

1 Editorial

2 Opinions and Perspectives

Challenging Popular Myths and Denial of Scientific Evidence in Public Discourse: An Aggression Researcher's Uphill Struggle by Barbara Krahe

8 Future EASP Meetings

Small Group Meeting: New directions in the social psychology of solidarity, May 10-11, 2016, Brighton, UK

Small Group Meeting: Promoting a Social Approach to Emotions, April 15-16, 2016, Cologne, Germany

10 New Publications by Members

*Debout les dominés*, 2015, by Jaques-Philippe Leyens

*How to Publish High Quality Research: Discovering, Building, and Sharing*, 2015, by J.A. Joireman & P.A.M. van Lange

*Power and Identity*, 2015, ed. by D. Sindic, M. Barreto, & R. Costa Lopes

13 News about Members

In memoriam: Jean-Pierre Deconchy

In memoriam: Serge Moscovici

In memoriam: János Laszlo

New Members of the Association

27 Grants Awarded and Grant Reports

**37 News from the Executive Committee**

Changes in the EASP grant scheme

2018 EASP Summer School: In search of a location

**38 Deadlines for Contributions**

**39 Executive Committee**

## Editorial

Dear colleagues and friends,

I hope you are enjoying a nice spring with the current academic year finishing up. It is my pleasure to introduce you to a new volume of the European Bulletin of Social Psychology that I have been editing with, once again, the precious help of Sibylle Classen.

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 three obituaries of three important and honorable EASP-members who unfortunately passed away recently: Jean-Pierre Deconchy, Joop van der Pligt and János Lazslo. As you will read, these three colleagues have been highly important figures in European social psychology. They also have substantially contributed to the field and to the firm establishment of EASP. I also would like to refer you to the special EASP "[tributes to Serge Moscovici](#)" that EASP has recently released. Additional contributions are welcome, so if you have memories, anecdotes and thoughts about the impact that Serge Moscovici had on your personal trajectory or your research please send them to me and Sibylle. They will be added to this issue.

Second, I would like to point to our section "Opinions and Perspectives". This section, initiated by our previous EASP secretary, Sabine Otten, aims at offering publication space to our members in order to communicate their subjective views on relevant – and potentially controversial - issues in our field. We welcome propositions so if you have some ideas... This time, the Bulletin includes a piece by Barbara Krahe on "*Challenging popular myths and denial of scientific evidence in public discourse: An aggression researcher's uphill struggle*". In this article, the author discusses the challenges involved in communicating to the wider public social psychological results that are at odds with everyday wisdom. In an engaging paper, Barbara Krahe shares her thoughts and experiences. She invites us to turn public resistance to scientific findings into a topic for psychological research.

As always, you will find in this Bulletin important information about future EASP meetings, new publications by our members, grant reports and new members. Finally, while the Exeter team is preparing the 2016 EASP Summer School, I would like to invite you to consider hosting the 2018 EASP summer school. Many of us have wonderful memories of past EASP summer schools. Summer schools are the core of the dynamism and life of our association. They are fun to attend but also to organize. So consider contributing to one of the most important actions of EASP.

I wish you a great summer

*Jean-Claude Croizet*

## Opinions and Perspectives

### Challenging Popular Myths and Denial of Scientific Evidence in Public Discourse: An Aggression Researcher's Uphill Struggle

Barbara Krahe, University of Potsdam, Germany

Research in social psychology addresses many issues that people feel passionately about in their everyday lives, which may be seen as a blessing and a curse at the same time. A blessing because it means that our field has an important role to play in explaining social issues that affect the lives of many people and contributes valuable insights on how to effectively address social problems; a curse because practically everyone is a "naïve social psychologist" holding strong views about what is true or false by way of explaining social phenomena. This becomes particularly apparent in the field of aggression research, beginning with the understanding of the term itself. Whereas there is a consensus within the research community to define aggression as a form of negative, antisocial behavior characterized by the intention to inflict harm on others, everyday discourse often designates aggression as a desirable form of social behavior. Sports teams vow to "aggressively" attack their opponents to secure victory, defeats are explained by the contenders not having been sufficiently "aggressive" in pursuing their goals, and many people talk about "good" aggression to be distinguished from the "bad" forms of aggression nobody wants to see or experience.

In this short commentary, I would like to share a few thoughts on the challenges involved in communicating social psychological findings that are at odds with everyday wisdom to the wider public, using two pertinent examples from aggression research: (1) the belief in the beneficial effects of releasing aggression, as reflected in the "catharsis hypothesis"; and (2) the denial of a link between media violence use and aggression. After citing evidence on the failure and unwillingness to take established findings from psychological research into account, I will sketch a two-pronged approach towards handling the gap between science and popular belief in a constructive way, acknowledging the psychological significance of laypersons' responses as a research topic in its own right.

#### **The unbroken appeal of the "catharsis" hypothesis**

In a notable amalgamation of Freud's psychoanalytic and Lorenz' ethological thinking (summarized in Krahe, 2013), the idea of getting rid of aggressive action tendencies by releasing them in a harmless way is deeply rooted in lay persons' thinking about aggression and, therefore, resistant to change. The very expression of "letting off steam" to return to a calm and nonaggressive frame of mind when angered both inspired and popularized Lorenz's "steam boiler" model of aggressive behavior. The idea that acting aggressively in a way that does not actually harm anyone feels "good" and removes the wish to lash out against an actual victim is so

popular that it has been turned into a successful business idea. In 2008, the first "anger room" was opened in Texas, <http://www.angerroom.com/>, setting an example that has been followed in other parts of the world (e.g. Germany, where an anger room was opened in the town of Halle in 2014). As noted on their website, the Texas anger room was "established to provide an alternative to seeing a 'head doctor' or talking it out when you're having a bad day. We believe that sometimes it's better to just do what you feel and lash out when you need to! And what better place to do that without judgement, consequences or public humiliation than at an *Anger Room*<sup>™</sup> location". Customers can choose between a five-minute "short break", a 15-minute "lash-out", or a full 25-minute "demolition", with prices ranging from 25 to 75 US\$ at the time of writing. During this time, they can destroy a wide range of items, with supplies coming in through donations of unwanted household items of all sorts.

The alleged benefits of engaging in this form of destructive behavior are stated in bold terms in the promotional video: "If there was an anger room around every corner, the world would be a better place." But would it? As intuitively appealing as the idea may be, there is much to quote against it. Both theorizing and empirical evidence accumulated in social psychological aggression research tell a different story. Conceptually, if acting their aggressive impulses makes people feel good, this can be explained as a classic learning mechanism by which associations between aggressive acts and positive affective states are formed. As a result, future aggressive behavior becomes more likely, as people seek to repeat the positive affective experience. This reasoning is consistent, for example, with a finding by Verona and Sullivan (2008), who showed that the more their participants' heart rate decreased after engaging in an aggressive act, the more aggression they showed in a subsequent situation. Social cognitive theories conceptualizing the acting out of anger or the generation of angry thoughts as a priming process equally suggest that the repeated activation of aggression-related cognitions and actions will lower the threshold for aggressive behavior by increasing the accessibility of aggressive thoughts and feelings (Bushman, 2002). Thus, both from a theoretical and an empirical point of view, behaving aggressively in a supposedly "safe" environment, be it an anger room or the virtual reality of a violent movie or video game, may not just be ineffective but counterproductive as a strategy for reducing aggressive behavior (see Gentile, 2013, for a more thorough discussion). Moreover, hitting a punching bag after a provocation was found to lead to heightened aggression on a subsequent measure of aggressive behavior, particularly among people who were told beforehand that catharsis was effective in reducing aggressive tendencies (Bushman, Baumeister, & Stack, 1999). This finding illustrates two things: (a) the need to debunk the catharsis idea and replace it by a conceptually sound account of why engaging in aggression either in a sheltered or a virtual environment is likely to increase rather than decrease the chances of future aggression, and (b) the difficulty of achieving this goal due to the good feeling people typically report when releasing their anger in this way.

### Challenging the "no harm" myth of violent media use

Few topics are more controversial in the exchange between researchers and the general public than the question of whether exposure to violence in the media has an effect on users' aggressive behavior in the real world. The sales figures for films and video games with highly violent content attest to the widespread popularity of such media, as do regular surveys of media habits across the world. It is not difficult to see that users may have a vested interest in rejecting the idea of any harmful effects that might result from the habitual exposure to violence in the virtual reality. Such effects with regard to increasing aggressive behavior have been demonstrated by a large body of research (see Krahé, 2013, for a summary) and even highlighted by prominent media figures like Robert Redford.<sup>1</sup> Instead, many people gladly accept the position advocated by the gaming community, the media industry, and some voices from within academia<sup>2</sup> that there is no evidence of any harmful effects or – alternatively - whatever evidence there may be is methodologically flawed. At the same time, people who are deeply skeptical about media violence effects are generally happy to take on board the positive effects claimed for educational or serious games, despite question marks about the quality of the research studies on which the claim is based (e.g., Girard, Ecalle, & Magnan, 2013; Primack et al., 2012). Thus, on the one hand, people deny that there is any effect of experiences made in the virtual reality of the media on how they feel and act in real life, on the other they highlight the good things that media can do for people in their daily lives.

