

1 Editorial

3 President's Corner

4 Opinions and Perspectives

Scientific fraud: lessons to be learnt *by Wolfgang Stroebe*

13 Situation of Social Psychology in European Countries

Spain: "How to keep social-psychological research alive and well in times of European financial crisis? A perspective from Spain *by Soledad de Lemus*

Greece: When less just means less *by Tilemachos Iatridis*

Ireland: Does Austerity bite? *by Orla Muldoon, Aisling O'Donnell, Clara O'Shea, Catherine Naughton & Stephen Walsh*

Portugal: How to keep social-psychological research alive and well in times of European financial crisis? A perspective from Portugal *by Ricardo Borges Rodrigues*

11 European Journal of Social Psychology Update

by Tom Postmes and Ernestine Gordijn (Editors)

25 New Publications by Members

Intractable Conflicts: Socio-Psychological Foundations and Dynamics, 2013, *by D. Bar-Tal*

Restoring Civil Societies: The Psychology of Intervention and Engagement following Crisis, 2012, *by K.J. Jonas. & T. Morton*

Sommes-nous tous racistes ? (Are we all racists ?), 2012, *by J.-Ph. Leyens*

Sommes-nous tous des psychologues? Nouvelle édition remaniée et augmentée (Are we all psychologists ? New revised and augmented edition), 2012 *by J.-Ph. Leyens and N. Scaillet*

Analysing identity: Cross-cultural, societal and clinical contexts, 2012, *by Peter Weinreich and Wendy Saunderson (Eds.)*

29 Future EASP Meetings

Small Group Meeting on Psychological Perspectives on Collective Victimhood and its Consequences for Intergroup Relations, June 25-27, 2014, Verona, Italy

Small Group Meeting on Culture and Psychology: Insights from the European Context, July 5-7, 2013, Leuven, Belgium

17th General Meeting of the EASP, July 9-12, 2014, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

EASP Summer School 2014, August 17-30, 2014, Lisbon, Portugal

33 Reports of Previous Meetings

EASP-SPSSI Joint Meeting: Proactive Behavior across Group Boundaries: Seeking and Maintaining Positive Interactions with Outgroup Members, November 29 - December 2, 2012, Port Jefferson, New York

36 News about Members

In memoriam Janez Bečaj (June 1943 – October 2012)

In memoriam Adrian Neculau (1938 – 2012)

New Members of the Association

43 Grants and Grant Reports

57 News from the Executive Committee

EASP membership fees, *by Daniël Wigboldus, Treasurer*

Reaching out together: Towards European funds for Social Psychology, *by Manuela Barreto, European Liaison Officer*

60 Announcements

EASP Summer School 2016: In search of a location

Jos Jaspars Awards – Call for Applications

Kurt Lewin Awards – Call for Nominations

62 Deadlines for Contributions

63 Executive Committee

Editorial

Dear colleagues and friends,

Please take some time to read through the current volume of the European Bulletin. As you will see, it is full of relevant news that deserve your attention. Let me pinpoint a few:

In our section “Opinions and Perspectives”, you will find a contribution by Wolfgang Stroebe titled “Scientific fraud: lessons to be learnt”. This piece follows up on previous contributions by Amélie Mummendey (Spring-Bulletin, 2012) and Fritz Strack (Fall-Bulletin 2012), who have reflected on the causes and consequences of the fraud committed by Diederik Stapel. Wolfgang Stroebe now critically discusses whether our field has indeed changed in reaction to this so very disturbing affaire, and what might be the most effective means to prevent fraud-cases in the future.

There is another section in the present Bulletin that I consider especially relevant, namely the one headed “Situation of Social Psychology in European countries”. The economic crisis has struck Europe considerably, and has affected more or less all its countries. Budget cuts are common place in many domains, and universities are not an exception to this rule. Obviously, some countries are facing more problems than others, and, given EASP’s mission to promote Social Psychology in Europe, we should take effort to be aware of and take measures if members may face hardships. Therefore, as a first step, we asked – mostly young – members from four European countries that are especially struggling with the economic crisis, to tell us about their current situation and their ideas on “How to keep social-psychological research alive and well in times of European financial crisis?” All four reports, from Greece, Ireland, Portugal, and Spain, respectively, give a both thoughtful and moving insight in the difficulties that our colleagues in these countries are currently facing, but also in their passion for Social Psychology and their strong motivation to keep on doing good research. The discussion on what EASP can and should do for members facing such difficult circumstances is still in its very beginnings, but two points are already noteworthy: One point is that we suggest a change in the structure of our fees in a way that does more justice to the changing situation in our various member countries, and that will make it easy for members to get reduced fees when in financial trouble. On page 47/48 our treasurer, Daniel Wigboldus, describes this suggestion in more detail. A second point is that we strongly encourage our young members, and especially those from European countries struggling with economic hardship, to keep in mind our Association’s grant opportunities, be it for supporting relevant travel for international exchange (travel grant), be it for supporting a specific research activity in the context of postdoctoral research (seedcorn grant), or for organizing international meetings to facilitate cooperation and exchange. The enthusiastic

reports by members that have been awarded such grants – in the present and also earlier volumes - only underline that it is worth applying for such support.

There is much more relevant information and food for thought in this Bulletin, such as an update on the situation of EJSP (by the two chief editors, Tom Postmes and Ernestine Gordijn), additional information about the 2014-General Meeting in Amsterdam and about the next Summer School in Lisbon, old and new Meetings organized by members, and, and, and

Take your time and realize that a lot is going on in Social Psychology in Europe.

I wish you all a wonderful summer!

Sabine Otten

President's Corner

Dear colleagues and friends,

As I write this President's Corner, the international news report that several European countries have finally decided to put the unemployment rate of our young citizens at the forefront of the political agenda. Their Ministers of Economy and Employment have publicly recognized that overlooking the situation of 14 million youths without a job, with unemployment rates exceeding 50% in some countries, has the potential to disrupt a whole generation, and have prepared a series of important measures aiming at addressing this issue in a coordinated way. Whether these measures are appropriate and sufficient is a matter of political economy, but recognising the problem is an important step towards change.

Young European scholars in Social Psychology are typically not in the age range considered by the statistics of youth unemployment, but the question of the future of young social psychologists in times of crisis is nevertheless one of utmost importance. I have tackled this problem already in a previous President's Corner? Our Secretary's Editorial in this issue already devoted a fair share of its space to this problem? Well, this should show how important we think this problem is, and how much effort the Executive Committee is investing in trying to mitigate the consequences of the general economic crisis in the very limited range of activities that are under its control. Let me focus on two initiatives.

The first consists of proposing a new membership fee structure, as also pointed out in the Editorial. This is an important change that allows overcoming the impasse I mentioned in the Spring 2012 issue of EBSF, when I pointed out that our membership fees were no longer adapted to a changing Europe, and that the EC could not find an adequate replacement for the present structure. The new fee system, presented in this issue by our Treasurer, is a simpler and especially more flexible system, based on the assumption that all the members will recognise the need for a more dynamical representation of solidarity. Economic crises tend to create uniform landscapes; I strongly believe that there will be no diversity in social psychological research without solidarity.

The second initiative has targeted the difficulties encountered by social psychologists to obtain European research funds, which is particularly important for scholars who work in countries where the national support to basic research has melted down to unprecedented levels. Again, this is not a new commitment of the Executive Committee, and you might have read Manuela Barreto's past report on the challenges that this endeavour represents. Please, make sure that you also read Manuela's follow-up piece in this issue. What is new, however, is that the EC has realised that European Social Psychology needs to display a consistent and tireless effort to follow all the opportunities to be more visible at the level of

European funding institutions. In recognition of this need, we have decided to create the position of “European Liaison Officer” within the EC, by giving this task to one of the Grant Officers. In ancient times it was believed that *nomina sunt omina*, and I hope that giving this new name to one of the EC Officers (and all the work that goes with it...) will be the precursor of a strengthened position of Social Psychology within European funding agencies.

Yours sincerely,

Fabrizio Butera
President, EASP

Opinions and Perspectives

Scientific fraud: lessons to be learnt

Wolfgang Stroebe¹

Utrecht University and University of Groningen, the Netherlands

The recent fraud cases in social psychology stimulated a flurry of analyses of what our field should do to minimize the risk of fraud in future (e.g., Chambers & Sumner, 2012; Crocker & Cooper, 2011; Mummendey, 2012; Roediger, 2012; Stroebe, Postmes & Spears, 2012a,b). In addition to introducing regular courses on research ethics, the two main structural solutions that were suggested were the facilitation of replications of studies and the implementation of strategies that would increase the accessibility of data sets. Although we have no solid data on the prevalence of fraud in our discipline, even less dramatic fraud cases than that of Stapel seriously undermine the credibility of our discipline. It is therefore important to discourage fraud by increasing the risk of detection. However, before we implement strategies aimed at reducing fraud, we need to be convinced that these strategies are effective.

Facilitation of replications. It is widely accepted that encouraging replications would increase our ability to detect fraud. For example, Crocker and Cooper (2011) argued: "Despite the need for reproducible results to drive progress, studies that replicate or fail to replicate others' findings are almost impossible to publish in top scientific journals. This disincentive means fraud can go undetected, which was the case with Stapel". Similarly, Roediger (2012) argued "that if others had tried to replicate his (Stapel's) work soon after its publication, his misdeeds might have been uncovered much more quickly". Along the same lines, Chambers and Sumner (2012) wrote: "Replication is our best friend because it keeps us honest. In science, false results have a short (albeit potentially damaging) lifespan because regardless of how they come about, other scientists won't be able to reproduce them. On the other hand, true results will be replicated time and time again by different scientists." Finally, Mummendey (2012, p. 7) goes even further and suggests: "Scientific journals could expand their already high standards of the peer review system by adding the requirement for a thorough external replication. Authors submit their manuscript together with their data. Once the publication has been approved by a preliminary group of reviewers, the editors invite suitable experts to attempt a replication of the results. After this has been accomplished, both the original manuscript and the replication study are published together."

This general trust in the value of replication as a fraud detector is another example for the truism that truisms are not always true. When we analyzed recent fraud cases in order to detect how fraud is typically discovered, my colleagues and I were surprised to find that replication failure played only a negligible role in the discovery of fraud cases (Stroebe et al., 2012a). Defenders of the value of replications as an instrument of fraud detection would probably argue that this was another indication for the need of more replications in science. But the problem was not the paucity of replications, but the fact that there are

¹ Author's Note: Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Wolfgang Stroebe, Department of Psychology, Utrecht University, PO Box 80140, 3508 TC Utrecht, The Netherlands. Phone: +31302531470. Fax: +31302534718. E-mail: w.stroebe@uu.nl. The author is grateful to Henk Aarts, Kai Epstude and Fritz Strack for helpful comments on an earlier version of this article.

always numerous reasons for failures to replicate. Therefore failure to replicate cannot be seen as an indicator of fraud. More often such failures are due to lack of detail in the description of experimental procedures or to undiscovered moderators. To give only one example, for many years the classic study of Festinger and Carlsmith (1957) was difficult to replicate until it was discovered that freedom of choice and negative consequences were necessary for counter-attitudinal advocacy to arouse dissonance.

Although single failures to replicate findings might not be informative, one could expect that meta-analyses that statistically summarize multiple replications would play a major role in fraud detection. In the fraud cases we reviewed, one meta-analysis raised alarm bells and yet was ineffective in uncovering the fraud (Stroebe et al., 2012a). In 2001, Kranke, Apfel, Eberhart, Georgieff, and Roewer published a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials of the use of the antiemetic "granisetron" for preventing postoperative nausea and vomiting. Their findings clearly showed that the results published by Yoshitaka Fujii and his group, who had conducted most research in this area, were significantly different from data published by all other research groups. Although Kranke et al. (2001) explicitly stated that they could see no difference between these sets of studies that could explain the difference in findings, Fujii was allowed to publish fraudulent data for another decade. With 172 articles fraudulent or questionable, he is presently the record holder on the list of the most significant fraud cases (Stroebe et al., 2012a).

In the meantime, I came across another example that is less blatant but even more relevant in the context of the Stapel fraud. In 2004 DeCoster and Claypool published a meta-analysis of priming effects and reported that the effect sizes were larger in studies conducted in countries outside the United States and Canada¹. The authors wrote: "We had not a priori expectation that nationality would moderate priming effects; moreover, there is little reason to believe that the underlying psychological principles responsible for assimilation, anchoring, or correction effects would differ cross-culturally. We therefore suspect that these effects simply reflect idiosyncratic differences between U.S./Canadian labs and those elsewhere." With hindsight, one striking difference is that Stapel was first author on 7 of the 10 assimilation studies, on 6 of the 7 anchoring contrast studies and on 2 of the 3 correction contrast studies that were responsible for the nationality effect. Was this reason to suspect fraud? Probably not. In fact, one has to admit even now that these differences could have been due to differences between laboratories.

This meta-analysis further illustrates another important point, namely that even successful replications cannot be seen as indication that the original result was not based on fraud. Since fraudsters are typically careful in suggesting plausible hypotheses, it is likely that their hypotheses are supported by empirical studies. Quite a few of the Stapel articles included in this meta-analysis are identified as fraudulent in the final report of the three committees that had been appointed to investigate the Stapel affair (Levelt, Drenth & Noort, 2012). And yet, even though Stapel may have been somewhat overenthusiastic in improving the data, his findings have been replicated by other authors. As Stapel wrote in his autobiography, he was always pleased when his invented findings were replicated: "What seemed logical and was fantasized became true" (Stapel, 2012).

I should emphasize that I am not arguing against replications. Clearly, information about multiple failures to replicate a study is important because it suggests that a given finding is

¹ I am grateful to Kai Epstude for pointing out this meta-analysis

not very reliable or stable (for whatever reason). Therefore the recent creation of a website, where researchers can upload and view results of replication attempts in experimental psychology is a useful initiative (PsychFileDrawer.org, 2012), even though it is difficult to decide on the basis of a brief summary how, or how well a given study was done. But while failure to replicate might indicate that findings in a given area are difficult to reproduce, they cannot and should not be taken as indication of scientific misconduct.

Increasing the accessibility of data sets. Because the rules of the APA publication manual clearly specify that authors should share research data with others on request (e.g. American Psychological Association, 2010), there would seem no need to make data sets publically available. However, authors are often reluctant to share their data. For example, Wicherts, Borsboom, Kats and Molenaar (2006), who contacted the corresponding authors of 141 articles published in psychology journals, reported that most authors failed to send their data. They only received a quarter of the data sets they had requested.

There are many reasons, why people are unwilling or unable to provide their data, most importantly because getting the files into a shape that makes them understandable to others costs time and effort. And yet, it is highly likely that fraudsters would have been particularly unwilling to comply with such a request.¹ Inventing a data set for a large factorial study is an extremely complex business and fraudsters, who attempt to do this, frequently make mistakes. Thus, the Levelt/Drenth/Noort committees (2012) used statistical methods (so far undisclosed) to identify those articles of Stapel, which were fraudulent.² We also know that the students at Tilburg university, who first suspected Stapel's fraud, found it suspicious that the reliability of some of the scales in the data sets he provided were low in relation to the effect sizes that were reported in some of the studies. Because this is not necessarily an indication of fraud, it was more telling that Stapel also made the mistake of copying rows of data of a set of participants in one study on to the data set of another study. Obviously, most of these mistakes could easily have been avoided, but then the invention of data sets would become more cumbersome than actually running the study and collecting the data.

The availability of data sets would also facilitate the application of statistical methods designed to expose scientific possible fraud. Such methods have been used by Simonsohn (2013) in identifying problems suggesting fraud in the articles of Smeesters and Sanna after carefully and elaborately analyzing the data of several studies and papers. (Both researchers had to resign from their university positions). Other methods of statistical fraud detection have been suggested (e.g., Diekman, 2007, 2010; Mosimann et al., 2002). For example Benford's law refers to the frequency distribution of digits in many real life sources from house numbers, the length of rivers around the world. It also applies to any

¹ One of the authors, who did not send the requested data set was Diederik Stapel. He wrote that he was too busy to do so. The request was for an article that has been retracted in the meantime. (Jeltje Wicherts, personal communication).

