
1	Editorial
2	President's Corner
6	Conversation with Gün Semin by Xenia Chryssochoou
22	New Publications by Members <i>Handbook of Implicit Social Cognition: Measurement, Theory, and Applications</i> by B. Gawronski & B.K. Payne (eds.) <i>The Psychology of Attitudes and Attitude Change</i> by G. Maio & G. Haddock
26	Future EASP Meetings – Calendar
27	Future EASP Meetings 16 th EASP General Meeting, July 12-16, 2011, Stockholm, Sweden Small Group Meeting on Debating Honor in the Context of Group and Gender Relations, the Self, and Aggression, August 20-23, 2010, Barcelona, Spain
31	Reports of Previous Meetings SPSSI-EASP Joint Meeting on Uncertainty and Extremism, November 16-19, 2009, Los Angeles, USA
36	Report from the SASP summer school 2010, Moreton Bay Research Station, Australia, February 5-10, 2010

43	News about Members In Memoriam: Stefan Hormuth In Memoriam: Caryl Rusbult New Members of the Association
55	Grants and Grant Reports
65	Announcements 2012 EASP Summer School: in search of a location Jos Jaspars Awards – Call for Applications Kurt Lewin Awards – Call for Nominations
68	Deadlines for Contributions
69	Executive Committee

Editorial

Dear Friends and Colleagues,

A new issue of the European Bulletin is now ready! Inside these pages you will find information concerning the activities of our Association: what books were recently published, new exciting deadlines for small group meetings, important information about our next General Meeting in Stockholm, reports regarding past meetings and grants. Carsten is also discussing important issues about the publications of the Association in the President's corner.

The Bulletin is your corner and we are happy to publish information about the activities of EASP members. This information relies on what we receive from you so please take this opportunity to tell us about your work. Among other things, we would be more than happy to publish reviews of books published by members of our Association, so when you read such a book drop a few lines for the next bulletin!

I will like also to draw your attention to the conversation I had with Gün Semin, Past President of our Association. I enjoy doing these conversations and I find that they raise so many questions about the EASP and social psychology. I am sure that you will enjoy this one too. In the next Bulletin we will publish a third interview I had with Claude Flament. I am interviewing past presidents when I get an opportunity so if you are one you will receive my invitation.

Regretfully, we report the loss of two colleagues - Stefan Hormuth and Caryl Rusbult. The thoughts of all of us are with their family friends and colleagues.

Finally, I would like as the organizer of the summer school to thank all of you who encouraged your students to apply for the EASP

summer school in Aegina this summer. We received almost three times the number of applications and we were obliged to slightly increase the places we were able to offer. We were impressed by the quality of applications. This gives all of us hope about the future of the discipline! It took us longer than expected to decide because of the number of good applications and I would like to assure everybody that all applications were fully considered. Our decision was multi-factorial and I really regret that we were not able to accommodate a number of excellent candidates. I know the disappointment that this decision creates. The quality of the applicants makes me confident that they will get other opportunities to further their knowledge and to meet their peers. We organizers, teachers and the committee, are doing all we can to make the summer school a memorable event. You can check the website of the summer school (<http://summerschool2010easp.pblogs.gr/>) for news and developments. I am looking forward to welcome those selected in Greece this August.

Enjoy your reading,

*Xenia Chryssochoou
Athens, April 2010*

President's Corner

Crossing Borders

With EASP becoming an increasingly international enterprise, we are increasingly affected by events that stretch way beyond the European borders, of those involving social psychology. Income we obtain for our journals depends on fluctuations in exchange rates, and economics influences social psychology in a quite unexpected manner – although a relatively strong Dollar is not to our disadvantage in this particular instance. And to meet we cannot have Volcanoes getting overly excited – our last Executive Meeting in Spain had to be cancelled, and many of the EC members found themselves stuck on airports, or trying to get back home by train, boat, or rental cars.

Notwithstanding these unexpected events, we were able to get some business done. For starters, there is good news on the publication front. The *European Review of Social Psychology*, edited by Wolfgang Stroebe and Miles Hewstone and published by Psychology Press, will soon be listed in the ISI Web of Science. It not only reflects back on the achievements of these editors, who have been consistently producing an annual volume containing a broad range of rigorous reviews and conceptual work. It will also positively influence the visibility of the work published in *ERSP* and, no doubt, the related research articles that appear in the *European Journal of Social Psychology*. As to the latter, the editorial team of *EJSP* led by Anne Maass and Russell Spears is now well in its second year and their energy and vision starts to show. The time-lag between a paper's acceptance and publication in the journal is steadily decreasing, the first "Fast Track Reports" have been published, and ground-breaking Special Issues are in the

making. Finally, about one year ago, *Social Psychological and Personality Science* opened its on-line submission portal. Two issues have been published already, and these contain the best papers from over 400 submissions to date. The average turn-around from submission to editorial feedback is below 40 days. Libraries are purchasing the Journal, over 6,000 researchers in social and personality psychology have electronic access, and media coverage is beyond expectations. It is fair to say that *SPPS* is a great success already, and promising a lot. Next to *ERSP* and *EJPS*, *SPPS* provides another top-level platform for social psychological research to be communicated. We owe a big Thanks to Wolfgang Stroebe, Miles Hewstone, Anne Maass, Russell Spears, and Vincent Yzerbyt and their editorial teams, as well as to the various publishers of our journals, for their efforts and for working with us in such a constructive manner. Last but not least, we thank all those members for submitting their work and turning in their constructively critical reviews in a timely fashion - without it, social psychological science would be nowhere and our journals would be not be as prosperous as they are right now.

Now publications are the end-result of getting inspired, turning ideas into studies, meeting with colleagues to discuss and improve inferences, et cetera. EASP seeks to facilitate these processes with seed corn grants, travel grants, meeting grants and, above all, by organizing the General Meetings. Manuela Barreto kindly accepted our invitation to be the Program Chair for the upcoming General Meeting in Stockholm, and she is already taking the first important steps to make our scientific program broad, interesting, stimulating and something you don't want to miss. She will need your help and inputs, mostly in the form of your very best research to be included in the program. Spread the word, and start writing! Also related to the General Meeting is the Call for nominations for both the Jaspars Awards and the Kurt Lewin Awards published elsewhere in this *Bulletin*. The awards intend to showcase and celebrate the achievements of some of our finest scientists, and we need you to

nominate those you believe deserve such distinction. Again, spread the word, and write to us!

*Carsten K.W. de Dreu
Utrecht, April 2010*

**Conversation with Gün Semin
(Executive Committee Member 1987-1990
and President 1990-1993)
by Xenia Chrysochoou**

XC: *Thank you for accepting to see me for this conversation. Let's start by how you became involved with the European Association*

GS: I joined the association in 1972.

XC: *Where have you been at that time?*

GS: At Sussex. I had just moved to Sussex from the London School of Economics . My first encounter with the European Association was a meeting at Leuven, organized by Jeff Nuttin. At that point in time, the entire meeting consisted of approximately fifty people, so it was a really small group. I was about to finish my thesis at the time and I shall never forget my presentation on that occasion, I was really tense... and remember Henri Tajfel being extremely supportive and positive. It was an entirely different experience from going to the Association's meetings these days because it was really small and I suppose you could say extremely 'luxurious', it was a terrific 3-4 day meeting ... So this is how I joined the Association; and later on I was the co-organizer of the triennial meeting of the Association at Sussex University in 1981. It was much later, at the Varna meeting in Bulgaria, that I joined the Executive Committee, and at the next round in 1990, I became the President of the Association.

XC: *In Budapest*

GS: Yes... One of the important issues at the time when I was at the Executive committee and during my second half as a President, was trying to facilitate the East-West relations, with medium size group meetings, facilitating support for libraries, etc. The first part of my tenure, with Gerold Mikula as President, where I was responsible for the extensive negotiations with Wiley yielded a substantial increase in the profits of the association.

XC: *What do you think about the Association now, how do you think the Association is doing now?*

GS: Well, I think the major change is reflected in the change of the name. Early on the Association was established to strengthen Social Psychology in Europe. It was an initiative to profile European research and internationalization. This was the early focus. But it has changed. In a sense, one could even say that it is potentially misleading to use the label *European*. It is an association of *Social Psychology* and is international. The current output of social psychology emerging from Europe is basically a contribution to science and science does not recognize geographic boundaries. If people subscribe to the scientific endeavor then this does not mean science with a European identity. It constitutes membership in a scientific community.

I think that the premises prevailing during the constitution of the Association have changed. This is *partially* due to the fact that, in my view, social psychology has become a highly respected scientific domain in Europe, and by and large, it is strongly supported, and funded. While this may not be true across Europe, overall social psychology has established itself as a significant discipline.

These two things go hand in hand. Once a scholarly domain becomes a respected member of the scientific community then

looking for encouragement and support from the ingroup loses its significance. In fact, I think it would be a clever move to go for a more encompassing title for the association: *Association of Social Psychology*. And that would actually put this group into a position where it signals the fact that science does not have any boundaries, geographically, or otherwise. So in terms of the European Association it may be helpful to take one more step and drop the geographical boundary. Of course, I realize that such a suggestion is utopian - change is always very difficult.

XC: *So why we dropped the "experimental" and not the "European" in the name?*

GS: I think this has already been answered. The 'experimental' was important at the beginnings of the Association to establish, to distinguish a group from a much more eclectic, descriptive, narrative social psychology, which also existed. In that sense, it was really functional to enhance social psychology as a discipline. Of course scholarly work is not only experimental work. If you have arguments that are logically well designed then one can make a number of very interesting observations and derive unambiguous conclusions. There are a number of ways in doing science, scholarly and disciplined work. And of course a lot of our members are not only experimentally working social psychologists.

XC: *Yes, nowadays there are over 1000 people attending the meetings which changed from the days of the 50 people who knew each other well...But I think, I recently read the book by Moscovici and Markova on the history of social psychology, and one of the things I didn't know and was interesting to see was this idea of a transnational committee that tried to establish social psychology and they did a lot of work in both sides of the Atlantic and they did a lot of work in Latin America as well to try to build associations in the same way the EAESP was built at the beginning for European Social Psychology. So the idea of the science without boundaries*

was there from the beginning. And at the beginning there were discussions, maybe in 1972 when you joined there were still these discussions...

GS: Yes, probably behind the scenes, yes.