There are two core messages to be conveyed to address this conundrum. The first is that there is plenty of support for the general notion of a transfer from the media reality to people's actual reality in different fields of society. The whole idea of commercial advertising is based on the assumption that people's exposure to a product in a TV or movie ad will make them more likely to buy it next time they go to the shops. The decision to train pilots in a flight simulator before allowing them to handle a real plane is based on the same logic. If, in principle, people are prepared to acknowledge the possibility of a transfer from experiences in the media environment to the real world, it should be straightforward to persuade them that it is very difficult to argue such a transfer should only happen in areas where they feel positive about it. They should easily see that the very processes, such as learning by reinforcement or imitation, that lie behind the transfer of attitudes and behaviors from the virtual reality to the real world in areas where such transfer is desirable also work in areas where it may be problematic, as in potentially promoting aggressive attitudes and behavior. The second point follows directly from the first, namely that it is content that matters. There is nothing inherently good or bad about media use in terms of influencing real-life feelings, thoughts, and behavior; the effects are strongly dependent on the presented content. Just as prosocial content may promote prosocial behavior, aggressive content may

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/jan/17/entertainment/la-et-mn-robert-redford-sundance-violence-20130117>

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Elson & Ferguson (2014) and responses by Bushman & Huesmann (2014), Krahé (2014) and Warburton (2014).

promote aggressive behavior (Greitemeyer & Mügge, 2014). These messages are neither complex nor in any way counterintuitive, which raises the question of why they are so difficult to get across.

### **Making a virtue out of necessity**

So how should we as scientists respond to the unwillingness by large parts of the public to be shaken in their lay psychological beliefs in relation to what causes or reduces aggression? The first response is obvious, namely that we should put as much effort as possible into feeding our findings into the public discourse on these matters through a diversity of channels. This can be done by presenting state-of-the-art summaries of our research findings to lay audiences, as illustrated by the expert statement on media violence commissioned by the International Society for Research on Aggression (Krahé et al., 2012), or by talking to journalists about the evidence against the idea of an anger room.<sup>1</sup> As all of you who have ever taken this route know, it is an uphill struggle.

The second, perhaps less obvious response, is to turn public adherence to myths and denial of social psychological findings into a topic for psychological research in its own right and examine it in the light of well-established theories in our field. Recent analyses by Huesmann, Dubow, and Yang (2013) and Nauroth, Gollwitzer, Bender, and Rothmund (2014) nicely illustrate this approach, seeking to understand why there is so much resistance to the idea that media violence may make users more aggressive. Huesmann et al. (2013) present a theoretical account, explaining the denial of violent media use effects as a result of four psychological processes: (a) need for cognitive consistency, leading people who produce, sell, or habitually use violent media to reject information about harmful effects of violent media use as inconsistent with their positive self-image, (b) reactance, shown in response to the perceived restriction of their freedom that is linked to negative reports about violent media as well as measures, such as age ratings, limiting their availability; (c) the "third-person" effect, acknowledging that negative effects might be true for others, but not for themselves, and (d) desensitization as a result of habitual exposure to depictions of violence that makes these contents appear less and less violent over time. In addition to these explanations focusing on an individual's personal identity, scientific findings of harmful media violence effects may elicit denial because they threaten a person's social identity. Nauroth et al. (2014) conducted a series of empirical studies showing that the more participants identified with the community of gamers, the more they felt angered and stigmatized by research findings showing negative effects, and the more strongly they discredited such findings.

Although engaging with the public by disseminating scientific evidence on media violence effects and the idea of catharsis in accessible ways remains an important task, these studies illustrate that providing sound and rigorous evidence is not enough. Understanding why sections of the general public are unwilling to take

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://international.sueddeutsche.de/post/108342829790/the-business-of-destruction-at-germanys-anger>

certain findings on board may open up new avenues for presenting our messages in such a way that they are more palatable for audiences from diverse backgrounds. Aggression research may be a good candidate for spearheading this mission.

## References

- Bushman, B. (2002). Does venting anger feed or extinguish the flame? Catharsis, rumination, distraction, anger, and aggressive responding. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 724-731.
- Bushman, B. J., Baumeister, R. F., & Stack, A. D. (1999). Catharsis, aggression, and persuasive influence: Self-fulfilling or self-defeating prophecies? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 367-376.
- Bushman, B., & Huesmann, L. R. (2014). Twenty-five years of research on violence in digital games and aggression revisited: A reply to Elson and Ferguson (2013). *European Psychologist*, 19, 47-55.
- Elson, M., & Ferguson, C. J. (2014). Twenty-five years of research on violence in digital games and aggression: Empirical evidence, perspectives and a debate gone astray. *European Psychologist*, 19, 33-36.
- Gentile, D. A. (2013). Catharsis and media violence: A conceptual analysis. *Societies*, 3, 491-510. <http://www.mdpi.com/2075-4698/3/4/491>
- Girard, C., Ecalle, J., & Magnan, A. (2013). Serious games as new educational tools: How effective are they? A meta-analysis of recent studies. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 29, 207-219.
- Greitemeyer, T., & Mügge, D. O. (2014). Video games do affect social outcomes: A meta-analytic review of the effects of violent and prosocial video game play. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40, 578-589.
- Huesmann, L. R., Dubow, E. F., & Yang, G. (2013). Why it is hard to believe that media violence causes aggression. In K. E. Dill (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of media psychology* (pp. 159-171). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Krahé, B. (2013). *The social psychology of aggression* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Hove: Psychology Press.
- Krahé, B. et al. (2012). Report of the Media Violence Commission. *Aggressive Behavior*, 38, 335-341; available in other languages: <http://www.israsociety.com/news.html#MVReport>
- Krahé, B. (2014). Restoring the spirit of fair play in the debate about violent video games. A comment on Elson and Ferguson (2013). *European Psychologist*, 19, 56-59.
- Nauroth, P., Gollwitzer, M., Bender, J., & Rothmund, T. (2014). Gamers against science: The case of the violent video games debate. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 44, 104-116.
- Primack, B. A., Carroll, M. V., McNamara, M., Klem, M. L., King, B., Rich, M., Chan, C. W., & Nayak, S. (2012). Role of video games in improving health-related outcomes: A systematic review. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 42, 630-638.
- Verona, E., & Sullivan, E. A. (2008). Emotional catharsis and aggression revisited: Heart rate reduction following aggressive responding. *Emotion*, 8, 331-340.



Warburton, W. (2014). Apples, oranges, and the burden of proof - Putting media violence findings into context: A comment on Elson and Ferguson (2013). *European Psychologist, 19*, 60-67.

## Future EASP Meetings

All announcements about upcoming EASP meetings can be found on:  
<http://www.easp.eu/themes/meetings.htm>

### Small Group Meeting

**New directions in the social psychology of solidarity**  
**May 10-11, 2016, Brighton, UK**

*Organizers:* John Drury, Roberto González, Nick Hopkins, Clifford Stevenson and  
Hanna Zagefka

*Contacts:* [j.drury@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:j.drury@sussex.ac.uk) [rgonzale@uc.cl](mailto:rgonzale@uc.cl) [clifford.stevenson@qub.ac.uk](mailto:clifford.stevenson@qub.ac.uk)  
[Hanna.Zagefka@rhul.ac.uk](mailto:Hanna.Zagefka@rhul.ac.uk) [n.p.hopkins@dundee.ac.uk](mailto:n.p.hopkins@dundee.ac.uk)

Solidarity is fundamental in informal social interaction, social organization, social institutions and social change. But while research has shown the importance of forms of solidarity across a range of topics,

The aim of this meeting is to discuss and analyse the different usages of 'solidarity' in contemporary social psychology and by doing so achieve some conceptual clarification and research agenda-setting.

The phenomenon of solidarity generates a large number of interesting empirical questions, some of which we expect contributions to this small group meeting to address. These include the following: Does solidarity between groups differ from that within a group? What are the points of similarity and difference between solidarity and prosocial behaviour? What is the relation between solidarity, politics and empowerment? How does solidarity create a sense of community and vice versa? Is solidarity in small groups different from solidarity with more abstract social categories and 'imagined communities'?

An expected outcome of the meeting will be the specification of research questions which would serve to delineate the necessary social psychological conditions and elements that are implied when we talk of 'solidarity'.

To apply for this meeting, send us the title and abstract (max. 250 words) of your application by January, 10, 2016, indicating whether you are a member of EASP. The meeting will take place in Brighton near the University of Sussex, UK.

Registration fee for faculty members will be EUR 277 and for PhD students EUR 119, covering accommodation (two nights), most meals, and other conference-related expenses. We will reserve five places for PhD students.

## Small Group Meeting

### Promoting a Social Approach to Emotions

April 15-16, 2016, Cologne, Germany

---

*Organizers:* Jens Lange, Jan Crusius, & Gerben van Kleef

*Contact:* Jens Lange, [jens.lange@uni-koeln.de](mailto:jens.lange@uni-koeln.de)

Emotions are inherently social in how they are elicited, communicated and regulated. Many emotions are so quintessentially social that their mere existence depends on other people. And they can be provoked on the group level, driving collective action. Moreover, emotions can be felt vicariously, they can be contagious, or intentionally mimicked and some people can infer them easily or manipulate them to reach their own goals. Emotions are so inherently social, that even the distinct emotion labels might constitute socially constructed categories shared during socialization. Such a social approach, however, still awaits more theoretical and empirical scrutiny.

With this meeting we aim to bring together researchers from different areas of research who share a social approach to emotions, to allow for theoretical and empirical integration.

We encourage doctoral students and senior researchers to send submissions in the format of either a presentation (30 minutes including discussion), a blitz talk (5 minutes including discussion), or a poster. It is also possible to give a blitz talk and additionally present a poster. Furthermore, we want to provide doctoral students with the opportunity to meet senior researchers individually if the respective senior researcher is willing to do that. The meeting will host around 30 participants. Decisions will be based on thematic fit. It will take place in Cologne, April 15 to 16, 2016. No fees for participation will be charged.