² In a rejoinder to criticism of the original report, Drenth, Levelt and Noort (2013) wrote: "The report has been praised for its thorough analysis of the complete oeuvre, 137 publications, of Stapel. The scientific record in social psychology can now be cleansed of all 55 fraudulent papers (co-) authored by Stapel, of another 10 papers with serious evidence of fraud and of 10 (at least partly) fraudulent dissertations completed under Stapel's supervision. This sets a new standard for the investigation of other cases of scientific misconduct." Since the report lacks an appendix in which the statistical methods by which Stapel's oeuvre was analyzed and the criteria that were used to identify fraud are described in detail, this statement may be somewhat premature.

group of data obtained carrying out measurements (Torres, Fernandez, Gamero & Sola, 2007). According to Benford's law, the number 1 occurs as the first digit in such measurements 30% of the time and the number 2 17.6% of the time, whereas the number 9 appears only 4.6% of the time. The law, which appears to be useful in detecting financial fraud cases, has recently been used to compare two anesthesia papers retracted for falsification with articles that were not retracted (Schuepfer, Hein, Konrad & Steiner, 2012). The authors found that the distribution of first and second digits in numbers reported in those papers deviated significantly from the Benford distribution. No deviations were found in control papers that (presumably) were not fraudulent.

Another indicator can be the inconsequential components of data sets that are not directly related to the scientific conclusions of an experiment, such as the numbers behind the decimal point, when series of means or standard deviations are reported to many positions after the decimal point in an article. In that case, these digits should show a uniform distribution. This is often not the case in fraudulent data sets (Mosimann, Dahlber, Davidian & Krueger, 2002). It is quite likely that more of this type of methods exist or could be developed. However, before applying them for the purpose of fraud detection, it still needs to be clarified how well such methods discriminate between fraudulent and non-fraudulent research (e.g., see comments on the use of Benford's law by Diekmann & Jann, 2010).

Although making data sets of published studies generally accessible is probably the most effective way of discovering fraud (and thus also a good deterrent), it will not be a perfect safeguard. One objection is that fraud will only be detected, if there are colleagues, who are motivated to check these data sets. Another objection raised by an editor of major social psychology journal is that "if a fraudster engaged in less 'clumsy' fraud than in the Stapel case (e.g., using simulation software to generate data instead of making up data oneself), examining the data per se would seem unlikely to identify the problem." But even though Stapel made some serious mistakes when faking his data sets, with the development of multiple indicators, it will become more and more difficult to avoid all of these pitfalls. Furthermore, there is some indication that he sometimes took short-cuts and did not even bother to construct the whole data set. The requirement to provide complete data sets would therefore make fraud not only more risky but also much more effortful.

Making data sets publically available would have other important advantages. If the data sets contained information about the stimulus material used, as well as all the measures taken in a study and the texts of all the instructions given, replications would become easier and more likely to be successful. This requirement would also discourage questionable research practices such as failing to report experimental conditions that did not work or not reporting findings on measures that were not supportive of the conclusions drawn in a study. The request that all dependent measures should be reported in a publication is unrealistic, because it would lengthen articles unduly. Furthermore, if these measures were irrelevant or had low reliability, it makes sense not to report them. Public availability of the data set would allow others to check whether these variables were indeed irrelevant. Therefore one of the most effective deterrents against fraud would be for journals to require authors on acceptance of their manuscript to submit a file with data (in anonymous form), as well as a codebook. They should also be required to submit descriptions of all conditions, manipulations, and measures taken in a study. This information should then be available as an electronic appendix to the article in the same way as some supplementary material is already made available these days.

What measures have been taken to reduce scientific fraud?

Since social psychological research methods are sophisticated and courses on research ethics form part of the social psychology training in most universities, we thought that we were doing everything right. The Stapel fraud was a wake-up call that in a system based of trust, there can always be people violating this trust. There was therefore great hope that the discipline would institute additional measures to reduce fraud, most importantly, require public accessibility of data sets for published research. When the executive director of the APS, Alan Kraut (2012) wrote in an article that APS was considering "online data repositories" for their journals, many of us hoped that such repositories would be introduced in the near future. It was therefore disappointing to read in a report of the SPSP Task Force on Responsible Conduct in Research (2012) of which Alan Kraut is a member that "Data sharing advances science, and should be encouraged but not (yet) mandated", because there is "Too much resistance at this stage". Apart from logistical problems and the protection of participants, a major concern appears to be that the originators of the data might not receive credit, if there should be publications ensuing from the data source. While these are legitimate concerns, they appear not insurmountable. After all, major funding agencies have for years had the requirement that the data of major studies they have funded should be publically available.

This resistance is also surprising, because a few months after the meeting of this subcommittee, Miles Hewstone and I (in our capacity as editors of the *European Review of Social Psychology*), received an e-mail from the Advisory Board of the Social Psychology Network (that has some personnel overlap with the SPSP Task Force on Responsible Conduct in Research) informing us that the Social Psychology Network "released an easy way for its profile holders to archive data sets and associated files ... and to link uploaded files to specific research articles." We were urged "to adopt a policy in which authors are required to archive their data between the time the article is accepted and the time of publication".

Although Miles and I are in favour of such a requirement, it did not seem very relevant for *ERSP* as a review journal, because the primary data reviewed in our journal have previously been published. However, even if the requirement had been more relevant, there would have been reasons for us to hesitate. Most importantly, despite high rejection rates, journals do compete for (good) authors. Therefore, if one journal would singlehandedly introduce such a requirement, while other journals did not, this journal would be likely to experience a significant drop in submissions. In addition, there are also historical precedents suggesting that it can be risky for editors to singlehandedly increase the requirements for manuscript submitted to their journal. When Tony Greenwald became editor of *JSPS* in 1976, he outlined additional requirements to authors in an editorial that was far ahead of its time (Greenwald, 1976). Although he did not request complete data sets, he asked for "one copy of the summary tables ... for the major analyses reported in the manuscript" and for "one copy of a statement of the research procedures in sufficient detail to serve as a guide for conduct of an exact replication of the reported research". There was an uproar in the field against these measures. As a result, APA relieved him of his editorship after 4 years of his 6 year term, even though they had originally agreed to his editorial policies. Thus, neither the fact that there is resistance to such policies, nor the fact that the heads of our professional associations yield to such pressure is new.

For these reasons the mandatory requirement for authors submit their data to journals on acceptance of an article for publication can only be introduced, if it is done as a coordinated action by all major journals in a given discipline.¹ Since nearly all of the journal titles in social psychology are owned by a small number of professional organizations (e.g., APS, APA) these organizations could and should take a leadership role in introducing such measures.

Whereas our professional organizations appear to shirk the responsibility of taking any action on this issue, many Dutch universities have been active in developing policies of mandatory data archiving for published articles. For example, several research groups at Utrecht University are busy with the introduction of two policies: First, all the data collected in computer labs will be automatically duplicated to a second server and stored there sealed. Second, the stimulus material and the data for studies that are included in dissertations or accepted for publication by a journal will be stored on a server at the university library. This would relieve individual researchers of the responsibility to guarantee the availability of published data and make excuses such as crashed hard disks a matter of the past. Whereas developing and implementing these policies takes time, they are likely to be adopted by many universities in the Netherlands.

I am not aware that such policies are being adopted by universities in other countries, except for the University of Michigan, where similar policies have been instituted. But there have been several initiatives to offer the possibility of data storage to researchers on a voluntary basis. For example, the Open Science framework (<http://openscienceframework.org/>), which was originally started as a project to collaborate in replicating psychological studies to assess their degree of replicability, offers data storage space and so does Social Psychology Network (<http://www.socialpsychology.org>). Because fraudsters would be foolish to volunteer their data for open access, these initiatives, which operate on a voluntary basis, are unlikely to aid the discovery of research fraud,

Although it is important that research facilities require data storage for all research that is being published, such measures may not be sufficient. First, as long as only a few universities institute such changes, it does not guarantee the general accessibility of the data of published studies. Second, even though this assures the availability at least of data of some of the studies, it does not assure easy access: All requests for data will have to be directed to the author of a study, who will still have the freedom to not respond to such a request. If an author leaves academia, he or she might have little incentive to act on such a request. Furthermore, in such a case it might even be difficult to contact that author in the first place. All of these are reasons, why the data should (also) be stored by the journal and accessed through the journal.

One common characteristic of many of the fraud cases reviewed by Stroebe et al. (2012) is that the fraudsters wasted millions in research money, which the funding agencies were unable to reclaim. One would therefore expect that these agencies would be keen to institute measures to ascertain that their funds are well spent. One way of doing this would be to conduct research audits of research groups on a random basis. Medical fraud cases are easily discovered when audits are being conducted, because medical research either involves patients or animals and therefore leaves a trace. Non-clinical psychological

¹ It is interesting to note that the European Journal of Social Psychology now requires that "researchers are to make their data available to the editor when requested".

research typically does not leave much of a trace (except perhaps receipts of money paid to participants). And yet, audits would still be effective in cases of fraud. For example, the Stapel fraud would have been easily discovered during such an audit, if the auditors had required the names of the schools at which much of his research had (allegedly) been conducted or the names of the (non-existent) research assistants, who collected the data for the study about disorder in railway stations and prejudice (Stapel & Lindenberg, 2011). It is puzzling that European research funding organizations do not seem interested in taking such actions (even though in the Netherlands they hire accountant bureaus to audit the financial accounts).

Conclusions

Most social psychology researchers expected that the Stapel case would bring the prevention of scientific misconduct to the top of the agenda in our discipline. And it did for a while. There was a flurry of activities and numerous committees met to discuss the changes that needed to be instituted to deter fraud and to create a more open research context. But as so often, all that talk resulted in very little action. After the shock has worn off, we seemed to have returned to business as usual. Naturally, researchers have become more aware that some research practices are indeed problematic and should be avoided in future. It is also likely that even more courses on research ethics will be offered in future. But there have been few structural changes aimed at reducing the risk of fraud. To my knowledge, the Netherlands are the only country where there is a broad movement by research institutions to introduce requirements for mandatory data storage to reduce the risk of scientific misconduct (closing the Stapel door, after the horse has escaped). However, as long as the rest of the world does not follow suit, this will be a drop into the research ocean.

Obviously, the requirement of mandatory data storage for all published research by journals will not eliminate scientific fraud. Scientific fraud is as old as science itself and like fraud in society in general (which might even be more destructive to social and economic welfare), will never be eliminated. The gains of scientific fraud are too great and the risk of being caught too small. However, an increase in the accessibility of the data of all published research would considerably increase the risk of fraud detection. It is probably the single most effective measure we could introduce. It is therefore disappointing that scientific organizations such as APS or APA, whose major source of income is from journals and who should therefore be interested in preventing the publication of fraudulent articles, do not seem interested in introducing such a measure as part of their future publication policy.

References

- American Psychological Association (2010). *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*. Sixth Edition. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Chambers, C. & Sumner, P. (2012). Replication is the only solution to scientific fraud. *The Guardian*, September 14. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/sep/14/solution-scientific-fraud-replication>
- Crocker, J., & Cooper L. (2011). Editorial: Addressing scientific fraud. *Science*, 334, 1182. doi:10.1126/science.1216775. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencemag.org.proxy.library.uu.nl/content/334/6060/1182.full>

- DeCoster, J., & Claypool, H.M. (2004). A meta-analysis of priming effects on impression formation supporting a general model of information biases. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8, 2-27
- Diekmann, A. (2007). Not the first digit! Using Benford's Law to detect fraudulent scientific data. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 34, 321-329.
- Diekmann, A. & Jann, B. (2010). Benford's law and fraud detection: facts and legends. *German Economic Review*, 11, 397-401.
- Drenth, P., Levelt, P, Noort, E. (2013). Rejoinder to commentary on the Stapel fraud report. https://www.commissielevelt.nl/wp-content/uploads_per_blog/commissielevelt/2013/02/The-Psychologist.pdf
- Festinger, L., & Carlsmith, J. M. (1959). Cognitive consequences of forced compliance. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59, 203-210.
- Kranke, P., Apfel, C., Eberhardt, L.H., Georgieff, M. & Rower, N. (2001). The influence of a dominating centre on a quantitative systematic review of granisetron for preventing postoperative nausea and vomiting. *Acta Anesthesiologica Scandinavia*, 45, 659-670.
- Kraut, A. (2012). Despite occasional scandals science can police itself. *Chronicle of Higher Education* <http://chronicle.com/article/Despite-Occasional-Scandals/129997/>
- Levelt, P., Drenth, P. & Noort, E. (2012). Flawed science: The fraudulent research practices of the social psychologist Diederik Stapel. https://www.commissielevelt.nl/wp-content/uploads_per_blog/commissielevelt/2013/01/finalreportLevelt1.pdf
- Mosimann, J.E., Dahlberg, J.E., Davidian, N.M. & Krueger, J. (2002). *Accountability in Research*, 9, 75-92.
- Mummendey, A. (2012). Scientific misconduct in social psychology: Towards a currency reform in science. *European Bulletin of Social Psychology*, 24, 4-7.
- Reich, E. S. (2009). *Plastic fantastic*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Roediger, H. L. (2012). Psychology's woes and a partial cure: The value of replication. *Observer*. Retrieved from <http://www.psychologicalscience.org/index.php/publications/observer/2012/february-12/psychologys-woes-and-a-partial-cure-the-value-of-replication.html>.
- Schuepfer, G., Hein, J., Steiner, L., & Konrad, C. (2012). Scientific fraud in 20 falsified anesthesia papers: Detection using financial auditing methods. *The Anaesthetist*, 61, 543-549
- Simonsohn, U. (2013). *Just post it: The lesson from two cases of fabricated data detected by statistics alone*. The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, PA. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2114571&download=yes
- SPSP Task Force on Responsible Conduct in Research: Report (2012). http://c.yumcdn.com/sites/www.spsp.org/resource/resmgr/files/task_force_on_responsible_co.pdf.
- Stapel, D. (2012). *Ontspoorings (Derailment)*. Amsterdam, NL: Prometheus
- Stapel, D. A., & Lindenberg, S. (2011). Coping with chaos: How disordered contexts promote stereotyping and discrimination. *Science*, 332, 251-252.
- Stroebe, W., Postmes, T. & Spears, R. (2012a). Scientific misconduct and the myth of self-correction in science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7, 670-688.
- Stroebe, W., Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (2012). What can we do to reduce scientific misconduct. *Dialogue*, 25, 2.
- Torres, J., Fernandez, S., Gamero, A., & Sola, A. (2007). How do numbers begin? *European Journal of Physics*, 28, 17-25.
- Wicherts, J.M., Borsboom, D., Kats, J. & Molenaar, D. (2011). The poor availability of psychological research data for reanalysis. *American Psychologist*, 61, 726-728

Situation of Social Psychology in European Countries

Spain

"How to keep social-psychological research alive and well in times of European financial crisis? A perspective from Spain."

When Sabine Otten contacted me about writing an opinion article on how social psychologists in Spain may be affected by the financial crisis, I could not decline the offer to make people in other places in Europe aware of our situation, despite my workload strongly suggested that I should not get involved into more things (!). It is well known that since the beginning of the financial crisis in 2008, the Spanish Government has applied important cuts in public policies, and this trend has become dramatic in the last one and a half years under Mariano Rajoy's mandate. Our work as social psychologists is affected by these cuts mainly in two ways: a) From 2009 to 2013, the funding cuts on research are of 31%. Further, we no longer have a Ministry of Science to manage it, being the money allocated to the Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness that emphasizes "excellence" in technology and innovation to optimize the limited resources (see <http://www.nature.com/news/turn-spain-s-budget-crisis-into-an-opportunity-1.10770>). The role of Social Sciences in this new framework is completely absent, which suggests that the cuts will possibly strongly affect our discipline in a direct way. b) Trade unions estimate that the cuts on Education policies at the University level reach the 62.5%, some of those directly referring to the (lack of) stabilization of positions and (lack of) hiring opportunities in academia, not to mention the salary reductions (5-7% per year) applied since 2010, which paradoxically affect *more* those who earn *less*. The new Government University policy has increased the teaching load limit from 240 to 320 hours per academic year for full-time positions (unless you can provide enough research merits in the last 6 years), and impedes almost completely hiring any academic staff in the coming years. These policies have important implications for the work environment at our departments. For instance, one common internal conflict these days refers to covering temporary leaves. We remain our right to take a leave if we need to (e.g., maternity permit, health leave), but the University will not pay another person to substitute us during that time (if they consider -applying the new regulations- that other people at the department should cover us). This necessarily creates strong internal conflicts and negative social climate that influences our work capacities.

Both circumstances (a and b, above mentioned) leave us in a really weak position to continue developing our work on Social Psychology for several reasons that differently affect those who are at the beginning of their academic career (pre- and postdoctoral stage), early-career (lecturers and not tenured and tenured assistant professors) and even those with more stable and permanent positions. I will now briefly refer to each one of these groups referring to the personal experiences of some of our colleagues at work that kindly replied to my questions. I would like to thank and acknowledge Gloria Jiménez-Moya (last year PhD student), Mónica Romero-Sánchez (postdoctoral researcher), Guillermo Willis (not-tenured lecturer/assistant professor) and Miguel Moya (professor) for their time and cooperation!