XC: *Discussions about comparative work and about experimental work. In their book they mentioned that Festinger and Lanzetta, that launched the idea of the association, Festinger was interested to see whether we can find the same findings in other places and do comparative work and there was a lot of debate on this issue... And I am asking this question because you work on language and you have a stance on this... because language is quite different in each country... What do you think? Is this still a debate that we should ask ourselves or did you manage to give an answer?*

GS: This is not about the Association.

XC: *Well yes it is about social psychology, of course we can go back to the association..*

GS: No, No. Let me give you some examples to sketch what I am going to say with some cautionary remarks. I think that comparative work is important. And let me give you one example that you probably know. There was work by Chatterjee and colleagues who showed that people to depict simple sentences like “John gives the ball to David” or “Mary pushes Joey” by drawing John or Mary on the left hand side thus representing the simple sentence as action flowing from left to right. The assumption was these findings represented some spatial primitives and were due to the functional properties of left-hemisphere processing. While this is interesting, Anne Maass and Aurore Russo, in 2003, showed that these findings were largely due to writing direction with Arabic writing participants showing a reverse depiction of the very same sentences. This is why a comparative or cultural perspective is very

important - say specific cultural habits influence the way we represent the world and obviously the way we understand it. Thus, while writing direction is an influential habit, so too are the habitual ways in which we use language and these also influence in the way we think.

However, doing research from a cultural perspective is not without its pitfalls. Culture is a very broad concept and if you take a look at or do research comparing culture @ and culture § then you rapidly realize the problems. A common one is ascertaining the equivalence of instructions, and stimulus materials. Another obvious one is how one guarantees comparability between samples - in other words, there are so many different things that vary between samples coming from two different cultures that it is impossible to know precisely what the contributory factor is to the difference one has observed. Identifying some mediating variables and showing their differential role across the two samples would be a start but even this is very difficult. There are potentially interesting non-obtrusive strategies that one can use as for instance in some recent research by Anne Maass and her colleagues who show differences in predicate use by Italian and Japanese participants when they represent a social event. This gives you some insights into how people construe social reality as a function of their cultural habits. Earlier, we did some similar work comparing a Dutch and a Hindustani Surinamese population by asking them to list in their native language as many emotion terms as they could think of. You find differences in the predicates that they use – for instance the Dutch mention more nouns and adjectives for emotions than the Hindustani Surinamese who tend to list more verbs. This difference is indicative since the function of verbs is to glue a subject with an object – thus reflecting a relationship. In contrast, nouns and adjectives describe an isolated individual (e.g., as “I am happy, sad”, etc.). So, one finds systematic differences in predicate use patterns depending on whether a culture is independent or interdependent.

Once you find this, you can ask, "OK, so what does this mean"? And then you can take such differences out of the comparative context and put them in the laboratory where you can conduct research with experimental control and with participants from the same culture. This way you avoid the pitfalls that potentially beset comparative research. Let's say that you prime people with verbs or with adjectives, and then you take a look at how this influences their perceptual processes. Are there differences in how their attention is directed to different features of objects, for instance? This is precisely what Diederik Stapel and I have done recently. You do find differences in what people attend to depending on whether they are primed with verbs or adjectives. But what you now have is a single linguistic community, which means that you are controlling a lot of the variables that are potential sources of error in cultural research; you manipulate the availability of one language category (predicate) or another by priming them differently, and then you ask if this affects perceptual processes and show that predicate type does make a difference – *within a culture* - depending on which language category is used as a prime. Now you can go back to the different cultures where these differences have been demonstrated and assume that the habitual use of one language category over another also means that different perceptual processes are in operation.

XC: *the other question is how we can advance a science that builds on and that does not stay within...*

GS: Cumulative Science...?

XC: *yes*

GS: that often happens slowly but surely. We have to have a movement towards a more systemic psychology, which involves the dissolution of boundaries in science: Personality, physiological, cognitive, etc. (within psychology) the borders are being crossed

slowly and intellectual mergers are taking place more strongly in some areas than others. So you have social neurosciences and social psychology in an emerging engagement, that's an example of an integrative intellectual movement. However, integrative movements are not only specific to psychology. There is an emerging systemic medicine, there is developmental bio-mathematics, which is an amazingly fascinating integrative approach between life sciences in general and mathematics and physics. And in some way this may be taking place in psychology, but not necessarily driven by an explicitly stated movement. Nevertheless, the seeds are there.

XC: *When you say "a movement" do you think that in other places some people took the initiative to do it on purpose?*

GS: I think it is more the Zeitgeist. I mean it is probably done in different areas, different times and something like what I was talking about earlier on. One thing that is very problematic in psychology particularly, it is a lack on cumulativeness in science. I think our research memory dates back to 15-20 years max.; anything beyond that is forgotten. And this is partially due to the organization of scientific institutions. You have editors of journals, who are young, productive, professional, and dynamic persons with a specific scientific socialization and a particular historical angle on what psychology is. Obviously, knowing the history from the textbook versus knowing the history as an integral part of the cumulative knowledge gives rise to different assumptions about what cumulative science is. In a sense... there are specific trends in journal publishing today that contribute to this trend as well. Certain journal policies can constitute a potential barrier to cumulative integrative science. For instance, if you have a short paper section or are completely devoted to short papers then by definition there are limits to how much you can elaborate upon as an author. For instance, if you have something that is conceptually completely novel then short articles cannot be the medium to pass

this on because it takes more than ten pages to say “look this is a entirely different angle” – assuming that the top journals in the field are open to innovative research. Similarly, if you want to draw out the continuity of different intellectual traditions and introduce an integrative perspective on a particular phenomenon then a short article journal is not the right outlet. So you go to a different journal which usually means a longer waiting period, etc. What you have -in a sense- if you want to advance knowledge is that you have to make strategic choices and target different types of outlets, except that now the short, rapid journals, ‘Science’ type journal imitation outlets, are very prominent. This is largely due to publication pressure but also a consequence of trying to secure a position or get promotion. So, specific types of journal policies have a whole set of advantages but also detriment aspects. The detrimental side is that it does not necessarily promote integrative developments and, to some extent, it also hampers cumulativeness. Obviously, these problems are not merely problems arising from journal policy, or editorial choices. The study of human functioning itself is currently largely fragmented and that does not help.

XC: *I've seen that when I was in Britain and I can still see that now, that the pressures to publish make you publish two or three experiments and then you make another ten but you do not wait till you can give a rounder picture of what you are doing.*

GS: Yes, that's a general problem. It is not a matter of longer or shorter articles. We do not want to, or we are not able to close a subject. Perhaps closing a subject or understanding a phenomenon conclusively is difficult given current tenure and publication policies, or intrinsically impossible.

XC: *Well, you see, in my opinion, it is much more complex than that. When you publish three, somebody else takes these and does another three and cites you so citation is important in academia. So*

if you close the subject yourself and wait till you finish you will be probably cited after that from people doing something else.

GS: You are right, so if research introduces closure and leads to a new vision - then you will be cited again. This has different citation implications: one is for unfinished work, which somebody else continues to improve, eventually you might have a debate, critical experiments, etc. The other one is: your contribution constitutes “The End” and this feeds into something else and that closure is very important for the next one and the next one. So you have cumulativeness.

The problem that we have is what Walter Mischel aptly noted in an article to the APS Observer: theories in psychology are like toothbrushes. Nobody wants to use somebody else's toothbrush so everybody has his or her own. I think this is a very appropriate metaphor that captures the current spirit of profiling one's self and the consequent attachment we have to our own little toothbrushes.

XC: *Moscovici in one of his books says that academics are like foxes or hedgehogs. They are foxes when they are trying to find something and once they have found something they become hedgehogs and they close and they don't want to be attacked in their theory...*

GS: Nice analogy...

XC: *Maybe it is the model of natural sciences, the idea that perhaps they need to be fast in publishing because developments are so fast in this area like for example medical research, and so they need to publish very quickly and we took this model as well...*

GS: Well, I am not sure, if the model is driven by the nature of the science, or by the high impact of the journal “Science”, because “Psychological Science” was modeled on the journal “Science”, and

it is very successful, too successful. And the difference I think, certainly in Physical Science is that, for instance, you have more cohesive and integrative paradigms. And you have an agreement that specific questions are the most important ones which are disseminated very rapidly because the large majority of scientists who share the urgency of specific answers to shared questions – for instance in physics... Certainly in medicine, I mean, in medicine there is a very different pattern, when you have a problem like AIDS then you disseminate what you find, to allow others to continue, so you literally build upon each other's work, and there is an entirely different pattern of citation and impact.

XC: *this is what I find more cumulative than in our area of research.*

GS: You want to and have to find solutions to urgent problems in this case... and in some fields urgent problems cannot be solved by opening your little local lab in the basement with a couple of computers...

XC: *MRIs and things like that...*

GS: That is partly what goes on. In the case of a number of disciplines urgent problems require urgent investments that are consensually driven, like a large scale particle accelerator, or fMRI -

XC: *What do you think social psychology is doing right now? Can it contribute to societal issues or questions that societies ask? From my own experience I see that many times when there is a problem they ask sociologists they ask other scientists, there is hardly ever a social psychologist on television...*

GS: Is this the case in Greece?

XC: *Not only in Greece, it was at least the case in the UK, now it is changing.*

GS: Well, my impression is that in the UK academics do not enjoy a particularly high status. It is an unusual place. I think in France is very different.

XC: *Well I think in France, sociologists and philosophers are much more prominent...*

GS: but also people like Serge Moscovici have been very influential. I think France has a different tradition of societal dialogue than is the case in the UK. In the Netherlands, for instance, one of the recent major funding initiatives by the Dutch Science Foundation has gone to a social psychological field with substantial applied relevance, namely about conflict and negotiation, with colleagues like Carsten de Dreu and Naomi Ellemers as major contributors, well as others. It appears to me that the Netherlands is a very permeable society, people are much more open to listen, to use, exploit knowledge ... and that makes a lot of sense.

XC: *I think that is an important message for students, as well, because they often ask "what can I do after with what I learned at university" and actually you can do much more than you think in terms of career, because this knowledge has also transferable skills...*

Speaking about work, let's talk about your own work. I am interested to see how people come to work on a specific area, for a long time you work on language and now you moved on to work on something else, so I would like to hear you talking about your work . How you came to work on language and why you changed...

