

1 Editorial

2 President's Corner

4 Opinions and Perspectives

The *Wow* and *How* of Research in Social Psychology, Causes and Consequences *by Fritz Strack*

9 Professional Workshops and Training for Community Service *by Peter Weinreich*

11 New Publications by Members

The impacts of lasting occupation: Lessons from Israeli society, 2013, ed. by D. Bar-Tal & I. Schnell

13 Future EASP Meetings

Small Group Meeting on Developing Diversity in EASP, June 12-14, 2013, Lausanne, Switzerland

Small Group Meeting on Social Determinants and –Consequences of Threat, June 18-19, 2013, Berlin, Germany

Small Group Meeting on Motivational, affective, and cognitive sources of the knowledge-formation process: Implications for intrapersonal, interpersonal, and intergroup phenomena, June 27-29, 2013, Krakow, Poland

Small Group Meeting: Towards a multifaceted understanding of empathy: Integrating findings on physiological, affective, cognitive, and behavioral underpinning, October 7-8, 2013, Schloss Reisenburg (near Ulm), Germany

- 17 Reports from the EASP summer school, August 6-19, 2012, Limerick, Ireland**
“Social Psychology in Action” – report of the organizer
Reports of participants
- 28 Reports of Previous Meetings**
Medium Size Meeting on the Psychology of Attitudes: Motivational Processes in Attitudes, May 25-27, 2012, Ghent, Belgium
Small Group Meeting on The societal meanings of minority influence, June 6-19, 2012, Delphi, Greece
Small Group Meeting on extreme emotions in human interaction, June 25-26, 2012, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Small Group Meeting on Control Experience, Power, and Intergroup Relations, June 2-5, 2012, Kazimierz Dolny, Poland
Small Group Meeting on Social Cognition and Communication, July 9-12, 2012, Pecs, Hungary
Small Group Meeting on Reconciliation in intergroup contexts: The divergent perspectives of perpetrator and victim groups, August 31 – September 4, 2012, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
- 40 News about Members**
In memoriam Dancker Daamen (1951-2012)
New Members of the Association
- 43 Grants and Grant Reports**
- 56 Deadlines for Contributions**
- 57 Executive Committee**

Editorial

Dear colleagues and friends,

I hope you will take some time to read through this most recent version of the European Bulletin. EASP and her members are very active and successful. Hence, there is enough to tell! Specifically, I want to draw your attention to the enthusiastic reports on the 2012 EASP Summer School in Limerick (Ireland), but also to the announcements of new meetings, grants (new and old), and new members. Important news is also that the EASP-Executive Committee settled on Amsterdam as a venue for the **2014 General Meeting**. Agneta Fischer and Kai Jonas from the University of Amsterdam are in charge of organizing the Meeting, and we are very happy and grateful that they agreed to take this responsibility. Don't forget to already save the dates in your agenda: **July 9-12, 2014**.

I am also happy to point to our section "Opinions and Perspectives", which we introduced in the last Bulletin. In this section, we offer publication space to our members in order to communicate their subjective views on relevant – and potentially controversial - issues in our field. This time, the Bulletin includes two such opinions and perspectives. While the one, by Peter Weinreich, seeks to alert us to the potential benefits of professional workshops and trainings for community service for EASP-members, the other (by our former president Fritz Strack) follows up on an issue that was already touched upon by Amélie Mummendey in the last Bulletin, namely whether and how we may need and want to change our research and publication culture. In times where Social Psychology needs to reestablish its good reputation and integrity, I can only strongly recommend reading about the *'Wow and how in Social Psychology'*, and I hope that this perspective will inspire further fruitful discussions amongst our members. And even though this debate was launched by a very unpleasant and negative event, I personally think that it also has brought as about a chance to reflect on and further advance Social Psychology in Europe and elsewhere.

I wish you all the best for the last weeks in 2012, and a wonderful year 2013!

Sabine Otten

President's Corner

Dear colleagues and friends,

It has been more than a year now that I had the unpleasant duty of sending you a message announcing the firm reaction of the Executive Committee of the EASP with regard to Diederik Stapel's fabrication of data. That message communicated the immense shock of the Executive Committee and of our community, and in that respect it was particularly severe. The message, however, also contained a short reference to the opportunity offered by that incident to reflect upon the particular structures, practices and pressures that our scientific community has put in place, and discuss those that might in fact lead to misconduct in research.

One year later, social psychology has undergone a thorough process of reflection. Discussions about cheating, data fabrication and scientific misconduct have been the favourite topic of many professional fora and blogs, as well as of more informal discussions during meetings and conferences. Several journals have published research and comments on various aspects of our scientific practices, launching important discussions on "grey-zone" practices, data sharing, replication, and other initiatives that may be important to tackle the problem of scientific misconduct, leaving us with a wealth of propositions and tentative solutions.

This movement has to be welcome in that it has allowed to reveal the multi-faceted nature of the problem. Of course, some of the proposed solutions are more interesting than others. Personally, I am not a big fan of policing solutions such as those focusing on fraud detection. Computer programs tracing anomalies in data sets, replications aiming at probing the work of fellow scholars, and requests of data sharing to check the effects reported in previous research may be valuable in a specific investigation, but used at a larger scale they have the potential to create a climate of mistrust and a representation of social psychology as a fundamentally flawed discipline, rather than create a sense of solidarity in the endeavour of reducing the likelihood of malpractice. I am, on the contrary, relieved to see that many colleagues in social psychology urge a systemic change in culture. Fraudsters are no psychopaths: they are scholars who know very well the rules, and who have decided to subordinate science to their own career. In this respect, we have to ask ourselves what kind of professional, institutional and societal pressures are exerted every day on junior as well as senior researchers that may make science appear like a means to gain individual power and recognition rather than an epistemic end.

The Executive Committee of EASP has been very active since the beginning of the debate on scientific misconduct, and I am proud to say that we have tried to adopt a systemic approach; thus, I would like to say a few words on several initiatives we have promoted.

First, we have joined forces with other associations to provide an institutionalized reaction to several issues raised by the recent frauds. In January 2012, I represented the EASP in a meeting convened by Jennifer Crocker to form a "Task force for responsible conduct", in which several associations of psychology and social psychology were represented. The "task force" discussed ways to render replication and data sharing an opportunity to increase collaboration within the scientific community rather than yet another source of

mistrust. A report of these discussions has been posted at http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/spsp.site-ym.com/resource/resmgr/files/task_force_on_responsible_co.pdf, as also mentioned by Patricia Devine in the last issue of Dialogue. The report is just a starting point, but we hope that it will be instrumental in steering the debate on the causes of scientific misconduct.

Second, we have met with the outgoing and incoming Editors of the EJSP to discuss ways in which social psychology journals in general, and the EJSP in particular can contribute to the effort of preventing fraud. Some steps have already been taken by the editors, as for instance sharpening the submission procedure to make authors more clearly aware of existing ethical regulations. The discussion is still open, and we will keep you posted on progress.

Third, as announced by Sabine Otten in her last editorial, the Editors of the EBSJ have launched a new section of the Bulletin, called Opinions and Perspectives; this new section has already featured a piece by Amélie Mummendey on how publications have become a sort of currency, and it features in the present issue a piece by Fritz Strack on the downsides of publishing to create a “wow effect”. We hope that the series will not stop and that other analyses of potential societal facilitators of academic fraud will follow.

Fourth, we recognise that junior scholars are likely to pay the heaviest toll for the present situation, and we have decided to include from now on a training module on “ethical concerns and scientific conduct” in the programme our summer schools. If you read Anca Minescu’s report of the past summer school in Limerick, you will realise that we have already started with this initiative, and that it has been a great success in terms of debate. We have also decided to promote a round table on the same topic in future General Meetings.

In just one year, social psychology – a relatively young discipline – has been forced to come of age and reflect upon the functioning of its own community. We hope that, although painful, this period will allow the discipline to reach full maturity; as Hermann Hesse once wrote, “maturity begins when one lives for others”.

Yours sincerely,

Fabrizio Butera
President, EASJ

Opinions and Perspectives

The *Wow* and *How* of Research in Social Psychology. Causes and Consequences.

Fritz Strack
University of Würzburg

Crises in Social Psychology

In the 1970ies, social psychology was seen to be in a crisis (McGuire, 1973). There was heated debate over the ethics of laboratory experimentation, whether one can generalize from artificial experiments to natural situations, whether attitudes really predict behavior, whether our theories are not universal but mere descriptions of culturally and historically bound behaviors (Gergen, 1973). Dissonance theory had been challenged, but there was still no unified perspective that would give the field a common orientation. (Rijsman & Stroebe, 1989).

With the advent of social cognition (Wyer & Srull, 1986) and that of social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) in the 80ies, the crisis seemed to be overcome and the field flourished on many dimensions. Moreover, there was an increasing public interest in our area and in our findings. The newspapers were eager to write about our studies and popular books were published on social psychology, Malcolm Gladwell's "Blink" (2005) and David Brooks' "Social Animal" (2011) being outstanding examples.

But during the last year, things have changed a bit. It started in September 2011 when a well-known colleague was found to have faked a great number of data sets. This massive fraud of a highly respected scientist made the headlines not only in his own country but all over the world. It was really hard to digest that his splendid and prize-winning academic career was, to a large degree, built on outright deception. And the perpetrator was a social psychologist, one of us, as you could read in every newspaper article. Not that all social psychologists were, all of a sudden, been seen as cheaters, but somehow, the great popularity of their findings started to backfire. People began to worry about the reliability of the psychic phenomena reported by Daryl Bem in *JPSP* (Bem, 2011). Some colleagues came out and reported failures to replicate various effects. Finally, two papers in *Psychological Science* suggested that social psychologists were particularly inclined to adopt "questionable research practices" (John, Loewenstein, & Prelec, 2012) and were admonished to spend more effort on direct replications (Simmons, Nelson & Simonsohn, 2011).

Research as Persuasive Communication

As a consequence, some soul searching has begun among social psychologists along with discussion about how their reputation can be restored. Many methodological suggestions are being advertised to avoid the file-drawer problem and particularly to deal with false positives. Some colleagues even seem to be on a crusade, and to them the prominent fraud seems to provide a moral license to engage in inquisitive actions that went beyond the norms of collegial conduct.

We as social psychologists have to deal with these challenges to avoid yet another and perhaps more serious crisis of our field. But unfortunately, there exists no methodological silver bullet that would solve all problems. In particular, there is no methodological procedure that links data and theory such that obeying certain rules would guarantee the truth. Rather, we must recognize that the scientific endeavor is more like a persuasive communication that requires humans both as communicators and recipients, while the methodology plays the role of the rhetoric.

Fortunately, and that makes this type of persuasion somewhat special, the recipients are highly critical and sophisticated, both about method and substance. As a consequence, convincing one's colleagues as editors, reviewers, readers, and to answer their sophisticated questions, meeting their scientific standards is a challengingly high obstacle to overcome. To be sure, this process does not end with the acceptance of a manuscript in a highly ranked journal. Even afterwards, the exchange goes on, explicitly and implicitly. Some publications get cited frequently; others will never be referred to.

Thus, instead of supporting moralistic pseudo-methodological standards, like storing one's original hypothesis in a locker (or in some functionally equivalent internet server), or reporting all of one's previous unsuccessful attempts at getting the results along with the subsequent modifications, I suggest that you simply have to report truthfully what you did, particularly all the potential determinants of subsequent responses. I admit that this may deviate from the basic tenets of inferential statistics, but who honestly believes that an alpha of .01 assures you that the probability of falsely rejecting the null hypothesis is one percent? Predominantly, P-values are indicators of reliability and are determined by the effect size and the n. Therefore, they serve an important goal in assessing the stability of a finding. As a consequence, the most direct replication is an increase in the n, or if one wants to take the effect size into account, the adoption of a more conservative p-level. Ironically, not so long ago, students had been educated that any desired p-level can be reached by increasing the n. Now, we learn that lenient p-levels provide circumstantial evidence for "questionable research practices".

Too much Wow, too little How

However, being skeptical about the healing power of certain methodological prescriptions does not imply an attitude of "everything goes". On a different dimension, it is much more important to advocate for a change, on a dimension that has been largely neglected in this debate (for an exception, see Ledgerwood & Sherman, 2012), namely the content and not the rhetoric of the persuasive communication.

Specifically, I have gained the impression that in many publications, the intended recipient of the persuasive communication is not the sophisticated, critical colleague but the journalist who formulates the headline in the newspaper. Journalists, however, are rarely interested in complicated methodological or conceptual issues. Instead, they want to get news they can sell. And this is mostly the simple, spectacular, surprising, bizarre, counterintuitive result. Man bites dog.

To be sure, surprising outcomes are often a byproduct of the search for psychological mechanisms and legitimate means to draw attention to the underlying mechanisms. But even then, the journalists' interest does not focus on the psychological process but on the unusual result. When we conducted our facial feedback study (Strack, Martin, & Stepper, 1988), the pen procedure was used to rule out a possible underlying mechanism. The

media, however, were mostly interested in the effects of the pen. Whenever I had talked to a journalist, I was asked about the possibility to treat depression with a pencil. And recently, I saw a summary of our work suggesting that "happiness is only a pencil away" (<http://www.mhfederation.co.uk/mhfederationvle/?p=1975>).

It seems as if in recent years, research in social psychology has been focused less on theoretical issues, particularly on the underlying processes, the "How?" of psychological phenomena. Instead, the focus has shifted to the collective "Wow!" that is elicited in the general public.

This goes along with a lack of understanding the underlying processes on a level that affords generalizations. An example is the failed replication of Bargh, Chen, and Burrows' (1996) study on stereotype induced behavioral activation. The failure to replicate the original result that activating the elderly stereotype (in the US) slowed down the speed of walking almost twenty years later in Belgium (Doyen, Klein, Pichon, & Cleeremans, 2012) has led to fervent (anonymous) attacks of the original study's senior author and to doubts about his scientific sincerity. To be sure, the obtained effect attracted media attention, but for a psychological scientist, it is the underlying mechanism that is newsworthy, namely the link between cognitive contents and behavioral habits. Nobody who is seriously interested in further exploring this relationship would expect that in times of demographic change, of increasing retirement ages and of public campaigns propagating "active aging", the elderly stereotype to still have the same implications as some 20 years ago in an entirely different context. It is therefore important to recognize that scientific progress in social psychology hinges less on the replication of specific phenomena but on demonstration of those universal underlying mechanisms that are responsible for producing them.

Why Wow?

There is reason to assume that newsworthy results are actively sought as various structural incentives and pressures contribute to this development.

- 1) The leading international *science magazines* are strongly oriented toward making an impact in the media. When a paper is submitted, its public interest is assessed first and used as a criterion for its entering the second stage of reviewing. Accepted articles are embargoed until the date of the publication. Then, press conferences are being held in which the most interesting articles are presented, accompanied by simplified summaries.
- 2) An increasing number of psychology journals are particularly focused on *short research articles*. Extensive theoretical discussions and the inclusion of data from several studies are discouraged and the repercussions of the findings in the media are closely monitored. Recently, APS has sent out an email in which the convention was advertised by drawing attention to lectures from "our headliners", speakers who have recently made it into the popular press.
- 3) Scientists increasingly include *media citations in their vitae*. There are tendencies to even consider their number as a criterion for annual pay raises. Magazines of the leading professional organizations (e.g., APS) list the presence of their members in the media.
- 4) Ph.D. students are encouraged to gain their *degree "publication based"*. Regulations often require a surprisingly high number of published articles.

All of those factors put a premium on short publications that are based on a minimum number of studies. At the same time, they discourage multiple experiments with lengthy conceptual discussions. As a consequence, the contribution to conceptual progress as a criterion is being replaced by the newsworthiness of the finding and its chances to find public attention.

