequent applications of ISA. This innovative book will appeal to academics and professionals in developmental, social, clinical and educational psychology and psychotherapy. It will also be of interest to those involved with sociology, political science, gender studies, ethnic studies and social policy.

### **Contents**

Part 1: Theory and Practice. P. Weinreich, *Identity Structure Analysis*. P. Weinreich, *Identity Exploration: Theory into Practice*. Part 2: Cross-cultural Issues. P. Weinreich, V. Bacova, N. Rougier, *Basic Primordialism in Ethnic and National Identity*. G. Horenczyk, S. Munayar, *Complex Patterns of Cultural Allegiances: The Ethnic Identity of Palestinian Christian Arab Adolescents in Israel*. Part 3: Societal Issues. K. Stapleton, J. Wilson, *Grounding the Discursive Self: A Case Study in ISA and Discursive Psychology*. M. Wager, *Complex Identities: The Case of Academic Women*. W. Saunderson, *The City, Gender and Identity*. H.

Irvine, Adults Returning to Education: Gender and Identity Processes. A. MacNabb, Enterprising Identities: Gender and Family Influences. Part 4: Clinical Issues. P. Harris, Identity Formulation and Reformulation in Clinical Assessment and Therapy. W. Saunderson, M. O'Kane, Anorexia Nervosa: Analysing Identity for Predisposing, Precipitating and Perpetuating Factors. S. Black, P. Weinreich, An Exploration of Counselling Identity in Counsellors Who Deal with Trauma. P. Weinreich, Coda.

**FORTHCOMING**

Psychologica Belgica, Special Issue "*Social Identity and Citizenship*", Vol. 43, 1/2, April 2003

Guest Editors: **Margarita Sanchez-Mazas** & **Olivier Klein**, Université Libre de Bruxelles

Abstracts, a downloadable introduction and ordering information can be found at the following URL:

<http://www.ulb.ac.be/psycho/psysoc/framebel.html>



## Future EAESP Meetings - Calendar

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.pte.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).

June 2-5, 2004, La Cristalera (Madrid), Spain

**Small Group Meeting on Conscious and Unconscious Attitudinal Processes**

*Organisers:* Geoff Haddock, Greg Maio, Pablo Briñol & Richard Petty

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

June, 16-19, 2004, Brussels, Belgium

**Small Group Meeting on Social Connectionism**

*Organisers:* Frank Van Overwalle & Christophe Labiouse

*Contact:* Frank Van Overwalle (Frank.Van.Overwalle@vub.ac.be).

## Future EAESP Meetings

### Small Group Meeting

#### Conscious and Unconscious Attitudinal Processes

June, 2<sup>nd</sup> - 5<sup>th</sup> 2004, La Cristalera (Madrid, Spain)

[Organizers and institutional sponsors: Geoff Haddock (Cardiff University), Greg Maio (Cardiff University), Pablo Briñol (Universidad Autonoma de Madrid) & Richard Petty (Ohio State University)]

Since the beginning of the last century, many influential social psychologists have argued that the attitude concept is perhaps the most indispensable construct within social psychology (e.g., Allport, 1935; Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). Much recent research within the attitudes literature emphasizes the role of conscious and unconscious processes. For example, research on implicit and explicit components of attitudes, conscious and unconscious processes of attitude formation and attitude change, automatic and deliberative processing of attitude-relevant information, and neuropsychological aspects of attitudes are all concerned with how conscious and unconscious processes influence individuals' attitudes.

The aim of the current meeting is to integrate the advances in knowledge about conscious and unconscious attitudinal processes. It is hoped that the meeting will serve as an opportunity for researchers to present current research and develop new conceptualizations of the attitude concept that encompass findings from multiple domains relevant to conscious and unconscious aspects of attitudes, such as attitude structure, attitude formation and persuasion, the neuropsychology of attitudes, and attitude-behavior relations. By considering research from each of these areas and integrating across them, the meeting will provide a snapshot of current developments and stimulate new conceptualizations of attitudes that provide a roadmap for the future.

The meeting, co-sponsored by the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, will take place from 2-5 June 2004 in La Cristalera, outside of Madrid, a palatial country estate in the mountains of Spain. We plan to include 20 participants, with at least 50% being EAESP members. Participants will be asked to give a 30-min presentation. A roundtable discussion will take place midway through the schedule of talks and at the end.

If you are interested in attending this meeting, please send an abstract (between 100-200 words) to Geoff Haddock before 30 September 2003, at the following address: School of Psychology, P. O. Box 901, Cardiff University, Cardiff, Wales CF10 3YG. Alternatively, e-mail your abstract to: haddockgg@cardiff.ac.uk.

## **Small Group Meeting**

### **Social Connectionism**

**June, 16<sup>th</sup> - 19<sup>th</sup> 2004, Brussels, Belgium**

[Organizers: Frank Van Overwalle (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium) and Christophe Labiouse (Université de Liège, Belgium)]

In the last decade, we have seen an upsurge of articles attempting to model social processes within a connectionist or computational framework. The aim of this small group meeting is to gain further insight in the possible connectionist processes that underlie social thinking by comparing and testing these different connectionist approaches. Papers are invited that propose improved models or that evaluate and discuss the merits of existing models. What are the basic properties of proposed connectionist architectures? The amount of known and novel findings in the field that it can account for? The amount of new hypothesis it generates? The breadth of empirical support? Apart from discussing the merits of specific connectionist implementations, we also want to address broader questions. What are general weaknesses of existing models?

What are novel directions and phenomena that these models should attempt to cover? For instance, how are motivation, attention, and goal-directed behavior accounted for? How should we make a distinction between episodic and semantic memory? Between implicit and explicit learning and reasoning? What is the neuropsychological basis of the model's core mechanisms? Questions to these answers might improve our understanding of the connectionist underpinnings of social reasoning. A number of renowned researchers in the field of connectionism are invited to present a state-of-the-art presentation of current and novel developments in their field: Bob French (topic: dual-memory models) and Axel Cleeremans (topic: implicit learning). Moreover, renowned social researchers who worked on connectionist models have also expressed their interest to come to the meeting (Eliot Smith, Stephen Read, and Yoshi Kashima).

