

1 Editorial

3 President's Corner

5 Opinions and Perspectives

Developing diversity in EASP as a mean to achieve a vibrant and relevant social psychology

10 Book Review

The Sage Handbook of Social Cognition, *ed. by S. Fiske and N. Macrae*, review by M. Häfner

11 New Publications by Members

Handbook of Social Resource Theory. Theoretical Extensions, Empirical Insights, and Social Applications, *ed. by K. Törnblom & A. Kazemi*

War, community and social change, 2013, *by D. Spini, G. Elcheroth & D. Corkalo Biruski*

Historical Tales and National Identity. An introduction to narrative social psychology, 2013 *by J. László*

Social Cognition and Communication, 2013, *ed. by J.P. Forgas, O. Vincze & J. László*

Neuroscience of Prejudice and Intergroup Relations, 2013, *ed. by B. Derks, D. Sheepers & N. Ellemers*

17 Future EASP Meetings

17th General Meeting of the EASP, July 9-12, 2014, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

SPSSI-EASP Joint Meeting on the Great Recession and Social Class Divides, September 4-6, 2014, Princeton NJ, USA

EASP Summer School 2014, August 17-30, 2014, Lisbon, Portugal

19 Reports of Previous Meetings

Small Group Meeting: Developing Diversity in EASP, June 12-14, 2013, Lausanne, Switzerland

Small Group Meeting on the Social Determinants and –Consequences of Threat, June 17-18, 2013, Berlin, Germany

Small Group Meeting on Motivational, cognitive and affective sources of knowledge formation process, June 27-29, 2013, Krakow, Poland

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

Report from the SISPP 2014, Summer School of SPSP, July 15-26, 2013, UC Davis, California, USA

33 News about Members

In memoriam Jacob Max Rabbie (1927 – 2013)

In memoriam Martin Irle (1927 – 2013)

New Members of the Association

40 Grants and Grant Reports

50 News from the Executive Committee

New EASP membership fee structure, *by Daniël Wigboldus, Treasurer*

51 Announcements

EJSP Editor: Call for Applications

Election of New Executive Committee Members – Call for Nominations

53 Deadlines for Contributions

54 Executive Committee

Editorial

Dear colleagues and friends,

I hope you have had a nice and relaxing summer and a lot of energy for all challenges the new academic year may bring with it. One of which being the 2014 General Meeting in Amsterdam, which is busily and very professionally prepared by Agneta Fischer and Kai J. Jonas as local organizers, and by Jean-Claude Croizet and his team as program committee. The prospects are excellent that we will have a well-organized and inspiring meeting in an energetic and buzzing European capital. Another highly relevant event will be our 2014 Summer School in Lisbon; the call for applications is out now, and I am convinced that the very interesting and challenging program, together with a great venue, will guarantee a wonderful experience for our talented PhD-students.

As always, I want to draw your specific attention to some of the contributions in the new volume of the European Bulletin. First of all, you will find two obituaries on two honorable EASP-members who unfortunately passed away, recently: Martin Irle and Jaap Rabbie. As you will read, in different ways both of them have been highly relevant in European Social Psychology and have substantially contributed to the field and to the firm establishment of EA(E)SP.

Second, in the current Opinions & Perspectives section you will find a piece by Christian Staerklé and others on “Developing diversity in EASP as a mean to achieve a vibrant and relevant social psychology”. In this piece, the authors express their concern about the more recent developments in EASP, and note both a lack of diversity in both EASP’s membership geographical backgrounds and in the content of their (published) work. It is the visible, provocative continuation of a debate that started prior and during the last General Meeting in Stockholm, and it will hopefully stir many responses. In terms of content, however, I take the advantage of this editorial to be the first to disagree. In my view, the characterization of the majority of social-psychological research in Europe as intellectually narrow and/or societally irrelevant does not accurately describe the state of the field. Moreover, I do think that many concerns that are raised are, in fact, already long incorporated in EASP’s functioning (for a similar point, see Hewstone et al., 2012, in their response to Schruijer, 2012). Diversity is an issue we are very aware of and concerned about. For example, our fees can easily be waived for members facing economic hardship; we give seedcorn and travel grants preferably to members from universities and countries where funds are hard to get; we are open to fund small or medium-sized group meetings on a large array of themes; and we have our Summer Schools and General Meetings at various places in all parts of Europe. In addition, we strive for diversity in terms of gender, nationality, and scientific expertise in the organizational structure of the EASP, be it in the Executive Committee, the Editorial Board of EJSP, or the Programme Committee for our General Meeting. Hence, personally, I think that diversity is and always has been a topic deeply and safely ingrained in EASP and its functioning. Yet, we also know from diversity research that in order to get the best

out of diversity, organizations need to clearly communicate to their members that they are aware of, open for, and appreciative of differences. In this respect, Christian Staerklé and his coauthors alert us at the very least that we could do a better job communicating what the Association is already doing for the sake of promoting diversity in Social Psychology in Europe. This editorial is a first attempt to do so. But I hope it is only the beginning of a lively debate that we hopefully can publish in the next Bulletin, in spring 2014.

Let me close by wishing you a very nice holiday season and all the best for the New Year!

Sabine Otten

President's Corner

Dear colleagues and friends,

What is the mission of EASP? I would say, in line with our Article 3, that it is to promote Social Psychology in Europe. All Social Psychology. In all Europe. When you read the presentation of the Association's goals on our website, however, you learn that this mission is "to promote excellence in European research in the field of social psychology". I always thought that the reference to excellence was a bit odd, but so far I didn't have very strong feelings towards this statement, and thought it didn't hurt. Now I have changed my mind, and think that it might lead to some important misunderstandings on the mission of EASP: it may convey the idea that our Association has a meritocratic attitude and a focus on performance, and conceal the actual activities in which EASP invests the majority of its time and resources.

The reason for this change in attitude is the Opinion Piece that you can read in this Bulletin, which depicts the Association as lacking diversity and striving to "become a major player" in the social psychological arena. This piece is important because it is the outcome of a group of Members who set out to study the state of diversity in European Social Psychology, and whom the Executive Committee sponsored under the form of a Small Group Meeting to this effect. In this President's Corner I will focus on just one point that they raise, as it pertains to the question of our mission: "the Association needs to be clear about its goals".

So, let us reflect on the goals of EASP. Or, since an association is made of people, let us rather reflect on the goals that the Executive Committee has set for itself. In my first President's Corner, in the Fall 2011, I clearly stated that diversity was one of the major challenges that the incoming EC would have to face, a challenge related to the internal issue of the growth of the Association and the external issue of the economic crisis in Europe. If you read the issues of the Bulletin that have followed, you will find that the EC has systematically reported a number of activities mainly aimed at promoting diversity within the Association. The most recent one, the change in the fees structure - which follows the call for increased use of our hardship fees - is not a minor decision, and we hope that it will be instrumental to increase solidarity with our members whom the economic crisis has hit the hardest. Along the same lines, the EC has also suggested being flexible in the interpretation of the purpose of our grants, so that we can support our younger Members through a larger array of initiatives that local funding does not allow. And, since national funding might be lacking for many of our members, the EC has worked very hard to increase as much as possible the presence of Social Psychology in European funding institutions.

This is just a selection of our initiatives targeting the promotion of diversity, and our Secretary has pointed out more in her Editorial. Thus, as far as goals are concerned, the EC's priorities are quite clear. However, more could be done, and I hope that you will participate in this endeavour by fuelling this discussion with your comments and suggestions, and by participating in promoting the numerous activities that the Association supports. Participation is the precursor of solidarity.

Yours sincerely,

Fabrizio Butera
President, EASP

Opinions and Perspectives

September 30, 2013

Developing diversity in EASP as a mean to achieve a vibrant and relevant social psychology

According to Article 3 of the *European Association of Social Psychology*, its mission is to promote and develop “*empirical and theoretical social psychology within Europe and the interchange of information relating to this subject between the members and other associations throughout the world [...].*” Historically, this article grew out of the desire to unite social psychologists after WWII, to give them the opportunity to exchange, to become visible as a group and as a discipline and to play a role in the rebuilding of Europe. The Association was indeed critical in establishing the discipline and in strengthening the position of researchers within the broader social and human sciences.

Given that the goals of the Association were explicitly framed within the geographical notion of “Europe”, the Association had not only to find ways to accommodate the vast diversity of intellectual and methodological approaches within this region. It also needed to establish strategies to effectively overcome political barriers and economic inequalities and to increase communication and exchange between regions. Starting from this premise, it was clear since the early years of the Association that its mission could not be limited to scientific promotion as such, but that scientific promotion *within Europe* required the active willingness to welcome diversity within social psychology and the explicit goal of promoting social psychology in underprivileged regions. In order to do so, the Association organised for example “East-West meetings” to bring together social psychologists from Eastern and Western Europe, and articles in the early volumes of the *European Journal of Social Psychology* contained summaries in French, German and Russian. The importance of diversity is also underscored by Grauman (1995) who declared that “leading representatives of the Association have always stressed the importance of accounting for the cultural diversity of Europe within a social scientific framework”.

Let us further illustrate this state of mind and the vision of social psychology as a discipline with quotes from the introductory chapter of the classic “Social dimension” book where Tajfel, Jaspars and Fraser (1984) reflect upon the many activities of the Association, including the EJSP, the European Summer schools, colloquia and conferences, and the continuing expansion of the Association itself, and claim that the “*mark of these developments has been their diversity. There is no doubt that their continuing vitality depends upon the continuation of this diversity. And yet, amidst the variation, there seems to exist a very general common denominator: in a phrase, it can be referred to as the social dimension of European social psychology.*” (p. 1, emphasis in original). Later on they define this social dimension by arguing that “[*the perspective of the two volumes*] consists of the view that social psychology can and must include in its theoretical and research preoccupations a direct concern with the relationship between human psychological functioning and the large-scale social processes and events which shape this functioning and are shaped by it” (p.3). These quotes testify to the “identity” of European social psychology and more specifically to the values and principles of the Association three decades ago. Tajfel certainly thought that the two volumes of the *Social dimension* were representative enough of the research activities of the members of the Association in order

to allow him to speak in the name of the Association and European social psychology in general.

The present opinion piece wishes to raise a debate within the Association as to whether these original goals of the Association are still valid and relevant, to what extent they are currently respected, and how the Association could improve the implementation of these goals.

The current situation of European social psychology has fundamentally changed since those early days, and one could reasonably claim that these are difficult times for social psychology, if not a crisis. The Stapel debacle for example has led to debates about research ethics in social psychology and to an increasingly negative public attitude towards the discipline. This can have severe consequences not only for the societal impact of social psychology, but also for funding opportunities. At the same time, the neo-liberal management of the scientific field has led to a 'publish or perish' culture that encourages career scientism, stimulates competition over cooperation (especially with peripheral regions) and has established a narrow quantification ethos of scientific output, assessed with an array of one-sided indicators (IF, H-index). Moreover, this assessment culture skews evaluations towards approaches which are seen as more likely to fit with natural sciences. And it places social psychology inevitably in a loser position, since social psychology is compared to the whole of psychology where even mediocre neuro journals have a higher impact factor than our highest impact factor outlets. And a final consequence is that social psychology has gradually lost its connection to other social sciences and has become irrelevant in the public sphere.

In this situation of internal and external challenges, the Association needs to be clear about its goals. It may be the case, for example, that in its drive to become a major player in what is considered 'scientific', the Association reinforces these practices rather than encourages those that are more in line with the founding principles of social psychology as formulated by EASP's pioneers (see Moscovici & Markova, 2006). There are at least three related concerns for the Association and its aim to encourage a vibrant, open and diverse social psychology.

A. THREE RELATED CONCERNS FOR THE ASSOCIATION AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

1. Underrepresentation

Despite the increase of the membership base and the presence of members in virtually all European countries, we argue that there is a lack of plurality in terms of geographical representation, theoretical and methodological approaches, and the dissemination of knowledge. The EASP website declares today that "*the overarching aim of the European Association of Social Psychology is straightforward: to promote excellence in European research in the field of social psychology.*" This aim, however, may not be as straightforward as it seems, since "promoting excellence" may refer only to the excellence of a lucky few working within privileged contexts.

We suggest that it is time to look more closely at these issues and to examine the extent to which diversity and plurality are present in the papers published in the journals supported by the Association, and more generally in the activities supported by the Association.

What are the areas of social psychological research that are represented, and those that are

missing? Which countries are missing? Are conferences, group meetings, grant holders sufficiently diversified and representative of the whole community? The answers to these questions will determine the measures to be taken to act against underrepresentation, to encourage the active participation of all members, and to support researchers who have difficulties in doing research and reaching the standards of publication due to challenging structural circumstances. A cursory look at the membership list shows for example that about 60% of members work in West- and North-European countries (out of which 15% in the Netherlands, 14% in the UK and 13% in Germany), about 20% in South-European countries (8% in Italy, 4% in Spain, 4% in Portugal), 10% in East- and Central-Europe (over 6% in Poland), and roughly 10% elsewhere (including 6.6% in the U.S.). It seems important, therefore, to know more about social psychological research in under-represented areas and the conditions in which our colleagues work.

2. Social irrelevance

From the beginning, European social psychology emphasized the role of social and cultural factors in social psychological models, thereby providing a voice to a more 'social' social psychology (Tajfel, 1984). But this focus on the 'social dimension' seems to have been somewhat lost with the turn to 'isolated' processes and methodological details, away from studying real life issues in their real life context. More often than not, costly technology and 'neat' findings seem to have replaced an interest in actual interactions and the complex and ambivalent nature of human action in a world of inequalities, struggles and upheavals. Whereas the original impetus was multidisciplinary, many European social psychologists have adopted individualistic, atomistic models of social behaviour (Schruijer, 2012). This does not only contribute to social psychology's limited visibility in societal debates and among policy-makers, research councils and European funding programs, but also to disciplinary 'isolation'. We lost the connection to sociology, political science and other social sciences. We don't read them and they don't read us.

