

1 **Editorial**

2 **President's Corner**

4 **Opinions and Perspectives**

Scientific Misconduct in Social Psychology – Towards a Currency Reform in Science by Amélie Mummendey

8 On a persistent shortcoming in the recent policy of the EASP by Willem Doise

11 EASP Membership Benefits in the Context of International Mobility by Kai J. Jonas

15 **Book Reviews**

Beyond pleasure and pain: How motivation works, by E.T. Higgins (2012),
Review by John Levine

Goal-directed behavior, by Henk Aarts & Andrew E. Elliot, Review by Kai Epstude

18 **Future EASP Meetings**

Medium Size Meeting on Intergroup conflict: The cognitive, emotional, and behavioral consequences of communication, June 27-30, 2013, near Utrecht, The Netherlands

20 **Reports of Previous Meetings**

Report from the Summer Institute in Social Psychology (SISP), Princeton, New Jersey, July 24 - August 6, 2011

Report from the SASP summer school, Moreton Bay Research Station, Australia, February 3-8, 2012

28 **News about Members**

New Members of the Association

- 31 Grants and Grant Reports
- 47 News from the Executive Committee
Improving European funding for social psychology
- 49 Deadlines for Contributions
- 50 Executive Committee

Editorial

Dear Friends and Colleagues,

I am happy to present to you a new edition of the European Bulletin. A Bulletin in which the label “new” and the topic of “innovation” is, as I will soon elucidate, in fact quite prominent.

As always, there are of course *new* members of the Association, *new* EASP-funded meetings, *new* grants assigned to support young members, and *new* books to be announced. But there is more:

Let me first point your attention to a contribution by Amélie Mummendey on “Scientific misconduct in Social Psychology – towards a currency reform in Science”. I invited Amélie to write this piece back in September 2011, after we had discussed the academic fraud committed by Diederik Stapel, and the implications for Social Psychology. But her piece goes much further than just dealing with the case of Diederik Stapel. Inspired by this so very unfortunate and disturbing event, she very compellingly invites us to think more generally about what makes academic work valuable and worthwhile.

Amélie’s piece describes an opinion that I personally very much embrace, but that not everybody in EASP might share. Hence, I strongly encourage our members to react and make this contribution a starting point for a debate with and between our members. Sibylle Classen and I will be happy to publish further opinions on this topic in the next Bulletin.

And, in fact, there are more opinions and perspectives that deserve further discussion. We therefore introduce an *new* section in the Bulletin, the “Opinions and Perspectives”. This section offers our members the opportunity to voice their subjective views on potentially controversial issues, be it about EASP as an academic organization, or be it more generally about Social Psychology in Europe. In the current issue, besides the opening piece by Amélie Mummendey, two more opinions and perspectives are voiced: There is a contribution by Willem Doise “On a persistent failure in the recent policy of EASP”, and another by Kai Jonas, who critically discusses “EASP Membership Benefits in the Context of International Mobility”. All pieces refer to changes in EASP and or (European) Social Psychology, and all raise the question of how to properly react to the challenges associated with such change.

I very much hope that the readers of the Bulletin will be inspired by the “Opinions and Perspectives” in this Bulletin, and that they will submit both discussions referring to the present pieces, but also *new* opinions and perspectives to think about, thereby contributing to further progress and *innovation* in our field. Together with the other members of the EASP Executive Committee I very much hope that you will welcome this opportunity of launching relevant discussions within EASP.

Have a nice spring and summer!

Sabine Otten

President's Corner

Dear colleagues and friends,

Since the beginning of our term, we in the Executive Committee have been constantly concerned with one of today's major threats to European Social Psychology, namely the financial and economic crisis and the related hardship that many countries are facing in Europe. A short piece about this topic was already published in the past Bulletin, but in the meanwhile the situation has not evolved for the better, and it has even deteriorated. All the countries that were already in dire straits are today facing even harsher conditions, for both internal and external pressures, and other countries are joining the list of those who are likely to suffer in the near future. If as European citizens we are concerned with the deterioration of living conditions in these countries, as EC members we worry about the impairment of research capacities that young and senior scholars are facing. Just to focus on research, in certain countries the present crisis may mean that academic positions are frozen and careers are hindered, that salary cuts prevent scholars from focusing on their research, that universities withdraw resources formerly allocated to activities such as participation in conferences or the organisation of scientific events, or that reduced access to national funding hampers the very potential for innovation of the country's scientists. In times of economic crisis, research is not one of the top priorities.

During these months we have extensively consulted with colleagues (and I take this opportunity to thank all the members who have spontaneously written to provide information or advice), discussed with economists and explored best practices implemented by other associations, to find a way that EASP could alleviate the conditions of members working in countries targeted by the EU, IMF, rating agencies and other sources of international pressure, of course as far as research is concerned. At first we thought of adapting the membership fees, currently organised around an East-West divide, and looked for an economic index that could help in this revision. However, we realised that the countries that are today on the front page of economic newspapers are still in the top categories in terms of GDP, GDP per capita, PPP, and World Bank classification. Basing a revision on unemployment rates didn't help either, because of tremendous variations within each country, and mean salary level is incomparable across countries. Of course, if you have a creative and feasible idea on this matter, we would be grateful, but for the time being we abandoned this path.

Instead, we reasoned that a great deal of EASP's activities is concerned with supporting various activities directly and indirectly related to research, and we decided to focus on these means in order to support members whose research activities are impaired by the financial crisis in Europe. Of course, we will also still consider requests for one-year waivers for those who are having financial difficulties; as already expressed in the last Bulletin, we encourage those experiencing hardship to write to our Executive Officer. But, apart from that, we have decided to implement a two-stage programme regarding our grants. First, we decided to adopt a more flexible interpretation of the purpose of our grants. Certainly we don't want to completely subvert the missions of the various grants that we offer, but we would now consider for instance a proposal for a travel grant within the country of origin, if this can be useful for data collection; or a regional activity grant focusing more on research than on teaching junior researchers; or a small group meeting

intended to build a consortium for larger scale funding from other sources. The aim is to use existing funds to further as much as possible research activities impaired by the financial crisis. In a second stage, if we manage to increase our revenues owing, for instance, to our new journal, we will study how our grants and services can be improved, diversified and augmented.

In the meanwhile, we strongly encourage you to use the existing funding opportunities of EASP, and to submit your best research ideas. We will try to do the best we can to avoid that the current economic gloominess spills over to research in Social Psychology.

Yours sincerely,

Fabrizio Butera
President, EASP

Opinions and Perspectives

Scientific Misconduct in Social Psychology – Towards a Currency Reform in Science

Amélie Mummendey
Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena
Translation: Stefani Nellen, Groningen

It was none other than Gordon W. Allport, one of the doyens of Social Psychology, who – albeit in his role as eminent Personality psychologist – introduced the concept of the functional autonomy of motives in order to explain the development of personality. According to Allport, motives can (during the course of a personality's maturation) become independent of their original function. For instance, a person might initially desire to earn enough money to afford a comfortable lifestyle. Gradually, however, the accumulation of money becomes in itself a source of happiness; the former means to an end becomes a goal in its own right (paradoxically, this sometimes occurs at the expense of the original goal, e.g., the person might accumulate more money while living an increasingly modest life).

Why did I have to think of Allport and his Functional Autonomy of Motives when I heard – during my vacation in Brittany, of all times – about the case of Diederik Stapel? After my initial shock, consternation and outrage had subsided and made way for a calm need for rationalization, I began, encouraged by Sabine Otten's invitation to write this commentary, to think more deeply about this incident; an incident which, according to some, signifies a deep crisis in (European) Social Psychology. I will return to Allport and my question later.

I don't want to reiterate the things that have already been said about the dimensions of Diederik Stapel's scientific misconduct. The "Levelt-Committee", which is investigating the case, emphasizes the shocking depth and extent of the fraud. And the international scientific community of social psychologists isn't alone in being shocked. The case has moved well beyond the boundaries of their circle. It immediately became part of the general scientific and science-political dialogue, right next to other legendary cases of scientific fraud.

Such an extreme event is bound to trigger a search for answers. How could this have happened? It is only natural to turn to the perpetrator for explanations. Well, his responsibility has been established, and there are many speculations about his motives and personality; there are diagnoses and analyses of his personal history. All of this has been discussed extensively, and won't be of interest here.

Of course, more questions need to be asked than those concerning the idiosyncrasies of the perpetrator and his reasons for his actions. It is interesting to take a closer look at the circumstances under which this blatant fraud could continue undetected for at least seven years.

Accordingly, the Levelt-Committee didn't stop at investigating Stapel's behavior in isolation. It devotes a considerable part of its analysis to his environment, i.e., the research culture at the universities of Amsterdam, Groningen, and Tilburg, where the fraud occurred for so long, and on such a large scale. Conditions and consequences of group dynamic processes are being identified as having played a role in covering up individual instances of fraud and enabling their originator to continue in his ways. Moreover, these conditions offered him a buffer of respect and almost fawning admiration, which tempted him further to refine and perfect his practices.

These group processes are a well-established and well-known part of social-psychological research. (Perhaps Social Psychology is more than history, after all: apparently these processes, despite being well known, didn't lose their power to regulate the behavior of those who knew them.)

Aside from the factors that prevented the detection of the fraud, we also need to focus on the individuals who eventually uncovered it. Apparently, three PhD students, in other words: young scientists in the most vulnerable position within the scientific hierarchy, were the first to notice certain inconsistencies, and instead of shrugging them off, they remained stubborn, challenged the barriers put up by authority, sought and found support, and eventually succeeded in moving those higher up in the hierarchy to action. This confrontation with the case of Diederik Stapel has the goal to identify means and strategies that will prevent similar cases in the future, or at least help in detecting them earlier, thus preventing the worst damage to science. For this reason, we have to investigate carefully any conditions and motives that have led to this positive exception, in the hope that we might generalize them to other situations and, as a result, see this behavior more often.

The EASP should consider rewarding these young scientists for their exemplary courage. I now want to offer some thoughts on the current research culture in Social Psychology. However, I feel that it would be worthwhile to move our analysis beyond the three universities already mentioned, and instead focus on our research culture as a whole. I am thinking of certain characteristics of this culture, which create pressure against the barrier between misconduct and us, and which might end up wearing it down. I am limiting myself to Social Psychology, but I acknowledge that other disciplines, including the natural sciences, might be dealing with similar problems.

The goal of social psychological research is the accumulation of knowledge about its object. Curiosity is the researchers' *motive*, and enthusiasm, often to the point of obsession, is the emotional foundation of their actions. Free time and sufficient financial security are necessary *resources* for being able to produce the *means* for achieving the goal: To think, to keep on learning and studying, to engage in communication with others about their (as well as your own) expertise, be it through personal meetings or through publications, which generally serve the purpose of sharing results and inviting a response. I think it is fairly obvious that the picture I painted above isn't an accurate depiction of the current working conditions faced by most scientists. The relationships between the individual factors have changed, or rather, they have become perverted. The goal is currently a high number of preferably prestigious publications. Enthusiasm is caused by successful publication. The choice of a research topic has to be optimized with regards to guaranteeing a high number of publications in a short time, with minimal risk. Thinking and the search for information are supposed to contribute to the publication count instead

of serving unbounded, genuine curiosity. The willingness to travel down unknown roads is small, and the idea of accepting failure comes across as naïve and unprofessional.

It could be said that the motive for scientific publication (the communication of knowledge) has become separated from its original function, i.e., it has become functionally autonomous. As we have said above, paraphrasing Allport: The means to an end has become a goal in itself. However, the current situation goes beyond the mechanism originally posited by Allport: We are no longer dealing with the changing motives of individual personalities. Instead, we are looking at the collective development of the scientific community, and its standards of quality and appropriate (financial) rewards. The number and prestige of publications determine the perceived quality of scientific work and the size of the payoff, both for the researchers and the institutions with which they are affiliated. Publications have literally become currency. To have more is better than to have less; to have a lot is good. (The same is true for the amount of grant money, at least in Germany. More is better; there is no optimum except the maximum.) Considering this, it should come as no surprise that scientists develop strategies to increase efficient and effective measures to reach this goal. Stapel's PhD-students felt privileged and smart when they accepted the master's offer and didn't waste time on developing their own questions and collecting their own data. But even experienced scientists apparently felt the allure of skipping the time-consuming parts of research and taking the express route to a quick publication with ready-made data.

The solid and valuable currency 'publication' and the functionally autonomous motive of accumulating this currency both lead to a willingness to commit scientific fraud. Obviously, this doesn't necessarily mean fraud of Stapel-esque proportions. This kind of event seems to be very rare, even if we do not know the actual numbers. I am convinced, however, that smaller types of fraud, all committed in order to achieve the big goal, are quite common – be it the silent omission of 'ugly' data, unexpected results, or entire studies. Cherry picking desired effects while deliberately ignoring data that don't conform to, or contradict, expectations is another strategy that leads to (false) positive conformation rather than satisfying a curiosity-driven thirst for knowledge.