We would like to invite 20-25 EAESP members (and especially postgraduates) with an interest in these topics to apply for participation. We expect people working in the fields such as covariation, causal judgment, illusory correlation, cognitive dissonance, person perception, attitudes and other judgmental processes. We would also like to invite cognitive researchers or neuropsychologists working in the connectionist or associative learning domain.

The meeting will be held in Hotel Le Lido in Genval, a pleasant, normal style half-timbered building located in a scenery place (Genval Lake) close to Brussels. If you are interested in participating, submit an abstract with the list of authors, including the first author's correspondence address and email, and a summary of not more than 150 of your proposed contribution before 1<sup>st</sup> February 2004 to Frank Van Overwalle (e-mail: Frank.Van.Overwalle@vub.ac.be).

**EAESP Summer School 2004****August, 1<sup>st</sup> - 15<sup>th</sup> 2004, Groningen, The Netherlands**

The EAESP Summer School 2004 will take place from August 1<sup>st</sup> to August 15<sup>th</sup> in Groningen, a medium-sized, pretty and lively city in the North of the Netherlands. Groningen has about 175.000 inhabitants, roughly 20.000 of whom are studying at the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen (RuG).

You can find information about the university and the town via  
<http://www.rug.nl>  
<http://www.Groningen.nl>

The University of Groningen was founded in 1614 and it is one of the oldest universities in the Netherlands. Every year it attracts about 4.000 new students, not only from the Netherlands, but also from abroad. Though looking back on a great tradition, it is undoubtedly a modern place with an excellent reputation for high-quality research.

The biannual EAESP-Summer Schools are already a tradition in the EAESP. Many full members nowadays remember 'their' summer school as an event where they not only acquired valuable knowledge about how to do good research, but where they also experienced that doing good research is a highly rewarding enterprise. Summer schools intend to familiarize students with the latest theoretical, methodological and empirical developments in various fields in experimental social psychology. This, in turn, should contribute to the individual dissertation projects. A similarly important function of the EAESP-summer schools is to facilitate contacts between young scholars from different European and non-European countries, encouraging friendships and collaborative research. All past summer schools were very successful in both respects.

Five parallel workshops are planned, each of which will comprise 12 students and two teachers. Staff members will be distinguished scientists from both Europe and the US. Typically, in each workgroup there will be

one staff member from a Dutch university, and one staff member from another country. So far, the following persons agreed to teach in the 2004-summer school: Olivier Corneille, Tanya Chartrand, Ap Dijksterhuis, Sabine Otten, Bret Pelham, Russell Spears, Diederik Stapel, Bernd Wittenbrink, and Marcel Zelenberg.

The final list of teachers and the thematic foci of the five tracks will be announced in the following issue of this Bulletin.

Eligible to apply are doctoral students in social psychology currently enrolled in a PhD-program in Europe, and who have not previously participated in an EAESP-summer school or a SISP-school (i.e. the summer school organized by the Society for Personality and Social Psychology or SPSP in North America). Some places will be given to students from outside Europe. As in the two previous summer schools (Clermont-Ferrand and Marburg), SPSP, which is the largest organization of social psychologists in North America, will sponsor the participation of five US/Canadian students in the summer school. The official language will be English.

Applications will be due by the end of 2003. You will find more information about the application procedure in the next issue of this Bulletin.

*The organizing committee,  
Diederik Stapel, Ernestine Gordijn and Sabine Otten  
Cognitive Social Psychology, University of Groningen*

## Reports of Previous Meetings

### **Medium Size Meeting On Processes of Amelioration versus Deterioration in the Relations Between Social Groups (5<sup>th</sup> Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes)**

**At Castle Kochberg, Germany, 19<sup>th</sup>-23<sup>rd</sup> June, 2002  
Organisers: Thomas Kessler & Amélie Mummendey**

#### *Report by the Organizers*

The Medium Size Meeting on "Processes of Amelioration versus Deterioration in the Relations Between Social Groups" (5th Jena Workshop on Intergroup Processes) was held at Castle Kochberg in Thuringia / Germany from 19th June 2002 to 23th June 2002. Researchers from numerous European Countries and the United States of America contributed to the scientific programme, with about approximately equal proportions of postgraduate students and senior researchers in the domain of intergroup research. We are particular happy that Heather Smith (Sonoma State University, US) and Miles Hewstone (University of Oxford, UK) followed our invitation to present invited talks. Thematic sessions focussed on the social identity perspective on contact and prejudice (i.e., contact as potential panacea for reducing prejudice), on common ingroup and ingroup projection (i.e., beneficial and harmful effects of a common ingroup on outgroup evaluation), and relative deprivation and other intergroup emotions (i.e., their appraisals and behavioural consequences).

The major goals of the meeting were (a) to bring into contact post-graduate students and senior researchers and (b) to get together researchers who worked on the improvement of intergroup relations as well as on factors that promote conflict between social groups. As the heterogeneity of academic levels and research topics of the participants demonstrated, our goals were largely met – thanks to all those who came

to Castle Kochberg, presented their current work and joined in the lively discussion.