The EASP pioneers were concerned with real world issues and argued that social psychology not only has the task of *studying* humans in social context, but also of trying to make society a more equal and just place. This societal relevance is increasingly sacrificed for the search of 'hard', but trivial evidence and the pursuit of academic credentials as a goal in itself. Progress has become a matter of disciplinary techniques and trying to become a successful (i.e., competitive and productive) social psychologist. This leads to numerous peer-reviewed articles on many 'small' questions that on average may be read by 5 to 10 colleagues and contribute little to 'the larger picture'. Increasingly, what 'counts' as a publication does no longer reach 'the public', and what the public reads is not recognized as a publication. This raises the question of which audience social psychologists want to reach and with what type of social psychological knowledge: *social psychology for whom and for what?*

3. Intellectual narrowness

Although social psychology remains a very heterogeneous discipline, the existing diversity goes along with unequal representation, lack of opportunities and limited access to the field. Many researchers who identify themselves as social psychologists and who teach and care about the discipline do not feel adequately represented by the Association and its flagship journal, the EJSP. Despite dropping the word 'experimental' in the Association's name, they tend to perceive it as promoting a view of social psychology based on narrow experimental approaches with largely homogeneous (student) samples. The aim of the Association is to promote European excellence in social psychology. But excellence and

quality seem increasingly equated with scientism resulting in publications of brief research reports and the use of limited criteria for deciding about careers, prestige and funding. Scientific quality is critical for the viability of any discipline and for making an informed and responsible contribution to societal debates. But the sole emphasis on number of publications, impact factors, H-index and the like, contributes to an unwelcome homogenisation of the field in general, and of European social psychology in particular. Is this why European researchers prefer to publish in American journals? Why the impact factor of the EJSP remains quite low despite high rejection rates? Why American journals are more diverse? This quantification ethos of our discipline undermines risky and potentially innovative work as well as the use of a broader range of knowledge dissemination and publication channels. To recognize and assess research ideas, proposals, papers, and other types of output, a relevant social psychology needs a workable set of diversified and balanced criteria that includes the active dissemination and use of the knowledge produced.

B. WHY THIS MATTERS (for the association and for social psychology)

Based on this short analysis of contemporary social psychology in Europe, we wish to highlight the need for the European Association to proactively encourage the further development of an open and pluralistic social psychology that recognizes different intellectual and methodological traditions, that is, a social psychology that matters for the social world. Such a project is important for European societies, for social psychology as a discipline, and for individual social psychologists some of whom do research in difficult social environments. The role of the Association is also important for young scientists who work on short term contracts on projects with limited opportunities to develop their own ideas. It matters for the future of the EASP to offer a vibrant intellectual environment and to support those who struggle to keep intellectual independence, theoretical importance, methodological rigour and ethical research practices in an academic world that favours fast production records. In that respect, striving for diversity and pluralism is not an end in itself, but a means to achieve a multi-dimensional and multi-level social psychology whose outcome is good science that can inspire and support people.

We realise and acknowledge that the Association has to day implemented many important measures to address these issues. Nevertheless, there is room for improvement, in particular due to the rather extraordinary circumstances of present-day social psychology. Many ideas can be put forward about how to increase diversity in the association and some of these are listed below. They are deliberately formulated in rather general terms, since their purpose is to open a debate about future policies and policy priorities within the EASP rather than to serve as ready-made recipes. They are organised as to address the three issues raised, that is, underrepresentation, social irrelevance and intellectual narrowness, with the exception of the organisational propositions that are relevant for all three concerns.

C. PROPOSITIONS

Organisation of the Association

- Diversify and / or increase composition of the EC
- Appoint diversity officer in the EC
- Diversify composition of editorial board of EJSP

- Establish sub-committees of diversity or plurality or give mandates to members of the Association

Underrepresentation

- Develop a comprehensive strategy to address under-representation.
- Make invisible research (e.g., non-English or non-paradigmatic research) visible (e.g., through an inventory, translate abstracts, support networks).
- Proactively promote intellectual visibility of and exchange with members of under-represented (minority) groups and European countries
- Proactively facilitate access to EASP activities for members of underrepresented countries, with appropriate communication strategies
- Encourage and support grant applications using bilateral and multilateral funding opportunities at the national and – particularly - European level.

Social irrelevance

- Develop a strategy to increase visibility of social psychology in society and with funding agencies at the national and European level.

Intellectual narrowness

- Develop a broader but workable list of indicators of quality that allow a more diversified assessment of research (outcomes) and that combine scientific rigour with societal relevance (examples can be found in ongoing debates in other social sciences and in some National Academies of Sciences)

We believe that developing diversity in EASP is a necessary step for the survival of a socially relevant, scientifically challenging and methodologically rigorous social psychology in the current academic and social context. With this opinion letter we hope to open the debate within the association.

Participants of the Small Group Meeting: 'Developing diversity in EASP', Lausanne, June 12-14, 2013 (in alphabetical order)

Dorra Ben Alaya, Xenia Chrysochoou, Alain Clémence, Anna-Maria De Rosa, Ewa Drozda-Senkowska, Guy Elcheroth, Andreea Ernst-Vintila, Isabelle Goncalves, Eva Green, Karolina Hansen, Caroline Howarth, Nikos Kalampalikis, Steve Reicher, Sandra Schruijer, Bernd Simon, Christian Staerklé, Ayse Uskul, Jorge Vala, Maykel Verkuyten, Chiara Volpato, Wolfgang Wagner

For comments, please contact christian.staerke@unil.ch.

Book Review

The Sage Handbook of Social Cognition, ed. by Susan Fiske and Neil Macrae
New York: Sage, ISBN: 9780857024817, Price 150 \$

Book review by **Michael Häfner** (Utrecht University, The Netherlands)

It has been a while since the two volumes of the classic Wyer and Srull's "Handbook of Social Cognition" were published. It is needless to state that the field developed extensively in these almost 20 years. Nevertheless, the Editors of the present volume, Susan Fiske and Neil Macrae, their impressive advisory board stuffed with icons of our field, and their more than 50 authors managed to condense all we know by now in 27 comprehensive chapters. Though these chapters are organized in only one volume, they are (implicitly) structured in a similar way to its ancestor, starting with basic processes (e.g., the chapter on "Implicit Social Cognition" by Nosek, Hawkins, & Frazier) and ending with applications (e.g., the chapter on "Social Cognition in Real Worlds: Cultural Psychology and Social Cognition" by Morling & Masuda).

This handbook is, however, different from "just" a state-of-the-art compendium (a truly complete one though) of almost five decades of social-cognitive research. In fact, all authors seem to be committed to take their immense knowledge a step further and try to sketch new directions of their research fields and their neighboring disciplines. Whereas such an outlook is often treated in a cursory manner in book chapters designed to "tell us the truth", the present volume makes this endeavor its mission: Be it the surprising and creative mixture of both authors and topics, be it the thought-provoking intro by Neil Macrae and Lynden Miles (which, by the way, kills a widespread definition of social cognition virtually in passing) or be it the direction giving outro by Susan Fiske; all chapters offer an extra kick that let the reader go on reading after long having found the information he or she was looking for.

As such, the Sage Handbook of Social Cognition is much more than a general reference book. Actually, it exhibits the most recent and most interesting social-cognitive research in 25 critical Psychological-Review-like papers, covered by two Current-Directions papers. There is not much more you could ask a book to offer.

Not an easy read, though, which asks the reader for careful attention. Nevertheless, a lot of stimulation is the reward; much more than I expected from a handbook. This makes the book a valuable source of knowledge and inspiration for the advanced student and every social psychologist; because if I have learned only one thing from the book then it would be that social psychology *is* social cognition. Above and beyond attracting this classic audience, the many links to neighboring disciplines, such as developmental, clinical, and personality psychology may also invite scholars from these disciplines to have a closer look at what social cognition is.

New Publications by Members

Handbook of Social Resource Theory. Theoretical Extensions, Empirical Insights, and Social Applications. Kjell Y. Törnblom and Ali Kazemi (Editors)

A more detailed overview and a sample chapter of the Handbook can be found at:

<http://www.springer.com/social+sciences/book/978-1-4614-4174-8>

Social relationships may be characterized by their use of social resources, both material ones, as in money and physical possessions, and intangibles such as love, knowledge, and power. Transactions involving their distribution and exchange are central to individuals' quality of life. Over the past four decades, Social Resource Theory (SRT) has evolved to build vital links between social psychology and public policy, providing a valuable lens for understanding and addressing social class, inequality, and injustice.

The possibilities for this robust field are on full display in the *Handbook of Social Resource Theory*. An international, interdisciplinary panel of experts expands on the pioneering work of the late Dr. Uriel Foa, starting with the basic structure of SRT and including recent conceptual and theoretical developments.

The topic of this *Handbook* spans several disciplines (psychology, sociology, social psychology, management, economics and marketing, political science, history, and applied ethics/philosophy), features both laboratory and field research from a number of different countries, addresses students and researchers as well as policy makers, and its application is potentially useful on different levels and in a variety of contexts. Following a Foreword by Morton Deutsch and an introductory chapter, this *Handbook* presents five parts containing 26 chapters and concludes with an Envoi by Elaine Hatfield and Richard Rapson.

A more detailed overview and a sample chapter of the *Handbook* can be found at:

<http://www.springer.com/social+sciences/book/978-1-4614-4174-8>

“Uriel Foa (1916-1990) developed social resource theory in the 1960s. In the next half century this theory has generated an enormous amount of new data and theory in social, cross-cultural, and educational psychology, as well as in related disciplines. It has inspired work on interpersonal relationships, attributions, the understanding of status, morality, distributive justice, procedural justice, social dilemmas, interpersonal evaluation, biosocial theory, and action construal. Applications in both organizational and educational settings and in marketing studies indicate the theory's relevance for the “real world.” This volume edited by Kjell Törnblom and Ali Kazemi is the wonderful Festschrift that Foa did not have, because he died when he was too young by contemporary life expectancy standards. It includes chapters by many of the stars of the fields that social resource theory has influenced.”

Harry C. Triandis
Professor Emeritus, University of Illinois

The Handbook presents the basic tenets of the social resource theory originated from the late Uriel Foa and provides an authoritative agenda for the future developments of this theory. Kjell Törnblom and Ali Kazemi have made an excellent job in gathering a global group of contributing scholars representing an outstanding mix of respected and long-standing researchers in social psychology, sociology, psychology, management, economics and marketing, political science, history, and applied ethics/philosophy. This Handbook is an ideal resource for researchers, instructors, and graduate students in all these fields with an interest in social resource theory.”

*Edna B. Foa
Professor of Clinical Psychology, University of Pennsylvania*

“Forty years ago Edna and Uriel Foa began to spell out the unwritten social rules by which we trade – on a daily basis – friendship, information, respect, gifts, favors and other rewards and punishments. Sociologists, psychologists, economists, and others owe the editors a tremendous debt of gratitude for reminding us of the eloquence and indispensability of the original work on social resource theory and for bringing together a distinguished roster of scholars and scientists to reflect on the theory and to exercise it in the service of addressing an astonishing number and variety of important social and organizational problems.”

*John T. Jost
Professor of Psychology and Politics, New York University*

“What material and symbolic goods count as resources? How do resources relate to power? How can the exchange and distribution of resources be understood in both interpersonal and societal terms? In this outstanding volume, Törnblom and Kazemi bring together a constellation of experts from a variety of disciplines to address questions such as these. Taking as their basis the classic statement by Uriel and Edna Foa of the resource theory of social exchange, the Handbook moves through theoretical to practical analyses and presents both laboratory and field research conducted in a number of different countries. The book makes an excellent contribution to our understanding of social exchange theory in particular and of social relationships in general. The collection is both impressive and important.”

*Faye J Crosby
Professor of Psychology, University of California Santa Cruz*

“A tour de force, this comprehensive volume presents cutting edge insights inspired by Foa and Foa’s social resource theory. Törnblom and Kazemi have brought together a stellar cast to address ageless questions about the cornerstones of social life and provide generative roadmaps for future theorizing and research. This volume is a rich resource for scholars as well as students and educated readers who want to know more about the complexities of social life.”

*Linda J. Skitka
Professor of Psychology, University of Illinois at Chicago*

War, community and social change. Dario Spini, Guy Elcheroth & Dinka Corkalo Biruski (2013).

New York and Berlin: Springer.

<http://www.springer.com/psychology/community+psychology/book/978-1-4614-7490-6>

War, Community, and Social Change documents and analyses how social representations and practices are shaped by collective violence in a context of ethnic discourse. What are the effects of political violence, and what are the effects of collectively experienced victimization on societal norms, attitudes, and collective beliefs? This volume stresses that mass violence has a de- and re-structuring role for manifold psychosocial processes. The interdisciplinary approach draws attention to how most people in the former Yugoslavia had to endure and cope with war and dramatic societal changes, but also how they faced and resisted ethnic rivalry, violence, and segregation. It is a departure from the belief that depicts most people in the former Yugoslavia as either blind followers of ethnic war entrepreneurs or as extremists intrinsically motivated for violence by deep-rooted intra-ethnic loyalties and inter-ethnic animosities. "

Historical Tales and National Identity. An introduction to narrative social psychology. János László (2013).

Routledge – November 2013 – 190 pages

Social psychologists argue that people's past weighs on their present. Consistent with this view, *Historical Tales and National Identity* outlines a theory and a methodology which provide tools for better understanding the relation between the present psychological condition of a society and representations of its past. Author János László argues that various kinds of historical texts including historical textbooks, texts derived from public memory (e.g. media or oral history), novels, and folk narratives play a central part in constructing national identity. Consequently, with a proper methodology, it is possible to expose the characteristic features and contours of national identities.

In this book László enhances our understanding of narrative psychology and further elaborates his narrative theory of history and identity. He offers a conceptual model that draws on diverse areas of psychology - social, political, cognitive and psychodynamics - and integrates them into a coherent whole. In addition to this conceptual contribution, he also provides a major methodological innovation: a content analytic framework and software package that can be used to analyse various kinds of historical texts and shed new light on national identity. In the second part of the book, the potential of this approach is empirically illustrated, using Hungarian national identity as the focus. The author also extends his scope to consider the potential generalizations of the approach employed.

Historical Tales and National Identity will be of great interest to a broad range of student and academic readers across the social sciences and humanities: in psychology, history, cultural studies, literature, anthropology, political science, media studies, sociology and memory studies.

Social Cognition and Communication. Ed. by Joseph P. Forgas, Orsolya Vincze, János László (2013).

