Editorial

Dear Friends and Colleagues,

You have in front of you a new edition of the European Bulletin and I hope that you will enjoy its content. There are several issues I would like to draw your attention to. First of all look at **our new logo**! You probably noticed it when receiving the European Journal but this is the first time we are using it. Our "new identity" has now a new symbol to be recognized by and we very much hope that you will like it.

Recently, the Executive Committee met and, besides welcoming new members (see the relevant section), we also decided to have our **next General Meeting in Stockholm in 2011** and our next **Summer School in Greece in 2010**. I (with a team of social psychologists) will be hosting this later event and very soon you will receive details via mail. Of course the autumn issue of the bulletin will also have relevant information. In this issue you will find the reports of the last summer school in Cardiff. I truly hope that the Greek summer school will be remembered as positively and will be as productive as the one described here! We are also looking forward to going to Sweden for our General Meeting. It is such an exciting place! Now that you know the location prepare your presentations!

With sadness we learned that our colleagues Gerard Duveen and Michael Riketta passed away so early in their life. The community shares the grief of their friends and colleagues.

Carsten, in his President's Corner is giving details of the **SPPS**, the new journal. I am sure you will be excited from our new collective editorial adventure. The Association and its members are thriving if one looks at the new books by members, the reports from the different meetings and of the grant-holders. We are very much looking at the future but we also have strong roots.

Taking my recent responsibility in the executive committee, I felt the need to consult people that served the Association in the past. Thus, the idea came to introduce a new column in the Bulletin, a kind of "**Past Presidents' Corner**" where I will interview colleagues who served the Association as Presidents. Unfortunately, I will limit my interviews to the Presidents, for the moment, since so many people were members of the Executive Committee and I would not have the opportunity to discuss with all of them. However, all members are welcome to send their comments on what is published, if they so wish. The idea is to interview people on their thoughts about social psychology, the association and their time on the Executive Committee and so we could all benefit from their wisdom and ideas. I will not do my interviews chronologically but I will try to find opportunities to meet with people. So, past presidents you will all receive a message from me, at some point, and if, for some reason, you come to Greece, let me know!

It is my pleasure to start this column with **Professor Willem Doise** (University of Geneva) who served the EA(E)SP as Treasurer from 1975 to 1978 and as President between 1978 and 1981. My questions are also enriched from his recent book in which he reflects on his research, grounding it in his personal experiences. I had sent some questions via mail to him but in fact we met end of March and the interview that you will read evolved during the discussion. It is therefore much more a conversation than a formal interview and since none of us is a native English speaker we have let the discussion to develop without stylistic constrains! I thoroughly enjoyed the interview and I hope that you will also do so and that you will adopt this column.

Enjoy your reading

Xenia Chryssochoou
Athens, April 2009

President's Corner

SPPS

The past few months have been quite exciting as we've been working hard to start Social Psychological and Personality Science. It started with an informal discussion over breakfast last June, where Rich Petty (SPSP) and I pondered the possibility of starting a journal covering social and personality psychology modeled after (psychological) science and with a true international aim and outlook. Early July and joined by Linda Skitka (SESP) and Brent Roberts (ARP) we wrote a short brief and asked several international publishers to offer. Early Fall we settled for Sage, Inc., who made an offer that both materially and immaterially was most attractive.

As most of you know, in a few weeks the online submission site for Social Psychological and Personality Science will be opened. Incoming editor Vincent Yzerbyt and his editorial team will be busy selecting those most outstanding manuscripts that warrant publication in the inaugural issue to appear in January 2010. If you're in for a party and wish to celebrate this memorial event, make sure you attend the 2010 SPSP meeting in Las Vegas…

Social Psychological and Personality Science is an important new activity for three reasons. With the other societies we share ownership of the journal. As with any business, we invest and hope to gain revenue at some point, revenue that will further the interests of EASP and European excellence in social psychology. However, our investments are modest and so will be our revenues – after all, making money is not among the main goals of our association.

SPPS is important also because it helps to further the dissemination of our research to as broad and international an audience as possible. Several of our finest journals, the European Journal of Social Psychology included, are getting more and more submissions each year. And with the increase in numbers there is an increase in quality as well. Social psychology in Europe and beyond is flourishing – it is getting bigger and better every day. This is a wonderful development and no small achievement. And it means that there is both room and need for additional journals that publish high quality work. Social Psychological and Personality Science is intended to do exactly that.

Finally, I think it is important to emphasize that SPPS is a truly international enterprise. In our past we have had successful joint meetings with the Society of Experimental Social Psychology, and we have a longstanding tradition of exchanging students in our summer schools and those organized by the Society for Personality and Social Psychology. SPPS is a logical next step in further making social psychology a strong and global science.

Carsten de Dreu
Utrecht, April 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

---

In this book, Willem Doise is revisiting intergroup relations and research on human rights with an eye towards the past and simultaneously an eye towards the future. The book includes four chapters and a conclusion in which the author describes how his research interests evolved during his career from studying the consequences of the existence of group boundaries to the study of human rights as social representations. Looking forward, he integrates this research in issues relating to the exercise of power, war and war crimes, economic asymmetries and social solidarities and the construction of terrorism. The author presents research he and others conducted on human rights in a coherent manner allowing the reader to understand how research on social representations can contribute to our understanding of contemporary societies. However, the rarity of this book lies on the fact that the author anchors his research on his personal experiences, showing how research interests can grow through our interaction with the social world. In this manner, Doise is not only inviting social psychologists to look at themes that bind people together and that we tend to remark only through their violation, but also introduces a new look in social psychology. He is pledging for a societal social psychology that "produces knowledge which integrates its past in its future, that creates new along the old, that remains mindful of local conditions and that introduces knowledge from elsewhere" (p.145).

Flashbulb memories: New issues and Perspectives
Luminet, O. & Curci, A. (2008)
Psychology Press
ISBN 978-1-84169-672-0, Hardback, £34.95, pp. 312

We all have memories of highly emotional personal and public events that may have happened some years ago but which are felt as strongly as if they happened yesterday.
We remember where they happened, the people who were with us, and seemingly irrelevant details such as the weather, particular sounds or specific clothes. Why do we remember these things? Is it because such events are so deeply emotional or so unexpected or because people talk about them so many times? Why are these "flashbulb memories" so vivid and lasting?
Flashbulb Memories: New Issues and New Perspectives explores these questions in the first book on flashbulb memories (FBMs) for more than a decade. It considers the many developments over the last 10 years, including new models of FBM formation, advances in statistical methods and neuroscience, and two key public events, the death of Princess Diana and the September 11th attacks in the US, which can help test FBM. The book examines the status of FBMs as "special" or "ordinary" memory formations, and the expert contributors represent a balance between those that favour each approach. It also investigates controversial topics of research such as:

❖ Are emotional, cognitive, or social factors highly relevant for the formation of FBMs?
❖ How can sociological, historical, and cultural issues help us to understand the process of FBMs?
❖ What are the differences between FBMs, memories for traumatic experiences, and highly vivid personal memories?
❖ How can we provide a valid and reliable measure for FBMs?

<div style="text-align:center">

Conversation with Willem Doise
(Treasurer 1975-1978 and President 1978-1981)
by Xenia Chryssochoou

</div>

XC: *One idea that interested me reading your book is that there is a relationship between research and the social and historical context. One thing that we, social psychologists do sometimes is that we pretend that ideology stops at the doorsteps of our laboratories, that we can do research that is not ideologically marked. In your book you write that a scientific theory is necessarily universal but its condition of production is situated in time and space. This is a very difficult thing to do. How could we do that, i.e. present universal theories taking into account that there are situated in time and space?*

WD: Well, I think that there is no problem arguing this about the so-called physical laws. All this universal knowledge has been discovered in concrete circumstances. There is no such a thing as a universal science that is not embedded all the time in a kind of situation where, in a certain location, people were confronted with an argument, a state of affairs and then they went further. For social sciences this a little bit more complicated and there are extreme cases. For instance I brought this European Bulletin when Dominic Abrams was the editor, where there is a very illuminating article by Andreeva "Successes and Failures of Russian Social Psychology". She shows that in order to be freed from the ideological iron collar (carcan in French in the conversation) of that period, social psychology had to become part of psychology, because psychology was considered to be free from ideological impacts. Thus, social psychology in order to be free from ideology had to become psychology. Then, she describes some things that were difficult for soviet social psychology. She mentions Vygotsky and so on. She did a list of things that were developed in the so-called soviet social psychology and she ends with a very interesting suggestion; it should be interesting to conduct an experiment: We could call western colleagues to name 10 Russian social psychologists in the field of attitudes, perception, socialization, ethno- psychology and to ask what do they know about them and then to ask colleagues from Russia to name western or American social psychologists and ask them what they know about them. We don't know much about them, whereas Russian colleagues would know much more about us. So what does this mean? Would this mean that what we achieved scientifically is universal and what they did is not? This is what the Germans would call a "Gedanken Experiment".

In social psychology, it is difficult to say what is really universal. In order to have a good theory in social psychology one always has to make a lot of implicit assumptions. Take for instance dissonance theory, which is perhaps one of the most successful theories in social psychology, the need of a kind of consonance. But there was already, long time ago, I think his name was Malewski, a Polish social psychologist in the '60s who asked, if there is a need for cognitive coherence, does this need exist with depressive people? Maybe they don't need cognitive coherence; they think that they are not able. Then there is the work by people like Beauvois, Joule and others that show that when you feel free to do something, dissonance works and it increases the actions that are consonant with previous actions. That means that even in the study of the most elementary processes one always build a set of assumptions that are rarely made explicit. For instance, as far as I know, very few people asked about age and cognitive dissonance. A lot of dissonance research was done with adults. So the whole idea of what is universal and what is not for me is a matter of studying a specific setting and without knowing if this specific setting is necessary. But we take it for granted. We use a lot of implicit, site specific wisdom. Donald Campbell in the Oxford summer school

gave a seminar on the necessity of site specific wisdom in order to formulate our hypotheses.

XC: *Perhaps, the fact that a lot of our research is cognitive produces this implicit assumption that cognition should work the same way everywhere… And one of the things that I liked when I read about social representations is the idea that social regulations guide cognitive elaborations.*

WD: Yes, it is the metasystem of cognitive regulations that organizes the cognitive elaborations… This is very clear for instance in political discourse. Politicians need to reach the conclusion that they are allowed to reach because they cannot go against the interests of their party. So they develop a whole discourse coming to that conclusion. For me that is a good example of the metasystem. They will build a very sophisticated cognitive elaboration but it is oriented. This goal oriented for instance the study of "activity" in Russian social psychology they have a specific word for it.

XC: *I was thinking that this is a point made also by Sampson in a paper called "Cognitive Psychology as Ideology" when he says that we are studying how people might make a decision between two options, A and B, but we do not look really how these options came to exist at the first place… My question related also to the debate about cultural specificities, it started with Jahoda with his "J'accuse" paper and there are still many people that define themselves as acculturation or intercultural psychologists but in fact they are doing social psychology putting more emphasis on cultural differences.*

WD: Well, I have never done really cultural psychology but I was involved in a project in the '60s with Dean Peabody where he showed that there is a difference between cultures concerning formality and informality. There are cultures in which people have to be very formal, looking always for the right thing and other cultures where you can be informal. A first remark is that within a

culture there is also difference. I always give an example, when Morton Deutsch speaks about distributive justice he has a table of 16 situations: formal/informal, there are rules/there are no rules (for example between two businessmen the rules are strict whereas between two students preparing a paper together the rules are not strict), there are status asymmetries (a boss, somebody with power and somebody without), situations where you have to produce something and in other not (in some situations people are happy to be together , just to play together whereas in other they have to work together)… Anyway there are four dimensions: a) status b) formality c) produce or not and d) competition/cooperation. So, in our culture we could have a table with 16 situations in which the implicit rules would be completely different: a mother with an infant, a prison guard with a prisoner … It would be a big mistake in our own culture to carry over rules from one situation to another. For example when two students are working together they will not allow somebody to give orders… So my understanding of cultural differences is that in some cultures some situations are considered as more prototypical, are more elaborated upon and are considered as more important. In theories of justice one has to consider the need of other people, the merit of other people and a norm of equality, people have to be treated similarly. It is very complicated just to evaluate the specific weight of these three norms in a given situation. In a sport situation the meritocratic norm is the best but when faced with disabled people you have to reconsider the norm to use. I have red about a school in which autistic children participating in exams are helped by someone to keep their attention on relevant aspects of the exam problem. Of course then one can say that some pupils are helped and some pupils are not, there is a compromise of taking into consideration differences in need and furthering equality. This is the kind of ideas on cross-cultural psychology that I have developed with Dario Spini in a chapter of a book edited by Serge Moscovici and Fabrice Buschini on methodology in social sciences.

XC: *For example, in the Human Rights research you found a lot of universality, a lot of common things, instead of cultural specificities…*

WD: Yes, yes and I found in the first wave of results that people understand basic rights because they take into consideration the elements of specific situations. By definition all participants in the first wave of research were in contact at least with information about other cultures since they were all students. However, in the sample, we had also other people like autochthones from Canada, workers and so on and they all gave the same type of answers. I think that in the present world, except in some specific situations, some tribes may be, everybody has come into contact with widely diffused aspects of a kind of universal culture, most people that we know even in countries such as Indonesia or the Philippines, that have tribal people, have been into contact with representatives of a more general authority, they have learned to deal with that, they have learned that there are some rules to be respected by both sides. I think that this is another aspect of intercultural psychology nowadays, people are aware that there are rules to be respected on both sides. So for example there is this famous study that I site in my book on human rights about people in the region of the big lakes in Africa. There were expelled from their region because there is now a natural park. They are called Ik. An anthropologist said about them that they had lost all rules, they are joking about other people that they take the food out of the mouth of elderly people. So when their descendants now learned what he had said, they asked whether they could sue him for this. They know that they have some rights…

So, for me Human Rights were a western, occidental enterprise at the beginning, others say that it was not occidental it was linked to international trade, whatever… When you get into relations with other people you have to assume that there are rules. You cannot just go on for a long time in the present world saying "I fix the rules". Maybe this existed when people invaded South America and

they thought that indigenous people had nothing to say, that there were savages. But this has now changed. I don't think that this change is an effect of Human Rights I rather think that Human Rights are an effect of these changed relationships.

XC: *And that people are accountable…*

WD: Yes, accountable, this is the difference.

XC: *Human Rights are for you a hegemonic representation? I mean that if representations are helping us to communicate, to make the unfamiliar familiar, would you say that we have produced here a representation that helps us organize our relationships?*

WD: Yes, it helps us organize relationships but whether it is only a hegemonic representation, as Moscovici talks about hegemonic and polemical representations, I think that it can be also a polemical one. As soon as you have issues of rights there are other rights that emerge… I think that everybody has the right to be respected but then there is the freedom of others, the whole issue of the respect of religion is now very important. I think that it is hegemonic in the sense that everybody knows that there are rules but there is never a complete consensus about the rules to be applied. And when we speak about the ideas of needs, equality and merit, some people would say that in order for our conceptions of these values to be respected we should not allow other people to come into the game… So in the name of justice you would have exclusion very often. Human Rights are something that is at stake. One can argue about their relevance without their being a superimposed consensual vision.

XC: *What you are saying about justice and exclusion it reminds me something I found interesting reading you. You say that we spread a kind of fatalism about the human kind, assuming that there be always prejudice, discrimination and conflict in intergroup relations. Thus, we study the violation of an order we have in mind…and it is very difficult to study for example the*

representation of peace because people understand peace through its violation. This came into my mind as an epistemological problem because in our research we are looking for differences and if for example we don't find differences then it is very difficult to publish our work. In your view is this something that is inherent to our scientific method or is this a representation we have about society?

WD: I think that there is probably a cognitive bias in our research in the sense that we are looking at what creates problems and not at what is not problematic. So there is something epistemological. I didn't thought about it very much but it is epistemological at different levels. In a certain way, as Deschamps wrote somewhere, after the WWII we were so much intrigued by this inhumanity of common human behavior and, thus, there is a lot of research around this. In Zimbardo's last book, the Pygmalion effect, where he speaks about his prisoners experiment and the Abu Ghraib situation, in the introduction he writes that we should not forget that these are exceptional situations and that there are many instances where people behave in a heroic way. Of course people can also say that people are heroic facing injustice, but, as a matter of fact, Zimbardo describes something that is an exception. He says that in the prison were two lines of command: the army authority and the CIA authority. The CIA became the more powerful authority and this resulted in this very inhuman and horrible situation. He also says that there should now be a lawsuit against the Bush administration. So, there is a given state of buffers but, this given state of buffers, is not a necessity. There are other countries where these things could not happen or could be more difficult to happen. Of course we don't hear very much about these other countries in the press. We hear, for example, that in some countries civil servants look at their own interests and everybody understands that they help themselves into the common wealth, whereas in other countries this is a transgression that is not at all acceptable. So, how can we define a concept to explain that this is

part of the everyday life for some people and constitute an exception for others? We need to study intercultural differences… Yet the two are true. I would say that we need to pay attention not to take for granted that what social psychologists consider a necessity is also a necessity for tomorrow. What we may now think as an inevitable thing may prevent us of thinking about other possibilities. So we should not be imprisoned by the dominant way of looking, of thinking and of writing in social psychology.