Thomas Kessler & Amélie Mummendey, University of Jena

### ***A taste of Château "Gross Kochberg", 2002***

Did you know that the main economic activity in Jena used to be wine production? You are forgiven if you thought that this is more famous for its social psychology than for its wineries. One much deserved reason for this fame is an initiative of the Social Psychology Unit of the University of Jena: thanks to its dedication and energy, researchers of all ages and backgrounds can convene every year at the meeting on intergroup processes held in a Thuringian Castle in Schloss Kochberg. This year, Thomas Kessler was the expert mastermind of a vintage dedicated to "*Processes of Amelioration versus Deterioration in the Relations Between Social Groups*". Held during the final stage of the World Cup, the meeting was a source of Cornelian dilemmas for those of us who are soccer aficionados. One of the invited speaker, Miles Hewstone, will agree with this statement, he who, so anxious about the outcome of the Brazil-England game, had found himself in the only place in the world where the game was not televised. Regrettably, wearing England' jersey was not sufficient to defeat the South Americans. Fortunately, the meeting provided a variety of bounties that largely compensated for this frustration. For example, the other invited speaker, Heather Smith, taught those whose teams had lost (and Miles was not the only one), how to respond to relative deprivation. One such option is "schadenfreude" (defined by Russell Spears as the joy of witnessing a German defeat). The meeting also covered very interesting topics, albeit unrelated to soccer, such as the identities of gypsies in Portugal (Joana Alexandre), the influences of making a fist on emotions (Thomas Schubert), collective guilt (Colin Leach), volunteerism (Stefan Stuermer), infra-humanization (Jeroen Vaes), mergers (Stefan Giessner), intergroup contact (Miles Hewstone) and the ingroup projection model (Amelie Mummendey, Sven Waldzus) to name a few. As each talk was performed in front of all other participants, and for a duration of 30 minutes, it allowed for a thorough discussions of the ideas presented. These are, of course, ideal conditions for developing these ideas



and expanding programs of research. Less obviously, social events, such as sharing Thuringian bratwursts, climbing the Grosskochberg tower, or visting Jena in the company of an expert guide, also offer wonderful opportunities for developing further social and scientific contacts. In spite of the General Meeting that immediately followed, this one will remain in my memory a one of the most exciting. Having attended it several times already, I can testify that, in the fiery battle that opposed the "Oriation couple", Amelie won over Dieter<sup>1</sup>. This meeting is like (good) Thuringian wine: it gets tastier every year.

### **Small Group Meeting On Processes of Shared Reality Construction and their Consequence for Individual and Group Phenomena**

**At Kazimierz at the Vistula River, Poland 22<sup>nd</sup>-25<sup>th</sup> September 2002  
Organisers: Arie W. Kruglanski & Mirek Kofta**

The conference took place in Poland in a lovely place Kazimierz at the Vistula River, about 130 kilometers from Warsaw in the South-East direction. Kazimierz is a beautiful small old town, surrounded by green hills with picturesque gorges.

The aim of the meeting was to discuss the processes whereby shared reality is constructed in the course of social interaction and the implications this has for the way persons function as individuals and as group members. In recent years, there has been growing interest in the phenomenon of social reality construction and the role it plays in individual functioning and social interaction. The quality of our psychological existence (e.g., the way we construct our individual and social selves) may depend on the perception that we share world views with others (e.g., family, peers, ethnic groups). Perception of social consensus may also account for the collective construction of the group as

---

<sup>1</sup> Complaints about this quip should be made solely to Russell Spears

an „entity” and for group identification. Moreover, there are reasons to assume that the forging of social realities is more intense under some circumstances than others, for some individuals more than for others, and in some groups more than in others. It is thus important to explore the conditions that augment the tendencies toward social reality construction and to investigate the kinds of groups that develop where firm social realities and consensual social environments are desired. Equally interesting seems to explore how people respond to the experience that some of their world views are not shared by others (e.g., peers, compatriots etc).

Our meeting was composed of four parts. In the first session, focused on formation and development of shared reality, Arie W. Kruglanski (The closing of the group mind and the emergence of group centrism), Andrzej Nowak (From individual knowledge to social representation: dynamical aspects of emergence of shared reality), John Levine (Development of shared reality before and during group interaction), and Yoshihisa Kashima (Shared reality, symbolic communication, and the generalized other) discussed variety of basic factors accounting for the development of shared reality including the need for closure, social impact and clusterization, within-group interactions, and the representation of the “generalized other”.

In the second session, discussing the interplay between shared reality and communication processes, E. Tory Higgins (Shared reality in communication: common knowledge from social tuning), Minoru Karasawa & Yoshiko Tanabe (Group stereotypes as shared reality: Stereotypic information processing reflected in dyadic conversations), and Françoise Askevis-Leherpeux (For and against: Perceived entitativity of opinion groups as a function of group position and issue under judgment), addressed the contribution of communication processes between individuals and groups to the formation and maintenance of shared beliefs.

In the third session, analysing the relationships between shared reality, culture, and group processes, R. Scott Tindale (Social sharedness and consensus processes in small groups), Andres A. Haye & J. R. Eiser (A collective memory approach to shared reality), Giovanna Leone (Living in history: How awareness of relationships between autobiographical

memories and history may influence the processes of construction of a shared reality), Bogdan Wojciszke, Wiesław Baryła & Aleksandra Szymkow (Shared beliefs in negative social world: Polish culture of complaining), and Robbie Sutton & Karen Douglas: (Language abstraction and shared reality), discussed a variety of cultural factors and processes, including language, social norms and values and collective constructions of group memory, as contributing to shared reality maintenance.

In the final session, devoted to the role of shared beliefs in within- and intergroup relations, Yechiel Klar (Who framed within-groups' frames of reference: The cases of nonselective superiority and inferiority biases), Hans-Peter Erb & Gerd Bohner (Social impact of large minorities and small majorities: Interactive effects of implicit and explicit consensus on attitudes), Jean-François Verhac & Dominique Oberlé (False consensus and true false consensus: Between reality of consensus and construction of reality), and Mirek Kofta, Wlodek Narkiewicz-Jodko & Marek Drogoz (When our worldviews are not shared: Effects of low-consensus information on stereotyping and attitudes) analysed several cognitive and motivational mechanisms responsible for the formation of group consensus, as well as the consequences of attacking the perceived sharedness of beliefs and views.

The sessions were accompanied by live and intellectually provoking discussions. It might be concluded that the meeting achieved its central purpose to provide a space for exchanging ideas concerning the meaning and the role of a critical ingredient of group life: shared reality. Due to a collective effort of researchers working in a variety of conceptual perspectives and methodologies we greatly enriched our knowledge about the processes of shared reality construction and maintenance.

