

European Bulletin of Social Psychology

Editors: Russell Spears & Sibylle Classen

2 Editorial

4 General Meeting, Opatija, Croatia, June 10-14, 2008

11 New Books by Members

Advances in the Psychology of Justice and Affect (2007) ed. by D. de Cremer
Social Connectionism: A Reader and Handbook for Simulations (2007) by F. van Overwalle

16 Book Reviews

To be an immigrant by D. de Cremer, Review by Maykel Verkyuten

20 Future EAESP Meetings – Calendar

21 Future EAESP Meetings

Small Group Meeting on Dehumanization: Determinants and Consequences of Perceiving Others as Less Than Humans, June 6-9, 2008, Kazimierz Dolny (Poland) – CHANGED DATE

24 Reports of Previous Meetings

Small Group Meeting on Fundamental Dimensions of Social Judgment: A View from different Perspectives, June 7-9, 2007, Namur, Belgium

28 Other Reports

Report from the Summer Institute in Social Psychology, Austin, Texas, July 25-27, 2007

Outlook from a Conference. Social Psychology in Sweden

The Second Warsaw-Jena Seminar on Victim/Perpetrator Relations in a Changing Europe, Warsaw, April 13-15, 2007

45 Grants and Grant Reports

64 Announcements

Jos Jaspars Awards – Call for Applications

Kurt Lewin Awards – Call for Nominations

Election of New Executive Committee Members – Call for Nominations

67 Deadlines for Contributions

68 Executive Committee

Editorial

Dear colleagues and friends,

as the next General EAESP meeting is approaching I would like to invite you to participate in this important event for a large community of European (but not only European) social psychologists. I want to share with you my excitement of being a host of the next General Meeting and announce that all preparatory activities are going smoothly and the conference website is now up and running.

The location for the 15th EAESP General Meeting Opatija, Croatia came up in early spring 2005 in Budapest when the meeting of Eastern European psychologists and EAESP Executive Committee members was held. This was a reflection of the well-known practice of the EAESP to bring together social psychologists from East and West to share their work and knowledge. While exchanging enthusiastically the work that has been done since the changes in the political landscape of the European continent, an idea about having the next GM in one of the Eastern European countries was born. When the members of the EAESP Executive Committee visited Opatija in April, 2006 they were enchanted. They decided to give the other members a very good reason to come and enjoy Opatija. It is my honour and my great pleasure to serve as a host and a chair of the Organizing Committee of the 15th EAESP General Meeting.

The city of Opatija is the top destination on the beautiful Adriatic coastline. The region and the city are renowned for their pleasant climate, crystal clear sea, excellent wines and gastronomy. It is no wonder that the first tourists were the European nobility who, having discovered this picturesque place, started building villas to enjoy the sun and the sea. Today, this Riviera is less than two hours by road from airports in Zagreb (Croatia), Ljubljana (Slovenia) and Trieste (Italy). It is also within driving distance of Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Italy, and Hungary. The Hotel Ambassador and the Grand Hotel Four Flowers, which are only five minutes walking distance apart, will serve as the conference venues.

These, as well as most of the other hotels, are located on the seafront, with private beaches and a short walk from the town's main attractions.

The conference scientific program is in the reliable hands of our distinguished colleague Professor Jens Förster. However, although being the main reason, the scientific program is not the only reason to participate in the conference. I do hope you will come to enjoy a company of the old friends and colleagues, to meet new people and to make some new friendships. The social program will offer an insight into the local culture, visits to the nearby attractions and evening entertainment. There will also be attractive pre- and post-conference tours to destinations such as Venice (Italy), the unique Plitvice Lakes National Park (a UNESCO World Heritage location), the monumental Postojna Caves (Slovenia) and the Istria peninsula. You could also visit one of the thousand Adriatic islands for a relaxing week. The weather in June should be sunny, with daytime temperatures of 20-23 degrees Celsius.

The local hosts, the Department of Psychology, University of Zagreb and the Society for Psychological Assistance (SPA), will make sure that you, as the EAESP members and guests, your family and friends feel welcome and comfortable. We believe that the beautiful environment, good companionship and delicious food will provide a stimulating atmosphere to the high quality scientific program for which we are gathering.

We look forward to welcoming you in Opatija!

On behalf of the Organizing committee

Dinka Čorkalo Biruški, chair

General Meeting

Opatija, Croatia, June 10-14, 2008

Introduction

The next General Meeting will take place in Opatija, June 10-14, 2008. We are pleased to offer you some general information about this upcoming EAESP meeting.

Anything you may want to know about the 15th General Meeting in more detail (travel, accommodation etc.) is now available on the website:

<http://www.eaesp2008.com>

This website can also be accessed via a link of the Associations website:

<http://www.eaesp.org>

Submitting proposals

Submissions can be made exclusively on line through the website indicated above, from September 1 until November 1, 2007.

We invite proposals for symposia and for individual contributions (poster and oral presentation). Each participant can be a first author for only one oral presentation at the Meeting (not including the role of a discussant at a symposium).

Detailed instructions for submission may be found on the website:

<http://www.eaesp2008.com>

Scientific Committee

Responsibility for the scientific program of the General Meeting rests with a Scientific Committee chaired by Jens Förster. The committee is structured into five editorial boards which correspond to the five thematic categories of the scientific program (see list below for an overview).

- 1) *Social cognition*
- 2) *Interpersonal processes*
- 3) *Intergroup relations*
- 4) *Group processes*
- 5) *Attitudes, emotions and motivation*

Registration info

You can register, submit abstracts or arrange accommodation from September 1, 2007.

Registration fees

As always, the conference fee varies, depending on the category of the attendee and the time of registration. The registration fee for the conference delegates includes access to all conference events, conference materials, the book of abstracts, morning and afternoon coffee break refreshments, lunches and the welcome cocktail. Registration fee for accompanying persons include the welcome cocktail and lunches. Admission to the conference venue will be restricted to the delegates wearing conference badges.

The table below provides an overview of conference prices that are given in Euros.

	until March 15, 2008	until April 30, 2008	until May 20, 2008	after May 21, 2008
Full/Affiliate member Student non-member	245 €	290 €	350 €	450 €
Postgraduate member/ Eastern member	165 €	200 €	250 €	350 €
Non-member	380 €	450 €	550 €	650 €
Accompanying person	55 €	55 €	55 €	55 €

Social events

The social programme will start with the Welcome Cocktail that will be held on the magnificent terrace overlooking the sea of the oldest and most elegant hotel, the Hotel Kvarner.

The special social event will be the Conference Dinner with the opportunity to enjoy exquisite gourmet dishes of the local and international cuisine, local wines and dance to the tunes of the music for all preferences.

The optional social program will offer conference participants and accompanying persons an insight into the culture from the Roman times to the imperial Habsburg family. A number of half and full-day tours will be offered to visit such places as the magnificent *Postojna Caves* in nearby Slovenia, *Venice* in Italy, *Brijuni National Park*, *Plitvice Lakes National Park* or see the spectacular inland of Istria with the unique mountain-top medieval cities such as *Motovun*. Visits to vine and olive making family-run facilities with wine tasting and opportunity to buy some of the world best virgin olive oil will be offered.

It will also be possible to organize pre- and post-conference tours to the destinations along the Adriatic coast. For those conference participants and their families wishing to take a few days of relaxing holidays on one of the thousands of the islands a travel agency will help make arrangements. The partner travel agency will be announced soon on the meeting website.

Accommodation

Accommodation includes a range of hotels from five to two star categories, and private rooms and 1- and 2-bed apartments. The conference participants can enjoy specially discounted prices. Accommodation is guaranteed until 10 April, 2008. However, given the attractiveness of the location and the season, early booking is strongly advised.

HOTEL	category	single room	double room
Ambasador	*****	96	132
Milenij	*****	92	138
Villa Ambasador	****	87	114
Kristal	****	87	114
Admiral	****	87	114
Grand Hotel 4 Flowers	****	85	124
Agava	****	73	104
Istra	***	53	66
Imperijal	***	53	66
Palace-Bellevue	***	53	66
Kvarner	***	53	66
Belvedere	**	49	58
Tax per person, per day 1 €			
All prices are in Euros and include bed, breakfast & VAT per room.			

Important Dates

2007

September 1 Open on-line submission via the conference website

November 1 Deadline for submissions

2008

February 15	Notification of authors about acceptance of submissions
March 15	Deadline for reduced early registration fees
April 10	Deadline for guaranteed accommodation
April 30	Deadline for standard registration fees
May 15	Confirmed time schedule of presentation to presenters
May 20	Deadline for late registration (on-site fees thereafter)
June 8-9	Pre-conference meetings
June 10-14	15 th EAESP General Meeting

Contact

For question regarding

... registration and accommodation

mail to: secretariat@eaesp2008.com

... abstracts

mail to: abstracts@eaesp2008.com

... transfers – organisation of airport transfers

mail to: transfers@eaesp2008.com

...the scientific program

Jens Förster

mail to: j.foerster@jacobs-university.de

Last but not least...

We sincerely hope that the above information and the website will pique your interest and will be helpful in your preparations to participate in the 15th General Meeting.

You can help to make the planning as smooth as possible by paying close attention to all instructions and deadlines. Please also check the website regularly, where more and updated information will be posted as the meeting draws closer.

If you have any other questions, please feel free to get in touch with the appropriate contact person.

New Books by Members

Advances in the Psychology of Justice and Affect

Edited by **David De Cremer (2007)**

Greenwich: Information Age Publishing

Paperback ISBN: 978-1-59311-733-3 (\$39.95)

Hardcover ISBN: 978-1-59311-774-0 (\$73.25)

Advances in the Psychology of Justice and Affect presents a collection of chapters written by leading scholars attempting to illuminate the developing trends in explaining and understanding the role that affect plays in justice and vice versa. The book comes at a particular fitting time as it is recognized that justice is in the eye of the beholder, but unfortunately clear theoretical perspectives have not been clearly outlined yet. This book addresses this need by presenting a variety of perspectives advocating the further integration between both fields and how this may be achieved. Moreover, the book also provides a discussion of what we know as yet and where this integrative field should be going. The book is divided in three parts discussing the nature of justice and affect, justice, morality and affect and affect at work.

The market for this book is students and researchers in social psychology, organizational behaviour and management, behavioural economics, philosophy, and other related social sciences fields. Graduate students and upper level graduates can make use of the book as a supplementary text.

CONTENTS:

Part I: Introduction. Justice and Affect: When Two Friends Meet
David De Cremer.

Part II: The Nature of Justice and Affect. Justice Violations, Emotional Reactions, and Justice-Seeking Responses, *Alicia F. Bembeneke, Denise R. Beike, and David A. Schroeder.* Do the Emotions of Others Shape Justice Effects? An Interpersonal Approach, *David De Cremer, Gerben A. van*

Kleef, and Maarten J. J. Wubben. Hot Cognition and Social Justice Judgments: The Combined Influence of Cognitive and Affective Factors on the Justice Judgment Process, Kees van den Bos. The Role of Emotions in Cross-Cultural Justice Research, Seger Breugelmans and David De Cremer.