The Costs

The resulting lack of conceptual development has some serious consequences:

- 1) *Generalization*. Isolated phenomena have little meaning beyond the circumstances under which they were obtained. Only a solid conceptual basis allows findings from one situation to be transferred to others that differ on various dimensions. Generalizations that go from phenomenon to phenomenon may come with the illusion of ecological validity. However, there is no theoretical basis that justifies the underlying inferences.
- 2) The same is true when it comes to translating our findings into *applications*. Similarities between the controlled situation of research and the real world may not be based of superficial characteristics do not justify interventions. Instead, it is the similarity of the underlying psychological mechanisms that provide the foundation for successful applications. Kurt Lewin's sentence of the practical implications of good theories has never been more appropriate.
- 3) *Replication/Reliability*. Although frequently demanded as the ultimate criterion of validity, replications in other laboratories are not popular for several reasons. First, there are statistical problems with rejecting the null-hypothesis. Even if this problem is solved or circumvented, little excitement comes from failures to replicate. As a result, journal editors are reluctant to publish such reports. More interesting are studies in which the nonreplication is integrated into a significant interaction in which the original effect obtains only if another condition is realized. Just like a conceptual replication, such an approach requires a theoretical basis that allows identifying the conditions under which the phenomenon does or does not occur. If this is not possible, the validity of the phenomenon may never be established on a solid and sustained level because it is not fueled by the trust in the underlying processes.
- 4) *Scientific progress*. Under a conceptual orientation, progress means a deeper, more inclusive understanding that goes far beyond the result of a particular study. In contrast, phenomenon-based research generates an illusion of progress that is based on new and even more surprising findings, once the excitement about a particular result has vanished. In the end, social psychology as a field may become a collection of curious phenomena while progress is measured by their number.
- 5) Finally, the pressure to obtain interesting findings, particularly for Ph.D. students, may facilitate *scientific misconduct*. From my days as a postdoc I remember very well how Bob Wyer would sit down with his graduate students to make sense of complicated 5-way interactions that had not been predicted. Typically, and always after considerable brooding over the pattern, a smile would pass over his face he would suddenly burst out "that's the way it should be!" Although I am not sure this was always the case, encouraging students to comprehend their data by allowing a conceptual reinterpretation that may then lead to a new experiment was an important intellectual exercise for any future academic. Of course, these results never made the headlines, but dealing with them has taught students that even a result that is unexpected and difficult to explain may be valuable and contribute to a better understanding.

Less Wow and More How in Social Psychology

I am not advocating restraint vis-a-vis the media. But I think social psychologists should try harder to communicate their ideas. Cute and newsworthy phenomena may be effective vehicles to get one's ideas across, but if they stand alone, they may end up as curiosities whose generators may be admired as magicians or entertainers, but always with an aura of frivolity and accompanied by suspicion.

In a nutshell, I am advocating less *Wow* and more *How* in social psychology. The need to talk to the media should not lead us to adopt their criteria, namely "newsworthiness" instead of explanation and understanding. The attention of the media is exciting and rewarding on many dimensions. But if we achieve it by trying to be sensational in our findings without aiming at the underlying processes, then the short-term publicity will backfire at a later time.

References

- Bem, D. (2011). Feeling the future: Experimental evidence for anomalous retroactive influences on cognition and affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100 (3), 407–425.
- Brooks, D. (2011). *The social animal. The hidden sources of love, character, and achievement*. New York, NY: Random House
- Doyen, S., Klein, O., Pichon, C.-L., & Cleeremans, A. (2012). Behavioral priming: It's all in the mind, but whose mind? *PLoS ONE*, 7(1)
- Gergen, K. J. (1973). Social psychology as history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 26 (2), 309-320.
- Gladwell, M. (2005). *Blink: The Power of Thinking Without Thinking*. New York, NY: Little, Brown and Company.
- John, L., Loewenstein, G., & Prelec, D. (2012). Measuring the prevalence of questionable research practices with incentives for truth-telling. *Psychological Science*, 23 (5), 524-532.
- Ledgerwood, A., & Sherman, J. W. (2012). Short, Sweet, and Problematic? The Rise of the Short Report in Psychological Science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(1), 60-66.
- McGuire, W. J. (1973). The yin and yang of progress in social psychology: Seven koan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 26 (3), 446-456.
- Rijsman, J., & Stroebe, W. (1989). The two social psychologies or whatever happened to the crisis? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 19, 339-344.
- Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2011). False-positive psychology: Undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. *Psychological Science*, 22 (11), 1359–1366.
- Strack, F., Martin, L. L., & Stepper, S. (1988). Inhibiting and facilitating conditions of the human smile: A nonobtrusive test of the facial feedback hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54 (5), 768 –777.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole
- Wyer, R. S., & Srull, T. K. (1986). Human cognition in its social context. *Psychological Review*, 93 (3), 322–359.

Professional Workshops and Training for Community Service

*Peter Weinreich **, PhD
Emeritus Professor of Psychology
University of Ulster
p.weinreich@ulster.ac.uk*

I would like to bring to the attention of the EASP membership the case for extending our influence with practitioners in the community who may be professional psychologists, or other professionals in areas that could benefit from the kind of expertise that we possess. At times, when we are restricted to academia, we appear somewhat remote from the problematic issues that confront professionals working in the community in areas such as social work, criminology and the law, youth justice, policing, and others. Significant academic research has been carried out by psychologists that has applications in these kinds of arenas. However, much of this is not effectively accessed by practitioners, because of a seeming barrier between the worlds of the academic and the practitioner.

It is most important that, as practising psychologists, we reach out to practitioners in the community, because we have techniques and knowledge that would be of benefit to them. Currently we engage in teaching University accredited undergraduate and postgraduate psychology courses, as well as conversing with the academic community in publications and conferences. However, there is also an all-important sphere of practical application of Psychological knowledge and expertise that can be enhanced by communicating to the community of professionals, including those whose first affiliation is not Psychology. One approach would involve well-considered workshops and training sessions provided by EASP members, which could be mounted to enhance the professional skills of practitioners in the community. Such events would need to be carried out to the appropriate professional/ethical standards. Caution would be required against abuse.

The issues that require attention for safeguarding against abuse by those who might wish to engage in ill-conceived promotions without professional aptitude are ones to do with the lack of professional standards, and with the possibility of distorting commercial pressures. Safeguards can be applied by insisting that:

- 1) The initiator and responsible person for these events has to abide by professional and ethical standards (e.g., in the UK, as a BPS Chartered Psychologist with a duty to act according to BPS ethical standards**);
- 2) The event is not-for-profit, but is held under the auspices of an accredited organisation (e.g., in the UK, the Community Interest Company – CIC – is a not-for-profit company that has a community welfare mission, otherwise having all of the auditing responsibilities of a conventional company – fees are simply to cover costs; any profits can only be reinvested in the CIC; highly-regarded accredited Charitable and Voluntary Organisations).

In my opinion, the best of EASP commitments to professional psychology could contribute effectively to excellent applications of psychological knowledge and expertise to the wider community by way of workshops and training, with the safeguards outlined here. The EASP mailserv facility could be used to circulate information about such workshop and training sessions that would fall outside the confines of academic institutions, being held at organisations more closely involved with community affairs.

*With thanks to Karen Trew (Queen's University Belfast) and Ivana Markova (Stirling University) for editorial assistance.

**Weinreich has held numerous international workshops on Complex Identity Processes in Inter-Cultural Contexts.

***The issue here is one of professional standards, the mode of implementation of which will differ from country to country and from one professional organisation to another.

New Publications by Members

Bar-Tal D., & Schnell I. (Eds.), (2013). *The impacts of lasting occupation: Lessons from Israeli society*. New York: Oxford University Press

Sept 2012 • 576 pp. \$99 • 9780199862184 • Save 20% with promo code 31056

• Phone: 800.451.7556 • Fax: 919.677.1303 • Web: <http://www.oup.com/us>

• Mail: Oxford University Press, Order Dept., 2001 Evans Road, Cary, NC, 27513

Protracted occupation has become a rare phenomenon in the 21st century. One notable exception is Israel's occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, which began over four decades ago after the Six-Day War in 1967. While many studies have examined the effects of occupation on the occupied society, which bears most of the burdens of occupation, this book directs its attention to the occupiers. The effects of occupation on the occupying society are not always easily observed, and are therefore difficult to study. Yet through their analysis, the authors of this volume show how occupation has detrimental effects on the occupiers. The effects of occupation do not stop in the occupied territories, but penetrate deeply into the fabric of the occupying society. *The Impacts of Lasting Occupation* examines the effects that Israel's occupation of Palestinian territories have had on Israeli society. The consequences of occupation are evident in all aspects of Israeli life, including its political, social, legal, economic, cultural, and psychological spheres. Occupation has shaped Israel's national identity as a whole, in addition to the day-to-day lives of Israeli citizens. Daniel Bar-Tal and Izhak Schnell have brought together a wide range of academic experts to show how occupation has led to the deterioration of democracy and moral codes, threatened personal security, and limited economic growth in Israel.

Content

Foreword—On Occupation—Michael Walzer

Introduction: Occupied and Occupiers--The Israeli Case. - Daniel Bar-Tal and Izhak Schnell

Fundamentals of Occupation

1. The Law of Belligerent Occupation as a System of Control: Dressing up Exploitation in Respectable Garb. - David Kretzmer.
2. Is There a Controversy about the Morality of the Occupation and its Implications? - Marcelo Dascal
3. Geographical Ramifications of the Occupation on Israeli Society. - Izhak Schnell.
4. Psychological Legitimization -Views of the Israeli Occupation by Jews in Israel: Data and Implications. - Tamir Magal, Neta Oren, Daniel Bar-Tal, and Eran Halperin.
5. Political Effects of Occupation
6. The Occupation and Israeli Democracy. - Yaron Ezrahi
7. The Occupation and its Effect on the Israel Defense Forces.- Reuven Pedatzur.
8. Intra-Domestic Bargaining over the Lands and the Future: Israel's Policy toward the 1967 Occupied Territories. - Gideon Doron and Maoz Rosenthal.

9. The Impact of the Occupation on the Political Discourse of the Palestinians in Israel.- Muhammad Amara and Mohanad Mustafa.
10. Societal Effects of Occupation
11. The Wallkeepers: Monitoring the Israeli-Arab Conflict.- Dan Caspi with Danny Rubinstein.
12. Economic Cost of the Occupation to Israel. - Shir Hever.
13. Gendering the Discourse on Occupation: A Sociological Perspective. - Hanna Herzog.
14. The Psychological and Moral Consequences for Israeli Society of the Occupation of Palestinian Land.- Charles, W. Greenbaum and Yoel Elizur.
15. Cultural Effects of Occupation
16. Appealing to Enlightened Self Interest: The Impact of Occupation on Human Rights within Israel.- Edward (Edy) Kaufman
17. The Occupation as Represented in the Arts in Israel. - Dan Urian.
18. Vocabulary and the Discourse on the 1967 Territories. - Nadir Tsur.
19. Conclusion: The Occupied Territories as a Cornerstone in the Reconstruction of Israeli Society. - Izhak Schnell and Daniel Bar-Tal.

“We, who hold dear the dignity and moral standing of the State of Israel and believe, as the founders did, that it will be ‘the light for the nations,’ have waited far too long for this book. A compendium of sober and honest accounts of the toxic impact of a nearly half-century-long occupation on the mind, spirit, and ethical standards of the occupiers and their children, born into a world that has managed to recycle violence, inhumanity, and moral blindness as necessary (if not sufficient) conditions for its survival. A warning, a clarion call, and a sound of alarm that everyone, especially occupiers, badly need – this warning needs to be loudly made, widely heard, and taken notice of.”

Zygmunt Bauman, Emeritus Professor of Sociology, University of Leeds

“Voices were raised in Israel in 1967, warning the country of the damage that prolonged occupation would do to the occupier. This book tells the story of how those warnings were ignored and how they came true.”

Daniel Kahneman, Professor at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School, recipient of Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics

"A profound and serious book, a must-read for those wishing to understand and even try to block the gradual yet ongoing decline of the State of Israel from its (supposedly temporary) military occupation into an apartheid-driven binational state whose Zionist fate is doomed."

A. B. Yehoshua

"It is impossible to understand the Israeli society without analyzing the nature of Israel`s long occupation of the West Bank and its implications. It is impossible to even start this analysis without reading this rich and deep book."

Mordechai Kremnitzer, Professor of Law (emeritus) at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Future EASP Meetings

Small Group Meeting

Developing Diversity in EASP

June 12-14, 2013, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Organisers: Steve Reicher (*St. Andrews University*), Ewa Drozda-Senkowska (*Paris Descartes*), Bernd Simon (*University of Kiel*), Christian Staerklé (*University of Lausanne*), Chiara Volpato (*Milan Bicocca*)

Contact: christian.staerкле@unil.ch

From its inception, EASP was committed to developing a social psychology which embraces all of Europe, which includes all sections of society and which is open to multiple intellectual traditions. In many ways, the Association has made remarkable strides forward in all of these respects, but equally, it is undeniable that we are still far from perfect, for example in terms of geographical diversity, gender equality and scientific recognition of different intellectual and methodological traditions. Moreover, it is arguable that the current economic crisis may have detrimental effects on our discipline. Funding cuts may affect the periphery more than affluent centres and increased competition privilege traditionally valued forms of research.

This small group meeting addresses these issues. It will have three aims: (1) to clarify the current state of affairs as concerns diversity in EASP; (2) to analyse the source of the problems; (3) to develop concrete plans for changes in the Association. The meeting will be structured in workshop format in order to maximize discussion and ensure that concrete outputs emerge from these debates. For each workshop participants will be asked to prepare position statements as a basis for discussion.

The meeting will be held at the University of Lausanne, Switzerland, starting early afternoon on Wednesday, June, 12 until Friday, June, 14, 2013. We envisage a meeting of 20 – 25 people and priority will be put on ensuring diversity in terms of geographical location, gender, level of seniority and theoretical/methodological orientation. There are no participation fees and costs of accommodation and meals will be partially covered. Please contact the organizers for further information.

If you are interested in participating, please send an email with your contact details and a short position statement (200 – 400 words) concerning the views on diversity within the association and concrete ways to deal with it to Christian Staerklé (christian.staerкле@unil.ch) before 15th of January 2013.

Small Group Meeting

Social Determinants and -Consequences of Threat June 18-19, 2013, Berlin, Germany

Organizers: Daan Scheepers, Kai Sassenberg and Kai Jonas

Contact: scheepersdt@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

As apparent from the media coverage of intergroup conflicts and rapid demographic, technological, and environmental changes, threat is a core psychological state in our modern society. Not surprisingly, threat is also a central motivational principle in a wide range of social psychological theories (e.g., terror management theory, social identity theory). Research in this area has been directed at exploring the different sources of threat (from material resources to self-esteem, belonging, meaning in life) as well as the different consequences of threat, ranging from information processing biases to prejudice against out-groups.

Despite the prominence of threat as an explanatory principle in social psychology, the concept of threat is complex, dynamic, and somewhat slippery. Different researchers have approached the topic in different ways (either as a contextual variable, or an emotional, motivational, or physiological state). Furthermore, the state of threat is difficult to capture using self-report measures due to defensive responding by research participants.

In order to bring more unity and clarity in the phenomenology, causes, and consequences of threat in social contexts, the current small group meeting aims to bring together a diverse group of researchers who have examined in their research the concept of threat in a variety of ways (e.g., cognitive processing, physiological responses) in a variety of domains (e.g., stereotyping and prejudice, group dynamics, attitudes, decision-making). The aim is an interactive meeting in order to stimulate theoretical unity and discuss methodological challenges.

We are planning to host the meeting at 17-18 June (arrival: June, 16, departure: June, 19) at the headquarters of the Leibniz Association located in the mid of Berlin. We are asking for indication of interest and/or submissions from both junior and senior researchers. If you are interested in participating, please send an email including an abstract (max. 250 words) and your contact details to Daan Scheepers (scheepersdt@fsw.leidenuniv.nl) before 15th of February 2013.

Small Group Meeting

Motivational, affective, and cognitive sources of the knowledge-formation process: Implications for intrapersonal, interpersonal and intergroup phenomena

June 27-29, 2013, Kraków – Przegorzały, Poland

Organizers: Małgorzata Kossowska, Arie W. Kruglanski, Arne Roets, Marcin Bukowski, Katarzyna Jaśko

Contact: kasia.jot@gmail.com

The meeting has two general aims. The first aim is to bring together researchers who are interested in the role of epistemic motivation and cognitive processes in the knowledge formation process in both intrapersonal and intergroup settings. The second aim is to enable researchers to share novel findings about epistemic process, and work towards developing a common, multi-level approach that combines the neuroscience of intra- and interpersonal processes as well as group, intergroup and cultural processes. Given the seminal contributions of lay epistemic theory, the construction of new knowledge is a persistent human activity. For activities that range from the relatively simple and mundane to the highly complex, new knowledge is essential to ensure confident decisions and reasoned actions. Given the breadth of interest in knowledge formation, and the essential psychological relevance of the field to the generation of human thoughts, feelings and actions, an understanding of how knowledge is formed and changed has been recognized as a very important goal in psychology. Thus, the general purpose of the present meeting is to offer an opportunity to develop an integrative, unique approach to the epistemic process. This will afford a bird`s eye perspective on knowledge formation process, its motivational, affective, cognitive and neurocognitive underpinnings, and its ramifications for a broad variety of social psychological phenomena. These phenomena include intrapersonal processes (e.g., decision making, ideological, or religious beliefs), interpersonal processes (e.g., perspective taking), and intergroup processes (e.g., group centrism and outgroup derogation).