GS: Well, there is a sense of continuity in the work I have been doing. My PhD was on group decision-making and risk-taking and I felt dissatisfied with the area because I never I was able to define what a group was. I did not come across any definition that was satisfactory. So we are talking about something that it is supposed to be glued together in some form or another.

While conducting my research in this area I became increasingly aware that the material I was using, the way the decision items were worded shaped the direction that the decisions took. At the time, I thought about it in terms of the then current research context, namely the social psychology of psychological experiments, which was concerned with artifacts, demand characteristics, volunteer subject effects, experimenter effects and so on. In a more systematic examination of the decision items I realized that if I changed a single word then I could change the direction of the group discussion and decision. It did not matter if it was a group, or individuals being asked to write arguments on the basis of the items – the meaning of critical words in an item, namely words that were relevant to risk taking or being cautious shaped the direction of the post decision or post argument generation decisions. So, it turned out to be the case that what was driving the “phenomenon” was nothing specific about the dynamics of group processes, this non-definable entity, but something to do with semantics. That actually focused me increasingly on semantic specification.

Pursuing this line of thinking in an entirely different domain about supposed memory driven biases regarding co-occurrence inferences, I published an article in 1985 in JPSP with Liam Greenslade where we made a distinction between abstract and concrete predicates and their differential susceptibility to semantic inferences, showing that while abstract predicates contributed to inferences via semantic associations, concrete predicates did not. It was shortly after this research was published that Klaus Fiedler and I got

together and we went beyond that by developing a taxonomy of interpersonal predicates. This model provided a powerful handle in the investigation of how people use interpersonal language strategically with the remarkable work that Anne Maass initiated on the ‘linguistic intergroup bias’.

The paper that Klaus and I published was very unusual at its time, because people were still concerned about cognitive processes between the ears rather than outside. And, here we were, arguing that language has cognitive properties.

I am now interested in the nature of embodiment – but that is in fact a pursuit that is a continuation of my earlier interests. The question is “are categories or concepts grounded by sensorimotor experiences?” This is not a novel question. Actually the origins of this concern are not recent but quite old. However, the current surge of interest is new. So, some of the questions I pursue here with my lab group are: do linguistic representations of emotional expressions somatically grounded? We find that when people read the word smile, for instance, that they activate the smile muscles, however imperceptibly, or when then read the word ‘frown’, they actually do frown. This is amazing, because it suggests – at least for some words – that the linguistic representation – assumed to be generally purely symbolic and amodal – is actually accompanied with a simulation of the physical state that is involved.

XC: *I think it is fascinating, because listening to you talking about this and I have to say that I am not familiar with this research, I could not avoid thinking how many connections there are with other traditions, for example when you talked about metaphors, I thought that in social representations tradition there is a key concept of objectification of these abstract terms like morality, freedom... The key issue is how we construct concepts that we all understand “what love is” without really being able to touch them. And I did, let’s say, a teaching experiment: I asked to a student to*

go out and when she came back I told her that all others in the room are extra-terrestrials and they will ask you to explain to them what is "love". So they will ask questions and you will have to try to explain assuming that they don't know anything. That was a fascinating experience. At some point she could not explain to them because they were pushing her and she said "it is when you have butterflies in your stomach"...

GS: This is an interesting illustration, and something that is related to the metaphor of affection that is grounded in sensorimotor experiences – funny that you should raise this because it is on something we published this year. The metaphor suggests that *affection is warmth*. This is something that other people have done as well but we have extended this somewhat in our studies. Imagine the following: I give you a cup to hold and it is either a hot chocolate or an iced tea. And then I ask you to judge a person on a number of adjective dimensions. If it is a warm cup you judge that person as friendly, warm etc. etc. If however you were in the cold cup condition, then you judge that person as cold, distant etc. etc. The same pattern of results emerge when you manipulate room temperature etc. So in a sense primary multimodal experiences in early childhood, but also those experienced in intimate relationships ground this abstract concept of affection. Proximity involves bodily contact, warmth, affection, etc. And that is similar to the example that you have given with the student's demonstration. That is precisely what the student is telling us. Concrete concepts are different from abstract concepts. So obviously, with different types of combinations you get more complex things. "Love is a journey" is another metaphor. And that tells you more about evolving aspects of change and all that. So you use these physical references. And there are some beautiful studies on time which show that that an abstract concept like that you cannot see, touch or feel is grounded spatially, for instance on a horizontal line from left to right – at least in Western cultures.

XC: *I think that... I think that speaking about time it is grounded ideologically in our society. For example the ability to see yourself in the future and to organize yourself is a kind of habitus for people and of course it can be learned but some people learn it because of their family experiences and position and others don't.*

GS: Well that is one of the consequences and distinctive features of language – a capacity that other species probably don't have. You can use language to project yourself to the past or the future. You can simulate. So you can detach yourself from "here and now". Our linguistic faculty gives us the possibility of temporally displacing yourself. For example we can talk about the next meeting of the Association, at a different time, location, and set of different people.

XC: *Hopefully with some affection...! As far as I am concerned I have asked the questions I wanted and I think that it will be an interesting reading! Rounding it up if you want to add something...*

GS: I would like to say that the European Association is a fantastic organization because it manages to bring Turks and Greeks to speak together!

XC: *I have to say that I've tried to learn Turkish but I found it extremely difficult.*

GS: Is that so?

XC: *It is true that I haven't put much effort, I have to try more at some point.*

GS: I'll tell you one thing and this is not chauvinistic. Turkish language has certain unusual features – for instance there are no exceptions to the rules, which means that children learn to speak proficiently faster, or another important facet is that gender is not

marked in Turkish, which gives rise to a whole host of interesting implications.

XC: *and there are no auxiliary verbs like “I am”, “I do”... and for somebody who perceives a language from the perspective of auxiliary verbs this is completely different and difficult. For example as we all learn English now the easy thing is to use the verb “to do” to do everything actually. And if you are facing a language where this is not possible... and also what I found very difficult is that you have to change the end of a word according to other vowels in the word...*

GS: yes. One of the things that appears not to exist in most if not all languages is a suffix “mis” actually “miş” (pronounced: mish), so let’s say that you are talking about the 1972 association meeting in Berlin that you heard from me but you didn’t experience you will use the “miş” form. So anything that you didn’t experience you immediately signal it and this is automatic. So when you are talking, I immediately know whether you show it or not. It does not exist in any other language. It actually gives you a truth value automatically. If there is “miş” it is hear-say and it can be right or wrong; if it is not then OK.

XC: *I will try to learn Turkish again! Anyway, Teşekkür ederim! I still remember to say “thank you” in Turkish!*

Amsterdam, September 2009

New Publications by Members

Handbook of Implicit Social Cognition: Measurement, Theory, and Applications

Bertram Gawronski & B. Keith Payne (eds.)

New York: Guilford Press

ISBN 978-1-60623-673-4, US-\$ 85, 626 pages

<http://www.guilford.com/pr/gawronski.htm>

Virtually every question in social psychology is currently being shaped by the concepts and methods of implicit social cognition. This tightly edited volume provides the first comprehensive overview of the field. Foremost authorities synthesize the latest findings on how automatic, implicit, and unconscious cognitive processes influence social judgments and behavior. Cutting-edge theories and data are presented in such crucial areas as attitudes, prejudice and stereotyping, self-esteem, self-concepts, close relationships, and morality. Describing state-of-the-art measurement procedures and research designs, the book discusses promising applications in clinical, forensic, and other real-world contexts. Each chapter both sums up what is known and identifies key directions for future research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: 1. A History of Implicit Social Cognition: Where Is It Coming From? Where Is It Now? Where Is It Going?, *B. Keith Payne & Bertram Gawronski*

I. BASICS: 2. In Search of a Measure That Qualifies as Implicit: Recommendations Based on a Decompositional View of Automaticity, *Agnes Moors, Adriaan Spruyt, & Jan De Houwer*; 3. Models of Implicit and Explicit Mental Representation, *Don Carlston*; 4. Building Blocks of Social Behavior: Reflective and

Impulsive Processes, *Roland Deutsch & Fritz Strack*; 5. Implicit Social Cognition: Insights from Social Neuroscience, *Tiffany A. Ito*

II. METHODS AND PROCEDURES: 6. A Practical Guide to Sequential Priming and Related Tasks, *Dirk Wentura & Juliane Degner*; 7. A Practical Guide to Implicit Association Tests and Related Tasks, *Sarah Teige-Mocigemba, Karl Christoph Klauer, & Jeffrey W. Sherman*; 8. A Practical Guide to Paper-and-Pencil Implicit Measures of Attitudes, *Denise Sekaquaptewa, Patrick Vargas, & William von Hippel*; 9. Mathematical Modeling of Implicit Social Cognition: The Machine in the Ghost, *Jeffrey W. Sherman, Karl Christoph Klauer, & Thomas J. Allen*; 10. Implicit Measures: Similarities and Differences, *Jan De Houwer & Agnes Moors*

III. CROSS-CUTTING PERSPECTIVES: 11. Consciousness, Introspection, and the Adaptive Unconscious, *Wilhelm Hofmann & Timothy D. Wilson*; 12. Formation, Change, and Contextualization of Mental Associations: Determinants and Principles of Variations in Implicit Measures, *Bertram Gawronski & Rajees Sritharan*; 13. The Development of Implicit Social Cognition, *Kristina R. Olson & Yarrow Dunham*; 14. Prediction of Behavior, *Marco Perugini, Juliette Richetin, & Cristina Zogmaister*; 15. Automatic Aspects of Judgment and Decision Making, *Galen Bodenhausen & Andrew R. Todd*; 16. Consistency and Inconsistency in Implicit Social Cognition: The Case of Implicit and Explicit Measures of Attitudes, *Robert J. Rydell & Allen R. McConnell*; 17. What is Implicit about Goal Pursuit?, *Melissa J. Ferguson & Shanette C. Porter*

IV. DOMAIN-SPECIFIC PERSPECTIVES: 18. Attitude Structure and Change: Implications for Implicit Measures, *Richard E. Petty & Pablo Briñol*; 19. Implicit Intergroup Bias: Cognitive, Affective, and Motivational Underpinnings, *David M. Amodio & Saaid A. Mendoza*; 20. Racial Bias and Stereotyping: Interpersonal Processes, *Sophie Trawalter & Jenessa R. Shapiro*; 21. Two Faces of Self-

