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1. Introduction

The Kurt Lewin Institute (KLI) is a center for graduate training and research focusing on the analysis of the psychological factors contributing to the shaping of social behavior. In 2008 the KLI is based on the collaborative input of psychologists working in five Dutch Universities, namely: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VU), Universiteit van Amsterdam (UvA), Rijksuniversiteit Groningen (RuG), Universiteit Leiden (UL), and Universiteit Utrecht (UU).

The general objective of the KLI is to stimulate and strengthen research in social psychology and its applications. To this end, the KLI offers a four-year graduate teaching and training program. PhD students from the five universities in the Netherlands participate in specialist and general courses throughout the four-year period.

As of January 2005 the commissioner (penvoerder) of the KLI is the Faculteit der Maatschappij- en Gedragswetenschappen at the Universiteit van Amsterdam. The KLI office is located at the programme group Work and Organizational Psychology.
2. Organization

2.1 Management structure

The structure and organization of the KLI are detailed and formalized in the Standing Orders (Huishoudelijk Reglement) and Articles (Samenwerkingsovereenkomst) of the Institute. Here we provide a brief overview of the organizational structure.

General Board
The General Board of the KLI consists of 6 members: a non-voting chairman, 5 members representing each of the 5 participating institutes and 1 external board member who is not a KLI member. It has ultimate responsibility with regard to research, teaching and budgetary decisions. The General Board delegates the daily running of the KLI to an Executive Committee consisting of the Scientific Director and two Adjunct Directors (responsible respectively for research and teaching).
Members of the General Board in 2008
Prof.dr. N. Ellemers (chair)
Prof.dr. K. van den Bos
Prof.dr. A.H. Fischer
Prof.dr. K.A. Jehn (until March 2008)
Prof.dr. P.A.M. van Lange
Drs. K.E. Stroebe (non-voting Ph.D. student member), until September 2008
Drs. E. Ufkes (non-voting Ph.D. student member), as of September 2008
Prof.dr. N. van Yperen
Prof.dr. D.H.J. Wigboldus (external member)

Executive Committee
The Executive Committee is responsible for taking all the relevant decisions, and shapes the scientific and educational policy of the KLI in consultation with and based on the advice of two formal bodies: the Teaching Committee and the Research Committee. Both committees report directly to the Executive Committee of the KLI, the former on the coordination and planning of research training, and the latter on research proposals and student progress.

Members of the Executive Committee in 2008
Prof.dr. E. van Dijk (Research Director)
Prof.dr. C.K.W. de Dreu (Scientific Director), until May 2008
Prof.dr. J.A. Förster (Scientific Director), as of May 2008
Dr. E.H. Gordijn (Teaching Director)

Teaching Committee
The Teaching Committee has primary responsibility for developing and evaluating the teaching program. The committee consists of two members, a graduate student and the Teaching Director.

Members of the Teaching Committee in 2008
Dr. W.W. van Dijk
Dr. E.H. Gordijn (Chair)
Dr. D.T. Scheepers
Drs. K.E. Stroebe (representing the PhD students), until September 2008
Drs. E.G. Ufkes (representing the PhD students), as of September 2008
Research Committee
The Research Committee has primary responsibility for evaluating Ph.D. projects and proposals, for annual assessment of Ph.D. projects (based on reports from graduate students), and for the scientific program of the KLI. The committee consists of three members including the Research Director.

Members of the Research Committee in 2008
Dr. I. van Beest
Dr. B. Doosje (until September 2008)
Prof.dr. E. van Dijk (Chair)
Dr. C. Finkenauer (until September 2008)
Dr. Gerben van Kleef (as of September 2008)
Prof.dr. W. Stroebe
Prof.dr. Barbara Wisse (as of September 2008)

General Manager
Finally, the Executive Committee is supported by the KLI administrative staff (based at the University of Amsterdam). This consists of a General Manager employed to assist the different boards and committees of the KLI in the preparation and execution of the KLI policies. The General Manager is executive secretary of the Executive Committee, the Teaching Committee and the Research Committee.

General Manager in 2008
Drs. Anouk K. Evers
2.2 Participating institutes

**Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam**
Van der Boechorststraat 1, 1081 BT Amsterdam
- Department of Social Psychology  
  T: 020 - 598 8865  F: 020 - 598 8921  
- Department of Work & Organizational Psychology  
  T: 020 - 598 8700  F: 020 - 598 8702

**Universiteit van Amsterdam**
Roetersstraat 15, 1018 WB Amsterdam
- Department of Social Psychology  
  T: 020 - 525 6890  F: 020 - 639 1896  
- Department of Work & Organizational Psychology  
  T: 020 - 525 6860  F: 020 - 639 0531

**Rijksuniversiteit Groningen**
Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, 9712 TS Groningen
- Department of Social & Organizational Psychology  
  T: 050 - 363 6386  F: 050 - 363 4581  
- Department of Differential Psychology, Methodology and History  
  T: 050 - 363 6340  F: 050 - 363 6304  
- Department of Experimental and Work Psychology  
  T: 050 - 363 64 72

**Universiteit Leiden**
PO box 9555, 2300 RB Leiden
- Department of Social & Organizational Psychology  
  T: 071 - 527 3705  F: 071 - 527 3619

**Universiteit Utrecht**
PO box 80140, 3508 TC Utrecht
- Department of Social & Organizational Psychology  
  T: 035 - 253 4794  F: 035 - 253 7584
2.3 Scientific Advisory Board

The Scientific Advisory Board consists of five international experts in the domains covered by the KLI from whom advice on the content and direction of the KLI can be solicited. Members of the Advisory Board are: prof.dr. M. West (Organizational Studies, Aston Business School, UK), prof.dr. E. van Avermaet (Lab. Exp. Soc. Psychologie, Universiteit Leuven, Belgium), prof.dr. A. Mummendey (Institut für Psychologie, Universität Jena, Germany), prof.dr. E. Smith (Dept of Psychology, Indiana University, USA), prof.dr. J. Levine (Dept of Psychology, University of Pittsburgh, USA).

2.4 Confidential advisors

Two “confidential advisors” (*vertrouwenspersonen*) have been appointed, to whom students can turn to confidentially ask advice about problems they may encounter with their supervisor or host institution. The confidential advisors in 2008 were: prof.dr. W. (Ivo) Molenaar (emeritus, Department of Psychology, University of Groningen) and prof.dr. T. (Tineke) Willemsen (emeritus, Department of Psychology and Society, University of Tilburg).
3. Members

3.1 Membership

Criteria for admission of teaching and training staff
Researchers can become members of the KLI if they meet the following criteria:

a. The applicant’s research must fit into the KLI’s mission;

b. The applicant must have a PhD;

c. The applicant must have a publication track-record showing a regular output (at least 20 points) over the last 5 years in peer-reviewed international journals; and

d. There must be evidence of successful PhD student supervision.

Journals are classified into two categories. Only peer-reviewed international journals qualify. Journals in category 1 are those with a mean citation impact score of at least 1.0 in the preceding five years. All other journals belong to category 2. Applicants and existing members receive points for publications as follows:
- first author of an article in a category 1 journal: 6 points
- first author of an article in a category 2 journal: 4 points
- second (or subsequent) author of an article in a category 1 journal: 4 points
- second (or subsequent) author of an article in a category 2 journal: 2 points
- author or co-author of an English-language monograph (max. one): 6 points

Full membership of the KLI requires a publication track record showing a regular output (at least 20 points) over the preceding 5 years.
Applicants who do not meet criteria c. and/or d. can become Associate Members for a maximum of 3 years.
Applicants who meet the selection criteria but who are not members of the five participating institutes of the KLI are welcome to become Affiliate Members. Affiliate members have the right to participate in teaching and training activities, but have no administrative responsibilities. Their graduate students can attend courses organized by the KLI.

Researchers who feel that they meet some or all of the admission criteria of the KLI can apply for Full, Associate or Affiliate membership, as appropriate. The Executive Committee decides on membership applications.
Criteria for the admission of graduate students
As of the academic year 2008-2009 the membership criteria for PhD student have been changed somewhat.

As of the academic year 2008-2009 the basic courses ‘Writing English for Publication’ and ‘How to Present’ are no longer offered in the KLI teaching program. All institutes participating in the KLI (UVA, VU, RuG, UL and UU) now offer a research master program in which students have sufficient opportunities to learn these skills. Most new Ph.D. students of the KLI are expected to have completed a research master.

For Ph.D. students who become a KLI member after September 1st 2008, the courses ‘Writing English for Publication’ and ‘How to Present’ are no longer a prerequisite to obtain the KLI-certificate. To guarantee that these Ph.D. students have acquired these skills however, they have been added to the membership criteria, which are listed below.

Membership criteria for Ph.D. students as of September 1, 2008
Ph.D. students can become a student member of the KLI when the following two criteria are met:

1) A research proposal submitted by one of the supervisors has been approved by the KLI Research Committee.
2) The Ph.D. student has sufficient skills in writing scientific English and presenting research. Criterion 2 is met by Ph.D. students who:
a. Have completed a Research Master at one of the institutes participating in the KLI (UvA, VU, RuG, UL and UU);
b. Have completed a Research Master at another institute, on the condition that teaching in writing scientific English and presenting research was part of the curriculum;
c. For writing scientific English: have completed an English language Master;
d. Can establish in some other way that he/she has acquired these skills, for example by means of:
   - a certificate of participation in a relevant course on at least the level of a Research Master
   - with respect to writing scientific English: an English language manuscript written (mostly) by the Ph.D. student, with a statement of one of the supervisors that the Ph.D. student masters these skills.
Ph.D. students who do not meet 2 can be admitted as a candidate student member for a maximum of 1 year. In this year the student can for example follow a course to meet the criterium and send a copy of the certificate to the KLI-office. If can be established that the student meets criterium 2 within the first year the regular student membership will be awarded. If the criteria are not met within the first year, the candidate membership will be ended and the Ph.D. student cannot become a member of the KLI. For the courses and workshops participated in the standard course fee for non-members (75 euro per day) will then be charged.

For Ph.D. students who were already a KLI member prior to September 1st 2008, completion of a course in writing scientific English and presenting research remains a prerequisite to obtain the KLI certificate.

**Evaluation of the project proposal**
The committee evaluates each project in terms of the following criteria:

1. **Formal issues**
   a. At least one supervisor must be a member of the KLI.
   b. The theme or topic of the research must fit within the scientific mission of the KLI.
   c. The proposal must be in a form that can readily be judged by the committee.
   d. Arrangements for the supervision of the project should be appropriate.

2. **Content issues**
   a. Theory. Is there a good theoretical framework for the proposed research?
   b. Applied relevance. What is the practical importance of the proposed work?
   c. Scientific relevance. What is the scientific importance of the proposed work?
   d. Feasibility of proposal. Can the proposed work be carried out in the time available?
   e. Methods. Are the proposed methods appropriate?
   f. Previous and/or pilot research. Have the applicants already carried out research on this topic? Are there publications reporting this work?
   g. General impression.

Applications that, according to the Research Committee, fall short of the desired standard with regard to content issues are returned to the applicants with a request to revise the proposal in the light of written feedback from the committee and to resubmit the proposal for consideration at a subsequent meeting.
Applications which are, in most respects, of a good standard but which are insufficiently clear with respect to specific issues are treated differently: The application is approved but the applicants are requested to ensure that the issues needing clarification are addressed in the first progress report submitted by the PhD student working on the project.

As of January 1, 2007 new KLI graduate student members can be a student member for a maximum of five years.
3.2 Full members on December 31, 2008

Prof.dr. H. Aarts, UU, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. B. Beersma, UvA, Work and Organizational Psychology
Dr. I. van Beest, UL, Social & Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. K. van den Bos, UU, Social & Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. B.P. Buunk, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. R. Custers, UU, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. B. Derks, UL, Social & Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. E. van Dijk, UL, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. W.W. van Dijk, VU, Social Psychology
Dr. A. Dijkstra, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. B. Doosje, UvA, Social Psychology
Prof.dr. C.K.W. de Dreu, UvA, Work and Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. N. Ellemers, UL, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. M.C. Euwema, UL, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. C. Finkenauer, VU, Social Psychology
Prof.dr. A.H. Fischer, UvA, Social Psychology
Prof.dr. H. van der Flier, VU, Work and Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. J.A. Forster, UvA, Social Psychology
Prof.dr. E.H. Gordijn, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. M.J.J. Handgraaf, UvA, Work and Organizational Psychology
Dr. F. Harinck, UL, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. F. van Harreveld, UvA, Social Psychology
Dr. A.H.B. de Hoogh, UvA, Work and Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. K.A. Jehn, UL, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. K.J. Jonas, UvA, Social Psychology
Dr. G.A. van Kleef, UvA, Social Psychology
Dr. U.C. Klehe, UvA, Work and Organizational Psychology
Dr. E.S. Kluwer, UU, Social & Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. B.M. van Knippenberg, VU, Work and Organizational Psychology
Dr. S.L. Koole, VU, Social Psychology
Dr. C. van Laar, UL, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. A.H. de Lange, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. P.A.M. van Lange, VU, Social Psychology
Prof.dr. R.W. Meertens, UvA, Social Psychology
Dr. B.A. Nijstad, UvA, Work and Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. S. Otten, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. J.P.L.M. van Oudenhoven, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology
MEMBERS

Prof.dr. K.I. van Oudenhoven-van der Zee, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. J. van der Pligt, UvA, Social Psychology
Prof.dr. T. Postmes, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. J.W. van Prooijen, VU, Social Psychology
Dr. B. de Raad, RuG, Differential Psychology, Methodology and History
Dr. M. Rotteveel, UvA, Social Psychology
Dr. K.I. Ruys, UU, Social & Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. C.E. Rusbult, VU, Social Psychology
Prof.dr. K. Sassenberg, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. D.T. Scheepers, UL, Social & Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. G.R. Semin, UU, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. F.W. Siero, RuG, Differential Psychology, Methodology and History
Dr. H.J.A.M. Staats, UL, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. L. Steg, RuG, Experimental and Work Psychology
Dr. T. Ståhl, UL, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. W. Steinel, UL, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. M. Stel, UL, Social & Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. W. Stroebe, UU, Social & Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. A.E.M. v. Vianen, UvA, Work and Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. E. van de Vliert, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. R.E. de Vries, VU, Social Psychology
Prof.dr. N.W. van Yperen, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. M. van Zomeren, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology

3.3 Affiliate members on December 31, 2008

Prof.dr. M.Ph. Born, EUR, Psychology
Dr. D. de Cremer, EUR, Rotterdam School of Management
Dr. E. Derous, EUR, Psychology
Dr. M. van Dijke, OU, Psychology
Dr. E.A.J. van Hooft, EUR, Psychology
Dr. C. Martijn, UM, Experimental Psychology
Dr. F.A. Rink, RuG, Human Resource Management and Organizational Behavior
Dr. R.A.C. Ruiter, UM, Work and Organizational Psychology
Prof.dr. K. Sanders, UT, Organisational Psychology & Human Resource Development
Prof.dr. D.A. Stapel, UvT, Psychology
3.4 Associate members on December 31, 2008

Dr. H. van den Berg, UvA, Social Psychology
Dr. K. Epstude, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. M. Hafner, UU, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. N. Hansen, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. D.A. van Hemert, UvA, Social Psychology
Dr. A.C. Homan, UL, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. N.B. Jostmann, UvA, Social Psychology
Dr. E.W. de Kwaadsteniet, UL, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. J.N. de Liver, UU, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. E.K. Papiès, UU, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. J.H. Park, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr.ing. I.E. de Pater, UvA, Work and Organizational Psychology
Dr. E.F. Rietzschel, RuG, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. E.F. van Steenbergen, UU, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. F.S. ten Velden, UvA, Work and Organizational Psychology
Dr. H.P. Veling, UU, Social & Organizational Psychology
Dr. S. Zebel, UvA, Social Psychology

1 VU = VU University; UvA = University of Amsterdam; RuG = Groningen University; UL = Leiden University; UU = Utrecht University; UvT = Tilburg University; EUR = Erasmus University Rotterdam; UM = Maastricht University; OU = Open University