Psychology Press – August 2013 – 354 pages

Series: Sydney Symposium of Social Psychology

Language is the essence of interpersonal behavior and social relationships, and it is social cognitive processes that determine how we produce and understand language. However, there has been surprisingly little interest in the past linking social cognition and communication. This book presents the latest cutting-edge research from a select group of leading international scholars investigating the how language shapes our thinking, and how social cognitive processes in turn influence language production and communication. The chapters represent diverse perspectives of investigating the links between language and communication, including evolutionary, linguistic, cognitive and affective approaches as well as the empirical analysis of written and spoken narratives. New methodologies are presented including the latest techniques of text analysis to illuminate the psychology of individual language users, and entire cultures and societies.

The chapters address such questions as how are cognitive and identity processes reflected in language? How do affective states influence language production? Are political correctness norms in language use effective? How do partners manage to accommodate to each other's communicative expectations? What is the role of language as a medium of interpersonal and intergroup influence? How are individual and cultural identities reflected in, and shaped by narratives in literature, school texts and the media?

The book is aimed at all students, researchers and laypersons interested in the interplay between thinking and communication, and should be required reading for all professionals who use language in their everyday work to interact with people.

Derks, B. , Scheepers, D., & Ellemers, N. (Eds.), (2013). *Neuroscience of Prejudice and Intergroup Relations*. London, UK: Psychology Press.

June 2013 • 374 pp. - £39.99 • 978-1-84872-641-3 •

Web: <http://www.taylorandfrancis.com/books/details/9781848726413/>

20% discount when the book is ordered on their website with promotional code: **IRK71**

Psychological research on the origins and consequences of prejudice, discrimination, and stereotyping has moved into previously uncharted directions through the introduction of neuroscientific measures. Psychologists can now address issues that are difficult to examine with traditional methodologies and monitor motivational and emotional as they develop during ongoing intergroup interactions, thus enabling the empirical investigation of the fundamental biological bases of prejudice.

However, several very promising strands of research have largely developed independently of each other. By bringing together the work of leading prejudice researchers from across the world who have begun to study this field with different neuroscientific tools, this volume provides the first integrated view on the specific drawbacks and benefits of each type of measure, illuminates how standard paradigms in research on prejudice and

intergroup relations can be adapted for the use of neuroscientific methods, and illustrates how different methodologies can complement each other and be combined to advance current insights into the nature of prejudice.

This cutting-edge volume will be of interest to advanced undergraduates, graduates, and researchers students who study prejudice, intergroup relations, and social neuroscience.

Reviews:

"The Neuroscience of Prejudice and Intergroup Relations presents cutting-edge research by leading international scholars. The volume is accessible to students and scholars both in intergroup relations and in neuroscience, but more importantly demonstrates to both groups the unique value and novel insights that can be derived from an integrative analysis. It sets a scholarly agenda in this area for many years to come." -- *John F. Dovidio, Ph.D., Yale University*

"Social neuroscience attempts to bring together social psychology's two essential elements: the mind 'in here' and the world 'out there'. Doing this properly — especially when tackling the gritty realities of prejudice and conflict — is no easy task for it is fraught with dangers of both method and theory. Happily, though, this book brings together the world's leading researchers in the field, and, collectively, they do a magnificent job of recognising and overcoming these challenges. Especially noteworthy are the candid insights that the book provides into the complexities of this task, as experienced by front-line researchers 'on the ground'. The result is a landmark book that will define and illuminate the field for decades to come." -- *Alex Haslam, Ph.D., University of Queensland, Australia*

"The search for the antecedents and consequences of prejudice, discrimination, and stereotyping has been one of the most important in social psychology for more than six decades. This book represents an important step forward in this historical pursuit and underscores how social neuroscience is shedding new light on age-old questions and problems." -- *John T. Cacioppo, Ph.D., The University of Chicago*

Content:

1. The "Nature" of Prejudice: What Neuroscience has to Offer to the Study of Intergroup Relations. *Daan Scheepers, Naomi Ellemers, and Belle Derks*

PART I

Categorization and Ingroup Favoritism

2. Imaging the Pictures in Our Heads: Using ERPs to Inform Our Understanding of Social Categorization. *Tiffany A. Ito*
3. The Implicit Effects of Social Identity: Measuring Early Social Categorization with Event-related Brain Potentials. *Belle Derks*
4. Oxytocinergic Circuitry Motivates Intragroup Cooperation and Intergroup Competition. *Carsten K. W. De Dreu*

PART II

Person Perception and Stereotyping

5. Scanning for Scholars: How Neuro-imaging the MPFC Provides Converging Evidence for Interpersonal Stratification. *Susan T. Fiske, Daniel L. Ames, Mina Cikara, and Lasana T. Harris*

6. Social Identity Shapes Social Perception and Evaluation: Using Neuroimaging to Look inside the Social Brain. *Jay J. Van Bavel, Y. Jenny Xiao, and Leor M. Hackel*
7. The Role of Memory Consolidation during Sleep in Social Perception and Stereotyping. *Michael A. Zárate and Luke R. Engle*
8. Heart Rate and Heart Rate Variability Responses to Stereotype Activation among Non-stereotyped Individuals: Stereotype Lift in the Motor Domain. *Aina Chalabaev, Philippe Sarrazin, and Jeanick Brisswalter*

PART III

Controlling Implicit Prejudice

9. Implicit Prejudice and the Regulation of Intergroup Responses: Theoretical Contributions of the Social Neuroscience Approach. *David M. Amodio*
10. Event-related Brain Potentials and the Role of Cognitive Control in Implicit Race Bias. *Bruce D. Bartholow*
11. Moral Accountability and Prejudice Control: Evidence from Cardiovascular and EEG Responses. *Naomi Ellemers and Félice Van Nunspeet*

PART IV

Coping with Prejudice and Identity Threat

12. The Biopsychosocial Model of Challenge and Threat: Reflections, Theoretical Ubiquity, and New Directions. *Jim Blascovich*
13. Studying Social Identity-based Threats and Challenges Using Cardiovascular Measures. *Daan Scheepers*
14. Physiological and Self-report Measures of Stress and Coping in the Study of Stigma. *Rodolfo Mendoza-Denton and Elizabeth Page-Gould*

PART IV

Intergroup Interactions

15. Using EEG Mu-suppression to Explore Group Biases in Motor Resonance. *Jennifer N. Gutsell and Michael Inzlicht*
16. Inspired by the Question, Not the Measure: Exploiting Neurobiological Responses in the Service of Intergroup Research. *Wendy Berry Mendes*
17. Suspicion in Interracial Interactions: Using Measures of Cardiovascular Activity to Index Threat. *Brenda Major and Jonathan W. Kunstman*
18. From Behavior to Brain and Back Again: Case Studies on the Use of fMRI to Investigate Intergroup Threat and Trust. *Katie N. Rotella and Jennifer A. Richeson*

Future EASP Meetings

17th General Meeting of the EASP

Amsterdam, The Netherlands, July 9-12, 2014

<http://www.easp2014.com>

SPSSI-EASP Joint Meeting

On the Great Recession and Social Class Divides
September 4-6, 2014, Princeton NJ, USA

To address the psychological implications of social class, especially at this time of economical crisis, a small group conference on "The Great Recession and Social Class Divides" is being held at Princeton University (Princeton, NJ), September 4-6, 2014. This is a joint Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI)-European Association of Social Psychology (EASP) conference, and will focus how belonging to different social classes influences various social psychological processes, along with the ways that the current context of economical crisis affects these psychological processes differently depending on the social class to which people belong. We aim to present a comprehensive summary of the social class and economical crisis literature as it affects several psychological processes, including trust, group deservingness, identity, educational attainment, stereotypes, ideologies, and group behaviors. Potential attendees must be a member of SPSSI or EASP or both. Abstracts describing new empirical work (300 words) should be submitted by email to Susan T. Fiske (sfiske@princeton.edu) or Miguel Moya (mmoya@ugr.es), by the deadline of April 30, 2014. The cost of registration and attendance will be offset by funding support provided by SPSSI, EASP, and Princeton University.

Susan T. Fiske (Princeton University)
Miguel Moya (Universidad de Granada)

EASP summer school 2014
Lisbon, Portugal, August 17-30, 2014

As was previously announced, the next EASP Summer School will take place in Lisbon from 17-30 of August, 2014 and will be co-hosted by the Institute of Social Sciences of the University of Lisbon (ICS-UL) and the University Institute of Lisbon (ISCTE-IUL).

The website of the summerschool is now online at <http://sseasp2014.iscte-iul.pt/>

In this website, you can find all the necessary information to apply and prepare for your participation in this Summer School.

For inquiries about the 2014 EASP Summer School, please contact the local organizing team: Rui Costa Lopes (rui.lopes@ics.ul.pt), Margarida Vaz Garrido (margarida.garrido@iscte.pt) or directly to the Summer School email address: sseasp2014lisboa@gmail.com.

Looking forward to see you in Lisboa!

On behalf of the organizing committee,
Margarida Garrido & Rui Costa-Lopes

Reports of Previous Meetings

Small Group Meeting: Developing Diversity in EASP
University of Lausanne, Switzerland, June 12 – 14, 2013
Organisers: Christian Staerklé (University of Lausanne), Steve Reicher
(St. Andrews University), Bernd Simon (University of Kiel)

This small group meeting on developing diversity within EASP was co-organised by Christian Staerklé (University of Lausanne), Steve Reicher (University of St. Andrews), and Bernd Simon (University of Kiel). Held at the University of Lausanne, Switzerland, between June 12 and 14, 2013, it was attended by 16 researchers, a number lower than expected due to a few last-minute cancellations. Nevertheless, the participants represented various geographical regions, including Western, Southern and Eastern Europe, as well as various theoretical and methodological approaches within social psychology. Thanks to the support of the Association and the Institute of Social Sciences of the University of Lausanne, accommodation and meal costs could be covered for all participants.

The meeting brought together young and established social psychologists to discuss issues of diversity in its broadest sense within the association. Set up following the general assembly of the last EASP General Meeting in Stockholm in 2011, the meeting had three aims: (1) to clarify the current state of affairs as concerns diversity in EASP; (2) to analyse the sources of the problems; (3) to develop concrete plans and policy proposals in order to support and encourage an open, diverse and pluralistic social psychology. These proposals are to be presented and discussed at the next general meeting in Amsterdam in 2014. The meeting was therefore organised as a workshop with extended discussion sessions rather than as a conventional scientific meeting with individual presentations. Ahead of the meeting, all participants sent an extensive position statement about the existing problems of diversity within the EASP, the causes of limited diversity, and possible solutions. These position statements were circulated ahead of the meeting and provided the basis of the discussions during the meeting.

The meeting was opened on the afternoon of June 12 by Christian Staerklé, followed by a tour-de-table of participants who briefly exposed their analysis of diversity within the EASP. A first general discussion was then held about the goals of the meeting and possible strategies of implementation to reach them.

Thursday was entirely devoted to structured discussions that were extraordinarily rich, engaging and productive. A first session concerned the various challenges of contemporary social psychology in its wider economic and ideological context. The group discussed for example the impact of a neo-liberal environment on social psychological research, the ever more widespread use of free-market and managerial principles in academic institutions and the obsessive quantification of scientific output within the human and social sciences more generally. Such principles may lead to serious disadvantages for individuals, institutions and countries without the necessary resources (in terms of training and financial support) to be competitive in the scientific market, and privilege uniform and standardised forms of research tailored to the norms of the highest-impact journals (e.g.,

"funny-effects" research). A recurrent theme in the discussions concerned the massive social inequalities between different countries in Europe and the impact of the current financial crisis on social psychology, in particular in Southern and Eastern Europe. The group also debated whether and to what extent social psychology was currently in a "crisis", due to its growing isolation within the social sciences (as illustrated by its marginal position in different international research organisations), its recent failures of research ethics, or its lack of relevance to address real-world issues.

At this point, the discussion turned towards the role of the association within this challenging context. It is useful to remind that the EASP was from its inception committed to developing a social psychology which embraces all of Europe, which includes all sections of society and which is open to multiple intellectual traditions. In many ways, the association has made remarkable strides forward in all of these respects, including recent initiatives to change the fee structure of the association. Yet, it is undeniable that in terms of geographical diversity and scientific recognition of different intellectual and methodological traditions there is a lot of room for improvement. Starting on Thursday afternoon, the group had intense debates about the possibilities and the responsibility of the association in addressing current challenges of the discipline. While the association cannot change the surrounding context, it can act proactively to shape the impact of the context on its members. After long discussions, the group agreed on two broad principles that should organise the diversity practice of the association: *Plurality*, as a permanent process with a funded subcommittee monitoring every activity of the association as a function of newly established plurality criteria; and *Development*, as a permanent process with a funded subcommittee addressing issues of periphery support and consequences of inequality between institutions and countries.

Among the general principles discussed, the association should for example make alternative research more visible (both in EJSP and the in the association more generally), decentralise its activities, actively promote and support contributions and funding applications from peripheral parts of Europe, elaborate new criteria of "good" or "good enough" research that go beyond the conventional criteria, encourage set-up of research networks between central and peripheral institutions and countries, adapt or change values and priorities of the association to promote a more inclusive and open social psychology (including a revision of publication principles and goals), and emphasise high-quality social psychological research that speaks to real-world problems.

The last session on Friday morning was devoted to organising the next steps of this initiative to address issues of diversity and promote an open and pluralistic social psychology. Two task groups were set up, one that would empirically demonstrate the problem of diversity and outline the proposed changes in the association with a text to be published in the EASP Bulletin, and another one that drafts a text with concrete policy proposals to be widely disseminated in order to prepare the General Meeting in Amsterdam in 2014.

In short, the meeting was a starting point for a process that should be interest to many members of the association, but one that would also allow attracting new members who hitherto were not interested in the association or felt that their work did not fit with the principles of the association.

**Small Group Meeting On the Social Determinants and -Consequences of Threat
June 17-18, 2013, Berlin, Germany**
**Organizers: Daan Scheepers (Leiden University), Kai Sassenberg (Knowledge
Research Media Center, Tübingen), & Kai Jonas (University of Amsterdam)**

Despite being often pointed as an explanatory principle in numerous social psychological theories (e.g., terror management theory, social identity theory), the concept of threat is strikingly complex and dynamic, as it can be defined, manipulated, and measured in many various ways. This meeting on the Social Determinants and -Consequences of Threat was organized in order to bring together scholars who investigate in their research the concept of threat using diverse measures (e.g., cognitive processing, physiological responses) in a variety of domains (e.g., prejudice, group dynamics, attitudes, decision-making).

