

1 Editorial

3 President's Corner: To be Member or Not to Be: What's the Issue?

5 Conversation with Claude Flament by Xenia Chrysochoou

18 New Publications by Members

Discriminations Sociales et Droits Universels by W. Doise (2009)

20 Future EASP Meetings – Calendar

28 Future EASP Meetings

Medium Size Meeting on Challenging stereotypes: When and how targets of negative stereotypes resist, July 6-8, 2011, Lisbon, Portugal

Small Group Meeting on the application of self-regulation approaches to the social psychological phenomena July 11-12, 2011, Stockholm, Sweden (preconference to the EASP General Meeting)

16th EASP General Meeting, July 12-16, 2011, Stockholm, Sweden

16th EASP General Meeting, Keynote Symposium: Social Psychology and the Neuroscience: Perspectives and Pitfalls

EASP-SPSSI Joint Meeting on Meaning and Existential Psychology, November 2011, Tilburg, The Netherlands

26 Reports of Previous Meetings

SPSSI-EASP Joint Meeting on Forgotten Alternatives: Denaturalizing Conditions of Injustice and Exclusion, March 17-19, 2010, City University of New York, USA

EASP Small Group Meeting on Developmental Perspectives on Intergroup Prejudice: Advances in Theory, Measurement, and Intervention, July 5-8, 2010, ISCTE Lisbon, Portugal

EASP Small Group Meeting on Debating Honor in the Context of Group and Gender Relations, the Self, and Aggression, August 20-23, 2010, Barcelona, Spain

37 Reports from the EASP summer school 2010, August 23-September 6, 2010, Aegina, Greece

54 News about Members

New Members of the Association

58 Grants and Grant Reports

73 Announcements

Election of the New Executive Committee Members – Call for Nominations

Open call for offers to host the next General Meeting 2014

EJSP early career best manuscript awards 2008 and 2009

Winner Ig-nobel prize 2010

Summer Institute in Social Psychology (SISP) 2011 – Call for Applications

79 Deadlines for Contributions

80 Executive Committee

Editorial

Dear Friends and Colleagues,

The Bulletin is entering a new era! We decided to publish it electronically and this is the first such edition! This move will make the bulletin easily accessible from the website, will economize postage, will make room to our bookshelves and last but not least will save some trees! In addition, we will publish electronically older issues and keep an archive of the information published in the bulletin. I hope that you will still enjoy reading it and send us material for publication.

As promised, we are publishing a conversation I had with Prof. Claude Flament, past president of the EASP. It was with great pleasure that I did this interview and I learned a lot about the beginnings of the association, the politics involved and the tasks and missions people had. Having the past in mind we can build a better future! The interview was done in French and translated in English afterwards. Both because it is a conversation and because oral discourse was translated I would ask you to be lenient with the language!

From past president's responsibilities we move, as usual, to present president's corner, a must-read of every issue that brings us back to the present and the future of EASP.

Prof. Flament said, among other things, that one of the major goals of the EASP (previously EAESP) was to foster contacts between social psychologists in Europe. This great tradition was kept till now as you can see from the various meetings planned and from the reports of the meetings already held.

I will draw your attention to the reports of the 68 terrific young scholars that participated in the Summer school and their devoted teachers. Organizing and participating in the summer school was one of the most enriching experiences I had in my life as a social psychologist and I would not praise enough the association for organizing this event. In this issue we publish the announcement of the next Summer Institute of SPSP another great opportunity for young social psychologists!

In the bulletin you will also see the new members and read the reports of activities and grants and the announcement of new books. Please send us information you wish to see published. Those of you who wish to do a review of a book please do not hesitate to contact me.

Last but not least, the Executive committee in its current form will end its activity at the Stockholm meeting this summer. I will like to draw you attention to the call for new executive members nominations (deadline 15th of March) and the call to host the next general meeting.

Wishing you an enjoyable (and probably well-deserved) winter break, I leave you with the content of the Bulletin

Xenia Chrysochoou
Athens, December 2010

President's Corner

To Be Member or Not to Be: What's the Issue?

At the 2008 General Meeting, the membership decided in favor of changing the name of our Association into European Association of Social Psychology. It fits the idea that solid social psychological research is not necessarily experimental—one can also rely on meta-analyses, on longitudinal designs, on archival data, and so on. Indeed, the top-ten most cited papers in the *European Journal of Social Psychology* since 2000 include four theoretical articles, three research articles relying on experimental methods, and three articles relying on non-experimental (i.e., survey and longitudinal) methodology.

Now in addition to the variety of methods we use, our members spread out in many different areas—into organizational psychology programs, health psychology, environmental sciences, or communications departments. Many (continue to) contribute interesting research insights to social psychology, publishing their work in the best social psychology journals. Many (continue to) find their academic home in EASP, which makes sense because “*Membership of the Association is confined to those who may be expected to make a substantial contribution to the development of experimental and/or theoretical social psychology, or to those who have already made such contributions by way of research and/or authorship of books, learned articles and other published material*” (see Article 5 of our Statues).

We don't mind whether scientists work in social psychology programs, in computer sciences, or in linguistics—when they contribute to social psychological science they can be full member. We seem to mind, however, whether they work in Europe—because those not working in Europe cannot be full member. We don't mind if a member moves from social psychology to economics, or environmental studies, or international relations. We seem to mind, however, if a member moves from a social psychology program in Europe to a social psychology program outside Europe—such mobile members lose full membership status.

That people move around and cross disciplinary boundaries more than before makes our current practice of distinguishing between full membership and affiliate membership status sometimes hard to explain. Importantly, our practice of limiting full membership status to colleagues working in Europe is not in line with our Statues. Full membership status is defined in Article 5 (quoted above). Affiliate membership status is defined in Article 12: “*Affiliate membership is available to scientists living outside Europe.*” Nowhere in Article 5 or elsewhere in the Articles or Standing Orders is it stated that full membership is limited to those working and/or living in Europe. Those scientists working and/or living in Europe can apply for full membership; those outside Europe have a choice between applying for full membership or affiliate membership. If those within or outside Europe apply for full membership status, the Article 5 criteria apply, and nothing else.

The current practice of denying full membership status to non-European colleagues has no legal basis in our Statutes and Standing Orders. It will not stand in court. In fact, current Statutes and Standing Orders allow us already to welcome as full member all those who meet the Article 5 criteria, regardless the country they work in, their departmental affiliation, or whatever other criterion one might think of. At the upcoming General Meeting, the Executive Committee will address these and related issues in more detail and propose concrete action to make EASP the academic home for *all* those individuals interested in and contributing to European excellence in social psychology.

Carsten K.W. de Dreu
Utrecht, December 12, 2010

**Conversation with Claude Flament
Executive Committee 1969-1975 and
President 1972-1975
by Xenia Chrysochoou**

XC: Thank you for accepting to see me to discuss about the association and about social psychology. Let's begin from the association; how you've got involved with, what were the preoccupations when you became president?

CF: I became president in 1972, the association started in 1963, perhaps not officially but the process was there. It has not been highlighted sufficiently, I think, that initially the initiative was American. It was Lanzetta who, as a representative of the Psychology of the American Navy he had a kind of sabbatical in London and went to see Tajfel wondering "what we can do to help social psychology in Europe?" He was the American who saw Europe as a whole... And indeed there was not much in Europe at the time. On the contrary Americans had money. So, Henri Tajfel suggested to invite social psychologists in Europe, to create an occasion that social psychologists can meet in Europe, and to give them the opportunity to see each other in Europe and not only when they were visiting the US. I remember very well this argument. Social psychologist in Europe got to know each other when they travelled to the US; of course those in Paris knew each other, but from one country to another they didn't. It seems an exaggerated image but it corresponded very well to reality. That's how this idea came; The Ford foundation then financed a meeting for the European social psychologists. And the first meeting took place in 1963 at Sorrento...

XC: and at that time the association did not existed as yet...

CF: They were people. As regarded France, practically all experimental social psychologist were there, we were five.

XC: five all social psychologists in France...

CF: Yes, there was Moscovici, Germaine de Montmollin, Robert Pages, a colleague that I lost track professionally later: Lambert and me. It is not very important but those who took care later of the association were Moscovici and me. There were three colleagues from Paris because I was already in Aix en Provence but we knew each other. So the first meeting took place. We exchanged, we made some presentations, I cannot remember anymore the details; one should look at the archives... We decided to meet again in Italy, at Frascati in 1964 or 1965, I can't remember if it was next year or two years later. There it was decided to create an association and some people offered to help. I did not propose myself because I did not have any material resources for assistance, because you know psychology in general at Aix was almost inexistent at the time. I don't know how it was in

Greece, here in France psychology was a branch of philosophy so we did not have the same environment that we have now. Hence, an association was created that was registered in the Netherlands because the colleagues there offered to do that, and the first president was Moscovici. Three years later was Tajfel and in 1972...

XC: In 1972 it was you

CF: I was not candidate. Tajfel proposed my name with an argument whose importance would be perhaps difficult to understand now; he had a political argument; he suggested that as I was known to be a communist I would be perhaps better accepted than somebody else by the East European countries. He had a point; indeed we had great difficulties, because our colleagues from these countries, perhaps with the exception of Yugoslavia, had problems in order to get authorizations to come. The president had as a task to enable the "door opening" so they would be able to come. In addition, we organized East-West meetings that took place in an East European country. These were international meetings and there were questions of political diplomacy. We went only a few from the West to these meetings trying not to invade, we tried to keep a numerical equilibrium at least, and we tried to develop contacts in favor of the East European colleagues. So, in that respect I had a certain action. It was what I was expected to do. I went to Hungary, I was received by the minister etc...and the colleagues at the corridor were saying "Ah you have been received for an hour and a quart whereas Tajfel last year was received only for $\frac{3}{4}$ of an hour..." It was a sign of interest... It is an atmosphere that is difficult to imagine now. So we were able to make a first East-West meeting. This meeting was in Budapest and there was another, later, when I was not anymore responsible, in Poland I think. You can check the archives, there were several such meetings; the idea was to facilitate the relationships with the colleagues.

I have been to Moscow, where I have been received by a psychologist that was not a social one, Leontiev, whom I knew from one of his visits to Paris. He travelled a lot. He was from the Academy of Educational Sciences. I have met him in Professor's Wallon home. Wallon was very well known as a psychologist, not a social one, and as a communist. Thus, I had both scientific and political links. Leontiev obtained without much difficulty a visa for me and I have been received, this was the objective, by the editorial committee of the official review "Questions of Philosophy". This was the ideological review of the USSR. So, the idea was whether the fact that this committee received the President of the European Association could have been interpreted as a kind of recognition from our "Soviet Brother" that would have enabled our colleagues to come over.

In Moscow, in fact in all Soviet Union, there was only a woman (I can't remember her name) that was a professor of social psychology. It was really the beginnings of social psychology. There was psychology in general caught in ideological conflicts. We did not care about that. What we cared was that the existence of the European Association of Social Psychology was mentioned in the Review as something

acceptable. So among my other duties as president I made a lot of trips to East European countries.

Of course, it was not the only thing we were doing. There were several important issues at the time as in any time. For example, when the Olympic Games in Munich took place, with the hostage taking of Israeli athletes by the Palestinians and the massacre, we phoned each other in the Executive Committee and I sent at the Israeli Embassy in Paris a letter of condolences. The Ambassador replied with a thanking letter saying how happy they were that we supported their policies; which was not true at all. We've just condemned the massacre. The Association as an international association found itself in many occasions to make political decisions, notably regarding East-West, that had nothing psychological, in so far that they enabled contacts with the East European colleagues and not only with them. We even did a meeting in which I was involved, in 1968 during the "Spring of Prague" we had planned one of these East-West meetings. I was not yet president, but I was in a small group of Americans and Europeans that met, we were 6-8 people. It was a very small working group that met, totally independently of the European Association, but Moscovici was in it.

XC: was this transnational committee?

FC: Well, it was a group that never had statuses and that wasn't institutionalized and again the Americans paid. It was a scientific group on conflict resolution. During this period of conflicts the Americans paid as if they thought that social psychology could resolve all conflicts. Among the Americans there were people like Kelley, Thibault, Morton Deutsch, you see people that worked not only on conflict resolution but who worked experimentally. And from France we were Moscovici, Faucheux and me and there was Jaap Rabbie from the Netherlands and Henri Tajfel from Britain. And we met. The Europeans knew each other from the Association but this group was not part of it. And it happens that we met in San Francisco in September, the moment of the Soviet intervention in Prague, and as Tajfel and Moscovici were there, we discussed whether we should keep the meeting in Prague or not. The colleagues from there wanted us to go to have as they said "some fresh air". We arrived there after the battles; in fact we saw the traces of the battles. Anyway, within this political framework, the people of the European Association like me had the aim to develop contacts with the East European colleagues in a purely scientific spirit. It was not either pro or against communism, in any case there were different opinions amongst us, it was the idea to develop contacts. So the main preoccupation and the matter I dealt with as a president was that. So the spirit of the association was to develop contacts to realize scientific work.

The problem is whether it was efficacious or not. Around 10 years ago in the European Bulletin, a German colleague looked at the names, the number of publications and inter-citations before the creation of the European Association and after to see whether these meetings had an impact. His conclusion was very clear. It would be possible to find these two papers in the archives of the Bulletin.

So, at that time for the French and I guess for most of the Europeans, independently of these contacts with the East European countries that was only one aspect of the issue, the main question was to develop the contacts among Europeans in order to develop social psychology that was almost inexistent. For example in the first meeting in Sorrento all French social psychologists were there and we were five of us.

XC: But how you recognized yourselves as social psychologists?

CF: This is another aspect that was evoked when it was decided to change the name of the Association and take out the word “experimental”. This was always discussed in the association. I remember the argument of our Dutch colleagues who said that faced, for example, with a person who worked in an organization, who did applied work and wanted to join the association, we could not say to this person that his work was not good, that we were not interested. We could ask however whether it was experimental. The use of the word “experimental” it was a barrier inside social psychology. Indeed, what were developed at the time were interventions within enterprises and the association wanted to stay a scientific association. Of course there is applied work that is scientific but for the Dutch, as far as I remember, it was not very often a good work; not always, but very often. Thus, the word “experimental” was a polite way to leave out these “bad” social psychologists. This was the idea for a long time. So taking out “experimental” did not bother me now because social psychology has been sufficiently developed in many countries with a scientific status and we do not need to defend ourselves as we needed to do at the beginning when, at least numerically, we were not very strong.

When I say that all five French social psychologists were at the meeting at Sorrento I meant experimental social psychologists. Because there was also another person that I knew well and who was a person of great quality, Maisonneuve, but he wasn't an experimentalist. There was a little bit of sectarianism in that. As far as I remember there weren't the French that had asked to put forward the word “experimental”. The Dutch did, at least some of them. I don't know if they had particular problems in Holland, we did not have in France.

For the Americans that financed the association the idea was to develop contacts not only between East and West but also among western social psychologists in Europe in the spirit of scientific social psychology, the dominant model being the American model. There were conflicts, let's say debates among the French, like Pages, who said that this was American Imperialism with their British representatives, speaking about Tajfel, to invade Europe. He made a parallel of what happened in the association with what happened internationally at a political level. So there was a political dimension but with the exception of the organization of East-West meetings, it wasn't fundamental.

There were also other issues like whether Israelis could be part of a European Association. In the first meetings of the association there were Israelis and

Palestinians. We had some discussions and we said that Israel was not part of Europe and so Israelis and Lebanese were excluded. You see, the idea that we had was to facilitate gatherings among people in Europe, instead of focusing on what sort of social psychology we were doing. It was of course necessary to do a good job, at least what we thought to be a good job scientifically, in collaboration with others and in a stimulating way.

The cold war signified the problems. When we met in Prague only some days after the Soviet invasion it was meaningful. We can interpret that in a way or another but for us, Festinger was there ... it was a conference with important people. There was also a political meaning. A Russian was also invited. But when we had our meals together- we were in a Grand Hotel-the Russian was alone in his table. He was boycotted by everyone. And at the discourses at the end there were some allusions about small countries that were dominated by stronger countries. No names of countries were given but everybody understood. So you see the idea to make Europeans meet within the framework of American inspired social psychology led to political problems because the situation was political. So when we moved beyond borders, but even within each country, these political problems became apparent.

XC Do you think that there is an American social psychology and a European social psychology?

CF This is an important issue. Doise must have talked about that because when the question was to remove the word "experimental" there were discussions and exchanges and I discussed with Willem when I met him at a thesis. For him, the argument is that the association is about the development of European social psychology. So we need not to be sectarian; others where stricter, more rigorous.

So the difference between European and American social psychology... When I was in Moscow I met a woman, the only social psychologist there at the time, who had studied in Sweden or Norway. Anyway, she told me that she gave once a conference in Sweden about social psychology in USSR and there a colleague in the audience asked her why she was doing such an American social psychology implying that it was a capitalist social psychology. This Swedish colleague found odd that a Russian colleague could do the same kind of social psychology as he was doing. So we had for a long time the question of doing differently from the Americans or not doing differently.

I have a personal view on that. It may not be shared by all social psychologists in France or in Europe. The social psychology in the US is very individualistic. This is due to their university curriculum that might have changed now. At the time, to take social psychology one needed to learn about personality and this is also reflected in the dominant journal, the JPSP. It is totally legitimate to do this. However, it leaves out the social, the societal part. So if you have been in Paris you know Moscovici, we are a certain number of us working on social representations that try to do a "social" social psychology. And this social psychology can be

experimental and rigorous but also finds itself at a more societal level. The insertion of the individual in the social, I think that has been developed more in Europe than in the US. However, in Latin America social representations are growing and a lot of people are interested. This issue was not important when I was president. In fact, even then it started to exist but the international problems were more important.

We did not have money problems. The Ford Foundation was extremely generous. Each year we had to solicit reporting to the next year the sums left because we did not spend everything. This is not the case now! Well, before becoming president, I was a member of the executive committee presided by Tajfel and I had as a responsibility to distribute money to those who wished to travel. I did not have any money problems. The only question was whether the applicant was going somewhere for tourism or for doing psychology. It happens that I refused a grant but it was never on money grounds. So we had a total freedom financially speaking. For our activities we had more than enough money. And this was American money. So one could say, and certainly some said so, that it was American imperialism.