The meeting will take place on June 27-29 2013 in Kraków - Przegorzały, a charming city in the southern part of Poland.

Applicants should submit a 250-word abstract to kasia.jot@gmail.com before January 30th, 2013. Please include your name, affiliation, contact information, and EASP membership status.

A conference website will be available soon and will provide all relevant information on this meeting, as well as an online application form (<http://victor.phils.uj.edu.pl/zps/>).

Small Group Meeting

Towards a multifaceted understanding of empathy: Integrating findings on physiological, affective, cognitive and behavioral underpinning
October 7-8, 2013, Schloss Reisenburg (near Ulm), Germany

Organizers: Claudia Sassenrath, Svenja Diefenbacher, Johannes Keller

Contact: claudia.sassenrath@uni-ulm.de, svenja.diefenbacher@uni-ulm.de

We are very happy to invite you to the EASP Small Group Meeting 'Towards a multifaceted understanding of empathy: Integrating findings on physiological, affective, cognitive and behavioral underpinnings' to be held at 07./08.10.2013 at Schloss Reisenburg near Ulm, Germany.

Empathy is a key component of effective social functioning and its importance is reflected in innumerable findings obtained in different fields of psychology. Hence, it is time to attempt an integration of this growing body of empirical evidence and theoretical developments as it provides the opportunity to enhance our methodological skills and to deepen our understanding of what empathy as a concept entails. Accordingly, with this Small Group Meeting we wish to bring together researchers from different fields of social psychology but also from other psychological disciplines who investigate empathy. In this way, we want to provide empathy researchers at all stages of their career with a chance to benefit from their colleagues' findings and to receive new impulses for their own research on empathy.

If you wish to participate,

1. Please contact the organizers and send a 250 word abstract of your oral presentation both to Claudia Sassenrath (claudia.sassenrath@uni-ulm.de) and to Svenja Diefenbacher (svenja.diefenbacher@uni-ulm.de) by February 28th, 2013.
2. You will be notified about acceptance a few weeks later.

The meeting (and accommodation) will be located at Schloss Reisenburg in Günzburg near Ulm, Germany. Schloss Reisenburg has a tradition in catering scientific conferences and meetings. For details of the venue, please see the website at: <http://www.uni-ulm.de/reisenburg/home.html>

All costs of accommodation and meals for the two days of the meeting will be fully covered. The conference will be supported by EASP and the University of Ulm. We expect that there will not be a registration fee.

Reports from the EASP summer school, August 6-19, 2012
Limerick, Ireland
Organizer: Anca Minescu

“Social Psychology in Action” – Report of the organizer

“What lies behind us and what lies before us are tiny matters compared to what lies within us.”

Ralph Waldo Emerson

Before the participants of the 2012 EASP Summer School arrived in Limerick, we had set ourselves the challenge to organize two weeks of “open space”... We had the confidence that if we provided the structural opportunity for minds alike to meet, feel comfortable, and start talking to each other, magic will start happening...

The wonderful modern campus of the University of Limerick in Ireland ensured that all the *structures* were in place, so the “space” was fine. The next step was to signal the *opportunity*, to create the “openness”. So, I thought that the quote above was going to give us the key to that “open space”. On the first day of the summer school, the people in the room, namely 77 doctoral candidates (26 nationalities, from 56 European universities, 5 American and 4 Australian) and 12 workshop-teachers, were invited to leave their past behind them, their future aside, and just be there, be in Limerick for the next two weeks. I wished that weighty past luggage and aspirations for future careers could be put aside, that dissertation pressures and daily worries could be put on stand-by. I wished we could all be who we are in the moment, in our richness as human beings who (not only) think and talk, (but also) walk, feel and have fun, while making a difference in the world around us. During the following days, magic did happen, we started talking, walking, and powerful creativity forces were soon unleashed (and in some case, went wild, since some of us even ended up writing limericks...). But this happened despite the fact that my wishes did not really seem to come true...

To start with, the past could not be left behind... Naturally, the teachers involved in our summer school brought their pasts into the present sharing their impressive expertise with amazing generosity, and with the sense that it’s not what you know that is important, but how you think about it and how you apply it to your own world and research interests. The doctoral candidates participated in one of 5 workshops on different themes, and with different teachers (see below). The commonality was the relentless dedication to make the best of every interaction, to keep questioning, and to do it all with a smile. By dedicating two weeks to the new generation of social psychologists, *pro bono* and with great enthusiasm, the teachers embodied the most important message of any summer school: that sharing knowledge and collaborating are not only strategies for success in the academia, but are also rewarding and inspiring- at multiple levels and for all those involved, crucial ingredients for creativity and innovation. On behalf of the participants, as well as from the organizer’s viewpoint, we remain deeply grateful to the following teachers and their wonderful contributions to the EASP Summer School 2012:

- **Workshop 1: Groups, identity, and health** with Alex Haslam (University of Exeter, UK) and Stephen Gallagher and Aisling O'Donnell (University of Limerick, Ireland)
- **Workshop 2: Morality in self, emotion, and social relations** with Colin Wayne Leach (University of Connecticut, USA) and Patricia M. Rodriguez Mosquera (Wesleyan University, USA)
- **Workshop 3: Intergroup Relations: Different identities → Different psychologies for ethnic minorities and national majorities?** with Karen Phalet (University of Leuven, Belgium) and Anca Minescu (University of Limerick, Ireland)
- **Workshop 4: 'The space between us': The role of intergroup boundaries in shaping social inclusion, integration, and well-being** with John Dixon (Lancaster University, UK), Kevin Durrheim (University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa) and Orla Muldoon (University of Limerick, Ireland)
- **Workshop 5: When is life meaningful? Social cognitive processes underlying inferences of meaninglessness and meaningfulness** with Leonard L. Martin (University of Georgia, USA) and Eric R. Igou (University of Limerick, Ireland)

So, we could not put the past aside... but how about the future? Well, my wishes did not come true there, either... Participants were focusing on building a future, just as much as they were using their past expertise. And this was most visible in the plenary sessions of our program. In a series of keynote lectures, our guests revealed promising research agendas, seriously re-thinking our contributions as social psychologists to various social issues. Orla Muldoon (University of Limerick, Ireland) presented her approach of applying social psychological theories in the (Northern/)"Irish" context, from dealing with the trauma of intergroup conflicts to living in economically deprived (but socially supportive) neighbourhoods. Alex Haslam (University of Exeter, UK) revisited evidence from a classic research example, reformulating the 'nature' of tyranny, and confronting the notion of "mindless conformity" with the alternative social psychological concept of "engaged followership". Kevin Durrheim (University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa) redrew the "Colour Line" with the toolkit of his Situated Action Theory, arguing that the racist potential of social behaviours is released (and must be analysed) in the micro-dynamics of inter-personal interactions. Jacqueliën van Stekelenburg (VU University Amsterdam, The Netherlands) discussed innovative research into how collective action and a sense of community emerge in newly-built neighbourhoods, a situation where network embeddedness becomes crucial to protest dynamics. As a culmination of opposing the status-quo understanding of psychological theories, methods and scope, Geraldine Moane (University College Dublin, Ireland) presented an overview of the emerging field of Liberation Psychology, a psychology done "by and with the people", where - rather than being objectified - participants become agents, and where "giving voice" has a transformative potential leading to social change. Last, but by far not least, the doctoral candidates themselves set a new research agenda with the 16 project proposals they developed in the course of the summer school. Titles and authors can be found on our website at the moment (<http://www.ul.ie/psychology/EASP2012>), but most likely, the actual research and their results will find their way on the pages and webpages of scientific journals, in the not too distant future.

Thirdly, my wishes to put the dissertation pressures and daily worries on stand-by also did not come true... Two roundtable sessions on "publishing in scientific journals" and on "ethical concerns and scientific conduct" gave room to vigorous discussions and were

outlets for serious concerns from the motivated young (and the other) academics. The teachers involved in these sessions thoughtfully and kindly shared personal stories about publishing (as journal editors, peer reviewers, authors, advisors, previous students) and about their own ethical models of doing research. The empowering message of these sessions was the awareness that we are all masters of our own destiny, and that- no matter how difficult sometimes- we as individuals always have and do make choices (“Power to the people!” someone said). Once again, having a network of trusted peers, collaborating and knowing the organizations and institutions in our discipline emerged as trusted guardians for good practice. The teachers discussed how they developed an explicit set of values to guide their own research, whether it was curiosity to discover what is yet unknown, the desire to give voice and honour the stories of our participants, or the wish to use psychology to effect social change, or help people see the world in a different light. On publishing, the myth of a “perfect paper” was wiped out and replaced by very practical pieces of advice, such as “best writing is re-writing (not just polishing!)”, “reviewers are there to help you fix your paper (especially reviewer 2)”, “it’s good to have a plan B for resubmission”, “it’s best to choose which story to communicate and to whom (before starting to write)”, and “submit! (hello!...don’t forget this one!)”. Most importantly, these sessions revealed the importance of having open-forum discussions where experiences and concerns are voiced and shared, where facts rather than “hear-say” are exchanged between those with more experience and those aspiring to belong and to become. By now, I did not care much about my wishes, because the reality was turning out to exceed any expectations: what was within us was shining through, irrespective of what was laying behind or ahead of us...

However, there was one wish that was fulfilled. The idea behind the workshop themes and program in general was to host a summer school that would best reflect the profile of our 5 year old Department of Psychology, at the University of Limerick. Our focus is on the contributions of social psychological research to various social issues, and we wished to “walk the talk” during the EASP Summer School, too. The idea to involve our participants into a field research trip into the city of Limerick, in other words the idea of “social psychology in action”, was masterminded by the foundation chair of our department: Orla Muldoon. In small groups (collaborating), participants explored a 5 kilometres trail between the campus and the city centre (walking), gathered evidence on “Limerick being a sporting city” and “Ireland a Catholic country” (talking, feeling, making photos and drawings, and even going to the pub for a coffee, or else...), and presented a psychological analysis (sometimes with an excitingly unexpected and impressive soundtrack). By the end of the 9th group presentation, we have all come to question our “scientific religions”, to problematize whether there is such a thing as “value-free research”, and to certainly reflect more on the audience of our research findings. What was never questioned was the unbelievable resourcefulness of the amazingly creative doctoral candidates. They walked the walk, and did the talk, and in doing this, they were *present* in Limerick, “doing social psychology live”, in the moment, and in the fullness of their potential, making our (greatest) wish come true.

And yet, all this would not have been possible without the (superordinate level) structural opportunity and financial investment of the European Association of Social Psychology. Sponsorships from Fáilte Ireland and our Department of Psychology helped make it all even more enjoyable. The European Social Cognition Network (ESCON) generously sponsored the organization of Workshop 5, via the European Science Foundation (ESF). And, for the smooth running of all logistical matters as well as the added fun and daily

(and nightly) “fuel”, we remain sincerely grateful to the University of Limerick Campus Life Services, and to the Scholars, The Paddocks and the Stables Club. Then again, while organizations and their structures are indispensable, it is the people who represent them that make the wheels turn and the journey unforgettable. I would like to renew my thanks to those who made this organizational journey a pleasure, with their precious advice and expertise, their kind patience, unlimited generosity, and their concrete and moral support in running the Summer School: Prof. Xenia Chryssochoou, the EASP Meetings Officer, Sibylle Classen, the EASP Executive Officer, Prof. Orla Muldoon, the foundation chair of the Psychology Department in Limerick, Dr. Eric R. Igou, Head of our Department, Lisa Gibbons and Dolores Hanly, events managers from the Campus Life Services, and team-mates: Caroline Rafter, departmental administrator, and our undergraduate students: Warren Tierney, Niall Russell and Dean Callaghan.

To end, I would like to give another quote used as a motto for the 2012 Limerick Summer School, and which could be a reminder from the past for all tomorrows as well as for our present-day encounters with theories, methods, colleagues and ideas: *“The union of the mathematician with the poet, fervour with measure, passion with correctness, this surely is the ideal”* (William James). I know we had a bit of everything in our privileged two weeks in Ireland. And while we, “the Limerick people”, will continue to enjoy and cherish our memories, I can now only make a brand new wish. May the tradition of the EASP summer schools continue, and may it inspire many generations of social psychologists to use (some of) the wisdom of the past in their attempts to redefine the present and build a new future for our discipline and societies.

Anca Mineescu, Organizer of the EASP Summer School 2012, Limerick, Ireland

Reports of participants

Workshop 1: Groups, Social Identity and Health – influencing physical and psychological wellbeing through the power of social groups

written by Johanna Frisch, Marijn Stok and Dale Weston

One summer they gathered in Limerick
Working, talking, and composing rhetoric
An abundance of fun,
Despite the lack of sun,
Who knew the two weeks would pass so quick?

Lauren-Grace McCloskey

This special kind of humorous poem is called a limerick, named after its city of origin, where the EASP Summer School 2012 took place. Whilst it would be impossible for a short limerick to summarize all the wonderful experiences we had at this summer school, it can provide a good first impression of what happened.

In workshop 1 we were concerned with discovering the beneficial, but neglected influence that a shared social identity has on health. For the first week, our tutors (Alex Haslam,

Stephen Gallagher and Aisling O'Donnell) provided us with the theoretical foundations for the workshop, including how Social Identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and Self Categorization theory (Turner et al., 1987, 1994) can be applied to health. They also introduced us to exciting physiological measurement methods that could be used to supplement more traditional self report measures of health. After the first week of background and theorizing, we were keen to use our newfound expertise to come up with research ideas. In three subgroups we developed the following research outlines and were even able to run some studies.

Group 1: Given the unique nature of the summer school (young social psychologists thrust together to work and party for a fortnight) we decided to conduct a social network analysis of the emerging EASP summer school network. Doing so provided an opportunity to examine how perceived social support, network position, and identification with the EASP summer school as a group influenced summer school participants' psychological and physical wellbeing. We also ran a lab-based experiment examining blood pressure reactivity to a stressful maths task (the PASAT, Gronwall, 1977) to see whether these variables affected actual physical health. The entire study enabled us to not only explore interesting new methods of data analysis but also gave us the opportunity to personally conduct a laboratory-based experiment.

Group 2: Inspired by Jones and Jetten's (2011) finding that making multiple group identities salient leads to higher a resistance to a stressful physical task than making only one group identity salient, we aimed to clarify whether it is belonging to social groups or simply making different identities salient (or both) which has beneficial effects on health. We were also interested in differences in health benefits flowing from making salient highly meaningful group identities (like your close family or friends) and less meaningful social identities (like all people in your age group). Finally, we also speculated about possible mediators of these effects, such as social support, control and self-efficacy.

Group 3: Research by Dunn (2012) suggests that giving is good for the health of the giver. On the other hand, Nadler (2012) suggests that the nature of giving is affected by inter-group dynamics. We proposed an extension to Dunn's individual level approach to giving to engage with the inter-group dynamics of giving and to explore how this dynamic may impact on the well-being of the giver. Further studies will explore how the well-being that results from giving may arise from pathways that vary as a function of the ingroup-outgroup status of the recipient and the type of help that is given.

On behalf of all the members of workshop 1 we would like to thank Alex Haslam, Stephen Gallagher and Aisling O'Donnell for sharing their knowledge and ideas with us, and for their inspiring enthusiasm! Moreover, we want to give one last big thank you to the EASP for the opportunity to be part of this summer school, and to the wonderful Anca Minescu and her team for organizing it so well.

Aude, Dale, David, Jennifer, Joanne, Johanna, Kasia, Katrien, Lauren-Grace, Leman, Marijn, Mouna, Namkje, Stephen, Stefano and Warren

Workshop 2: Morality in Self, Emotion, & Social Relations

Arriving at the campus of Limerick University was like entering a small, encapsulated academic world somehow detached from the world around it. This year's EASP summer school took place in this intellectually inspiring place in the middle of beautiful but rainy Ireland.

In Workshop 2, we discussed the meaning of morality in self and social relationships, in an exceptionally open-minded, friendly, and enthusiastic atmosphere. During the first week, we talked, we agreed, we disagreed, and we exchanged ideas about what morality actually is. In doing so, we touched on general theories about morality; we focused on moral identity in self and others and we discussed the importance of culture. We focused on moral emotions, such as shame, guilt and anger. Furthermore, we discussed the processes of moralization and moral disengagement, and the moral meaning of justice and revenge.