Esteem: Implicit and Explicit Forms of Self-Esteem, *Virgil Zeigler-Hill & Christian H. Jordan*; 22. The Self-Concept: New Insights from Implicit Measurement Procedures, *Konrad Schnabel & Jens B. Asendorpf*; 23. Measuring Implicit Processes in Close Relationships, *Mark W. Baldwin, John E. Lydon, M. Joy McClure, & Sara Etchison*; 24. Divided Minds, Divided Morals: How Implicit Social Cognition Underpins and Undermines our Sense of Social Justice, *B. Keith Payne & C. Daryl Cameron*

V. APPLIED PERSPECTIVES: 25. Implicit Cognition in Health Psychology: Why Common Sense Goes Out the Window, *Reinout W. Wiers, Katrijn Houben, Anne Roefs, Peter de Jong, Wilhelm Hofmann, & Alan W. Stacy*; 26. Clinical Applications of Implicit Social Cognition Theories and Methods, *Bethany A. Teachman, Meghan W. Cody, & Elise M. Clerkin*; 27. Implicit Social Cognition in Forensic Settings, *Robert J. Snowden & Nicola S. Gray*; 28. Implicit Social Cognition and Indirect Measures in Consumer Behavior, *Andrew Perkins & Mark Forehand*; 29. Implicit Political Cognition, *Brian A. Nosek, Jesse Graham, & Carlee Beth Hawkins*

The Psychology of Attitudes and Attitude Change **Greg Maio & Geoffrey Haddock**

Extent: 288pp

Paper ISBN: 978-1-4129-2975-2, Cloth ISBN: 978-1-4129-2974-5

Price: Paper £22.99 Cloth £70.00

Published: December 2009 SAGE Publications Ltd

Book Description:

In four sections and 11 chapters, Greg Maio and Geoffrey Haddock describe how scientific methods have been used to better

understand attitudes and how they change. The first section looks at what attitudes are and why they are important. The second section examines the ability of attitudes to predict behaviour. From there, the authors consider how attitudes are formed and changed. Finally, they present a variety of major issues for understanding internal (such as, neurological) and external (such as, culture) influences on attitude, along with unresolved questions. With the aid of a few helpful metaphors, the text provides readers with a grasp of the fundamental concepts for understanding attitudes and an appreciation of the scientific challenges that lie ahead.

Table of Contents:

PART ONE: WHY DO ATTITUDES MATTER?

What Are Attitudes and How Are They Measured?

The Three Witches of Attitude

PART TWO: WHAT DO ATTITUDES DO?

The Influence of Attitudes on Information Processing and Behaviour

How Do Attitudes Influence Behaviour?

PART THREE: WHAT SHAPES ATTITUDES?

Cognitive Influences on Attitudes

Affective Influences on Attitudes

Behavioural Influences on Attitudes

Basic Principles in How Attitudes are Shaped

PART FOUR: WHAT MORE IS THERE TO LEARN?

The Internal World

The External World

Adding to the Witches' Brew

Future EASP Meetings - Calendar

July 5-8, 2010, Lisbon, Portugal

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

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

August 20-23, 2010, Barcelona, Spain

Small Group Meeting on Honor in the Context of Group and Gender Relations, the Self, and Aggression

Organisers: Patricia Rodriguez Mosquera (Wesleyan University), Ayse K. Uskul (University of Essex), and Hans IJzerman (VU University, Amsterdam)

July 12-16, 2011, Stockholm, Sweden

16th EASP General Meeting

Organiser: Torun Lindholm

Future EASP Meetings**16th General Meeting of the EASP
Stockholm, Sweden July 12-16, 2011**

Chair of the Scientific Committee: Manuela Barreto, Centre for Social Research and Intervention, Lisbon, Portugal

Chair of the Local Organizing Committee: Torun Lindholm, Stockholm University, Sweden

It is our pleasure to welcome you to the 16th EASP General Meeting in Stockholm, the capital of Sweden. It is our ambition to make this meeting a stimulating and exciting experience of high quality, international social psychological science. We are also confident that the Nordic light and the short nights in summer Stockholm will provide many opportunities for invigorating informal meetings and discussions between colleagues from all over the world.

Please find below some important dates and deadlines for the Meeting:

A call for submissions will be published on the conference website, **www.easp2011.com**, from June 2010. At this date, we will also make an announcement on the EASP website and by email to the members.

Deadline for submissions will be November 15th 2010.

The Scientific Committee and the Local organizers will meet in Stockholm in mid January, 2011.

Confirmation of accepted papers and changes of format will be announced January 31st.

Early registration up to March 15th, 2011

Standard registration between March 16th and April 30th.

Late registration between May 1st and May 20th,

On-site registration between May 21st and July 12th.

The final program will be confirmed at the end of March.

We look forward to seeing you in Stockholm!

*The 16th EASP General Meeting Scientific and Organizing
Committee*

Small Group Meeting

On Debating Honor in the Context of Group and Gender Relations, the Self, and Aggression

August 20-23, 2010, Barcelona, Spain

Organizers: Patricia Rodriguez Mosquera (Wesleyan University), Ayse K. Uskul (University of Essex), and Hans IJzerman (VU University, Amsterdam)

The concept of 'honor' in modern day societies has both positive (respect, trust) and negative (honor killings) implications. Researchers in social psychology and anthropology have long been interested in the concept of honor and its psychological and societal consequences in different cultural contexts, but there has been limited interaction between these disciplines, and indeed within the disciplines, on the subject. The aim of this meeting is to bring together established and early career researchers across a range of fields and disciplines both from within and outside Europe to share and integrate innovative research using a variety of methodologies to study honor in different cultural contexts. The meeting will also provide an opportunity for researchers and practitioners to discuss challenges concerning understandings of honor in multicultural societies and provide a platform for researchers to discuss possible future collaborative work and funding opportunities.

The format of communication will include keynotes and presentations followed by discussion sessions initiated by discussants, as well as posters. This will be a small group meeting with around 30 participants which should facilitate interaction between researchers.

The deadline for applications for posters and presentations is **May 31, 2010 at 13.00 (CET)**. Potential participants can send an **abstract of maximum 250 words** by email to Hans IJzerman (h.ijzerman@psy.vu.nl) with 'Honor Meeting' indicated on the subject line. Registration fee is 50 Euros. To apply, please send a brief statement of interest with research interests to Hans IJzerman with 'Application Honor Meeting' indicated in the subject line.

Reports of Previous Meetings

SPSSI-EASP Joint Meeting

On Uncertainty and Extremism

November 16-19, 2009, Claremont Graduate University, Los Angeles, USA

We live in uncertain times – a world characterized by religious, nationalistic and political fundamentalism, mass migration, rapid cultural and technological change, and profound cultural, life-style and economic turmoil and uncertainty. What will happen to us – our sense of self, our identity, and how we live our lives? What impact does uncertainty have on us and how and when do we respond to uncertainty? In particular, does uncertainty about self, one's place in the world and the future of the social order play a role in the emergence or persistence of extremist ideological systems that are orthodox, fundamentalist and ethnocentric and associated with bigotry, intolerance and violence? Does uncertainty spawn extremism?

These are important questions, both theoretically and practically, that social psychologists have increasingly begun to focus on in a variety of different ways. In order to explore the social psychological relationship between uncertainty and extremism it seemed like a good idea to organize a small two-day residential conference.

The conference was sponsored and funded by the European Association of Social Psychology (EASP) and the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) under their annual joint small group conference program. It was hosted by Claremont

Graduate University (CGU) and also supported and funded by CGU's School of Behavioral and Organizational Sciences and the John Stauffer Charitable Trust. The conference organizers were Michael Hogg (Claremont Graduate University), Arie Kruglanski (University of Maryland), and Kees van den Bos (Utrecht University); ably assisted by two of Mike's graduate students, Justin Hackett and Namrata Mahajan.

We scheduled 20 talks across two full days. But 4 people had to withdraw at the last moment due to family emergencies and the H1N1 flu – leaving us with 17 talks, as Kees van den Bos was a collaborator on one of the talks and able to give it. We got to hear Kees twice, which was a delight, as ever. Our 17 speakers were a diverse crowd – 9 from the US, 3 from Canada, 3 from The Netherlands and one each from the UK and Germany. Travis Proulx and Ian McGregor brought 3 of their students from Canada (Mike Prentice, Kyle Nash and Dan Randles), Brenda Major brought 3 from her lab in Santa Barbara (Dina Eliezer, Pamela Sawyer and Heather Rieck), and a number of students from Mike Hogg's social identity lab sat in on some sessions (Amber Gaffney, Liran Goldman, Fiona Grant, John Haller, Monique Matelski, David Rast, Heather Stopp, and Dana Turcotte). Shana Levin wandered over from Claremont McKenna College to sit in on one session, and Mike's fellow social psychologists at CGU, Bill Crano and Allen Omoto, made appearances when there was food to be had, wine to be drunk, and of course social psychology to be talked about.

We were a merry gathering, and the talks, which inspired much questioning and substantial discussion, covered a lot of ground and a wide diversity of perspectives on uncertainty, extremism and the uncertainty-extremism relationship.