However, to my knowledge, our American colleagues that came over several times and animated the start of the association, never and none of them tried to impose a scientific point of view. I remember a kind of personal anecdote; in 1968-69 with this independent group of colleagues, formed by Americans, we made experiments in parallel in different countries. It concerned conflict resolution so there were experiments using the prisoners' dilemma paradigm. We did the same experiments in Paris, New York, Los Angeles, Aix etc. We added to the usual research protocol a small questionnaire of six questions asking subjects why they behave as they did in the dilemma and trying to measure issues like reciprocity etc. At the time I was doing my *These d'Etat* on the mathematical study of questionnaires. Kelley did this experiment in Los Angeles, Lanzetta in New England, Joseph Nuttin in Belgium, and I did it in Aix. Tajfel did it as well but he introduced other variations and it was not anymore comparable. So for the four of us it was exactly the same experiment done of course in the language of each country. I analyzed the results. Of course as I was doing an important mathematical job on questionnaires it was evident that I could apply it in this research. And I found that the subjects' responses were oriented mainly in relation to reciprocity. Some refused it and others accepted it but reciprocity in general organized the responses. Of course I do not remember every detail. I divided the sample in relation to the median on this variable and I realized that the behaviors were very different but predictable from the responses on the questionnaire.

At this point I wrote to the three other colleagues and asked them to send me their data. So I did the same analysis and what I found was that in Los Angeles it was like in Aix whereas in New England and Belgium the important variable was the "gain": to have more for oneself. Some people refused the "gain" other accepted it but their preoccupation was not reciprocity as in Aix and Los Angeles but "gaining". Again this was predicting the behaviors. So in these four places we were

able to predict behaviors from responses to questionnaires which were different in the North from those in the South.

These results merited to be published. My mistake was at the time... I was exhausted. It was just after May 1968 in France and we were reforming the university and I had meetings all the time... So I published in French with the agreement of the colleagues, I think in "Psychologie Francaise". Anyway, with Kelley, after, we tried to publish in the US but it was refused because it was already published and therefore not anymore original. I remember Kelley had my article at hand and said "The Americans will never know this".

So, you see, we consider very often that experiments are a good picture of what happens in reality in terms of conflicts. However, the results of the questionnaire which in fact were a social representational issue brought a societal dimension to the experimental work. And Americans, like Kelley, believed that it would be good that other Americans were made aware of this. So you see there was a difference between American social psychology and European. We had these differences, not conflicts etc.

The old generation of Americans spoke French, not necessarily to speak but at least to read technical documents, because before in order to have a PhD in the States one should spoke a foreign language and it was mainly French and sometimes German. So most of them spoke and read French. So, it happened that I asked why you do not read papers in French. People like Kelley and Thibault replied that they did not have the time. They had to read all American papers in psychology so when in the next APA conference they met a young colleague they could say that they had read this person's paper. As they were describing it, this was a social necessity more than a scientific one. And they did not read the British papers because they did not meet with the British. So it was not a question of language. It was a question of time. This is, at least, what they said and, if somebody like Kelley explained how it worked in the US one should trust that he knows what he was talking about.

As far as I am concerned the difference that I find with American social psychology... You know Moscovici and his work. He worked on social representations and also on minority influence. Minority influence is a social psychology that was likeable in the US and Moscovici was many times invited there. Social Representations had zero impact in the North American continent. Perhaps Moscovici could have made an effort to present things differently... The fact is that North American colleagues are formed in Personality and Social Psychology which is different with what was done in Europe. May be this has changed in the last 10-15 years that I had not the opportunity to go to the U, but I don't think so.

XC: Well there are some Americans now that are interested in Social Representations but of course this is not a...

CF: It is not mainstream anyway.

XC: You, however, you work on social representations but you have also worked on intergroup relations. You collaborated with Tajfel notably in the case of the famous matrices...

CF: Well, you see, I am a social psychologist, I am not personality and I also do mathematics. I am not only social psychologist. You know the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris, where Moscovici had his laboratory. I have been director of studies in EHESS and my field was "studies of social psychology and mathematics". Sometimes, in France, my old doctoral students when they were candidates for a job a colleague defending them mentioned that this person did his thesis with me; those who were against them would question whether I was really a psychologist... I do not have the reputation to be a "normal" psychologist, because I did a lot of mathematics.

For what concerns the matrices, in 1968 we discussed with Tajfel in the plane coming back from San Francisco. What I am saying now was published in the "*Cahiers Internationaux de Psychologie Sociale*". Sometime ago, Canadian colleagues called me to ask me details about that. I have found a letter of Tajfel in my papers and I had faxed it to them (no internet at the time). So they published the letter at the beginning of their paper on the use of Tajfel's matrices, in French. I am not at the origins of these matrices but I worked a lot on them. The idea is that each matrice tests two variables at the same time. How he tested each variable? It was by crossing the different results. For the point of view of logic it is a routine. Tajfel was perfectly able to do it himself but we have talked, he had asked me and I had told him what I thought. It is anecdotic. Indeed, these are things that interest me. But the fact that I am a co-author of the paper Tajfel, Bundy, Flament... is because Tajfel imposed it. I did not know. He did not ask me. So you see I was a little bit external to this path of research but I was interested. And of course I am quite proud to be associated, even without knowing, to this publication that is so important. But I do not have much merit.

As far as I am concerned, the last years I have been really specialized in the domain of social representations. I did this certainly because... this is personal; when I was a student psychology was part of philosophy... I think that what interested me, what I wanted to do was "Social Philosophy". Of course it does not mean much... It was the young student who was interested in this... What interested me was sociology, psychology... And if I became a psychologist and not a sociologist or a philosopher it was because the university system at the time, this idea comes back now, had a first general year, a preparatory year if you see what I mean. We were so bored, it was horrible and without any interest. And several of us where asking where I can study without this foundation year. And in Paris was this Institute of Psychology at rue Serpente, it is now at Boulogne-Billancourt...

XC: I know this place, I did my PhD there

CF: Well, I had an office there for 5-6 years. In this institute anyone could be enrolled without exams. It was this old idea of Pieron wanting to form professional psychologists to go on the ground. So I became a psychologist because I could enroll without exams. And I found in social psychology a place of interest for the social. If the structure of studies in France was different I could have been a sociologist. So I am interested in everything societal. And in my research for 30 years now social representations are the privileged domain. I don't think that this was by chance. I knew the work of Moscovici... But I found two young researchers in Aix that did their thesis on social representations, one is Abric who was an assistant in Aix and did his thesis with Moscovici and the other is Kaes, a clinician, psychoanalyst who did clinical social psychology but who was responsible for the Institute of Work in Strasbourg.

The institute of work was a university structure that existed in France we had one in Aix and there was another in Paris, I don't know whether it still exists, for the education of union leading cadres. We were some of us that intervene in these structures, we also distributed questionnaires etc. We respected the ideology of the unions, we did not mix the unions, the program was organized with the agreement of those responsible for the unions, but it was a university structure for the formation of workers that wanted to be union leaders. In this place the main word was "social". Continuously in the discussions or the questionnaires, these people were interested by the syndicalism. So there was this young colleague in Strasbourg who worked in these structures and had collected quite a lot of material on the representation of French workers about culture. He did his PhD thesis on that and then he came as an assistant here in my lab. I had two assistants that worked on social representations. Thus, this created a climate that had duration. So my involvement with social representations was a little bit by chance.

That's why intergroup relations, with the exception of this collaboration with Tajfel, were not in the centre of my interest; mainly because of these circumstances. On the contrary, Willem Doise did his thesis on that. I think it is a little bit the circumstances that lead us to follow one path of research or another. The position that Doise occupied in Geneva, Piaget had asked me to present myself as a candidate in 1970. I did not want to go in the North, it is cold, and there is fog, no sun... Doise in this job he did some work that he said he could not avoid doing. You know the work developed with Perret-Clermont; what happens when a child of a certain age passes Piaget's test to a younger child and he found "social" again. I knew very well Geneva. I have taught there for 6 months. Piaget was omnipresent and he was "heavy"... Doise had to work in this context. To be able to collaborate with others he developed a line of research that now is developed by Perret-Clermont. Each of us can have circumstances and when we specialize in one domain it is often by chance. So for me, my specialization is social representations without of course ignoring what happens outside my area.

The work done in parallel in Los Angeles, Aix and Belgium I talked about earlier, was a way to explain quite directly, not completely, but quite directly the behaviors of the subjects in the prisoners' dilemma from their representations of

the situation. If I had published it directly in English at the time it might have had a greater impact in the US. But it happened like that. They would have met something that resembles social representations and which interfered with the classic prisoners' dilemma which was extremely inter-individual and not at all societal. For me this is the visible part of the difference between North American and European or South American, for that matter, social psychology. The US was not open to that. This is why the question was asked whether the European Association had a reason, whether the European social psychology was different...

As I said, the European Association was founded with the money and the initiative of American colleagues; this was very clear at the beginning. I don't know whether European social psychology benefited but there is a clear difference between some of us, Europeans, and the Americans. Personally, I prefer social representations to personality and social psychology. I was only a student when the important journal was the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. From what I understood from Kelley it was compulsory to do personality if one wanted to do social psychology in the American system. It was evident that those things matched. This is marking them still. I can see this through social representations that I know better.

*XC: and in the book you recently wrote with Rouquette, *Anatomie des idées Ordinaires (Anatomy of Ordinary ideas)*, unfortunately I was not able to get it before coming, are you talking about all this?*

CF: In fact I am not so happy about this book. I have insisted that Rouquette was the first author because he is the one who did the most in this book. He asked me to do some chapters we discussed and in the introduction written by Rouquette I think that either of us is in total contradiction with what the other says. I suppose we are only a little bit in contradiction! The part about the hierarchy of ideological structures is Michel-Louis that wrote it. It is a way to look at the issue. I don't disagree totally. Serge Moscovici is trying for many years now to convince me to write a book. It is a lot of work... I might do it one day. Anyway, I am not sure I would have presented things like that. By doing a hierarchy of ideology etc Social representations become quite individualistic in its functioning and I think that he did not integrate completely the social aspect of social representations.

There are several directions one could possibly take. There is Saadi Lalhoul who came to visit us last year with a perspective of social constructionism; but this way of treating the problem was also disappointing for me, it was too individualistic in my point of view. When I talk about social representations I have the tendency to forget the individual. It is not what exists in common. Of course there are common things. It is a little bit what it was attempted to address with cognitive polyphasia. What I am trying at the moment to work at is the internal structure of representations with facets that are eventually contradictory. It is a way to come back to Herbert Mead and the Me as the intersection of the different groups one belongs to. It is not the intersection that interests me. It is the functioning, the

process. So in a certain way, the outcome of these processes, the individual aspect does not interest me really.

Since we are always sectarian, for me social representations are the “normal” domain of social psychology. In abstract, the experiments that we are doing are indeed cultural with also contradictory aspects. For example, if we ask now in France people what they think of Muslims there are discourses in favor and discourses against. Both aspects are present but people will not say both at the same time. So I believe that most of the studies on social representations are missing something. Why there is a negative prejudice against North Africans, one can give a multitude of reasons. Why we forbid ourselves from expressing it at least completely? It is around problems like this that we see, to embrace Rouquette’s terminology, the play of ideologies. This is what I am trying to develop at the moment and we will see if something comes out. But I think that studying this will enable us to see how social representations are structured within society.

XC: Are you studying this contradiction, the fact that we refrain from saying these things together with the technique of substitution?

CF: Among other things. We have several techniques. And when we do fine-grained studies with different techniques, we have quite a few results now, we can see in the natural responses of the subjects some traces of their ideological position. It is very delicate. We need to know what we are looking for. It doesn’t come like that. We are covering individual differences within a social framework.

XC: A general criticism of social representations is expressed through the question “how many people I need to interrogate to know that I am in front of a social representation?” However there is variation in social representations.

CF: Of course; if I take three people, if there are in discordance I cannot say much but if they are in agreement, I am in presence of something. Of course for the studies it depends. If you are doing an experiment, so you compare conditions, 20 people may be enough for each condition. If you are doing one study this is not enough because of this multiplicity of orientations, of different components. It is a legitimate question that students have because it makes the job much heavier!

XC: to come back to this idea of method that often divides social psychologists. You have done experiments. Have you worked with Correspondence Analysis that some people say that is quite descriptive?

CF: I did not work personally with Correspondence Analysis because simply did not happen but I did a lot of factor analysis. Let’s say that I have a way of thinking, of course it depends of the problem... my education was fundamentally experimental. I also did a thesis on the mathematical study of questionnaires so I know surveys as well. Sometimes the problem imposes the method and for example it could be meaningless to do an experiment. But I find myself most of the

times with situations that can be treated experimentally. For example I can pass the same questionnaire to a population of North Africans and one researcher is visibly North African whereas the other is not. These are invoked and non provoked variables. For me this is also an experimental study. We do a lot of experiments by questionnaire and make subjects think. It is a long time that I haven't work in a laboratory. It is not a problem for me. The research I was telling you I did with Thibault and Kelley on the prisoners' dilemma where we introduced social representations is for me an experimental approach.

XC: Well, these are the sort of things I wanted to discuss with you. We talked a lot about social psychology, what it was, what you think of it. A last thing I wanted to ask. How you feel about the discipline today? What is its future? What you see the future of the Association?

CF: For the Association I cannot say much because I have not been to the meetings the last 15 years. I can see that there are quite a few affiliate members and it is possible that some Americans are in the meetings. I don't know whether this changes the atmosphere... I don't know where the association stands now. The fact that "experimental" was taken out is not an issue for me. My impression is that European social psychology on the whole is differentiated from American social psychology. We do not need to try to be different in a general sense. What our American colleagues do is often very interesting. However, these societal aspects are neglected and they are not sufficiently developed. Maybe we are too much Americanized.

XC: Do you mean that these aspects are not developed in Europe as well?

CF: Not as much as I would like.

XC: Is it a problem of people, or of theory or even of methods?

CF: It is perhaps an issue related to our education. I don't know what happens in Europe in general or even in France but one thing is true: social psychology is taught by psychologists whose sociological education is very thin. So it is quite normal that they do a psychology at an individual level. If you take a few people you believe it is social...

XC: As a discipline can you see a theoretical future, an applied future or it would reproduce itself?

CF: Applied I don't know. There is certainly research that could have applied outcomes. There was a time that social psychology was associated with Occupational psychology. It is a different approach than personality. I don't know the future perspective perhaps because the last years I am not going to meetings etc. I miss information to express an informed opinion about the future.

XC: Well, I have asked all the questions I had in mind and I would like to thank you very much for spending this time with me and for all the things I learned about the association and social psychology and I am sure that others will find this conversation interesting.

Aix en Provence, November 2009

New Publications by Members

Discriminations Sociales et Droits Universels

Willem Doise (2009)

Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble

ISBN 978-2-7061-1494-6, 14 €, pp. 165

Revised version of: DOISE, W. (2008). Van discriminatie naar mensenrechten.

Sociaalpsychologische studies. Brugge, Die Keure

IDENTITY AND PARTICIPATION IN CULTURALLY DIVERSE SOCIETIES

EDITED VOLUME BY ASSAD AZZI, XENIA CHRYSOCHOOU, BERT
KLANDERMANS AND BERND SIMON

ISBN: 978-1-4051-9947-6

Hardcover

400 pages

October 2010, Wiley-Blackwell

Price 90 Euros

Identity and Participation in Culturally Diverse Societies presents an original discussion in an edited volume of how the links between identity, political participation, radicalization, and integration can provide a scientific understanding of the complex issue of coexistence between groups in culturally diverse societies.

Offers a scientific understanding of the complex issue of coexistence between groups in culturally diverse societies

Utilizes original theory which combines social psychology, sociology, and political science

Includes an original and extensive discussion of combining the concepts of identity and diversity

Innovatively and engagingly employs the latest research and state-of-the-art theory

Editor's reviews

This is a timely, incisive, and groundbreaking book on participation amidst societal change. Its fascinating chapters discuss a set of related topics – identity, intergroup relations, inequality, and migration – providing rich insight into dynamics of inclusion and exclusion. It is a great read that capably charts the course for future research on complex and global social issues.'

— **Professor Susan Opatow**, City University of New York, US

‘This is really a remarkable book on an important, complicated and challenging topic. It is a brilliant example of the fruitfulness of true interdisciplinarity, which is not interested in just being right, but in solving a problem with the serious and open use of contributions from different sources. And it shows that a strictly analytic perspective is not only possible in these soft fields of identity and political engagement, but also the only chance to find a way out of the various traps of more or less open discourses or casual descriptions that we are mostly used to seeing in these fields.’

— **Professor Hartmut Esser**, University of Mannheim, Germany

‘Multi-disciplinarity is extolled by many, but practiced by very few. This international team of contributors moves across levels of analysis, disciplines, and contexts with real intellectual verve. The volume impresses with its genuine and serious attempt to examine identity as a rich latticework of society and subjectivity. The esteemed team of editors – learned scholars all – provide what may prove to be the new social science of identity in society. I am excited by the possibilities.’

— **Professor Colin Wayne Leach**, Department of Psychology, University of Connecticut, US

‘Bridging psychology and sociology, this book demonstrates the importance of self and identity for analyzing and understanding social movements in diverse societies. With essays by some of the most eminent scholars, this volume is a must-read for scholars interested in how identity influences social movement recruitment, activism, and maintenance.’

— **Professor Verta Taylor**, University of California Santa Barbara, US

‘This volume represents a turning point in the study of cultural diversity. Migrations in a globalised world have rendered the question of identity within diversity such a complex matter that it requires the coordinated effort of several disciplines in the social and human sciences. *Identity and Participation in Culturally Diverse Societies* achieves this coordination through the scientific rigour of an outstanding group of international scholars with the insight derived from the added value of genuine interdisciplinarity.’