*Mirek Kofta*

**Grants**

*Maria Augustinova* (travel grant)  
*Alain Bonacossa* (travel grant)  
*Jaap Ham* (travel grant)  
*Silvia Leitner* (travel grant)  
*Sandrine Redersdorff* (travel grant)  
*Magdalena Smieja* (regional support grant)  
*Jeroen Vaes* (seedcorn grant)  
*Cristina Zogmaister* (regional support grant)

**GRANT REPORTS**

**Jan-Willem van Prooijen**  
**Free University Amsterdam, The Netherlands**  
*Seedcorn grant*

Supported by an EAESP seedcorn research grant I recently took a two-month trip to several prominent social justice researchers in the US (20 September to 28 November 2002). The general aim of this trip was to benefit from the expertise of these justice researchers to generate innovative research ideas. These new research ideas were intended to form the base of my research project during my immediate post-doctoral period. Thus, I wanted to come up with new and innovative studies in the US, and subsequently conduct these studies in the Netherlands. Additionally, I wanted to meet up with some of the world's leading experts in the social justice field.

The trip started with a 5-week visit to Prof. Rob Folger at Tulane University, New Orleans (LA). During my stay at Tulane Rob Folger and I had many discussions about the relatively unexplored psychology of retributive justice (i.e., the perceived fairness of punishing norm violators) and possible determinants of offensiveness. These discussions led to numerous new research ideas, including research that integrates the

procedural and retributive justice domains, research that explores intergroup effects in the psychology of retributive justice, and research that explores when people are relatively more focused on retribution of norm violators and when people are relatively more focused on compensation of victims. These ideas led to specific experiments that are currently being run in the Netherlands. Furthermore, Rob Folger and I came up with some new ideas about the role of emotions such as shame and guilt in the psychology of procedural justice. These latter experiments will be carried out somewhere in the near future. Moreover, Rob Folger and I have (with the help of two graduate students) conducted an experiment on Tulane University about determinants of offensiveness: When will the use of force in power relations lead to perceptions of power abuse? Finally, I gave an oral presentation of some of my work for my PhD-thesis at Tulane University, and conducted a lot of reading and writing.

Following my visit to Prof. Folger I traveled to Durham (NC) to meet up with Prof. Allan Lind at Duke University for one week. Prof. Lind and I had several discussions about integrating group dynamic procedural justice theories with social-cognitive procedural justice theories. This led to a new research idea on the relation between social exclusion and procedural justice, extending some of my earlier work. I am currently running a first pilot on this topic in the Netherlands; the actual experiment to investigate this topic is scheduled in February 2003.

After this, I traveled to New York to visit Prof. Tom Tyler for 3,5 weeks at New York University. With him I have discussed new research ideas about the role of social status in the psychology of procedural justice, extending some of my earlier work. Additionally, we have discussed innovative research ideas on the role of promotion versus prevention foci in the psychology of procedural justice. Both of these ideas will be carried out in the Netherlands, somewhere in the near future. Finally, I gave an oral presentation at New York University, and conducted some reading and writing.

During my stay at NYU I took the opportunity to meet up with several other well-respected social psychologists. At NYU I had a discussion with Prof. John Bargh about how social cognitive methods can be used to

investigate the social psychology of justice. Additionally, I paid brief visits of one afternoon to Dr. Larry Heuer (Barnard College, Columbia University, New York) and one afternoon to Prof. Joel Brockner (Columbia University, New York). Both are well-known procedural justice scholars and with both researchers I discussed group-dynamic effects in the psychology of justice.

To summarize, during my 2-month visit to the US I had the opportunity to meet up with five social justice experts and one social cognition expert. The many discussions I had with these social psychologists led to fruitful innovative research ideas that will form the base of the research I will be conducting in my immediate post-doctoral period. It can therefore be concluded that my research visit to the US was highly successful in terms of achieving my intended scientific goals. I am very grateful to the EAESP for financially supporting me on this trip, which I regard as a massive contribution to my development as a social psychologist, as a scientist, and as a person.

**Marisol Palacios, University of Huelva, Spain**  
*postgraduate travel grant*

Thanks to the EAESP postgraduate travel grant I visited the Section of Social and Organisational Psychology at Leiden University (The Netherlands), from July 12 until September 28 of 2002. The reason of my visit was to work with Manuela Barreto and Naomi Ellemers on my dissertation. The aims were to discuss the progress of my dissertation, to analyse data collected after my last visit to this Section, and to write a paper reporting two studies that we conducted together. In general, I can say that these aims have been satisfied: we analysed the data, we wrote a first draft of the paper, and we discussed how to proceed with my research.

Manuela Barreto, Naomi Ellemers, and the rest of the staff in the Section gave me a very warm welcome when I arrived at Leiden University. 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 quite fast. I

could take part in the research meetings of the Kurt Lewin Institute (the cross-University post-graduate school on social and organisational psychology) on Perception, Motivation, and Behaviour in groups, chaired by Naomi Ellemers, Russell Spears, and Bertjan Doosje. In addition, I was able to participate in social activities of the section, such as a day out in which the staff played “paint-ball” and a social dinner.

In summary, my stay in Leiden was a very motivating, inspiring, productive, and useful professional experience. I learned once again that visiting a foreign University is very stimulating, and I encourage other postgraduate students to do it. I am very thankful to the EAESP for providing me the financial aid for this visit to the University of Leiden.

**Cristina Zogmaister, Università di Padova, Italy**  
*regional support grant*

Thanks to the EAESP Regional Support Grant I visited the University of Cologne (Germany) from March 6 to March 28, 2003. The reason of my visit was to attend the 32<sup>nd</sup> Spring Seminar organised by the Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung of the University of Cologne on “Basic and Advanced Topics in Modelling”.

The Spring Seminar is an intensive training course in advanced techniques of data analysis and in the application of these techniques, and the contents of this year’s seminar were the most recent techniques of data analysis developed respectively in regression analysis, linear models with latent variables, multiway contingency tables. All of these topics are very interesting and useful for my own research interests.