3.5 PhD students

On 31 December 2008, 83 PhD students were participating in the Kurt Lewin Institute. In the same year, 31 PhD students started their research, 23 PhD students completed their research, 1 PhD student stopped, 13 PhD students found another job but will finish their PhD later and the PhD position of 5 PhD students was ended but they will finish their PhD later.
Table 1: Institutional participation of PhD students on December 31, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VU University</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Amsterdam</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Groningen</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Leiden</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utrecht</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External PhD students</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of PhD students in 2008, their supervisors and the title of their research project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th>Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drs. Y.R. Avramova**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. D.A. Stapel</td>
<td>UvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. F.M.G. Pieters</td>
<td>UvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Mood, focus level, and accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. N. Ayub</td>
<td>Prof.dr. K.A. Jehn</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: The Effects of National Diversity, Organization Culture, and Conflict on Workgroup Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. M. Baas</td>
<td>Prof.dr. C.K.W. de Dreu</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. B.A. Nijstad</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Is it positive or negative mood that fosters creativity and innovation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. E.H. Bijleveld</td>
<td>Prof.dr. H. Aarts</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. ir. R. Custers</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Priming effects on behavior: Cognitive versus motivational mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. M. Blaga</td>
<td>Prof.dr. N.W. van Yperen</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Approach goals, performance attainment and task interest - the role of moderators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. D. Bleeker</td>
<td>Prof.dr. N. Ellemers</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. C. van Laar</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Motivation and performance in low status groups: Balancing the interests of the ingroup and outgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. E.J. Boezeman***</td>
<td>Prof.dr. N. Ellemers</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Vrijwilligerswerk als onderdeel van sociale liftfunctie van de stad: Hoe vrijwilligersorganisaties betrokkenheid, inzet, en behoud van vrijwilligers kunnen bevorderen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. J.W. Bolderdijk**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. J.A. Rothengatter</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. E.M. Steg</td>
<td></td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Increasing the effectiveness of incentives through framing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. A.Z. Bosch****</td>
<td>Prof.dr. B.P. Buunk</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. F.W. Siero</td>
<td></td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Social comparison and individual differences in social comparison orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. L.O. Bosma</td>
<td>Prof.dr. K. Sanders</td>
<td>UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof.dr. J. Scheerens</td>
<td></td>
<td>UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: How Performance Related Pay and Leadership bring out the best in employees: the role of HRM content, strength and climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. T.M. Brakel</td>
<td>Prof.dr. B.P. Buunk</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A. Dijkstra</td>
<td></td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Evidence based development of patient education information to be provided through different media to increase quality of life in cancer patients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. B.M. Braun-Ekker</td>
<td>Prof.dr. D.A. Stapel</td>
<td>UvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. S. Otten</td>
<td></td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. E.H. Gordijn</td>
<td></td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Determinants of ingroup versus outgroup bias in aggressive interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. L.G.G. Brebels***</td>
<td>Dr. D. de Cremer</td>
<td>UvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof.dr. C. Sedikides</td>
<td></td>
<td>U. Southampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Injustice and action: A Self-based Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. R. Broeders</td>
<td>Prof.dr. K. van den Bos</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. J.R.C. Ham</td>
<td></td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Automatic and controlled processes in the social psychology of justice judgments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. L. Bullens**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. J.A. Förster</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. F. van Harreveld</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: The impact of decision difficulty on choice, satisfaction, and motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. N. Cem Ersoy</td>
<td>Prof.dr. H. van der Molen</td>
<td>EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. M.Ph. Born</td>
<td>EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Effects of individualistic and collectivistic culture on organizational citizenship behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. C. den Daas**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. J. de Wit</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. H. Aarts</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Is automaticity indeed everywhere? A second-generation study of the moderation of impulsive influences on evaluation and behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. S.E. Dalley</td>
<td>Prof.dr. A.P. Buunk</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. J.H. Park</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: The antecedents and consequences of the female body image dissatisfaction: A social comparison perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. L.A. Dannenberg</td>
<td>Prof.dr. J.A. Förster</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Personal agency as a goal structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. G. Danner-Vlaardingerbroek**</td>
<td>Dr. E.S. Kluwer</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. E.F. van Steenbergen</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. T. van der Lippe</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Habits and the role of awareness and planning in health behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. P. Desmet**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. D. de Cremer</td>
<td>EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. E. van Dijk</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Repairing Trust: When money matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. L.F. van Dillen*</td>
<td>Prof.dr. G.R. Semin</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. S.L. Koole</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. D.J. Heslenfeld</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Neurological foundations of affect regulation and self-activation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. S.R.S. Does**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. N. Ellemers</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. B. Derks</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Turning Threat into Challenge: Improving majority group members’ acceptance of minorities by focusing on morality gains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. E.-J. van Doorn**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. J. van der Pligt</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. G.A. van Kleef</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Interpersonal effects of emotional expressions on persuasion: Testing the emotions as social information (EASI) model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. B. Duyx</td>
<td>Prof.dr. C.K.W. de Dreu</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. B.A. Nijstad</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Constructive delay and decision avoidance in a temporal context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir. K.J.P.M. van Erp</td>
<td>Prof.dr. K.I. van Oudenhoven-v.d. Zee</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. E. Giebels</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Expatriate Adjustment: The Influence of Justice and Conflict in an Intimate Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. K. Faddegon****</td>
<td>Prof.dr. N. Ellemers</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. D.T. Scheepers</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Group dynamics and regulatory focus: Consequences for arousal, emotion and group performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. M. Gillebaart**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. J.A. Forster, Dr. M. Rotteveel</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Emotional, Motivational, and Cognitive Consequences of Novelty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. M.E.E. de Goede</td>
<td>Prof.dr. A.E.M. van Vianen</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. U.C. Klehe</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Applicant perceptions of prospective multilevel fit: Idiosyncratic fit-foci and selection lenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. C. de Groot*****</td>
<td>Prof.dr. A.P. Buunk</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. A. Dijkstra</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: The social context of self-threat and self-evaluative emotions in HRBs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. S. van der Haar**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. K.A. Jehn Prof.dr. M.S.R. Segers</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: <em>High reliability teams and team learning: The importance of transactive memory systems</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. M. Hamstra**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. N.W. van Yperen Prof.dr. K. Sassenberg</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: <em>A self-regulation approach to leadership behavior</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. S.T. Hawk</td>
<td>Prof.dr. A.H. Fischer Dr. G.A. van Kleef</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: <em>Emotional contagion: The role of self and others</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. J. Hofstra****</td>
<td>Prof.dr. J.P.L.M. van Oudenhoven Prof.dr. A.P. Buunk</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: <em>Attachment styles and EVLN-intentions</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. I.E. de Hooge*</td>
<td>Prof.dr. M. Zeelenberg Dr. S.M. Breughelmanns</td>
<td>UvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: <em>Social Emotion in Social Dilemmas: Guilt versus Shame</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. N. Hoogervorst</td>
<td>Prof.dr. D. de Cremer</td>
<td>UvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: <em>When Leaders Enact Fair Procedures: The Roles of Power and Belongingness Motives</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. F. van Horen</td>
<td>Prof.dr. D.A. Stapel Prof.dr. F.M.G. Pieters</td>
<td>UvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: <em>Imitation in the supermarket: When does a look-alike strategy increase liking and choice of leader brand and copycat?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. E. Kamans</td>
<td>Prof.dr. D.A. Stapel Dr. S. Otten Dr. E.H. Gordijn</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: <em>The role of power and emotions in intergroup conflicts</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. L. Kessels</td>
<td>Dr. R.A.C. Ruiter</td>
<td>UM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. B. Jansma</td>
<td>UM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. V. van de Ven</td>
<td>UM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. dr. G. Kok</td>
<td>UM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Threatening health information makes us look away: An fMRI study of the neural processes of negative arousal, personal relevance and attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. A.H.M. Klep</td>
<td>Prof. dr. B.M. van Knippenberg</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. dr. H. van der Flier</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>A Social Identity Model of Group Emotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. L. Koning</td>
<td>Prof. dr. E. van Dijk</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. I. van Beest</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. W. Steinel</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Power and deception in bargaining: an interdependence analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. K.E. Kubacka</td>
<td>Dr. C. Finkenauer</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. dr. C.E. Rusbult</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>The Search for Inter-Personal Accuracy (SIPA) Project: An integrative approach to the determinants of accuracy in social prediction of others' internal states</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. D. Lakens</td>
<td>Prof. dr. G.R. Semin</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. F. Foroni</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Synchronization; grounding the processing of facial expressions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. G. Langendijk**</td>
<td>Prof. dr. Jasper von Grumbkow</td>
<td>OU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. M. van Dijke</td>
<td>OU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. dr. D. de Cremer</td>
<td>EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. J. Syroit</td>
<td>OU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>The role of procedural fairness in power dynamics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. R. van der Lee**</td>
<td>Prof. dr. N. Ellemers</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. D.T. Scheepers</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Morality, competence, and motivation in group contexts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. G.-J. Lelieveld**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. E. van Dijk</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. I. van Beest</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: A social functional account of reactions to and strategic of negative emotions in bargaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. M. Leliveld***</td>
<td>Prof. dr. E. van Dijk</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. I. van Beest</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. J.R.C. Ham</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Misleiding en interdependentie: Eigenbelang en distributieve rechtvaardigheid bij onderhandelen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. A.M. Lokhorst</td>
<td>Prof.dr. E. van Dijk</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. H. Staats</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Feedback, social support and public commitment to improve environmental quality of farm lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. A. Loseman</td>
<td>Prof.dr. K. van den Bos</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. J.R.C. Ham</td>
<td>TUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: On objective truth and subjective principles about justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. K. Luerken**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. A.E.M. van Vianen</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. B. Beersema</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: External and internal fit of teams affecting decision-making processes and performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. K. Luijters*</td>
<td>Prof.dr. K.I. van Oudenhoven-v.d. Zee</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. S. Otten</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: The role of personality, threat and social identity in coping with ethnic diversity in organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. J. Marguc</td>
<td>Prof.dr. J.A. Förster</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Nasty But Good For You: On the Benefits of Obstacles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. K. Massar***</td>
<td>Prof.dr. A.P. Buunk</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Evaluation of rivals in jealousy evoking situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. J. Mastop</td>
<td>Prof.dr. E. van Dijk</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. M. Stel</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Nonverbal behaviour and its consequences towards people with high and low status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. I.M. McNeil</td>
<td>Prof.dr. C.K.W. de Dreu</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. B.A. Nijstad</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. M.J.J. Handgraaf</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Constructive delay and decision avoidance in a temporal context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. K. Menninga</td>
<td>Prof.dr. T. Postmes</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. A. Dijkstra</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Testing a new theory on continued abstinence and relapse in ex-smokers and the development of a computer system for individualized feedback to support ex-smokers’ abstinence for a longer period through the internet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. S. Mollen**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. G.J. Kok</td>
<td>UM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. R.A.C. Ruiter</td>
<td>UM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Adverse effects of health messages: Preventing the communication of unintended social norms stimulating unhealthy behaviors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. E. ter Mors***</td>
<td>Prof.dr. N. Ellemers</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. W.H. Weenig</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Effects of source characteristics and message content on the interpretation and acceptance of information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. J. Niemann**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. N.W. van Yperen</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. K. Sassenberg</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>A self-regulation approach to leadership behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. M.K. Noordewier</td>
<td>Prof.dr. M. Zeelenberg</td>
<td>UvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. D.A. Stapel</td>
<td>UvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>The psychology of expectancies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. S. Oosterwijk</td>
<td>Prof.dr. A.H. Fischer</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. M. Rotteveel</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>The effect of emotion representation on emotional experience and bodily changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. J.K. Oostrom**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. M.Ph. Born</td>
<td>EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. H.T. van der Molen</td>
<td>EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: <em>Effects of Implicit and Explicit Trait Effectiveness Beliefs on the Performance on Technologically Advanced Selection Devices</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. R. Pals</td>
<td>Prof.dr. K.I. van Oudenhoven-v.d. Zee</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. L. Steg</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. F.W. Siero</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: <em>Evaluation of experiences in Zoo Emmen – preferences for confirmation or disconfirmation of expectancies</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. L.L. Phan</td>
<td>Prof.dr. G.R. Semin</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. W.W. van Dijk</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. M. van Zomeren</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: <em>Group-based Emotions: a Model of the Affective Route from Social Identity to Prejudice</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. S. Pietersma</td>
<td>Prof.dr. A.P. Buunk</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. A. Dijkstra</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: <em>Dimensions of physical and social negative consequences of Health Risk Behaviors and their moderators in inducing self-threat</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. M.M.H. Pollmann***</td>
<td>Prof.dr. G.R. Semin</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. C. Finkenauer</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. W.W. van Dijk</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: <em>I know how you feel: a two step process model of predicting others’ affective reactions</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. P.M. Poortvliet*</td>
<td>Prof.dr. N.W. van Yperen</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. O. Janssen</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. E. van de Vliert</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. F. Stokman</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: <em>Doeloriëntaties in taakgerelateerde uitwisseling tussen collega’s</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. T.Y.P. Preenen</td>
<td>Dr.ing. I.E. de Pater, Prof.dr. A.E.M. van Vianen</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. C.K.W. de Dreu</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: The allocation of challenging tasks: Determinants and consequences of supervisors’ task allocation behavioral styles and task assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. M.K. van Putten*</td>
<td>Prof.dr. M. Zeelenberg</td>
<td>UvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Causes and consequences of inaction inertia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. M. Redeker**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. H. van der Flier, Dr. R.E. de Vries</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: The Leadership Circumplex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. N.F.E. Regenberg</td>
<td>Prof.dr. G.R. Semin</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: The linguistic underpinnings of perception, action, and the self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. L.J. Renkema***</td>
<td>Prof.dr. N.W. van Yperen</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Performance and interests: Determinants or consequences of achievement goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. J.P. van 't Riet</td>
<td>Prof.dr. H. de Vries, Dr. R. de Ruiter</td>
<td>UM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Framing Health Messages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. F. Righetti</td>
<td>Prof.dr. C.E. Rusbult, Dr. C. Finkenauer</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: The Search for Inter-Personal Accuracy (SIPA) Project: An integrative approach to the determinants of accuracy in social prediction of others’ internal states</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. M. Roskes**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. C.K.W. de Dreu, Dr. B.A. Nijstad</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Cooperation vs. conflict mental-set and creativity: Cognitive load versus motivated-focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. H.A.H. Ruigendijk**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. C.E. Rusbult, Dr. S.L. Koole</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Minding the body: The role of somatic feedback in ruminative thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. J. Rupert</td>
<td>Prof. Dr. K.A. Jehn</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Group composition and diversity: a multimethod examination of alignment, conflict and performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. B. Rutjens**</td>
<td>Prof. Dr. J. van der Pligt</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Dr. J.A. Forster</td>
<td></td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. F. van Harreveld</td>
<td></td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Regulating lack of control and uncertainty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. J. van der Schalk</td>
<td>Prof. Dr. A.H. Fischer</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Dr. D.H.J. Wigboldus</td>
<td></td>
<td>RU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Emotional contagion in intergroup contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. I.K. Schneider**</td>
<td>Prof. Dr. J. van der Pligt</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. F. van Harreveld</td>
<td></td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. M. Rotteveel</td>
<td></td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: The dynamics of ambivalence: An investigation into the consequences of evaluative conflict in attitudes and decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. E.C. Seip**</td>
<td>Prof. Dr. E. Fehr</td>
<td>Uni. of Zurich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. M. Rotteveel</td>
<td></td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. W.W. van Dijk</td>
<td></td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Altruistic punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. S. Shalvi</td>
<td>Prof. Dr. C.K.W. de Dreu</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Cooperation vs. Conflict Mental-set and Creativity: Cognitive Load versus Motivated-Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. R.B.L. Sijbom**</td>
<td>Prof. Dr. O. Janssen</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Dr. N.W. van Yperen</td>
<td></td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Achievement goals and interpersonal behavior: How do leaders respond to creative ideas proposed by their subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. J.M. Slijkhuis</td>
<td>Prof. Dr. N.W. van Yperen</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. E.F. Rietzschel</td>
<td></td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Determinants of creative performance in ambiguous situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. K.E. Stroebe***</td>
<td>Prof.dr. N. Ellemers, Dr. M. Barreto</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Information processing and the recognition of implicit prejudice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. J.A.L. Tanghe***</td>
<td>Prof.dr. H. van der Flier, Prof.dr. B.M. van Knippenberg</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> A social identity model of group emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. B. Terwel****</td>
<td>Prof.dr. N. Ellemers, Dr. F. Harinck</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Trust as a function of motives and argumentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. E.G. Ufkes</td>
<td>Prof.dr. K.I. van der Zee, Dr. S. Otten, RuG, Dr. E. Giebels</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Conflict and conflict mediation in an intergroup context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. N.R. van Ulzen***</td>
<td>Prof.dr. G.R. Semin</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Infusing affect and social context into the action-perception interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. R. van Veelen**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. S. Otten, Dr. N. Hansen</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Cognitive projection processes as underlying path to inclusive identity formation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. S.W. van der Velde***</td>
<td>Prof.dr. D.A. Stapel, Dr. E.H. Gordijn</td>
<td>RuT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Constraints of emotion contagion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. F.S. ten Velden*</td>
<td>Prof.dr. C.K.W. de Dreu, Dr. B. Beersma</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Negotiating a group decision: the Role of Social and Epistemic Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. M. Veltkamp***</td>
<td>Prof.dr. H. Aarts</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Having a goal in mind? Automaticity in goal-directed behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs.ing. N. van de Ven</td>
<td>Prof.dr. M. Zeelenberg</td>
<td>UvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. R. Pieters</td>
<td>UvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. K. van den Bos</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: The Social Psychology of Envy: An inquiry into the causes and consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. M.W. Vos***</td>
<td>Prof.dr. K.I. van Oudenhoven-v.d. Zee</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. A.P. Buunk</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. R.P.M. Witteck</td>
<td>RuG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Patterns of social identity and solidarity among diverse work groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. A. de Vries**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. M. Ph. Born</td>
<td>EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. R.E. de Vries</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Specificity in Personality Measurement: Improving the Prediction of Academic and Work Performance in Culturally Diverse Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. J.H.K. Vuolevi**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. P.A.M. van Lange</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Cooperation and person perception in incomplete information situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. A. van der Weiden**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. H. Aarts</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. K. Ruys</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: From nonconscious goals to the conscious experience of goal achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. R. Wijn</td>
<td>Prof.dr. K. van den Bos</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. H. Aarts</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Social justice, and intuitive and reflexive determinants of behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. F.R.C. de Wit**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. K.A. Jehn</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Asymmetrical perceptions of conflict and their antecedents: A cognitive perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. S. de Wit****</td>
<td>Prof.dr. K. van den Bos</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: The relative impact of cognitive and affective factors on the process of justice judgment formation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. M.J.J. Wubben</td>
<td>Dr. D. de Cremer</td>
<td>UvT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.dr. E. van Dijk</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: The Emotional Basis of Individual and Structural Decisions in Social Dilemmas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. M.P. Zaal</td>
<td>Prof.dr. N. Ellemers</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. C. van Laar</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. T. Stahl</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. B. Derks</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. C.M. Zedelius**</td>
<td>Prof.dr. H. Aarts</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. H.P. Veling</td>
<td>UU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Finished his/her PhD in 2008; **started his/her PhD in 2008; ***started job elsewhere in 2008 but will finish PhD later; ****PhD position ended in 2008 but will finish PhD later; *****stopped her/his PhD in 2008

42% are funded by NWO (Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research); 43% are funded by the universities; 15% of the research projects are funded through other sources.
4. Training and teaching program

4.1 Introduction

The overall goal of the training and teaching program of the Kurt Lewin Institute is to develop independent research skills in the participating PhD students. Secondary goals of the program are (a) to learn to translate societally relevant questions into scientifically researchable ones, and (b) to develop a capacity to draw practical implications from scientific research. To achieve these goals the KLI has established a training program.