During these lively discussions our teachers Patricia M. Rodriguez Mosquera and Colin W. Leach provided us with deeper theoretical and practical insights than any amount of literature studies would have done. Again, thank you very much for this great workshop! By sharing with us your experience and your knowledge, you motivated and inspired us. During the second week, thanks to the versatility of morality, we divided in small groups based on our common interests, and we developed quite diverse research proposals including: gendered responses to moral transgressions, revenge among oppressed groups, the moralization of women, understanding anger, and moral identity.

Engaging discussions and new friendships were not restricted to our workshop boundaries. We reduced the "space between us" and we improved our "intergroup relations." The pubs at the campus as well as the garden - and living rooms - of Beech and Holly houses, were popular gathering locations which provided opportunities to get to know PhD students across workshop boundaries, find "the meaning of life" and create our identity as "the 2012 Limerick group." These opportunities were further enhanced during the field and the boat trips where we left our encapsulated on-campus-world and got some impressions about real-life Limerick and the beautiful landscape around it. These trips resulted in an unforgettable Monday morning where our impressions of Limerick were shared in a very creative plenary session filled with photos, limericks, and a video.

In sum: After a while we got used to the constant drizzle and didn't worry about missing rain coats any more, but instead appreciated each sunny moment and enjoyed two unforgettable weeks with inspiring discussions, interesting talks and round tables, a lot of new insights, and great people. Because of all of that, our participation in the 2012 EASP summer school was an enriching and unforgettable experience! Many thanks to Anca Minescu and the staff and faculty of Limerick University for their hospitality and for doing a great job organizing this summer school!

And this might sound crazy, because we just met, but we shared numbers, so call me, maybe, Limerick.

*Gabrielle Filip-Crawford, Katrin U. Obst, Katerina Petkanopoulou,
Romy van der Lee*

Workshop 3 - Context matters: Intergroup relations and group formation across the world

Our workshop was comprised of a highly diverse group of young social psychologists representing twelve different countries both within and outside of Europe. During the first week, everyone introduced themselves by giving a presentation about the various areas of research and specializations that were currently guiding us on our PhD paths. We learned about a variety of topics through these presentations ranging from group identity formation, biculturalism, and gender differences. In addition to these presentations, each of the 15 core papers was also presented by one of the participants to highlight the key points and to further stimulate discussions and even methodological debates at time.

The second week of our workshop was dedicated to working in three subgroups that we created according to our PhD projects and/or general research interests. The goal was to work together to create a collaborative future research project that was directly linked to our workshop's discussions. After hours of planning and researching, the following three research projects were formed:

1. Mixed Perceptions of Leadership: Biracial Identities (Sarah Gaither, Carola Leicht & Mary Kinahan)

The mixed-race population is the second fastest growing population in the US and the fastest growing population in the UK, yet research to date has largely understudied how this population may differ from their monoracial counterparts. In two studies we aim in investigating how intersecting racial identities may affect perceptions of leaders. In Study 1, we would compare monoracial White, monoracial Black and biracial Black/White individuals on how likely they would be to follow or endorse different leaders from different gender and racial backgrounds. Study 2, would examine whether making one half of a biracial person's racial identity salient in turn affects how likely they would be to follow these same hypothetical leaders. Additionally, this study would be the first to date to include a biracial sample from both the US and the UK. Overall, these studies would help highlight how having dual racial identities may affect social perceptions and whether there are cultural variations of these findings in different contexts.

2. The European Identity (Caroline Ng Tseung, David Seewald, Maria Chayinska & Kerstin Hammann)

Studying "European identities" is a complex question - do minority and majority groups within different countries have the same understanding of a European identity? And are there certain contexts in which people may choose one definition of their European identity over another? This study would explore these questions as a way to investigate 1) the role of having a superordinate identity and how that affects European identity definitions; and 2) the role that context plays in the formation and use of European identities. The role of group status and positioning will also be examined. Overall, this study aims in further defining the term "European identity" as a means to see, if it really can be universal or not.

3. Mobilizing for "the others": majority and minority pathways to collective action (Lauren Hall, Judit Kende, Diego Carrasco, Benjamin Liersch & Ana Figueiredo)

Much research has shown the processes by which members of minority groups may mobilize to improve their ingroup's situation. Other lines of research research have also

shown some pathways for majority group members to mobilize for minority groups. However, little research has consistently analyzed the processes by which minority group members may mobilize on behalf of other minority groups. Therefore, the present project aims to investigate instances in which majority and minority group members may mobilize on behalf of the other minority groups and take collective action. By taking into consideration processes of identification, perceptions of efficacy and emotional processes, we aim to answer two main questions: 1) What pathways best explain why majority groups act on behalf of minority groups? And 2) What pathways best explain why minority groups act on behalf of other minority groups? Overall, this study aims to test different predictions already existent in the literature and to augment our knowledge of when, how and why would outgroup members take action on behalf of other groups.

The 2012 Summer School at the University of Limerick, although intense and rigorous at times, was an extremely unique opportunity, where we were able to meet with colleagues from different countries, provide constructive feedback on tentative research designs, discussed modern issues of social psychology with experts in several plenary discussions, and last but not least, introduce ourselves to Irish culture and learning in new environments. We would like to thank the Organizing Team of the EASP Summer School 2012, and especially our two teachers Karen Phalet and Anca Minescu for this experience and we hope that our research paths will cross again soon!

Sarah Gaither, Kerstin Hammann, Ana Figueiredo, Ahmet Coymak, Mary Kinahan, Carola Leicht, Daniel Seewald, Maria Chayinska, Caroline Ng Tseung, Lauren Hall, Judit Kende, Diego Carrasco, and Benjamin Liersch

Workshop 4

We know what follows might seem exaggerated and perhaps only those who have been part of a similar experience can understand us. A few months ago we didn't know one another and now we are an important part of each other's lives. We read the same papers before arriving in Ireland and the most optimistic among us checked the weather forecast hoping for a sunny EASP Summer School. And although sunny days did not come that often, we felt that we did not need them when conversations first began on August 6. We came from more than twenty different countries but we all shared the same thoughts - we are common people with a thirst for knowledge. We were full of excitement and high expectations. But we were all wrong; it was much better than we could have ever imagined.

In our first week together in Workshop 4, we began by exploring the properties of physical and symbolic intergroup boundaries. Examining contexts as diverse as Belfast peace walls in Northern Ireland to racial segregation on South African beaches to gated communities in the United States, we discussed the negative and positive consequences of such boundaries (i.e., social exclusion, the propagation of social inequality, the potential for psychological security and well-being). Our experiential learning continued by working in small groups, creating presentations on key theoretical readings. With the majority of us being trained primarily in experimental methods, we left with a greater appreciation for the multitude of ways in which research questions can be answered using novel non-experimental methods (e.g., observational techniques employing mapping and digital photography).

During our second week, we divided into three groups and had the opportunity to work at very different levels of analysis (from seating distances within a room, to boundaries within a neighbourhood, to psychological distances within the EU) and propose various research instruments and methodologies. Below are brief descriptions of our research proposals:

Project 1: Project NIMBY: The role of social composition and segregation of urban space in shaping residential preference - Ajana Löw, Aline Lima-Nunes, Clara O'Byrne, Sabina Torunczyk-Ruiz, Tomás Walsh

In this proposal, we want to understand whether (1) socio-economic composition and (2) spatial segregation of urban space influence residential preferences. Also, we want to verify how this influence is mediated by perceptions of two types of threat (threat to safety and threat to social status).

Project 2: Exploring implicit and explicit responses to Social Identity Threat and spatial distance: A dual pathway model - Hedy Greijdanus, Hillie Aaldering, Joel Anderson, Susana Lavado, Wiebren Jansen

This research project focuses on the role of spatial distance in implicit and explicit intergroup behaviors, attitudes, and perceptions. It aims to investigate whether intergroup bias and seating distance are reciprocally related, and whether smaller seating distance can decrease intergroup bias.

Project 3: The impact of identity threat and relative group status on intergroup relations: The case of the PIIGS - Thijs Bouman, Ana Leite, Rocío Martínez, Francesca Prati, Katerina Tsantila, Amy Williams

In our project, we aim to investigate how different levels of identity threats and relative group status may influence the need to associate or distance oneself from a devalued superordinate identity. The current state of affairs within the European Union enables us to test our assumptions with real groups (namely citizens of the European peripheral countries).

Our workshop leaders were second to none: John Dixon, Orla Muldoon, and Kevin Durrheim established a supportive and inspiring environment from the start, encouraging creative intellectual risk-taking and infusing our discussions with a contagious passion for intergroup boundary research. They challenged us to expand how we think about studying intergroup questions and consistently provided constructive feedback during our discussions. Through their actions and attitudes they modeled a generosity of spirit as scholars for which we are most grateful. We also wish to thank EASP and the wonderful summer school organizers, Anca Mineescu and her team, for creating an unforgettable learning experience.

Inside class, but also during lunch and dinner we had the opportunity to discuss the challenges of doing science. We soon realized that we all had many things in common: concerns about experiments that don't work, the challenges and joys of statistical analyses, the "p<.05 dream", difficulties drafting manuscripts, and the excitement of submitting our first papers and the disappointments when our papers are rejected. And most importantly, we shared an appreciation for how social psychology can help bring about actual social change.

The Summer School brought us closer than we could have imagined as both friends and scholars. And now we have numerous memories that we won't ever forget and a thousand pictures to remember every moment of laughter. We had so much fun dancing "killing the cockroaches" (a creative instructional technique for learning the Samba!) and lived many gorgeous moments. We studied borders and we crossed boundaries. And although each of us returned home, we feel like we are one. Now we are all Limerick. And while difficult to explain, we are sure that it is something really special for us.

To the "georgeous" time we had together...

Ajana, Aline, Amy, Ana, Clara, Francesca, Hedy, Hillie, Joel, Katerina, Rocío, Sabina (Saja), Susana, Thijs, Tomás, Wiebren

Workshop 5: "When is life meaningful? Social cognitive processes underlying inferences of meaningfulness and meaninglessness"

Written by Shir Etgar, Sanne Nauts & Christina Steindl¹

Even long-term, committed relationships can have their ups and downs. For most of us, our relationship with social psychology is no exception to this rule. True, some people have a love for doing research that is truly unconditional. But for others, discouraging data and desk rejections sometimes make us softly whistle the song from Monty Python's "What's the meaning of life?" during dull days in dimly lit labs.

To cure their three-year-itch, many couples choose a romantic get-away to a tropical destination, but we opted for Limerick (aka "stab city") instead. Quite fittingly, the topic of our workshop was "When is life meaningful? Social cognitive processes underlying inferences of meaningfulness and meaninglessness". Together with our teachers, Leonard Martin and Eric Igou, we spent the first week of the summer school discussing research on meaning. What is meaning, and how do people maintain meaning in the face of mortality salience, uncertainty or boredom? How are low-level threats to meaning (such as watching confusing Monty Python-sketches, or trying to grab a potato that keeps rolling away from your fork) related to efforts to re-establish meaning? And do people really need meaning, given that those who never look for meaning in the face of adversity are frequently better off than those who do?

Luckily, the potatoes that were served to us in insurmountable amounts (potatoes & pasta, potatoes & fries-this is Ireland!) did not have the tendency to escape from our forks, so we could focus on developing new research ideas in the second week of the summer school. We came up with four research projects that are currently being carried out in labs across Europe. The projects are focused on a) developing a new "need for meaning" scale, b) investigating prosocial behavior as a strategy to restore meaning after a meaning threat, c) investigating competing predictions of the meaning maintenance model and terror management theory, and d) investigating the moderating role of here-and-now vs. delayed mindset in the well-known relationship between meaning threat and a need to restore meaning.

¹ Authors' names appear in alphabetical order

Granted, after two weeks of discussing the meaning literature, we still had no idea what researchers really mean when talking about "meaning", nor did we suddenly find meaning in desk rejections. But with interesting discussions, amazing keynote talks, great teachers and 77 amazing, creative, fascinating, PhD students we became even more aware of what we love about doing research (and discovered some new, fascinating things along the way). The perfect organization (led by the awesome Anca Minescu), interesting "social psychology in action"-fieldtrips and un-Irish amounts of sunshine only added to this great mix.

After two weeks in nerd-paradise, we left the summer school with lots of new ideas, friends, collaborations and memorable experiences. And when Leonard Martin told us with a big smile that we have the greatest job in the world, making a living just because we "sit and think", we knew he was right.

Thanks for a meaningful summer, workshop 5:

Maria, Nina, Shir, Florian, Michèle, Claudia, Janet, Kasia, Sanne, Christina, Carolin, Tamara, Zenobia and Kenneth.

Reports of Previous Meetings

Medium Size Meeting on the Psychology of Attitudes: Motivational Processes in Attitudes

May 25 – 27, 2012, Ghent, Belgium

Adriaan Spruyt, Jan De Houwer, Pablo Briñol, Geoff Haddock, Rob Holland, Greg Maio, Richard Petty

During the last weekend of May 2012, the Learning and Implicit Processes Laboratory of Ghent University (headed by Jan De Houwer) hosted the 4th EASP Meeting on the Psychology of Attitudes. The meeting took place in "Het Pand", a former Dominican Monastery, situated beside the river Leie in the historic center of the city of Ghent. Earlier EASP meetings on the Psychology of Attitudes focused on "Contemporary Perspectives on the Psychology of Attitudes" (2000, Cardiff), "Non-conscious and Conscious Processes" (Madrid, 2004), and "Affective Processes in Attitudes" (2008, Nijmegen). The topic of the 4th EASP meeting on the Psychology of Attitudes was "Motivational Processes in Attitudes". The organizing committee consisted of Jan De Houwer (Ghent University), Pablo Briñol (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid), Geoff Haddock (Cardiff University), Rob Holland (Radboud University Nijmegen), Greg Maio (Cardiff University), Richard Petty (Ohio State University), and Adriaan Spruyt (Ghent University). The local organizing committee consisted of Jan De Houwer, Maarten De Schryver, Tom Everaert, Niclas Heider, Helen Tibboel, and Adriaan Spruyt. The meeting was attended by 48 researchers from various European (Belgium, Germany, Great-Britain, Poland, Spain, Switzerland, and The Netherlands) and non-European countries (Australia, Canada, Israel, and the United States of America). In total, more than 90 researchers authored or co-authored at least one presentation or poster.

The meeting started on Friday, May 25, at 10.00 am and ended on Sunday, May 27, after lunch. The scientific program consisted of 27 oral presentations and a poster session (17 posters). The oral presentations were grouped in 9 thematic (plenary) sessions, 4 of which were scheduled to take place on the first day. The first session focused on "Ambivalence" and consisted of presentations by Richard E. Petty (40'), Kenneth G. DeMarree (20'), Frenk van Harreveld (20'), and Jochen E. Gebauer (20'). The second session focused on "Spontaneous Evaluations and Controllability" and consisted of two 30-minute presentations: one presentation by Kate A. Ratliff (30') and one by Karl Christoph Klauer (30'). The third session, consisting of presentations by Bertram Gawronski (30'), Adriaan Spruyt (20'), and Nicolas Koranyi (20'), focused on the "Acquisition and Generalization of Spontaneous Evaluations". The fourth session focused on "Persuasion" and consisted of presentations by Pablo Briñol (20'), Jason K. Clark (20'), and Colin T. Smith (20'). Immediately after these 4 sessions, the poster session took place (90'). Simultaneously, the attendees were regaled with a cava reception in the beautiful patio of Het Pand. The first day of the meeting ended with a conference dinner in the restaurant of Ghent University, also located in Het Pand.

On the second day of the meeting, the scientific program consisted of 3 (plenary) sessions. The theme of the first sessions was "Automatic Evaluation". Presenters were Jan De

Houwer (40'), Torsten Martiny-Huenger (20'), and Russell H. Fazio (20'). In the second session, both Klaus Fiedler and Duane T. Wegener gave a 30-minute talk on "Motivation and Selective Exposure". Finally, in the third and last session of the second day, Geoffrey Haddock (30'), Jochen Gebauer (20'), and Emiko Kashima (20') focused on "The Self". Next, it was time for leisure. After a short walk through the historic city center of Ghent, the complete group was welcomed at the city brewery "Gruut". While tasting 2 different, home-made beers, the group was presented with a (rather funny) exposition about the historic origins of the beer-brewing process as well as the brewery itself. Next, the complete group traveled by boat to a restaurant outside the city center. During this scenic boat trip, the group was presented with historic (and funny) facts about the city of Ghent ... and more Belgian beer, of course. Officially, the social event of this EASP meeting ended with a short boat trip back from the restaurant to the city center around 10 pm.