XC: Yet, how can we take some necessary distance?

WD: We are perhaps able in formal situations… but in the research, when reacting to previous research, we have to admit to some extent that there are people we do not agree with. That is why I sometimes hesitate to reply to research that I consider somewhat biased, because when you become part of the game and you do an experiment you take to some extent that research for granted. It is very difficult if you are not really committed to spend a big part of your research life to falsify some of the dominant theories, to deal with them. If you deal with them in a rapid way, you would reinforce the implicit assumptions. It is a very difficult issue.

XC: Talking about implicit assumptions, in your book you cite Tajfel and Israel and you say that we should be explicit about the nature of the human beings, the nature of society and the relationship between individuals and society that our research implies. I was also impressed by Solomon Asch's book "Social Psychology" where the first chapter is about the "Doctrines of Man" and where he criticizes previous theoretical assumptions to introduce the cognitive approach. He then makes the point that we cannot do a science without being aware of what theory of human nature we are producing. What I found amusing is that Asch wrote this in 1952, Tajfel and Israel wrote the same thing in 1972 and now, in 2009, you are bringing again this issue. It seems to me that nothing changed…

WD: Yes… well, I think that something changed in a rather strange way: something changed because regularly people leave the field. It is a fact that social psychology, as it is carried out and practiced is not necessarily a kind of consensual affair. There were always people that have been considered troublemakers. I do not remember all the names but already in Bristol there were people that were troublemakers and did not agree… It is always very difficult to say why, is it for personal reasons? You know processes of psychologization are very often involved… "they do not agree because they are not very successful" and all these things. Regularly there is a kind of crisis in social psychology and maybe there is one way of dealing with this crisis. Another way of thinking is something I became very aware when I started studying Human Rights. These studies started because I was in Kolombari with the Marangopoulos Foundation and the theme of the conference was "Social Sciences and Human Rights". There was a criminologist, Szabo, that I knew and he invited me as a social psychologist to participate. Really, I hesitated to go because I said that as a social psychologist I did not have anything to say. But then I thought about Kohlberg and Piaget and moral development. They considered the idea of basic rights shared by some people that go beyond the necessities of the social system to function. So I said that I had a good reason to go to Crete because I can say something. And this was really a challenge for me. I said: can we go on as if this does not exist? I think it was in 1986, and for me it changed my priorities. This relates also to the Association. When I was chairman of the executive committee of the European Association one of the problems of the Association was to deal with people from the so-called Eastern countries and Human Rights was a very tough issue. Yet, my first real contact with human rights was in 1968 in Nanterre were it was thought that Human Rights was "une pommade pour enculer le proletariat" (the pomade to f…ck up the proletariat). Later in 1975 there was the Helsinki Pact for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the whole idea of the Cold War where it was said "let's live together and the strongest will win but let us

not exceed some levels of escalation". In this context Human Rights became more and more important. After then there was the Prague Chart in the name of Human Rights. Thus, Human Rights became an issue. One could not ignore them as a professional if one had to deal with colleagues and had some responsibility. However, in social psychology we didn't take it seriously. So that was my decision then: let us take it seriously. Thus, the way to start was to ask, in a social representations tradition, whether human rights are meaningful for people. In fact to check empirically with our tools whether it was meaningful. And again and again, using different methods I found meaningfulness. This was the first step. Even if I did not know how to do it I was convinced I had to do it. With some law people in Paris we came up with a summary of some decisions taken by the European Court and we found that people, when you ask them, reason as expert people, as the members of the Court.

XC: *This is probably one problem we have at the discipline, that we deal so much with common sense that sometimes when we talk about our theories we give the impression that this is common sense. With students this is a very common problem. They might understand, but when they have to apply they still apply their common sense theories on the issues and not the knowledge they acquired in a scientific way.*

WD: Yes, this is what the Americans call "the social psychology of the grand-mother". This is to some extent true, but we also find that everything is not evident, that there are some contradictory findings and there are social psychologists that would make a list of all these that there are not just common sense. But for me this is not a very important problem because understanding common sense is already not such an easy thing, and what is common sense for the ones is not for the others…When you ask in the Milgram experiment how many people will go till the end of the experiment, even psychiatrists say something like 20%. When you are not in the situation, then you don't know how people react. But when you

act in the situation then you act as the other people and common sense could go against your previous life conceptions. For me it is a pedagogical issue and not a theoretical issue.

XC: To come back to that nature of the human being that we are producing but we are not reflecting on, you proposed 4 levels of explanation in social psychology. Do you think that we are reducing our explanations prioritizing one level over another?

WD: Well, if we considered the issue on the whole, let's say yes. We privilege the first (intra-personal) and the second (inter-personal) levels and even some people would say that the rest is not social psychology. However, as soon as you introduce differences in status, for instance gender differences; Fabio Lorenzi-Cioldi for instance showed the difference between collections of individuals considered as eminent and belonging to the human nature because of their excellence and people that were more reduced to some aggregate status. You see that categorization processes function in another way: you enhance the singularity of dominant people and you enhance what is common to non-dominant people. Thus, already introducing such differences, you cannot just predict how simple processes will function. And one more example, when you take the self-categorisation theory and I am speaking about Turner's theory because already in his book people like Reicher had another idea. So he writes that there is an antagonism between a definition of the self in one level of categorization and the definition of the self in another level, in the sense that when you think of yourself in terms of a region in comparison of another region you do not necessarily define yourself in terms of a superordinate category. I think that he is right on a level of treating information and you could measure it in milliseconds, I don't necessarily think of Belgians when I think about Flemish people and Walloons. But I think that the whole fabric of social life is to make links. And in politics people can argue that to solve problems on one level we need to solve problems at another level. This is what Tapia for example showed in his research with South Europeans.

They say "in order to solve our problems as Greeks, as Italians, Europe can be a superordinate identity that could help us." The people from the North will reason differently "we as Dutch, we know how to be democratic and to mix with people from the South will make things more difficult". But is has nothing to do with the definition that Turner gives of different levels of categorization.

XC: I think that he was referring more to an idea of flexibility of identities, that identities are not …

WD: Sure, yes. But I would say that even identity, what is an identity? My identity changes when I speak with you and my identity changes when I speak with my wife and when I speak with another social psychologist… So what does this means … I think that it is too, with all due respect to Turner and to Tajfel in some respects, it is too reified. I agree with the basic idea that it is not just a bottom up approach, you look at people, you see similarities and dissimilarities and then you built an idea of a common category… no, we have ideas on common categories before and we project… It is a very complex situation. But it is not just a way of categorizing at different levels. It is also having an implicit idea about the relationship between these levels and this is not developed in the introductory chapter of Turner's and al. book on self-categorization.

XC: This gives me the opportunity to ask you another question. You mention in your book the relationship between identity and social representations these two large theoretical movements in Europe that seem to go on parallel and never meet. For a long time Europeans are working on these issues, and I was wondering whether the distinction between these two approaches is arbitrary or there are bridges we could find between them.

WD: I have been working on that with Elcheroth and Reicher, have you been in this symposium at the Political Psychology conference in Paris? I could not be there…

XC: Yes, and a lot of people came and wanted to discuss it

WD: Both Elcheroth and Reicher would like to build new links between the two approaches. Of course we could give personal explanations that the leaders of these two approaches Moscovici on one side and Tajfel on the other, that their interest was not to stress commonalities and I think that now Social Identity Theory is better known among the people of the Association than Social Representations. In my view, I would say, you cannot work even on social categorization without speaking about content, about the origin of the criteria, and social identity theory does not speak about the origin of categorization, about the criteria on which people categorize themselves. Of course there is the theory of meta-contrast but there are all kinds of meta-contrasts. If you introduce meta-contrast between pre-existing theories that are becoming salient you will have all these effects. As Tajfel himself showed you can just introduce a categorization, Klee-Kandinsky, and you will have it. But when you go to more real life settings, (I don't want to make a contrast between experiments and real life), to understand what makes people categorize in some situations in a particular way and in a different situation in another way you need something to complement the social categorization theory in two directions. One direction will be the structure of interdependence, and this is also another "drama" for social categorization. Look at Rabbie's work that has been considered to some extent as not relevant. There is this book edited by Peter Robinson, I think 20 years after the passing of Henri Tajfel where there is a very strong attack from Turner and Bourhis on Rabbie and literally they say that he never understood social identity theory… Did they understand also the meaning of interdependence? Interdependence structures all the time the social relations. So that will be one way of bringing them together. As I said before you never enumerate in an exhaustive way all the conditions that are necessary for a social psychological process. The other way would be social representations theory: what are the meaningful dimensions, I

would say the organizing principles, in my jargon, for people in some situations and how do they define the social field, antagonisms in the social field. The recent book by Staerkle and colleagues is a very good book on the representation of social order as part of the social field. When I wrote about the anchoring of social representations I referred also to how people anchor them in the antagonisms they consider important in a social field. We need, I think, a kind of an implicit way of studying social representations, how people represent the meaningful divisions and antagonisms, not necessary in the sense of conflict but as contrasts. I always think that it is a more integrative way of thinking. Tajfel is right and Moscovici is right but the question is how to bring the two theories together. It reminds me this famous saying by Isaiah Berlin who in 1953 has written a small booklet on the fox and the hedgehogs. Moscovici develops this idea in his book "La Machine a Faire des Dieux": we are foxes when we try to look at the various things that we want to explain but when we have a theory we become hedgehogs. Why is that? I think that this is a real question and not one that you can easily deal with. I think that it is necessary, when you have a theory to take your theory seriously and to go to the greatest extent you can…but of course you will have a confirmatory bias… you can't escape from that. I have seen people having strong feelings about a theory and consider it as more relevant than other theories. I think that if you feel as a hedgehog you create a world you would not live in, you could not live in. This is one of the oldest discussions I remember. In a summer school in Louvain, there were a lot of people members of the staff there, Zimbardo, Jones, Gerard and other people and they were all coming to Paris, because Moscovici, I believe he was chairman of the Association at the time, had the money, it was partly sponsored with the money of the Ford Foundation that was located in Paris. Anyway, Moscovici invited them all to give seminars. At that time it was the beginning of my research in social psychology, and at the occasion of these series of meetings in Paris, Claudine Herzlich, who actually left the field to do sociology and health, had a very

clever remark; she said if we could ask ourselves in which world we would like to live the world of Zimbardo, the world of Tajfel, the world of Gerard, the world of Milgram, that was the kind of discussion we had. Think of a world you would like to live in. There is no such world. Of course these were informal conversations; we went to have lunch together in the small restaurants in Paris. But that also shows that there is an impoverishment if you take one scheme. You go as far as you can go, you cannot go very far and you deal only with a part of reality, and there are a lot of things you are not taking into consideration.

XC: this brings me again in this question about the human nature and the different levels… I had once a very interesting remark from a student when I came to teach in Switzerland. I was explaining the levels of analysis and in another class I was talking about the different anchorings of social representations and he came at the end of the course and he said to me "do you think that the different anchorings is a way to understand how common sense is organized and the different levels of explanation are the same way to understand how scientific representation is organized". And I thought that this was a really clever remark…

WD: Well yes! Certainly the levels were a kind of exercise trying to understand how scientific thinking is organized at a given moment and I came to that idea in order to define what we were doing in comparison to Piaget. This idea was formalized in 1978 when I was invited, I was just appointed chairman of the European Association and I was invited, not because I was chairman but it was my first sabbatical, to spend 2-3 months in New Zealand. There I had always to explain what European Social Psychology was. I was really concerned about how to explain the difference and not to become Eurocentric, because I did not feel that we had something so different to offer. So I came to say that there are different levels and some put more attention to one level than to another.

XC: So what do you think we do as European social psychologists, which level…

WD: This is a very good question but then I have my question to you: what European Social Psychologists are?

XC: Well, that is what we are trying to find out… Because we changed the name of our Association, members voted against keeping the word "experimental" in the Association's name but we kept the European! We are the European Association of Social Psychology.

WD: Yes! I think that we have to remain the European Association and the role of the European Association is now they say to promote excellence in social psychology. For me the purpose is to make social psychology develop in as many, not only countries, but universities you can. For me that is the scope. I think that social psychology is a meaningful scientific enterprise even if there is not a consensual definition and it is good that an association is there in order to further social psychology and to make it possible for social psychology to develop. So when I became chairman there was a kind of division of labor: Moscovici had to go to Spain and even still in his recent book with Markova he wrote that he did not go to Portugal because nothing existed there! Tajfel said that he would go to Portugal. So Moscovici went to Spain and he organized a big meeting there In Barcelona with Gabriel Mugny and many other colleagues, myself included and I went also with Tajfel to Lisbon. So I will not speak about Spain because I was not involved very much, but in Portugal there were a lot of young people, but also more senior ones as Jesuino etc. In 1976 I went for the first time with Henri Tajfel to Bologna since I spoke Italian. For me it became almost my second appointment. My first appointment was Professor at the University of Geneva. I always said to people in Geneva that the more we did to develop social psychology in other universities, the more we helped our own university. So we went very often with Gabriel Mugny and we did a lot of experiments in

Bologna and thereafter I returned very often to Portugal. I had also many contacts in the Netherlands, especially in Tilburg. So I was really thinking what we should do as social psychologists. Actually I also went to Romania 3 or 4 times after the fall of the Berlin war. That is what I consider important to do. How can you develop social psychology with people who really think that a lot of problems in society can be studied by social psychology… So why am I speaking about all that? It is about these levels of analysis. So if you ask me what are the levels of analysis of European Social Psychology then I would say don't look only at the European Journal but look how people work in different laboratories. It is quite different. For instance, in Bologna, there is a strong school (and also in Torino, there is a book that just came out by Piero Amerio, who I believe he is not a member of the European Association) about community psychology. What is community psychology, what does community psychology mean for people of the European Association? I would say to some extent it is not existent in the Journal. But then you see a lot of people, people like Bruna Zani in Bologna studying the relationships in a neighborhood in Bologna where there is a psychiatric hospital between the neighbors and the psychiatric patients at a time when Italy was debating the de-institutionalization of mental illness, and they had to deal with it. This is why Palmonari and his colleagues wrote a book on "The Psychologists". I think that this is one of the best works on social representations. But what did it mean for the European Association? Palmonari became a member of the committee. It is only when people translate some of these problems in issues like stereotyping then it becomes an issue of the European Association. But to deal with this community problem in Bologna was not a problem of the European Association, although it prepared them to become very active members of the European Association. So I always hesitate to make a statement but then if you ask me what the policy of the European Association is, this is something different. Then the answer would be, however I did not analyze the recent issues because it changes also, the policy would

be that there is a kind of prototypical approach of social psychology that is too "reductionist" of the problems. There is a kind of competition between a very powerful group of people and this gives a kind of forum in the European Journal that is perhaps too dominated by some views. But of course there are exceptions. I am quite sure that somebody who does not do a kind of very rigorous quantitative study in the field of community psychology could not publish in the journal. And I think that it is arbitrary to say that social psychology is only this kind of quantitative, manipulative of variables -not necessarily experimental manipulation but operationalized variables-, with hypotheses that can be operationalized quantitatively. That is very different from the question why was it that in Italy, at a certain moment, people considered it a political commitment to have community centers with strong psychological teams and all these teams were linked with the development of clinical psychologists. How can we explain that? Is this a matter of social psychology or not? Palmonari and colleagues have written a book on that, we have done a questionnaire showing that there is a social activist view of what psychology is, there is a professional practitioner view, there is a clinical view and there is a kind of pluri-disciplinary view. And we show that these are meaningful ways of looking at psychology even for students in Geneva, in Paris and this is not just an Italian problem. We were very happy to have the social representations theory to do that. Is there an article at the European Journal with this model of four typologies? I do not remember. But it was not our first concern to have an article published. So that is the kind of thing… It is better to stay a little bit longer with one example. Now Palmonari and a lot of social psychologists in Italy have created (it is now in its fourth issue) a journal "Psicologia Sociale" to publish articles in social psychology in Italian. One can ask the question of what is the meaning of that. Is there something, to go back to our earlier discussion, of a universal science? Why not just sticking to the European Journal? They feel a need, I think, also to maintain a network of communication between themselves that is

not necessarily passing through the European Association. So it would be, I have not done it, but it would be worthwhile, just for scientific reasons, to look what is the difference between the mainstream articles in the European Journal and what they consider as necessary for them to make social psychology develop in Italy. I would be much more interested now to do such a study than to do another experiment in social psychology. It is for me, as a social psychologist, as important to understand why very sophisticated colleagues in Scandinavian countries, and I have worked with Rommetveit in the summer school in Oxford, I mentioned already that Campbell was also on the staff. Do you see now people on the staff as Campbell and Rommetveit? We had long discussions even on risky matters. We discussed these things. And Rommetveit is still I think a reference in Scandinavian countries but not a reference in the rest of Europe, except for some people, as for instance some years ago Rodolphe Gighlione working on discourse analysis in Paris… Is this a question that the European Association should take seriously or not? Because, otherwise it is just the kind of…how would I say… "let's see what survives" and the strongest will survive… That is now to some extend the attitude: who are the people who have the biggest impact factors and how to improve one's impact factors… I have been on appointments for professors all over Western Europe from Helsinki to Portugal and Cyprus. You see now that in some countries the papers published in the language of the country are not longer taken into consideration for a nomination in their own country. I have thought about all that two weeks ago because there is a whole discussion about Francophonie but I missed the meeting. So next time, if I go to the meeting I will say that we know now a lot about gender equality now let's talk about language equality. .. Going back to the EASP, I think that we now have a very strong European Association that homogenizes the field. I wonder whether we went too far in a kind of centralization. Should we had a kind of federation of national associations with a common meeting to explain to each other what we were doing? There are also national

associations but when they meet the leaders are missing and there are only junior people. National associations are declining and I wonder whether this is a good thing. By centralizing we are creating an asymmetry; people need to pass through a filter (also a language filter) that gives an advantage to English speaking countries and countries with postgraduate studies in English. Psicologia Sociale, this new journal, seems to me a counter reaction to this trend. I also need to make a personal remark. I am afraid that my views are influenced by personal reasons, perhaps disappointment. Becoming older I feel that I have the right to question things that I thought self-evident (look at my book). I feel now free to say things without official obligation (no devoir institutionnel de réserve). I find myself in a peculiar position. I look back at the book "Groups and Individuals" and I feel that I have to study myself. I want to go back and ask questions such as what happened to Marxism in social psychology. Now we are more concerned about what is standard social psychology. Studying the development of lifespan, Spini and colleagues analyzed how time was looked by social psychologists. They found that in the last 8 years the JPSP developed a concern about time whereas in the EJSP we are still behind. We have a way of looking at social reality and it takes time for innovation. An association should not be concerned about the present but should explore what is in the fringes, what can be developed. When we look at the dominant trends we miss the innovation. Every social institution should do that. If for example a new teaching method is introduced in Universities there are certainly people that would find this difficult. To give prevalence to the present and not to what could become is a conservative bias.