If you are interested, please send your submission via mail to Jens Lange ([jens.lange@uni-koeln.de](mailto:jens.lange@uni-koeln.de)) including an abstract (max. 250 words) and an indication of your preferred contribution. For senior researchers, please also indicate whether you would be available for individual meetings with doctoral students. Submission deadline is Oct 31, 2015.

## New Publications by Members

Debout les dominés by Jaques-Philippe Leyens  
De Boeck 2015, 136 pages  
ISBN-10: 2804185494, ISBN-13: 978-2804185497

Comment dominants et dominés cohabitent-ils ? Ces derniers sont-ils sans ressources face à leurs "maîtres" ? Ne disposent-ils pas de plus d'échappatoires que l'on ne pourrait le croire ? C'est ce que vous découvrirez en lisant ce livre !

Introduction : Dominés ! Haut les cœurs !  
Chapitre 1 : Déficits des dominés  
Chapitre 2 : Elites et dominants  
Chapitre 3 : Mobilité individuelle et changement social  
Chapitre 4 : Tension, décatégorisation, recatégorisation  
Chapitre 5 : Stigmates : souffrance et remèdes  
Chapitre 6 : Action collective, méritocratie et banalisation  
Chapitre 7 : La réconciliation  
En guise de conclusion

Joireman, J. A., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2015). *How to Publish High Quality Research: Discovering, Building, and Sharing*. American Psychological Association. Washington DC.  
[http://www.amazon.com/How-Publish-High-Quality-Research-Contribution/dp/1433818612/ref=sr\\_1\\_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1424188791&sr=1-1](http://www.amazon.com/How-Publish-High-Quality-Research-Contribution/dp/1433818612/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1424188791&sr=1-1)

New book from APA (How to Publish High-Quality Research, Joireman & Van Lange, 2015) offers systematic approach to publishing in top tier journals in psychology and marketing. Topics include discovering novel and interesting research questions, theory building, ethics, writing and revising, and eight "publication paradigms" that lay the groundwork for high-quality publications (e.g., bridging disciplines, challenging assumptions, developing novel methods). Interviews with 48 highlighted authors provide insights into the publication process and an integrative process model for publishing high-quality research with implications for training the next generation of high-quality scholars.

Power and Identity, 2015; Psychology Press  
 N of Pages: 192 pages, ISBN-10: 1848721773, ISBN-13: 978-1848721777  
 Price: 36\$ Paperback; 109\$ Hardcover

Edited by Denis Sindic, Manuela Barreto & Rui Costa-Lopes

**Denis Sindic** is Research Fellow at the Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon, Portugal.

**Manuela Barreto** is Professor of Social and Organizational Psychology at the University of Exeter, UK.

**Rui Costa-Lopes** is Research Fellow at the Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon, Portugal.

The concepts of power and identity are vital to many areas of social research. In this edited collection, a prominent set of contributors - from diverse disciplinary backgrounds - explore the double relationship between power and group identity, focusing on two complementary lines of enquiry:

- \* In what ways can the powerful dictate the identities of the powerless?
- \* How can the powerless redefine their identity to challenge the powerful?

Each chapter is written by leading authorities in the field, and investigates a particular aspect of the interplay of identity and power via a range of empirical contexts such as colonialism, nationalism, collective action, and electoral politics. The case studies include early modern Goa under Portuguese rule, the tribes of modern-day Jordan, the use of sexual stereotyping and objectification by female activists seeking to transform social systems, and a revisiting of the classic Stanford Prison Experiment. The chapters include contributions from a variety of social disciplines and research methodologies, and together provide a comprehensive overview of a subject at the cutting-edge of social and political psychology. Power and Identity will be of great interest to researchers, graduates and upper-level undergraduate students from across the social sciences.

Book contents:

- “Power and Identity: The multiple facets of a complex relationship” by *Denis Sindic, Manuela Barreto and Rui Costa-Lopes*
- “Empire, Religion and Identity: The making of Goan people in the early modern period” by *Ángela Barreto Xavier*
- “State power and the genesis of Portuguese national identity” by *José Manuel Sobral*

- “They’re Here to Stay: Tribes and power in contemporary Jordan” by *Eleanor Gao*
- “Angry Naked Ladies: Can stereotyping and sexual objectification be used to transform social systems?” by *Olivier Klein, Jim Allen, Philippe Bernard and Sarah J. Gervais*
- “Empowerment: The intersection of identity and power in collective action” by *John Drury, Atalanti Evripidou and Martijn van Zomeren*
- “May the Force be With You: Social identity, power and the perils of powerlessness” by *Stephen Reicher and S. Alexander Haslam*
- “Power By the People and For the People: Political power and identity in the separation and integration of national states” by *Denis Sindic*
- “Understanding Intergroup Relations in Context: Power and identity” by *John F. Dovidio*

## News about Members

### In Memoriam: Jean-Pierre Deconchy 1934-2014

by Chiara Volpato & Anne Maass

Jean-Pierre Deconchy was born in 1934 in Tourcoing, in northern France, where he grew up in a working-class neighbourhood of red brick houses. His upbringing marked him deeply and he always claimed this identity with pride. After having joined the Church at 22, he became a teacher in Tripoli (Lebanon) and a student at the *Ecole Supérieure des Lettres de Beyrouth* in 1956. Under dramatic political circumstances in the Middle East, and practically without academic supervision, he found himself catapulted into the role of a French teacher, without teaching materials and without teaching training, in a school hosted in dismantled barracks, in which "the luckiest students shared a desk between three".

The period spent in Lebanon (a "splendid interlude", to use his own words) became an important milestone in his life, an experience that opened entirely new and unknown horizons. Thence his desire to travel and to discover different cultures. Thence his love for the Muslim culture, a love that would accompany him throughout his life, a love kept alive by regular visits to Muslim countries and, in particular, to Morocco.

Lebanon also marked the beginning of his scientific career. While teaching French language to Arabic-speaking primary school students on the outskirts of Tripoli, under circumstances that the author describes vividly in the introduction to his last book (2014), he immediately became aware of the power of writing direction in affecting all kinds of mental and manual tasks. During the two years in Tripoli, he conducted a fascinating and very carefully designed set of studies on right-to-left bias. Although truly pioneering research (spatial asymmetries became a fashionable line of research only decades later), his master's thesis, written in French, was to remain unknown to the international academic community for many decades.

He received his *Diplôme d'Etudes en Psychologie Supérieures* in 1958 from the University of Lyon, and became a researcher at the University of Paris V (Sorbonne) in 1962. In 1967 he received the *Doctorat de Troisième Cycle en Psychologie* and in 1975 the *Doctorat ès-Lettres et Sciences Humaines* from the University of Paris X (*Université Paris-Ouest, Nanterre-La Défense*), where he subsequently became a professor of social psychology and the director of the Experimental Social Psychology Laboratories. In 1984 he was one of the professors of the Southern Europe Workshop, organized in Evora (Portugal) by the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology (now EASP). The other professors

of the summer school, still remembered with affection and nostalgia by all participants, were Jos Jaspars, Jean-Pierre Di Giacomo, and Augusto Palmonari, in collaboration with Bruna Zani.

He has also served as a member of the National University Council and was declared Emeritus Professor at the University of Paris X in 2001. He received a number of important awards, including a prize for Psychological and Psychophysiological Research by CNRS (1973), one from the *Association pour la Diffusion de la Recherche Internationale en Psychologie Sociale* in 1998, and a Doctorate Honoris Causa from the University of Athens (Panteion) in 2001. Although unique, his Lebanese experience was not his only adventure abroad. During his career, Jean-Pierre Deconchy spent extended periods as a visiting scholar in numerous universities in Canada, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Cameroon, Poland, and Mexico.

Throughout his career, Jean-Pierre Deconchy combined insightful and often provocative theoretical analyses with rigorous experimentation. Most strikingly, he opened new lines of inquiry decades before others approached the same issues, revealing a truly creative mind. Unfortunately, much of his rich and varied work was written in French, and thus remained inaccessible to the international academic community, a sign of perduring language barriers in science.

At the risk of oversimplification, one can consider Jean-Pierre Deconchy's research as covering three main "construction sites", as he liked to call them.

The first construction site regards the above-mentioned work on horizontal spatial asymmetries, conducted mainly while he was still a master's student. To our knowledge, his thesis constitutes the first systematic investigation of the role of writing direction in human cognition and action. Only decades after his pioneering research did spatial asymmetries and their neurological and cultural underpinnings become a main field of experimental and social psychology. Starting from the observation that Arabic-speaking children encounter specific problems with reading French, Jean-Pierre Deconchy developed a number of possible explanations that were then ruled out one by one, leaving script direction as the only remaining. This was then tested with a wide range of different methods, including field observations, systematic analyses of archival data, and sophisticated experimental designs. Quite differently from current approaches in which tried and tested paradigms are used over and over again, he tested the same general hypothesis on a multitude of tasks (including, among others, manual, technical, cognitive, social, aesthetic preference tasks, and games) and under highly naturalistic conditions.

The ground-breaking character of his work is all the more admirable if one considers that it was conducted by a then still inexperienced young researcher, in a "remote" area of the world (from a European perspective), practically without supervision, and certainly without any technical assistance. None of these obstacles were able to restrain his intellectual curiosity: if anything, they



stimulated his creative mind. For instance, faced with a total absence of research tools, Jean-Pierre Deconchy showed remarkable inventive and technical skills, such as when he turned a camera lens into a tachistoscopic projection device, and when he constructed a visual interference apparatus.