4.2 PhD projects

4.2.1 PhD projects completed in 2008

In 2008 23 PhD projects were completed:


Summary: Stereotypes are generalized beliefs about the characteristics of groups of individuals and form the basis of prejudice. Stereotyping can be functional in at least two ways: as a tool to understand the world around us and because it can help to elevate ones self-esteem. In this dissertation, the focus lies on the specific influences of these two goals on the use of stereotypes in social perception.

Through a number of experiments, it is shown that an increased need to understand the world around us (for example, when one walks around in an unfamiliar city), results in more positive and negative stereotyping, whereas an increased need to elevate ones self-esteem (for example, when one failed an exam), results only in more negative stereotyping. Subsequently, when these needs are relieved through stereotyping or in a different way, stereotype use decreases.

Furthermore, it appears that these two goals are not interchangeable with respect to stereotyping: when stereotyping is driven by a comprehension goal, only increased understanding, and not an increased self-esteem, counteracts stereotyping. This finding highlights the importance of distinguishing between comprehension driven and self-enhancement driven stereotyping, because they represent two different routes that lead to different kinds of stereotyping and can
be countered in different ways. In other words: why we stereotype influences how we use, and can counteract the use of, stereotypes.


Summary: In this thesis, we investigated the role of several individual and social factors (i.e., personal self-esteem, social norms and social influence) that directly affect how people deal with uncertainty, in reaction to blatant versus subtle discrimination. While responses to blatant discrimination were not affected by any of these factors, these factors determined to a significant degree responses to subtle discrimination.

The main idea throughout the thesis is that blatant discrimination involves a clear rejection situation. Because of this clarity, the factors that are addressed in this dissertation are not expected to determine responses to this type of unfair group-based treatment. However, when situational cues fail to indicate the cause of the negative outcome such as in case of subtle discrimination, targets are more dependent on their level of self-esteem, the tolerance of social norms, and the opinion of others regarding the discriminatory treatment.

The thesis provides us with insightful information about responses to multi-interpretable rejection situations where people are unsure about whether the negative treatment is due to their individual qualities or due to the prejudice the other holds about their social group. Furthermore, the thesis clarifies why group-based rejection can sometimes have negative and at other times have positive consequences by comparing responses of the targets to blatant and subtle discrimination.


Summary: This dissertation examines goal contagion: The phenomenon that people unconsciously copy social goals that they perceive in another’s behavior. Specifically, it is investigated whether goal contagion is moderated by one particular situational feature, which is the behavioral effort that we observe in an agent’s behavior. As the amount of effort that an agent invests reveals the strength of her motivation, and hence the value of the pursued goal, it is predicted that goals that are pursued with high effort behavior are more
contagious than low effort behavior goals. In a total of nine experiments the influence that perceiving effort has on the occurrence of goal contagion via different underlying cognitive processes is demonstrated. First, it is shown that the goal that an agent tries to attain is more readily observed (spontaneously inferred) when the agent does so in a more effortful manner. Because of this, the goal is also more adopted by the observers. Second, it is demonstrated that people are more likely to infer a goal from effortful behavior because they become more motivated to find out to what end the effortful behavior is aimed (versus medium or low effort behavior). That is, people are more eager to know what an agent wants to attain when the latter invests more effort. Third, even when an agent’s goal is already known to observers, the mere effort that the agent invests to reach the goal is sufficient to make the goal more desirable to observers, and leads to more motivated behavior to attain the goal themselves. In other words, observers are more eager to attain a goal when they see that someone else tries hard (versus not hard) to reach it. The results above are clarified with a framework that utilizes the concepts of accessibility and desirability as key social-cognitive components to explain goal contagion. The role of perceiving effort on these different components is revealed and discussed. In addition, the human tendency to anthropomorphize is incorporated in the implications of the studies, as most of the experiments use non-living geometrical objects to convey ‘behavior’.


Summary: Though negative emotions are often adaptive, they can occupy people’s thoughts unwarrantedly and thereby undermine personal well-being. It is therefore important to look for ways in which people can shield themselves against the disruptive power of negative emotions. The present dissertation examined how processing of negative emotional information may depend on the availability of working memory resources. The central hypothesis under investigation is that the more working memory is being used by a distracting activity, the less room may remain for negative emotions to persist. In line with this idea, taxing working memory was found to moderate the impact of negative emotional stimuli on negative feelings (Chapter 2 and 3), circuits within the emotional brain (Chapter 3), and attentional interference of negative information (Chapter 4). Taken together, the present dissertation demonstrates how the
strategic allocation of working memory resources may allow people to regulate their negative emotional responses in accord with ongoing task demands and goal-directed activities.


Summary: The dissertation investigated evaluative processing in dynamic environments. Previous research suggests that people can respond easier to positive or negative stimuli (i.e. target), if it is preceded by another stimulus (i.e. “prime”) of the same rather than opposite valence. This “affective priming” effect is short-lasting and depends on a number of conditions. Consequently, the question arises whether and if how primes influence target processing in more complex and dynamic situations, whereby primes can also occur after targets, as well as in the context of other relevant and irrelevant primes, close or removed from the targets. A first series of studies in this dissertation provided evidence that primes can still influence target processing, if they occur short after target presentation (i.e. backward priming). Subsequent research investigated the joint influence between primes that occur before and after the target, across different short time intervals and target processing aims. The results suggest that relevant primes that occur shortly before and after the target have an additive influence on target processing. Irrelevant primes only influenced target processing if they contained very salient information. Furthermore, relevant primes that occurred somewhat earlier in time displayed reversed effects on target processing, in particular if the target was rendered ambivalent by close and incongruent information. Together, the present dissertation provides evidence that people extract meaning from their environment through quick and automatic integration of relevant information and through flexible correction for irrelevant information.


Summary: Within teams, individual members may have very different cognitions and behaviors. In my dissertation, I look at the implications of this for research on group composition and conflict. I identify reasons why individual cognitions relating to group composition and diversity may differ, such as the individual’s position in a team. I investigate the repercussions of these cognitive differences
related to diversity and group composition for team and individual performance. I also investigate how individuals in teams may have different cognitions and behaviors relating to intragroup conflict. I examine the factors that could lead some individuals to be more likely than other individuals in the same team to engage in intrateam conflict, and I also investigate the consequences of differences in individual conflict engagement within a team for team and individual performance. In understanding individual differences in cognitions and behaviors within the same team, my dissertation proposes and finds that understudied forms of group composition, such as status and power differences, may be key explanatory factors. For example, I propose and find that an individual’s position in a status hierarchy within the team may affect the individual’s perceptions and behaviors, and ultimately performance, within the team. In my dissertation, I employ multiple methods, including field studies (a quasi-experiment, surveys, interviews, and qualitative observation), laboratory studies, and archival studies.


Summary: The four empirical studies presented in the dissertation aim to answer the question whether competencies are a farce, a fad, or a useful concept that should continuously be used in the future. We examined the nature of the competency concept, its relevance, and its use in daily practice. In separate studies we focused on the relationships between competencies and constructs such as personality and cognitive ability, and on relationships between competencies and effectiveness. Furthermore, we studied the value of various competencies beyond other constructs including cognitive ability and personality in the prediction of sales and managerial effectiveness. Finally, we focused on the use of competencies in daily practice. A multi-source and multi-method approach was adopted in order to enhance the generalizability of research findings. Results showed that, as expected, psychologists mostly focus on cognitive ability, personality or behavioral aspects of applicants, depending on the competency domain (i.e. thinking, feeling, or power) they are rating. Furthermore, competencies were indeed found to be related to perceived effectiveness. Probably due to variation in situational demands and roles, subordinates, peers and supervisors differed in the competencies they relied on when assessing managerial effectiveness. Also, based on data gathered at
multiple time-points, competencies were found to contribute uniquely to the prediction of perceived effectiveness, including sales and managerial effectiveness. Finally, results of a survey and a scenario study provided clear guidelines for the implementation of one of the most widely used competency applications, namely competency management. It was shown that employee involvement contributed to a positive attitude towards competency management and to a sense of perceived behavioral control. Both attitude and perceived behavioral control were found to be responsible for the use of competency management by employees.

All in all, though critics have expressed their concern about the merits of the competency concept, competencies do seem to be of value. We therefore believe it is safe to argue that the competency concept could be fruitfully further used in the future. Specifically, the use of competencies may contribute to successful human resource practices such as training, development, personnel selection, and performance appraisal.


Summary: Emotions play a large role in daily life. They influence what we think, how we act, and what decisions we make. One important area in which emotions might play a role is social behavior. Many scholars have often wondered why people act prosocially and cooperate in daily life. This dissertation tries to shed light on why and when people act prosocially by focusing on two very interpersonal emotions: shame and guilt.

There are many theories about what shame and guilt are and when they arise, but it is unclear how these emotions influence behavior. According to moral emotions theories, shame and guilt act as commitment devices, stimulating prosocial behavior and committing people to options that are best for society and themselves in the long run. In emotion research, shame is perceived as an ugly emotion with negative influences on behavior such as social avoidance, withdrawal and rejection. Guilt is perceived as a negative feeling with positive behavioral consequences, motivating apologies and amending behavior.

In summary, different theories offer different predictions about what behaviors shame and guilt motivate. Unfortunately, empirical research can not provide an answer. The few studies on consequences of shame and guilt have provided contrasting results, and there are almost no studies that have measured actual
behavior following from shame or guilt. The aim of this dissertation is to fill this gap and empirically study what behaviors shame and guilt motivate.

In four empirical chapters, the dissertation shows that the effects of shame and guilt can only be understood when specific elements of the emotion and the situational relevance are taken into account. When taking a closer look at shame, it appears that this emotion gives rise to negative thoughts about the self and about what others would think about the self. As a consequence, the goal of shame is to deal with a threatened self. The dissertation shows that shame first motivates approach behaviors such as prosocial behavior to restore the self, and when this is not possible or too risky, it motivates avoidance behaviors to protect the self. Guilt revolves around a threatened relationship and activates a goal to improve the hurt relationship. The dissertation reveals that guilt motivates prosocial behavior towards the victim of the transgression, but at the expense of third others present and not at the expense of oneself.


Summary: In this dissertation I argue that our social psychological understanding of power is too material and physical and insufficiently social. I furthermore argue that this has led us (i) to ignore the perspective of the powerless (low power) party, (ii) to ignore the important role of how power is evaluated, and (iii) the question how power positions remain stable over time. To partially repair this, I first focus on the role of a powerless party in intergroup settings. Where previous literature has claimed that the powerful tend to stereotype more, I argue and show that the powerless, on their part, tend to metastereotype more. I than focus on the role of how people evaluate their position of high or low power. The past years a wealth of research has shown that, compared to the powerless, powerful people prefer to go their own way and show less restraint. They are also less keen on cooperation and take more risks. We show that opposite effects are found when people perceive their power position as illegitimate. That is, in that case the powerless start to show less restraint, are less keen on cooperation, etc. The powerful, on their part, become risk averse and willing to cooperate.

In a fourth empirical chapter I focus on the stability of power differences, in particular between men and women in the political domain. I show that by changing what people think is the Most Important Problem in current politics
(e.g. the economy) people either have a preference for male, or for female politicians. If people e.g. think the economy needs attention they prefer males, if they think education needs to be improved they prefer female politicians. This effect however completely flips around if candidates are counter-prototypical in terms of their gender.

By showing these effects I feel I have made one step toward a more social social psychology of power. I am confident that future research can build on our findings to continue this journey.


Summary: In this dissertation, I focussed on the processes in organizations that determine both positive as well as negative effects of cultural diversity, i.e. diversity in ethnic backgrounds. Cultural diversity affects employee identification, the degree to which employees feel part of their work groups. This dissertation shows that the more similarity in cultural values employees perceive, the more they identify with their work groups. Obviously, this poses a challenge for diverse work groups, because perceived similarity in cultural values is lower in cultural diverse work groups. Therefore, alternative ways of enhancing identification have been studied. Results show that despite low perceived similarity, employees in cultural diverse work groups identify strongly with their work groups when diversity is appreciated as an advantage for the work group, and differences are openly discussed.

How do cultural minority member employees deal with their team and cultural identities at work? A study among minority member employees indicates that they prefer strong team identity adoption: they prefer to have strong ties to their workgroup. Additionally, results indicate that being different yet belonging to the same workgroup poses a challenge: a preference for a strong team identity in combination with strong cultural maintenance is related to the personality characteristic emotional stability: only minority member employees that feel sure of their grounds prefer this combination.

Lastly, diversity perspectives of team managers were studied. Most managers predominantly stress the importance of a fair and equal treatment of all employees (‘Discrimination and Fairness’ perspective). However, employees experience more openness towards differences in their workgroup when the manager differentiates between employees of different cultural backgrounds for functional reasons (‘Access and Legitimacy’ perspective) and wants to learn of
cultural differences ('Integration and Learning' perspective). In addition, results indicate that the 'Access and Legitimacy' perspective, but especially the 'Integration and Learning' perspective are more effective for team processes such as communication and creativity, than the 'Discrimination and Fairness' perspective.


Summary: The subjective quality of justice judgment processes makes it rather unpredictable how people will react when confronted with unjust events. The effects social justice can have on people's subsequent behaviors have been widely recognized in literature by showing that perceived fairness influences people's behaviors, attitudes, and feelings in many social interactions. Yet, the acknowledgement that people have different reactions to experienced fairness does not tell us much about how people come to experience events as fair or unfair and when these fairness experiences may differ in intensity. The aim of the work presented in this thesis is to gain more knowledge of these processes and factors underlying social justice judgment processes. In order to try to achieve this aim, I addressed the question of how the way people process justice-related information may influence their subsequent reactions. In Chapter 1 it is argued that gaining further knowledge about how experiential-intuitive versus rationalistic-analytic modes of information processing work together and may potentially interact in helping people to distinguish between right and wrong may contribute significantly to understanding how people perceive and react to fair and unfair events. In three chapters I have examined various elements of the experiential and rationalistic processes pertaining to justice judgment processes. Chapter 2 shows in two experiments that when personal uncertainty had made participants susceptible to individual differences in affect intensity, they reacted with both stronger procedural justice judgments and stronger affective reactions toward experienced procedural fairness. In Chapter 3 a new way of manipulating both experiential and rationalistic mindsets is introduced and results show that both ways of processing information may influence people's fairness reactions, but that particularly the strongest affective reactions to fair and unfair events tend to be found when people's experiential mindsets make experienced fairness susceptible to individual differences in affect intensity. Chapter 4 addresses the question whether experiential versus rationalistic modes of information processing also work together and may
potentially interact in helping people to distinguish between right and wrong when they are confronted with fair and unfair events that happen to someone else. Results of two experiments show that participants in experiential mindsets held victims blameworthy, irrespective of usually found effects of individual differences in general belief in a just world or the level of threat to the just world. In contrast, participants in rationalistic mindsets show the generally observed just world reactions. In sum, the findings presented in this thesis advance our knowledge of processes and factors underlying social justice judgment processes, by furthering insights in how experiential and rationalistic ways of processing justice-related information influences how people perceive and react to fair and unfair events.


Summary: not available.


Summary: The research reported in De Meijer’s dissertation has highlighted several issues. One important issue is language as Dutch language-proficiency of applicants explained a substantial part of the score differences between the ethnic majority group and ethnic minority groups. Interestingly, assessor-applicant (dis)similarity did not differentially affect evaluations of ethnically diverse applicants. This finding alleviates concerns that discrimination of ethnic minority groups due to (dis)similarity may occur during personnel selection. However, a difference was found in the decision-making process of ethnic majority assessors judging ethnic minority applicants compared to ethnic majority applicants. This finding indicates that assessors are, in some way, affected by the ethnicity of applicants. Gaining experience in assessing ethnic minority applicants, exchanging knowledge about assessment in a multi-cultural setting among assessors, or perhaps further standardizing the selection process should diminish differential effects. Furthermore, selection measures, both cognitive and non-cognitive, appear to differentially predict training performance of ethnic majority and minority trainees. A possible explanation of this differential
effect may lay in the subjective evaluations of supervisors during training. Finally, scores on a newly developed situational judgment test (SJT) turned out to show substantially smaller ethnic group differences than generally are found on the cognitive ability test. These findings yield practical guidelines for personnel selection in a multi-cultural setting, such as further standardization of the decision-making process to hire or reject applicants and diminishing the influence of language skills of applicants by means of SJTs. More research is needed to further improve our understanding of personnel selection, specifically, and job opportunities, in general, in a multi-cultural setting.


Summary: In the social psychological literature, empathy is seen as an emotional response which invokes the altruistic motivation to help others. One cognitive tool to increase the experience of empathy is perspective taking. The current dissertation investigates how different perspectives on the suffering of others, in combination with individual differences and situational variations, lead to empathy and the willingness to help those others. It also explores how empathy has been measured within psychology in the past five decades. On the basis of new data, a more optimal measurement of the construct is proposed, by dividing the original measure into two new scales: a sympathy and a tenderheartedness scale. These concepts are subsequently distinguished from related concepts such as emotional contagion, personal distress and compassion. Finally, a new model is proposed in which altruistic behaviour is a consequence of several choices one can make while perceiving the suffering of others.


Summary: Organizations increasingly rely on teams composed of a diverse set of people. Examples include multidisciplinary teams, project teams, and research & development teams. Organizational managers implement these teams with the implicit premise that effectiveness can be enhanced when members combine and employ their differences. However, practice reveals that
team members often prove ineffective at capitalizing on the potential benefits of their differences. Aad Oosterhof examined why some team members cooperate effectively, whereas others experience cooperation problems. Results suggest that the effectiveness of work relations depends on how team members perceive their differences with other team members. To the extent that team members perceive that other team members have dissimilar complementary expertise, teams perform better. Team members experience more complementarity in expertise to the extent that they have more work experience and when another team member has a different type of expertise and a similar level of expertise.