On the third and last day of the meeting, there were 2 more sessions. The first session focused on "Group Processes" and consisted of presentations by Jeff Stone (20'), Kristof Dhont (20'), Adi Amit (20'), and Roger Giner-Sorolla (20'). The last session of the meeting consisted of two 20-minute presentations by Baruch Eitam and Rene Kopietz on "Motivation and fluency". The meeting ended with a closing discussion, moderated by Geoffrey Haddock. During this discussion, Duane T. Wegener launched the idea of founding a new research society, specifically devoted to the study of attitudes. Such a society would not only help promoting attitude research as a vibrant research area, it will also help intensifying the collaboration and exchange between attitude researchers across the globe. Geoffrey Haddock also announced that both him and Greg Maio, the initiators of this wonderful series of attitude meetings, are considering to organize the 6th EASP Meeting on the Psychology of Attitudes at Cardiff University. Everybody acknowledged that 2020 will be the perfect year to organize a meeting on 20 years of attitude research at the same location as the first meeting. The location of the 5th EASP Meeting on the Psychology of Attitudes (2016) is yet to be determined.

Adriaan Spruyt

Small group meeting on The societal meanings of minority influence
June 6-10, 2012, Delphi, Greece
Stamos Papastamou, Antonis Gardikiotis, Gerasimos Prodromitis

The processes of social change and innovation have been at the core of social psychological research since Moscovici's early theorizing in the late 1960s.

Research in the area has focused, among other things, on a number of key themes such as the interplay between minority influence and dual-process models of persuasion, the importance of indirect, as well as direct, influence, the dynamic character of minority influence in intra-group contexts and the diversity of minority sources (Martin & Hewstone, 2010). The common denominator of all these four themes is the need to bring out the societal dimension and significance of minority influence phenomena.

Within this context, the aim of the meeting was to explore the role of active minorities in the construction and deconstruction of social consensus, by focusing on the influence they exert as well as on the resistance processes triggered against it.

The meeting has brought together researchers from five European countries (Germany, Greece, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom) and the USA. We all met at the Temple of Olympian Zeus near Syntagma Square in Athens on the morning of the 6th of June to begin our journey. The presentations of the first day took place in a small picturesque Greek village, Palaiokerasia, Fthiotida in central Greece. The venue was the old Primary School of the village, nicely prepared by the members of the local council to fit our meeting needs. In the evening of the same day and after a couple of hours we arrived at European Cultural Center of Delphi, our main conference site.

Each speaker had 60 minutes in total, with 20-25 minutes for discussion. This scheme fostered essential and extensive discussions around each paper. The general feeling was that of positive and constructive interactions during discussions that started after each presentation and continued till the end of the day.

The original program consisted of the following talks:

Charlan J. Nemeth (University of California, Berkeley). *Minority influence: Past and future contributions.*

Willem Doise (University of Geneva). *Social Justice and Social Influence*

William D. Crano (Claremont Graduate University). *The leniency contract model of social influence: Distinct processes, distinct outcomes*

Alain Quiamzade & Gabriel Mugny (University of Geneva). *Dissociation vs. self-categorisation theories: Toward an integration*

Fabrizio Butera (University of Lausanne), **Jean-Pierre Vernet** (Universities of Lausanne and Lisbon) & **Jorge Vala**, (University of Lisbon). *Influencing people's (negative) attitudes towards active minorities: The case of feminist movements*

Stephen Worchel (University of Hawaii at Hilo), **Hank Rothgerber**, (Bellarmine University), **Dawna Coutant** (University of Hawaii at Hilo). *The high price of success: The impact of change in size on the influence of the minority*

Robin Martin, **Geoff Thomas** (Aston University), **Miles Hewstone** (Oxford University). *When leaders are in the numerical majority or minority: Differential effects on decision-making.*

Pablo Briñol (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid), **Javier Horcajo** (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid), **Richard E. Petty** (Ohio State University), **Maria Stavraki**, (Universidad a Distancia de Madrid). *Minority influence: New mechanisms and outcomes.*

Stamos Papastamou (Panteion University of Athens), **Antonis Gardikiotis**, (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki), **Gerasimos Prodromitis**, (Panteion University of Athens). *Reconsidering the socio-cognitive processes underlying majority and minority influence*

Ilia Sirigou & Stamos Papastamou, (Panteion University of Athens). *Diachronic consistency against psychologization: Resisting the resistance to minority influence*

Gerasimos Prodromitis & Stamos Papastamou, (Panteion University of Athens). *Implicit theories of social influence: as a key determinant and latent outcome of social influence processes.*

Antonis Gardikiotis, (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki). *The perception of majority and minority influence and their underlying processes*

Radmila Prislín, (San Diego State University). *A case for diversity in minority influence.*

Anna-Lena Majkovic, (Durham University) & **Richard Crisp**, (University of Kent). *Making minority voices heard: The beneficial effects of a diversity priming intervention in negotiation settings*

Deborah Thoben, Hans-Peter Erb, (Helmut-Schmidt-University Hamburg), **Gerd Bohner, Nina Dickel** (University of Bielefeld). *Mind over matter: Target states, not stimulus characteristics, determine information processing in minority influence.*
Juan M. Falomir, Alain Quiamzade & Gabriel Mugny, (University of Geneva). *Promoting reverse discrimination policies: A motivation analysis of minority and majority support to equality and non-discrimination.*

Highlights of the social program of the meeting included: in a way of welcoming reception on the first day we had a memorable dinner at Stamo's place at his house (in Palaiokerasia) overlooking the valley and the sea. Another night, we travelled to Galaxidi, a beautiful small village by the sea, where we had a very pleasing dinner with fresh seafood. On the third day we had a guided tour in the archeological site and the museum of Delphi. Having seen the temples, the theater, the oracle and all the antiquities in that breathtaking natural surrounding no wonder why ancient Greeks thought of that place as the center of the world!

The meeting was concluded by fruitful discussions regarding the state of research in minority influence and it left us with the impression that the meeting advanced the discussion on the study of minority influence and confirmed the significant theoretical and empirical interest in the area.

Stamos Papastamou (Panteion University of Athens)
Antonis Gardikiotis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)
Gerasimos Prodromitis (Panteion University of Athens)

Small group meeting on extreme emotions in human interaction
June 25 -26, 2012, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Marte Otten, Agneta Fischer & Kai Jonas

The meeting was opened by Marte Otten. After this, Agneta Fisher gave a short introduction about extreme emotions, commenting on a number of reasons why this is a topic that has not received much attention, but also highlighting the importance of research into this subject.

Following the short introduction, the first keynote speaker, Eran Halperin, gave an inspiring presentation about a large number of studies highlighting the role of intergroup hatred and other negative emotions in intractable intergroup conflicts. Interestingly, Eran noted that anger is not always a bad thing within intergroup conflict, as it at least ignites people to act instead of retracting (and thus never reaching a solution). Hatred, however, seems to ignite less flexibility in negotiations to resolve conflicts, and more negative views of the other groups that are part of the conflict. Indeed, interventions that reduce feelings of hatred also seem to lead to more support for compromise to resolve conflict.

Nicole Tausch argued that, within an intergroup conflict, feelings of contempt lead to more support for non-normative forms of collective action such as violence and sabotage, while anger is linked to increased levels of support for normative forms of collective anger, such as peaceful marches and petitions. Nurit Schnabel presented evidence that people in an intergroup conflict seem to strive to see their group as powerful and moral. However,

she argued that the sense of power seems to take precedence over the sense of morality, which could explain support of immoral actions against other groups within conflicts. After these three conflict-filled presentations, everyone needed some time to relax at lunch. After lunch, all participants were surprised with a practical workshop on extreme emotions. In this workshop actor and director Fransje Christiaans had everyone experiencing and expressing a whole range of positive and negative emotions. This engaging workshop was an inspiring deviation from the standard format of scientific meetings, in which a topic is often studied from a certain distance, but seldom personally experienced.

Since everyone was completely immersed in their emotional expressivity we were a bit delayed in starting the afternoon session. Luckily, we were able to simply move the whole program up, so that Wilco van Dijk still had his full timeslot to present his research on *schadenfreude*, the experience of feelings of joy upon witnessing the misery of others. Then it was time for the only presentation about a positive extreme emotion, with Rob Nelissen talking about the role of hope in goal-striving. His work shows that hope has unique motivational properties, supporting persistence and protecting against negative feedback. For the last presentation of the day we returned to negative interpersonal interactions, with Elise Seip presenting on the boundary conditions for taking revenge. While everyone enjoyed a drink and some snacks, it was time for the poster session. Six people presented their work in this small and very interactive session. This presented the opportunity for constructive discussion, and people took advantage of that opportunity. Scientific (and other) discussions continued over dinner. With good company, good food and good wine, and only a minor disaster involving an exploding water bottle, lots of gushing red wine and two of the organizers, this dinner turned out to be a great success. In the end, nobody was gravely injured, dry cleaning was arranged, and everyone left for their home or hotel (or to the pub) happily and well fed.

The next morning the second keynote speaker, Eddie Harmon-Jones, started the day with a discussion on anger and its behavioral consequences. Based on a large number of neuroscientific studies, Eddie argued that anger only leads to aggression if there is an underlying approach motivation. In other cases, anger can actually lead to avoidance. David Amodio then presented some of his work showing that anxiety induced by (anticipated) inter-racial interactions can have vast consequences for the ability to exert cognitive control. Marte Otten continued with a study showing that experiencing humiliation through social exclusion is also detrimental to impulse control. As the last speaker before lunch, Lasana Harris still expertly managed to capture the attention of the audience with his work on the effects of contempt and disgust on the brain processes that underlie attempts to get away from disgusting others.

After lunch Kipling Williams gave an entertaining presentation on the vast (negative) emotional consequences of social exclusion. Roger Giner-Sorolla presented a number of studies on the role of disgust, anger and fear on the dehumanization of others. He showed that all these emotions contribute specifically to dehumanization, with disgust leading to animalistic dehumanization and fear leading to mechanistic dehumanization. The last presenter of the meeting, Catalina Kopetz, presented evidence that risk taking can function as a means of emotion regulation for people who experience extreme emotions. After the closing remarks by Kai Jonas, some people went on to have a drink at the pub around the corner, and reflect on all the information that they had gathered during this meeting.

Taken together, the Small Group Meeting on Extreme Emotions in Human Interaction brought together a very diverse group of scientists. As such, this meeting provided a perfect background for inspiring knowledge transfer and constructive discussion.

**Small Group Meeting on Control Experience, Power, and Intergroup Relations
July 2-5, 2012 (Kazimierz Dolny, Poland)
Miroslaw Kofta, Immo Fritsche, Ana Guinote, Marcin Bukowski, Aleksandra
Cichocka**

The EASP Small Group Meeting on *Control Experience, Power and Intergroup Relations* took place from the 2nd to the 5th of July 2012 in Kazimierz Dolny (Poland), a picturesque village ca. 2 hours drive away from Warsaw. On Monday the 2nd of July participants who arrived to Warsaw were received at the Psychology Department at the University of Warsaw and a bus took them to the conference venue in Kazimierz Dolny. In total 39 participants from all over the world took part in the meeting, 20 of which are current members of the EASP.

The conference started with a welcome reception meeting at 8 pm at the Kwadrans Restaurant in Kazimierz Dolny. On the next day morning the scientific programme received the best possible opening in a form of a keynote talk addressed by Susan Fiske (coauthored by Hilary Bergsieker, Deborah S. Holoien, Nicolas Kervyn, & Lisa Leslie) entitled *Power of Positive Speaking: Stereotyping by Omission, Innuendo, and On-Demand*. In her talk, professor Fiske emphasized the indirect impact of stereotypes that takes place when particular stereotypical contents are not explicitly expressed. She argued that stereotyping by omission lets dominant groups to seem nice but keep bias. A set of presented studies proved that communicators omit negativity in describing individuals and groups and listeners infer negativity from this omission. Therefore, it seems that just setting anti-prejudice norms is not enough to deal with existing biases.

After the keynote talk followed the first session entitled *Control deprivation: Basic processes and applications*. In this session Dmitrij Agroskin talked about the control-restorative power of interpretive and vicarious control. In the next talk Marcin Bukowski described various consequences of uncontrollability experiences for cognitive control processes and in the third talk of this session Miroslaw Kofta highlighted the role of implicit negative mood, evoked by uncontrollability, for intergroup judgments. After a coffee break, the session continued with a talk by Sindhuja Sankaran who discussed the role of repetitive success and failure outcomes in experiencing learned helplessness in sports performance. Later on, Guillermo Willis described the effects of perceived insecurity on sense of control using the example of violence linked to the drug trade in Mexico. After a lunch break the next session on *Control, stereotyping and gender* followed. The session started with a talk given by Soledad de Lemus about the activation of resistance goals by women in situations of exposure to stereotypic gender roles. The session continued with a presentation delivered by Anna Studzinska regarding differences in evaluation of male and female sexual harassment perpetrators and perception of harm caused to their victims and finished with a talk by Janina Pietrzak who proposed a conceptualization of ambivalent

sexism as group based control restoration. The last session of the first day regarded the issue of *Control at the collective level* and an opening talk was given by Immo Fritsche who argued that people may act in terms of social instead of personal identity when personal control is questioned in order to restore a global sense of control through the (social) self. Next, Jannine Deppe showed that people who perceive low personal influence and control in their life might be particularly susceptible to social influence from the ingroup. Finally, Tomasz Besta talked about identity fusion, radicalization of attitudes and feeling of agency on group and personal level of self-definition and Aleksandra Cichocka about defensive and genuine group identification in the face of collective trauma. The first day of the meeting ended with a dinner at the Dwa Księżycy hotel and with numerous informal discussions until late night in Kazimierz Dolny.

The second day started with a session on *Power and basic psychological processes*. Ana Guinote gave the first speech in which she showed that power increases reliance on chronically or temporarily accessible constructs that. Mehrad Moeini Jazzani argued that “bikini makes kings impatient”, that is, that power instigates the generalized reward sensitivity. Next, Alice Cai talked about power and multitasking, showing that power holders prioritize one task at a time, whereas powerless individuals prefer to switch between tasks. After a coffee break the meeting followed with the next session regarding *Power and motivational processes*. In the first talk of the session Małgorzata Kossowska argued that powerlessness can decrease one’s efficacy at meeting epistemic needs. In the following presentations Georg Förster talked about the role of autonomy in explaining power-effects on context independent thinking and Joris Lammers claimed that the need for power is a satiable need for personal control. After the lunch break a large two part session on *Power, control and intergroup relations* started. The sessions focused on the mutual influences between power / control and intergroup relations. The first part, that regarded the negative consequences of power relations (“The Dark Side”), Katie Greenaway showed that loss of control can be associated with greater prejudice and social hostility towards a variety of outgroups. In the next presentation Roland Imhoff was tracking individual differences in conspiracy mentality. Jennifer Sheehy-Skeffington provided evidence for the idea of a vicarious experience of control, which means that people experience a sense of control when they see that a position of control is held by another member of their social group. The next part of the seminar, related to the positive effects (“The Bright Side”) of control and power on intergroup relations started with Esther van Leeuwen’s talk, in which she argued that intergroup helping instigates power differentials through attributions of control. In the next talk, Riam Kanso showed how powerful vs. powerless people process feedback from the surrounding environment, using in her research a paired EEG paradigm. Later on, Michał Bilewicz discussed the potential role of empowerment and heroic narratives for reconciliation and intergroup relations after mass violence and genocide. The intensive second day finished with a presentation by Małgorzata Gocławska who sent out to the public an optimistic message that focusing on the benefits of diversity can encourage inter-group contact. After the last session still some time remained to explore the surroundings of Kazimierz (some people even were brave enough to climb the nearby castle despite the stormy afternoon weather). The second day of the meeting came to an end with a dinner and informal meeting all around the beautiful main square in Kazimierz. For the third and last day of the meeting only one session was planned that considered the mutual relations between *Power, emotions and social threats*. The first speaker, Katerina Petkanopoulou examined the effects of power on emotion suppression. Anika Scholl talked about the impact of social power on counterfactual thinking in the face of joint failure and Dominika Mazur closed the session

with her talk about the negative effect of group-affirmation on academic performance under stereotype threat.

The last point of the *Control Experience, Power, and Intergroup Relations* small group meeting was a final discussion. The leading theme of the discussion regarded the basic relations between control and power concepts. The participants emphasized the importance of control in the effects observed in research on power but they also argued that differences between power and control emerge more at the conceptual level rather than the empirical level, having similar effects on cognition and emotion. An interesting asymmetry in power and control research was also pointed out, which is, that power researchers typically discuss the effects of having power, whereas control researchers focus on the effects of lack of control and also focus on control restoration processes. Possible lines of mutual inspiration for control, power and intergroup relations researchers were drawn. In sum, the entire meeting was exceptionally stimulating and thought provoking. It was also very fruitful in terms of bringing together senior and junior researcher with different theoretical backgrounds – from basic control deprivation research, to power and intergroup relation processes. In order to help to create a beneficial environment for future collaborations, on-line forms of knowledge sharing activities were proposed.