Although his thesis is undoubtedly an avant-garde piece of research, it had no impact on the field. Unfortunately, this treasure remained hidden until recently and it took decades before other researchers, independently, rediscovered the same principles. By the time Deconchy's thesis was published as part of a broader volume (Maass, Suitner, & Deconchy, 2014), it had become a historical document.

The second construction site is the study of religious orthodoxy, the work for which he is best known and for which he was awarded the *Prix Quinquennal de Psychologie Scientifique de la Religion* from the European Commission in Luxemburg. In this he was again greatly ahead of his time. What has now become a lively research area in the U.S. and in Europe was then a minority field at the margins of psychological research (Deconchy, 1971, 1980, 2000a, 2002; for overviews in English language, see Deconchy, 1984a, and 1985a, and for a methodological analysis see Deconchy, 1985b). One is not surprised that the very first contribution published in the then newly established *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* was Deconchy's article on religious belief systems (Deconchy, 1991). Interest in orthodox religious thought accompanied his entire career, and can be found in some of his last publications (Deconchy & Deschamps, 2008; Mvessomba, M'Bede, & Deconchy, 2009; Deconchy, 2011). It seems that the knowledge from his early religious training as a priest, followed by a subsequent agnostic detachment from religion, put Jean-Pierre in an ideal position to investigate religious orthodoxy scientifically.

Deconchy proposed to overcome the analysis based on personality traits and dogmatism and to study orthodoxy experimentally, conceived as a complex social system. According to his definition, an individual is considered orthodox when accepting, or even demanding, that his/her thought, language, and behaviour be regulated by the institutions of power of the ideological group to which s/he belongs. In turn, a group is defined as orthodox when it ensures that type of regulation, based on the professed doctrine. The orthodox system is defined as a set of social and psychosocial devices that regulate the activity of the orthodox individual within the orthodox group. The conceptual corpus developed by Deconchy can be applied to any kind of institutionalized orthodoxy - political, religious, artistic, scientific - since it does not refer to any particular content. His research, however, is directed mainly towards the Catholic Church, an organization whose functioning he understood very well; his work shows how, in an orthodox system, the internal social control has priority over the meaning of the doctrine itself (Deconchy, 1971, 1976). Deconchy analysed the alternation, in orthodox systems, between times when social control works effectively (moments when all group members proclaim the same beliefs and the power structure is stable) and times of effervescence - phases of Messianism - in which discourse

becomes freer and the power structure and roles are contested. The main hypothesis is that, in an orthodox system, the fragility of rational content is compensated by the force of social regulation. When orthodoxy is under threat, hence when people perceive the fragility of rational beliefs and ideological claims, the control apparatus generally increases, the very number of words used decreases, and the criteria for group membership become more rigid. In contrast, in moments of "pacified" orthodoxy, in which people are less aware of the weakness of ideological claims, social regulation and social control diminish in intensity.

The third construction site, to which Deconchy devoted the last part of his professional life, has as its object the study of the production of knowledge about the human being. His goal was to understand how the human being builds the idea of him/herself or, in other words, how s/he produces an implicit theory of the human. Deconchy wanted to understand how the idea of the human being as different from and superior to other animals, a sort of super-natural animal (*supernaturel*, Deconchy, 2000b), came about. Again, he was less interested in the content of the beliefs than in the processes through which this content originates. His idea was that humans do not conceive of themselves as an object belonging entirely to the world of nature, and therefore not subject to the law of determinism. The human being produces the idea of belonging to a species that is different from the animal species, a species that is something more than the sum of its individuals, as would be the case for the animal species (Deconchy, 1987, 2000b). The starting point of his studies was the investigation of the cognitive immunization strategies that arise in reaction to "disturbing" and experimentally validated pieces of information that challenge the person's beliefs. In a series of original experiments, Deconchy showed that such ideology-challenging information is accepted if it is based on observational methods, but rejected if based on experimental methods. The former allows one to think that, in other places and under different circumstances, the results may have been different; by contrast, the causal link established by the latter does not allow loopholes, but obliges people to take a stand and to make a choice between accepting the information that challenges their ideology or denying it *en bloc* (Deconchy, 1984b, 1986). From the study of cognitive immunization strategies Deconchy, in his final work, passed on to analyse the processes of ideological construction, which lead human beings to resort to myths to explain unexplained data. According to his hypothesis, as usual tested in a series of vivid and original experiments, human beings make greater use of unverifiable beliefs whenever they are in difficult situations in which their cognitive resources are reduced (Deconchy, 2006; Deconchy & Deschamps, 2008, 2009; Deconchy, Volpato, & Deschamps, 2013).

The two authors of this text – Chiara and Anne – got to know Jean-Pierre Deconchy, at different times, as teacher and as friend. Anne met him only during the last years of his life, after discovering (through Chiara) a unique treasure: his master's thesis, machine-typed on fragile, thin paper, with hand-drawn illustrations, dated 1958. Luckily he agreed immediately to a joint book project in which his thesis was reproduced in its original form (Maass, Suitner, & Deconchy,

2014) and which led to a "serendipitous collaboration", as he called our short but intense and lively collaboration. This book, published only a few months before his death, completes the circle of his professional life, linking his very first research to his very last publication.

Chiara met him for the first time in 1982 at a conference in Ravello, an important moment for southern European social psychology, where many central figures of our field gathered in a magic place that facilitated scientific exchange and personal conversations. In that context, Jean-Pierre Deconchy stood out for the originality of his thought. In his proposal to study orthodox systems with scientific methods, one caught the desire to understand the mechanisms by which ideology is constructed. The goal was - and is - ambitious, fascinating, and hard to reach, a goal that embodies the very meaning of social psychology: to understand the ways in which women and men give meaning to the world in which they live, build ideological systems that may, at different moments, become prisons or take on a sense of liberation.

The interest in these issues summarizes the essence of Deconchy as a person and as a social scientist. In these interests converge: his working-class origin that allowed him to look at power with disenchanted eyes; his experience within the Catholic Church, which had given him precious first-hand knowledge of the structure and superstructure of the most powerful consent-producing machinery in the Western world; his being a man of the left that led him to question the processes of production of ideology; his inexhaustible curiosity about the social world; and the methodological rigor that made him a tireless experimenter.

His interest in the construction, defence, and change of ideologies accompanied him also during his numerous travels. Titian's Assumption of Mary in the Frari Church in Venice invoked in him great aesthetic pleasure and, at the same time, admiration for the power of the ideological construction of the Catholic church. In a similar way, a visit to the temples of Angkor in Cambodia struck him because he sensed the deployment of a great ideology that was the antipodes of Western thought. His journeys were, at the same time, geographical and social-psychological. "*Je fais des observations ethnographiques*" he stated when describing his travels, in which he loved to spend time scrutinizing seemingly insignificant daily habits, strolling through markets, noting the use of time of the local populations.

To know Jean-Pierre as a scientist was to be struck by his taste for the unknown, his curiosity, and his intellectual enthusiasm and commitment, combined with a scrupulous attitude towards science and a firm belief in rigorous experimentation. To know him at a personal level was to also appreciate his moral integrity, his loyalty, and his capacity to develop and maintain profound friendships. In a world of appearance and consumerism, he was a convinced minority, maintaining, with pride, the simplicity, humility, and sobriety that distinguished his social background.

Jean-Pierre Deconchy leaves us all a great legacy: The courage to address big issues, a courage that associates him with Henri Tajfel and Serge Moscovici. He had the audacity to approach such problems, without letting him be discouraged by their complexity.

### *References*

- Deconchy, J.P. (1971). *L'orthodoxie religieuse. Essai de logique psycho-sociale*. Paris : Editions Ouvrières.
- Deconchy, J.P. (1976). Régulation et signification dans un cas de « compromis » idéologique entre ecclésiastiques catholiques et propositions « marxistes ». *Bulletin de Psychologie*, 30, 436-450.
- Deconchy, J.P. (1976). Expérimentation et processus d'influence idéologique dans les groupes réels. *Psychologie Française*, 21, 281-286.
- Deconchy, J.P. (1980). *Orthodoxie religieuse et Sciences humaines. Suivi de (Religious) orthodoxy, rationality and scientific knowledge*. Paris-La Haye : Mouton.
- Deconchy, J.P. (1981). Laboratory experimentation and social field experimentation: An ambiguous distinction. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 11, 323-347.
- Deconchy, J.P. (1984a). Rationality and social control in orthodox systems. In: H. Tajfel (Ed.) *The social dimension: Volume 1. European Developments in Social Psychology* (pp. 425-445). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deconchy, J.P. (1984b). La résistance à la validation expérimentale d'une connaissance portant sur les comportements « idéologiques ». *Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religions*, 58, 117-138.
- Deconchy, J.P. (1985a). The paradox of "orthodox minorities": When orthodoxy infallibly fails. In S. Moscovici, G. Mugny, E. Van Avermaet (Eds.) *Perspectives on minority influence* (pp. 76-112). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deconchy, J.P. (1985b). Non-experimental and experimental methods in the psychology of religion. In L. B. Brown (Ed.) *Advances in the psychology of religion* (pp. 76-112). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Deconchy, J.P. (1986). La résistance à l'explication causale des productions idéologiques. Un cas de leurre causal. *Bulletin de Psychologie*, 39, 241-251.
- Deconchy, J.P. (1987). Conduites sociales, comparaison sociale et représentation du patrimoine commun à l'homme et à l'animal. Filtres cognitifs et théories implicites. In J.L. Beauvois, R. V. Joule, J.M. Monteil (Eds.) *Perspectives cognitives et conduites sociales. Théories implicites et conflits cognitifs* (pp. 151-186). Fribourg : Delval.

