

1 Editorial

2 President's Corner

3 Conversation with Naomi Ellemers by Xenia Chrysochoou

12 Future EASP Meetings

Medium Size Meeting on Motivational Processes in Attitudes, May 25-27, 2012, Ghent University, Belgium

Small Group Meeting on the Societal Meanings of Minority Influence, June 6-10, 2012, Delphi, Greece

Small Group Meeting on Social Cognition and Communication, July 9-12, 2012, Pecs, Hungary

17 16th General Meeting of the EASP, Stockholm, Sweden, July 12-16, 2011 – News from the Program and Organization Committee

19 News about Members

In Memoriam: Tatiana Slama Cazacu

New Members of the Association

30 Grants and Grant Reports

39 Announcements

Election of New Executive Committee Members

Call for Manuscripts for a Special Issue of the *European Journal of Social Psychology* on "Mental Time Travel: Social psychological perspectives on a fundamental human capacity"

2011 Oswald-Külpe-Prize for the Experimental Study of Higher Mental Processes – Call for Nominations

48 Deadlines for Contributions

49 Executive Committee

Editorial

Dear Friends and Colleagues,

I am happy to present a new edition of the EBSF! As usual you will find news about our association and its members.

Please pay attention to deadlines for group meetings, special issues and prices as well as to deadlines for applications. In this issue you will also find important information about the General Meeting in Stockholm! This year, three members are leaving the Executive Committee and three new members will be elected. Short bios and statements of the five new candidates are published in this issue. Soon, full members will receive mailed ballots to vote, and the new Executive Committee will be announced in the Business Meeting in Stockholm.

In this edition you will also find the general features of the Bulletin, the reports of the different grants, and the list of the new members. It is pleasing to see so many postgraduates joining the association!

With sadness we learned about the death of our Romanian colleague Prof. Slama-Cazacu. The obituary published on pp 19 ff in this bulletin gives an interesting insight into her professional life and work and an insightful account of four decades of social psychology in Romania. Our thoughts are with her family and colleagues.

Of course the President's Corner is a must-read in every issue but most importantly this one since it is the last Carsten will write for this Bulletin.

As far as I am concerned this is probably the last Bulletin I am editing, since a new committee will be soon elected and I will change responsibilities. It was a pleasure and honor to serve you in this capacity and edit the news of the Association. In this edition you will find the last interview I did with a **past president of the Association: Prof. Naomi Ellemers**. Enjoy!

*Xenia Chrysochoou
Paris, May 2011*

President's Corner

With less than six weeks before our General Meeting, my term as President is almost over. It is tempting to look back. I have been blessed with an excellent Executive Committee, with whom productive business meetings always ended in fun get-togethers in excellent restaurants. It has been gratifying to work with the editors of our journals, and with Torun Lindholm and Manuela Barreto in preparing our conference in Stockholm. In between, I much enjoyed the encounters with the many members and students who, each in their own way, are committed to sustaining the functioning and outlook of our Association. It has been busy, those last three years. I will miss it dearly.

It is tempting also to look forward. EASP is a healthy association with many committed members. Membership continues to rise steadily, and financial prospects are good. There is no need for sharp budget cuts; current programming and activities are neither threatened or in substantial revisions. Soon new members of the Executive Committee will be elected. The list of candidates is just outstanding and it is a pity that not all can be elected at once. No matter what the outcome will be, EASP will be in excellent hands in the years to come.

By virtue of our Statutes and Articles, the Executive Committee invited all affiliate members to become full member of EASP as of January 2012. Many have already accepted, and many expressed their appreciation of the possibility to become full member of an association they identify with, and contributed to already in so many ways. It is my sincere hope that in the years to come, country or university affiliation no longer serves as bases for sub-group categorization and that diversity within EASP will be cherished and exploited even more than it is today.

I am much looking forward to the upcoming General Meeting in Stockholm. We have to business, to award outstanding scholars, to give and listen to scientific presentations and, last but not least, to meet old and new friends. And it will be a success: The scientific program looks truly impressive, both in terms of quantity and quality. Stockholm is a beautiful city, and as I'm writing this Corner, it is 20 degrees Celsius in Stockholm with clear blue sky. It's EASP's future.

I'd like to save the last two words of this final Corner to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation for the support I have received from our executive officer, Sibylle Classen:
Thank You!

*Carsten K.W. de Dreu
Utrecht, May 2011*

Conversation with Naomi Ellemers
Treasurer 1996-1999, President 1999-2002
By Xenia Chryssochoou

XC: Good morning, thank you for accepting to have this conversation with me. I am interviewing you in your capacity as past president of the association. You had several jobs in the Association, you served as treasurer and then president, so I leave it to you to tell me how you joined the association and what were the issues when you were president and what do you think of the Association right now...

NE: Well, I learned about the Association first through the journal and later through the summer school. These were my first acquaintances with the European Association. Later I thought that it was important to convey the goals of the Association and to communicate about social psychology to other scholars from Europe, to educate and also to connect people from other European countries... and in particular about summer schools where young people working on their PhD's were meeting. I thought it was very exciting and I still think that this is a very important activity for young people to know about the Association and also to forge their professional networks. This is why I think in some places in the US are now putting in place similar activities learning from the experience of the European summer schools. This, I guess, was an important step for me to get involved in the Association.

XC: You participated in one summer school ...

NE: Yes it was in 1989 in Tilburg.

XC: I was part of the 1991 in San Sebastian. It was a wonderful experience this is why I decided to organize one...

NE: Mine was in Holland so I didn't even get to a nice sunny place...but still it was a brilliant experience...

XC: So then you decided to get more involved and to run also for the Executive committee, you became treasurer...

NE: Yes, this was many years later and actually I would never would have thought that. But Gun Semin who was in the board and also was President of the Association, suggested to me to be a candidate for the executive committee. So I first I was very surprised and then I thought OK, if he is willing to support me, why not? He should be able to judge the activities and he should be able to judge what I could do. So I run for the executive committee and I was very surprised that I was elected. But in the end this is a job with responsibilities like any other job and you have to work with people. In general people do not think that they could do it and do not put themselves forward so one has to push them and I think that this is important that people start thinking that they could do it.

XC: In preparation for these interviews I looked at the past presidents of the Association and I realized that you are the only woman president of the Association so this has

another importance, in terms of showing other women that this is also a possibility, that this is not an old boys network...

NE: Yes, when I was in the committee it was a special situation, there was Anne Maass Carmen Huici and Maria Jarymowicz, so we were four women members and this I think was also a unique occasion. I know that the other female members strongly supported me to become president. Again, I was very reluctant to do this, I was pregnant at the time with my second baby and I wasn't sure I was going to do that. But they convinced me to be candidate for the presidency and the other members of the Executive committee agreed. And I like to think that it was not only because I was a woman but also because they thought that I could do the job, having been treasurer and things having gone well, so hopefully...

XC: I know that sometimes women feel that they have some positions because they are women and this is not right or fair...

NE: Yes. But I know also from our research about discrimination in the workplace that women are usually very reluctant to be promoted in these special opportunities programs and also that other colleagues are very suspicious of their abilities when they are part of these programs, so this is also a very tricky business...

XC: So you have been treasurer and president of the Association and you won the Jaspars lecture in 1990 and the Lewin award in 2008, so how you see the Association today? Are there any issues? How do you see social psychology in Europe?

NE: My experience from the Association when I was serving at the Executive committee was that the EASP was in transition from a small, almost family oriented group of people, with a family feeling, that knew each other and wanted to be organized also professionally. But during the years I was part of the Executive committee there was a large increase of members and funds and activities and there were other possibilities. So one of the things we tried to deal with was to make this transition towards a more professionally run Association where different members of the executive committee would have specific tasks to do. Also at the time the administrator, Sibylle, was working for the association on a part-time basis. So we set her up as a professional administrator with her own business to support the Association and also to support the editors of the journal. I think that these were activities that might not have been visible for the members but we tried to be more professional, to be better organized, to deal with the different demands of the organization. Of course this is an ongoing business, this is never finished, but at the time it was very important for us to deal with.

XC: The growth of the Association continues and it is very difficult to run it if we are not well organized, so many people attending the GM and the summer schools... Now about the content of the Association... You are coming from SIT that is identified as a European theory, that is part of the European tradition. Do you think that the development of social psychology in Europe is going well, theoretically, empirically?

NE: I think so. We have now a breadth of topics in social psychology that are now also represented in the activities of the European Association, the journal and the meetings. I think there is now also more integration between experimental work and more applied work. Of course this is also symbolized by the change in the name of the organization

that I think is appropriate because there is no longer a distinction between those who do experimental, empirically sound work and people who do applied more subjective work. So I think that this is more integrated right now. But I also think that it represents the reality, that European Social Psychology is very active and internationally visible. So you could say that European Social Psychology represents world social psychology. Perhaps this is ingroup projection ... Or you could say that European Social Psychology is very determined and also has a great impact on international social psychology. And I know that our colleagues in the US or in Australia are quite aware of what goes on in Europe, and are quite interested in people who are here and in what they are doing. I wouldn't say that this is all due to the European Association but the Association has helped to make all this visible and has also helped people who are perhaps in less privileged circumstances to get access to the same scientific networks and to the same scientific information through the journals, through the summer schools and through the meetings and I think that that has been very very important.

XC: We have now a new journal that apparently is going very well...

NE: Yes, this new journal or the fact that the Americans are taking over the idea of the summer school are clear marks that we are taken very very seriously, as equal partners. That we are equally important from a scientific point of view and equally active. And I think that this is valid and this is evidence for the Association's importance.

XC: I also wanted to discuss with you the fact that you received last time at the GM the Lewin award, this is a very important award that the Association gives to people for their scientific work, you also received another award in the Netherlands from the Royal Academy of Science for your work as a woman scientist. This is very pleasing to know that there are these kinds of awards and I would like you to comment on the role of women in our discipline. For example, when I was organizing the summer school a lot of applications came from women PhD students and 2/3 of the participants were women. Yet, I think there is a discrepancy in professorial positions. What do you think? Is there any advice we can give to our young colleagues?

NE: I don't know. We see the same situation here and all over the place, and I think that when you compare statistics in Holland it is even worse than elsewhere. Optimists say that this is a generational thing and that now you have all these female students and you only have to wait and in twenty years they will be the professors. I am already old enough to be able to say that this is not the case. Because if we look at the statistics over time there is a small increase but it is not at all proportional to what you would expect. So apparently there are reasons why women are more likely to drop out of science at later stages in their careers. Why? I don't know. There are many different reasons and the scientific literature shows that there are many little reasons that combine to bring this outcome. But I think there are some things that we can do as scientists or as people involved in running societies or journals or involved in the administration of universities and faculties. There are things we could do to help women to express their ambitions and to realize their ambitions. When I look at our own research on this topic we have learned a lot about the effects of what we call subtle discrimination which is very hard for women to deal with. Even the fact that you can see in statistics that there are not many women in high level positions and at the same time it is explicitly said that there is no gender discrimination: this is already a form of implicit discrimination. Because if you do that, like when the Dutch government was asked why there are hardly any women in the

government, they said “we do not vote gender, we vote quality”. So what they implicitly say is that there are no women with high quality. So if you are at the university and there are only one or two female professors even in a field such as psychology, where we have 70-80 % female students - and even among the PhDs, post-docs, researchers there are a lot of women at least 50% or something - , but we are saying we do not discriminate, actually what you are saying is that women apparently are not good enough to do this type of job. And this is something that we already know from our studies: this is already enough to discourage women, to make them doubt about their abilities, to make them underperform. For instance when we assess their intelligence, after we provide such information they perform worse than otherwise. Then, of course, we have a self-fulfilling prophecy. Because implicit discrimination makes women less motivated so that they start to perform less well and become less willing to invest in their careers. So yes, if you then only select people who are showing the best performance then women are at a disadvantage. Only the trick is to find out what is the cycle there and whether you can do something to break the cycle. That is not so easy. Although some things are actually relatively easy. Again in our studies we found out that if men, for instance, simply acknowledge that even if they are not consciously trying to discriminate against women there might be rules or regulations that are less favorable for women, if they acknowledge this, that women may have additional disadvantages, that might already be enough to overcome these motivational differences and the performance losses. So, sometimes just acknowledging that even if we want to believe in a just world, perhaps it is not completely true, that already helps people deal with this. Making available statistics and showing that even if we think we are doing well because we've just appointed a woman, still you know it is only 7% women or whatever, that also helps: reminding people that things are not equal. Because people like to think that we are living in a fair world, people like to think of the positive examples, people like to think of the cases where “ that woman was really not as capable as the male candidate and therefore it was a just decision not to appoint her” and people like to look at examples of fair judgments. And they don't feel very comfortable about thinking that there might be disadvantage. Women don't like to think about that because then they think “oh whatever I do I will never achieve the same”. Men don't like to think about that because then they might think that “ perhaps I've got my position not just because I am such a good researcher but also because I am a man”. So both parties are very motivated to maintain the conviction that we have a fair system. But if you look at the statistics, you can see it is not a fair system.