Summary: In this dissertation we explain how members of disadvantaged groups come to experience emotions about the position of their group in society, in particular anger. In the first two studies we investigate the antecedents and consequences of group-based anger for historical and current disadvantages. We show that for both appraisals of outgroup blame are important in explaining the experience of anger. This anger results in action tendencies consisting of demanding reparation for the disadvantages through protest. Having shown how anger arises and what it leads to, in the following studies we focus on how intergroup communication affects this emotion. In particular we demonstrate that for members of disadvantaged minorities the group membership of a source is an important predictor of the reactions to a message. Whereas ingroup members are allowed to voice opinions in which they argue for the suppression of the minority identity, members of an outgroup give rise to anger when they want to restrict the freedom of expression by members of the minority. The last studies show that opinions of ingroup members are not always received more positive than outgroup opinions. Here we show that ingroup members who emphasize the lower status of their group, give rise to anger. Outgroup members on the other hand give rise to anger when they discount the low status. If sources give rise to anger this leads to a willingness to change the opinion of the source. This shows that anger can motivate members of disadvantaged groups to conquer the status quo.

Summary: In this dissertation the effect of achievement goals on information exchange is examined. Achievement goals are goals that people pursue in achievement situations. A distinction is made between mastery goals, the goal to improve oneself, and performance goals, the goal to outperform others. It turned out that mastery goals lead to more openness when individuals give task-related information to others, compared to performance goals. This could be explained by the fact that, relative to people with performance goals, individuals with mastery goals have a stronger desire to provide good information to others in order to receive good information back. This also showed when individuals with mastery goals learned to have a poor performance. In that case they first invested in their task performance before they shared information with others. Another aspect of information exchange, the utilization of information from others, was also investigated. The outcomes showed that, relative to mastery goals, performance goals led to more utilization of high-quality information, and less utilization of poor-quality information. Finally, results showed that people with mastery goals had stronger intentions to collaborate with, and showed less harmful behavior to an other, when they and the other scored worse on a task. For performance goals the intention to collaborate was weaker when they and the other scored very good or very bad, compared to an intermediate performance. This negative influence of performance goals relative to mastery goals was limited to low performance situations.


Summary: The aim of this dissertation was to gain knowledge and insight into the inaction inertia effect, which shows that missing an attractive opportunity decreases the likelihood that people will act on a subsequent opportunity within the same domain. For example, people are less likely to book a discounted vacation to Tuscany for $900 instead of the regular $1000 when they missed a prior opportunity to book the vacation for $400 than when they missed it for
$800. Although the inaction inertia effect was well-established and seemed to be a robust finding, many questions concerning its robustness, boundary conditions, causes and consequences remained. This dissertation tried to answer most of these questions.

Chapter 2 investigated what the effect of the presence of multiple options during the decision process on inaction inertia was. The results showed that inaction inertia decreases when there are more options available to choose from. Thus, inaction inertia typically occurs when there is one missed and one current opportunity. The second investigation of the boundary conditions of inaction inertia looked at the association between the missed and the current opportunity. Chapter 3 showed that when this association between the missed and the current opportunity is weak, inaction inertia is less likely to occur. Specifically, the findings show that inaction inertia decreases when, (a) the information about the attractiveness of the missed opportunity is unclear, or ambiguous, and therefore less easy to compare with the attractiveness of the current opportunity; (b) the missed opportunity was not just one step away, but an extra decision was necessary to obtain it; and (c) the missed opportunity is less comparable to the current opportunity. Some people are better at dissociating past events and present events. A relevant individual difference in coping with missed opportunities is well captured by the distinction between action and state-oriented people (Kuhl & Beckmann, 1994). Chapter 4 showed that action-oriented people, who get over negative events relatively quickly, show less inaction inertia effects than state-oriented people, who keep thinking about negative events. Moreover, the findings show that action-oriented people are less influenced by the missed opportunity in their valuation of the current opportunity than state-oriented people. As a result, action-oriented people value the current opportunity more than state-oriented people, and thus are more likely to act on it. Finally, in Chapter 5 the idea is tested that missing a more attractive opportunity leads to the experience of negative feelings, specifically that missing an attractive opportunity is frustrating. A way to cope with this type of frustration is to make the object of frustration less important or less valuable. The findings of Chapter 5 show that thinking about the positive aspects of the opportunity increases frustration and decreases inaction inertia. These findings show a new and interesting explanation of inaction inertia.

Summary: One of the cornerstones of humanity’s success has been our unrivalled ability to cooperate. Its fruits are all around us: from massive physical manifestations like the pyramids, to the less tangible, but even more immense pool of collective knowledge which makes up our culture. The ability to cooperate enables us to achieve goals that are impossible to achieve on our own. But despite these great collective successes, the question why people actually cooperate is far from straightforward: paradoxically, people in fact are often better off if they choose not to cooperate. For example, it may be more attractive to let our partner do all the dishes, or to let others pay for public goods like health care. How is it possible then that cooperation nevertheless is so widespread?

In this dissertation, we reveal that people’s decisions to cooperate or not may depend strongly on the context in which they make these decisions. On the one hand, our research reveals that how people perceive and experience their interactions is tied strongly to their interpersonal orientations – the way in which they value the outcomes of themselves in relation to those of others. For example, some people perceive their decisions particularly in terms of their self-interest, while others may do so in terms of the collective interest. Our research reveals that this has strong implications for their decisions, and for how they see the actions of others. On the other hand, however, the present dissertation reveals that such orientations may be less stable than thought previously, and may depend strongly on the context in which people interact. If people make a decision when fulfilling a different social role, they may have a different construal of the situation, may value different outcomes, and may have a different perception of what others say and do. The present dissertation in particular reveals that when people interact as representatives – individuals whose actions have consequences for others outside of the interaction – they adopt a much more competitive mindset, which leads them to make more competitive decisions, to have more competitive expectations of others, and to have a perception of others’ communications and actions that is biased toward distrust. As such, the present dissertation reveals that people’s goals may be quite plastic, and that their decisions and experience of their interactions may depend strongly on their social roles. However, our research also reveals that much may be gained by taking the “mindset” and roles of others into account: by doing so, they can more effectively persuade others to cooperate, to the benefit of all.

Summary: The Linguistic Intergroup Bias (LIB, e.g., Maass, Salvi, Arcuri, & Semin, 1989) shows that people describe positive behaviors of others close to them (e.g., in-group member, friend) in abstract terms (for example: ‘X is helpful’), but in concrete terms (for example: ‘X helps’) for people who they are not close to (e.g., out-group member, enemy). In contrast, negative behaviors of people whom they are close to are described in concrete terms (for example: ‘X hurts’), but in abstract terms (for example: ‘X is aggressive’) for people who are distant to them. The aim of this dissertation is to examine the impact of receiving linguistically biased messages upon receivers who are also the actor of the behavior being described. To this end we conducted a number of studies that showed that receiving linguistically biased messages about one’s own behavior do have an impact upon a receiver. These linguistically biased messages influence the perceived interpersonal distance to the sender as well as their performance on a subsequent task. Furthermore, the studies made clear that this impact of receiving linguistically biased message upon a receiver depends on the communication context. The research reported in this dissertation opens the research on the LIB to the broader domain and extends the previous research of using linguistically biased language when one talks about others to the consequences of linguistically biased language use when one talks directly to these others. The main contribution of this research is that it closes the communication cycle by investigating the impact of messages about a receiver’s behavior that are given directly to the receiver. This extends the research on the LIB and related research into a full communication context and underlines the important role of subtle differences in language use in interpersonal communication settings.


Summary: In many of our interactions with other people we implicitly or explicitly negotiate: We try to reach agreement about our perceived divergence of interests. To reach a high quality agreement, negotiators need to gain insight into the negotiation problem at hand, and make sense of this complex and
difficult situation. This dissertation focuses on two important relevant motivations: Social and epistemic motivation. Results reported in this dissertation reveal that although social motivation plays an important role in group negotiation, behavior and outcomes are not determined merely by the number of pro-social or pro-self negotiators in a group, but by their relative positions and the decision rule that is employed. When majority rule applies, those that hold a majority position with regards to their preferences are relatively empowered, whereas the minority is empowered when using unanimity rule. In a further set of studies, it was revealed that research on social motivation has been too restricted to the distinction between pro-social and pro-self motivation, and different motivations need to be taken into account. For example, research reported in this dissertation revealed that competitive motivation can be disentangled into two different underlying processes, so-called appetitive competitive motivation (a motivation to come out ahead) and aversive competitive motivation (a motivation not to lose), and these different underlying motives have different effects in negotiation. Those with an appetitive competitive motivation are more inclined to overestimate their chances of success, whereas aversive competitors experience more anxiety, and are therefore more inclined to end in impasse. Finally, this dissertation revealed that negotiators can obtain high individual and collective joint outcomes, when at least one negotiator has high epistemic motivation, and is thus motivated to exchange and process information thoroughly.


Summary: The value that is attached to academic performance by Western society, and also many non-Western societies, leads most students to be concerned with their school performance, and evokes a need for evaluating how they are doing at school. One way to obtain this evaluative information is by comparing one’s own performance with that of peers, i.e. by engaging in social comparison. The central question of this dissertation was whether social comparison influenced children’s academic performance at high school. The focus was on the social comparison components comparison choice, i.e. choice of a comparison target, and comparative evaluation, i.e. how students feel they are doing at school compared to their classmates. The studies were part of a
large-scale longitudinal cohort study that was carried out among Dutch students from all different tracks in secondary education. The first of the main findings was that, after controlling for earlier performance, the more upward students compared and the more favorable their comparative evaluation was, the higher students’ own performances were two years later. In addition, the positive effect of comparison choice only applied to students with a favorable comparative evaluation. Second, three types of responses to social comparison were distinguished: empathic, constructive, and destructive. These responses appeared to be (indirectly) related to students’ academic performance. In particular, the destructive thinking seemed to matter for academic performance. Third, it was found that on average students lowered their comparison level after only a weak manipulation of imagining a failure on a test as compared to imagining a success on a test. Nevertheless, comparison levels after failure were still relatively high. Lastly, illusory superiority was associated with lower dropout rates and with better progress through high school over a period of three to six years. On the contrary, illusory inferiority was associated with higher dropout rates and with worse progress through high school. The results of this dissertation are theoretically valuable and provide insight in the situation in school classes. Despite the small effect sizes the results show that the comparison of school grades is not necessarily detrimental and that it may even have positive consequences for school performance.


Summary: Representation is a day-to-day phenomenon. For example, people are represented by others in the parliament, a trade union or an employees council. The main characteristic of representatives is that they are involved in decision-making processes in which they voice their opinion on behalf of their group members. Decision-making processes in which people are granted an opportunity to voice their opinion by means of their representative are referred to as voice by representation. The findings of the current thesis have underlined the importance of voice by representation. In particular the results of Chapter 2 revealed that group members are very concerned about the procedures their representative is subjected to. Fair procedures are not only of interest for those who are directly involved in the process (the representatives), but certainly also for those who are indirectly involved in the process (those who are being
represented), as was indicate by the fact that effects of indirect voice were stronger than effects of direct voice. Furthermore, from the results of Chapter 3 it can be concluded that it matters who acts as the representative. Effects of indirect voice are stronger when a highly compared to hardly preferred representative is involved in the decision-making process. It is assumed that feelings of commitment are the force behind the strong effects of indirect voice.

The results of Chapter 4 revealed that the more people feel committed to their representative, the more likely they are to feel personally targeted by the procedures their representative is subjected to. Since there are so many situations in which it is not possible to hear every single person individually, and hence, people are represented by a representative in the decision-making process, it can be concluded that voice by representation is a worthy topic for investigation.
4.2.2 PhD projects started in 2008
In 2008 31 PhD projects were started:

Yana Avramova
University: Tilburg University, Social Psychology
Title project: Mood, focus level, and accessibility
Funding: Tilburg University
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. D.A. Stapel and prof.dr. F.M.G. Pieters (UvT)
Period: 15.10.07 - 15.10.10
Project description: My PhD project is devoted to gaining a better understanding of the effects of different mood states on perception and judgment. Some of the questions I would like to answer in my experimental research are how mood affects basic perception; how people process information while in a particular mood; how moods influence the salience and use of contextual information and guide accessibility effects in target judgment; what is the impact of affect on attributinal thinking; how mood and mood orientation interact to influence self and other-judgments, etc. Furthermore, it is my goal to apply the insights gained in this line of fundamental research to the field of consumer behavior, that is to explore the effects of people’s fleeting moods on their processing strategies, decisions and choices in a consumption/purchase context. In investigating these issues, I hope to contribute to both the fields of social psychology and consumer behavior by extending previous research on the interplay of affect and cognition, by reconciling some contradictory findings, and by developing a new, more parsimonious model of the effects of diffuse affective states on perception, judgment, and choice. I am working on this project with my supervisors Diederik A. Stapel and Rik Pieters.

Jan Willem Bolderdijk
University: University of Groningen, Social and Organizational Psychology
Title project: Increasing the effectiveness of incentives through framing
Funding: External sources
Supervisor(s): dr. E.M.Steg and prof.dr. J.A. Rothengatter (RuG)
Period: 01.03.06 - 16.09.10
Project description: Prior research suggest that the effectiveness of financial incentives might depend on how they are communicated (or framed): whether the potential financial losses or gains are stressed may exert strong influence on resulting decisions. However, based on prior research, it is not clear under which conditions stressing either the financial gains or losses is more effective. The current research project is aimed at gaining insight in factors that influence
the effects of framing of financial incentives. Amongst others, we will conduct lab experiments to examine how incentive size and chronic regulatory focus moderate the impact of gain/loss framing on decision making. Furthermore, we test how actually experiencing versus merely anticipating gain and loss framed incentives affects behavior. The external validity of our findings will be tested in a field experiment. The results may have important consequences for policy making, as they reveal how the effectiveness of incentive schemes can be increased.

**Lottie Bullens**  
University: University of Amsterdam, Social Psychology  
Title project: The impact of decision difficulty on choice, satisfaction, and motivation  
Funding: University of Amsterdam  
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. J.A. Forster and dr. F. van Harreveld (UvA)  
Period: 01.06.08 - 01.06.12  
Project description: Several studies on motivation, decision-making, and self-perception of dispositions examine the effect of perceived decision difficulty on subsequent motivation to pursue, evaluations, and rated importance of the chosen and rejected alternatives. It is, for example, proposed that from a difficult decision people infer that the rejected alternative is valuable, and from an easy decision that the alternatives are remote in value. This extends the ‘experience as information’ model (Schwarz, 1998) which focuses on ease-of-retrieval as guiding principle. Interestingly, it also qualifies cognitive dissonance theory, according to which alternatives are spread apart in attractiveness after a difficult decision. This research has significance for human motivation, decision-making, self help, and self control.

**Chantal den Daas**  
University: Utrecht University, Social and Organizational Psychology  
Title project: Is automaticity indeed everywhere? A second-generation study of the moderation of impulsive influences on evaluation and behavior  
Funding: Utrecht University  
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. J. de Wit and prof.dr. H. Aarts (UU)  
Period: 19.05.08 - 19.05.12  
Project description: The present research addresses what Bargh (2006) has termed a ‘second-generation’ question concerning non-conscious influences on social behaviour. A set of studies is proposed that challenge the widely shared but largely unsubstantiated theoretical notion that most human experience and
behaviour reflects automatic processes (cf. Bargh & Chartrand, 1999). The project’s main hypothesis holds that, rather than being ubiquitous and pervasive, automatic influences on evaluation and behaviour occur in the absence of strong competing, deliberative goals. Sexual behaviour is presented as a unique exemplar of social behaviour to study the multiple, complex ways in which impulsive and reflective behavioural systems interact.

Gerdientje Danner-Vlaardingerbroek  
University: Utrecht University, Social and Organizational Psychology  
Title project: The impact of work-family conflict and facilitation on family relationships  
Funding: Utrecht University  
Supervisor(s): dr. E.S. Kluwer, dr. E.F. van Steenbergen and prof.dr. T. van der Lippe (UU)  
Period: 01.03.08 - 01.03.12  
Project description: The proposed research project is part of an interdisciplinary research program on the work-family interface and aims to gain more insight in how work affects family relationships. We aim to demonstrate on a more general level that work-family conflict and facilitation contribute to the prediction of family relationships and family outcomes, such as interactions with partner and child(ren), conflict with partner and child(ren), and satisfaction with the relationship with partner and child(ren). Second, we will investigate on a more specific level to what extent positive work experiences positively affect family relationships via the experience of positive mood and enhanced energy and self-esteem. Third, we include both women, men, and children in our studies and assess gender differences in the experience as well as the consequences of work-family conflict and facilitation. The proposed research includes two large surveys and two diary studies.

Pieter Desmet  
University: Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam School of Management  
Title project: Repairing Trust: When money matters  
Funding: Erasmus University Rotterdam  
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. D. de Cremer (EUR) and prof.dr. E. van Dijk (UL)  
Period: 15.09.06 - 15.09.10  
Project description: The issue of trust has been on the forefront of research agendas across a variety of sub disciplines in social sciences including psychology, management, organizational behavior, law and economics ((Kramer, 1999; Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998; Tyler & Huo, 2002).
However, most of these trust studies primarily focus on understanding what happens when trust is present and alive, and “surprisingly few studies have directly examined how trust may be repaired” (Kim, Dirks, Cooper, & Ferrin, 2006, p. 50).

In this PhD project, we will study the extent to which economic motives (i.e., financial needs) versus relational motives (i.e., indicators of respect) play a role in the repairment of trust. It is proposed that under certain circumstances trust cannot be “bought” again but needs to be restored by means of relational solutions. Different types of compensations (e.g. apologies, financial amends) will be investigated together with different types of trust violations (e.g. explicit unfair allocations in a dictator game or unfair allocations following a broken promise). Thereafter, judgmental and behavioral reactions (in a trust game) will be assessed. Although trust has typically been defined in a cognitive manner, we also stress the need to look more closely at the role of motivation and emotion, particularly with respect to the issue of trust repairment. Therefore we will also pay special attention to emotional and motivational antecedents and mediators.