Arie Kruglanski (University of Maryland). *Commitment and extremism: A goal systemic analysis*

Chris Federico (University of Minnesota). *Status asymmetries in the relationship between the need for closure and extremity in group-centric biases*

Agnieszka Golec de Zavala (Middlesex University). *Collective narcissism, perceived threat and intergroup hostility*

Michael Hogg (Claremont Graduate University). *Self-uncertainty and group threat: A foundation for radicalism*

Travis Proulx (Simon Fraser University). *Meaning maintenance model: Anomaly and affirmation*

Vicki Esses (The University of Western Ontario). *Uncertainty, threat, and the dehumanization of immigrants and refugees*

Janice Adelman (Claremont Graduate University). *The mix of religious and national identities under uncertainty in an intergroup conflict setting*

Aaron Kay (Duke University). *Compensatory control and religious belief*

Kees van den Bos (Utrecht University). *Personal uncertainty in delayed-return cultures*

Ian McGregor (York University). *Compensatory conviction as palliative goal regulation: Aversive uncertainty, uncertainty aversion, and reactive approach-motivation*

Brenda Major (University of California, Santa Barbara). *Uncertainty, ideology and threat*

Jaime Napier (Yale University). *Naturalistic rationalizations of the status quo among the disadvantaged*

Michele Gelfand (University of Maryland). *Culture and extremism*

Mark Dechesne (Leiden University). *What's in a name? The representation of extremism using political organization names*

Immo Fritsche (Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena). *Social extremism and group-based control restoration*

Mark Landau (University of Kansas). *The existential function of enemyship: Evidence that people attribute influence to personal and political enemies to compensate for threats to control*

Bertjan Doosje (Universiteit van Amsterdam). *The multiple paths from uncertainty to radical right-wing attitudes and violent intentions*

The conference was held on the campus of Claremont Graduate University, in the lovely wood-paneled Board of Trustees Conference Room. Claremont Graduate University is in the community of Claremont in Los Angeles – a tranquil university neighborhood with a relaxed village atmosphere, nestled beneath the 10,000 foot San Gabriel Mountains 35 miles east of downtown Los Angeles. Delegates arrived in the afternoon on Monday November 16 – some arrived earlier to recover from travel, mainly the rigors of negotiating LA's "awesome" freeway system to get from LAX to Claremont. There were papers all day on Tuesday and Wednesday, the conference dinner on Wednesday night, and delegates headed home on Thursday – though some stayed on to do important things like shopping, sight-seeing, and spa treatments.

Most of us stayed right in The Village at Casa 425, a trendy boutique hotel with the very exciting (possibly disconcerting?) feature that each room had a bathtub right in the middle of the room – as yet no one has owned up to ending up sleeping in the bathtub. The bar and courtyard at Casa 425 became the assembly point for evening sorties to bars and restaurants in the village – Claremont village is tiny, just a few quaint blocks. However some people were wooed by the considerable attraction of a pool and hot tub to stay at the Doubletree hotel – no trendy bath in the middle of the room, but located on legendary Route 66.

Both hotels were just under a mile from the conference venue, but the weather was perfect (Southern California – what can you say?) so people took their time to saunter in in the mornings – beautiful tree lined streets, California Mission architecture, and huge mountains in the clear cool morning light. Also, en route the not insubstantial temptation of perfectly prepared Illy espresso at *The Last Drop*.

The conference was a great success, and a subset of the presented papers are currently being configured for publication in a forthcoming special issue of the *Journal of Social Issues*, edited by Michael Hogg, Arie Kruglanski and Kees van den Bos.

Michael Hogg (Claremont Graduate University)

Kees van den Bos (Utrecht University)

Arie Kruglanski (University of Maryland)

Report from the SASP summer school 2010 February 5-10, 2010, Moreton Bay Research Station, Australia

Last February four PhD students in social psychology left the grey icy cold winter in Wales, France and the Netherlands to enjoy an intense learning experience on a sunny island all the way down in the southern hemisphere. Linh Lan Phan, Marie-Pierre Fayant, Reem Saab and Maarten Zaal attended this year's fourth Australasian summer school in social psychology, which was held from February 5th to February 10th. Every second year, the Society of Australasian Social Psychologists organises a summer school for about 35 PhD students coming mainly from Australasian universities, who are also joined by some students from Europe and the US. This year the summer school was organized and hosted by the University of Queensland and took place at the Moreton Bay Research Station on Stradbroke Island.

Three different workshops were held. One was on political attitudes and action and was run by Winnifred Louis and Steve Wright. The second was on prejudice and intergroup emotions and was run by Aarti Iyer and Russell Spears. The third workshop was on social neuroscience and was run by Eric Vanman and Tiffany Ito.

Linh, Maarten and Reem joined Steve and Winnifred's workshop. The first day students briefly presented their PhD research and got useful and constructive feedback by the instructors and their fellow students. Luckily most of the group members' research topics were directly relevant to political attitudes and action, which was a great recipe for ensuring high engagement and enthusiasm during our discussions.

We had been assigned a reading list before the summer school, and our first task was to generate general themes from the readings, which we were to then narrow down into specific research questions along with other team members.

The choice of readings provided a rich and diverse platform for discussions as the assigned articles included the most recent advances in the social-psychological literature on political attitudes and action and spanned a wide variety of approaches. One recurrent theme centred around the necessity to integrate the literature on prejudice reduction and that on collective action. Of particular interest to many was how the prejudice reduction effects of intergroup contact could ironically reduce collective action tendencies and social change. Another theme contrasted the personality and individual differences approach to political attitudes (particularly research on ideological tendencies), with more contextual approaches to political action such as social identity theory. And yet another theme concerned how the social-psychological study of political attitudes and action could benefit from the way other disciplines approach to the topic in other disciplines such as sociology and social work. The contrast between different methodological approaches was also tackled through exposure to studies relying on both quantitative as well as qualitative methods.

Most importantly, the instructors made clear from the outset that a central objective of our five days together was to lay the foundations for research projects that would actually be carried out and would materialize into concrete international collaborations. This focus ensured great interest and motivation for the projects we worked on. After the first couple of days which were spent generating themes and research questions, three teams were formed and we each started working on separate research proposals.

Maarten and Reem formed a team with two other Australian PhD students (Kerry O'Brien from the Australian National University and Carla Barnett from the University of Queensland). Their research project focused on proposing a model to account for how, through increased politicized identification, activists can ironically come to distance themselves from third parties/the general public, the very people they should be seeking to mobilize. Linh formed a team with three other Australian PhD students: Laurin Milsom from the Australian National University, and Rachel McDonald and Anna Cooke from University of Queensland. Their research project focused on invoking moral outrage as a tool for political actions and social change, especially when there is an injunctive norm of approval for the inequality. The planned collaboration will involve populations from two continents in an attempt to bring more public awareness to the unjust treatment of the Northern Territory Emergency Response toward indigenous people of Australia.

From the third day onwards, we spent most of our time with our other team members refining our research question, developing a proposal, trying to balance between heated and interesting theoretical debates generated by the research topic at hand and the need to come up with a concrete plan for the project. This was all done under the valuable supervision and guidance of our instructors who spent time with each team, helping us clarify our ideas and evaluate the novelty of our proposals. We also gathered with the rest of the class everyday to discuss progress and get feedback. Importantly, the instructors spent some time giving us concrete tips and valuable advice on how to carry out collaborations, which was particularly useful since most of us are inexperienced in this regard.

On the last day each team presented their research proposal in front of all the other summer school students as well as all instructors. This was very useful as there was ample time for questions and feedback from the audience, which helped us refine our research

ideas even further. At the time of this writing, we are already actively engaged in moving our research projects forward into concrete studies.

Marie-Pierre joined the social neuroscience workshop. The first day, we introduced ourselves very briefly and described our motivations for attending the social neuroscience workshop. On the whole, research interests varied widely among the students. Some students were seeking to familiarize themselves with social neuroscience research while others had used social neuroscience research techniques quite extensively in their PhD research.

Most of the workshop sessions consisted of lectures centred around papers we had been assigned to read before the summer school. Discussions were encouraged. Given that we were only eight students in the workshop, discussions developed quite easily and everyone expressed their ideas with ease. To begin with, Eric and Tiffany gave us a quick background on social neuroscience and the new research questions arising with this approach.

On the second day, we were exposed to the diverse methodologies used in social neuroscience. For two days, we attended different lectures on measures of electrodermal activity, heart activity, facial activity, hormones activity, and brain activity. These courses were quite comprehensive. We learned about the biological basis of the different tools used in the field, and got explanations on how to use these tools along with examples. At the end of the third day, we were assigned to groups of four in order to develop a research project using neuroscientific tools.

The project was meant to lend itself to the use of the different tools introduced during the summer school. It was made clear that we had to develop a research project that was not linked to our own PhD research topic. The idea was to get to us to understand in

what contexts it is useful to use neuroscience tools whilst cautioning us about using them with no proper justification.

Marie-Pierre worked with Fika Karnadewi, Sashenka Milston, and Lori Leach, three Australian students. We developed a project examining the change of prejudice across different generations of immigrants, using Facial Electromyography and Electroencephalography to measure implicit prejudice.

On the fourth day, we had discussions on empathy and mirror neurons. Eric gave us a general background on this topic which is his research area. Each of us had been assigned an article we had to introduce to others. This generated interesting and critical discussions on both theoretical and methodological issues.

On the fifth day, we followed the same work format, but this time focusing on person perception. Tiffani Ito introduced the topic and gave us a general background on the most famous works in the field after which we began group discussions. In the afternoon, we continued to develop our research project and prepare our presentation for the last day.

In between small group debates and big group meetings, we attended two full-hour seminars offered by senior academics on the broad topics. *Ten Commandments on how to Produce an Exceptional PhD* was given by Russell Spears, Winnifred Louis, Jolanda Jetten, and the seminar *Pitching your Research Inside and Outside Academia* was given by Winnifred Louis, Matthew Hornsey and Eric Vanman. Both seminars brought us valuable advice, tips and tricks for both beginner PhDs and students who are closing up their projects.

All in all, the summer school was a very stimulating, inspiring and immensely useful experience which promises to materialize into fruitful research collaborations.

Perhaps one of the few comments regarding the organisation of the summer school was that it was very Australian in orientation rather than Austral-Asian. All the Asian students were indeed studying in Australia or Europe. One recommendation is that future summer schools attempt to attract students from Asian universities, to ensure even greater intellectual and cultural diversity amongst the student body.

Through out the week, the Moreton Bay research station was lit up until late at night by groups of students and faculties surrounding a computer deeply absorbed in a heated debate, or around a game table in a rowdy party mood. For all the European students, the social experience of a summer school *down under* was unforgettable, not just the toasting hot sun beating down on our walks along the beach, but also the tasty sweet wine and the roaring laughter around the tables at night. As quick as the Aussie initial quietness thawed in lively academic discussions in the morning, we have come to discover our own celebrities: Mary Poppins (Aarti Iyer), Vanilla Ice (Russell Spears), Osama bin Laden (Airon Truffet) and even God (Jolanda Jetten). Our new found friendship and alliance crystallized into a moment of explosive fun on the last day, when Linh's brain was overcharged and produced the short-circuited idea of naming Batman as the most famous exemplar of social activists. The hall almost burst with laughs! We believe none of us took offense in being compared to the single-handed most peculiar hero of American comic history.

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 summer school. We would

also like to thank all of our instructors, the organizers and the students for making this a wonderful learning and social experience.