Part III: Justice, Morality and Affect. Emotional Responses Uncover the Contextual Meaning of Acting (Un)Fairly, *Celia Gonzalez and Tom R. Tyler. Justice, Fairness, and Strategic Emotional Commitments, Timothy Ketelaar and Bryan Koenig. Passions for Justice, Elizabeth J. Horberg and Dacher Keltner.*

Part IV: Justice and Affect at Work. Scholarly Biases in Studying Justice and Emotion: If We Don't Ask, We Don't See, *Thomas M. Tripp and Robert J. Bies. The Interplay between Justice and Affect in Groups, Barbara van Knippenberg, Daan van Knippenberg, and David De Cremer. A Cognitive-Emotional Theory of Customer Injustice and Emotional Labor: Implications for Customer Service, Fairness Theory, and the Multifoci Perspective, Deborah E. Rupp, A. Silke Holbu, and Alicia A. Grandey. Consequences of Interactional (In)justice: A Look at Leader Behaviors and Follower Perceptions, Nicole E. Kohari and Robert G. Lord.*

Part V: Conclusion. Justice and Affect: Where Do We Stand?, *Jerald Greenberg and Deshani B. Ganegoda.*

*Social Connectionism: A Reader and Handbook for Simulations*By **Frank Van Overwalle**¹⁾ (2007)

Psychology Press

Many of our thoughts and decisions on social beings and ourselves occur without us being conscious of them taking place; connectionism attempts to reveal the internal hidden dynamics that drive the thoughts and actions of both individuals and groups. Connectionist modeling is a radically innovative approach to theorizing in psychology, and more recently in the field of social psychology. The connectionist perspective interprets human cognition as a dynamic and adaptive system that learns from its own direct experiences or through indirect communication from others.

Social Connectionism offers an overview of the most recent theoretical developments of connectionist models in social psychology. The volume is divided into four sections, beginning with an introduction and overview of social connectionism. This is followed by chapters on causal attribution, person and group impression formation, and attitudes. Each chapter is followed by simulation exercises that can be carried out using the FIT simulation program; these guided exercises allow the reader to reproduce published results.

Social Connectionism will be invaluable to graduate students and researchers primarily in the field of social psychology, but also in cognitive psychology and connectionist modeling.

The accompanying FIT Program is freely available, as well as the FIT Exercises described in the book (see www.vub.ac.be/FIT).

¹⁾ **Frank Van Overwalle** is a full professor affiliated with the Department of Psychology at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel. He got his MSc in psychology in 1980, and defended his PhD in 1987, for which he received the Tobie Jonckheere Award of the Belgian Royal Academy of Sciences, Letters and Arts. Recently, he has developed artificial neural network models of social cognition, and has authored some 35 peer-refereed scientific publications in leading journals.

REVIEWS

About the book:

"An excellent and timely overview of one of the most important theoretical developments in social cognition in the past years" - Gerd Bohner, University of Bielefeld, Germany

About the FIT software:

"My students are absolute beginners with respect to running a simulation, but have mastered the FIT2 program pretty quickly. Okay, "mastered" may be a slight exaggeration, but they learned pretty quickly how to use it. The program is a very valuable tool!" - Frank Siebler

CONTENTS

Part I: Basics.

Van Overwalle, *Introduction and Overview*. Vanhoomissen & Van Overwalle, *Connectionist Basics*. Van Overwalle & Vanhoomissen, *Recurrent and Feedforward Connectionist Networks, and their Emergent Properties*. Van Overwalle & Van Rooy,

Part II: Causal Attribution.

Van Overwalle & Van Rooy, *When More Observations are Better Than Less: A Connectionist Account of the Acquisition of Causal Strength*. Read & Montoya, *An Autoassociative Model of Causal Reasoning and Causal Learning: Reply to Van Overwalle's (1998) Critique of Read and Marcus-Newhall (1993)*. Van Overwalle, *When One Explanation is Enough: A Connectionist View on the Fundamental Attribution Bias*. Van Overwalle,

Part III: Person and Group Impression Formation.

Smith & DeCoster, *Knowledge Acquisition, Accessibility, and Use in Person Perception and Stereotyping: Simulation With a Recurrent Connectionist Network*. Van Overwalle & Labiouse, *A Recurrent Connectionist Model of Person Impression Formation*. Van Rooy, Van Overwalle, Vanhoomissen, Labiouse & French, *A Recurrent Connectionist Model of Group Biases*. Queller

& Smith, *Subtyping Versus Bookkeeping in Stereotype Learning and Change: Connectionist Simulations and Empirical Findings*. Van Overwalle,

Part IV: Attitudes.

Van Overwalle & Siebler, *A Connectionist Model of Attitude Formation and Change*.

Appendix: FIT Manual

FEATURES of the FIT SOFTWARE:

- You can directly compare the simulation output with real observed data from actual experiments (hence its name FIT). While it is of great importance to test whether a simulated theoretical model can reproduce actual data, this often is a tedious job in other programs. In this program, this is the basic of the program input (although it is possible also to specify no actual data).
- In addition, you can automatically search for the parameter values of the simulated model that best fit with your actual data.
- The program allows you to specify different categories (blocks) of trial and test data, which can be processed in a random order per category if you wish. Most importantly, each of these categories can be processed in an order that you specify in a session. This allows you to follow actual experimental procedures or imaged learning histories in detail, without complicated script writing. It is even possible to specify several session categories, so that you can test different learning histories for the same data.
- You specify the data input (trial and session categories) in a user's friendly data grid, which is very similar to common spreadsheets like Excel. The simulated output is also given as grid data, and can be visually inspected by graphs, or can be exported to other programs.

Book Reviews

To be an immigrant, by **Kay Deaux**

Russel Sage Foundation

<http://www.russellsage.org/publications/books/060712.429956>

Review by **Maykel Verkuyten** (Utrecht University, The Netherlands)

This book makes a convincing and stimulating case for the relevance of social psychology in immigration studies. Immigration is a process that affects people and their identities in profound and many different ways depending on individual capacities, perceptions and motivations, and on social conditions and circumstances. An increasing number of social psychologists is interested in questions related to immigration. This is illustrated in the growing number of papers that are being published in the major social psychological journals. Social psychologists tend to study how immigrants adapt to a new homeland and form distinctive identities, how host society members respond to immigrants and refugees, and also the dynamics of intergroup encounters. The great value and major strength of this book is that it tries to give a comprehensive analytical framework for studying immigration.

The central theoretical perspective is one of persons in contexts, or the intersection between the individual and environment. This means that three levels of analysis are considered. On the macro level, attention is given to immigration policies, demographics and social representations; on the meso level the focus is on social interactions, intergroup relations and social networks; and on the micro level, individuals attitudes, values, expectations and motivations are studied.

The first two chapters of the book examine the macro contextual factors that form the boundary conditions for possibilities and potentials that individual immigrants have in negotiating an identity and finding a place in society. The focus in these chapters is on North American, and the

United States in particular. A concise history of U.S. immigration policy, demographics and social representations about immigration and immigrants is given. This is particularly useful for European readers.

In addition, separate chapters discuss research on existing images of immigrants and newcomers. What the host society thinks that people are, shapes who they tend to become. Importantly, one chapter is concerned with the beliefs and images of the generic immigrant and another chapter focuses on specific beliefs about specific groups of immigrants.

Immigration and immigrant attitudes can be more or less affirmative or favourable, depending, for example, on perceived threats and beliefs about group competition and zero-sum outcomes. However, not all immigrants are alike in the eyes of the host, making it necessary to examine the role of group-specific stereotypes. In a separate chapter, Deaux discusses social psychological work on immigrant stereotypes and group-based discrimination. This work shows that not all immigrants encounter the same expectations or face the same challenges. There are important differences between groups, as there are individual differences within groups.

Chapters 5 to 7 focus on ethnic and national identity. Many social psychologists are interested in the topic of group identity. This interest has resulted in various conceptualisations and distinctions between elements or dimensions of identity, and has yielded different measures. Deaux argues, and clearly shows, that ethnic identity is multifaceted, dynamic in nature and that it combines with other group identities in different ways. This diversity and complexity requires an organizing framework that allows for sensible analytical distinctions and makes adequate comparisons between empirical work possible. The framework proposed was first introduced by Deaux and colleagues in an influential paper on collective identity published in *Psychological Bulletin* in 2004. In addition to this paper, the book provides many examples and discussions about the ways that this organizing framework allows for more targeted and precise discussions of ethnic identity and identity change. In addition, the important issues of multiplicity and intersectionality are addressed. Too often social psychologists tend to examine group identities 'in isolation' whereas ethnic identity merges and conflicts with other identities. Deaux argues that multiple identities take two distinct forms

and she makes the useful distinction between within-category and between-category multiplicity. The former concerns two potentially competing group identities that need to be reconciled in one way or another. Examples are bicultural and biracial people or situations in which ethnic and national identities are defined as tending to conflict, such as having dual citizenship or being a Muslim in a Western country. The latter is concerned with combinations that – in principle – represent different categories of identification, such as ethnicity, gender, and social class. These combinations can result in gendered or religious definitions of ethnicity.

Chapter 6 deals with the dynamic nature of ethnic identity and the question of identity negotiation, and individual paths in particular. Three key questions are developed in the identity process analysis that is proposed. The first one is what immigrants bring to the situation, such as motivations, expectations, skills and needs. The second is the social networks, social climate, and opportunity structures that immigrants encounter. The third relates to what immigrants do in terms of identity negotiations, social comparisons and political actions. These three questions provide important markers for what a theory of immigrant negotiation needs to consider and the kinds of relationships that could be examined.

The social psychological approach developed throughout the book is put together in a separate chapter that deals with West Indian immigrants to the United States. This chapter convincingly shows the usefulness of the approach and nicely illustrates how all parts come together. The dynamic interplay of the different factors is unique for each immigrant group, but there are also common processes and more general questions and challenges that immigrants face. The model of social psychological analysis proposed in the book is broadly applicable and also provides directions for future research. Social psychological research on immigration is in its early stages and many specific questions need to be asked. The final chapter suggests some promising areas of investigation.

To conclude, this is a timely and very stimulating book, which will be extremely useful for any researcher or student with an interest in immigration issues. It offers an overarching view and a comprehensive

framework for studying these issues at different levels and from different perspectives. The book is easy to read, gives a great introduction to this emerging field, and identifies key directions for further social psychological research. It is highly recommended to students and scholars who try to understand the social and psychological correlates of what it means to be an immigrant.

Future EAESP Meetings - Calendar

September 23-27, 2007, Rapallo, Italy (30 kms from Genoa); Hotel Astoria

Small Group Meeting on Shared Memories, Shared Beliefs: The Formation and Use of Joint Representations in Social Interaction

Organisers: Gerald Echterhoff, Anna E. Clark, Amina Memon & Gün R. Semin
Contact: gerald.echterhoff@uni-bielefeld.de

June 6-9, 2008, Kazimierz Dolny, Poland

Small Group Meeting on Dehumanization: Determinants and Consequences of Perceiving Others as Less Than Humans

Organisers: Mirosław Kofta, Jacques-Philippe Leyens, Emanuela Castano, Michal Bilewicz
Contact: Michal Bilewicz (bilewicz@psych.uw.edu.pl)

June 6-9, 2008, The Netherlands

Small Group Meeting on Emotions, social identity, and intergroup conflict

Organisers: Sabine Otten & Ernestine Gordijn
Contact: Sabine Otten (s.otten@rug.nl)

June 10-14, 2008, Opatija, Croatia

15th General Meeting of the EAESP

Organisers: Dinka Corkalo Biruski & Dean Ajdukovic

Future EAESP Meetings**Small Group Meeting****On Dehumanization: Determinants and Consequences
of Perceiving Others as Less Than Humans****June 6-9, 2008, Kazimierz Dolny, Poland****CHANGED DATE!**

[Organisers: Mirosław Kofta, Jacques-Philippe Leyens, Emanuela Castano,
Michał Bilewicz

Contact: bilewicz@psych.uw.edu.pl]

In recent years, research concerning various forms of dehumanization (e.g., infra-humanization, mechanistic dehumanization, moral exclusion) has flourished. Publications, presentations and posters at the Würzburg EAESP general meeting, several symposia at SESP annual meeting, at SPSP General Conference and Pre-conference, and a soon-to appear special issue of Social Cognition are all events that witness the centrality of this topic in social psychology research.