Serena Does
University: Leiden University, Social and Organizational Psychology
Title project: Turning Threat into Challenge: Improving majority group members’ acceptance of minorities by focusing on morality gains
Funding: NWO
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. N. Ellemers and dr. B. Derks (UL)
Period: 01.10.08 - 01.10.12
Project description: This project examines the role of psychological and physiological threat and challenge responses in majority groups' behavior towards minority groups. We propose that focusing majority groups on group-gains in morality rather than on group-losses in competence transforms threat into challenge, leading to more positive interactions between majority and minority groups.

Evert-Jan van Doorn
University: University of Amsterdam, Social Psychology
Title project: Interpersonal effects of emotional expressions on persuasion: Testing the emotions as social information (EASI) model
Funding: University of Amsterdam
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. J. van der Pligt and dr. G.A. van Kleef (UvA)
Period: 01.09.08 - 01.09.12
Project description: Emotions influence not only the people who experience them, but also those who perceive them. This project explores the interpersonal effects of emotions on persuasion. Based on the emotions as social information (EASI) model (Van Kleef, in press), emotional expressions are predicted to affect attitude formation and change through two distinct processes: by triggering attitudinal inferences and by eliciting affective reactions in observers. The relative predictive strength of these processes depends on information processing tendencies and social-relational factors. Nine experiments will reveal when and how discrete emotional expressions facilitate or hinder persuasion, thus extending theorizing on emotions and social influence.

Marleen Gillebaart
University: University of Amsterdam, Social Psychology
Title project: Emotional, Motivational, and Cognitive Consequences of Novelty
Funding: University of Amsterdam
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. J.A. Forster and dr. M. Rotteveel (UvA)
Period: 01.02.08 - 01.02.12

Project description: Key questions in this research project are ‘When do people avoid and when do they approach novelty?’, ‘When do novel events invoke fear and when are they perceived as a learning opportunity?’ and ‘What are the cognitive consequences of novelty? (i.e. do people narrow or broaden their perception when confronted with novelty?)’. The notion that novelty is always threatening is opposed, because novel events can be a valuable source of information or learning opportunities. Especially in safe, benign situations, people should be willing to approach rather than avoid novel situations. In order to understand and use positive novel information, it needs to be integrated, which results in a necessary shift to a broad or global processing style. Considering that previous evidence has shown that bad mood generally narrows perception (leading to a local processing style), a link between novelty and global processing would take the edge of the novelty = bad notion.

Selma van der Haar
University: Leiden University, PLATO
Title project: Team learning in ad hoc multidisciplinary action teams: The importance of shared cognition
Funding: Leiden University
Supervisors: prof.dr. K.E. Jehn and prof.dr. M.S.R. Segers (UL)
Period: 01.07.07 - 01.04.12
Project description: In this project we study two types of ad hoc multidisciplinary action teams (AMA teams): trauma teams in hospitals and crisis management teams in disaster management. The challenge for these teams is to operate in an adequate way immediately from the start, under highly pressing circumstances. However these teams lack a history as a team. To be able to perform well, these teams therefore need to develop shared cognition in a short period of time. In this project we define the development of this shared cognition as team learning. We study the team interaction process needed for team learning to occur and how factors like familiarity, cohesion, informational diversity, and interdependence influence team learning. Both the team types we study in an educational setting. Therefore we also investigate the influence of the educational design. The main goal of the project is to shed light on team learning processes in AMA teams in order to find ways to improve the educational support for these teams.

Melvyn Hamstra
University: University of Groningen, Social and Organizational Psychology
Title project: A self-regulation approach to leadership behavior
Funding: NWO
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. N.W. van Yperen and prof.dr. K. Sassenberg (RuG)
Period: 01.09.08 - 01.09.12

Project description: Leaders’ behavior is one of the keys to organizations’ success, because it strongly influences subordinates’ motivation and performance. Two strategies have proven to be especially efficient in affecting subordinates’ motivation: (a) transformational leadership behavior (TFLB), that is, setting visionary goals and providing subordinates with the freedom to plan goal-striving according to their needs and (b) transactional leadership behavior (TALB), that is, following clear rules for exchange and monitoring subordinates’ errors closely.

Research on the preconditions of these two types of behavior in leaders is scarce, especially concerning the effects of leaders’ motivation. The current proposal presents a self-regulation model of leadership behavior, which aims at predicting TFLB and TALB based on contemporary motivational theories. The core concept of the introduced model is self-regulatory focus (Higgins, 1997). Regulatory focus theory distinguishes between a focus on ideals and potentials gains driven by eagerness needs (promotion focus), which is expected to elicit TFLB, and a focus on obligations and potential losses driven by security needs (prevention focus), which is predicted to elicit TALB behavior.
The first proposed project concentrates on the impact of regulatory focus on leadership behavior and its underlying processes. The second project addresses the effects of high task demands (which can be perceived as threatening or challenging) on leadership behavior and their interplay with regulatory focus. Finally, the third project addresses the problem that successful leaders have to show both TFLB and TALB in close succession. To predict the ability to live up with this requirement, a new concept is introduced, namely regulatory flexibility, which is the ability to switch between different regulatory modes.

The outcomes of these three projects will allow deriving criteria for the selection of leaders and the design of leaders' environment that provide an optimal basis for motivating, successful leadership behavior.

**Gerben Langendijk**  
University: Open University, School of Psychology  
Title project: The role of procedural fairness in power dynamics  
Funding: Open University  
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. J. von Grumbkow, dr. M. van Dijke, dr. J. Syroit (OU) and dr. D. de Cremer (EUR)  
Period: 01.09.07 - 01.09.11  
Project description: This project aims to enhance our understanding of procedural justice and power processes by studying their interrelations. People in power generally behave more according to their dispositional characteristics than people in a low power position. We argue that in a clear procedural justice climate power holders behave less in accordance with their dispositions because a clear procedural fairness climate enhances power holder's accountability. Moreover, we argue that in a clear procedural justice climate, the stability of power relations is particularly effective in affecting power holders as well as subordinates: Unstable power differences make power holders show fair behavior, out of self-presentation concerns, which should thus further attenuate dispositional effects on power holder's behavior. Subordinates on the other hand, view fairly acting power holders as insincere when power differences are unstable, and thus as abusing their power, resulting in reactions that are just as negative as reactions towards unfairly power holders. In four laboratory experiments, we test our basic predictions. We replicate these predictions and focus on organizationally relevant behaviors, such as employee health, organization citizenship behavior, and antisocial behavior, in two longitudinal field studies.
Romy van der Lee
University: Leiden University, Social and Organizational Psychology
Title project: Morality, competence, and motivation in group contexts
Funding: Leiden University
Supervisor(s): pof.dr. N. Ellemers and dr. D.T. Scheepers (UL)
Period: 01.11.08 - 01.11.12
Project description: Recent research has revealed that morality judgements play a central role in social identification processes. Morality is a more important source of ingroup value than competence, and group members are more inclined to adjust their own behavior to moral judgments of other ingroup members about the self than to competence judgments. However, as yet we know very little about the reasons why morality is more important than competence in group contexts, nor do we know how this affects the motivation and goal oriented behavior of individual group members. The proposed research examines how intra-group morality vs. competence ratings of self and others elicit different strategies for coping and goal achievement. The central prediction is that competence judgments induce a state of challenge and elicit promotion responses, while morality judgments induce a state of threat and elicit prevention responses. This prediction is examined in two sets of studies. The first research strand focuses on the effects of competence and morality judgments of other group members about the self; the second addresses how the morality and competence of others in the group affect one’s own responses and strategies for goal achievement. Effects of these manipulations are examined in terms of physiological threat vs. challenge responses, self-reports indicating promotion vs. prevention, and task behavior focusing on (individual and group) goal achievement in terms of competence and morality.

Gert-Jan Lelieveld
University: Leiden University, Social and Organizational Psychology
Title project: A social functional account of reactions to and strategic of negative emotions in bargaining
Funding: Leiden University
Supervisors: prof.dr. E. van Dijk and dr. I. van Beest (UL)
Period: 01.09.08 - 01.09.2012
Project description: Research on the interpersonal effects of emotions has shown that bargainers may obtain higher outcomes if they communicate anger, but also that anger may backfire. Specifically, research has now shown that communicating anger is most likely to result in lower outcomes when (1) the anger is directed at the person, (2) the opponent has the possibility to use...
deception, (3) the opponent is more powerful, and (4) when alternative negotiation partners are readily available. Communicating anger is thus a risky strategy.

In the present project we set out to advance theorizing about the social functions of emotions by considering another negative emotion. We compare anger to disappointment and suggest that bargainers may obtain higher outcomes by communicating disappointment than by communicating anger. Whereas the potential benefits may be as high as communicating anger, disappointment may be less likely to backfire in the conditions that do show negative effects for communicating anger. In addition to studying and comparing reactions to communicated emotions, we also investigate to what extent bargainers strategically use these emotions to influence bargaining partners. Do they indeed refrain from communicating anger in conditions where anger may be expected to backfire? Do bargainers selectively display (alternative) emotions that will yield them the highest outcomes?

Katharina Luerken
University: University of Amsterdam, Work and Organizational Psychology
Title project: External and internal fit of teams affecting decision-making processes and performance
Funding: University of Amsterdam
Supervisor(s): prof. dr. A.E.M. van Vianen and dr. B. Beersma (UvA)
Period: 01.09.08 - 01.09.12

Project description: In a series of laboratory experiments, this PhD project aims to investigate two different types of fit. First, a team’s external fit is investigated. The external fit concerns the match between a team’s regulatory focus and the demands of its environment. Furthermore, the internal fit of a team is examined, which concerns the degree to which members share their regulatory foci and basic values. According to regulatory focus theory, two types of regulatory foci can be distinguished: A promotion focus contains that an individual is concerned with the presence of absence of positive outcomes, and his or her behavior is driven by ideals, advancement, and accomplishment. On the other hand, individuals with a prevention focus are concerned with the presence or absence of negative outcomes, whose behavior is motivated by duties, obligations, and protection. Our hypotheses will be tested by examining team processes and performance in high pressure command-and-control teams as they are modeled in the Dynamic Distributed Decision simulation.
Saar Mollen
University: Maastricht University, Work and Social Psychology
Title project: Adverse effects of health messages: Preventing the communication of unintended social norms stimulating unhealthy behaviors
Funding: ZonMW
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. G.J. Kok and dr. R.A.C. Ruiter (UM)
Period: 01.01.08 - 01.01.12
Project description: Health promotion campaigns are often initiated because of large numbers of people behaving in an unhealthy way: i.e. alcohol abuse, inadequate diet, or lack of exercise. The campaigns often start with making people aware of how many people behave in such an unhealthy way, indicating how serious the problem is. Unfortunately, these messages -unintentionally- create a social norm that in fact supports the unhealthy behavior. The adverse effect of these health messages is that people experience that unhealthy behavior is normal; a social norm in favor of i.e. alcohol abuse, inadequate diet and lack of exercise. Social norms are an important determinant of behavior; people like to do what other people do and what others expect. There is strong evidence in the area of environmental concern for this adverse effect. In a series of laboratory and field experiments (total N= 360), we will demonstrate that this adverse effect is also present in health promotion. We will analyze the role of visibility of the behavior on the effect of norms, and then we will show that in health promotion practice, alternative messages are feasible and effective. The basic approach is to replace the descriptive norm (what people do) with injunctive norms (what people approve or disapprove). The project will deliver clear examples and a practical guide to develop evidence-based health promotion interventions using the right kind of social norms optimally.

Jana Niemann
University: University of Groningen, Social and Organizational Psychology
Title project: A self-regulation approach to leadership behavior
Funding: NWO
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. N.W. van Yperen and prof.dr. K. Sassenberg (RuG)
Period: 01.09.08 - 01.09.12
Project description: Leaders’ behavior is one of the keys to organizations’ success, because it strongly influences subordinates’ motivation and performance. Two strategies have proven to be especially efficient in affecting subordinates' motivation: (a) transformational leadership behavior (TFLB), that is, setting visionary goals and providing subordinates with the freedom to plan goal-striving according to their needs and (b) transactional leadership behavior
(TALB), that is, following clear rules for exchange and monitoring subordinates’ errors closely.

Research on the preconditions of these two types of behavior in leaders is scarce, especially concerning the effects of leaders’ motivation. The current proposal presents a self-regulation model of leadership behavior, which aims at predicting TFLB and TALB based on contemporary motivational theories. The core concept of the introduced model is self-regulatory focus (Higgins, 1997). Regulatory focus theory distinguishes between a focus on ideals and potentials gains driven by eagerness needs (promotion focus), which is expected to elicit TFLB, and a focus on obligations and potential losses driven by security needs (prevention focus), which is predicted to elicit TALB behavior.

The first proposed project concentrates on the impact of regulatory focus on leadership behavior and its underlying processes. The second project addresses the effects of high task demands (which can be perceived as threatening or challenging) on leadership behavior and their interplay with regulatory focus. Finally, the third project addresses the problem that successful leaders have to show both TFLB and TALB in close succession. To predict the ability to live up with this requirement, a new concept is introduced, namely regulatory flexibility, which is the ability to switch between different regulatory modes.

The outcomes of these three projects will allow deriving criteria for the selection of leaders and the design of leaders’ environment that provide an optimal basis for motivating, successful leadership behavior.

Janneke Oostrom

University: Erasmus University Rotterdam, Institute of Psychology
Title project: Effects of Implicit and Explicit Trait Effectiveness Beliefs on the Performance on Technologically Advanced Selection Devices
Funding: Erasmus University Rotterdam and External Sources
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. M.Ph. Born, prof.dr. H.T. van der Molen (EUR) and dr. A.W. Serlie (GITP/EUR)
Period: 01.09.07 - 01.09.10

Project description: Developments in ICT are having a great impact on psychological testing practices in the Western world. Paper-and-pencil tests are rapidly being taken over by computerized testing, among which situational judgment tests, management games, and webcam testing. These modern tests have in common that they measure behavioral effectiveness as opposed to stable traits. The scientific goal of the present study is to shed light on the relation between test takers’ implicit and explicit beliefs about behavioral
effectiveness and their scores on modern selection instruments. The implicit trait policy (ITP) theory of Motowidlo, Hooper, and Jackson (2006a) will play a central role in this research project. Subgroup differences in implicit and explicit beliefs and the effects of applicant perceptions of modern testing devices on their explicit beliefs about the predictive validity of these devices will also be included. The practical goal of the study is to shed light on the psychometric qualities and the added value of modern testing devices for personnel selection over and above the classical array of intelligence tests and personality questionnaires.

Marleen Redeker
University: VU University Amsterdam, Work and Organizational Psychology
Title project: The Leadership Circumplex
Funding: VU University Amsterdam and External sources
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. H. van der Flier and dr. R.E. de Vries (VU)
Period: 15.08.08 - 15.08.12
Project description: Leadership can be to a large extent described by referring to two main dimensions. These two dimensions have a striking resemblance to the interpersonal dimensions 'agency' and 'communion'. In this PhD-project a leadership instrument based on the interpersonal dimensions will be evaluated in a number of laboratory and work settings to test its circumplex properties, its convergent validity with well-known leadership and interpersonal scales, possible predictors (breadth of acquaintance and social desirability) of self-other and other-other agreement, its relation with LMX quality, complementary versus mimicry interaction hypotheses, and the predictive validity of self-ratings, other-ratings, and self-other agreement using both conventional self-ratings and meta-perception ratings.

Marieke Roskes
University: University of Amsterdam, Work and Organizational Psychology
Title project: Cooperation vs. conflict mental-set and creativity: Cognitive load versus motivated-focus
Funding: NWO
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. C.K.W. de Dreu and dr. B.A. Nijstad (UvA)
Period: 01.09.08 - 01.09.12
Project description: When in conflict people adopt a conflict-mental-set (they expect hostility and seek relative gain) or a cooperation-mental-set (they expect collaboration and seek fairness and joint gain. The widely accepted threat-rigidity hypothesis is that people in a conflict-set become less creative than people in a cooperation-set. Because of inconsistent research evidence, we
develop a motivated-focus hypothesis: compared to a cooperation-set, in a conflict-set people focus their cognitive resources to cope with the aversive situation, and therefore become more creative when conflict-related thinking and behavior is considered, but less flexible and creative when conflict-unrelated thinking and behavior is considered. We test specific predictions in 8 experiments.

Hester Ruigendijk
University: VU University Amsterdam, Social and Organizational Psychology
Title project: Minding the body: The role of somatic feedback in ruminative thinking
Funding: VU University Amsterdam
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. C.E. Rusbult and dr. S.L. Koole (VU)
Period: 01.01.08 - 01.01.12
Project description: Ruminative thinking, or the involuntary occurrence of repetitive, often negative, thoughts, is a major contributor to depression. Phenomenologically, rumination is often accompanied by a sense of being a stranger to one’s own body. The research for this project examines whether this subjective aspect of rumination may point to an underlying functional impairment of people’s ability to integrate their bodily sensations. The experiments will examine integration of bodily feedback in interoception, conceptual processing, and decision making. Rumination will be either manipulated or measured as a chronic individual difference. The results of this research will inform basic theories of human emotion and cognition and may point to new ways of treating depression.

Bastiaan Rutjens
University: University of Amsterdam, Social Psychology
Title project: Regulating lack of control and uncertainty
Funding: University of Amsterdam
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. J. van der Pligt, prof.dr. J.A. Forster and dr. F. van Harreveld (UvA)
Period: 01.02.08 - 01.02.12
Project description: This project aims to investigate affective, motivational, and cognitive consequences of low levels of control and certainty. Control and the associated levels of uncertainty will be experimentally manipulated in a series of studies. First, we assess the relation between limited control and negative affective responses. In a first series of studies we intend to illustrate these adverse effects and explore a number of cognitive mechanisms which people
use to repair these effects. In the next stage we investigate the relative ease and impact of various strategies aiming to deal with these effects. In doing so we also assess the role of self-esteem in this context. The final aim is to develop a model integrating the mechanisms people employ when confronted with lower levels of control.