— **Professor Fabrizio Butera**, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Future EASP Meetings - Calendar

July 6-8, 2011, Lisbon, Portugal

Medium Size Meeting on challenging Stereotypes: When and how targets of negative stereotypes resist

Organizers: Beate Seibt, Soledad de Lemus, David Marx, Russell Spears, Clara Kulich, Natasza Kosakowska

July 11-12, 2011, Stockholm, Sweden

Small Group Meeting on the application of self-regulation approaches to social psychological phenomena

Organizers: Kai J. Jonas, Daan Scheepers & Kai Sassenberg

July 12-16, 2011, Stockholm, Sweden

16th EASP General Meeting

Organizer: Torun Lindholm

November 2011, Tilburg, The Netherlands

Small Group Meeting on Meaning and Existential Psychology

Organizers: Travis Proulx and Diederik Stapel

Future EASP Meetings

Medium Size Meeting

On challenging stereotypes: When and how targets of negative stereotypes resist

July 6-8, 2011, Lisbon, Portugal

Organizers: Beate Seibt, Soledad de Lemus, David Marx, Russell Spears, Clara Kulich, Natasza Kosakowska

Contact: challengingstereotypes@gmail.com

The effects of activated stereotypes on the targets of these stereotypes themselves have been examined extensively in recent years. Some approaches have proposed that subordinate groups might actually accept or contribute to their plight (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), whereas research also suggests that disadvantaged groups can challenge and resist their situation (Mullen, Brown, & Smith 1992; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Some research has been concerned with when and how the activation of negative stereotypes undermines performance (e.g., Steele & Aronson, 1995; Steele, Spencer, & Aronson, 2002). In a different line, it has been proposed that subtle forms of prejudice and discrimination, such as patronizing and paternalistic behaviour, make them more difficult to recognize and resist (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Ellemers, 2001; Glick & Fiske, 1996; 2001; Jackman, 1994; Kilianski & Rudman, 1998).

Interestingly, some of this research has shown circumstances under which the targets of negative stereotypes manage to avoid, transcend, and even challenge the burden of stigma and stereotypes. Various cognitive and motivational processes have been identified as responsible for such stereotype resistance or contrast such as self-affirmation (Martens, Johns, Greenberg, and Schimel, 2006), regulatory focus (Seibt & Forster, 2004), presentation of counter-stereotypic exemplars (Marx, Stapel, & Muller, 2005), or perceived illegitimacy (Spears, Greenwood, de Lemus, & Sweetman, 2010). In this small group meeting we aim to evaluate and discuss the resources, strategies, and (even unconscious) processes, that help targets of negative stereotypes to resist the negative emotional and behavioural effects of negative self-stereotypes, as individuals and also as groups.

The meeting will take place from July 6 to 8, 2011 near Lisbon in Pousada D.Maria I.

<http://www.pousadas.pt/historicalhotels/EN/pousadas/Portugal/LisboaValedoTejo/DMariaI/home/>

Deadline for submissions is February 1, 2011

Small Group Meeting

On the application of self-regulation approaches to social psychological phenomena (preconference to the General Meeting of the EASP 2011)

July 11-12, 2011, Stockholm, Sweden

Organizers: Kai J. Jonas, Daan Scheepers & Kai Sassenberg

The integration of self-regulation theories has undertaken tremendous speed during the last years and many areas of social psychology have been benefitting from this new approach, e.g. (inter)group processes interpersonal processes, health research, media effects, as well as self-regulation theorizing has improved, vice versa. It is the aim with this Preconference to document the state of the research and to further its impact. In doing so we seek to establish a more “social” view on self-regulation by focussing on the intersection of basic (intra-personal) cognitive and motivational principles and inter-personal, intra-group, and inter-group phenomena like negotiation, leadership, decision-making, health processes, stereotyping, discrimination, and media effects. Therefore, the current meeting aims to bring together research on individual and social processes and self-regulation, recurring to a similar set of theories and foster the exchange among them.

The format of the meeting is single session, with a strong focus on discussion to be reflected in the schedule. We believe that this meeting should provide a fruitful means to bring existing research accounts together. As one of the keynote speakers, we are happy to welcome E. Tory Higgins.

We are asking submissions from both junior and senior researchers. There are a limited number of presentation and poster slots available. Please indicate in your submission which format you would prefer. We are planning to host the meeting from Monday, 11th of July (arrival in the evening) to Tuesday, 12st of July at one of conference hotel locations in Stockholm, Sweden. A nominal fee will be asked from the participants.

If you are interested in participating actively, please send an email including an abstract (max. 250 words), the format of presentation (talk or poster), and your contact details to Kai J. Jonas (k.j.jonas@uva.nl) before 01. December 2010.

Sign-up for general participation will be asked for as soon as the program has been finalized.

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

In the following you can check the „frame“ program of the General Meeting. It can be found on the General Meeting website, programme at a glance:

<http://www.easp2011.com/PAG.asp>

12th July, Tuesday:

Registration opens in the afternoon at Stockholm International Fairs. Pre-conference activities, including

- A small group meeting on "The application of self-regulation approaches to social psychological phenomena"
- and a keynote symposium (co-sponsored by EASP and APS): "Social Psychology and the Neurosciences: Perspectives and Pitfalls"

13th July, Wednesday:

8.45 to 18.00: Scientific program.

Registration open with welcome coffee and tea until 10.00

19.00: Welcome reception in the Stockholm City Hall.

14th July, Thursday:

8.45 to 19.00: Scientific program.

15th July, Friday:

8.45: Award session

10.00: Tajfel lecture

11.00-13.00: Business meeting

14.30-19.00: Scientific program

16th July: Saturday:

8.45 to 19.00: Scientific program.

Farewell dinner

Departure on 17th July

More information about highlights and social events (as the Town Hall reception and the farewell dinner) can be found on the General Meeting website, social programme: <http://www.easp2011.com/social.asp>

16th General Meeting of the EASP
Keynote Symposium: Social Psychology and the Neuroscience:
Perspectives and Pitfalls
(cosponsored by APS and EASP)
Stockholm, July 12, 2011

Symposium Chair

Gün Semin, Utrecht University, The Netherlands

Introduction 13:00

Walter Mischel, Columbia University, USA

Keynote Addresses

Susan Fiske, *Princeton University*

Neuroimaging and the study of intergroup bias

Naomi Ellemers, *Leiden University*

Psychophysiology in intergroup relations

Christian Keysers, *Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences, Neuroscience Institute*

Neuroimaging, mirror neurons, and social coordination

Carsten De Dreu, *University of Amsterdam*

The neuro-endocrinology of human conflict and cooperation

Tania Singer, *Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Leipzig*

Social Emotions from the Lens of Social Neuroscience: From Empathy to Egocentricity

Roundtable Discussion 16:00

Neuroscience and Social Psychology: Challenges and Opportunities

Moderator: **Susan Fiske**

Symposium speakers will be joined by **Walter Mischel**, *Klaus Fiedler*, *Universität Heidelberg, Germany*, and **Ed Vul**, *University of California, San Diego, USA*

Closing Reception 17:00

Further Information and Registration:

Early 2011 an updated announcement will provide information on the specific location of the meeting, and registration procedures.

EASP-SPSSI Joint Meeting**On Meaning and Existential Psychology****November 2011, Tilburg University, The Netherlands**

Organizers: Travis Proulx (Simon Fraser University) and Diederik Stapel (Tilburg University)

The psychology of meaning has never been more relevant than in the current age of societal uncertainty. We find ourselves in an endless crossfire of information, where every angle on every issue is accessible at a keystroke and worldviews can shift in a 24-hour news cycle. To address the psychological implications of this unique era, a small group conference on Meaning and Existential Psychology is being held at Tilburg University in Tilburg, Holland, November 2011. This is a joint Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI)-European Association of Social Psychology (EASP) conference, and will focus on the ways that people find meaning in their experiences, along with the ways that these meaning frameworks allow us to make sense of ourselves, our world and our relation to it. We aim to present a comprehensive summary of the meaning literature as it addresses essential existential concerns, including free will, mortality, uncertainty, and the desire for happiness and well-being.

Potential attendees must be a member of SPSSI or EASP or both. Abstracts (300 words) should be submitted by email to Travis Proulx (travis_proulx@sfu.ca), by the deadline of May 31, 2011. The cost of registration and attendance will be offset by funding support provided by SPSSI, EASP and Tilburg University.

Reports of Previous Meetings

SPPSI-EASP Joint Meeting

Forgotten Alternatives: Denaturalizing Conditions of Injustice and Exclusion

March 17-19, 2010, Graduate Center, City
University of New York, USA

Organizers: Michelle Fine, Susan Opatow, Xenia Chrysochoou & Dario Spini

Theoretical, Methodological and Contextual Diversity

With a remarkable and international group of scholars (see Table 1 below), the conference was organized around theoretical panels, provocative keynotes, and cultural events. The panels were designed to incite conversation around key notes of justice work. Each panel integrated scholars by expertise and geography. Unified by the question, "*Where is injustice and exclusion?*" each panel offered answers to this question in history, ideology, science, bodies, and intergroup relations.

The papers relied upon a variety of methodological approaches to the study of justice and exclusion, from archival work to participatory designs, participant observation and laboratory experiments. While there were papers on social representations in history texts, museums, magazines, science and the law, there were also experimental and ethnographic analyses of intergroup dynamics, stereotype threat, and moral exclusion. Using historical data on 19th and 20th century racism in America, Susan Opatow described 'forgotten alternatives' as an analytic tool that can provoke rethinking a *status quo* that normalizes injustice. Chiara Volpato presented images of Jews and Blacks from the Nazi era in Italy. Aida Hurtado examined how bodies of women of color are represented in US and international magazines and Sara McClelland examined representations of young sexuality and desire embedded in scientific measures. Broadening our understandings of selves in social and political contexts, Glen Adams presented on his research on intentional social worlds, while Kevin Durrheim presented interview and participant observation material to challenge traditional notions of how racism circulates in social interactions. Liz Cole is working with legal documents to track the parallel arguments against racial miscegenation and same sex marriage as forms of scientized essentialism. Peter Hegarty provided a critical historical analysis of scientific representations of intelligence during the 20th century.

Theoretically we engaged, challenged, and extended a variety of theoretical traditions. There were papers that extended Moscovici's work on social representations, including Xenia Chrysochoou who took up the question of immigration in Greece with a blend of social representation and intergroup theory. Tajfel's work on social identity was pushed forward when Dario Spini offered a theoretically provocative reversal of the traditional argument that ethnic identities produce conflict and war by arguing that conflict and war provoke polarized ethnic identities. Goffman's theory of stigma was challenged by Akemi Nishida's exploration of disabled disability rights activists who reject the stigma that infects ableism.

A set of papers took on dominant social institutions as reproductive sites for injustice, including Amy Smith's work on the courts and the death penalty; Michelle Fine on public schools and prisons; Jean Claude Croizet's investigation of IQ testing.

Another set of papers expanded our imaginations for activism. Again relying upon diverse methods, Davide Morselli offered up experiments to study obedience and disobedience as social change strategies; Maddy Fox explored participatory action research and performance as a way to study how bystanders can become allies in social movements; Bernd Simon presented evidence on how people develop politicized collective identities, and Ronni Greenwood presented interviews with White allies in a racial conflict buried in USA history.

A number of participants introduced sets of ideas that have remained outside the canon of psychology, arguing for their significance to the field. Colin Leach spoke on questions of morality, suggesting the need for a social psychology of context and semiotics. Sunil Bhatia proposed post-colonial theory to achieve a critical analysis of nation, belonging, and diaspora, stretching and revising our notions of self, culture, and nature.

Of particular interest to many of the participants were questions of identity and intergroup relations as manifest in attitudes toward, exclusion of, and integration of immigrants and other "out groups" in societies accustomed to homogeneity. Tilemachos Iatridis addressed the paradoxical effect of making minority status salient while Thierry Devos, relying on a set of IAT studies, spoke on the systematic exclusion of ethnic minority from the national identity in the U.S. The same afternoon Julia Chaitin tracked this question in Israel, offering powerful reflections on her work with Israeli and Palestinian women, working collaboratively toward peace, elaborating the elements of contact that enable justice among differences. And Phil Hammack challenged traditional conceptions of contact, drawing on his ethnographic work with Palestinian and Jewish Israeli youth at a summer camp in the US.

Seasoning Psychology: Interdisciplinary Perspectives that Provoke a Sense of Injustice

While our conversations within psychology were rich and varied, we punctuated our meeting with four speakers from outside the field, asking each to discuss how their work takes up questions of method, provocation, and injustice. These experts in law, media studies, and higher education administration allowed us to consider the praxis of moral exclusion and (in)justice in the enactment of victims' and prisoners' rights, in archival film on prison and prison resistance movements in the USA, and in the joys and challenges of being a public university president in times of crisis, an economic downturn, and assaults on freedom of speech.

Susan Herman, Professor of Criminal Justice and Human Services at Pace University and author of *Parallel Justice for Victims of Crime* (2010), spoke as a lawyer and as a scholar of victims' rights. She described justice for victims as intimately interwoven with justice for prisoners. One of the few intellectuals and advocates who works across systems, with an interest in what she calls *parallel justice*, Herman encouraged us to think about justice across silos and systems, rather than within the categories of victims and perpetrators.

Chris Hill, media curator and author of *Surveying the First Decade: Video Art and Alternative Media in the U.S., 1968-1980* (2008), helped us imagine how film and historic media can be used to invite audiences into forgotten alternatives, recall buried voices, and incite new understandings of the cumulative impact of social injustice, in this case mass incarceration in the United States of America.

Two prominent public university presidents, Jeremy Travis of John Jay College of Criminal Justice and Bill Kelly of the Graduate Center, joined us to discuss the role of public intellectuals and public institutions in times of crisis. Both spoke eloquently and passionately about the joys and struggles of being president of leading public institutions in times of social crisis, when the voices of intellectuals, of dissent, and of possibility need to be circulating within the university and in the public sphere.

To change pace and to infuse art and culture into our thinking, we attended a performance of *Fela!*, a Broadway play that integrates history, dance, performance, and social movements, as we learned the braided political history of Nigeria, civil rights, and music through the Afrobeat rhythms, perspective, and life of Fela Anikulapo Kuti.

Our meeting ended with a glorious bike ride for the international troupe of brave souls willing to don helmets and pedal through the New York City's boroughs with Michelle Fine's brother, Richard Fine – another way to re-view the forgotten alternatives of NY – beyond the narrow gaze of midtown Manhattan.

Next Steps

We have begun follow up with plans for panels at upcoming SPSSI and EASP conferences, and have started discussing the publication of conference proceedings in an edited volume or in *Journal of Social Issues*. Some participants hope to develop exchange programs at their universities so that doctoral students and post-docs can continue discussing and researching topics connected with forgotten alternatives.

Panel 1: Where are injustice and exclusion? In history

Susan Opotow: Forgotten alternatives and the inclusionary trajectory

Dario Spini: Ethnicity: A cause or a tool for political violence and opposition to change?

Chiara Volpato, Federica Durante, & Alessandro Gabbiadini: The naturalization of groups' inferiority in an historical context: the role of pictures

Ronni Michelle Greenwood: 'Yesterday redeemed and tomorrow made more beautiful': Pursuing future collective selves through reckoning with past Injustice

Sunil Bhatia: When the subaltern resides 'here' and 'there': A transnational approach to psychology of injustice and exclusion

Panel 2: Where are injustice and exclusion? In ideology

Colin Wayne Leach: Moral mis-engagement: How moral self-evaluation leads to injustice

Elizabeth Cole: Against nature: How essentialist discourses in debates on marriage policy privilege heterosexuality and Whiteness

Glenn Adams: Intentional worlds of injustice: A cultural-psychological analysis of racist oppression

Peter Hegarty: Forgetting the social constructionist alternative: Sexual prejudice and essentialist thinking about sexual identity

Tilemachos Iatridis: Liberal anti-discriminatory assumptions and the rationalization of discrimination: The paradoxical effect of making minority status salient

Guest speaker: Susan Herman, Parallel justice for victims of crime

Panel 3: Where are injustice and exclusion? In science

Xenia Chrysochoou: The representation of the Social and the representation of the Cultural fight each other for defining Status' criteria: The new conflict in plural societies

Jean-Claude Croizet: The racism of intelligence: From stereotype threat to symbolic violence and oppression

Amy Smith: Which way justice? Exclusion by, exclusion from science

Michelle Fine: Theorizing circuits of dispossession, privilege and resistance:
Reclaiming the language of critical validity through participatory methods

Presidents' panel: The role of public institutions in times of crisis

Jeremy Travis, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, City University of New York
William Kelly, The Graduate Center, City University of New York

Panel 4: Where are injustice and exclusion? In bodies

Aida Hurtado: Visuality, corporality, and power: Transnational images in the
creation of relational white/of color sexualities

Akemi Nishida: Where is justice and exclusion: In bodies: Ableism and resistance
from disability community

Sara McClelland: Intimate injustice: Development of a theoretical framework for
sexuality & relational research

Guest speaker: Chris Hill: Witnessing incarceration: Negotiated documents

Panel 5, Part 1: Where are injustice and exclusion? In intergroup relations

Julia Chaitin: Co-creating peace: Confronting obstacles to psycho-social-economic
injustice in the Israeli-Palestinian context

Thierry Devos: Who is American? Implicitly excluding ethnic minorities from the
national identity

Kevin Durrheim: Accounting for injustice and exclusion: Stereotyping-in-
interaction

Panel 5, Part 2: Where are injustice and exclusion? In intergroup relations

Bernd Simon: Politicized collective identity

Maddy Fox: Engaging bystanders: A methodological dilemma

Davide Morselli: Obedience/disobedience dynamics for social change: Introducing
and testing prosocial disobedience

Phillip Hammack: Peace, (in)justice, and intergroup contact: Reconfiguring social
psychological contributions to social and political change

EASFP Small Group Meeting**Developmental Perspectives on Intergroup Prejudice: Advances in Theory, Measurement, and Intervention****July 5-8, 2010, ISCTE, Lisbon, Portugal**

Organizers: Maria Benedicta Monteiro, Allard Feddes, Juliane Degner, and Yarrow Dunham

Over the last decade, research on the development of prejudice in childhood has combined research from both the fields of social and developmental psychology. This work has proven to be important for understanding how the development of prejudice in childhood and adolescence is related to prejudice in adulthood, as well as for informed intervention research.

The development of explicit prejudice has a long history in social psychology. In addition, social psychological research in the 80s and 90s focused on "subtle" prejudice due to antiracist norms in western societies (i.e., Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). And more recently new work on subtle 'implicit' prejudice in childhood has emerged (e.g. EASFP special issue on "Origins of Intergroup Bias: Developmental and Social Cognitive Research on Intergroup Attitudes", 2010).

This meeting served as a significant opportunity for experts and junior researchers to share their knowledge and research experience regarding these issues. Specifically, the conference has been a live forum for discussing to what extent existing measures addressing indirect and implicit prejudice in children are capable of capturing developmental cognitive, emotional and behavioural dimensions.

The meeting has brought together 33 junior and senior researchers from 12 different countries and backgrounds (particularly from developmental psychology and social psychology) both within and outside Europe (EU – 21; USA, Canada and Australia -12).