The process of dehumanization, and its links to intergroup violence, has attracted the interest of psychologists and social scientists in general for decades. However, with few exceptions, its discussion has mostly been theoretical or characterized by the consideration of limited and anecdotal empirical evidence. On the contrary, the new interest innovates by a more systematic effort to test experimentally the hypotheses deriving from various theoretical models and to develop measures of dehumanization. Its detection mobilizes techniques as diverse as content analyses, questionnaires, implicit measures, or neuro-imaging. In other words, research on dehumanization is now akin to, although it greatly expands upon, traditional research in stereotyping, prejudice, and intergroup bias.

Dehumanization is a complex process. It takes different forms in strong, protracted conflicts than in milder ones. It seems to differ depending on

the relationship between the ingroup and the outgroup, sometimes being akin to animalization of the other, while at other times equating the target to an emotionless machine. And while it occurs in subtle forms in everyday life, it can be used to prepare for intergroup violence, or to justify past violence against another group. We are also interested in the opposite process: How people humanize themselves, ingroups or (sometimes) outgroups? When one thinks about how to combat dehumanization, it is very natural to focus on the processes allowing to perceive others - also outgroupers - as full-scale human beings.

Recognizing the complexity of this phenomenon, the aim of the small group meeting is to bring together researchers representing this great variety in situations, theories, and techniques to assess it, with the goal of drawing a map of the existing research, and to facilitate exchange and cross-fertilization among researchers.

If you are interested in participating in this meeting, please send an email with an abstract to Miroslaw Kofta (kofta@psych.uw.edu.pl) until March 15, 2008.

Reports of Previous Meetings

Small Group Meeting On Fundamental Dimensions of Social Judgment: A View from different Perspectives

At the Hotel 'Le Chateau de Namur', Namur, Belgium, June 7-9 2007

Organisers: A. Abele, A. Cuddy, C. Judd & V. Yzerbyt

Over the last decades two fundamental dimensions underlying the evaluation of individuals, groups, and even cultures, have repeatedly emerged in psychological research. Even though different labels have been established for these dimensions (e.g., *warmth/communion* and *agency/competence*), they seem to have a common basis. The first dimension points to such concepts as morality, warmth, cooperation, and attachment in interpersonal or intergroup relations, whereas the second dimension addresses a person's or a group's self-reliance, building on such concepts as power, competence, and control.

In order to bring together coexisting approaches, an EAESP small group meeting was held in Namur, Belgium. Thirty-one psychologists met, discussing the field from different perspectives (e.g., stereotypes, perception of self and others, and cross-cultural psychology) and contributing to an integration of the different approaches. The specific focus of the meeting made possible a broad discussion from several viewpoints.

In addition to the multitude of perspectives represented in the meeting, the variety of international contributors was outstanding. Researchers from Europe (Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, Poland, Italy, France, the UK, and Spain) met with colleagues from the U.S. and Canada. The organizational committee, Andrea Abele, Amy Cuddy, Charles Judd, and Vincent Yzerbyt, mirrored this international composition. The local organization was managed by Nicolas Kervyn.

The meeting was funded by the EAESP, Northwestern University, Kellogg School of Management, the Fond National de la Recherche Scientifique, the German Research Foundation and the Social Psychology Section of the German Society for Psychology. Due to this generous funding, a scenic venue at the Hotel 'Le Chateau de Namur' could be chosen, providing the chance to experience the excellent Belgian cuisine.

The scientific part of the meeting was opened on late Thursday afternoon by Amy Cuddy, who presented the 'BIAS Map', which extends the Stereotype Content Model to the level of behavior. Her presentation was a basis for several other talks on the effects of the broad stereotype dimensions of warmth and competence on emotions and behavioral intentions. Next, Joachim Krueger discussed the effects of perceptions of rationality (competence) and morality on decision making in social dilemmas. Nicolas Kervyn presented a series of experiments conducted in cooperation with Vincent Yzerbyt, Charles Judd, and Ana Nunes. These authors found that a compensation effect of warmth and competence (i.e., groups characterized by high scores on one dimension are seen as scoring low on the other), also emerges when observers search for new information. In the final presentation of the day, Oscar Ybarra referred to the dominance and universality of the morality dimension across cultures. The competence dimension, in contrast, seems to be much more culture-bound.

In the evening we enjoyed dinner at the Chateau's fine restaurant. During the 3½ hours there was plenty of time for socializing and discussion of the first presentations.

On Friday there was a tight schedule with as many as 15 presentations. Guido Peeters, whose groundbreaking research provided a basis for many of the studies presented at this meeting, opened the program with a comparison of structural and functional models on the two dimensions. Wolfgang Scholl then complemented the two-dimensional structure by a third dimension (*activation/arousal*) and illustrated a possible theoretical extension. Subsequently, Bogdan Wojciszke presented a functional approach and indicated that agentic traits are more central to the perception of self while communal traits are more important for the perception of others. In the final talk of the first session, Andrea Abele and

Mirjam Uchrowski presented longitudinal data on the stability and variability over time of communion and agency as dimensions of the self and showed the relation of these dimensions to career success and life satisfaction.

After the break, Nathalie Delacollette presented a study with Benoit Dardenne. These authors found that the prescription of stereotypic traits to subordinates by members of dominant groups is determined by the trait's benefit for the dominant groups. A rather different perspective was taken in the following talks. Juliane Degner used a masked version of the affective priming paradigm to show that mental representations of attitudes are based on a two-dimensional structure of self- and other-relevance. These mental representations affect social judgments and behavior. Anne Maass presented a study with Caterina Suitner on the special agency bias, which indicates a special representation and perception of agency in individuals and groups.

In the first talk after lunch, Nicole Dubois presented a more sociological cognitive approach of the two dimensions, the social desirability/social utility approach. Laurent Cambon continued with this approach and presented a series of studies on the relation between the two dimensions to values. The following two talks concentrated on the Stereotype Content Model. First, Susan Fiske showed in a study with Ann Marie Russel that the Stereotype Content Model also holds for interpersonal relations and not only for intergroup relations. Then Peter Glick analyzed, in a study with Margaret Thomas, Theresa Vescio, and Susan Fiske, the effects of warmth and competence on intergroup attributions. He introduced his talk with some entertaining American stereotypes about Europeans and their verification at the Small Group Meeting.

After the coffee break, Chiara Storari drew attention to the combination of *warm and competent*, which has received little attention in research on the Stereotype Content Model. She indicated that the ingroup's stereotype content can vary depending on its role in the social structure. Charles Stangor approached the two fundamental dimensions from the perspective of prejudice research. He claimed that all measures of individual differences in prejudice can be subsumed under the fundamental value dimensions of *Protecting the Self and the Ingroup* and

Enhancing Social Harmony. Both are fundamental components of U.S. American culture. Afterwards, Janine Bosak presented a study on gender stereotypes concerning agency and communion as a function of social roles and within-group standards. The final presentation on Friday was given by Soledad De Lemus on the activation of gender stereotypes (male – competent, female – warm) as a function of the context (kitchen – office) in a priming experiment.

After this long day it was a pleasure to take a walk from the Chateau down to the nearby city of Namur and to enjoy another great dinner, this time in a restaurant that had just recently received a Michelin star. Again, there was plenty of time to talk in a relaxed atmosphere about the interesting presentations as well as less scientific topics.

Kathleen Vohs was in the somewhat tricky position to give the first presentation on Saturday morning. She managed to get everybody's attention by presenting a series of studies on the effect of money on behavior: Even slight, nonconscious reminders of money are sufficient to reduce helpfulness and to increase social distance. Romin Tafarodi then discussed the fundamental role of moral values and agency for self-esteem. In a series of experimental studies, Aleksandra Cislak tested how self-perception of competence and morality is influenced by own actions that serve the interests of self or of other people. Then, Nicole Tausch showed that the confirmability and disconfirmability of positive and negative traits depend on the trait contents. In the next talk, Jared Kenworthy extended these results to the context of intergroup conflicts by presenting two studies with Blacks and Whites in the U.S. and with Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland. Afterwards, Frank Asbrock showed that the BIAS Map also allows the prediction of individual discriminatory behavior. The final presentation of the meeting was given by Ronni Greenwood. In a study with Russell Spears she analyzed ingroup projection by Welsh and English in the context of national stereotypes.

Andrea Abele and Amy Cuddy took stock of the meeting and summarized the main results and new insights. Due to the specific focus of the meeting, all presentations were related to each other, even though they came from a multitude of different areas of social psychology. This allowed intensive and lively discussions about every presentation. The

whole atmosphere of the meeting was outstanding, not the least due to the scenic venue. It facilitated the exchange between scholars and especially between young scientists and experts in the field. The summary ended with some open questions for further discussion and further research. In sum, the Small Group Meeting enhanced agentic as well as communal traits of all participants.

Frank Asbrock & Mirjam Uchronski

Other Reports

Report from the Summer Institute in Social Psychology Austin, Texas, July 15–27, 2007

From July 15 to 27, SPSP organized its biannual Summer Institute in Social Psychology (the SISP), at the University of Texas at Austin. EAESP offers five postgraduate members a travel grant, providing the opportunity to attend a course at SISP. We were the lucky ones. After hearing that we could go, all of us were already really happy. But after finding out what SISP entails, the experienced happiness only increased and we look back upon a wonderful time.

SISP turned out to be a great mix between intellectually stimulating classes, and cheerful social happenings. The separate classes covered the following topics:

- Gender and Social Roles (Alice Eagly & Peter Glick),
- Social Neuroscience (Jennifer Beer & Kevin Ochsner),
- Self-Regulation and Goals (Constantine Sedikides & James Shah),
- Political Ideology (John Jost & Arie Kruglanski),
- Novel Approaches to Assessing Social Behaviour and Individual Differences (Will Fleeson, Sam Gosling, Matthias Mehl & Simone Vazire).

The discussions with the staff as well as those with the fellow students sparked further interest in many domains, and forged relationships that will help us in our academic careers.

Some of the official social events tended to get cancelled due to the rain (a draught that had been going for years, was over when we left), but the unofficial ones were great as well. Mentionable were the Gospel Brunch (a brunch-barbeque with gospel singers) and a bat-boat trip, a boat trip along the beautiful Austin riverside with thousands of bats. One of the main conclusions we and our fellow American PhD students drew from our

talks in bars was that we really are nerds: We even like to talk about science over a beer.