We would like to thank the EASP for supporting this exciting and fruitful Small Group Meeting!

The Organizing Team

Small Group Meeting on Social Cognition and Communication
July 9-12, 2012 (Pecs, Hungary)
Janos Laszlo, Joe Forgas, Orsolya Vincze

The Social Cognition and Communication EASP Small Group meeting was held at The University of Pécs, Hungary on a picturesque venue between July 9 and 12. 18 lectures by authors from three continents were presented. Participants represented a nice mixture of established scholars and early stage researchers, as well as researchers contributing to the meeting from the complementary perspectives of social cognition, linguistics and narrative psychology. The principle of gender balance was also followed.

The conference brought together scholars from as diverse perspectives of language and communication research as e.g., evolutionary psychology, social cognition, speech accommodation theory, linguistic category models, intergroup relations, affective influences on linguistic phenomena, psychological correlates of language use, and identity correlates of historical narratives. New methodologies were also presented including cutting edge research on application of info-communication technologies to studying social psychological phenomena.

The program started with a historical and theoretical overview of the question of language and social cognition presented by the organisers. Each presentation was followed by vivid and extensive discussion and the general discussion concluding the conference showed that participants gained numerous new insights during the four days of the conference.

The material of the conference is to be published in the near future in the Sydney Symposium of Social Psychology series by Psychology Press, New York.

János László, Orsolya Vincze and Joe Forgas

Program and contributors

I. Introduction and basic issues

Forgas, J.P. (UNSW), Laszlo, Janos & Vincze, Orsolya (Pecs). Welcome, introductory remarks, and background

Pennebaker, James W. & Chung, Cindy K. (*University of Texas, Austin*). Counting little words in big data: the psychology of communities, culture and history.

Giles, Howard & Gasiorek, J. (University of California, Santa Barbara). Parameters of non-accommodation: refining and elaborating communication accommodation theory.

Laszlo, J. & Ehmann, B. (Hungarian Academy of Sciences). Narrative social psychology.

Fiedler, K. & Mata, A. (Heidelberg University). The art of exerting verbal influence through powerful lexical stimuli.

II. Cognitive and affective influences on communication

Beukeboom, Camiel J. (University of Amsterdam). Mechanisms of linguistic bias: How words reflect and maintain stereotypic expectancies 3.00 – 3.45

Forgas, Joseph P. (University of New South Wales). Feeling and speaking: affective influences on communication strategies and language use.

Kissine, Mikhail & Klein, Olivier (Université Libre de Bruxelles). Models of communication, epistemic trust and epistemic vigilance.

Abele, Andrea A. & Bruckmüller, Suzanne (University of Erlangen-Nürnberg). Are there systematic differences in describing self vs. others in terms of agentic and communal traits?

Koch, Alex, (University of Cologne), Forgas, Joseph P. & Goldenberg, Liz (University of New South Wales). In the mood to break the rules: affective influences on linguistic abstraction and adherence to Grice's conversational maxims.

II. Communication, identity and group processes

Pearson, Adam R. (Pomona College) & Dovidio, John F. (Yale University). Intergroup fluency: How processing experiences shape intergroup cognition and communication.

Crano, William D & Alvaro, Eusebio M. (Claremont Graduate University). Social factors that affect the processing of minority-sourced persuasive communications.

Peters, Kim (University of Exeter) and Yoshihisa Kashima (University of Melbourne). Gossiping as moral social action: A functionalist account of gossip perceptions.

Vincze, Orsolya, Ilg, Barbara (University of Pecs) & Polya, Tibor (Hungarian Academy of Sciences). The role of narrative perspective in the elaboration of individual and historical traumas.

Cooper, Joel & Trujillo, Matthew (*Princeton University*) Multiple meanings of communicative acts in the reduction of vicarious cognitive dissonance.

IV. Social and cultural influences on communication

Maass, Anne, Suitner, Caterina & Merkel, Elisa (University of Padova). Does political correctness make (social) sense?

Fulop, Eva, Cserto, Istvan Ilg, Barbara, Szabo, Zolt, slugoski, Ben and Laszlo, Janos (University of Pecs and Hungarian Academy of Sciences). Emotional elaboration of collective traumas in historical narratives. 11.45 -12.30

Nencini, Alessio (University of Padova). Narrative constructions in Italian identity: an investigation into literary texts over time.

Catellani, Patrizia & Bertolotti, Mauro (Catholic University of Milan). Political communication, social cognitive processes and voters' judgments.

Conclusions and summing up

Small Group Meeting on Reconciliation in intergroup contexts: The divergent perspectives of perpetrator and victim groups**August 31-September 4, 2012 (Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina)****Sabina Cehajic-Clancy & Ruth Ditzmann**

Early in September, a group of social psychologists met in Sarajevo, Bosnia-Herzegovina, for a small group meeting about reconciliation in intergroup contexts. We opened the meeting with Bosnian buffet in the evening of August 31st and ended with Bosnian dinner in the evening of September 3rd. These culinary highlights framed three days of scientific presentations and discussions.

27 social psychologists at the doctoral, postdoc, assistant and full faculty level representing 22 universities in 14 countries actively participated in the meeting. The range of conflict and post-conflict societies where these researchers conduct their research is even larger. Despite this great contextual variety the group repeatedly uncovered psychological processes of relevance everywhere. Rather than chronologically recounting the content of each of 26 very interesting and important presentations this report will summarize three basic themes that emerged as particularly important and spurred a lot of discussion.

First, the perception that one's group was or continues to be a victim or a perpetrator is an important process underlying reconciliation. Shnabel presented current extensions to the needs-based model of reconciliation she had previously developed with her colleagues. The audience learned, for example that the need for acceptance of perpetrator groups, and the need for empowerment of victim groups can be satisfied by third parties. Mazziotta and colleagues provided evidence from Liberia demonstrating that adopting a perpetrator focus beyond a greater need for acceptance and readiness for reconciliation also promotes intergroup empathy. Gausel and colleagues showed that it is the emotion of shame that promotes a desire to seek repair of damaged social relationships when individuals adopt a perpetrator focus. However, individuals are often reluctant to adopt a perpetrator focus on their group because it makes them uncomfortable. Klar and colleagues showed that exposing groups to the narrative of the other group that construes their own group as perpetrators is cognitively depleting for participants. Related to this, Boyle presented data on the effects of minimization of perpetrator group responsibility on willingness towards reconciliation through presentation of different interpretations of in-group responsibility. Saguy and colleagues presented evidence that when members of dominant groups feel wronged themselves they feel entitled which predicts selfish behavior. In Turkey and Burundi, Bilali showed that members of groups that committed mass violence place equal responsibility on both groups and see themselves as victims. She further presented evidence that the mass media has the capacity to change their self-perception as victims. Moving from the macro-level of mass media to the individual level, Cidam and Leach showed that individual's moral self-concept buffers them from moral disengagement at the group level, thus allowing them to ask critical questions about their ingroups' actions. Vaes and colleagues showed that beyond buffering them from disengagement, reconciling with a former enemy can re-humanize the perpetrator and thus has direct, positive effects on the self. Shedding light on the psychology of the victim role, Nahhas showed that a collective sense of victimhood is transmitted between three generations in Palestinians. The young generation adopts a victimhood perspective because of current day inequality but also because of their family's historical experience. Gausel and colleagues showed that fear of others-condemnation promotes the desire for revenge in individuals with a victim

focus. Beyond debating perpetrator and victim roles, victimhood by itself can also be competitive. McNeill showed that it is sometimes used instrumentally to obtain resources. Vollhardt and colleagues specified and provided evidence in six survey studies that it is exclusive victim consciousness that predicts negative outcomes. Inclusive victim consciousness in contrast, predicts higher levels of intergroup closeness. Overall the small group meeting showed that it should be fruitful for our field to further our understanding of perpetrator and victim roles and the psychological processes that ensue from identifying with these social roles.

A second topic of discussion was intergroup apologies. As Hornsey and colleagues explained even though there has been a stark increase in the number of collective apologies in recent years they are often far from effective. Goto and Philpot presented data from Japan showing that regardless of whether they were innocent victims or perpetrators who apologized both parties, namely Japanese whale catchers and Sea Shepherd wailing protestors, were blamed and not forgiven for a collision incident. Hornsey and colleagues presented evidence that a causal relationship between apologies and forgiveness is limited. In order to be effective apologies have to be framed appropriately, for example in terms of primary rather than secondary emotions. Cehajic-Clancy and Brown presented evidence that apologies are linked to forgiveness if they are combined with no emotions and reparation offers. Perhaps, this particular combination is perceived as non-instrumental, which would be consistent with Berent and colleagues presentation. According to their presentation, perceptions of non-instrumentality are an important condition for collective apologies to reduce collective punishment. Wohl and Hornsey ended the session on collective apologies by reconciling these and other, often contradictory findings on the topic by presenting their staircase model for effective intergroup apologies.

A third main theme of the conference was collective emotions. Collective, self-conscious emotions, such as shame, guilt and regret were considered in many of the presentations at the small group meeting. A few presentations, such as Imhoff and Bilewicz's, made intergroup emotions the specific focus of their presentation. Imhoff and Bilewicz presented evidence that guilt leads to a willingness to compensate victims whereas regret leads to a greater openness to intergroup contact. In his presentation, Rees distinguished between image shame that is concerned with how others view the group and moral shame that arises from the belief that ones group has violated an important moral value. One important take-away message was that image shame predicts forms of apologies that close the chapter (e.g., one time payment) while moral shame predicts gestures of moral obligation (e.g., erection of monument). In an in-depth discussion some of the present scholars contended that more empirical evidence on collective emotions is necessary, while others argued for a theoretical integration of existing evidence. Finally, the perception of emotions or absence of emotions in others also seems to play an important role in reconciliation processes. Leidner and colleagues presented works suggesting that the perceived emotional depth attributed to others increases support for conflict resolution by negotiation rather than political violence.

The conference program featured several additional presentations, for example, two presentations on intergroup contact. Tropp and colleagues showed that positive intergroup contact predicts positive beliefs about out-group intentions, greater support for reconciliation and greater optimism for future relations. Dittmann and colleagues demonstrated the important role of the implicit power motive as an individual difference variable that could perhaps predict whether intergroup dialogues about past injustice will

be a positive contact experience. In addition, the important role of macro-processes, such as the media emerged in many of the presentations. Kopf-Beck's work explicitly focuses on how different format of visual holocaust representations (documentaries) inadvertently promote anti-Semitism today. While providing a broad and in-depth discussion of the psychology of reconciliation Bar Tal's closing speech also focused on the importance of macro-level variables, such as the media, political and social institutions and the importance of integrating them into social psychological research.

The psychology presentations were complemented by Bosnian political scientist, Adnan Huskic who gave an introduction to the political situation of Bosnia Herzegovina. Our small group learned even more about the current political situation and how residents of Sarajevo cope with the past: during a screening of the award winning documentary "Interrogations" and Q&A with film director Namik Kabil; a visit to the Srebrenica Photo Exhibition and Q&A with photographer Tarik Samarah and a presentation on the art of memory and reconciliation by historian and art director, Nihad Kresevljakovic from Modul Memorije, Sarajevo. A visit to the Sarajevo Tunnel museum provided a hands-on encounter with the past. At this memorial site visitors have the opportunity to see and enter a tunnel that was built during the siege of Sarajevo. This tunnel facilitated food supply from the neighboring countryside and helped some residents to escape. Our tour-guide provided a vivid account of history with many anecdotes from her own experience as a child during the siege of Sarajevo. She also gave us insight into the current struggle of coming to terms with the past and building trust between different ethnic communities. Many of the meeting participants were first time visitors to Sarajevo and reported an intense and profound experience in a city where the past war and ongoing struggle for reconciliation, forgiveness and healing are palpable. We learned about the notion of an unfinished war, unburied Dead, and distrust in the international community. These first hand experiences reinforced the importance of our research and encouraged us to expand our empirical research to the Balkans, thus far an under-researched area.

Finally, during a city tour, Bosnian dinner and buffet and in our bed-and-breakfast- style hotels we enjoyed Sarajevo's rich cultural heritage and religious diversity including over 100 mosques, quaint coffee shops and restaurants in romantic, candlelight patios. We drank coffee from beautifully ornamented silver jars in matching mugs and, woke up to the calling of the Muezzin. Overall, the small group meeting on reconciliation in intergroup contexts was a fruitful event that should spur further research and academic discussions and left a lasting impression on participants.

News about Members

In memoriam Dancker Daamen (December 16, 1951 – September 27, 2012)

We are deeply grieved by the sudden death of our dear colleague, **Dr. Dancker Daamen**.

Dancker was a student of social psychology at Leiden University, where he completed his studies in 1979. He worked at the Kohnstamm Institute (University of Amsterdam), and the 'Hogeschool Haarlem'. As of 1980 he held different positions at Leiden University, and was employed as a lecturer at the Social and Organizational Psychology group since 1984. He completed his PhD at Leiden University in 1991, on a thesis entitled: 'Range and skewness effects in survey interviews'.

During many years he was active as a board member of our national Association of Social Psychological Researchers (ASPO), and was involved in editing the proceedings of its annual meeting.

In the research group on Energy and the Environment, Dancker made an effort to approach very practical issues concerning energy use and environmental conservation – such as risk assessment - in a rigorous scientific way. He combined his societal engagement with his extensive knowledge of psychological research methods to address important societal issues.

Colleagues in the Netherlands and abroad know Dancker as a highly involved, critical, and sincere researcher, who was not easily satisfied, but made an enthusiastic effort to contribute to the resolution of the problems he identified. He was a mentor for many students and young researchers.

Dancker enjoyed life. He was a warm person who voiced explicit views, but also showed a consistent interest in new people and novel ideas. He was passionate about his work, but also about other important activities in his life. Perhaps sailing was his greatest passion.

We will miss Dancker as an enthusiastic researcher, committed teacher and mentor, and especially as a highly involved and much beloved colleague.

*Social and Organisational Psychology Group,
Leiden University*

New Members of the Association

The following applications for membership were approved by the Executive Committee in October 2012. Names of members providing letters of support are in parentheses:

Full Membership

Dr. Elizaveta BEREZINA
Moscow, Russia
(I. Bovina, M. Sachkova)

Dr. Michèle BIRTEL
Manchester, UK
(R. Crisp, M. Hewstone)

Dr. Olivier CODOU
Nice, France
(W. Doise, G. Schadron)

Dr. Nelly COURVOISIER
Lausanne, Switzerland
(I. Gilles, C. Storari)

Dr. Wendy DE WAAL-ANDREWS
Tilburg, The Netherlands
(C. Sedikides, I. van Beest)

Dr. Nadira FAULMÜLLER
Oxford, UK
(A. Mojzisch, R. Kerschreiter)

Dr. Ana FIGUEIREDO
Coimbra, Portugal
(L. Licata, J. Valentim)

Dr. Eerika FINELL
Helsinki, Finland
(K. Liebkind, K. Helkama)

Dr. Nicolay GAUSEL
Fredrikstad, Norway
(V. Vignoles, C. Leach)

Dr. Marleen GILLEBAART
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(J. van der Pligt, A. Fischer)

Dr. Malogorzata GOĆLOWSKA
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(C.K.W. de Dreu, R. Crisp)

Dr. Aiden GREGG
Southampton, UK
(C. Sedikides, T. Wildschut)

Dr. Jens H. HELLMANN
Münster, Germany
(G. Echterhoff, U. Kühnen)

Dr. Marie JUANCHICH
Kingston, London, UK
(K.H. Teigen, A. Smeding)

Dr. Kuba KRYS
Lodz, Poland
(B. Wojciszke, A. Kwiatkowska)

Dr. Tim KURZ
Exeter, UK
(M. Ryan, K. Peters)

Dr. Anca MINESCU
Limerick, Ireland
(A. O'Donnell, A. Haslam)

Dr. Alice NORMAND
Poitiers, France
(J.-C. Croizet, A. Chatard)

Dr. Ravid NUSSINSON
Raanana, Israel
(B. Seibt, T. Schubert)

Dr. Daniela RENGER
Kiel, Germany
(B. Simon, A. Bachmann)

Dr. Leonie REUTNER
Basel, Switzerland
(M. Wänke, R. Greifeneder)

Dr. Bastiaan RUTJENS
Vancouver, Canada
(J. van der Pligt, M. Barreto)

Dr. Roxane SAINT-BAUZEL
Metz, France
(D. Bourignon, V. Fointiat)

Dr. Sabine G. SCHOLL
Mannheim, Germany
(H. Bless, R. Greifeneder)

Dr. Sana SHEIKH
St. Andrews, UK
(S. Reicher, N. Tausch)

Postgraduate Membership

Konrad BOCIAN
Warsaw, Poland
(B. Wojciszke, W. Baryla)

Igor BRONIN
Yekaterinburg, Russia
(E. Belinskaya, E. Dubovskaya)

Tim FABER
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(K. Jonas, J. Förster)

Christine HEINEN
Hagen, Germany
(K. Jonas, A. Rohmann)

Mickaël JURY
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(C. Darnon, A. Smeding)

Judit KENDE
Budapest, Hungary
(M. Kovács, A. Minulescu)

Alexandra KRAUS
Aarhus, Denmark
(D. Wigboldus, K. Rothermund)

Ana LEITE
Porto, Portugal
(M. Cameira, I. Pinto)

Loes MEEUSSEN
Leuven, Belgium
(K. Phaet, N. Vanbeselaere)

Maartje MEIJS
Tilburg, The Netherlands
(M. Stel, J. Lammers)

Marlon NIEUWENHUIS
Cardiff, UK
(T. Manstead, T. Postmes)

Emma PAPE
Reading, UK
(N. Hall, L. Lepore)

Stuart READ
Exeter, UK
(M. Ryan, T. Morton)

Anna STEFANIAK
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Bilewicz, M. Lewicka)

Katerina TSANTILA
Athens, Greece
(A. Hantzi, S. Stathi)

Orkin YETKILI
Kent, UK
(S. Husnu, R. Giner-Sorolla)

Grants

Thijs Bouman (travel grant)
Susanne Bruckmüller (travel grant)
Isabelle Goncalves (seedcorn grant)
Ana Rita Farias (travel grant)
Lisa Horvath (travel grant)
Yashpal Jogdand (travel grant)
Hans Marien (travel grant)
Namkje Koudenburg (travel grant)
Marco Rego (travel grant)
Lee Shepherd (seedcorn grant)
Anouk Smeekes (travel grant)

Grant reports

Emma A. Bäck
Stockholm University
Seedcorn grant

Receiving the EASP seed corn grant made it possible for me to visit Professor Carsten de Dreu at University of Amsterdam for three months. The aims of the visit were to a) develop one of my own projects, b) start up new collaborations, c) learn more how the work is organized and conducted at the Work- and organizational division at the University of Amsterdam.