*Marie-Pierre Fayant, Linh Lan Phan,
Reem Saab and Maarten Zaal¹*

¹ A picture of the group can be viewed in the picture gallery of the EASP website: <http://www.easp.eu/gallery/photos/events/summerschool/2010/1.html>

News about Members

In Memoriam: Stefan Hormuth

On 21 February 2010, Stefan Hormuth prematurely passed away shortly after his 60th birthday. With his death, European social psychology lost a scholar whose political, administrative, and scientific contributions have been an invaluable asset to the field.

Stefan received his first degree at the University of Heidelberg in 1975. After earning his PhD at the University of Texas at Austin in 1979, he assumed a postdoctoral position at Northwestern University. At that time, it was highly unusual for a German psychologist to receive his graduate training in the US and to be exposed to the open spirit of American research universities. Consequently, it wasn't easy for Stefan to readjust to the more rigid German system. But instead of being frustrated, he embraced this as a challenge to bring a breath of fresh air to his home university.

Specifically, he initiated what became an informal set of biannual meetings in which internationally oriented young colleagues and guests from abroad presented their research. In addition to Stefan and this author, Dieter Frey, Peter Gollwitzer, Anne Maass, Norbert Schwarz, and Bob Wicklund were the core group that was unofficially called the 'Kurt-Lewin Society'.

The enormous enthusiasm for the field of experimental social psychology that emerged from these meetings soon spread to the institutions of German psychology, particularly to the social psychology section that was founded at that time. Here too, Stefan played a vital role in moving the section in a new direction. After

his habilitation in 1987 in Heidelberg, where he subsequently assumed an untenured associate professorship (C2), he obtained a tenured position at the University of Giessen (1990–1993) and a full professorship at the Technical University of Dresden (1993). During his time as a professor he assumed various positions in the German Psychological Society (DGPs), among them member of the executive committee of its social psychology section.

In 1997, Stefan returned to Giessen, where he was elected president of the university. He held this administrative position until 2009, shortly before his death. His tenure was marked by numerous achievements that were acknowledged in many obituaries. Stefan's presidency was unanimously perceived as a period of prosperity for the university and of increasing visibility in its national and international standing. During this time, Stefan Hormuth adopted other obligations, among them the vice presidency of the German Council of University Presidents (HRK).

In 2008, a dream of many years came true when he was elected president of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). However, his great desire to devote himself exclusively to this office was thwarted by the cruel disease he could not overcome. Still, the two years of his DAAD presidency were highly successful and led to a substantial increase in funding.

Among his many scientific contributions, his book *The Ecology of the Self* (Hormuth, 1990) deserves special mention. It provided new insights into the ecological determinants of the self. His research addressed issues of both conceptual and applied relevance, such as the role of relocation in self-perception. His empirical approaches were diverse, and included experiments in both the lab and the field, the analysis of archival data, and particularly experience sampling. One of his methodological publications (Hormuth, 1986) has become a citation classic for this procedure.

Of special importance were Stefan's administrative and political contributions to a university system that became increasingly open to international influences and expanded international exchange. Moreover, in all of his high-ranking positions, he always identified himself as a social psychologist and thus added to the prestige of our discipline. But all of this would not have been possible without his great integrity, reliability, and humanity.

When I had once asked him about how he would want to describe himself, he referred to Jerry Suls's (1993) review of his book. Suls wrote that Stefan Hormuth 'promises and delivers'. When Stefan promised, he delivered.

Social psychology owes Stefan Hormuth a tremendous debt. We shall miss him as a role model, source of wise counsel, colleague, and friend.

Fritz Strack

In Memoriam: Caryl Rusbult

Caryl Rusbult, 57, a Professor in the Department of Social and Organizational Psychology at the VU University, passed away peacefully on January 27, due to the consequences of cancer. Trained as an experimental social psychologist, Caryl Rusbult was a dynamic and creative thinker, a generative and rigorous theorist, and a committed and energetic researcher. She dedicated her professional career to the study of interdependence processes, especially as they apply to close relationships. Caryl made numerous important theoretical contributions to the literature and was also an exceptional teacher and a beloved mentor. She conveyed her passion for theory and research to students with warmth and dedication.

Caryl Rusbult received her B.A. in Sociology at UCLA and her PhD in Psychology at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1978. Caryl began her professional career at Franklin and Marshall College, but soon moved to the University of Kentucky. In 1986, she returned to the University of North Carolina. Chapel Hill was the scene of her most important theoretical contributions, including the investment model of commitment processes, a theoretical model of accommodation processes, and, most recently, the Michelangelo effect (the manner in which close partners "sculpt" each other in ways that help them attain valued goals). In 2004, she and her husband, Professor David Lowery, moved to the Netherlands, where she became Professor and Chair in Social Psychology. There, Caryl expanded her interdependence theoretical orientation, developed new lines of research, and served as an important source of inspiration to students.

Caryl Rusbult's Investment Model of Commitment Processes is one of the most well-known and influential theoretical frameworks in the area of close relationships. This exceptionally generative model

explains how committed partners maintain and promote their relationships by transforming personal motives to take into account the necessity of coordinating and getting along with partners. Caryl was truly inspired by Kelley and Thibaut's Interdependence Theory, especially its rigorous mathematical-theoretical approach to understanding social interaction, and became a major figure in that theory's advancement. Among several important writings on the topic, she was a major contributor to the *Atlas of Interpersonal Situations* (Cambridge, 2003). A year later, with Harry Reis she published *Key Readings on Close Relationships* (Sage, 2004). Caryl served as an Associate Editor for the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (1990 to 1994) and the *Encyclopedia of Psychology* (1996 to 2000), and has been elected to the boards of several national and international organizations (e.g., Society of Experimental Social Psychologists, International Society for the Study of Personal Relationships).

Caryl Rusbult regarded "the social" and the "relationships between people" as the central root of human cognition, feelings, and behavior, and was very strongly committed to pursuing that mission. The enormous impact of her theory, research, and teaching was recognized by several major grants and awards, including the Mentoring Award (2002) and Distinguished Career Award (2008) from the International Association for Relationships Research, the New Contribution Award (1991/1992) from the International Society for the Study of Personal Relationships, the Reuben Hill Award from the National Council on Family Relations (1991), and the J. Ross MacDonald Chair (1997-2002) and the Distinguished Alumni Award from the University of North Carolina (2009).

Caryl Rusbult was an exceptionally generous scholar who was equally committed to good theory and research, and to the students and colleagues with whom she worked and lived. She genuinely enjoyed sharing and giving, in the form of committed mentorship, unflagging emotional support, and deep friendship. Caryl made an

exceptionally strong impression on those who knew her. She knew how to bring out the best in others, and did so often. Her genuine love for others, her constructive friendship and mentorship, and her immense ability to care for others is part of the collective memories of many friends, faculty and students, all over the world.

Caryl E. Rusbult Young Investigator Award:

The Foundation for Personality and Social Psychology installed the Caryl E. Rusbult Young Investigator Award. Well-wishers can send a check that should be made out to the Foundation for Personality and Social Psychology, marking Caryl Rusbult Award on the check, and sending it to David Dunning, Dept of Psychology, Uris Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA.

For more information, see www.carylrusbult.com

Paul van Lange

New Members of the Association

The following applications for membership were approved by the Executive Committee in April 2010. Names of members providing letters of support are in parentheses:

Full Membership

Dr. Gamze BARAY
Ankara, Turkey
(T. Morton, T. Postmes)

Dr. Maja BECKER
Sussex, UK
(S. Guimond, X. Chryssochoou)

Dr. Olga BOGATYREVA
Moscow, Russia
(E. Belinskaya, I. Bovina)

Dr. Luciana CARRARO
Padova, Italy
(L. Castelli, L. Arcuri)

Dr. Rui S. COSTA
Lisbon, Portugal
(L. Garcia-Marques, M. Ferreira)

Dr. Tracy EPTON
Sheffield, UK
(T. Webb, P. Harris)

Dr. Silvia GALDI
Padova, Italy
(L. Arcuri, M. Cadinu)

Dr. Erica HEPPER
Southampton, UK
(C. Sedikides, T. Wildschut)

Dr. Maria del Carmen
HERRERA
Granada, Spain
(M. Moya, F. Expósito)

Dr. Philipp JUGERT
Jena, Germany
(A. Rutland, C. Cohrs)

Dr. Marina KOUZAKOVA
Leiden, The Netherlands
(A. van Knippenberg, N. Ellemers)

Dr. Tina LANGER
Trier, Germany
(E. Walther, R. Trötschel)

Dr. Marcella LATROFA
Padova, Italy
(M. Cadinu, J. Vaes)

Dr. Stephen LOUGHNAN
Canterbury, UK
(S. de Lemus, S. Stathi)

Dr. Silvia MACHER
Graz, Austria
(G. Mikula, U. Athenstaedt)

Dr. Claudia MARINETTI
Leuven, Belgium
(G. Simons, B. Parkinson)

Dr. Petra MARKEL
Wuerzburg, Germany
(F. Strack, A. Höfling)

Dr. Christina MATSCHKE
Tübingen, Germany
(K. Sassenberg, N. Hansen)

Dr. Benoit MONTALAN
Rouen, France
(O. Corneille, F. Askevis-Leherpeux)

Dr. Marret NOORDEWIJER
Tilburg, The Netherlands
(D. Stapel, M. Zeelenberg)

Dr. Aisling O'DONNELL
Limerick, Ireland
(M. Ryan, J. Smith)

Dr. Müjde PEKER
Istanbul, Turkey
(R. Crisp, K. Douglas)

Dr. Régis SCHEIDEGGER
Lausanne, Switzerland
(A. Clémence, C. Staerklé)

Dr. Christiane SCHOEL
Mannheim, Germany
(R. Greifeneder, D. Stahlberg)

Dr. Chaehan SO
Berlin, Germany
(U. Klocke, W. Scholl)

Dr. Baptiste SUBRA
Grenoble, France
(L. Bègue, D. Muller)

Dr. Susanne TÄUBER
Groningen, The Netherlands
(K. Sassenberg, N. Hansen)

Dr. Katerina TASIOPOULOU
London, UK
(G. Randsley de Moura, A. Eller)

Dr. Niels VAN DE VEN
Tilburg, The Netherlands
(M. Zeelenberg, D. Stapel)

Dr. Guido VAN
KONINGSBRUGGEN
Tilburg, The Netherlands
(H. Aarts, W. Stroebe)

Dr. Guillermo WILLIS
Granada, Spain
(R. Rodríguez Bailón, A. Guinote)

Affiliate Membership

./.