Of course, I realize that good publications aren't usually achieved through bad research. And I also realize that the road to publication has seen considerable improvement during the past decades, especially because of the multiple quality checks provided by the peer review system. I do believe, however, that the emerging view of publication as currency is regulating our behavior in a manner that is counterproductive. We are focusing on an efficient and effective increase in the number of publications. Consequently, we, as authors, are trying to squeeze as many papers as we can out of our available data. Let us imagine a different approach. Instead of publishing a lot, we could focus on publishing only our very best work. We could only consider publication once we were sure that the results could be inflicted on critical readers without wasting their time. Changing the focus from quantity to quality would improve the situation for everyone: researchers would enjoy more time and creative freedom. Readers (or recipients) would have more time to digest the papers, since they would no longer have to deal with a mass of, at best, superficially interesting articles. Last but not least, such papers would make a significant contribution to the accumulation of knowledge.

How do these speculations relate to the problem of scientific misconduct? I think if we change the function of our motives, we can put our need to increase efficiency and

efficacy in a new, healthier context. In a recent discussion about the general topic of this article, Klaus Dicke, political scientist and president of the Friedrich Schiller University in Jena, called for a 'currency reform' in the way we define, evaluate, and measure the quality of scientific work. I agree: we need a reform of the publication currency.

At this point, it could be argued that changes to our publication system along the lines proposed above might lessen the general temptation to commit fraud, but won't prevent a determined individual from developing and implementing specific fraudulent schemes. This is correct, since there is no point in the research process (at least within experimental Social Psychology) that explicitly calls for an independent and systematic check of the raw data. In contrast to the empirical social sciences, where all datasets (which are usually large and not collected by the researchers themselves) are available in public archives, we are somewhat reluctant in this regard, because we devised the variables and measures ourselves, and we collected the data ourselves – which means that we think of them as our genuine intellectual property. (This further illustrates the deeply unscientific nature of Stapel's practice of "sparing" his PhD students these aspects of scientific work.)

This problem could be solved with the following method, even if it seems to require a lot of work: What about waiting with calling results "good" and "important" until there has been a careful and independently conducted replication? Scientific journals could expand the already high standards of the peer review system by adding the requirement for a thorough external replication. Authors submit their manuscript together with their data. Once the publication has been approved by a preliminary group of reviewers, the editors invite suitable experts to attempt a replication of the results. After this has been accomplished, both the original manuscript and the replication study are published together.

This method would have more advantages than discouraging the fabrication of data. It would also add to the substance and robustness of scientific knowledge. Replication studies are essential for ensuring the quality of the research process, but they are currently not at the top of many scientists' to-do lists: They are difficult to publish, and therefore a waste of time (see above). If they became an integral part of the reviewing process, they would become much more attractive, because they would add to the prestige of those invited to contribute, not to mention giving them an additional publication credit as co-authors.

If I remember correctly, it took thirty years before a publication in a journal without peer review was regarded as irrelevant. Maybe it doesn't need to take quite as long before we take a similar view of empirical, or at least experimental results without external replication.

The comprehensive and sophisticated scientific fraud of Diederik Stapel has shaken Social Psychology to the core. Apart from his personal characteristics and motivations, it is hard to deny the role of certain conditions prevalent in our research culture. Even if this shock hasn't managed to push Social Psychology into a real crisis, it could be helpful to remember Joseph Schumpeter's notion of the creative power of destruction, and to use this unpleasant break as an inspiration for necessary and useful innovations.

On a persistent shortcoming in the recent policy of the EASP

Willem Doise
University of Geneva

I had the privilege to be a participant observer of the foundation of the EASP and to be admitted as a member practically since its beginning. This Association unfortunately no longer exists; the previous Committee fundamentally changed principles incorporated in the Articles and Statutes, and these modifications were accepted by the General Assembly. At different phases of this process I tried to discuss with the Committees in charge, but without receiving answers to elementary questions.

Therefore, I want to describe for the members of the Association **when** my first doubts about its functioning started and **why** I now think that recent decisions no longer allow the Association to fulfill its initial mission.

When

About twenty years ago, it was decided at the General meeting of the Association in Lisbon that a professor of a University in Amsterdam, Tony Manstead, would follow up as Chairman of the Executive Committee Gun Semin, professor at another University in Amsterdam.

This decision was a clear infringement on the principle of cultural diversity that should have guided the policy of the Association. Many participants at that Meeting had expected that either Luciano Arcuri or Jorge Vala would have been appointed as Chairman. I asked each of them why they had not been appointed; either answered that they did not feel fluent enough in English to assume this position. Never before I thought that linguistic discrimination could interfere with appointments of Chairmen. Colleagues, myself included, had been appointed Chairmen without mastering the English language better than either Jorge or Luciano.

At the Lisbon meeting, the policy of the Association changed. Indeed, thereafter two more colleagues from Dutch universities were appointed chairpersons, two others from a same Belgian University and one from a German University. A Golden Cressent (Joaquim, 2009, p. 340) emerged in the Association. Was it a fatality that no colleague from a more Southern country was chosen to chair the Committee?

Only now with the nomination of Fabrizio Butera, as President, a slight move further to the South was made.

Why

At the epoch of the Berlin Wall, when I was member of the Committee from 1975 to 1981, and chaired the Committee's meeting from 1978 to 1981, a main concern of the Association was to deal with diversity within Europe; with ideological diversity (see, Batur, 2011) but also economic, cultural and institutional diversity.

Nowadays, similar sources of diversity in Europe subsist, although frontiers of all kinds may have moved. I adhere to a universalistic conception of science; I am also aware of the truism that ideological, cultural and economic conditions intervene in the actual

production of science in general and of socialpsychological science in particular. After the Fall of the Berlin Wall, dealing with such differences was no longer considered to be a priority for the Association. The award of a preeminence to the English language became commonly accepted as a way to overcome tensions between the exigence of universalism and the interference of more “local” conditions. This bias was of course reinforced by the fact that main publications in european social psychology are edited in Great Brittain.

Unfortunately, in the present context the “higher” status of mainstream English language journals often results in homogeneisation and not universality or diversity in scientific thinking. I will not summarize here the growing consensus on that topic but reproduce two quotations from an article by Peter B. Smith (2005) who explains why social representation theory has remained an “indigenous European” social psychology, whereas social identity and minority influence theories became more internationalized. Indeed the latter two theories became highly influenced by the “transatlantic traffic” : “Evaluation of research productivity among European researchers is typically based upon their success in publishing their work in APA journals. In the UK, an individual’s high rating in their periodic assessment of research productivity is based upon publication in ‘international’ (i.e., APA) journals. In the interuniversity consortium of Dutch social psychologists known as the Kurt Lewin Institute, similar criteria are applied. Thus the design and conduct of studies is often undertaken with forethought given to the likely response of US reviewers to a journal submission. The greater appeal of the theory of social representations further south may reflect a lesser dependence on such criteria in these nations, and a stronger emphasis on training in more qualitative modes of data analysis” (Smith, 2005, p. 260). Social representation theory so far avoided merging with transatlantic theories : “ .. because of a greater preponderance of publication in languages other than English, and partly because of the preference for publication in books rather than journals. The theory of social representations currently commands much greater attention in Latin America, particularly in Brazil (..) than it does in North America” (ibidem, p. 260). Of course merging of theories across national borders is a necessity, but not at the cost of losing scientific creativity and originality. To avoid such loss, national networks should be maintained and furthered, which is not the policy of the EASP. Alerted by the article of P. B. Smith, I was not at all surprised that French scientific authorities, after an exhaustive study of scientific publication practices, dissuaded the use of impact factor considerations for the evaluation of individual researchers in two branches of science : in mathematics and in social sciences (Institut de France, Académie des Sciences, 2011, p. 38 & p. 49).

It is a pity that in this matter the Association climbed on the Anglosaxon bandwagon and seems no longer concerned about real European issues of diversity. An economic asymetry is interfering with such a policy, and to some extent reinforcing it. There was a time when open-minded colleagues as Henri Tajfel, in collaboration with the Maison des Sciences de l’Homme of Paris and with Cambridge University Press, searched for books of interest not yet published in English and managed to rise funds for translating and publishing them in English. Apparently, this practice now belongs definitely to the past. No publisher in Great Britain seems to be willing to pay for translation costs nowadays, at least in the realm of social psychology. This is a trivial monetary issue; in any case they have a broad readership offered to them thanks to the current policy of the EASP and do not have to invest in translations. Small publishing houses on the continent still accept to pay for translations. I consider this to be a new form of unfair competition, and no longer wish to

participate in this monopolistic business. The promotion of English language social psychology as the real social psychology leads to unfair practices.

A recent expression of this Anglomania is the *Handbook of the History of Social Psychology*, edited by A. W. Kruglanski & W. Stroebe (2012). The title should of course have been "Handbook of the History of English Language Social Psychology". Just two examples of historical fallacies : when critical social psychology is presented by K. J. Gergen on half a column, the name of the founder of Kritische Psychologie, Klaus Holzkamp, is not mentioned. His Marxist critical psychology perdured independently for several decades as shown in a recent historical study by M. Markard (2009). The failure of not mentioning the founder of the Kritische Psychologie and his school is prototypical : in considering only English language sources, important parts of the European heritage in social psychology are cast aside. In the same vein, no chapter in the book deals with the history of developments in social representation theory since its beginning in 1961 which are still ongoing, for instance in countries as diverse as Brazil, Indonesia and Tunesia. I am afraid that the Kruglanski & Stroebe Handbook will function as a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy. Even if it does not cover the history of social psychology in Europe, it may become a blueprint of the homogenized social psychology that shall prevail in Europe if the EASP does not drastically change its policy in matters of cultural diversity.

To conclude

My future time perspective is shortening and I no not longer wish to waste part of the time left in trying to engage discussions with Committees that avoid addressing basic challenges. The time has now come for me to withdraw from these debates and to inform directly the membership about my reasons for doing so. Some of them endowed with a longer time perspective, with more energy and more diplomatic skills, may succeed in reversing what looks like a fatality.

Bibliography

- Batur, S. (2011). Marxism, Social Psychology and Marxist Social Psychology. In : J. P. Valentim (Ed.) *Societal Approaches in Social Psychology*, Bern, Peter Lang, pp 107-127.
- Institut de France, Académie des Sciences (2011). *Du Bon Usage de la Bibliométrie pour l'Evaluation Individuelle des Chercheurs*. Rapport remis le 17 janvier 2011 à Madame la Ministre de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche.
- Kruglanski, A. W. & Stroebe, W. (2012). *Handbook of the History of Social Psychology*, London, Psychology Press, Taylor & Francis group.
- Markard, M. (2009). *Einführung in die Kritische Psychologie*. Berlin, Argument Verlag.
- Smith, B. P. (2005). Is there an indigenous European social psychology ? *International Journal of Psychology*, 40, 4, pp 254-262.
- Valentim, J. P. (2009). Uma entrevista de Willem Doise com Xenia Chrysochoou (Março de 2009) e com Joaquim Pires Valentim (Setembro de 2009). *Psychologica*, 51, 321-343.

EASP Membership Benefits in the Context of International Mobility

Kai J. Jonas
University of Amsterdam

As a PhD student, when I became a member of our association (it was still EAESP back in 1998), my main reason was to receive my own copy of EJSP. Online access to journals was still far away and being a member of the association seemed to guarantee, little did I really know back then, instant access to scientific knowledge when it was fresh out of the oven. In addition, membership would allow me to attend the General Meeting at a discounted price. Fourteen years later, I could actually stop my membership. Access to all journal is electronic and supplied by universities, and I doubt that my home institution would mind the slightly higher registration fee for the General Meeting, given that I attend more expensive conferences anyway.

Before many may object now that this is an arrogant view of a scientist at a rich institution, and does not reflect the situation of many colleagues in less fortunate academic climates, let me state that I did this on purpose to get my point across: I believe that academic associations such as EASP have to develop their membership benefits in line with the international scientific environment we work and live in. Journal subscription, small grants application rights, eligibility for prizes and registration discounts are important constituents of a scientific association membership, but they have not changed much since EASP was founded in 1966.

In the world of marketing there is concept of USP, unique selling proposition, and it denotes characteristics that make a product unique and differentiate it from others. What I want to argue for here is the need to re-think the membership benefits of EASP. Beyond journal access, reduced registration fees, grant opportunities and the odds of winning a prize, there are necessary and novel benefits EASP should offer to its members, I believe. This piece is meant to trigger a discussion on what these new benefits should entail. In other words, we have to ask ourselves, what are the desirable benefits of EASP membership that could put EASP at the forefront of academic organizations providing service to their members?

From my point of view, in 2012, it is not sufficient to grant members access to the journals or congress rates at a discount, and offer access to some grant opportunities. Academic associations such as EASP have to use their multi-national weight to offer their members more, especially when the members face the challenges of international mobility in their careers. To delineate such a set of new membership benefits we have to investigate the challenges that our members are facing now.