Iris Schneider
University: University of Amsterdam, Social Psychology
Title project: The dynamics of ambivalence: An investigation into the consequences of evaluative conflict in attitudes and decision-making
Funding: University of Amsterdam
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. J. van der Pligt, dr. F. van Harreveld and dr. M. Rotteveel (UvA)
Period: 01.10.08 - 01.10.12
Project description: Both the number of choice options and the information available about these options have grown dramatically over the past decades. It has been argued that this abundance leads to uncertainty, stress, and procrastination. We examine one consequence of this increasing amount of information; ambivalence. It is hypothesized that ambivalent attitudes are unpleasant when one has to choose and thus commit oneself. Only then ambivalence will be related to negative affect. We investigate if this is the case and, if so, how people reduce these negative feelings. Our program can provide insight into processes underlying decision-making in an increasingly complex world.

Elise Seip
University: University of Amsterdam, Social psychology
Title project: Altruistic punishment
Funding: NWO
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. E. Fehr (Uni. of Zurich), dr. M. Rotteveel (UvA) and dr. W.W. van Dijk (VU)
Period: 01.09.08 - 01.09-12
Project description: Explaining human cooperation is a long-standing challenge in both social and biological sciences. Recent research has shown that altruistic punishment provides a solution to this intriguing puzzle. Altruistic punishment means that individuals punish non-cooperators, even if punishment is costly and yields no apparent benefits for the punishers themselves. However, why would people incur costs to punish non-cooperators and thereby provide benefits to others? In the proposed research we argue that emotions are the underlying
mechanism for costly punishment. More specifically, we argue that anger and satisfaction work in concert to provide the motivation necessary for people to costly punish noncooperators.

**Roy Sijbom**  
University: University of Groningen, HRM&OB  
Title project: Differential reactions of managers to creative employees: An achievement goal approach  
Funding: NWO  
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. O. Janssen and prof.dr. N.W. van Yperen (RuG)  
Period: 01.09.08 - 01.09.12  
Project description: Based on achievement goal theory, we assume that achievement goal orientations affect how managers approach and respond to creative employees. We first explore how mastery-oriented versus performance-oriented managers perceive subordinate employees who put forward creative ideas (Study 1). In Study 2, we investigate how managers differ in their substantive, person-oriented, and strategic reactions to these employees (Study 2). Furthermore, we examine how these differential reactions are moderated by an employee-locus versus manager-locus of the creative ideas (Study 3), and by explicitly expressed causal attributions by employees who voice creative ideas to their managers (Study 4).

**Ruth van Veelen**  
University: University of Groningen, Social and Organizational Psychology  
Title project: Cognitive projection processes as underlying path to inclusive identity formation  
Funding: University of Groningen  
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. S. Otten and dr. N. Hansen (RuG)  
Project description: Increased multiculturalism in the Netherlands, as led the Dutch to be confronted with the question how to create a sense of common bond, within an individualized, pluralized society. This project focuses on how cognitive processes can enhance or diminish formation of inclusive identities. Early research on social identification processes stated that when people identify with a group, they categorize themselves in terms of prototypical group norms, therewith ‘depersonalizing’ the self-concept. However, more recent research has shown that expression of individuality can also shape a social identity. Such an individualized approach to social identification is suggested to be a possible solution to create an inclusive identity multicultural group context; an identity in
which a sense of common bond can be combined with the acknowledgement of individual differences. On an intra-individual level, the cognitive projection process expected to enhance inclusive identity formation is self-anchoring. In this process, the self-concept is projected on the group, making an individual feel like she/he is a prototypical group member, while also feeling appreciated for individual uniqueness. The cognitive process expected to hinder inclusive identity formation is ingroup projection, in which majority members ‘claim’ a group prototype, therewith excluding minority members. The relationship between self-anchoring and ingroup projection with respect to inclusive identity formation will be investigated, as will possible moderators expected such as individualism/collectivism, identity complexity and composition, and threat.

Anita de Vries
University: Erasmus University Rotterdam, Institute of Psychology
Title project: Specificity in Personality Measurement: Improving the Prediction of Academic and Work Performance in Culturally Diverse Groups
Funding: External sources
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. M. Ph. Born (EUR) and dr. R.E. de Vries (VU)
Period: 01.01.08 - 01.01.12
Project description: Although cognitive abilities research has extensively focused on reasons and remedies of ethnic group score differences, similar differences on personality tests are yet to be explored. In the proposed series of studies, causes and consequences of ethnic group differences on personality tests will be investigated using recent awareness on the importance of three types of specificity: 1) trait specificity, 2) referent specificity, and 3) contextual specificity. With respect to trait specificity, existing differences between groups on specific facet-level traits may be masked by the common use of broad factor-level traits. Additionally, facet-level traits, especially those related to conscientiousness and integrity, have been found to offer higher predictive validities of important academic and work outcomes than factor-level traits. With respect to referent specificity, ethnic score differences on personality tests or the lack thereof may be due to a comparison-other effect. Depending on whether ethnic minority members compare themselves to the majority or the minority group, they may be more or less likely to self-stereotype. Last but not least, ethnic minority members may have fewer problems describing their personality when they have a specific context in mind. Consequently, contextualized personality tests may offer better predictive validities, especially among ethnic minority members. The proposed studies will investigate the nature of trait, referent, and contextual
specificity, and their effects on the prediction of academic and work outcomes, in field and experimental studies.

**Joel Vuolevi**  
University: VU University Amsterdam, Social Psychology  
Title project: Cooperation and person perception in incomplete information situations  
Funding: VU University Amsterdam and External sources  
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. P.A.M. van Lange (VU)  
Period: 01.11.07 - 01.07.10  
Project description: How do we interpret others’ behavior when we lack important pieces of information? Do we give others the benefit of the doubt, believing that they behave in a fair or even generous manner? Or do we “fill in the blanks” with self-interest? Based on previous research showing that global beliefs about others in general are guided by self-interest, the present project aims to demonstrate that in people’s attempts to make sense of the social environment, they fill in the missing information with a self-interest frame of mind. That is, when observing overt behavior of others under incomplete information, people overestimate outcomes others allocate to themselves. The second main goal is to demonstrate that this initial overestimation of others’ self-interest has serious behavioral consequences in dyadic interactions. That is, because of people’s strong tendency to reciprocate, overestimation of others self-interest leads to reduced cooperation and a systematic deviation from reciprocity. Finally, the present project investigates how people use information as a resource in building reputation and eliciting cooperation from others. In general, the overarching theme of the project is to investigate how information, or lack of it thereof, influences outcome evaluations, person perception and cooperative behavior, and how people use information to achieve their interaction goals.

**Anouk van der Weiden**  
University: Utrecht University, Social and Organizational Psychology  
Title project: From nonconscious goals to the conscious experience of goal achievement  
Funding: NWO  
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. H. Aarts and dr. K. Ruys (UU)  
Period: 01.09.08 - 01.09.12  
Project description: This research project aims to unravel the link between unconscious goal directed behaviour and the conscious experience of agency.
Recent research has shown that we are often unaware of the goals that we pursue. However, at the same time, we often feel like we behave in a goal directed manner and that we have some inner agent that is in control of our own actions. The issue, then, is how we arrive at the conscious experience of goal achievement, an experience that is not straightforward if we would assume that our goal pursuit arises in the absence of awareness.

Frank de Wit
University: Leiden University, Social and Organizational Psychology
Title project: Asymmetrical perceptions of conflict and their antecedents: A cognitive perspective
Funding: Leiden University and NOW
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. K.A. Jehn (UL)
Period: 01.01.08 - 01.01.12
Project description: Theoretical and empirical work on conflict has indicated that individuals tend to perceive conflicts differently. These perceptual asymmetries are expected to result from a process in which differences in conflict-specific, contextual, and individual characteristics cause asymmetries in three cognitive modalities; attention, interpretation, and memory. Utilizing psychophysiological techniques unprecedented in conflict research, we aim to increase our understanding of why, when, and how much conflict individuals perceive. With our findings we are able to address important shortcomings of past work while helping individuals and workgroups to overcome and manage the detrimental effects that asymmetrical perceptions of conflicts have on group-processes, group-effectiveness, and conflict management.

Claire Marie Zedelius
University: Utrecht University, Social and Organizational Psychology
Title project: Beyond the Will: Implicit Motivation and Adaptation of Goals and Experiences
Funding: NWO
Supervisor(s): prof.dr. H. Aarts and dr. H.P. Veling (UU)
Period: 01.10.2008 - 01.10.2012
Project description: The research project aims to advance a new framework for the examination of unconscious human goal pursuit. The IMAGE (Implicit Motivation and Adaptation of Goals and Experiences) framework postulates that: (1) Goals can be activated and pursued non-consciously in the environment and serve adaptive functions via non-conscious executive processes; (2) Affect plays a fundamental role in non-consciously motivating
goals; and (3) Experiences of willful goal pursuit are shaped by the cognitive and affective-motivational processes underlying non-conscious goal pursuit. The project focuses especially on the executive processes underlying flexible non-conscious goal pursuit, such as keeping a goal active in working memory and shielding it from interfering information.
4.3 Training program

Training at the KLI consists of research training under the supervision of members of the KLI at the universities participating in the KLI, and a general teaching program.

4.3.1 Supervision

Supervision and progress monitoring are standard practice in the KLI. The theoretical and/or practical training that the students receive within the context of their own research projects, belongs to this part of the training.

4.3.2 Teaching program

The teaching program starts with Methodology and Theoretical courses and lectures provided by tutors from within the KLI. The goal is to provide students with a high level of general knowledge about recent developments in several areas in the field. In general courses are given in the form of workshops in which students actively participate. In the course of the years the types of courses offered have evolved into a standard package, partly in response to requirements imposed by the KLI Teaching Committee, partly in response to the needs and interests of the students, but also in response to the requirements of the labor market.

The main part of the general training program consists of theory-oriented workshops and seminars. These workshops are field-specific and offer students the opportunity to acquire general knowledge of the field, to study theory and research actively in the field in depth, as well as its theory-derived applications (in some of the courses). International well-known researchers are invited to participate in these workshops by presenting their research and by actively participating in the workshop in which graduate students present their work.

The methodology training is an important part of the program. The courses are offered to increase the students’ skills in research methods. Courses are planned in which relatively large groups of students can be trained. Advanced statistical courses are given as well as advanced courses in experimental design and analyses, designing survey research, psychometrics.
One of the objectives of the program is to train PhD students in writing publications in international books and journals. To achieve this goal Basic Skill courses are planned. Basic Skill courses are designed to increase the students’ publishing skills with courses such as Writing English for Publication and How to Publish/APA Style Guidelines. These Basic Skill courses reflect the need for diversity in the program in order to tune in better with the needs and interests of the students. All students follow these courses. Another course in this respect is the course Reading and Reviewing the Empirical Journal Article.

Practical Skill courses are also designed to improve the opportunities for students on the labor market. An important responsibility of the KLI, is preparing PhD students for careers inside but also outside the academic world. Courses like Pursuing a Career in Science and Outside Academia, and Physiological Measurements in Social Psychology are specially designed for this objective.

In addition, State of the Art Lectures (SOFAs) are given by the KLI staff to provide students with a broad overview of the major developments in the fields covered by the KLI. This broad theoretical perspective is also provided by participation in the biennial conferences organized by the KLI.

National and international well-known researchers are invited to participate in this conference by offering a lecture. During the two-day conference there is ample opportunity for graduate students to communicate with the researchers and to expand their network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Summary of the teaching program in 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses/workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the complete teaching program in 2008, please refer to appendix 1 of this report.
5. Research

5.1 The scientific mission of the KLI

The research program of the KLI embraces the full range of social psychology and its applications, entailing a commitment to both fundamental and applied research. Throughout the KLI research endeavor there is an emphasis on the complementarity of fundamental and applied research. The guiding principle is to improve our understanding of fundamental scientific questions and our awareness of and responsiveness to applied and policy-relevant issues in current society. This is also a policy that is sensitive to the career perspectives of graduate students, many of whom go on to pursue successful research careers in employment outside the academic world.

Thus research conducted within the KLI is of two types. It is either primarily theory-driven, in the sense that it addresses questions generated by social psychological theories, or it is primarily problem-driven, in the sense that it uses social psychological knowledge to address questions generated by societal events or processes. Both laboratory and field methods are used in the course of each type of research.

Research conducted within the KLI can be described in terms of four levels of analysis: intrapersonal; interpersonal; group and organizational; and intergroup. These levels of analysis provide the basis for the four research divisions.

The first of these divisions is Social Cognition. Research within this division addresses those domains of social behavior in which cognition plays an important role, including the interface of cognition with overt behavior, emotion, and motivation. Among the topics covered are person perception and stereotyping, language, social judgement, attitudes and attitude change, and the cognitive antecedents and consequences of affective states.

The second research division is Interpersonal Processes. This research division focuses on psychological aspects of interactions between individuals. Falling within this division is research on social motivation in social dilemmas and negotiation, interpersonal attraction and personal relationships, communication, aggression, prosocial behavior, and interpersonal aspects of the emotion process.
The third research division is *Group and Organizational Processes*. Members of social groups and organizations have to deal with two interrelated problems: How to organize their social relations, and how to solve their tasks in such a way that the group or organization is successful. The emphasis in the KLI research program is on how groups of individuals arrive at socially creative ways of organizing social relations and solving shared problems. Key topics include interdependence, social influence, affect and commitment, group decision-making, group performance, and leadership.

The fourth research division is *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*. Research within this division addresses cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects of relations between social groups. Among the key topics are social identity processes, social and self categorization, prejudice and ingroup bias, “collective” emotions, and intergroup contact.

### 5.2 Dissertations of the KLI

The number of dissertations of PhD students of the KLI in the past five years are listed in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of dissertations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3 Research output

The scientific publications of the full members of the KLI, and publications first authored by PhD students members, are listed in the appendix to this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of publications</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of full members</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per full member</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>3,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Number of publications by PhD students (first authored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of publications</th>
<th>Number of PhD students</th>
<th>Average per PhD student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Publications in top journals

A simple index is provided by the number of papers written by KLI members that were published in the top 3 journals in social psychology and the top 2 journals in the applied domains (as reflected in their citation impact indices) during this period. The journals in question are Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, Journal of Applied Psychology, and Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes.

Table 6: Publications in top journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5.5 Scientific impact

Table 7 presents the impact score of full members of the KLI in the last four years.

Table 7: Average impact of full members of the KLI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of full members</th>
<th>Total impact score</th>
<th>Average per member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2056</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2711</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3509</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Social Sciences Citation Index
5.6 Grants (fellowships and PhD projects)

Grants by NWO (Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research)

- Prof.dr. H. Aarts (UU) received an NWO ZONMW research grant for “Social Cognition and Health Behavior”, in collaboration with prof.dr. W. Stroebe.
- Dr. B. Derks (UL) received an NWO VENI grant for “A Neuroscience Approach to Social Identity Threat: The Role of Preconscious Processes in Motivational Withdrawal among Members of Stigmatized Groups”.
- Drs. S.R.S. Does (UL) received an NWO Mozaiek subsidie for “Turning threat into challenge: improving majority group members’ acceptance of minorities by focusing on morality gains”.
- Dr. C. Finkenauer and dr. W.W. van Dijk (VU) received an NWO Individual grant for “I know how you feel: A two-step process model of predicting others’ affective reactions” (period: 2004-2008).
- Prof.dr. B.M. van Knippenberg (VU) received an NWO grant for the PhD Project “A social identity model of group emotion” (period: 2005 - 2009).

Grants by KNAW (Royal Dutch Academy of Arts and Sciences)

No such grants in 2008

Grants by other sources

- Dr. W.W. van Dijk (VU) received a research grant from VU University Amsterdam for “Communication of emotions in interpersonal relationships: A new integrated functional perspective” for the period 2004-2008.
- Dr. F. van Harreveld and J. van der Pligt (UvA) received a grant from Achmea for research on risk perception entitled: “What we do when the ice is thin”.
- Dr. S.L. Koole (VU) received a Templeton Foundation Grant for “The psychological effects of prayer on anger and aggression” (period 2007-2008).
- Prof.dr. P.A.M. van Lange and drs. Vuolevi (VU) received a research grant from Finland for “Social Dilemmas and uncertainty” for the period October 1, 2008 until September 30, 2009.
- Prof.dr. P.A.M. van Lange and C. Liu (VU) received a research grant from China for “Behavioral Decision Making in Social Dilemmas: A Two-Stage Model” for the period December 1, 2008 until July 31, 2009.
- Dr. L. Steg (RuG) received funding from EU, FP7, Theme 5, Energy. Title: “Barriers for energy changes among end consumers and households (BARENERGY)".
- Dr. L. Steg (RuG) received a grant from EU, FP7 for “Governance, Infrastructure, Lifestyle Dynamics and Energy Demand: European Post-Carbon Communities (GILDED)”. Er is een promovendus aangesteld op dit project; zij is in 2009 begonnen.
- Prof.dr. A.E.M. van Vianen and dr. U.C. Klehe (UvA) received a grant from Gemeente Amsterdam, Dienst Werk & Inkomen to study reintegration.
- Prof.dr. A.E.M. van Vianen, dr. U.C. Klehe and drs. J. Koen (UvA) received a grant from Gemeente Amsterdam, Dienst Werk & Inkomen for the PhD project “(The lack of) job-search behavior among the unemployed”.
- NOA PhD-project: Specificity in Personality Measurement: Improving the Prediction of Academic and Work Performance in Culturally Diverse Groups (Born, de Vries) VU (period: 2008-2012)
- Performance Coaching PhD-project: The Leadership Circumplex (de Vries) VU (period: 2008-2012)