- Deconchy, J.P. (1991). Religious belief systems: Their ideological representations and practical constraints. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 1, 5-21.
- Deconchy J.-P. (2000a). Les processus idéologiques. In N. Roussiau (Ed.), *Psychologie sociale* (113-120). Paris : In Press Editions.
- Deconchy, J.P. (2000b). *Les animaux surnaturés. La construction mentale de la singularité humaine*. Grenoble : Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.
- Deconchy, J. P. (2002). Représentations et processus idéologiques: Effets d'enveloppe et expérimentation. *Nouvelle Revue de Psychologie Sociale*, 1, 90-98.
- Deconchy, J.P. (2006). Comment fait-on pour expliquer ce qui est inexplicable ? Contrôle, déficit et croyances. In R.V. Joule, P. Huguet (Eds.) *Bilans et perspectives en psychologie sociale* (pp. 45-79). Grenoble : Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.
- Deconchy, J.P. (2011). La psychologie expérimentale de la religion. L'état des choses. *Bulletin de Psychologie*, 64, 117-132.
- Deconchy, J.P., & Deschamps, J.C. (2008). Traitement cognitif d'une représentation "mythique". *Psychologie Française*, 53, 97-114.
- Deconchy, J.P., & Deschamps, J.C. (2009). Les explications de l'inexplicable. Chronologie discursive et chronologie événementielle. In P. Rateau, P. Moliner (Eds.) *Représentations sociales et processus socio-cognitifs* (85-120). Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- Deconchy, J.P., Volpato, C., & Deschamps, J.C. (2013). Représentation mythique, imputation causale et pertinence sociale des stéréotypes. Musulmans et Bouddhistes dans la représentation des tours du World Trade Center. *Psihologia Social*, 31, 39-59.
- Maass, A., Suitner, C., & Deconchy, J.P. (2014). *Living in an asymmetrical world: How writing direction affects thought and action*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Mvessomba, E. A., M'Bédé, R., & Deconchy, J.P. (2009). Herméneutique radicale et proximité inter-groupes. Catholiques traditionnels, Catholiques charismatiques et Pentecôtistes au Cameroun. *Les cahiers internationaux de psychologie sociale*, 84, 59-79.

## In Memoriam: Serge Moscovici (1925-2014)

We would like to refer you to the special EBSP "[tributes to Serge Moscovici](#)" (EBSP 27,1) that EASP has recently released. Additional contributions are welcome, so if you have memories, anecdotes and thoughts about the impact that Serge Moscovici had on your personal trajectory or your research please send them to Jean-Claude Croizet ([jean-claude.croizet@univ-poitiers.fr](mailto:jean-claude.croizet@univ-poitiers.fr)) and Sibylle ([sibylle@easp.eu](mailto:sibylle@easp.eu)). They will be added to this issue.

The European Association of Social Psychology is committed to paying tribute to Moscovici's legacy and to ensure that it continues to influence theory and research in future years. With input from our members, specific activities have been developed. Towards the end of 2015, the European Journal of Social Psychology will publish a Virtual Special Issue consisting of an online collection of many of Moscovici's major contributions accompanied by an editorial in the print journal highlighting their significance for contemporary social psychology. In 2017, EJSP will additionally publish a Special Issue bringing together review and empirical papers that reflect on, as well as build upon, Moscovici's contributions. Further commemorations are currently being planned.

## In Memoriam: János Lazslo

Dear Friends, Dear Colleagues,

János has departed. After a disease borne with courage and patience, he found eternal rest on 25 January afternoon. He left a lot to us. He left thoughtfulness, creativity, activity, experience, friendship and love.

We were not prepared for János's departure. We knew he was seriously ill and we worried whenever receiving bad news concerning his health but we believed that he would overcome his disease and return to us. He left an immense heritage as well as an immense burden on us. We are convinced that he would have not left us if he had not had to do so, if he had had any chance to stay. We still had a lot to ask him about and there was no time left. Now we need time to receive the weight of our loss.

János was a man of stature. With a pragmatic attitude, he based his groundbreaking ideas on the reality of everyday life. He was an innovative scholar, a sage who told stories, a teacher who showed the right paths, a strict and demanding boss, an understanding and loving friend, a fascinating discussion partner – and all these together, all these for us. He was an ideal and – borrowing the word from Giovanna Leone – a Maestro.

János has laid the foundations of scientific narrative psychology. He created knowledge where he found a gap. First of all, he found a gap in the empirical approach to the close relationship between memory and identity where he created something new and unique. His work is based on an extensive knowledge spanning across psychology, history, linguistics, literature and theatre, this latter as both theory and experience.

It is hard to tell a story now – not only a good story but any story. It needs time to hear the voice of memories.

We have created a web page where all of us can pay tribute and express condolences. Dear Friends and Colleagues, all memories and thoughts to share are welcome.

His colleagues and students

<http://pszichologia.pte.hu/memoriam-prof-janos-laszlo?language=en>

**In Memoriam: Prof. Dr. Joop van der Pligt**

22.11.1951 Sluis, the Netherlands – 09.01.2015 Xàbia, Spain

*by Frenk van Harreveld, PhD*

When on January 9<sup>th</sup> of this year, at the age of 63, Joop van der Pligt unexpectedly passed away; Dutch social psychology lost one of its key figures. Over the last 30 years Joop was of immense importance not only to the department of social psychology at the University of Amsterdam but also to the development of the field as a whole. Joop was a respected and altruistic leader, who inspired his colleagues with his intellect, warmth and sense of humour.

Joop obtained his PhD at King's College, University of London in 1981, after which he was research fellow at the University of Exeter and Associate Professor at the Institute of Environmental Studies (Free University of Amsterdam) before in 1986 becoming professor of Experimental Social Psychology the University of Amsterdam.

At that point in time, social psychology was not nearly the area of research it is today in the Netherlands and Joop was one of the people dedicated to developing it. As only a few illustrations of his contributions to social psychology, Joop was president of the Dutch Social Psychology Association (ASPO) from 1989 to 1994, member of the Teaching Committee of the Kurt Lewin Institute (1991-1993) and member of the governing board of the KLI (1994-1997), which he chaired from 1997 to 2003. As the head of the department of social psychology at the University of Amsterdam he was responsible for what in the last research assessment of psychology departments was called "the flagship of social psychology in the Netherlands". In recent years he went to great lengths to steer this ship through turbulent times in social psychology.

Within the University of Amsterdam his influence extended way beyond the area of social psychology. As chair of the Science Committee of the Department of Psychology (1987-1992) Dean of the Department of Psychology (1994-1998), member of the Amsterdam University Senate (1998-2001) and director of the Psychology Research Institute of the University of Amsterdam (2000 – 2006), Joop guided the Department of Psychology through various important transitions.

On the basis of his research, Joop published almost 200 empirical papers, books and book chapters. Joop had a broad research interest, but most of his research addressed topics that relate to attitudes and decision-making such as the role of (anticipated) affect in judgment and decision-making, how people deal with counter-attitudinal information, ambivalence, perceived risk and the acceptability of risk. Also he investigated the consequences of uncertainty and (lack of) control on judgment and decision-making.



In addition to empirical work on basic processes in attitudes and decision-making, Joop's broad perspective on psychology and society also led him to applied research and applications of his research. In his applied research he for example investigated the perceived risks of technological developments, dietary behavior, compliance, and risk and insurance, for organizations such as the Dutch Ministry of Justice, the UK Ministry of Transport, The Netherlands Institute for Social Research, Achmea and the National Coordinator for Counterterrorism and Security. Joop was a member of numerous committees overseeing research on topics such as climate change, law enforcement, food and energy sustainability and AIDS.

As Joop operated on the borders between social psychology and decision-making, he contributed to the latter field as well. In 1993 he was one of the founders of the European Association of Decision Making (EADM) and Joop was a member of the organizing committees of SPUDM ('Subjective Probability, Utility and Decision-Making') conferences in 1991, 1992, 1999 and 2001.

Transferring knowledge and inspiring others was of great importance to Joop. Throughout his career he was a dedicated teacher, who inspired students with his broad knowledge and love for social psychology, both in the classes he taught as well as in the individual supervision of students. He played an important role in the development of several teaching programs such as the Research Master's program in Psychology and the masters track in Health and Behavior at the University of Amsterdam. Joop's influence on the Dutch social psychological landscape is further illustrated by the 27 dissertations he supervised. He was a beloved mentor to many Dutch social psychologists, who now hold professorial positions or have successfully pursued careers in more applied domains.

Notwithstanding his accomplishments, and him being one of the people who have built social psychology in Netherlands to what it is today, Joop was always more substance than ego. He was a loved and respected member of the social psychological community with a highly developed sense of morality and a sharp sense of humour. His warmth made his closest colleagues feel like his extended family. But above all, Joop was a loving and dedicated father and husband. His family have made a memorial website where many friends, relatives and colleagues have contributed their memories:

[www.joopvanderpligt.com](http://www.joopvanderpligt.com)

At this website everyone can pay tribute and express condolences.

Joop is, and will be, deeply missed.