International career mobility

We are often proudly referring to our discipline as a truly internationalized one. We publish worldwide, fly to conferences at the other end of the globe, cooperate with colleagues via Skype conferences and gather data online with participants we have never even seen. Yet, it is not this internationalized characteristic of modern social psychology, but the mobility of whole generations of researchers that is in focus here.

While the majority of full professors from the three countries in Europe with the most social psychologists (The Netherlands, UK, Germany) have spent their entire professional career, except for some sabbaticals, in their home countries (a picture that notably always looked much different for colleagues from emerging countries), the new generations of social psychologists in all EASP member-countries are characterized by extreme mobility opportunities and -pressures. Out of the well-known social psychology group from Jena (Germany), then led by Amélie Mummendey (as an example that I know well since I was part of this group), since 2002 almost all colleagues got their first position abroad. Some of them have moved back to Germany, some are still moving around. When I was planning to move to the Netherlands, I was lucky that I could fall back on those colleagues, some of them also having moved to The Netherlands, to gather important information. But I know from personal conversations that not everybody else has this large personal network ready to give them advice. *Here, EASP could offer some mentoring system, up-to-date and country specific, that young scientist on the verge of a career move abroad can turn to and receive independent consulting.* First steps in this direction were made during the last General Meeting in Stockholm. Paula Niedenthal organized a very well received lunch workshop that identified much sought after information. Why not turn this workshop into a permanent mentoring group? In such a group, „expat“ members from all countries can bring in their knowledge and make it accessible for new generations on the move. In the current scientific climate of budget cuts and structural change such insider information is vital and can prevent unwanted surprises, e.g. regarding grant likelihood expectations, tenure options, realistic teaching load and contract specifications.

Pensions, healthcare & babies

Leaving the scientific benefits of mobility aside for the moment, I want to focus on the personal consequences. Call me square, but I am concerned about my pension situation. So far, I have fractured accumulated pension rights in Germany and in The Netherlands that are both insufficient to sustain me later. I lack crucial accumulated years in both systems and the funds are non-transferable. Given that I have a tenured position here the picture changes, but if I ever would move back to Germany, most likely, I would not get awarded a highly beneficial civil servant status because I am too old. If I would move to another country, my pension scheme would look even more like a piecemeal of small scale pensions. No one told me that when I made my career decisions. But I would have liked to know when I signed a pension plan in Germany years ago that is now nothing but a burden, with no tax benefits and already too big of a loss if I would stop paying. My personal professional mobility experience is limited to European contexts, but I have heard similar and exacerbated experiences from colleagues with international mobility backgrounds. *Here, EASP again could offer crucial information early on what PhD students - who plan to move - should or should not do in terms of investment for old age.* Country specific information will be subject to change, structural information is highly appreciated. One could even go so far and think of an EASP pension product that is being developed and offered together with an international financial services provider and that caters to the needs of scientists on the move.

The same counts for health care information. Not such a big deal, one might argue, but I have colleagues who regularly travel home for medical treatment (mostly at their own expense) and I can vividly remember the shocked faces of several female colleagues in various countries when they – after happily announcing that they are pregnant – found out which health care benefits they took as granted back from their home country were not provided in the system they were now stuck in. Maternity leave issues and

(in)flexibility of science funding organizations in terms of grant extension, or pausing are equally stressing topics. You may ask, is this really the core interest of a science association? I believe yes, if we want to support more female careers in science and not end them prematurely due to such reasons. In certain cities day care is impossible to finance on a post-doc salary. Yet few investigate such questions when they apply for such a position. *A continuously updated fact sheet of the oddities, and specific rules and regulations of national health care and science funding organizations would be a great help.*

Grants and lobbying at EU level

In an Europe characterized by national austerity policies obtaining funding from European sources is becoming more and more relevant. Having just been part of such a grant submission I am aware of the bureaucratic hurdles this entails. Many university therefore provide grant offices that support researchers in the process, many do not. However it is not only difficult to get the administration elements right, many endeavors end before they could actually start. Applications need partners from several European countries and interesting contributors are often hard to trace, especially when more than 3 countries need to be involved. *Here, EASP could take a matchmaking role and could support newly developing research groups with specific support for Seedcorn Meetings to help members prepare application of cooperative work financed by EU-grants. Consortiums in preparation could search via a central data base for interesting, potential partners.* Smaller universities could get access to the European arena above and beyond personal networks. Another EU-related topic is the underrepresentation of social psychologists in decision making committees at the EU level. Grant and prize criteria are in many instances far removed from what top researchers in our field can achieve, while other disciplines, who had the criteria tailor-made for their output schemes, walk home with millions of Euros. *Here, lobbying of our most senior EASP members is needed, if we want to make social psychology more successful on the EU level.*

Competition between associations

SPSP is updating its membership site and services and wants to turn it into a social network of scientists. Social Psychology Network, where most of us also host a profile (with or without supporting SPN), offers many services on their website that I would like to see at EASP. In other words, our befriended associations are also competitors, too, and woe for members. Of course, many membership rights are now often limited to geographic regions, but smaller thematically bound associations are converting from national to international organizations, to attract more eligible members. Larger ones will soon follow. This whole process will be sped up when publishers change their funding models, an aspect that I have not addressed here at all, given complexity. Yet, there are many other aspects that can be useful for us members, and that can be supported by EASP, for example high quality press relations work and liaison to top newspapers in Europe (similar to what Psychological Science is doing in the US). Such services are offered by specialized companies, why not hire one of them for EASP, the German Psychological Association is doing this now. *In sum, EASP could make up ground, for example by re-launching the website and bringing it up to the standards of Web 2.0, or by maintaining a press mailing list, or providing press services for its members.*

To sum up, internationalized science and international mobility of scientists is leading to new demands and challenges for EASP and its members. I am aware of many of us already

being active in ways I have mentioned above, partly, EASP would just need to channel those activities better and join ranks with existing initiatives and give individual information provision a home. Last but not least, I am aware that many of my suggestions, mentoring, matchmaking, and information provision, take time and effort, and have to be provided by members of the organization. This may be seen as a hurdle, but it could turn into an asset. Members who can give back to their association, who are more engaged in the activities of EASP, are more highly identified with their group, cherish it more and support its existence. I look forward to the next 45 years to come.

Book Reviews

Beyond pleasure and pain: How motivation works, by E.T. Higgins (2012)
New York: Oxford University Press

Book review by **John Levine** (University of Pittsburgh, USA)

A strong contender for the most important theoretical construct in psychology is "motivation." Decades of theoretical and empirical work have produced two primary answers to the question, "What does a motivated person really want?" One is that people want to survive, that is, to satisfy the biological requirements necessary to stay alive. The second is that people want to maximize pleasure and minimize pain (the famous hedonic principle). In his 2012 book, *Beyond Pleasure and Pain: How Motivation Works*, Tory Higgins argues that neither of these answers is adequate. Instead, building on the insights of scholars such as Hebb, White, Bandura, and Deci and Ryan, Higgins suggests that what a motivated person really wants is to be effective in life pursuits. In analyzing the foundations of motivation, Higgins goes well beyond previous analyses and, in so doing, provides a fresh and compelling perspective on human motivation.

Higgins first identifies three ways of being effective – value effectiveness (having desired results); truth effectiveness (establishing what is real); and control effectiveness (managing what happens). In discussing each type of effectiveness, Higgins compares and contrasts his viewpoint with prior formulations, addressing a number of fundamental motivational issues. These include the bases of positive and negative value; the processes underlying strength of engagement; the mechanisms by which people determine what is true about themselves, others, and the world at large; the determinants of affective, cognitive, and behavioral self-regulation; and the factors that elicit and sustain commitment to goal pursuit.

Next, in what is the theoretical heart of the book, Higgins discusses how the three ways of being effective *work together* in determining goal pursuit. In so doing, he provides a persuasive case for the importance of value-truth relations, value-control relations, truth-control relations, and finally value-truth-control relations. A major integrative theme of this section is the importance of "fit" in self-regulation.

Finally, in the last section of the book, Higgins discusses the implications of his analysis for understanding issues of theoretical as well as practical importance. These include the relationship between personality and culture, techniques for effectively managing others' motives and thereby behavior, and the fundamental qualities of "the good life."

The book is impressive on several grounds. It makes a compelling case that motivation involves much more than maximizing pleasure and minimizing pain. It provides a comprehensive summary of classic and contemporary motivational theories and findings. And it integrates the field of motivational science in a new and exciting way. The book deserves to be read and studied by both laypersons and professionals who seek to understand the complexities of human motivation.

“Goal-directed behavior” by **Henk Aarts & Andrew E. Elliot**
New York/London: Psychology Press

Review by **Kai Epstude** (University of Groningen, The Netherlands)

Why is social psychology concerned with the study of goals? This question is quite common when talking to colleagues from other fields. Even colleagues from within our own discipline respond somewhat frosty once in a while when realizing that social cognition research has adjusted its focus in recent years. There was a shift away from what they perceive as social psychology’s core topics with a stronger focus on self-regulation and motivation. However, looking back at the history of our field one will quickly realize that the interest of social psychology in goals is not an anomaly. Rather the apparent lack of interest in studying goals was. Many aspects of goal research have in some form already been discussed by one social psychology’s defining figures, Kurt Lewin. Therefore the recent volume edited by Henk Aarts and Andrew Elliot is an important illustration of how social psychology can profit from considering goals as one of its core topics. Moreover, the book also provides a very comprehensive summary of many different variants of goal-related behavior.

The book starts with four chapters outlining basic questions of the topic. Moskowitz outlines how goals are represented and regulated, while Satpute, Ochsner, and Badre have similar questions but provide answers from a neuroscience perspective. Fujita and MacGregor illustrate several distinctions that can be made when studying goals (e.g. abstract vs. concrete; approach vs. avoidance). Gollwitzer, Kappes, and Oettingen show how goals might arise from the various needs that have been proposed within social psychological research (e.g. need for cognition, need for achievement, need to avoid failure).

In a second set of chapters phases and determinants of actual goal pursuit are outlined. Förster and Liberman present classic as well as very recent research on goal gradients and illustrate the usefulness of this somewhat forgotten concept for our discipline. Sheeran and Gollwitzer describe how goals lead to action with an eye on the actual general processes instead of focusing on a single phase. Fishbach and Finkelstein describe research on difficulties in goal-attainment and potentially resulting disengagement.

Finally, three chapters illustrate how conscious and unconscious processes contribute to our understanding of goal-directed behavior. Custers, Bargh, and Eitam describe recent research on these two topics with a focus on integration of findings that up until now oftentimes remain unconnected. Cavallo and Fitzsimmons outline how competing goals are represented and what self-regulatory consequences they might have. In the final chapter of the book Aarts and Dijksterhuis focus on perceptions of control and agency which are strongly influenced by conscious and unconscious goal.

When assembling such a prominent lineup of contributors there is always the danger that all the chapters deliver useful insights but the overall message of the book is unclear. I was pleasantly surprised that this is by no means the case when it comes to this impressive volume. Many of the contributors (if not all) go considerably beyond their own findings and reach out into different domains. Links to classic research and neighboring disciplines are regularly made. Yet the reader gets the impression that there is really a lot that can be learned from the very recent findings reported in that book.

I think the volume edited by Aarts and Elliot is an important read for everyone who is interested in what social psychologists have to say about goals. Those who doubt that we as a field can (or must) contribute anything might find themselves proven wrong after reading the book. Those who have to justify why we as social psychologists study this topic now have a perfect book they might refer to when those nagging questions arise again.

Future EASP Meetings

Medium Size Meeting

Intergroup conflict: The cognitive, emotional, and behavioral consequences of communication

June 27-30, 2013, near Utrecht, The Netherlands

Organizers: Susanne Täuber, Ernestine Gordijn, Hedy Greijdanus, Tom Postmes, Bart de Vos, and Martijn van Zomeren (all University of Groningen, The Netherlands)

Contact: s.tauber@rug.nl

This meeting aims to bring together researchers who study the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral consequences of communication— crucial factors in (de-)escalating intergroup conflict. There is an emergent consensus that a multilevel perspective encompassing interpersonal, intragroup, and intergroup communication is required to fully understand the association between communication and intergroup conflict. This multilevel approach carries with it considerable theoretical and empirical advancement in the field, for it necessitates us to focus on the dynamic that unfolds between the different levels of interpersonal, intragroup, and intergroup communication.