XC: There are a lot of issues and young girls sometimes have to think about family and career and they move more often to follow a partner than a partner follows them and they abandon even if they are in a good track, even if they have started publishing etc.

NE: Yes, but I think that these things are connected to an extent. It is fine if you think “I can ask my partner to change his career” or “I can decide not to have a family”, or move my family or whatever... But if you are very insecure about whether your abilities will also help you get ahead with your career then it is much more difficult to make that sacrifice. And if you are more confident, if you know that “if I do my best, I will be able to do this” then it is also easier even with your partner to negotiate this type of thing and to make this type of choices. So, again I think that there is a vicious circle going on there too. So as long it is so unclear for women whether they would be able to make it even if they show an excellent performance, then the price they are willing to pay, if they don't have confidence in the equality of the system, becomes too high. Well, what if I can do all that and I can sacrifice all that and still this would not help me because I am in a disadvantaged

position as a woman. So, again, there too, I think there is much to gain by giving women the confidence that they will have an equal chance and that we will support them, and if there are unjust features in the system we will try to address them, we will try to fight them. At least women will have more confidence to negotiate with their partners or to make family decisions that would benefit their careers. And then it will be worth it also.

XC: Yes I think it would, and I am happy that such things are said in the Bulletin because a lot of post-graduate members are reading the bulletin and knowing that people are aware of the situation and that there are women who passed through all these difficulties it is important. It works a little bit as a role model although somebody would say that it could be used as an alibi of the system. But if these people are aware of the situation, like you said, it is very very important for young researchers.

NE: It was at least for me, through the European Association because in Holland I didn't know any female professors, and I met women through the European Association. I met people like Amelie Mummendey and Anne Maass and I was asking them things, how could you do this with your work and with your family. I was very eager to speak to them and to find out whether it was even possible. It helped me really a lot to know that perhaps there are not very many women like that but they do exist and it is possible and that you can create the conditions to do that. So again this is another way in which the European Association has been very instrumental for me in making my own personal decisions. So hopefully if it works like that, why not?

XC: So, having made all these decisions, you arrived very recently to receive a very prestigious award, the Spinoza award which is a Dutch award to reward scientific work and it comes with a large amount of money, I think it is 2.5 million euros. So this shows confidence in people, when they are awarded so much money, and this is also very nice for our discipline. Independently of the fact that you are a woman, it is also important for social psychology.

NE: Yes, I think it is also important because in the Dutch system - but I think this is also something that you could find also in other countries - it is not always the case that psychology or social psychology is regarded as real science. In previous years, when these awards were given, it was often the case that only hard sciences got this type of award and people said that there was no quality in the "soft sciences", that they are not real sciences. So it is also important for the image of psychology and social psychology in particular, that an external committee has decided that it is equally good as real science.

XC: I guess this type of award changes somebody's research life, because it makes things easy and perhaps some other things more difficult because it is a huge responsibility...

NE: Well, I am not going to complain... What is unique about this award, not only in the Dutch system but it would be rare internationally is that... You can, of course, apply for large amounts of money, for instance through the European Union, but you first need to prepare a very detailed plan and you have to make a budget and you have to go through the peer review and you have to defend it... And as a scientist you know that you make this plan for four or five years while you already know that after the first couple of studies things are going to be different. So you are never going to do the program exactly as you write it but still you are supposed to write it as if you know what you are going to do. I always think that this is a little bit funny because as a scientist you know that what you

write in your research proposal is fiction. So, what is very special about this one is that on the basis of your track record and your past performance you get that amount of money for your research and they say “we know that you are doing good quality work and we trust you to do something useful with this money”, without first having to write all these plans. So you first get the money and you can spend it on whatever you think is necessary and this is really unique and it gives you also a lot of intellectual freedom to pursue all issues that you think are important and to be able to change directions or to do something different if you think that is better, or to spend it on equipment or to spend it on personnel. Because sometimes it is very restrictive: there is a specific type of things you can get funding for, and then you apply according to the funds that you can get. But this is complete freedom and a vote of confidence of the scientific community to award money on this basis. This makes it even more special than anything.

XC: I think that this academic freedom that you mentioned is important, not having to reply to a specific call and to be able to decide in what direction you are going to go.

NE: And we all had this experience when you know we say that “Oh if I am creative I can frame my research in such a way to match this type of funds” etc...And of course you can do this to some extent but still you are jumping through hoops in order to get the funds. Here is the reverse, so it feels like a luxury situation.

XC: So what you are going to do with that money?

NE: Well, part of the answer is: I don't know yet! Which is very nice, I think. I want to start slowly. What I am trying to pursue at the moment is to bring brain measures in my research. My research has been always looking at relatively very rich social situations, even in the lab I always work with group interactions so there are a lot of uncontrolled variables in data collection. And to combine this type of paradigm and this type of research questions with brain measures: this is a big challenge. Because the brain measures are not compatible with our standard ways of doing research and cannot be combined with the complex tasks that we use. They are not immediately, obviously suitable to examine these types of questions. We've been working during the past year or so to prepare paradigms that could combine these types of measures with these types of research questions. This is one of the directions that I would like to try to pursue. But because it is also new and I do not have a lot of data yet, I am also a little bit careful. Yes, I now have all this money but this is still tax-payers' money. These are public funds, I don't want to spend it all at once just because I can. So I really want to know what I am doing before I open another project in the same line of research. Perhaps, if it is very disappointing, I can still decide to do something else. I would like to keep that open in my mind. This is a general research question I am interested in but I am not yet sure how it will be and how it will go and I think this is a realistic approach to science. At least, more realistic than making detailed plans for five years that you already know that you are not going to keep...

XC: You are working on how groups influence people, or how being part of a group influences people. Do you think that physiological measures, whether these are brain measures or other things, would tell us more about processes in that respect?

NE: Yes, I think so. Very much. Because this information would help us find out how people monitor their responses. So I wouldn't say that real behavior that you show to

others is the real thing or that the brain activity is the real thing. What I am interested is the interplay between the two. In many social situations you immediately have a physiological stress response or you have an immediate brain response even at a pre-conscious level. This occurs at early stages of information processing and only later people become aware of that. They work with somebody and only later they say "I feel stressed", or "I feel uncomfortable" or "I have all these thoughts that are coming up in my mind and I need to suppress them because I don't want to think about them" or "I have prejudiced views about this person and I don't want to spoil the interaction". But only the fact that this does happen automatically and that you need to consciously reverse that or manage that or try not to show that in your overt behavior... I think that this interplay between automatic level processes and more controlled external behavior is very interesting and very important in our social relations and in how we manage social relations and how we manage group membership or the fact that other people approach us in terms of our group memberships. I think that there is a world of research out there that can be done and we are beginning to go towards that direction. I am very excited about this.

XC: Do you think, for instance, that identity maps to physiological...

NE: Yes, I think so. There are some initial studies showing that brain areas that are associated with thinking about the self can also been activated when you think about other ingroup members. So even at that level you can show that people do have social identities and that some others are more selected as part of the self than other people. And people can switch identities across situations and what I like about it is that on the one hand you can say that the responses are hard-wired. On the other hand, however, it is not hard-wired in the sense that somebody is an ingroup member or an outgroup member and that's that. No, you can shift that around and this of course offers a lot of scope for helping people to live together and work together in a more productive way, to see how you can shift the situation in order to, at that unconscious level, get that type of response. I think that there are a lot of challenges there both in terms of basic research and in terms of applications that you can have.

XC So you think that there will be a practical outcome...

NE: Oh yes, and that's also my main motivation. That's also the reason why in my research I always try to combine different types of research paradigms. I do this very basic lab research but I also do applied work in organizations, I do interviews, I do surveys, I speak to people because I think ultimately with the research we are doing we want to apply and to use it in real situations for people, to improve the working conditions and to improve social relations in society and you need to connect all these levels if only in order to be able to communicate about your research. Each research method has its own limitations. If we are in the lab applied people would say "how will this work in the field" and if we are working in the field other people would say "we don't know anything about causality.." So then OK, I think that we have to combine the different methodologies and then the weakness of one methodology is compensated by the strength of another methodology. But in the end... For instance, when I speak about our research I actually talk about results of laboratory experiments but the way I explain it to people I do it by using cites and quotes from interviews in organizations because they illustrate the things that we do in the labs. So we do not research it in that way but these are clearly the same things going on. So I also use information from the field and the interviews to talk about

the implications of our lab work and in my experience that makes it much easier to convey also to the general public what is the use of what we are doing.

XC: Well it is important to articulate different levels of analysis in research... You became known with your research on the structural variables that Tajfel proposed in relation to intergroup behavior, legitimacy, stability, permeability, and how they are perceived. Now you are going towards more physiological measures. A lot of people are going the other way round, from more physiological they get to know the more social aspects but you want to see their interplay.

NE: Yes, and I think that now I am at a stage that I can do it. Because of course as an individual researcher looking at each type of methodology, you need to learn a lot about how to do it, how to analyze how to write it up, how to get it published and it is very hard to be specialized in all these different methodologies. So, I am now fortunate that I am at a stage in my career that I can collaborate with many different people who have different types of expertise. So this makes it possible because as an individual researcher is almost impossible to do more than one thing at the same time. This is a benefit of getting older! I don't need to know every detail of every methodology to be able to work with these different people and to be able to try forge a link between these different ways of doing research. And I like to think that this is the benefit of being a little bit at a distance of the details of the research and being the more senior researcher in a group: that you can make these links. And as long as people would think that there is an added value I think that this is very useful. So, you change your role during your career in a sense.

XC: As far as I am concerned these were the type of questions I had in mind to ask you. In doing these interviews, I chose past presidents because they had a senior role in the Association and also because they are all people who have a position in the field so they can talk about the Association and about social psychology and they can give members food for thought. So if you want to add something in our discussion...

NE: I don't know... We talked about a lot of things... The Association is very important for my professional life but also for my personal life... It started with the summer school but it continued and I think that is part of the work of the Association and the activities of the Association: to enable people to make friends with people across the world. Not just because they are good colleagues and you respect their work, but because you get to know them as individuals, you learn about what is like to live and to work in other parts of Europe. I think that this is very precious. People come to visit our home, our children get exposed to different types of experiences, to international colleagues, we travel... We used not to take them but now that they are older we take them sometimes when we travel for work. I think it also changes my personal life. You have this international network, you have these connections and this is a very special part of it. One of my sons the other day: I was joking with him and I asked whether he already knew what he wanted to be. My husband always says that he should become a dentist because then he would become very rich! My son said that perhaps he wants to become a scientist because then you get to travel and you have friends in different parts of the world. So I think: OK, they understand that part very well. This is a strong point of the Association and of this work and it is very enriching at a personal and a professional level: to be aware that there are different social realities and people work in different circumstances. I think that the Association was always very aware of that too. One of the goals always was that regardless of the circumstances of people they should be given access to the same scientific

network and be helped to perform up to the same standards. To try to offer the network or the tools to be able to do that or to allow people to travel or to allow people to visit. I think that is very special, it is very unique, I guess. It makes the European situation, for instance, different from the universities in the US where there is more of the same social culture or educational system. I think that the added value of the European Association is unique for Europe and it is not just past history. It is still going on. There are still parts of Europe that we do not exactly know what is going on there and how people have been trained and educated there. And I think that it is a very important function and job and goal of the Association. This is very hard to understand for people who are educated in a different system. For them it is much easier to have access to resources, it is much easier to know what colleagues are doing. But Europe is still a patchwork.

XC: I became very aware of it when I moved from Britain to Greece. There are still huge inequalities in Europe, to be able to work and publish. Just take the language issue.

NE: yes but also I know colleagues who tell me that there are university full professors who still have to do organizational consultancies to earn a living. We don't even know the situations that people have to confront to in order to be able to do science...

