
1 Editorial

3 President's Corner

6 New Publications by Members

Coping with Minority Status: Responses to Exclusion and Inclusion by F. Butera & J.M. Levine (eds.)

Psychological Perspectives on Ethical Behavior and Decision Making by D. DeCremer (ed.)

Special Issue of *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, Guest editors: H. Giles, J.M. Hajda & D.L. Hamilton

Identities, Intergroup Relations and Acculturation. The Cornerstones of Intercultural Encounters by I. Jasinskaja-Lahti & T.A. Mähönen (eds.)

Argumentation and Education. Theoretical Foundations and Practices by N. Muller Mirza & A.-N. Perret-Clermont (eds.)

Dominants et dominés: Les identités des collections et des agrégats (Dominants and subordinates: The social identities of collections and aggregate) by F. Lorenzi-Cioldi

Crossing the Divide: Intergroup Leadership in a World of Difference by T. Pittinsky (ed.)

19 Book Reviews

The Psychology of Risk by G. Breakwell, Review by Paul Slovic

20 Future EAESP Meetings – Calendar

21 Future EASP Meetings

16th EASP General Meeting, July 2011, Stockholm, Sweden

Small Group Meeting on Developmental Perspectives on Subtle and Explicit Intergroup Prejudice, July 5-8, 2010, Lisbon, Portugal

24 Reports of Previous Meetings

Small Group Meeting on Cognitive Consistency as an Integrative Concept in Social Cognition, June 11-15, 2009, Bronnbach, Germany

Small Group Meeting on Self-Regulation Approaches to Group Processes, June 21-24, 2009, Hohenstein-Ödenwaldstetten, Germany

Medium Size Meeting on Collective Action and Social Change: Towards Integration and Innovation, July 3-6, 2009, Appingedam, The Netherlands

Small Group Meeting on Resolving Societal Conflicts and Building Peace: Socio-Psychological Dynamics, September 7-10, 2009, Jerusalem, Israel

44 Report from the Summer Institute in Social Psychology, Evanston, Illinois, July 12-25, 2009

48 News about Members

New Members of the Association

51 Grants and Grant Reports

76 News by Members

Misogyny in Italian Media and Politics: The Voice of Social Psychology

77 Announcements

The new Journal: SPPS

EASP Summer School 2010: Call for Applications

82 Deadlines for Contributions

83 Executive Committee

Editorial

Dear Friends and Colleagues,

It is my pleasure to present a new issue of the European Bulletin! As always we have tried to give an account of the multiple activities of the EASP and of its members. There are plenty of new books by members and reports of small group meetings and grants that show how busy we are all “doing social psychology”.

Carsten in the President’s corner discusses how “our product”, social psychology, communicates with other fields and how well it “exports”. Maria Paola Paladino thought that we should mention an initiative of committed social psychology in Italy by our colleagues Anne Maass, Angelica Mucchi-Faina and Chiara Volpato. In the section News by Members, they describe this initiative that was widely publicized and led to an article (see the link) to NY Times. For those who found the conversation with past presidents enjoyable, regrettably in this bulletin we will not publish one. The only reason is that printing deadlines did not allow me to produce a reasonable document. I was very happy to learn that my conversation with Prof. Doise attracted attention and that now a Portuguese version, extended by a new discussion that Willem Doise had with Joachim Pires Valentim, appears in the journal "Psychologica" (n° 51). I am continuing this initiative. Already two conversations took place: one with Prof. Gün Semin and another with Prof. Claude Flament both presidents of the association at different times. I’ve enjoyed and learned a lot from these conversations and I am keen to share them with you. Please be patient! As Carsten says there is “the Past, the Present, and a Swedish Future...”

Speaking about the future, both Carsten and Fabrizio attract your attention to the next General Meeting in Stockholm. The site is

found and all we need is to put the dates on our calendars and to continue doing research! We also publish an appeal for our new journal. Please look at the end of the bulletin and order the journal for your university libraries.

Last, but not least, in this issue you will find the announcement and call for applications for the EASP Summer School that I will have the pleasure to host in Greece between the 23rd of August and the 6th of September 2010. A lot of us have benefited from this special activity of our association. Please pass the torch to your students and publicize this information. We have a wonderful team of teachers, all waiting to meet the exciting and excited bright PhD candidates!

Enjoy your reading!

Xenia Chrysochoou
Athens, December 2009

President's Corner

The Past, the Present and a Swedish Future

In the past year, Jacques-Philippe Leyens from the Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve and Amélie Mummendey from Friedrich Schiller Universität Jena reached retirement age. Both have made a number of important and long lasting contributions to EASP – they served on the Executive Committee, and (co)organized summer schools and medium-sized meetings. Both worked on the Editorial team of the *European Journal of Social Psychology*, both made important scientific contributions to social psychological science internationally, and both trained a stunning number of productive young scientists that now work across Europe, including Portugal, Italy, France, the Netherlands, Germany and Belgium. It is hard to underestimate the influence Jacques-Philippe Leyens and Amélie Mummendey have had on social psychology in Europe and beyond. It was for these reasons that EASP formally recognized their investments with a certificate. It is our sincere hope that we'll see them both not taken retirement too literally, and that EASP will continue to benefit from their energy and insight.

It is our sincere hope too that Jacques-Philippe and Amélie serve as role models that inspire new generations to contribute because it is precisely because of people like them that EASP is what it is today – a vibrant, healthy, and steadily growing Association of scholars working on making social psychology in Europe a creative, inspiring, and practically relevant science. Increasingly, members of our Association are venturing into other areas, including (neuro)economics, developmental and cognitive psychology, communication sciences, law, and the political sciences. Clearly we have a “product” that exports well, that other scientific disciplines find informative and inspiring. More and more, our work is being

recognized as relevant to a broad range of phenomena that are not always closely associated with social psychology in and of itself. It is exciting to see this happening, yet it also begs questions about its impact on EASP. What role do we have this development, and are there unrealized opportunities along with downsides that we should consider? It might be useful to ponder these and similar questions to be well-prepared for a social psychological science that may be very different in ten years from now.

A key issue here is that social psychology in Europe and elsewhere is increasingly becoming a global science. If you look at the scientific publications produced by EASP members, international collaboration flourishes; our Summer schools host students from the US and Australia, and we send our students there. Postgraduates trained in Europe now work in Singapore, or Sydney, or Montreal. In our small group meetings faculty from Europe work side-by-side with non-European scholars who value the exchange (and the food perhaps too). Again, though at a different level, we have a “product” that exports well and no matter how exciting this is, it again begs questions about its impact on EASP. What is our function in such a globalizing world, how should we organize ourselves and our activities to optimally benefit from opportunities and manage the challenges that these developments pose? More specifically, is our current mission to promote European excellence in social psychology optimally served by the ways we organize our grant schemes, our summer schools, our membership system, and so on?

Pondering these important but slightly abstract issues is no easy task (at least not for me), and I hope that many members join the Executive Committee in thinking along, by providing us valuable inputs, ideas, concerns. We need to know your views, as these will help us in preparing EASP for the future. I will return to these and related issues in the Spring 2010 issue of the *Bulletin*.

The not-so-distant future involves our 2011 General Meeting, and as you can see in the announcement elsewhere in the *Bulletin* we're going to Stockholm. Now why Stockholm you may ask. There is a good tradition in our Association to seek out new places, new countries, and new experiences. And EASP has never been even close to Sweden, despite the fact that it has much to offer. Whereas Nobel prizes are for the happy few, the Hall in which they are presented to the Laureates hosts many, including us. Stockholm has great conference facilities; it has a wonderful downtown area, and the usual range of hotels and hostels that cater for everybody. Most important, however, is that in summer Stockholm nights are short and days are long – it will allow us to have more papers, symposia, roundtables, keynotes, and poster sessions without expanding the number of conference days, and without sacrificing one minute of socializing with old friends and new acquaintances. So mark your calendars to make sure you won't miss it. And keep your eyes open for the next Bulletin, where our local host Torun Lindholm will provide you with more (and more accurate?) details about Stockholm and the 2011 General Meeting.

*Carsten de Dreu
Utrecht, December 2009*

New Publications by Members

Coping with Minority Status: Responses to Exclusion and Inclusion

Fabrizio Butera & John M. Levine (eds.)

New York: Cambridge University Press

ISBN-13: 9780521671156, 24.99\$, pp. 359

Society consists of numerous interconnected, interacting, and interdependent groups, which differ in power and status. The consequences of belonging to a more powerful, higher-status “majority” versus a less powerful, lower-status “minority” can be profound, and the tensions that arise between these groups are the root of society's most difficult problems. To understand the origins of these problems and develop solutions for them, it is necessary to understand the dynamics of majority-minority relations. This volume brings together leading scholars in the fields of stigma, prejudice and discrimination, minority influence, and intergroup relations to provide diverse theoretical and methodological perspectives on what it means to be a minority. The volume, which focuses on the strategies that minorities use in coping with majorities, is organized into three sections: “Coping with Exclusion: Being Excluded for Who You Are”; “Coping with Exclusion: Being Excluded for What You Think and Do”; and “Coping with Inclusion.”

Contents

Introduction Fabrizio Butera and John M. Levine; Part I. Coping with Exclusion: Being Excluded for Who You Are: 1. On being the target of prejudice: educational implications Michael Inzlicht, Joshua Aronson, and Rodolfo Mendoza-Denton; 2. To climb or not to climb? When minorities stick to the floor Margarita Sanchez-Mazas and Annalisa Casini; 3. Managing the message: using social influence and attitude change strategies to confront interpersonal discrimination Janet Swim, Sarah

Gervais, Nicholas Pearson, and Charles Stangor; 4. A new representation of minorities as victims Serge Moscovici and Juan Pérez; 5. Marginalization through social ostracism: effects of being ignored and excluded Kipling Williams and Adrienne Carter-Sowell; Part II. Coping with Exclusion: Being Excluded for What You Think and Do: 6. Delinquents as a minority group: accidental tourists in forbidden territory or voluntary emigrées? Nicholas Emler; 7. Minority group identification: responses to discrimination when group membership is controllable Jolanda Jetten and Nyla Branscombe; 8. Coping with stigmatization: smokers' reactions to antismoking campaigns Juan Manuel Falomir-Pichastor, Armand Chatard, Gabriel Mugny, and Alain Quiamzade; 9. Terrorism as a tactic of minority influence Xiaoyan Chen and Arie Kruglanski; 10. The stigma of racist activism Kathleen Blee; 11. Why groups fall apart: a social psychological model of the schismatic process Fabio Sani; Part III. Coping with Inclusion: 12. Multiple identities and the paradox of social inclusion Manuela Barreto and Naomi Ellemers; 13. Pro-minority policies and cultural change: a dilemma for minorities Angelica Mucchi-Faina; 14. Influence without credit: how successful minorities respond to social cyptomnesia Fabrizio Butera, John Levine, and Jean-Pierre Vernet; 15. Influence and its aftermath: motives for agreement among minorities and majorities Radmila Prisljin and Niels Christensen.

Psychological Perspectives on Ethical Behavior and Decision Making

David DeCremer (ed.)

<http://www.infoagepub.com/products/Psychological-Perspectives-on-Ethical-Behavior-and-Decision-Making>

Paperback: 978-1-60752-105-1 Web Price: \$31.99 (Reg. \$39.99)

Hardcover: 978-1-60752-106-8 Web Price: \$59.19 (Reg. \$73.99)

The book is divided into three relatively coherent sections that focus on understanding the emergence of (un)ethical decisions and behaviors in our work and social lives by adopting a psychological framework. The first section focuses on reviewing our knowledge

with respect to the specific notions of ethical behavior and corruption. These chapters aim to provide definitions, boundary conditions and suggestions for future research on these notions. The second section focuses on the intra-individual processes (affect, cognition and motivation) that determine why and how people display unethical behavior and are able to justify this kind of behavior to a certain extent. In these chapters the common theme is that given specific circumstances psychological processes are activated that bias perceptions of ethical behavior and decision making.

The third section explores how organizational features frame the organizational setting and climate. These chapters focus on how employment of sanctions, procedurally fair leadership and a general code of conduct shapes perceptions of the organizational climate in ways that it becomes clear to organizational members how just, moral and retributive the organization will be in case of unethical behavior.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I: INTRODUCTION. Psychology and Ethics: What It Takes to Feel Ethical When Being Unethical, David De Cremer.

PART II: REFLECTIONS ON (UN)ETHICAL BEHAVIOR. On the Causes and Conditions of Moral Behavior: Why is This All We Know? Scott J. Reynolds and Tara L. Ceranic. Psychological Processes in Organizational Corruption, Celia Moore.

PART III: PROCESSES WITHIN THE INDIVIDUAL AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR. Moral Self-Regulation: Licensing and Compensation, Chen-Bo Zhong, Katie Liljenquist, and Daylian M. Cain. Ethical Standards in Gain versus Loss Frames, Jessica S. Cameron and Dale T. Miller. Why Leaders Feel Entitled to Take More: Feelings of Entitlement As a Moral Rationalization Strategy, David De Cremer, Eric van Dijk, and Chris P. Reinders Folmer. Actual and Potential Exclusion as Determinants of Individuals' Unethical Behavior in Groups, Madan M. Pillutla and Stefan

Thau. When The Need to Trust Results in Unethical Behavior: The Sensitivity to Mean Intentions (SeMI) Model, Mario Gollwitzer and Tobias Rothmund. The Neural Basis of Morality, Maarten A. S. Boksem and David De Cremer.

PART IV: THE SOCIAL CONTEXT AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR. The Two-Fold Influence of Sanctions on Moral Concerns, Laetitia B. Mulder. Making Ethical Climate a Mainstream Management Topic: A Review, Critique, and Prescription for the Empirical Research on Ethical Climate, David M. Mayer, Maribeth Kuenzi, and Rebecca L. Greenbaum. Ethics and Rule Adherence in Groups, Tom Tyler and David De Cremer.