For all of this, we like to thank the organizers and staff of SISP who spent a lot of time in making this in what it turned out to be, and EAESP for providing us with the opportunity to go there. The University of Texas seemed like a great university, and was an excellent host for SISP.

Nadine Chaurand (Université Blaise Pascal),
Malte Friese (University of Basel)
Eva Krumhuber (Cardiff University)
Michal Parzuchowski (Warsaw School of Social Psychology)
Niels van de Ven (Tilburg University & TIBER)

When does a person look forward to go to Texas? The answer is when (s)he gets to go to SISP! I was lucky enough to be selected as one of the European participants that could go this year, and was thrilled that I got into the Novel Approaches to Assessing Social Behavior and Individual Differences class.

The class was an excellent mix between lectures and discussion, providing many stimulating insights. In my case, it especially triggered further interest into some non-standard ways of doing research, ranging from the EAR (a voice recorder that samples during a day) to measuring hormone levels or using Virtual Reality. Furthermore, it pointed me to the fact how often we (or at the very least, I), in social psychology, neglect personality. Since social psychology can be defined as the person - situation interaction, in which the situation tends to get much more attention in the usual experimental approach. I like to thank Will Fleeson, Sam Gosling, Matthias Mehl and Simine Vazire for their time and energy they put into this wonderful experience.

Outside of class, the eighty-something participants had a great time as well. Living in dorms was a strange experience for a European, as was the typical (officially unallowed) booze party with all the professors present. I'm confident that many people I met will remain scientific friends, and

some of them will likely lead to future collaborations. For all this, I'd like to thank the EAESP for making this possible!

Niels van de Ven (Tilburg University)

I very much enjoyed the class on “Social Neuroscience” held by Kevin Ochsner and Jenni Beer. The aim of the class was twofold: Firstly, to introduce us to basic concepts in social neuroscience, and secondly to give us a hands on experience in neuroanatomy and the collection as well as analysis of fMRI data. The morning sessions usually consisted of in-depth discussions of topical readings in social neuroscience (e.g., emotion, self, person perception). Both instructors did a wonderful job in raising methodological and theoretical questions regarding current approaches in social neuroscience. In this context, the need for proper control conditions as well as the collection of behavioural measures in parallel to fMRI data were recurrent issues that came up in our paper discussions. Highlights of our afternoon sessions were a sheep brain dissection and the fMRI scanning of two members of our class, both conducted at the Imaging Centre at the University of Texas at Austin. In the course of the summer school we learnt how to preprocess and analyse fMRI data using one of the most popular software packages (SPM). This experience was invaluable for getting each of us started on neuroscientific research. Regardless of previous expertise, we all enjoyed and learnt a lot during these two weeks in Austin. Thanks to our two instructors who made this such a pleasurable time and to EAESP for their financial support.

Eva Krumhuber (Cardiff University)

I participated in “Self-Regulation and Goals” class led by James Shah and Constantine Sedikides. Our seminar discussed three topics: distinctions and characteristics of motivation (*the nature of goals*), fundamental motivational processes and systems (*the pursue of goals*), and implications of self-regulation for social behavior and well-being (*consequences of goal pursuit*). We had six days of general reviews and lectures in morning sessions followed by group discussions and paper reviews after lunch. We had also an opportunity to listen to invited lecturers: Bill Swann speaking on self-verification theory and Hart Blanton talking about his deviance

regulation theory; as well as take part in statistical class on Multi-Level Data Analysis by Niall Bolger. Our seminar was discussion-centred and focused on working on incorporating the goals and regulation theories in individual research proposals. Jim and Constantine did a perfect job of balancing the “Institute in Social Psychology” and the “Summer” part of it. Although course ended with thirty minutes presentations of each participant’s research proposal and syllabus for those six days covered 80 papers (!) we also had time to socialize. In fact our group mastered socializing during (Constantine’s affection for Borat-style jokes did help) and after classes (finest selection of Austin’s pubs and diners helped too), finally earning a nickname “Class with No Goals & No Regulation”. To conclude: this was an extraordinary opportunity to meet and befriend graduate students from the USA/Canada and that will surely result in future collaborations. It was an unforgettable experience both scientifically and socially, for which I want to thank Jim and Constantine, EAESP, organizers at University of Texas and my fellow classmates. As they say in Texas: “*See ya `ll at General Meeting 2008 in Croatia!*”.

Michal Parzuchowski (Warsaw School of Psychology)

Two Europeans in the *Political Ideology* class. No, this wasn’t anything unusual at all since in our class we profited from the US still being an immigration country. It was a thrill working with other graduate students from numerous different countries from all over the world and this diversity added a special and valuable extra to our experience.

The class was led by John Jost and Arie Kruglanski. We could hardly have been luckier with this choice. John and Arie were not only extraordinarily knowledgeable in research on political psychology (and many other fields). They were also very good in provoking discussions in class, giving us assignments that really made us think, or guiding us in developing our research projects. On top of it, we have to admit that they are just awesome guys who are fun to hang out with. So, no surprise when they showed up in some of these fancy Austin bars we spent some time at or even at our dorm parties.

Basic issues we were concerned with during these two weeks were – among others – relating to the definition of political ideology and whether or not ideology exists at all, ideology as a dimension of personality, system justification theory, and terrorism. Each morning we had a lively discussion or a simulated debate of the topics that were covered by the four readings that were due for each day. In the afternoon we worked in small groups. During the first week John and Arie gave out assignments to each group that needed to be fleshed out and presented later the same day to the whole class. During the second week, each small group came up with a research question in the domain of political ideology that we turned into a research project with several empirical studies during the course of the week. At various points we received feedback on the process by our teachers and the rest of the class. This work turned out to be very intense, especially as the last day of class moved closer when all groups presented their complete projects. These research projects are intended to actually be carried out and some groups indeed already analyzed their first data.

In sum, this class was – as was SISP in general – a highly stimulating and rewarding experience for us, both scientifically and personally. We can only thank John and Arie as well as the local organizing team in Austin for the fantastic job they did. Of course, very special thanks go to EAESP for making this happen for us. It was awesome!

Malte Friese (University of Basel)

I participated, along with Malte, in the class “Political Ideology”. I enjoyed it a lot, for several reasons. Indeed, although political ideology is a topic I was not perfectly familiar with, our teachers John Jost and Arie Kruglanski have a way to communicate their passion about it that immediately took me into the subject. Besides, I particularly appreciated the theoretical discussions between John, Arie, and all the students of the class, discussions whose (very) high quality triggered lots of interesting questions about the future orientations of research about political ideology. Moreover, we were asked to work in groups on specific topics related to political ideology. The group work in itself was very interesting and very challenging, but it also allowed us to know the others more and

to share interests about future studies in common. Finally, for such an interesting class to be held in such a beautiful city as Austin, with all its cultural and social places (and longhorns everywhere!), was the cherry on the cake for a trip that, as the other students, I will never forget.

Nadine Chaurand (Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand)

Outlook from a Conference. Social Psychology in Sweden

Abstract:

In 2005 the Swedish professors in psychology, Bo Ekehammar and Anders Biel, published their article "Social psychology in Sweden. A brief look". Their article intends to tell the history and contemporary situation of social psychology in Sweden. Taking their article as an invitation to discuss social psychology among Swedish social psychologists my article is a response in the shape of another brief look at social psychology in Sweden. While Ekehammar and Biel defines social psychology as being conducted within the department of psychology, their view of social psychology could be perceived as narrow. Attending the fifth biannual conference on group and social psychology in 2006, their definition of social psychology does not seem to cover all of the research presented. In this article I thus argue that the attendance to a national conference in social psychology could be used as a guideline of the state of contemporary social psychology in Sweden. In this sense self-identification as a social psychologist as well as departmental belonging is taken into account when it comes to identifying social psychologists. With this outlook from a national conference, I suggest some ways to improve the map provided by Ekehammar and Biel.

Key words: Social psychology, Sweden, self-identification.

Biographical note on the author: Jessica Mjöberg is a doctoral candidate at the Department of Sociology at Uppsala University, Sweden. With a background in social psychology she is interested in the field of social psychology, both regarding its potential of standing on its own and as being a part of sociology and/or psychology. At the moment Jessica is working on her thesis on "Intimacy and Modernity".

Outlook from a Conference. Social Psychology in Sweden

In 2005 two Swedish professors in (social) psychology published an article concerning current social psychology in Sweden (Ekehammar & Biel, 2005). Their article, *Social Psychology in Sweden. A Brief Look*, intends to provide us with a brief history of social psychology within Swedish academia, followed by an inventory of contemporary social psychological research in Sweden. Their attempt is both interesting and important. Internationally, many scholars have written about the history and present status of social psychology, but within Swedish social psychology, we mainly find these accounts in textbooks, rather than in scientific journals (Augustsson, 2005; Eisle, 2003; Johansson, 2004; Nilsson, 2006). Reading Ekehammar and Biel's outline, though, it soon appears that social psychology in their terms is more about psychology than social psychology. Their inventory does not cover the extensiveness of research conducted within the field of social psychology; it is confined to research carried out within the discipline of psychology. Even though their inventory is thorough in mapping academic settings where psychological social psychology is present as well as the research topics of immediate interest, from a broader perspective on social psychology the inventory seems one-sided.

Attending the fifth biannual Nordic conference on Group and Social Psychology (GRASP), it appeared to me that the map of social psychology in Sweden provided by Ekehammar and Biel did not fit the research presented. In this debating article I thus want to discuss further aspects on social psychology in Sweden. Using Ekehammar and Biel's idea of mapping social psychology in Sweden, the map could perhaps be extended with guidance from this conference in social psychology. What I suggest is to use some of our social psychological knowledge on ourselves. In particular, I would argue that the attendance at a conference can show us self-identification as social psychologist as well as categorisations within this field. Both disciplinary belonging, as Ekehammar and Biel use and self-identification, as I suggest, are in themselves argued to be insufficient in defining social psychology (House, 1977). But when the purpose is to make an inventory of contemporary research in the area I suggest that self-identification, here seen in the attendance to a conference, could be a useful guideline.

DIFFERENT WAYS OF WRITING OUR HISTORY

Before we turn to the current state of social psychology in Sweden I would like to comment on Ekehammar and Biel's history on social psychology in Sweden. A reasonable question to ask while writing the history of an academic discipline is how to decide when an academic discipline is born. When it comes to social psychology it is a discipline that seems to have been put at a disadvantage since its birth. Actually, even its birth is plagued by this inconvenient situation. Simultaneously sociologists and psychologists came to the conclusion that social psychology, which was embedded in the research of their respective main discipline, rather was a special field of interest, which would need its own methods and theories. This simultaneous encounter is manifested by the publication of two textbooks in social psychology in the year of 1908, one in psychology (McDougall, 1908) and another in sociology (Ross, 1908). This fortunate coincidence could have been the birth of social psychology as a separate discipline, where parts of psychology and parts of sociology would embrace each other. However, this was not to be the case, and it has been argued that social psychology instead has been better seen as a battlefield between the two areas, both in fear of losing an interesting topic to the other. The discussions between the two fields were hence characterized as "a struggle for property rights to social psychology" (Archibald, 1976:116). That is why we subsequently find social psychology either as a sub discipline of psychology, a sub discipline of sociology or as an applied form of either of these two. I dare to say that a consequence of this is that social psychologists are consequently in risk of feeling at a disadvantage in relation to their main subject. This may further possibly be the reason why numerous social psychologists are interested in writing the history of their subject, attempting to give it the justice that they believe that it deserves.