Three keynotes respectively from Melanie Killen, Karen Wynn, and Dominic Abrams reflected the three areas of research and provided an outline of the current state-of-the art.

Melanie Killen approached the emergence of prejudice from a Social-Developmental perspective, outlining theoretical and empirical examination of the constructs of fairness and expressions of intergroup bias. A developmental view on prejudice issues in childhood was provided by Karen Wynn who gave a talk about the developmental origins of social judgements and implications for intergroup cognition more generally. Finally, Dominic Abrams presented his work on

development and measurement of prejudice in childhood from a social psychological perspective. His talk explored the question of how children establish a working understanding of group processes in terms of articulation of intergroup attitudes in inter- and intragroup relationships.

The format of the Meeting included three keynote talks designed to set the stage for extended reflexion on social and developmental issues regarding prejudice (Melanie Killen, U. Maryland, USA; Karen Wynn, U. Yale, USA; Dominic Abrams, U. Kent, UK) and 18 oral presentations. PhD students also presented and discussed 6 posters (including a five minute oral presentation for each poster). The main focus was on measurement of explicit and implicit attitudes (i.e., do they match?), and development of new assessment techniques and meta-theoretical frameworks to guide the research questions (i.e., social identity developmental theory, socio-normative theory, theory on moral reasoning, biological and cognitive foundations of human intergroup behaviour, etc.).

Authors of the papers that were presented included Nicola Abbott, Sara Alfieri, João António, Rebecca Bigler, Rita Correia, Juliane Degner, Yarrow Dunham, Allard Feddes, Diana Grace, Mariline Justo, Philipp Jugert, Katherine Kinzler, Lynn Liben, Lynn McKeague, Maria Benedicta Monteiro, Rita Morais, Cristina Mosso, Drew Nesdale, Claire O´Driscoll, Kristina Olson, Sally Palmer, Adam Rutland, Ricardo Rodrigues, Irene Solbes, Kristin Shutts, Lotte Thomson, Luca Váradi, and Amanda Williams.

The conference was sponsored and hosted by ISCTE – Lisbon University Institute and funded by the *European Association of Social Psychology* and the *Centre for Psychological Research and Social Intervention/ School of Social Sciences/ISCTE*. The team of conference organizers included Allard Feddes (ISCTE-Lisbon University Institute), Maria Benedicta Monteiro (ISCTE- Lisbon University Institute), Juliane Degner (University of Amsterdam) and Yarrow Dunham (University of California), ably assisted by Mariline Justo (Master student) and Rita Morais, João António and Rita Correia (PhD students at ISCTE).

Most Delegates arrived on Monday July 5, so we moved to Lisbon downtown together and had a tasteful and relaxed dinner at an open air restaurant. On Wednesday July 7, a social evening included crossing the Tejo River on a ferryboat and having dinner by the moonlight, while some colleagues anxiously stopped at a brewery to look at the semi-final match of the Football World Cup between Germany and Spain.

The conference provided time for advanced scientific questioning and for merry intercultural gathering, which turned it into a great success.

*Maria Benedicta Monteiro
and Allard Feddes (ISCTE, Lisbon University Institute)
Juliane Degner (University of Amsterdam)
Yarrow Dunham (University of California)*

EASFP Small Group Meeting¹

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

August 20-23, 2010, Barcelona, Spain

Organizers: Hans IJzerman, Ayse K. Uskul, and Patricia M. Rodriguez Mosquera

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

The meeting was funded by the European Association of Social Psychology under its Small Group Meeting Fund and the British Academy under its Conference Support Scheme. Thanks to these funding sources all speakers' accommodation costs, lunches, and partial travel costs were funded. A conference dinner on the second evening of the meeting was also funded which included a gourmet selection of Catalan dishes. The organizers were Hans IJzerman (VU University, Amsterdam), Ayse K. Uskul (University of Essex) and Patricia M. Rodriguez

¹ This meeting was co-funded by the British Academy within their Conference Support Scheme

Mosquera (Wesleyan University); skilfully assisted by Hans' master student Romee Houben.

We scheduled 21 talks across three full days. One person had to withdraw at the last moment due to an accident on the day of the flight, leaving us with 20 talks. Our 20 presentations came from a diverse crowd – six from the United States, six from the Netherlands, two from United Kingdom, one from Singapore, one from Canada, two from Portugal, one from United Arab Emirates, and one from Spain. The diversity was not only due to origin, but also to content: Presentations covered diverse disciplinary approaches including sociological, anthropological, historical, and psychological approaches, as well as diverse and creative methodological perspectives such as simulations, experimental and survey methods, interviews, and analysis of space. Furthermore, the presentations consisted of materials that originated from geographic regions and cultural backgrounds that went beyond what has typically been covered in social psychological work on honor. Specifically, research from Pakistan, Turkey, diasporic Muslim communities in Europe (e.g., immigrants from Turkey, in the Netherlands, and Germany), Albania, 18th century Mexico, Latinos in the US, and Italy was presented. Each speaker had 50 minutes in total, with a minimum of 10 minutes for discussion.

Beate Seibt, Bertjan Doosje, and Esther López-Zafra co-presented with their graduate students (Cláudia Simão, Alba Jasini, and Noelia Rodriguez-Espartal, respectively). Veronica Benet-Martínez from the Pompeu Fabra University (Barcelona, Spain) and Fieke Harinck from Leiden University (the Netherlands) also joined in the sessions.

The original program consisted of the following talks:

Patricia Rodriguez Mosquera (Wesleyan University, USA). *Family dishonor: Emotional vulnerability and the negotiation of social image*

Martijn van Zomeren (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, The Netherlands). *Collective morality: Elusive, but influential*

Colin Leach (University of Connecticut, USA). *The importance of moral virtue in honor*

Roger Giner-Sorolla (University of Kent, Canterbury, UK). *Moral codes as predictors for honor concerns*

Angela Leung (Singapore Management University, Singapore). *Within- and between-cultural variations: The cultural logics of honor, face, and dignity*

Susan Cross (Iowa State University, USA). *Conceptions of honor in Turkey and the United States: What do situations reveal?*

Dov Cohen (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA). *Culture as a symphony, not a solo: Using agent-based modelling to understand the mix of personalities in a culture*

Sonya Lipsett-Rivera (Carleton University, Canada). *Space and morality in Mexican honor systems*

Beate Seibt & Cláudia Simão (CIS/ISCTE, Portugal). *Disgust heightens sensitivity with honor-concerns*

Hans IJzerman (VU University, Amsterdam, the Netherlands). *Grounding cultural syndromes: Body comportment and values in honor and dignity cultures*

Thomas Schubert (CIS/ISCTE, Portugal). *Power, honor, and height: A review of findings and explanations for embodiment*

Bertjan Doosje & Alba Jasini (University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands). *When your group has been dishonored: Group-based humiliation in different cultures.*

Sharon Coen (Canterbury Christ Church University, UK). *Cross-cultural differences in group-based guilt and shame experiences*

Katherine Pratt-Ewing (University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA). *New 'honor crimes': Gay rights, authenticity, and the secret in Muslim communities.*

Unni Wikan (University of Oslo, Norway). *Honor killings and the problem of empathy: Can they be understood?*

Said Shafa (Leiden University, the Netherlands). *Insults: What people find insulting and why*

Yvette van Osch (Tilburg University, the Netherlands). *Turkish-Dutch aggression after insults is not due to plurastic ignorance*

Sezgin Cihangir (Kiwa Prismant & Lost Faces Foundation [Stichting Verdwaalde Gezichten], the Netherlands). *Perceptions of honor among Dutch youth with different ethnic backgrounds. How robust is the honor concept?*

PJ Henry (New York University, Abu Dhabi Branch). *Intergroup differences in the importance and value of honor. Perspectives from low-status compensation theory.*

Esther López-Zafra & Noelia Rodríguez-Espartal (University of Jaén, Spain). *Culture of honor and couple relations: Effects of (in)congruence and emotional variables in normal couples and gender violence prisoners*

Alan Fiske (University of California, Los Angeles, USA). *Honor-shame is a moral model for combining social relationships*

A full program with abstracts can be downloaded from <http://tiny.cc/c0ktn>

The conference was held at Hotel Salles Pere IV, in the neighborhood called Poble Nou in Barcelona. The hotel was located within approximately 15 minutes walking distance from the Barri Gotic, 10 minutes from the beach, and nestled 25 minutes below La Sagrada Família. Most guests arrived on August 20 throughout the day. Some arrived earlier to explore the amazing sights of Barcelona; others arrived earlier mostly to enjoy the weather, the beach, and the enchanting cuisine. The hard but inspiring labor consisted of papers that were presented all day on Saturday, Sunday, and Monday. Guests of the conference (along with Roger's wife Rea, Katherine's daughter, Ayse's husband Neophytos, and their soon-to-be-born daughter Mira) tasted the delights of the Catalan food during the conference dinner, which was held on Sunday night at Bar-Restaurant Pla in the Barri Gotic.

Throughout the meeting, we discussed the concept of honor from a multitude of perspectives. Facets of honor that were covered at the meeting included honor and morality; differences between cultural syndromes like face, honor, and dignity; the

social consequences of group-based honor; emotions central to honor systems; the meta-relational content of honor; the embodiment of honor; and positive (e.g., respect and status) and negative (e.g., honor-based crimes) aspects of honor.

The meeting was concluded by fruitful discussions of the steps to be taken next including the possibility of applying to interdisciplinary funding opportunities available in Europe and North America, bringing together different disciplinary approaches to the study of honor under an edited book, and exploring opportunities for special issues in psychology journals that are open to an interdisciplinary discussion on the topic. While the discussions and presentations inspired and advanced our discussion on the study of honor to a great degree, at least one of the co-organizers will claim that the greatest inspiration was the magnificent Catalan food.

Hans IJzerman (VU University, Amsterdam)

Ayse K. Uskul (University of Essex)

Patricia M. Rodriguez Mosquera (Wesleyan University)

**Reports from the EASP summer school¹
August 23 – September 6, 2010
Aegina, Greece**

“Social Psychology across Borders” - Report of the organizer

“...Just take your drink down to the pool-This is the Aegina Summer School!” (lyrics by Fasoli, Shapira and Baram 2010)

It is with great pleasure and somehow nostalgic that I am writing these few words about the 15th EASP summer school. Organizing a summer school is a great adventure. Having had the chance to participate in 1991 at the San Sebastian summer school I felt anxious to create a summer school environment that would give to the participants the wonderful experience I had. This is a huge responsibility! I was fortunate enough to be supported by Prof. Papastamou, head of Department, and my colleagues of the social psychology group at the department of Psychology and more generally by Panteion University who generously financed this endeavor. More importantly I was blessed with the assistance of our departmental secretary Mrs Iro Karsaliakou who generously gave time and who spared no effort to make the summer school happen and keep everybody satisfied! All participants know how important her presence was. Six of the doctoral students at Panteion were also present, had helped with organizing and supported the summer school in many ways. To Takis, Sophia, Artemis, Katerina, Nikos and Myrto the summer school owes much.

A summer school's success depends for a large part to the teachers involved. I was extremely pleased to be able to work with a great team of people who gave their time and expertise in five different areas:

Workshop 1: Implicit Social Cognition with Bertram Gawronski and Rainer Banse.

Workshop 2: Social Influences in Learning with Fabrizio Butera, Antonis Gardikiotis and Makis Prodromitis

Workshop 3: Social Psychological Approaches of Intractable Intergroup Conflict and their Peace-Making with Daniel Bar Tal and Karen Trew

Workshop 4: Societal Psychology and Social Representations with Christian Staerkle and myself

Workshop 5: The Emotional side of Intergroup Relations with Nyla Branscombe, Machos Iatridis and Kate Reynolds.

¹ You can see a photo of the organizer, teachers, and participants in the gallery on the EASP website: http://www.easp.eu/gallery/photos/events/summerschool/2010_2/9_big.jpg

These great teachers took their job seriously, contributed heavily to the selection process, gave long reading list to their students, organized the workshops and guided the projects that students proposed. Summer schools depend on colleagues who are willing to create intensive scientific labs during their holidays. Reading their reports I was pleased to see how enriching the exercise was also for them. I personally want to thank them also for the great company they were!

Once the location and the practical arrangements were made the most difficult job was to select the participants. We received a record of 168 applications and unfortunately we had only 60 positions in which should have been included the 5 students from the USA the 4 students from Australia and the 6 local students. All applicants were great and the selection process was extremely difficult. We increased the number of students to 68 in order to give the opportunity to more students to participate. All teachers were involved in the selection process and we made our most to make the best selection possible, to be fair to all candidates and to include a variety of nationalities and universities. Looking at these applications I was amazed by the quality of young social psychologists in Europe. Moreover, I was surprised to notice that most of the applicants were young women. Indeed, at some point, I thought that we will have an all female summer school since only 43 out of 167 applicants were men! I leave to you to decide whether women are exceeding the levels of excellence of men or are more willing to spend their holidays in school! You can see the list of participants by workshop and have information about their university on our site.
<http://summerschool2010easp.pblogs.gr>

The theme of the summer school was “Social Psychology across Borders” and I think that we honored it by hosting more than 20 nationalities. We also had the opportunity to go beyond social psychological borders by intensively discuss theories and applications. Panteion University supported 5 plenary talks and 2 debates. We were very pleased to listen to Willem Doise, Stamos Papastamou, Bernd Simon, Steve Reicher and Carsten De Drew. You can find details about the talk at the website mentioned earlier. The audience was very lively, asked thoughtful questions, made interesting points and challenged the speakers in many occasions. Vassilis Pavlopoulos also organized a very successful session on SEM followed by many students despite the heat! We were also able to organize two debates. The first one was between Willem Doise and Steve Reicher on social representations and social identity theories. Bernd Simon joined them for a second debate on power and social psychology. These debates reminded me how much we have to gain as a discipline if we engage in serious theoretical discussions. I would like to thank particularly Willem Doise whose presence during the summer school gave us the opportunity to benefit from the wisdom of somebody present at the beginnings of the association and of somebody who contributed to the development of European Social Psychology.

But a summer school is nothing without the students. They were a wonderful group of people who managed to combine work and pleasure, who were serious

and lively, who although from so different origins lived together in great harmony (as far as I am able to know!!), who very professionally prepared and presented great projects, who were so pleasant to work with and to drink mochitos and margaritas at the “In on the Beach” in the evening... All teachers and organizers were extremely touched by the creative way they thanked us the last evening at the farewell party and we cherish the award they gave us! Personally, I try to live up to my “bravery” and “child care” awards!

As you can see a summer school is a moment of important scientific undertaking of great friendships and of happy times. For all these moments I would like to thank The EASP for organizing summer schools and Sibylle Classen for being such a support. Moreover, the implicit social cognition workshop was financially supported by ESCON and ESF. Many thanks are due to Vincent Yzerbyt, Claudia Tomas and all those responsible for this partnership. The Municipality of Aegina and Mr Koukoulis the head teacher of the primary school that hosted us have also greatly contributed as did the ELPSE (The Greek Psychological Society) and the EEKPSY (The Greek Society for Social Psychology). I am sure that reading the teachers’ and students’ reports one can see how enriching this experience was.

I wish to the Limerick team to have in 2012 such nice moments as we did! We maybe diagonally opposed geographically but we are brought so close by our common fate under the economic crisis that our levels of solidarity are increased! Many thanks are due to the EASP for believing to Ireland and Greece at this moment in time.

Xenia Chrysochoou
Summer School Organizer

Workshop 1: “Implicit Social Cognition” - Report of the teachers

Social behavior is often influenced by automatic processes that occur without intention or outside of conscious awareness. Even though automatic processes have been a major topic of interest for social psychologists since the mid 1980s, research in this area experienced a surge with the development of implicit measurement procedures around the millennium. The overarching goal of our workshop was to provide an overview of theories, methods, and empirical findings in the area of implicit social cognition. More specifically, the course was intended to provide (a) practical knowledge in the use of implicit measures, (b) theoretical knowledge in the interpretation of data obtained with implicit measures, (c) conceptual knowledge of the range and the limits of implicit measures, and (d) empirical knowledge about current findings, open questions, and future directions in the area of implicit social cognition.

A large proportion of the workshop was devoted to the procedural details of implicit measurement procedures. Even though implicit measures are widely used in social psychology, many of them involve complex procedural details that are rarely reported in the method sections of empirical articles. Thus, using implicit measures can be a challenging task for novices who do not have the “expert knowledge” that is required for successful implementations of these measures. To equip our students with this knowledge, we spent most of the first week discussing measurement-related issues, including functional and dysfunctional features of different measures, differences between experimental and individual difference designs and their implications for the programming of implicit measures, and criteria for the choice of particular measures for a given research question. In addition, the first week included a hands-on seminar on advanced statistical procedures to analyze data obtained with implicit measures (e.g., process dissociation, multinomial modeling). Finally, we devoted a major portion of the time to address our participants’ questions about measurement issues, many of which concerned the use of implicit measures in their own research.

Expanding on the foundations that we have set during the first week, we began the second week with an elaborate discussion of current controversies between proponents of dual-process versus single-process theories. A major question in these discussions concerned the implications of the two approaches for the interpretation of data obtained with implicit measures. The remainder of the week was devoted to discussions of specific empirical questions, including the formation and change of automatic associations, the nature and meaning of context effects, implicit processes in goal pursuit, and the prediction of behavior with implicit measures. Throughout the workshop, we also discussed various questions regarding the presumed automaticity/unconsciousness of the constructs assessed by implicit measures. Another major component of the second week was the preparation of small group projects, which involved the conceptual design of a study in the area of implicit social cognition. The product of this work were four sophisticated study proposals that—if successful—may all have good chance to get published in a high-ranking journal.

In sum, we hope that our students gained a lot of practical and theoretical knowledge from their participation in our workshop and that this knowledge will be helpful if they intend to use implicit measures in their own research.

Bertram Gawronski, The University of Western Ontario, Canada
Rainer Banse, University of Bonn, Germany

Workshop 1 - Report of the participants

When the garden of science turns into a catwalk -Written by Thijs Verwijmeren and Stéphane Doyen

We, a group of 13 PhD students, set out on a journey to uncover the hidden mysteries of our minds. The destination: Implicit Social Cognition Workshop, EASP Summer School, Aegina, Greece. This endeavour would lead us to discover about models of knowledge structure, to define hard to grasp concepts, to measure evanescent constructs.

We sought the answer to fundamental questions that had yet been left with no answer, and perhaps would remain so for decades to come:

How can we ensure the existence of unconscious information processing if even patients in deep coma still can provide sensible answers to external stimulation by modifying the pattern of their brain activity?