The Meeting was sponsored and funded by the European Association of Social Psychology (EASP), and hosted by the Leibniz Gemeinschaft located in the mid of Berlin. The conference organizers were Daan Scheepers (Leiden University), Kai Sassenberg (Knowledge Research Media Center, Tübingen), & Kai Jonas (University of Amsterdam). The organizers brought together 32 participants. The group was very international, as it consisted of scholars coming from Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, France, Italy, Scotland, the UK, Poland, Austria, Belgium, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates, Australia, and the USA. Most of us arrived on Sunday June 16 – even if some had chosen to arrive before, so as to do critical things such as sightseeing, shopping, and local food discovering. An important event in Berlin was happening simultaneously due to the visit of Barack Obama, who was to give a speech at the Brandenburger Tor on Wednesday; however he did not show up for any of our talks (which was quite disappointing).

Seventeen talks, as well as 7 posters, were scheduled across two full days. The program was subdivided into several themes, designed to cover a wide variety of topics related to the phenomenology, causes, and consequences of threat in social contexts. The first day, which mostly dealt with *Sources of Threat*, started with a session on *Basic/Physiological Processes*, during which Eva Jonas, Johannes Klackl and Dmitrij Agroskin talked about the attentional and motivational factors associated to compensatory reactions that follow existential threats. Then Ayse Uskul presented cultural data exploring the sources and consequences of social exclusion. The next session on *Ambivalence and Inconsistency* started with a talk by Frenk van Harreveld who discussed the consequences of ambivalence on perceptions and beliefs; later on, Travis Proulx presented new evidence regarding the antecedents that can trigger compensation behaviors.

The next session, entitled *Lack of Control*, started with a talk given by Janine Deppe, who discussed the role of group goals for coping with control threats. Then, after a lunch break, Aleksandra Cichocka talked about narcissic vs. secure national identification consecutive to control threats. In the next session focusing on *Comparisons*, Marie Crouzevialle presented evidence that pursuing performance-approach goals can interfere with cognitive performance, and Devin Ray showed that motivation to share information can be undermined if we rely on social comparison for self-evaluation motives. Following a coffee break, the last session of the day on *(Im)orality* started, during which Marco Brambilla talked about morality and intergroup threat. At last, there was over an hour available for the posters presented by Megan Birney, Nicole Fasel, Katharine Greenaway, Angela

Maitner, Alice Normand, Tobias Rothmund and Bastiaan Rutjens, during a very interactive session.

On the evening was scheduled a dinner at Katz Orange –a charming, well-decorated restaurant located only a few minutes away from the Leibniz Association. The dinner was memorable and gave everyone the opportunity to get to know each other and chat in an informal setting. Discussions proved to be highly diversified – traveling, classic literature, Hegel's quotes, and even Clint Eastwood's movies (which after all might be good candidates for efficient threat manipulations). Fishes and asparagus were accompanied with a tasty white wine (the waiter kept topping up glasses in a quite zealous way); we even had the opportunity to taste the local liqueur (highly worthwhile).

The second day started at 10 am with a presentation given by Emma Onraet who focused on the relationship between threat and right-wing ideological attitudes, followed by Andrea Paulus who talked about the threat-related message of emotional expressions. In the next session focusing on *Information Seeking and Processing*, Frank de Wit presented work on cardiovascular reactivity consecutive to intragroup conflict, and James Shepperd presented a number of studies on threatening information avoidance.

The last session of the day on *Social Identity and Change* started with a talk given by Clara Wilkins on the threat of racial progress, followed by Belle Derks who discussed the Queen Bee phenomenon as a response to social identity threat. Then, after a coffee break, Beril Türkoğlu talked about threat to manhood, and its relation to favorable attitudes towards violence. Kai Jonas gave the final talk of the meeting and presented work on intergroup bias regarding an ingroup projection perspective. Finally, in order to extend our pleasant interactions, and because the weather was so warm and sunny, we then enjoyed a last drink and dinner outside, as a final opportunity to enjoy together our last moments in Berlin.

Taken as a whole, the papers and posters presented at the meeting documented a wide range of recent research related to the concept of threat – a diversity that precisely promoted very rich interactions and contributed to the exchange of ideas in a pleasant atmosphere. Blending both junior and senior scholars who work on various research questions and use different methodologies successfully gave rise to productive debates and creative brainstorming, which undoubtedly opened the way to new collaborations. Many thanks to the EASP for supporting this meeting, and to Daan Scheepers, Kai Sassenberg and Kai Jonas for a great organization – I think we all enjoyed the enthralling and very stimulating discussions, and came back home with both nice memories and fruitful new research ideas. The next meeting will take the form of a pre-conference preceding the upcoming EASP Group Meeting in Amsterdam scheduled on July 2014, and we are eagerly looking forward to this event!

Marie Crouzevialle (University of Lausanne, Switzerland)

Small Group Meeting on Motivational, cognitive and affective sources of knowledge formation process
 27th – 29th of June, 2013; Kraków - Przegorzały , Poland
 Program Committee: Małgorzata Kossowska, Arie W. Kruglanski, Arne Roets, Marcin Bukowski, Katarzyna Jaśko
 Local organizing team: Małgorzata Kossowska, Marcin Bukowski, Katarzyna Jaśko, Piotr Dragon, Paweł Strojny, Aneta Czernatowicz-Kukuczka

The EASP Small Group Meeting on *Motivational, cognitive and affective sources of knowledge formation process* took place from the 27th to the 29th of June 2013 in Przegorzały, Kraków (Poland). Participants started to arrive already on the 26th of June and after registering could attend an informal dinner in the guesthouse “Przegorzały”. In total 37 participants from 21 universities registered and took part in the meeting (one person did not arrive due to health problems), 19 participants were current members of the EASP.

The scientific programme started on Thursday the 27th at 9.00 a.m. with an official opening of the Small Group Meeting and Małgorzata Kossowska welcomed the participants and introduced the goals of the meeting on behalf of the programme and organizational committee. The introduction was followed by a keynote talk provided by Andrzej Nowak (co-authored with Agnieszka Rychwalska & Michał Ziembowicz) on *Novelty, coherence and construction of knowledge*. The first session entitled *Basic mechanisms of knowledge formation* started with a talk by Jeff Sherman, who described how “New Knowledge Depends on Old Knowledge” in the domain of stereotype formation, person perception, and attitude change. Next, Małgorzata Kossowska talked about the impact of need for closure and ability to achieve this need on heuristic information processing. Gabriela Czarnek followed by showing evidence for neurocognitive correlates of the need for closure. The session was closed by a talk of Grzegorz Sedek and Klara Rydzewska who talked about the interaction of aging and depression on impairment of sequential decision making. After a lunch break started a set of two thematically related sessions on *Motivational and affective underpinnings of knowledge formation*. In the first part Edward Orehek talked about the assessment regulatory mode and accuracy during interpersonal knowledge formation. Betty Chang addressed a question of “How do people monitor their progress on personal goals?” and Sherwin Ignatius Chia talked about the locomotors' decision and assessor's discomfort, that is the effects of regulatory mode on epistemic motivation and predilection to present. After a coffee break Marcin Bukowski continued with the topic of the session by talking about two routes to closure, that is, how time pressure and goal activation affects information processing. Ulrich Von Hecker raised the question, whether spatial reasoning can support social reasoning and Katarzyna Jaśko examined the effects of need for closure on decision-making process. The first intensive day finished with a dinner in the Przegorzały guesthouse.

On the second day of the topics of the small group meeting moved from more basic, intrapersonal processes of knowledge formation to its consequences for interpersonal and intergroup phenomena. We could not receive a better keynote address than the one of Arie Kruglanski, who fascinated the audience by showing some real world effects of epistemic motivation in the form of research on immigration, islamophobia, and support for terrorism performed across the globe. The next session entitled *Epistemic motivation, social influence and communication* started with a presentation from Gennaro Pica, who

argued that “seeking closure induces the inhibition of undesired memories”, specifically in the context of eyewitness memory. Next, Patrizia Catellani talked about the impact of prior knowledge and epistemic motivation on message framing in policy communication. The session followed with a presentation of Stefano Livi about compliance, the use and effectiveness of power tactics under need for closure. Celina Kacperski closed the session with her talk on the effects of online communication on knowledge formation. After a lunch break started a session on *Epistemic motivation and intergroup relations*. First, Arne Roets talked about “the roots of the prejudiced personality” and pointed to need for closure as the motivated cognitive basis of (all) prejudice. Next, Ambra Brizi reflected upon the effects of uncertainty and need for closure on outgroup discrimination and Agnieszka Golec de Zavala discussed the interplay between motivated social cognition and salient worldviews in predicting outgroup hostility. Closing the session, Piotr Dragon talked about need for closure as a moderator of uncertainty influence on out-group derogation in intergroup comparisons context. The day continued with walks and discussions in the Old Town of Kraków and a conference dinner in a charming place in the city center called Chimera Restaurant.

On the third day of the small group meeting the contextual and applied consequences of epistemic motivation were mainly raised. The keynote talk provided by Rex Wright regarded effortful processing of new information and created a theoretical inspiration stemming from the Motivation Intensity Theory perspective. The first session of the day called *Epistemic motivation in context: Culture and creativity* consisted of three talks. The first talk was provided by Małgorzata Gocłowska, who raised the question, whether “an Eskimo on the desert make us more creative?” and argued that schemata violation increases flexibility when need for structure is low. Next, Tommaso Alioto talked about creativity by fulfilling personal needs and the self-group dynamic in group performance. Finally, Ying-yi Hong discussed “How Does Epistemic Motivation Underlie Cultural Processes?”. The last session of the meeting considered the topic of *Epistemic motivation in applied social contexts*. In the first talk of the session Avigail Yinon discussed the influence of teachers' epistemological beliefs on their instructional practices when facing students' difficulty and failure. In the next talk, Nicolas Sommet discussed the issue of detrimental effects of numeros clausus on self-efficacy, mastery goals and learning. Yoram Bar-Tal in his presentation described the Cognitive Motivational Model that explains the effect of stress on cognitive structuring. Last but not least, Sindhuja Sankaran closed up the session talking about “Thinking good vs. Thinking bad”, that is the role of biases in information processing affecting sports performance.

The small group meeting ended with a summary of the meeting provided by Arie Kruglanski, who integrated the various strands of research discussed in the meeting into a cohesive whole. The meeting turned out to be exceptionally inspiring and thought provoking. The meeting gave the participants a unique opportunity to exchange their ideas during many discussions that hopefully will lead to fruitful research projects and new collaborations.

We would like to thank the EASP for supporting this excellent Small Group Meeting!

The Organizing Team

List of Participants

1. Tommaso Alioto, University of Bologna
2. Yoram Bar-Tal, Tel Aviv University

3. Mauro Bertolotti, Catholic University of Milan
4. Jenny Bittner, University of Twente
5. Ambra Brizi, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
6. Marcin Bukowski, Jagiellonian University
7. Patrizia Catellani, Catholic University of Milan
8. Betty Chang, The University of Sheffield
9. Aneta Czernatowicz-Kukuczka, Jagiellonian University
10. Sherwin Ignatius Chia, Nanyang Technological University
11. Chi-Yue Chiu, Nanyang Technological University
12. Gabriela Czarnek, Jagiellonian University
13. Piotr Dragon, Jagiellonian University
14. Małgorzata Gocłowska, University of Amsterdam
15. Agnieszka Golec de Zavala, CIS IUL, Lisbon
16. Ying-Yi Hong, Nanyang Technological University
17. Katarzyna Jaśko, Jagiellonian University
18. Celina Kacperski, University of Western Ontario
19. Mirosław Kofta, University of Warsaw
20. Małgorzata Kossowska, Jagiellonian University
21. Arie Kruglanski, Maryland University
22. Stefano Livi, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
23. Andrzej Nowak, University of Warsaw
24. Edward Orehek, University of Pittsburgh
25. Gennaro Pica, University of Rome "La Sapienza"
26. Arne Roets, Ghent University
27. Klara Rydzewska, Warsaw School of Social Sciences and Humanities
28. Sindhuja Sankaran, Jagiellonian University
29. Grzegorz Sędek, Warsaw School of Social Sciences and Humanities
30. Jeff Sherman, University of California, Davis
31. Nicolas Sommet, University of Lausanne
32. Paweł Strojny, Jagiellonian University
33. Ewa Szumowska, Jagiellonian University
34. Ulrich von Hecker, Cardiff University
35. Rex Wright, University of North Texas
36. Avigail Yinon, Bar-Ilan University
37. Yoel Yinon, Bar-Ilan University

Information about the meeting is available on the conference website:

<http://www.sgmkrakow.eu>

Medium Size Meeting on Intergroup conflict: The cognitive, emotional, and behavioural consequences of communication

June 27th – 30th, 2013, Soesterberg, The Netherlands

Susanne Täuber, Ernestine Gordijn, Hedy Greijdanus, Tom Postmes, Bart de Vos, and Martijn van Zomeren

During the last days of June, we hosted a Medium Size Meeting on the cognitive, emotional, and behavioural consequences of communication in intergroup conflict. We were happy to welcome an incredibly diverse set of 38 junior and senior researchers from Israel, Australia, Hungary, England, Scotland, Italy, France, Poland, Spain, Germany, Belgium, and The Netherlands. On Thursday evening, a welcome dinner allowed participants to get to know each other.

Day 1

Friday started with the keynote by Yoshihisa Kashima. He gave an inspiring review on his research on the construction of social reality. His talk was followed by presentations that were mainly focusing on the role of intragroup communication in intergroup conflict. The research they presented covered the creation of a shared reality with the audience through tuning (Gerald Echterhoff), "flaming" as an identity-affirming strategy in online conflicts between video gamers and scientists (Peter Nauroth), the impact of sacrificing major vs. minor issues on support for the outcome in multiple-issue negotiations (Adi Amit), the role of abstract vs. concrete communication of stereotypes within a group on intergroup harmony (Hedy Greijdanus), the impact of cultural diversity on identity formation in work groups (Loes Meeussen), and the role of social norms for regulating the use of the linguistic intergroup bias (Yvette Assilaméhou).