Firstly, the public fundings for predoctoral researchers have been reduced in the last two years from 950 to 800 grants for all scientific areas in Spain (in 2012, 32 were granted for

Psychology in general nation-wide). Further, they have reduced by almost 50% the funding for external research visits which have been a key aspect of the development of our labs in the past. Moreover, if a student decides to fund the research stay abroad by his/her own means, they have sometimes been declined the allowance to leave their position at the local university (if they are lucky enough to have one!). Highly prepared and motivated students face real economic hardships to fund themselves the master and PhD programs (students' fees have raised up to a 66% depending on the region), which could lead to abandoning a promising research career or moving out to a different country with better opportunities.

The situation that young researchers face just after finishing their PhD is not at all more encouraging. The national postdoctoral grants scheme has not been open for applications since last year. That is, there are no possibilities to get a postdoctoral fellowship funded directly by the state as there used to be. The only programs that are still working (i.e., Juan de la Cierva, and Ramón y Cajal programmes) are those strongly biased towards the so-called "hard" scientific disciplines in which social psychologists have almost no chance to get funded.

Moving on to the next stage in the academic career, we encounter the difficult situation that not-tenured lecturers or assistant professors (i.e., "ayudantes doctores") face these days. These positions imply a four-year contract, after which (theoretically) one could get promoted to a tenured position if certain research and teaching achievements were obtained. However, the national and regional governments have also paralyzed this process. The situation that many of these academics face now is such that, despite having achieved the merits to get promoted, they might see their contracts withdrawn or downgraded to an even less stable and worse-paid position. The increasing lack of stability of early-stage academics in Spain has important consequences in their work at the psychological level (anxiety-related problems, lowered motivation for teaching and research, reduced identification with the university as a group), and impedes their access to resources that would contribute to a higher performance (e.g., they are not allowed to apply for grants by themselves, nor to get their research achievements acknowledged to reduce their teaching load; they cannot directly support students interested in doing a PhD to get their own funding, or even supervise them without a full professor's support).

Finally, those who have a permanent or stable (tenured) position at the University face the problem of the drastically reduced research funding opportunities. In 2013 there has been no public contest at all for obtaining medium or large-size research grants. This has a "domino effect" on the rest of the researchers, since it implies no grant money to hire pre- or postdoctoral researchers, no travel funding for attending conferences, and no budget for new research equipments or publishing reasons (e.g., translation or proof-reading of articles).

Summing up, the hardships that we are encountering are numerous and challenging. However, we do not get discouraged and some promising initiatives such as the foundation of a new Spanish association of social psychology ([Sociedad Científica Española de Psicología Social, SCEPS](#)) are arising that will hopefully help us to overcome the barriers. In this sense, the EASP could play an important supporting role for Spanish researchers (as well as those from other countries affected by the crisis) in different ways by: a) Increasing the number and the economical amount of the mobility grants (*travel grants*) to allow predoctoral students to visit other departments and benefit from the

academic exchange experience. b) Increasing the number and the economical amount of the postdoctoral seedcorn grants, for first year postdoctoral researchers that have no access to other funding opportunities, to allow them to start developing their own research programs or develop networks at the European level that would potentially improve their access to other funding bodies (i.e., European funding). c) Promoting a free proof-reading service in our scientific journals that allows non-native English speakers to access publishing more easily. d) Providing funding for the organization of training programs and international workshops in Spain at the master and the doctoral level to develop basic scientific methodological skills (e.g., specific advanced data analyses, writing successful papers, communicating scientific findings) and scientific knowledge sharing. e) Finally, internal networking between social psychologists within Spain needs to be promoted. For this purpose, it would be very useful to support regional meetings that could help to formalize and expand some of the already existing networks (e.g., SCEPS). Further, we could join our efforts with our neighbor country, Portugal, to strengthen networking and enhance the exchange of research experiences by young researchers.

In my short experience in the field (10 years have passed since the beginning of my PhD), I have seen an important expansion of the international visibility of Spanish social psychologists within Europe and worldwide. As my colleagues, I attribute this success mainly to individual as well as collective efforts of different research groups scattered all over the country, as well as to the fruitful cooperation with several colleagues who have welcomed us in their overseas labs providing us with extremely valuable learning experiences. These improvements have been partly possible by the economic support of previous Governments that is now disappearing. We hope and believe that the networks that we have developed (and continue to develop) will help us sustaining the efforts to promote scientific excellence in the field of social psychology in our country.

Soledad de Lemus (Universidad de Granada)

Greece

When less just means less

Writing about the effects of the financial crisis in Greece means writing about the losses and ruins caused by the relevant policies. Higher education and research centres in particular have suffered major losses since the beginning of the austerity measures agreed upon by the Greek government and international lenders three years ago. University budgets have literally halved and keep shrinking further. Salaries, already comparatively low, have been cut by more than 40%, with a number of new taxes lowering the actual income even further (at this point in time, a young lecturer – tenure track – earns less than 1,000 Euros a month). Cuts have been blind, hitting all sectors in universities and research institutions.

When the austerity measures started, the word in the system was “doing more with less.” Three years ago, it was said that the crisis would spur research reform. A new higher-education law fed an expectation that Greek research institutions would become more efficient, even attractive to Greek scientists working abroad who might now return. Presumably the change had come in time, considering that a great part of current faculty

members and researchers would be retiring over the next years. However these expectations prove overoptimistic. In fact, in the past few years we have been witnessing a brain-drain of young and even senior researchers to other countries. Greek research centres have been striving to survive by attracting funds from EU institutions. The Greek government also has put out a handful of calls for research grant proposals making use of EU money. Yet, social sciences and social psychology in particular have not had a decent share. Research focused on science and technology has attracted the bulk of funding, on a scale even larger than in other countries.

At the end of the day, the situation is rather one of “doing less with less,” I am afraid. Funding for participation in conferences has practically stopped. Access to international journals and data bases, including PsychInfo, is in limbo at this point in time, because subscription costs have not been taken into account by the government and universities cannot afford them. New academic posts are out of the question for the next years, due to the scheme the Greek government and international lenders have agreed upon. And for the time being, 800 mostly new academics, who were elected in university posts in the past four years, are still waiting to be appointed. All these mount to a feeling of gasping for air that can hardly help you out. What is worse, the occasional cries of despair are often met with the public’s suspicion, largely due to a campaign against Greek academia that was launched by the government and the press in order to justify the forthcoming drastic cuts in the past years.

As university and research funding shrink further, being optimistic becomes harder and harder. There is an unprecedented social and even humanitarian crisis putting pressure on our social psychological theories and understandings of how people and societies transform and adapt to change. But unfortunately I feel we are also caught up in the turmoil, and that might result in losing a great opportunity for both social psychology and the society.

Tilemachos Iatridis, University of Crete

Ireland

Does Austerity Bite?

The Department of Psychology at University of Limerick will be 6 years old in August 2013. Psychology is a young discipline in comparison to many others for sure; that said, our Department is in its infancy. The founding chair and first head of department Orla Muldoon was recruited in September 2006 with a promise of only two further posts. Her first task was to develop an academic plan for the new Department of Psychology in the closing months of 2007, which copper-fastened the University’s commitment to developing a suite of Psychology programmes and hiring a total of 10 full time academic posts.

It is never straightforward to secure resources within Universities. In environments where there are lots of worthy potential recipients for these resources, clever, articulate and invested faculty across the institution are very good at making their case. So it was difficult to secure these resources in the early days.

A key difficulty was not knowing the landscape and the particularities of our institution. With a small number of staff, all new to the University and the Irish academic system, it became apparent early on that there was much to learn. The University is a relatively small institution in the West of Ireland: a peripheral location in Ireland on the periphery of Europe. Knowing the people that operate the system can be as important as knowing the system itself. Colleagues argue this is a peculiarly Irish problem, others we know associate it with collectivist political systems. Indeed it is an attribute that is seen as shared by the peripheral (dare we say PIGS) nations that are at the centre of the current financial crisis in Europe. And though Limerick is a poor city, with an unusually high number of social woes, nestling between protected landscapes and Atlantic coastlines, the University is seen locally as a vehicle that has improved the situation within the region. And it likes to see itself as such: social psychology and the value of the discipline to understanding social issues was something that 'fit' in our new home.

Obviously in the years since developing the initial academic plan, the landscape in Ireland has changed more dramatically. Within a year of the Department of Psychology opening its doors, the fiscal landscape nationally and within the University changed. And year on year, another set of budgetary constraints have arrived that has affected us all in our work and home lives. We have all taken two significant pay cuts since 2007, and there has been the imposition of additional taxes and levies on those working within the public sector. These have had very real consequences for those working in the sector, and in particular those who are on lower salaries. One particular discomfort created under the national employment control framework (imposed by government and the Troika) is that new colleagues are now paid 10% less than those already in posts doing equivalent work, and will remain on this reduced pay scale as long as they continue to work in Ireland.

At a national level, education and higher education in particular, has been seen as a vehicle that facilitated developments in science and technology, contributing centrally to both employment and economic innovation. However, it was not until the economic boom of the 1990s that the Irish government started to invest and develop in research and funding agencies. The fit of the department to the region and its applied social issues orientation has to some degree protected us from the worst vagaries of research funding that have arisen in the wake of the financial crisis. However, it is without question more difficult to secure research funding. The Humanities and Social Sciences research council has merged with the Science and Engineering council. There is widespread concern that those with 'softer' approaches to science will lose out as a consequence of this merger. In particular, the drive at national level to support research that can underpin employment via new technological developments is clearly a priority, and is likely to trump even the best of projects emanating from those with an interest in the most pressing of social issues. Despite this, over the last years of the crisis, the Department has been delighted with the interest and uptake in its degree programmes. Whilst the pressure within the system has increased with rising undergraduate student numbers and no possibility of any commensurate increase in income or budget, the growth and development of post-graduate research remains both enjoyable and gratifying for us all. Amongst PhD students, there is a keen awareness of the financial crisis; indeed, the lack of employment may well be a key factor in sustaining interest in post-graduate programmes right now. The financial crisis has made some more aware of the difficulty of securing post-doctoral funding and employment. As a consequence, even those early in their PhD work are availing of every opportunity to build networks beyond Ireland which may help with

securing future funding. In many regards students are having to work harder and smarter, developing skills which will open up employment opportunities beyond academia in the private or NGO sectors. And this has to be done in a context where funded professional development training opportunities are almost entirely absent. This problem is amplified by difficulties students encounter sustaining themselves over the course of their studies as a consequence of financial institutions that are unwilling, or unable, to consider offering long term student loans. For those nearing completion of their PhD studies, the feeling is that the financial crisis has made emigrating a necessity to successfully develop their new careers. Whilst the challenge and opportunity inherent in this broadening of horizons is both positive and invigorating, it is hard to watch so many of our highly skilled and promising graduates leave without any certainty that they will ever have the opportunity to return.

*Orla Muldoon, Aisling O'Donnell, Clara O'Shea, Catherine Naughton,
Stephen Walsh
Centre for Social Issues Research, Department of Psychology, University of Limerick,
Ireland*

Portugal

How to keep social-psychological research alive and well in times of European financial crisis? A perspective from Portugal

Dear colleague, the following paragraphs are a response to a kind and challenging request of the EBSP editors for a junior Portuguese social psychologist to give his perspective on the consequences of the European financial crisis on social psychological research in Portugal. The challenge here was to produce some thoughtful and concise writing about the recent history and main achievements of social psychology in Portugal, and from that, project what the future might enclose and how we can address anticipated adversities.

I guess it is never easy to speak about your own country, especially when in the midst of a lively and acrimoniously political debate that encloses many of the ingredients of a typical intergroup exchange. Watching the news on the European financial (economic, social, and political) crisis, I cannot help going through a mental checklist of confirmed social psychological hypotheses on intergroup dynamics, and to go revisit seminal work by social psychologists and other social scientists on these issues (e.g., Breakwell & Lyons, 1996; Hewstone, 1986; Mummendey & Waldzus, 2004). Recently released polls seem to indicate that the antagonisms between European countries and towards the EU are on the rise (e.g., Pew, 2013). From a research perspective, this (in many ways) new and very dynamic context might offer an opportunity for social psychologists to restate the soundness of well established theoretical models and hypotheses, as well as to enrich the public debate by bringing into play other perspectives beyond the economic perspective.

At the same time, and as it happens so often with social psychological research, I see myself within a large scale, uncontrolled, "study", assigned to an experimental condition that puts subjects through a myriad of insidious events, such as being exposed to the word

“crisis” (and “unemployment”, and “public debt”, and “recession”, and “cuts”, etc.), in the first 10 seconds every time you switch on the TV. After a couple of months this operates as a black-hole-mantra for any sort of hope, vision, and creativity – a depressive shared *frame of reference* (Sherif, 1936) – that also blocks most of your capacity for acknowledging big chunks of inconsistent (i.e. positive) reality. So, in order to give you a fair-minded perspective on Portugal and its social psychology – where it stands and where it might go –, I guess I have to take one step outside this very reductionist and negative frame of reference.

Over the last decade Portugal undertook hulk steps in developing its scientific field. Between 2005 and 2010 the number of Portuguese *doctorates* and *publications* per 100.000 inhabitants increased significantly (respectively, 11.4 to 15.8 and 70.5 to 121.7). In Social Psychology the number of published papers increased 10 times within the same period, and 2010/2011 contributed alone to 57% of the total production between 1996 and 2011 (SCImago, 2013). Portugal has also contributed in a very active way to many of the activities of the EASP during the last two decades: in 1993 the country hosted the General Meeting, several small/medium-size meetings were organized since 2000, and the upcoming Summer School will be held in Lisbon, next year, under the joint collaboration of ISCTE-IUL and ICS-UL.

There is no doubt we came a long way in our recent history as Portuguese social psychologists since one of its symbolic inaugural events, the 1980 Symposium *Social Change and Social Policy* that took place in Lisbon, in Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, under the auspices of Henri Tajfel, Willem Doise, and Jacques-Philippe Leyens (Lima, Castro, & Garrido, 2003; Vala, & Costa-Lopes, 2012). Coincidentally, and as I write these lines, the 9th edition of *Psicologia Social* (Vala & Monteiro, 2013) is being released, an handbook that has been instrumental since its first edition in 1993 in disseminating the discipline of social psychology in Portuguese speaking countries.

These developments in science and specifically in social psychology are the result of many factors, two of paramount historical significance: the 1974 democratic revolution that liberated the country’s human capacity from over four decades of dictatorship, followed by a strong and consistent investment in education and (more recently) in science. Between 2005 and 2010 the public and private expenditure for R&D as percentage of the country’s GDP doubled from 0.8% to 1.6% (PORDATA, 2013). The impact of this investment was greatly boosted by one key ingredient: *a two-way openness*.

On the *one-way*, young Portuguese researchers applied for individual doctoral and post-doctoral grants from the National Science Foundation (NSF) with the option to carry out part of their research program abroad. This was my case, as well as the choice of 46.4% of the doctoral students with a NSF scholarship in 2011, that went to the UK, the USA, Spain, France, The Netherlands, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, etc. (FCT, 2013). On the *second-way*, doctoral and post-doctoral candidates from other countries could also apply for these grants, and many did so. Alongside, there were also work opportunities for more experienced researchers which attracted colleagues from abroad. In my research center (CIS-IUL), in Lisbon, we have colleagues from Germany, the USA, Italy, and Poland, more than half of the teachers in our Masters in Psychology of Intercultural Relations are non-Portuguese, and our International Meeting in social and organizational psychology for Ph.D. students that takes place every two years in ISCTE-IUL attracts students from many different countries.

These are just some, very personal, examples of this *two-way openness*, or *internationalization*, which exists today and was still a project two decades ago in the minds of a few enthusiastic Portuguese social psychologists. What, then, are we at risk of losing with the financial crisis, and with the prospect of cuts in the funding for research projects, Ph.D. and post-doctoral grants, travel grants, etc.? My short answer would be, precisely the vigor and stability of these prolific two-way open exchanges between junior/senior social psychologists, that overcomes national borders, something that took many years and hard work to build, which was instrumental not only for the development of social psychology in Portugal, but also for the integration and excellence of social psychology within Europe.

The EASP has played a key role since its foundation in 1966 in building this inclusive network of researchers, while facing many challenges on the way. For that reason, I'm convinced that together we will find both traditional and innovative ways to keep this network of people alive and well, while at the same time increasing the visibility of the contributions of social psychology outside our network. In a way it is interesting to note that if you Google the words "crisis", "Europe", and "social psychology", you have to scroll down a bit before you find a reference to a "crisis" situated "outside" social psychology. Maybe we might gain some perspective and insights if we challenge ourselves to take one step outside our customary frame of references.