XC: Thank you very much for this conversation

NE: My pleasure

Leiden, October 2010

Future EASP Meetings

Medium Size Meeting

On Motivational Processes in Attitudes

May 25-27, 2012, Ghent University, Belgium

Organizers:

Adriaan Spruyt, Ghent University. Adriaan.Spruyt@ugent.be

Jan De Houwer, Ghent University. Jan.DeHouwer@UGent.be

Pablo Briñol, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. pablo.brinnol@uam.es

Geoff Haddock, Cardiff University. haddockgg@cardiff.ac.uk

Rob Holland, Radboud University Nijmegen. r.holland@psych.kun.nl

Greg Maio, Cardiff University. maio@cardiff.ac.uk

Rich Petty, Ohio State University. petty.1@osu.edu

Contact: Adriaan.Spruyt@ugent.be

The role of motivation in attitudes is becoming increasingly important as an issue. Diverse motivations are important in attitude change, including accuracy motivation, self-esteem, consistency, and social acceptance. Many of these motivations were highlighted by classic theories of attitude function many decades ago, but our understanding of their effects has become increasingly sophisticated in the past decade. At the same time, the contributions on this topic have become very diverse, including research on goals and evaluation, the self as a target of change, and motivations in intra- and inter-groups attitudes, deliberative versus incidental self-persuasion, and even motives to feel consistent with our own bodily responses. Recent developments in theories of associative learning, motivation, goals, and values also have important implications for attitude and behavior change. In addition, there is increasing knowledge of the impact of motivational processes on attitudes, as assessed using implicit and explicit measures. Not only do these findings have important implications for theories of social cognition, they also call for further refinement and sophistication of implicit measures of attitude and the way they are used in applied fields. Finally, there is more knowledge about relevant individual differences in motivation (e.g., need to evaluate, need for cognition, preference for consistency) and about relevant biological and cultural factors. There is a pressing need for integrative perspectives on these diverse motivational influences. The aim of the proposed meeting is to facilitate this integration.

The meeting will take place May 25-27, 2012, at Ghent University, Belgium. We plan to include 40-50 participants, with at least 50% from Europe and 50% at the junior faculty or postgraduate level. Up to 20 participants will be asked to give a 30-min presentation, and the remaining participants will present posters. During the poster session, there will be several opportunities for informal interaction and discussion. A roundtable discussion will take place midway through the schedule of talks. If you are interested in attending this meeting, please send an abstract (between 100-200 words) to Adriaan Spruyt before November 30th, 2011.

Small Group Meeting

On the Societal Meanings of Minority Influence

June 6-10, 2012, Delphi, Greece

Organizers: Stamos Papastamou, Antonis Gardikiotis, & Gerasimos Prodromitis

Contact: papastamou@eekpsy.gr

Minority influence has been a central issue for social psychological research since Moscovici's early theorizing in the late 1960s. In a last review of research on minority influence, (Martin & Hewstone, 2010), several key themes of minority influence research were identified. Four of these themes are interesting, in our opinion, not only because they remain timely but because they are largely unexplored. These themes are:

1. *The interplay between minority influence and dual-process models of persuasion,*
2. *The importance of indirect, as well as direct, influence,*
3. *Minority influence in dynamic, intra-group contexts and*
4. *The diversity of minority sources as social influence.*

The common denominator of all these four themes is the need to bring out the societal dimension and significance of minority influence phenomena. In other words, we suggest that it is timely to explore the role of active minorities in the construction and deconstruction of social consensus, by focusing on the influence they exert as well as on the resistance processes triggered against it.

The aim of the proposed small meeting is to contribute in filling this epistemological and theoretical gap in the social influence literature by providing the podium to social psychologists working in this area to present their work.

Topics to be covered are the following:

- 1) *Social vs cognitive processes of social influence: cooperation vs antagonism*
- 2) *Majority and minority influence: a singular or a double socio-psychological process?*
- 3) *Conversion vs appropriation of minority ideas*
- 4) *Different meta-theoretical considerations such as the third person perception or implicit theories of social influence through which the determining contribution of social representation is reintroduced in the study of minority influences.*

Applications for participation, including an abstract for a contribution (up to 200 words) and contact information, can be sent to Stamos Papastamou (papastamou@eekpsy.gr).

Deadline for applications: July 30, 2011.

Small Group Meeting

On Social Cognition and Communication

July 9-12, 2012, Hungarian Academy of Sciences,
Pecs, Hungary

Organizers: János László, Institute for Psychology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary (laszlo@mtapi.hu), Orsolya Vincze, Institute of Psychology, University of Pécs Hungary (vincze.orsolya@pte.hu), Joseph P. Forgas, School of Psychology, University of New South Wales, Australia (j.p.forgas@unsw.edu.au)

Contact: Orsolya Vincze at vincze.orsolya@pte.hu

Contributors to the meeting will explore the close and interdependent relationship between social cognition and communication at the individual, intergroup and cultural level. Papers may explore the psychological processes involved in the way people use language and construct narratives, stories and explanations, and the ways that our social cognitive processes are shaped by communication, and in turn, cognitive processes and representations influence how social actors communicate with each other. Cognitive mechanisms associated with priming, moods, fluency, and salience have an important influence on people's communicative strategies, and recent theories produced important new insights into the links between evolutionary and cultural processes in shaping interactive strategies. The aim of this small group meeting is to bring together established scholars and young researchers from the fields of contemporary social cognitive and communications research, in order to explore the multifaceted ways that social cognitive mechanisms and communicative processes interact at the individual, group and cultural level.

The location: PECS, HUNGARY

Pecs, selected as European Capital of Culture in 2010, is a delightful small town in the south of Hungary, with an excellent Mediterranean climate and a rich historical and cultural tradition. The city (then called Sopianae) was founded by the Romans in the 2nd century; it was the capital of Valeria province, and has been an important cultural and religious centre and a bishopric from the Middle Ages. The first University in Hungary was founded in Pecs by Louis I the Great in 1367, and the city retains to this day a rich and varied architectural heritage and a large number of museums and artistic treasures. In 2008 Pecs was selected as the second most Livable city (The LivCom Awards)[5] in the category of cities between 75-200 thousand inhabitants. For further information and pictures, check out the following websites:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/P%C3%A9cs>

http://www.usatoday.com/travel/destinations/2007-07-18-pecs-hungary_N.htm

<http://www.tripadvisor.com/Tourism-g274905-Pecs-Vacations.html>

<http://www.1hungary.com/info/pecs/>



The meeting (and accommodation) will be located in the University Hotel Hunyor, in easy walking distance from all the major attractions. The hotel has been recently refurbished and is under new management. For details of the hotel, please see the website at <http://hunyorhotel.pte.hu/>



All costs of accommodation and meals for the three days of the conference will be fully covered (from July 9 to July 12th). Further, a rich and varied cultural and social program including a wine tasting in the local wine region will also be organised as part of the meeting.

The conference will be supported by EASP and the University of Pécs. We expect that there will not be a registration fee.

Contributions will be subsequently published in a book form. Draft chapters should present a brief review of a significant area of research emphasizing especially the latest theoretical and empirical developments (length: 6000 words).

Abstract submission deadline: 15.06.2011 (150-250 words)

If you wish to participate,

1. Please contact the organisers and send a 150-250 word abstract of your proposed paper both to Joe Forgas jp.forgas@unsw.edu.au and Orsolya Vincze vincze.orsolya@pte.hu by June 15th 2011.
2. You will be notified about acceptance a few weeks later.
3. If invited, we need to receive a full draft of your proposed paper (6000 words text) that will form the basis of the book chapter **by February 15th 2012**.

Thank you for considering this, and we look forward to hearing from you!

Kind regards

Janos Laszlo, Joe Forgas, Orsolya Vincze
Organisers/Editors

**16th General Meeting of the EASP
Stockholm, Sweden July 12-16, 2011
News from the Program and Organization Committee**

The General Meeting of the EASP in 2011: Welcome to Stockholm!

The 16th General Meeting of the European Association of Social Psychology will be held coming July (12-16) in Stockholm, Sweden. The meeting will be held at Stockholm International Fairs, a modern and pleasant venue, with plenty of space for our scientific as well as social activities.

We received a total of 960 submissions this year, including symposia (137, each including either 4 or 5 talks), individual oral presentations (578), and posters (245). This reflects a total of roughly 1200 talks, within symposia and thematic sessions. This constitutes a 34% increase relative to Opatija, which is particularly impressive given the current financial constraints that affect many of our colleagues' ability to attend conferences. Each symposium proposal and each individual oral presentation was evaluated by two reviewers, and by at least one member of the program committee. In cases of doubt, submissions were also reviewed by a second member of the program committee, and sometimes even by a third member of the committee. Sub-chairs for each panel made final decisions regarding submissions in their panel. Sub-chairs also evaluated the posters submitted to their panel. The program chair carefully considered each poster that was recommended for rejection, and made final decisions regarding acceptance of posters. Authors of individual oral presentations and symposia which could not fit in the program were offered the chance to bring posters to the conference, and most accepted to do so. To maximize the number of talks that we could accept, we added one parallel session (we now have 11 parallel sessions, in contrast to the 10 of Opatija), shortened the length of the symposia (talks within symposia now take only 20 minutes in total, the same as individual oral presentations), and divided the day into slots of 4 and slots of 5 talks (be it symposia or thematic sessions), so as to ensure that as few time slots as possible would be wasted by parallel sessions with unequal numbers of talks. The result of all of these maneuvers is that we were able to accept close to 67% of all symposia and 51% of all individual oral presentations submitted.

The program is thus rather full, but there is still time for some special social events, such as the reception at the Stockholm Town Hall (the venue where Nobel prizes are awarded), the farewell dinner at a restaurant in the beautiful Skansen open air museum, and the traditional football game. During Tuesday the 12th of July, at least 4 pre-conferences will be held at various locations in the city. The registration desk for the main conference will open on Tuesday at 15:00 (3 pm), and again on Wednesday morning at 8:30, at Stockholm International Fairs. The scientific program will start on Wednesday at 9:30 and will occupy most of Wednesday, Thursday, and Saturday, while Friday will only have scientific sessions during the morning. Friday afternoon will be dedicated to the awards session (including the Tajfel lecture), and the business meeting. There will be one poster session per day (so 4 in total). Posters will be up all day, and authors are expected to be close to their posters during a portion of the lunch break. The poster sessions will be held in a spacious area of the venue, with plenty of light and space to move around, close to where food and drinks can be found, and close to the area where the talks will be held. There is

no way posters can be missed, and we wish to emphasize and promote their importance in events such as these. To facilitate navigation through the poster sessions, posters are also organized into themes on each day, and these themes will be indicated by signs.

The scientific program will be made available online ahead of time, on the conference site: www.easp2011.com. When this is available, please check the details of your presentation or poster and let us know if you spot a mistake. The last speaker in each thematic session has been designated as the chair of that session, so if you are included in a thematic session, please also check whether you have been indicated as chair of that session and please let us know if you are unable to fulfill this role. You will be reminded of this when the program becomes available.

Upon registration, you will receive a conference package that includes a light and easy to handle paper version of the program, where you can see all of the talk and poster titles and short abstracts, as well as their time and location. In addition, a memory stick will be provided where the complete program, with full abstracts, is included. Be sure to check the conference web-site to register and to consult information about accommodation.

We look forward to seeing you in Stockholm this July!

Manuela Barreto, Program chair
Torun Lindholm, Chair of the local organizing committee

News about Members

In Memoriam: Tatiana Slama Cazacu (25.01.1920 – 05.04.2011)

Tatiana Slama Cazacu, a renowned Romanian specialist in applied social psycholinguistics, unexpectedly passed away on 5 April 2011, at 91 years, in her full creative strength. In her last years she has been working assiduously, publishing her work and writing her memoirs. She just started answering questions for our publication in *Social Psychology*; on Friday she told us that she was working on our interview and on Monday we received the sad news.

She was born on 25 January 1920 in Bucharest, in a family of intellectuals. She studied at Bucharest University, Faculty of Letters and Philosophy (Degree in Philosophy - Psychology, Pedagogy and Aesthetics Specialization, 1942) and Linguistics (Modern Philology - Italian Language, History of Art, 1943). Her PhD, defended on 25 July 1949, under the supervision of an eminent psycho-sociologist, Mihai Ralea, was not recognized by the new regime established after the Second World War. She received her title only in 1966, after a new defence of the thesis. Her thesis became the well-known book *Langage et contexte* (1959, 464p, The Hague, Mouton, 1961).