In a brave attempt to unite these diverse yet similar topics in the closing discussion, Andrew Livingstone and Martijn van Zomeren pointed out that no matter what is communicated and how it is communicated, the act of communication itself is crucial for people and groups in order to relate to each other. Building on this, they argued that while much research focuses on what is said and how, it might be fruitful to examine whether something has been communicated at all. One could argue that the very first step in this process is one of intra-personal communication in which a person engages himself in a conversation and tries to construct a meaningful interpretation of the world. Subsequently, communication between people, through the use of a feedback loop is a tool allowing to test one's interpretation and further try to make sense of the world. Communication provides norms and standards through grounding and establishing a social reality. During the discussion, it was stated that too little is known about the experiential aspects of grounding: Are people conflicted about communication goals (the why), about the way of communication (the how), and about the content of communication (the what)? Which emotions play a role in such experiences (curiosity, fear, hope, anxiety)?

We finished the Friday evening with a cooking workshop in the beautiful heart of Utrecht, which was great fun and a welcomed opportunity to resume earlier discussions. However, the activity itself offered room for talking about completely different things as well: It was amazing to see (and taste!) social scientists' less obvious talent for preparing the most delicious dishes.

Day 2

Saturday started with a key note by Karen Douglas, in which she gave an impressive overview over the role of language in intergroup conflict. Her account of the capacity of language to perpetuate intergroup conflict, to shape intergroup relations, and to enforce non-prejudiced norms was very inspiring. The key note was followed by presentations covering ingroup members' satisfaction with intergroup apologies if the apology is seen as motivated by image improvement or obligation shifting (Roger Giner-Sorolla), the potential of communicating anger to de-escalate intergroup conflict (Bart de Vos), the extraordinary role of cognitive reappraisal on de-escalating the conflict between Israel and Palestine (Eran Halperin), the potential of helping in reducing separatism threat (Esther van Leeuwen), and the cognitive and emotional consequences of being "the effect to be explained" (Susanne Bruckmüller).

Following the oral presentations, a one-hour **poster session** was held. The research presented here focused on the use of kinship metaphors for stimulating parochial altruism (Maria Abou Abdallah), the role of online political discussion in contemporary collective action (Isabella Alberici), the effect of non-native speech patterns on attitudes towards immigrants (Megan Birney), the role of metaphorical stereotyping on group behaviour and conflict potential (Dmitry Chernobrov), the risk of gender-fair language to backfire (Magdalena Formanowicz), the role of ascribing responsibility for group membership on out-group rejection (Anna Kende), that playing down 'conflict' is actually part of the repertoire of high-status groups' strategies deployed in defence of the ingroup's interests (Andrew Livingstone), manifestations of microaggressions in a multicultural context and how its experience relates to subjective wellbeing (RoseAnne Misajon), expressing shared humanity through equality recognition as a means to achieve more constructive intergroup relations (Daniela Renger) the role of intragroup communication in polarizing members' attitudes and reducing their willingness to engage in intergroup contact (Sandy Schumann). As with the oral presentations, also the poster presentations elicited vivid discussions and exchanges of ideas.

The day's scientific program was finalized by a presentation regarding the legitimization of different acculturation expectations through different representations of intergroup relations in media and political communications (Kaat van Acker) and on high identifiers' willingness to challenge ingroup conformity about the legitimacy of low group status (Gloria Jiménez-Moya).

Karen Phalet and Ernestine closed the second day with a discussion on the many different ways today's presenters implicitly suggest conflicts can be resolved, ranging from changing the way we communicate emotions to others to changing the way we perceive others and talk about others. They noted the strong implications of testing interventions, something that is still under-represented in research on conflict and communication.

Day 3

Our final conference day was opened by a presentation on the communication of power-congruent emotions as a means to legitimize violence in intractable conflict (Elanor Kamans), followed by research on the emotional burden that is felt when guilt is experienced in the name of the group while the group does not feel guilty (Amit Goldenberg), the effects of categorization on majority members' acceptance of different

ethnic minorities (Susanne Täuber), and the positive emotions and empowerment resulting from experienced relatedness at crowd events (Anouk van Leeuwen).

Closing Discussion and setting an agenda for future research

Eran Halperin and Tom Postmes chaired the closing discussion, a very energetic and intense exchange of impressions, ideas, and opinions emerging from the conference. The first conclusion to be drawn from the conference is that, despite being spread across diverse (sub-)fields, communication research is "alive and kicking". However, we seem to be conducting research in a rather narrow way, representing a real niche: A comprehensive view on the phenomenon is lacking, which is also evident in the relative neglect of methodologies and investigations that go beyond testing participants in the lab. In order to improve this, we need to step out of our comfort zone.

Some of the talks in the program already dealt with rather under-researched topics within the field of conflict and communication, such as how the ingroup can be a problem to conflict resolution, too, or how ingroups can actually reach out to outgroups. Further topics that emerged as important for the future research agenda are the dynamic aspect of emotions as both independent and dependent variables (something that is difficult to study with the present statistical tools), and interventions in real conflicts as well as testing in how far our insights would work if used as interventions.

Finally, we were very happy to receive feedback from a practitioner participating in the conference, Peter Lindenmayer who is working for the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) in Zimbabwe. He said the conference reminded him of the complexity of the issues that are treated rather simplistic in praxis. However, this is consistent with our statement that interventions should have a top priority on the research agenda: Practitioners need interventions that can be implemented easily. In identifying relevant topics for future research, Peter pointed out that in the research presented, samples are mainly composed of white Westerners, raising the question whether our findings generalize to other cultures, such as the African culture. He specifically pointed out that the communication and expression of emotions differs substantially between the Western and African cultures.

We would like to thank all participants for making this conference a very inspiring and special event, and also thank the EASP and the Dutch Research Foundation (NWO) for the kind financial support!

Eyes on Hungary

One side effect of the conference was that it brought to our attention the difficulties experienced by Hungarian social psychologists in participating in a fruitful exchange of ideas by means of attending conferences. Anna Kende (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest) shared her experiences with us. Please see her report on the meeting and her thoughts on the issue. We believe this is something that deserves the attention of EASP and her members.

Report from a participant

As a relatively new member, the Medium Size Meeting on Intergroup conflict: The cognitive, emotional, and behavioral consequences of communication in Soesterberg, The Netherlands, was only the second EASP event that I have attended. This also meant that I was no longer surprised at, but still very much noticed the warm and welcoming atmosphere of the meeting, and the openness of the academically more established participants to both the early stage researchers and the newcomers, like me. The program itself was organized in a way that following the highly informative keynote lectures by Yoshihisa Kashima (University of Melbourne) and Karen Douglas (University of Kent), a good number of PhD students' presentations and posters were mixed in with the talks of prominent scholars of the field who also had the task of reflecting on the presentations at the end of each day.

The impressive choice of location for the conference in a former monastery made us forget the harsh weather conditions of the Dutch summer, and we also all very much enjoyed cooking together by the central canal of Utrecht.

The meeting brought together communication researchers and social psychologists of the intergroup relations field which was a new and inspiring experience for me. Furthermore, the studies on linguistic intergroup bias, asymmetrical framing, apologizing, or anger expression, to name just a few, also showed the inherent connection between the two fields. I listened to the talks on communication with much interest, and was thrilled to hear and meet scholars of my narrower field of interest of intergroup conflict and collective action.

Medium size meetings are perfect occasions for taking a glance at current research in social psychology, mastering the art of presenting multiple studies within a limited amount of time, and taking a look at the new methodological and statistical trends. But equally importantly, they offer the opportunity for developing personal contacts, a key factor in the increasingly international academic field. Coming from East-Central Europe, I feel that these small and medium size EASP events provide a unique opportunity for developing these invaluable relations, not independently from the fact that they are financially much more attainable than conferences with high registration and accommodation fees.

EASP recently announced its new membership fee scheme which no longer simply differentiates between members coming from former communist and Western European countries. We can only welcome this new scheme, as it shows that although inequality in financial opportunities still exists within European academia, there is no longer a simple divide between East and West. Unfortunately some of the older EU member states have become problem zones, and fortunately, some of the former Eastern bloc countries have understood the necessity to invest in research and education. We are no longer, and we are no longer seen as a homogenous set of countries, which is an important step within the wider frame of social change.

However, it seems that some of the East-West differences still linger on: academic life in Hungary and in other Eastern European countries is often almost paralysed by a severe brain drain. EASP is clearly in no position to directly address this problem, while it has the potential to give us, Eastern European social psychologists a chance to participate in the international academic world by these very meetings, but also by seeking new and creative ways to make international collaborations, academic exchanges more diverse, advocating interaction in both directions. There is still a long way to go. It cannot be accidental that

at the two EASP events in which I had the chance to take part, both times I was the only East-Central European participant actually coming from a university situated in the region. Brain drain is by no means a new phenomenon: the greatest scholars in the history of social psychology come from our region, and they all made careers as social psychologists after being forced out of these countries by the very events they studied and we study up to this day: intergroup conflicts, social inequality and prejudice.

EASP meetings, conferences, exchange programs, but most of all international research collaboration are also essential for us, East-Central European social psychologists, to develop our research and education programs to reach international academic standards. However, as we are scholars of social change, we also understand that overcoming inequalities is a long and often futile process. Meetings, such as the one in Soesterberg, are great ways to put our expertise on the communication aspects of intergroup relations into practice. Therefore, I would like to thank the organizers once again for the opportunity to participate in this stimulating meeting, and also for taking the initiative to make it happen.

Anna Kende

Report from the SISPP 2013 Summer School of SPSP, UC Davis, California, July 15 – July 26, 2013

This year's Summer Institute in Social and Personality Psychology (SISPP), a biannual 2-week workshop organized by SPSP, took place at UC Davis in sunny California. Next to the 70 American and five Australian PhD students, SPSP in collaboration with EASP traditionally gives five European PhD students the opportunity to participate along with their mostly North American peers.

The five lucky Europeans of 2013 were Alexandra Kraus (Aarhus University), Hannah Nohlen (University of Amsterdam), Janina Steinmetz (University of Cologne), Konrad Bocian (SWPS Sopot), and Maartje Meijs (Tilburg University). We were given the opportunity to spend two weeks of our summer at the beautifully situated campus of UC Davis. SISPP 2013 was opened by Phil Shaver who gave a memorable keynote on the unpredictability of academic careers and the importance of following one's true interests. With this as inspiration, we started our classes the next morning. SISPP 2013 offered five different courses: Automaticity & Control (Bertram Gawronski & Jeff Sherman), Belonging, Responsiveness, and Close Relationships (Cynthia Pickett & Harry Reis), Embodied Cognition (Art Glenberg & Dennis R. Proffitt), Social Neuroendocrinology (Pranj Mehta & Wendy Mendes), and Culture (Veronica Benet-Martinez & Heejung Kim). In addition, there were also two one-day workshops: Longitudinal Data Analysis (Emilio Ferrer) and Smartphone Sensing (Andrew Campbell & Nicholas Lane).

Janina attended Veronica's and Heejung's course on culture, which looked at this very broad topic and cultural psychology in general from different angles and perspectives. As a basis for discussions, we read a few empirical and theoretical papers for each session. The papers covered diverse aspects of cultural psychology such as methods, cognitive and emotional correlates of culture, and cultural neuroscience. During the first week, we got to

know each other's work by each giving a data-blitz talk. Then, we discussed caveats and benefits of working cross-culturally and some fascinating findings of cultural psychology. In the second week, we split up into groups of two. Each person came up with a cross-cultural research idea that we then discussed with our partner, who gave feedback and suggestions. Veronica and Heejung also spoke with us individually about our ideas. On the last day, we all presented our research proposals in class. Thanks for Veronica's and Heejung's feedback, our class developed many interesting and very diverse ideas for future research in cultural psychology.

Maartje and Hannah attended the workshop on Automaticity and Control led by Bertram and Jeff, who send us an ambitious list of articles to be read before the beginning of SISPP. These theoretical papers served as a basis for the course and with a convincing email from Bertram we knew that the reading list wasn't 'suggested', but very 'mandatory'. Despite our worry about the amount and density of information to be digested during the course, this approach proved to be advantageous and insightful in the long run as it left us with more time for discussions and less time that needed to be spent preparing for class in the evenings.

The workshop was structured along questions that we generated as response to the theoretical papers covered in the reading list. This led to interesting and profound discussions on a broad range of topics. After reaching a consent on the gist of automaticity and control, we looked at how (the different features of) automaticity and control relate to dual process theories, association formations, habits and goals, fluency, priming processes, as well as implicit and explicit measures. The first week was mainly characterized by class discussions and debates, whereas in the second week we continued our discussions in the morning and the afternoons were reserved for meetings in small groups that were formed according to research interests. Each group developed a new research project that was presented in class on the last day of the workshop. These projects have led to some interesting collaborations and we look forward to seeing most (if not all) of our projects realized in the future. We would like to thank our entire class, and Bertram and Jeff, for their great input, contagious enthusiasm, and many fun (and late) evenings.

Alexandra and Konrad participated in the course on Embodied Cognition that was taught by Arthur Glenberg and Dennis Proffitt. Both teachers truly opened our eyes to embodiment research and enthusiastically showed us that this field goes beyond the influences of hot coffee mugs and heavy clipboards. Art, an expert on higher level cognitions (i.e., language), and Denny, a specialist in perception and perceiving spatial layout, brought in a whole new approach to their mostly social psychological students. Prior to the summer school, our teachers provided us with an online wiki that included more than 200 related research papers. For each day we read assigned articles that were presented and discussed by Denny and Art during morning lectures, as well as for the afternoons, where we got the chance to choose articles, present and discuss them in class. Our first week was pre-structured by the teachers and tailored to introduce us to the field. For instance, we studied the biological foundations, as well as perceptual and motoric systems and their role in cognition. For the second week, we could pick six additional topics that Art and Denny would cover in their morning lectures. Finally, during the last two days of our course, we worked in student groups and presented our newly developed research proposals which will (in most cases) end up as serious research collaborations.