References

- Breakwell, G. M., & Lyons, E. (Eds.). (1996). *Changing European Identities: Social Psychological Analyses of Social Change. International Series in Social Psychology*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (2013, April, 25). Retrieved April 25, 2013 from <http://www.fct.pt/>.
- Hewstone, M (1986). *Understanding attitudes to the European Community: A social-psychological study in four member states*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lima, M. L., Castro, P. & Garrido, M. V. (2003). Identidade e diversidade na psicologia social europeia: Contributos para a história da disciplina em Portugal, In M. L. Lima, P. Castro & M. V. Garrido (Eds.), *Temas e Debates em Psicologia Social* (pp. 11-36). Lisbon: Horizonte.
- Mummendey, A & Waldzus, S. (2004). National differences and European plurality: Discrimination or tolerance between European countries. In R. Herrmann, T. Risse, & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Transnational Identities: Becoming European in the EU* (pp. 59-72). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Pew Global Attitudes Project (2013). *The New Sick Man of Europe: the European Union*. NY, USA: Pew Research Center.
- PORDATA (2013, April 27). Retrieved April 27, 2013 from <http://www.pordata.pt/>.
- SCImago (2013, April 27). Retrieved April 27, 2013 from <http://www.scimagojr.com/>.
- Sherif, M. (1936/1966). *The psychology of social norms*. NY, USA: Harper & Row.
- Vala, J. & Costa-Lopes, R. (2012). Dynamics and dilemmas in social psychology: Social relations, identities and cognition. *Portuguese Journal of Social Science*, 11, 3-14.

Vala, J. & Monteiro, M. B. (Eds.). (2013). *Psicologia Social* (9th ed.). Lisboa, PT: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

Ricardo Borges Rodrigues
Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL),
Centro de Investigação e Intervenção Social (CIS-IUL), Lisboa, Portugal

European Journal of Social Psychology Update

by Tom Postmes and Ernestine Gordijn (Editors)

The editorial team of the journal has been in post for slightly more than a year now. We met a few months ago and wanted to share with you an update on journal matters, including some thoughts on our policies for the future.

To begin with, some key developments and statistics. In May last year, we saw some changes in the editorial team with Kirsten Ruys stepping down, and Gerald Echterhoff and Tobias Greitemeyer joining us as new associate editors. The submission rate has remained steady from 2008-2010, up slightly for 2011 and back to normal for 2012 (around 440 manuscripts per year). In the day-to-day running of the journal, we continued the procedures of the previous team. Concerning handling times, regular papers are returned, on average, well within the 3 month target. For fast track papers, we set the target at 6 weeks: fast but not unrealistically so, we thought. Indeed, the modal handling time is on target. For all this, we owe a big thanks to all of you, the many members of the association who have reviewed for EJSP this past term. But although we are happy that the handling times are sound on average, we have also agreed some new internal procedures to speed things up more, and particularly to bring the response lag down for individual papers which (for whatever reason) can take longer to come through the system.

Regarding policy, EJSP has undergone major changes in the past years both in its appearance and in the numbers of issues and papers published per year. The number of papers increased from 50 in 2005 to 100 in 2010. From that year onwards, we have remained steady at around 100: there were 106 papers in 2012. In view of all the changes effected by the past two teams, the present editorial team decided with the EASP executive to aim for continuation of existing policies and practices. This intention was communicated in our editorial of 2012, which also signalled the breadth of content we were looking to publish (e.g., in addition to high quality empirical research, also a commitment to publishing more theoretical and review articles, a renewed emphasis on the value of diversity, etc.). But since then, there have been some small but important changes, which we would like to alert you to.

One major issue we dealt with this past year concerns ethical standards. The Stapel misconduct case played out against the background of a transdisciplinary debate concerning the validity of scientific research and distortions due to research biases, errors, negligence and (to a lesser extent) fraud. Not least because EJSP was among the journals heavily affected by Stapel's fraud, we have discussed with the EASP executive and the editorial team what our response to these broader developments should be. We decided that it would be undesirable for individual journals to change standards unilaterally. We also share the observation of many commentators and experts that existing standards are comprehensive and cover many concerns. We therefore decided to make those existing standards more explicit through the author guidelines and during the submission procedure.

It is important to be clear about what this means. For many years now, the journal has adhered to the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (American Psychological Association, 2010) and follows the code of conduct of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE, 2011). We now devote much more attention to this in the

author guidelines, and we ensure that it is understood when authors submit their work. In principle, nothing new is happening here because we are only making explicit rules that were already in operation. In practice, this reminder affirms standards which — we are convinced — are upheld by the large majority of our community anyway.

We have also negotiated with Wiley the ability for authors to submit supplementary materials with their journal article. We emphasize that this can include many things the authors may want to share with readers, including supplementary analyses, data or precise details about procedures and materials that would be relevant to only a small proportion of readers. In addition, we would point out that Wiley/Blackwell now offer authors the opportunity to record brief podcasts or “video abstracts” to accompany their publication. Wiley inform us that such recordings are an excellent way of reaching a broader audience: they tend to be very popular.

Moreover, we thought that EJSP should devote attention to the issue of standards in a different sense: Faced with the need to ensure and enhance the validity of quantitative research in social psychology, we decided to encourage the submission of papers that explicitly address best practices. We have decided to promote this by launching a call for submissions to a “special section” of the journal on developments in social psychological methods and statistics, edited by Christoph Klauer (as guest editor) in conjunction with Dominique Muller and Kai Sassenberg (as associate editors). The idea behind such a special section, we should add, is that it allows us to devote a part-issue of EJSP to a subject which we feel would be topical and beneficial. Indeed, the importance of this was also conveyed in the 2013 agenda article by Naomi Ellemers (2013).

With regard to an entirely different issue, readers of the paper version of EJSP will have noticed that Issues 2 and 3 were short. That the printed version of the journal did not have a “spine” took us by surprise and we have made arrangements with the publisher, Wiley/Blackwell, to address this issue differently should it occur again in the future. This is especially important because the shortage of copy we faced in February and March, when these issues were printed, was only temporary: it was due, among other things, to the delayed publication of this year’s special issue. At this point the queue is adequate again and we have a healthy number of papers in production. EJSP continues to attract a high number of quality submissions. And in terms of diversity, an important trend is for an increasing proportion of these to come from social psychologists across the globe.

We conclude this journal update by reflecting on EJSP’s journal impact. Across the past years the journal impact as published by ISI’s Web of Knowledge has remained steady. On other indices of impact EJSP’s performance is ranked more highly: on the recently developed Google Scholar (2013) ranking of top journals in Social Psychology for example, EJSP ranks 6th (see <http://goo.gl/bqEoh>). Perhaps more directly relevant are indicators of audience attention. In terms of numbers of downloads, in particular, EJSP is proving to be among the most popular social psychology journals. This is also reflected in a high numbers of content alert subscriptions and a high institutional subscription rate. We infer from this that if you are looking for an outlet which allows you to get your message out there, and across, EJSP is among the top outlets of our field. We thank you all for the various contributions that have made this possible.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2010). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/ethics>, 21 May 2013
- COPE (2011). *Committee On Publication Ethics: Code of conduct and best practice guidelines for journal editors*. Retrieved from <http://publicationethics.org/resources> on 21 May 2013. Note: On this same website, there are various helpful guidelines for editors, reviewers and authors.
- Ellemers, N. (2013). Connecting the dots: Mobilizing theory to reveal the big picture in social psychology (and why we should do this). *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43, 1-8. doi:10.1002/ejsp.1932
- Google Scholar (2013). *Top publications in social psychology*. Retrieved from http://scholar.google.nl/citations?view_op=top_venues&hl=en&vq=med_socialpsychology on 28 May 2013. Short URL <http://goo.gl/bqEoh>

New Publications by Members

Bar-Tal D.¹⁾: *Intractable Conflicts: Socio-Psychological Foundations and Dynamics*

584 pp./ Hardback / 978-0-521-86708-5

www.cambridge.org/us/9780521867085

Enter discount code DANIELLBT13 at checkout to receive discount, offer expires

07/31/2013-04-08

Cambridge University Press 2013

This book provides a comprehensive, interdisciplinary, and holistic analysis of the socio-psychological dynamics of intractable conflicts. Daniel Bar-Tal's original conceptual framework is supported by evidence drawn from different disciplines, including empirical data and illustrative case studies. His analysis rests on the premise that intractable conflicts share certain socio-psychological foundations, despite differences in their context and other characteristics. He describes a full cycle of intractable conflicts—their outbreak, escalation, and peace-building through reconciliation. Bar-Tal's framework provides a broad theoretical view of the socio-psychological repertoire that develops in the course of long-term and violent conflicts, outlines the factors affecting its formation, demonstrates how it is maintained, points out to its functions, and describes its consequences. The book also elaborates on the contents, processes and involved factors in the peace building process

Contents

Introduction; **Part I:** 1. Nature of intractable conflicts; 2. Eruption of intractable conflicts; 3. Escalation of intractable conflicts; **Part II:** 4. Collective memory of intractable conflicts; 5. Ethos of conflict; 6. Collective emotional orientations in intractable conflicts; **Part III:** 7. Institutionalization of the culture of conflict; 8. Socio-psychological barriers to peaceful conflict resolution; **Part IV:** 9. Breaking the cycles of intractable conflict; 10. Peace building: concepts and their nature; 11. Peace building: processes and methods; Epilogue; References

¹⁾ Daniel Bar-Tal has served as President of the International Society of Political Psychology (ISPP) and received various prizes for his work, including ISPP's Harold Lasswell Award, given for distinguished scientific contributions in the field of political psychology, and ISPP's Nevitt Sanford Award, recognizing the practical application of political psychological principles and the creation of knowledge used by practitioners to make a positive difference in the way in which politics is carried out.

Jonas, K. J. & Morton, T. (2012). *Restoring Civil Societies: The Psychology of Intervention and Engagement following Crisis*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell
 ISBN 978 0 470 67143 6
 Hardcover, app. 67 GBP 80

Breakdowns in civil societies can be catalyzed by factors ranging from war and genocide to natural disaster, disease, and economic downturns. *Restoring Civil Societies* examines social processes related to civic engagement in the wake of these societal ruptures. The authors show how crises in civil society can be both pervasive and localized, broad-based and limited to defined social subgroups. Whatever their scale, *Restoring Civil Societies* identifies models that analyze the social psychology of crises in order to devise ways of reactivating civic engagement and safeguarding civil society.

Focusing in these positive interventions, the authors identify a number of key strategies, ranging from the simplicity and directness of bystander interventions to the volunteer armies mobilized in the wake of natural disasters. They include collective action organized to redress systemic inequalities, and the vial healing role played by truth commissions in Rwanda and elsewhere. *Restoring Civil Societies* fills the gap between basic research on social issues and translation into social policies and programs - an area which, in light of current economic and social unrest, is more important now than ever.

"This is a must-have resource for scholars interested in the application of psychology to civil and humanitarian crises, and who want to stay on the cutting edge of theoretically-driven best practices. With an equal commitment to theory and application, this volume is ideally suited for scholar-practitioners interested in addressing pressing social issues"

Rodolfo Mendoza-Denton, University of California, Berkeley

"The breakdown of civil society poses an array of intellectual and practical challenges that define our age. What are its causes and consequences? What can we do about it? In this book, leading researchers tackle these questions head on and provide powerful, compelling answers. The book will be essential reading for a broad readership, and is restorative in every sense"

Alex Haslam, University of Queensland

Leyens, J. Ph. (2012). *Sommes-nous tous racistes ? (Are we all racists ?)*
 Wavre : Mardaga. ISBN : 978-2-8047-0088-1
 164 pages, 21 Euros, info@editionsmardaga.com

This French-written book defends the thesis that we are all (likely) racists. Racism is not limited to ethnic groups but may be encountered against any group. Contrary to many other books on the topic, this one does not provide ways to diminish racism. The best way to fight racism is to become aware that one can be a racist. Fighting racism is a problem for one's whole life.

Leyens, J. Ph. and Scaillet N. (2012). *Sommes-nous tous des psychologues?* Nouvelle édition remaniée et augmentée (Are we all psychologists? New revised and augmented edition).

Wavre: Mardaga. ISBN: 978-2-8047-0101-7

25 Euros, info@editionsmardaga.com

This book is a follow-up of the popular previous edition (Leyens, J. Ph. (1983)). Are we all psychologists? Psychosocial approach of implicit theories of personality. Sprimont: Mardaga). While implicit theories of personality are still shown to be main determinants of behaviors, this revision takes the formation of impressions as its main guideline. Written for lay people and students, the book is an invitation to examine the dangers of first impressions. It wishes to warn students in psychology that their degree in Psychology does not entitle them to confuse impressions and certainties.

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

Hove: Routledge & Psychology Press (Taylor & Francis).

Paperback ISBN 978-0-415-64581-2, published 15th Dec 2012, Price £28.00 / \$49.95.

Hardback ISBN 978-0-415-29897-1, Price £65.00 / \$105.00.

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

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

"I am confident that ISA provides an extraordinary and powerful resource for the field [of traumatology] that will force a paradigm shift in the way we understand, assess, and treat the traumatized." Charles Figley, Florida State University, and Editor of Traumatology

People's identities are addressed and brought into being by interaction with others. Identity processes encompass biographical experiences, historical eras and cultural norms in which the self's autonomy varies according to the flux of power relationships with others.

Identity Structure Analysis (ISA) draws upon psychological, sociological and social anthropological theory and evidence to formulate a system of concepts that help explain the notion of identity. ISA can be applied to the practical investigations of identity structure and identity development - at individual level and/or group level - in a number of clinical, societal and cross-cultural settings. The book includes studies of national and ethnic identification in multi-cultural contexts and gender identity relating to social context and the urban environment. Clinical applications that describe identity processes associated with psychological distress are also examined. These include anorexia nervosa and vicarious traumatising of counselors in the aftermath of atrocity. Analysing Identity

is unique in its development of this integrative conceptualisation of self and identity and the subsequent applications of ISA. This innovative book will appeal to academics and professionals in developmental, social, clinical and educational psychology and psychotherapy. It will also be of interest to those involved with sociology, political science, gender studies, ethnic studies and social policy.

Of particular note is the availability of new software, Ipseus, which facilitates ISA for use by practitioners that enable them to enhance their professional skills by ascertaining their clients' perspectives on self as is located in the social world. This has been successfully used with pre-school three to five year-old children, and all other age-ranges through childhood, adolescence and adulthood. Ipseus is designed to be used in inter-cultural contexts and appeals to practitioners for their input for the generation of customized identity instruments (see www.identityexploration.com).

Contents

Part 1: Theory and Practice. P. Weinreich, Identity Structure Analysis. P. Weinreich, Identity Exploration: Theory into Practice. Part 2: Cross-cultural Issues. P. Weinreich, V. Bacova, N. Rougier, Basic Primordialism in Ethnic and National Identity. G. Horenczyk, S. Munayar, Complex Patterns of Cultural Allegiances: The Ethnic Identity of Palestinian Christian Arab Adolescents in Israel. Part 3: Societal Issues. K. Stapleton, J. Wilson, Grounding the Discursive Self: A Case Study in ISA and Discursive Psychology. M. Wager, Complex Identities: The Case of Academic Women. W. Saunderson, The City, Gender and Identity. H. Irvine, Adults Returning to Education: Gender and Identity Processes. A. MacNabb, Enterprising Identities: Gender and Family Influences. Part 4: Clinical Issues. P. Harris, Identity Formulation and Reformulation in Clinical Assessment and Therapy. W. Saunderson, M. O'Kane, Anorexia Nervosa: Analysing Identity for Predisposing, Precipitating and Perpetuating Factors. S. Black, P. Weinreich, An Exploration of Counselling Identity in Counsellors Who Deal with Trauma. P. Weinreich, Coda.

Future EASP Meetings

Small Group Meeting

Psychological Perspectives on Collective Victimhood and its Consequences for Intergroup Relations June 25-27, 2014, Verona, Italy

Organizers: Masi Noor (Canterbury Christ Church University), Silvia Mari (University of Milan Bicocca), Johanna Ray Vollhardt (Clark University), Arie Nadler (University of Tel Aviv)

Contact: masi.noor@canterbury.ac.uk

Collective victimhood is among the most powerful of human experiences. Its dynamic goes well beyond the traditional notion of learned helplessness and lack of agency. In fact, violent intergroup conflicts around the world are triggered, maintained and resolved partly depending on how victimhood is dealt with.

There are compelling reasons why direct or vicarious experiences of harm at the hands of another group are of such importance. Collective memories of past victimhood trigger potent psychological needs and can give rise to intense affective responses. Such responses are often transmitted through generations and can provide the motivation for continued revenge and legitimization of violence in present-day, unrelated conflicts. Conversely, perceptions of shared victimhood may promote harmonious intergroup relations and solidarity.