The participation to the spring seminar has been an important occasion to develop my knowledge of statistical methods, both from the theoretical and the applied point of view, because the courses were a combination of class lessons and practical PC sessions. Every day, we spent the morning attending the lessons from well-known scientists in the field of social research: namely Josef Brüderl, Professor of Statistics and Methods in

Social Sciences at the University of Mannheim (Germany), Jeroen K. Vermunt, of the Department of Methodology, Faculty of Social Sciences at the Tilburg University (The Netherlands), Andries van der Ark, of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, at the Tilburg University (The Netherlands), and Tamás Rudas, Professor of Statistics and Director of the Institute of Sociology and Social Policy, Eötvös Loránd University, and Academic Director of the TÁRKI Social Research Institute (Bulgaria).

During the afternoon, we were busy with various statistical packages, like the well-known SPSS and Stata, but also Latent Gold and LEM (the latter are two statistical packages developed for the analysis of latent categorical variables), and these PC sessions have proven extremely useful upon my return to Padova. I now have the feeling that I can not only understand the meaning of some more advanced statistical analyses, but also apply them to my own data. For this reason, I think that the participation to the Spring Seminar of the Central Archive of Cologne has been important for my development as a scientist and I am very thankful to the EAESP that gave me the chance to attend it.

Furthermore, my visit to the University of Cologne has given me the opportunity to learn more about the structure of the Central Archive and about the other Institutes related to it around Europe, also because I could attend a presentation by Dr. Ekkehard Mochmann, director of GESIS and Executive Manager of the Central Archive, regarding the services of the Central Archive and the network of related structures. The Central Archive collects primary material (data, questionnaires, code plans) and results of empirical studies in order to prepare them for secondary analyses and to make them available to the interested public.

The Central Archive of the University of Cologne is an institute of GESIS (Gesellschaft Sozialwissenschaftlicher Infrastruktureinrichtungen; German Social Science Infrastructure Services) and it is connected to a net of institutes that collect data on social issues, often administering the same questionnaires in different states of Europe (for example the well-known Eurobarometer public opinion surveys, conducted on behalf of the European Commission), and renders them available to the scientists for their research.



In summary my participation to the Spring Seminar has been extremely useful because I learned new methods for data analysis and new opportunities of research by the usage of great pools of data stored at various Archives in Europe. And, least but not last, I had a great time in Cologne, interacting with other participants of the Spring Seminar, mainly (but not only) Ph.D. students coming from different European countries as well as from Asia, America and Africa.

## News about Members

### In Memoriam: Harold H. Kelley

Harold Kelley passed away on January 29 of cancer at his home in Malibu. In addition to his beloved wife (and dear companion for 61 years), Harold Kelley is survived by his son, Sten Kelley, his daughters Ann Kelley and Megan Emory, and five grandchildren.

#### **From Idaho to California, and from Michigan to Malibu**

Harold Kelley was born in Boise, Idaho, in 1921. At the age of ten, he moved with his family to California, where he met and married his highschool sweetheart, Dorothy. Kelley received his MA degree in psychology from the University of California, Berkeley, in 1943. He then served in the Aviation Psychology Program of the Army Air Corps until entering MIT in 1946. After completing his Ph.D at the Research Center for Group Dynamics (under the direction of Dorwin Cartwright) in 1948, he moved with the center to the University of Michigan, where he worked closely with a team headed by Leon Festinger. He then served successively on the psychology faculties there, at Yale, and at the University of Minnesota. In 1961, he accepted a professorship in the Department of Psychology at U.C.L.A. He retired in 1991 but remained fully involved in his scholarly career until his recent illness. Throughout most of his academic life, he was closely connected with many researchers working in Europe, such as Claude Faucheux, Serge Moscovici, Jef Nuttin, and Jaap Rabbie, to mention only the European members of a nine-person international group studying bargaining. Also, Kelley was one of the inspiring staff members of the very first summer school sponsored by the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology and held at Leuven, Belgium in 1968.

In the following I discuss first *some* of this contributions to social psychology. Indeed, I really think a heading "his contributions" would imply that I know them all, which is not true. What I *do* know is that his

contributions extend the field of social psychology, as well as the discipline of psychology, which is why I use the heading "...to science". To illustrate, some years ago, he received a prestigious Cooley-Mead award from the American Sociological Association. I will also share some of my own experiences with him, which go back to 1986, even though I got to know him much better during the last decade; thus, in the following, I refer to "Hal" (he was rarely referred to as Harold by friends and colleagues) rather than Kelley.

### **Some of his contributions to science**

In classic and especially contemporary psychology, there are numerous scientists who have made an important contribution to a specific topic of research. However, there are only a few who have made a leading contribution to several specific fields, thereby shaping the entire field of social psychology. For example, his early research on impression formation, published more than fifty years ago (Kelley, 1950), is still cited as the first study to show that the warm-cold distinction is of central importance to impression formation and person cognition. As another example, the negotiation paradigm that he designed several decades ago is still the dominant paradigm in experimental research on negotiation. And how about his classic work with Antony Stahelski, demonstrating how and why self-fulfilling prophecies may operate in the context of a prisoner's dilemma? Indeed, the theory proposed in that article is still inspiring numerous scientists around the world. A final example is his work on social dilemmas with Janusz Grzelak, which is one of the first, if not the very first empirical study, in which the 2 person Prisoner's dilemma is extended to an N-person social dilemma, thereby importantly enhancing the generalizability of game research to real-life situations. There are several other classic empirical articles, which turned out to be ground-breaking – for example, his work on the development of cooperation in minimally social situations with very little information about one another's options, or the coordination problems involved in panic situations. Thus, by being the first to study a new topic, Hal has not only contributed to social psychology, but has in many respects shaped our field. It is hard to judge whether, and if so how, various topics of research (e.g., impression formation, cooperation and competition) would have developed, if Hal had not published those seminal articles.