Announcing a special issue of ***Group Processes and Intergroup relations*** (Vol. 12, Issue 3, July 2009, <http://gpir.sagepub.com/>)

Harmony and Discord: The Music of Intergroup Relations

Guest Editors:

Howard Giles, John M. Hajda, and David L. Hamilton

University of California, Santa Barbara

Music is a social phenomenon, human product, and a form of communication between composer, performer, and audience. It directly affects most individuals' lives and plays a crucial role in constructing, communicating, and ritualizing collectivities. Indeed, it is amongst the most highly structured cultural expressions reflecting social groups' essential values. Music, then, is a significant dimension of personal and particularly social identity, relating as it does to nationalities, ethnicities, religions, politics, age groups and generations, genders and sexual orientations. This Special Issue is devoted to providing a coherent, culturally-diverse set of contributions exploring the roles of music in intergroup dynamics.

Contents

Striking a Chord: Prelude to Music and Intergroup Relations
Howard Giles, Amanda Denes, David L. Hamilton and John M. Hajda

Social Identity on a National Scale: Optimal Distinctiveness and Young People's Self-Expression through Musical Preference
Dominic Abrams

Musical Taste and In-group Favoritism
Adam Lonsdale and Adrian North

You Are What You Listen to: Young People's Stereotypes about Music Fans
Peter J. Rentfrow, Jennifer A. McDonald and Julian A. Oldmeadow

Self-esteem, Misogyny and Afrocentricity: An Examination of the Relationship between Rap Music Consumption and African American Perceptions
Travis L. Dixon, Yuanyuan Zhang and Kate Conrad

Blame It on Hip-Hop: Anti-Rap Attitudes as A Proxy for Prejudice
Christine Reyna, Mark Brandt, G. Tendayi Viki

The Impact of Music on Automatically Activated Attitudes: Flamenco and Gypsy People
Rosa Rodríguez-Bailón, Josefa Ruiz and Miguel Moya

The Dynamic of Songs in Intergroup Conflict and Proximity: The Case of the Israeli Disengagement from the Gaza Strip
Moshe Bensimon

Identities, Intergroup Relations and Acculturation. The Cornerstones of Intercultural Encounters

Inga Jasinskaja-Lahti & Tuuli Anna Mähönen (eds.)

Gaudeamus 2009, ISBN: 978-952-495-117-3

PBK, 240 pages, Retail price 31 €

Migration is one of the most intensively discussed topics in almost every media in Europe today yet the phenomenon is not a new one. This book provides researchers, students, and other interested readers with a timely and multidisciplinary perspective to the research on immigration and intercultural encounters. The volume aims at enriching the understanding of these phenomena in three different ways. For first, it seeks for a better conceptualization of identity, intergroup relations, and acculturation as dynamic and contextual processes. The second goal is to present different methodological solutions for capturing these processes. Finally, ways to promote positive intergroup relations in society are discussed.

Contents

Editors' introduction

Inga Jasinskaja-Lahti & Tuuli Anna Mähönen

Introductory chapter: Ethnic identity and acculturation

Karmela Liebkind

PART I- IDENTITIES

Studying ethnic identity

Maykel Verkuyten

"There is a difference" A discourse analytic study on the social construction of Finnishness and Finnish identity

Sirkku Varjonen, Linda Arnold & Inga Jasinskaja-Lahti

Multiple reference groups: towards the mapping of immigrants' complex social worlds

Gabriel Horenczyk

Identity projects in multicultural nation-states

Xenia Chrysochoou

Ethnolinguistic vitality, the media and language retention in multiethnic societies

Tom Moring & Charles Husband

PART II - INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Intergroup attitudes among majority and minority groups

Inga Jasinskaja-Lahti & Tuuli Anna Mähönen

I can feel we don't like them: on the emotional nature of prejudice

Jorge Sinisterra, Eerika Finell & Daniel Geschke

Ingroup and outgroup in morality and moral development

Klaus Helkama

Social representations and intergroup relations: An indispensable alliance

Inari Sakki & Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman

PART III - ACCULTURATION AND IMMIGRANT ADAPTATION

The role of ethnic hierarchies in acculturation and intergroup relations

Fons J. R. Van de Vijver

Perceived discrimination and psychological adjustment of immigrants: A review of research

Mitch van Geel & Paul Vedder

Adaptation of young immigrants: The double jeopardy of acculturation

David L. Sam & John W. Berry

Significance of the ingroup and the collectivistic value-orientation

Rauni Myllyniemi & Raul Kassee

Finnish immigration policy in change

Simo Mannila

The book was published to honour the 60th birthday of Professor Karmela Liebkind.

Argumentation and Education. Theoretical Foundations and Practices

Muller Mirza, Nathalie & Perret-Clermont, Anne-Nelly (eds.)

Springer 2009, VI, 237 p. 25 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-0-387-98124-6

During the last decade, argumentation has attracted growing attention as a means to elicit processes (linguistic, logical, dialogical, psychological, etc.) that can sustain or provoke reasoning and learning. Constituting an important dimension of daily life and of professional activities, argumentation plays a special role in democracies and is at the heart of philosophical reasoning and scientific inquiry. Argumentation, as such, requires specific intellectual and social skills. Hence, argumentation will have an increasing importance in education, both because it is an important competence that has to be learned, and because argumentation can be used to foster learning in philosophy, history, sciences and in many other domains.

However, learning argumentation and learning by arguing, at school, still raise theoretical and methodological questions such as: How do learning processes develop in argumentation? How to design effective argumentative activities? How can the argumentative efforts of pupils can be sustained? What are the psychological issues involved when arguing with others? How to evaluate and analyze the learners' productions?

Argumentation and Education answers these and other questions by providing both theoretical backgrounds, in psychology, education and theory of argumentation, and concrete examples of experiments and results in school contexts in a range of domains. It reports on existing innovative practices in education settings at various levels.

Written for:

Researchers, educators, and graduate students in primary, secondary, and higher education

Keywords:

- * Argumentation CSCL tools
- * Argumentation and Learning
- * Argumentation and Social Constraints of Knowledge
- * Argumentation as Social and Cultural Resource
- * Argumentation in Higher Education
- * Argumentation, debates and oral skills
- * Argumentative Design
- * Developing Argumentation
- * Multidisciplinary Perspectives
- * Psychosocial Perspective on Argumentation in Education
- * Role of ICT Tools in Argumentation
- * The Argumentum Experience
- * Theoretical foundations

Table of contents

Introduction, Nathalie Muller Mirza and Anne-Nelly Perret-Clermont

Part I. Theoretical Foundations

Argumentation as an Object of Interest and as a Social and Cultural Resource, Eddo Rigotti and Sara Greco Morasso

Psychosocial Processes in Argumentation, Nathalie Muller Mirza, Anne-Nelly Perret-Clermont, Valerie Tartas, and Antonio Iannaccone

Argumentation and Learning, Baruch B. Schwarz

Argumentative Interactions and the Social Construction of Knowledge, Michael Baker

Argumentative Design, Jerry E. B. Andriessen and Baruch B. Schwarz

Part II. Practices

Developing Argumentation: Lessons Learned in the Primary School, Neil Mercer

Argumentation in Higher Education: Examples of Actual Practices with Argumentation Tools, Jerry E. B. Andriessen

The Argumentum Experience, Sara Greco Morasso

Author Index

Subject Index

Dominants et dominés: Les identités des collections et des agrégats (*Dominants and subordinates: The social identities of collections and aggregate*)

Fabio Lorenzi-Cioldi

Presses Universitaires de Grenoble (PUG) 2009, www.pug.fr

ISBN: 978-2-7061-1150-9

Price 21 €

The following website gives additional details and a short excerpt of the book: <http://www.pug.fr/Titre.asp?Num=1099>

Readers : Academics: teachers and students at all levels in social sciences, social psychology, and psychology.

Abstract:

Why do blue-collar, women, and immigrant workers seem to have more things in common than managers, men, and local workers? In contrast to traditional perspectives which consider that an individual's uniqueness declines in a group to the benefit of common characteristics, this book speaks for a plurality of conceptions of a social group. The commonsense representations spread a conception of the group as an aggregate that is a homogeneous entity composed of similar and interchangeable persons. However, this picture fades away as one looks towards the top of the hierarchy, where the group comes to light as a short-lived collection of people expressing their own personality. Five major domains from the social sciences enlighten this distinction between groups as collections and aggregates: norms, attribution, oppression, covariation, and ideology.

The origin, the use and the social functions of these contrasted social representations of a group are examined and criticized by the author, who shows a number of illustrations taken from empirical research as well as from the media.

Crossing the Divide: Intergroup Leadership in a World of Difference

Todd Pittinsky (ed.)

Harvard Business Press, 288 pages

Publication Date: Aug 18, 2009

Synopsis

Bringing groups together is a central and unrelenting task of leadership. CEOs must nudge their executives to rise above divisional turf battles, mayors try to cope with gangs in conflict, and leaders of many countries face the realities of sectarian violence. *Crossing the Divide* introduces cutting-edge research and insight into these age-old problems. Edited by Todd Pittinsky of Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, this collection of essays brings together two powerful scholarly disciplines: intergroup relations and leadership. What emerges is a new mandate for leaders to reassess what have been regarded as some very successful tactics for building group cohesion. Leaders can no longer just "rally the troops." Instead they must employ more positive means to span boundaries, affirm identity, cultivate trust, and collaborate productively. In this multidisciplinary volume, highly regarded business scholars, social psychologists, policy experts, and interfaith activists provide not only theoretical frameworks around these ideas, but practical tools and specific case studies as well. Examples from around the world and from every sector - corporate, political, and social - bring to life the art and practice of intergroup leadership in the twenty-first century.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

Intergroup Leadership: What It Is, Why It Matters, and How It Is Done
-Todd L. Pittinsky

PART I – INSIGHTS & CONCEPTS

Chapter 1 Leadership Across Group Divides: The Challenges and Potential of Common Group Identity

-John F. Dovidio, Samuel L. Gaertner, and Marika J. Lamoreaux

Chapter 2 From Group Conflict to Social Harmony: Leading Across Diverse and Conflicting Identities

- Michael A. Hogg

Chapter 3 On the Social Psychology of Intergroup Leadership: The Importance of Social Identity and Self-Categorization Processes

-Michael J. Platow, Stephen D. Reicher, and S. Alexander Haslam

Chapter 4 United Pluralism: Balancing Subgroup Identification and Superordinate Group Cooperation

-Margarita Krochik and Tom Tyler

Chapter 5 Imaginative Leadership: How Leaders of Marginalized Groups Negotiate Intergroup Relations

-Jolanda Jetten and Frank Mols

PART II - TOOLS AND PATHWAYS

Chapter 6 Creating Common Ground: Propositions About Effective Intergroup Leadership

-Rosabeth Moss Kanter

Chapter 7 Boundary-Spanning Leadership: Tactics to Bridge Social Identity Groups in Organizations

-Chris Ernst and Jeff Yip

Chapter 8 Trust-Building in Intergroup Negotiations: Challenges and Opportunities for Creative Leaders

-Roderick M. Kramer

Chapter 9 Boundaries Need Not Be Barriers: Leading Collaboration Among Groups in Decentralized Organizations

-Heather M. Caruso, Todd Rogers, and Max H. Bazerman

Chapter 10 Operating Across Boundaries: Leading Adaptive Change

-Ronald Heifetz

PART III - CASES IN CONTEXT

Chapter 11 Leadership for Enhancing Coexistence: Promoting Social Cohesion Among Groups in Pluralistic Societies

-Alan B. Slifka

Chapter 12 Bringing Groups Together: The Politics of Africa and Elsewhere

-Robert I. Rotberg

Chapter 13 The Context for Intergroup Leadership Among Women's Groups in Saudi Arabia

-May Al-Dabbagh

Chapter 14 From Bolted-on to Built-In: Diversity Management and Intergroup Leadership in American Corporations

-Candice Castleberry-Singleton

Chapter 15 Reaching Across the Aisle: Innovations for Cross-Party Cultural Collaboration

-Mark Gerzon

Chapter 16 Collective Memory and Intergroup Leadership: Israel as a Case Study

-Irit Keynan

Chapter 17 Interfaith Leadership: Bringing Religious Groups Together

-Eboo Patel, April Kunze, and Noah Silverman

Book Reviews

The Psychology of Risk, by **Glynis M. Breakwell**

P aperback, ISBN-13: 9780521004459

Also available in Hardback, Published November 2007

Review by **Paul Slovic**

Psychologists have been studying how people think about risk since the middle of the last century. Glynis Breakwell has taken on the ambitious task of summarizing hundreds of empirical studies, documenting their theoretical and practical implications. The book is organized by chapters that reflect major issues; hazard perception, individual and group differences in risk perceptions, decision making about risks, risk and emotion, risk communication, errors, accidents and emergencies, risk and complex organizations, the social amplification of risk, and practical and ethical implications of attempting to change risk attitudes and behaviors. The coverage is theoretically inclusive, reviewing the variety of medium-range explanatory models that have been developed and presenting their respective pros and cons. Some 36 pages of references attest to the comprehensiveness of coverage of these topics and I can attest to the clear and engaging quality of the writing. The book will inform researchers, risk managers in organizations, policy makers in government and, of course, students in courses on risk and decision making. It is a superb and much-needed text for such courses.