5.7 Awards

In 2008 the following KLI members received the following awards:
- Drs. M. Baas, prof.dr. C.K.W. de Dreu and dr. B.A. Nijstad (UvA) received the ASPO Best Paper Award 2008 Conference paper award by the Dutch Association for Social Psychology for “Sluimerend leed en uitputtend ongenoegen: Hoe verdriet en boosheid creativiteit beinvloeden”.
- Prof.dr. N. Ellemers (UL) received the Kurt Lewin Award.
- Dr. C. Finkenauer and P. Kerkhof (VU) were awarded the Top paper in Interpersonal Communication at the International Communication Association, Montreal Canada (May 2008): Relationship Quality and Compulsive Internet Use: A Study Among Newlywed Couples.
- Dr. G.A. van Kleef (UvA) received the Jos Jaspars Early Career Award of the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology.
- Dr. G.A. van Kleef and prof.dr. C.K.W. de Dreu (UvA) received the Best Paper Award of the International Association for Conflict Management for "Longer-term consequences of anger expression in negotiation: Retaliation or spill-over?"
- Prof.dr. C.E. Rusbult (VU) was awarded the distinguished Career Award, International Association for relationships Research (2008) for “In recognition of a full career of eminent, notable contributions tot research in, theories of, or the practice of relationships science”.
- Drs. F.R.C. de Wit and drs. L.L. Greer (UL) received the Best Student Paper Award, Conflict Management Division, Academy of Management, Anaheim,

### 5.8 Editorial positions

**Editorship and Associate Editorship**
- Cognition and Emotion (prof.dr. J.A. Förster)
- European Science Foundation (prof.dr. K. van den Bos)
- Gedrag & Organisatie (dr. B.A. Nijstad)
- Gedrag en Organisatie - Series Diversity in the Workplace (dr. A. Homan)
- Health Psychology Review (prof.dr. J. van der Pligt)
- Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin (prof. dr. C.K.W. de Dreu)
- Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin (prof.dr. E.H. Gordijn)
- Personal Relationships (dr. C. Finkenauer)
- Social Cognition (prof.dr. A.H. Fischer)
- Social Justice Research (prof.dr. K. van den Bos)
- Social Science Research Network Journal (prof.dr. K. van den Bos, prof.dr. K.A. Jehn - editor in chief)
- The Leadership Quarterly (dr. R.E. de Vries)

**Membership of the Editorial Board**
- Academy of Management Journal (prof.dr. A.E.M. van Vianen)
- Academy of Management Review (prof.dr. K.A. Jehn)
- Administration Science Quarterly (prof.dr. K.A. Jehn)
- British Journal of Management (dr. A. Homan)
- British Journal of Social Psychology (dr. W.W. van Dijk)
- Energy Efficiency (prof.dr. S. Otten, dr. L. Steg)
- European Review of Social Psychology (prof.dr. N. Ellemers, prof.dr. S. Otten)
- Gedrag en Organisatie (prof.dr. K. van den Bos, prof. dr. C.K.W. de Dreu, prof. dr. A.E.M. van Vianen)
- Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice (dr. J.W. van Prooijen, dr. B.A. Nijstad)
- Group Processes and Intergroup Relations (prof.dr. C.K.W. de Dreu)
International Association of Conflict Management (dr. F. Harinck, prof.dr. K.A. Jehn)
International Journal of Selection and Assessment (prof.dr. A.E.M. van Vianen)
Interne Communicatie (dr. R.E. de Vries)
Journal of Behavioral Decision Making (prof. dr. C.K.W. de Dreu)
Journal of Business and Psychology (dr. U-C Klehe)
Journal of Experimental Social Psychology (prof. dr. C.K.W. de Dreu)
Journal of Management (dr. B. Beersma)
Journal of Managerial Psychology (dr. U-C Klehe)
Justice and Negotiations Division of Management Research (prof.dr. K. van den Bos)
Negotiation and Conflict Management Research (dr. B. Beersma, prof. dr. C.K.W. de Dreu, dr. F. Harinck)
Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes (prof.dr. E. van Dijk)
Personality and Social Psychology Review (prof.dr. C.K.W. de Dreu, prof.dr. S. Otten)
Personnel Psychology (prof. dr. A.E.M. van Vianen)
Personal Relationships (dr. E.S. Kluwer)
Review of Work and Organizational Psychology (dr. U-C Klehe)
Social and Personality Psychology Compass (prof.dr. P.A.M. van Lange)
Social Cognition (prof.dr. H. Aarts)
Social Influence (dr. B. Beersma, prof. dr. C.K.W. de Dreu)
Social Issue and Policy Review (prof.dr. P.A.M. van Lange)
The Leadership Quarterly (prof.dr. B.M. van Knippenberg)
The International Journal Negotiation of Conflict Management (prof.dr. K.A. Jehn, dr. W. Steinel)
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Appendix 1: Teaching program 2008

Basic courses

Title: How to Present
Teaching staff: Dr. F. Harinck (UL) and dr. B. Beersma (UvA)
Type of course: Basic course
Date: January 28-29, 2008
Duration: 2 days
Language: Dutch or English (depending on participants)
Location: Leiden University
Content: The course focused on a training in the presentation of papers for international audiences e.g. oral presentation and the use of (media) facilities.
Enrollment: 13

Title: Writing English for Publication
Teaching staff: Dr. G.A. van Kleef, drs. S. Hawk, prof.dr. J. van der Pligt and Matt Gailliot (UvA)
Type of course: Basic course
Date: February 22, 2008
Duration: 1 day
Language: English
Location: Leiden University
Content: Key problem areas in written English for Dutch academics (e.g., verb-tense conventions in scientific writing, verb forms, word order, vocabulary, Dutch-English differences in punctuation and paragraph structure).
Enrollment: 20
Title: How to Publish and Review
Teaching staff: Prof.dr. P.A.M. van Lange (VU), prof.dr. C.E. Rusbult (VU), prof.dr. C.K.W. De Dreu (UvA)
Type of course: Basic course
Date: April 3 and 4, 2008
Duration: 2 days
Language: English
Location: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (day 1) and University of Amsterdam (Day 2)

Content: The focus of Day 1 (Van Lange & Rusbult) was on how to publish research articles. The objective was to present and discuss all important aspects of the process of getting one’s work published in international refereed journals. The main topics for publishing were (1) manuscript preparation, form and content; and (2) strategic issues in publishing (such as choice of journal, how to react to reviews). The focus of Day 2 (De Dreu) was on how to review a paper that is submitted for publication. The main topics were (1) how to structure and write a review; (2) when to accept or decline an invitation to review; and (3) what happens after you wrote your review. During both days, there was ample opportunity for participants in the workshop to ask questions and to engage in discussion.

Note: KLI members who have completed the course ‘How to Publish/APA’ and/or ‘Reading and Reviewing the Empirical Journal Article’ can request for an exemption for one or both days of this course at the KLI office.

Format: Participants were expected to actively participate in each meeting. Day 1 (publishing) asked each participant to write part of an introduction to be discussed during the course, and Day 2 (reviewing) asked each participant write and submit a review of a manuscript prior to the meeting.


Enrollment: 22 (day 1) and 24 (day 2)

Title: Introduction to the Kurt Lewin Institute

Teaching staff: Prof.dr. Jens Förster (UvA), prof.dr. Eric van Dijk (UL), prof.dr. Ernestine Gordijn (RuG), drs. Katherine Stroebe (UL), dr. Belle Derks (UL) and drs. Elze Ufkes (RuG)

Type of course: Basic course

Date: November 7, 2008

Duration: 11.00 am - 16.30 pm (drinks afterwards)

Location: University of Amsterdam

Language: Dutch or English (depending on participants)

Content: The aim of this introduction was two-fold. First, new Ph.D. students are familiarized with the Kurt Lewin Institute. In addition, the management and opportunities of the Ph.D. research program and the KLI teaching program are outlined. The second purpose of this meeting was to introduce your own Ph.D.-project and to exchange ideas with other new Ph.D. students.

Format: In the morning the Executive Committee of the KLI offered an insight into the scope, management, history and future of the KLI. After lunch senior Ph.D. students in different stages of their project shared their research and project
management experiences and their plans for the future. In the afternoon, participants were asked to introduce their own research projects and prepared a brief presentation in small groups. Here, the focus was on the introduction of research programs to scientific and laymen audiences.

Enrollment: 33
Methodology and practical skills courses

**Title:** Structural Equation Modeling using AMOS

**Teaching staff:** Dr. R.E. de Vries (VU)

**Type of course:** Methodology course

**Date:** February 28 and March 6, 2008

**Duration:** 2 days, 1 week apart, from 10.00 am – 5.00 pm

**Language:** English

**Location:** Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

**Content:** The workshop was meant to familiarize researchers, who were knowledgeable of multivariate statistics, such as factor analysis and regression analysis, with the theory behind SEM. Approximately 1/4th of the time was devoted to practice using AMOS. AMOS (Analysis of MOment Structures) is a Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) program, designed to fit causal models with multiple dependent and independent manifest and latent variables. It is similar to LISREL and EQS in most aspects, but it has, at least compared to LISREL, a much more user-friendly interface (AMOS Graphics) and it allows direct access and use of SPSS data.

**Program:**

**Day 1:**

- **Morning:** Introduction: Causal Models
  - (Co-)Variance algebra
- **Afternoon:** Identification
  - Introduction 'How to AMOS'
  - Exercises

**Day 2:**

- **Morning:** Scaling & Constraints
  - Fitting & Fit Indices
- **Afternoon:** How to AMOS Nested Models
  - How to AMOS Multiple Groups
  - Exercises & Own data

**Literature:**


Enrollment: 9

Title: Introduction to Structural Equation Modelling (using EQS)

Teaching staff: Dr. B. Doosje (UvA)

Type of course: Methodology course

Date: May 26, 2008

Duration: 1 day

Location: Leiden University

Language: English

Content: Structural equation modelling (SEM) has become an important new statistical tool to analyze (social) psychological data. It can be used to analyze large correlational datasets. However, it is also possible to test different models in experimental research (given a large sample size per cell). This one-day workshop provided an introduction to SEM. In the first part of the workshop, we outlined the conditions under which to use and not to use SEM. As such, we discussed the benefits and limitations of SEM. In the second part of the workshop, we briefly introduced one of the computer programs that is available to run SEM-analyses, namely EQS. In the third and final part of this workshop, each participant had access to a computer, and received a dataset and an assignment to run some EQS-analyses themselves.

Literature: To be read BEFORE the workshop:


Enrollment: 9
Title: Applying Psychophysiological Measures to Social Psychological Research

Teaching staff: Dr. M. Rotteveel (UvA) and dr. D.T. Scheepers (UL)

Type of course: Methodology course

Date: June 2 and 3, 2008

Duration: 2 days

Language: Dutch or English

Location: Leiden University

Content: The aims with this workshop were two-fold. The first was to make the participants actively think about what psychophysiology can add to their research. More specifically, the focus was on what kind of measure (e.g., ECG vs. EEG) fits best with what kind of research question. The second aim was to get a flavour of what it is to work with psychophysiological measures (e.g., participant preparation, data-acquisition, filtering, analysis). To this end we went into the lab to take measurements (ECG, EMG, GSR, EEG, and ERP) after which we learned about the basics of data-analysis. Although after the workshop the participant was not a full-trained psychophysiologist, he or she had a clear insight in what social psychophysiology can add to his or her project, as well as an impression of all practicalities around taking psychophysiological measurements.

Literature:


Enrollment: 9
In social psychological research researchers are increasingly confronted with different levels of nesting. People can be nested in dyads or groups, individual responses may be nested in individuals, and to make matters even more complicated, answers may be nested in individuals and individuals may be nested in dyads or groups. These types of data require Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM), also known as multilevel analysis. HLM not only corrects for the dependency of the data (avoiding spurious significant results), it also enables the researcher with numerous possibilities (e.g., the inclusion of predictors of multiple levels, studying individual patterns of change over time, and studying actor and partner effects all in one design).

In social science research, HLM is increasingly the standard for dealing with nested data. Researchers typically do not realize how often data is nested: HLM can be applied on all data with interdependence issues, including group research, research on dyads, repeated measures and time-lagged analyses (where it can handle missing values more effectively than other methods) and even meta-analyses.

As HLM increases in popularity, it increasingly becomes part of the standard skills of social psychology researchers. This workshop was designed to give participants a practical introduction to the main concepts and principles of HLM, including hands-on experience of conducting various multilevel analyses using HLM software (mostly SPSS).

During the two-day workshop participants learned to translate a social scientific theory involving different levels of nesting into a statistical model and to analyze whether the model fits the data. The emphasis of this workshop was on
the methodology of HLM rather than on its statistical backgrounds, and on the use of SPSS (and potential other software) for HLM analyses. To get most out of the workshop, participants should have had a reasonable working knowledge of multiple regression and/or general linear model analyses, but no previous experience of HLM was required.

Format: Day 1 & 2: Morning: Conceptual issues
Afternoon: Exercises

Enrollment: 31

Title: Methodological Seminars
Teaching staff: Dr. Marcello Gallucci (University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy) and dr. Wilco van Dijk (VU)
Type of course: Methodology courses
Date: September 25 and 26, 2008
Duration: 2 days: 10.00 am - 1.00 pm (seminars 1 and 2) and 2.00 - 5.00 pm (seminar 3)
Location: University of Amsterdam
Language: English
Content: The seminars consisted of the following three meetings:

1. When in Doubt, Regress: Using regression to analyze experimental designs with nominal and continuous independent variables, covariates, and interaction effects

   Date: September 25, 2008

   In this class we reviewed the general linear model as applied to various research designs and problems. We discussed how regression can solve these problems when properly used. We discussed a general way to use regression to obtain effect sizes and hypothesis testing for ANOVA and ANCOVA, path analysis, and model with interactions between continuous and nominal variables.

   Enrollment: 36
2. A Mix Within: Mixed models, random effect models, and hierarchical linear models applied to within-subject and repeated measures designs

Date: September 26, 2008

In this class we reviewed theory and applications of the general mixed model, with fixed and random effects, as it applies to different repeated measure designs. The student got familiar with the classical toolbox associated with the regression/ANOVA approach (i.e. simple effects analysis, simple slope analysis, planned comparisons, orthogonal contrasts), in the case of clustered data in a repeated measure form. Examples of further applications (not in the experimental field) were also discussed.

Enrollment: 30

3. Just Do It: Application of the general linear model and mixed models to real experimental data

Date: September 26, 2008

In this class we reviewed statistical and methodological problems submitted by KLI PhD students of particular importance, relevance, or interest. Examples were focused on the mixed model (HLM, random effect models), and on mediation and moderation effects. Nonetheless, participants were kindly requested to contact the teacher to present their statistical problems and/or solutions met in their own research activity.

Enrollment: 27

**Title:** Programming Experiments in Authorware

**Teaching staff:** Drs. Daniël Lakens (UU), drs. Chris Reinders Folmer (UvT), drs. Kaska Kubacka and dr. Wilco van Dijk (VU)

**Type of course:** Methodology course

**Date:** October 30, 2008

**Duration:** One 1-day meeting preceded by one day of self-study

**Location:** VU University Amsterdam

**Language:** English
Content: Nowadays the computer has become an indispensable tool for research in social psychology. Allowing experimental control and ease of data collection, most experiments are administered through a computer. Programming experiments, however, can be problematic – both for graduates and for more experienced researchers. The course taught participants how to make the experiment they want to make, and be limited by their imagination instead of your programming skills. This workshop was intended for students who use or expect to use Authorware to administer their experiments in a lab environment and were interested in learning the possibilities of Authorware and/or improving their programming skills. The workshop consisted of two parts: a plenary workshop meeting and a self-study part before the meeting. During the first part of the meeting participants were introduced to the program and its interface, how to create interactivity, use functions and variables, and how to debug experiments. During the second part of the meeting advanced possibilities of the program were shown, such as enabling communication between cubicles, advanced visual interfaces, using E-Prime and Authorware together and the benefits of using more advanced functions and variables. Furthermore, participants were invited to contact the teachers with specific questions encountered in their own programming, or make known any wishes they have for future experiments on which they need some help with programming. A workbook and goodie bag was given after attending the workshop. By working through the workbook and completing exercises, novice programmers learned the basics of Authorware and more advanced users expanded the possibilities for future experiments. The teaching staff was available for any questions through e-mail and instant messenger for people who have chosen to work through the workbook after the workshop.
Title: Pursuing a career in or outside science

Teaching staff: Prof.dr. Naomi Ellemers (UL), drs. Joost Baas (Management coaching) and guest teacher

Type of course: Practical course

Date: Day 1: December 3, 2008. Day 2: January 12, 2009

Duration: First part: 1 day (theory and data, analysis of own career development goals). Second part: 1 day (preparing a cv for ‘external’ use, how to present yourself to different employers).

Location: Leiden University

Language: Dutch or English (depending on participants)

Content: The Ph.D. trajectory often constitutes the first step of a further career as a social/organizational psychologist, in or outside science. Accordingly, during this first career stage, Ph.D. students are further socialized as scientific researchers, and are in the process of learning what is the best way for them to function effectively in a research environment. An important decision to make during this period is what it is they actually want in their professional career, and what is the best way for them to realize these ambitions.

This course consisted of two parts. The first part was intended to explicitly address the question of what students want to get out of their professional careers, and to consider the possibilities and consequences of pursuing a career as a scientific psychologist. Specific topics of concern included setting career goals and dealing with feedback on scientific work, coping with the organizational culture and office politics at the university, establishing effective working relationships with other researchers, etc. Based on statistical data, social psychological theory, and results from scientific research, participants were first reminded of the psychological processes that are also relevant for the development of their own professional careers. In doing this, special attention was
devoted to the ways these processes can work differently for men and for women. The aim of this part of the course was for students to find out what is the best way for them to achieve optimal effectiveness and satisfaction in their own work-related interactions.

The second part of the course took place a few weeks later, after students have had time to further consider their own career goals in view of what they have learned during the first part of the course. The second part more explicitly addressed different career possibilities inside and outside science (in the Dutch context). This part of the course focused on how the skills acquired during their Ph.D. trajectory may be valued in different types of careers. With the help of guest teachers who have broad experience with the different careers social/organizational psychology Ph.D.’s can pursue, students practiced in how to present their skills and achievements to other than university employers, and learned more about the things to consider when pursuing a professional career in different types of organizations.

**Literature:**

- Hagen, H. & Baas, J. Giving and receiving feedback.
- Ellemers, N. Ten tips for phd's.
- Ellemers, N. How to survive in academia.