One way of dating the birth of an academic discipline is by means of its institutionalisation, i.e. through its acknowledgement as an organisational part of a University, with professors, research and journals for publication. However, it is unusual to find social psychology institutionalised in this sense. As stated by Ekehammar and Biel, the only place in Sweden where social psychology is thus institutionalised is at Skövde University College Skövde, as late as 2001 (Ekehammar & Biel, 2005:18). To date the birth of

social psychology this late, is not very satisfying. Ekehammar and Biel states that “[...] it seems clear that the previous professional positions in social psychology in Sweden have been linked to the applied areas of work, organisational or personnel psychology” (Ekehammar & Biel, 2005:16). As a solution to this indistinctiveness of the discipline, they choose the institutionalisation of psychology as the point of departure for social psychology in Sweden, only later to turn – or rather return – to the preceding and still present applied field of research.

In their brief historical background we find scholars with dual disciplinary affiliations (e.g. economy and psychology, sociology and psychology). Social psychology in a historical view seems to be an area located *between* different disciplines rather than *within* them. Social psychology could hence be seen as a science of “betweens” rather than as a “pure” field.¹ Given this background it is surprising to find Ekehammar and Biel’s statement that this “probably has hampered the development of basic social psychology research” (Ekehammar & Biel, 2005:17). The surprising component is that they have a conception of what *basic social psychology* is, which seems to follow Floyd Allport’s ideas in *Social Psychology* (Allport, 1924). These ideas had not yet reached Swedish social psychology, during the period to which Ekehammar and Biel refer. But it is due to this view of social psychology that Ekehammar and Biel choose to leave both sociological and applied areas of social psychology out of their scope, defining social psychology as research based on psychological grounds.

It would be tempting to reply to Ekehammar & Biel’s article by giving a similar but different picture of social psychology in Sweden, showing the history of sociological social psychology. Ekehammar and Biel starts with the first chair in psychology, 1948, but it would be equally reasonable to start with the first chair in sociology in Sweden in 1947 and the undeniably social psychological works of Torgny Segerstedt.² However interesting and supplementing such an outline would be, it would still be a

¹ The idea of social psychology as a science of “betweens” is further developed by the Swedish social psychologist Johan Asplund in his chapter on social psychology in his book “Tid, rum, individ och kollektiv” (Asplund, 1983:62).

² Torgny Segerstedt’s philosophy and sociology is presented in among other texts (Hammarström, 1997), (Fridjonsdottir, 1987) and (Segerstedt, 1955).

history of one side of a plenty sided area, leaving us with a fragmented picture. Clearly that is not the intention with this article. Neither is it my intention to criticize Ekehammar and Biel's inventory of the research conducted in Sweden. On the contrary, I find their initiative of drawing a map of contemporary social psychology in Sweden important. Their map gives us an overview of the research conducted within the field of *psychological social psychology*. Moreover it could be seen as an invitation to discuss the contemporary research conducted, in a broader sense. It is therefore of importance to remember that the intention of this article is to take Ekehammar and Biels idea serious and give an additional brief look at contemporary social psychology in Sweden. This brief look will try to locate social psychology, as in its younger years, outside or between disciplinary boundaries rather than inside specific disciplines. With that I leave the history of social psychology and turn to the contemporary situation.

OUTLOOK FROM A CONFERENCE

As an attempt to locate social psychology outside the boundaries of academic departments the sample of contemporary research presented here is based upon the attendance to the fifth conference on Group- and Social Psychology (GRASP) held in Linköping, Sweden in may 2006.¹ Conferences on this theme have been arranged every second year since 1998, as an effort to bring Nordic researchers in the fields of group- and social psychology together. The conference committee consists mainly of social psychologists working within the field of psychology, but the conferences are open to everyone addressing the fields of group and social psychology. The interest for this Nordic (and predominantly Swedish)²

¹ In 2004, after the fourth GRASP-conference the Swedish journal *Sociologisk forskning*, published a thematic issue on social psychology. The issue contained some reflections by Lars-Erik Berg on the delegates and the presentations of the conference (Berg, 2004). Moreover sociologist Per Månson (Månson, 2004) and psychologist Per Eisle (Eisle, 2004) published one article each from their respective positions of social psychology. The issue though did not concern a thorough analysis of the contemporary social psychology in Sweden.

² Of 61 delegates, only two were from other Nordic countries than Sweden.

conference was manifested by 61 delegates and 30 presentations.¹ Characterizing contemporary social psychology by drawing from the attendance at a conference could surely be criticized in several ways. It could be seen as biased from the network of the organizer, from who has time and money to attend to conferences, who has the knowledge of the conference taking place, etc. But nevertheless, I would argue that the attendance tells us something about social psychology: It tells us something about who defines themselves as social psychologists (and maybe who does not), and mainly it tells us something about contemporary Swedish social psychological research.

Dominant and Marginal Social Psychologies

Categorising the delegates by their disciplinary belongings we find 40 psychologists, 8 sociologists, 3 pedagogues, and 10 others (mainly from healthcare science).² One way of interpreting this constitution of delegates is that it contains a dominant social psychology in the psychological area, represented by two thirds of the delegates, and a collection of marginal social psychologies represented by one third of the delegates. Put together as a collection of dominant and marginal social psychologies we find social psychology in a broader perspective.

What could be discussed further in such a division is what is meant by dominant and marginal branches of the discipline. Being dominant in a sense merely means being the perspective that is largest in numbers; it is in this sense numerically and spatially dominant, while the marginal social psychology is numerically minor and thus attains less time and space. Further implications of being dominant and marginal are found in the light of power relations, while they could be power-laden positions. Trying to say something about power from the attendance at this conference, which has an inclusive character, would though be a false step, while the attendance and the programme is based on who decides to

¹ This information is based upon registered delegates and the schedule of presentations and abstracts of the conference.

² Basing this information from the list of delegates, it was in some cases difficult to decide what theoretical base some of the delegates belonged to, especially in cases of thematic, rather than disciplinary bound departments.

attend the conference. What could be said though is that being in a marginal position is not necessarily simply a negative position. It can rather be an empowering position. The position on the margin, or as the conference points out – on the edge – has often been a position that is in a sense naturally social psychological.

Different Levels of Interests?

Yet another way of viewing the breadth of the field is by looking at the titles of the papers presented during the conference. The theme of the conference “*Interaction on the Edge*”, emphasize the character of social psychology being situated on the edge between several disciplines, of the conference as being filled with research on the edge of knowledge production and the character of social psychology as being on the edge between the subjective and the intersubjective world. The theme of the conference was tackled from a variety of angles of social psychological research. Interestingly the presentations differed in characteristic ways in accordance with the different disciplinary belongings.

The psychological presentations were mainly held at an empirical and experimental basis. With an interest in finding valid hypotheses that can be tested, and provide us with causal relations the titles of the papers included causality. As an example we could take the presentation: “*Effects of Resource Valence and Group Goal on Allocation Decisions in Social Dilemmas*”. The sociological contributions were mainly theoretical and conceptual. The interest here seems to be to conceptualize the social world as social as possible, as we can see in the presentation: “*On Social Edges. Some limits of Conceptual Purity*”. Lastly, within the applied areas of health care and education, the emphasis was instead on a pragmatic or practical level, where the idea of the usefulness of concepts and theories were being tested: “*How do Team Members Talk About Their Inter-professional Care Team?*”

These characteristic types of presentations could be seen as emphasising different levels of interest in social psychological research; *experimental*, *pragmatic-theoretical* and *pragmatic-practical*. The different levels of interest in the social are supposedly due to the origins of and traditions in different fields of social psychology. Attending the presentations at a conference of

this character it seems clear that the different groupings are bound to different resources, methods and ideals in conducting their research. Talking in terms of Thomas Kuhn, what we are dealing with here is obviously not social psychology as a unified science in the shape of one paradigm, but at least three paradigms. If this “tri-furcation” of social psychology gives us reason to search for one paradigm or not, is not to be further discussed in this article. However, these three branches seems to be incompatible in some senses, and still, they are all investigating the world of sociality.

MAPPING SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY IN SWEDEN

The delegates of the conference have now been categorised in terms of their institutional belongings and their different levels of interest in social psychology. With this suggestion of categorising social psychologists in Sweden it is time to return to Ekehammar and Biel’s map of different areas of research in Sweden. The outlook from the GRASP conference gives us additional information about departments and research topics to add to this map. As made clear at this conference not only the departments of psychology should be represented, but also the sociological departments, and some pedagogical departments. Special attention and an inventory of social psychological research should also be given to the University Colleges of Mälardalen and Skövde, since we find more than one of the three aspects of social psychology here presented working in these academic milieux. Advocating an inclusive idea of social psychology, as GRASP does, university colleges like University of Gävle, Kristianstad University, The Swedish National Defence College could be added to the map, in the same manner as Ekehammar and Biel takes into account Stockholm School of Economics. This revised map of social psychology in Sweden would then be based on self identification with the label social psychology rather than merely departmental belongings. A conference like this and the researchers attending it provide us with some guidelines for the understanding of the scope of contemporary social psychology in a new and broader map.

REFERENCES

- Allport, F. H. (1924). *Social Psychology*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press.
- Archibald, P. (1976). Psychology, sociology and social psychology: bad fences make bad neighbours. *British Journal of Sociology*(27), 115-129.
- Asplund, J. (1983). *Tid, rum, individ och kollektiv [Time, space, individual, collective]*. Stockholm: Liber Förlag.
- Augustsson, G. (2005). *Socialpsykologins ansikten*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Berg, L.-E. (2004). Om en konferens [On a conference]. *Sociologisk forskning*(4), 19-25.
- Eisle, P. (2003). *Experimentell och tillämpad socialpsykologi [Experimental and applied social psychology]*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Eisle, P. (2004). Socialpsykologi i Sverige ur ett psykologiskt perspektiv [Social psychology in Sweden from a psychological perspective]. *Sociologisk forskning*(4), 3-9.
- Ekehammar, B., & Biel, A. (2005). Social Psychology in Sweden. A Brief Look. *European Bulletin of Social Psychology*, 17(1), 16-30.
- Fridjonsdottir, K. (1987). *Om svensk sociologi. Historia, problem och perspektiv [Sociology in Sweden. History, problems, perspectives]*: Carlssons förlag.
- Hammarström, G. (Ed.). (1997). *Sociologiska institutionen 50 år. 1947-1997. [The Department of Sociology turns 50 years. 1947-1997]*. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.
- House, J. S. (1977). The Three Faces of Social Psychology. *Sociometry*, 40, 161-177.
- Johansson, T. (2004). *Socialpsykologi [Social psychology]*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- McDougall, W. (1908). *An Introduction to Social Psychology*. London: Methuen.
- Månson, P. (2004). Socialpsykologi. Tunneln som aldrig blir färdig? *Sociologisk forskning*(4), 11-17.
- Nilsson, B. (2006). *Socialpsykologi: uppkomst och utveckling [Social psychology, its origins and development]*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Ross, E. A. (1908). *Social Psychology. An Outline and Source Book*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Segerstedt, T. (1955). The Uppsala School of Sociology. *Acta Sociologica*, 1, 85-119.