## New Members of the Association

The following applications for membership were approved by the Executive Committee in May 2015. Names of members providing letters of support are in parentheses:

### *Full Membership*

#### **Dr. Hillie Aaldering**

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

#### **Dr. Katarina Blask**

Trier, Germany  
(E. Walther, R. Weil)

#### **Dr. Magdalena Bobowik**

San Sebastian, Spain  
(V. Sevillano, V. Benet-Martinez)

#### **Dr. Lottie Bullens**

Leiden, The Netherlands  
(E. van Dijk, F. van Harreveld)

#### **Dr. Pascal Burgmer**

Cologne, Germany  
(T. Mussweiler, R. Imhoff)

#### **Dr. Katarzyna Cantarero**

Warsaw, Poland  
(J. Roszak, K. Kryś)

#### **Dr. Charlotte Diehl**

Bielefeld, Germany  
(G. Bohner, H. Carvacho)

#### **Dr. Michelle Gelfand**

Maryland, USA  
(C.K.W. de Dreu, F. Durante)

#### **Dr. Gregor Halbeisen**

Trier, Germany  
(T. Glaser, R. Weil)

#### **Dr. Alina S. Hernandez Bark**

Frankfurt, Germany  
(R. van Dick, J. Ullrich)

#### **Dr. Antonio Herrera**

Granada, Spain  
(F. Exposito, M. Moya)

#### **Dr. Mickaël Jury**

Clermont Ferrand, France  
(A. Smeding, C. Darnon)

#### **Dr. Céline Launay**

Toulouse, France  
(M. Becker, H. Blank)

#### **Dr. Nikhila Mahadevan**

Southampton, UK  
(W. van Tilburg, C. Sedikides)

#### **Dr. Oana Rebega**

Cluji, Romania  
(C. Toma, G. Jiga-Boy)

#### **Dr. Sandy Schuman**

Oxford, UK  
(L. Licata, O. Klein)

#### **Dr. Catherine Verniers**

Clermont-Ferrand, France  
(C. Darnon, V. Bonnot)

#### **Dr. Julia Vogt**

Reading, UK  
(K. Epstude, M. Haefner)

*Postgraduate Membership***Philip Anderson**

St. Andrews, UK  
(N. Tausch, S.D. Reicher)

**Harriet Baird**

Sheffield, UK  
(T. Webb, P. Sheeran)

**J rome Blond **

Aix-en-Provence, France  
(F. Girandola, M. Cristea)

**Janina Buehler**

Basel, Switzerland  
(S. Sczesny, V. Brandstaetter)

**Vincenza Cinquegrana**

Caserta, Italy  
(S. Pagliaro, M.G. Pacilli)

**Almudena Claassen**

Brussels, Belgium  
(O. Klein, O. Corneille)

**Thia Sagherian Dickey**

Belfast, UK  
(R. Turner, C. Stevenson)

**Xia Fang**

Amsterdam, The Netherlands  
(G. van Kleef, D. Sauter)

**Djouaria Ghilani**

Brussels, Belgium  
(L. Licata, O. Klein)

**Sandra Godinho**

Lisbon, Portugal  
(M. Garrido, R. Costa-Lopes)

**Sarah Gramazio**

Padova, Italy  
(M. Cadinu, S. Pagliaro)

**Pelin Gul**

Cambridge, UK  
(A. Uskul, R. Giner-Sorolla)

**Marloes Huis**

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

**Nora Lantos**

Budapest, Hungary  
(M. Kovacs, A. Kende)

**Stefan Leach**

Cambridge, UK  
(R. Giner-Sorolla, D. Abrams)

**Karol Lewczuk**

Warsaw, Poland  
(D. Kobylinska, M. Kofta)

**Maartje Mulders**

Brussels, Belgium  
(O. Klein, O. Corneille)

**Lydia Raither**

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

**Nils Karl Reimer**

Oxford, UK  
(M. Hewstone, N. Faulm ller)

**Marine Rougier**

Grenoble, Switzerland  
(A. Smeding, D. Muller)

**John Sabo**

Canterbury, UK  
(R. Giner-Sorolla, G. Randsley de Moura)

**Thea Schei**

Cambridge, UK  
(S. Schnall, S. Sheikh)

**Ewa Szumowska**

Krakow, Poland

(M. Bukowski, M. Kossowska)

**Anne Templeton**

Sussex, UK

(J. Drury, P. Harris)

**Xijing Wang**

London, UK

(E. Krumhuber, A. Guinote)

## Grants awarded

---

Olga Bialobrzeska (*travel grant*)  
Asuman Buyukcan Tetik (*travel grant*)  
Wiebren Jansen (*travel grant*)  
Wojciech Kulesza (*regional support grant*)  
Eline Meijer (*travel grant*)  
Sindhuja Sankaran (*travel grant*)  
Johannes Seehusen (*travel grant*)  
Catia Teixeira (*seedcorn grant*)  
Catherine Verniers (*seedcorn grant*)

## Grant reports

---

**Inna Bovina**

(Moscow State University of Psychology and Education)  
*General Meeting Support Scheme*

The 17<sup>th</sup> EASP General Meeting hold in Amsterdam on July, 9-11, 2014 was such an interesting scientific event. I am very grateful to the EASP that my poster titled «Drugs and drug addicts in the lay representations of young Russians: from «observer» to «actor»» (based on a study realised in collaboration with N.Dvoryanchikov, E.Berezina, M.Debolsky, and A.Il'in) was supported by the EASP Organisational Committee and my travel to the conference was financed by the Association. The objective of the reported study was to reveal the changes of the lay representations of drugs and drug addicts as result of social practice and social influence. It was found that the lay representations of drugs and drug addicts were crystallized around the different items from public (social, medical, and legal) context, and from private context (life style) in transition from the position of «observer» to the position of «actor».

For me to attend the EASP General Meeting means to learn about the advances in social psychology, to present my actual study, to get some ideas and insights where to move further with new studies, to see once again my dear colleagues and friends, and to meet some new ones. Although, I think that it is almost the same for many other participants. In Amsterdam I have got several directions for further reflections.

First of all, it concerns the new interpretation of Milgram's experiment. Listening to the presentations of S.Reicher, S.A.Haslam (Symposium «Milgram at 50: New data, new insights, new perspectives») and keeping in mind the recent replication of Milgram's experiment by J.-L.Beauvois with colleagues, I was wondering about these lines of arguing. Reading now the Special Issue of the «Journal of Social

Issues»: «Milgram at 50: Exploring the Enduring Relevance of Psychology's Most Famous Studies» (2014), edited by S. Alexander Haslam, Arthur G. Miller, Stephen D. Reicher, I am discovering more and more questions about Milgram's work and the recent interpretations of it.

The next line of reflections is concerned with the collective action (presented at two Symposia «The role of morality in collective action participation and social change», «Social media and collective action: New perspectives on online and offline forms of political activism»). The most puzzling presentations were focused on the online and offline activity, how the intention to participate in a collective action declared on the social media predicts the offline involvement into the collective action.

The third line of interest was about the power (presented at Symposia «On power and prosociality: Dynamic and reciprocal relationship between hierarchical position and (anti)social behavior», and Thematic section «Power and status»). The presentations were quite impressive, I have got an inspiration, as result I have started a study where the concept of power is analysed through the ideas of the social representations theory.

I am always happy to see my dear collaborators from the EASP Summer School-1998, and I am very pleased to meet a very nice person from Israel, we talked for three hours one evening and I thought that I known him for ages.

The picture of the the General Meeting would not be completed without saying some words about Amsterdam itself. The city is charming, marvelous, with its canals and nice buildings... famous museums and Concertgebouw – well these are the places to visit in future! With my colleague we walked around every evening trying to memorise the unique beauty. I really appreciated the choice of the city for another reason as well. I got a chance to see once again a friend of mine (a former student of Jef Syroit at Tilburg, the one I met at once at the conference in Moscow).

I would like to thank the EASP for this excellent event and for the chance to attend it, special thanks to Sibylle Classen for kind help and assistance.

\*\*\*\*\*

Jonas Dalege  
(University of Hamburg)  
*Travel Grant*

The EASP travel grant gave me the opportunity to visit the Department of Psychology of the University of Amsterdam for one month. The purpose of this visit was to continue my collaboration with Prof. Han L. J. van der Maas, Prof. Denny Borsboom and Dr. Frenk van Harreveld. Our collaboration focuses on the development of a network model of attitudes. During my stay at the University of Amsterdam, we worked on a revision of a theoretical paper on this model and on an empirical paper, which focused on the relation between attitude strength and network connectivity.

The basic idea of our model is that attitudes can be conceptualized as networks of interacting evaluative reactions. This idea is grounded in recent advancements in different subfields of psychology, where similar network models have provided insights into the dynamics of clinical disorders, personality and intelligence (Cramer, Waldorp, van der Maas, & Borsboom, 2010; Cramer et al., 2012; van der Maas et al., 2006). Based on the tripartite model of attitudes (e.g., Rosenberg, Hovland, McGuire, Abelson, & Brehm, 1960) relevant evaluative reactions include beliefs (e.g., judging a presidential candidate as competent, charismatic and honest), feelings (e.g., feeling hope and proudness towards a presidential candidate) and/or behaviors (e.g., showing support and voting for a presidential candidate). These evaluative reactions form nodes in a network and are connected by edges that represent (bidirectional) causal influence (e.g., judging a presidential candidate causes feelings of hope towards the presidential candidate). Evaluative reactions that are similar to each other are proposed to be closely connected and therefore tend to cluster. Generally, evaluative reactions that belong to the same attitudinal component are more similar than evaluative reactions that belong to different attitudinal components. Attitude components can thus be conceptualized as clusters in a larger attitude network. Some evaluative reactions that belong to different components, however, are also closely connected (e.g., judging something as dangerous and feeling afraid), thereby creating so-called shortcuts between the clusters. This combination of clusters and shortcuts is known as a small-world structure in network theory (Watts & Strogatz, 1998).