Unlike many other social psychologists, Hal Kelley has contributed two influential, innovative theories to contemporary psychology. Although they are considered social psychological theories, the scientific scope and general relevance of both theories extends beyond our field, as several other disciplines have benefited from the development of both these theories. First, Hal Kelley advanced *a theory of attribution*, which has received immense attention. It provides a logical conceptual framework, outlining the primary features (or dimensions of a three-dimensional cube) that could underlie causal reasoning regarding interpersonal events and behavior. It is very likely that, in the next several decades, Kelley's attribution theory will remain classic within social psychology.

The other theory, derives from his highly influential book with John Thibaut (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). It is most often referred to as *a theory of interdependence*, after the title of perhaps an even more influential book published almost two decades later (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978). Interdependence theory is a broad theory that helps us understand many social psychological and truly interpersonal phenomena, including many of the interaction-relevant topics Harold Kelley has studied himself (e.g., attribution, impression formation, negotiation, social dilemmas, coordination, cooperation and competition, love and commitment, decision-making). One key contribution of the interdependence theory is the fact that it provides a taxonomy of interpersonal situations, using the language and logic of game theory. At the same time, it is *an inherently psychological* theory, because the second key contribution derives from the fact that Kelley and Thibaut advance a transformation process, assuming that the given situation is subject to translation, construal, and interpretation. Importantly, the concept of transformation process extended game theory and original formulations of exchange theory, in that it explicated the self-centered and prosocial interaction goals that may be afforded by a given situation. In the past two decades, Hal has extended interdependence theory by suggesting so-called transition lists as an alternative to games for analyzing interaction situations. Also, with a group of nine authors, he wrote a book on close relationships, which has had a tremendous impact on research on relationship processes, as well as on the ways in which relationship researchers conceptualise processes such as affect, love, and commitment. And in the past seven years, Hal Kelley worked intensely with the so-called Atlas group, consisting of John

Holmes, Norbert Kerr, Harry Reis, Caryl Rusbult, and myself. In this project, we conceptualized 21 interaction situations, described their main interdependence features, the person variables (e.g., motives, cognitions, emotions) each of them affords, and the interaction patterns that they may elicit. The main idea, not surprisingly, came from Hal Kelley, and he was our inspirational, yet informal, leader during all seven years. The Atlas group is pleased that Hal Kelley got to see an early published version of the *Atlas of Interpersonal Situations* just five days before he passed away. (With John Holmes, Hal was quite close to completing another volume, entitled *Interdependence Theory: Situations, Relationships, and Personality*.)

I find it exceptionally difficult to picture a social psychology without Hal Kelley's contribution. For example, it is not clear how research on impression formation or negotiation would have developed in the absence of the most seminal paper that he has written in that area. Attribution theory, and interdependence theory in particular, are exceptional theories because they provide logic, coherence, and structure to social psychology – that is, to the dimensions underlying causal interpretations and to dimensions underlying interpersonal situations, respectively. Interdependence theory has become one of the main theories in the literatures of relationships and social interaction, and as such is used to illuminate numerous processes, such as processes relevant to cooperation and competition, prosocial behavior, intergroup relationships, dominance and submission, moral and conventional norms, stereotype maintenance, interpersonal trust, as well as attribution and impression formation. Each of these issues is basic to the understanding of social interaction and relationship processes.

Hal Kelley also shaped the field of social psychology in a more implicit manner. That is, Hal was a prominent member of an international group of leading scientists who brought together two relatively distinct traditions of social psychology: The American social psychology and the European social psychology. Many European social psychologists have benefited tremendously from Hal's visits to Europe. In fact, in 1970 Hal published one of the first cross-national experimental studies within social psychology (this article had; aside from Hal, four American and four European co-authors). Moreover, throughout his career, he was strongly attached to social psychology in Europe: he was an affiliate member of the

European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, he taught at the Association's summer schools, and attended our General Meetings. Moreover, Hal Kelley inspired several European social psychologists of different generations. Thus and in his unique way, Hal has also made a somewhat less visible, yet very important contribution toward the integration of American and European traditions of research and theory.

### **Beyond the bright mind: From generosity to modesty**

The first time I met with Hal was in 1986, when – as a young student - I was visiting the University of California at Santa Barbara. He took nearly three hours, including a generous lunch, to discuss with me the concept of social value orientation, the power and limitations of matrix representations, and so on. Looking back, it is really amazing that Hal took so much time to meet and discuss research with an undergraduate student whom he did not know. In arranging the visit, I may have presented myself as a little less junior than I was to make sure that he would indeed agree to meet. As I learned later, the effort was wasted, because issues of seniority and experience were nearly completely irrelevant to him. This very first visit already illustrates his extraordinarily high level of intellectual generosity and open-mindedness, which others and I would have the opportunity to experience over and over on later occasions. Indeed, one of his typical reactions to basic social psychological questions, put to him by others, was: “What do you think?”

Later interactions with him served to fine tune my initial impressions, because his bright and ever young mind also displayed an interesting combination of openness and reservation. While Hal did not rapidly reject an idea, neither did he rapidly accept an idea. (Wittingly, the almost complete absence of any tendency toward *cognitive closure* on ideas may well have inspired his former student, Arie Kruglanski, to introduce the concept in the early nineties). After talking to someone about a particular idea, he would simply make sure that he would take sufficient time to think it over. The fact that he did not quickly accept an idea implies that Hal used stringent standards for ideas. He wanted to see logic and structure, and would not begin to feel satisfied until he began to see some structure and coherence in an idea. Sometimes he would express some reservation with the field, noting that we had gone too far in the direction

of an empirical, data-driven enterprise at some costs to structure and logic. This is, of course, not to argue that he disrespected data. On the contrary, but he felt that structure and logic needed more careful attention in doing social psychology.

Another striking quality of Hal is that he was always extremely well-prepared for any form of public event. Once he had agreed to take on a particular task, he went to work, directly and with lots of energy. For example, at the retirement of his colleague and friend Chuck McClintock in 1992, Hal presented an overview of all the work that McClintock had done over more than 35 years. It was an extraordinary overview that he gave in front of an informal audience consisting of (former) students and colleagues at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He took that task very seriously, yet every now and then throughout his scholarly exposé, he made use of his unique and fine sense of humor. Just a year before that retirement event, Eddy van Avermaet had organized one of the most impressive conferences that I ever attended. Having just retired from UCLA Hal was the guest of honour at this conference. During that conference Hal spontaneously organized a party one evening, in which he showed the participants to the conference slides of “the old days.” These slides revealed that Hal Kelley was very good friends with many European social psychologists of his generation. Moreover, this group seemed to be capable of combining excellent work and friendship in the most fruitful manner.