Future EASP Meetings - Calendar

July 5-8, 2010, Lisbon, Portugal

Small Group Meeting on Developmental Perspectives on Subtle and Explicit Intergroup Prejudice: Advances in Theory, Measurement, and Intervention

Organisers: Maria Benedicta Monteiro (mbbm@iscte.pt), Allard

Feddes (a.r.feddes@iscte.pt), Juliane Degner (j.degner@uva.nl),

Yarrow Dunham (ydunham@ucmerced.edu)

Second week of July 2011, Stockholm, Sweden

16th EASP General Meeting

Organiser: Torun Lindholm

Future EASP Meetings

16th EASP General Meeting

Dear Members,

In the last Bulletin you have learned that **Stockholm** was chosen for our next **General Meeting**. In the present Bulletin, the Executive Committee is happy to inform you that the conference venue has been selected: the Stockholm International Fairs (SIF) centre, a modernly equipped, state-of-the-art conference centre, conveniently located on the metro line. SIF is an enormous centre that will provide plenty of space for our sessions, symposia and posters, all in the same location. We think that it will be an ideal venue. The next Bulletin will feature an article by Torun Lindholm, the local organizer. We keep you posted on the progress of the General Meeting.

Best regards,

Fabrizio Butera, Meetings Officer

Small Group Meeting

On Developmental Perspectives on Subtle and Explicit Intergroup Prejudice: Advances in Theory, Measurement, and Intervention

July 5-8, 2010, Lisbon University Institute (ISCTE-IUL) Centre for Research and Intervention (CIS), Portugal

Organisers: Maria Benedicta Monteiro (mbbm@iscte.pt), Allard Feddes (a.r.feddes@iscte.pt), Juliane Degner (j.degner@uva.nl), Yarrow Dunham (ydunham@ucmerced.edu)

Over the last decade, research on the development of prejudice in childhood has combined researchers from both the fields of social and developmental psychology. This work has proven to be important for understanding how the development of prejudice in childhood and adolescence is related to prejudice in adulthood, and has also informed intervention research.

The development of explicit prejudice has a long history in social psychology. In addition, social psychological research in the 80s and 90s focused on "subtle" prejudice due to anti-racist norms in western societies (i.e., Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). And more recently new work on subtle 'implicit' prejudice within children has emerged (i.e., forthcoming special issue on "Origins of Intergroup Bias: Developmental and Social Cognitive Research on Intergroup Attitudes" in the *European Journal of Social Psychology*). This meeting will serve as a unique opportunity for experts to share their knowledge and experience regarding these issues. In addition, the conference will be a forum for discussing to what extent existing measures addressing implicit prejudice in adults are capable of capturing implicit prejudice in children. Finally, new methods of

measurement of implicit and explicit prejudice in children will be discussed.

The meeting will bring together researchers and PhD students from different backgrounds (particularly developmental psychology and social psychology) both within and outside Europe. The aim is to get an overview of the theoretical and methodological advances in the social-developmental study of prejudice and, in addition to initiate new collaborations for current and future researchers in this field.

The format of communication will include keynotes and presentations by senior and junior researchers followed by discussions initiated by discussants, as well as posters (including a five minute presentation of the poster). The focus may be on measurement of explicit and implicit attitudes (i.e., do they match?), development of new methods and metatheoretical frameworks to guide the research questions (i.e., social identity developmental theory, socio-normative theory, theory on moral reasoning, etc.). In addition, a main aim of the meeting is to identify key questions and to set out future research lines. It should be noted that this will be a small group meeting with around 30 participants which facilitates interaction.

The deadline for applications is **Monday February 15, 2010**. Potential participants can send an **abstract of maximum 250 words** by email to one of the organizers:

Allard Feddes (a.r.feddes@iscte.pt)
 Maria Benedicta Monteiro (mbbm@iscte.pt)
 Juliane Degner (j.degner@uva.nl)
 Yarrow Dunham (ydunham@ucmerced.edu)

Reports of Previous Meetings

Small Group Meeting on Cognitive Consistency as an Integrative Concept in Social Cognition

June 11-15, 2009, Bronnbach, Germany

Organizers: Bertram Gawronski & Fritz Strack

Even though consistency theories clearly dominated the field of social psychology in the 1950s and 1960s, their popularity waned considerably since the early 1970s. Some scholars blamed this development to the increasing focus on highly specific, yet peripheral differences between competing theories. This focus gave the impression that the apparently insurmountable disagreements between researchers reflected a fundamental problem with all of these theories. Over the past few years, however, cognitive consistency has enjoyed renewed interest as a powerful concept in social psychology. What is particularly remarkable about this trend is that it can be observed in a variety of different areas that used to progress relatively independently without mutual recognition of each other's contributions.

The main goal of this meeting was to bring together researchers from a variety of areas that make either explicit or implicit reference to the notion of cognitive consistency, and to explore the range and the limits of cognitive consistency as an integrative concept in social psychology. Supported by a Small Group Meeting Grant from the EASP, 27 researchers from Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, The Netherlands, Poland, and the United States congregated in early June 2009 at Kloster Bronnbach (Germany), a beautiful monastery that was built in the 12th century and has recently been converted into an attractive conference center that combines historic atmosphere with modern

amenities. The multi-national group included researchers at all career levels, ranging from doctorate students and post-docs to junior researchers, mid-career scholars, and senior scientists. The meeting included a total of 18 presentations, providing plenty of time for discussions of the individual talks and integrative discussions at the end of the thematic sessions.

The meeting started in the afternoon of Thursday June 11th with a guided tour through the old buildings of the monastery, followed by a welcoming dinner and a wine tasting in the historic wine cellar of the monastery. The official program commenced on Friday June 12th with three thematic sessions on cognitive balance. In the first session on *Cognitive Balance and Emotion*, Stephen Read (University of Southern California, USA) presented theory and data on how cognitive appraisals in affect, emotion, and motivation can be integrated from a cognitive balance perspective (the talk was supposed to be given by the first author Dan Simon, who had to cancel his attendance last minute). The second talk by Bogdan Wojciszke (Warsaw School of Social Psychology, Poland) presented research on how Schadenfreude and envy serve to restore of cognitive balance. In the second session on *Cognitive Balance and Attitudes*, Eva Walther (University of Trier, Germany) showed how cognitive balance and associative transfer of valence differentially influence attitudes during attitude formation and attitude change, and Johannes Ullrich (Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany) discussed the roles of ambivalence and bivariate attitude similarity in interpersonal liking. The afternoon started with a session on *Cognitive Balance and Cognition*, in which Hartmut Blank (University of Portsmouth, Great Britain) showed how common versus differing valence of two objects can influence basic perceptions of physical similarity and distance, and Denis Hilton (University of Toulouse, France) discussed how fundamental principles of linguistic polarity can shed further light on balanced conditionals. The Friday program ended with a session on *Consistency Between Explicit and Implicit Representations*, in

which Konrad Schnabel (Humboldt-University Berlin, Germany) presented data on how discrepancies between implicit and explicit self-concepts influence the stability of implicit measures. A second talk in this session by Friederike Dislich (University of Koblenz-Landau, Germany) on the consequences of discrepancies between implicit and explicit representations of the intelligence self-concept had to be cancelled, as the presenter had to call off her attendance last minute.

The two morning sessions on Saturday June 13th focused on *Affective and Behavioral Consequences of Inconsistency* and on *Consistency and Processing Fluency*. In the first talk by Ulrich Klocke (Humboldt-University Berlin, Germany), we learned about two facets of preference for consistency—preference for attitude-action consistency and preference for balance—which were shown to have unique effects on social judgments and social behavior. In the following talk, Marret Noordewier (Tilburg University, The Netherlands) showed that inconsistency can sometimes feel good, even though inconsistency from expectancy violations tend to elicit negative affect even when the expectancy violation involves a positive event. The second session commenced with a presentation by Sascha Topolinski (University of Würzburg, Germany) who showed that semantic incoherence can produce non-propositional forms of dissonance, and Piotr Winkielman (University of California, USA) discussed the relation between priming and fluency, showing that repetition priming does not necessarily increase fluency. The afternoon was dedicated to our social event, which included a boat trip and a guided tour through the historical village of Miltenberg. The day ended with a traditional dinner and a wine tasting at a local winery, where the owner introduced us to some selected specialties of the region.

The scientific program continued in the morning of Sunday June 14th with a session on *Affective and Cognitive Dynamics of Ambivalence*. This session included a presentation by Adam

Grabowski (University of Warmia and Mazury, Poland) who examined the influence of cognitive representations of another person on ambivalence and attitude extremity toward that person, and a presentation by Frenk van Harreveld (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands) who illustrated the explanatory and predictive power of the MAID (Model of Ambivalence-Induced Discomfort). The morning continued with a session on *Modeling of Consistency Processes*, in which Stephen Read (University of Southern California, USA) introduced an integrative feedback neural network model of cognitive dissonance. A second talk in this session by Tobias Schröder (Humboldt-University Berlin, Germany) on how Affect Control Theory integrates valence, potency, and activation in a mathematical model of consistency had to be cancelled, as the presenter had to call off his attendance last minute. The afternoon included two sessions on *Applications of Consistency Principles to Basic Phenomena*. In the first session, Paul Sparks (University of Sussex, Great Britain) discussed how self-affirmation processes can have undesired backfire effects, and Paula Brochu (University of Western Ontario, Canada) showed how different forms of prejudice, such as aversive, modern, and old-fashioned prejudice, can be integrated in a single consistency model. In the second session, Jeff Stone (University of Arizona, USA) showed how hypocrisy can be used to promote prosocial behavior in real-world settings, and Verlin Hinsz (North Dakota State University, USA) discussed how cognitive consistency can be understood as the outcome of information sharing in social groups. The official program ended with a general, integrative discussion about the range and the limits of cognitive consistency as an integrative concept in social psychology and open questions that need to be addressed in future research. The meeting itself concluded with a reception in the garden of the monastery and a farewell dinner on Sunday evening. Participants departed in the morning of Monday June 15th.

Overall, we interpret the wide range of research that was presented at the meeting as an indicator that, after more than 50 years, research on cognitive consistency is still alive and well, and that cognitive consistency has not lost its appeal as a powerful, integrative concept. The lively and stimulating discussions at the meeting made us even more optimistic that cognitive consistency has a promising future in our field and we look forward to seeing the research that has been inspired by the meeting. We would like to thank the EASP, the Alexander-von-Humboldt-Foundation, the University of Würzburg, and the University of Western Ontario for their generous support that made this meeting possible; all of our speakers and participants for their inspiring and thought-provoking contributions; our student assistant Juliana Rost for all her help during the meeting; and in particular Rita Frizlen (well remembered from the 2005 General Meeting in Würzburg) for her support in organizing the meeting. Our conference would not have run as smoothly as it did without her professional experience and organizational skills.

Bertram Gawronski (University of Western Ontario, Canada)
Fritz Strack (University of Würzburg, Germany)

Small Group Meeting on Self-Regulation Approaches to Group Processes

June 21-24, 2009 at Hohenstein - Ödenwaldstetten, Germany

Organizers: K. Jonas, K. Sassenberg & D. Scheepers

The small group meeting aimed to bring together researchers working on self-regulation approaches to group processes in order to document the state of this young and growing field of research and to further its impact. By focusing on the intersection between

the basic cognitive and motivational principles of theories of self-regulation and the more social psychological fields of interpersonal, intra-group and inter-group processes, the meeting aimed to provide a more social view of self-regulation, as well as providing interesting new ways of considering social psychological phenomena. As such, the meeting was an opportunity to share up to date knowledge with others working in field and provided a platform for discussion and innovation.

The meeting was held at a hotel situated in a former brewery in Hohenstein- Ödenwaldstetten, a beautiful small village in a rural area approximately 50 km south of Stuttgart, Germany. A total of twenty-seven, both junior and senior researchers from seven different countries participated. The format (25 minute talks, 15 minutes for discussion) worked well, with the time for discussion being used to its full extent. Most of the presentations were themed around new insights on regulatory focus theory, although other approaches to self-regulation, such as threat / challenge and ego-depletion, were represented as well.

The first session of the meeting revolved around self-regulation in intra-group contexts. Frank Wieber gave the opening presentation about the effects of implementation intentions on the quality of group decision making. His work demonstrated that forming the implementation intention to share unique information with a group of fellow decision makers facilitates the discussion of goal-relevant information and improves the quality of group decision making. Next, Bianca Beersma presented her work on the effects of regulatory focus on dynamic team decision making, showing that a promotion focus improves team decision making when the task reward structure is unambiguous, competitive and/or requires little coordination between team members. By contrast, when tasks were ambiguous, cooperative in nature and/or required coordination, prevention oriented individuals outperformed promotion oriented individuals.

After a short break, Verlin Hinz continued the session with his presentation about teams performing tasks in a dynamic contexts. He outlined a way of considering the complexities of performing such tasks at multiple levels of analysis, ranging from the individual level to the inter-group level. Richard Moreland then presented his work on reflection as a means of improving group performance. His work showed that, despite its growing use in practical settings, reflection on past group-performance does not necessarily improve future group performance.

Susanne Täuber kicked off the afternoon program with her presentation on the correspondence between personal and group goals. She showed that a divergence between the goals of the individual and the goals of the group to which he or she belongs leads to disengagement with the group and to a willingness to reengage with other groups. Next, Karl-Andrew Wolfin presented his work on the effects of regulatory focus on the way deadlines are perceived and acted upon. He argued that promotion focus determines how deadlines are seen, whereas prevention focus determines how deadlines are dealt with.

The final session of the day comprised presentations by Winnifred Louis and Jessica Salvatore. Winnifred's work centered around the effects of inter-group conflict on ego depletion, and showed that inter-group conflict is depleting, especially for individuals who are low in prejudice. Jessica argued that in American culture independence from normative influence is idealized, and that this causes paradoxical effects of independent self-construals on conformity among Americans.

Day two of the meeting started with a session on challenging contexts, consisting of presentations by Claudia Sassenrath and Johannes Keller. Claudia investigated the relation between regulatory focus theory and threat and challenge. Johannes

discussed his work on the effects of promotion and prevention focus on behavior in social dilemma situations.