For the empirical paper, we focused on a prediction of our model: Network connectivity provides a mathematically formalized conceptualization of attitude strength. Attitude strength refers to an attitude's stability, resistance and impact on behavior and information processing (Krosnick & Petty, 1995). These different aspects of strong and weak attitudes closely mirror what is known about the different dynamics of highly and weakly connected networks. Highly connected networks are both more stable and resistant to change than weakly connected networks (Cramer, 2013; Kindermann & Snell, 1980). Furthermore, the strong connections between nodes in highly connected attitude networks make it likely that the evaluative reactions align to a univalent evaluation – making it more likely

that the attitude will be informative for decision-making. The drive of the nodes to align in a highly connected network could also cause the motivation to integrate information in an attitude-congruent fashion.

To provide a first test of the proposition that network connectivity provides a mathematically formalized conceptualization of attitude strength, we investigated whether strong attitudes correspond to highly connected networks. To do so, we analyzed data from the open-access data sets of the American National Election Studies (ANES) from 1980-2012. In the ANES, evaluative reactions toward the presidential candidates were assessed. The ANES furthermore included a question, which can be used as an indicator of attitude strength. Based on this indicator variable, we assigned participants to a low, intermediate and high attitude strength group. We then checked whether the groups differed in their attitude's stability, extremity and impact on voting behavior. These checks clearly showed that the groups differed in their attitude strength. We then fitted networks for each attitude strength group at each election and for each candidate and compared the connectivity of the groups' attitude networks. The results showed that attitude strength and network connectivity were robustly and strongly connected. The proposition that network connectivity provides a mathematically formalized conceptualization of attitude strength thus received support.

During my stay at the University of Amsterdam we made great progress on the two papers that focus on our model – we will both resubmit the theoretical paper and submit the empirical paper soon for publication. The visit to Amsterdam was a very fruitful stay and I want to thank the EASP for making this stay possible.

## References

- Cramer, A. O. J. (2013). *The glue of (ab)normal life: Networks of interacting thoughts, feelings and behavior*. University of Amsterdam.
- Cramer, A. O. J., van der Sluis, S., Noordhof, A., Wichers, M., Geschwind, N., Aggen, S. H., Kendler, K. S., & Borsboom, D. (2012). Dimensions of normal personality as networks in search of equilibrium: You can't like parties if you don't like people. *European Journal of Personality*, *26*(4), 414–431. doi:10.1002/per.1866
- Cramer, A. O. J., Waldorp, L. J., van der Maas, H. L. J., & Borsboom, D. (2010). Comorbidity: a network perspective. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *33*, 137–150; discussion 150–193. doi:10.1017/S0140525X09991567
- Kindermann, R., & Snell, J. L. (1980). *Markov Random Fields and their Applications*. *Science* (Vol. 1, p. 142). Providence, RI: American Mathematics Society. doi:10.1109/TVCG.2009.208
- Krosnick, J. A., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Attitude strength: An overview. In R. E. Petty & J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), *Attitude Strength: Antecedents and Consequences* (pp. 1–24). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.



- Rosenberg, M. J., Hovland, C. I., McGuire, W. J., Abelson, R. P., & Brehm, J. W. (1960). *Attitude organization and change: An analysis of consistency among attitude components*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Van der Maas, H. L. J., Dolan, C. V, Grasman, R. P. P. P., Wicherts, J. M., Huizenga, H. M., & Raijmakers, M. E. J. (2006). A dynamical model of general intelligence: the positive manifold of intelligence by mutualism. *Psychological Review*, *113*(4), 842–61. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.113.4.842
- Watts, D. J., & Strogatz, S. H. (1998). Collective dynamics of "small-world" networks. *Nature*, *393*, 440–442. doi:10.1038/30918

\*\*\*\*\*

**Matthew J. Easterbrook**  
(University of Sussex, UK)  
*Seedcorn Grant*

### Unpacking Identification

The EASP's seedcorn grant enabled me to conduct my own independent research whilst working as a postdoctoral researcher with Tony Manstead at Cardiff University. It gave me the resources I needed to lay the foundations for what I hope will be a long line of research, as well as some valuable experience which has helped my career progress. I outline the background and findings from the research below.

Colin Leach and colleagues' (2008) well-known and often used identification scale suggests that identification consists of five different facets that are clustered into two higher order dimensions: A self-investment dimension that contains the satisfaction, solidarity, and centrality facets; and a self-definition dimension that contains the self-stereotyping and ingroup homogeneity facets. Although the body of research investigating the associates of identification is very large, there has been very little research into whether the different identification facets are related to different outcomes, and whether this varies by the social context. This is what I set out to investigate with the help of the EASP's seedcorn grant.

By delving into a broader literature, some tentative hypotheses can be drawn about the functions of these different facets. *Satisfaction*, for is often understood to be an indicator of subjective well-being (Diener, 2000), suggesting satisfaction may be positively related to well-being. *Self-stereotyping* involves perceiving the self as similar to a group prototype, and *ingroup homogeneity* involves perceiving the group members as similar to each other. Both of these facets provide feelings of belonging to the group (Easterbrook & Vignoles, 2013), and may therefore be linked with the positive outcomes associated with satisfying one's need to belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). *Solidarity* is associated with a commitment and bond towards the ingroup, which is promoted by the feelings of common fate that a

perceived threat can provoke (Drury, 2011). Solidarity also implies a closing of ranks and tightening of group boundaries, which again have been found to increase in response to threat (Castano, 2004; Castano, Paladino, Coull, & Yzerbyt, 2002). This suggests that this facet act as a buffer in the face of a group threat. *Centrality* refers to the salience and importance of the group to one's self concept, and may therefore increase group members' sensitivity to ingroup and intergroup events (Leach et al., 2008; Sellers & Shelton, 2003).

There has been a few studies directly investigating the separate effects of the identification facets, and these seems to reinforce my tentative hypotheses drawn from the fragmented literature. Giamo, Schmitt, and Outten (2012), for example, reported that, for a group that was discriminated against, satisfaction and self-stereotyping were positively related to life satisfaction, while centrality was negatively related. Furthermore, perceptions of discrimination were positively related to solidarity and had a positive indirect effect on life satisfaction via self-stereotyping. Leach and colleagues (Leach et al., 2008; Leach, Rodriguez Mosquera, Vliek and Hirt, 2010) found that satisfaction was the only facet to be sensitive to an ingroup devaluation manipulation, and that centrality was the most strongly related to perceptions of group threat.

Although not very conclusive, the above review seems to suggest that satisfaction will be associated with well-being outcomes, as will self-stereotyping and homogeneity because of their part in satisfying the belonging need. Solidarity may buffer against a group threat because of the security offered by a closing of ranks. Centrality seems to amplify the effect of status and stigma. The main purpose of the research I conducted with the EASP Seedcorn grant was to investigate if the facets of identification were differentially related to well-being, and whether they responded differently to different intergroup contexts. I managed to stretch the funds out to cover four different studies, which I summarise below.

Study 1 was mainly exploratory, allowing me to investigate the factorial structure of the identification scale and how the different facets were associated with well-being. The study was ran with female students, and included a simple manipulation of the salience of gender discrimination, similar to an order manipulation used by Leach and colleagues (2010). Study 2 built on this simple beginning by developing article manipulations used by Craig et al. (2012) to create an intergroup threat, a threat that devalued the ingroup but not at the hands of an outgroup, and a control. The idea here was to investigate whether outgroup hostility affected the role of the different identification facets differently in comparison to a non-intergroup devaluation, as my literature review implied it might.

The manipulations weren't particularly effective, with no main effects. However, they did manage to alter the factorial structure of the identification scale! Investigating why this was across the two studies revealed that the centrality facet was the culprit, which merged with solidarity in the no-threat condition in Study

1, and with satisfaction in the group-devalued condition in Study 2. In line with some other researchers (e.g. Jans, 2014), I opted to remove the centrality facet, which resulted in a clear factor structure: The two self-definition facets merged into a single factor while the other facets remained as separate factors. Although there were still no main effects of the manipulations (a feature of all the studies!) there were some differences in how the facets related to the well-being outcomes. In both studies, self-definition had a significant positive relationship with well-being, but only in the absence of threat. Satisfaction was consistently positively related to well-being, and solidarity was positively related to well-being, but only when there was a hostile outgroup. These results were not perfect, which isn't surprising given the facets are pretty strongly correlated with each other, but they are largely in line with my tentative hypotheses.

In Study 3, I continued using an intergroup threat, a non-intergroup ingroup devaluation, and a control condition, but switched the ingroup to a university so as to investigate the generality of the initial findings. Although the results were not as clear cut as I would have hoped, there were similarities to the previous studies. Again, self-definition was weakly positively related to well-being, but only in the absence of threat. Satisfaction was once again consistently positively related to well-being. Solidarity was again more strongly related to well-being in the face of a threat.

The fact that there were consistencies across these three studies was encouraging, and I am attempting to replicate them again in Study 4 using a rather different ingroup – those with low levels of education. I used what I hope will be a stronger manipulation; real cartoons which are openly discriminatory towards people with low levels of education. I am only just beginning to analyse the data, but the initial results are encouraging. If these results confirm the earlier ones, I believe that I will have a strong basis to develop this line of work further, and hopefully to attract some more funding.