„The Second Warsaw-Jena Seminar on Victim/Perpetrator Relations in a Changing Europe”, Warsaw, April 13-15, 2007

The seminar was a three-day conference organized by Warsaw University's Faculty of Psychology in cooperation with Jena University (Germany) and University of Delaware (United States) as well as the Institute of Social Studies at University of Warsaw. The meeting took place in Warsaw, Poland from the 13th through the 15th of April, 2007. The main meeting's objectives were:

- ◆ to sustain the cooperation between social psychologists coming from many countries such as Poland, Germany, and the US, established last year during the first edition of the seminar
- ◆ to mark the establishment of the Center for Research on Prejudice – a newly created research institution at the University of Warsaw's Faculty of Psychology.

The conference gathered renowned researchers from around the world interested in the social psychology of intergroup relations, prejudice and stereotypes. Keynote speakers included: John Dovidio (Yale University, USA), Samuel Gaertner (University of Delaware, USA), Kai Jonas (Jena University, Germany), James Jones (University of Delaware, USA) and Yona Teichman (Tel-Aviv University, Israel). They were supported by their Polish colleagues: Maria Lewicka (University of Warsaw, Poland), Mirosław Kofta (University of Warsaw, Poland) and Grzegorz Sedek (Warsaw School of Social Psychology, Poland).

The meeting was also an opportunity for the next generation of social researchers to present results from their recent studies. During two days of a seminar, with talks and a poster session, scholars from Austria, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Portugal and Spain discussed the results of their studies, exchanged their scientific experiences and created new scientific projects. The whole event ended with a small-group discussion session.

The scientific part of the conference was supplemented by informal meetings organized by the Warsaw organizing committee. The

participants had a chance to take a walking tour around Old Warsaw, participate in a small group meeting combined with a wine reception, etc.

We hope that the Warsaw-Jena Seminar will be continued in the coming years and will become a regular event in timetables of European social psychologists.

Additional information about the conference as well as the presentations' abstracts can be obtained through the web page of Center for Research on Prejudice at: <http://cbu.psychologia.pl>

Adrian Wojcik

Grants

Luciana Carraro (postgraduate travel grant)
Katarzyna Gusztyla (seedcorn grant)
Wojciech Kulesza (postgraduate travel grant)
Marcella Latrofa (postgraduate travel grant)
Helen Soteriou (postgraduate travel grant)
Christoph Stahl (seedcorn grant)

GRANT REPORTS**Katarzyna Aluchna**

(Warsaw School of Social Psychology, Poland)

Postgraduate travel grant

The European Association of Experimental Social Psychology provided me with a travel grant in February 2007. This generous financial support allowed me to participate in the 3rd European Spring Conference on Social Psychology organized by Arie Kruglanski, Carolyn Morf and Fritz Strack.

The conference was an unique opportunity to meet great researchers from all around the world. I have learned a lot and discovered new areas of psychology I would like to explore more intensively. The presentations I was listening to let me identify what the future directions in psychology are. I was also impressed by the applicability of the results from presented research directly to the real life.

During the conference I had the opportunity to talk about the results of the experiments I have conducted within my PhD project. The researches concerned the possibilities of stereotype change seen from cognitive perspective. The conference presentation I had gave me the greatest occasion to discuss with the participants the method I used and obtained

results. Thanks to the participants I got the feedback and know already the strengths and weaknesses of the experiments I have conducted.

The conference program was very suitable and there was enough time to explore the beauty of St. Moritz. The mountain views were astonishing and people were very friendly. I can recommend to visit this incredible place to everybody.

I would like to express my thanks the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology once again. I am very grateful for the generous support to join the conference.

Marcin Bukowski

(Jagiellonian University, Poland)

Seedcorn grant

Project title: **Selective gender stereotype activation as determined by task context and interpersonal goals**

Activities undertaken

During the guest visit at the University of Granada a pilot study and set of two related studies was performed. In all 194 participants from the UGR took part in the research programme. Materials such as, pilot questionnaires with ratings of trait typicality, analytical and emotional skills tasks, words for the Lexical Decision Task, questionnaires used during the experimental trial were prepared and translated into Spanish. Participants recruitment and debriefing as well as questionnaire data coding was performed with the help of two PhD students from UGR. Data was analyzed, discussed with professor Miguel Moya and a draft paper was prepared. The main results obtained in the study are described in the scientific report prepared for the European Bulletin of Social Psychology.

Realization of the goals

The main goals of the project were to lead a set of studies at the University of Granada in order to develop a cooperation with professor Miguel Moya and his research team. In this sense the EAESP Seedcorn grant proved to be fully successful, we obtained interesting data that were discussed and prepared for publication. We also managed to develop a cooperative relation which shall develop into further strands of research on gender stereotype activation.

Contribution of the supported activities to the wider research activities of the grant recipient

The supported research project was a continuation of my PhD topic which encompassed the interactive influence of interpersonal goals and task context on stereotype activation. Thanks to the Seedcorn grant I could develop and carry out further studies exploring more precisely on the topic of gender stereotypes. I also managed to develop a research cooperation with the group of Miguel Moya and build up a new research strand that uses the goal and context manipulation procedure used so far but combined with measures of competence and warmth dimensions from the Stereotype Content Model (Fiske et al., 2002). The research project performed at the University of Granada provided the unique opportunity to carry on and improve my current research activities.

Oliver Christ

(Philipps-University Marburg, Germany)

Postdoctoral travel grant

The EAESP postdoctoral travel grant allowed me to visit the Oxford Centre for the Study of Intergroup Conflict at Oxford University headed by Professor Miles Hewstone in November 2006. My research visit offered me the opportunity to work with two leading experts in the field of intergroup conflict, Miles Hewstone and Nicole Tausch, using recent survey data from Northern Ireland and Germany, on three interrelated research questions: (a) the effects of direct and indirect contact on

intergroup attitudes and attitude strength, (b) the effects of positive and negative intergroup contact experiences on intergroup attitudes and attitude strength, and (c) the moderating role of attitude strength on the relation of intergroup attitudes with discriminatory intentions. The Oxford group has recently collected an impressive data set from Northern Ireland with both Protestant and Catholic participants (Tausch, Hewstone, Cairns, & Hughes, 2007). I brought with me recent representative German survey data asking German adult participants about their contact experiences with and attitudes towards foreigners living in Germany (e.g., Heitmeyer, 2007).

Using these different data sets from different intergroup contexts we extended previous research on direct and indirect contact by showing that indirect contact is most effective when individuals live in segregated areas (i.e., mixed vs. segregated areas in Belfast; Eastern and Western Germany), and/or have only few, or no, direct friendships with out-group members (Christ et al., 2007). In addition, by including measures of attitude strength, our results qualify the extended contact hypothesis in an important way. Based on earlier findings by Fazio and colleagues on the effects of direct and indirect experiences with an attitude object on attitude strength (Fazio & Zanna, 1981), we proposed that direct contact would have stronger effects on attitude strength than indirect contact. Results of both studies confirmed our assumptions.

Regarding the other research questions, analyses are still ongoing. Preliminary results show that both positive and negative contact experiences increase meta-attitudinal strength. But whereas the former lead to more positive intergroup attitudes, the latter relate to more negative attitudes. Furthermore, preliminary analyses suggest that meta-attitudinally stronger intergroup attitudes are more strongly related to discriminatory intentions, i.e. avoiding or helping out-group members.

Although I stayed only for a little more than four weeks in Oxford, it was a really inspiring and motivating time. I'm very grateful to Miles Hewstone and Nicole Tausch for giving me the opportunity to work with them. Good to know that the cooperation will continue! I would also like to thank all other members of the Oxford group for their hospitality. And last but not least thanks again to the EAESP for their financial support.

References

- Christ, O., Tausch, N., Hewstone, M., Wagner, U., Hughes, J., & Cairns, E. (2007). *The precarious benefits of indirect intergroup contact: Direct contact is necessary for enduring prejudice reduction*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Fazio, R. H., & Zanna, M. P. (1981). Direct experience and attitude-behavior consistency. In L. Berkowitz (ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (vol 14; pp. 161-202). New York: Academic Press.
- Heitmeyer, W. (2007). Deutsche Zustaende. Folge 5 [The German situation. Part V]. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Tausch, N., Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., & Hughes, J. (2007). *A comparison of segregated and mixed areas of Belfast*. Manuscript in preparation.

Marieke de Vries

(Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands)
postgraduate travel grant

Thanks to an EAESP postgraduate travel grant, I had the opportunity to visit Piotr Winkielman at the University of California in San Diego during the Spring Quarter, 2007. We met the year before, when Prof. Winkielman gave workshops at the Behavioural Science Institute at my home university and at the Workshop on Cognitive and Social Perspectives on (Un)Consciousness in Poland. Piotr Winkielman is a leading expert in the field of research that I am interested in, i.e. the role of affect in judgment and decision making. I attended his workshops and was very much inspired by his work. I also remember Piotr took Jochim Hansen from Basel and me on an excellent sightseeing tour of Warsaw, which I very much enjoyed. We discussed plans for a potential visit at these various geographical locations and I decided to apply for a travel grant.

After a 24-hour trip from Nijmegen to San Diego, I received a warm welcome in San Diego. Together with Piotr's PhD student Troy Chenier, Mark Starr, and the undergraduate students in Piotr's lab, Piotr and I

further detailed our research plans and set up and conducted various experiments. We were able to conduct three experiments on the influence of mood on fluency processes. Thanks to the facilities and expertise at Piotr's lab, I also had the opportunity to learn how to use physiological measurements and to get some hands-on experience with these. With the help of Rob Holland, we conducted a fourth experiment on mood and reliance on intuitive versus deliberative processes in decision making in Nijmegen. In previous research that I have conducted for my dissertation together with Rob Holland and Cilia Witteman, we had found that people in a positive mood state rely more strongly on intuitive processes in a complex decision task than people in a negative mood state. Moreover, we had found evidence that a fit between positive versus negative mood states and intuitive versus deliberative decision strategies enhances the subjective value of a decision outcome. The studies we designed and conducted during my time in San Diego enable us to test whether people in a positive mood state also rely more strongly on fluency experiences than people in a negative mood state. Moreover, we hope to gain further insight in the influence of mood on the reliance on intuitive versus deliberative processes in decision-making. We are currently analyzing data.

In addition to my collaboration with Piotr Winkielman, I had the opportunity to participate and present in brown bag and lab meetings, and in a seminar on social psychology. I also accepted an invitation to give a guest lecture in a course on Social Cognition that Piotr was giving at UCSD during the time of my visit, which was a great experience for me. Furthermore, I attended a series of interesting and inspiring talks, mostly in the Colloquium Series of the Psychology Department. I also very much enjoyed Prof. Ramachandran's talk on how to amputate phantom limbs. The rest of my time I spent writing. I was able to revise a paper and get a lot of work for my dissertation done. And last but not least, I had a great time hanging out and doing lots fun things with Sabine, Thomas, Minna, Piotr, Dave, Kate, Claire, and many others. I really enjoyed all the great "experiences" with Piotr, from having some authentic Mexican fish tacos and lots of Thai food, to discussing a paper while enjoying raw, surprisingly delicious food in Hillcrest. Then there were cocktails and a party at Prof. Stuart Anstis's house, bagel pizzas and a great barbeque followed by a table tennis competition at Prof. Don Macleod's house, a lab dinner at Piotr's place... Biking home through the beautiful Torrey Pines

reserve after a long day of work and watching the dolphins jump out of the waves... Life is good in California!