**Enrollment:** 15 (day 1) and 16 (day 2)
Research Group Meetings

**Title:** Group and Organizational Processes Research Meetings

**Teaching staff:** Coordinators: dr. Bernard Nijstad (UvA) and dr. Wolfgang Steinel (UL)

**Type of course:** Thematic Research Meeting

**Date:** 2 times this year: February 29 and November 28, 2008.

**Duration:** 1 day per meeting, 11.00 am – 5.00 pm

**Location:** Leiden University.

**Language:** Dutch or English (depending on participants)

**Content:** Ph.D. students were expected to give a presentation of their research projects. They received feedback from their fellow Ph.D. students and staff members.

**Enrollment:** 15 and 21

---

**Title:** Group Processes and Intergroup Relations Research Meetings

**Teaching staff:** Coordinators: dr. Bertjan Doosje (UvA) and dr. Sabine Otten (RuG)

**Type of course:** Thematic Research Meeting

**Date:** October 16-17, 2008

**Duration:** 1 or 2 days per meeting

**Location:** Leiden University

**Language:** English

**Content:** Ph.D. students were expected to give a presentation of their research projects. They received feedback from their fellow Ph.D. students and staff members.

The purpose of the additional progress meetings was to discuss recent advances in the area of group processes and intergroup relations. The meetings had mixed agenda, in the sense that they were partly devoted to participants presenting and discussing their own research in progress (in oral or written form) and partly to discussion around novel theoretical developments or empirical advances in this area of research based on recent relevant publications.

**Enrollment:** 14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Social Cognition Research Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching staff</strong></td>
<td>Coordinators: prof.dr. Gün Semin, prof.dr. Henk Aarts (UU),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prof.dr. Ernestine Gordijn (RuG) and prof.dr. Jens Förster (UvA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of course</strong></td>
<td>Thematic Research Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>November 5 and 6, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td>2 days per meeting, 10.00 am - 5.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>University of Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Ph.D. students were expected to give a presentation of their research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>projects. They received feedback from their fellow Ph.D. students and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>staff members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theory-oriented workshops and courses

Title: Perspectives on Approach and Avoidance Motivation and Task Performance

Teaching staff: Prof.dr. N.W. van Yperen, dr. K. Sassenberg, dr. E.F. Rietzschel and drs. L.J. Renkema (RuG)

Date: January 10 and 11, 2008

Duration: 2 days

Language: English

Location: University of Groningen

Content: For both researchers and practitioners, the challenge is to acquire a more precise understanding of how to enhance the individual’s motivation, how to maintain and improve task performance, and how to reduce the risk of dropout in achievement settings (such as the work place) in which normative evaluation is apparent and even necessary. Both the Achievement Goal Approach and Regulatory Focus Theory have emerged as highly influential frameworks for understanding how people define, experience, and respond to achievement situations. The focus on (potential) positive and negative events is central to both approaches. In this workshop, the similarities and differences between the Achievement Goal Approach (approach vs. avoidance) and Regulatory Focus Theory (promotion vs. prevention) have been discussed, as well as the conditions under which each of the four states foster or hinder performance.

Format: This workshop had an exercise format. Specifically, all the participants were requested to read the four articles listed below in advance. After a plenary discussion at the beginning of the workshop, the workshop have been broken up in groups of three to four members. Each group generated theoretical and research ideas which have been presented and discussed at the plenary meeting at the end of the workshop. Furthermore, time was scheduled for participants’ presentations that fit well into the workshop’s theme.
Literature:


Enrollment: 13

Title: Interpersonal Processes: Methodological and Theoretical Challenges for Truly Interpersonal Research

Teaching staff: Prof.dr. H.T. Reis (University of Rochester), dr. C. Finkenauer (VU) and prof.dr. K. van den Bos (UU)

Type of course: Workshop

Date: April 8 and 9, 2008

Duration: 2 days, 10.00 a.m. - 5.00 p.m.

Language: English

Location: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Content: Relationships represent one of the most important endeavors in human life, and impinge on virtually every aspect of people’s lives. It hence is important to theoretically understand more about how relationships affect behavior across all domains of human activity. Methodologies and statistical procedures too need to capture the truly social nature of people’s relationships and reflect a diverse array of cognitive, behavioral, emotional, and social processes. The aim of this workshop was to provide participants with an
understanding of recent developments in the theories and (statistical) methods of relationships science. The workshop showed that both are essential in explaining patterns of behavior in social relationships. Additionally, this workshop sought to provide both theoretical and methodological suggestions for participants' own research.

**Format:**

**Day 1:** After a brief introduction of participants and teachers, Professor Reis (University of Rochester) addressed some of the methodological challenges that are raised by research on interpersonal relationships. In the afternoon, students gave presentations. Beforehand, students were asked to submit a brief abstract of their research. Based on these abstracts, students whose research was most closely related to the topic of the morning presentation (e.g., interdependent data, couples, families, nested designs, repeated measures, longitudinal data) were invited to give a presentation and ask specific questions about methodological issues regarding their own research. Participants received detailed feedback from professor Reis and the other participants of the workshop.

**Day 2:** During the second day professor Reis addressed his latest research on interpersonal processes. Partner responsiveness, capitalization of positive events, and attachment are but some of the topics that will be covered. Again, after this presentation, workshop participants were invited to present their own research. Beforehand, students were asked to submit a brief abstract of their research. Based on these abstracts, participants whose research was most closely related to the topic of the morning presentation were encouraged to present their own work and receive feedback from prof. Reis and the other participants of the workshop.

In the afternoon, participants of the workshop discussed in small groups how the presented research may be applicable to their own research. Based on this discussion, each group of participants presented a research idea relevant to the material presented in the workshop presented research. This was followed with a brainstorm session on the applied and
APPENDIX 1

basic implications of the ideas discussed in the workshop and on what participants can learn from this for their own research endeavors.

Enrollment: 29

Title: The Role of Positive and Negative Valence Processing in Research on Motivation and Human Goal Pursuit

Teaching staff: Prof.dr. A. Elliot (University of Rochester), prof.dr. H. Aarts and dr. J.N. de Liver (UU).

Type of course: Workshop

Date: May 19 and 20, 2008

Duration: 2 days, 10.00 am – 5.00 pm

Language: English

Location: Utrecht University

Content: In psychology, the processing of positive stimuli (objects, events, possibilities) is often supposed to energize approach motivation, whereas negative stimuli elicit avoidance motivation. Until recently, the processing of positive and negative valence and its relation to approach and avoidance motivation had been widely utilized and applied without taking a step back to explicitly define and articulate the nature of this relation. In essence, the approach-avoidance distinction has moved from the ground to the figure, such that this distinction is now being considered as fundamental and basic in many motivational analyses. In this workshop we aimed to focus on positive and negative valence processing and its relation to the approach-avoidance distinction as a general organizer of motivation and action currently examined in the area of social cognition (including affective social-cognitive neuroscience). We also gave attention to the explicit/implicit process distinction as far as relevant to understand the role of approach and avoidance motivation in human goal pursuit.

Format: Day 1: After introduction of participants and teachers, Andrew Elliot presented an overview of the approach–avoidance concept in psychology. This talk thus covered and integrated most of the existing literature on the role of approach and avoidance distinction in understanding human
motivation and goal-directed behavior. The overview ended with a general discussion. In the afternoon, students gave presentations. Beforehand, students were asked to submit a brief outline of their research. Based on these outlines, students whose research was most closely related to the topic of the workshop were invited to give a presentation. Students and teaching staff discussed the relation between their own work and professor Elliot’s overview.

Day 2: On the second day, the teaching staff addressed more specific topics concerning approach/avoidance motivation concepts based on recent research. Here, we examined how human functioning evolves from multiple levels of positive-negative valenced based processing mechanisms, ranging from rudimentary spinal cord reflexes to subcortical affective-motivational computations to cortical processes related to higher cognitive functions. In the afternoon, participants were invited to work in small groups relating the work presented in the workshop to their own research. Each group was expected to come up with one research idea, that was presented at the end of the afternoon. The aim of this exercise was to make students aware of the potential applications of the different levels of analysis on the approach and avoidance concept presented in the workshop.


Elliot, A.J., Handbook of approach and avoidance motivation, Chapter 1.

Enrollment: 22
Title: How members of minority and majority groups feel about intergroup contact

Teaching staff: Dr. L. Tropp (University of Massachusetts), dr. S. Otten (RuG) and dr. B. Doosje (UvA)

Type of course: Workshop

Date: May 22 and 23, 2008

Duration: 2 days, 10.00 am – 5.00 pm

Language: English

Location: University of Groningen

Content: Linda Tropp is a highly respected researcher in the domain of intergroup relations. Her work centers around issues of prejudice and prejudice reduction, whereby she specifically has been focusing on investigating the effects of intergroup contact.

In this workshop, Linda laid the grounds for further discussion with a lecture summarizing a number of her recent studies (meta-analytic, survey, and experimental studies) on how minority and majority members experience intergroup contact. Moreover, two or three Dutch researchers working in the same domain of research presented their work to the workshop participants. Based on these lectures, and based on some readings (to be announced later), participants worked in small groups on empirical approaches to investigate questions such as:

- In which way may members of minority (devalued) and majority (dominant) groups perceive, interpret, and/or experience intergroup contexts in different ways?

- What are the mechanisms that appear to be driving these different patterns of responses to contact among minority and majority groups?

- What do these different patterns of responses mean for using intergroup contact as a means of improving intergroup attitudes?


Maoz, I. (2004). Coexistence is in the eye of the beholder: Evaluating intergroup encounter in-terventions between


**Enrollment:** 15

**Title:** Interpersonal Processes: Bridging Relationship Science and Emotion Research: How Emotions Shape Relationships (Or is It the Other way Round?)

**Teaching staff:** Prof.dr. Margaret Clark (Yale University), dr. Catrin Finkenauer (VU) and dr. Michael Häfner (UU)

**Type of course:** Workshop

**Date:** October 7 and 8, 2008

**Duration:** 2 days, 10.00 am – 5.00 pm

**Language:** English

**Location:** VU University Amsterdam

**Content:** Relationships represent one of the most important endeavors in human life, and impinge on virtually every aspect of people’s lives. Also, emotions are among the most powerful experiences of every day life. Recognizing the influential nature of both relationships and emotions in human life, this workshop was concerned with how emotions are related to relationships and vice versa. The aim of this workshop was to provide participants with an understanding of recent developments in the theories on relationships and emotions. The workshop showed that both are essential in identifying the factors that ensure (versus) obstruct the quality of close relationships. Additionally, this workshop sought to provide both theoretical and methodological suggestions for participants’ own research.

**Format:** Day 1: After a brief introduction of participants and teachers, Professor Clark (Yale University) addressed her latest research on communal and exchange processes as they apply to close relationships emphasizing why communal
processes are most adaptive for such relationships along with what facilitates such approaches and what interferes with them.

In the afternoon, students gave presentations. Beforehand, students were asked to submit a brief abstract of their research. Based on these abstracts, students whose research was most closely related to the topic of the morning presentation (e.g., relationships, communal vs. exchange relationships, individual dispositions and their effect on relationships, relationship quality) were invited to give a presentation. Students commented on the relationship between their own work and Professor Clark’s work if it made sense to do so. Participants received detailed feedback from Professor Clark and the other participants of the workshop.

Day 2: During the second day Professor Clark presented her latest research on the functions emotions serve in relationships. Sample questions that were addressed are:
How do emotions (such as jealousy, hurt, or gratitude) influence the nature of our interaction with others? Why and how are people willing to express emotions in relationships?

Again, after this presentation, workshop participants were invited to present their own research. Beforehand, students were asked to submit a brief abstract of their research. Based on these abstracts, participants whose research was most closely related to the topic of the morning presentation were encouraged to present their own work and received feedback from Prof. Clark and the other participants of the workshop.

In the afternoon, students again gave presentations. If time permitted, participants of the workshop discussed in small groups how the presented research may be applicable to their own research. Based on this discussion, each group of participants presented a research idea relevant to the
material presented in the workshop presented research. This was followed with a brainstorm session on the applied and basic implications of the ideas discussed in the workshop and on what participants can learn from this for their own research endeavors.

**Literature:**


**Enrollment:** 14
Joint Seminars

**Title:** Virtual Reality as a Tool for Psychological Research

**Teaching staff:** Prof.dr. D.H.J. Wigboldus (BSI), drs. R. Dotsch (BSI), prof.dr. H. Aarts (KLI) and dr.ir. R. Custers (KLI)

**Type of course:** Joint seminar. This workshop is a collaboration between the BSI and KLI.

**Date:** May 27 and 28, 2008

**Location:** Radboud University Nijmegen, Behavioural Science Institute (BSI)

**Duration:** 2 days

**Language:** Dutch or English

**Content:** The aims of this workshop were: (1) To get acquainted with the possibilities that Virtual Reality (VR) technology has to offer for research in behavioral sciences (including social psychology). (2) To critically assess the use of this technology for this kind of research. (3) To discover what possibilities VR technology offers for your own research.

**Format:** On Day 1, an overview was presented of research in psychology in which VR technology is used. A critical assessment of the possibilities was based on the paper of Blascovich et al. (2002, Psychological Inquiry) and the reactions on this paper by participants (participants are requested to read this paper before the workshop). The morning program was a mixture of lectures and small group discussions. In the afternoon, participants briefly presented their research and indicated how VR technology can be used to improve the research in question. The staff commented on presented ideas, mainly focusing on feasibility of the presented solution and the question of whether VR technology is really necessary to tackle the particular research question.

On Day 2, Ron Dotsch gave a detailed description of the technological possibilities of VR. He focused on questions such as: What are currently the possibilities in the Netherlands in general and Nijmegen in particular? What kind of research can be conducted? What has to be programmed and how does this work? One of the BSI
modellers has shown how three-dimensional models are built. The morning ended with a demonstration of the current possibilities and examples of research conducted in the RIVERlab in Nijmegen.


**Enrollment:** 17

**Title:** Antecedents and Consequences of Experiencing Prejudice

**Teaching staff:** dr. C. Kaiser (University of Washington), drs. S. Cihangir, prof.dr. N. Ellemers, dr. M. Barreto (UL)

**Type of course:** Joint Seminar

**Date:** June 18, 2008

**Duration:** 1 day, 10.00 am – 5.00 pm

**Language:** English

**Location:** Leiden University

**Content:** Cheryl Kaiser’s research focuses on understanding prejudice and intergroup relationships, particularly from the perspective of members of socially devalued groups. Her research addresses how personal and situational factors affect whether individuals perceive prejudice-related threats. She also examines cognitive, emotional, and behavioral responses to prejudice, and the implications of the way people cope with prejudice for well being and interpersonal relationships. Her newest research focuses on how identity expressions affect the experience of prejudice. In this workshop Dr. Kaiser gave an overview of these different programs of research. She specifically addressed the antecedents and consequences of experiencing prejudice, as well as discuss the roles of group identity and status legitimacy in these processes.

**Format:** In the first part of this one-day workshop, Cheryl Kaiser presented her own recent research on and the antecedents and consequences of experiencing prejudice and discrimination. There was room for further discussion about
the research presented and the literature assigned in the
morning. After lunch, with the aid of the teaching faculty,
students worked on specific assignments in small groups.
The aim of these assignments was to prepare a presentation
for the teaching faculty and other participants, in which they
related their own research to the topic of the workshop.

**Literature:**

prejudice: Do Whites direct their prejudice toward strongly
identified minorities? Invited revision under review at
*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.*

Why are attributions to discrimination interpersonally
costly?: A test of system and group justifying motivations.
*Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32,* 1523-
1536.

expectations moderate preconscious attention to social
identity threatening cues. *Psychological Science, 17,* 332-
338.

perspective on perceiving and reporting discrimination.
*Law and Social Inquiry, 36,* 801-830.

**Enrollment:**

12

**Title:**

The Psychology of Forgiveness and Religion

**Teaching staff:**

Prof.dr. M. McCullough (University of Miami, USA), dr.
S.L. Koole and prof.dr. P.A.M. van Lange (VU)

**Type of course:**

Joint Seminar

**Date:**

June 19 and 20, 2008

**Duration:**

2 days

**Language:**

English

**Location:**

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

**Content:**

In recent years, social psychologists have increasingly
tackled broad themes that traditionally belonged to the
domain of religion. This workshop featured current
social-psychological analyses of two classic religious
topics, forgiveness and religious self-control. Dr.
McCullough discussed how recent theorizing from the
field of evolutionary psychology can help us to understand the place of revenge, as well as the place of forgiveness, in human nature. In addition, dr. McCullough discussed his new theory of religious self-control. This theory seeks to explain how religion influences health, well-being, and social behavior.

In the morning sessions, dr. McCullough provided an overview of his work. On Day 1, we focused on forgiveness; on Day 2, we focused on religious self-control. In the afternoon sessions, (some of the) participants presented their work and engaged in discussions. About two weeks in advance, the written (preliminary) version or abstract of each student’s presentation was sent to a discussant. McCullough, Koole, and van Lange received all written contributions.

On the first day, Michael Inzlicht presented his research on the effects of stereotype threat on self-regulation, self-control and ego-depletion. Moreover, he gave an overview of research in social psychology employing EEG measurements. In his seminar, he discussed how using EEG to study brain asymmetries and derive ERP’s can contribute to research in intergroup relations. Then, Belle Derks presented a new research project that relates the experience of stereotype threat to lateralized asymmetrical brain activity in the frontal cortex. Based on these talks and the literature assigned, there was further discussion about the research presented. Also, a demonstration of the EEG equipment gave participants insight into the practical issues concerning measuring EEG in social psychological experiments. At the end of the first day, small groups were formed in which participants discussed the possibilities of EEG in their research.

On the second day, these groups designed research that employs EEG measurements. At the end of the second day, each group presented their research ideas.


Enrollment: 12
Appendix 2: Publications 2008

Scientific publications (full members, associate members and research fellows)


Cooper (Eds.), Research companion to emotion in organizations (pp. 392-404). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.


deprivation into motivation. *Journal of Experimental Social psychology*, 44, 866-873.


Scientific publications first authored by PhD students


Faddegon, K., Scheepers, D., & Ellemers, N. (2008). If we have the will, there will be a way: Regulatory focus as a group identity. European Journal of Social Psychology, 38, 880-895.