In conclusion, I must say that unpacking identification is a tricky business. The facets are quite strongly related to each other, and their relationships and how they cluster tend to vary across contexts. However, there were some fairly consistent results across the studies. Satisfaction is positively related to well-being. Self-definition is also positively related to well-being, but only in the absence of a threat. Solidarity is again positively related to well-being, and actually more so in the face of threats. I hope that the analysis of Study 4 will confirm these tentative conclusions, and enable some more concrete theorising regarding how the identification facets react to the social context and impact upon well-being.

Running this research based on my own proposal has been a great experience and I would like to thank the EASP for awarding me the Seedcorn grant that enabled me to do so. I would also like to specifically thank Sibylle Classen, whose fantastic support, enthusiastic communications, and impeccable organisation are a wonder!

## References

- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*, 497–529.
- Castano, E. (2004). In case of death, cling to the ingroup. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *34*, 375-384.
- Castano, E., Paladino, M. P., Coull, A., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. (2002). Protecting the ingroup stereotype: Ingroup identification and the management of deviant ingroup members. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *41*, 365-385.
- Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 34–43.  
DOI:10.1037//0003-066X.55.1.34
- Drury, J. (2011). Collective resilience in mass emergencies and disasters: A social identity model. In J. Jetten, C. Haslam, & S. A. Haslam (Eds.), *The Social Cure: Identity, Health and Well-Being* (pp. 195-216). Hove: Psychology Press.
- Easterbrook, M. J., & Vignoles, V. V. L. (2012). Different Groups, Different Motives Identity Motives Underlying Changes in Identification With Novel Groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*, 1066–1080.  
DOI:10.1177/0146167212444614
- Giamo, L. S., Schmitt, M. T., & Outten, H. R. (2012). Perceived discrimination, group identification, and life satisfaction among multiracial people: A test of the rejection-identification model. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *18*, 319-328.
- Jans, L., Leach, C. W., Garcia, R. L., & Postmes, T. (2014). The development of group influence on in-group identification: A multilevel approach. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. doi:10.1177/1368430214540757
- Leach, C. W., Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M. R., Vliek, M. L., & Hirt, E. (2010). Group devaluation and group identification. *Journal of Social Issues*, *66*, 535-552.
- Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., ... Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *95*, 144–165. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.144
- Sellers, R. M., & Shelton, J. N. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*, 1079-1920.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Wiebren Jansen**  
(University of Groningen)  
*Travel Grant*

The EASP postgraduate travel grant I was awarded allowed me to accept an invitation to participate in an invited symposium organized by Professor Gro Mjeldheim Sandal from the University of Bergen, Norway. The symposium was held at the bi-annual conference of the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology in Oslo, Norway (May 20<sup>th</sup>-23<sup>rd</sup> 2015).

The symposium consisted of five presentations that all focused on the theme of cultural diversity at work. This topic is closely related to my PhD research, in which I studied how social inclusion in demographically diverse work settings can be fostered. I hereby specifically focused on how an organization's ideological stance towards diversity (i.e., the organization's diversity approach) affects the extent to which individual employees perceive to be included. In addition, I investigated whether different diversity approaches have different effects on group members, depending on whether they belong to the demographic majority and minority.

In this particular symposium, I presented one of the empirical chapters of my dissertation (Jansen, Otten, & Van der Zee, 2015). Specifically, I presented two experiments in which I demonstrated that explicitly including the cultural majority group in an organization's diversity approach (all-inclusive multiculturalism; Stevens, Plaut, & Sanchez-Burks, 2008) increases the extent to which majority members feel included in their organization and indirectly enhances their support organizational diversity efforts.

Undoubtedly, this travel grant was very valuable to me. It allowed me to present my research and to extend and maintain my professional network. It also enabled me to participate in a high-quality large-scale conference attended by both organizational and social psychologists. As such, I believe this grant made a significant contribution to my career. I would like to thank the EASP for providing me this opportunity.

#### References

- Jansen, W. S., Otten, S., & Van der Zee, K. I. (2015). Being part of diversity. the effects of an all-inclusive multicultural diversity approach on majority members' perceived inclusion and support for organizational diversity efforts. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, doi:10.1177/1368430214566892
- Stevens, F. G., Plaut, V. C., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2008). Unlocking the benefits of diversity: All-inclusive multiculturalism and positive organizational change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44(1), 116-133. doi:10.1177/0021886308314460

**Eftychia Stamkou**  
(University of Amsterdam)  
*Travel grant*

I started my PhD at the University of Amsterdam in October 2012 under the supervision of prof. Gerben Van Kleef on the role of social norms on hierarchical relationships. Thanks to a travel grant I received from the European Association of Social Psychology (EASP), I was able to work as a visiting scholar at Columbia Business School (CBS) from August 31<sup>st</sup> 2014 until November 27<sup>th</sup> 2014. During my visit I collaborated with prof. Adam Galinsky on a research project but I also had the chance to present my research in labgroups, to attend a conference, meet exceptional academics of the field, and get acquainted with the local culture of New York.

The weekly research meetings with prof. Galinsky have been very inspiring and fruitful. We mainly focused on a project we started in Amsterdam investigating the role of norm violations in the formation of social hierarchies. We had already carried out 6 studies before my visit to CBS and we designed and collected data for 6 more during my stay there. The results were insightful and helped me better understand the underlying mechanisms of the perceivers' own hierarchical standing on their tendency to support norm following or norm violating leaders. At the moment, we are running a final study and we aim to write up a scientific report, which will include a meta-analysis of all 13 studies. We intend to submit this report to a journal and we hope to also present it at the Academy of Management meeting in 2015.

Furthermore, I became member of prof. Michael Morris' cross-cultural research lab, where I also presented my research on the moderating effects of culture on the way people react to norm violators across 19 countries. I was also given the opportunity to attend a small conference on biculturalism organized at the University of Columbia. Finally, my collaborator, prof. Michele Gelfand from University of Maryland, invited me to present our cross-cultural research to her labgroup.

I would like to warmly thank the EASP for their generosity and support, which made this rich experience possible.

## News from the Executive Committee

### Announcements

#### Changes in the EASP grant scheme

Recently, the EC decided about some changes in the grant scheme.

First, there are some changes with respect to the Postgraduate or postdoctoral travel grant. The travel grant covers up to 800 euro for short visits of postgraduate or postdoctoral students to departments elsewhere in the world in order to conduct new research, complete ongoing projects, undergo training in a particular methodology or technology, or participate in EASP (co)sponsored events as meetings, conferences or summer schools. We have added to this grant the option for people from countries/departments who have no access to travel funds to apply for an additional supporting grant, for example, to cover living expenses.

Second, the postdoctoral 'seedcorn' research grant (a maximum of 2000 euro per grant), which is intended to assist researchers in developing new research projects during the immediate postdoctoral period, may also be used by used for supporting research that was designed at EASP summer schools.

Third, the regional activity grant is changed into the Research Knowledge Transfer Scheme (RKTS). The Research Knowledge Transfer Scheme (RKTS; a maximum of 3500 euro per grant) is intended to promote any initiative that specifically serves EASP members from regions or departments where access to scientific information, facilities and/or funding is scarce compared to European standards.

With respect to all grants it should be noted that the scientific merit of proposal, as well as the academic need and expected academic benefit are central when evaluating it. In addition, we would like to emphasize that members from countries/departments which have only limited access to travel funds and whose infrastructure or training facilities are less well developed than elsewhere are especially encouraged to apply.

#### 2018 EASP Summer School: in search of a location

While the Exeter team is preparing the 2016 EASP Summer School, the Executive Committee has already started its search for a location to host the 2018 edition. Some of you who still have lively memories of earlier schools, either as participants, teachers, or as sponsors of participants, may perhaps consider becoming responsible for organising a summer school themselves. The Executive Committee welcomes all proposals (just drop a note to Sibylle Classen by **September 15, 2015**, at [sibylle@easp.eu](mailto:sibylle@easp.eu)).

## Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Executive Officer by **September, 15<sup>th</sup>, 2015** latest. Applications for grants and for the International Teaching Fellowship Scheme can be received by the deadlines end of March, June, September, and December. The deadline for the next issue of the Bulletin is **September, 15<sup>th</sup>, 2015**.

The next Executive Committee Meeting will take place in October 2015.



## Executive Committee

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

**Mara Cadinu (Meetings)**, D.P.S.S., University of Padova, Via Venezia 8, I-35131  
Padova, Italy  
e-mail: [mara.cadinu@unipd.it](mailto:mara.cadinu@unipd.it)

**Jean-Claude Croizet (Secretary)**, CeRCA (UMR CNRS 6234, MSHS Université de  
Poitiers, F-86000 Poitiers, France  
e-mail: [jean-claude.croizet@univ-poitiers.fr](mailto:jean-claude.croizet@univ-poitiers.fr)

**Ernestine Gordijn (Grants)**, Department of Social and Organizational Psychology,  
University of Groningen, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, NL-9712 TS Nijmegen, The  
Netherlands  
e-mail: [e.h.gordijn@rug.nl](mailto:e.h.gordijn@rug.nl)

**Torun Lindholm (European Liaison)**, Department of Psychology, Stockholm  
University, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden  
e-mail: [tlm@psychology.su.se](mailto:tlm@psychology.su.se)

**Kai Sassenberg (Treasurer)**, Knowledge Media Research Center, Schleichstr. 6, D-  
72076 Tuebingen, Germany  
e-mail: [k.sassenberg@iwm-kmrc.de](mailto:k.sassenberg@iwm-kmrc.de)

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Executive Officer:**  
**Sibylle Classen**, P.O. Box 420 143, D-48068 Muenster, Germany  
e-mail: [sibylle@easp.eu](mailto:sibylle@easp.eu)

**website of the EASP:**  
<http://www.easp.eu>