The proposed Small Group Meeting seeks to bring together emergent social psychological approaches to collective victimhood. We aim to discuss theory and empirical findings on the psychological processes, dimensions, functions, antecedents, consequences, and policy implications of collective victimhood. This meeting aims to facilitate the theoretical integration of emerging theoretical approaches to collective victimhood, to assess their present empirical validation in diverse contexts of conflict and its aftermath throughout the world, and to stimulate future research and research collaborations on the psychology of collective victimhood. We welcome both empirical and theoretical contributions. The meeting will take place from June 25-27, 2014 in Verona, Italy. There are no registration fees, and costs of meals will be covered. Contingent on receiving further grants, the cost of accommodation may be subsidized. If you are interested in participating, please send an email including an abstract (250-300 words) and your contact details to Masi Noor (masi.noor@canterbury.ac.uk) until **February 17th, 2014**.

Small Group Meeting

Culture and Psychology: Insights from the European Context July 5-7, 2014, Leuven, Belgium

Organizers: Ayse Uskul (University of Kent), Matthias Gobel (University College London), Batja Mesquita (University of Leuven), Veronica Benet-Martinez (Pompeu Fabra University), William Maddux (INSEAD)
Contact: a.k.uskul@kent.ac.uk , matthias.gobel.11@ucl.ac.uk

We invite both junior and senior researchers to submit abstracts for the first EASP small group meeting on the topic of '*Culture and Psychology: Insights from the European Context*'. The meeting will take place at the University of Leuven in Leuven, Belgium from July 5th to 7th 2014, shortly before the 17th EASP General Meeting.

The aim of the small group meeting is to provide a platform for researchers who examine psychological processes using a cultural lens within the European context. To date, much of the work in cultural and cross-cultural psychology has been conducted comparing Western (e.g., North American cultures) and Eastern cultures (e.g., East Asian cultures). Cultural groups in Europe are distinct from North American and East Asian counterparts due to very different historical, political and economic circumstances. In an era where Europe faces enormous economic and social challenges and governments must make difficult choices about social equality and financial stability, the meeting aims to discuss the role of culture within the European context and promises important insights into the psychological reality of its citizens. The meeting also sets out to advance our theoretical understanding shifting the attention of (cross-)cultural research towards dimensions beyond individualism-collectivism. The meeting will host around 30 participants and thus will facilitate the exchange and discussion between researchers at all stages of their career.

The meeting will conveniently take place in geographical and temporal proximity to the 17th EASP General Meeting as to facilitate attendees' travel to Amsterdam. If you are interested in participating, please send an email including title, abstract (max. 250 words), contributing authors, and the contact details of the presenter to Ayse K. Uskul (a.k.uskul@kent.ac.uk) or Matthias Gobel (matthias.gobel.11@ucl.ac.uk) before 31 January 2014.

There will be no participation fees. Costs of accommodation and meals will be partially covered. Please feel free to contact the organizers for any questions.

We look forward to this exciting meeting and receiving your abstracts.

Best wishes,

Ayse Uskul (University of Kent), Matthias Gobel (University College London), Batja Mesquita (University of Leuven), Veronica Benet-Martinez (Pompeu Fabra University), William Maddux (INSEAD)

17th General Meeting of the EASP

Amsterdam, The Netherlands, July 9-12, 2014

Agneta Fischer and Kai J. Jonas are very happy to welcome you in Amsterdam on behalf of the EASP and the organizing team. Amsterdam is one of the most beautiful cities of Europe, known for its cozy and hospitable atmosphere, its canals, nightlife, and numerous museums. We are organizing the General Meeting in the heart of the city, in one of the oldest university buildings. Thus, attendants of the General Meeting can combine the Amsterdam ambiance and top science in a walking distance. To keep you informed, we will be continuously updating the website: www.easp2014.com. In order to give you a short overview of the global scheme of the conference, please find the program at a glance below.

July 8, Tuesday

Preconferences and registration

July 9, Wednesday

Registration and start of the Scientific program

July 10, Thursday

Scientific program

July 11, Friday

Scientific program

July 12, Saturday

Scientific program

Farewell dinner

Departure on July 13

Please take notice of the fact that Amsterdam is a popular and busy tourist location, especially during the summer months. We have pre-booked a number of hotels rooms, during and around the conference dates, but we can only advise you to book your accommodation and travel arrangements early. Otherwise finding accommodation in a medium price range may turn out to be difficult.

Scientific Committee

The scientific committee of the upcoming 17th EASP General Meeting encourages you to start thinking about potential submissions. The call for submissions will be issued in July 2013 on the conference website, www.easp2014.com

It will also be announced on the EASP website and directly by email to EASP members.

Deadline for submission will be **November 8th**.

We are looking forward to seeing you in Amsterdam for a stimulating and challenging scientific meeting !

Jean-Claude Croizet, Université de Poitiers (Chair)

Johannes Keller, Universität Ulm (Social cognition)

Carolyn Morf, Universität Bern (Interpersonal processes)

Michelle Ryan, University of Exeter (Intergroup relations)

Dario Spini, Université de Lausanne (Group processes)

Bas Verplanken, University of Bath (Attitudes)

EASP Summer School 2014
August 17-30, 2014, Lisbon, Portugal

We are pleased to announce that the 2014 EASP Summer School will take place in Lisbon, Portugal (August 17-30, 2014). The Summer School will be co-hosted by the Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon (ICS-UL) and the University Institute of Lisbon (ISCTE-IUL).

The local organizing team is looking forward to welcome promising young researchers to attend broad and intellectually stimulating workshops and keynote addresses that were put together.

In line with previous editions of the EASP Summer School, applicants are invited to apply for participating in one of the following five workshops:

WORKSHOP 1: *Socially Situated Cognition*

Gün Semin (Utrecht University) & Margarida Garrido (ISCTE-IUL)

WORKSHOP 2: *Implicit Prejudice, stereotypes and discrimination*

Daniël Wigboldus (Radboud University Nijmegen) & Rui Costa Lopes (ICS-UL)

WORKSHOP 3: *Identity, influence and deviance*

Michael Hogg (Claremont Graduate University) & José Marques (FPCE-UP)

WORKSHOP 4: *Social Psychology of Justice*

Robbie Sutton (University of Kent) & Isabel Correia (ISCTE-IUL)

WORKSHOP 5: *Epistemology and methods in social psychology*

Klaus Fiedler (University of Heidelberg) & Leonel Garcia-Marques (FP-UL)

Specific application guidelines will be announced in the next issue of the EBSP and on the Summer School website that will be available from October, 1st (website address will be announced through EASP mailing list).

Important dates:

Application period: 1 – 15 December, 2013

Decisions on the selection of participants: March, 31st, 2014

Deadline for registrations: May, 30th, 2014

For inquiries about the 2014 EASP Summer School, please contact the local organizing team: Rui Costa Lopes (rui.lopes@ics.ul.pt), Margarida Vaz Garrido (margarida.garrido@iscte.pt) or directly to the Summer School email address: sseasp2014lisboa@gmail.com

Looking forward to see you in Lisboa!

On behalf of the organizing committee,

Rui Costa-Lopes & Margarida Vaz Garrido

Reports of Previous Meetings

EASP-SPSSI Joint Meeting: Proactive Behavior across Group Boundaries: Seeking and Maintaining Positive Interactions with Outgroup Members
 November 29 – December 2, 2012, Port Jefferson, New York
 Todd Pittinsky (Stony Brook University), Birte Siem & Stefan Stürmer
 (FernUniversität in Hagen)

Negative intergroup processes (prejudice, discrimination, intergroup conflict) have been a traditional focus of social psychological research. However, we are left with only rather indirect and limited answers to the questions of when and why people develop curiosity about other groups, proactively engage in cross-group exploration, or show forms of prosocial behavior across group boundaries. A main aim of the meeting was to bring together a group of active researchers from SPSSI and EASP who are investigating the role positive intergroup processes by from a variety of emerging perspectives at different levels of social scientific inquiry ranging from the „macro“ (or intergroup) level to the „micro“ (or individual) level.

Meeting participants came from five European countries (Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Romania, United Kingdom), North-America (Canada, USA) and Australia. They represented different theoretical backgrounds, they employed a variety of different and highly creative methodologies to study positive cross-group behavior (experimental research in the laboratory, diary studies, large scale field studies). Their presentations covered basic research on the psychological foundations and motives for positive intergroup attitudes, research that could be applied to societal problems (e.g., research on conflict resolution) as well as perspectives on the direct application of social psychological theory to issues of social activism and social change on behalf of out-groups. Each speaker had 25 minutes presentation time followed by 10 minutes for follow-up questions. The program was divided into five thematic sessions, each of which was followed by a facilitated discussion. This scheme fostered essential and extensive discussions around each theme.

The original program consisted of the following talks:

Session 1: Allophilia / Xenophilia

TODD PITTINSKY, *Allophilia: What it is, why it matters*

STEFAN STÜRMER, *Psychological Foundations of Xenophilia: The Role of Major Personality Traits in Predicting Favorable Attitudes towards Cross-Cultural Contact and Exploration*

STEFANIA PAOLINI (with IRENE FAVARA & LAMEEZ ALEXANDER), *Approach and avoidance of intergroup contact: Field and experimental evidence of deprovincialisation of the self through self-expansion*

STEPHEN WRIGHT (with ODILIA DYS-STEENBERGEN & GENEVIEVE LORENZO), *Self-expansion and intergroup relations*

SHERI LEVY & LISA ROSENTHAL, *Polyculturalism and proactive, positive intergroup relations*

DIANA ONU (with JOANNE R. SMITH & THOMAS KESSLER), *Learning from high-status outgroups: An improvement strategy for lower-status groups*

RAM MAHALINGAM (with ASHLEY HAJSKI), *Intersectionality, mindfulness, globalized self and allophillia*

Session 2: Social Activism & Change

NICOLA CURTIN, *The role of discrimination, collective identification, and structural awareness of group inequalities on the mobilization of outgroups*

GLENDIA RUSSELL, *Privilege and stigma in collective action*

CRAIG MCGARTY (with EMMA THOMAS and ALISON GEE), *Integrating identity, emotion and opinion for cooperative social change*

ANNA KENDE & JUDIT KENDE, *Paths to political activism: Agents of positive intergroup processes in Hungary*

BENJAMIN EVERLY (with MIGUEL UNZUETA & MARGARET SHIH), *Can being gay provide a boost in the hiring process?*

Session 3: Intergroup Contact

DAVID LIVERT, *Intercultural contact and the traveling chef: Quantitative and qualitative data from three weeks in Vietnam*

JORDAN P. LABOUFF (& CHARLES J. BERGERON), *The power of a conversation: Imagined intergroup contact reduces anti-Muslim prejudice*

ANJA ELLER (& ANGEL GOMEZ), *White sheep and black sheep: Effects of normative vs. counter-normative interactions with an outgroup*

KRISTIN DAVIES & ART ARON, *Positive cross-group contact through friendship*

Session 4: Intergroup Helping

BIRTE SIEM & KATHARINA LOTZ-SCHMITT, *Helping Across Cultural Boundaries: The Role of the Target's Individual Attributes*

JOHANNA RAY VOLLHARDT, *Promoting outgroup help and positive relations between minority groups - the role of inclusive victim consciousness*

NURIT SHNABEL (with ILANIT SIMANTOV-NACHLIELI & ARIE NADLER), *Reassuring conflicting groups' sense of agency increases their prosocial behavior toward an other-conflict party*

KATHERINA ALVAREZ & ESTHER VAN LEEUWEN, *Overcoming social and psychological obstacles to receiving aid*

ESTHER VAN LEEUWEN & ALI MASHURI, *How helping can negate separatism threat*

Session 5: New Directions

SUSANNE VEIT (& RUUD KOOPMANS), *Helping strangers: A lost letter experiment on cooperation in ethnically diverse neighbourhood*

JULIA SPINTHOURAKIS (with IOANNA PAPADIMITRIOU and PANAGIOTA SOTIROPOULOU), *Proactive behavior across group boundaries: Positive immigrant experiences in Greece*

ELIZABETH CARBONE & JESSICA SALVATORE, *Direct benefits of metastereotype improvement: Evidence from a novel intergroup system*

SUSAN OPOTOW, *Understanding the inclusionary shift*

MALGORZATA GOCLOWSKA (with RICHARD CRISP & KIRSTY LABUCHAGNE), *When and why will counter-stereotypic diversity boost creativity?*

OLIVER LAUENSTEIN & JEFFREY MURER, *The 'other' next door: Predictors of accepting 'others' in Hungarian political activists*

The diversity of perspectives covered by the presentations created an intellectually highly engaging atmosphere, and encouraged opportunities to explore the relations between and among theoretical perspectives and programs of empirical research. The idea inspired the proposal for a special issue of the Journal of Social Issues on *Proactive Behavior across Group Boundaries* covering the diverse perspectives on these issues presented on the meeting.

Stefan Stürmer (FernUniversität in Hagen)

News about Members

In memoriam Janez Bečaj (June 1943 – October 2012)

We are deeply grieved by the unexpected death of our dear colleague, Dr. Janez Bečaj. Janez Bečaj was a student of psychology at Ljubljana University, where he completed his studies in 1967. As psychologist, he worked at different mostly educational and counseling institutions and was employed as an assistant and later as teacher/ professor of social psychology since 1984. He completed his PhD at Ljubljana University in 1992, on a thesis entitled: »Double function of social interaction«.

During many years he was active as a member of the chair of social psychology at Faculty of arts (Department of psychology, Ljubljana University), contributing essentially to its professional and scientific development. He basically occupied with theoretical social psychology, social motivation, group dynamic, communication, dissociality and school culture. He combined his practical experiences with his deep and extensive insight into basic methodological, theoretical and applied contents of social psychology to address different micro and macro problematic in actual Slovene environment. As a teacher, he was a mentor for many students so from psychological, as from other departments.

Janez Bečaj was very popular and respected so among students and colleagues at faculty, as among Slovene professional psychologist, but also among the people having any touch with psychology as profession and science.

Janez Bečaj will be missed and beloved as unforgettable person and personality, as highly popular teacher, original scientific thinker, engaged professional and respected colleague.

Ljubljana, January 27, 2013

*Velko S. Rus, Chair of social psychology
Department of psychology, University of Ljubljana*

* * *

The author of actual »In memoriam« enclose also the speech he had at ceremony at Faculty of arts in Ljubljana, to add also his personal note **To the memory of Janez Bečaj. English translation of the speech is in italics:**

»Because we, who yet have the gift of the life, we are the debtors of the truth ..., that's why I'll reach with my word into the time before 30 years, when the spreading of our chair for social psychology from the one-year-course into the two years long study had been in the same time the essential professional additional value, because just this spreading made the coming of Professor Bečaj possible.

From this time on, what means more than the quarter of century, what's not a little bit for a human being, the chair for social psychology meant relatively secure personal space for everyone, contributing to its start and elevation.

I can say, what I have said also to him personally, when I had not known that he would decide, as he had, for maybe too premature retirement, premature also because of his work and creation ... because of the concluding phases of his work, which I knew very well, because I've been, in the period of 20 years, the member of all election/ evaluation committees for evaluation of his work; therefore I was capable to follow the extraordinary development and to have the insight into all of this basic works and I have just said to him that he has just been entering his the most creative phase.

In last more than quarter of century I have significantly strengthened my belief that Janez sincerely loves his profession, he has been all the time devoted to his work, he has been seriously and responsibly implementing its duties ...

Or, as had told the priest, in his speech, which did not only touch, but also fascinated everybody with deeper feeling for questions connecting the sense of living, at the end of the beginning funeral ceremony – the priest, who had also been his school mate/friend at leaving examination in the year 1962 - had said: »nobody's perfect ... » and I'll add: the meaning and the significance of the contours of the human being are so more expressive, as they express the dimension of self – transcendence.

Janez Bečaj was modest without pretending and I remember that I have several times said to him that some of his thoughts and reflections seem to me more serious than the comparable ones by the side of some social – psychological classics ...

Instead of Janez' restraint, it was quite impossible to neglect his spiritual amplexness, the deepness of his education, he was classically educated, domestic with many secrets of classic education, and also, what's less known, long years playing violinist, who simultaneously imprinted and transcended his aesthetics of an art play with his eigen system of knowledge, thinking and life style.

Anyhow we treat it, it has to be particularly underlined: Janez Bečaj was and independent thinker, original in his tendencies and legitimate in theoretical bases of his system. Authenticity and originality, so very rare characteristics of Slovene psychology, humanistic and social sciences, obtained with Janez Bečaj the representative, with whom the mentioned values had obtained yet new dimensions, which penetrate into the society, into the Slovene individual, into our actuality and future, even more, as it seems at the first look.