XC: *In an era that calls for more interdisciplinary dialogue how our discipline can converse with other disciplines and what could be its unique contribution?*

WD: There is a long tradition in multi-disciplinarity and there are also new developments. The work by Staerkle and colleagues is

interesting for political psychology, economics and sociology. Seemingly, the work by Spini and colleagues in former Yugoslavia and the war is interesting for political scientists. However, in order to have dialogue we need to be informed of what political scientists and sociologists do and we have a lot to learn. Look for example Social Representations Theory. Bourdieu's work on distinction can be considered as a work on social representations. My definition of Social Representations comes from Bourdieu. There are others that have done this dialogue like Jean Viaud who unfortunately passed away. But of course there were/are rivalries for funding. There was a meeting that later was published (Moscovici and Farr 1984) were Bourdieu came as well at some sessions. There are other issues such as health psychology that cannot be thought without social and community psychology. We should not just stick with solid experimental work but we should make a synthesis in order to go further.

XC: *Coming to an end of this conversation, drawing from your past experience and looking towards the future what would you advise us serving at the Executive Committee and more generally the members of the EASP?*

WD: At the beginning the EAESP was much more proactive; we wanted to influence what was going on taking into account what was done locally. Our mentality was that in order to be strong in comparison with the American Social Psychology we had to develop social psychology. Now, looking for excellence we are developing an elite: the strongest wins. I am not against competition. I am wondering whether the Association knows what happens in each country. Is social psychology compatible with social psychology as it was practiced before? I am concerned with what happened to those who were members in Eastern European countries, some served on the Committee but paradoxically I lost contact with them after the fall of the Berlin Wall. Is there something still considered valuable from what was done in Eastern Europe before 1989? These are delicate issues but we also have a

moral responsibility. Perhaps this is more of a personal interest and not a concern of the EASP although it should. This is our heritage.

Satigny, March 2009

Future EAESP Meetings - Calendar

June 11-15, 2009, Kloster Bronnbach, Wertheim, Germany
Small Group Meeting on Cognitive Consistency as an Integrative Concept in Social Cognition
Organisers: Fritz Strack & Betram Gawronski
Contact: Bertram Gawronski (bgawrons@uwo.ca)

June 21-24, 2009, Tübingen, Germany
Small Group Meeting on Self-Regulation Approaches to Group Processes
Organisers: Kai J. Jonas, Kai Sassenberg, & Daan Scheepers
Contact: Karin Kaldewey (k.kaldeway@iwm-kmrc.de)

July 3-6, 2009, Groningen, The Netherlands
Medium Size Meeting on Collective Action and Social Change: Toward Integration and Innovation
Organisers: Martijn van Zomeren, Andrew Livingstone, Nicole Tausch & Aarti Iyer
Contact: Nicole Tausch (tauschn@cf.ac.uk)

September 7-10, 2009, Jerusalem, Israel
Small Group Meeting on Resolving Conflicts and Building Peace: Socio-Psychological Dynamics
Organisers: Daniel Bar-Tal, Christopher Cohrs, Eran Halperin, Evanthia Lyons, Dario Spini
Contact: Eran Halperin (eranh75@hotmailcom)

October or November 2009, Los Angeles, USA
Joint SPSSI-EASP Meeting on Uncertainty and Extremism
Organisers: Michael Hogg, Kees van den Bos, Arie Kruglanski
Contact: Michael Hogg (michael.hogg@cgu.edu)

Future EASP Meetings

Joint SPSSI-EASP Meeting

On Uncertainty and Extremism

Los Angeles, USA, October or November 2009

A joint Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI)-European Association of Social Psychology (EASP) small group conference on **Uncertainty and Extremism** organized by Michael Hogg, Kees van den Bos and Arie Kruglanski is being held at Claremont Graduate University in Los Angeles, October or November 2009. The conference focuses on the role of uncertainty about self and identity, one's place in the world and the future of the social order in the emergence or persistence of extremist ideological systems that are orthodox, fundamentalist and ethnocentric and associated with bigotry, intolerance and violence. This topic is highly and globally relevant to a modern world characterized by religious and political fundamentalism, mass migration, rapid cultural and technological change, and profound cultural, life-style and economic uncertainty. The 3-day conference will have 20-25 delegates presenting their work, and a subset of these presentations will be assembled and edited for publication in a special issue of the *Journal of Social Issues*.

Those interested in attending the conference must be a member of SPSSI or EASP or both. Abstracts (300 words) should be submitted by email to Michael Hogg (michael.hogg@cgu.edu), copied to Justin Hackett (justin.hackett@cgu.edu), by the deadline of May 31, 2009. Registration is yet to be finalized, but the cost of registration and attendance will be offset to some extent by funding support generously provided by SPSSI and EASP.

Reports of Previous Meetings

Joint EASP-SPSSI Meeting on intergroup contact: Recent advancements in basic and applied research

August 28-30, 2008, Marburg, Germany
Organisers: Oliver Christ, Miles Hewstone, Linda Tropp, Ulrich Wagner

---

This joint EASP / SPSSI small group meeting was, in my view, an unmitigated success. It was the third such conference I have attended – Grenada, Spain and Toronto, Canada were the other two. All three of these small group meetings were effective and enjoyable gatherings; but I believe the Marburg meeting ranks as the most outstanding.

There are many reasons for this success. [1] It centered more narrowly on a specific topic – intergroup contact theory and research. And virtually everyone who attended specialized, at least in part, in this topic and apparently knew the current and relevant literature.

[2] Professor Ulrich Wagner and the other organizers had carefully screened the presentations and chosen the papers and posters wisely. Instead of the usual 50% or so first-rate papers, I thought all but two of the 18 papers (89%) were outstanding and actually advanced what we know about intergroup contact.

[3] The attendees and presenters covered the globe. From Norway, Italy and the Czech Republic to Chile, Cyprus and Australia, the representation was widespread – a total of 13 nations participated. This wide cultural spectrum ensured that the lively and pointed discussions were anything but parochial.

[4] The meeting had the largest percentage of young attendees – many of them graduate students – of any similar meeting I have ever attended. These young participants were well-informed and quite enthusiastic. Indeed, I think their élan gave the sessions an up-beat, spirited quality that even a 77-year-old participant like myself could appreciate.

[5] The location at Philipps University and the astute planning for the conference were superb. Ulrich Wagner and Oliver Christ of the host institution had carefully planned all three days, reserved nearby housing and restaurants, and mobilized student volunteers to help out. The facilities at the University's psychology department were more than adequate, with the three lunches served in the open air just a few yards from the meeting room. The weather was fine, and Marburg itself is a picturesque university town that resembles a Disney film set for a 17th-century fairy tale.

So, in every respect, the contact meeting could not have been better. But, from SPSSI's perspective, I think there is a problem raised by the small number of North American attendees. I believe the problem is that the low value of the dollar now makes it extremely difficult for Americans to attend European meetings. Only three American scholars were present (< 10%) (Kenworthy, Tropp and myself) – and each of us had financial assistance (Wagner personally found German funds for Tropp and myself). Four foreign graduate students who study in the United Sates also attended, but all of them were already in Europe.

Perhaps, a working rule of thumb for the future might be: *When the dollar is down in comparison to the euro, hold more of the joint meetings in North America. And when the dollar is up in comparison to the euro, hold more of these joint meetings in Europe.*

If any further information is needed, please contact me at: 831-425-4777; pettigr@ucsc,edu; or 524 Van Ness Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060.

Thomas F. Pettigrew

****

The EASP-SPSSI Small Group Meeting on „Intergroup contact: Recent advancements in basic and applied research" took place in Marburg, Germany, 28-30 August. Marburg is a beautiful medieval city with a long university tradition, located in the heart of Germany. With all important facilities situated in the walking distance, Marburg felt as if it were designed exactly for an event like our small group meeting.

The small group meeting brought together 30 participants – a balanced mixture of senior scientists, early career researchers, and doctoral students – all connected by their interests in Intergroup Contact Theory and by their motivation to share and enlarge their knowledge and expertise within the field. The goal of the meeting was to bring together scholars interested in this area and to reflect the recent resurgence of new theory and data on this central topic in the social psychology of intergroup relations.

The Meeting was supposed to start on Thursday 28.8. However, the participants started their fruitful discussion already a night before as they exchanged ideas on the terrace of a cozy restaurant called *Galileo*.

On Thursday morning, Oliver Christ opened the conference in the name of whole organizing team at the meeting venue – the Psychology Department of Marburg University. After he had given us information on how the meeting would proceed, the first

presenters, Ángel Gómez and Anja Eller, took the stage in the opening session „Social identity processes in intergroup contact". In their longitudinal study, these authors demonstrated the relevance of group identity verification for positive effects of intergroup contact. After the opening presentation, Katharina Schmid, Miles Hewstone, and Nicole Tausch reported on two studies examining the relationship between intergroup contact, distinctiveness threat, social identity complexity and out-group attitudes in Northern Ireland. They showed that social identity complexity mediates the positive effect of intergroup contact on favorable attitudes towards the out-group as well as the negative effect of perceived threat on less favorable out-group attitudes. Before lunch, Pablo De Tezanos Pinto conceptualized the effect of direct and indirect cross-group friendship on attitudes towards an out-group in a normative perspective. The lunch was served at the conference venue so that the time we had between presentations could be used most effectively. We did not even have to interrupt the nourishing discussions that took up recently-heard presentations by having to relocate to eat elsewhere.

After a light lunch, Nurit Shnabel, Johannes Ullrich, Arie Nadler, and John F. Dovidio presented the Needs-Based Model of Reconciliation (Shnabel & Nadler, 2008) with its implication for minority (victims) and majority (advantaged) groups in the society. They brought evidence from three different contexts on how the difference in needs between these two groups – need for empowerment and need for acceptance, respectively – and their fulfillment enhance reconciliation tendencies. The second session „Affective and cognitive processes" continued with Hermann Swart, Miles Hewstone, Oliver Christ, and Alberto Voci's three-wave longitudinal analysis of affective mediators of intergroup contact in South Africa. Emphasizing the role of intergroup anxiety and empathy/perspective taking, their study supported the causal direction from contact to prejudice, providing further support for the contact hypothesis. The first day's presentations were

concluded by Oliver Christ and Christian Issmer's diary study of foreign exchange students from various countries. Their results indicated that evaluative concerns contributed to a positive change in intergroup attitudes over time, although they were related to a worsening of the perceived quality of intergroup interactions and to more negative feelings toward the interaction partner at the same time.

After the inspiring presentations of the first day, all participants shifted to the Old University Hall to be present at the ceremony for awarding an honorary doctorate to Professor Tom Pettigrew. Throughout the ceremony, we could admire the stunning interior of the old university hall with its centuries-old wall decorations. The room was soon filled with tones of a classical music piece performed by a string quartet. We were in a state of 'elevated festivity' when Ulrich Wagner, as Dean of the Psychology Faculty at Marburg, introduced Tom Pettigrew as one of the most recognized and productive scientists in the field of Intergroup Contact research. After naming Pettigrew's numerous achievements, Linda Tropp, Pettigrew's last of a long line of graduate students, shared her personal experience with her senior colleague and former supervisor. Ulrich Wagner's presentation of Pettigrew's curriculum was not just a chronology of published papers and interests. We could witness and be inspired by not only by Tom Pettigrew's devoted approach to research but also by his heightened sensitivity to and awareness of the need to conduct research on highly relevant societal issues. Tom Pettigrew has contributed to the field of Intergroup Contact Theory with sophisticated innovative research designs but also with his actions aimed at changing the conforming status quo in society. His example is particularly encouraging to all of us not just as researchers, but also for us personally in our attempts to become better persons and conscious citizens with a potential to change the world into a better place. After being awarded the honorary doctorate, Tom Pettigrew held a lecture where he reviewed the

history of intergroup contact research, mentioning the most influential studies and introducing us to his current research interests. During the following reception at the old university building, we were able to break away from our self-imposed seating order in the conference room and get to know other participants of the meeting better.

Friday morning started with the session on "Status as moderator". In the first presentation, Linda Tropp conceptualized the effect of contact separately for majority and minority groups, further distinguishing between minorities that perceive high and low levels of discrimination in society. She showed that beneficial effects of intergroup contact tend to be weaker for minority groups than for majority groups However, even when being experimentally exposed to prejudice, the minority members with out-group friends displayed fewer negative expectations towards outgroup in general, providing further evidence for the importance of outgroup friendships. Christopher Bratt told us about his own research in Scandinavia looking at the comparative effectiveness of cross-group friendships of boys and girls. But most of all he took up and developed an ever-present theme at the meeting, the need for highly sophisticated methodology to unpack the ever more complex research questions we seek to answer. Nicole Tausch, Tamar Saguy, John Dovidio, and Felicia Pratto were authors of the last presentation within the third session. They looked at beneficial effects of intergroup contact on outgroup attitudes and increased perceptions of cross-group commonalities from a completely different perspective. The authors directed our attention to the fact that these positive effects can actually undermine recognition of inequality and support for actions promoting egalitarian social change among socially disadvantaged groups.

After a coffee break, Anja Eller, Dominic Abrams, Tendayi Viki and Dionne Imara opened the fourth session on "Extended/indirect contact" with their study testing whether public-police relations

improved through extended contact with a Black (or White) police officer via a Black (or White) acquaintance . They showed the double-outgroup extended contact for both White and Black participants, and mixed group extended contact for Whites worsened public-police relations, while double-ingroup extended contact for Whites, and mixed-group extended contact for Blacks improved these relations. Stefania Paolini, the second presenter in the section on "Extended/indirect contact", introduced both experimental and longitudinal approaches to study direct and indirect cross-gender friendships, distinguishing between episodic and chronic process variables (e.g. category salience or intergroup anxiety) mediating between contact and prejudice reduction.

After the lunch break, we returned to the fifth session on "Intercultural variations in intergroup contact". Roberto Gonzáles, David Sirlopú and Thomas Kessler brought us to Latin America, throwing light on predictors of prejudice and intergroup attitudes among native Chileans and Peruvian newcomers. Our second destination on Friday afternoon was Cyprus with its peculiar socio-demographic and political division between the island's two historically-troubled groups – Greek- and Turkish-Cypriots. Charis Psaltis, Miles Hewstone, and Alberto Voci explored both present and past contact, realistic and symbolic threats, and intergroup attitudes between the two groups, revealing the effect of past extended contact on contact quantity, direct friends, and extended contact in the present. They also found present contact quantity and present extended contact were associated with a reduction in realistic and symbolic threats that was, in turn, related to more positive outgroup attitudes.

While others enjoyed discussions during the afternoon coffee break, participants presenting their research within a poster section were preparing the stage. The content of studies presented was very wide, encompassing various contexts and groups engaging in intergroup contact: black and white American children, victimized

and non-victimized groups in the US, Turkish immigrants in Frankfurt and Amsterdam, Czech and Austrian citizens in the border region. Flemish citizens with and without Moroccan/Turkish descent, and the context of workgroups. A large number of variables determining effects of intergroup contact were researched, e.g. metaperceptions, cross-group friendships, prosocial attitudes toward refugees, acculturation orientations, outgroup affects, value similarity, interpersonal relationships, and many others. The format of poster sections enabled participants to seek out presenters interested in the same research topic and so to establish small discussion groups, where exchange of ideas on that specific topic flourished intensively.