Besides all the hard work during the day, free time was dictated by socializing and – especially – having a lot of fun. The sunny weather coerced us to spend a considerable number of afternoons at the pool, and nights out in town were organized daily. Whether it was karaoke, line dancing classes, pub quizzes, pub crawls, the cinema, or the farmer's market: we all had our share of entertainment outside of research and quickly made our own experiences with the culture of the 'university town Davis' (a.o. drinking Wicky Wacky Woos and going to the 'University of Beer'). On Sunday all SISPPers made a day-long trip to Napa valley. At Korbel Champagne Cellars we tried the famous Californian champagne every American President is presented with after inauguration and made a short hike through the Redwood National Park where we saw the tallest and oldest trees on Earth. On our way back to Davis we stopped at the coast to marvel at the breathtaking view of the Pacific Ocean.

To sum up, we can be sure that the academic and social benefits from participating in SISPP are long-term and unrivalled. The SISPP Facebook group still works as a communication and information platform which is tremendously helpful in maintaining regular contact with our peers. The next meeting is already scheduled: a reunion is organized for the first evening of the next SPSP meeting in Austin, TX. Thence, we would like to thank the European Association of Social Psychology and the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, as well as the organizers of UCD SISPP 2013 for giving us the opportunity to participate in one of the most inspiring experience in our scientific life so far. Our thanks also go to all the summer institute instructors, TAs and fellow students for making this workshop such a memorable and enjoyable experience, see you at SPSP and EASP 2014 (and all following years of course)!

*Alexandra Kraus (Aarhus University), Hannah Nohlen (University of Amsterdam),
Janina Steinmetz (University of Cologne), Konrad Bocian (SWPS Sopot),
and Maartje Meijs (Tilburg University)*

A photo of the group is available on:

<http://www.easp.eu/gallery/photos/events/summerschool/2013/1.html>

News about Members

In memoriam Jacob Max Rabbie (1927 – 2013)

Jacob Max Rabbie — Jaap for all who have known him — an internationally prominent social psychologist and a founding member of the European Association of Social Psychology (EASP) passed away on June 29th, 2013. He was born in Haarlem (The Netherlands) on October 4th, 1927 in a Jewish family. When Germany invaded The Netherlands, Jaap was almost 13 years old and he was 15 years of age when the persecution of the Jews started. It was only after he saw his mother sewing the yellow star on his coat that he realized that he was different from others. Boys in the neighborhood with whom he played soccer did not allow him to play in their team anymore. Yet, he felt pride when, on his way to school, an elderly gentleman who noticed the yellow star, respectfully took off his hat for him. His older brother did not survive Auschwitz and Jaap himself lived in hiding at more than thirty different refuges. These experiences greatly affected his choice of research topics in his later scientific career.

After finishing his study in social and political sciences at the University of Amsterdam (1947–1954), he became research assistant at Utrecht University (formerly Utrecht State University). There he met Harold Gerard, on whose recommendation Jaap received a grant for following the graduate program at Yale University. At Yale he worked with, among others, Jack Brehm, Bob Cohen, and Stanley Milgram. There he also met Philip Zimbardo and the two families became friends for a lifetime. Jaap graduated in 1961 on a dissertation entitled: "Factors influencing the magnitude and direction of affiliate tendencies under stress." His education in the Lewinian tradition not only profoundly affected his way of thinking, but also his interactions and dealings with others: a keen and heartfelt interest in individuals and their personal histories, a lack of status orientation, an aversion for administration and hierarchy, openness to discussion, putting the research problem in the center, and appreciating those who contributed solving it even when they made mistakes. In his early career, after returning to Utrecht, Jaap further developed his immanent interest into theoretical as well as applied group dynamics. His orientation to applied science became apparent in his training seminars on group dynamics, developed in collaboration with Leopold Vansina, in which executives of international firms participated. It is also reflected in the organization and staffing of the Institute of Social Psychology at Utrecht University and in the fact that his appointment in 1963 was that of Senior Lecturer in Applied Social Psychology. In 1968, he was appointed full professor in Experimental Social Psychology and Organizational Psychology. Jaap was also Dean of the Department of Psychology at Utrecht University during very turbulent times (1972-1975). Inspired by his horrible youth experiences, in his research, Jaap tried to find answers to profound questions of high societal relevance which all concern us until this very day. In his studies, Jaap showed that he also was a rigorous experimentalist. For many years, his research efforts aimed at answering the question about the necessary conditions for groups to become discriminatory. Almost simultaneously, a group of researchers at Bristol (UK) — gathered around Henri Tajfel (and later John Turner) — were examining the minimal conditions for ingroup favoritism to occur. The Minimal Group Paradigm (MGP), developed by the Bristol group, was actually modeled after the control condition of Jaap's

1969 seminal study on the origins of ingroup bias with Murray Horwitz. Quite ironically, the relationship between the two research groups gradually became polemic and impassionate. The Bristol group advanced a purely cognitive approach to (inter)group behavior, maintaining that mere categorization was sufficient for eliciting discriminatory behavior. Jaap's Lewinian legacy, combined with his personal experience during the war, led him to challenge this view. Basically, the polemic involved opposing theoretical conceptions about what constitutes a 'social group'. On one occasion, Jaap was asked by a critical colleague whether he "had ever stumbled across a group." His answer was very clear and direct and it succinctly summarizes his approach to intergroup relations: "Yes, I did, when German soldiers invaded my country." Although there is increasing evidence that he was correct and that other than cognitive processes are involved in the MGP, challenging the dominant theoretical position came at a price: His major contribution to intergroup research did not receive the recognition it deserved. As follow-up of his ingroup bias studies, in his later work, Jaap and his co-workers studied determinants of intergroup aggression. Again, in these projects he did not evade the controversy with other leading scholars in the field. Ultimately, Jaap was dedicated to science and truth-finding, nothing else mattered. He reluctantly retired, but he never said farewell to science.

Jaap Rabbie's international career is strongly interwoven with the development of the European Association of (Experimental) Social Psychology (EA(E)SP). At the time Jaap returned from Yale to The Netherlands, European social psychologists had more contact with their American colleagues than with each other. This was noted by John Lanzetta and Luigi Petrullo, liaison officers of the USA Office of Naval Research (ONR), who were surveying the scientific endeavors of European social psychologists. In the winter of 1963, they arranged a small group of active social psychologists to meet in Sorrento (Italy) for the First European Conference on Experimental Social Psychology. Jaap presented a cross-cultural study involving parent-child relationships in the USA and Germany. He was also invited to the second meeting in Frascati near Rome in December 1964, where the foundations for the EASP were laid, as well as to the very first, official plenary meeting of the Association organized by Serge Moscovici in the Abbey of Royaumont near Paris in March-April 1966. Jaap was also a staff member of the first, and legendary, EASP Summer School, officially labeled "European Training Seminar in Experimental Social Psychology", organized by Jef Nuttin Jr. in July-September of 1967 at Leuven (Belgium). The other staff members were all renowned social psychologists: Phil Zimbardo, Hal Kelley, Bob Zajonc, Hal Gerard, Jef Nuttin, and Jos Jaspars. Jaap became member of the Executive Committee of the EASP from 1969 until 1975, and from 1981 until 1987. After the General Meeting of 1984 in Tilburg (The Netherlands), he became treasurer of the Association. At the General Meeting in Gmunden (Austria) in 1996 Jaap received the Association's Tajfel Distinguished Scientist Award in recognition of his scientific oeuvre and his contribution to the EASP.

Then again, there was more than science in Jaap's life. As a boy, he loved to play soccer and soccer remained his favorite sport. He was a fervent supporter of Ajax, the famous Amsterdam soccer team, as well as the Dutch national team. Jaap and his wife Geesje loved opera, although at the department we never heard him sing beautiful arias. What we did hear many, many times were his boisterous bursts of laughter. He had a tremendous sense of humor, even when discussing serious matters such as research plans and results. Jaap was more than a colleague. He was our friend, and inspirer. We miss Jaap. Those who

have known him will keep him in their hearts and minds as a beautiful, warm, understanding, and pleasant man.

*Hein Lodewijkx
Jef Syroit
Open University, The Netherlands*

In memoriam Martin Irle (1927 – 2013)

Martin Irle died on October 26, 2013. With him, the European Association lost one of its founding members and German social psychology its most important nestor. Martin Irle's commitment to social psychology as an experimental science, his conviction that scientific insight is useless unless communicated, and his emphasis on interdisciplinary and international communication have shaped German social psychology in the 1970s and 1980s and have opened numerous opportunities for the large number of young scientists he has attracted to the University of Mannheim.

Martin Irle studied psychology at the University of Göttingen, where the experimental psychologists Johannes von Allesch and Kurt Wilde were his mentors. Between his 1952 Diploma and 1955 PhD, Irle worked as an organizational psychologist in private industry, followed by appointments at the George Washington Institute for Comparative Social Research in Stuttgart (1956) and the Institute for Empirical Sociology at the Mannheim Academy for Economics (1957), the precursor of the University of Mannheim. Following his Habilitation in 1964, Irle was appointed professor of sociology and social psychology at the newly minted University of Mannheim, a position he held until his retirement in 1992, despite various attractive outside offers. Of particular importance for his scientific development was a year as Theodor Heuss Professor at the New School for Social Research in 1969, during which he established close contacts with leading American social psychologists of the time, most notably his long-term friend Leon Festinger. During that time, Irle became convinced that the egalitarian atmosphere of American graduate programs is preferable to the hierarchical dependencies of the traditional German academic system. In the following years he established this atmosphere in Mannheim and created one of the most successful interdisciplinary social science research centers in Germany.

The center was part of an innovative funding scheme of the German Research Council, which created interdisciplinary research groups focused on a broad cross-cutting theme and named them with a number. The unit in Mannheim, formally known as "Sfb 24", brought together researchers from psychology, sociology, business, and law to study decision processes at the individual, group, and organizational level. Its funding was repeatedly extended until it reached its maximum possible lifetime of 25 years, closing shop in 1983. Crucial for the success of the Sfb 24 was a large number of international visitors who not only contributed to the intellectual discourse but also to an atmosphere that differed markedly from many other German university departments. Among the frequent guests were Jack Brehm, Morton Deutsch, Leon Festinger, Chuck Kieser, Hal Kelley, Arie Kruglanski, Elaine Walster, Bob Wyer, Phil Zimbardo, and many others, who often held extended "guest professorships". Younger scientists who spent several semesters at the Sfb included Gun Semin and Bob Wicklund. As PhD students in this

environment, we enjoyed exposure to a broad range of ideas, took it for granted that social psychology is experimental and international, that science needs to be communicated beyond national borders, and that international collaboration is just a normal part of academic life. As we learned later, none of this went without saying at German universities of the time.

Irlé served the field in numerous professional roles, including as co-founder and long-time editor of the German *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie* (now *Social Psychology*) and President of the German Psychological Association. His contributions to European social psychology were acknowledged with EASP's Jean-Paul Codol Award in 2005. We owe him a lot and he will be missed.

Norbert Schwarz and Fritz Strack

New Members of the Association

The following applications for membership were approved by the Executive Committee in October 2013. Names of members providing letters of support are in parentheses:

Full Membership

Dr. Leslie ASHBURN-NARDO
Indianapolis, USA
(J. Becker, M. Barreto)

Dr. Axel BURGER
Mannheim, Germany
(H. Bless, R. Greifeneder)

Dr. Brad BUSHMAN
Columbus, Ohio, USA
(L. Begue, D. Muller)

Dr. Huseyin CAKAL
Oxford, UK
(C. Psaltis, M.D. Birtel)

Dr. Héctor CARVACHO
Bielefeld, Germany
(G. Bohner, R. Gonzáles)

Dr. Jan CRUSIUS
Cologne, Germany
(K. Corcoran, T. Mussweiler)

Dr. Matt EASTERBROOK
Sussex, UK
(T. Manstead, V. Vignoles)

Dr. Adam FETTERMAN
Tübingen, Germany
(K. Sassenberg, A. Scholl)

Dr. Eran HALPERIN
Herzliya, Israel
(D. Bar-Tal, D. Spini)

Dr. Karolina HANSEN
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Bilewicz, M. Steffens)

Dr. Jacob JUHL
Southampton, UK
(C. Sedikides, T. Wildschut)

Dr. Nicole KRONBERGER
Linz, Austria
(X. Chryssochoou, W. Wagner)

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

Dr. David LOSCHELDER
Saarbruecken, Germany
(M. Friese, R. Troetschel)

Dr. Joanne LUMSDEN
Aberdeen, UK
(S. Quadflieg, N. Macrae)

Dr. Délphine MARTINOT
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(F. Butera, C. Darnon)

Dr. Nicole MUSCANELL
Tübingen, Germany
(S. Utz, K. Sassenberg)

Dr. Robert OUTTEN
Lisbon, Portugal
(R. Costa Lopes, J. Vala)

Dr. Sascha SCHWARZ
Wuppertal, Germany
(D. Niesta Kayser, M. Hassebrauck)

Dr. Zsolt Péter SZABÓ
Pecs, Hungary
(O. Vincze, J. Laszlo)

Dr. Kaat VAN ACKER
Göttingen, Germany
(K. Phalet, B. Mesquita)

Dr. Romy VAN DER LEE
Leiden, The Netherlands
(N. Ellemers, D. Scheepers)

Dr. Emilio Paolo VISINTIN
Lausanne, Switzerland
(E. Green, A. Voci)

Dr. Marten ZAAL
Exeter, UK
(M. Barreto, C. van Laar)

Postgraduate Membership

Cristina AELENEI
Clermont-Ferrand
(C. Darnon, C. Buchs)

Hani AL NABULSI
Sussex, UK
(R. Brown, J. Drury)

Yvette ASSILAMÉHOU
Rennes, France
(N. Lepastourel, P. Morchain)

Andrey BARSKY
Nottingham, UK
(C. Leygue, A. Spence)

Daniela BECKER
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(N. Jostmann, R. Holland)

Maria Laura BETTINSOLI
Padova, Italy
(C. Suitner, A. Maass)

Antonin CARRIER
Strasbourg, France
(O. Rohmer, D. Muller)

Jaysan CHARLESFORD
Plymouth, UK
(N. Wyer, S. Pahl)

Brittany CHRISTIAN
Aberdeen, UK
(K. Quinn, N. Macrae)

Odile CUENOUD GONZALEZ
Lausanne, Switzerland
(F. Butera, A. Clémence)

Angela DORROUGH
Göttingen, Germany
(M. Barreto, T. Kurz)

Adrienne GIROUD
Lausanne, Switzerland
(E. Green, A. Clémence)