In closing, I would like to thank all who contributed in various ways to the wonderful time I had in San Diego. I really enjoyed my stay at UCSD and I am confident that further valuable collaborations will come out of it. I would like to thank the Psychology Department at UCSD for hosting me, Piotr and the people from his lab for the good collaboration, and of course the EAESP for giving me this great opportunity.

Natalie Hall

(University of Reading, UK)

Postdoctoral travel grant

In May 2006 I visited the University of Cologne, in Germany to work with Prof Thomas Mussweiler and the Social Cognition research group. The overriding aim of my PhD research had been to address how motivation factors influenced automatic behavioural responses to outgroup primes. Following on from my PhD research I wanted to study the processing that underlies social comparison more directly, and felt that a study visit with Prof Mussweiler and his research team would provide a stimulating environment in which to discuss current research on social comparison and to generate new lines of research.

On my arrival at the department I was invited to give a “brownbag” talk about my research to date. This provided an excellent opportunity to receive feedback on my research from leading scholars in the field. Secondly, it also meant that everyone in the research team, knew immediately what my research interests were. In subsequent weeks the brownbag meetings provided a forum for the whole research team to meet and discuss one person’s most recent findings.

I was also invited to attend the weekly journal club. Each week one person picked a journal article and everyone read and discussed the article. This provided a really nice balance to my research trip. Not only was I learning in more detail about social comparison processes, but this was

complemented by an increase in my breadth of knowledge about topics such as the placebo effects of exercise, name-letter effects, justice and the human alarm system.

I spent much of my time in Cologne reading, thinking and talking about research questions and ideas. I met regularly with Prof Mussweiler to discuss my research thoughts as they developed. One of the most exciting elements of the trip was that I was able to discuss my ideas as they formed with an expert in the field. Prof Mussweiler's knowledge made discussion stimulating and valuable both at the research question generation stage and at the experimental design stage. As a result of the time spent in Cologne we have two lines of research that we are hoping to develop. Now that I am back in the UK, I am hoping to pilot these ideas in the near future and to write a research grant to develop these ideas.

I feel that the study visit was a very useful and stimulating experience. I would like to thank everyone in the Social Cognition research team at the University of Cologne who made me so welcome throughout my stay. Everyone took the opportunity to help me become acquainted with the local way of life including the bike-riding, the Kölsch and der Spargel! Finally, I would like to thank EAESP whose funding made this valuable experience possible.

Michel Handgraaf

(University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

Postdoctoral Travel Grant

Thanks to the travel grant, I was able to meet with Prof. Elke Weber and dr. Ryan Murphy at Columbia University (NY, USA; 1-8 July) to work on 2 projects (see below) and also to present at the International Conference on Social Dilemmas in Seattle (8-13 July).

Project 1: Group vs. Individual Decision-Making

During a visiting scholarship (fall 2006) at the Center for Research on Environmental Decisions (CRED) at Columbia University, NY, I worked with Prof. Elke Weber and two of her graduate students on two studies regarding group vs. individual decision making. These studies will result in two manuscripts; one has recently been submitted and the other is currently in preparation (Appelt et al. 2007; Milch et al. 2007).

We examined framing in individual and group decisions, including gain vs. loss framing and status-quo or default effects, comparing magnitude and direction of framing effects for individuals and three-person groups. For half of the groups, members first read scenarios and made decisions individually (*predecided* groups in *pregroup* phase). The groups were then presented with the same decision scenarios and told to reach a consensus (*predecided* groups in *group* phase). The other half of the groups were presented with the scenarios for the first time as a group (*naïve* groups in *group* phase). Two choice tasks known to produce framing effects in the decisions of individuals were used to test the hypothesis that groups are less vulnerable to framing effects and to examine the effect of prior, individual consideration of a decision on group choice. Group discussions and written reasons were analyzed for process explanations of observed choices. For a modified Asian disease problem, a smaller framing effect was observed for groups than individuals. For a decision to accelerate or delay consumption, naïve groups (with members who had not considered the decision before) showed a framing effect in the direction opposite to that observed in individuals, less discounting in the delay frame. Written and discussed reasons better explained variability in the choice data across conditions than frame alone.

The results of these studies were exciting enough to warrant follow up. To this end we prepared - during my visiting scholarship and afterward - a grant proposal for NSF (SES – Decision, Risk & Management Science, Proposal # 0720452). This has recently been awarded (in May) and entails a three year project under supervision of Prof Weber and Prof Higgins (Psychology, Columbia University) and myself. The amount awarded is approx. \$ 500.000.

Summary of NSF grant. When decisions made by individuals vs. groups differ, and decision quality can be assessed, sometimes individual decisions (or their aggregate) turn out better, at other times group decisions prevail. We will examine the relative advantages and disadvantages of having decisions made by an individual or by a group. We will focus on environmental decisions, i.e., important and complex decisions that involve uncertainty, with consequences that are realized at different points in time, and conflicting goals (consideration of short- vs. long-term, individual vs. collective, and material vs. moral/ethical consequences, and cooperative vs. competitive motives). We will examine the susceptibility of individual vs. group decisions to a range of framing manipulations in decisions with outcomes that occur at different points in time, in both riskless and risky decisions, and in social dilemma situations. We will contrast individuals and groups in their risk attitudes, degree of loss aversion, and discounting of future costs and benefits in financial/material and environmental domains. We make a (new) distinction of potential practical importance, namely between *predecided* groups whose members have considered a problem or decision individually before deliberating it as a group and *naïve* groups who are considering a problem or decision for the first time in the group setting. Some studies will examine crosscultural differences on obtained results through replication in the US, the Netherlands, and Argentina. Others will examine the effect of differences in group composition (heterogeneity in psychological traits known to affect decision making and heterogeneity in pregroup decision framing).

The proposed research will suggest (a) what types of decisions benefit from being made by groups rather than individuals, (b) how group decisions are affected by the composition and preparation of the group, (c) how group decision processes can be improved as a result of a better understanding of these dynamics, and (d) how these improvements can be implemented in the field.

One of the main purposes of this EAESP-supported visit was to discuss ways to approach the project in terms of hiring people to run studies, planning studies, but moreover to evaluate and further develop our new online paradigm for group decision making that we are currently developing and piloting at Columbia University (ran by a research-master student from the University of Amsterdam). Together with Prof. Weber

and her students I have also been working on the manuscript that is in preparation. I spent an intensive week full of very productive meetings: We prepared an ad for hiring someone to run our studies and made good progress on the paper. We furthermore worked on finetuning the online paradigm and preparing the second phase of the pilot. The first phase looks promising and our new approach of having groups meet via teleconference rather than having them come to the lab seems to yield similar processes and decisions as our previous studies in which people did interact face-to-face. Our new paradigm promises to be a very efficient way of conducting group decision studies.

Project 2: Measuring SVO

During my visiting scholarship last year, I also started a project with Dr. R. Murphy of the Center for Decision Sciences (Columbia University) on the measurement of Social Value Orientation. Social Value Orientation (SVO) is an important construct in accounting for individual differences that are often observed in social dilemma research. As is well documented, narrow self-interest does not account for other regarding preferences decision-makers often exhibit when making choices in interdependent contexts. The dominant measure of SVO employs a set of nine “decomposed games” that are used to elicit a decision-maker’s preferences for distributions of payoffs for self and another player. People can be categorized into one of three categories: pro-social, individualist, and competitive.

We have created a new and practical measure for SVO. We improved upon the method of measuring SVO in order to overcome several problems that exist with the current measures, such as:

- Nominal level of measurement (our measure yields continuous data)
- Only the first social preference is assessed (we also assess second, third and fourth preferences)
- Many subjects are not classified (our measure classifies 95%)
- Confound between prosocial orientation and inequality aversion (our measure allows distinguishing between the two)

Our new method can be administered with relative ease using an online tool. It uses a systematic set of two-outcome decomposed games for which decision-makers indicate their preference on a continuous scale. Measuring SVO in this way facilitates parameterization that is not possible within other frameworks. See <https://vlab2.gsb.columbia.edu/svo> for the actual measure.

The second purpose of my visit was to meet with Dr. Murphy, and work on the data-analysis and manuscript and prepare our presentation at the International Conference on Social Dilemmas in Seattle (Handgraaf & Murphy, 2007). We met several times during my stay in NY and made significant progress on our theorizing and the manuscript (Murphy & Handgraaf, 2007). We prepared the talk I gave at the International Conference on Social Dilemmas the next week which was very well received.

I thank EAESP for their generous contribution to a very fruitful visit.

Relevant references:

- Appelt, K.C., Milch, K.F., Handgraaf, M.J.J., & Weber, E.U. (2007). The impact of personality on individual decisions before and after group discussion. *Manuscript in preparation.*
- Handgraaf, M. J. J. & Murphy, R. O. (2007) *Measuring Social Value Orientation*. Talk at the 12th International Conference on Social Dilemmas, Seattle, USA.
- Milch, K.F., Weber, E.U., Appelt, K.A., & Handgraaf, M.J.J. (2007). From individual preference construction to group decisions: Framing effects and group processes. *Manuscript under review.*
- Murphy, R. O. & Handgraaf, M. J. J. (2007). *Measuring Social Value Orientation*. *Manuscript in preparation.*

Armelle Nugier

(University Blaise Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand, France)

Postgraduate travel grant

During two months, I was to the University of Amsterdam for visiting Prof. Agneta Fischer. Doing this short (but intense) trip was one of the best things that could have happened to me just after the redaction of my PhD. thesis. It allows me to go over my shyness about speaking English, thereby giving to me the opportunity to open myself to others, as on a professional plan than on a personal one, and to improve considerably my English. Moreover, I learnt a lot from the educational system and my way of doing my future research activities has definitively changed. I'm really grateful to the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology for giving to me the opportunity to expand my knowledge about my general topic of interest (moral emotions), to do research with one of the most famous actual emotional researcher (Agneta Fischer), and to meet people from the University of Amsterdam who are really warm, funny, enthusiastic, clever and stimulating.

As soon as I arrived, I received a very warm welcome, and I benefited from all the attention that I needed for a truly good integration in the laboratory. I rapidly met all the people working there and I was invited to and attended various social and work events organized by the department. I could also benefit from several and constructive feedbacks from people of the laboratory about articles that I wrote and I am actually working to perform them. Prof. Agneta Fischer and I immediately had a lot of discussions about the initial project and came up quickly with new hypotheses and new design. Based on previous researches that I did during my Ph.D, we focused on a current societal issue, namely how individuals perceive the message of an act of social control, and how this leads to moral versus anger-related emotions and specific actions tendencies directed toward the social controller.

Informal social control is considered to be any behavior whereby an individual communicates his or her disapproval to someone who holds a counter-normative attitude or who engages into a counter-normative behavior (Brauer & Chekroun, 2005). Asking somebody to stop smoking in a public space is a good example of informal social control.