Hal Kelley was a warm person, with a genuine interest in others. In addition to intellectual discussions, Hal also appreciated “less serious” discussions and he loved to tease, always with a kind and warm smile on his face. I have very fond memories of the many pleasant discussions we had with him during and after meetings of the Atlas-project. Every now and then Hal would tell a story that he thought might be of interest to some of us, but just as often he was listening, smiling, and enjoying the group discussion. This style also characterized his very pleasant leadership during the Atlas Project. He would be thinking and listening quietly, while respecting and appreciating everybody’s contributions. And he never seemed distracted by what seemed to be less relevant discussions, because he knew where we could be going with this project. He would perhaps only be distracted by grandiose language. Whenever one of us used

high-flying terms that Hal considered unnecessary and messy, we could almost feel him think: "That logic needs work"!

Last but definitely not least, modesty was definitely one of Hal's most salient qualities. In nearly every presentation, he acknowledged the influence of John Thibaut on his thinking, and his contribution to the development of interdependence theory. He also acknowledged the work of several others, such as Ellen Berscheid, Charles McClintock, and David Messick, as having influenced his theorizing with John Thibaut. More generally, his interpersonal style was one of care, openness and respect. He was alien to anything that was even remotely related to expressions of self-importance.

### **An intellectual giant and an exceptional person**

Hal Kelley was an intellectual giant. He received almost every award there is in psychology (including also some from other disciplines). He was one of the few social psychologists to become elected as a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the National Academy of Sciences. And even in the last years, at the end of a career of nearly six decades, he was still one of the most cited scholars within social psychology.

Hal Kelley was an exceptional scholar and an exceptional person. He had the unique talent to combine professional and personal qualities in the most natural and perfect of ways: his warmth, generosity and modesty were as much a part of himself as was his incredibly bright and creative mind. Only rarely do we have the good fortune to come across people of such grandeur!

Note: Some biographical information is based on a brief overview distributed at the Memorial Service at UCLA, February 9, 2003.

*Paul van Lange*



**In memoriam: Harald G. Wallbott**

Harald Wallbott died, completely unexpectedly, on April 1, 2003, at the age of 51, of a heart attack linked to a cancer condition that was undiagnosed until his death.

Harald Wallbott was, since 1994, Chair ("Ordentlicher Universitätsprofessor") and Head of the Department of Social and Organizational Psychology and Head of the Research Institute for Organizational Behavior, at the University of Salzburg, Austria, where he taught social psychology, emotion psychology, and some areas of applied psychology and psychological methods. He had obtained his doctorate and his "venia legendi" (Habilitation) from the University of Giessen, Germany, where he has also taught social psychology.

Harald was a researcher with very many talents and interests. His main research focus was nonverbal behavior as applied to emotion, interpersonal perception, social interaction, and media communication. Starting with his dissertation research, he has put gestures on the map of nonverbal behavior research. In addition he has made important contributions to the literature on facial expression, including issues concerned with expression, perception, and decoding. Importantly, he was among the first to systematically use new computer-based techniques for the presentation, experimental manipulation, and judgment of expressive stimuli, testifying to his important drive and capacity for innovation. He has made very good use of this capacity in his numerous studies in the psychology of the media. He also made his intuition and expertise in this respect generously available to fellow researchers. Thus, for many years he produced a newsletter on the use of video in research of nonverbal communication and other psychological applications at a time when video recording as a tool for psychological research was still in its infancy. When organizing the Salzburg conference on Facial Expression -- Measurement and Meaning-- in 1997, which is still remembered as one of the most inspiring and friendly ones within that series of meetings, the Internet was used systematically to involve colleagues who could not attend.

Harald has also played a major role in several large-scale cross-culturally comparative studies on emotional experience, which have benefited not only from his psychological insight and methodological skills but also from his strong motivation and enthusiasm. He has been a very active member of many different scholarly groups and associations in this area, in particular the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology and the International Society for Research on Emotion. He also served as a conscientious editor and co-editor of various German and international scientific journals.

Harald's impact on the field will undoubtedly persist, given the solid record of publications in major international journals and chapters in widely distributed books. But the research community working on emotion and nonverbal communication, as well as in social psychology and media psychology in general, will be deprived of his contributions that were always substantial and often particularly interesting because of his ability to invent new methodologies and to address important issues in a fresh and appealing manner. His style as a scientist was marked by modesty and understatement. Yet, those who knew his work well realized early on that his ideas anticipated many of the current discussions in nonverbal behavior research. Moreover, he was a very warm person, always supportive with students and colleagues in a quiet, unpretentious manner. Those who knew him personally will miss his friendly presence, his incisive remarks in discussion, his sense of humor, and his boundless enthusiasm for research. He will be fondly remembered by his students, colleagues, and friends.

*Jens Asendorpf, Heiner Ellgring, Hede Helfrich,  
Ursula Hess, Arvid Kappas, and Klaus Scherer*

**Announcements****Social Cognition: Special discount rate for  
EAESP members**

Social Cognition is offering a special discount rate to all EAESP members:

- For a one year subscription: \$52 for U.S. members, \$67 for international members (includes \$15 for airmail shipping).
- This represents almost a 50% discount from the standard individual 2003 subscription rate (\$90.00 in the U.S., or \$120 outside of the U.S., which includes \$30 for airmail shipping).

How?