We hope for this meeting to be a first step towards creating an overarching perspective on cognitive, emotional, and behavioral effects of communication. We invite contributions to one of the three sub-themes of our meeting: Intergroup communication (subtheme 1), intragroup communication (subtheme 2), and challenges of predicting and investigating the links between communication and intergroup conflict in real-life (subtheme 3). Example questions involve: Which characteristics of communication between groups, their representatives, and between ingroup members can lead to intergroup conflict (de-)escalation (e.g., communication content, emotion expression or suppression, shared reality formation)? Which group characteristics moderate the effects of communication on intergroup cognition, emotion, and behavior (e.g. majority or minority, power, status, identification)? Which factors play a role in the interplay between intragroup and intergroup communication processes as it occurs in real life conflict settings (e.g., identity salience, polarization)? How does mixed inter- as well as intragroup communication influence intergroup conflict?

We invite submissions from senior and junior researchers from different disciplines ranging from cognitive to applied research. We will host a single session format with ample time for presentation and discussion in order to facilitate the exchange between researchers from different disciplines. The meeting will contribute to a better understanding of the role of communication in (de-)escalating intergroup conflict, thereby identifying strands for future research and multidisciplinary theorizing on this topic.

Applicants should submit a 250-word abstract to s.tauber@rug.nl before 5pm GMT on **Wednesday, January 30th, 2013**. Please include your name, affiliation, contact information, and EASP membership status.

A conference website is under construction and will soon provide all relevant information on this meeting. Please see <http://www.gmw.rug.nl/~conflictandcommunication>

Reports of Previous Meetings

Report from the Summer Institute in Social Psychology (SISP) Princeton, New Jersey, July 24th – August 6th, 2011

Every two years the Society for Personality and Social Psychology organizes its Summer Institute in Social Psychology (better known as SISP) at a university in the United States. Besides a larger group of American PhD candidates and some more students from all over the world, each time five Europeans get the opportunity to share this wonderful experience.



Left to right: Milica Vasiljevic, Frederieke van Dongen, Francesca Righetti, Annemarie Wennekers, Christian Issmer.

The five Europeans joining SISP in 2011 were Frederieke van Dongen, Christian Issmer, Francesca Righetti, Milica Vasiljevic, and Annemarie Wennekers. We had the great pleasure to visit the famous Princeton University from July 24th to August 6th. The summer institute started with a welcome reception and an inspiring keynote address by Susan Fiske on Sunday. The next day, class started and the participants branched out into five different courses: Accuracy in Judgments of Personality and Social Relations (David Funder and Tessa West), Health Psychology (Sally Dickerson and Traci Mann), Self-

Knowledge and Understanding (David Dunning and Simine Vazire), Social Influence in Groups (Fabrizio Butera and John Levine), and Social Psychological Intervention (Hart Blanton and Deborah Prentice).

Annemarie and Christian attended Fabrizio's and John's workshop. This workshop covered a wide range of research areas related to the central topic "Social Influence in Groups". For example, we studied decision making in groups, shared realities, minority and majority influence, social exclusion, leadership, and negotiations between groups. The workshop was held as a seminar, with participants preparing a number of papers every day (27 in total!) and then discussing them in class. Fabrizio and John thereby enjoyed using a variety of different learning and teaching techniques, which were introduced as "planned argumentations", "problem-based learning", or "cumulative construction of knowledge". In the second week we split up into small groups and worked on designing a research project. On the last day of the workshop a small-group conference was held in class, with all groups presenting their final projects. Summing up, we can say that despite the amount of reading every day (which was first grumbled about, but then effectively handled by means of an ingenious European distribution system), the workshop and the teachers were a big hit. And maybe Christian, Annemarie and colleagues will become famous one day with their research project "Ostracism by strategic use of shared and unshared information". Who knows?

Frederieke and Francesca attended the workshop on Self Knowledge and Understanding by David Dunning and Simine Vazire. This workshop covered very important questions such as "To which extent do we know ourselves?", "To which extent are we biased in the way we perceive ourselves?", "Is it good or bad to have positive illusions in self-perception?", and "When do others have a better knowledge of us than ourselves?". The workshop was particularly interesting because it was taught through the perspective of a Social Psychologist (David Dunning) and a Personality Psychologist (Simine Vazire). In class we discussed assigned articles, the instructors' work and our own ideas and insights. The whole workshop was very active, with plenty of discussions and assignments. For example, at the beginning of the course we were divided into 4 teams and we were asked to prepare a debate by the end of the first week. Half of the class (2 teams) had to prepare the debate arguing for the positive effects of positive illusions in self-perception, and half of the class (the remaining 2 teams) had to prepare the debate arguing for the negative effects of positive illusions. At the end of the first week, we had a very funny, lively and constructive debate. Certainly, everyone was well-prepared and very certain that their arguments were correct. In the second week, we were divided in small groups according to our research interests and asked to generate a research question and a study to test our idea. In the last day of the workshop we presented our research proposals. We anticipate that our collaborations will continue into the future and hope that they will result in a successful research project with our fellow SISPers.

Milica attended the workshop on Social Psychological Intervention led by Hart and Deborah. Throughout the two weeks Hart and Deborah covered various theories and models of social psychological intervention. The workshop was organized in lectures held by Hart and Deborah, and discussions and activities carried out by all the workshop participants. Hart and Deborah designed different activities that taught us the fundamentals of social psychological interventions, but also brought the student participants closer together and helped us get to know each other better. One such activity involved going outside in Princeton in a small group and compiling a list of all the coffee

shops, including their location, opening times, and other details. The other workshop participants had similar tasks, for example to compile a list of all the libraries, all the restaurants etc. Once the task was done all the workshop participants gathered together and shared their newly gained knowledge. The topics we discussed during our workshop sparked off lively debates that inspired our research projects which we presented at the end of the summer institute. The projects designed by the workshop participants aimed to ameliorate various social ailments such as environmental pollution, and police racial profiling. In addition to the lectures and debates on the topic of social psychological intervention, we also had two eminent guests visit our workshop, John Darley and Elizabeth Levy Paluck. Both Darley and Paluck shared their extensive knowledge and experience with us on how best to design and evaluate social psychological interventions.

Alongside the full length courses there were also three interesting weekend workshops: Implicit Measurement (Keith Payne), Introduction to Secondary Data Analysis (Kali Trzesniewski), and Missing Data (John Graham).

But the summer institute also involved lots of fun. In addition to the busy working schedule we had the opportunity to socialize with the other SISP participants on a daily basis. There were game nights, movie nights, as well as karaoke nights during which some of the participants were brave (or foolish?) enough to take up the stage and sing. There were also organized trips to the nearby beach and lovely New York. For those amongst us who enjoy art the Princeton University Museum offered long hours of enjoyment alongside artistic masterpieces by Van Gogh, Goya, and David. The rich schedule of extracurricular activities finished with a BBQ on the lawn in front of the Frist building, otherwise better-known as the building that is filmed as Princeton Plainsboro Hospital in the popular television series *House*.

In combination with Karaoke nights, climbing Princeton trees, swimming in fountains, and enjoying the heat wave, SISP 2012 proved to be a great success, and now - almost a year later - the long-term benefits are undeniable. Different cross-continental research collaborations resulted from the summer school. For example - as a direct result of SISP - Milica started collaborating with Jimmy Calanchini and Prof Jeff Sherman (UC Davis), and Frederieke begun a collaboration with Paul Conway (University of West Ontario) and Alexa Tullett (University of Toronto). The data that is currently being collected is a substantial outcome of the summer school. The SISP facebook group that was created for communication between the Princeton summer school attendees is still used on almost a daily basis. A variety of topics - so wide they range from statistical problems, recommended readings, Mturk (the number 1 favorite topic), room sharing and reunions at conferences, teaching tips to 'what is the best response you've been given when people learn you're a psychologist?' - are actively being discussed. Whenever we need a quick advice, opinion, or help, our SISP facebook community comes to the rescue. Next to all the academic benefits, an outcome that may have not been as predictable to us beforehand is the social outcome. At the SPSP conference in San Diego there was a big reunion that started off in a Californian pub that could barely hold us all, and ended with an after-party on a roof top overlooking the city. Not just social gatherings, but even long-term friendships have emerged from these 2 weeks in Princeton, resulting in people crossing country borders to see each other again.

The summer school was only two weeks, but the positive effects are long-standing. We wish to thank EASP for making this experience possible for us and the organizers at Princeton University for a wonderful SISP 2011.

**Report from the SASP summer school 2012
February 3-8, 2012, Moreton Bay Research Station, Australia**



Left to right: Diana Onu, Evert van Doorn, Anouk Smeekes, Magdalena Bobowik, Matt Easterbrook.

In February 2012, five European PhD students went *down under* to join the fifth Australasian Summer School in Social Psychology. Together, we - Anouk Smeekes (Utrecht University), Diana Onu (University of Exeter), Evert van Doorn (University of Amsterdam), Magdalena Bobowik (University of the Basque Country), and Matt Easterbrook (University of Sussex)—left our homes looking forward to a great learning experience and a small holiday in sunny and warm Australia. We rented an apartment one week before the summer school started to enjoy some of the wonders of Queensland together. At the beginning of our stay, we feared the sunburn and the sharks. At the end of our vacation week, we cursed the jetlag and the heavy rainfall that accompanied us for most of the week (Queensland was flooded!). Thankfully, the summer school at the

University of Queensland's Moreton Bay Research Station on Stradbroke Island was full of sun, shiny people, and scientific enlightenment.

The SASP summer school 2012 included three workshop streams, which covered breathtaking and spectacular topics. We had the pleasure to learn from and work with the best, the bold, and the beautiful. The Social Justice stream was led by Heather Smith (Sonoma State University) and Kelly Fielding (University of Queensland); the Working with Real Groups stream was run by Tom Postmes (University of Groningen) and Blake McKimmie (University of Queensland); and finally, the teachers of the Interpersonal and Group-Based Emotions stream were Brian Lickel (University of Massachusetts Amherst) and Tom Denson (University of New South Wales). Due to unknown motivations and maybe even fortune-telling abilities (please see comments on the quantity of the readings in the Emotions workshop), 4 out of 5 of us joined the Working with Real Groups stream.

Working with Real Groups

Anouk, Diana, Matt and Magdalena joined Tom Postmes' and Blake McKimmie's workshop. The various preparatory readings aimed to provide students with a critical perspective on conducting social psychology research, focusing on the false dichotomy between the lab and the real world, and on the overwhelming concern with reducing uncertainty in research.

The research process often focuses on addressing gaps in the social psychological literature, but for the purpose of the workshop we were encouraged to think very differently about the topics we research in social psychology and even to address those topics which are hardly under investigation at all. We managed to narrow down a list of ten very exciting initial ideas to four topics. Thus, four groups worked on developing research proposals on (1) the importance of roles in social groups, (2) how the environment shapes groups, (3) motivations of protesters, and (4) the current Zeitgeist in Western societies. Over five days, we strived to achieve the difficult balance between staying true to our 'big ideas' while finding ways to capture their essence using our methodological tools in social psychology.

Diana and Anouk worked on a research proposal investigating the current Zeitgeist of Western societies (together with Alexa Hayley, Deakin University, and Kylie Fisk, University of Queensland). Starting on the observation that the same ideas of discontentment seem to run through most of the Western world (threats to privacy from technological advances, environmental threats, increased individualism and breakdown of communities, etc.), we proposed the existence of an underlying phenomenon called Zeitgeist (spirit of the times) that encompasses social perceptions on the various issues that society is facing. We used a short pilot study with Summer School participants to show that people have a unitary conception of what the current Zeitgeist is. Our proposed studies focus on measuring Zeitgeist as the latent variable that explains the common variance of societal perceptions of climate change, individualism, technology, distrust in institutions, societal breakdown, and economic collapse. We aim to convincingly show that the Zeitgeist exists relatively independent of the objective state of society (e.g. people might be convinced that society is breaking down despite evidence that integration is improving). If we succeed, our results will show that in order to increase people's happiness about society, it is insufficient for policy makers to improve the objective indicators of societal well-being; they need to address the underlying social perceptions as well.

Matt worked on the topic 'environments and social identity' with Peta Hoffmann from the Australian National University, and Faye Nitschke and Rachel McDonald from the University of Queensland. We started our proposal based on the idea that the physical environment around us can influence our perceptions of collective identity. Through our many discussions with Tom and Blake, we whittled this topic down to some concrete and manageable research questions, and went on to devise a series of studies to test our predictions. The process of bringing the focus of such a broad topic down to specific research questions was a fantastic learning experience, one in which Tom and Blake's contrasting but strangely complimentary approaches really helped in empowering us to tackle these rather daunting topics. Since the summer school our group has continued to be 'real' despite being spread across the globe, and we are currently making plans to carry out our research together.

Magdalena had a pleasure to work in a cross-cultural team of a three (with Maria Kostyanaya, Australian National University, and Alexander Saeri, University of Queensland). We proposed a program of research that was aimed at accomplishing two goals. First, our objective was to describe the experience, goals, and identity of protesters who do not share the moral motivation traditionally attributed to all activists. Second, we desired to examine the effect of a *ludic* (play-oriented) motive, in contrast to a moral motive, and goal salience in the recruitment and perceived success of an instance of collective action. Our project experienced numerous miraculous transformations (thanks to ground-breaking interventions by Tom and Blake) and our teamwork was as a passionate love relationship; with a honeymoon effect at the beginning, substantial crisis resolved over wine, and a happy end! Overall, we are all still excited about our "big idea" which reflects so well the *Zeitgeist* (yes!) of the global wave of protests and we hope to run the study "for real" and with real groups.