The second session of the day consisted of presentations about power and status by Daan Scheepers and Ana Guinote. Daan opened by discussing the meaning of power in terms of promotion and prevention focus. He argued that power is not always related to promotion focus, as it sometimes implies responsibility and should therefore be relevant to prevention oriented self-regulation. Ana presented her work on power and behavioral variability and showed that power leads to more behavioral variability and to the use of more flexible information processing strategies. Eric Rietschel then presented his work on regulatory climates within organizational teams. He argued that organizational teams can have promotion or prevention regulatory climates that affect teams performance and team-member well-being.

Tomas Sthl opened the final session of the meeting with his presentation on regulatory focus and stereotype threat. He showed that adopting a prevention focus facilitates recruitment of additional regulatory resources when under stereotype threat. As a consequence, adopting a prevention focus protects performance when the task relies on cognitive control, but impairs performance when the task relies on proceduralized skills. The final talk of the meeting was given by Maarten Zaal, who presented his work on the effects of regulatory focus on engagement in collective action. The small group meeting ended with an excellent dinner in restaurant Rose, which served food that mirrored the meeting both in its high quality and in its experimental nature.

Overall, the small group meeting on self-regulation approaches to group processes was very successful. All presentations were followed by lively, and sometimes intense discussions. The atmosphere of the meeting was nevertheless very pleasant, and this in particular facilitated exchange between the younger and the

more senior scientists. Many thanks to Kai Sassenberg, Kai J. Jonas and Daan Scheepers for organizing the meeting. I am already looking forwards to the next one.

Maarten Zaal

Medium-Size Group Meeting on Collective Action and Social Change: Towards Integration and Innovation

July 3-6, 2009 at Landgoed Ekenstein, Appingedam, the Netherlands

Organizers: Martijn van Zomeren, Nicole Tausch, Andrew Livingstone, & Aarti Iyer

This meeting brought together international researchers in the field of collective action and social change. The aim was to provide a platform from which ideas could be exchanged, collaborations developed, and new directions for research explored among both established and emerging researchers. We were pleased to receive nearly 50 excellent submissions from Europe, North America, and Australia, and were able to invite 40 researchers – including 10 co-authors – to present 16 papers and 14 posters. These were organized around four major themes: ‘Predicting protest and social change among disadvantaged groups’; ‘The experience and consequences of collective action’; ‘Explaining collective action and social change among advantaged groups’; and ‘Social stability and obstacles to social change’.

The meeting took place in the picturesque countryside in the North of the Netherlands, at Landgoed Ekenstein. Participants braved the rainy weather, swine flu quarantines, and the train delays to arrive in time for the welcome dinner on Friday night, where people reconnected with old friends and made acquaintances with new ones.

The formal program was held over two days (Saturday and Sunday), with a series of papers and posters that were organized into the four thematic sessions. Oral presentations were each allocated 45 minute slots, providing ample time for presenters to communicate their work in sufficient depth while also allowing meaningful discussion to develop after each paper.

The first day opened with a session focusing on “Predicting protest and social change among the disadvantaged.” In the opening presentation, *Prof. Peter Grant* (University of Saskatchewan, Canada) integrated aspects of social identity theory and relative deprivation theory to explain collective action. Using samples of immigrants in Canada and teenagers in Scotland, he showed that cultural and national identification, as well as affective collective relative deprivation, directly predict intentions to participate in social protest and to vote for a separatist party. *Prof. James Cameron* (Saint Mary’s University, Canada) also sought to explain protest behaviour with group identification, but he focused on identification with opinion-based groups. His results demonstrated that identification with the anti-globalization movement mediated the relationship between political ideology (e.g., social dominance orientation) and participation in anti-globalization protest. After the coffee break, *Prof. Karen Phalet* (University of Leuven, Belgium) examined the effects of politicised and radicalised religious identity in predicting normative and non-normative political action tendencies among Turkish and Moroccan Muslims in Belgium. In the final presentation, *Dr. Emma Thomas* (The Australian National University, Australia) considered how the developed of opinion-based group identities might facilitate participation in collective action through the mediating processes of group-based emotion (e.g., anger) and norms about collective efficacy.

We then broke for lunch, which provided an opportunity for some spirited informal conversation, as well as a formal poster session.

Posters were presented by Alejandra Henriquez (Free University Brussels, Belgium), Fenella Fleischmann (University of Leuven, Belgium), Nicolas Görtz (University of Leuven, Belgium), Nina Hansen (University of Groningen, the Netherlands), Dr. Nicole Harth (University of Jena, Germany), Elanor Kamans (University of Jena, Germany), and Anca Minescu (Utrecht University, the Netherlands).

After lunch, the second thematic session focused on “The Experience and Consequences of Collective Action.” *Dr. Winnifred Louis* (The University of Queensland, Australia) focused on a question that has received very little attention in social psychology: how collective action may be used to create social change. Drawing on work in sociology, political and science, and social psychology, she proposed a range of variables that should influence the effectiveness of collective action to effectively change the status quo. *Dr. John Drury* (University of Sussex, UK) then examined the implications of crowd events for self-transformation drawing on the Elaborated Social Identity Model (ESIM) to outline the consequences of such collective action for social identity content, empowerment, and boundaries of identity. *Dr. Leda Blackwood* (University of St. Andrews, Scotland) discussed the process of politicization among union members, presenting evidence that prior union behaviours and organizational structures predicted intentions to engage in future union activity, and that these effects were mediated by union-related beliefs and identity factors. In the final presentation of the day, *Prof. Steve Reicher* (University of St. Andrews, Scotland) argued for the key roles of social identity and positive emotion in the experience of collective action, and called for a research collaboration to document activist experiences in major protest events during the 20th century.

After the formal paper and poster presentations, the conversations were continued over drinks on a 2-hour river cruise, followed by dinner. The weather was warm and sunny, and the small boat

made a circle around the nearby town of Appingedam at a leisurely pace. It provided nice scenery along the way, and relaxed participants' state of mind in preparation of a large BBQ after returning from the boat trip.

Day two started with a session on "Explaining Action and Change among the Advantaged." In the first presentation, *Joseph Sweetman and Prof. Russell Spears* (Cardiff University, Wales) integrated social identity theory and social dominance theory to outline the ways in which members of dominant groups and third-party groups may maintain systems of group-based hierarchy. *Dr. Emina Subasic* (The Australian National University, Australia) then discussed the political solidarity model of social change, which outlines the circumstances in which members of the majority group become willing to actively challenge the authority in solidarity with the minority group. In the third presentation, *Reem Saab, Prof. Russell Spears, and Dr. Nicole Tausch* (Cardiff University, Wales) examined the conditions under which members of third-party groups would support a disadvantaged group's use of violence as a non-normative form of collective action. Lastly, *Dr. Clifford Stott and Sophie McDowell* (University of Liverpool, UK) presented their research on the different strategies high-status groups may use to maintain their group's position of power in a status hierarchy.

The lunch break included a second poster session, with presentations by *Dr. Carrie Langner* (California Polytechnic State University, USA), *Diana Leonard* (University of California, Santa Barbara, USA), *Dr. Oliver Christ* (Marburg University, Germany), *Fergus Neville* (University of St. Andrews, Scotland), *Sonya Saroyan* (University of Exeter, UK), *Dr. Johanna Vollhardt* (University of Massachusetts, Amherst, USA), and *Maarten Zaal* (Leiden University, the Netherlands).

The last session focused on "Social Stability and Obstacles to Social Change." *Prof. Tom Postmes* (University of Groningen, the

Netherlands) examined how high-status groups may take action to oppress other groups and thus present a formidable obstacle to social change. He presented evidence that in-group norms regarding collective action may be developed through group discussion. These norms, in turn, had an important influence on support for oppressive collective action. *Dr. Julia Becker* (University of Marburg, Germany) focused on another obstacle to social change: benevolent sexism. She presented evidence that because benevolent sexism appears to be positive and flattering, it can serve to attenuate women's demands for social change by increasing levels of system justification and perceived advantages of being a woman. In the third presentation, *Shaun Wiley* (City University of New York, USA) focused on the relationships between different social creativity strategies and support for social change. Data from Dominican and Mexican immigrants in the U.S. showed that an intra-group creativity strategy (seeking more respect) was associated with increased support for collective action, whereas an inter-group creativity strategy (seeking alternative comparison dimensions) was associated with decreased support for collective action. Both these relationships were mediated by perceived group efficacy. In the final presentation of this session, *Dr. Jacquelin van Stekelenburg and Prof. Bert Klandermans* (VU University Amsterdam, the Netherlands) discussed how stigmatized groups' levels of identification with the in-group and a dominant group may have different implications for choice of response to the status quo. A survey of Dutch Muslims showed that identification with the dominant group was associated with no action; identification with the in-group only was associated with support for radical collective action; and identification with both groups was associated with support for moderate (or mainstream) collective action.

Dr. Colin Wayne Leach (University of Connecticut, USA) then led a general discussion of the key themes of the conference, and of potential future research agendas. This discussion helped to draw

out a number of important issues relating to collective action and social change that have so far been under-researched, pointing the way towards further innovation and integration. These included the importance of taking into account multi-organizational fields and the role of third parties and support by the wider public for action in social change and conflict resolution, as well as the role of violence in social change. This represented a stimulating close to the meeting, and gave all participants an impetus not only to continue their existing lines of research, but also to develop new ones in collaboration with other participants at the meeting. After this concluding session, participants relaxed over drinks and dinner.

All in all, the meeting succeeded in its goal of bringing together scholars in the burgeoning fields of collective action and social change research, not only to take stock of existing perspectives, but also to stimulate further integration and innovation. This goal was very much helped by the fact that participants were a perfect blend of junior and senior scholars, and came from a range of theoretical as well as national backgrounds. Moreover, the format of the meeting facilitated the goal of allowing constructively critical discussion as well as overviews of presenters' work.

With respect to specific outputs, an edited book is currently being organized, with the hope that many of the participants will collaborate on chapters. The meeting also saw several participants propose the development of large-scale collaborations. In addition to Steve Reicher's proposal for a Europe-wide initiative to document the experiences of participants in major social events and instances of societal change, Bert Klandermans (VU University Amsterdam, The Netherlands) announced an opportunity for researchers to collaborate with him and Jacqueline van Stekelenburg on a project that examines protests across different countries. Several participants of the meeting are currently collaborating on this project. Overall, the meeting seems to have lived up to its promise of providing a timely exchange of ideas and the

development of collaborations that will help to develop our understanding of these important social issues.

Aarti Iyer

Small group meeting on Resolving Societal Conflicts and Building Peace: Socio-Psychological Dynamics

September 7-10, 2009 at Interdisciplinary Center (IDC) Herzliya and Neve Illan Hotel, Israel

Organizers:

Daniel Bar-Tal, Tel-Aviv University, Israel
 Christopher Cohrs, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland
 Eran Halperin, The Interdisciplinary Academic Center, Israel
 Evanthea Lyons, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland
 Dario Spini, University of Lausanne, Switzerland.

One of the major concerns of the contemporary societies and the modern social science is a question of how resolve societal conflicts and build an enduring peace. The answer to this question is of vital importance for both more or less stable societies that face with low intensity conflicts and for the societies that live under pressure of intractable conflict. This is why a place near the city of Jerusalem for the small group meeting was a perfect choice: in the heart of one of the most tragic conflicts of modern times a group of dedicated scholars and researchers gathered for four days in order to share knowledge, discuss research results, and offer new insights in the area of conflict resolution and peace building.

The organizers brought together about 35 participants, the researchers at various stages of their carriers, which made discussions more lively and fruitful. The group was really international: there were scholars from Bosnia and Herzegovina,

Croatia, Cyprus, England, France, Israel, Italy, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Poland, Switzerland and the USA.

The meeting started with the poster session held at the IDC Herzliya, where 18 mostly graduate students from the Israeli Universities presented their work, inspired mainly by the major issues in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: 1. the role of group narratives, values, collective memories and ethnic ideologies in preserving the conflict; 2. the role of group emotions, particularly guilt, shame and empathy in the conflict resolution and reconciliation; 3. the concepts of victimhood and the perpetual in-group victimhood orientation; and 4. children's experiences of the conflict and the role of dialog group encounters in the process of peace building in Israel. After the poster session, the participants continued their conversations during welcome dinner after which the group was taken to the hotel in Neve-Ilan, a *moshav* located west of Jerusalem, and the main meeting venue.

The next three days were organized in nine panels, with 24 presentations. On the first day *Nicole Tausch* presented her work on the role of emotions (anger and contempt) and perceived group efficacy in normative and non-normative collective actions. She showed that disadvantaged groups with low perceived group efficacy are more likely to advocate more extreme violent actions and suggested that empowerment of disadvantaged groups could be a road to a more harmonious society. *Gilad Hirschberger* discussed the relation between mortality salience and support for nonviolent and violent solutions in conflict, and showed that in circumstances when perceived social consensus is high, when violence can be justified and when war seems inevitable the mortality salience makes the support of violent solution more likely. In her presentation on social representations and terrorism *Andrea Ernst Vintila* showed a mediating role of personal involvement in making social representations.

In the second panel *James H. Liu* contrasted the issue of cultural universality vs. cultural specificity by examining the representations of the most important events in the world history and by showing significant differences between western and non-western representations of the major historical events. Next, *Shifra Sagy* suggested an important role that peace talks of political leaders and violent realities on the ground may have in accepting or rejecting the narrative of the out-group among Israeli Jewish and Arab adolescents. Similarly, *Phillip L. Hammack* discussed how sharing the group narrative does not bring peace; however it helps to build the empathy.