The productive poster section did not close our afternoon program. We changed from the context of intergroup contact to the beautiful lanes of Marburg. The guided city tour provided us with many details from the past of the city and let us enjoy the meeting venue from a different perspective. It was pleasant to transform into ordinary tourists for a while. Hungry after an hour of walking, we met at the restaurant Local Central. Right after we arrived, we were confronted with a memory performance task, as we attempted to remember the number of the menu item we had ordered earlier that day. Having found out that all courses tasted just as delicious, the score on the memory task no longer mattered. With our attention distracted from the intergroup contact theory, we spent the evening discussing a broad range of interesting topics. However, our last evening did not last excessively long as everybody wanted to be fresh for the last session on "Generalization of contact effects" that was planned for Saturday morning.

Miles Hewstone and Jared Kenworthy opened the sixth session with their research on generalized effects of intergroup contact. Using cross-sectional and longitudinal data from two unique intergroup contexts (Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland; Latino and white participants in Texas), the authors found that the

effect of contact with members of one outgroup on attitudes towards other, uninvolved outgroups, was mediated by attitudes towards the involved outgroup, and not by ingroup reappraisal, in both intergroup contexts. Rita Guerra and Samuel Gaertner continued the session. reporting their efforts to translate research on the „common ingroup" and „dual identity models" into an education setting in a Portugese primary school, demonstrating the effectiveness of both models in generalizing the positive effects of intergroup contact over time.

After our last coffee break, Alberto Voci, Miles Hewstone, and Lisa Pagotto presented a complex series of studies on generalization processes in the relation between intergroup contact and prejudice reduction within an Italian context. Using structural equation models, the authors showed that meaningful (rather than superficial) contact with single immigrants reduces prejudice toward the whole category of immigrants through the mediation of empathy (both reactive and parallel), anxiety and trust, especially when group memberships are highly salient.

The closing presentation by Gunnar Lemmer and Ulrich Wagner introduced us to the outcomes of their exhaustive (but not exhausting) meta-analysis dealing with the effectiveness of contact-based prevention programs for ethnic rejection. Their research provided an applied examination of Intergroup Contact Theory and ensured that we all left Marburg fully aware of the promise of this area of research, but also of the pitfalls so often associated with attempts to redue prejudice in applied interventions.

General evaluation of the meeting
Overall, this was an extraordinarily successful meeting. The quality of presentations and the enthusiasm and knowledge of the presenters were uniformly high. Much has been achieved in this area of research since Allport's pioneering work in 1954. The 'contact hypothesis' has been developed theoretically and

methodologically almost beyond recognition; it definitely is no longer a (mere) hypothesis, but a full-blown, sophisticated *intergroup contact theory*. I personally hope that the future will bring a second conference on this exciting topic, which clearly has many proponents in both EASP and SPSSI. I hope that I do not overstep myself in saying, on behalf of all the participants at the EASP-SPSSI Small Group Meeting on „Intergroup contact" participants, that we all look forward to more and more cooperative contact, across many different settings!

Sylvie Kourilova
Institute of Psychology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

---

Medium Size Meeting on Affective Processes in Evaluation
June 5-8, 2008, Berg en Dal (Nijmegen), The Netherlands
Organisers: Pablo Briñol, Geoff Haddock, Greg Maio, Rich Petty, and Rob Holland

---

Early June 2008 we welcomed 45 researchers from all over the world for the 3rd EAESP Medium Sized Group Meeting on the Psychology of Attitudes. After wonderful meetings in Wales (2000) and in Madrid (2004) the meeting now moved to the east of the Netherlands. The meeting addressed recent research on Affective Processes in Evaluation. The meeting preceded the general EAESP meeting in Opatija. Therefore, for most participants it served as a pre-conference. Our goal was to have an inspiring and interesting meeting on affective processes in attitudes by means of 1) a series of excellent talks and poster presentations, and 2) by organizing various social events in order to facilitate informal conversations between participants. We certainly think we obtained our goal. The

location was good, the weather was great (this is always a risk for organizing a meeting in the Netherlands), and most importantly, the content was excellent.

The role of affective processes is emphasized in much recent research within the attitudes literature, and there have been several recent developments in the theories of emotion. For instance, various studies have focused on the contribution of affect to implicit and explicit measures of attitude. Furthermore, a substantial amount of recent research has focused on the roles of mood and affective orientation in attitude formation and change. At the same time, prototype views of emotion are challenging traditional, dimensional conceptions, and showing how divergent processes can be elicited by seemingly "similar" positive emotions or "similar" negative emotions. In addition, there is increasing knowledge and sophistication in the assessment of emotion over time and at conscious and non-conscious levels (e.g. with implicit measures). Also, there is more knowledge about relevant individual differences in affective and evaluative experience and about relevant biological and sociological factors. All of these developments point to a pressing need to begin focused discussions of how affective processes are integrated within attitudes, attitude change, and relations between attitudes and behavior. The aim of this meeting was to facilitate this integration.

On June 5 late afternoon, the meeting started with an informal reception and dinner on Thursday evening welcomed all participants to the Netherlands. The conference officially started on Friday with talks that were held in three sessions. Rich Petty started the first session with a presentation on the fundamental processes by which incidental emotions influence attitudes and other judgements, and highlighted the importance of examining specific emotions rather than emotional valence. Russ Fazio continued by discussing the mechanism of implicit misattribution underlying evaluative conditioning, and presented a variety of

studies in which greater evaluative conditioning was observed when conditions were conducive to source confusability. Duane Wegener chaired the first session of presentations, and led an interesting discussion round.

In the second session, Madelijn Strick described a series of studies demonstrating that as humour distracts and involves positive affect, it is a useful advertising strategy to overcome consumers' resistance to persuasion. Robert Livingstone raised the question whether racial attitudes have their origin in lower-level affective processes and suggested new strategies for prejudice reduction via affective reconditioning. Harm Veling focused on the behaviour-regulatory consequences of inhibiting impulses elicited by positive objects, and stated that behavioural inhibition can modify attitudes to facilitate future behaviour. Pam Smith addressed individuals' subjective sense of power and suggested that approach-avoidance behaviour can affect self-perception in a non-diffuse fashion. Geoff Haddock made some integrative comments and led a stimulating general discussion.

The third session of the day started with a presentation by Michael Häfner, who provided evidence that the information processing style induced by negative mood states yields information representations at higher levels of perceptual fluency and as a consequence elicits positive affect which may spread to subsequent implicit attitudes. Rob Holland drew upon the effects of diffuse affective states on the role of deliberative and intuitive attitudinal processes in behaviour regulation. Duane Wegener presented evidence for the hedonic contingency view of mood and message processing, showing that individuals in a happy mood process information about a negative event to a greater extent when it serves the goal to manage mood in the long term. Ron Dotsch ended the session with the idea that highly prejudiced individuals hold more negatively biased mental representations of ethnic faces than less prejudiced individuals. Joop van der Pligt led the general

discussion following the presentations and introduced a number of interesting discussion points to individual contributions.

After a very interesting poster session, with 20 posters being presented, some decided to get a better view of ancient Nijmegen by going on an organized city walk whereas others preferred to broaden their mind by learning more about whisky from Ap Dijksterhuis. The day was ended with an informal dinner at 'De schat' in the city centre.

Presentations were given in two sessions on the second day. Gerald Clore started off with a talk on the accessibility model, suggesting that attitudes may be alternatives to behaviour rather than causes of behaviour. Pablo Briñol described studies supporting the idea that confidence in emotion-related thoughts can be influenced by meta-cognitive experiences (e.g. ease). These presentations were followed by a general discussion overseen by Roger Giner Sorolla, who led a stimulating question and answer round.

In the second session, Geoff Haddock addressed the importance of individual differences in need for affect and need for cognition in the attention individuals devote to affect- and cognition-based appeals. Helma van den Berg discussed differences between an affective and a cognitive focus in terms of attitude formation, and suggested that an affective focus results in structurally different attitudes. Frenk van Harreveld argued that the relation between attitudinal ambivalence and feelings of discomfort is mediated by uncertainty about outcomes. Marc Kiviniemi introduced his behavioural affective associations model, which describes the interplay of affective and cognitive influences on behavioural decision making, and suggested that the affective component of attitudes mediates the effects cognitive components have on behaviour. To complete the session, Ap Dijksterhuis introduced some common themes across contributions and chaired a discussion session in which a number of interesting issues were raised.

The remaining time of the day was spent at the Kröller Müller Museum in park de Hoge Veluwe near Arnhem, exchanging thoughts on affective reactions towards Van Gogh paintings and cycling in the Netherlands on "white bikes". Upon return to the hotel, participants were welcomed back with a barbecue.

The final day of the meeting was opened with a talk by Ap Dijksterhuis on the competence of consciously and unconsciously weighting the importance of alternatives' attributes in the decision-making process. Piotr Winkielman drew attention to the useful, causal, and contextual nature of the embodiment of emotions, and also presented evidence for non-embodied processing of emotions. This session of presentations were chaired by Rich Petty, who made some integrative comments and led a lively discussion.

The second session of the day included contributions from four speakers. Kirsten Ruys described studies on the evaluative-matching hypothesis, suggesting that automatic evaluations induced by a stimulus' features facilitate access to evaluatively congruent category dimensions of this stimulus. Adriaan Spruyt argued that affective and non-affective processing of task-irrelevant stimuli can proceed in an equally 'automatic' fashion, given that feature-specific attention allocation is being considered. Roger Giner-Sorolla presented arguments for the idea that specific types of emotional associations have different processing implications. The last speaker of the day was Joop van der Pligt, discussing the moralization of attitudes and the role of emotions, showing that attitudes were stronger when they were primarily based on moral concerns, and that emotions fully mediate their impact on behaviour. Rob Holland ended the final session of the conference with a fruitful discussion on issues raised in the preceding talks. Geoff Haddock closed the meeting by addressing key issues which manifested themselves during the conference, expressing positive thoughts about the meeting's success, the lively discussions and scientific

exchange. The goal to faciliate integration of affective processes in attitudes, attitude change, and relations between attitudes and behavior has definitely been met.

Our thanks go, next to the participants for making this such an interesting meeting, also to the EAESP, Cardiff University, the Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, the Ohio State University, and the Radboud University Nijmegen, and especially the Behavioral Science Institute of the Radboud University Nijmegen, for their essential support. Additionally, we would like to express our special thanks to the local organizing committee: The "Orange Team" (our team of students driving participants from and to Schiphol airport and helping in many other ways), Ron Dotsch, Madelijn Strick, Severine Koch, Marijke Crum, Ap Dijksterhuis, and especially Maarten Bos for making this meeting a stimulating experience.

Also on behalf of the other organizers,

Rob Holland
Behavioral Science Institute
Radboud University Nijmegen

**Reports on the EASP Summer School 2008
August 17 – August 31, Cardiff, Wales, UK**

❖ Attitudes (Greg Maio & Geoff Haddock)

❖ Gender and Sexuality (Peter Hegarty, Thomas Morton & Michelle Ryan)

❖ Intergroup Relations (Thomas Kessler & Stéphanie Demoulin)

❖ Self and Identity (Aiden Gregg & Claire Hart)

❖ Social Cognition (Luigi Castelli & Wilhelm Hofmann)

The Cardiff Summer School: Organizer's report

It is with some nostalgia that I look back to the EASP summer school that we organized in Cardiff at the end of last summer. The "end" of the summer is probably a good way of describing it, as the passage of time since cannot disguise that there was precious little sun and quite a lot of rain during the whole two weeks (although "end" is not entirely accurate either, as summer in Cardiff last year never seem to have got started at all!). Fortunately, Cardiff was brightened up by the arrival of around 60 international students from more than 20 different countries in Europe, of course, but also across the globe, including the US, Canada, and Australia.

This diversity was matched by our excellent line-up of teachers. In no particular order these were Aiden Greg and Claire Hart (Self and Identity), Luigi Castelli and Wilhelm Hofmann (Social Cognition), Peter Hegarty and Thomas Morton (Gender and Sexuality), Stéphanie Demoulin and Thomas Kessler (Intergroup Relations) and our very own local team of Greg Maio and Geoff Haddock (Attitudes). In a very welcome collaboration (and contribution!) the European Social Cognition Network (ESCON) sponsored the social cognition track, also with a commitment to do this in the

foreseeable future. Sadly for us (but for happy reason) Michelle Ryan who was originally scheduled to co-teach the Gender and Sexuality workshop had to withdraw at a late stage with the arrival of a baby very much due. In fact the summer school was appropriately "christened" (if that is the right word) the "summer school of the babies" as two other teachers were also very soon to become parents (Stéphanie and Geoff) not to mention at least one student that I recall who withdrew for similar reasons. Anyway I am happy to report that all parents and children are doing very well! Despite her absence Michelle's presence was very much felt especially in the preparations leading up to the event, as the students started their reading and got to know each other virtually via email, and on some newfangled thing called 'facebook' (some new internet technology apparently – I am starting to feel old!).

In the meantime it was our job to be "in loco parentis" to a very large and international family of students, and although it was a lot of work (and some stress!) it was also a great deal of fun. In addition to the visiting students, as is the tradition, one or two local students were attached to each workshop to act as local ambassadors, showing people around, helping the teachers, making the tea and coffee and so forth. They were also invaluable guides to the social side of Cardiff, especially its nightlife, and I think it is fair to say that, with their help the visiting students indeed got to see all sides of Cardiff! (and I got see some places I hadn't seen before too!).

The local students were a tremendous help with the running of the summer school and I want to thank them, together with the team of postdocs and admin staff who gave up their time not just for the two weeks but for many months of preparation beforehand (including a making a local guidebook). Specifically our participant student organizers were Caroline Leygue, Dina Dosmukhambetova, Jochen Gebauer, Joe Sweetman, Sian Jones, Reem Saab, and Wing Cheung (aka Verbon). The ever-reliable postdoc lieutenants Nicole

Tausch, Andrew Livingstone, Anja Zimmermann were especially helpful in their support at all stages leading up to and during the event. You will notice from the names that the students and postdocs at Cardiff have a profile that is every bit as international as the visiting students. In my introduction I referred to that old joke about national stereotypes you may heard in which heaven is populated by French cooks, German organizers, British police and so forth, but in hell this all gets mixed up (e.g. British cooks!). Well, we had enough German students and postdocs in our team to ensure that the organization went like clockwork. And fortunately (speaking of British cooks) we made a decision early on (and partly I have to admit with the EASP budget in mind) to minimize the level of catered British food, leaving that to personal taste (and responsibility!) Well, at least after a hearty British Breakfast! We also had great admin support from Louise Hartrey, Sarah Hennessy-Davies, Dave Johnson, Alison Roberts and Val Pearce. Thanks too to all the technical and support staff, especially Phil Fayers and Dave Griffiths, Laura Morris, Lorraine Woods, to Sonja Haerkoenen who gave a talk on the library access, and of course to Dylan Jones, Head of School for his support. I want to thank you all.

I also want to thank the invited visiting speakers who added their voices to the already outstanding talks provided by the teachers, namely Piotr Winkielman and also Alex Haslam, who also represented the Association. Like the teachers they gave their service free to the association (although I did hand out a per diem expenses to the teachers throughout, usually in the pub, which made me look like some kind of drug dealer!). I also want to thank Wilhelm Hofmann for providing a workshop on regression, and Tony Manstead for one on 'how to publish'. Your efforts were very much appreciated by us all!

And of course, and needless to say but important to acknowledge, none of this would have been possible without the support of EASP (personified as always by Sibylle!) and also ESCON and SPSP.

It is the tradition to work hard and play hard at the summer school and judging by the excellent presentations at the end there was plenty of hard work (and you can read more of the students' experiences below). A large part of the experience, though, is the social side (we are after all social psychologists!) and I doubt very much whether anyone involved got much sleep (I know I didn't). The Pen and Wig was the summer school pub, hijacked by us for these two weeks and to remind ourselves that we were in Wales (not England) we had a trip to St Fagan's, the (mostly outdoor) museum of Welsh life. The weather just about held up for that but rained off our barbecue plans so we went to the seaside (Barry Island) instead, with the cover of some cafes and amusements. Ironically given the surfeit of falling water outside, there was a period where one group (social cognition I think) was beset with a lack of falling water inside (i.e. failing showers). But as Nietzsche says, things that don't kill us make us stronger and this seemed to add to rather than detract from the great group spirit. To help things along we stole an idea from the Groningen summer school and organized a t-shirt competition (won by the Attitudes workshop) and needless to say the weather theme featured in that too!

Overall then I think the summer school was a big success (although I do say it myself, but appropriately supported by the feedback data) even though it felt at times more like a winter party than a summer school (but no the worse for that!). So now we hand over the baton to the next one in two years time (not forgetting the American SISP version to be held this summer) and wish them well. The good news is that whatever the weather you can be sure those lucky enough to take part will learn a lot and have a great time into the bargain.

Russell Spears

"Attitudes"
(Teachers: Greg Maio & Geoff Haddock)

We all were very happy to enjoy the two-week summer school of the EASP in August 2008, held in Cardiff, Wales (UK). The topics we dealt with during the two-week workshop covered a wide array of psychological research on attitudes, among them: attitude matching and persuasion, attitudes and the self-concept, attitudes and values, intergroup attitudes and values.