Her academic career was often obstructed due to political reasons. Her father, an advocate, once a member of the Liberal Party, was convicted on political grounds and imprisoned. She had never seen him again, as he died in prison in 1954. She started as a substitute professor in several neighborhood schools but was soon dismissed because of her "unclean social descent". She was then hired as a researcher at the Psychology Institute of Academy, run by the same Mihai Ralea, and she became there the Head of the Language Psychology Laboratory, managing a very productive research group. Her studies began to be recognized and some of them were translated. She became acknowledged by the Soviet researchers and was brought back at the University as a Professor at the Faculty of Letters. There, for the first time, she taught courses of Psycholinguistics and Applied Linguistics between 1968-1980 when she was involuntarily given early retirement. What was the reason? She had received an invitation to be an associated Professor at Sorbonne. She was forbidden to take this position, and when she insisted, she vexed the authorities. In 1971 she founded the Psycholinguistics Laboratory at Bucharest University - the first one of this kind in Europe. It was a model institution with a director, a council, a research team, a testing room and equipment. Here, as in the Laboratory of Psychology Institute, she carried out with her team important studies that inserted this field into the scientific community.

She supervised numerous PhDs in Psychology (from 1971) and Linguistics (from 1979) and educated numerous researchers. The Laboratory at the University of Letters was abusively dissolved in 1973, and the one at the Psychology Institute was decommissioned after 1980, when psychosocial research and studies in psychology were no longer permitted according to a decision taken by the heads of the communist regime at that time.

She was a talented manager preoccupied with institutional constructions; several laboratories, research groups, institutions and publications appeared and functioned only due to her insistence and perseverance. She initiated professional associations, organized congresses, wrote and edited publications. In 1963 she initiated the creation of the Psychological Association of Romania; she edited the Statutes, was elected the General Secretary and successfully organized The First Conference of Psychology (with international participation). She was dismissed from this position once again on political grounds. She initiated and managed in Romania (1971) the Romanian Group of Applied Linguistics (GRLA) affiliated to AILA, Commission of Psycholinguistics, 1972-2000). The Group organized monthly meetings, periodical conferences (10) and published its work (10 volumes). Slama-Cazacu was one of the founding members, President and Honorary President, of ISAPL (International Society of Applied Linguistics). Among her top achievements ranks the prestigious publication *International Journal of Psycholinguistics* [„IJPL”], which she created, organized and ran on the suggestion of Mouton Publishing House (Haga), from 1972 until 1980. She was Editor-in-Chief and in the Editorial Committee she invited R. Jakobson, J. Piaget - at his request! - and G. Miller, among many others. She proposed the cover design of the Journal, organized the collaboration (there was no such thing as *e-mail*). She did not have a secretariat and she did everything by herself, paying the post office expeditions in the time of political censorship of Romania. From 1993 the Journal was published in Osaka.

She conceived the human being as a whole whose essence should be considered as having bio-psycho-social basis. She was preoccupied by the link between Science and Reality, by practical applications (communication improvement, teaching languages, correct language use, counteracting manipulative strategies, etc.). Her main theoretical postulate started from the real communication act expressed by language. She created, systematically formulated, applied, validated (research, international recognition, publications) the CONTEXTUAL - DYNAMIC Theory and Methodology. This involved a) a new Model of Communication Act (starting from the reality of this Act; b) the first transformation of static structuralism through demonstrating the possibility of observing the "dynamic" character of Structure. c) the transformation of the "Communication Scheme" (the inclusion of the Emitter - Receiver in reality, "in context"; d) the first development of the concept of CONTEXT (with the subordinate spheres of the contextual levels – explicit – implicit, linguistic – situational, verbal – nonverbal); e) the demonstration of the "contextual organization of Emission" Act and of "contextual interpretation of "message Reception" etc, f) the study of communication in the Dynamic of Reception as an individual act (momentary or in ontogenesis) or historical, and in the construction of the dynamic context of the message; g) she initiated the first research of "children dialogue" and new studies on the structure of the dialogue in the work process.

She published over 55 volumes, among which 35 as a single author: for example, *Dialogul la copii* [Dialogue in children], 1961, awarded the Academy Prize; *Comunicarea în procesul muncii* [Communication in the workplace], 1964; *Introducere în Psiholingvistică*, 1968; *La Psycholinguistique - Lectures*, Paris, Klincksieck, 1972, *Introduction to Psycholinguistics*, The Hague, Mouton, 1973; *Introduzione alla Psicolinguistica*, Padova, 1973, *Dialogue in children*, The Hague, Mouton, 1977 - translated in Bloomington, Indiana University and approximately 500 articles and scientific studies in psycholinguistics, communication psychology, language analysis etc. She continued to work after the political change from 1989: *Psiholingvistica. O știință a comunicării* [Psycholinguistics – A science of communication], 1999 (800 pages), *Stratagemă comunicățională și manipularea*

[*Communicational strategies and manipulation*], 2000; *Via* [], *personalitate, limbaj. Analize contextual-dinamice de texte literare* [*Life, personality, language. Contextual-dynamic analyses of literary texts*], 2007.

She was better known outside than inside Romania; when I started participating in different scientific events after 1989, I was often questioned about her scientific research. She had several books translated in the Netherlands, France, Italy, Spain, Brazil, Mexico, Germany, United States and she was considered as the most famous Romanian Psychologist. However, the prestigious Italian psychologist and pedagogue, Renzo Titone, a specialist in pluri-linguistics and intercultural education, considered her in 1985 as „the greatest researcher in applied psycholinguistics” [Her approach] ... constituted in itself a considerable progress of the previous unilateral theories developed before 1954 in psycholinguistics”. Professor Slama-Cazacu also published an important book in communication psychology (dialogue for children, language disorders, the role of communication in the work process), general and applied linguistics, reading psychology, learning foreign languages, communication in mass media, and intercultural analysis of politeness, political speech, psychosocial and dynamic context.

When her books were translated into other languages, she was often invited (but during the Communist regime her departure was forbidden) to give classes, conferences and plenary lectures. Equally, she was invited to organize congresses in Europe (France, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Finland, Norway etc.), as well as in Japan, USA, Mexico, Canada, Brazil, Peru and Israel. She was a member in the editorial committees of several national and international journals; she was editor of a large number of international volumes of which at least 30 were indexed in international databases.

Professor Slama-Cazacu has often been given honours, a number of volumes were dedicated to her, though none in Romania. She was not only a well-known researcher but also a writer. She wrote prose, essays and theatrical plays. Her debut in 1948 brought her the National Prize for Short stories. She was able to publish her literary work only after 1989, as „livre de poche”. Her writings *8 patimi. Nuvele de sertar* [*Eight desires. Drawer short stories*] (2002) are impressive. In her short story, *Not final* [*Final note*], she reconstructs the dramatic context in which she wrote each of the eight short stories, including her efforts to publish them, her corrections of each text, changes of titles, discussions and adventures she experienced in different publishing houses. It is the history of a lifetime in which she uses her dynamic-contextual analysis in concrete circumstances, expressing a continuous fight that is never abandoned but impressively pursued. *Un copil in vechiul Bucuresti* [*A child in the old Bucharest*] retraces a lifestyle we can hardly imagine nowadays. The most impressive thing about the literature of this well-educated woman is her careful and clear writing style. There is no discordant note, no error; everything is well-placed; it is perfectionism that may frustrate some people.

When I was preparing the volume *Via a cotidian in communism* [*Everyday life during communism*] (2004) I invited her to participate in the project. She sent me a special text, a mixture of psychology and literature, a study case, a reconstruction of her family life in the social context of a democracy invented by the communist regime: „Cohabitants’ Institution”. As a result of a national law limiting the living space, the Cazacu family was found to have a „supplementary space” and due to this, a family was assigned to live with them in the house built by her grandfather in 1902. The cohabitants had the impression that they could control the private life of the bourgeois family. When the cohabitants

moved away, Tatiana and Boris tried to go back to the life they had before but it was no longer possible. Their house was demolished and the story of its event is evoked in an emotional writing *Nașterea, viața și moartea unei case* [*Birth, life and death of a house*].

Slama-Cazacu was a fascinating person; she would stand out in her education, professionalism, the power of work and perseverance. She knew how to value herself and she fought to be treated as she thought that she deserved. She fought for her value to be acknowledged throughout all her life. She was overwhelming; if she cherished you, she would fill you with her personality and she would make you follow her. Some people would abandon her. She would regret it, she would be unhappy, but she would never give up; she lived her life according to her belief.

Adrian Neculau

New Members of the Association

The following applications for membership were approved by the Executive Committee in April 2011. Names of members providing letters of support are in parentheses:

Dr. Marieke Adriaanse
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(G. van Koningsbruggen, C. Evers)

Dr. Julien Chappé
Nanterre, France
(P. Chekroun, J.-B. Légal)

Dr. Flavia Albarello
Bologna, Italy
(S. Moscatelli, M. Rubini)

Dr. Wing Yee Cheung
Southampton, UK
(T. Wildschut, C. Sedikides)

Dr. Karl Ask
Gothenburg, Sweden
(M.A. Reinhard, D. Stahlberg)

Dr. M. Mercedes Durán
Granada, Spain
(M. Moya, R. Rodriguez-Bailón)

Dr. Céline Bagès
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(C. Darnon, S. Redersdorff)

Dr. Francisco Esteves
Lisbon, Portugal
(M. Barreto, T. Schubert)

Dr. Daniel Balliet
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(P.A.M. van Lange, J.-W. van Prooijen)

Dr. Ferdinando Fornara
Cagliari, Italy
(M. Bonaiuto, M. Bonnes)

Dr. Anat Bardi
London, UK
(T. Viki, H. Zagefka)

Dr. Eva Fülöp
Budapest, Hungary
(T. Polya, J. László)

Dr. Luisa Batalha
Canberra, Australia
(N. Akrami, A. Haslam)

Dr. Margherita Guidetti
Reggio Emilia, Italy
(N. Cavazza, M. Conner)

Dr. Tomasz Besta
Gdansk, Poland
(B. Wojciszke, H. Brycz)

Dr. Tanja Hundhammer
Cologne, Germany
(T. Mussweiler, B. English)

Dr. Sara Bigazzi
Pecs, Hungary
(J. László, A. De Rosa)

Dr. Hans Ijzerman
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(P.A.M. van Lange, C. Finkenauer)

Dr. Marco Brambilla
Milano, Italy
(A. Carnaghi, M. Ravenna)

Dr. Roland Imhoff
Bonn, Germany
(R. Banse, H.-P. Erb)

Dr. Jacek Buczny
Warsaw, Poland
(B. Wojciszke, M. Parzuchowski)

Dr. Nicolas Kervyn
Louvain, Belgium
(C. Toma, K.-A. Wolтин)

Dr. Paszkál Kiss
Budapest, Hungary
(G. Hunyady, A. Kosic)

Dr. Natasza Kosakowska
Gdansk, Poland
(H. Brycz, A. Chybicka)

Dr. Sylvie Kourilova
Brno, Czech Republic
(M. Hrebickova, P. Macek)

Dr. Monika Kovács
Budapest, Hungary
(M. Bilewicz, I. Síklaki)

Dr. Clara Kulich
Geneva, Switzerland
(M. Ryan, F. Lorenzi-Cioldi)

Dr. Toon Kuppens
Cardiff, UK
(S. Demoulin, R. Spears)

Dr. Daniël Lakens
Eindhoven, The Netherlands
(K. Ruys, M. Stel)

Dr. Ioana M. Latu
Neuchâtel, Switzerland
(M. Schmidt Mast, V. Eicher)

Dr. Tuuli Anna Mähönen
Helsinki, Finland
(K. Helkama, I. Jasinskaja-Lahti)

Dr. Karlijn Massar
Maastricht, The Netherlands
(G. Kok, A. Bos)

Dr. Jesus L. Megías
Granada, Spain
(M. Moya, R. Rodríguez-Bailón)

Dr. Orla Muldoon
Limerick, Ireland
(X. Chryssochoou, A. Haslam)

Dr. David Novelli
Sussex, UK
(J. Drury, V. Vignoles)

Dr. Marte Otten
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(K. Jonas, A. Fischer)

Dr. Lisa Pagotto
Padova, Italy
(A. Voci, M. Hewstone)

Dr. Louisa J. Pavey
Kingston, UK
(P. Sparks, T. Greitemeyer)

Dr. Johanna Peetz
Cologne, Germany
(K. Corcoran, G. Kedia)

Dr. Caroline Pulfrey
Lausanne, Switzerland
(F. Butera, C. Buchs)

Dr. Timothy D. Ritchie
Limerick, Ireland
(C. Sedikides, E. Igou)

Dr. Paolo Riva
Milano, Italy
(L. Andrighetto, F.P. Colucci)

Dr. Sonia Roccas
Raananana, Israel
(R. Spears, A. Maass)

Dr. Simona Sacchi
Milano, Italy
(M. Cadinu, F.P. Colucci)

Dr. Selahattin Adil Saribay
Istanbul, Turkey
(U. Kühnen, M. Peker)

Dr. Annique Smeding
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(G. Kedia, I. Régner)