The next panel assembled three papers. *Emanuele Castano* showed how reminders of in-group atrocities operate in changing the meaning of events, making the moral principles more relative. *Karen Trew* discussed causes and implications of the relatively limited influence of socio-psychological research and practice on the peace-making and peace-building process, by referring to the case of Northern Ireland; however her insights and constructive critiques calling for a more involved engagement of psychologists is equally applicable to the other social contexts. The idea for a more active leadership in changing socio-psychological repertoire that supports the conflict was shared by *Daniel Bar-Tal*, who offered a conceptual framework for emergence and development of an alternative societal repertoire supporting the peace.

In panel 4 *Stephen Worchel* presented his experiences with the peace camp research, supporting an idea of a more active role of psychologists in programs that are designed for the prevention of violence and not only in programs that bring together children and adolescents from already belligerent sides. *Janusz Reykowski* developed a model of societal conflict resolution based on socio-psychological theories of inter-group behaviour and his participation in the Round Table Negotiations between ruling communist elite and Solidarity movement in Poland in 1989.

After a fruitful discussion of papers and presented ideas, the first day of the meeting finished by the session given by the representatives of the both sides of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: Dr. Walid Salemas an Palestinian representative and Dr. Gershon Baskinas an Israeli representative shared their views on the conflict and its possible resolution, in the light of the recent negotiations under support of the US president Barack Obama.

The morning panel of the second day of the meeting brought together five presentations. *Eran Halperin* presented a general framework for study of emotions (emotional sentiments) and emotion regulation in intergroup conflict. *Steven Reicher* elaborated the mechanisms of mobilization for collective actions and analyzed the role of leadership in mobilizing these strategies. *Yechezkel Klar* discussed the role of three important psychological mechanisms (perpetual in-group victimhood orientation, the concept of a group as a transgenerational entity and the commitment to the ingroup narrative) in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. *Ankica Kosic* analyzed the effects of constructive conflict resolutions strategies within families on attitudes towards reconciliation within adolescents in two divided communities: the city of Vukovar (Croatia) and Belfast (Northern Ireland). *Ifat Maoz* integrated examples of Israeli-Palestinian group encounters (about 16% of Jewish population have participated in some kind of reconciliation-aimed group encounters with Palestinians) and analyzed their efficacy and goals in the context of an asymmetrical conflict.

During the afternoon of the second day the group visited the city of Jerusalem, with an excellent guidance of the Israeli journalist *Ronni Shaked* (a doctoral student). We visited holy places of major religions and had a first-hand experience of "so much history in so tiny place".

The last day of the meeting started with *Guy Elchereth's* presentation on the role of international justice in creating post-conflict societies and collective narratives about the conflict and human rights violations. *Dinka Corkalo Biruski* presented results on a new scale for measuring a tendency for social reconstruction, and advocated use of a term social reconstruction instead of intergroup reconciliation. Her presentation was followed by *Tamar Saguy's* innovative insights on the role of intergroup contact in promoting peace.

On the last day of the meeting there were four presentations. *Sabina Cehajic-Clancy* described two studies conducted in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Israel, showing that more secure personal identity (self-affirmation), but not group self-affirmation made people more prone to acknowledge their in-group responsibility. *Masi Noor* presented his work on the role of empathy in people's willingness to forgive extreme acts of violence, like suicide bombing in three cultural contexts with a different degree of violence threat. *Giovanna Leone* analyzed the role of media description of in-group and out-group victims during war-time and the role it may have in the process of conflict de-escalation. The final presentation was given by *Gavriel Salomon*, who analyzed major challenges of peace education by pointing out that short term effects of it are not disputable; however that the real challenge is to achieve sustainability of these effects.

The meeting was closed by the general discussion where several themes were identified as being dominant issues in the papers that had been presented: 1. The elements, mechanisms and processes that contribute to conflict and its maintenance (media, mechanisms of mobilization, memorials and historical narratives, intergroup emotions and politics); 2. Movements towards peace making (difficulties in mobilizing the public for peace, especially in the circumstances of the intractable conflicts, conditions for moving people towards peace, peace education as a preventive action); 3.

Conflict resolution and postconflict processes (techniques of conflict resolution, influence of the context; elements that facilitate the process of change and obstacles that prevent the change, the role of agents and societal factors); 4. Reconciliation (how the process is understood, when the process should start, what helps and maintains reconciliation, what is the role of international justice); 5. Conflict prevention (what are the indicators of conflict eruption).

The group also discussed the role of social psychology and social psychologists in the peace movement. Some participants advocated political activism as a key factor in making social psychology more influential in the field of conflict resolution and peace building. Nevertheless, we all acknowledged that it is our shared responsibility to find ways to make our knowledge and skills available and useful to relevant social agents that can work with us in making the world a better place to live in.

The small group meeting was closed by a joint dinner when two of our colleagues Uri Gopher and Dennis Kahn shared with us their songs devoted to peace. It was a moving farewell dinner among colleagues and friends who have shared scientific curiosity, common interests and values and an enduring commitment to work for peace.

Dinka Corkalo Biruski

Report from the Summer Institute in Social Psychology Evanston, Illinois, July 12–25, 2009

In July this year, five enthusiastic European PhD candidates crossed the North Atlantic to attend the Summer Institute of Social Psychology (SISP) in Evanston, Illinois. Approximately every two years a group of American graduate students, joined by a few more students from all over the world, gather together for a unique experience. In two weeks they follow classes taught by some of the greatest teachers in their field, they meet many other PhD students, and—when there's time left— they have a lot of fun!

This year, we (**Jan Crusius, Ron Dotsch, Suzanne Oosterwijk, Caroline Pulfrey, and Elze Ufkes**) had the pleasure to join SISP 2009, which took place at Northwestern University. The week started on Sunday July 12th with a keynote by Alice Eagly and an all-American barbeque and bonfire—with marshmallows and *S'more*¹. The next day class started and the circa 100 participants spread out over five different courses: *Conflict and Negotiation* (instructors: Adam Galinsky and Michael Morris), *Emotions in Group and Intergroup Contexts* (instructors: Ernestine Gordijn and Eliot Smith), *Biological Basis of Social Behavior and Personality* (instructors: Iris Mauss and Oliver Schultheiss), *Prejudice and Stereotyping* (instructors: Jack Dovidio and Laurie Rudman), and *Relationship Development and Maintenance* (instructors: Eli Finkel and Jeff Simpson).

Elze and Ron joined the course of Jack and Laurie. In this course the central themes were racial bias and sexism. Although these themes are certainly studied here in Europe, it soon became apparent that

¹ a traditional campfire treat popular in the United States and Canada, consisting of a roasted marshmallow and a layer of chocolates and witched between two pieces of graham cracker. The name "s'more" means "some more", as in: "give me some more!"; <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/S'more>

living in different societies gives an entirely different perspective on the socio-cultural and psychological problems related to prejudice. Nevertheless, the discussed theories applied to both continents and complemented our existing knowledge well. A lot of modern research on implicit cognition was discussed within a mixed framework of social cognition and social identity theory. We learned that according to the Common Ingroup Identity Model it would be better to present ourselves as social psychologists instead of Europeans—which we did not. And although we think we like Americans explicitly, our non-verbal behavior towards them probably revealed some negative implicit associations. Thus, we tried to interact with American social psychologists as if they were all European (a strategy used by some aversive racists, called colorblindness). The response we received on average was generous laughter, which from now on will forever be known as a Europeanist reaction (analogous to sexist or racist; actually ‘continentalist’ would be more appropriate, but “You’re a pianist” will likely go undetected and can thus be used strategically in conversation). Luckily, by means of recategorization the intergroup situation became bearable. We were assigned to different subgroups, which resulted in two very promising research lines that will be pursued in a European, American, and Israeli collaboration.

Jan and Caroline attended Adams’ and Michael’s course. In this course, we studied a wide range of aspects of the psychology of negotiations, for example how culture, emotions, gender, power, status and other demographic or psychological variables affect the negotiation process. In addition we worked on related topics such as identity negotiation and conflict resolution. The course consisted of seminar style classes in the mornings and every afternoon a guest lecturer delivered a presentation on a related theme. In this way, we had the opportunity to learn about the latest research being carried out by a range of well-known researchers working in the Chicago area. Over the two weeks, we also worked in groups, putting together research proposals based on ideas that were generated by

the course material and discussions. Caroline worked with Selin Kesebir, a graduate student from Virginia State University, on the question of whether gender influences negotiation outcomes because of sex stereotypes or differential behavior patterns. Jan worked with Ingrid Johnson from Ohio State University and Mark Brandt from DePaul University on how negotiating moral issues changes the course and the outcome of negotiations.

Suzanne joined Iris’ and Oliver’s course, which introduced the use of autonomic psychophysiology and social endocrinology to study emotion, motivation and social cognition. The course started with a very enthusiastic and thorough overview of the use of electrodermal and cardiovascular measures by Iris Mauss. The second week we learned everything (and more) about implicit motives and the measurement of hormones from Oliver Schultheiss. On a theoretical level, these classes challenged us to think about the many ways in which biological measures can help us to study psychological processes. Additionally, the classes went into a detailed description of the practical issues concerning the measurement of hormones and autonomic nervous system activity. In between lectures, every student was asked to present his or her favorite paper, which resulted in long discussions about testosterone, oxytocin, facial EMG, cardiovascular measures and the ‘brain activity’ of dead salmon. At the end of the first week, a ‘speed date’ session provided us with a quick (and fun) way to team up with other students to work on a research proposal. On the last day, enjoying pies and coffee, we all presented our research proposals. Taken together, the course by Iris and Oliver was highly informative, inspiring, of extreme practical value, and last but certainly not least, a lot of fun!

Next to these inspiring courses, when school was out, members of all courses reunited for various kinds of activities. Some of these activities were organized by the local organizers which did a great job—thank you Laura Luchies, Eli Finkel and Derek Rucker! For

instance we participated in a photo scavenger hunt (split up in subgroups and make weird pictures of your team all over Chicago), got the opportunity to eat as much of the real Chicago 'deep dish' pizza as we wanted, and went to an amazing farewell dinner! In addition, all kinds of spontaneous activities were organized by members themselves. As a result the White Sox lost 10-2 against Baltimore because their star players got distracted by a bunch of crazy SISPers in the audience. The neighbors of an Asian karaoke place in Evanston still suffer from severe headaches, because singing is something different from doing good research. And some of us discovered the most awesome jazz band, in a place which once was the favorite bar of Al Capone.

We would like to thank EASP for making it possible for us to attend SISP. All in all it was a very inspiring and enjoyable experience. We sincerely hope that in the upcoming years there will be many PhD students that also get the chance to either join the European (next years in Athens) or the American summer school (in two years again)!

Jan, Ron, Suzanne, Caroline, and Elze

News about Members

New Members of the Association

The following applications for membership were approved by the Executive Committee at its meeting in October 2009. Names of members providing letters of support are in parentheses:

Full Membership

Dr. Wieslaw Baryla
Gdansk, Poland
(B. Wojciszke, M. Parzuchowski)

Dr. René Kopietz
Bremen, Germany
(G. Bohner, G. Echterhoff)

Dr. Elena Belinskaya
Moscow, Russia
(I. Bovina, E. Doubovskaya)

Dr. Nadia Lepastourel
Rennes, France
(C. Darnon, P. Morchain)

Dr. Clémentine Bry
Reading, UK
(N. Hall, P. Chekroun)

Dr. Faris Nadhmi
Eskilstuna, Sweden
(A. Maass, N. Akrami)

Dr. Peter Fischer
Graz, Austria
(A. Haslam, U. Athenstaedt)

Dr. Andreas Olsson
Stockholm, Sweden
(T. Lindholm, F. Björklund)

Dr. Mauro Giacomantonio
Rome, Italy
(C.K.W. de Dreu, L. Mannetti)

Dr. Alena Prikhidko
Moscow, Russia
(I. Bovina, O. Goulevitch)

Dr. Julia Herfordt
Walferdange, Luxembourg
(K.C. Klauer, J. Hansen)

Affiliate Membership

./.

Postgraduate Membership

Pilar Aguilar
Madrid, Spain
(J.M. Fernandez-Dols, P. Carrera)

Daniel Alink
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(F. van Harreveld, J. van der Pligt)

Michèle Bal
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(K. van den Bos, H. Aarts)

Philippe Bernard
Bruxelles, Belgium
(L. Licata, O. Klein)

Erik Bijleveld
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(R. Custers, H. Veling)

Jacek Buczny
Sopot, Poland
(B. Wojciszke, M. Parzuchowski)

Aleksandra Cichocka
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Kofta, M. Bilewicz)

Nadja Contzen
Zurich, Switzerland
(K. Jonas, M. Hewstone)

Ellen Delveaux
Leuven, Belgium
(E. Van Avermaet, N. Vanbeselaere)

Chantal den Daas
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(H. Aarts, K. van den Bos)

Nicole Fasel
Lausanne, Switzerland
(E. Green, A. Clémence)

Fabio Fasoli
Trento, Italy
(M.-P. Paladino, A. Carnaghi)

Marleen Gillebaart
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(J. Förster, K. Jonas)

Jacopo Grisolagi
Florence, Italy
(C.K.W. de Dreu, R. Brown)

Melvyn Hamstra
Groningen, The Netherlands
(K. Sassenberg, N. Van Yperen)

Christian Happ
Luxembourg, Luxembourg
(U. Wagner, O. Christ)

Anne-Laure Hernandez
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(P. Niedenthal, A. Nugier)

Kat Jamieson
Dundee, UK
(A. Haslam, H. Blank)

Namkje Koudenburg
Groningen, The Netherlands
(E. Gordijn, T. Postmes)

Tiina Likki
Lausanne, Switzerland
(I. Jasinskaja-Lathi, C. Staerklé)

Beatriz Lloret
Lisbon, Portugal
(M. Barreto, T. Schubert)

Anna Pasin
Padova, Italy
(D. Capozza, A. Voci)

Francesca Prati
Bologna, Italy
(R. van Dick, M. Rubini)

Alexander Rikel
Moscow, Russia
(E. Dubovskaya, I. Bovina)

Marieke Roskes
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(C.K.W. de Dreu, B. Nijstad)

Adil Samekin
Moscow, Russia
(I. Bovina, E. Dubovskaya)

Elise Seip
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(W. van Dijk, G. van Kleef)

Daniel Sligte
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(C.K.W. de Dreu, B. Nijstad)

Anouk van der Weiden
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(K. Ruys, H. Aarts)

Yvette van Osch
Tilburg, The Netherlands
(M. Zeelenberg, R. Nelissen)

Stephanie Welten
Tilburg, The Netherlands
(M. Zeelenberg, D. Stapel)

Claire Zedelius
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(H. Aarts, H. Veling)

Grants

Marieke de Vries (travel grant)
Dina Dosmukhambetova (travel grant)
Gabriela Jiga-Boy (travel grant)
Ankica Kosic (travel grant)
Elisa Puvia (travel grant)
Shaul Shalvi (travel grant)
Sofia Stathi (travel grant)
Lotte van Dillen (seedcorn grant)

GRANT REPORTS

Julia Becker

(University of Marburg, Germany)
travel grant

One of my central research interests refers to the question why disadvantaged group members tolerate societal systems that produce social and economic inequality and what motivates people to work for social change. Therefore, I was delighted that the EASP postgraduate travel grant supported me to work with Prof. Stephen Wright, one of the leading researchers in this area. From August to October 2009, I had the opportunity to visit the Centre for Intergroup Relations and Social Justice at the Simon Fraser University in Canada to work with Steve Wright and his lab group in a very stimulating research environment.