Our teachers, Profs. Gregory Maio and Geoffrey Haddock (Cardiff University) provided us with the necessary literature, which we prepared in advance. The workshop itself was separated into two main parts. In the first week we spent the mornings discussing research suggested by the teachers. In the afternoons and evenings we worked in small groups of four students to discuss new research ideas on the topics discussed in the morning. The second week was mostly spent in small groups to elaborate some ideas that emerged out of the brainstorming during the first week. In a final presentation, the small groups from all workshops presented their research questions and how they wanted to realize the ideas. Throughout the summer school, we attended lectures by renowned researchers (e.g., Prof. Piotr Winkielman), and participated in workshops on specific issues (e.g., regression analyses, publication procedures).

In our three small groups, we developed the following research questions, which we presented during the final presentation:

Contrast effects in value priming

(Luciana Carraro, Torsten Huenger, Robert Kordts-Freudinger, & Emiko Yoshida): We predicted a counter-intuitive effect of value priming on the accessibility and behavioral consequences of the primed and opposite to the primed values.

Depending on the explicit endorsement of the primed values we expect eitherassimilation or contrast effects of value accessibility after priming. We ran a first experiment and found evidence for a contrast effect in value activation if participants are primed with a value that is opposite to their self-reported value importance. We are currently planning a follow-up experiment to further investigate the conditions of this contrast effect.

Self-serving values: Motivated construal of value-relevant event

(Michal Chmiel, Chris Jones, Veronica Sevillano, & Catia Teixeira): The group developed and plans to test a motivated social cognition model of value application. We expect that individuals will construe people, objects, and events in terms of one applicable value rather than another as a function of cognitive factors such as fit and accessibility, but also in a way that facilitates preferred conclusions rather than non-preferred ones.

Effect of values on categorization tendency

(Arthi, Dina Dosmukhambetova, Tobias Raabe & Maria Stavraki): We developed and plan to test several innovative measures to test how specific values influence the way we categorise stimuli in our environment. We expect that individuals who are high in self-transcendence values, such as equality, will categorize stimuli in fewer categories than individuals who are high in self-enhancement. Results of this experiment could have important implications on social categorisation processes.

A truly international group of 12 students (mostly European, but also including some participants from Japan, Kazakhstan, Singapore and the United States) participated in our workshop. All of us really enjoyed the summer school and profited from the intensive work atmosphere. Research collaborations were built up, as well as foundations of friendships. For the goal of bringing together this group of different students from very different backgrounds, the

organizers - first of all, Prof. Russell Spears - provided us also with an interesting and funny social program (including trips to near-by sights, opening and farewell dinners etc.) which we really enjoyed. This was made possible during the summer school even though the weather (British rain and chill) and some of the organizational details were not perfect (e.g., short opening times of computer rooms, lack of warm water in the residences for some days).

Nevertheless, we hope that a lot of students will get the same chance of an interesting, stimulating and unforgettable workshop in the following years that we took advantage of in 2008. We wish to thank the EASP for providing us with this great opportunity.

The students of the Attitudes group
of the 14th EASP Summer School, Cardiff, Wales(UK)
(contact: Facebook group 'Attitudes! EASP Summer School 2008')

"Gender and Sexuality"
(Teachers: Peter Hegarty, Thomas Morton & Michelle Ryan)

The 2008 EA(E)SP summer school in Cardiff was the first to include a workshop specifically on "Gender and Sexuality". The breadth of this topic presented quite a challenge—both to the students and to the workshop teachers (Peter Hegarty, Thomas Morton, & Michelle Ryan). With a topic like that, where do you start? In addition to addressing more familiar social psychological topics such as prejudice, discrimination, and stigma, we focused the workshop specifically around *science*; how scientists are themselves social actors prone to the biases, stereotypes, and taken-for-granted assumptions about gender and sexuality that we (social psychologists) typically study among "lay people" but not among ourselves.

Inevitably our reflexive conversations about science scribbled outside the lines defined by the terms 'gender' and 'sexuality.' In getting reflexive about science, our goal was to understand how scientific practice is embedded within society and what social psychology could say about that. Our sessions on prejudice and stigma attempted to take the 'target's perspective' with a particular focus on the "double-binds" individuals from minority and devalued groups face when they express their identities to others. Our conversations on science similarly involved 'studying up' and applying critical tools for looking at practices that are too-often assumed to be the normative rational basis of our scholarship. As one student (Rim Saab) said in the final presentation, this was not an approach that was 'anti-science' but one that took seriously the scientist's responsibility to be humble about what our current epistemological tools can – and can not – do to represent people fairly and accurately.

During the first week we discussed five themes across the five days of the workshop: 1) The politics of studying gender and sexuality; 2) The relationship between science and society; 3) The role of context in (gendered) behaviour; 4) Prejudice and stereotyping, and; 5) Coping with stigma. Each day a group of three or four students would prepare the readings and lead discussion for the morning hours – at least theoretically. In practice, the discussions tended to drift very quickly in unexpected directions, conceptually going far beyond the readings for the respective day. Although most of these discussions started with some issues concerning gender or sexuality, we would soon dive into broader questions about psychology as a science and its repercussions on society. At the end of each day, we would try to synthesise the discussions into a smaller set of research questions that might be amenable to research investigation.

In the second week, the students broke up into groups and honed in on some of the research questions that emerged in the previous week, with the goal of developing hypotheses and research designs

that might address these questions. The projects that were developed ultimately reflected the workshop themes. One group examined the impact of revealing a stigmatized sexual identity during a scientific talk (Ivana Jogovic, Marie Marekwica, Sarah Martiny, Ingrid Wahl); a second looked at the appeal of evolutionary psychology explanations of gender differences (Marco Brambilla, Susanne Bruckmueller, Mercedes Duran, Ilina Natcheva); and the third looked at implications of different graphical representations of group differences (Caroline Blink, Joachim Hueffmeier, Rim Saab, Noa Schori).

The input from each of the workshop participants made the formal scientific content come alive. With students from Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Germany, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, and Spain, and instructors from Ireland and Australia (via the US and the UK) we often used each other to sound out hypotheses about what was cross-cultural and what was not. We had long discussions about whether or not benevolent sexism was a meaningful concept in all cultures, we learned that slang terms for gay men focused on anal sex in every language we could represent, and we found that John Gray's popular psychology book *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus* was perhaps the most commonly accessible text on the psychology of gender across the wide range of cultures represented. One of the most positive experiences of the workshop was the open atmosphere of discussion that developed, and the relationships that formed between the participants. As well as being productive, we had a lot of fun and shared (quite) a lot with each other! Hopefully the research projects and the relationships we developed at the summer school will continue into the future and across the different countries to which we have all returned.

Caroline Blink, Marco Brambilla, Susanne Bruckmueller, Mercedes Duran, Peter Hegarty, Joachim Hueffmeier, Ivana Jogovic, Marie Marekwica, Sarah Martiny, Thomas Morton, Ilina Natcheva, Michelle Ryan, Rim Saab, Noa Schor, Ingrid Wahl

"Intergroup Relations"
(Teachers: Thomas Kessler & Stéphanie Demoulin)

Intergroup Misunderstandings: the Applied Nature of our Workshop

One of the conceptual themes that motivated the intergroup relations section was the notion of intergroup misunderstanding. The role of group-based misunderstandings and misattributions – where no prejudice is intended although one party construes the behaviour as such – was the cause of a rather lengthy and passionate debate over definitions of prejudice, oppression and the easily resolved notion of free will. Wanting to emphasise how intergroup relations is one of the most applied fields in social psychology, our teachers cleverly primed intergroup misunderstanding by introducing the example of opening a door for a female. Needless to say that this example, among a mixed gender group, not only caused even more debate but also induced stereotype threat and intergroup anxiety in the workshop participants. Behavioural measures included a strong effect on time taken to get downstairs for coffee. With at least four sets of doors between the participants (us) and the coffee, members of our workshop spent a much longer time starring at each other and the door in a kind of stereotype threat standoff. This effect was moderated by "niceness" with those individuals who were particularly nice (pre-prime) overcompensating by slamming doors in the faces of both female and male colleagues.

Altruistic Punishment: It's for Your own Good!

Our group (Toon Kuppens, Miriam Rosa, & Joseph Sweetman) reflected on the possible links between altruistic punishment and authoritarianism (especially authoritarian aggression). The 'altruistic' in altruistic punishment immediately led to a heated debate about whether altruism exists and can be studied. Ensuring the survival of our subgroup, we defined altruism in behavioural

(instead of psychological) terms. Punishment can then be altruistic if it benefits others more than it benefits the punisher.

Altruistic punishment has often been studied in public goods games, but the altruistic nature of punishment is even clearer in the case of third-party punishment. Third-party punishment refers to situations in which a third party punishes someone else's behaviour in an economic exchange (e.g., a dictator game) by which the third party is not affected. This kind of punishment has been observed in laboratory experiments, although the amount of punishment is smaller than in the case where the punisher is directly affected by the exchange.

As altruistic punishment can not be explained by referring to individual costs and benefits it is often regarded as a group phenomenon aimed at ensuring within-group cooperation. Adding to this group processes explanation, Bernhard et al. (2006) found that when a third party was allowed to punish the dictator in a dictator game, the punishment was especially harsh when the receiver of the dictator's unfair offer was an ingroup member rather than an outgroup member (ingroup and outgroup were two small-scale societies).

The research proposal we developed was aimed at clarifying the mechanism or process that is responsible for altruistic punishment. As several authors (Kessler & Cohrs, 2008; Kreindler, 2005) have asserted that authoritarianism is an intragroup process related to the enforcing of group norms, we hypothesised that third-party punishment in an intragroup situation (an ingroup member making an unfair offer to another ingroup member) would be positively correlated with the third party's level of authoritarianism. While authoritarianism is hypothesised to be an *intragroup* process, several researchers think of Social Dominance Orientation as an *intergroup* process (Kreindler, 2005; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). This is why we predict that punishment will be related to SDO in an

intergroup context (an ingroup member making an unfair offer to an outgroup member or vice versa).

Bernhard, H., Fischbacher, U., & Fehr, E. (2006). Parochial altruism in humans. *Nature, 442*, 912-915.

Kessler, T. & Cohrs, J. C. (2008). The evolution of authoritarian processes: Fostering cooperation in large-scale groups. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 12*, 1, 73-84.

Kreindler, S. A. (2005). A dual group processes model of individual differences in prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9*(2), 90-107.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance. An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The meta-stereotype content model

The topic of our subgroup (Monika Miroslawska, Caterina Suitner, Elena Trifiletti, Keon West) was meta-stereotypes, particularly the fundamental dimensions of meta-stereotype content. The issue of meta-stereotypes became particularly relevant in our group as the members came from very different cultural backgrounds that affected the way we related to each other. Specifically, the Italians (Elena and Caterina) were keen to show their warm character by producing nice Italian dishes. Keon couldn't resist the black Jamaican meta-stereotype, wonderfully dancing all over the summer school. And Monika, our very blond group member has demonstrated that blond does not always mean stupid! This is how our meta-stereotypes pushed us to confirm or disconfirm what we thought the others were thinking of us. And meta-analysing our behaviours, we ended up with a model of meta-stereotype content predicting emotions and behaviours deriving from the endorsement of the ingroup meta-stereotype.

Specifically, the aim of our research project was to apply the Stereotype Content Model (SCM; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002) to meta-stereotypes. An ingroup meta-stereotype is an individual belief concerning the stereotype that outgroup members hold about one's own group (Vorauer, Main, & O'Connell, 1998). Vorauer et al. argued that such beliefs can have a significant impact on intergroup interactions, by affecting peoples' self-concept and their emotional and behavioural reactions to outgroup members. According to SCM, there are two fundamental dimensions of stereotype content - competence and warmth - originating from relative status and perceived interdependence (competitive vs. cooperative). Data collected on 20 culturally and geographically different samples showed that competence and warmth universally emerged as basic judgments (Cuddy et al., in press). The aim of our project is twofold. First, we will identify the core dimensions of meta-stereotypes by means of an exploratory approach; our prediction is that meta-stereotypes are defined by the competence and warmth dimensions proposed by SCM. Second, a model of emotional and behavioural consequences of meta-stereotype content will be proposed and tested experimentally.

Overcoming discrimination through superordinate inclusion Alejandra Alarcon-Henriquez, Siân Jones and Tuuli Anna Mähönen approached intergroup misunderstandings from a reconciliatory point of view: their aim was to find ways to make subordinate (low status) groups feel included again in a common superordinate group after discriminatory encounters.

More specifically, they were interested in finding out, with an experimental design, how a multicultural vs. colour-blind ideology adopted by the discriminating (high-status) group and the permeability of group boundaries as perceived by the victims (low-status group members) affect the extent of the victims' identification with the superordinate group. As colour-blindness is concerned with equality between individuals, it can be seen to

match with permeability. Conversely, as multiculturalism stresses equality between (diverse) groups, it can be seen to match with impermeable group boundaries. Thus, based on social identity theory and common conceptualizations of multicultural and colour-blind ideologies, it was predicted that after being discriminated against, feeling of inclusion is stronger when 1) group boundaries are permeable and the high-status group uses colour-blindness to invite the discriminated group members to cooperate, and when 2) group boundaries are impermeable and the high-status group uses multiculturalism to invite the discriminated group members to cooperate. If these hypotheses hold, the question of "which ideology is best for diversity management" seems to lose its meaningfulness: an ideology can have different impacts depending on the perceived permeability of group boundaries. Moreover, it could be suggested that multiculturalism should be applied primarily to groups with experiences of pervasive discrimination.

This group also discussed how this research paradigm could be used to explore further factors which may be associated with re-inclusion ideologies, including group status, trust, inter-group anger and group identification. The ways in which these hypotheses may be tested with real-life groups could also be investigated.

Diversity management

The study of intergroup relations may be best known for examining the negative aspects of diversity, e.g., stereotypes, prejudice, discrimination. During this summer school, we (Donna Ghezzi, Sarah Townsend, Job van der Schalk and Elanor Kamans), wanted to explore how diversity might be best managed to lead to positive outcomes. We propose that the effectiveness of specific diversity management strategies depends on the nature of the intergroup relations. In our proposed research, we compare two diversity management strategies: colour-blindness, the ideological perspective that group differences should be ignored; and colour-consciousness,

the ideological stance that group differences should be acknowledged. We further propose that the relative effectiveness of these strategies in inducing positive intergroup interactions is impacted by the level of competition versus cooperation between the groups. We index the positivity of the interaction by assessing individuals' evaluations of the outgroup and the interaction, as well as the extent to which the interaction partner is categorized as an ingroup or outgroup member.

Research wise, the summer school was very inspiring to us all. However, the summer school also provided a great opportunity to make friends with other young social psychologists from Europe and beyond. During the dinner on the last night, everyone from the intergroup relations workshop recreated the diversity image that we used in our presentation (several arms of multiple skin tones, forming a circle by grasping each other's wrists). As well as being a fun little thing to do, we also see it as a testament to Thomas and Stephanie's management of the academic and cultural diversity within our workshop.

"Self and Identity"
(Teachers: Aiden Gregg & Claire Hart)

Getting researchers from all over the world, all interested in social psychology in the broadest sense of the concept, together for an intensive 2-week research program, certainly results in inspiring, intellectual conversations and nice research ideas. Getting a bunch of young, enthusiastic folks from different cultures and countries, all out to meet new people and have a good time, together for 2 weeks in a rainy, Welsh city, certainly results in loads of funny moments, new found friendships and hilarious pictures! The EASP Summer School 2008 to me was an amazingly fun and valuable experience. Every social psychological PhD student is just bound to

have a great time. If not for the great scientific program, or for the fabulous people you're definitely going to meet, than certainly for the fact that you constantly feel like you're a participants in a social psychological study yourself! Groups get created, they compete with one another in a Very Important (T-shirt design) Contest becoming true rivals, but they eventually merge into one big group because of their shared identity.

'Summer' School 2008 rules!

Before I went to the EASP Summer School, everyone kept telling me how valuable it would be and how much I would enjoy myself. I have to admit that I was a complete cynic, and felt two weeks was a lot of time to give up for something unrelated to my own research. However, I am now a convert. It was an extremely intense two weeks, but it was lots of fun. I now have numerous new friends all over Europe and some potential new collaborators. To PhD students contemplating going to a future summer school, I would say it really is useful learning how to collaborate with people other than your supervisor, and you will inevitably benefit from the new links forged during these two weeks.

For many years, I had heard stories about the legendary EAESP summer schools and I have witnessed the close friendships that have developed through these experiences when people bump into each other at subsequent conferences and seminars. I had also heard many senior academics enthuse about the associated benefits of meeting other junior academics in my field, sharing my research interests and forming budding collaborative relationships. For all of these reasons I was overjoyed to be accepted to take part in the 2008 summer school in Cardiff. I have to say in the weeks prior to the commencement of summer school my excitement was somewhat overtaken with nervous anticipation, mainly at the thought of not knowing anybody and of completing the reading in time! To my relief, I found that the summer school was filled with people in the same position as me and that the environment was

warm and extremely welcoming. This made a fantastic environment to share research interests and because everybody could come together with their own insights and expertise, it also became the ideal environment to develop new research ideas. All the academic benefits I had anticipated came to fruition and whilst there was ample intellectual stimulation, it was perfectly punctuated by lots of good fun.