Dr. Melanie Steffens
Jena, Germany
(K. Jonas, A. Mummendey)

Dr. Nadzeya Svirydzenka
Leicester, UK
(F. Sani, R.M. Greenwood)

Dr. Manuela Thomae
Canterbury, UK
(G.T. Viki, R. Giner-Sorolla)

Dr. Sascha Topolinski
Würzburg, Germany
(F. Strack, R. Deutsch)

Dr. Elze Ufkes
New Haven, USA
(S. Otten, E. Kamans)

Dr. Inmaculada Valor-Segura
Granada, Spain
(M. Moya, F. Expósito)

Dr. Job van der Schalk
Cardiff, UK
(T. Manstead, A. Fischer)

Dr. Femke van Hooren
Cologne, Germany
(K. Ruys, K. Corcoran)

Dr. Dimitri Vasiljevic
Nanterre, France
(M. Augustinova, P Chekroun)

Dr. Renate Ysseldyk
Exeter, UK
(A. Haslam, T. Morton)

Affiliate Membership

Dr. Christopher Agnew
West Lafayette, USA
(C. de Dreu, E. Kluwer)

Dr. Ximena Arriaga
West Lafayette, USA
(C. de Dreu, E. Kluwer)

Dr. Monica Biernat
Lawrence, KS, USA
(C. Sedikides, M. Hewstone)

Dr. Jim Blascovich
Santa Barbara, USA
(P.A.M. van Lange, N. Ellemers)

Dr. Adrienne Carter-Sowell
Texas, USA
(F. Butera, J.M. Falomir-Pichastor)

Dr. Christian Crandall
Lawrence, Kansas, USA
(J. Vala, S. Guimond)

Dr. Kent Harber
Newark, USA
(C.K.W. de Dreu, P. Harris)

Dr. Janelle M. Jones
Queensland, Australia
(A. Haslam, I. Gleibs)

Dr. Nurit Shnabel
Tel-Aviv, Israel
(J. Ullrich, C.K.W. de Dreu)

Dr. Michael Wohl
Ottawa, Canada
(A. Haslam, C.K.W. de Dreu)

Postgraduate Membership

Séverine Balon
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
(B. Rimé, G. Herman)

Nicole Behringer
Tuebingen, Germany
(K. Sassenberg, J. Jacoby)

Jacques Berent
Geneve, Switzerland
(G. Mugny, J.M. Falomir-Pichastor)

Christopher Berger
Stockholm, Sweden
(A. Haslam, C.K.W. de Dreu)

Magdalena Bobowik
San Sebastian, Spain
(M. Moya, J.-F. Valencia)

Christoph Borzkowsky
Kiel, Germany
(B. Simon, A. Bachmann)

Ambra Brizi
Rome, Italy
(A. Kotic, L. Mannetti)

Axel Burger
Mannheim, Germany
(H. Bless, R. Greifeneder)

Pascal Burgmer
Cologne, Germany
(T. Mussweiler, K. Corcoran)

Héctor Carvacho
Bielefeld, Germany
(G. Bohner, A. Zick)

Marie Courtois
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
(G. Herman, D. Bourguignon)

Gerdientje Danner-Vlaardingerbroek
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(K. van den Bos, E. Kluwer)

Matthew Easterbrook
Sussex, UK
(V. Vignloes, M. Becker)

Constanze Eib
Stockholm, Sweden
(T. Lindholm, N. Akrami)

Sarah P. Elbert
Groningen, The Netherlands
(K. Epstude, T. Postmes)

Natasha Flannigan
Aberdeen, UK
(S. Cunningham, N. Macrae)

Anabel Fonseca
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(M. Brauer, C. Darnon)

Matthias Forstmann
Cologne, Germany
(K. Corcoran, T. Mussweiler)

Alessandro Gabbiadini
Milano, Italy
(C. Volpato, F. Durante)

Rebecca Graber
Leeds, UK
(M. Conner, R. Turner)

Hannah Greving
Tuebingen, Germany
(K. Sassenberg, J. Fehr)

Meltem Güler
Mersin, Turkey
(C.K.W. de Dreu, G. Baray)

Frederico Guilherme
Porto, Portugal
(I. Pinto, M. Cameira)

Marc W. Heerdink
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(G. van Kleef, A. Fischer)

Alina S. Hernandez Bark
Frankfurt, Germany
(R. van Dick, G. Bohner)

Lisa K. Horvath
Bern, Switzerland
(S. Sczesny, U. Athenstaedt)

Carmel Joyce
Limerick, Ireland
(E. Igou, F. van Dongen)

Robin Jund
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(C. Darnon, M. Désert)

Mariska Kappmeier
Hamburg, Germany
(X. Chryssochoou, K. Trew)

Laura Kimberley
Birmingham, UK
(K. Quinn, H.E.S. Rosenthal)

Caitriona Kinsella
Limerick, Ireland
(A. O'Donnell, E. Igou)

Elaine Kinsella
Limerick, Ireland
(X. Chryssochoou, E. Igou)

Sara Koeser
Bern, Switzerland
(U. Gabriel, S. Sczesny)

Ruth Lamont
Canterbury, UK
(D. Abrams, S. Stathi)

Florian Landkammer
Tuebingen, Germany
(K. Sassenberg, J. Fehr)

Paul Löblich
Würzburg, Germany
(F. Strack, P. Markel)

Jennifer Lord
Kent, UK
(D. Abrams, G. Randsley de Moura)

David D. Loschelder
Trier, Germany
(R. Trötschel, E. Walther)

Ana Louceiro
Lisbon, Portugal
(T. Schubert, S. Waldzus)

Joanne Lumsden
Aberdeen, UK
(S. Cunningham, N. Macrea)

Liesbeth Mann
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(K. Jonas, A. Fischer)

Tamara Marksteiner
Mannheim, Germany
(M.-A. Reinhard, D. Stahlberg)

Marie Mazerolle
Poitiers, France
(J.-C. Croizet, L. Selimbegovic)

Rose Meleady
Canterbury, UK
(G. Randsley de Moura, R. Crisp)

Malgorzata Mikolajczak
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Bilewicz, S. Otten)

Pilar Montanés
La Rioja, Spain
(M. Moya, S. de Lemus)

Rui Moreira
Nanterre, France
(J.-P. Légal, P. Chekroun)

Amy Murphy
Kent, UK
(K. Douglas, G. Randsley de Moura)

Sanne Nauts
Nijmegen, The Netherlands
(J. Karremans, D. Wigboldus)

Sarah Niemeier
Bielefeld, Germany
(G. Bohner, R. Kopietz)

Wieteke Nieuwboer
Nijmegen, The Netherlands
(J. Karremans, D. Wigboldus)

Marlène Oppin
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(C. Darnon, M. Brauer)

- Jennifer Paterson
Leeds, UK
(R. Turner, M. Conner)
- Andrea Pereira
Geneva, Switzerland
(J.M. Falomir-Pichastor, C. Staerklé)
- Joanne Persson
St. Andrews, UK
(M. Farr, N. Tausch)
- Katerina Petkanopoulou
Granada, Spain
(M. Moya, R. Rodríguez-Bailón)
- Dragos Petrescu
Oxford, UK
(G. Simons, B. Parkinson)
- Anneli Portman
Helsinki, Finland
(K. Helkama, A.-M. Pirtillä-Backman)
- Ann-Christin Posten
Cologne, Germany
(T. Mussweiler, K. Corcoran)
- Claire Powell
Kent, UK
(D. Abrams, A. Rutland)
- Martina Prazienkova
Trento, Italy
(C. Zogmaister, M.-P. Paladino)
- Jonas Rees
Bielefeld, Germany
(G. Bohner, R. Brown)
- Eefje Rondeel
Nijmegen, The Netherlands
(R. Holland, A. van Knippenberg)
- Janice Sanchez
Oxford, UK
(G. Simons, B. Parkinson)
- Simon Schindler
Mannheim, Germany
(M.-A. Reinhard, D. Stahlberg)
- Susanne Schmittat
Cologne, Germany
(K. Corcoran, B. English)
- Said Shafa
Leiden, The Netherlands
(M. Kouzakova, N. Ellemers)
- Daniela Šincek
Osijek, Croatia
(D. Corkalo, S. Kljaic)
- Anouk Smeekes
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(X. Chrysochoou, C. Staerklé)
- Janina Steinmetz
Cologne, Germany
(T. Mussweiler, B. English)
- Philipp Süssenbach
Bielefeld, Germany
(G. Bohner, A. Zick)
- Laura Taylor
Oxford, UK
(G. Simons, B. Parkinson)
- Hagar Ter Kuile
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(K. van den Bos, E. Kluwer)
- Reine van der Wal
Nijmegen, The Netherlands
(L. van Dillen, J. Karremans)
- Félice van Nunspeet
Leiden, The Netherlands
(B. Derks, N. Ellemers)
- Bianca von Wurzbach
Mannheim, Germany
(H. Bless, J. Keller)

Dale Weston
Exeter, UK
(T. Morton, J. Smith)

Michael Wood
Kent, UK
(K. Douglas, S. Loughnan)

Katherine Wilson
Kent, UK
(K. Douglas, G. Randsley de Moura)

Grants

Lottie Bullens (travel grant)
Soledad de Lemus (seedcorn grant)
Silvia Galdi (seedcorn grant)
Isabelle Goncalves (travel grant)
Malgorzata Kossowska (regional support grant)
Evgeniya Kravchenko (travel grant)
Eva Krumhuber (seedcorn grant)
Stephen Loughnan (seedcorn grant)
Alexandrina Moisuc (travel grant)
Esther Papies (travel grant)
Monika Prusik (travel grant)
Francesca Righetti (travel grant - SISP)
Magdalena Rychlowska (travel grant)
Claudia Sassenrath (travel grant)
Claudia Simao (travel grant)
Frederike van Dongen (travel grant - SISP)
Yvette van Osch (travel grant)
Milica Vasiljevic (travel grant - SISP)
Annemarie Wennekers (travel grant - SISP)

Grant reports

Marieke de Vries
Seedcorn Grant

“Affect and Intuition in (Medical) Decision Making”

Thanks to an EASP Seedcorn grant, I had the opportunity to invest in the building of my research program by visiting and starting collaborations with international top researchers in my area of research: Affect and intuition in (medical) decision making. As I hoped for, my research visits involved ample opportunity to discuss and design new research with truly inspiring researchers and these visits have already resulted in a paper (under review, see below) and several joint, ongoing research projects; but also involved a heavy, scary earthquake in Christchurch (while I was walking in the gardens of the “garden city”, fortunately). A little bit of background information first: My research has 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, in press), and on unconscious and intuitive processes (e.g., De Vries, Witteman, Holland & Dijksterhuis, 2010; Holland & De Vries, 2010). In 2003, I obtained my Master’s degree in Social Psychology from the Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands. In 2008, I obtained my PhD from this same university, after four years of research focusing on mood effects in judgment and decision making in both Nijmegen (most of the time) and at the University of California in San Diego (during two research visits in 2007 and 2008; see below). 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. This summer, I will move to the Department of Social Psychology at Tilburg University to continue my research on affect and intuition, in both medical and non-medical decision making.

For me, the Seedcorn grant has been an excellent opportunity to invest in the building of my research program, which will hopefully facilitate my efforts to obtain larger scale research funding for this research from other resources in the near future. I feel privileged that the EASP gave me the opportunity to visit several top end research institutes and meet with international experts at those places. Discussing research ideas with them has been truly inspiring and several ongoing projects and collaborations have resulted from these research visits. First, in October 2010, I visited Dr Angela Fagerlin at the Center for Bioethics and Social Sciences in Medicine (CBSSM), at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Dr Angela Fagerlin is co-director of the CBSSM, has a background in experimental psychology, and is a top expert in my area of research. We share research interests in the psychology of medical decision making. During my stay in Ann Arbor, we discussed intriguing new research ideas, mainly focusing on patient decision making. She also introduced me to Dr Laura Scherer. Laura Scherer is currently doing a postdoc project at the CBSSM and as it turned out, we share a lot of research interests. We spent a lot of time together during my stay in Ann Arbor and came up with lots of new research ideas. I served as a consultant on a grant application by Laura for a new research project focusing on intuitive and non-intuitive thought processes in patient decision making, which recently got funded by the Foundation for Informed Medical Decision Making. The first study will run soon, and we will discuss our first results during the EASP general meeting in Stockholm (where I will also present recent findings of a previous EASP sponsored research project in collaboration with Dr Piotr Winkielman and others, on mood and the familiarity-affect link), as well as more research plans which we will pursue in the near future. Over the past few months, Laura Scherer, Angela Fagerlin, Holly Witteman and I have also been working on a paper on intuitive and non-intuitive thought processes in patient decision making, which has been submitted for publication and is currently under review (Scherer, Fagerlin, Witteman & De Vries, under review). In Ann Arbor, Angela Fagerlin also introduced me to Dr Brian Zikmund-Fisher and Dr Frank Yates, and invited me to join their weekly research meeting. It has been a wonderful experience for me to meet with those people and discuss research. Moreover, I ran into Dr Norbert Schwarz close to the botanical gardens on my first day in Ann Arbor, and very much enjoyed his campus tour a few days after; thanks a lot!