Can we make a valid distinction between implicit and explicit constructs?

These sheer intellectual challenges were carried out in small subgroups, from which emerged various research projects that we would set up over the following months.

If implicit and explicit representations are distinct, when do they differentiate and which one guides our behaviour? Does psychological distance influence the extent to which judgments and behaviour can be predicted from implicit and explicit attitudes?

Do we store negations in our memory or are they derived online from inconsistencies in associative networks?

Can our mindset, holistic versus analytic, promote the use of different strategies in sequence learning?

On other days, the implicit, uhm, indirect measures were contrasted and challenged over and over again, sweating away in the hot and blazing classrooms of the local primary school. At night, we were sleeping in our air-conditioned rooms of the Danae hotel, all dreaming of Implicit Association Tests and Affect Misattribution procedure. These hallucinated scrutiny, led to further research questions:

To what extent is the misattribution of the affect measured in the Affect Misattribution procedure? Could there be confounded variables in this measure?

Our outstanding teachers Bertram Gawronski and Rainer Banse guided us through

this implicit maze with great expertise and determination, providing us with more insights and practical knowledge than any amount of reading we could have done.

Working and sweating in the local primary school were not the only activities. It also enabled us to do science in a Greek paradise. Is there a better atmosphere than 70 PhD students sitting next to the pool working individually on their laptops, or discussing in groups the content of their research projects, the validity of this or that theory, scientific ethics, as well as the movies we liked best? Is there a better way to discuss the hard but fundamental questions than sitting by the seaside, at a restaurant eating grilled cheese, and gambas?

The hotel pool was indeed an excellent socializing vector. It served well for our leisure, was the social centre during the day as well as at night (sometimes with 'fierce' consequences). We abused it for playing, talking, swimming (obviously), and waiting for the bus. It was truly the epicentre from which concept and science were spread. It was the focal point gathering seventy people closer together and made of us the tight group we became. It is not often that we get to know so many fine characters in such a short period of time. As today, three month down the road, EASP 2010 summer-schoolers are meeting all across Europe and getting involved in fruitful collaborations.

The amazing social atmosphere, our wonderful teachers and the exceptional organisers (Xenia & crew) made us more knowledgeable, more skilled as well as more confused (after all, isn't that what science is about?). In other words, the people were great, the bus was late, we worked hard, and at the end of the day there was only one certainty: for dessert, there will be watermelon!

Thanks for the good times,

*Gosia, Timothee, Oren, Rebecca, Maaïke, Tomás, Sofia, Nikos,
Michael, Chris, Gloria, Thijs, and Stéphane*

Workshop 2: Social Influences in Learning - Report of the teachers

The 2010 EASP Summer School in Aegina was an amazing social and professional experience. On the social side, how can one describe the feeling of being suddenly shipped to a small island where all you have to do is engage in endless disquisitions on an incredible variety of topics with interesting colleagues coming from all over the world, and witness the elaboration of astonishingly innovative projects devised by an awesome set of passionate PhD students, while eating the whole panoply of Greek delicacies right by the seashore? One cannot. We just entered this world where Athena and Dionysus were good friends and put their complementary competences to make our summer school unforgettable. And, on top of that, we

were pampered, coddled and spoiled by Xenia, the ultimate event organizer. We wish to take this opportunity to thank her; and to thank the EASP for its longstanding and never-failing commitment to promoting summer schools.

On the professional side, we decided to carry out a real-life pedagogical experiment: We taught a workshop on “social influences in learning” by organising the work following the principles developed by the theories we were teaching. The PhD students were organised in groups where they interacted following the structure and functioning of cooperative learning groups. They worked on the bibliography of the workshop following a method inspired by problem-based learning. We interacted with the students following the principles that can be derived from the literature on socio-cognitive conflict. We must say that the results were well beyond our expectations: the students endured countless hours of fervent discussions—in the August heat—maintaining an incredible level of concentration, good spirit and enthusiasm, always arguing with decision but never competing for being right. It was astounding to see how a group of strong-willed, ambitious young researchers, potentially motivated to show their own worth, worked in perfect synergy, not only within their own groups, but also across groups, contributing beyond assignment, helping whenever needed and creating an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect. From a teacher’s point of view, it was like being in a dream. And, sure enough, the projects that emerged from these groups were simply stunning: sound, creative, rigorous, innovative, feasible, professional, relevant, timely, ... It was probably one of the most significant experiences in our professional trajectory.

Fabrizio, Antonis and Makis

Workshop 2: Reports of the participants

The 2010 EASP Summer School in Aegina Greece was an inspiring and enjoyable experience. We got to know and exchanged ideas with upcoming and established researchers from Europe and around the world and learned about and discussed interesting research within and beyond our primary research areas. During the two weeks of the summer school, we engaged ourselves in various exciting activities that ranged from intense workshop discussions (held in the classroom, the pool and in the warm sea), plenary sessions including talks, discussions and debates given by expert researchers from various social psychological backgrounds (as well as a talk by the headmaster of the local school and the Mayor of Aegina), excursions to ancient ruins and the beautiful beaches of Aegina, and elongated conversations that carried on long after our joint evening meals with watermelon deserts.

In the first week of the Social Influences in Learning workshop we reviewed some of the major theories accounting for social influence in learning and got acquainted with some of the most used methodologies in these areas. The examples and

exercises addressed important social mechanisms related to learning, such as motivation, goals, assessment, and anti-social behavior and seamlessly merged this work with some of the major theories of social influence with an emphasis on minority influence. Importantly, we applied a method of problem-based learning ourselves: The teachers gave us a problem that we discussed in small groups with changing composition. We used our knowledge of the workshop literature and our own individual knowledge and expertise to discuss the problems and to come to varying solutions. All discussions were based on a cooperative learning environment, creating positive interdependence between all participants and a group climate where we could assist each other.

During the second week, we discussed and developed our own research ideas, both in small groups and once a day with the whole workshop group. For the resulting research questions, we derived hypotheses, designed studies, and gathered materials so that we could begin data collection on our projects with our new colleagues after returning home from the summer school. Excitement grew on the summer school's last day when each group proudly presented its work to the entire summer school with all of the students and teachers in attendance, receiving both productive feedback and raving applause.

This workshop and the whole summer school provided an ideal basis for getting to know each other, to learn and combine new working styles, and to discuss our newly developed research questions. We developed all research ideas through constructive discussions and through an immense amount of social and informational support, both from our three amazing teachers and all of our fellow students. In addition, we were encouraged to use our newly acquired knowledge in our own domains and research. Thus we gained knowledge that was fresh and new learned the skills so that we could apply these new ideas to our own research. The two weeks in Aegina flew by and we celebrated our fantastic time, our hard work, and all of the time that we had spent together with a joyful party at our hotel that was a grand finale to our experiences filled with chatting, relaxing, dinner, a DJ, and dancing.

In closing, we would like to thank EASP, Xenia, our three incredible teachers, as well as all of the other people involved in coordinating this summer school. Last (but not least), we thank our fellow students, for making this once in a life-time experience happen – we “will never forget you” and these two weeks in Aegina and hopefully we all meet again soon!

*Alice, Amber, Anneli, Celine, Daniel, Joanna, Niklas,
Mauro, Saar, Tali, Tegan and Yvonne.*

Workshop 3: Social Psychological Approaches of Intractable Intergroup Conflict and their Peace-Making – Report of the teachers

Anyone who is invited to lead a workshop in the EASP summer school probably views it in terms of opportunities and challenges. In terms of opportunities, the workshop provides a rare opportunity to meet a group of excellent doctoral students from top European, North American and Australian universities. This is an occasion to meet the future elite of social psychology and through them to get to know the state of art in our discipline.

Secondly, it provides a unique opportunity to present your own work to young social psychologists and get feedback about these ideas. This captive audience extends the group that is acquainted with the developed conceptual thinking and the empirical research and can provide critical opinions about them. But leading the workshop does not only provide opportunities, there are also challenges. The first challenge is to prepare comprehensive presentations that introduce, in an interesting and stimulating way, an area of social psychology. In our case it was the social psychology of intractable conflict and its peaceful resolution. Thus, the challenge was to present the main concepts like collective identity, lasting contexts, ethos of conflict, emotional collective orientation, or culture of conflict. On their basis we tried to present the analysis of the nature of intractable conflict, its eruption, escalation, and then its de-escalation and peacemaking. This challenge required not only the early preparation of a content outline, readings and didactic methods, but later their adaptation to the needs of the particular group and the environmental conditions of the workshop. So we needed to change the scope of the workshop, the methods tasks and so on. But a special challenge was the attempt to propagate our view of what social psychology should be, how research problems should be approached and what research methods should be selected. This was a special challenge since we were aware that our views diverge from the mainstream in social psychology.

Thus from our perspective, it was also a great opportunity, but at the same time a great challenge to introduce to the group a different way of approaching issues in social psychology. We labeled our approach as “Thinking with big head” (an unsuccessful translation of Hebrew expression). This meant that before a social psychologist begins to think about variables, their operationalization, manipulations and experimental design there is need to think about the problem that is raised: The scope of the phenomenon, its nature, its dynamics, the influencing factors—only then it is possible to formulate the research question and on its basis to select the particular research methods that can be of different kind (not only an experiment). In this line a special challenge was also to present how to study real life problems such as an intractable conflict.

The final challenge was to lead the group into meaningful projects that could apply the provided conceptual framework and the approach to the selected

research questions. Thus it was challenge to direct the teams to select a meaningful research question and to turn it into a research plan that can be realized.

Time will say whether we met the challenges with success. The planned projects were impressive and we hope that we planted seeds that may be were absorbed and their fruits may be seen in the future.

But there is no doubt that the last summer school under the direction of Xenia Chryssochoou provided an unique opportunity to many of the participants to get exposed to the neglected part of social psychology—societal psychology. She managed to organize workshops that introduced to doctoral students a full spectrum of social psychology. She deserves a lot of thanks and also encouragement to bring back social psychology to its full scope, diversity and relevance that have been somewhat lost in the last decades. It is our hope that the participants of the 2010 summer school in Greece will pick up the torch and carry it in their career.

Daniel Bar-Tal and Karen Trew

Workshop 3: reports of the participants

Our approach to conflict and peacemaking was at the level of the broad conceptual framework. That is, most of the research we discussed was theoretical rather than empirical. We were particularly interested in interstate conflicts and those that are intractable, or “total.” We asked questions such as: Why do inter-societal conflicts erupt? Escalate? How are they managed? We wanted to focus particularly on peacemaking, asking: How and when does peace making process evolve? And how is it possible to launch the reconciliation process and construct a culture of peace?

Indeed this theoretical approach influenced our small group projects (of 2-4 people) to focus heavily on theory. We will briefly outline each of the projects below and provide a contact person for those who might be interested.

- Building Shared Collective Memory - a Conceptual Approach on the Macro level of Peace Building -- Collective memories are representations of the society's past that are mutually adopted. In an intractable conflict situation, each side of the conflict has a unique “truth” of the conflict history. To achieve peace, these disparate memories must be reconciled to form a consensual shared collective memory. We propose a model though which this can be achieved through gradual trust building. Contact: aurore.chow@anu.edu.au
- The emergence of leadership in times of conflict. The recent financial crisis can be seen as a major event, which has relevance for the well-being of the members of many European societies. We propose that when the financial crisis embodies elements of a violent conflict, psychological conditions, including fear

of death, emerge. Our project addresses the question of how different psychological conditions mediate the behaviour of society members in terms of preference for a charismatic leader. Contact: takis@eekpsy.gr

- Collective memory as a vehicle memory: From cold war to cold peace. Collective memories function as obstacles to peace-making by providing dehumanized pictures of the opponent and by presenting the society in-group as the sole victim. We propose that leading individuals to consider out-group members' traumatic history from an emotional perspective can reduce the threat associated with the exposition to the rival's narrative and help shape the required common vision of the past. Contact: isabellegoncalves@gmail.com
- How do apologetic acts alter willingness to engage in peacemaking for both groups involved? Case studies of Northern Ireland and Cyprus. Apologies for past wrongdoings can promote reconciliation through their potential to create a new common narrative, recognition of pain and loss, and helping to restore broken relationships. We created models of victim and perpetrator responses to apologetic acts, and plan to test these models in the contexts of two separate conflicts. Contact: ericazaiser@gmail.com
- Re-categorization into a peace oriented identity. By integrating intergroup contact and collective action theories, we developed a model which outlines how members of groups involved in intractable conflict can be re-categorized into an identity that promotes collective action. Through contact, group members entrenched in intractable conflict can come to see members of the opposing outgroup as individuals. From this point they can join to form a dual identity which recognizes the similarities and differences of each individual member and establishes a goal toward peace-making. Contact: eliezer@psych.ucsb.edu , L.jans@rug.nl

The projects show one product of our two weeks together, but there were also intellectual and social elements that must be noted. While most in the group admitted a certain degree of apprehension going into the experience (...will I be smart enough?) we agreed that the reality was very non-threatening. There was a general sense that the summer school was the most intellectually stimulating and rewarding experience we have encountered in our academic lives. Without a doubt, it fostered the types of academic collaborations which will continue to be fruitful in the future and social relationships which we will enjoy in years to come.

Alexandra, Aurelie, Aurore, Dina, Erica, Inma, Isabelle, Lise, Marek, Maria, Mariska, Rauha, Stephanie and Takis

Workshop 4: Societal Psychology and Social Representations – Report from the teachers

Arriving at the spectacular setting of Aegina Island on Sunday prior to the start of the summerschool, it was immediately clear that the following two weeks would become a memorable experience. And so they did! Recognisable by their brown name tags, we first met the students of our workshop on *Societal psychology and social representations* at the opening dinner on Monday night. It was fascinating to notice how a slightly intimidated, yet cheerful crowd of unfamiliar students quickly engaged in lively discussions about social psychology as if they would have known each other for a long time.

The following day, we started our workshop with a diverse crowd of 14 highly motivated participants who shared a passion for a social psychology which stresses the contextual, normative and collective determinants of human thought and behaviour. In the first days, Xenia and Christian presented an overview of the field of societal psychology which sparked off many passionate discussions about the role of ideological beliefs and social norms, the importance of social context and membership in status groups, or the social and political implications of our research. At the end of the first week, participants then briefly presented their own PhD research and explained how it related to the field of societal psychology. The thematic diversity of research topics covered—from European integration and gender inequality to the impact of national histories on intergroup attitudes, from ecological attitudes and intergroup conflict to multiculturalism—was an impressive illustration of the strength and variety of societal psychology. While the broad array of epistemological assumptions and methodological strategies to study these issues were often at the heart of our discussions, these presentations also underscored the many ways through which social psychologists can contribute to a better understanding of political and ideological phenomena.

The second week was devoted to the development of new and original research paradigms, based on the discussions and developments of the first week. A first group decided to study the relationship between religious identification and human values across European countries. A second group started to investigate how a mixed methods approach could deepen our understanding of the dynamics of intergroup contact. A third group was concerned with the impact of representations of national wrongdoings in determining support for far-right parties, while a fourth group created a research paradigm for studying new forms of political identities in a globalised world. In the end, all groups came up with viable and innovative research projects, although a few more days of intensive collaboration would have helped to completely nail down all the research projects. As a teacher, it was particularly gratifying to engage in in-depth discussions and collaboration with highly motivated and competent students without having to formally evaluate their production. This is certainly one of the great assets of a summerschool which allows freely exchanging and developing ideas in an open and stimulating environment. It remains an open question whether the temperatures of the first week, somewhere between 35 and 40 degrees in the classroom, actually enhanced or hampered the quality of our discussions and the development of ideas!

In any case, the final evening at the students' hotel (in which some of our participants played a prominent role in testing the pool at night-time) was the glorious ending of a summerschool which we all remember for the exquisite food served directly on the beach, feet in the sand, the sauna-like temperatures, the inspiring exchanges, and the new relationships and networks developed out of this stunning experience.

Christian Staerklé & Xenia Chrysochoou

Workshop 4 - Reports from the participants

Societal psychology and social representations: "Towards a more "social" social psychology"

-Written by Anouk Smeekes & Kaat Van Acker

This workshop was dedicated to the study of societal psychology and social representations. Whereas most social psychological research is concerned with generic processes in individual's cognitions, emotions and motivations, societal psychology tries to extend this perspective by focusing on how contextual variables, such as norms, beliefs, values and ideologies, shape these individual processes. Striving towards a more contextualized social psychology, one of the recurring discussions in this workshop was: *how can we make social psychology more social?*

This workshop used Social Representation Theory (SRT) as a theoretical tool for analyzing the links between individual cognitive functioning and more general societal factors. Since there is an ongoing debate in the SRT literature on whether it should mainly be a theoretical, or also an empirical, perspective, a question that often came up was: *how can social representations be operationalized and measured?* We talked about how to conceptualize and empirically analyze social representations, using qualitative and quantitative methods, or a combination of the two.

To put our newly acquired shared knowledge into practice, we developed several research projects in small groups. This was facilitated by daily meetings with our teachers, Xenia Chrysochoou and Christian Staerklé, who provided challenging feedback. All projects shared a common focus: how present and historical representations of intergroup relations shape individual's current intergroup attitudes, emotions and behavior. Moreover, all projects put forth that studying the content of social representations constitutes a necessary step in understanding individual's psychological processes.

From a societal psychological perspective, we must emphasize that context also matters for the understanding of our summer school activities and experiences. With temperatures rising above 35 degrees and no air conditioning, discussions about how to keep the temperature agreeable, the sweating reasonable, and the water bottle filled, became almost as important as heated discussions about the

themes of the workshop. Moreover, with the Aegean Sea about 100 meters away and our towels and bathing suits packed, other questions that came up on a daily basis were how long we would be able to swim during lunch break and if we would be able to work on our tan. Additionally, being on such a sunny, warm and scenic Greek island for fourteen days, with a group of young researchers, was a fertile breeding ground for emerging friendships and collaborations, and a good practice in how to combine both of them.

The topic of social representations and the more general notion of a contextualized social psychology was also prominent in the plenary sessions (with all summer school participants), in particular in the debates and lectures of Willem Doise and Steve Reicher. These debates and lectures were especially inspiring and provoking for the participants of our workshop, since they brought together speakers who embodied the debate between the two “big” theories in European social psychology, namely Social Identity Theory (SIT) and Social Representations theory. It was debated how these theories complement or contradict one another. Where Reicher proposed that social identity is at the core of social psychological functioning and hence that social identities are people’s core representations that guide and organize their experiences, Doise wondered whether social representations need such a guiding principle in the first place and in the form of social identity in particular. These debates often continued in the classroom and reflect our own enthusiasm, as young social psychologists, to contribute to the development of a more contextualized social psychology in the future.