When spending two weeks in the summer school, consider choosing a workshop that is not immediately related to your own research area. Instead of diving deeper into your expertise, just as much, if not more, good research ideas and insights will present themselves when you work on a topic that is not central to your own research. Stepping back and taking a more general look at social psychological research will not only improve your general knowledge about the field, but highlight new points of interest, introduce you to relevant theoretical work you never had time to study and paradigms which might be useful in your own research.

This year's EA(E)SP Summer School in Cardiff was a very intense and valuable experience for me. On a professional level, I was especially fascinated by Aiden Gregg and Claire Hart's general overview of the theoretical and philosophical problems of the Self. On a nonprofessional level, it is perhaps most telling that I liked my fellow Summer Schoolers enough to open a Facebook account so that we could keep in touch. To elaborate on why this is telling: it wasn't until recently that I bought a mobile phone! Also noteworthy is the contagious PhD humour, the peculiar and for me incomprehensible Welsh language, me being surprised about other people's surprise of me not having a laptop, the "magic" surrounding the Self workshop and, above all, the fact that the organizers of the Summer School succeeded in pulling this off!

You need a new perspective or advice on your research, you want to discuss some research ideas, you want to explore new research topics or connect with people who have the same interests, then join a EAESP Summer School. The EAESP Summer School offers various opportunities and it's up to you to use them. What I took home, were a lot of enthusiasm, some new ideas, and a lot people that I can imagine to work with in the future.

The summer school was a great experience scientifically as well as socially. The workshop was a stimulating environment. I gained knowledge of various topics. The discussions were opportunity to share ideas with people from different scientific background. I think that good ideas emerge thanks to our diversity. It's enriching to have to incorporate new point of view in our usual way of thinking and conceptualizing. Thanks to the poster session I received feedbacks about my research that allow me to improve it. The different plenary talks gave rise to discussion about topics that were not directly related to our workshop. They were also good examples of how to present research in an interesting way. Social events were opportunities to share more than scientific ideas. The summer school was also a chance for cultural and personal exchange. We now all have some shared experience, and a great t-shirt to show this new membership…

The EASP Summer School was an opportunity for personal and professional development. It provided me with an opportunity to gain skills that will be valuable for an academic career. The most valuable experience I gained from the Summer School was the opportunity to collaborate with my peers on devising a research question and designing studies to answer it. Previously, my only experience of collaboration was with my supervisors where the issue of producing an independent, coherent and defensible thesis in a limited time period often overshadows the enjoyment of research and the effectiveness of the collaborative process. Working with my

peers, I quickly learnt the golden rule of a healthy collaborative relationship - a good idea is good regardless of the source (and contributing to improve someone else's idea is a valuable skill). Peer collaboration was a liberating, interesting and worthwhile experience.

The workshop also gave me a greater self-awareness i.e., knowledge of my own strengths and weaknesses. I have learnt that the skills I have gained from my own area, of health psychology, can be effectively transferred to unfamiliar areas of research, I have good time planning skills and I am willing to compromise. I found my overall knowledge of social psychology relatively weak: I lack an overview of the current trends in social psychology and a natural ability (or desire) to network. Although the workshop mainly provided the opportunity to gain skills I also gained knowledge of important issues in self and identity research and social psychology (e.g., motivational vs. cognitive explanations for psychological phenomena, veridical effect vs. artefacts of data collection methods) through group debates of a range of self and identity topics. The nurturing environment of the Summer School has given me greater confidence to network, to ask questions in talks and to discuss research issues with peers, my supervisor and other academics.

"Social Cognition"
(Teachers: Luigi Castelli & Wilhelm Hofmann)
Workshop sponsored by ESCON
Report from Participants

Looking back at the workshop we participated in, our memories combine into a warm and fuzzy collection of (social) cognitions. The warmth of our Cardiff memories has, however, little to do with the actual weather – by now the subject of endless jokes or t-shirt designs. Instead, it was fuelled by our daily encounters and exchanges that started during these two weeks and – for some of us – will probably continue.

Our first week together aimed at creating a common basis for the research projects we would later develop. We discussed three topics from social cognition research: self-regulation, information processing and indirect/implicit measures of attitudes. Each topic was introduced by one of our two teachers, to give us quick insights into the cutting edge of the research field. After each introduction, discussions would start and small groups would be formed, which would further debate each on a specific question and make research proposals that tried to answer these questions. To conclude, each group presented their brilliant research proposals and received input from the other participants at the workshop. Our teachers Luigi and Wilhelm attempted to regulate our passionate exchanges on some topics more than on others. However, we all seemed to show a complete lack of need for cognitive closure – which, in turn, facilitated our involvement into topics of research we were not necessarily familiar with before the summer school. As it turned out, some of the most creative and highest quality input can come from someone who is totally new to a field.

A boost to our creativity was the occasional lack of sleep due to Cardiff night life, which is not to be underestimated. For those of us who are not from the UK, the British way of trying to create a

balance between the amount of water (rain) outside of the body and the amount of water (beer) inside the body can be a bit overwhelming. To quote a cab driver: "It rains 350 days a year in Cardiff!" - so understandably, creating that equilibrium can be a daunting task. However, open to new cultures as most of us are, we quickly adjusted.

In our second week, we eventually searched for cognitive closure in Cardiff cafés (reminder: parks were wet and rainy) and set up three research projects, based on our previous discussions. One project, by Florian Kutzner, Gabriela Jiga-Boy, Monique Pollmann, and Susanne Quadflieg, was called *"Follow the white rabbit: What makes cues critical for implementation intentions"*. The aim of this project was to dive deeper into what gives accessibility advantage to critical over neutral cues, during the implementation of a goal. Another project, by Anne Gast, Laura Dannenberg, Laurent Waroquier, Maarten Bos, and Rui Soares Costa was called *"At the boundaries of the impulsive system: inferential processes at the associative level"*. This project looked at the possibility of negation at a very low level of cognition. The third project, by Caroline Leygue, Guillermo Byrd Willis, Kelly Danaher, VerBon Cheung, and Luca Andrighetto was called "*Implicit attitude formation can be influenced by goals*". In this project three experiments were designed to test whether individuals' relational goals could influence attitude formation at the implicit level.

These research projects were presented to all students, teachers, and organizers of the Summer School on the last day. With helpful comments from our colleagues and with endurance and the help of modern tools such as e-mail, some of the presented projects are still alive today.

So far in this report, the warmth of the days we spent at the summer school seems to have sparkled almost exclusively from work. Nothing could be farther from the truth, though. While

Cardiff Bay proved to be a sunny frame for coffee and ideas, various restaurants and (dancing) clubs reminded us that a day's work is worth much more after a warm beer. Or two. We were happy to find that having the status of Summer School teacher does not preclude someone from entering into all of the social activities the Summer School in general and Cardiff in particular have to offer.

To sum up, we had a great time, be it sun or rain (all right: be it rain). And regarding the fuzziness of our memories, we were actually joking: we thank the organizers for having set up such a great two-weeks' time work & play. We are thankful for this unique experience and recommend it to every PhD student. The connections we have made will for some of us last at least our entire academic career and hopefully even beyond that.

Maarten Bos
Gabriela Jiga-Boy

"Social Cognition"
(Teachers: Luigi Castelli & Wilhelm Hofmann)
Workshop sponsored by ESCON
Report from Teachers

The experience within the Summer School has been extraordinarily positive. In large part this was due to the enthusiasm, talent, generosity, and creativity of our students. Of course, they differed considerably in their background, interests, and their personality, yet each contributed substantially to the group efforts. Within a very friendly atmosphere, students have been freely discussing a variety of different issues and they were finally able to transform

these discussions into concrete and promising research projects. We have been impressed by their analytical reasoning, their creativity and cooperative spirit, and we believe that EASP and ESCON will see the fruits of their labor in some journal someday.

The selection process: The "Social Cognition" Workshop received the highest number of applications. Almost 60 PhD students indicated the Workshop as their first option, demonstrating the great interest for this topic. The selection process has been carried out by Prof. Arcuri and the two teachers by taking into accounts several different criteria: nationality, gender, quality of the curriculum as derived by the publications, letter of reference by the supervisor, and English proficiency. Unfortunately, several extremely talented students could not be admitted in the Workshop due to number limitations. Nine different countries were finally represented. The full list of students participating in the Workshop is provided in Appendix A. Importantly, all students had a very strong background in social cognition research but also quite diverse interests, ranging from social neuroscience and computational models to intergroup relations. This diversity has been a valuable resource.

The activities: Three major topics have been covered during the Workshop:

a) Implicit and explicit mental representations and their assessment

b) Implicit attitude formation, development, and change

c) Automatic and controlled processes in self-regulation

During the first two days, there has been an extensive presentation of recent models about implicit and explicit mental representations, like the RIM by Strack & Deutsch and the APE model by Gawronski & Bodenhausen. Students have widely discussed and challenged these models in a very analytical and constructive way.

A subgroup has also chosen this topic for the final project, trying to test the idea that negations can also be implemented at the level of the associative system. In addition, we presented an overview of the most common techniques aimed at tapping attitudes in an indirect way.

The following two days have been devoted to the analysis of the formation of implicit and explicit attitudes both among children and adults, discussing the processes that influence their development and change. A subgroup prepared the final project on this issue with the aim to investigate the role of goals in the formation of implicit attitudes.

The final day of the first week has been centered on the analysis of self-regulatory processes, discussing how an effective regulation of behavioral and emotional responses can be achieved thanks to controlled and automatic processes. A third subgroup within the Workshop has specifically developed a project on implementation intentions, attempting to test the idea that critical cues might be tagged with a "somatic marker".

The second week was primarily devoted to the discussion of the remaining critical issues raised during the first week and especially to the preparation of the final project. Thus the activities were mainly carried out within smaller groups formed by 4-5 students.

In sum, this experience in the Summer School has been extremely engaging and enriching both at the professional and personal level. We have been pleasantly surprised by the overall high quality of the students and by their incessant willingness to participate in the discussions in a very constructive way. There is little doubt that most of them will pursue an outstanding career. Perhaps most importantly, however, the bases for long-lasting relationships of friendship and collaborations have been shaped. Therefore, we

thank EAESP and ESCON for this opportunity, hoping that there will be a continual support for similar initiatives in the future.

Luigi Castelli & Wilhelm Hofmann

News about Members

In Memoriam: Gerard Duveen

Gerard Duveen died in Cambridge on 8 November 2008 at the age of 57. Gerard was Reader in Genetic Social Psychology in the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences of Cambridge University and a Fellow of Corpus Christi College. In late May, Gerard organised and hosted a Workshop on Social Representations, despite feeling a little unwell. Just weeks later he was diagnosed as suffering from advanced inoperable cancer. In mid-July on a bright sunny day in his College's gardens a large luncheon party was held for family, friends and colleagues from far and wide, including numerous social psychologists from throughout Europe. They came not only to honour Gerard but also to discreetly say their farewells. It was a remarkably moving and surprisingly pleasant occasion, in large part because Gerard was his usual friendly, positive, unflappable self, pleased to talk and listen to all who had come.

Gerard was born into a family that had suffered badly during the Holocaust. It was a politically engaged family and although his early activism subsided, he appeared to retain his left-wing sympathies throughout his life. His attachment to Cambridge and to his College, allied with his restrained manner and sense of privacy made him in some ways very English. But his intellectual interests and personal friendships as well as his strong connections to Paris, Vienna, Turin and elsewhere, led him to be described as 'a European….of no fixed abode'. Gerard was a more complex man than his easy going manner conveyed. He had firm networks of family, friends and colleagues but, until the last few months of his life, he maintained his privacy by keeping those different groups

separate. To some, he appeared to be a confirmed bachelor, but among the many who mourned his death was a grieving female partner. His interests and erudition extended far beyond psychology, into the social sciences, philosophy, education, literature, languages, politics, music and photography.

Gerard moved to Cambridge in 1989, initially in Education before moving to Social and Political Sciences, having completed his PhD at the University of Sussex, where, after short-term teaching and research posts elsewhere, he had returned as Research Fellow. Being scientifically inclined, he had originally started a first degree in chemistry but did not find that to his liking. In exploring alternatives, he read some Piaget and Vygotsky and opted for psychology. Their influences were to remain throughout his academic career, intertwined with that of Moscovici. Gerard's Piagetian research followed from the Genevan social psychologists who explored the impact on children's cognitive development of interaction with peers. One contribution of Gerard, his colleagues and students to both cognition and moral judgment was to combine ever more sophisticated experimental designs with ever more exact analyses of the interactions and dialogues between children, Building on his work at Sussex, with Barbara Lloyd, Gerard also became a key figure in the Social Representations network, through his writing, editing and translation. He even succeeded in persuading a publisher to finally produce last year an English language edition of Moscovici's 'La Psychoanalyse'.

Whether pursuing his interwoven interests in cognitive and moral development or social representations or gender identities or cultural knowledge, Gerard was a subtle, thoughtful, imaginative and clear thinker. He was a popular, if at times hesitant, lecturer. As a colleague, he was cooperative, supportive and quietly amusing and amused. Indeed it is hard not to imagine from Gerard a wry smile and mildly ironic 'Ah, well!' when he agreed that his progressive, Jewish, non-religious and unostentatious life would be

celebrated by a magnificent, choir-led, Anglican funeral service in the striking chapel of his beloved, if somewhat conservative, College. For me, some words from that service capture very succinctly the scholar who was Gerard Duveen: 'Happy is the one who meditates on wisdom and reasons intelligently, who reflects in his heart on her ways and ponders her secrets ……

Colin Fraser

'

In Memoriam: Michael Riketta

Michael Riketta, our dear friend and colleague, died on 4th November 2008 at the age of 37.

Michael was born 1971 in Ingolstadt, Germany. He first studied business and economics and received his first Masters degree in 1997 from the University of Augsburg. During his studies at Augsburg, he developed an interest in psychology which he focused on in his second studies at the University of Eichstätt. There, he completed his second Masters degree in psychology in 1999. At Eichstätt, Michael also had his first academic position as research associate at the Department of Economic and Social Psychology where he worked with Roland Wakenhut on several projects such as "Cultural identities in Italy". Michael then moved to Mannheim where he studied factors affecting the activation of self-concept relevant motives at the Department of Social Psychology. After completing his PhD in 2003, Michael worked as Assistant Professor at the Department of Social and Personality Psychology at the University of Tübingen. Finally, Michael moved to the United Kingdom where he was a lecturer in the Work & Organisational Psychology Group at Aston University in Birmingham.

Starting already during his years in Mannheim and Tübingen, Michael was doing research on the interface of the disciplines of social and organizational psychology. One of his most frequently cited papers on the relationship between organizational commitment and job performance was published in 2002 in the *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. This paper was probably the starting point for his increased interest in the nature and effects of people's attachment to social groups and he further explored this phenomenon with meta-analyses as well as original field studies and laboratory experiments. His research resulted in a number of publications in the very top journals of our field. Michael published in the *European Journal of Social Psychology*, the *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, and the *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. I am certain that these publications will have lasting effects on our discipline and will stand out both for the relevance of their topics and the rigor of investigation. Although already terminally ill, Michael continued his scientific work and was awarded his "second PhD" (i.e. the German Habilitation) in July 2008.

Personally, I got to know Michael in 2003. We worked together on several projects and as fellow guest editors of a special issue of the *Journal of Personnel Psychology* in 2006. Michael was a friendly and helpful colleague I could always rely on. The collaboration with him was always inspiring. Michael was a determined scholar, committed to a deeper understanding of the phenomena he was researching. I will miss him and his untimely death is a loss to all who have got to know him as colleague, friend and a nice human being. Michael died just as his work was flourishing, but through his papers and the people he worked with as friend, colleague, and teacher his influence will live on!