When it comes to developing my own project, I have worked with Professor de Dreu and associate professor Frenk van Harreveld. The underlying idea was that challengers of the status quo display lowered tolerance for others deviating opinions than do defenders of the status quo. I have previously done several studies on this, and it was part of my thesis. However, the weak spot in my earlier studies was that participants themselves chose their own position on different social attitude issues (such as prohibiting religious symbols in schools or allowing gay couples to adopt). Thus, the aim during my visit was to design an experiment where we tried to manipulate participants' attitudes and thereby their choice of position (for or against the status quo). This is also what we did, and we are currently analysing the data from this project.

The second aim was to become involved in an ongoing project and broaden my own research interests on group decision-making, which was also a part of my thesis. With respect to this, I have become part of a project on intergroup competition and decision-making together with Femke ten Velden, Matthijs Baas, Daniel Sligte and Professor de Dreu. I have learned a lot during our meetings and data for this project is about to be collected during the next months. I am really looking forward to continue this work.

The third aim was to learn more about the way of working at the Work- and organizational division. During my stay, I have been participating in lab meetings, group meetings and meetings planning for lab use. This has been very rewarding to me in terms of learning how the work in this department is organized and executed. My goal is to try to implement at least some of the forms of working together and combining experiments to maximize efficiency when I return to Sweden. I believe that just observing and learning about the ways of working will benefit me and my research in the future.

As a side note, I have also taken the opportunity to meet with researchers in other areas that are of interest to me while in the Netherlands. Thus, I have made other connections that I hope will bear fruit in the future. With that said I want to thank Professor Klandermans and Marjoka van Doorn for your friendly and open approach, and taking the time to meet with me and discuss ideas.

Taken together, I am very happy to have been given the opportunity for this visit and I believe that it has been very instructive. I am also glad to have found new research collaborations that I hope will last and develop into other research projects in the future.

Aleksandra Cichocka

University of Warsaw, Poland

Travel grant

Thanks to the EASP Travel Grant I was able to visit the Centre for Psychological Research and Social Intervention (CIS – IUL) of the Lisbon University Institute between May 5th and June 16th 2012. The purpose of my visit was advancing and completing some of the ongoing projects which I have been developing with dr. Agnieszka Golec de Zavala, a Marie Curie Fellow at the centre.

During my stay we focused our work on the concept of collective narcissism - an emotional investment in an unrealistic belief about the in-group's greatness - aiming to explain how feelings about an in-group shape hostility toward out-groups (Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, Jayawickreme, & Eidelson, 2009). We were predominantly working on two manuscripts. We finalized a revision of a paper that presents research on the role of collective narcissism in moderating responses to group threats. In a series of experiments we show that collective narcissism predicts direct, retaliatory hostility toward the out-group that offend the in-group but not toward non-offending out-groups. We also prepared a draft of a new manuscript reporting longitudinal research on the Polish national identification before and after the Smolensk airplane crash. In this paper we demonstrate that Polish collective narcissism (but not non-narcissistic national identification) increased after the catastrophe. This effect was driven by experience of loss of control associated with this collective trauma. Aside from working on the manuscripts, we designed a website of the concept of collective narcissism which is available at: <http://cbu.psychologia.pl/cn/> Moreover, we discussed my other projects, including my dissertation research. I benefited greatly from dr. Golec de Zavala's insightful and supportive comments on my work.

During my visit I was also attending weekly meetings of the Groups, Cognition and

Intergroup Relations (GCIR) lab, where I was invited to present my work. I received invaluable feedback from all the lab members. I found discussions with Professor Sven Waldzus especially helpful in thinking both about my research and future career steps. While in Lisbon, I also had an opportunity to consult with members of other social psychological labs located in the city (e.g. the Institute of Social Sciences of the University of Lisbon).

My stay coincided with a workshop on Inequality and Violence organized by CIS-IUL in the honour of professor Maria Benedicta Monteiro. At the workshop, I was pleased to present a talk on the curvilinear relationship between system justification and political participation (co-authored with John Jost). The conference was not only a great exchange of scientific ideas, but also a wonderful way to learn more about the history of social psychology in Portugal, and in Europe more broadly.

Last but not least, the travel grant gave me the opportunity to experience the beauty of the city of Lisbon and the amazing Portuguese culture. The coffee, the wine and pasties de nata will be missed greatly.

I would like to express my gratitude to Agnieszka Golec de Zavala, the whole GCIR group and my other Portuguese friends for their great hospitality and scientific support. I also wish to thank EASP for making this visit possible. Finally, I thank Sibylle Classen for her invaluable help, patience and kindness while assisting this, and many other, EASP projects.

Małgorzata Gocłowska
University of Kent, UK
Travel grant

Counter-stereotypes and creativity.

Increasing social and cultural diversity is a critical issue that Europe faces today. One of the hallmarks of European diversity is that people are entering groups that defy stereotypic expectations. Women become top politicians (e.g., Angela Merkel, the female chancellor of Germany), Brits retire in Spain, and Russians (Andre Geim & Konstantin Novoselov) win a Nobel Prize while working in the UK. From a psychological point of view these are instances of societal diversity that defy stereotypic expectations.

Challenging stereotypes can have profound consequences to how people think and construe their social reality (Crisp & Turner, 2011). My PhD tested this idea by looking at whether forming impressions of counter-stereotypic individuals can boost creative performance. I found that counter-stereotypes can induce more flexible and creative thinking, but that these effects are warranted by certain conditions. From past literature we know that when individuals feel uncomfortable about a challenge to stereotypic expectations, impressions of counter-stereotypic individuals are built in a piecemeal, individuating and resource-consuming fashion (Hutter, Crisp, Humphreys, Waters, & Moffitt, 2009). We also know that creativity is hampered when cognitive resources are scarce (De Dreu, Nijstad, Baas, Wolsink, & Roskes, 2012), leading to the prediction that while exposure to counter-stereotypes can boost creativity in those comfortable with counter-stereotypic stimuli, it could also lead to creative decrements in those who are

averse to uncertainty and lack of structure. In line with these ideas I found that counter-stereotypes elicit a flexible thinking mindset when using tasks that do not tap on cognitive resources (Gocłowska, Crisp, & Labuschagne, 2012), and in participants who are low in Personal Need for Structure (Gocłowska & Crisp, 2012).

Following up from this research I became interested in the more general question of whether exposure to inconsistent information can boost creativity, and what personality or social factors can moderate that influence. During my PhD I gained expertise in intergroup relations and prejudice, but I had not had much exposure to academics researching creative thinking. The ideal lab in which I could learn more about this type of work would be the Conflict and Creativity Lab at the University of Amsterdam (UvA), lead by Professor Carsten De Dreu. I met Professor De Dreu during the EASP Summer School in 2010, and talking to him convinced me that we should start collaborating. De Dreu's work on creativity is highly cited and, in terms of empirical findings, had excellent fit with my research interests. For instance his recent paper demonstrated how important working memory capacity is to creative performance (De Dreu et al., 2012), supporting my own findings on how, following impression formation of counter-stereotypes, creativity drops in high PNS participants.

I applied for an EASP travel grant by the end of 2011, and visited UvA for one week in April 2012, and for a short follow-up visit in June the same year. These meetings have been very fruitful: I gave a talk in the department, attended several meetings and discussed my research with creativity and organizational behaviour researchers from the lab. The many inspiring discussions we had helped me to develop new research ideas and learn about creativity measurement. More importantly we developed a new line of research and designed four experiments that we plan on running in September 2012, and I am currently pre-testing materials that we will use in these experiments. Luckily, around the time of receiving the travel award I had also learnt that I would begin a postdoc in Amsterdam in autumn 2012. This means that we now have funding to continue the projects that my EASP funded trip has kick-started. The support from the EASP has been invaluable at this stage of my career: it allowed for a smooth transition from my PhD to postdoctoral research.

References

- Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2011). Cognitive adaptation to the experience of social and cultural diversity. *Psychological Bulletin, 137*(2), 242-66. doi:10.1037/a0021840
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Nijstad, B. a, Baas, M., Wolsink, I., & Roskes, M. (2012). Working Memory Benefits Creative Insight, Musical Improvisation, and Original Ideation Through Maintained Task-Focused Attention. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin.* doi:10.1177/0146167211435795
- Gocłowska, M. A., & Crisp, R. J. (2012). On counter-stereotypes and creative cognition: When interventions for reducing prejudice can boost divergent thinking. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, in press.*
- Gocłowska, M. A., Crisp, R. J., & Labuschagne, K. (2012). Can counter-stereotypes boost flexible thinking? *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, in press.*
- Hutter, R. R. C., Crisp, R. J., Humphreys, G. W., Waters, G. M., & Moffitt, G. (2009). The Dynamics of Category Conjunctions. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 12*(5), 673-686. doi:10.1177/1368430209337471

Daniël Lakens

Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands
Travel Grant

With the support of the EASP I was able to visit Dr. Ruud Custers at University College London in June 2012 through a postdoctoral travel grant. The purpose of this visit was to work out theoretical ideas about the mental representation of goals, and to translate these research ideas into testable hypotheses. Recent studies have highlighted the circumstances under which goals can be automatically activated through associations between the goal and positive primes (Custers & Aarts, 2005). Goals are represented as desired states, but how such desired states are automatically activated and can still be flexible and adaptive is an important challenge for future research (Custers & Aarts, 2010). Recent theoretical advances have proposed that working memory plays an essential role in automatic goal pursuit, because 'It allows for flexible, context-sensitive representations of the environment, as well as for the creation of new cognitive representations' (Hassin, Aarts, Eitam, Custers, & Kleiman, in press).

The question is how these flexible, context-sensitive representations of the psychological meaning of goals emerge. Indeed, this question has been identified as "one of the next challenges that social-cognitive psychologists will face in the near future." (Fischbach & Ferguson, 2007, p. 491). The aim of visit was to initiate a research collaboration that will examine this fundamental question and combine findings from research on automatic goal pursuit with recent insights into how people mentally represent psychologically meaningful concepts. Together, Ruud and I discussed ways to investigate the importance of relational structures in the mental representation of goals. During very pleasant and inspiring meetings, these ideas were subsequently translated into concrete experiments. The goal is to perform some of these experiments in the next few months, and use these first explorations as the based for a collaborative research grant proposal to be submitted in the beginning of 2013.

Although my primary reason to visit UCL was starting the research collaboration described above, I also had extremely interesting discussions about theoretical ideas and research with several of the researchers at UCL. Prof. Dr. Julio Santiago was a visiting scholar at UCL during my visit, and we had several meetings where we discussed theoretical ideas about the mental representation of relational concepts, a research interest we both happen to share. We have each performed an experiment to test our (opposing) predictions in relation to these theoretical ideas, and I have learned a lot from our enjoyable discussions over coffee or dinner. Furthermore, I discussed empirical work on movement synchrony with Dr. Daniel Richardson, who is the director of the eye think lab at UCL.

Taking some time to further develop theoretical ideas I had been working on for the last few months in a new environment with excellent researchers who are experts in their field was a great educational and motivating experience. The research collaborations I started at UCL will hopefully lead to interesting results in the future, but have in any case been an important opportunity for me to develop as a scientist. UCL is a vibrant research community with outstanding researchers, and the many nearby pubs provide a very

enjoyable way to talk about research after (or sometimes, during) working hours while enjoying the city of London.

References

- Custers, R., & Aarts, H. (2005). Positive affect as implicit motivator: on the nonconscious operation of behavioral goals. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *89*(2), 129-42. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.89.2.129
- Custers, R., & Aarts, H. (2010). The unconscious will: how the pursuit of goals operates outside of conscious awareness. *Science*, *329*(5987), 47-50. doi:10.1126/science.1188595
- Fishbach, A. & Ferguson, M. F. (2007). The Goal Construct in Social Psychology. In A. W. Kruglanski & T. E. Higgins (Eds.) *Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles*. (pp. 490-515). NY: Guilford.
- Hassin, R. R., Aarts, H., Eitam, B., Kleiman, T., & Custers, R. (in press). Non-conscious goal pursuit, working memory, and the effortful control of behavior. In E. Morsella, P.M. Gollwitzer, & J.A. Bargh (Eds.), *The psychology of action (Vol. 2)*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gert-Jan Lelieveld

University of Leiden, The Netherlands
Travel grant

The EASP postgraduate travel grant allowed me to visit the lab of dr. Lasana Harris at Duke University for two months. The grant enabled me to start a fruitful cooperation with Lasana Harris. The main goal of my visit was to work on an fMRI project for which I collected data before my visit. This project focused on the brain regions associated with the exclusion of other people. At the Boundaries of Social Cognition (BSC) lab of Lasana Harris, I analyzed the fMRI data that I collected in the Netherlands and started writing the paper.

Although before my visit I did have experience with running fMRI studies, my knowledge of the software to analyze fMRI data was insufficient. Dr. Lasana Harris is not only a collaborator on the project, but also has considerable knowledge of software that can be used to analyse fMRI data. Also, he has lots of experience in writing a neuro-imaging article. These were two project-related reasons for me to visit his lab. He helped me to analyze the fMRI data and taught me a lot about social neuroscience.

Another important aim of my visit to Durham was to broaden my scientific network. Duke University has a vibrant research environment and houses some excellent scientists in the field of Brain and Society. During my stay I actively participated in the research meetings of the BSC lab and attended all social psychology and neuropsychological activities. Another reason for my visit was that besides the BSC lab, other labs at Duke University also use various measures of neurophysiological processing, such as fMRI (functional magnetic resonance imaging), EEG (electroencephalogram), cardiovascular measures and EMG (electromyogram). These labs use these measures for entirely different

purposes than I am used to. For instance, to study monkey behavior or non-social behavior. I learned a lot from these labs by attending their lab meetings.

At the Social and Affective Neuroscience conference in New York, I presented the work that I analyzed at the BSC lab. Researchers that attend this conference are experts on the field of social neuroscience. The researchers were all very interested in the results that we obtained and based on their positive feedback, I am confident that we can get the paper that we will finish writing published in a high impact journal.

Finally, I started several new projects with Lasana Harris, but also with other researchers that go to Duke University. My visit was thus not only useful for the project that I worked on at the BSC lab, but I also got enough ideas for future research. I enjoyed my time at Duke and I got to meet knowledgeable and passionate researchers.