In November 2010, I went from Ann Arbor to Columbus, and visited Dr Ellen Peters at the Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio (USA). 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 recent research visit to Dr. Ellen Peters provided me with a very good opportunity to continue our recently started collaboration. Ellen Peters and Martin Tusler generously offered me to stay at their home, which I enjoyed very much (our walks in the German village, playing with Bentley, the cute little dog, discovering "Glee", and, of course, Martin's excellent cocktails!). Thanks again for your hospitality! And thanks for the opportunity to present my research during a talk at the psychology department, and to further discuss our research plans. In Columbus, we started two research projects: one focusing on mood and intuitive number sense and another one focussing on mood and preference consistency. Other collaborators

on these projects include Dr. Arwen Pieterse, a cognitive psychologist at my home department, Medical Decision Making in Leiden, Dr. Erik de Kwaadsteniet, a social psychologist from Leiden University, and two students from the University of Amsterdam: Linda ten Barge and Loan van Hoeven. First data have been collected and further data are being collected by Linda and Loan in Amsterdam right now, as I am writing this report, so Ellen and I will soon be able to discuss the first results of these research projects.

Finally, in February 2011, I visited Dr Jamin Halberstadt at the University of Otago in Dunedin (New Zealand). After the long trip from the Netherlands to New Zealand, I went for a bit of a walk in the botanic gardens of Christchurch, the so-called "Garden City" of New Zealand, to facilitate my recovery from the jetlag before continuing the last part of my journey to Dunedin. While I was trying to stay awake in the Rose Garden, I suddenly experienced a heavy earthquake, which severely damaged the city of Christchurch and its surroundings. My thoughts are still with the people from Christchurch. After spending a night in a shelter, I was really happy to be able to stay with Jamin's family in their wonderful home in Dunedin: Jamin, Cindy, Abby, and Paxton, thank you so much for your warm welcome and hospitality! I would also like to thank the University of Otago for the opportunity to present my research at the Psychology Department, and Jamin and his lab group for their hospitality. Due to the earthquake, we spent quite a bit of time making necessary adjustments in our plans and arrangements due to for example lost luggage, and "discussing" the quake rather than research, but I still very much enjoyed the research conversations we *were* able to have and I look forward to further collaborations with you!

In closing, I would like to thank the EASP for providing me with this great opportunity to invest in the building of my research program together with brilliant researchers from around the world, and all colleagues, friends and others who contributed to this: Thanks a lot!

Malte Friese
(University of Basel, Switzerland)
travel Grant

From December 2010 until February 2011 I had the opportunity to visit Prof. Bill von Hippel and Dr. Courtney von Hippel for a 3-month research visit at the University of Queensland in Brisbane, Australia. The EASP supported this research visit with a postgraduate travel grant, for which I am very grateful.

There were two main purposes of this research visit. First, I wanted to develop a joint line of research with my hosts Bill and Courtney von Hippel. Second, I sought some quiet time to work on projects that I did not find the time to work on in my home institution for a long time.

The project that we have been working on is concerned with the role of self-control processes in the workplace. In particular, we are interested in the contribution of basic executive control processes such as such as monitoring and updating of working memory, inhibition, or mental set shifting that underlie many self-control efforts. Although

abundant research, especially in cognitive psychology and the neurosciences, investigates executive control processes, comparatively little research applies these concepts in real-world settings. In particular, while broader self-regulation concepts such as self-regulated learning or planning abilities play a role in the organizational literature, the potential implications of executive control has not been debated in this literature. The general idea is that individual differences in executive control will account for variance in important organizational outcomes such as worker's ability to stay calm and friendly even under stressful conditions, the ability to focus attention on boring and tedious jobs, and much more. We approach this topic both theoretically and empirically. Relating to the former, we spent some time to work on a draft of a theoretical overview introducing the idea that basic executive control processes underlying self-control play a role in important outcomes in the workplace. Relating to the latter, we designed several empirical studies that seek to test the ideas empirically. One of these studies with managers in a department store chain is already underway, one other study with nurses in hospitals is in a concrete planning stage.

In addition to working on this concrete project, the research visit gave me the opportunity to work on several other projects in depth, and start new research collaborations with other members of the social psychology group. I also attended lab meetings, seminars, and had the chance to present some of my work to the School of Psychology.

Working with Bill and Courtney von Hippel has been very productive, fun, and rewarding. They were fantastic hosts, both to me as a visiting researcher, but also with regard to making life in Brisbane easy and very much enjoyable for my family.

One obstacle for an even more productive time was the flood that hit Queensland in January of 2011. At first, only northern parts of this gigantic state were affected with areas bigger than France and Germany together being flooded. After torrential rain falls for several days, the Brisbane river burst its banks and flooded many parts of the city. My family and I were safe, as we were located on the top of a hill, but not even 5 minutes from us people lost their homes. The University of Queensland was also badly hit and remained closed for more than 10 days. We were without electricity for a week, the supermarkets were completely sold out for a couple of days and new supplies couldn't come in. It was quite an experience.

Despite the floods that we were lucky enough to mainly experience as observers without being too heavily affected directly, the stay in Brisbane was also a memorable experience for my family and me on the private level. We felt very lucky for having the chance to meet many new and exceptionally helpful and friendly people, see a new city, enjoy Brisbane's beautiful climate (no kidding – most of the time it was really nice ;-)), and much more. It wasn't easy coming back into the cold European winter.

Taken together, this research visit was a wonderful experience from which I profited immensely in terms of research, development as a scientist, and also on a private level. I sincerely thank the EASP for supporting me in this project.

Malte Frieese
(University of Basel, Switzerland)
Seedcorn Grant

In 2010, I received a Seedcorn Grant from the EASP to financially support a study on the antecedents and consequences of attentional biases toward food cues in normal eaters. In this report, I will briefly describe the theoretical background of the study and some initial results.

In many social contexts, individuals are confronted with tempting, but unhealthy foods. For many individuals, regulating the intake of such foods represents a self-regulatory challenge for which the control of attention plays a central role (Baumeister, Schmeichel, & Vohs, 2007; Metcalfe & Mischel, 1999). Attentional biases (AB) are an obstacle for successful attention control. The term refers to the phenomenon that some stimuli in the environment attract individuals' attention more strongly than other stimuli. ABs have been observed in response to tempting stimuli such as alcohol (Field & Cox, 2008), nicotine (Mogg, Bradley, Field, & De Houwer, 2003), or food (Dobson, & Dozois, 2004; Faunce, 2002).

AB toward food cues is prevalent not only in clinical populations, but also in normal-eating individuals (e.g., Mogg, Bradley, Hyare, & Lee, 1998), especially for so-called external eaters, that is, individuals who regulate their food intake in response to external food cues such as those prevalent in social situations, and not internal signals such as satiation (Brignell, Griffiths, Bradley, & Mogg, 2009). However, the effect of external eating on AB has never been carried further to the investigation of their effect on actual food consumption.

The present study pursued two goals: First, recent evidence in the domain of alcohol shows that alcohol-related associations as measured with a Single Category Implicit Association Test (Karpinski & Steinman, 2006) predict the strength of AB toward alcohol for individuals low, but not high in executive control as indicated by a complex-span working memory task (Frieese, Bargas-Avila, Hofmann, & Wiers, 2010). We sought to conceptually replicate this pattern in the domain of eating with a different implicit measure (approach-avoidance tendencies as measured with the stimulus-response compatibility task, SRC; Mogg et al., 2003) and a different measure of AB (visual dot-probe instead of eye-movements during a picture-viewing task).

Second, although AB have been implicated in the development and maintenance of eating disorders such as obesity (e.g., Castellanos et al., 2009), attempts to predict actual food consumption with AB have been rare. Building on the correspondence principle (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977), we sought to assess AB toward a particular food (m&m's candy) and use this index to predict subsequent consumption of this particular food. In this context, we also investigated a possible mediating role of AB for the relationship between external eating and actual consumption.

Results revealed some reassuring and some puzzling findings. As expected, external eating was associated both with a stronger AB toward m&m candy cues and with increased m&m's consumption during a subsequent product test. Importantly, AB toward m&m's was significantly related to consumption in the product test. To our knowledge, this is the first evidence for a significant relationship between AB for food cues as indicated by an

unequivocal measure of AB and actual eating behavior. There was no evidence for a mediation of the effect of external eating on consumption through AB.

Approach-avoidance reactions toward m&m's as indexed by the SRC task predicted AB toward m&m's cues interactively with executive control as indexed by the complex-span working memory task. However, follow-up analyses revealed that the SRC task predicted AB particularly well for participants *high*, not low in executive control. This finding is at odds with both theoretical expectations (Hofmann, Friese, & Strack, 2009) and prior research in the domain of alcohol with different, albeit similar measures (Friese et al., 2010). Enlightening suggestions on how to explain this outcome are always welcome. In sum, the study produced some interesting and novel findings on the self-regulation of eating, especially concerning the relation between external eating, AB toward food cues, and actual consumption. The results concerning the prediction of the strength of AB as a function of approach-avoidance tendencies and executive control are thought provoking. My colleagues and I are currently preparing research to further scrutinize this topic.

References

- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin*, *84*, 888-918.
- Baumeister, R. F., Schmeichel, B. J., & Vohs, K. D. (2007). Self-regulation and the executive function: The self as controlling agent. In A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles* (2nd ed., pp. 516-539). New York: Guilford Press.
- Brignell, C., Griffiths, T., Bradley, B., & Mogg, K. (2009). Attentional and approach biases for pictorial food cues. Influence of external eating. *Appetite*, *52*, 299-306.
- Castellanos, E. H., Charboneau, E., Dietrich, M. S., Park, S., Bradley, B. P., Mogg, K. et al. (2009). Obese adults have visual attention bias for food cue images: Evidence for altered reward system function. *International Journal of Obesity*, *33*, 1063-1073.
- Dobson, K. S., & Dozois, D. J. A. (2004). Attentional bias in eating disorders: A meta-analytic review of Stroop performance. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *23*, 1001-1022.
- Faunce, G. J. (2002). Eating disorders and attentional bias: A review. *Eating Disorders: The Journal of Treatment & Prevention*, *10*, 125-139.
- Field, M., & Cox, W. M. (2008). Attentional bias in addictive behaviors: A review of its development, causes, and consequences. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *97*, 1-20.
- Franken, I. H. A. (2003). Drug craving and addiction: Integrating psychological and neuropsychopharmacological approaches. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry*, *27*, 563-579.
- Friese, M., Bargas-Avila, J., Hofmann, W., & Wiers, R. W. (in press). Here's looking at you, Bud: Alcohol-related memory structures predict eye movements for social drinkers with low executive control. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*.
- Hofmann, W., Friese, M., & Strack, F. (2009). Impulse and self-control from a dual-systems perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *4*, 162-176.
- Karpinski, A., & Steinman, R. B. (2006). The single category implicit association test as a measure of implicit social cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 16-32.
- Kemps, E., & Tiggemann, M. (2009). Attentional bias for craving-related (chocolate) food cues. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, *17*, 425-433.

- Metcalfe, J., & Mischel, W. (1999). A hot/cool-system analysis of delay of gratification: Dynamics of willpower. *Psychological Review*, *106*, 3-19.
- Mogg, K., Bradley, B. P., Field, M., & De Houwer, J. (2003). Eye-movements to smoking-related pictures in smokers: Relationship between attentional biases and implicit and explicit measures of stimulus valence. *Addiction*, *98*, 825-836.
- Mogg, K., Bradley, B. P., Hyare, H., & Lee, S. (2007). Selective attention to food-related stimuli in hunger: Are attentional biases specific to emotional and psychopathological states, or are they also found in normal drive states? *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *36*, 227-237.
- Robinson, T. E., & Berridge, K. C. (1993). The neural basis of drug craving: An incentive sensitization theory of addiction. *Brain Research Reviews*, *18*, 247-291.