Rolf van Dick

New Members of the Association

The following applications for membership were approved by the Executive Committee at its meeting in April 2009. Names of members providing letters of support are in parentheses:

Full Membership

Dr. Theodore ALEXOPOULOS
Heidelberg, Germany
(K. Fiedler, F. Ric)

Dr. Luca ANDRIGHETTO
Milano, Italy
(D. Capozza, R. Spears)

Dr. Frank ASBROCK
Marburg, Germany
(U. Wagner, O. Christ)

Dr. Sabine BACKES
Zurich, Switzerland
(V. Brandstätter, K. Jonas)

Dr. Julia BECKER
Marburg, Germany
(R. van Dick, U. Wagner)

Dr. Laurent BEGUE
Grenoble, France
(F. Butera, D. Muller)

Dr. Annalisa CASINI

Bruxelles, Belgium
(X. Chryssochoou, F. Butera)

Dr. Sabina CEHAJIC
Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
(R. Brown, R. Spears)

Dr. Rui COSTA LOPES
Lisbon, Portugal
(M. Barreto, J. Vala)

Dr. Lysann DAMISCH
Cologne, Germany
(T. Mussweiler, K. Corcoran)

Dr. Marieke DE VRIES
Leiden, The Netherlands
(R. Holland, C. de Dreu)

Dr. Andrea ERNST-VINTILA
Marseille, France
(C. Badea, A. Neculau)

Dr. Jennifer FEHR
Tuebingen, Germany

(N. Hansen, K. Sassenberg)

Dr. Jochen GEBAUER
Southampton, UK
(C. Sedikides, G. Maio)

Dr. Lavinia GIANETTONI
Lausanne, Switzerland
(E. Green, C. Staerklé)

Dr. Anna GLUCHOWSKA
Lublin, Poland
(W. Blaszczak, M. Lewicka)

Dr. Anke GOERZIG
London, UK
(H. Bless. K. Quinn)

Dr. Verena GRAUPMANN
Salzburg, Austria
(P. Sparks, E. Jonas)

Dr. Atilla HÖFLING
Würzburg, Germany
(R. Deutsch, F. Strack)

Dr. Regina KRIEGLMEYER
Wuerzburg, Germany
(R. Deutsch, F. Strack)

Dr. Eva KRUMHUBER
Geneve, Switzerland
(T. Manstead, R. Spears)

Dr. Alessandro NENCINI
Verona, Italy
(A. Contarello, J. Laszlo)

Dr. Cécile NURRA
Chambery, France

(D. Muller, F. Butera)

Dr. Stefano PAGILARO
Chieti, Italy
(A. Mucchi-Faina, N. Ellemers)

Dr. Michal PARZUCHOWSKI
Sopot, Poland
(A. Szymkow-Sudziarska, B. Wojciszke)

Dr. Samuel PEHRSON
Limerick, Ireland
(R. Brown, V. Vignoles)

Dr. Monique POLLMANN
Tilburg, The Netherlands
(D. Stapel, C. Finkenauer)

Dr. Chiara STORARI
Lausanne, Switzerland
(E. Green, C. Staerklé)

Dr. Katherine STROEBE
Groningen, The Netherlands
(N. Ellemers, T. Postmes)

Dr. Claudia TOMA
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
(V. Yzerbyt, F. Butera)

Dr. Elena TRIFILETTI
Padova, Italy
(D. Capozza, R. Spears)

Dr. David VAIDIS
Nanterre, France
(P. Chekroun, J.-B. Légal)

Dr. Lotte VAN DILLEN
Utrecht, The Netherlands
(K. van den Bos, H. Aarts)

Dr. Marijke VAN PUTTEN
Leuven, Belgium
(M. Zeelenberg, E. van Dijk)

Dr. Frank WIEBER
Konstanz, Germany
(P. Gollwitzer, S. Giessner)

Dr. Karl-Andrew WOLTIN
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
(K. Sassenberg, A. Mummendey)

Affiliate Membership

Dr. Tamar SAGUY
New Haven, USA
(N. Tausch, M. van Zomeren)

Postgraduate Membership

Michèle Denise BIRTEL
Canterbury, UK
(R. Crisp, R. Giner-Sorolla)

Lottie BULLENS
Amsterdam, NL
(F. van Harreveld, J. Foerster)

Huseyin CAKAL
Oxford, UK
(C. Psaltis, M. Hewstone)

Frank DE WIT
Leiden, The Netherlands
(B. Derks, D. Scheepers)

Jonathan DEDONDER
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
(V. Yzerbyt. O. Corneille)

Marie-Pierre FAYANT
Grenoble, France
(F. Butera, D. Muller)

Ana FIGUEIREDO
Coimbra, Portgual
(S. Zebel, J. Valentim)

Jens-Hinrich HELLMANN
Bremen, Germany
(U. Kuehnen, G. Echterhoff)

Alex IGUNDUNASSE
Londonderry, UK
(N. Hopkins, F. Sani)

Kamil IMBIR
Warsaw, Poland
(M. Jarymowicz, D. Karwowska)

Kuba KRYS
Lodz, Poland
(H. Brycz, B. Wojciszke)

Timothée MAHIEU
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
(V. Yzerbyt, S. Demoulin)

Sylvain MAX
Grenoble, France
(C. Darnon, D. Muller)

Aurélie MERCY
Bruxelles, Belgium
(L. Licata, O. Klein)

Saar MOLLEN
Maastricht, The Netherlands
(G. Kok, A. Bos)

Alice NORMAND
Poitiers, France
(F. Ric, J.-C. Croizet)

Tomás PALMA
Lisbon, Portugal
(G. Semin, L. Garcia-Marques)

Andrea PAULUS
Saarbruecken, Germany
(J. Degner, D. Wentura)

Vincent PILLAUD
Lausanne, Switzerland
(F. Butera, M. Désert)

Sindhuja SANKARAN
Cardiff, UK
(G. Maio, U. von Hecker)

Iris SCHNEIDER
Amsterdam, NL
(J. van der Pligt, F. van Harreveld)

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

Niklas STEFFENS
Exeter, UK
(T. Kessler, A. Haslam)

Rose THOMPSON
Cardiff, UK
(G. Haddock, T. Manstead)

Jonathan TILQUIN
Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
(V. Yzerbyt, S. Demoulin)

Fanny VALLET
Chambéry, France
(D. Muller, E. Dépret)

Romy VAN DER LEE
Leiden, The Netherlands
(N. Ellemers, E. van Leeuwen)

Hazel Moira WARDROP
Canterbury, UK
(D. Abrams, R. Giner-Sorolla)

Grants

Julia Becker (travel grant)
Marco Brambilla (travel grant)
Eleanor Kamans (travel grant)
Regina Kriegelmeyer (travel grant)
Annemarie Loseman (travel grant)
Maya Machunsky (seedcorn grant)
Cécile Nurra (seedcorn grant)
Andrea Paulus (travel grant)
Kim Peters (travel grant)
David Vaidis (travel grant)

GRANT REPORTS

Belle Derks
(Leiden University, The Netherlands)
Travel Grant

Thanks to the postdoctoral travel grant I received from EAESP I was able to spent one month (September 2008) collaborating with Dr. Tiffany Ito at the University of Colorado at Boulder. In her work Dr. Ito integrates theories and methods from social neuroscience into the study of stereotyping and prejudice. My visit was aimed to learn more about social neuroscience methodology, to discuss some studies I did in this field and to set up a research collaboration on neurological correlates of social categorization and ingroup bias.

In the research I conducted for my dissertation, I examined how threats to social identity affect the motivation and performance of

members of socially devalued groups. More specifically, me and my collaborators examined how the negative effects of social identity threat on the performance of minority groups such as women and ethnic minorities could be alleviated (Derks, Van Laar, & Ellemers, 2006; 2007a; 2007b; in press). While conducting my dissertation research, I noticed how difficult it is to directly measure social identity threat and the processes leading up to it.

Social identity threat is hypothesized to be a negative state that leads to psychological and physiological stress responses (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). People experience social identity threat when comparisons between a group that they identify with and a reference group lead them to conclude that their group has low status. However, with self-report measures it has proven quite difficult to reliably measure how valuable people perceive their group to be and the social identity threat they experience as a result of this (Scheepers & Ellemers, 2005). This is because people who experience social identity threat are often motivated to reduce this threat, leading them to use self-report measures of group evaluations and negative emotions to bolster their social identity. As a result, sometimes those people who feel most threatened will report not being threatened at all. Moreover, it is unclear whether people are even aware of how they are affected by threatening cues in the environment. For these reasons, rather than examining the conscious evaluations that people make of their ingroup, I am currently conducting research in which I examine the effects of social identity threat on how people evaluate their ingroup *preconsciously*. By measuring brain activity (EEG/ERP) while people are under social identity threat, I aim to gain more insight into the precise preconscious mechanisms of social identity threat. This research is innovative in two respects: First, it introduces the idea of automaticity and preconscious processes into social identity theory. Second, it makes use of state-of-the-art psychophysiology measures borrowed from the field of social neuroscience.

In a first study, I examined directly how social identity threat affects the preconscious evaluation people have of their ingroup and a relevant outgroup (see Derks, Inzlicht & Kang, 2008, for details). I manipulated social identity threat among female students and then measured event-related brain potentials (ERPs) while participants evaluated pictures of women and men. Previous research by Tiffany Ito and her colleagues (2004) employed this same methodology to examine whether White people's racial bias against Blacks was measurable in their brain responses to pictures of Blacks and Whites. She measured the preconscious positive/negative attitudes towards ingroup and outgroup faces with the amplitude of a specific component of the ERP called the late-positive-potential (LPP). This component has been shown to vary with the degree to which a stimulus is evaluated differently from the context in which it is presented, thus reflecting automatic evaluation (Cacioppo et al., 1994). Ito and colleagues (2004) revealed that White participants showed higher LPPs to White faces than Black faces when these pictures were presented in a context of negatively valenced pictures.

In my own experiment, I borrowed this paradigm to examine whether people's preconscious evaluations of ingroup and outgroup targets are affected by contextual manipulations of social devaluation. Results from this first study indeed revealed that female participants automatically evaluated female faces as less positive after having been primed with negative stereotypes about their own gender group. This study hereby confirms my hypothesis that social identity threat negatively affects the preconscious evaluations that people have of their group. In future studies I plan to link this unconscious process to actual behavior, for example by examining whether these preconscious processes account for the negative effects of stereotype threat on performance.

Since Dr. Ito's ERP research on person perception and implicit evaluations was what inspired me to apply these methods to the field of social identity in the first place, it was very valuable to discuss this first study with her and discuss possibilities for future studies. During my stay we had many meetings in which we talked about methodological, theoretical

and analytical issues concerning the data I collected in Leiden. These meetings gave me the invaluable opportunity to improve my own knowledge of the theoretical and practical basis of social neuroscience research. Moreover, in the month I was in Boulder we set up a new line of studies that look at the link between threats to one's social identity (e.g., stereotype threat or social devaluation), automatic social categorization (with ERP-measures, see for example Ito & Urland, 2005) and implicit and explicit forms of ingroup bias (i.e., IAT-scores vs. self-reports). Previous work by Livingston (2002) has found that when members of socially devalued groups notice their group's devalued status they tend to show more positive evaluations of their ingroup on **explicit** measures, which could be interpreted as attempts to restore a threatened social identity. However, on **implicit** measures of ingroup favoritism they are negatively affected by group devaluation, leading to less positive evaluations of the ingroup compared to an outgroup. In the new project that we set up during my stay we plan to study whether automatic categorization processes (measured with ERP measures of social categorization) mediate the relationship between social identity threat and implicit/explicit ingroup bias. We hypothesize that social identity threatening cues in the environment lead people to *automatically* categorize others more in terms of their group membership and that this implicit and uncontrollable form of social categorization also leads people to implicitly attach lower value to their group (implicit ingroup evaluation) and explicitly restore the value of their group (explicit ingroup bias). Up till now social identity processes have mostly been conceptualized as processes of which people are aware and that are therefore in their control. By studying the neural correlates of social categorization and identity threat we aim to show that many of the processes that are set in motion when people feel discriminated or socially excluded are in fact implicit in nature and therefore outside of people's control.

Apart from the meetings and discussions I had with Tiffany, I also experienced the stimulating research environment of the CU Stereotyping and Prejudice Laboratory. During my visit I was able to present my

dissertation research and received stimulating comments and suggestions. I am very grateful to Tiffany Ito for the warm welcome she gave me in Boulder and for the motivating and inspiring discussions we had. I am looking forward to a fruitful and stimulating collaboration. I also want to thank the members of the CUSP lab for welcoming me at their meetings and the graduate students (especially Michaela Huber) for showing me around in Boulder.

I sincerely thank EAESP for making this trip possible.

****

Krispijn Faddegon
(Den Haag, The Netherlands)
travel grant

Activities engaged and results achieved
For six weeks I worked at the University of Pittsburgh together with Professor John Levine. Together we worked on new research ideas in the realm of Regulatory Focus and group processes. Also, John Levine invited me to accompany him on the annual SESP meeting in Chicago and I participated in a computer science work group and John Levine's own lab group at the University of Pittsburgh. The main result of our collaboration is the development of two new research ideas on regulatory focus in group contexts. We have precisely described these ideas (see appendix), and have discussed them with Tory Higgins (the founder of regulatory focus theory) via a conference call. We decided that the ideas were worth pursuing. The plan is that I will first collect data in Leiden, which will be followed by a study in Pittsburgh.

Appendix
All the ideas presented here are based directly or indirectly on observations and theory concerning the group-socialization model (Levine & Moreland, 1994). This model distinguishes 4 main role transitions a group member may go through:
1. entry (transition from prospective to new member) (person enters socialization phase)
2. acceptance (transition from new to full member) (person enters maintenance phase)
3. divergence (transition from full to marginal member) (person enters resocialization phase)
4. exit (transition from marginal to ex-member) (person enters remembrance phase)

A basic premise of the model is that these transitions only occur when the commitment of both the group and the individual reach their respective decision criteria (i.e., commitment levels signaling that a role transition should occur). In the case of entry and acceptance, commitment levels must *rise* to decision criteria. In the case of divergence and exit, commitment levels must *fall* to decision criteria. At any moment in time, the group's and the individual's commitment to one another depend on the past, present, and anticipated future rewards/costs of their relationship relative to the past, present, and anticipated future rewards/costs of alternative relationships. Based on this model, we developed several potential research ideas.

Research ideas
(1) Would the regulatory focus of a prospective member influence his/her relative attention to the benefits and costs of groups that he/she might join? For example, perhaps promotion-focused individuals pay special attention to the potential benefits of groups, whereas prevention-focused individuals pay special attention to the potential costs of groups. Of course, these same asymmetries might be involved in the other role transitions as well. Regarding the entry decision, this idea might be studied using scenario experiments

("imagine you are thinking about joining a group….") or with prospective members of real groups. Regulatory Fit studies could also be done by describing the group as using either eager or vigilant means for attaining its goals.

(2) A second idea concerns the behavior of a new group member after he or she joins a group. Evidence indicates that new group members are often expected to be anxious, reserved, dependent, and conforming. To the extent this is true, new members may show behaviors consistent with a prevention focus (i.e., don't make any mistakes and cause problems), whereas oldtimers (who feel more confident about their acceptance) may show behaviors consistent with a promotion focus. (Also, newcomers may shift over time from prevention to promotion as they become more confident in their acceptance.). On the other hand, as you mentioned on the telephone with John, the paper by Brodscholl, Kober, & Higgins (in press) indicates that goal attainment is associated with a promotion focus, while goal maintenance is associated with a prevention focus. In terms of newcomers and oldtimers, this would suggest that the former would show a promotion focus and the latter would show a prevention focus (assuming they felt somewhat insecure about maintaining their position). (Also, newcomers may shift over time from promotion to prevention as they become more confident in their acceptance.). These alternative hypotheses could be studied in lab experiments. Another possibility is that newcomers simply try to behave in the way they think the group would like (i.e., promotion behaviors in groups that seem promotion-oriented and prevention behaviors in groups that seem prevention-oriented). No doubt we could generate ideas about Regulatory Fit in this context as well.

****

Jochen Gebauer
(University of Southampton, UK)
travel grant

****

Natalie Hall
(University of Reading, UK)
seedcorn grant

An EA(E)SP seedcorn grant was provided to support pilot work investigating social comparison processes. The aim of the seedcorn grant was to address whether perceiver's make social comparisons in a different manner when they are evaluating themselves/evaluating an equivalent other versus an exemplar. It was predicted that perceiver's may be self-serving in the evaluations of themselves but would not be self-serving in their evaluations of an equivalent other.

Two pre-tests were carried out to identify appropriate moderate and extreme exemplars for both intelligence and athleticism. This pre-testing identified four exemplars for intelligence; moderate upward and downward exemplars and extreme upward and downward exemplars, and two extreme exemplars upward and downward for athleticism. These exemplars were used in the experiments that followed.

The first study investigated whether perceivers evaluated themselves and an equivalent other differently following exposure to *moderate* exemplars. According to the selective accessibility model moderate exemplars generally lead to assimilative judgements, with perceivers engaging in similarity testing between the standard to be evaluated and the target (Mussweiler, 2003). It was predicted that perceivers may wish to avoid processing their similarities to a downward target and so instead may chose to look for dissimilarities and hence contrast from the exemplar when evaluating the self and assimilate to an exemplar when evaluating an equivalent other.

These predictions were tested in a pilot study (N= 64). Participants were asked to complete a social-networking task (see Mussweiler &

Rüter, 2003). One part of this task asked participants to ascribe one member of their social-network who exemplified various traits. One of the items asked participants to name the social network member who is "as intelligent as you are". The name supplied here was used as the equivalent other in the other condition. Participants then completed two distracter tasks that took approximately 10 minutes. Participants were then asked to think about themselves/equivalent other (the social-network member rated as being of equal intelligence to the participant) in relation to either a moderately intelligent standard (Cherie Blair, Barrister and QC) or a moderately unintelligent standard (Paris Hilton, Socialite) on the basis of intelligence. Participants were given 1 minute to do this and then they were asked how many simple mathematical computations they/the equivalent other could do in one minute (see Mussweiler & Strack, 2000).

A 2(Target: Self vs. Equivalent other) x 2 (Exemplar: Upward vs. Downward) between subjects ANOVA on the number of simple sums people could perform in 1 minute revealed a main effect of target $F(1, 56)= 4.19$, $p= .046$, such that perceivers who evaluated themselves said they could complete less simple mathematical calculations than an equivalent other. There was also a main effect of exemplar $F(1, 56)= 5.99$, $p = .018$, such that those primed with the upward standard reported being able to complete more sums than those confronted with the downward standard. These results suggested that when the exemplars are moderately extreme that perceivers always assimilate their judgements regardless of whether they are judging themselves or an equivalent other.