Because the goal of and independent searching is not to discover the eternal, unchangeable and the only valuable truths: never, but really never, I experienced Janez Bečaj in such a role, when he would be anyhow connected with such a principle ... just the opposite ... I can say that the chair for social psychology has been in last more than quarter of century and more the most favorable environment, regarding any possible environment in Slovenia, for our common development, also for the personal and scientific development of Janez Bečaj.

As the human being is alternative, so is alternative also the legacy of Janez Bečaj: me, I see it in the deepness, involvement and argumentation of the scientific searching, where/when the way alone is in great deal also the basic content of creation and of human existence, I see it in this open, founded and to the eigen conscience responsible consistency

of searching, where/when the autonomous eigen consciousness, as mentioned by the side of Thomas Akvinski, is the highest intrapersonal instance of ethical judgment. In the secrecy of the creation and of the human being Janez Bečaj contributed the dialectics of autonomous creator, what is, expressing my own personal view to phenomenon and people, much, much more than the belief into the infallibility of the word, spoken/ written by any one from us, imperfect human beings.

Janez Bečaj left, as the creator, very strong personal impression in the development of the profession, so of social psychology, as of psychology, but also much spreader, also in the future, as person, and as somebody, spiritually accompanying all those, who involving, seriously, basically, independently and creatively accept the challenges from himself and from the world, regardless the fact, how we actually experience the world, people and events. With his spoken and written word, supported by his unique person and by the energy of its authenticity, Janez Bečaj will leave among us the undeletable human, personal and scientific seal.

Ljubljana, 24. 11. 2012

Velko S. Rus

In memoriam Adrian Neculau (1938 – 2012)

Adrian Neculau, probably the most influential social psychologist in the recent history of our discipline in Romania, and probably also in the daily lives of his country's citizens, passed away on December 21, 2012 in Iasi. Professor Emeritus at the University of Al I. Cuza of Iasi, son of schoolteachers persecuted by the totalitarian communist regime, a student of Prof. Vasile Pavelcu who himself had attended the courses of Henri Wallon and Pierre Janet in the Sorbonne, and the courses of Henri Pieron and Emile Gley at the College de France, Adrian Neculau is the person to whom Romanian social psychology owes its rebirth from the ashes after the fall of the communist regime since 1990.

Founder of the *Psychology of the Social Arena* Research Centre at the Al. I. Cuza University of Iasi, close to Serge Moscovici, Adrian Neculau was a tireless engine of the East-West cooperation in Europe, he developed cooperative relationships with the most prominent European research centres and universities, participated in research teams interested in the study of the social representations of poverty, power and minorities, was a longstanding member of the EASP, a member of the Executive Committee of the European PhD on Social Representations and Communication, he hosted in Iasi the 7th Congress of Social Psychology in French Language (ADRIPS), but also Willem Doise and Annamaria De Rosa for the title of Doctor Honoris Causa of the Al I Cuza University and Michel-Louis Rouquette, guest of honor of the first Romanian Conference of Social Psychology.

In Romania, Adrian Neculau initiated and coordinated the prestigious *Journal of Social Psychology*, which hosted over the years texts by authors such as Ivana Markova, Serge Moscovici, Michel-Louis Rouquette. He led two collections at the Polirom publishing

house, *Collegium. Psychology and Applied Psychology*, where he published original works and translated the best social psychology textbooks and works of foreign authors. Driven by Adrian Neculau, many of his students have done remarkable internships in research laboratories in Europe and North America.

In addition to his numerous scientific articles, Adrian Neculau published numerous books: *The Leaders in Group Dynamics* (1977), *The Lost Memory* (Polirom, 1999), *Traces of Time. Romanian Illusions, European Confirmations. A Dialogue with Serge Moscovici* (Polirom, 2002), *Adults Training* (Polirom, 2004), *The Daily Life in Romania during communism* (Polirom, 2004, L'Harmattan, 2008), *Groups and Teams Dynamics* (Polirom, 2007), *A Psychologist in the Agora* (Polirom, 2007) *The Psychology of Voluntary Servitude* (Polirom, 2011). In the recent years, Adrian Neculau has published every Saturday in the Journal of Iasi a "tablet", as he called it, a psychosocial analysis of the Romanian society, reflections on the psychologists' role and their interaction with the society, and also analyses of his experiences of the Western societies, memories about his mentors and his friends in European universities.

His recent research focused mainly on the effects of the totalitarian ideology on the social representations, but also on the drama and the persecution of Romanian psychologists during communism and the history of social psychology in Romania. He recently quoted the word of Anzieu about professor Vasile Pavelcu, whom Anzieu had known in Paris: "*That is for us, my dear colleague, the history of psychology; no one today knows about our predecessors. Do write, to not forget anything that your mentor has told you*".

A renowned researcher, a teacher in his heart, a man with a succulent verb and a contagious smile whose whole being meant kindness and tolerance, Adrian Neculau is one of those who leave behind them a world that they tried to repair and improve. Our thoughts are with his wife Rodica and his son Radu, professor of philosophy at the University of Windsor in Canada.

Andreea ERNST-VINTILA
University of Reims Champagne-Ardenne

New Members of the Association

The following applications for membership were approved by the Executive Committee in May 2013. Names of members providing letters of support are in parentheses:

Full Membership

Dr. Adi AMIT

Raanana, Israel

(S. Roccas, C.K.W. de Dreu)

Dr. Gülseli BAYSU

Istanbul, Turkey

(K. Phalet, R. Brown)

Dr. Veronica BENET-MARTINEZ

Barcelona, Spain

(A. Uskul, B. Mesquita)

Dr. Lily CHERNYAK-HAI

Netanya, Israel

(A. Nadler, D. Bar-Tal)

Dr. Arik CHESHIN

Amsterdam, The Netherlands

(G. van Kleef, A. Fischer)

Dr. Mioara CRISTEA

Versailles, France

(M. Boza, F. Buschini)

Dr. Laura DRYJANSKA

Rome, Italy

(B. Mazzara, A. Silvana de Rosa)

Dr. Katarzyna HAMER

Warsaw, Poland

(A. Cislak, A. Kwiatkowska)

Dr. Mathias KAUFF

Marburg, Germany

(F. Asbrock, U. Wagner)

Dr. Masi NOOR

Canterbury, UK

(S. Coen, S. Mari)

Dr. Maria PACILLI

Perugia, Italy

(S. Sacchi, S. Pagliaro)

Dr. Tomás PALMA

Lisbon, Portugal

(M. Garrido, E. Papies)

Dr. Ann-Christin POSTEN

Cologne, Germany

(T. Mussweiler, K. Corcoran)

Dr. Susanne QUADFLIEG

Abu Dabhi, United Arab Emirates

(D. Lakens, T. Schubert)

Dr. David RAST

Claremont, USA

(W. Crano, S. Giessner)

Dr. Marieke ROSKES

Beer Sheva, Israel

(C.K.W. de Dreu, B. Nijstad)

Dr. Oriane SARRASIN

Berlin, Germany

(U. Gabriel, E. Green)

Dr. Claudia SASSEN RATH

Ulm, Germany

(J. Keller, K. Sassenberg)

Dr. Emma THOMAS

Murdoch, Australia

(L.G.E. Smith, C. McGarty)

Postgraduate Membership

Yasemin ACAR

Istanbul, Turkey

(M. Hogg, W.D. Crano)

Tommaso ALIOTO
Bologna, Italy
(M. Menegatti, M. Rubini)

David ATKINS
Kent, UK
(A. Uskul, N. Geeraert)

Benoite AUBÉ
Bordeaux, France
(F. Ric, A. Follenfant)

Arin AYANIAN
St. Andrews, UK
(N. Tausch, S. Sheikh)

Anatolia BATRUCH
Lausanne, Switzerland
(F. Autin, F. Butera)

Megan BIRNEY
Exeter, UK
(M. Barreto, A. Haslam)

Michael BOIGER
Leuven, Belgium
(B. Mesquita, N. Vanbeselaere)

Erika Rosa CAPPELLETTI
Milano, Italy
(S. Sacchi, C. Manzi)

Anna CZARNA
Krakow, Poland
(M. Bukowski, M. Sekerdej)

Gabriela CZARNEK
Krakow, Poland
(M. Bukowski, M. Kossowska)

Laura DI BELLA
Kent, UK
(R. Crisp, G. Randsley de Moura)

Jim EVERETT
Oxford, UK
(K. Schmid, M. Hewstone)

Edita FINO
Bologna, Italy
(M. Rubini, M. Menegatti)

Justyna GERLOWSKA
Lublin, Poland
(P. Colloqua, S. Costarelli)

Matthias GOBEL
London, UK
(R. Sanitioso, R. Custers)

Aurelien GRATON
Bordeaux, France
(F. Ric, A. Follenfant)

Annelie HARVEY
Essex, UK
(N. Geeraert, A. Uskul)

Anthony LANTIAN
Grenoble, France
(D. Muller, S. Demoulin)

Wim MEERHOLZ
Groningen, The Netherlands
(R. Spears, K. Epstude)

Kirsty MILLER
Dundee, UK
(F. Sani, N. Hopkins)

Thekla MORGENROTH
Exeter, UK
(M. Ryan, K. Peters)

Peter NAUROTH
Marburg, Germany
(U. Wagner, M. Gollwitzer)

Luca PANCANI
Milano, Italy
(S. Sacchi, C. Manzi)

Claudia ROSCINI
Greenwich, UK
(S. Stathi, D. Capozza)

Julia SASSE
Groningen, The Netherlands
(R. Spears, E. Gordijn)

Jellie SIERKSMA
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(F. Fleischmann, J. Degner)

Eftychia STAMKOU
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(G. van Kleef, A. Fischer)

Pawel STROJNY
Krakow, Poland
(M. Kossowska, M. Bukowski)

Jolien VAN BREEN
Groningen, The Netherlands
(C.K.W. de Dreu, R. Spears)

Julie VAN DE VYVER
Kent, UK
(D. Abrams, G. Randsley de Moura)

Anne Marthe VAN DER BLES
Groningen, The Netherlands
(M. van Zomeren, T. Postmes)

Grants

Liesbeth Mann (travel grant)
Maartje Meijs (travel grant)
Lisa Pagotto (seedcorn grant)
Sana Sheikh (seedcorn grant)
Marte van der Bles (travel grant)

Grant reports

Thijs Bouman

(University of Gronigen, The Netherlands)

Travel Grant

Thanks to the EASP postgraduate travel grant I was able to attend and present at the fourteenth SPSP annual meeting in New Orleans, January 2013.

In September 2010, I started my 4-year PhD project entitled "Local globalism: How global change influences local relationships" at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands. In this project, together with my supervisors Sabine Otten and Martijn van Zomeren, I investigate how threats from distant outgroups (e.g., Al Qaeda) influence local intergroup relationships within someone's nearby environment (e.g., interactions with Turkish Dutch, Arab Americans).

During my stay in New Orleans, I attended the "Group processes and intergroup relations" pre-conference and the SPSP general meeting, where I presented my poster "Threat by association: From distant threats to local intolerance". On my poster I presented three studies concerning the existence of so called "carry-over effects" of distant threats; that is, whether threats from distant outgroups are able to influence people's attitudes toward local outgroups which are associated to—but still clearly different from—the distant group that was originally posing the threat. In these studies we showed that particularly symbolic threats (i.e., threats to the ingroup's worldview, norms, and values) have the ability to carry over and influence intolerance toward local outgroups. In addition to the original session in which I was scheduled to present my poster, I was also given the opportunity to present my poster during the student poster awards final, in which I (together with 6 others) ended up as a winner.

The opportunity to present at the SPSP fourteenth annual meeting was extremely valuable for me and my project for multiple reasons. Because I am currently halfway my project it was the perfect opportunity to get feedback on my work so far, while still having the opportunity to incorporate the feedback in my future PhD work. Accordingly, the timing was optimal with regard to my project. In addition, because I could present my poster twice, I had ample time to present and discuss my work, which resulted in very useful feedback. These comments benefited my paper about these studies, my overall project, and provided me with new ideas for future studies.

In addition to these specific benefits regarding the poster presentation, the SPSP meeting was also very valuable in getting to know others' research. Both the poster sessions and the symposia provided many novel theoretical, methodological, and statistical insights. In addition, the conference was a good opportunity to get to know researchers with similar interests.

Lastly—and particularly relevant for the EASP—many fellow students/friends from the EASP 2012 summer school attended SPSP. Therefore, SPSP was a great place to talk about our research projects, catch up, and go out. Sanne Nauts and Michèle Bal even organized a "Limerick reunion" dinner which was a lot of fun. Accordingly, SPSP proved that the EASP summer school is not only a very useful learning experience, but also the perfect place to make friends all over the world.

I want to close by expressing my gratitude to the EASP for offering me the postgraduate travel grant and making this great experience possible: Thank you!

Marco Brambilla
(University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy)
Travel Grant

The Role of Morality and Perceived Threat in Shaping Intergroup Behaviours

Thanks to the EASP Post-Doctoral travel grant, I was able to visit Prof. Naomi Ellemers at the University of Leiden in November 2012. The main goal of my visit was to work on a project investigating the role of morality in shaping intergroup responses. During my stay, I worked on three studies that were designed in collaboration with Naomi Ellemers, Simona Sacchi, and Stefano Pagliaro. During the past decades, social psychology has addressed the social implications of morality in interpersonal relations and group processes (Haidt & Kesebir, 2010) showing the prominent role of moral characteristics in social judgment. Indeed, morality is a key element in people's self-concepts and perceptions of others (Rodriguez Mosquera, Manstead, & Fischer, 2002; Schwartz, 1992). Furthermore, at the group level, morality judgments play a prominent role (vs. sociability and competence) in shaping ingroup pride and identification, as well as guiding the formation of ingroup and outgroup impressions (Brambilla, Rusconi, Sacchi, & Cherubini, 2011; Brambilla, Sacchi, Rusconi, Cherubini, & Yzerbyt, 2012; Ellemers, Pagliaro, Barreto, & Leach, 2008; Leach, Ellemers, & Barreto, 2007). The primacy of morality in individual and group impression formation raises the important question of whether morality also guides people's behaviours towards others. However, to date little attention has been paid to the behavioural implications of perceived morality. Even more intriguing, is defining the factors driving the behavioural implications of morality. Indeed, prior research has not examined the important question concerning the basic mechanisms underlying the prominence of moral information over other information in different contexts. Thus, we designed three studies aimed at addressing these neglected issues by using an intergroup perspective and exploring the behavioural implications of group morality and the factors driving the impact of morality on behaviours toward ingroup and outgroup members. In Study 1, we experimentally ascribed moral characteristics to an ingroup or an outgroup member. In Study 2 we manipulated morality and competence characteristics, while in

Study 3, morality and sociability characteristics were manipulated. Results lend consistent support for our hypotheses that information about morality has a prominent role in predicting action tendencies and that this is driven by distinct mechanisms depending on the target of evaluation. Study 1 showed that moral information was equally important in determining behavioural responses toward an ingroup (i.e., an Italian guy) and an outgroup (i.e., an Indian guy) member. However, specific profiles of threat drive these behavioural dispositions. That is, as predicted, threat to group image mediated the effect of morality on the intention to approach an ingroup member, while the impact of morality on behavioural dispositions towards an outgroup member was mediated by the experience of safety threat. Study 2 corroborated these findings in a design that enabled us to disentangle the effects of perceived morality from competence as another important evaluative dimension. Results of this study confirmed the specific role of morality in this sense, as differential perceptions of the perceived competence of the target had no comparable effects on behavioural approach-avoidance tendencies. Study 3 offered further evidence for the unique effects of morality in predicting the experience of threat and determining behavioural dispositions. During my stay at Leiden, I worked on the data analysis and write-up of these studies, in consultation with Naomi Ellemers and other members of her research group.

I would like to thank Sibylle Classen for her valuable assistance in all stages as well as the Executive Committee for its support. Special thanks go to Naomi Ellemers and her research group for sharing nice research discussions.

References

- Brambilla, M., Rusconi, P., Sacchi, S., & Cherubini, P. (2011). Looking for honesty: The primary role of morality (vs. sociability and competence) in information gathering. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*, 135–143.
- Brambilla, M., Sacchi, S., Rusconi, P., & Cherubini, P., Yzerbyt, V.Y. (2012). You want to give a good impression? Be honest! Moral traits dominate group impression formation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*.
- Ellemers, N., Pagliaro, S., Barreto, M., Leach, C. W. (2008). Is it better to be moral than smart? The effects of morality and competence norms on the decision to work at group status improvement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 1397-1410.
- Haidt, J. & Kesebir, S. (2010). Morality. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (5th Edition) (pp.797-832). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Leach, C.W., Ellemers, N., & Barreto, M. (2007). Group virtue: The importance of morality (vs. competence and sociability) in the positive evaluation of in-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*, 234-249.
- Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M., Manstead, A. S. R., & Fischer, A. H. (2002). The role of honour concerns in emotional reactions to offences. *Cognition and Emotion, 16*, 143–163.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1–65). New York: Academic Press.