Interpersonal and Group-Based Emotions

Evert joined the Interpersonal and Intergroup Emotions workshop, which was taught by Brian Lickel and Tom Denson. The readings for this workshop took some preparation, as 28 articles were assigned to be read before the summer school commenced. Each student was asked to pay special attention to one or two of the articles, and prepare a presentation of the contents. The program was ambitious, but turned out to be very insightful as a result. Pending a 5 minute presentation of their work on the first day, students were put into groups based on their research topic. Over the course of the 5 days, each group prepared a research proposal which, according to Tom and Brian, should yield at least a JPSP publication.

Besides work on this proposal, the time spent in the emotions stream consisted of a thorough discussion of the literature, and presentations by Tom and Brian. The student-given presentations ensured that the main points of each article were briefly re-iterated to everyone just prior to the discussion. This resulted in a comprehensive overview of the emotion literature, as discussions covered topics such as physiological systems and their role in emotion elicitation, the physiological and social-contextual factors involved in the experience of various discrete emotions, intergroup emotions research, and emotion regulation. Tom and Brian complemented these discussions with excellent presentations on emotion measurement (Tom) and intergroup emotion research (Brian), enthusiastic encouragement, and a healthy dose of humor and self-mockery.

The development of the research proposal was the most exciting part of the program. Within just 5 days, each of the subgroups came up with an independent, feasible multi-experiment project that, in many cases, was ready to be run. Working on a proposal while at the same time discussing the literature was a very stimulating experience, which yielded some very promising ideas. Tom and Brian were, of course, there with expert guidance in order to allow the groups to get the most out of it. Many of the groups have started collaborating in order to make the proposed studies a reality. This is a lot of fun to do, and a very good experience to have as a starting researcher. As a result, some exciting papers from the emotions stream should be popping up in journals in the future! On a closing note, let it be known that besides being an incredible summer school instructor, Tom Denson is terrible at trivia.

Outside the streams

At the beginning of the school, all the students were given the customary health and safety talk by the research centre's manager. For us Europeans, however, this more resembled a horror film than a health and safety talk. Rather than warnings of repetitive strain injuries from overzealous mouse clicking and the hazards of a suboptimal screen height, we were warned about the cunningly disguised rock fish that inflicts days of endless agony if you are unfortunate to stand on one; and the blue ringed octopus, whose sting can leave you paralyzed! Needless to say we were all rather tentative swimmers after such a talk.

Apart from the teachers of the three research streams, Jolanda Jetten and Aarti Iyer were also at the research centre enjoying the atmosphere and chatting with the students. Jolanda Jetten, as president of SASP, gave the welcome talk, introducing the teachers and setting the mood of the school by revealing some of the teachers answers to her rather personal questions!

Aarti Iyer gave herself over to the summer school students by agreeing to give a talk on whichever topic the students decide they'd like to hear, in this case writing and publishing tips. Getting advice on such an important aspect of academia from one who has had so much success was really useful in highlighting some of the manageable ways we can all increase our writing potential. Aarti's talk did, however, contain some rather fear-inducing moments, especially with reference to the number of papers a successful PhD student should have published. The only reassurance was the look of panic on some of the other teachers faces when "4-6 first author papers" flashed upon the projector!

Impressions and experience

Despite the heavy rainfall, giant lizards (Brisbane national park), huge spiders (Mt. Coot-tha) and vampire-like bats (Brisbane botanical gardens), we felt more than welcome in Australia throughout all of our stay. Jolanda Jetten hosted a lovely drinks and pizza party for all foreign students, the day before the summer school started. Also during the summer school, all teachers and organizers were very open and approachable, and shared many of their experiences with a new generation of young social psychologists.

Overall, the summer school was an inspiring experience which convinced us that big dreams and ideas can come true in small steps and simple way. We practiced developing new research ideas in a short amount of time. We also became more familiar with the research trends in other parts of globe than Europe and America, and shared our experience

with non-European researchers. We feel that this experience helped us to set-up a research network at “inter-continental” scale.

Despite the sense of connection between everyone at the summer school, it took a Morton Islander to provide us with a lasting symbol of this. A local woman took quite a fancy to Brian Lickel, and showered him with gifts. One of these was a beautiful handmade didgeridoo, which, in a rather touching display of solidarity, has now become the symbol of the SASP summer school.

Acknowledgement:

We would like to thank the European Association for Social Psychology and the Society of Australasian Social Psychologists for giving us the opportunity to attend the SASP summer school 2012. Moreover, we want to thank all the summer school teachers, organizers and students for their efforts, contribution and warm welcome to the SASP summer school 2012. We enjoyed it a lot!

News about Members

New Members of the Association

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

Full Membership

Dr. Katarzyna ALUCHNA-KUNYSZ
Warsaw, Poland
(D. Dolinski, G. Sedek)

Dr. Frederique AUTIN
Poitiers, France
(J.-C. Croizet, M. Dambrun)

Dr. Mauro BERLOTTI
Milano, Italy
(P. Milesi, P. Catellani)

Dr. Susanne BRUCKMÜLLER
Erlangen, Germany
Abele-Brehm, B. Wojciszke)

Dr. Cindy CHATEIGNER
Nanterre, France
(A. Nugier, P. Chekroun)

Dr. Fabio FASOLI
Bielefeld, Germany
(A. Carnaghi, M.-P. Paladino)

Dr. Marie-Pierre FAYANT
Grenoble, France
(D. Muller, F. Butera)

Dr. Beatriz GANDARILLAS
Segovia, Spain
(P. Briñol, G. Haddock)

Dr. Isabelle GONCALVES
Nanterre, France
(J.-F. Verliac, J.-B. Légal)

Dr. Sian JONES
Keele, UK
(R. Spears, M. Cadinu)

Dr. Rodolphe KAMIEJSKI
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(S. Guimond, A. Nugier)

Dr. Florian KUTZNER
Heidelberg, Germany
(H. Plessner, H. Fiedler)

Dr. Mara MAZZUREGA
Trento, Italy
(T. Schubert, M.-P. Paladino)

Dr. Tila PRONK
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(C. Ashton-James, J. Karremans)

Dr. Elisa PUVIA
Canterbury, UK
(J. Vaes, A. Carnaghi)

Dr. Miguel RAMOS
Lisbon, Portugal
(I. Correia, R. Guerra)

Dr. Francesca RIGHETTI
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(P.A.M. van Lange, C. Finkenauer)

Dr. Odile ROHMER
Strasbourg, France
(D. Muller, A. Mignon)

Dr. Joanna ROSZAK
Warsaw, Poland
(A. Kwiatkowska, U. von Hecker)

Dr. Jenny ROTH
Dresden, Germany
(M.C. Steffens, R. Deutsch)

Dr. Rim SAAB
Cardiff, UK
(N. Tausch, R. Spears)

Dr. Annika SCHOLL
Tübingen, Germany
(K. Sassenberg, J. Jacoby)

Dr. Lee SHEPHERD
Stirling, UK
(R. Spears, T. Manstead)

Dr. Birte SIEM
Hagen, Germany
(S. Stürmer, A. Rohmann)

Dr. Valery TODOROV
Sofia, Bulgaria
(K. Helkama, K. Petkova)

Dr. Jojanneke VAN DER TOORN
New Haven, USA
(B. Klandermans, N. Ellemers)

Dr. Wijnand VAN TILBURG
Limerick, Ireland
(T. Ritchie, E. Igou)

Dr. Juliet WAKEFIELD
Dundee, UK
(N. Hopkins, F. Sani)

Postgraduate Membership

Hillie AALDERING
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(C.K.W. de Dreu, G. van Kleef)

Kasia BANAS
Edinburgh, UK
(A. Lenton, W. van Dijk)

Olga BIALOBRZESKA
Warsaw, Poland
(B. Wojciszke, M. Parzuchowski)

Guila Luisa BOSETTI
Padova, Italy
(A. Voci, L. Pagotto)

Jeroen CAMPS
Leuven, Belgium
(J. Stouten, M. Gollwitzer)

Katarzyna CANTARERO
Wroclaw, Poland
(G. Sedek, M. Gamian-Wilk)

Stefano DE DOMINICIS
Roma, Italy
(M. Bonaiuto, W. Crano)

Gian Antonio Di BERNARDO
Padova, Italy
(G.T. Viki, D. Capozza)

Piotr DRAGON
Krakow, Poland
(M. Kossowska, M. Bukowski)

David GORDON
Exeter, UK
(M. Barreto, K. Peters)

Wiebren JANSEN
Groningen, The Netherlands
(S. Otten, N. Hansen)

Elena LEMONAKI
Cardiff, UK
(G. Maio, T. Manstead)

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

Noémi Z. MÉSZÁROS
Pecs, Hungary
(O. Vincze, J. Laszlo)

Josephine NEUGEBAUER
Tübingen, Germany
(K. Sassenberg, C. Matschke)

Marco REGO
Exeter, UK
(M. Barreto, M. Koschate-Reis)

Ozum SAYGI
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(C.K.W. de Dreu, G. van Kleef)

Giovanni A. TRAVAGLINO
Canterbury, UK
(D. Abrams, G. Randsley de Moura)

Emilio Paolo VISINTIN
Padova, Italy
(R. Crisp, A. Voci)

Krystal WARMOTH
Exeter, UK
(A. Haslam, J. Smith)

Grants

Marco Brambilla (travel grant)
Aleksandra Cichocka (travel grant)
Mauro Giacomantonio (seedcorn grant)
Malgorzata Gocłowska (travel grant)
Daniël Lakens (travel grant)
Tomás Palma (travel grant)
Lolita Rubens (travel grant)
Caterina Suitner (seedcorn grant)

Grant reports

Lottie Bullens

Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Travel grant

The EASP travel grant supported me to visit Prof. Tory Higgins at Columbia University (NY). He is one of the leading experts in the field of cognition and motivation. The main goal of my visit was to learn from Prof. Higgins and the researchers in his lab, and to develop a collaborative research project that would fit within my PhD project. The general aim of my PhD project is to gain more insight in the (detrimental) consequences of reversible decision-making. Previous research has shown that although people have a preference for reversible decisions, the option to revise actually leads to lower levels of choice satisfaction. In my project we examine the cognitive processes underlying decision reversibility. So what happens in people's minds when being confronted with a reversible versus irreversible decision; how does the reversibility of a decision affect people's motivation to make the decision; and how will it influence the decision outcome?

During my 3.5 months stay at Columbia University, we developed two experiments. The first experiment was designed as a follow-up on a set of previous studies demonstrating that irreversible decisions are more related to a promotion motivation whereas reversible decisions are more related to a prevention motivation. With this experiment we wanted to examine whether regulatory motivation, induced by decision reversibility, also impact upon the decision itself i.e., people's decisional preferences. With the second experiment, we wanted to investigate more thoroughly why reversible decisions lead to lower choice satisfaction by measuring (on both an implicit and an explicit level) to what aspects of the choice alternatives people attend to after having made a reversible versus irreversible decision. Thus, the goal of the second experiment was to gain insight into the processes driving the established relation between decision reversibility and outcome satisfaction. The results of both studies are encouraging.

My stay at Columbia University was very valuable and inspiring to me. Not only did I enjoy my discussions with Prof. Higgins, I also learned a lot from all the well-trained researchers in his lab. I particularly valued the weekly lab meetings in which great research ideas were proposed and discussed. I also got the chance to work on a project on helping

behavior together with Prof. Higgins and one of his post-docs Dr. Justin Cavallo. Hopefully, we can continue our collaboration in the future. From New York, I also visited the SESP 2011 conference in Washington. I very much enjoyed all the inspiring talks at this conference.

I am very grateful for my time at Columbia University, and would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Higgins and his lab for their warm welcome. Furthermore, I wish to thank the European Association of Social Psychology for enabling my visit.

Soledad de Lemus
Universidad de Granada
Seedcorn grant

Activation of resistance goals as a function of stereotype exposure

Thanks to an EASP Seedcorn grant that I obtained in May 2011, I had the opportunity to develop a project in collaboration with Marcin Bukowski (Jagellonian University, Poland) and Russell Spears (Groningen University, Netherlands) to study the influence of stereotype exposure on the automatic activation of resistance goals as a factor leading to social change in low status groups (women, in this case). In this report, I will briefly describe the theoretical background of the studies and some initial results.