Francesca Righetti

travel grant

The EASP postgraduate travel grant supported me in visiting the Department of Psychology at Northwestern University. I spent there four months during the fall of 2010 visiting Dr. Eli Finkel. During my PhD I have been working on the study of interpersonal relationships and Dr. Finkel is one of the most active and invigorating researchers in this field. We share a large amount of research interests, for example we are both interested in the role of the Self-regulatory processes (e.g. Self-regulation and Regulatory Focus) in the relationship. My time at Northwestern University has been very prolific and I had the chance to work on different projects. In the Netherlands, I started a line of research on the role of Self-control in willingness to sacrifice and, during my time at Northwestern, I could carry on several follow up experiments that could potentially contribute to my PhD dissertation. Willingness to sacrifice is the readiness to forego immediate self interest to promote the well-being of a partner or relationship. Some scholars have considered willingness to sacrifice a pro-relationship behavior that requires self-control. However this assumption has not been studied yet. In my studies in the Netherlands we consistently (and intriguingly) found that in close relationships lower level of self-control is associated with greater willingness to sacrifice. During my visit, we then tried to replicate these findings and assess possible mechanisms and boundary conditions.

I also worked on a couple of lines of research on Regulatory Focus in collaboration with Eli Finkel and Daniel Molden. Previous research has shown the positive role of promotion orientation for interpersonal ideal-self goal support (Righetti, Rusbult, & Finkenauer, 2010). In my time at Northwestern, we investigated whether prevention orientation is beneficial for interpersonal ought-self goal support and we explored possible differences between the two orientations in the way they affect interpersonal goal support (e.g. openness to support, receptivity to support etc.). We also explored the effect of promotion orientation on perceiving similarities with others and its consequences for first attraction and for developed relationships.

Besides the great possibility of starting and conduction several research projects, I also had the chance to attend weekly talks from experts of different fields in Social Psychology, to attend Eli Finkel's lab meetings and to learn new statistical procedures. Given all the great opportunities that this visit involved, I wish to thank Eli Finkel and EASP for making this

possible. I am extremely grateful to Eli Finkel for the warm welcome and the great professional and personal support throughout the visit. I am also grateful to EASP for providing me with the travel grant and for the support in the realization of this invaluable professional experience.

Annika Scholl

(Knowledge Media Research Center Tübingen)

travel grant

My visit at Ana Guinote's lab at University College London took place from January to March 2011. The goals of my visit were to discuss and refine some research ideas and to conduct a first set of studies together, building upon her findings on how power affects persistence during goal pursuit.

Previous research on social power demonstrated that power holders are more goal-focused and more effectively self-regulate their behavior during goal pursuit. Along the way, the powerful less easily give up in case of obstacles than the powerless (Guinote, 2007). Our research aimed at extending these findings. While persistence on a course of action usually contributes to goal attainment, it can at times also prove to be dysfunctional. For instance, this can be the case when persistence represents a dysfunctional strategy for solving a task, or when facing repeated failure and alternative goals are available (e.g., Wrosch, Scheier, Carver, & Schulz, 2003). Thus, it is (also) a great value in knowing when to withdraw from a goal. We were therefore interested in the question how power affects individuals' persistence during goal pursuit, depending on whether persistence is functional in a given situation or not. This topic was of special interest for me as it relates to my PhD research on how power affects individuals' reactions to failure, but uses a different approach and includes situational circumstances (e.g., the functionality of persistence) as potential moderator.

On the one hand, prior findings indicate that power can induce an illusory sense of control over outcomes even beyond one's actual reach (Fast, Gruenfeld, Sivanathan, & Galinsky, 2009). It could thus be derived that power enhances persistence, regardless of whether it is functional in this situation or not, by creating the illusion that one will be able to manage obstacles by all means. On the other hand, however, multiple findings on power and goal-directed behavior have also demonstrated that power holders adapt their behavior more in a way functional for goal attainment (e.g., Overbeck & Park, 2001). Based on the substantial evidence supporting this highly adaptive behavior of the powerful, we therefore assumed that power holders will be better calibrated in regulating their persistence in line with situational circumstances. Thus, we expected that power holders will invest more effort into a goal than the powerless if persistence is useful in a situation, and otherwise more easily withdraw from it (i.e., give up).

After my arrival at UCL, we discussed our assumptions on this topic in greater detail and developed a comprehensive research plan combining different operationalizations for (the functionality of) persistence during goal pursuit. Two studies were conducted at UCL (N = 74 and 118) using two different manipulations of power and measures on goal dis- and reengagement (Wrosch et al., 2003) and the sunk cost effects (Arkes & Blumer, 1985).

Additionally, we developed and pretested a task relevance manipulation for future studies to investigate whether power facilitates persistence especially if a task is of high (versus low) relevance. This first set of studies provided the basis for a joint line of research on this topic and we are thus currently preparing materials for follow-up studies in Germany. Along the way of refining our research ideas, I gained many new insights in discussions with Ana and fellow researchers. I was also able to extensively explore literature on this topic and to exchange experiences and materials with other PhD students working on power and goal pursuit or on related topics, such as judgment and decision making. Collecting data in a different work environment was a very exciting experience for me, where I profited very much from Ana's experience on studying power and persistence. My colleagues were also extremely supportive in organizing the studies, which I am very grateful for. In addition to preparing and conducting the experiments, I visited interesting talks and participated in research discussions and social meetings of the department. Furthermore, in presenting my PhD research in the labmeeting at UCL and in a research seminar at the University of Canterbury, I received very constructive feedback on my results and thereby developed new ideas for my future research. Therefore, I am also very grateful to Mario Weick and my colleagues in Kent for discussing the findings from my PhD research with so much interest.

In sum, the visit supported by the EASP provided me with the opportunity to gain research experience in a highly stimulating environment. I am very grateful to Ana Guinote for our enjoyable and very productive discussions and to my supervisor Kai Sassenberg for supporting this visit in every way possible. Many thanks also go to my friends and colleagues for the exciting research conversations at UCL and at many other beautiful places in London. In closing, I would like to thank EASP for making this visit possible and Sibylle Classen for her kind support.

References:

- Arkes, H. R., & Blumer, C. (1985). The psychology of sunk cost. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *35*, 124-140. doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(85)90049-4
- Fast, N. J., Gruenfeld, D. H., Sivanathan, N., & Galinsky, A. D. (2009). Illusory control: A generative force behind power's far-reaching effects. *Psychological Science*, *20*, 502-508. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02452.x
- Guinote, A. (2007). Power and goal pursuit. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *33*, 1076-1087. doi: 10.1177/0146167207301011
- Overbeck, J. R., & Park, B. (2001). When power does not corrupt: Superior individuation processes among powerful perceivers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 549-565. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.81.4.549
- Wrosch, C., Scheier, M., Carver, C., & Schulz, R. (2003). The importance of goal disengagement in adaptive self-regulation: When giving up is beneficial. *Self and Identity*, *2*, 1-20. doi: 10.1080/15298860309021

Announcements

Election of New Executive Committee Members

Three members of the current Executive Committee will have served their term of office and are due to be replaced on the General Meeting this year in Stockholm. Carsten de Dreu (The Netherlands), Miguel Moya (Spain), and Bogdan Wojciszke (Poland) will leave the Executive Committee in July 2011.

Fabrizio Butera (Switzerland), Xenia Chrysochoou (Greece), Alex Haslam (UK), and Sabine Otten (The Netherlands), will stay for another 3-year term.

5 members have been nominated and declared their willingness to serve as candidates for the 3 new positions in the Executive Committee:

Manuela Barreto, Mara Cadinu, Fabio Sani, Grzegorz Sedek, & Daniël Wigboldus

Ballot forms will be sent to all full members by regular mail prior to the General Meeting in Stockholm.

Please find in the following statements from the five candidates:

Manuela Barreto

Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)

Lisbon, Portugal

(e-mail manuela.barreto@iscte.pt)

I completed my undergraduate studies in psychology in 1995 at the University of Porto, Portugal, and received a PhD in social psychology in 2000 from the Free University, Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Between 2000 and 2008 I worked as a postdoctoral researcher, assistant professor, and then associate professor at Leiden University. In 2008 I chose to return to Portugal, where I am now at the Lisbon University Institute (Instituto Universitário de Lisboa, Centro de Investigação e Intervenção Social, ISCTE-IUL).

I have been a member of the EASP since 1997 and I have since then been closely involved in the association's activities. I attended the EASP Summer School (in 1998, Leuven), all of the General Meetings of the association since 1997, several small and medium size group meetings, and received funding from the association to organize a small group meeting (in 2007, at the Oud Poelgeest Castle, the Netherlands). I am currently serving the EASP as Associate Editor of the European Journal of Social Psychology (2009-2011 term) and as Program Chair of the 2011 General Meeting of this association, in Stockholm.

My research focuses on intergroup relations, and more specifically on the psychology of social disadvantage, exemplified by my work on identity (dis)respect, reactions to prejudice and discrimination, intergroup interactions, and the psychology of concealed stigmatized identities. I am also interested in social influence processes and on the link

between morality and group membership. My most recent financed research project focuses on the factors that affect evaluations of targets who confront prejudiced perpetrators, as well as on the factors that may encourage or discourage targets to engage in such confrontation. My research has benefited from financial support from the European Commission, the Dutch Scientific Organization, and the Portuguese Science Foundation.

Having worked in the Netherlands and in Portugal, as well as maintaining close contact with colleagues in other countries such as Spain, Germany, Italy, and the UK, allows me to understand the opportunities and challenges social psychologists face in different European Countries. My terms as editor of the EJSP and as Program Chair of the General Meeting of this association have also been illuminating in this regard. I thus think that I can make a positive and useful contribution to the management of this association.

Selected publications:

- Barreto, M., Ellemers, N., & Fiske, S. (2010). The power of prejudice: How power of source affects the experience of prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66, 477-492.
- Barreto, M., Ryan, M., & Schmitt, M. (2009). *The glass ceiling in the 21st century: Understanding barriers to gender equality*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Ellemers, N., Pagliaro, S., Barreto, M., & Leach, C. (2008). Is it better to be moral than smart? The effects of morality and competence norms on the decision to work at group status improvement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 1397-1410.
- Barreto, M. & Ellemers, N. (2005). The burden of benevolent sexism: How it contributes to the maintenance of gender inequalities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 633-642.
- Barreto, M., Ellemers, N. & Palacios, M. S. (2004). The backlash of token mobility: The impact of past group experiences on individual ambition and effort. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 1433-1445.
- Barreto, M. & Ellemers, N. (2002). The impact of respect versus neglect of self-identities on identification and group loyalty. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 629-639.

Mara Cadinu
University of Padova, Italy (e-mail mara.cadinu@unipd.it)

I studied at the University of Trieste and then moved to the U.S., where I received my PhD in 1996 at the University of Oregon. Since 1996, I have been a Faculty member at the University of Padova, first as an Assistant Professor and currently as an Associate Professor. Since 1996, I have been a member of EASP, also serving as an Associate Editor of the *European Journal of Social Psychology* from 2002 to 2005.

Belonging to two low-status groups (Sardinians and women), my interests in social psychology have focused on the psychological consequences of belonging to social groups, with particular attention to two main areas of research. In the first area, I have explored

the causal direction of influence between self-perception and in-group perception, resulting in self-anchoring or self-stereotyping for different types of groups. A current project explores implicit and explicit self-stereotyping in response to the group context for homosexual and heterosexual individuals. The second area of research has been devoted to the effects of stereotypes for low-status group members, such as women and minorities, for which I have explored some of the mechanisms underlying stereotype threat, including low expectations and negative thinking. I am currently extending this line of research to real-life stereotype threat contexts, such as media exposure to objectified women.

As a member of the EASP Executive Committee, I would contribute to the Association in three ways. First, I would support the Association's longstanding commitment to promote social psychological research across Europe, with special attention to disadvantaged areas, such as Southern and Eastern countries. Living in Italy, I am personally faced with this issue, in relation to the financial struggles of Universities. For example, after several years as a member of the association of European Social Cognition (ESCON), Italy was forced to drop its membership due to lack of national funding. Importantly, other Southern and Eastern European countries face similar financial difficulties. Second, because young researchers all over Europe are now confronted with limited access to doctoral and post-doctoral opportunities, as well as a difficult job market, it is my intention to strengthen the Association's focus on young researchers through the active promotion of new opportunities for research in social psychology across Europe. Finally, being concerned about gender equality in science, I would promote initiatives to enhance equal representation of males and females in the Association, such as the recent attempt to introduce a new, gender-balance editor scheme in the *European Journal of Social Psychology*.