During my visit, we have planned two experiments, which will be conducted in the fall and winter 2009. The experiments expand

work of Steve Wright and Micah Lubensky (2009) who have found that although positive intergroup contact is helpful to reduce advantaged group members prejudice against the disadvantaged group (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), it can also inhibit disadvantaged group members from engaging in collective action to improve the status of the disadvantaged group. The experiments we have planned during my visit aim to test for moderating variables and to answer the question *when* intergroup contact undermines disadvantaged group members' engagement in collective action. We will test the hypothesis that positive or friendly intergroup contact undermines disadvantaged group member's engagement in collective action when either the disadvantaged group member believes that their advantaged group interaction partner perceives the intergroup status difference as being legitimate, or where here is enough ambiguity that the disadvantaged group member is unsure about the advantaged group partner's position on the legitimacy of the intergroup status differences. In contrast, when the advantaged group partner explicitly describes the intergroup status differences as illegitimate, intergroup contact should not undermine (or may even enhance) participation in collective action. The first experiment will be attached to a larger online study of collective action among gays/lesbians/bisexual/ transgendered people in the San Francisco Bay area as "low status group" (compared to heterosexual people as "high status group"), the second study is a laboratory experiment with students of the Simon Fraser University as "low status group" (compared to students of the University of British Columbia as the "high status group"). During my visit, I was also invited to give a talk at the meeting of the Social Research Area at the Simon Fraser University. This was a great opportunity to discuss research findings and to receive valuable feedback.

Finally, the nice and scholarly atmosphere at the Simon Fraser University supported me to write up a series of studies on collective

action and on sexism research and the “natural” atmosphere allowed me to see a wild Grizzly bear.

In sum, my visit to the Simon Fraser University was a wonderful experience. I would like to thank Steve Wright for inspiring and vivid discussions, the social psychology and SISC lab members for all their help. Working with them was a real pleasure for me. Last but not least I would like to thank the European Association for making this visit possible!

Marco Brambilla
(University of Bologna, Italy)
travel grant

Intergroup Threat and Stereotype Content

Thanks to the EASP postgraduate travel grant I was able to spend three months at the Department of Social Psychology at the Catholic University of Louvain at Louvain-La-Neuve (from January to March 2009). This grant allowed me to continue a very fruitful cooperation with prof. Vincent Yzerbyt and his research group, a collaboration that started in 2008.

The main goal of my visit was to work on a project aimed at investigating the role of the intergroup threat in predicting stereotype content. During these three months, I was able to design and set up two studies as well as collect the relevant data.

Specifically, we examined the role of symbolic and realistic threat in predicting the perception of warmth of social groups. Previous studies in this domain have only considered the economic competition (i.e., realistic threat) as a predictor of warmth, omitting symbolic, i.e., value-driven competition (i.e., symbolic

threat). In Study 1, participants rated a series of real groups on symbolic and realistic threat as well as on perceived warmth. In Study 2, participants read an immigration scenario depicting an unfamiliar social group in terms of high (vs. low) symbolic (vs. realistic) threat. They then reported the degree of warmth that they associated with the group. Our data show that symbolic threat and realistic threat were differentially related to the sociability and morality components of warmth. That is, whereas realistic threat was a stronger predictor of sociability than symbolic threat, symbolic threat was a better predictor of morality than realistic threat. Our findings show that the prediction of warmth stereotypes can be improved by using two distinct predictors of the two components of the warmth dimension.

I am very grateful to the EASP for making this visit possible. I would like to thank Sibylle Classen for her valuable assistance at all stages as well as the Executive Committee for their support. Special thanks go to Vincent Yzerbyt and Nicolas Kervyn for their precious help and for sharing nice research discussion. Thanks also to all the people in the Department and to Raffaella, Francesco, Laura, Guillermo, Manuela and Betty for making my stay in Louvain-La-Neuve unforgettable. Finally, I would like to thank my Italian supervisors – Marcella Ravenna, Andrea Carnaghi, and Monica Rubini - for making this research project possible.

Vagelis Chaïkalis-Petritsis
(University of Kent at Canterbury, UK)
travel grant

The postgraduate travel grant allowed me to partially fund my visit to John Jost’s lab at New York University (NYU), United States, from February to May 2009. I am deeply grateful to EASP for their financial support, to my thesis supervisor Dominic Abrams for his

“long-distance” support during my 3-month stay in New York City, and to John Jost for giving me the opportunity to work with him.

John is a great person to work with and so are his lab students. By being warm and friendly they all made sure I integrated with the lab from the very beginning, which set the stage for a delightful stay in New York. I had the chance to attend weekly meetings run by John whereby research students from both within and outside the department got the chance to present their latest research. These seminars were extremely beneficial in enhancing my understanding of system justification theory and its underpinnings. As part of these series of seminars I was invited to give a talk about my own PhD research on system justification and its relationship with collective protest tendencies among members of low-status groups. My talk was very well received by John’s lab and I am grateful for their extremely useful feedback and constructive suggestions they provided me with. In sum, my participation in these seminars, both as speaker and member of the audience, helped me build my academic network and acquaint potential future colleagues with my own work as well as to learn about theirs.

Most importantly, my visit to NYU was a great opportunity for John and me to work closely together on a collaborative project that was meant to replicate and extend my PhD findings among an American sample. The main scope of my thesis is the specification of those motives that are particularly important for participation in normative (e.g. petitioning) and counternormative (e.g. building occupation) acts of protest (Wright, Taylor, & Moghaddam, 1990). Two of the motives I am looking at in my thesis are a) system justification (i.e. a socially acquired motive whereby people justify the status quo and try to endow it with a sense of legitimacy; see Jost & Banaji, 1994) and b) collective efficacy (i.e. the belief that one’s group has the capacity to improve an unfair situation and influence those responsible for the ingroup disadvantage; see Abrams & Randsley de Moura, 2002; Bandura, 1995, 1997;

Klandermans, 1997). Past research shows that the latter is a reliable predictor of participation in collective protest (for a relevant meta-analytic review see Van Zomeren, Postmes, & Spears, 2008). However, system justification has been largely neglected in the protest behaviour literature. Wakslak, Jost, Tyler and Chen (2007) do show, though, that system justification is negatively associated with willingness to help the disadvantaged and with support for social change in terms of redistribution of resources. By the same token, one could also expect system justification to be negatively correlated with willingness to take part in collective protest against ingroup disadvantage.

With regards to the distinction between normative and counternormative protest behaviour, what I predict and find in my PhD research is that both system justification and collective efficacy are primarily related to the latter rather than to the former. Indeed, the more ingroup members justify the system the less likely they are to take part in counternormative acts because participation in these implies an even greater willingness to go against the system and its norms than would be the case for normative acts. Conversely, the more ingroup members think they have the power to influence the outgroup responsible for their disadvantage the more likely they are to participate in counternormative acts. One can argue that this is so because of the ensuing uncertainty from going against the norms. Because uncertainty concerns regarding the consequences of protest behaviour should be less pronounced in the case of normative acts, it comes as no surprise that collective efficacy, an empowerment-granting experience (Drury & Reicher, 2005), becomes particularly predictive of participation in counternormative acts.

Drawing on these findings John and I conducted one experimental study the aim of which was twofold. We were, first, interested to see whether economic, rather than general, system justification (ESJ; Jost & Thompson, 2000) could also be particularly

discouraging for counternormative acts of protest. Secondly, we aimed to examine whether uncertainty could indeed have a direct discouraging effect on those acts. Therefore, we expected both ESJ and uncertainty to lower willingness to take part in counternormative acts of protest but we expected a lesser effect, if any, on normative acts. To test the above hypotheses, we recruited 108 NYU students (45 men and 63 women, mean age 20 years) and first measured their scores on the ESJ scale by Jost and Thompson (2000). After this, we manipulated uncertainty salience using the method developed by Van den Bos, Van Ameijde, and Van Gorp (2006).

Students in the uncertainty-salience condition answered questions about their feelings and thoughts of being uncertain and about situations in which they experience personal uncertainty. Students in the television-salience (control) condition answered questions similar in format and not reminiscent of their uncertainties. Following the manipulation we asked all students to read an article adapted from the New York Times about the recent bankers' bailout by the U.S. government, which is arguably a case of unequal distribution of resources with taxpayers "getting the short end of the stick". Having read the article, students were asked to report their willingness to write with fellow students a letter of protest to be sent to the government (normative act) and to take part in a NYU building occupation as a sign of protest (counternormative act).

Results were in line with our hypotheses: ESJ and uncertainty had a significant and a marginally significant main effect, respectively, on the counternormative protest item such that students high in ESJ were less likely to report willingness to take part in a building occupation and, in a similar vein, students in the uncertainty-salience condition were also less likely to be willing to take part in the same act. Analyses revealed no main effect of either ESJ or uncertainty on the normative protest item. Thus, consistent with

hypotheses, the discouraging effect of ESJ and uncertainty on willingness to protest was stronger in counternormative acts than in normative ones. These findings are in line with my PhD research and have an important implication. Although protest tendencies do not of course equate actual protest behaviour, it is perhaps no wonder that people's reactions towards the bankers' bailout worldwide have not been commensurate with the extent of the current economic crisis that has been widely attributed to the bankers' financial policies. The great uncertainty of our times, where thousands of people around the globe are losing their jobs as a result of the crisis, has been perhaps a discouraging influence on peoples' willingness to express their dissent against the bailout.

John and I are planning for the above experimental study to provide the basis of a publication. As well as hoping to make a substantive contribution to the research literature this should also be important for my career development. Once more then I would like to express my gratitude to EASP for contributing to the wonderful experience I had at NYU and for the fruits that this visit has already brought and is going to bring in the future. Thanks again to John, his lab, and his research assistants who helped me collect data, as well as to my thesis supervisor, Dominic, for being an eternal source of support and encouragement.

References

- Abrams, D., & Randsley de Moura, G. (2002). The psychology of collective political protest. In V. C. Ottati, R. S. Tindale, J. Edwards, D. O'Connell, E. Posavac, E. Suarez-Balkazar, L. Health & F. Bryant (Eds.), *The social psychology of politics* (pp. 193-214). New York: Plenum Press.
- Bandura, A. (1995). Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies* (pp. 1-45). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

- Drury, J., & Reicher, S. D. (2005). Explaining enduring empowerment: A comparative study of collective action and psychological outcomes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*, 35-38.
- Klandermans, B. (1997). *The social psychology of protest*. Oxford, England: Basic Blackwell.
- Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 1-27.
- Jost, J. T., & Thompson, E. P. (2000). Group-based dominance and opposition to equality as independent predictors of self-esteem, ethnocentrism, and social policy attitudes among African Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 209-232.
- Van den Bos, K., Van Ameijde, J., & Van Gorp, H. (2006). On the psychology of religion: The role of personal uncertainty in religious worldview defense. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 28*, 333-341.
- Van Zomeren, M., Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (2008). Towards an integrative social identity model of collective action: A quantitative research synthesis of three socio-psychological perspectives. *Psychological Bulletin, 134*, 504-535.
- Wakslak, C. J., Jost, J. T., Tyler, T. R., & Chen, E. S. (2007). Moral outrage mediates the dampening effect of system justification on support for redistributive social policies. *Psychological Science, 18*, 267-274.
- Wright, S. C., Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1990). Responding to membership in a disadvantaged group: From acceptance to collective protest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 994-1003.

Dina Dosmukhambetova
(Cardiff University, UK)
travel grant

This grant enabled me to attend the International Summer School in Affective Sciences (ISSAS) which took place between August 24 and September 3, 2009, in Chandolin (Switzerland). ISSAS 2009 was the first summer school organized by the National Centre of Competence in Research for the Affective Sciences; it focused on "Emotion elicitation: appraisal, values and norms".

The summer school was divided into two parts. The *methodology period* took place from August 25th to August 29th, 2009, and consisted of lectures on different methods of emotion elicitation; these lectures acquainted the participants with practical issues involved in using each method, including their domains of application, strengths and weaknesses. The *theory period* took place from August 30th to September 2nd, 2009, and consisted of series of lectures on approaches to appraisal values and norms (behavioural economics, neurobiology, etc.). Each lecture was given by a speaker representing a different discipline.