Thanks to the EASP for making this trip possible.

Lolita Rubens

Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense University, France

Travel grant

Supported by an EASP travel grant, I was recently given the opportunity to visit Pr. Olivier Corneille at the Catholic University of Louvain-La-Neuve (UCL, Belgium). My three-month stay was a postdoctoral experience and the main goals of my visit were to discover a new laboratory, its everyday functioning and to develop fruitful collaboration with Olivier Corneille. We worked on different projects while I was there. On the one hand, we worked on a paper dealing with applied social psychology / pro-environmental behavior. On the other hand, we developed two experiments with Karl-Andrew Wolpin. The starting point of the two experiments was a paper about physicians' recommendations for patients when different treatments were available (Ubell, Angot, & Zikmund-Fisher, 2011). The results showed that physicians choose different treatments for themselves than they would recommend to their patients: they tended to choose the procedure with higher mortality rate (and a lower rate of adverse effects) for themselves, but recommend to their patients to choose the procedure with the lower mortality rate. As Olivier Corneille and Karl-Andrew Wolpin worked on level of construal theory and local vs. global mindset, we wonder if this difference in recommendations could be due to different ways of handling information. We conducted two experiments to test this hypothesis. In the first one, participants who were students from the UCL were asked to complete a Navon task before choosing between two procedures (higher rate of mortality / lower rate of adverse effects vs. lower rate of mortality / higher rate of adverse effects). Moreover, they had to choose for them or for another student. In the second study, we asked participants to choose between two procedures for themselves vs. another student from the UCL vs. another student from another university. It was very interesting and inspiring to experience a different research climate and profit from the expertise of people at the UCL.

Besides the possibility of working with two scholars, I truly enjoyed participating in many activities of the lab. I regularly participated in "labgroup" meetings and had the chance to

attend many excellent talks from a very diverse set of speakers and on a wide range of themes. I also presented my work in a seminar. I felt truly welcomed in all those activities. I really enjoyed getting to know other graduate students, our lunches in the *cafet'* were great moments.

Apart from those academic achievements, this stay in Belgium allowed me to discover Brussels as I lived there for three months. It is a wonderful city, very animated. Living abroad was a new experience for me and I really loved it. I had the opportunity to eat exquisite waffles and fries, see the Manneken Pis, walking through the Grand Place every day to go to work and attend a wonderful Brussels play at the puppet theatre Toone. I also discovered Louvain-La-Neuve which is a pedestrian city and where there is always an event to attend. I think that this campus must be very inspiring for all the students there. All in all, my stay in Belgium was a very valuable and fruitful experience. Not only did it give me the chance to collaborate with Olivier Corneille and Karl-Andrew Wolter, it also allowed me to meet wonderful people. I want to express my gratitude to Pr Olivier Corneille and the members of his lab and other members of the department for their very warm welcome, the enjoyable discussions and the great cooperation. And I would like to thank the European Association of Social Psychology for enabling this visit and Sibylle Classen for her kindness.

Caterina Suitner
University of Padova
Seedcorn grant

Metaphors and Group perceptions

Thanks to the EASP Seedcorn Grant, I had the opportunity to start a research project studying metaphors in relation to stereotypes and group perceptions.

Metaphors are here defined as figures of speech in which relatively concrete, tangible concepts (referred to as "*source domain*") are used to represent more abstract concepts (referred to as "*target domain*"). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999) states that metaphors are a tool of thought rather than of language, and that they have a crucial role in the cognitive management of abstract concepts. Several metaphors are used in everyday language to describe social groups, ranging from basic spatial metaphors (*down* for clinically depressed and *out of their mind* for mentally ill) to references to the animal world (*beast* for criminal offenders, *apes* for African American, or *loan-sharks* for Jews). Nonetheless, the study of metaphors from a social psychological perspective is at the moment very limited.

The basic idea of the present project was that metaphors are so common in intergroup discourse because they are powerful social tools, as they allow generalizations across all members of a given category while at the same time communicating very concrete and vivid images (Gibbs, 2008). The main research question of the present project is whether metaphors are a powerful social tool for creating and maintaining stereotypes. This issue was addressed from two different perspectives, namely analyzing the spontaneous use of

metaphors in relation to immigration in newspapers articles and the impact of metaphoric labels on target and group perception.

METAPHORS AND IMMIGRATION IN NEWSPAPERS ARTICLES:

Two archival studies were conducted on newspaper articles published in Italy. The first study focused on newspapers describing crimes committed by Italian vs. Immigrant offenders, the second focused on articles facing the issue of immigration in general. The content analyses of the articles of the first archival study confirmed that metaphors are strategically used to describe crimes committed by Italian and Immigrant offenders, with the first group of criminals being associated to the image of *explosion* (e.g., “the fight exploded, burning of anger”) and the second group being associated with the concept of *beast* (e.g., “The beast attacked the victim”). This difference is interesting because *explosion* metaphors might reduce the responsibility of Italian criminals, whereas *beast* metaphors might enhance the entitativity of the crime-immigration association. This interpretation is currently under investigation using an experimental design. The second archival study confirmed the use of two main metaphors to describe immigration, namely immigration as *war* (e.g., “Italy is currently facing an invasion of immigrants”) and immigration as *natural catastrophe* (e.g., “Italy is currently facing a flood of immigrants”). The use of these metaphors was particularly common among articles published in conservative newspapers. A subsequent experimental study investigated the consequences of the use of such metaphors by presenting participants with a journal article in which immigration was metaphorically described either as *war* or as *natural catastrophe*. The presentation of immigration in terms of *war* (vs. *natural catastrophe*) promoted the preference for an enforcement approach (e.g., strengthening borders) rather than a policy approach (e.g., implementing effective channels of legal immigration) to manage immigration.

METAPHORS AND SOCIAL PERCEPTION

The second line of research focused on the role of metaphoric labels on target and group perception, hypothesizing that metaphors facilitate the attribution of stereotypical characteristics a) to the described target and b) to the social group.

The first step of this research line consisted in creating a database of metaphors that described characteristics that apply to persons or groups (such as functioning like a Swiss clock for a precise person). A list of 146 metaphors was pretested in order to identify the social groups that are associated with the metaphors and the corresponding literals of the metaphors. This database served to build the experimental material of the following two studies.

STUDY 1: Imaginability and group representativeness

In order to test whether metaphors facilitate the imaginability of social groups, social targets (e.g., a lawyer) were labelled either with a metaphorical nickname (e.g., “the shark”), its corresponding literal (e.g., “the merciless”) or without nickname (control condition). Participants were asked to indicate how easy they could imagine the target, how representative the target was of his/her respective group. The results confirmed that compared to both a literal correspondent and a control condition, the metaphorical nickname enhanced the imaginability of social target and its representativeness of the group. Unexpectedly, the experimental condition did not affect the attribution of stereotypical characteristics to the targets.

STUDY 2: Target vs. group perception

In Study 1 the hypothesized effect of metaphors of target perceptions was not confirmed. In Study 2 this was further investigated by comparing the effect of metaphors on the perception of targets and the social group to which the target belonged. The social targets were persons with psychological disorder and were presented either stressing their condition with a metaphoric label (e.g., “Maria the breadstick”) or with a literal correspondent (e.g., “Maria the skinny”). Both the target (in the example Maria) and the social group (i.e., people suffering psychological disorder) were then evaluated on warmth, competence and morality (see Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007 and Leach, Ellemers, & Barreto, 2007). In line with the previous study, the experimental condition did not affect of the social target in terms of stereotypes. Importantly, there was a significant effect of experimental manipulation on the perception of the social group, with metaphoric labels worsening the evaluation of the group compared to the literal correspondent in all the three investigated dimensions.

Together the findings confirmed that metaphors are spontaneously and strategically used to represent social groups. Importantly, the role of metaphors on stereotyping seems to affect more the evaluation of groups than single targets. Even if this issue remains to be further explored it suggests a potential role of metaphors as social tool for stereotype communication and maintenance.

Thanks to this Seedcorn Grants metaphors are studied for the first time in relation to social processes offering important implications both from a theoretical and a practical perspective. Indeed, the theoretical function of metaphors and specifically of social metaphors is under-investigated and the understanding of the function of metaphors for social cognition is a key question firstly addressed here. Moreover, the results have concrete implications in terms of communication strategies, since the frequent use of social metaphors in everyday language and in the media may contribute to the status quo maintenance and to promote prejudice.

Acknowledgment:

First of all I wish to thank the European Association of Social Psychology for funding this project. I would also like to thank Anne Maass and Luciano Arcuri for collaborating in this project. Indeed part of this work is reported in the chapter titled **The role of metaphors in intergroup** written together with Anne Maass and Luciano Arcuri, to appear in *Metaphorical Thought in Social Life* edited by Mark J. Landau, Michael D. Robinson, and Brian P. Meier. Finally, I would like to thank Angela Alessandrini, Serena Benincà, Stefano De Giorgi, Martina Muratore and Alice Sandri for their contribution to the project.

References

- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11, 77–83.
- Glusksberg (2008), How metaphors create categories – quickly. In R. W. , Gibbs (Ed.). *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Leach, C. W., Ellemers, N., & Barreto, M. (2007). Group virtue: The importance of

morality (vs. competence and sociability) in the positive evaluation of ingroups.
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93, 234–249.

Claire Zedelius

Utrecht University, The Netherlands
Travel Grant

With the support of an EASP travel grant, I attended the SPSP conference in San Diego and spent three month at the University of California Santa Barbara (UCSB), where I conducted research with Prof. Jonathan Schooler. This visit was a valuable and inspiring experience at a critical time in my doctoral studies. I would like to thank the EASP for making this visit possible. I would also like to thank Prof. Schooler and the other members of his lab for giving me such a warm reception as well as a very interesting intellectual exchange.

Through our many interesting discussions, I gained a broader perspective on the topic of consciousness, which will add to my dissertation research. My thesis research, conducted with Prof. Henk Aarts and Dr. Harm Veling, deals with the role of consciousness in the regulation of goal-directed behavior. Specifically, we investigated the effects of conscious and unconscious (i.e., subliminal) reward presentation in different performance contexts. Recent research has shown that unconsciously perceived reward cues can improve effortful cognitive performance just as consciously perceived reward cues do (e.g., Bijleveld, Custers, & Aarts, 2009; 2010; Pessiglione et al., 2007; Zedelius, Veling, & Aarts, 2011). However, there is also evidence for unique effects of conscious reward processing (Bijleveld, Custers, & Aarts, 2010; 2011). Interestingly, our research shows that, compared to unconscious reward processing, conscious reward processing can at times be disadvantageous for successful performance. Findings suggest that because conscious perception of rewards allows for conscious reflection on the value of a reward, consciously perceived high value rewards can actually distract attention from an ongoing task and thereby disrupt performance (Zedelius, Veling, & Aarts, 2011). These findings relate well with research being conducted in Prof. Schooler's lab investigating mind-wandering, a state in which the content of consciousness is decoupled from one's primary task (e.g., Schooler et al., 2011). I was therefore very glad for the opportunity to work with Prof. Schooler and learn more about these related topics.

During my visit, I had many opportunities to participate in seminars and meetings around the topic of consciousness, approached from various angles. I attended a class on consciousness held by Prof. Schooler in a very interactive style for a small group of PhD students, which gave rise to long and in-depth discussions. I also attended meetings of a monthly reading group, in which junior and senior researchers from different disciplines discussed articles addressing psychological and philosophical perspectives on consciousness. These meetings were truly inspiring due to the breadth of divergent information covered. I also attended weekly lab meetings in which ongoing research projects related to consciousness and mind-wandering were discussed. In one of the lab meetings, I had the opportunity to present my dissertation research, which led to an interesting discussion on conscious and unconscious processes in the motivation of goal-directed behavior.

Next to these theoretical discussions, I also had the chance to get involved with a research project that connects to a recent study by Benjamin Baird and colleagues, which investigated the effect of mind-wandering on creativity. Previous research has shown that, when a creative task is interrupted by an unrelated task (a so-called incubation period), subsequent performance is often enhanced (Smith & Blankenship, 1989). The study by Baird and colleagues (in press) suggests that mind-wandering may play a role in this “incubation effect”. That is, they found that creative performance was enhanced following interruption by a task conducive to mind-wandering, but not following a more demanding task that limited mind-wandering. A likely explanation for this finding is that mind-wandering enhances creativity by increasing associative processing (see Cai et al., 2009). If this explanation is true, however, mind-wandering may be detrimental for creative performance in situations where creative problem solving is complicated by the presence of contextual cues that lead to incorrect solutions. In such situations, increased associative processing might increase the likelihood that people use these cues and arrive at the wrong solution. During my stay at UCSB, I collected data on a first study investigating this issue. The project is currently still going on, and I hope that it will yield interesting results. Being involved in this project was especially interesting, because it taught me a lot about the different academic cultures in the USA and the Netherlands.

All in all, my stay at UCSB was very positive and enriching. Santa Barbara is a beautiful place with a charming campus, where it is easy to feel at home. I was lucky to meet many interesting people who shared a great passion for research. I am especially grateful to Jonathan Schooler and the EASP for enabling this great experience.

References

- Baird, B., Smallwood, J., Mrazek, M. D., Franklin, M. S., & Schooler, J. (in press). Mind-wandering facilitates creative incubation. *Psychological Science*.
- Bijleveld, E., Custers, R., & Aarts, H. (2009). The unconscious eye-opener: Pupil size reveals strategic recruitment of resources upon subliminal reward cues. *Psychological Science*, *20*, 1313-1315.
- Bijleveld, E., Custers, R., & Aarts, H. (2010). Unconscious reward cues increase invested effort, but do not change speed-accuracy tradeoffs. *Cognition*, *115*, 330-335.
- Bijleveld, E., Custers, R., & Aarts, H. (2011). Once the money is in sight: Distinctive effects of conscious and unconscious rewards on task performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *47*, 865-869.
- Cai, D. J., Mednick, S. A., Harrison, E. M., Kanady, J. C., & Mednick, S. C. (2009). REM, not incubation, improves creativity by priming associative networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *106*, 25, 10130.
- Pessiglione, M., Schmidt, L., Draganski, B., Kalisch, R., Lau, H., Dolan, R. J., & Frith, C. D. (2007). How the brain translates money into force: A neuroimaging study of subliminal motivation. *Science*, *316*, 904-906.
- Schooler, J. W., Smallwood, J., Christoff, K., Handy, T. C., Reichle, E. D., & Sayette, M. A. (2011). Meta-awareness, perceptual decoupling and the wandering mind. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *15*, 319-326.
- Smith, S. M., & Blankenship, S. E. (1989). Incubation effects. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, *27*(4), 311-314.

Teasdale, J. D., Proctor, L., Lloyd, C. A., & Baddeley, A. D. (1993). Working memory and stimulus-independent thought: Effects of memory load and presentation rate. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, *5*, 417-433.

Zedelius, C. M., Veling, H., & Aarts, H. (2011). Boosting or choking - How Conscious and unconscious reward processing modulate the active maintenance of goal-relevant information. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *20*, 355-362.

Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Executive Officer by **March, 15th, 2013** latest. Applications for grants and for the International Teaching Fellowship Scheme can be received by the deadlines end of March, June, September, and December. The deadline for the next issue of the Bulletin is **March, 15th, 2013**.

The next Executive Committee Meeting will take place in May 2013.

Executive Committee

Manuela Barreto (Grants), College of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter EX4 4QG, UK
e-mail: m.barreto@exeter.ac.uk

Mara Cadinu (Grants), D.P.S.S., University of Padova, Via Venezia 8, I-5313 Padova, Italy
e-mail: mara.cadinu@unipd.it

Fabrizio Butera (President), Institute of Social Sciences - SSP - Vidy, University of Lausanne, CH 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
e-mail: Fabrizio.Butera@unil.ch

Xenia Chrysochoou (Meetings), Department of Psychology, Panteion University, Syngrou Av. 136, Athens 176 71, Greece
e-mail: chrysochoou@eekpsy.gr

Alex Haslam (Journals), School of Psychology, University of Exeter, Exeter EX4 4QG, UK
e-mail: A.Haslam@exeter.ac.uk

Sabine Otten (Secretary), Dept. of Social and Organizational Psychology, University of Groningen, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, NL-9712 TS Groningen, The Netherlands
e-mail: s.otten@rug.nl

Daniël Wigboldus (Treasurer), Department of Social Psychology, Radboud University Nijmegen, PO Box 9104, NL 6500 HE Nijmegen, The Netherlands
e-mail: d.wigboldus@psych.ru.nl

Executive Officer:

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

website of the EASP:

<http://www.easp.eu>