Selected publications:

- Cadinu, M. R., & Rothbart, M. (1996). Self-anchoring and differentiation processes in the minimal group setting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 661-677.
- Cadinu, M., Maass, A., Frigerio, S., Impagliazzo, L., & Latinotti, S. (2003). Stereotype Threat: The effect of expectancy on performance. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 267-285.
- Cadinu, M. R., Maass, A., Rosabianca, A., & Kiesner, J. (2005). Why do women underperform under stereotype threat? Evidence for the role of negative thinking. *Psychological Science*, 16, 572-578.
- Latrofa, M., Vaes, J., Cadinu, M., & Carnaghi, A. (2010). The Cognitive Representation of Self-Stereotyping. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36, 911-922.
- Tomasetto, C., Alparone, F. R., & Cadinu, M. (in press). Girls' Math Performance under Stereotype Threat: The Moderating Role of Mothers' Gender Stereotypes. *Developmental Psychology*.

Fabio Sani
University of Dundee, Scotland (UK)
Chair in Social Psychology
(e-mail: f.sani@dundee.ac.uk)

I grew up in Italy and obtained my first degree from the University of Florence. Subsequently I moved to England. Here, I received an MSc in Social Psychology from the London School of Economics & Political Sciences (LSE) in 1991, a PhD in Psychology from the University of Exeter in 1995, and spent one year as research fellow at the University of Surrey. In 1996 I moved to Scotland, to join the University of Dundee.

Starting as a lecturer, I was eventually promoted to senior lecturer, then to reader, and recently to chair in social psychology. I have been visiting professor at the Australian National University in Canberra, at the University of Bari (Italy), and at the University of Pittsburgh (USA). I have been a member of the EAESP (then EASP) since 1994, and I am currently a Consulting Editor of the *European Journal of Social Psychology*.

I undertook a career in social psychology because of an interest in the interplay between the self and group processes. Initially, I was especially intrigued by the powerful repercussions of group schism (the secession of one faction from the parent group) on the thoughts, feelings, and behaviours of the members of the group going through the schism. Therefore, I devoted the first years of my research career to the investigation of schisms in groups, focussing on political organisations and religious institutions. Subsequently, I have studied the developmental aspects of social identity, and the perception of group continuity through time. Recently, I have started an international research program on the effects of group identification on wellbeing and health. Over the years, my research has greatly benefited from the input of my PhD students, my colleagues at the Universities of Dundee, St Andrews, Exeter, and other institutions, and from the financial support of the UK based Economic & Social Research Council as well as the British Academy.

As a member of the EASP Executive Committee I would give my contribution to the Association's continuous dedication to the promotion of social psychological research. Thanks to the efforts of our association, social psychology in Europe is now thriving and is able to attract many excellent researchers. However, I believe that social psychologists' ground-breaking research is still not obtaining the recognition it deserves from the wider research community, and is not having the societal impact that it could potentially display. I believe that this is mainly due to the relative insularity of our discipline. Therefore, I would promote the dialogue of social psychology with other psychological fields (e.g., developmental, organisational, clinical, and health psychology) and other disciplines (e.g., economics, medicine, law). This should not entail diluting our distinctive approach and scientific asset, but rather making our distinctiveness count! In addition to that, I would also endorse communication between social psychologists and policy makers. These actions, I believe, could enhance the visibility of our discipline and increase its general impact, thereby attracting more financial resources and an even higher number of young, talented researchers.

Representative publications:

Sani, F., Magrin, M. E., Scignaro, M., & McCollum, R. (2010). Ingroup identification mediates the effects of subjective ingroup status on mental health. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49, 883-893.

- Sani, F., Herrera, M., & Bowe, M. (2009). Perceived collective continuity and ingroup identification as defence against death awareness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 242-245.
- Sani, F., Bowe, M., Herrera, M., Manna, C., Cossa, T., Miao, X., Zhou, Y. (2007). Perceived collective continuity: Seeing groups as entities that move through time. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 37*, 1118-1134.
- Sani, F. (2005). When subgroups secede: Extending and refining the social psychological model of schisms in groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1074-1086.
- Sani, F. & Reicher, S. (1998). When consensus fails: An analysis of the schism within the Italian Communist Party (1991). *European Journal of Social Psychology, 28*, 623-645.

Grzegorz Sedek, Ph.D.

Professor, Warsaw School of Social Sciences and Humanities
 Director of Interdisciplinary Center for Applied Cognitive Studies (ICACS)
 Chodakowska 19/31 03-815 Warsaw, Poland
E-Mail: gsedek@gmail.com, gsedek@swps.edu.pl; **Phone:** (48 22) 517 9804

Research

My main areas of current research are: (1) Dual process models in social cognition (with special reference to attitude change, social stereotypes and prejudices); (2) Cognitive limitations in depression, aging, and after uncontrollability pre-exposure (with special reference to mental models, reasoning tasks, working memory, and attention)

Organizational Experience

Chair of Scientific and Organizational Committee of Plenary Conferences of ESCON (2006) and ESCON 2 (2009) in Poland. Chair of Scientific Committee of Intensive ERASMUS Programme REMICS (Research Methods in Cognitive Studies, Winter Schools, 2 weeks each, Zakopane, Poland, 2009, 2010, 2011)

As a member of the EASP Executive Committee I would like to work on more active role of members from new EC countries and non-EC countries in organizing scientific events (conferences, workshops, and summer/winter schools) in Middle and Eastern Europe. Together with members of my research center ICACS I have organized several ESCON (plenary conferences) and ERASMUS Intensive Programmes (methodological Winter Schools). These have been important in development of promising international projects and I would like to further expand these international activities. In addition, I would like to work on developing a possible role for the EASP in facilitating international research collaboration on interdisciplinary domains such as social cognition and aging or social neuroscience.

Selected Publications

- Kofta, M., & Sedek, M. (2005). Conspiracy stereotypes of Jews during systematic transformation in Poland. *International Journal of Sociology*, 35(1), 40-64.
- von Hecker, U., Sedek, G., Piber-Dabrowska, K., & Bedynska, S. (2005). Generative reasoning as influenced by depression, aging, stereotype threat, and prejudice. In R. W. Engle, G. Sedek, U. von Hecker, & D. N. McIntosh, D. N. (Eds.), *Cognitive limitations in aging and psychopathology* (pp. 377-401). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sedek, G., & von Hecker, U. (2004). Effects of subclinical depression and aging on generative reasoning about linear orders: Same or different processing limitations? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 133, 237-260.
- Kofta, M., & Sedek, G. (1999). Uncontrollability as irreducible uncertainty. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 577-590.
- von Hecker, U., & Sedek, G. (1999). Uncontrollability, depression, and the construction of mental models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 833-850.

Prof. dr. Daniël Wigboldus
Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands

I am a professor of social psychology at Radboud University Nijmegen in the Netherlands. My academic career started at the Free University Amsterdam (PhD in 1998). Subsequently, I worked as a postdoctoral researcher at Radboud University and as an assistant/associate professor at the University of Amsterdam. In 2005 I became a full professor at Radboud University. Currently, I am the director of the School of Psychology and Artificial Intelligence in Nijmegen, president of the Dutch Association of Social Psychological Researchers, and an external member of the General Board of the Kurt Lewin Institute.

My research focuses on person perception in general and stereotyping and prejudice in particular. Among other things, I am interested in how stereotypes are maintained at an interpersonal level through biased language use, how stereotypical expectancies affect spontaneous trait inferences, and how implicit prejudice affects impulsive behaviours. More recently, I have started research on how prejudice and stereotyping affect face processing. Throughout my academic career I have been interested in innovative research and teaching methods. I believe that besides great ideas, innovative methodology and good teaching are also critical for advancing science. I am proud to have served as a consulting editor for the *European Journal of Social Psychology* for some years. Currently, I serve on the board of the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Social Cognition*, and *Social Psychological & Personality Science*.

As a member of the EASP Executive Committee, my main aim would be to further facilitate high quality social psychological research throughout Europe. Personally, I have profited a lot from the EASP. The general meetings and the summer school I was involved in as a teacher have given me the opportunity to share my work with others, and to start collaborations with great colleagues throughout Europe. In my experience, the best

research is done in collaboration with others. Providing the means to make this possible will be my main focus as a member of the EASP Executive Committee. It would be an honor for me to serve the EASP to provide researchers of today and tomorrow with similar opportunities as I have had.

Representative publications:

- Dotsch, R., Wigboldus, D. H. J., & van Knippenberg, A. (in press). Biased allocation of faces to social categories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
- Beukeboom, C. J., Finkenauer, C., & Wigboldus, D. H. J. (2010). The negation bias: When negations signal stereotypic expectancies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99, 978-992.
- Pronk, T. M., Karremans, J. C., Overbeek, G., Vermulst, A. A., & Wigboldus, D. H. J. (2010). What it takes to forgive: When and why executive functioning facilitates forgiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 119-131.
- Dotsch, R., Wigboldus, D. H. J., Langner, O., & Van Knippenberg, A. (2008). Ethnic faces are biased in the prejudiced mind. *Psychological Science*, 19, 978-980.
- Wigboldus D. H. J, Semin G. R., & Spears R. (2006). Communicating expectancies about others. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 815-824.

More information about Daniel Wigboldus, including a full list of publications (and a little bit of music) can be found on <http://www.danielwigboldus.nl>

**Call for Manuscripts for a
Special Issue of *The European Journal of Social Psychology* on “Mental
Time Travel: Social psychological perspectives on a fundamental
human capacity”**

Reflecting on the past and imagining the future are crucial aspects of human cognition. The question of how individuals represent the past and the future has increasingly gained attention over the past few years within several different areas of social psychology.

The European Journal of Social Psychology will publish a special issue that aims to integrate a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives on mental time travel and to facilitate communication between the various areas within social psychology for which cognitions about time are relevant. The Special Issue will be guest-edited by Kai Epstude (University of Groningen, The Netherlands), and Johanna Peetz (University of Cologne, Germany).

We cordially invite submissions from researchers who study social-cognitive effects of time (e.g., impact of construal level mindset on cognitions, the role of time perception in decision making), affective, motivational, and behavioral consequences of mental time travel (e.g., counterfactual thinking, future fantasies, affective experiences like regret, hope, or nostalgia), time and the self (e.g., determinants and consequences of past and future self appraisal), and time in the context of interpersonal and intergroup relations (e.g., the time-course of pro-relational behavior, consequences of temporal distance to group-relevant events).

Important dates for manuscript submission:

June 15th, 2011: Paper submission deadline.

September 15th, 2011: Provisional acceptance of papers.

December 15th, 2011: Revised final manuscript due date.

Original research papers should be no longer than 10.000 words in line with research articles in regular issues. Manuscripts that are considerably shorter than this word limit are also welcome. All manuscripts should be prepared in accordance to the editorial guidelines of EJSP (see notes for authors) and should be submitted via the Manuscript Central online submission site <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ejsp>.

Please indicate that the paper is to be considered as a contribution to the special issue. All papers will be peer-reviewed. For further inquiries, please contact Kai Epstude (k.epstude@rug.nl) or Johanna Peetz (johanna.peetz@uni-koeln.de).

**2011 Oswald-Külpe-Prize
for the Experimental Study of Higher Mental Processes
- Call for Nominations -**

Honoring the great tradition of the Würzburg School of Psychology and its founder Oswald Külpe, the University of Würzburg invites nominations for its Oswald-Külpe-Prize, which is conferred biennially in a special ceremony.

The purpose of the award is to recognize exceptional scientific contributions to the experimental study of higher mental processes. It will be presented in Würzburg on November 18, 2011. The Külpe-Award includes a cash prize of €4.000,- and the recipient's expenses for travelling and accommodation. Previous recipients were Profs. Asher Koriat, University of Haifa (Israel), Richard E. Nisbett, University of Michigan (USA), and Michael Tomasello, Max-Planck-Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig (Germany).

Eligible are scientists of all nationalities and without any age restrictions. The only criterion is the candidates' proven excellence in experimental research on higher mental processes. This may pertain to different areas of psychology. Self-nominations are possible.

Nominations must be received by June 1, 2011. They should include a letter addressing the candidate's merits with respect to the criterion of the award; a current curriculum vitae and bibliography; the names of two distinguished colleagues who are willing to write letters of recommendation.

Materials should be sent to the chair of the psychology department:

Prof. Fritz Strack
LS Psychologie II
Universität Würzburg
Röntgenring 10
97070 Würzburg
Germany

For further information write to:

strack@psychologie.uni-wuerzburg.de

For information about the previous winners click:

<http://www.i2.psychologie.uni-wuerzburg.de/PSY2-PHP/index.php?Seite=gallery>

Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Executive Officer by **September, 15th, 2011** 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, 2011**.

The next Executive Committee Meeting will take place in October 2011.

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>