Mauro Giacomantonio
(University of Rome "Sapienza", Italy)
Seedcorn Grant

I recently received the Seedcorn research grant from the EASP. I used the assigned budget to finance a research project I developed together with my colleague Caterina Suitner (University of Padova, Italy). The main goal of our current research is to examine whether and how impact of embodied phenomena can be moderated by psychological distance and concomitant changes in construal level. In our opinion this is an important goal because little is known about conditions under which embodied phenomena are more likely to affect judgment, evaluations and actions.

Recent research from Maglio and Trope (2012) found that only individuals led to think concretely (vs. abstractly) were responsive to bodily states because of their concrete and contextual nature. To test this notion, the authors primed processing style (abstract vs. concrete) and then asked half of participants to wear a heavy backpack whereas the other half of participants did not wear any backpack. All participants evaluated the length of a hallway. As expected, wearing the backpack was associated with higher length estimates but only under concrete thinking.

Suitner and Giacomantonio (2012), with a similar research goal, focused on a different embodied phenomena based on writing and reading activities. The authors showed that a global, abstract (vs. local, concrete) thinking style promotes the tendency to use cognitive representations of social interactions with the agent to the left of the recipient and with the action evolving from left to right. The authors explained the finding by advancing that this Spatial Agency Bias (henceforth S.A.B.) is applied when no contextual information regarding the interaction is included in the mental representation, as is typically the case under global thinking. When an interaction is construed in a concrete fashion, it is likely to be imagined with greater attention to peripheral details, which in turn will influence the positioning of the agent.

Results obtained by Maglio and Trope (2012) might thus appear in contrast with those obtained by Suitner and Giacomantonio (2012). Indeed, in the first case the embodied phenomena considered (heavy backpack) was promoted by concrete thinking, whereas in the second case embodiment was more pronounced when individuals adopted an abstract thinking style.

To reconcile these findings we should consider that the SAB can be seen as a case of off-line embodiment, because the writing direction is reactivated in order to help form a mental image of the event which is to be represented. Off-line embodied phenomena, indeed, consist of motor/perceptual representations that are formed before a given situation is encountered and are later used to form judgments about the situation in the here and now (Wilson, 2002). In contrast, the effect of weight on length estimate examined by Maglio and Trope (2012) is an instance of on-line embodiment because it consists of the actual and immediate effect of contingent perceptual information on cognition (Niedental, Barsalou, Winkelman, Krath-Gruber, & Ric, 2005; Wilson, 2002). Indeed the evaluation of the length was simultaneous to the bodily experiences associated to the backpack wearing. Given these premises and based on apparently contrasting

previous findings, we hypothesize that off-line embodied processes will be emphasized and therefore more influential under abstract rather than concrete construal of the situation. In contrast, on-line processes will be more influential when individuals adopt a concrete rather than abstract mindset.

Research

At the present moment several experiments have been conducted and consistent, but not conclusive, evidence supporting the hypothesis has been collected.

In one of the first experiments conducted, we wanted to replicate the finding that abstract construal promotes off-line embodiment by testing whether manipulated psychological distance promotes the association between power and verticality (Schubert 2005). We have found weak but consistent pattern of data in line with this notion. For example, more frequently under high rather than low psychological distance, individuals recalled that a powerful person has been placed on higher position on sheet of paper as compared to a powerless person.

In subsequent experiments, in order to fully test our main hypothesis, we developed and adopted a different and original paradigm designed to vary, over a very short term, the extent to which participants were required to simulate the judgment originating from a specific bodily state. More specifically, in one condition, participants were asked to formulate a judgment of a target while experiencing a certain bodily state. The resulting embodied effect was *on-line* because participants do not need to recall and simulate the target and the bodily experience associated with it. In another condition, participants were asked to make a judgment after having observed the target in association with a given bodily state. In this case the judgment is not based on actual bodily states and, in order to formulate the required evaluations, participants recur to an abstract association between the target and the body experienced shortly before. This echoes the stable and decontextualized nature of *off-line* embodiment and its foundations of simulation processes (see Barsalou, 2008). The same paradigm has been applied to several different embodied phenomena such as, for example, the influence of facial muscles contraction on evaluations of neutral stimuli (Strack, Martin & Stepper, 1989) or the impact of font fluency and evaluation of task difficulty (Song & Schwarz, 2008). All in all, we found more than encouraging results suggesting that construal level differently moderate the influence of off-line vs. on-line simulations. For example, in one experiment, we asked participants to read a recipe written either with a difficult (mistral) or easy font (arial). We asked participants to imagine that the plan is to cook the recipe today (low psychological distance) or in a year from now (high psychological distance). Our dependent variable was perceived difficulty of the recipe. In the on-line condition participants were asked to evaluate difficulty while reading the recipe. In the off-line condition, participants first read the recipe and then, when the text was not available anymore, rated the perceived difficulty. As expected the difficult font led to increased rating of difficulty but only when the off-line condition was combined with high psychological distance and the on-line with low psychological distance.

Although several interesting findings solicit us to publish the results of the studies quickly, several methodological issues and unexpected findings force us to step back and approach our results with the due caution. Indeed, in some cases well-tested manipulations did not affect participants ratings on manipulation checks item. In other cases the manipulations of sensorimotor states had opposite effects than what expected. At the present moment

we are running more studies in order to provide a more clear-cut, straightforward evidence.

I used the budget for several purposes, all related to my research. For example I bought books, a computer, an Inquisit license. I also paid the fee and expenses of a national conference where I presented preliminary results and obtained valuable feedback. These purchases will help me in conducting future research. For these and other reasons I am very grateful for this grant.

I would like to thank Caterina Suitner for our wonderful collaboration and, as others before me, Sibylle Classen for her competent and kind help.

References

- Barsalou, L. W. (2008a). Grounded cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *59*, 617–645.
- Maglio, S. J., & Trope, Y. (2012). Disembodiment: Abstract Construal Attenuates the Influence of Contextual Bodily State in Judgment. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Genera*, *141*, 211-216..
- Niedenthal, P. M., Barsalou, L.W., Winkielman, P., Krauth-Gruber, S., & Ric, F. (2005). Embodiment in attitudes, social perception, and emotion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *9*, 184–211.
- Schubert, T. W. (2005). Your highness: Vertical positions as perceptual symbols of power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *89*, 1–21.
- Song, H., & Schwarz, N. (2008). If it's hard to read, it's hard to do: Processing fluency affects effort prediction and motivation. *Psychological Science*, *19*, 986–988.
- 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*, 768–777.
- Suitner, C., Giacomantonio, M. (2012). Seeing the Forest From Left to Right: How Construal Level Affects the Spatial Agency Bias. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *3*, 180-185.
- Wilson, M. (2002). Six views of embodied cognition. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *9*, 625–636.

Lisa K. Horvath

University of Bern, Switzerland
(Travel Grant)

Thanks to the EASP Travel Grant I was able to visit Prof. Madeline Heilman at the New York University for one month (October, 1st until 31st, 2012). My PhD thesis deals with „Gender-fair language and workplace discrimination“ and is based on Prof. Heilman's work on gender stereotypes and workplace discrimination (for a review see Heilman, 2012), respectively the 'lack of fit'-model (Heilman, 1983, 2001). In general, gender-fair language (e.g., feminine-masculine word pairs, German: *Projektleiterin/Projektleiter*, project leader,

fem./project leader masc.) leads to a higher mental inclusion in comparison to the masculine form (e.g., German: *Projektleiter*, project leader, fem./project leader masc.), which is still used as a generic to address both women and men (for a review see Stahlberg, Braun, Irmen & Sczesny, 2007). My PhD thesis is investigating whether the use of masculine forms endorse the lack of fit for women in leadership, whereas gender-fair language is a possibility counteracting it.

Because I had already started working with Prof. Heilman before this visit, the main aims of my time there were to continue our fruitful collaboration, to complete ongoing studies and papers and, furthermore, to undergo training in research methods. This month at NYU working with Prof. Heilman and her team was a very productive, instructive, and inspiring one. With respect to training, every week I presented parts of my research in the lab meetings. I have learned much about and from the experiments on workplace discrimination the other lab members presented. I also attended the meetings of the Social Psychology Department with great presentations from invited speakers or PhD students from the department. Furthermore, I was able to take part in the 'Research Methods' course taught by Prof. Heilman for PhD students.

Most important, I received precious feedback on my PhD studies – the most in many personal meetings with Prof. Heilman, but also from her lab members in the lab meetings. This feedback highly enriched the studies and papers we are currently working on. Moreover, all the mentioned activities and attendances to meetings and courses led to an improvement of my methodological knowledge, my scientific English, my presentation skills, and my skills in scientific debates.

Considering my future, this visit has given me a lot of inspiration and motivation, and furthermore, has strengthened my desire to continue with research after my PhD. With Prof. Heilman, we have already started developing a new project concerning men as norm violators and workplace discrimination. Specifically, men breaking gender norms and stereotypes in the workplace, for instance with not being exclusively career-oriented, but also being family-oriented, make men facing severe workplace discrimination (Heilman, 2012). This has rarely been subject to social psychological experimental research. During my visit at the New York University we developed a set of studies and a draft for a funding application to realize this project.

Summing up, this travel grant allowed me to acquire new knowledge and to visit a high-level research organization outside Europe. Moreover, it helped me to develop my research interests at the very cutting edge of the discipline, which supports my development as an independent researcher. Furthermore, this grant made it possible to deepen my collaboration with Prof. Heilman and to establish a long-term collaboration. Many thanks to EASP for making this visit possible!

References

- Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 5, 269–298.
- Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 657–674.
- Heilman, M. E. (2012). Gender Stereotypes and workplace bias. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 32, 113–135.

- Rudman, L. A. & Mescher, K. (2012). Penalizing Men Who Request a Family Leave: Is Flexibility Stigma a Femininity Stigma? *Journal of Social Issues*, Manuscript in press.
- Stahlberg, D., Braun, F., Irmen, L., & Sczesny, S. (2007). Representation of the sexes in language. In K. Fiedler (Ed.), *Social Communication* (pp. 163–187). New York: Psychology Press.

Maartje Meijs
Tilburg University, The Netherlands
(*Travel Grant*)

The EASP supported me to visit Dr. Kate Ratliff at the University of Florida in the United States in January and February 2013. Dr. Ratliff is one of the experts on implicit attitudes and a principal investigator in Project Implicit, a project initiated by Dr. Brian Nosek (University of Virginia) that focuses on basic and applied research concerning thoughts and feelings that occur outside conscious awareness or control. The aim of my visit to the University of Florida was to continue my collaboration with Dr. Ratliff with whom I have been working at Tilburg University, to start new research projects with her, and to learn about the measurement of implicit biases and the usage of Project Implicit.

My research deals with the effects of stereotype consistent and inconsistent behaviors and when these behaviors are used as an influence tactic with a focus on testing in which instances inconsistent behavior is seen as more positive and leads to positive outcomes for the actor. In my first (working) paper I focused on inconsistency with gender-stereotypes, but during my stay I tested whether these effects would also occur for other stereotypes. Under the supervision of Dr. Ratliff and Dr. Lammers (Tilburg University) I conducted three online scenario studies, but found no evidence that there is such a thing as a broader phenomenon in which stereotype-inconsistent behavior is judged more favorably. Evidence until now seems to indicate that inconsistency with gender-stereotypes can be seen as positive, but no such process takes place for other stereotypes.

Besides these studies Dr. Ratliff and I started a new project that is related to feminism. Many women are reluctant to call themselves feminists, although they agree to the basic principles of feminism. The new project that we started together will investigate two processes that may play in women's identification with feminism. The first line of research tests the hypothesis that women's identification with feminism will be lower to the extent that there is a mismatch between one's stereotypes of feminists and one's self-image on the stereotyped dimension. When women observe an inconsistency between their feminist-stereotypes and their self-image, they will be less likely to identify with feminism than women who do not observe such inconsistency. At the moment data for the first study of this line of research is being collected on Project Implicit. The second line is designed to test the idea that identification with feminism is influenced by reactance against the feminist message and tests the hypothesis that greater reactance, defined as an aversive state experienced in consequence of the perception that one has been limited in their freedom, will predict lower identification with feminism. We have planned to run studies for this line of research in the spring.

The department of Psychology at the University of Florida provided an inspiring and intellectually challenging environment for me by the many activities that I was able to attend. For example, I had the opportunity to follow the graduate seminar on attitudes by Dr. Ratliff in which I learned a lot about implicit attitudes and biases through the interesting discussions I had with the other graduate students. I loved the Fridays at the department with the statistics course by Dr. Webster that refreshed my memory and made me look at my research from a different angle. Following the class I was welcomed to attend the brownbag lunches where diverse speakers presented their research. The great people and their amazing hospitality, the beautiful nature of Florida, and the nice weather made my stay even better and I enjoyed every minute of it.

This was a very exciting experience which I truly enjoyed. Not only have I started a new line of research, I have also learned much about implicit biases and Project Implicit. I believe these skills will not only help me in my PhD project, but also in my later research career as post-doc and beyond. I would like to thank the European Association of Social Psychology for awarding me this postgraduate travel grant and the department of Social Psychology at Tilburg University for the willingness to fund part of this collaboration. Also I am very grateful to the department of Psychology at the University of Florida for their warm welcome and the inspiring time that I had in Gainesville.

Tomás A. Palma

Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL), Cis-IUL, Lisboa, Portugal
(*Travel Grant: Matlab Summer School for Psychologists, University of Nottingham, UK*)

Thanks to the EASP postgraduate travel grant, last year (July 2012) I had the opportunity to go to the Robin Hood's land, Nottingham, UK, to attend to the Matlab Summer School for Psychologists. The course took place at the University of Nottingham, in its beautiful University Park Campus, and was organized and lectured by Dr. Antonia Hamilton.

The goal of attending to this course was to get started with Matlab. Matlab is a powerful software based on a very flexible programming language that makes it optimal to work with advanced experimental designs, implement interactive experiments or analyze complex datasets including fMRI, EEG, EMG, or eyetracking.

The course spread through three days. In the first day we learned the basic notions and commands of Matlab. In the second day we learned about how to do scripts, to enter and manipulate data, and to make plots. In the last day we learned how to set up experiments. The classes were very well structured. There were always lots of exercises after each new topic we learned. Besides Dr. Antonia, we also had her Postdoc and PhD students helping solving the difficult exercises and giving smart advises. These people were Lauren Marsh, Yin Wang, and Pete Jones. During this course, I also had the chance to meet and discuss research with colleagues working in various topics, such as empathy or the mirror neurons system. Attending to the Matlab Summer School was also useful for my evaluation in the PhD program at ISCTE, as I did an assignment accessing my Matlab skills that I used to complete the number of assignments requested by my PhD program.

I also enjoyed the city of Nottingham, although it was almost always raining all the time. I had some time to walk in the city centre and discover some nice pubs and to eat the best chocolate cheesecake ever.

Taken together, I am very happy to have been given the opportunity to go to this Matlab Summer School. I believe my research will profit substantially from the knowledge I acquired. Thus I would like to express my gratitude to the EASP for making this possible and to Sibylle Classen for her help, efficiency, and kindness.

Marco Rego

(University of Exeter, United Kingdom)

(Travel grant)

Supported by a travel grant from the European Association of Social Psychology (EASP), I was given the opportunity to attend the meeting called "Power, politics, and paranoia: Why people are suspicious about their leaders", which took place from 13 to 14 July, 2012, in Amsterdam (the Netherlands). This meeting was organized by Jan Willem van Prooijen and Paul van Lange, from the Free University, Amsterdam, and took place at the Felix Meritis, in the center of Amsterdam.

In general, this meeting focused on a topic of extreme relevance for the PhD project I am working on, supervised by Prof. Manuela Barreto, University of Exeter: social power, its boundaries and its implications. I started my PhD early this year and I found it critical to get to know the work of the experts that attended the meeting. Specifically, my PhD project intends to examine the interplay between social power and (il)legitimacy, and aims to show that perceptions of illegitimate power raise psychological salience of alternative social systems which, in turn, affect powerful and powerless individuals and groups differently. We aim to investigate how perceptions of (il)legitimate power impact on the extent to which individuals accept the social hierarchy and, consequently, accept or reject the leaders.