*Ana, Anouk, Artemis, Babette, Ellinor, Inari, Janice, Kaat,
Katerina, Mali, Matthias, Nicole, Rebecca, Sana*

Workshop 5: The Emotional side of Intergroup Relations – Report of the teachers

The emotional side of the 2010 EASP Summer School involved hot summer days, much jostling for the fan, very noisy crickets, delicious fruit, and 14 students and 3 teachers in deep discussions concerning the antecedents and consequences of collective guilt, anger, fear, shame, pride, hope, morality, and forgiveness - all as part of the curriculum of this workshop in the stunningly beautiful setting of Aegina!

Our task was to examine the complex but compelling role of collective emotions in intergroup relations. We discussed a range of issues including:

where "emotions" fit in within current work on intergroup relations

what is new, different, and interesting about "emotion" for understanding intergroup processes
 what are measures of "emotion" actually assessing
 how social history and the current social context shape collective emotional experience
 when and how collective emotions can be created and harnessed to influence social stability and social change
 what emotions are most likely to be experienced by high and low status groups
 how collective emotions can intensify intergroup conflict and violence or enhance intergroup reconciliation and forgiveness
 what role the "emotional side" of intergroup relations plays in maintaining, affirming, and changing social identity and the impact on behaviour

Each student was assigned (prior to arrival) the role of "Topic Leader" and was responsible for explaining to the group what has been done on a particular theme, the aims of the research thus far, what has not been done, and where research might most profitably go in the future. Another student was assigned the role of the "Keeper of the Daily Diary" documenting the key points that emerged from our discussions of each of the topic areas.

A little to all of our surprise, these processes worked extremely well and we managed to distil some very critical and important insights into the emotional side of intergroup relations. Further discussion and targeted 'thought experiments' in smaller groups also ensured all students had the chance to collaborate closely with each other. This group work set the stage for some very productive and collaborative final research projects.

Students' projects emerged within a rich theoretical context raising key issues in the emotion and intergroup relations literature. The three final projects that were developed address questions concerning:

- how social categorization shapes collective emotions
- how collective emotions are shaped by ingroup norms
- how emotions may be crafted to ideological ends and the role of leadership in that process
- how emotion links to collective action and when it will predict social change.

One group (Fabio Fasoli, Adela Fofiu, Andrea Pereira, & Lee Shepherd) focused on the role of threat and fear on collective action among majority group members. A second group (Aleksandra Cichocka, Katie Greenaway, Myrto Kakkou, Tinna Likki, & Ruth Van Veelen) dealt with the effects of emotional appeals by minorities on majority group members' willingness to engage in social change. And, our third group (Hadas Baram, Alessandro Gabbiadini, Frederico Guilherme, Vincent Pillaud &

Jessica Salerno) focused on the impact of self-categorization on collective emotions and collective action.

This summer school experience reminded us all of the very best aspects of being academics - having time to read, discuss, critique and reflect on some of the most complex and important questions in social psychology. To do all of this with bright, interested, committed, and delightful students who are optimistic and enthusiastic about the importance of research in our field was a truly pleasurable collective emotional experience!

Nyla Branscombe, Katherine Reynolds, & Tilemachos Iatridis
E-mails: nyla@ku.edu; Katherine.Reynolds@anu.edu.au; iatridis@fks.uoc.gr

Workshop 5 - Reports from the participants

The Emotional Side of Intergroup Relations

An international group of 14 participants from 13 different countries participated in this workshop directed by Nyla Branscombe, Katherine Reynolds and Tilemachos Iatridis. We investigated the role of emotions in intergroup relations. Specifically, the workshop focused on the role of different group-based emotions in promoting collective action and social change. The program was separated in two main parts. The first week was organised around a discussion of articles. Each morning was dedicated to a specific emotion (such as guilt and shame, angst and envy) or topic area (such as reconciliation and forgiveness, categorization and prejudice). The afternoons were often organized around working in small groups to extend the discussions and to start thinking about how we could add something new to the debate. These debates provided a common basis for the research projects and helped us to identify our topics of interest. Because one main objective of this summer school was to develop teamwork, the second week was devoted to the development of research proposals in small groups. These research proposals are detailed below.

The role of threat and fear on collective action among majority group members

(Adela Fofiu, Andrea Pereira, Fabio Fasoli and Lee Shepherd)

This research proposal focused on collective action from the point of view of a majority group. They propose to investigate why majority members would engage in collective action on behalf of minority members. They planned two different studies in which they consider the role of emotion, the perception of threat and the fear of the minority in the willingness to engage in collective action. In the first study, they propose to manipulate the perception of threat by either making the reference of a growing Muslim minority vs. indicating the stability across time of this minority. This population was chosen as they intend to run this

study in Switzerland in which there is currently a debate about the Muslim community.

In the second study, they plan to add a manipulation of the salience of the norm of equality by either making a reference to its pervasiveness across the in-group vs. making no reference. They hypothesize a 2 by 2 interaction between the salience of the norm and the perception of threat on collective action.

The Audacity of (Minority) Hope : The effects of emotional appeals by minorities on majority willingness to engage in social change

(Aleksandra Cichocka, Katie Greenaway, Ruth van Veelen and Tiina Likki)

This proposal focused on social change and raised the question of how do expressions of hope and fear about the future from minority members influence the willingness of majority members to engage in social change. They propose a 2 by 2 design in which emotional appeal (hope vs. fear) is crossed with message frame (emotion expressed only about the minority group vs. emotion expressed about superordinate group including majority group members). They predict that support for social change among majority group members should be greatest when hope is expressed for the future of the superordinate group. They also intend to measure perceived threat and perceived efficacy as potential mediators.

The impact of self-categorization on emotions and collective action

(Alessandro Gabbiadini, Frederico Guilherme, Jessica Salerno, Hadas Baram and Vincent Pillaud)

This third proposal focused on the role of the shift in self-categorization on emotions and collective action. This study is intended to take place in Italy and uses the debate about cessation between North Italy and South Italy as a discrimination message. They assess three different levels of self-categorization. Participants will take the perspective of an individual (the individual level), either as considering themselves as a Northern Italian (the in-group level) or as an Italian (the superordinate group). They postulate that this shift in identity should impact the responsibility appraisals, the type of aroused emotion (shame or anger) and the type of collection action (either reconciliation or confrontation). It is hypothesized that appraisals of self-responsibility will induce shame and ultimately lead to more reconciliation, whereas appraisals of other-responsibility will induce anger and more confrontation.

The students of the workshop on the Emotional Side of Intergroup Relations Workshop of the 15th EASP summer school, Aegina, Greece.

News about Members

New Members of the Association

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

Dr. Ananthi AL RAMIAH
Oxford, UK
(B. Parkinson, M. Hewstone)

Dr. Florian DELMAS
Grenoble, France
(C. Darnon, D. Muller)

Dr. Claire E. ASHTON-JAMES
Groningen, The Netherlands
(N. Hansen, K. Epstude)

Dr. Kamila DOBRENKO
Warsaw, Poland
(D. Karwowska, M. Jarymowicz)

Dr. Matthijs BAAS
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(C.K.W. de Dreu, B. Nijstad)

Dr. Veronique EICHER
Fribourg, Switzerland
(F. Butera, E. Morales Marente)

Dr. Anne BERTHOLD
Jena, Germany
(T. Kessler, H. Blank)

Dr. Alice FOLLENFANT
Bordeaux, France
(J.-C. Croizet, F. Ric)

Dr. Mauro BIANCHI
Lisbon, Portugal
(A. Mummendey, S. Waldzus)

Dr. Madgalena FORMANOWICZ
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Bilewicz, J. Karylowski)

Dr. Rodrigo BRITO
Lisbon, Portugal
(M. Barreto, S. Waldzus)

Dr. Anne GAST
Ghent, Belgium
(M. Machunsky, K. Rothermund)

Natalia COJOCARU
Chisinau, Moldova
(A. Neculau, I. Markova)

Dr. A. Erik GIANNAKAKIS
Plymouth, UK
(N. Wyer, I. Fritsche)

Dr. Elizabeth COLLINS
Lisbon, Portugal
(M. Barreto, T. Schubert)

Dr. Mario GOLLWITZER
Marburg, Germany
(M. Schmitt, N. Hansen)

Dr. Philip J. COZZOLINO
Essex, UK
(C. Sedikides, N. Geeraert)

Dr. Katarzyna GROWIEC
Warsaw, Poland
(J. Trzebinski, M. Drogosz)

Dr. Rita GUERRA
Lisbon, Portugal
(S. Waldzus, T. Schubert)

Dr. Michael HAEFNER
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(K. Epstude, E. Kluwer)

Dr. Nicole Syringa HARTH
Jena, Germany
(T. Kessler, I. Fritsche)

Dr. Shenel HUSNU
Derby, UK
(R. Crisp, G. Randsley de Moura)

Dr. Paul HUTCHINGS
Swansea, UK
(G. Maio, G. Haddock)

Dr. Gabriela JIGA-BOY
Grenoble, France
(R. Spears, G. Semin)

Dr. Konstantinos KAFETSIOS
Crete, Greece
(V. Zammuner, G. Abakoumkin)

Dr. Kimberly KAHN
Lisbon, Portugal
(M. Barreto, J. Vala)

Dr. Elanor KAMANS
Groningen, The Netherlands
(S. Otten, N. Hansen)

Dr. Severine KOCH
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(A. van Knippenberg, D. Wigboldus)

Dr. Marianna KOSIC
Doberdò del Lago, Italy
(A. Kosic, G. Csepli)

Dr. Joris LAMMERS
Tilburg, The Netherlands
(M. Zeelenberg, D. Stapel)

Dr. Marijke LELIVELD
Groningen, The Netherlands
(B. Fennis, E. van Dijk)

Dr. Caroline LEYGUE
Nottingham, UK
(G. Maio, R. Spears)

Dr. Amanda MAHAFFEY
Lisbon, Portugal
(A.P. Lenton, M. Luke)

Dr. Sibila MARQUES
Lisbon, Portugal
(L. Lima, D. Abrams)

Dr. Stamos PAPASTAMOU
Athens, Greece
(X. Chryssochoou, F. Butera)

Dr. Vassilis PAVLOPOULOS
Athens, Greece
(A. Gardikiotis, X. Chryssochoou)

Dr. Cícero PEREIRA
Lisbon, Portugal
(J. Vala, M. Barreto)

Dr. Gerasimos PRODROMITIS
Athens, Greece
(X. Chryssochoou, F. Butera)

Dr. Daniela RAKIC
Jena, Germany
(A. Maass, A. Mummendey)

Dr. Rolf REBER
Bergen, Norway
(T. Garcia-Marques, C. Unkelbach)

Dr. Letitia SLABU
Canterbury, UK
(K. Douglas, A. Guinote)

João ANTÓNIO
Lisbon, Portugal
(M. Barreto, R. Costa Lopes)

Dr. Anna STEIDLE
Chemnitz, Germany
(L. Werth, R. Deutsch)

Thijs BOUMAN
Groningen, The Netherlands
(S. Otten, K. Epstude)

Dr. Caterina SUITNER
Padova, Italy
(A. Maass, M. Cadinu)

Susanne BRUCKMÜLLER
Erlangen, Germany
(B. Wojciszke, A.E. Abele)

Dr. Monika TARNOWSKA
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Stysko-Kunkowska, M. Kofta)

Lieke CURES
Nijmegen, The Netherlands
(R. Holland, D. Wigboldus)

Dr. Orsolya VINCZE
Budapest, Hungary
(J. Laszlo, J.F. Valencia)

Elektra DIAKOLAMBRIANOU
Athens, Greece
(X. Chrysochoou, T. Iatridis)

Affiliate Membership

Koen DIJKSTRA
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(J. van der Pligt, G. van Kleef)

Dr. Karen GONSALKORALE
Sydney, Australia
(R.S. Costa, L. Garcia-Marques)

Ana Rita FARIAS
Lisbon, Portugal
(G. Semin, M. Garrido)

Dr. Bernhard LEIDNER
New York, USA
(B. Hannover, R. Giner-Sorolla)

Georg FÖRSTER
Würzburg, Germany
(F. Strack, W. Hofmann)

Dr. Emina SUBASIC
Canberra, Australia
(A. Haslam, S. Reicher)

Babette GEKELER
London, UK
(R. Kopietz, G. Philogene)

Postgraduate Membership

Sofia GKOUMATSI
Athens, Greece
(X. Chrysochoou, M. Iatridis)

Soultana ANASTASOPOLOU
Athens, Greece
(X. Chrysochoou, M. Iatridis)

Katerina GOULA
Athens, Greece
(C. Staerklé, X. Chrysochoou)

Hedy GREIJDANUS
Groningen, The Netherlands
(T. Postmes, M. van Zomeren)

Artemis GRIVA
Athens, Greece
(L. Licata, X. Chryssochoou)

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

Panagiotis KAKALETRIS
Athens, Greece
(M. Iatridis, X. Chryssochoou)

Elisabeth KUHN
Trondheim, Norway
(S. Sczesny, U. Gabriel)

Hans MARIEN
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(H. Aarts, R. Custers)

Stefanie MARIS
Leuven, Belgium
(E. Van Avermaet, V. Hoorens)

Luis Filipe MARTINS
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(P. van Lange, M. van Vugt)

Elisa MERKEL
Padova, Italy
(S. Sczesny, A. Maass)

Linda MUUSSES
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(C. Finkenauer, P.A.M. van Lange)

Nikolaos PLAKAS
Athens, Greece
(M. Iatridis, X. Chryssochoou)

Hester RUIGENDIJK
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(P. van Lange, S.L. Koole)

Lisa SCHUBERT
Würzburg, Germany
(S. Giessner, T. Schubert)

Cláudia SIMÃO
Lisbon, Portugal
(B. Seibt, T. Schubert)

Thomas STEMMLER
Würzburg, Germany
(F. Strack, R. Deutsch)

Anna Magda STUDZINSKA
Warsaw, Poland
(B. Wojciszke, A. Chybicka)

Iliia-Vassiliki SYRIGOU
Athens, Greece
(X. Chryssochoou, M. Iatridis)

Evelyne TREINEN
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
(O. Corneille, C. Toma)

Marco VAN BOMMEL
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
(P. van Lange, J.-W. van Prooijen)

Sabine VOLK
Würzburg, Germany
(A. Höfling, F. Strack)

Grants

Erik Bijleveld (travel grant)
Marieke de Vries (seedcorn grant)
Malte Friese (travel grant)
Malgorzata Gamian-Wilk (seedcorn grant)
Lise Jans (travel grant)
Carola Leicht (travel grant)
Marieke Roskes (travel grant)
Annika Scholl (travel grant)
Elise Seip (travel grant)

Grant reports**Jochen Gebauer**

University of Southampton

seedcorn grant

The association funded my internship with Professor Mark Leary at Duke University, North Carolina. The generous funding provided the first possibility for me to spend several weeks at a US university. The experiences I made there complemented my experiences at UK universities (in particular Cardiff University and the University of Southampton) and German Universities (in particular the Universität Tübingen and the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin). More important, the funding provided an opportunity for me to start working with Professor Mark Leary, whose work I have admired for years. After getting to know Professor Leary personally-I was fortunate to meet with him 2-3 times per week-I can now say that I also admire his openness to competing perspectives as well as his genuine interest in the ideas of less experienced researchers (like me). For example, when we started thinking about the social psychology of interpersonal “clicking,” he advocated to host a brainstorming session with master and PhD students on the topic in order to get a more comprehensive idea of what “clicking” actually is and how it functions. This group-session turned out to be extremely helpful and saved us from going down the wrong road with this project.

Following the intent of the *Seedcorn Grant* schema, the internship helped to set up several divergent lines of research in collaboration with Mark Leary. One particular line of research, together with Constantine Sedikides (University of Southampton), Mark Leary (Duke University), and Jens Asendorpf (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin), has led to a small grant proposal submitted to the “*Interdisciplinary Wolfgang Köhler Research Centre ‘Conflicts in Intelligent Systems’*” at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. We have received this grant, which provides me with the opportunity to visit Duke University again next summer and to conduct two experimental studies. If these

studies provide encouraging results, we will use them as preliminary work in a larger grant application that is supposed to build the foundation of my Habilitation at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

I would like to thank the *European Association of Social Psychology* for providing me with their *Seedcorn Grant*. We very much hope that we will be able to live up to the EASP's expectation to attract larger funding based on the outcomes of the *Seedcorn Grant*.

Gabriela M. Jiga-Boy

(formerly at University of Grenoble II, France,
now at Swansea University, Wales, UK)

travel grant

This grant allowed me to start a research collaboration with Prof. Jacky Boivin and Prof. Greg Maio at Cardiff University's School of Psychology, in August - October 2009. During my stay, we have set the basis for a project on 'Time and Reproductive Decision-Making: When Is the Right Time to Have Children?' This project originally followed Jacky Boivin's initiative, 'ESRC Fertility Pathways Network', which brings together experts in the field of reproductive decision-making (psychologists, social scientists, medical doctors). At the first meeting, this group articulated a few ideas around the potential role of time/timing skills in the success of a fertility intervention. Therefore we decided to explore this topic, because my recently completed doctoral thesis on future forecasts offered me a good background. Together, we planned an experimental study (partly conducted) and I had the opportunity to join the 'ESRC Fertility Pathways Network'.

Firstly, I helped making a theoretical review of fertility issues, and then finding a way of adapting future forecasts models to the field of reproductive decision-making. Various factors can impact the way one makes a decision of having or not having children. One is purely objective: the biological timing (e.g. declines in fertility rate, Boivin, Bunting, Collins, & Nygren, 2007). Another factor is one's knowledge – about what influences one's fertility rate (e.g. Bunting & Boivin, 2008). And when incorrect knowledge is coupled with various prediction errors (e.g. Buehler, Griffin, & Ross, 1994), it poses serious threats to the success of a fertility intervention. For example, people may underestimate how long a fertility medical intervention actually lasts or for how long they are willing to persist in undergoing treatment, if unsuccessful. In addition, temporal distance to a future goal may render the obstacles one needs to overcome, in order to achieve the goal, more or less concrete (e.g. Liberman, Trope, & Stephan, 2007), or alter one's perception of how easy/hard it is to overcome these obstacles or one's expectations of how one will adapt to a life with/without children. We presented the idea of whether problems occur due to one's incorrect factual information and to one's incorrect subjective estimations of medical procedures duration, at the next Fertility Pathways Network meeting (October 2009). The

comments we got helped us shape the type of questions we used in the experimental study.