Attending this Summer School was an extremely valuable experience for me for a number of reasons. First and foremost, it enriched my understanding of different methods of emotion elicitation. It was particularly helpful that the lectures included many examples of the ingenious use of the induction methods. This enabled me to think more creatively about how to address theoretical questions empirically, and to develop a paradigm to tackle my own research questions in an efficient, yet a cost-effective manner. The lectures about questionnaires and scale construction were also very useful, because they clarified many issues associated with choosing how to measure dependent variables of interest. The devil is in the detail, as they say!

Another reason I benefited from this experience is that the Summer School brought together emotion researchers from different areas. It was illuminating to become acquainted with the way behavioural economists and philosophers think about emotions and emotion-

related phenomena. Behavioural economists, in particular, have much to share when it comes to methods of inducing and studying moral emotions.

Last but not least, I enjoyed my time in Switzerland because I got to spend 10 days in an excellent venue located in a beautiful town and to meet knowledgeable and passionate researchers, many of whom I hope to maintain contact with in my academic career.

Thank you very much to the Association for making this trip possible!

Ankica Kosic

(Sapienza – University of Rome, Italy)

travel grant

First, my sincere thanks to the EASP for the travel grant and opportunity to attend the 2009 Small Group Meeting on “Resolving Societal Conflicts and Building Peace: Socio-Psychological Dynamics” held in September 7-10 in Israel. The meeting took place in Neve Ilan, a place close to Jerusalem. Special thanks are also extended to the organisers of the conference, for their excellent work, and to all colleagues for making this meeting a stimulating and valuable experience.

This small group meeting brought together approximately 30 participants, a mixture of leading senior scientists, early career researchers, and doctoral students – all connected by their interests in socio-psychological processes and outcomes of reconciliation in conflict and post-conflict areas.

I enjoyed many interesting presentations followed by discussions. The broad range of topics covered in a relatively short time frame resulted in an accelerated learning process. It was a great

opportunity to listen to the presentations by scholars such as Daniel Bar Tal, Stephen Reicher, Gabriel Salomon, Stephen Worchel, Dinka Coralo Biruski, and other senior and junior researchers. We also had the opportunity to hear about problems and possibilities for reconciliation from the two practitioners, representatives of both sides of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict—Dr Walid Salem (Director of the Society of Democracy and Community Development) and Dr Gershon Baskin (Co-director of Israel-Palestine Center for Research and Information- IPCRI).

I presented my research on the process of reconciliation among young people in Belfast and Vukovar and on the role of conflict management strategies within family. Children, teenagers and young people in post-conflict areas grow up and live in the environment marked by a culture of violence and hatred. In my paper I discussed whether communicative styles and attitudes within family may influence attitudes toward the other community and reconciliation. The psychological aspects of reconciliation have been explored mostly through the prism of the theories on inter-group contact. Results of my study confirmed that family is an important context where children and adolescents learn conflict management strategies. Once again it has been confirmed that young people who use constructive strategies within family, in comparison to those who do not use these strategies, are more open toward reconciliation with the other community, even when they perceive their environment as not safe. Communication strategies could be a resource for improving relationships in a larger context of the society. If the youth could be brought to learn to use constructive communicative strategies in dealing with frustrating situations and as the integral form of their being, the post-conflict areas may be on their way towards overcoming conflicts and towards achieving reconciliation. The correlational nature of the data imposes limits on the conclusions that can be reached about cause-effect relationships. Future research should address the

causality question as well as the treatment-outcome data for the various problem-solving and communication styles. I received useful feedbacks which will help me increase the quality of my work.

The conference ended with a fruitful discussion on the issues raised in the preceding talks, and with the conviction that social psychology may contribute significantly to the process of reconciliation. We reflected also on the possibilities for an interdisciplinary approach that future work should consider in order to better understand the inter-group conflict resolution and peace building.

This meeting helped me to enlarge my knowledge and expertise within the field, to meet people that I would like to collaborate with in the future, and to take home some new ideas for new research projects. I truly enjoyed the meeting and the stimulating professional and social interactions that I experienced.

Last but not least, I enjoyed the good food - all platters were delicious, and I think I would like to eat falafel, baba ganoush, and hummus every day.

Regina Krieglmeyer

Universität Würzburg, Germany
travel grant

The EASP Travel Grant supported me in visiting Jan De Houwer at Ghent University in Belgium. The goal of my visit was to establish a collaboration with Jan De Houwer and his PhD student Julia Vogt on the influence of action goals on perception of goal-related stimuli. On the one hand, previous research showed that goal-congruent stimuli receive prioritized processing (e.g., Moskowitz,

2002). On the other hand, an independent line of research revealed that action preparation makes people “blind” to action-congruent stimuli (e.g., Müsseler & Hommel, 1997). To resolve this apparent contradiction, we hypothesized that goal-relevance moderates whether action-congruent stimuli are perceived more easily. If stimuli are relevant for action execution and goal achievement then the cognitive system is tuned to preferentially process them. Because action-congruent stimuli fit the pre-activated action plan, they can be processed more easily than action-incongruent stimuli (cf. Soto, Hodsoll, Rotshtein, & Humphreys, 2008). If stimuli are irrelevant for goal achievement but are at the same time congruent with the representation of the action plan then they may act like distractors. Based on research on goal-shielding, we predicted that in this case processing of these stimuli is inhibited (cf. Shah, Friedman, & Kruglanski, 2002). Up to now, we were able to conduct one study to test our hypotheses. Currently, we analyze the data and plan further studies to gain more knowledge about the processes underlying the impact of action-goals on perception. During my stay, we also developed a second line of research that investigates the mechanisms underlying the facilitation of approach and avoidance behavior. Previous research has shown that perceiving positive stimuli facilitates approach behavior and perceiving negative stimuli facilitates avoidance behaviors (e.g., Chen & Bargh, 1999). Some theories of approach-avoidance motivation distinguish between strategies and tactics (e.g., Lang, 1995). While the strategy refers to the ultimate goal of a behavior, the tactic refers to the immediate response. Theories of approach-avoidance motivation typically predict that valenced stimuli facilitate behaviors that *ultimately* lead to a compatible distance change (e.g., Strack & Deutsch, 2004). Surprisingly, this assumption has not been tested yet. In previous research on the facilitation of approach and avoidance behavior, immediate and ultimate distance change generally were confounded. We conducted a study in which we independently varied immediate and ultimate distance change. Preliminary results support the hypothesis that valenced stimuli

facilitate behavior that ultimately leads to a compatible distance change, irrespective of whether this behavior initially causes a compatible or an incompatible distance change.

I am very grateful to the EASP for providing me with the opportunity to stay at Ghent University in order to develop this research. Without the support of the EASP I would have not been able to establish this great and inspiring collaboration with Jan De Houwer and Julia Vogt. I am also very thankful to Sibylle Classen for her always supportive and friendly manner.

References

- Chen, M., & Bargh, J. A. (1999). Consequences of automatic evaluation: Immediate behavioral predispositions to approach or avoid the stimulus. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 215-224.
- Lang, P. J. (1995). The emotion probe: Studies of motivation and attention. *American Psychologist*, 50, 372-385.
- Moskowitz, G. B. (2002). Preconscious effects of temporary goals on attention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 397-404.
- Müsseler, J. & Hommel, B. (1997). Blindness to response-compatible stimuli. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 23, 861-972.
- Shah, J. Y., Friedman, R., & Kruglanski, A. W. (2002). Forgetting all else: On the antecedents and consequences of goal shielding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 1261-1280.
- Soto, D., Hodsoll, J., Rotshtein, P., & Humphreys, G. W. (2008). Automatic guidance of attention from working memory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 12, 342-348.
- Strack, F., & Deutsch, R. (2004). Reflective and impulsive determinants of social behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8, 220-247.

Iloona McNeill

(University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

travel grant

Last fall and winter I spent six months at Columbia University in New York to work with Prof.dr. Tory Higgins and Prof.dr. Sheena Iyengar. The main purpose of this visit was to conduct research for my PhD project that focuses on how differences in motivational focus when starting a decision task influence the decision process and outcome, and to do so with two experts in the fields of motivation and decision making. During the six month period we designed 2 experiments that are discussed in more detail below. Next to running experiments I also participated in the CRED lab group on environmental decision making run by Prof.dr. Elke Weber and Prof.dr. David Krantz, and in the Higgins lab group run by Prof.dr. Tory Higgins. I presented some of my previous PhD work in the CRED labgroup, and received good and critical feedback. The CRED lab group furthermore gave me a good opportunity to see decision making research in a more applied setting, with weekly talks given by people with a great variety in background (from Anthropologists and Psychologists to Earth and Climate scientists), all sharing a focus on the climate change issue and how to attack it. In the Higgins lab group I presented the results of my first study and some preliminary results of the second study and was able to receive good feedback and helpful comments about the possible design of a third study. Furthermore, I was able to follow Prof.dr. Tory Higgins' class on motivation, which was very interesting and useful to me. Finally, I attended the weekly meetings held by the social psychology department of Columbia with a great variety of talks and joined some of the weekly behavioral economics seminars given at NYU, which helped me increase my understanding and appreciation of the commonalities and differences between economic psychological and behavioral economic research.

The two studies I ran during this period both focused on the influence of motivational focus and expertise on decision making, and more specifically on their influence on the value attributed to the chosen option. Even though decision makers are often motivated to find the outcome that has the highest subjective expected value attached to it, research has shown that focusing on choosing the best option while deciding does not necessarily lead to the highest valuation of the chosen option (Higgins, Camacho, Idson, & Spiegel, 2005). More specifically, this research showed that increasing people's focus on the process of deciding rather than the outcome by telling them that they should focus on making the decision in the right way led them to value the subsequent chosen option more than telling them that they should focus on making the right decision. Another way of letting people focus more on the process of deciding rather than the outcome is by giving them a learning (cf., achievement) orientation (e.g., Ames & Archer 1988; Dweck & Leggett 1988). We were interested in whether a learning orientation would also lead to greater valuing of the chosen option than an outcome orientation. Furthermore, we wanted to know whether this difference would exist for all levels of expertise in the decision domain. Decision makers differ both interpersonally and intrapersonally (over time) in the level of expertise in a given decision domain. Since a learning focus is especially valuable to people with lower levels of expertise, we expected the effect of a learning focus versus outcome focus to be stronger for people with lower levels of expertise. The first study set out to test these hypotheses with a decision making task concerning a cheese menu of which students could pick a cheese. Results showed that inducing a learning focus before selecting a cheese indeed led to greater valuing of the chosen cheese (i.e., they were willing to pay more for a piece) than inducing an outcome focus, and that this was especially the case for people with lower rather than higher levels of cheese expertise. The lower expertise learning group also thought they had succeeded more at actually finding a cheese to their liking than the lower expertise group for which finding a

cheese to their liking had been the main focus during the task (i.e., outcome focus). In a second study we set out to examine the process underlying these effects. The higher value could either be due to more actual knowledge concerning the chosen option, or it could be due to increased engagement (Higgins, 2006) during the task, so we designed the second study (again with a cheese menu) so that it could discriminate between these two underlying processes. Results are currently being analyzed.

All in all, I learned a lot during my time at Columbia, I did research in a new environment using different tasks, and I met many new people. In addition to this, the discussions I had with Prof.dr. Tory Higgins, concerning my research project, the broader area of motivation, and thinking about research in general were extremely valuable to me. Also, the discussions with Prof.dr. Sheena Iyengar greatly benefitted my ability to intermix theoretical thinking with applicability for businesses and government. Next to high levels of enjoyment I thus also greatly profited from the discussions with both researchers and am therefore very grateful to EASP for providing me with a travel grant to enable this trip.

- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes, *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80* (3), 260- 67.
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A Social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality, *Psychological Review, 95* (2), 256-73.
- Higgins, E. T. (2006). Value from hedonic experience and engagement. *Psychological Review, 113*, 439-460.
- Higgins, E. T., Camacho, C. J., Idson, L. C., & Spiegel, S. (2005). *Value from making a decision with proper means*. Unpublished manuscript, Columbia University, New York.

Andrea Paulus

(Universität des Saarlandes, Saabrücken, Germany)

travel grant

Thanks to the EASP travel grant I was able to visit the University of Amsterdam (UvA) this spring for a period of five weeks. At the UvA, I conducted a study examining automatic facial reactions towards in- and outgroup members using Electromyography in collaboration with Mark Rotteveel and Juliane Degner.

In this study, participants watched short video clips of Dutch and Moroccan males with varying emotional expressions (e.g., anger, happiness). Participants' facial reactions were recorded using EMG. We hypothesised that emotions shown by outgroup members evoke less mimicry than emotions shown by ingroup members. In addition to the EMG task we conducted an affective priming task to test whether automatic prejudice activation would be related to intergroup differences in degree and/or direction of facial mimicry.

The social psychology department at the UvA offered the perfect environment for this study: I was able to work with experienced researchers who helped me with the many questions I had regarding the research method. Mark Rotteveel gave first instructions for the use of EMG and was an excellent contact person regarding this method as he is well acquainted with the EMG technique. With the help of Juliane Degner, an experienced researcher in the field of assessing automatic attitudes, I designed an affective priming task. Furthermore, I worked in close contact with several PhD students at the department who provided insightful information and advice for my study.

Thanks to my collaboration partners (and the help of many others!) I was able to reach the goals I set myself for the stay at the UvA: Acquiring the basic knowledge needed for the application of EMG-research in social psychology and conducting a long-planned and

anticipated study with a sample of over 50 participants. And last but not least, I enjoyed spending five weeks in Amsterdam, a city that has so much to offer. At this point, I am unfortunately not yet able to give any details about the result of the study, as data preparation and analyses are a quite complex process and will take some more time to be completed.