Natalija KECK
Hamburg, Germany
(S. Giessner, G. Echterhoff)

Mike KEESMAN
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(E. Papies, H. Aarts)

Maja KUTLACA
Groningen, The Netherlands
(M. van Zomeren, K. Epstude)

Eve LEGRAND
Villeneuve, France
(V. Christophe, A. Mignon)

Gaylord LUYPAERT
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
(S. Demoulin, O. Corneille)

Polimira MITEVA
Sofia, Bulgaria
(E. Green, X. Chryssochoou)

Niamh O'REILLY
Limerick, Ireland
(W. van Tilburg, E. Igou)

Tom PAGE
Canterbury, UK
(A. Maitner, S. Stathi)

Abigail PLAYER
Canterbury, UK
(G. Randsley de Moura, D. Abrams)

Virgine WIEDERKEHR
Clermont-Ferrand, France
(C. Darnon, C. Buchs)

Oana Luiza REBEGA
Cluj-Napoca, Romania
(C. Toma, G.M. Jiga-Boy)

Lukas WOLF
Cardiff, UK
(U. von Hecker, G. Maio)

Péter RESTÁS
Pecs, Hungary
(O. Vincze, J. Laszlo)

Chao ZHANG
Tübingen, Germany
(D. Lakens, S. Utz)

Natalia RUSNAC
Strasbourg, France
(O. Corneille, O. Rohmer)

Stefanie SALMON
Groningen, The Netherlands
(L. van Dillen, A. Fischer)

Johannes SEEHUSEN
Groningen, The Netherlands
(K. Epstude, R. Spears)

Aude SILVESTRE
Liège, Belgium
(M. Barreto, B. Dardenne)

Anders SØNDERLUND
Exeter, UK
(M. Ryan, T. Morton)

Adrian STANCIU
Bremen, Germany
(C. Cohrs, U. Kühnen)

Iryna SUVOROVA
Moscow, Russia
(E. Dubovskaya, T. Folomeeva)

Felicity TURNER
Groningen, The Netherlands
(M. van Zomeren, T. Postmes)

Anna VAN'T VEER
Tilburg, The Netherlands
(M. Stel, I. van Beest)

Grants

Arin Ayanian (travel grant)
Edita Fino (travel grant)
Matthias Gobel (travel grant)
Karolina Hansen (travel grant)
Alina Hernandez Bark (travel grant)
Ana Leite (travel grant)
Thekla Morgenroth (travel grant)
Josephine Neugebauer (travel grant)
Alice Normand (seedcorn grant)
Jellie Sierksma (travel grant)
Félice van Nunspeet (travel grant)

Grant reports

Susanne Bruckmüller

(University of Exeter, United Kingdom)

Travel Grant

In January 2013, I had the opportunity to attend and give a presentation at the fourteenth SPSP annual meeting in New Orleans, thanks to an EASP postdoctoral travel grant.

My presentation was part of a symposium entitled "*Challenging the White male default: An analysis of social identity norms in contemporary society*" chaired by Erin Thomas (Yale University) and Jessica Cundiff (Penn State University). The symposium brought together research showing that (1) certain identities in our society are privileged as the implicit standard against which other identities are compared and marked as different, and that (2) positioning some social identities as normative and others as deviating from that norm has important consequences. For example, both laypersons and psychologists tend to describe and explain gender differences by focusing more on how women are different from men (thus implicitly taking men as the normative default) than by focusing on how men are different from women (Hegarty & Buechel, 2006; Miller, Taylor, & Buck, 1999); similarly, differences between ethnic or racial groups are more commonly described in terms of how ethnic/racial minorities differ from Whites than vice versa (Pratto, Hegarty, & Korchmaros, 2007). The individual presentations in the symposium addressed contributing factors, manifestations, and consequences of such asymmetric constructions and framings of social groups and the differences between them. Taken together, the presented research highlighted how social inequalities are constructed and reinforced through subtle processes in communication.

I presented a series of three studies that examined how being "the effect to be explained", that is, having to explain one's own group identity vis-a-vis a the implicit norm of another group, affects the collective self-esteem of members of normative and non-normative groups. Participants who were either single or in a relationship read (Study 1) or wrote (Study 2) either about how singles differ from coupled people, a group generally regarded as normative in society, or they read or wrote about how coupled people differ from

singles, an often stigmatized non-normative group (DePaulo & Morris, 2006). In both studies, single participants felt less positively about being single – that is, they reported lower collective self-esteem – when comparisons were framed in terms of how singles are different from coupled people than when the focus was on how coupled people differ from singles. Importantly, what mediated this effect of comparative framing on collective self-esteem was the extent to which single participants focused their responses on their own group, irrespective of the extent to which their statements about their group were positive or negative (Study 2). In other words, what mattered was being the effect to be explained, not so much what was being explained. In contrast, coupled participants' collective self-esteem was unaffected by the comparative framing. Study 3 replicated these findings for very different social groups, namely left-handed and right-handed participants (with right-handers being a normative group due to being a clear numerical majority in society).

Jointly, these studies show that the asymmetric framing of group differences that is so common in both lay and scientific discourse can have negative implications for the group-based self-evaluation of members of stigmatized and/or minority groups, regardless of the specific content of these explanations (see also Bruckmüller, 2013).

Participating in this symposium gave me a chance to meet and discuss research ideas with the other participants in the symposium: Felicia Pratto, whose joint work with Peter Hegarty on implicit norms and asymmetric explanations is extremely relevant for my own work on the consequences of such norms and asymmetries, as well as Jessica Cundiff and Erin Thomas, whose work and research interests also have great overlap with mine. For example, Jessica presented research on the consequences of asymmetrically marking gender groups in occupational labels (such as "male nurse" or "female surgeon"). In addition to interesting discussions surrounding the symposium that were extremely valuable in terms of gaining new insights into my own research and in developing future research questions, my participation in the SPSP meeting and the Group Processes and Intergroup Relations Pre-conference allowed me to gain an overview over important current directions within social psychology and recent developments in key areas. In addition, it gave me a chance to meet and catch up with several colleagues, friends, and collaborators.

Most importantly, however, my participation in SPSP, our symposium on "challenging the White male default", and the discussions arising from that symposium were not only extremely valuable in terms of gaining additional insights on a theoretical level. Understanding the ways in which social inequality is maintained and reinforced by the ways in which we articulate and explain group differences also has extremely important practical implications for social psychologists and (social) scientific practice. Differences between social groups are at the heart of the social sciences in general and of social psychology in particular. Realizing that the way we approach these differences and frame our respective questions and findings can have important consequences for the groups we study – and may even facilitate the maintenance and reproduction of inequality in subtle ways! – calls for a critical examination of the practices of reporting and explaining group differences in psychology and in the social sciences more generally (see also Hegarty & Bruckmüller, 2013). SPSP with its over 3,000 attending social psychologists from all over the world was certainly a key audience to alert to this realization and its implications.

References

- Bruckmüller, S. (2013). Singled out as the effect to be explained: Implications for collective self-esteem. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *39*, 237-249.
- DePaulo, B. & Morris, W. L. (2005). Singles in society and in science. *Psychological Inquiry*, *16*, 57-83.
- Hegarty, P. J., & Bruckmüller, S. (2013). Asymmetric explanations of group differences: Experimental evidence of Foucault's disciplinary power. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *7*, 176-186.
- Hegarty, P., & Buechel, C. (2006). Androcentric reporting of gender differences in APA journals: 1965-2004. *Review of General Psychology*, *10*, 377-389.
- Miller, D., Taylor, B., & Buck, M. L. (1991). Gender gaps: Who needs to be explained? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61*, 5-12.
- Pratto, F., Hegarty, P. J., & Korchmaros, J. D. (2007). How communication practices and category norms lead people to stereotype particular people and groups. In Y. Kashima, K. Fiedler, & P. Freytag (Eds.), *Stereotype dynamics: language based approaches to the formation, maintenance, and transformation of stereotypes* (pp. 293-313). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Isabelle Goncalves

(LSE, London, UK)

Seedcorn Grant

An EASP Postdoctoral Seedcorn Research Grant provided me with the opportunity to visit the School of Psychology and Neuroscience at the University of St Andrews for a three-month period. The aim of this visit was to further develop with Prof. Steve Reicher a research project previously initiated in collaboration with Dr. Guy Elcheroth and Prof. Christian Staerklé (University of Lausanne, Switzerland). The theoretical underpinnings of this research and some preliminary conclusions are briefly presented below.

Drawing upon the social representation approach (SRA; e.g., Howarth, 2006; Moscovici, 1974/2008; Staerklé, 2009), that brings together the social identity and social representation theoretical traditions, this research aimed to explore the role of meta-representations (i.e., beliefs as to what other in-group members believe; Elcheroth, Doise, & Reicher, 2011) in shaping people's political behaviours. Four studies were designed and carried out in an attempt to refine prior research on this question (e.g., Davis, Bowers, & Memon, 2011; Hornsey, Majkut, Terry, & McKimmie, 2003). More specifically, our intent was to continue improving a research paradigm that would allow to further specify the socio-psychological processes leading individuals to either speak or silence their political views in a public setting.

We were primarily interested in identifying the conditions under which meta-representations inhibit the expression of disagreement regarding a political minority – hence, conditions possibly participating in the diffusion of non-accurate beliefs as to the support received by this minority. In political science, an influential theory addresses the potential effect on political behaviours of people's beliefs as to what others think: the spiral of silence theory (Noelle-Neumann, 1984/1993). According to this theory, people's gauging of the political climate affects their willingness to express their personal opinions

and leads them to behave consistent with what they perceive as being the majority's opinion. Behaviours developed on this basis are likely to affect others' perception of the political climate and, as a consequence, political outcomes come to reflect people's beliefs as to the majority's opinion rather than prior political attitudes. While the spiral of silence theory asserts that individuals use the general majority of voters as reference group to estimate the appropriateness of their initial political attitudes, a strong theoretical case can be made for the view that what is crucial for individuals is not to present a political position in line with the vast majority of voters; rather, what is crucial is to present a position which appears normative for the particular social group that is both important and salient to them (Elcheroth et al., 2011). The SRA (and, with it, the social identity tradition) suggests that individuals' political behaviours are not shaped by their beliefs as to what people think, but rather by what members of their own social group think (e.g., Oshagan, 1996; Terry, Hogg, & Duck, 1999).

Accordingly, a series of pilot studies was implemented to better circumscribe the conditions under which believing that in-group members hold positive attitudes vis-à-vis a minority leads people not to publicly express their negative views regarding this minority. In all four studies, participants were exposed to an anti-immigration speech. This speech mirrored discourses recently issued by European political parties on the topic of immigration. The studies differed among other things in the characteristics of the social groups likely to be mobilised by participants (e.g., content of the social identity), in the ways the speech was administered, and, more importantly perhaps, in the content of the then current national debate surrounding immigration issues.

While our results are to be cautiously considered given their preliminary nature, the set of studies developed in St Andrews allowed to attest the critical importance of considering meta-representations jointly with the nature of the social group and societal context at play to understand why and when people speak or silence their opinions in public. Importantly, the data collected at the occasion of this postdoctoral research not only complement but also shed further light on a number of experiments previously carried out in more ecological political contexts. We now hope that these studies will help secure larger funding to continue exploring this fascinating and promising path of research.

Beyond the research per se, this postdoctoral visit was also the opportunity to meet and discover a number of new colleagues and friends. The warm welcome and support I received from those I encountered in the "Yellow room" or via the stirring social group meetings (together with the fabulous Scottish landscapes!) participated in rendering this experience unforgettable. Finally, I would like to thank Prof. Steve Reicher for the time he dedicated to this research and for the inspiring discussions we had. I am also grateful to the EASP for making this research possible, and of course to Sibylle Classen for her kind help and patience.

References

- Davis, C. J., Bowers, J. S., & Memon, A. (2011). Social influence in televised election debates: A potential distortion of democracy. *PLoS ONE*, 6.
- Elcheroth, G., Doise, W., & Reicher, S. (2011). On the knowledge of politics and the politics of knowledge: How a social representations approach helps us rethink the subject of political psychology. *Political Psychology*, 32, 729-758.

- Hornsey, M. J., Majkut, L., Terry, D. J., & McKimmie, B. M. (2003). On being loud and proud: Non-conformity and counter-conformity to group norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42, 319-335.
- Howarth, C. (2006). A social representation is not a quiet thing: exploring the critical potential of social representations theory. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 65-86.
- Moscovici, S. (1974/2008). *Psychoanalysis: its image and its public*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Noelle-Neumann, E. (1984/1993). *The spiral of silence: Public opinion – our social skin* (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Oshagan, H. (1996). Reference group influence on opinion expression. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 8, 335-354.
- Staerklé C., (2009). Policy attitudes, ideological values and social representations. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 3, 1096-1112.
- Terry, D. J., Hogg, M. A., & Duck, J. M. (1999). Group membership, social identity, and attitudes. In D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity and social cognition* (pp. 280-314). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Ana Rita Farias

(Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL), Cis-IUL, Lisboa, Portugal)
Travel Grant

Matlab Summer School for Psychologists, University of Nottingham, UK
Toolkit of Cognitive Neuroscience: essentials of major neuroimaging techniques, Donders Institute, Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands)

Supported by a travel grant from the European Association of Social Psychology (EASP), I was given the opportunity attend to the Toolkit of Cognitive Neuroscience: essentials of major neuroimaging techniques at Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands (August 2012) and Matlab Summer School for Psychologists at University of Nottingham (September 2012).

The tool-kit course was an intensive 5-days course, which provided me the essentials of all major neuroimaging techniques, including ERP, MEG, fMRI, PET, and TMS. In general, this course provided me knowledge about measurement methods, design requirements, experimental set-up, data processing, and multi-modal imaging. I found the course very complete, divided in two different and complementary forms, lectures and video demonstrations.

Smaller tutor groups were formed in the final of each day for question-answer sessions, exercises, and discussions, what permitted me directly talk with qualified experts from the Donder Institute and had the chance to meet and discuss research with colleagues working in various topics.