There are solid reasons to assume that resistance to stereotypes may not be easy, especially in the realm of implicit processes. One influential theory of gender stereotyping proposes that these stereotypes reflect the distribution of men and women into social roles (Eagly & Steffen, 1984; Eagly, Wood, & Diekmann, 2000), suggesting that a change in these roles is required to change the stereotypes. Some research has shown that exposure to counter-stereotypical exemplars either in reality (Dasgupta & Asgari, 2004) or via mental imaginary (Blair, Ma, & Lenton, 2001) *can* reduce the activation of automatic gender stereotypes. Such counter-stereotypical exemplars can influence the perceived stability of gender role distribution, and suggest that not all women (or men) behave stereotypically. However, stereotypical roles are predominant in society, hence, exposure to the existing role distribution as a whole provide less optimism that the conditions under which stereotypes are contested will emerge spontaneously for many women. Research has shown that pervasiveness of gender discrimination has negative consequences for self-esteem and behavior (e.g., Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999). Moreover exposure to gendered role distributions, in which the discrimination itself is quite implicit, might be very subtle, making it more difficult to resist (Barreto, Ellemers, Scholten, & Smith, 2010).

However, we should not necessarily assume that women will always passively accept the discrimination implied by gender role distributions. The notion that people are generally motivated to resist or reject an unpalatable situation is not new, and is reflected in theorizing on 'reactance', when a situation threatens perceived freedoms (Brehm, 1966). Social identity theory extends this rationale to the intergroup realm to argue that low status groups are motivated to contest their negative identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Although low status can put a reality constraint on the form or extent of such resistance, research reveals good support for the motivation to see one's group in the most positive

light that the evidence allows. Research shows that, at least at the explicit level, members of low status groups are likely to be motivated to resist and even challenge negative images of their group (e.g., Mullen, Brown & Smith, 1992; Schaller & Maass, 1989).

There is already some suggestive evidence from social cognition research indicating that motivational variables, such as internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice, can influence implicit biases (Devine, Plant, Amodio, Harmon-Jones, & Vance, 2002). For example, in previous research we have shown that interpersonal goals interact with context to determine the activation of gender stereotypes at the implicit level (Bukowski, Moya, de Lemus, & Szmajke, 2009). Further, there is evidence that chronic egalitarian goals can prevent the activation of stereotypes (Moskowitz, Gollwitzer, Wasel, & Schaal, 1999). What is less clear is whether members of the stigmatized groups themselves are motivated and able to resist this stigma at the implicit level. In our previous research (de Lemus, Spears, Bukowski, Lupiáñez, & Moya, 2012a; de Lemus, Lupiáñez, Spears, Bukowski, & Moya, 2012b) we examined women's reactions to pervasive gender stereotypes at the implicit level. An associative procedure was used to expose participants to stereotypical vs. counter-stereotypical gender roles, and an evaluative priming task measured participants' automatic responses. Results showed that women do not passively accept sexist roles, but contest them by showing "semantic resistance" (i.e., reversing the automatic activation of warmth and competence stereotypes) or showing "evaluative resistance" (i.e., favouring their ingroup over the outgroup). Further, exposing participants to stereotypic role associations promotes negative emotions in women as well as increased persistence on a subsequent stereotype relevant task (spatial intelligence test).

We have some evidence that women are able to resist pervasive gender stereotypes at the implicit level, however we do not have direct evidence for the motivational underlying processes that lead to such responses. Based on recent research that shows that goal pursuit can proceed unconsciously (Bongers, Dijksterhuis, and Spears, 2009; 2010), we aim to examine the activation of resistance motives in women as a reaction to pervasive gender stereotypes at the implicit level. For that purpose, we examine in the first place the influence of stereotypical exposure on implicit resistance goals activation (as a D.V.).

The first study was conducted in Granada, Spain. We used the same stereotype exposure paradigm as in our previous research (de Lemus et al., 2012a, 2012b) described above to manipulate exposure to stereotypical roles (women-kitchen; men-office) vs. counter-stereotypical roles (women-office, men-kitchen). We measured the activation of acceptance vs. resistance vs. neutral related words in a subsequent Lexical Decision Task. Results showed a significant influence of exposure to stereotypes on the activation of acceptance vs. resistance words, such that participants exposed to stereotypical roles reacted relatively faster to resistance words than to acceptance words. Further, the activation of resistance words in the stereotypical condition was marginally correlated with ingroup bias in a positive way, whereas this correlation was reversed (negative) for the counter-stereotypical condition. These results provided initial support for our *motivated resistance hypothesis*. That is, exposure to traditional stereotypes might activate resistance related goals in women, as a low status group.

However, there are two possible underlying explanations for our findings that remain unexplored: On the one hand, the activation of resistance-related words might be an effect of women's group identity being threatened when exposed to stereotypical roles which perpetuate the status quo. In that case, the effect should not occur in a male sample. On

the other hand, the activation of resistance-related words might be a consequence of egalitarian goals, which might be held both by certain women and men. In order to gain some further insight about the underlying processes that trigger the activation of resistance goals in a second study, we are comparing a female and a male sample of participants (ongoing research). Further, we aim to replicate our motivated resistance effect in a different cultural context, in Poland, with new pretested gender roles stimuli (men and women in office vs. cleaning contexts). Finally, we have also included some behavioral tendencies measures of support for collective action to analyze the influence of the activated goals on them. The adaptation of the materials to a new cultural context was done and pretested during my visit to the Jagellonian University in Cracow, Poland. The data will be collected in the coming weeks.

I would like to thank once again the EASP for the opportunity of holding this seedcorn grant. And I am looking forward to further developing this line of research with my cooperators in the coming months.

Isabelle Goncalves

University Paris X, Nanterre, France

Travel grant

Last May, I was given the opportunity to visit Prof. Christian Staerklé at the University of Lausanne (Switzerland) for a two-month period. The purpose of this visit was to discuss research perspectives regarding Terror Management Theory (TMT; Greenberg, Pyszczynski, & Solomon, 1986), building upon his expertise in the field of social representations theory. I am particularly thankful to the EASP for enabling this research visit to take place.

The project initiated at the University of Lausanne intends to resort to social representations theory to shed light on conceptual and paradigmatic ambiguities related to TMT. The first issue regards the experimental paradigm of mortality salience. This paradigm is used to assess the effect of death-related anxiety on the implementation of (distal) defences. In a classic study, participants allocated to the mortality salience condition complete two open-ended questions on the subject of their own death (*versus* an aversive and non-death related topic). While social representations of death are diverse (see Bradbury, 1999), content analyses of participants' responses to these questions are scarcely ever reported. This lies at the source of a methodological problem as participants understood to be in the very same experimental condition are likely to mobilise different representations of death. Through this project, we intended to verify whether different social representations would convey discrete effects on (distal) defence.

Second, the ambiguity surrounding the concept of "cultural worldview" extensively used in TMT appears to be at the source of difficulties at the time of testing the theory. Cultural worldviews have been defined as referring to "shared conceptions of reality that imbue life with order, stability, meaning, and permanence, and that provide bases for viewing ourselves as enduringly significant contributors to a meaningful reality rather than as mere transient animals groping for survival" (Greenberg, Solomon, & Arndt, 2008, p. 116). Given this broad definition, experimental studies carried out in this field have

resorted to social identities to operationalise cultural worldviews. Our aim was to consider cultural worldviews through the light of social representations theory.

To start exploring these questions, one study ($N = 172$) was carried out using the mortality salience paradigm. Half of participants were invited to jot down the thoughts that the consideration of their own death produced in them, while other participants were led to consider an experience of dental pain (i.e., a non-death related aversive event). We then not only assessed the effect of mortality salience on the upholding of one's political attitudes; we looked at how distinct social representations of death affected political attitudes. Content analyses revealed that the responses of participants in the mortality salience condition referred to discrete social representations of death (e.g., death as an eternal bliss, as physical putrefaction, as an anxiety-provoking event). Of interest, content analyses of the responses given by participants in the control condition also underlined a substantial heterogeneity of representations (e.g., dental pain as an anxiety-provoking experience, as an experience of lack of control). Results showed that the effects of mortality salience on political attitudes differed depending on the social representation(s) of death which had been mobilised by participants.

Besides the possibility of initiating this research, my visit was also the opportunity to develop a new research project focused on the role of meta-representations on the implementation of voting behaviours favourable to far-right parties. Discussions in Lausanne with Prof. Staerklé and Dr. Guy Elcherth constituted an undeniable incentive and firm basis for the elaboration of this project. Here, I would like to thank both of them as well as Prof. Stephen Reicher for their support and for the time they dedicate(d) to this stirring project.

My stay at the University of Lausanne was also punctuated by events organised by the Department of Social Psychology. I had the chance to attend different seminars and talks on a wide range of themes, and to present my work to other fellow PhD students. The very constructive feedback I then received was extremely useful at the time of preparing my PhD defence.

The success of this visit could not be only accounted for by its research dimension. The benevolence and kindness of the individuals I met at the University of Lausanne (permanent staff, PhD students, post-docs, etc.) were sincerely disarming. This indubitably contributed to making this visit a memorable experience. For all these souvenirs (and for those to come!?), thanks a thousand times to all of them!

All in all, the visit at the University of Lausanne was a very fruitful and inspiring experience. Not only did it give me the chance to collaborate with Prof. Christian Staerklé, it also provided me with the opportunity to develop new perspectives of collaboration, to deepen my understanding of social representations and societal psychology, and to get to meet fascinating individuals. I am very grateful to Prof. Christian Staerklé for his time and for the enjoyable discussions we had, to the EASP for making this visit possible, and to Sibylle Classen for her unwavering patience and kindness. Many thanks as well to Prof. Jean-François Verliac and Prof. Thierry Meyer for their constant support and encouragement.

Reference

- Bradbury, M. (1999). *Representations of death: A social psychological perspective*. Florence: Taylor & Frances/Routledge.
- Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., & Solomon, S. (1986). The causes and consequences of a need for self-esteem: A terror management theory. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Public self and private self* (pp. 189-212). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., & Arndt, J. (2008). A basic but uniquely human motivation: Terror management. In J. Y. Shah & W. L. Gardner (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation science*. (pp. 114-134). New York: Guilford Press.

Eva Krumhuber

(Jacobs University Bremen, Germany)

Seedcorn Grant

With the financial support of EASP I was given the opportunity to develop a Dynamic Eyes Test (DET) that could be used as a new measure of adult social intelligence. The postdoctoral seedcorn grant allowed me to build a complex corpus of dynamic facial stimuli and to test it in two participant samples. Below I will shortly describe the theoretical background followed by the project particulars and how these contribute to the goals and wider context of my research.

As a social psychologist I am particularly interested in what social and emotional information observers derive from the dynamic movement of the face (i.e., how the face conveys meaning through its movement). Previous research (Krumhuber & Scherer, 2010) has found that adults can judge emotional and cognitive states from minimal dynamic cues only visible around the eyes. Such sensitivity to motion information in the eye region cannot be overlooked. For example, work on autism spectrum disorder (ASD) has shown that people with ASD have difficulties interpreting the mentalistic information conveyed by the eyes (Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, & Jolliffe, 1997). Following previous research on the link between engineering and autism (see Wheelwright & Baron-Cohen, 2001), I aimed to develop a new DET that allows for the detection of meaningful individual differences in emotion perception between two subject groups consisting of psychology and engineering students that are highly likely to vary in their orientation to social stimuli.

The first part of the project involved the development of the DET that would extend the existing stimulus set by including additional facial stimuli and dependent measures. During this time I met with Prof. Tony Manstead at Cardiff University, UK, to discuss issues regarding the experimental design and the production of dynamic stimuli of various difficulty levels. In order to gain a better understanding of autism and related problems in mentalizing and in emotion perception, I established links with Dr. Leo Schilbach and Prof. Dr. Kai Vogeley at the University Hospital in Cologne, Germany, which hosts an out-patient clinic for high-functioning autistic adults. In the context of an invited talk within their research group, further refinements were made with the outlook for possible future application of the DET in clinical samples.

The second part of the project consisted of testing 80 participants from the Schools of Psychology and Engineering/Computer Science/Physics at Cardiff University. To achieve equal samples sizes (40 males and 40 females from Psychology and Engin/ComSci/Physics) many of the participants from schools outside of psychology had to be recruited face to face. All participants completed the DET as well as two standard measures of autistic traits (Autism Spectrum Quotient; Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, Skinner, Martin, & Clubley, 2001) and alexithymia (Toronto Alexithymia Scale; Bagby, Parker, & Taylor, 1994). Because data collection was completed in December 2011, results of the DET will be available over the next months. From inspection of the self-report data, results confirmed our first hypotheses. Specifically, students from the Schools of Engineering/Computer Science/Physics scored significantly higher on the autism questionnaire than the psychology students. Moreover, autism scores were significantly and positively correlated with those on the alexithymia questionnaire, with female engineers/computer scientists/physicists scoring particularly high (!). Subsequently, it will be important to examine associations between scores on autism/alexithymia and performance on the DET. The results promise to be interesting and potentially relevant for publication.