I would like to thank EASP for making this research stay possible. It helped me a lot to enlarge my research network, to become more independent as a researcher and to give me the confidence to work with a totally new method. I also would like to thank my collaboration partners, especially Juliane Degner, who was my primary contact person and who helped me with the organisation of the study as well as with the data collection. I am very grateful that I got the chance to make this experience!

Kim Peters

(University of Exeter, UK)

travel grant

The EASP travel grant allowed me to spend 3 months as a visiting scholar at the University of Berkeley examining the role that shared emotional experiences can play in leadership in collaboration with Dacher Keltner. To date, the role of emotion in leadership has received relatively little attention, which is perhaps surprising in light of the ease with which we can think of cases where emotions are intrinsic to leadership – think of Barak Obama's message of the hope and the widespread joy and adulation that surrounded his election as President.

It is only more recently that some researchers have recognised that the examination of mechanistic 'cold' cognitive factors and contingencies are of limited utility in explaining our 'hot'

experience of leadership. These researchers have sought to establish whether leaders who express particular emotions are particularly effective. However, while this research has yielded some interesting insights, it has generated conflicting answers and while some studies have found that leaders who express positive emotions are more effective than those who express negative emotions, many have found the opposite (for a discussion see Damen, van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2008).

Drawing on a social identity approach to leadership (e.g., Turner, 1991; Haslam, 2001) we argue that shared emotional experiences may be particularly important for leadership effectiveness. To explore this idea, during my visit we designed two studies that examine the effectiveness of leaders who express emotions that are or are not shared with their followers. The data collection for these studies is currently underway.

In addition, drawing on the idea that shared emotions are important for social relationships, we also designed a study examining the links between personality and shared emotions. Specifically, we hypothesise that individuals who are highly neurotic may be less likely to perceive that they share emotions with others, and that this could underlie some of their difficulties in maintaining positive social relationships with others. We are currently analysing the data from this study.

In sum, the generous support that EASP provided for this visit was of great benefit in allowing me to develop a strong collaborative relationship with a leading researcher in the field of emotion, in helping me to extend my research ideas, and in allowing me to design and conduct interesting research projects.

Damen, F., van Knippenberg, B., & van Knippenberg, D. (2008). Affective match in leadership: Leader emotional displays, follower positive

affect, and follower performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38, 868-902.

Haslam, S. A. (2001). *Psychology in organizations: The social identity approach*. London: Sage.

Turner, J. C. (1991). *Social influence*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

David Vaidis

(Université Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense, France)

travel grant

From January 2009 to April 2009, I had the opportunity to go for a postdoctoral visit at the Stanford University to follow up a research I started with Prof. Monin several months ago.

The Stanford University is a wonderful place. You can feel the history of social psychology in the corridors: the original Festinger and Carlsmith's (1959) material is still conserved there and here; walking in the base ground can drop you in location of the Stanford Prison Experiment (Zimbardo, 1974); and looking at the office names sounds like reading the summary of a manual... The Stanford University is beautiful, and California has a great climate, even in winter season. Nevertheless, I spent 3 months to do research, but all of these made easier working all the day.

Research activities on Moral Rebel

I went to Stanford to follow up a project on *moral rebel* (Monin, Sawyer, & Marquez, 2008). The moral rebel effect is a rejection and dislike of the rebel individuals (i.e. people who take a principled stand against the status quo, who refuse to comply whereas others compromise their values) from individuals involved in the same

situation (actors), whereas uninvolved observers are positively impressed by the rebels (observers).

This project follows up experiments I conducted in France in May 2008 with Peggy Chekroun (Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense) and Benoit Monin (Stanford University). While Benoit Monin was a visiting professor at Paris during Spring 2008, –in parallel I was finishing my PhD– we designed a French version of the *police decision task* (Monin et al., exp. 2) and suggested an arousal measure prior to the judgment (i.e., a self-oriented affect scale composed from Norton, Monin, Cooper & Hogg, 2003, exp. 3 and Nugier, Niedenthal, Brauer, & Chekroun, 2007). We hypothesized that people experienced an emotional discomfort prior to the judgment of the rebel, and supposed that this discomfort was responsible for the rejection of the deviant individual. The results of the designed experiment supported the hypothesis. Nevertheless, people reporting self-oriented affects prior to the judgment did not reject the rebel, but rather increased the attraction of the rebel and his morality. According to these results, we wondered if the reported emotions were responsible for the positive view of the rebel. This former hypothesis has been discarded with a second experiment we designed at the end of Fall 2008. The main goal of my visit was to develop and run follow up studies at Stanford.

Three months were pretty short to do everything I planned to do. The IRB being long to be approved, I was unable to run the first experiment there. Nevertheless, Benoit and I met several times and we were able to design further studies to complete the understandings of the moral rebel effect. Kieran O'Connor (Benoit's PhD student) and I designed an online version of the criminal task, which should make easier the replications and further experiments in both countries. Moreover, we built a new paradigm for the moral rebel effect, based on the rejection of prejudiced jokes. We are currently running the follow up designed study at Paris, and the new paradigm we built at Stanford will be running soon both in the United States and France via the online protocol.

Finally, besides research on rebel moral, these months totally vouchsafed to research gave me the opportunities to write two articles on previous studies.

Other activities

During my journey at Stanford, I followed Benoit Monin and Liz Mullen lab meetings. The group is pretty small and allows constructive interactions. The lab is in between psychology department and graduate school of business department, which make the topics spread. This has been a good place to discover new issues and approaches of social psychology. Moreover, being present at the social psychology department colloquia permitted to see great conferences and interesting debates. Besides, I took the Lee Ross and Mark Lepper's psychology 212 winter quarter course. This is a classic class of social psychology at Stanford. Above the quality of teach, both professors are the best to "make long a short story", telling the hidden storyline of social psychology, which make this course a really amazing one. Finally, and as an advice, the Stanford library is huge: if you ever visit it, take a map before getting lost!

In a nutshell, spending some months at Stanford was a wonderful experience and it gave me the opportunities to refine my formation in one of the best place it could be. Last but not least, I would like to thank gratefully Benoit Monin for his invitation, and I thank the *France-Stanford Center for Interdisciplinary Studies*, the *ED139 "Langage, Connaissance, et Modélisation"* (Université Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense), the *European Association of Social Psychology* (EASP), and the *Association pour la Diffusion de la Recherche Internationale en Psychologie Sociale* (ADRIPS), who trusted me and gave financial supports for this travel.

References:

- Monin, B., Sawyer, P. J., & Marquez, M. J. (2008). The Rejection of Moral Rebels: Resenting Those Who Do the Right Thing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 1, 76-93.
- Norton, M. I., Monin, B., Cooper, J., Hogg, M. A. (2003). Vicarious Dissonance: Attitude Change From the Inconsistency of Others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 1, 47-62.
- Nugier, A., Niedenthal, P.M, Brauer, M., & Chekroun P. (2008). Moral and Angry Emotions Provoked by Informal Social Control. *Cognition and Emotion*.

News by Members**Misogyny in Italian media and politics: The voice of social psychology**

At times social psychological theorizing and research come handy when facing social or political issues, even more so when dealing with true emergencies. And Berlusconi and his Government are a true emergency.

Over the past months, the three of us have tried to put our knowledge to use in the political domain, trying to fight the discrimination of women in Italian media (where women are reduced to pure objects) and in politics (from which they are, by all practical means, banned). After our Appeal to the First Ladies (signed by 15.000 petitioners, see <http://appelloallefirstladies.tk/>), calling for a boycott of the G8 as a sign of protest against Berlusconi's sexist treatment of women, we are now engaged in making findings about sexism, objectification, role-models, derogatory language, and norm setting known to the general public, using conferences and public discussions, journal and magazine articles as the forum. To our own surprise, we receive remarkable attention, suggesting that part of the public opinion is ready to listen to what social psychology has to say about phenomena such as sexism and objectification.

Anne Maass, Angelica Mucchi Faina, Chiara Volpato

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/27/opinion/27volpato.html>

Announcements**The new Journal: SPPS**

The first issue of the Association's collaborative new journal, ***Social Psychological and Personality Science***, is scheduled to be ready soon. All members of EASP will receive electronic access to the journal and get a hard copy of the first issue. However, no libraries will receive the new journal unless they explicitly sign on to get it.

It is important that your library subscribes to our new journal, for two reasons. First, it will allow your students and colleagues in adjacent fields to access the journal's content. Library subscriptions ensure that your students learn the latest research results, and can use them in their own work. Second, library subscriptions provide income to EASP, and this helps to keep our dues low, provide (travel) grants to postgraduate members, subsidize small group meetings, summer schools and our General Meeting, and so forth.

Please take a minute to download and process the form at http://www.easp.org/publications/SPPS_Library%20Rec%20Form.pdf

Your help is much appreciated!

**EASP Summer School 2010 August 23 – September 6,
Aegina Greece
Call for Applications**

The EASP Summer School of 2010 will take place from Monday August 23rd (arrival day) to September 6th (departure day) 2010 in Aegina, Greece at the 1st Primary School of Aegina in collaboration with the Department of Psychology Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences and the Municipality of Aegina.

Aegina is a small island near Athens (approx. 1 hour of boat) that attracts Athenians and tourists all over the year. The visitor is able to see in Aegina the long history of Greece. The temple of Athena Aphaia is built in the northern part of the island in a place covered with pine trees and with a view of the beautiful blue sea. It's in a very good condition. Twenty-four pillars of the temple remain, out of a total of 34. It has been built in 480 b.c. just after the naval battle in Salamina. Vestiges of the Byzantine times and the Ottoman empire are also present on the island. In 1828 Aegina became the first capital of Greece and the neoclassical buildings testify of these era. Just not to forget mentioning that Aegina is the homeland of the famous pistachoes! There are plenty of activities, in Aegina but of course we will be all dedicated to social psychology!

The EASP Summer School is currently organized every two years and is a central activity of the Association, and one that has a long and illustrious history – many members have benefited over the years from this unique chance to work with up-and-coming and established scholars from around Europe and indeed the globe (see below). It provides an ideal educational opportunity where much can be learnt about theory, methodology, and research design in social psychology, whilst also honing communication and presentational skills. It stimulates the cross fertilization of ideas and

approaches between countries, continents and cultures as well as individuals. The close working in small groups provides a uniquely intense “hothouse” environment with the teaching more interactive than didactic. It is also “fun”. The social networks that emerge often lead to lifelong collaborations and friendships and those attending will be encouraged to design and develop collaborative research projects that continue afterwards.

For the Aegina Summer School we have been lucky to recruit a very dynamic set of leading scholars to teach five workshops covering some classic topics but also some new ones. The topics and teachers are as follows:

- Implicit Social Cognition (*Bertram Gawronski*, University of Western Ontario and *Rainer Banse*, University of Bonn)
- Social Influence in *Learning* (*Fabrizio Butera*, University of Lausanne, *Antonis Gardikiotis* University of Thessaloniki, and *Gerassimos Prodromitis*, Panteion University)
- Social Psychological Approaches to Intractable Intergroup Conflicts and their Peace-making (*Daniel Bar Tal*, Tel Aviv University and *Karen Trew*, Queen’s University Belfast)
- Societal Psychology and Social Representations (*Christian Staerklé*, University of Lausanne and *Xenia Chrysochoou*, Panteion University)
- The Emotional Side of Intergroup Relations (*Nyla Branscombe*, Kansas University, *Tilemachos Iatridis* University of Crete, *Alexandra Hantzi*, Panteion University)

Professor Willem Doise (University of Geneva) will take part in some of the summer school activities. In addition, this year, again, the Social Cognition workshop will be sponsored by the European Social Cognition Network (ESCON), continuing the close collaboration with EASP.

The Summer School will accommodate 12 students per workshop making 60 in all (with a small number of local students helping with the organization also taking part). The limited number of places means that with great regret we already anticipate that we will not be able to take many students who apply.

PhD students who are currently eligible for a PhD program in Europe and who have not previously participated in a previous summer school are eligible. The Association also has an arrangement with SPSP to admit 5 students from the USA/Canada (with a reciprocal agreement to send a similar number of European postgraduates to the US equivalent of the Summer school held in alternate years: the Summer Institute in Social Psychology) American and Canadian students should apply via SPSP. We have also agreed to admit 4 students from Asia and Australia that should apply via SASP. A limited/discretionary number of places will be open to applications from other parts of the globe making the summer school truly international enterprise.

Students will be accommodated in twin bedrooms in a hotel for the two weeks of the Summer School. Their own institution is expected to cover their travel to and from Aegina and a registration fee of € 550 that will cover registration, accommodation and a daily meal.

The closing date for applications is January 31, 2010. Please check the website

<http://www.easp.org/activities/own/summerschool.htm>

for more information and send your applications to Xenia Chrysochoou at easp.summerschool2010@gmail.com

Xenia Chrysochoou
Local organizer,
On behalf of the organizing committee.

Organizing Committee

Xenia Chrysochoou

(Local Organizer, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences)

Stamos Papastamou

(Head of the Department, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences)

Antonis Gardikiotis

(Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)

Alexandra Hantzi

(Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences)

Tilemachos Iatridis

(University of Crete)

Ioannis Katerellos

(Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences)

Panayotis Kordoutis

(Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences)

Anna Madoglou

(Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences)

Gerassimos Prodromitis

(Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences)

Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Executive Officer by **March, 15th, 2010** latest. Applications for grants and for the International Teaching Fellowship Scheme can be received by the deadlines end of March, June, September, and December. The deadline for the next issue of the Bulletin is **March, 15th, 2010**.

The next Executive Committee Meeting will take place April 16th - 18th 2010.

Executive Committee

Fabrizio Butera, ISSP - BFSH 2, University of Lausanne, CH 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
e-mail: Fabrizio.Butera@unil.ch

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

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

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

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

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

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 EASP:

<http://www.eaesp.org>