The meeting I mentioned above addressed the fact that nowadays people are increasingly suspicious of the intentions and actions of their political leaders. It tried to understand where these feelings of distrust towards powerful people originate from, how people perceive their leaders and to what extent people are willing to accept transgressive power holders. The research that was presented covered a range of perspectives that helped us better understand the structure of a (distrustful) power relation: what a conspiracy theory is and when it emerges; the fact that some individuals are more prone to have a strong conspiracy belief than others; the consequences of believing in these theories; how events such as terrorism are experienced; but also the fact that power can be construed as an opportunity or as a responsibility; and the role that feelings of trust have on the cognitive differentials and executive abilities of powerful and of powerless people.

I found the meeting extremely interesting because not only it created an opportunity to discuss distinct research but also to learn novel arguments that, overall, pointed out why social change can be difficult to achieve. Indeed, attending this meeting enabled me to connect points and to build bridges between various research areas. Taking on board the

research that was presented, the general idea that people may have a particular dependency on their leaders, which might confine their possibility to object to them, was fascinating. Consequently, individuals may be more willing to accept (to some extent) the transgressive behaviour of their leaders and this could lead to a vicious cycle of power reinforcement. I think this is a very exciting idea and one that definitely provided some insights on my own project.

During my time in Amsterdam I personally thought that one of the possible answers to the question that was raised in the very title of the meeting ("Why people are suspicious about their leaders?") could be connected to the perception of illegitimate power and, consequently, of leaders. I believe that power is dynamic and that it can change. When people perceive a social hierarchy as illegitimate, it is then liable to be questioned. Thus, I would suggest that perception of illegitimate power can potentially stop the vicious cycle of power reinforcement - which is the main focus of my PhD project.

All in all, attending the meeting was a rewarding and extremely valuable experience for various reasons. First, it enriched my knowledge of the potential relation between power, illegitimacy and leaders but also enabled me to develop my thinking and work, making it possible to further advance on empirical ideas and methods. Another reason why this meeting was rewarding was the fact that it brought together scholars from different areas. It was indeed very interesting to understand the perspective of differential, social, economic and political psychologists on topics like tax compliance, authority, cooperation, conspiracy and cover up theories. This meeting was also an excellent opportunity to meet new people and top researchers. Discussing research ideas with them was truly inspiring.

Finally, I must say that discovering Amsterdam was fascinating and that it was the perfect setting for the meeting.

Taken together, this meeting was a fantastic opportunity from which I benefited greatly as a researcher but also on a private level. I sincerely thank the EASP for its support.

Lee Shepherd
University of Stirling
(*Seedcorn Grant*)

An EASP Postdoctoral Seedcorn Grant provided me with the opportunity to undertake a collaborative project with Russell Spears (University of Groningen) and Antony Manstead (Cardiff University). The aim of this research was to assess the relationship between directly experienced and anticipated group-based emotions. Below, I outline the rationale for this work and discuss some preliminary results.

Emotions may be experienced in the absence of personal responsibility when group members perceive an intergroup situation in a way that is consistent with a pre-existing emotional appraisal (Smith, 1993; Devos et al., 2003; Smith et al., 2007). For example, appraising the actions of one's group as illegitimate may evoke group-based guilt (Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, & Manstead, 1998), shame (Iyer et al., 2007; Johns et al., 2005; Lickel et al., 2005), ingroup-directed anger (Iyer et al., 2007), or regret (Imhoff et al., 2012). These group-based emotions are associated with different action tendencies. Group-based shame and anger are associated with reparation and collective action (Brown & Cehajic, 2008;

Iyer et al., 2007). Group-based guilt, on the other hand, is more likely to predict less effortful behaviours (such as reparation) rather than highly effortful behaviours, such as collective action (for discussions, see Iyer et al., 2007; Leach et al., 2006). Moreover, regret is likely to predict reparation (Imhoff et al., 2012).

Recently, Baumeister et al. (2007) cast doubt on the idea that emotions directly predict behaviour, arguing instead that this relationship is mediated by anticipated emotions. Negative emotions (e.g., sadness) may lead to action tendencies (e.g., alcohol consumption) because people anticipate (based on previous experiences) that this action would make them feel better. This approach implies that the anticipation of positive emotions (e.g., satisfaction) for undertaking actions that alleviates negative arousal mediates the relationship between emotions and their corresponding action tendencies. Although there is support for this hypothesis at the interpersonal level (e.g., Brown & McConnell, 2011), it has not been tested at the intergroup level. Feeling regret, guilty, ashamed and angry about Britain's inaction in Syria might result in ingroup members anticipating group-based satisfaction for undertaking actions (such as reparation and protesting in favour of an intervention) that may alleviate these aversive emotions. There is indirect support for this idea from research demonstrating that experiencing satisfaction for a past ingroup action increases support for this action in the future (Maitner, Mackie, & Smith, 2007) and that group members feel satisfaction after undertaking action tendencies that alleviate a negative emotion (Maitner, Mackie, & Smith, 2006). The first aim of this research was to provide direct support for this mediating hypothesis by assessing whether the relationship between directly experienced group-based emotions and behaviour is mediated by anticipated group-based satisfaction.

Baumeister et al. (2007) also suggest that negative directly experienced emotions serve the social function of increasing the accuracy of their anticipated counterpart, which, in turn, prevents a transgression from being repeated in the future. In previous research we have found that people may anticipate group-based guilt, shame and anger for a proposed ingroup transgression (e.g., the use of military force against Iran), and that shame and anger promote collective action against the transgression, whereas guilt evokes reparation (Shepherd, Spears, & Manstead, 2012). However, to date no research has assessed whether these anticipated group-based emotions mediate the relationship between directly experienced group-based emotions and future behaviour. This longitudinal study will assess whether experiencing group-based guilt, shame and anger for an ingroup transgression (e.g., Britain's failure to intervene in Syria) predicts collective action in favour of Britain helping an oppressed outgroup (e.g., Bahraini anti-government protestors) a week later and whether this relationship is mediated by the anticipation of aversive group-based emotions (e.g., regret, guilt, shame, and anger) for failing to help oppressed groups.

We assessed these hypotheses in the context of the Syrian Uprising. After giving consent, participants read some information about the Syrian Uprising and the government's use of military force against its own people. The information described some of the massacres that have occurred in Syria and the Syrian people's request for help from Western Nations. Participants were told that Western Nations could not use military force because such action has been vetoed by China and Russia. However, there were numerous non-military interventions that may be used to help to reduce the violence and protect the Syrian people from their government. For example, Western forces could provide the rebel army with logistical support, prevent arms from being sent to the Syrian Military, or put

pressure on Syrian army officials to persuade them to stop fighting against rebels. We then manipulated the legitimacy of such actions. Participants in the illegitimate condition were told that it would be illegitimate to undertake such actions without the support of the UN. In the legitimate condition participants were told that it may be possible to use such actions without the support of the UN and that the failure to do this may mean that Britain is partly responsible for the atrocities committed against Syrian people.

Next, participants rated the extent to which they felt (group-based) regret, guilt, shame and anger at the fact that Britain had not used the non-military interventions to help reduce the violence committed against the Syrian people. Participants then rated the extent to which they anticipated feeling satisfaction if Britain were to a) use non-military interventions to help the Syrian people and b) compensate the Syrian people. Finally, participants rated their support for collective action in favour of the use of the non-military interventions in Syria and their willingness to compensate the Syrian people.

One week later participants were invited to take part in the second part of the study via email. In this online study participants first rated the extent to which they anticipated feeling group-based regret, guilt, shame and anger if Britain failed to help an oppressed nation that was in need. Participants then read about the political situation in Bahrain. This information stated that Bahraini security forces were using excessive force to crush anti-government protests and that the Bahraini people had recently asked for Western Nations to pledge their help in order to prevent future violence by the government's security forces. Participants then rated with willingness to undertake collective action in favour of Britain pledging to help protect Bahraini people from violence from their country's security forces.

Although we are in the early stage of analysis, the preliminary results are positive. Experiencing group-based anger for Britain's failure to undertake non-military interventions positively predicts people's willingness to engage in collective action in favour of non-military interventions and their willingness to compensate Syrian people. Importantly, these relationships were mediated by the extent to which people anticipated feeling satisfaction for undertaking such actions. These results reflect the fact that group-based anger predicted collective action and reparation via anticipated group-based satisfaction.

The extent to which participants felt the directly experienced group-based emotions at Time 1 also predicted the extent to which people anticipated these emotions at Time 2. Interestingly, feeling group-based anger towards Britain's failure to help Syrian people positively predicted collective action in favour of helping Bahraini people. As hypothesized, this relationship was mediated by anticipated group-based anger. These results reflect the fact that feeling anger at the ingroup's failure to help another country positively predicted the extent to which people anticipated feeling group-based anger if their group failed to help an oppressed nation in the future. The more group members anticipated feeling this anger, the more willing they were to undertake collective action to help an oppressed group.

In line with our rationale, this research suggests that the relationship between directly experienced group-based emotions and behavior is (at least partially) mediated by anticipated group-based emotions. This pilot work has produced some promising findings and will be the basis for a series of future studies in this area. I would like to thank EASP

for providing me with the opportunity to conduct this research. Moreover, I would highly recommend that other early-career researchers apply for this funding.

News from the Executive Committee

EASP Membership fees

Currently, the EASP has a quite complicated membership fee structure. In line with our articles and standing orders, there are full members, affiliate members and postgraduate members. Full members currently pay €6, affiliate members pay 80% of this fee (currently €7) and postgraduate members and retired members 50% (currently €4).

Moreover, we have different types of reduced membership fees. First, there are reduced fees depending on the country the member is located. Full members and postgraduate members living in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia or Slovenia pay half of the fee (€4 and €2 respectively). Full members and postgraduate members living in Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania, or Russia pay €3 and €1.5 respectively. Second, there is a 50% reduction for retired members. Finally, we have the option of a one-year waiver available for those who are having financial difficulties and are unable to pay dues. Please note that none of these different types of reduced membership fees is mentioned in our articles or standing orders.

There are two problems with the current membership fee structure. First, it is too complicated. Currently we have eight different types of membership fees and the option for a full waiver. From an administrative perspective this is a quite a nightmare. Second, it is outdated. Due to major economical and political changes in Europe, the list with reduced membership countries does not seem up to date anymore. This is also clear from the requests for waivers that we have received from members from countries other than the ones mentioned above.

We think that it is time to change our membership fee structure. Our aim is to make it simpler (fewer different types of membership fees), more up to date, and more flexible. At the same time we want to stay in line with the current articles and standing orders of the EASP.

The proposal is to have five types of membership fees:

Regular full membership €6
Regular postgraduate membership: €4
Affiliate membership: €7
Reduced full membership: €4
Reduced postgraduate membership: €2.

Whether a member opts for the regular fee or for the reduced fee is up to the individual member, no questions asked. However, it is important to note that a membership incorporates a subscription to the European Journal of Social Psychology (only on-line in the case of postgraduate membership), to the European Review of Social Psychology, and on-line subscription to Social Psychological and Personality Science. The regular fees barely cover the actual costs of this package for the EASP. A reduced fee means that the EASP is in fact sponsoring the membership. This is not, and should not be a problem, as long as only those that need it use reduced membership. In line with the mission of the

association, the EASP has sponsored membership from Eastern European countries for years. Currently around 10% of our members have a reduced membership fee. At this moment in time, however, it is less clear what the basis for reduced membership should be. Therefore, we propose to leave this up to the individual member. Of course we will monitor this closely. If too many members need to make use of a reduced membership fee, we need to rethink our membership fee structure and costs.

Finally, and importantly, the option for a one-year full waiver will remain.

The executive committee aims to introduce this new membership fee scheme in 2014. All comments by members on this new scheme are welcome. Please e-mail to Daniël at d.wigboldus@psych.ru.nl or to Sibylle sibylle@easp.eu

Daniël Wigboldus, Treasurer

Reaching out together: Towards European funds for Social Psychology

In a prior issue of this bulletin, we described some steps we have taken to improve the prospects for European funding for social psychological research. One of the needs we identified is to increase the representation of social psychologists on evaluation panels. We have taken several steps in this direction, and have had some success, but much more needs to be done. We face an important obstacle: finding responsive contact persons within European funding agencies. European funding agencies are rather opaque organizations and our chances to succeed in this endeavour strongly depend on approaching the right people. We have received some tips from some members, but these have so far had only limited success. Therefore I leave here an appeal to all members: if you have any contacts within European funding agencies (especially ERC or EC), please let us know. Any other suggestions are, of course, very welcome as well.

We also remain attentive to discussions and negotiations surrounding Horizon 2020, and continue to join forces with other associations in this regard. In this way, we have become aware of an initiative to explore the potential role of Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH) in Horizon 2020. You may have received an email through our mailing list explaining how you can contribute to this initiative, i.e., by answering 5 questions regarding your research. Your contribution is essential: the more social psychologists respond, the more likely it will be that our topics of research will be funded through European funding agencies between 2014 and 2020. If you have not seen this email, please let us know.

Many social psychologists do not see discussions surrounding European funds as relevant to their own activities. This may be partly because it has not been easy (to say the least) for social psychologists to attract such funds. Beyond this, however, social psychologists may also fail to understand that European funds are indeed 'for us' (more on this soon!). European funds cover a variety of projects, from more individual and fundamental research, to applied and collaborative projects, as well as funds to develop infrastructures.

Interdisciplinarity is not essential for some of these schemes, but it is also clear that social psychologists can be a valuable part of interdisciplinary projects. European funds are for us, but only if we take part in shaping them—and this is what we need to be more proactive about.

Manuela Barreto, European Liaison Officer

Announcements

EASP Summer School 2016: in search of a location

While the Lisbon team is preparing the 2014 EASP Summer School, the Executive Committee has already started its search for a location to host the 2016 edition. Some of you who still have lively memories of earlier schools, either as participants, teachers, or as sponsors of participants, may perhaps consider becoming responsible for organising a summer school themselves. The Executive Committee welcomes all proposals (just drop a note to Sibylle Classen by **mid of September 2013**, latest at sibylle@easp.eu).

Jos Jaspars Awards - Call for Applications

Candidates for the Jos Jaspars awards should have obtained their PhD not earlier than January 1st of the year of the previous General Meeting (January, 1st 2011). Note that this period can be extended for up to one additional year in case the candidate can prove to have taken a maternal or paternal leave.

Candidates should be full members of EASP by the time their application for the award is submitted.

Recipients of the Jos Jaspars awards will be decided by a four-person panel comprising one member of the Executive Committee and three external members.

Candidates are asked to submit their curriculum vitae, and two references; at least one of the referees should be a member of the Association. These items should be sent by e-mail to the Executive Officer sibylle@easp.eu, **before October 1st 2013**.

Members of the Association are asked to encourage suitable candidates to apply at the appropriate time.

As a tribute to Jaspars' influential editorship of the European Journal of Social Psychology, the publishers of the Journal are sponsoring the Awards financially. This funding will cover the registration fees of the awardees for the General Meeting in Amsterdam.

Recipients of the Jos Jaspars Award will be decided by a four-person panel comprising one member of the Executive Committee and 3 external members.

More information is available on our website:

<http://www.easp.eu/activities/own/awards/jaspars.htm>

Kurt Lewin Awards – Call for Nominations

Criteria and application procedure for the Kurt Lewin Awards for a significant research contribution.

The Kurt Lewin awards are designed to recognize significant research contributions made by any full member of the Association who has passed beyond the age/time criteria of the Jos Jaspars award. This can be seen as similar to mid-career contribution awards in other associations although no age-limit is placed on the recipient: it is their contribution to the field through a particular research program or area of research that is being recognized.

The procedure for this award is that candidates are nominated by two full members of the Association, who motivate in their letters why, in their view, the candidate deserves this award. Nominators should inform the proposed candidate of their intention to nominate in order to coordinate the procedure (e.g., ensure a minimum of two nominations being proffered). Both nominators should state in writing that they have permission of the candidates as their official nominators (i.e. to ensure that no more than two “official” nominations are considered per candidate by the panel). These nominations including the curriculum vitae of the candidate should be received by the Executive Officer sibylle@easp.eu, before **October, 1st, 2013** who will forward it to the selection committee

Recipients of the Kurt Lewin Award will be decided by a four-person panel comprising one member of the Executive Committee and 3 external members.

Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Executive Officer by **September, 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 **September, 15th, 2013**.

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

Executive Committee

Manuela Barreto (European Liaison), 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 - Géopolis, 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: xeniachr@panteion.gr, xeniachrysochoou@yahoo.gr

Alex Haslam (Journals), School of Psychology, University of Queensland, St Lucia
QLD 4072 Australia
e-mail: a.haslam@uq.edu.au

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>