I thank the Association for their financial support of this project. The idea for a new DET grew partly out of my previous work on facial dynamics at the PhD and Post-doc level. The realization of this project not only strengthened existing links with collaborators from Cardiff University, but also allowed me to take my research into a new direction with respect to the clinical aspects of dynamic emotion perception. I am grateful for this opportunity to broaden my academic interests and am looking forward to extending this new line of research in future projects.

References:

- Bagby, R. M., Parker, J. D. A. & Taylor, G. J. (1994). The twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale-I. Item selection and cross-validation of the factor structure. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 38, 23-32.
- Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., & Jolliffe, T. (1997). Is there a "Language of the eyes"? Evidence from normal adults, and adults with autism or Asperger syndrome. *Visual Cognition*, 4, 311-331.
- Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Skinner, R., Martin, J., & Clubley, E. (2001). The Autism-Spectrum Quotient (AQ): Evidence from Asperger syndrome/high-functioning autism, males and females, scientists and mathematicians. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 31, 5-17.
- Krumhuber, E., & Scherer, K. R. (2010). The look of fear varies with the sequence of appraisal. In C. Douilliez & C. Humez (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Third European Conference on Emotion (CERE)* (p. 54), Lille, France (April).
- Wheelwright, D., & Baron-Cohen, S. (2001). The link between autism and skills such as engineering, maths, physics, and computing: A reply to Jarrold and Routh. *Autism*, 5, 223-227.

Steve Loughnan
University of Kent, UK
Seedcorn grant

Thanks to the EASP I recently had the chance to engage in a new line of research looking at the association between economic inequality and aggression. There are five major outputs from the Seedcorn Grant which I am happy to report here. After a brief background, the outputs are summarized.

Background

Levels of interpersonal aggression vary across societies. One clear measure of interpersonal aggression is homicide. Three major trends exist in national homicide rates: they are in long-term decline; homicide is less common in developed nations; homicide rates vary considerably amongst developed nations (Spierenburg, 2008). The first two trends likely reflect improvements in quality of life and the strength of government institutions (i.e., the police, judiciary). The third trend – differences between modern, developed nations – is more puzzling. Why do some developed nations report much higher levels of homicide, violent crime, hostility and aggression? Within this literature there is an emerging consensus that inequality – particularly income inequality – plays a crucial role in interpersonal violence. Hsieh and Pugh (1993) reviewed the literature on crime and inequality and found a positive relationship on 34 out of 35 indices. At a more general level, social inequality is linked to hostility towards others (Williams, Feaganes, & Barefoot, 1995). This relationship holds at the international (Daly et al., 2001), regional (Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010), and municipal level (Wilkinson & Pickett, 2006, 2010). The message from this work is clear: unequal societies are linked to hostility and aggression.

Despite the mounting evidence that inequality is linked to aggression, the existing research cannot provide evidence for a causal relationship. This research took the first steps towards establishing a causal relationship between macro-social inequality and interpersonal hostility and aggression. To do so, I employed a procedure derived from Kelley's (1955) basic model (see also Taylor & Fiske, 1978; Oysermann & Lee, 2008) of making inequality salient in the laboratory and measuring the effect. Specifically I sought to examine a) whether inequality provokes aggression, b) whether it is the disadvantaged, advantaged, or both who are more aggressive under inequality.

Outcomes

The first outcome is a set of studies exploring the relationship between economic inequality and aggressive tendencies. After initial failures to manipulate inequality (3 studies), a successful manipulation was found and the results are promising (1 study). In an online study using American participants, we primed feelings of advantage and disadvantage and measure reported positive and negative-emotions and hostility/aggression. We found that both the advantaged and disadvantaged were more aggressive, and this was mediated by experienced negative emotionality in the case of the former. We are currently constructing an SEM to better model the results and are preparing a manuscript for submission.

The second set of studies reflects an off-shoot of the original, unsuccessful studies into inequality and aggression (above). It explored the idea that inequality may lead to selfish behaviour. In two studies we found that this is the case for advantaged people, but disadvantaged people are more concerned with fairness. A paper was prepared reporting

two studies and it is currently under review at an EASP sponsored journal; *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. I would like to thank Dr Boyka Bratanova and Prof Olivier Klein (Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium), my co-authors on this paper.

The third outcome is the completion and implementation of a behavioural manipulation of inequality. The 'Fisherman' program can be found at <http://www.kent.ac.uk/psychology/technical/sl/fc/FleetCommander.html>. Data collection examining the effect of this manipulation on self-reported and behavioural aggression is currently on-going (n=50) and show promising results. Specifically, we have found that experienced inequality leads to increased behavioural aggression. This finding provides a behavioural replication of the questionnaire results reported as outcome one.

The fourth major outcome is the initiation of a large survey examining the relationship between inequality, interpersonal, and intergroup aggression. This study is being conducted with Dr Bernhard Leidner (University of Massachusetts, Amherst). We are sampling individuals from all 50 states of the USA and examine how self-reported and objective (i.e., state-wide) inequality statistics might relate to levels of interpersonal and intergroup aggression. We have collected over 600 participants and data collection is on-going.

The fifth outcome is the preparation of an ESRC grant application to examine inequality and aggression. With Dr Eduardo Vasquez (University of Kent) and Dr Boyka Bratanova (Université Libre de Bruxelles) a grant is being prepared to examine how inequality impacts on aggression. The grant will employ a mixed-method approach using laboratory studies (validated in the experimental studies with Dr Bratanova, funded by this grant), surveys of UK households (validated in the survey study with Dr Leidner, funded by this grant), and forensic interviews with incarcerated criminals. We are seeking 3 years of research funding to employ two PhD students and a post-doctoral research fellow. Preparation of the grant is well advanced and we anticipate submission within the next 4-6 weeks.

I would like to thank the EASP for the Seedcorn funding. As can be seen above, it has allowed me to pursue a range of topics related to inequality and aggression. I would like to thank Dr Boyka Bratanova, Prof Olivier Klein, Dr Bernhard Leidner, and Dr Eduardo Vasquez for their assistance in running various aspects of this project. In addition to experimental, behavioural, and survey studies, it has allowed me to prepare a larger grant which is greatly buoyed by the opportunity to conduct preliminary studies. I hope to be able to give back to the community with the announcement of some PhD candidatures and post-doctoral fellowship in the future.

Alexandrina Moisuc
Blaise Pascal University, France
Travel grant

The EASP travel grant allowed me to realize an internship in Austria. I was currently working in Clermont-Ferrand, France, being in my 2nd year of my thesis. My research interest concerns people's reaction to uncivil behaviors in public settings. My supervisor,

Markus Brauer, and me agreed that a time spent abroad will be an extra point for the thesis and for the perspective that we already had about this research. With the kindness of Prof. Tobias Greitemeyer this idea became possible. Prof. Tobias Greitemeyer agreed to receive me in his social psychology laboratory in University of Innsbruck, Austria, for a period of 2 months. He is an expert on civil courage and helping behavior research and he was able to analyze and give his opinion about my next studies. I arrived in Innsbruck and I was warmly received. Soon we started to develop a new study. The goal was to identify the antecedents of people's overt opposition to uncivil and immoral behaviors. We examined what was the likely reaction of people who were watching some uncivil behaviors. It involved using several short video materials that were already realized. A bystander could be anyone who sees or otherwise becomes aware of a norm transgression and we wanted to see what individual characteristics these persons gather. The participants for this study were students at the University of Innsbruck. We developed an online questionnaire, which included the video materials, several personality scales, two scales regarding people's reaction and demographic information. The study was distributed to all students in the university and they had a limited time to answer to it. We had a good number of respondents, over a thousand students. After a descriptive statistic we kept for further analysis approximately 850 participants. The particularity of our population was that in this university there are a high percentage of foreign students, more precisely German students. Even though they are foreign they speak the same language as the Austrian students. Because of this particularity we were expecting to have some interesting results concerning the different mentality and different kind of reaction to incivilities. The possible reactions started with no evident reaction, going to a disapproving look, a sigh or a comment addresses to the perpetrator. In addition we wanted to realize a comparison between these results to a study using video material and previous studies that used descriptions for the incivilities. We were able to identify some interesting differences in this issue too. All results will be gathered in an article in order to become public knowledge.

The trip to Innsbruck allowed me to attend SoDoc 2012 in Munich. The short distance between these two cities made my trip easier and more economic. Attending SoDoc was a new and inspiring experience for me because it was my first doctoral students focus meeting. I find this kind of meeting very benefic for an ongoing thesis. Working in small groups directed, supervised and positively criticized by an exterior professor gives to the student the opportunity to a fresh breath of air for his research. I become aware of the image that other's have about my way of seeing my research and I left from this meeting with brand ideas. I am thankful for this experience.

In a more individual way, the time spent in Innsbruck permitted me to organize my thoughts about my research and about my thesis in particular. I consider it an important step to be able to detach yourself from your original working place and to be in contact with other researchers in another laboratory. Being a small laboratory in Innsbruck gave me the feeling of a greater autonomy in my work. I enriched and enlarged my research perspective with this opportunity given by EASP and this gave me the desire to continue exploring different backgrounds and maybe one day to focus on cultural differences.

The city in itself was a great experience, too. I loved to discover the Austrians, their habits, their food and their entertaining skills. The some much known schnitzels and strudels have their unique taste in this country. I had the opportunity to see several street spectacles where local and national band performed. The big plus of this city in my opinion is his geographical location and surroundings. It is a pleasure to go out to work

each day just because you can admire the beautiful mountains that offer such a speechless view. Being able to have a different mountain activity each weekend is a great boost for everyone's mood. Innsbruck is an animated city, full with pleasures, kind people and public cultural activities. I had the opportunity to go to the theater and to a free traditional festival that I really enjoyed. I will keep a special memory of my internship over there.

I want to share with you another interesting fact from there: student's elections for the Parliament. More than a month I was able to see all around how students were involved in the national campaign in order to elect their representatives. The candidates mobilized hundred of students that were making shifts between class hours and after the class hours to distribute materials, to organize public activities, to gather more votes and to convince all students of their real implication to the politics of the state. It was an interesting thing to watch and analyze, I had the feeling that a "nursery" for the next generation of politicians is set.

All in all, I think that my visit to University of Innsbruck was a wonderful experience. It was a very inspiring and motivating time. Thanks to Prof. Tobias Greitemeyer, his PhD. student Dirk Mügge and my supervisor Markus Brauer. Working with them was a real pleasure for me. I am sincerely grateful to EASP for making my trip possible.

Esther K. Papies

Utrecht University, The Netherlands
travel grant

Supported by an EASP travel grant, I recently visited prof. Larry Barsalou at Emory University for two months. This was a very interesting and enriching experience which I truly enjoyed. While at Emory, I worked on different projects with prof. Barsalou and members of his Cognitive Science and Cognitive Neuroscience Lab, all which revolve around grounded cognition, the new and emerging field of contemplative science, and their interface.

Prof. Barsalou and I have been cooperating for a while on a project investigating the benefits of mindfulness, a Western form of traditional Buddhist meditation practices, to facilitate the healthy regulation of eating behavior. Specifically, we have developed a 10-minute procedure which trains participants in the core principle of mindfulness meditation, namely to observe one's own thoughts and experiences, and to view them as passing mental states. Participants then apply this perspective while viewing pictures of attractive and neutral food items. Thus, they learn to observe their own spontaneous mental simulations of eating the food and of the resulting reward experience, and they learn to consider these simulations as mere thoughts, or as passing mental events. As a result, participants' motivation for the food strongly diminishes. Indeed, our studies show that this *mindful attention* procedure reduces automatic approach reactions towards attractive, high-calorie food, reduces explicit preferences and cravings for this food, and shifts spontaneous choices towards healthier, more neutral options (see Papies, Barsalou, & Custers, in press).

During my visit at Emory University this winter, we further developed this line of research and worked on new experiments applying this in the domain of food and eating behavior. In addition, we continued our ongoing work on applying mindful attention in a neuroimaging experiment, which will be conducted this spring. Finally, I consulted with prof. Barsalou about the first results of my recent research on the role of embodied simulations in the motivation for food and developed ideas for further experiments. Next to these activities which were directly related to my own research, I truly enjoyed participating in the many activities of Emory's vibrant research community more generally, and the excellent Psychology department in particular. I regularly attended a graduate seminar of prof. Barsalou's, where I also enjoyed getting to know many graduate students. I also participated in three different research group meetings, and I attended numerous excellent talks of a very diverse set of speakers. Moreover, I was invited to give a departmental talk myself, and I felt truly welcomed in this and all other activities. Finally, I also thoroughly enjoyed the city of Atlanta, its beautiful surroundings, and the amazing weather, which even allowed us to hold a wonderful goodbye-lunch with 20 degrees and sunshine just before Christmas. I am very grateful to prof. Barsalou and the members of his lab and other members of the department for the very warm welcome, the great cooperation, and the inspiring discussions at all our meetings – and I would like to thank the EASP for their generosity in facilitating this very inspiring visit by offering me a postgraduate travel grant.