The EASP also supported my attendance to Matlab Summer School for Psychologists at University of Nottingham organized and lectured by Dr. Antonia Hamilton. The goal to attend this course was the idea that Matlab computer programming language is an increasingly important skill for psychologists and cognitive neuroscientists, and an essential tool to implement and analyse complex data sets that occur with neuroimaging techniques like fMRI, EEG, MEG or eyetracking. Was an intensive 3-days course where I had a chance to learn basic notions and commands of Matlab, how to do scripts, how to enter and manipulate data, how to make plots and set up experiments. Dr. Antonia Hamilton provided the necessary material, all slides, a lot of exercises and some script examples. I found the classes very well structured.

These two courses were essential to the work that I am developing at the moment. I am currently pursuing a new research interest (cognitive - affective neuroscience) by specializing and performing a study by the use of a brain scanning technique (fMRI) at the University of Wisconsin under the supervision of Professor Wen Li, as well as Professors Monique Smeets and Gün R Semin at Utrecht University. These two courses gave me the knowledge to be able to develop the project where I am involved now.

I would like to express my gratitude to the EASP that gave me the opportunity to attend to these courses and to Sibylle Classen for her help, efficiency, and kindness.

Karolina Hansen
(University of Warsaw, Poland)
Travel Grant

Thanks to the EASP postgraduate travel grant I was able to visit for four weeks professor John Dovidio at Yale University.

Last year as a doctoral fellow at Friedrich Schiller University Jena I visited Prof. Dovidio for three months. During that visit we designed and conducted two experiments on perception of foreign-accented speakers. The first results were intriguing and promising, but some aspects of what we observed remained unclear. Thanks to the EASP support, I visited Prof. Dovidio again and we continued working on our research.

Most studies on accents show that standard accented speakers are preferred over nonstandard accented speakers (e.g., Fuertes, Gottdiener, Martin, Gilbert, & Giles, 2012; Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010). Nevertheless, some studies surprisingly show that accented speakers are perceived positively and as willing to assimilate (Hopkins, 2013). This suggests that different interpretations on the side of the listener may play a crucial role in perceiving accent as something negative or positive. In our studies we wanted to explore under what circumstances accent can be perceived as something positive and if, for example, information about length of residence in a host country would cause different evaluations of the speaker. Other aspect that we studied was objective and subjective comprehension of speech, as those two do not always align.

During my visit, we extensively discussed with Prof. Dovidio the results we obtained last year. We also prepared a draft of an article presenting the results. We also discussed our other ideas for further research on accents. It was a very productive and inspiring time.

Besides of regular meetings with Prof. Dovidio and working on the article, I was attending the Intergroup Relations Lab weekly meetings and the meetings of the Social Psychology Department, with great presentations from the faculty members and from invited speakers. Attending these meeting was not only interesting and inspiring scientifically, but was also a great opportunity to strengthen my contact with the faculty and graduate students there.

I also visited Washington, D.C., where I met with Dr. Agata Gluszek, a specialist in research on accents. We discussed an article we were finishing working on and we submitted it for publication. The article presents a content analysis of newspaper articles talking about speaking with a foreign accent.

It was a great pleasure to visit and continue working with Prof. Dovidio and Dr. Gluszek. The research that we are working on can help in understanding discrimination of nonstandard speakers and is related to issues of immigration more broadly. I believe that my experience gained from working with Prof. Dovidio and Dr. Gluszek, as well as from visiting the Yale Intergroup Relations Lab, is and will be beneficial not only directly to me, but also to others. I am sharing what I have learned and observed there with my colleagues in Warsaw and beyond.

Many thanks to EASP for making my visit possible!

References:

- Fuertes, J. N., Gottdiener, W. H., Martin, H., Gilbert, T. C., & Giles, H. (2012). A meta-analysis of the effects of speakers' accents on interpersonal evaluations. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 42*(1), 120-133. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.862
- Gluszek, A., & Dovidio, J. F. (2010). The way they speak: A social psychological perspective on the stigma of nonnative accents in communication. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 14*(2), 214-237. doi: 10.1177/1088868309359288
- Hopkins, D. J. (2013). The upside of accents: Language, inter-group sifference, and attitudes toward immigration. Working Paper. Available at SSRN: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1879965>.

Namkje Koudenburg
(University of Groningen, The Netherlands)
Travel Grant

Thanks to the EASP travel grant, I had the opportunity to visit Prof. dr. S. Alexander Haslam and Prof. dr. Jolanda Jetten at the Univerity of Queensland in Australia. I visited Brisbane for three months, from February to April 2013. The purpose of the visit was to develop a new line of research in which my own research on the emergence of social structures through communication is integrated with the work on personal and social identities and health of both prof. Jetten and prof. Haslam. The collaboration involved analyzing data from a previously conducted field study, as well as collecting and analyzing new data, and writing a joint paper.

Our project focused on the interplay of social and personal identity processes in health and wellbeing. Although individuality and group membership have often been seen as conflicting forces, recent research suggests that this need not be the case (Jetten, Haslam, Pugliese, Tonks, & Haslam, 2010; Koudenburg, Postmes, Gordijn, & Van Mourik Broekman, 2013; Postmes & Jetten, 2006; Postmes, Haslam, & Swaab, 2005). Our central research question was whether people could acquire a sense of personal identity from their inclusion in groups. We examined this question in two laboratory experiments and in two data sets that were collected in a drug and alcohol rehabilitation center and during activities that were organized for homeless people (together with dr. Genevieve Dingle). The results of both the lab and field data sets are encouraging, and we will continue this project when I am back in Groningen.

I have experienced my visit at UQ as extremely valuable. It was inspiring to profit from both the expertise of Prof. Haslam and Prof. Jetten, and their grandiose hospitality, as they welcomed me to all relevant research and social meetings at UQ and around. During my stay I participated in the research meetings of the CRISP-lab, and was given the opportunity to discuss my own work on the role of speech coordination in developing different forms of social unity. In this research, we show that people can develop a sense of unity by means of different forms of coaction, and we compare synchronous action with the act of turn taking (Koudenburg et al., 2013). The shared knowledge of this enthusiastic lab group is amazing, and I received a lot of thoughtful and constructive feedback on my research. Additionally, I had the opportunity to broaden my scientific network by visiting the SASP conference in Cairns, where I visited many interesting talks and presented my own work as well.

I am very grateful to Prof. Haslam and Prof. Jetten, the members of their SIGN-lab and the colleagues at the CRISP-meetings for the very warm welcome, the great cooperation, and the insightful discussions. Finally, I wish to thank the European Association for their generosity in facilitating this very inspiring visit by offering me a postgraduate travel grant.

Koudenburg, N., Postmes, T., Gordijn, E.H., & Van Mourik Broekman, A. (2013). *Uniform and Complementary Social Interaction: Distinct Pathways to Social Unity*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Jetten, J., Haslam, C., Pugliese, C., Tonks, J., & Haslam, S. A. (2010). Declining autobiographical memory and the loss of identity: Effects on well-being. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 32(4), 408-416.

Postmes, T., Haslam, S. A., & Swaab, R. I. (2005). Social influence in small groups: An interactive model of social identity formation. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 16, 1-42. doi:10.1080/10463280440000062

Postmes, T. & Jetten, J. (2006). *Individuality and the group: Advances in social identity*. London: Sage.

Hans Marien
(Utrecht University, The Netherlands)
Travel grant

Supported by a postgraduate travel grant from EASP, I visited the Department of Psychology at Harvard. During my visit of three months, I worked in the moral cognition lab with Dr. Joshua Greene. I am very thankful to the EASP for enabling this research visit to take place.

My aim for this visit was to develop interesting new research ideas together with Prof. Greene by combining ideas from my own research on unconscious goal activation and executive control with Prof. Greene's intriguing work on moral reasoning. His research suggests that people often engage executive control processes to disregard moral rules, such as behaving dishonestly or acting greedy. My own research suggests that unconsciously activated goals engage executive control processes for their own attainment. This unconscious activation diminishes availability of control processes for other purposes, and thus could potentially influence the outcome of moral reasoning and moral judgment processes as well, especially when they involve executive control. In the moral cognition lab, Greene and his colleagues try to understand how moral judgments are shaped by automatic processes and controlled cognitive processes. For instance, what they found is that people often apply moral rules in an automatic fashion. This means that people are intuitively predisposed to act in a moral way. As a consequence people engage executive control processes to disregard these moral rules, and this recruitment of control processes determines why people act greedy in a social dilemmas. This idea was substantiated in a study where it was found that neural activity in control-related regions of the prefrontal cortex is increased in dishonest moral decisions.

So when people are not given the opportunity to engage executive control processes during moral decision making, they could potentially become more cooperative or honest. One way to establish this particular situation is to unconsciously activate a goal that hijacks the executive function of the moral decision maker. This goal can be any goal that is deemed important by the participant, together with Dr. Greene I developed an idea for a paradigm to test whether people become more cooperative while a goal that is unrelated to cooperation is unconsciously activated.

Our further discussion about this hijacking phenomenon led to another interesting new idea for addiction research as well. Together with the help of Dr. Joshua Buckholtz (an expert in addiction research also working at Harvard University), we developed a new idea for contingency management to prevent relapse in patients suffering from substance dependence. By simply rewarding patients for their abstinence on a more frequent basis, they will be less prone to be hijacked by their substance use goal. The idea is that the motivation to stay abstinent is increased and that the abstinence goal maintains activated for a prolonged period of time because the accompanying rewards facilitate the recruitment of executive control resources and leave less opportunity for the (also rewarding) substance use goal to take over control.

After I will complete my PhD later this year, I am planning to pursue these ideas further as a post-doc at Utrecht University. Furthermore, I intend to write a grant proposal this fall that would support me to go back to Harvard and work there as a post-doc for one year.

The collaboration that we have initiated is thus far from finished and I was happy to hear that Dr. Greene was also interested to continue our collaboration.

Next to setting up of the above described collaboration, my visit also resulted in a number of other outcomes. First of all, it gave me the opportunity to broaden my scope of interest to the domain of moral psychology. I think it was very important for me to get a good taste of this research domain, because I believe it helps me to translate my current, more fundamental, research agenda to one that has a more clear societal impact. Secondly, my visit to the moral cognition lab also helped me to get better acquainted with the methodology of cognitive neuroscience. More specifically, I discussed a lot of functional neuroimaging (fMRI) research in several weekly meetings at the Psychology department at Harvard University. Finally, in general this was a great learning experience for me, because I was surrounded by highly acknowledged researchers all working at one of the best universities in the world. I am very grateful to EASP for awarding me the travel grant and enabling my visit, it was a great experience.

News from the Executive Committee

New EASP Membership fee structure

Based on the announcement in the last issue of the European Bulletin of Social Psychology (http://www.easp.eu/publications/ebasp/ebasp_25_1.pdf, p. 57f) and the comments from our membership (thank you for these), we now have changed the membership fee structure from 2014 onwards.

These are the five types of membership fees:

- Regular full membership €96
- Regular postgraduate membership: €48
- Affiliate membership: €77
- Reduced full membership: €48
- Reduced postgraduate membership: €24.

Whether a member opts for the regular fee or for the reduced fee is up to the individual member, no questions asked. However, it is important to note that a membership incorporates a subscription to the European Journal of Social Psychology (only on-line in the case of postgraduate membership), to the European Review of Social Psychology, and on-line subscription to Social Psychological and Personality Science. The regular fees barely cover the actual costs of this package for the EASP. A reduced fee means that the EASP is in fact sponsoring the membership. This is not, and should not be a problem, as long as only those that need it use reduced membership. In line with the mission of the association, the EASP has sponsored membership from Eastern European countries for years. Currently around 10% of our members have a reduced membership fee. At this moment in time, however, it is less clear what the basis for reduced membership should be. Therefore, we leave this up to the individual member. Of course we will monitor this closely. If too many members need to make use of a reduced membership fee, we need to rethink our membership fee structure and costs.

Finally, and importantly, the option for a one-year full waiver will remain.

As soon as the changes are implemented in the payment portal, it will be announced through the EASP mailserve and the EASP website will be changed accordingly. Please note that membership fees for 2014 will be due in December 2013.

Daniël Wigboldus, Treasurer

Announcements

EJSP Editor: Call for Applications

The Executive Committee of the European Association of Social Psychology is inviting applications for a three-year term as Editor of the *European Journal of Social Psychology*, beginning in January 2015.

Applicants must be members of EASP and ideally should have extensive experience in a role such as a journal Editor, Associate Editor, Program Chair, or related positions. They should be motivated and able to ensure that the high standard of editorship and standing of the journal is maintained, and promote the development of Social Psychology through the publication of high-quality, innovative research.

Applications should be sent via email to the Executive Officer, sibylle@easp.eu, and include a curriculum vitae and a brief statement (1 page) outlining the candidate's vision for the future development of *EJSP*. Candidates should apply by December 31, 2013.

Election of New Executive Committee Members Call for Nominations

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

Fabrizio Butera (Switzerland), Xenia Chrysochoou (Greece), Alex Haslam (Australia, before UK), and Sabine Otten (The Netherlands) will leave the Executive Committee in July 2014.

Manuela Barreto (UK), Mara Cadinu (Italy), and Daniël Wigboldus (The Netherlands), will stay for another 3-year term.

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

At least four months before the election, full members are asked for nominations.

Each nomination must be supported by two full members and addressed to the Executive Officer (sibylle@easp.eu). The deadline for receiving nominations is **March, 1st, 2014**.

Each nomination packet has to contain:

- A letter from the nominee, agreeing to serve on the Executive Committee, if elected
- Letters of support from two full members of the Association

- Brief (half an A4 page maximum) background information from the nominee, including (a) a summary of academic positions, administrative experience, and current research interests; (b) the nominee's perspective on what are relevant issues for EASP and its Executive Committee to consider in the future, and (c) a list of three publications the nominee considers to be most representative for his or her work.

Please check the Standing Orders the EASP website (<http://www.easp.eu/about/docs/standingorders.pdf>) for more detailed information.

Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Executive Officer by **March, 15th, 2014** latest. Applications for grants and for the International Teaching Fellowship Scheme can be received by the deadlines end of March, June, September, and December. The deadline for the next issue of the Bulletin is **March, 15th, 2014**.

The next Executive Committee Meeting will take place in April 2014.

Executive Committee

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

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

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

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

Alex Haslam (Journals), School of Psychology, University of Queensland, St Lucia
QLD 4072 Australia
e-mail: a.haslam@uq.edu.au

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

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

Executive Officer:

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

website of the EASP:

<http://www.easp.eu>