Further obtaining ethical approval to conduct the study from the School's Ethical Committee, I have trained myself in using an online-study platform (Survey Tracker) and displayed the study online on a few portals (<http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/psych/home2/fertilitystudies/children.html>).

In *Phase I* (completed), participants answered measures of general coping skills, perceived self-efficacy, and values and proactive attitudes scales (Schwartz, 1992; Maio, 2010). These measures were independent of our manipulation. Phase II (ongoing) was conducted a few weeks after Phase I and participants were first asked to think about having a child in the near vs. distant future, then to answer questions about their intentions to have children (e.g. "When would you like to have a baby?"), the timing ("When would you think you should start having a baby?"; "How long do you think it would take until you become pregnant?") and their adaptive abilities to cope with the new situation (e.g. "How happy do you think you will be if you succeed in having a child?"). We believe people's time forecasts will depend on the concreteness with which they are able to think about having a child and also on their abilities to adapt to the new situation. This link can help us understand what aspects need to be targeted by interventions aiming at maximizing the impact of fertility treatments.

I would like to thank the EASP for this grant and Sibylle, my colleagues, doing both academic (the weekly Spears-Manstead Lab Group meetings and the Social Psychology Club talks) and leisure activities - because Cardiff is anything but a boring place to be. Therefore I thank all the PhD students, postdocs, and permanent staff for making my stay memorable!

References:

- Boivin, J., Bunting, L., Collins, J. A., & Nygren, K. G. (2007). International estimates of infertility prevalence and treatment-seeking: potential need and demand for infertility medical care. *Human Reproduction*, 22(6), 1506-1512.
- Buehler, R., Griffin, D., & Ross, M. (1994). Exploring the "planning fallacy": Why people underestimate their task completion times. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 366-381.
- Bunting, L. & Boivin, J. (2008). Knowledge about infertility risk factors, fertility myths and illusory benefits of healthy habits in young people. *Human Reproduction*, 23(8), 1858-1864.
- Liberman, N., Trope, Y., & Stephan, E. (2007). Psychological distance. In A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (Vol. 2, pp. 353-383). New York: Guilford Press.

Maio, G. R. (2010). Mental representation of social values. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 42, 1-43.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Wojciech Kulesza

(Warsaw School of Social Psychology)

seedcorn grant

Chameleon effect vs. similarity effect. Sign of equality or of difference? Empirical verification.

I am waiting for a connecting flight at a large airport and watching people, particularly pairs, sitting at airport cafeteria tables in a lobby. Just to kill time I awake my spirit of psychologist-researcher and ask myself a question: which couples are composed of persons who like each other, maybe perhaps in love; which pairs are at variance; which tables harbor two incidental people who entertain themselves with an impromptu chit-chat with a stranger. Let's assume that people I watch are in such a distance from me that I can not hear their conversations. How can I solve this riddle? Some readers of this project would suggest me to benefit from numerous researches conducted by social psychologists. They have demonstrated, that people are moved, steered by a natural tendency to imitate an other person, which is frequently experienced at various levels: poses or gestures (Bernieri & Rosenthal, 1991; Charney, 1966; McGrath & Kelly, 1986), voice timbre or pitch (Cappella & Planalp, 1981; Street, 1984). What's more important in several researchers: Tanya Chartrand, John Bargh and Rick van Baaren have demonstrated, that this mechanism is in charge of increase of positive attitude toward a person who imitates our behavior. Let me briefly revue these above mentioned researches as they stand for basic point to my project.

In course of their investigations Chartrand and Baragh (1999) have conducted three experiments to research the influence of gestures and mimicry on our attitude to an other individual. In a course of all experiments two persons (research assistant inclusive) were encouraged to discuss freely a set of photo pictures: to describe picture content and associations raised by them. In first experiment research assistant performed various moves and gestures (swinging foot, rubbing face, smiling). Subsequently, analysis was made how far a tested person has been prone to imitate partner's movements (would he/she be a chameleon?), which – as results have demonstrated – actually took place: while assistant smiled frequently, the other person essentially more frequently did the same (same response for foot swinging, etc.). Objective of the second experiment was to review how far the observed

mechanism was in charge of increasing the positive attitude toward an other individual. In this experiment assistant imitated (or not) tested person's behavior. Results confirmed that there had been an immense positive relation between imitation and the positive attitude: when assistant "was" a chameleon he/she had been "more liked", conversation was evaluated "better", etc. In the third experiment researchers demonstrated, that a person who had scored high marks on empathy scale (Davis, 1981) evidently had swung her/his leg for longer period of time or rubbed a face as a reaction to movements of experimenter. Subsequent research conducted by the Dutch team (van Baaren, *et al.* 2004) creatively developed an original chameleon concept. They prove, i. a., that experiencing of influence of this mechanism generates increase of pro-social behavior (2004), makes people to leave higher tips (social influence technique) (van Baaren, *et al.* 2005).

On returning to initially described observation of airport cafeteria we would claim, that chameleon theory could be helpful in evaluating sympathy or antipathy of interlocutors. We are in a position to ascertain this fact by considering did a copying of gestures, demeanor, mimicry of other person actually appeared. If so – probably the said people have presented positive attitude to partners of interaction. In case we do not realize such effect we may assume that level of mutual sympathy is considerably lower.

Let us dwell for a while on presented research and on offered predictions, and take us a part of *advocatus diaboli*. Would a reader of this report agree with an objection that chameleon effect duplicates statement which relates similarity with liking? This question appears from an observation that in both cases we talk about resembling of gestures, postures, mimicry - so there emerges an issue of rationale of developing that paradigm which duplicates only a previously existing theoretical. The objective of this project was to formulate introductory answer to just raised objection and to prove that these two mechanisms are of different nature.

In series of experiments I intended to directly verify relations between chameleon effect and similarity mechanism.

Methodology

Induced similarity. In course of replication of Chartrand & Bargh (1999) experiment a research assistant imitated or not movements, mannerisms, mimicry of tested person. Additionally, prior to an experiment, tested person was provided with information on existing similarity, difference or of lack of them. I adopted method developed by Finch and Cialdini (1989). A tested individual was instructed that interaction partner has very similar/different date of birth, or this piece of information would not be issued at all.

Gestures synchronisation degree, mimicry: degree of synchronization of research assistant with tested person. In case of high similarity assistant with highest possible

accuracy imitates gestures, facial look, mimicry of tested individual. In case of low synchronization research assistant did not attempt to imitate any gesture or facial look of tested person.

Experiment scheme.

	High coordination	Low coordination
High similarity: day of birth		
Low similarity: day of birth		
Control group		

As an indicator of dependent variable a specific questionnaire was used, which comprises questions of general liking. The tested person expressed his/her level of positiveness/negativism of partner's attitude. Range is divided in five grades; where 1- means negative attitude, 5-affirmative attitude.

Results

Analysis of variance was performed (2 x 3: coordination*birth date). That analysis has demonstrated, that output was reciprocal to assumed relations (different date of birth created greater liking toward the other person). The chameleon effect has not been observed as well as interaction effect between variables has not been registered.

In process of in-depth analysis I have realized that two (blind for the hypothesis) researchers (males) who had participated in experiment scored different grades in regard to positive attitude toward them. It comes out, that one of researchers has obtained chameleon effect with this reservation that in relations with males only (men whom he had imitated liked him while not imitated didn't. In relations with women the chameleon effect has not appeared.

In the first instance the lacking or appearance of chameleon effect may be explained by different way of influencing interaction partners by one researcher and by the other. Secondly: fact of influence within limits of same sex offers interesting implications for further research and in non-direct way may confirm relation between chameleon effect and similarity.

To study the topic more thoroughly at present I am running a follow-up research in which:

- a) females are persons who imitate tested people
- b) we adopt version of chameleon effect from experiment nr 1 (Chartrand & Bargh): experimenter makes a specific gesture and we analyze would a tested person imitate the researcher,
- c) Change of similarity manipulation (not a birth date is given but similarity or difference in social status– e.g. Cheng & Chartrand, 2003),
- d) Change of point in time of providing information (before interaction vs. after interaction but prior to measurement of dependent variable).

I do hope that in the nearest future I would present output of this research in a form of scientific article.

I take the liberty to express my gratitude to European Association of Social Psychology for funds which made this research (as it comes out – pilot research) possible. Without generous support from the Association my work would take definitely much more time.

Maya Machunsky
(Mannheim University, Germany)
seedcorn grant

The well-known phenomenon of social projection refers to the attribution of self characteristics to another person or a group. For instance, if a person perceives herself as creative, she is likely to perceive other people as creative, too. Despite extensive research efforts, we do not know much about the antecedents and consequences of this phenomenon. However, one finding has been widely accepted, namely that people project to ingroups but not to outgroups (see Robbins & Krueger, 2005, for a meta-analysis), so that Krueger (Krueger, 2000) concluded that “the surest way to eliminate projection is to ask people to estimate social consensus for a group to which they do not belong. (...) It is as if people treat members of out-groups as members of different species” (p. 334-335).

This research was set out to shed some more light on this finding. We believe that it is not social categorization itself that moderates social projection. In particular, we argue that social categorization is typically confounded with valence such that ingroups are by default more positive than outgroups. By and large, ingroups are favored over outgroups (Brewer & Kramer, 1985; Messick & Mackie, 1989). Hence, it is possible that in fact category valence and not social categorization moderates social projection.

In a previous experiment, an evaluative conditioning procedure was used to experimentally vary the valence of a target. In an evaluative conditioning procedure a priori neutral stimuli (CS) are repeatedly paired with positive or negative Stimuli (US- and US+, respectively). Research has shown that the pairing of neutral stimuli (CS) with positive or negative stimuli (US+/-) changes the liking of the CS in the direction of the valence of the US (Hofmann, De Houwer, Perugini, Baeyens, & Crombez, 2010). In order to vary target valence we capitalized on the fact that people in general hold positive self-attitudes and used the self as a positive US. That is, half of the CSs (i.e., targets) were paired with self-related words as *I, me, myself* and half of the CSs were paired with other-related words as *he, himself, his* etc. In addition, category membership of the targets was varied orthogonally to the valence of the targets. Referring to Krueger's (2000) conclusion that, concerning social projection, outgroup members are treated as if they are members of different species (p. 334-335, 2000), we exaggerated social categorization by using categories of different species. That is members of the categories "giraffes", "chimpanzees", and "human beings" served as targets. In line with our hypothesis, the analysis revealed that participants projected more to self-associated targets than to other-associated targets. In direct contradiction to the notion that people project to ingroups but not to outgroups, we could show that participants projected more to giraffes and chimpanzees than to humans. This effect may be directly attributable to a priori differences in valence. In sum, this experiment supports our claim that target valence and not target categorization is essential for social projection to occur.

There is however an alternative explanation for the effect of self-association on social projection: It may not be valence but the reference to the self that triggers social projection. The Seedcorn Grant from EASP was used to address this question and to further explore the effect of target valence on social projection. A first experiment (N = 61) was a direct follow-up of the above reported experiment. To clarify the role of valence and self-association we added two types of USs, namely a priori positive and neutral nouns. If it is self-association that elicits social projection we expected increased levels of social projection only for the CSs that have been paired with the self. If it is however target valence that triggers social projection, as we suspected, then we should find increased levels of social projection not only for the self-associated CSs but also for the positive-associated CSs. In contrast to the Experiment reported above, we did not use the rather time intensive procedure of Olson and Fazio (2006) in which participants have to pass through hundreds of filler trials. Instead we employed a procedure in which the CS and the US are simply paired a couple of times (cf. Pleyers, Corneille, Luminet, & Yzerbyt, 2007; Stahl & Unkelbach, 2009) without filler trials. Unfortunately, this procedure did neither produce typical EC effects (i.e. changes in liking) nor any social projection effects.

In a second and third experiment, the role of target valence and social categorization for social projection processes was addressed with a different paradigm. In particular, we used a minimal group like procedure and varied either the valence of the ingroup (Experiment 2, N = 108) or of the outgroup (Experiment 3, N = 86). In line with the valence-hypothesis, Experiment 2 revealed that participants projected more to

positive ingroups than to negative ingroups with neutral ingroups in-between. Likewise, participants projected more to positive outgroups than to negative outgroups with neutral outgroups in-between. A follow-up study is planned in which ingroup and outgroup valence will be varied simultaneously in order to estimate the joint effects of valence and social categorization. To further corroborate the valence-hypothesis, such an experiment should ideally reveal that all variations can be attributed to category valence and not to social categorization itself. However, we are aware that this is a rather strong claim so that most likely some variations will be still attributable to social categorization.

To conclude, the presented experiments open new perspectives on the social projection phenomenon. Specifically, none of the current, cognition-based models would have predicted an effect of target valence on the amount of social projection. This led us to a new conceptualization of social projection as a motivational phenomenon from which we derived several novel hypotheses. The EASP Seedcorn Grant enabled a series of experiments which form the starting point for a larger grant application and I am deeply grateful to the EASP for making this possible.

Reference List

- Brewer, M. B. & Kramer, R. M. (1985). The psychology of intergroup attitudes and behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 36, 219-243.
- Hofmann, W., De Houwer, J., Perugini, M., Baeyens, F., & Crombez, G. (2010). Evaluative conditioning in humans: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 390-421.
- Krueger, J. (2000). The projective perception of the social world. In J. Suls & L. Wheeler (Eds.), *Handbook of social comparison: Theory and research* (pp. 323-351). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Messick, D. M. & Mackie, D. M. (1989). Intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 40, 45-81.
- Olson, M. A. & Fazio, R. H. (2006). Reducing automatically activated racial prejudice through implicit evaluative conditioning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 421-433.
- Pleyers, G., Corneille, O., Luminet, O., & Yzerbyt, V. (2007). Aware and (dis)liking: Item-based analyses reveal that valence acquisition via evaluative conditioning emerges only when there is contingency awareness. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 33, 130-144.
- Robbins, J. M. & Krueger, J. I. (2005). Social Projection to ingroups and outgroups: A review and a meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9, 32-47.
- Stahl, C. & Unkelbach, C. (2009). Evaluative learning with single versus multiple unconditioned stimuli: The role of contingency awareness. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes*, 85, 286-291.

Cécile Nurra

(University of Grenoble, France)

seedcorn grant

How does imagining oneself in the future influence the current self? Connection to the future self and current behavior

Thanks to the European Association of Social Psychology, I had a post-doctoral seedcorn research grant that helped me to finance a visiting period. During this visiting period, I worked with Pr. Daphna Oyserman at the university of Michigan. The broad question raised in the project we conducted and still conduct now is: How does imagining oneself in the future influence the current self and current actions? We suggest that the way the future self is pictured is critical. More specifically, we suggest that if a future self feels connected with the current self, it will be a more efficient goal post for current behavior directed toward the future self. In other words, when the future self feels psychologically connected to the current self, the current self should take more actions to assist the future self.

The desired images of the self in the future, a future self, allows one to perceive a link between the present and the future, which in turn inspires future-focused actions (Markus & Nurius, 1986; Oyserman & Markus, 1990). For example, adolescents' fall expected future selves are associated with improved academic achievement at the end of the school year, especially when linked to specific strategies (Oyserman, Bybee, & Terry, 2006). As far as more proximal performance are concerned, results from Ruvolo and Markus (1992) showed that imagining a successful future self leads to more persistence and better performance in a task than imagining failure in the future.

The literature already outlined factors that help the future self to be an incentive for action. Actual distance of the future self is one such factor. Indeed, there is evidence, in the goal literature, that a proximal future goal is more likely to lead to motivation and action than a distant one (e.g., Gollwitzer, 1999; Bandura, 1989; Bandura & Shunk, 1981). Other studies deal with the role of feeling of distance, instead of actual distance. Peetz, Wilson, and Strahan (2009) recently showed that when a goal feels closer, either a mid term exam or a test assigned by the experimenter, people are more motivated and take more action directed toward the goal.

Apart from the actual or perceived distance to the current self, the construction of the future self in mind has been shown to be important for action. For instance, Destin and Oyserman (2009) manipulated the feeling that the path to the future—in their study the path to college—is either “closed” or “open”. For their sample, low-income children and minority youth, college is too expensive, so they might see going to college as something impossible (closed path) unless they know way to get financial aid (open path). Therefore, they manipulated the mind-set of their participants as follows. The closed path condition was manipulated by presenting college tuition cost in Study 1 and by not mentioning college in Study 2, while the open path was manipulated by presenting need-based financial aid opportunities. Results showed

that children in the open path condition expected to have higher grade (Study 1) and to spend more time on homework (Study 2). Even if picturing the path as open is a helpful and important lever to lead low-income children to more actions, we suggest that this effect can be explained by connection to the future: seeing an open path can lead to more connection between the current self and the future self.

Connection to the future has already been shown to change behaviors linked to the future. Indeed, the *temporal discounting* literature showed that the current self might prefer smaller current benefits over future larger ones (see Lowenstein, O'Donoghue, & Rabin, 2003 for a review). This preference is sometimes explained as a self-control failure (e.g., Metcalfe & Mischel, 1999), but it can also be explained as a difference in connection between the current self and the future self. In several studies, Bartels and Rips (2010) showed that depending on how connected college student felt toward a future self had an effect on how much they were willing to delay monetary reward (see also Ersner-Hershfield, Garton, Ballar, Samanez-Larkin, & Knuston, 2009). As connection (also labeled self-continuity) can be defined as the fact to see the future self as a different person (Ersner-Hershfield et al., 2009), it is no wonder that people fail to take current action that would benefit the future self (e.g., do homework, diet, save for retirement).

Building up on this literature, we suggest that the key factor to predict the incentive power of the future self is connection between future self and current self. This connection hypothesis implies that several manipulations can induce connection and that connection leads to more actions directed toward reaching the future self. In the two studies we will describe, our samples are fourth and fifth graders (aged 9-11).

The first study took place in a classroom and we manipulated the feeling of connection between the current self and the future self. In a between subjects design, children were told that the future is either connected or disconnected from the current self, that imagining the future is like imagining being either the same person or another person. This explanation came with the presentation of two overlapping circles (connected condition) or separated circles (disconnected condition) representing what they are now and what they want to be like in the future. Then, they had to say (on a Likert scale) if they were doing things to become as they want to be like. Results showed that feeling the future as connected improved the extent to which children self-reported behavior directed toward the future self. In other words, in the connected condition, they reported to do more things directed toward their future than in the disconnected condition.