Consistent with recent theories of emotion that hold that emotions have defined social functions and are triggered by specific patterns of appraisal of the environment (e.g., Keltner & Haidt, 1999; Smith & Kirby, 2001), the receipt of informal social control should lead a perpetrator to experience moral emotions (i.e. embarrassment, shame, and guilt; Tangney, 1991). These emotions are held to be functional in that they serve to motivate reparative acts and to discourage similar deviant acts in the future (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). However, informal social control can also give rise to anger-related emotions (i.e., anger, hostility, contempt, and indignation) in the perpetrator of the counter-normative act (Nugier, Niedenthal, Brauer, & Chekroun, in press) and by consequence, be quite ineffective. In other words, if a person receives social control after committing a counter-normative behavior, this person can apologize and repair the behavior (stop smoking...) or have an aggressive reaction toward the controller. Whatever the reaction, simply being the target of social control triggers negative emotions, as guilt and anger that could lead to more or less desirable consequences. In the ongoing project we wanted to highlight the importance of the subjective interpretation of the social control message in the perpetrator's emotional reactions to social control.

As I was invited to participate in the labgroup that Prof. Agneta Fischer held every two weeks, I could take the opportunity to present this project. This labgroup was a very good and fruitful experience for me and offer me the chance to get good and critical feedback that helped me to catch the hypotheses through a final and proper methodology. Through an exploratory study that concerned smokers participants, we tried to assess how they considerate the social control message and the effect of these consideration on their emotions and behaviors. First analyses are encouraging and show that smokers tend to generally interpret the social control message as ever moralizing or self-serving. Moralizing is when the social controllers point out the fact that the behavior is in some fundamental sense "wrong" and this the moral judgment serves to underline the moral inaptitude of the self. Self-serving is when the social controllers point out the fact that they personally suffer the consequence of the counter-normative behavior. These two kinds of interpretation of social control seem to affect differently the emotional reactions and behavior of smokers. While a moralizing act of social control elicits anger-related emotions and lead to hostile behaviors, a self-serving act of social

control elicits moral emotions and lead to repair behaviors. These effects appear to be tied to the estimations that do the smokers of the legitimacy of the social control and the harmfulness of their own behavior. Additional data will be collected soon in order to enhance the validity of these results.

Based on the results of this first study, we would like to plan a follow-up study in which we will manipulate experimentally the content of the message of social control and over-subtle the predictions about the underlying processes.

All in all, my trip to Amsterdam was extremely motivating, inspiring, and useful professional experience. I sincerely thank the EAESP for making my trip possible and I would like to thank particularly Agneta Fischer and Sibylle Classen for their patience, for their kindness and for assistance whenever needed. Big thanks also to all the doctoral and post-doctoral students who played a fundamental role in the pleasure that I took to be at the UvA. Thanks to the Criterion.

References

- Brauer, M., & Chekroun, P. (2005). The relationship between perceived violation of social norms and social control: Situational factors influencing the reaction to deviance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35*, 3519-3539.
- Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. (1999). Social functions of emotions at four levels of analysis. *Cognition and Emotion, 13*, 505-521.
- Nugier, A., Niedenthal, P.M., Brauer, M., & Chekroun, P. (in press). Moral and Angry Emotions Provoked by Informal Social Control. *Cognition and Emotion*.
- Smith C. A., & Kirby, L. D. (2001). Affect and cognitive appraisal processes. In J. Forgas (Ed.). *Handbook of Affect and Social Cognition* (pp. 75-92). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tangney, J. P. (1991). Moral affect: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 598-607.
- Tangney, J. P., & Dearing, R. L. (2002). *Shame and Guilt*. New York: Guilford Press.

Helen Soteriou

(Nottingham Trent University, UK)

postgraduate travel grant

With the generous grant provided by the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology and the tireless help and support of Sibylle Classen I was able to travel to Tokyo, Japan in June 2007 to realize not only a number of academic goals, but also to forge links with eminent Japanese professors whilst disseminating findings to a national audience.

My PhD centers on whether gamblers exhibit certain personality traits and specifically compares poker players with online poker players and slot players with the pachinko game.

This research will in turn be used to help the vulnerable and those in the throws of addictions.

I am indebted to Professor Kazuaki Sasaki for being my patient guide and translator during my stay.

I was able to gain an invaluable understanding from both players, pachinko parlour owners and leading political lights in this area, and as a result of my observations and interviews I have been commissioned to write a story for a national paper.

Another important aspect of my visit was not only to arrange meetings with the only two other gaming researchers in Japan - Prof. Ichiro Tanioka and Prof. Yu Mihara, but to also work closely with Professor Sasaki on developing a questionnaire which will be administered to pachinko gamblers in Tokyo in the near future.

Nicole Tausch

(University of Oxford, UK)

postdoctoral travel grant

Thanks to the EAESP postgraduate travel grant I was able to visit Prof. Felicia Pratto at the Department of Psychology at the University of Connecticut (UConn) for three months (January 21st – April 14th 2007). The purpose of my visit was twofold: First, I wanted to start working on a project on predictors of support for terrorism. Prof. Pratto has worked on predictors of support for terrorism in the Middle East, so I was hoping to benefit from her expertise in this area when planning my project on support for terrorism in the UK. Second, I was planning to design a series of experiments on the effects of group-based social exclusion in collaboration with Prof. Pratto.

I was welcomed very warmly to the Department of Psychology. I participated in the weekly departmental seminars and lab meetings and had the chance to discuss my research plans with the faculty and graduate students. I was also able to attend lab meetings and social seminars at Yale, and to present and discuss some of my own work there. (Thanks to Jack Dovidio for giving me this opportunity!)

I spent the first few weeks at UConn reading widely on research on terrorism and discussing ideas with Prof. Pratto. We developed a framework on how social psychology can contribute to understanding terrorism, which we are planning to write up in the near future. Prof. Pratto also gave me valuable advice on two grant applications for a project on predictors of support for terrorism in the UK, which I completed and submitted during my stay at UConn. I also had the opportunity to attend a meeting at Harvard University, where Prof. Pratto and her collaborators met to discuss measures for a new project on predictors of support for terrorism in the Middle East.

Furthermore, we explored a number of ideas on the effects of group-based social exclusion during my visit and designed a series of experiments that examine the effect of group-based social exclusion on aggressive behaviour and extremism. We are planning to run these experiments at UConn in the fall.

In addition, I started a joint project on the effects of intergroup contact on motivation for social change with Tamar Saguy, who is a graduate student at UConn. Using her data sets from surveys of Jews and Arabs in Israel, we tested a number of hypotheses on how intergroup contact would affect members of the low- vs. high-power group differentially. The results of these analyses look very promising and we are currently writing them up for publication.

Overall, my visit to the University of Connecticut was very fruitful and gave me many ideas for future research. I hope that this visit will be the beginning of some lasting collaborations. Thanks again to the EAESP for their support!

Marijke van Putten

(Tilburg University, The Netherlands)

Postgraduate travel grant

Thanks to an EAESP travel grant I was able to visit the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, from March until May 2007 to work with Jonathan Baron. It was a wonderful experience that improved my knowledge and skills and thus improved my own research substantially. Thus, I can full hearted say that the goals of my visit were more than attained.

Jonathan Baron and I started a new project in the field of indecision, and explored the differences between not deciding and deciding not to act in terms of responsibility and morality of the outcome. The results of two studies indicated that not deciding is often actually perceived to be a decision and that sometimes people are even held more responsible for an outcome when they did not make a decision to obtain it. We are currently continuing our collaboration to shed more light on our interesting insights.

While I was working at Penn I also met a lot of other interesting people, and I had many interesting discussions with them about their and my

research. I was very grateful to be able to join the Brown Bag meetings at the Wharton business school and the seminar on decision making with Barry Schwartz at Swarthmore college. This resulted in a new insights and even new research projects in collaboration with Barry Schwartz which we are continuing while I am back in Tilburg.

All in all, this visit was very fruitful in the sense that it resulted in new ideas and collaborations, but also in the sense that I met many kind and smart people who helped me a lot. These people made my stay very successful and pleasant. I would like to thank EAESP for making this trip possible.

Announcements

Jos Jaspars Awards - Call for Applications

Criteria and application procedure for the Jos Jaspars Awards for early career contribution

Candidates for the Jos Jaspars Awards either should have obtained their PhD not earlier than January 1st of the previous General Meeting (January 1st, 2005) or, if their PhD was obtained before that date, they should have been under the age of 30 on January 1st of the year of the previous General Meeting (January 1st, 2005). There will be 3 Jos Jaspars awards.

They need not to be members of the Association.

Candidates are asked to submit their curriculum vitae, naming two referees, one of whom should be a member of the Association. These items should be sent to the Executive Officer, before **October, 1st, 2007** who will forward it to the selection committee.

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 Opatija.

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 [Miguel Moya, Fabrizio Butera, Naomi Ellemers, and Paula Niedenthal]

Address for correspondence:

Sibylle Classen, P.O. Box 420 143, D-48161 Muenster, Germany, e-mail: sibylle@eaesp.org

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, before **October, 1st, 2007** 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 [Miguel Moya, Miles Hewstone, Anne Maass, and Ad van Knippenberg]

Address for correspondence:

Sibylle Classen, P.O. Box 420 143, D-48161 Muenster, Germany, e-mail: sibylle@eaesp.org

Election of New Executive Committee Members - Call for Nominations-

Four members of the current Executive Committee will have served their term of office and are due to be replaced on the General Meeting next year in Opatija.

Patrizia Catellani (Italy), Russell Spears (UK), Fritz Strack (Germany), and Eddy Van Avermaet (Belgium) will leave the Executive Committee in June 2008.

Carsten de Dreu (The Netherlands), Miguel Moya (Spain), and Bogdan Wojciszke (Poland) will stay for another 3-year term.

According to the Standing Orders of the Association, the nomination procedure is as follows:

- (1) At least four months before the election, full members are asked for nominations.
- (2) Each nomination must be supported by two full members and addressed to the Secretary Russell Spears at least three months before the members' meeting. Thus, the deadline for receiving nominations is **March, 10th, 2008**.
- (3) Each nomination packet has to contain:
 - A letter from the nominee, agreeing to serve on the Executive Committee, if elected
 - Letters of support from two full members of the Association
 - Brief background information from the nominee (max. half an A4 page maximum), with a summary of academic positions, administrative experience, representative publications, and current research interests.

Please check the Standing Orders the EAESP website (Articles and Standing Orders) for more detailed information.

Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Administrative Secretary by **September, 15th, 2007** latest. Applications for grants and for the International Teaching Fellowship Scheme can be received by the deadlines March 31, June 31, September 30, and December 30. The deadline for the next issue of the Bulletin is **September, 15th, 2007**.

The next Executive Committee Meeting will take place from October 12-14, 2007.

Executive Committee

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

Carsten K.W. De Dreu (Treasurer), Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, Roetersstraat 15, NL-1018 WB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
email c.k.w.dedreu@uva.nl

Miguel Moya, Faculty of Psychology, University of Granada, Campus de Cartuja, E-18011, Granada, Spain
e-mail: mmoya@ugr.es

Russell Spears (Secretary), School of Psychology, Cardiff University, Tower Building, Park Place, Cardiff, Wales CF10 3AT, UK
e-mail: SpearsR@Cardiff.ac.uk

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

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

Bogdan Wojciszke, Institute of Psychology, Polish Academy of Science, Chodakowska 19/31, PL-03-815 Warsaw, Poland
e-mail: bogdan@psychpan.waw.pl

Executive Officer:

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

web site of the EAESP:

<http://www.eaesp.org>