- To take advantage of this offer, using your credit card, please fax or email Guilford Press (publisher of Social Cognition) directly at the email or fax address below, quoting EAESP offer in your message.
  - Email: [news@guilford.com](mailto:news@guilford.com)
  - Fax: (00 1) 212-966-6708

**Subscriptions may also be ordered online at [www.guilford.com](http://www.guilford.com)**

Click on "Periodicals" then scroll down and click on Social Cognition. Choose U.S. or International Individual, then follow the instructions for special prices. (The department number is EAESP.) There is no need to include additional postage beyond what is quoted above.

- This offer is open to full, affiliate and postgraduate members of the Association (Social Cognition staff will check the membership from the latest membership lists).
- Please do not contact EAESP, as they will accept no correspondence on this matter.

## Announcements from the Executive Committee

The Executive Committee feels that a subset of items, treated at its most recent meeting (April 25-27, 2003), should be brought to the attention of the members of the Association. Some reflect decisions, but most involve calls for assistance regarding initiatives taken by the Executive Committee.

### **2005 General Meeting: location and dates**

The next General Meeting will be held at *Würzburg (Germany), July 19-23, 2005*. Fritz Strack and his team will be our hosts. Early prospection indicates there is every reason to believe the 2005 General Meeting will be as successful as its 2002 San Sebastián predecessor. Future issues of the Bulletin will gradually provide the necessary information towards your contributions and your participation. In the meantime, please mark July 19-23 in your 2005 calendar as 'Association days', and you may want to begin and think about suggestions for symposia.

### **2006 EAESP Summer School: in search of a location**

While the Groningen team is preparing the 2004 EAESP Summer School, the Executive Committee has already started its search for a location to host the 2006 edition. The Executive Committee is of course taking its own initiatives in this respect, but at present it is open to any suggestions. Some of you who still have lively memories of earlier schools, either as participants or as sponsors of participants, may perhaps consider becoming responsible for organising a summer school themselves. The Executive Committee welcomes all proposals (just drop a note to Sibylle Classen before the end of September 2003).

If you would consider the idea, but you hesitate because of x, y and z, it may interest you to know:

- (a) that you can benefit from the experience of recent past organisers via a fully worked out summer school scenario, which provides detailed information regarding all the steps involved (put together by Rolf van Dick and Ulrich Wagner of Marburg);
- (b) that you can count on substantial financial and logistic support from the Association;
- (c) that the Executive Committee is now actively looking into the possibility of submitting a proposal to the European Union towards obtaining a grant that would allow EAESP to provide solid structural support for a number of Summer School editions to come.

### **European Bulletin: Here is what I experienced: anybody interested?**

The Bulletin would like to start a new series of articles with the provocative title: "Here is what I experienced: anybody interested?" Members are invited to contribute brief articles reporting, in a semi-journalistic style, their reflections over such things as failed studies, methodological problems experienced in running research (or getting it published), procedures or techniques of research over which they would like to get a discussion started, etc... In short, we are looking for anything members would like to get off their professional chest and share with other members, in the hope of drawing support, sympathy, reactions, assistance, criticisms, comments or whatever.

Please submit your contributions (beginning 'now') to Sibylle Classen.

### **European Bulletin: Social Psychology across Europe**

The Bulletin has always and will continue to report on social psychology meetings organised with the assistance of the Association. In addition however, the Executive Committee feels that the membership may also be interested in being informed of other national/regional social psychology conferences via brief reports of such meetings. The Bulletin will be happy to publish such reports if you feel that they may have relevance for EAESP members at large. Moreover, through such reports you can provide an

indication of the vitality and the dynamics of social psychology in your own country or region.

### **EAESP Archives**

Especially younger members may not know, but as described on the inside cover of the 1999 edition of the EAESP ProFile, there really exists an EAESP archive, which came about through the efforts of former president and co-founder of the Association, Jef Nuttin. These archives, which contain interesting documentation, especially from the early years, are being kept at the Central Library of the University of Leuven. Rich as this collection is, at the same time an analysis of its contents shows many gaps.

The Executive Committee therefore takes this opportunity to call upon your sense of history inviting you to contribute to these archives any materials that you consider relevant with respect to "the history of EAESP". We are thinking of programme books of General Meetings, East-West Meetings, earlier Summer Schools, or any other meetings or activities sponsored by the Association. But we are also thinking of relevant correspondence and the like. If you do have such materials (the older they are the better; we do have the more recent materials), just drop an email message to Sibylle Classen or to Eddy Van Avermaet and you will be informed of what to do. So, up to your attics, down in your cellars, and into forgotten corners of your book chests!

### **EAESP website: the beginnings of a picture gallery**

The Executive Committee intends to enhance the attractiveness of its website by setting up a gallery of pictures of events (and people) that mark the older and more recent history of the Association. There can be no doubt that many members (older and younger) do have pictures of Association related events. The Executive Committee would appreciate your sharing them with others. Hence, if you want to contribute to this picture gallery, please send your pictures to Sibylle Classen, preferably indicating who is in them (if you remember) and on which occasion the pictures were made. Don't worry, you will get your originals back. They will be scanned, put on the website and then returned to you.

**Letters of support for applicants for membership**

As described on pp. 15-16 of the ProFile, applications for membership should be accompanied by two letters of support written by full members. The ProFile describes the types of information that should be provided in these letters of support.

The Executive Committee calls upon potential supporters to please first read the relevant section in the Bulletin and to carefully provide 'all' the information requested. More generally, truly informative letters of support will be appreciated. Vague letters cast in only general terms do not make the Executive Committee's task lighter.

Many of the letters received do meet these criteria, but unfortunately there are other cases as well.

**New edition of the ProFile planned**

A thoroughly revised edition of the ProFile is currently being prepared. It will be made available in the Fall of this year.

**In concluding**

If you have managed to work your way through all the above announcements and calls for assistance, you will agree that there is work ahead for you. May we suggest that you jot the key items down on a flashy reminder note that you place in front of you, in a clearly visible place. For many of us it is the only way to make sure things get done. Otherwise, they run the risk of getting buried deeper and deeper under a pile of good intentions which never materialise.

## Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Administrative Secretary by **September, 1<sup>st</sup>, 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 **September, 15<sup>th</sup> 2003**.



## 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>