We designed the second study to add ecological validity to the test of the connection hypothesis. First, as Study 1, it took place in classrooms and, second, the dependent variable was performance on a subsequent and ostensibly separate task provided by the teachers after the experimenter left the room (described as a worksheet that could be completed in the remaining ten minutes of class). In a between subjects design, children were told that their future self as an adult is either near in the future (connected condition) or far in the future (disconnected condition). Then, after filling

items, experimenter left the class and they did the exercise with their teacher. Results showed that feeling the future self as connected (near prime) led to higher performance at the school task (the first pathways they encounter after they spoke about their future). Importantly, this effect remains significant when we control for actual temporal distance children felt between now and the achievement of their future self. This is critical as it suggests that it is not the feeling of proximity in and on itself that explains our results, but more likely the feeling of connection between the current self and the future self.

Together with Daphna Oyserman, we believe that these results are a great support to the connection hypothesis and showed that the connection between the current self and the future self is a key variable to explain when the future self is more incentive to action. Since then, we conducted follow up studies and results support our hypothesis. Follow-up studies are planned to go further on this idea. As one would say: *to be continued*.

Here, I would like again to express all my gratitude to the European Association of Social Psychology for supporting me with the post-doctoral seedcorn research grant. It really helped the project we had with Daphna Oyserman to go further and helped to create, in my sense, a fruitful collaboration. This all thing, however, would not have been possible if Daphna Oyserman was not as she is, both as a researcher and as a person. She always connects two important things: fun with thinking and my current self to my future self.

References:

- Bartels, D. M., & Rips, L. J. (2010). Psychological connectedness and intertemporal choice. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *139*, 49-69.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist*, *44*, 1175-1184.
- Bandura, A., & Schunk, D. H (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *41*, 586-598.
- Destin, M., & Oyserman, D. (2009). From assets to school outcomes: How finances shape children's perceived possibilities and intentions. *Psychological Science*, *20*, 414-418.
- Ersner-Hershfield, H., Garton, M. T., Ballar, K., Samanez-Larkin, G., & Knuston, B. (2009). Don't stop thinking about tomorrow: Individual differences in future self-contonuity account for saving. *Judgment and Decision Making*, *4*, 280-286.
- Gollwitzer, P. M. (1999). Implementation intentions: Strong effects of simple plans. *American Psychologist*, *54*, 493-503.
- Lowenstein, G., O'Donoghue, T., & Rabin, M. (2003). Projection bias in predicting future utility. *Quarterly Journal of Economic*, *4*, 209-1248.

- Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible Selves. *American Psychologist*, 41, 954-969.
- Metcalfe, J., & Mischel, W. (1999). A hot/cool-system analysis of delay of gratification: Dynamics of willpower. *Psychological Review*, 106, 3-19.
- Oyserman, D., Bybee, D., & Terry, K. (2006). Possible selves and academic outcomes: How and when possible selves impel action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 188-204.
- Oyserman, D., & Markus, H. R., (1990). Possible selves and delinquency. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 112-125.
- Peetz, J., Wilson, A. E., & Strahan, E. J. (2009). So far away: the role of subjective temporal distance to future goals in motivation and behavior. *Social Cognition*, 27, 475-495.
- Ruvolo, A. P., & Markus, H. R. (1992). Possible selves and performance: The power of self-relevant imagery. Special issue: Self-knowledge: Content, structure, and function. *Social Cognition*, 10, 95-124.

Sofia Stathi

(University of Kent, UK)

travel grant

Last May I visited Professor Veronica Benet-Martinez at the University of California, Riverside with the help of an EASP travel grant. Professor Benet-Martinez is an expert in the field of biculturalism, an area which I have come to develop a great interest for. After familiarising with the literature on biculturalism, I considered her work extremely noteworthy and I was looking for an opportunity to visit her. This opportunity came when I received the EASP travel award.

My visit lasted almost one week, during which Professor Benet-Martinez and I met and discussed issues regarding the current theories and potential advances in the field. When considering some -- always current-- social issues, such as immigration and the globalisation of job and education markets, biculturalism is definitely an area worth exploring. For example, it is forecasted that globally, the number of International students in higher education will reach 5.8 million by 2020 (Bohm, Follari, Hewett, Jones, Kemp, Mearns, et al., 2004). In addition, when considering the ethnic diversity in western countries, we can see that in Germany, for example, reside more than 2,000,000 people of Turkish or Kurdish origin after the large wave of Turkish and Kurdish immigration in the 1960's (Zick, Wagner, van Dick, & Petzel, 2001). Furthermore, an extensive research organized by the Institute of Public Policy in the United Kingdom, indicated that immigrants constitute more than 7.5% of the population in Britain (Institute for Public Policy Research, 2005).

My meetings with Professor Benet-Martinez were very interesting and fruitful. As a result, we are considering applying for further funding that would allow us to advance the research on biculturalism, a prospect that I look forward to. All in all, my experience was very positive. I thoroughly enjoyed creating the proposal for this grant, finding out the good news about the success of my application, and of course the visit itself. I would encourage all PhD students and young researchers to make the most of this opportunity.

To a very large extent, I owe the realisation and success of my visit to this travel grant. I am very grateful to EASP for enabling my visit to UC Riverside. Furthermore, I would like to thank Ms Sibylle Classen for her great help and patience; it has been very much appreciated.

References

- Bohm, A., Follari, F., Hewett, A., Jones, S., Kemp, N., Meares, D., et al. (2004). *Vision 2020: Forecasting international student mobility: A UK perspective*. London: British Council.
- Institute for Public Policy Research (2005). Britain's immigrant communities more diverse than ever. Retrieved June 17, 2009 from <http://www.ippr.org.uk/pressreleases/?id=1688>
- Zick, A., Wagner, U., van Dick, R., & Petzel, T. (2001). Acculturation and prejudice in Germany: Majority and minority perspectives. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 541–55.

Lotte van Dillen
(University of Kent, UK)
seedcorn grant

Thanks to a seedcorn grant of the European Association of Social Psychology, I was able to carry out a six-month research project at the Phelbs Lab, at New York University, on the context sensitivity of the negativity bias. In this project, which I conducted in collaboration with Lasana Harris, and which builds upon earlier findings (Van Dillen & Koole, 2009; Van Dillen, Lakens, & Van den Bos, in press) we investigated how the attention bias to threatening faces is modulated by how people categorize these faces.

Various attentional paradigms have demonstrated the enhanced ability of threatening faces to capture attention. To account for such findings, theorists have proposed that evolution has equipped people to efficiently screen the environment for potential threats. One important question is how flexibly such an attention mechanism operates. We hypothesized that one way the attention bias to threatening faces is moderated is by how people categorize these faces. If facial expressions are part of the

mental representation of a category, the attention system will be more susceptible to these features. Accordingly, people should display vigilance for threatening faces especially when the activated category prompts attentional processing of facial expressions. Facial expressions play a pivotal role in social categorizations, as they communicate information about the person's intentions. Through social learning and/or stereotyping, people may come to associate emotional expressions with certain social categories. Hence, threatening facial expressions should bias attention especially during social categorization tasks.

To test this notion, we compared people's reaction times and facial muscle activity during a categorization task of threatening (angry, disgusted) and non-threatening (neutral, happy) faces. By means of a popular science article, we informed participants that through genetic coding, different eye-colors (blue or brown) indicate both a personality trait (introversion, extraversion) as well as a physical trait (sensitivity to high versus low light frequency). Participants were then instructed to use this information to categorize a series of faces. Accordingly, participants categorized the same faces on both a social dimension and on a strictly physical dimension. The results showed that threatening faces interfered with categorization responses when participants used eye-color to categorize the personality trait of extraversion but not when participants used eye-color to categorize the physical trait of light frequency. In addition, we found facial muscle activity in response to threatening faces (angry, disgusted) to predict response times to these faces, but again, only when participants had to implement the personality category of extraversion. There was no relationship between facial muscle activity and responses to the happy or neutral faces. Thus, converging evidence from both behavioral and physiological measures suggests that the attention bias to threatening faces is contingent on people's categorization strategies, supporting the perspective that social influences modulate even basic emotional processes.

I would like to thank the association for giving me the opportunity to work directly with my friend and colleague, Lasana Harris, whom I've come to know well at the 2006 EASP summer school in Padova, Italy. Thanks to the initiatives of the EASP, we have been able to transform our friendship into a long-term collaboration, which will hopefully lead to many (more) interesting research findings. I would also like to thank all members of the Phelps Lab at New York University, and in particular Elizabeth Phelps, for her warm welcome and generosity, and Erica, Jackie, and Eyal for their assistance. It has been a great pleasure to work in such a top notch, social, and truly interdisciplinary environment.

Announcements**Election of New Executive Committee Members
Call for Nominations**

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

Carsten de Dreu (The Netherlands), Miguel Moya (Spain), and Bogdan Wojciszke (Poland) will leave the Executive Committee in July 2011.

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

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

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

Each nomination must be supported by two full members and addressed to the Executive Officer (sibylle@easp.eu). The deadline for receiving nominations is **March, 15th, 2011**.

Each nomination packet has to contain:

A letter from the nominee, agreeing to serve on the Executive Committee, if elected
Letters of support from two full members of the Association
Brief background information from the nominee (max. half an A4 page maximum), with a summary of academic positions, administrative experience, representative publications, and current research interests.

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

Open call for offers to host the next General Meeting (2014)

The Executive Committee calls for offers to organize and host the next General Meeting in three years time (2014). We are particularly interested in offers from countries (and parts of Europe more generally) that have not staged our most important meeting before. However the most important concern for us is to host a successful meeting so offers from members of the Association from all parts of Europe are very welcome and will be given full consideration at our next committee meeting in April.

We expect around 1000 people, and will therefore need the necessary hotel capacity (bear in mind that demand as well as prices may also be high in the months we typically hold the meeting), and a conference centre with one big room of about 800 seats and 10 rooms for between 25 and 150 people in each case. The typical time of the conference is somewhere in July or August but flexibility is also possible here (the meeting was once held in April for example).

These are the basic requirements but it is important also not to underestimate the work involved in planning and hosting event of this magnitude. Although some of the more mundane tasks (e.g. hotel reservations and registration) can be devolved to a professional conference organizing company, the executive committee consider it essential for the host organizers to take the initiative in organizing the other aspects of the conference. Experience has shown that this is important not only to keep costs down but also to stamp the identity of the organizing team on the conference. Although the task can seem onerous, the executive committee is of course willing to help in any way it can, particularly in terms of advice and experience derived from previous organizers. A program committee will be responsible for the scientific program but this will also include representation of the local organizers. Despite the work involved the benefits can also be enormous, not only in terms of our gratitude, but more importantly in terms of raising the profile of the social psychology in the university, region and country of the host organizers, and stimulating social psychology in this area.

Deadline: In view of the date of the next committee meeting please send letters of interest, detailing the basic facilities and feasibility of your offer in line with the requirements outlined above to our Executive Officer, Sibylle Classen (sibylle@easp.eu) **as soon as possible** but in any case **by March 15th, 2011**.

EJSP early career best manuscript awards 2008 and 2009

I am pleased to inform you about the EJSP early career manuscript award winners for 2008 and 2009. Each year, from 2003 onwards, the editorial team of the EJSP awards a prize to the best paper published in *EJSP* to have been first-authored by a researcher within three years of their doctoral degree (please see: <http://www.easp.eu/activities/own/awards/ejsp.htm>). The former editor Leonel Garcia-Marques and his team have chosen the following articles for the EJSP early career manuscript award 2008 and 2009:

2008: Monika Stelzl

Monika Stelzl, Leslie Janes & Clive Seligman (2008). Champ or chump: Strategic utilization of dual social identities of others, *EJSP*, 38(1) 128-138.

2009: Suzanne Oosterwijk

Suzanne Oosterwijk, Mark Rotteveel, Agneta H. Fischer & Ursula Hess (2009). Embodied emotion concepts: How generating words about pride and disappointment influences posture, *EJSP*, 39(3) 457-466.

Wiley flagged these papers on the *European Journal of Social Psychology* journal homepage – please see: [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/\(ISSN\)1099-0992](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/(ISSN)1099-0992)

Winner Ig-nobel prize 2010

Simon Rietveld and **Ilja van Beest** were awarded the Ig-nobel prize for their research on asthma. They used roller coaster rides to induce emotions and showed that the valence of emotions affected the relation between self-reported breathlessness and actual lung function. This prize is awarded to science that makes you first laugh and then think.

Rietveld, S., & Van Beest, I. (2006) Rollercoaster asthma: When positive emotional stress interferes with dyspnea perception. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 45, 997-987.

Summer Institute in Social Psychology (SISP) 2011 Call for Applications

General information

Modelled on the bi-annual EASP summer schools, which are held in even-numbered years, the Society of Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) offers comparable two-week intensive summer schools for US/Canadian doctoral students, to be held in the United States in odd-numbered years, beginning in 2003.

SISP 2003: University of Colorado, Boulder, July 13-26, 2003

SISP 2005: University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, on July 24-August 6, 2005,

SISP 2007 : University of Texas at Austin , July 15-28, 2007

SISP 2009: Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois from July 12-25, 2009.

The 2011 SISP will be held at Princeton, New Jersey, USA from July 24 - August 6, 2011.

EASP schools are set up primarily for European students, but the organisers also always accept five US-students, selected and sponsored by SPSP. Vice versa, the SPSP schools are set up primarily for USA/Canadian students, but the organisers will also accept five European students (EASP postgraduate members), selected and sponsored by the EASP.

Format of SISP 2011

Full length courses

Each student will enrol in one of five full-length courses, each taught by two prominent instructors. For 2011, the instructors and courses are:

(1) ACCURACY IN JUDGMENTS OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL RELATIONS

David Funder, Department of Psychology, University of California, Riverside & Tessa West, Department of Psychology, New York University

(2) HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY

Sally Dickerson, Department of Psychology & Social Behavior, University of California, Irvine & Traci Mann, Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota

(3) SELF-KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING

David Dunning, Department of Psychology, Cornell University & Simine Vazire, Department of Psychology, Washington University

(4) SOCIAL INFLUENCE IN GROUPS

Fabrizio Butera, Department of Social Psychology, University of Lausanne & John Levine, Department of Psychology and Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh

(5) SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERVENTION

Hart Blanton, Department of Psychology, University of Connecticut & Deborah Prentice, Department of Psychology, Princeton University

Three day workshops

(1) IMPLICIT MEASUREMENT

Keith Payne, Department of Psychology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

(2) INTRODUCTION TO SECONDARY DATA ANALYSIS

Kali Trzesniewski, Human and Community Development Department, University of California, Davis

(3) MISSING DATA: ANALYSIS AND RELATED ISSUES IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH

John Graham, Department of Biobehavioral Health and Prevention Research Center, The Pennsylvania State University

SISP website

Further details can be found on the SPSP website <http://www.spsp.org/sisp/> and on the SISP website

<https://weblamp.princeton.edu/~psych/psychology/related/SISP/index.php>

(European EASP postgraduate members should not apply via SPSP but should follow the instructions listed below).

Application procedure for EASP members and deadline

Interested EASP postgraduate members should check the EASP website

<http://www.easp.eu/activities/joint/spsp.htm#sisp> and fill in the application form.

Please send it as Word- or Pdf attachment to the EASP Executive Officer Sibylle

Classen and attach your cv.

The application should be supported by the applicant's Ph.D. supervisor. Supervisors are therefore asked to write a letter of support, explaining why they feel their student could benefit from and add to this summer school. Supervisors are asked to email their letter directly to Sibylle Classen (mentioning SISP and the name of the applicant supported in the Ref-Field).

The deadline for applications (and the support letter) is **December 31, 2010**.

Applications and letters of support received after Friday, December 31, 2010 will not be considered.

The selection procedure

Among the candidates five students will be selected for participation by the SISP Decision Committee of EASP.

In making this selection the Committee will rely on the following criteria:

- at least in the second year of the Ph.D. programme;
- a sufficient level of (self espoused) proficiency at English;
- active in an area sufficiently close to a topic of SISP;
- strength of the supervisor's letter of support;
- not having participated in an EASP summer school;
- definitely not more than one student per institution;
- a reasonable distribution over countries.

Decisions will be made and communicated to those selected and not selected by end of January 2011.

Costs and sponsoring

EASP will sponsor travel expenses to Princeton for the five selected students, for a maximum of 600 Euro per student, if financial support is needed. Selected students will be informed regarding the details of payment.

Each student is expected to contribute a registration fee of 200 US-Dollars to SISP. Details about mode of payment will be communicated to selected students.

Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Executive Officer by **March, 15th, 2011** latest. Applications for grants and for the International Teaching Fellowship Scheme can be received by the deadlines end of March, June, September, and December. The deadline for the next issue of the Bulletin is **March, 15th, 2011**.

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

Executive Committee

Fabrizio Butera, ISSP - BFSH 2, University of Lausanne, CH 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

e-mail: Fabrizio.Butera@unil.ch

Xenia Chrysochoou (Secretary), Department of Psychology, Panteion University, Syngrou Av. 136, Athens 176 71, Greece

e-mail: chrysochoou@eekpsy.gr

Carsten K.W. De Dreu (President), Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, Roetersstraat 15, NL-1018 WB Amsterdam, The Netherlands

email c.k.w.dedreu@uva.nl

Alex Haslam (Treasurer), School of Psychology, University of Exeter, Exeter EX4 4QG, UK

e-mail: A.Haslam@exeter.ac.uk

Miguel Moya, Faculty of Psychology, University of Granada, Campus de Cartuja, E-18011, Granada, Spain

e-mail: mmoya@ugr.es

Sabine Otten, Dept. of Social and Organizational Psychology, University of Groningen, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, NL-9712 TS Groningen, The Netherlands

e-mail: s.otten@rug.nl

Bogdan Wojciszke, Institute of Psychology, Polish Academy of Science, Chodakowska 19/31, PL-03-815 Warsaw, Poland

e-mail: bogdan@psychpan.waw.pl

Executive Officer:

Sibylle Classen, P.O. Box 420 143, D-48068 Muenster, Germany

fax: +49-2533-281144

e-mail: sibylle@easp.eu

website of the EASP:

<http://www.easp.eu>