Postgraduate Membership

Audrey ABITAN
Boulogne-Billancourt, France
(S. Krauth-Gruber, E. Drodza-Senkowska)

Ana BARBEIRO
Lausanne, Switzerland
(D. Spini, C. Staerklé)

Jennifer BASTART
Grenoble, Switzerland
(D. Muller, N. Chaurand)

Robin BERGH
Uppsala, Sweden
(B. Ekehammar, N. Akrami)

Mauro BERTOLOTTI
Milano, Italy
(P. Milesi, P. Catellani)

Oleg BURUKHIN
Moscow, Russia
(I. Bovina, E. Dubovskaya)

Cindy CHATEIGNIER
Nanterre, France
(A. Nugier, P. Chekroun)

Marie CROUZEVALLE
Lausanne, Switzerland
(F. Butera, C. Staerklé)

Bart DE VOS
Groningen, The Netherlands
(M. van Zomeren, T. Postmes)

Jung Yin FANG
Lausanne, Switzerland
(F. Butera, C. Staerklé)

Helene FONT
Clermont Ferrand, France
(C. Darnon, M. Brauer)

Esther GLÜCK
Ulm, Germany
(H. Bless, J. Keller)

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

Sara HAGÁ
Lisbon, Portugal
(L. Garcia-Marques, T. Garcia-Marques)

Karolina HANSEN
Jena, Germany
(M. Bilewicz, M. Lewicka)

Antonio HERRERA ENRIQUEZ
Granada, Spain
(F. Expósito, M. Moya)

Christian ISSMER
Marburg, Germany
(O. Christ, U. Wagner)

Lise JANS
Groningen, The Netherlands
(T. Postmes, S. Otten)

Gloria JIMÉNEZ
Granada, Spain
(R. Rodríguez-Bailón, M. Moya)

Racki KA
Boulogne, France
(V. Bonnot, B. Sanitioso)

Mathias KAUFF
Marburg, Germany
(J. Becker, F. Asbrock)

Marat KHACHATRYAN
Moscow, Russia
(I. Bovina, E. Dubovskaya)

Evgeniya KRAVCHENKO
Moscow, Russia
(A. Prikhidko, O. Goulevitch)

Anne LANDHAEUSSER
Ulm, Germany
(H. Bless, J. Keller)

Simona LASTREGO
Lausanne, Switzerland
(F. Butera, C. Staerklé)

Rauha LAURUS
Kiel, Germany
(B. Simon, A. Bachmann)

Carola LEICHT
Canterbury, UK
(R. Crisp, G. Randsley de
Moura)

Bejnamin LIERSCH
Bielefeld, Germany
(G. Bohner, A. Zick)

Rocío MARTÍNEZ GUITÉRREZ
Granada, Spain
(R. Rodríguez-Bailón, M.
Moya)

Alexandrina MOISUC
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(P. Niedenthal, M. Brauer)

Hannah NOHLEN
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(F. van Harreveld, J. van der
Pligt)

Ellinor OWE
Brighton, UK
(V. Vignoles R. Brown)

Stefan PFATTHEICHER
Ulm, Germany
(J. Keller, H. Bless)

Monica ROMERO SANCHEZ
Granada, Spain
(R. Rodríguez-Bailón, M.
Moya)

Maaïke ROUBROEKS
Eindhoven, The Netherlands
(J. Ham, C. Midden)

Magdalena RYCHLOWSKA
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(M. Brauer, P. Niedenthal)

Roxane SAINT-BAUZEL
Aix-en-Provence, France
(C. Flament, R.V. Joule)

Claudia SASSEN RATH
Tübingen, Germany
(K. Sassenberg, J. Jacoby)

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

Lee SHEPHERD
Cardiff, UK
(T. Manstead, R. Spears)

Nicolas SOMMET
Lausanne, Switzerland
(F. Butera, C. Staerklé)

Linda TIP
Brighton, UK
(H. Zagefka, R. Brown)

Kaat VAN ACKER
Leuven, Belgium
(E. Van Avermaet, N.
Vanbeselaere)

Frederieke VAN DONGEN
Limerick, Ireland
(R.M. Greenwood, E. Igou)

Wijnand VAN TILBURG
Limerick, Ireland
(R.M. Greenwood, E. Igou)

Ruth VAN VEELLEN
Groningen, The Netherlands
(S. Otten, N. Hansen)

Suzanne VOSSEN
Eindhoven, The Netherlands
(C. Midden, J. Ham)

Rebecca WEIL
Trier, Germany
(E. Walther, R. Trötschel)

Annemarie WENNEKERS
Nijmegen, The Netherlands
(A. van Knippenberg, R.
Holland)

Grants

Malte Friese (seedcorn grant)

Jochen Gebauer (seedcorn grant)

Linh Lan Phan (travel grant)

Francesca Righetti (travel grant)

Reem Saab (travel grant)

Maarten Zaal (travel grant)

GRANT REPORTS

Janine Bosak

(Dublin City University, Ireland)

Seedcorn Grant

The postdoctoral seedcorn grant that I received from the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology helped me to carry out my research project entitled "Competence and warmth: Compensatory stereotypes in the German-speaking world". Building upon research by Yzerbyt, Provost and Corneille (2005), the aim of the research project was to investigate whether status differences in the linguistic domain are reflected in compensatory judgments about groups' warmth and competence. In contrast to previous research (Yzerbyt et al., 2005), the present study did not only address perceptions of warmth and competence by others, but also participants' self-perception. Moreover, the present study examined the compensation hypothesis in a different linguistic context than the one chosen by Yzerbyt et al. (2005), that is, in view of the situation of the German-speaking world.

German is considered to be a pluricentric language as there are different varieties of Standard German (Clyne 1995; Ammon 1995). The most accepted distinction is between different national varieties of Standard German: Austrian Standard German, German Standard German, and Swiss Standard German. However, regardless of this definition, research indicates that people usually perceive the standard variety spoken in Germany as the norm in German, meaning the 'good German' (high status). Consequently, other German-speakers such as the Swiss-Germans are seen and see themselves as low-prestige speakers (Scharloth, 2006). Therefore, I expected that Germans would be judged as more linguistically skilled than the Swiss-Germans and that these status differences in the linguistic domain would also be reflected in participants' perception of the in-/outgroup and their self-perception on competence and warmth. In line with the compensation hypothesis, Germans would be judged and would judge themselves as more competent but less warm than the Swiss-Germans.

Following the procedure by Yzerbyt et al. (2005), 124 German students at the University of Freiburg/Germany and 100 Swiss-German students at the University of Bern/Switzerland were asked to communicate their impressions of the ingroup (endo-stereotypes), the outgroup (exo-stereotypes) and of themselves (self-perception) in relation to three dimensions: linguistic skills (e.g., rich vocabulary, slow flow), competence (e.g., intelligent, prestigious), and warmth (e.g., friendly, generous). Thus the experiment was based on a 2 (Judge: German vs. Swiss-German) x 2 (Target: German vs. Swiss-German) x 3 (Domain: Linguistic Skills vs. Competence vs. Warmth) mixed design with the first factor varying between participants and the last ones varying within participants.

Stereotyping. As expected the results of the analyses showed that the Germans were rated higher in linguistic skills than the Swiss,

whereby the Swiss judges differentiated the linguistic skills of the German and the Swiss more than the German judges.

Moreover, the 2 (Judge: Swiss vs. German) \times 2 (Target: Swiss vs. German) \times 2 (Domain: Warmth vs. Competence) analysis of variance revealed a main effect for target, indicating that the Swiss were given higher ratings than the Germans. The Swiss targets were attributed more warmth than German targets. However, although German targets were rated as slightly higher on competence than Swiss targets, this difference was not significant. Moreover, there was a significant Judge \times Target \times Domain interaction; analyses revealed that the warmth and the competence of the two target groups were not judged similarly by both groups of judges: German judges differentiated the competence *and* warmth of the German and the Swiss respondents/participants more than the Swiss judges.

Self-Perception. As expected, German respondents rated their linguistic skills higher than Swiss respondents. Moreover, in line with our predictions, Swiss respondents rated themselves higher on warmth than German respondents. However, in contrast to our predictions, Swiss respondents and German respondents rated themselves as similarly competent.

Taken together, the results of the present study confirmed negative beliefs about the Swiss as being less linguistically skilled in German than Germans. Evidence was found in German and Swiss respondents' stereotypes about both groups as well as in the self-perception of Germans and Swiss-Germans. Moreover, our results provide some support for the compensation hypothesis as Swiss targets were judged higher on warmth but lower on competence than German targets. In addition, Swiss respondents judged themselves higher on warmth than German respondents but this effect was not reversed for competence.

I am very grateful to the Association for the financial support, which allowed me to carry out this research. I would also like to thank Vincent Yzerbyt and Micheal Schrackmann for the fruitful collaboration on this project, and my mentor Sabine Sczesny for her advice and encouragement. Last but not least, I would like to thank Sibylle Classen for her excellent assistance.

References

- Ammon, U. (1995): *Die deutsche Sprache in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz, das Problem der nationalen Varietäten*. Berlin.
- Clyne, M.G. (1995): *The German Language in a changing Europe*. Cambridge.
- Scharloth, J. (2003). Zwischen Fremdsprache und nationaler Varietät. Untersuchungen zum Plurizentritätsbewusstsein der Deutschschweizer. *TRANS. Internet-Zeitschrift für Kulturwissenschaften* 15. http://www.inst.at/trans/15Nr/06_1/scharloth15.htm.
- Yzerbyt, V. Y., Provost, V., & Corneille, O. (2005). Not so competent but warm . . . really? Compensatory stereotypes in the French-speaking world. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 8, 291-308.

Marieke de Vries

(Leiden University Medical Center, The Netherlands)
Travel Grant

Research visit to Dr. Ellen Peters, Decision Research, Eugene (Oregon, USA), January/February 2010

Thanks to an EASP postdoctoral travel grant, I had the opportunity to visit Dr. Ellen Peters at Decision Research, a renowned research institute in Eugene (Oregon, USA) with a strong group of

researchers. I visited Ellen Peters during the first half of February, 2010, after attending the Society for Personality and Social Psychology conference in Las Vegas.