Papies, E. K., Barsalou, L. W., & Custers, R. (in press). Mindful attention prevents mindless impulses. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*.

Kristina Petkova
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
Regional Activity Grant

Thanks to the European Association of Social Psychology I received a Regional Activities Grant in September 2011. The grant supported a research project which I carried out together with Alexander Todorov (Princeton University, member of EASP) and Pepka Boyadjieva (Bulgarian Sociological Association). The aim of the project was to test the hypothesis that rapid, shallow inferences can predict important election outcomes.

Background

There has been a long tradition in political science and social psychology assuming that voting is related to rational choice (Kuklinski and Quirk 2000; Quattrone and Tversky 1988). A number of studies though have demonstrated a relationship between various forms of nonverbal visual cues and political preferences (Noller et al. 1988, Bucy 2000). It has also been shown that people form rapid impressions from facial appearance and these impressions shape social interactions. In the case of political choices, a number of studies have shown that impressions based solely on facial appearance predict election outcomes (for a review see Olivola & Todorov, 2010)

The study

In the present study we tested whether the results from the upcoming presidential elections in Bulgaria could be predicted by evaluating the facial appearance of the candidates through their photos. To rule out the possibility that participants were already acquainted with the faces of the candidates or that they had additional information about the candidates or the political climate before the elections we decided to collect evaluations of the candidates in the USA

The study was carried out in two stages. In the first stage the task was to define which attributes, according to Bulgarians, a President should have. To do this we asked 140 respondents from 7 regions in Bulgaria (differing in age, gender and education) to list which attributes they considered to be most important for a President. An attribute which was listed by more than 25 participants was defined as important

The attributes were honest (non corruptibility), ability to defend national interest, non partisanship, being educated (competence), dominance, likability, and presentability. Then in a representative survey, 1,040 respondents were asked to indicate on a 5-point scale how important this attribute was for the Bulgarian President to have. The factor analysis which was carried out reduced the attributes to 4 attributes – honest, competence, liability, and dominance

In the second stage the study was moved to the USA. Participants in the experiment were 184 Americans (average age 38,4, 56% male) who volunteered to take part in an online survey. They were shown black and white pictures (no names) of all 18 Bulgarian presidential candidates. Participants were informed that these were people who were running for a political position. Bulgaria was not mentioned at all. They were asked to judge each face on one of the four 4 attributes – how honest does the person on the picture look; how competent, etc. Participants were also asked to answer one additional question: Would you vote for this person? All answers were given on a 7-point scale from extremely likable to not at all likable, from completely sure I will vote for this person – to completely sure I will not vote. To avoid any bias different groups of respondents judged different attributes. The pictures of the candidates were presented in a random order.

To reveal the probability that each candidate would be elected if voters based their choices on the attributes they consider important, as evaluated by facial appearance, we carried out regression analysis. The results obtained were published online in the newspaper Dnevnik (www.dnevnik.bg) on 21 October 2011 - 2 days before the elections. They coincided with the results from the real elections in Bulgaria. Please check the English translation of the newspaper article on our website:

http://www.easp.eu/activities/own/Dnevnik_2011.doc

References

- Bucy, E. P. (2000). Emotional and evaluative consequences of inappropriate leader displays. *Communication Research*, 27, 194–226
- Kuklinski, J. H., & Quirk, P. J. (2000). Reconsidering the rational public: Cognition, heuristics, and mass opinion. In A. Lupia, M. D. McCubbins, & S. L. Popkin (Eds.), *Elements of reason: Cognition, choice, and the bounds of rationality* (pp. 153–182). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Noller, P., Gallois, C., Hayes, A., & Bohle, P. (1988). Impressions of politicians: The effect of situation and communication channel. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 40, 267–280

Olivola, Ch. Y. and A. Todorov (2010). Elected in 100 milliseconds: Appearance Based Trait Inferences and Voting, *Journal of Nonverbal Behaviour* 34:83–110

Iris Schneider

University of Amsterdam

Travel grant

The EASP travel grant supported me to visit Prof. Dr. Strack and Dr. Topolinski at the University of Würzburg in Germany. Prof Dr. Strack has been a leader in the field of Social Psychology for many years and is an expert on a wide array of topics, including judgment and decision-making. He has also pioneered in research on the effect of body movement on judgment and decision-making. Dr. Topolinski is an expert on embodiment and judgment processes. The aim of my stay in Würzburg was to broaden my knowledge of embodiment research and to develop and execute a collaborative project to incorporate in my dissertation.

My research mainly focuses on ambivalence, or, to simultaneously hold negative and positive evaluations about an object or behavior. Recently we started to investigate how experiences of ambivalence are related to motor behavior. We explored this issue using the Mouse Tracker paradigm and the Wii balance board, respectively measuring arm and whole body movements. We found that people move their body more from side to side when they are ‘torn’ between two sides of an issue. Furthermore, we found that inducing side-to-side movements (or, wavering) increase experiences of ambivalence.

During my 3 months stay at the University of Würzburg, I developed two experiments under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Strack and Dr. Topolinski. The first experiment was designed as a follow-up on a set of previous studies demonstrating that ambivalence is accompanied by specific motor patterns when people reflect on an ambivalent issue. With this experiment we wanted to examine the boundaries of this previous effect by using a minimal instruction paradigm and video taping the participants unobtrusively. With the second experiment, we wanted to investigate more thoroughly how inducing ambivalent motor patterns affected thought content. Thus, the goal of the second experiment was to gain insight into the processes driving the established relation between ambivalence and body movement. Although both experiments relied heavily on laborious manual coding, and only preliminary analyses are available as of yet, the results of both studies are encouraging.

I experienced my stay at the University of Würzburg as extremely valuable. I have benefited a great deal from Prof. Dr. Strack’s vast knowledge, both theoretical and methodological. Both him and Dr. Topolinski were very involved in our joint project. Dr. Topolinski proved to be a motivating and intellectually inspiring mentor. I am confident that my stay has also established grounds for further collaboration in the future. Additionally, I have learned a lot from the members of the department who helped me in

developing my ideas and executing them. The weekly lab meetings were very stimulating and the atmosphere at the department is both encouraging and critical.

I am very grateful for my time at the University of Würzburg, and would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Strack, Dr. Topolinski and the Würzburg lab for their hospitality, time and care. Furthermore, I wish to thank the European Association of Social Psychology for enabling my visit and Sibylle Classen in particular for her assistance.

Ruth van Veelen

(University of Groningen, The Netherlands)

Travel Grant

Thanks to the EASP travel grant, I had the opportunity to visit Prof. Mara Cadinu and Anne Maass at Padova University in Italy, two renowned scholars in the field of social cognition and intergroup relations. I visited Padova University for two months in January and February 2012. For me it was wonderful and inspiring to experience a different research climate and profit from the expertise from scholars at Padova University. It has certainly broadened the perspective on my own research in social identification processes, as well as its relatedness to other fields of research.

In my Ph.D project I focus on a cognitive framework for how people identify with groups. In general, perceived mental overlap between the self-concept and the group-concept is a necessary precondition for social identification. Traditionally, *self-stereotyping*, or the assimilation to group prototypes is seen as the core cognitive route to social identification (Turner, Hogg, Oaks, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). However we were recently able to show that, *self-anchoring*, or projection of personal traits onto the group (Cadinu & Rothbart, 1996) is also a distinct and unique cognitive process underlying social identification (Van Veelen, Otten, & Hansen, 2011). Based on this finding we aim to specify the conditions under which either self-stereotyping or self-anchoring is most successful in predicting social identification. Thus far, we've investigated this in relation to individual differences, group clarity and diversity issues (minority or majority status within groups).

In the summer of 2011, my two PhD advisors, Sabine Otten and Nina Hansen and I met Mara Cadinu and Anne Maass at the European Association of Social Psychology conference in Stockholm. We shared our mutual interests in cognitive projection processes and social identification. It turned out our research aims are closely related as we all seek to integrate self-stereotyping and self-anchoring into one research paradigm to investigate its impact on group processes. This is quite exciting considering that thus far self-anchoring and self-stereotyping have been mostly investigated in separate lines of research. Scholars in both fields have been concerned to show that the one process is more relevant than the other. We developed the idea of writing a review article together on this particular topic, in which we review self-anchoring and self-stereotyping literature, its measurement, its past application in separate fields, and most importantly its integrative potential in the future.

And so I went to Padova in January 2012. We combined our most recent work and started writing and organizing the review article together. The meetings were inspiring and

dynamic. Mara Cadinu taught me a lot about different methodological approaches to measuring self-anchoring and self-stereotyping, and its consequences for conceptual interpretation. The philosophical discussions with her have surely triggered me to critically evaluate my own approach to measurement and interpretation. From Anne Maass I learned a lot about structuring and argumentation when writing a review article. She challenged me to look at my own research from a distance, focusing on its meaning and relatedness to other research fields.

I was also given the opportunity to present my work in the Specola (i.e, labmeeting). It was wonderful to meet the whole research group. My research will surely benefit from their insightful feedback.

Aside from thanking EASP, I would like to thank Mara Cadinu and Anne Maass for taking me in so warm-heartedly in Padova. Our collaboration has been wonderful and plans are already in the making for my return to Padova to prolong working together. Also, I would like to thank Marcella Latrofa and Jeroen Vaes for the nice and insightful conversations, while enjoying delicious Italian lunches, espresso's and Spritz! Also, I would like to thank Anne Maas for inviting me for a Venetian dinner; it was truly an exquisite evening. One of the main aims of my travel was to gain broader research experience and to develop myself as a researcher. This is definitely what this visit provided for me. I am truly grateful for this experience.

News from the Executive Committee

Improving European funding for social psychology

The Executive Committee has been involved in two types of lobbying efforts to improve the prospects for European funding for social psychology: to influence European policy for regarding the social sciences and humanities in the next European framework (which will be called Horizon 2020), and to increase the representation of social psychologists in evaluation panels for European grants.

The European Commission is currently developing what will become the funding priorities between 2014-2020. The working papers that have been released around one year ago made it clear that funding for the social sciences and humanities would be very much reduced. On the one hand, the 5 themes prioritized (designated as 'challenges') centre around other disciplines, and on the other hand funding for basic research (through ERC) and for early career training (through Marie Curie grants) was expected to substantially decrease. European research policy has implications not only for the funding that our discipline might be able to attract from European sources, but also for funding at the national level, given that national funding agencies often align their priorities to European ones. This has led several associations, consortia, and other groupings to react and eventually to unite in an alliance that has now been created: the European Alliance for the Social Sciences and Humanities (EASSH) to which the EASP now belongs. We have now taken part in two meetings of this Alliance, the meeting in which it was launched, last December, in Amsterdam, and more recently, in March, in Brussels. This alliance has been very active both in developing itself and its structure, and in engaging in several lobbying efforts, which have already resulted in the addition of a 6th challenge (theme) which has the social sciences and humanities at its very centre: a challenge currently termed 'Inclusive, innovative, and secure societies'. Our efforts are now to secure a specific budget for this 6th challenge, as well as to ensure that mechanisms are developed to ensure that the social sciences and humanities are involved in the remaining themes.

This effort also has a positive collateral effect: that of making social psychology more visible to other disciplines. The meetings that I have attended, representing the EASP, have made it very clear that our colleagues in the social sciences and humanities are very unaware of what we do. As future funding will very much rely on interdisciplinary work, it is fundamental that our discipline becomes more visible. This is also important because social psychologists are very poorly represented in evaluation panels for European funding. This obviously means that our proposals are mostly evaluated by other social scientists who do not really know our discipline or understand what we do. The result is that even the very best within our discipline are having great difficulty attracting European funding, such as ERC grants. Therefore, besides making our discipline and its relevance more visible to other social scientists, what must be done is clearly to increase our representation in the relevant evaluation panels. We are working on that as well.

The Executive Committee is discussing various steps that could be taken to address these issues. Any ideas members might wish to share will be most welcome: feel free to send them either to Sibylle Classen (sibylle@easp.eu), directly to me (m.barreto@exeter.ac.uk), or to Fabrizio Butera (Fabrizio.Butera@unil.ch). But above all, it would seem that the

most important thing that each of us can do is to act as a representative of social psychology whenever asked to be involved in evaluation panels, to review grants, or to engage with other disciplines in any way. Only then can we contribute to the visibility of our discipline, to increased interest and respect for the work we do, and ultimately to more funding for our activities.

Manuela Barreto

Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Executive Officer by **September, 15th, 2012** latest. Applications for grants and for the International Teaching Fellowship Scheme can be received by the deadlines end of March, June, September, and December. The deadline for the next issue of the Bulletin is **September, 15th, 2012**.

The next Executive Committee Meeting will take place in October 2012.

Executive Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Executive Officer:

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

website of the EASP:

<http://www.easp.eu>