At the annual meeting of the Society for Medical Decision Making in Philadelphia in the autumn of 2008, I met Dr. Ellen Peters. She is one of the leading scientists in my field of research. Not only do we share a research interest in decision making, affect, emotion and risk perception, on top of that we are both interested in developing and applying theories on these topics in the domain of health. My research has so far been mainly focused on mood effects on judgment and decision making (e.g., De Vries, Holland, Chenier, Starr & Winkielman, 2010; De Vries, Holland & Witteman, 2008a; 2008b; De Vries, Holland, Corneille, Rondeel & Witteman, under revision), and on unconscious and intuitive processes (e.g., De Vries, Witteman, Holland & Dijksterhuis, in press; Holland & De Vries, 2010). In September 2008, I obtained my PhD at the Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands. Currently, I am affiliated to the department of Medical Decision Making at the Leiden University Medical Center (LUMC), the Netherlands. Here, I have been given the opportunity to start a research program on the role of affect and intuition in medical decision making. My recent research visit to Dr. Peters provided me with a tremendous opportunity to develop new ideas and set up experiments with an international expert in my field, and to be inspired by an excellent group of researchers.

The research we designed is intended to advance on current international developments regarding the role of affect and intuitive and unconscious processes in judgment and decision making. For example, we designed a series of studies to investigate the Unconscious Thought Effect in medical decision making (see e.g., De Vries et al., in press), and studies to test the role of positive affect in preference construction and decision making. In addition to that, I had the opportunity to participate in several stimulating

research meetings, and to attend an inspiring lecture by Dr. Paul Slovic at the Psychology Department of the University of Oregon. I was also invited to give a presentation about my research at Decision Research. In the evenings and during the breaks, I enjoyed great activities, in very good company, such as the exiting Pool and Ping Pong evening with Ellen Peters, Martin Tusler, and Daniel Västfjäll, attending the basketball games of the women's team of the University of Oregon ("Go Ducks!") with Paul and Roz Slovic, sightseeing and an excellent vegan lunch in Eugene with Leisha Wharfield, the Art Walk with Ellen and Martin, and a fabulous diner at their home. It was a privilege to be surrounded by such a wonderful group of people, thanks to all of you!

In closing, I would like to thank all who contributed to this wonderful stay in Eugene. I very much enjoyed my visit to Decision Research and I am confident that interesting new research will result from it. I would like to thank Ellen Peters and Decision Research for the warm welcome, for hosting me, and for making my stay both highly inspiring and very enjoyable. Finally, I wish to thank the Department of Medical Decision Making of the LUMC and the EASP for giving me this wonderful opportunity!

*** For further information on our work, please visit the following websites, or send an e-mail to Marieke de Vries (M.deVries@lumc.nl). *Thank you!* ***

<http://www.lumc.nl/con/2050/43311/904090257505212>

<http://www.decisionresearch.org/>

References:

- De Vries, M., Holland, R.W., Chenier, T., Starr, M. J., & Winkielman, P. (2010). Happiness cools the glow of familiarity: Psychophysiological evidence that mood modulates the familiarity-affect link. *Psychological Science*. [first published online].

- De Vries, M., Holland, R.W., Corneille, O., Rondeel, E., & Witteman, C.L.M.. Fooled by one’s happiness: Positive mood induces departures from logical rules. *Manuscript under revision*.
- De Vries, M., Holland, R.W., & Witteman, C.L.M. (2008a). In the winning mood: Affect in the Iowa gambling task. *Judgment and Decision Making, 3, 42-50*.
- De Vries, M., Holland, R.W., & Witteman, C.L.M. (2008b). Fitting decisions: Mood and Intuitive versus Deliberative Decision-Strategy. *Cognition and Emotion, 22, 931-943*.
- De Vries, M., Witteman, C.L.M., Holland, R.W., & Dijksterhuis, A. (in press). The unconscious thought effect in clinical decision making: An example in diagnosis. *Medical Decision Making*.
- Holland, R.W., & De Vries, M., (2010). Implicit evaluation as a basis for intuition. In A. Gloeckner and C. L. M. Witteman (Eds.), *Foundations for tracing intuition: Challenges and methods*. Psychology Press.

Elisa Puvia

University of Padova, Italy
Travel Grant

The EASP postgraduate travel grant supported me in visiting the Department of Psychology at the University of South Florida in Tampa, United States. I spent there nine months between the second and third year of my Ph.D. with the main goal to develop and realize some new research ideas within the main theme of my Ph.D., that is, sexual objectification of women.

Specifically, I conducted several studies with the aim to examine the psychological function of make-up use on woman’s self-perception. According to Objectification Theory (Frederickson &

Roberts, 1998), girls and women are socialized to view themselves as objects to be appreciated by others. Make-up is one of the most popular tools used by women in order to enhance their (facial) attractiveness.

If, on the one hand living up to the standards of value prescribed by one’s culture has positive effects on one’s own self-perception, on the other hand studies on self-objectification showed that women in a state of self-objectification exhibited decreased performance in a cognitive task. So, we hypothesized that a woman in a state of self-objectification, that is, focusing on her face with make-up could exhibit a discrepancy between an enhanced self-perception, and a decreased real performance in a cognitive task.

Results showed that focusing on one’s face with make-up increases women’s self- perception in terms of competence and warmth. At the same time, however, focusing on one’s face with make-up undermines women’s performance on an attentional task, but enhanced the perception of their performance.

Two elements of novelty are involved in this study: The first novelty is the present focus on a single source of objectification, that is, the face instead of the body as a whole. The second extension compared to previous work is the fact that a focus on one’s own appearance can affect self-perceptions with respect to an interpersonal context of assessment.

All in all, my trip to the University of South Florida was particularly fruitful because there I met Prof. Jamie Lynn Goldenberg who is an expert in the field of research regarding Objectification. The meetings with Prof. Goldenberg provided me with insightful suggestions in defining my research ideas and allow me to develop new ones.

Moreover, I was invited to give two talks about my research in two different contexts: one, for a conference at the Department of World Languages and the other at Department of Psychology both at the University of South Florida. These provided an excellent opportunity to receive a broader feedback from other researchers. Furthermore, I attended the annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology in Las Vegas in which I had the opportunity to meet with a lot of different scholars and follow some interesting talks. In addition I had the opportunity to follow the Colloquium Series of the Psychology Department at the University of South Florida where I managed to further broaden my general knowledge on a variety of psychological topics. During this period in the United States, I also had the possibility to improve both my spoken and written English considerably, giving me the opportunity to exchange research ideas with other researchers and hopefully create connections for future collaborations.

In conclusion I would like to thank all the people I met for contributing to realize this important and thrilling experience that allowed me to develop my skills as a scholar and as a person. Finally, I would like to thank the EASP for supporting me in the realization of this experience.

Shaul Shalvi

(University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

Travel Grant

The EASP postgraduate travel grant supported me in visiting the Department of Psychology at the University of Pennsylvania during the fall semester of 2009. During this visit I developed a chapter of my dissertation by collaborating with Dr. Jason Dana.

In my dissertation I attempt to answer questions relating to ethical decision making – would people lie in order to increase personal profit? Is there a psychological price for such unethical behavior? And would people lie more when they got an excuse for doing so? Before arriving at Penn I have ran several studies employing a ‘die under cup’ paradigm, allowing people to lie for profit without ever getting caught. By reporting the outcome of a die roll, placed under a paper cup, participants can make money knowing that no one but them will ever get to know what they actually rolled.

Upon arriving at Penn, I received the opportunity to present this initial data during the decision making seminar held at the psychology department. This presentation allowed me to focus on the next steps that had to be taken in order to advance the project. Following the presentation Dr. Dana and I collected data that suggests that people evaluate misreports to be less of a lie when people can justify such untruthful behavior. Moreover, reducing the possibility to come up with excuses for unethical acts reduces lying behavior.

I wish to thanks all of those who contributed to this wonderful experience. I am grateful to Jason Dana for his warm welcome at Penn and the amount of time he devoted to our frequent meetings. I would also like to thank Prof. Maurice Schweitzer at the Wharton business school for his great hospitality and the opportunity to collaborate on an additional research project. Finally, I wish to thanks the European Association of Social Psychology for providing me with the travel grant without which the visit could not have happened.

Announcements

2012 EASP Summer School: in search of a location

While the Greek team is preparing the 2010 EASP Summer School, the Executive Committee has already started its search for a location to host the 2012 edition. Some of you who still have lively memories of earlier schools, either as participants, teachers, or as sponsors of participants, may perhaps consider becoming responsible for organising a summer school themselves. The Executive Committee welcomes all proposals (just drop a note to Sibylle Classen by **mid of September 2010**, latest at sibylle@easp.eu).

Jos Jaspars Awards - Call for Applications

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

Candidates for the Jos Jaspars Awards either should have obtained their PhD not earlier than January 1st of the previous General Meeting (January 1st, 2008) or, if their PhD was obtained before that date, they should have been under the age of 30 on January 1st of the year of the previous General Meeting (January 1st, 2008). There will be 3 Jos Jaspars awards.

They need not to be members of the Association.

Candidates are asked to submit their curriculum vitae, naming two referees, one of whom should be a member of the Association. These items should be sent to the Executive Officer, before **October, 1st, 2010** who will forward it to the selection committee.

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

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

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

Address for correspondence:

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

Kurt Lewin Awards – Call for Nominations

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

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

The procedure for this award is that candidates are nominated by two full members of the Association, who motivate in their letters why, in their view, the candidate deserves this award. Nominators should inform the proposed candidate of their intention to nominate in order to coordinate the procedure (e.g., ensure a minimum of two nominations being proffered). Both nominators should state in writing that they have permission of the candidates as their official nominators (i.e. to ensure that no more than two “official” nominations are considered per candidate by the panel). These nominations including the curriculum vitae of the candidate should be received by the Executive Officer, before **October, 1st, 2010** who will forward it to the selection committee

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

Address for correspondence:
Sibylle Classen, P.O. Box 420 143, D-48161 Muenster, Germany, e-mail: sibylle@easp.eu

Deadlines for Contributions

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

The next Executive Committee Meeting will take place in October 2010.

Executive Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Executive Officer:

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

website of the EASP:

<http://www.easp.eu>