The second study investigated whether perceivers evaluated themselves and an equivalent other differently following exposure to *extreme* exemplars. According to the selective accessibility model extreme exemplars generally lead to contrastive judgements, with perceivers engaging in dissimilarity testing between the standard to be evaluated and the target (Mussweiler, 2003). It was predicted

that perceivers may wish to avoid processing their differences to an upward target and so instead may look for similarities and hence assimilate towards the exemplar when evaluating the self and contrast from an exemplar when evaluating an equivalent other.

These predictions were tested in a second pilot study (N= 60). Participants were asked to complete a social-networking task (see Mussweiler & Rüter, 2003). As in study 1 the name of the social network member who was "as intelligent as…" the participant served as the equivalent other in the other condition. Participants then completed two distracter tasks that took approximately 10 minutes. The social comparison task then diverged dependent on condition. In the control condition, participants were asked to think about their own intelligence. All other participants were asked to make a comparison the comparison was either self and extreme upward standard, self and extreme downward standard, equivalent other and extreme upward standard, or equivalent other and extreme downward standard. The extreme upward standard for intelligence was Albert Einstein and the extreme downward standard for intelligence was David Beckham. All participants were given 1 minute to think about this and then they were asked how many simple mathematical computations they/the equivalent other could do in one minute (see Mussweiler & Strack, 2000) and how many Trivial pursuit questions they would get correct out of 10 (adapted from Dijksterhuis et al., 1998).

Social comparison results from the two items Sums and Trivial pursuit questions were converted to z-scores and then averaged together. A 5 Condition (Control vs. self upward, self downward, other upward, other downward) between subjects ANOVA revealed a main effect of condition $F(4, 55)= 4.32$, $p = .004$. Planned t-tests suggested that perceivers exposed to an upward standard contrasted their judgements when evaluating the self and assimilated their judgements of the equivalent other. There were no significant effects on the downward comparison exemplars.

These results suggested that when the exemplars are extreme that perceivers do differ in the way they make social comparisons about the self and an equivalent other, however, these differences were in the opposite direction to predictions. This may be due to the domain used, intelligence is something that our participants (psychology students) are receiving regular feedback on via their assessed work and so when evaluating themselves it may be that the self is very immutable with regard to this domain, whereas, an equivalent other is more mutable and the perceiver could bask in the reflected glory of their equivalent other (if they are a close friend). Follow up research is in progress to investigate these possibilities.

References

Dijksterhuis, A., Spears, R., Postmes, T., Stapel, D., Koomen, W., van Knippenberg, A., et al. (1998). Seeing one thing and doing another: Contrast effects in automatic behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75* (4), 862-871.

Mussweiler, T. (2003). 'Everything is relative': Comparison processes in social judgements. The 2002 Jaspers Lecture. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33,* 719-733.

Mussweiler, T., & Rüter, K. (2003). What are friends for!: The use of routine standards in social comparison. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*(3), 467-481.

Mussweiler, T., & Strack, F. (2000). The "relative self": Informational and judgmental consequences of comparative self-evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(1), 23-38.

****

Elanor Kamans
(University of Groningen, The Netherlands)
travel grant

In January 2009 I traveled to the University of Cardiff to work together with Russell Spears for a period of two months. About a year before, we had discovered that we shared an interest in understanding why groups that are in desperate and hopeless positions sometimes respond aggressively; the so called nothing to lose effect. Moreover, it turned out that several people at Cardiff University did work along similar lines as well. Therefore, I was really looking forward to work with Russell Spears ant to get the chance to meet other people in the department.

The aim of he visit.

Prior to my visit to Cardiff I conducted several studies on this topic as part of my PhD-thesis. The goals of my visit were to discuss the findings of these studies, and to proceed this line of research with Russell Spears. These goals were reached. First of all, being in an other surrounding encouraged my to use other methods of data analysis (SEM) that really contributed to the understanding of the processes involved (thank you Andrew Livingstone!). Second, our new insights made us realize that we had quite an interesting story already and we wrote a paper about it. Third, the discussions with Russell lead to the design of a follow up study, which I will run in the next month. Therefore, I could return to Groningen as a happy and satisfied person; certainly, this visit had not only met my positive experiences, but clearly exceeded them.

My experience

I am really glad that I got the opportunity to go abroad and work at an other University. I found it inspiring and motivating to work with somebody else for a while, and this experience turned me into a more independent researcher. Moreover, Cardiff University was a

nice, friendly and inspiring place to work, that offered me a lot of opportunities to present and discuss my work. On top of that, I got the chance to meet a lot of people working on the topics that I find fascinating.

Therefore I would like to thank…
- … EASP for making this visit financially possible
- … Russell Spears for having me and for all the nice discussions we had
- … the Spears & Manstead labgroup for giving me a warm welcome, scientific input and a really great time.
- … Sabine Otten and Ernestine Gordijn for letting me go and for encouraging me to do so.

****

Suzanne Oosterwijk
(University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)
Travel grant

From October till December 2008 I visited the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) to work with Professor Piotr Winkielman on the topic of emotion and embodiment. I am very thankful to the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology for the postgraduate travel grant that made this visit possible.

My visit to Piotr Winkielman's lab at UCSD was very fruitful and inspiring. I enjoyed the open atmosphere, the many interesting talks, and the focus on interdisciplinary research. During my stay I started a research project with Piotr Winkielman and two Dutch researchers that visited UCSD; Diane Pecher and René Zeelenberg.

All three researchers have contributed greatly to the literature on embodied cognition, and I consider myself very fortunate for the opportunity to work with them. Our project examined the embodiment of mental states such as thinking and remembering or feeling angry, happy, hungry or dizzy. According to theories of embodied cognition, knowledge about the world is represented through simulations of experience. In relation to abstract concepts about mental states, it has been suggested that experiences that normally accompany mental states, such as introspective feelings, expressive actions and bodily responses, are re-enacted when people understand conceptual references to these states. We examined the embodiment of a variety of mental states using a paradigm based on the property verification task. In this paradigm sentences were presented about emotional states (e.g. fear, embarrassment and pride), visceral states (e.g. hunger, dizziness) and mental operations (e.g. thinking, remembering). These sentences described these states focusing on introspective experiences (internal focus) or actions and expressions (external focus). Our results show that switching costs occur when participants shift between sentences with an internal and external focus, suggesting that different forms of simulation underlie the understanding of these sentences. In addition, these findings also imply that references to very different categories of mental states are grounded in a similar way. These findings have resulted in the preparation and submission of an empirical paper.

In addition to working in the lab, I took two classes by Piotr Winkielman and Professor Vilayanur Ramachandran. These classes were very lively and filled with long discussions between teachers and students about subjects varying from alien hand syndrome to emotion theory. In addition to an inspiring academic environment, San Diego offered much more. I learned how to surf, and I have to share the amazing feeling of getting up early in the morning to walk to the beach and "catch some waves". San Diego is a great city, with excellent food, fantastic beaches and amazing weather. I

feel very fortunate that I had the opportunity to visit California and experience all it has to offer.

****

Suzanne Pietersma
(University of Groningen, The Netherlands)
travel grant

My research visit offered me the opportunity to work with a leading expert in the field of self-threats and Terror Management Theory, Dr. Jamie Arndt.

Following on from my previous work on self-threats, in the context of health communications, I wanted to study the underlying cognitive associations that are sparked by a particular self-threat in the domain of health. And, how self-affirmation procedures influence these associations.

One theory that could provide interesting and stimulating new insights to this research question is Terror Management Theory. This theory explicitly focuses on possible cognitions underlying self-threats, namely death-related thoughts. Jamie Arndt is an expert in this field and has recently started applying his insights into the domain of health. Therefore I was delighted that I got the opportunity to visit him and discuss the outcomes of several studies I already performed on the role of death-related concerns in health threats. During my stay in the USA I was also able to brainstorm with Jamie Arndt and his research team about new research ideas.

On my arrival at the department I was invited to present the results of the studies I had already conducted at the weekly lab meeting of the research group on terror-management. This provided an excellent opportunity to receive feedback on my research. Because of the stimulating discussion that emerged it became clear that a follow-up study was needed to pull all research findings together. Although the findings of the studies clearly showed that self-affirmation lowers people's death-thoughts when confronted with a health threat, it was not totally clear what the underlying mechanism was (i.e., relaxed attitude or active suppression). We designed a follow-up study to determine the underlying process; we subliminally primed participants with a health threat, reasoning that people only engage in suppression when confronted with a conscious threat. Suppression is unnecessary when the threat is activated outside of conscious attention. Due to very efficient planning and great research facilities at MU I was able to run the experiment during my stay in the USA. The new study showed convincingly that self-affirmation enables participants to suppress death-related thoughts and consequently participants have a stronger intention to alter health habits.

Moreover, I was provided with the opportunity to give a talk about my other research lines at the meeting of the entire Social/Personality Research Area at MU. This provided an excellent

opportunity to receive feedback from other researchers at the Psychology department.

In closing I would like to thank all who contributed in various ways to the wonderful time I had in Columbia. I would like to thank Jamie Arndt for all the great discussions we had, Matt Vess and Cathy Cox for all their help, and of course the European Association of Experimental Psychology for making this visit possible.

****

Chiara Storari
(University of Lausanne)
travel grant

The EAESP travel grant allowed me to spend three weeks at the Division of Social and Organizational Psychology at the Catholic University of Louvain, Belgium, starting September the 19th. The main goal of my visit was to perform two experiments, related to different studies.

The first experiment was designed to complete an ongoing research project on infrahumanization, in collaboration with Professor Demoulin. The study investigated the relationship between infrahumanization (Leyens et al., 2001) and willingness to help in-group and out-group victims. A first study highlighted a moderated mediation on willingness to help victims: the more participants attributed uniquely human emotions to victims, the worse they felt, and the more they were willing to help. Still, this effect characterized the in-group's victims condition only. However, Cuddy, Rock, and Norton (2007) showed that attribution of uniquely human emotions to victims positively predicted willingness to volunteer in relief effort in the aftermath of

hurricane Katrina, but only in the out-group's victim condition. We designed a second study to better understand these processes. In our first study, we confronted participants with a multiple-victims scenario. Cuddy et al. (2007) considered a single-victim scenario. We conducted a second study, contrasting a single-victim scenario with a multi-victims one. We expected to reproduce Cuddy et al (2007) results in the one-victim condition and results of our first study in the multiple-victims condition. Preliminary results partially confirmed our hypothesis.

The second experiment was intended to complete a second ongoing international research program. The aim of the study was to investigate the implicit association of black people with great apes in different cultural settings (see Goff, Eberhardt, Williams, & Jackson, 2008). Preliminary results confirmed the implicit association of black people with great apes in Belgium.

I am very grateful to the Association for enabling my stay in Louvain. Without the postgraduate travel grant I would not have been able to complete these two projects. I am also grateful to Sibylle Classen for her patience and precious assistance.

References

Cuddy, A.J., Rock, M.S., & Norton, M.I. (2007). Aid in the aftermath of hurricane Katrina: Inferences of secondary emotions and intergroup helping. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *10*, 107-118.

Goff, P.A., Eberhardt, J.L., Williams, M.J., Jackson, M.C. (2008). Not yet human: Implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*, 292-306.

Leyens, J.-P., Paladino, M.-P., Rodriguez-Torres, R., Vaes, J., Demoulin, S., Rodriguez-Perez, A., & Gaunt, R. (2000). The

emotional side of prejudice: The attribution of secondary emotions to ingroups and outgroups. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*, 186-197.

****

Jeroen Stouten
(University of Leuven, Belgium)
Travel Grant

This postdoctoral travel grant allowed me to visit Washington State University. More specifically, my visit at WSU provided a good opportunity to stimulate ongoing research with prof. Tom Tripp.

Currently, my main research focuses on aspects of self-interested leadership, justice, and retribution. Prof. Tripp's research and interests highly correspond with these topics as his expertise lies in the areas of revenge and emotions (including justice and forgiveness). Because of these common interests we started our collaboration a few years ago. The main project we currently work on is based on research on how leaders' self-interested and destructive behavior affects group members with regard to emotional and retributive reactions as well as cooperation. Previous research demonstrated that especially leaders were prone to self-interested behavior even in situations in which subordinates needed a leader's guiding most. Follow-up research showed that subordinates seem tolerant to such self-interested leaders with regard to their emotions, retributive actions, and cooperation. This fascinating finding was the start of our mutual project.

During this visit we were able to draw a new series of studies which are currently being tested. Additionally, we have drafted a review paper on the topic of self-interested leadership and currently

are in the process of submitting this work. In all, this visit provided an excellent opportunity to work more closely on our mutual project. Moreover, it showed to be a tremendous stimulation for future research which wouldn't have been possible without the travel grant.

****

Cristina Zogmaister
(University of Milano Bicocca, Italy)
Seedcorn grant

**The IAT as a measure of implicit attitudes:
Are measured attitudes reactive to the IAT procedure?**

The postdoctoral seedcorn grant that I received from European Association of Experimental Social Psychology supported my research project, that aimed to investigate the Implicit Association Test (IAT, Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998). The IAT is one of the most interesting and widely used techniques for implicit attitude measurement. Despite considerable effort in understanding the mechanisms underlying the IAT effect, several critical aspects still need to be clarified in order to appreciate the meaning and limits of IAT measures.

In particular, I was interested in the reactivity of the IAT, namely the possibility that the administration of the IAT by itself might change the attitude being measured. Recent studies indicate that the critical blocks of the IAT may deplete the accessibility of the attitude through a process of interference (Klauer and Mierke, 2005), and produce a change in subsequent evaluations and

behavioral intentions toward an object (Perkins et al., 2005; Perkins, 2007).

With my research I aimed to expand this line of research by investigating whether the two initial learning blocks of the IAT could change the attitude being measured through a process of spreading attitude or sensory preconditioning (see for example Walther, 2002). Indeed, in the first learning block of IAT, in which the respondent is asked to classify two different target objects through two different keys, an association between each target and the corresponding key may form; in the second learning block, in which the respondent is asked to use the same keys to categorize valenced words, an association between each key and the corresponding valence may form; the acquired valence of each key may then be transferred to the object categorized through it in the first block of IAT.

The studies
Thanks to the seedcorn grant, I could conduct a series of three studies. Overall, 199 participants took part to the research (47 to the pretests; 152 to the experiments).

In these studies, the effects of the two learning blocks of IAT on implicit attitudes have been assessed through the Affect Misattribution Procedure (AMP, Payne, Cheng, Govorun, & Stewart, 2005) and the Go/No-Go Association Task (GNAT, Nosek & Banaji, 2001). Effects on explicit attitudes and open behavior were investigated as well.

Results
In the three studies no significant effect of the learning blocks on either AMP or GNAT indexes emerged; the observed effects were negligible and in one of the studies they were contrary to the

hypothesis. This strongly suggests that the initial learning blocks of IAT may have at best a very low influence on the implicit attitude being measured.

Further support to the conclusion that implicit and spontaneous reactions are not affected by the initial blocks of IAT comes from the observation that, consistently in the studies, no effect of the manipulation emerged on speeded measures of "gut" reactions to the stimuli.

An effect of the manipulation on the explicit measure of feeling thermometer was observed in one of the studies, but this effect was not replicated in the subsequent study, despite independent indications of predictive validity of the feeling thermometer.

Conclusion

The present research aimed to put light on the reactivity of the procedure, which could change the attitude being measured. In summary, these experiments suggest that the phenomenon of spreading evaluation is not an important cause of contamination of implicit attitudes in the IAT.

Bibliography

Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1464-1480.

Klauer, K.C., & Mierke, J. (2005). Task-set inertia, attitude accessibility, and compatibility-order effects: new evidence for a task-set switching account of the Implicit Association Test effect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 31, 208-217.

Nosek, B., & Banaji, M. (2001). The Go/No-Go Association Task. *Social Cognition, 19,* 625-666.

Payne, B.K., Cheng, C.M., Govorun, O., & Stewart, B.D. (2005). An inkblot for attitudes: affect misattribution as implicit measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 89,* 277–293

Perkins, A., Forehand, M., & Greenwald, A. (2005). Implicit self-referencing. The self-concept as a source of implicit attitude formation. *Unpublished working manuscript.*

Perkins, A. (July 2007). The self-concept as a source of implicit attitude formation. *Presentation at the Workshop on Implicit Attitude Change, Bertinoro, Italy.*

Walther, E. (2002). Guilty by mere association: evaluative conditioning and the spreading attitude effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82,* 919-34

Announcements

An Update:
The European Review of Social Psychology (ERSP)

<u>What's European About the European Review of Social Psychology?</u>
Readers of the *Bulletin* need no introduction to the *European Review of Social Psychology* (*ERSP*). It is now in its 20th year and has already become widely accepted as one of the major international series in social psychology. It occupies that position with the classic *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* and the more recent *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, but the *ERSP* alone has a distinctly European flavour.

We are European in our Editors, and the fact that we publish much of the very best of social psychology in Europe. This European emphasis is now enhanced thanks to the fact that *ERSP* is an official journal of the *European Association of Social Psychology*, along with its sister journal, the *European Journal of Social Psychology.* The *ERSP* publishes overviews of substantial research programmes, while the *EJSP* is mainly an outlet for primary research.

We emphasize, however, that the *European Review of Social Psychology* is an international review that publishes outstanding work of authors from all nations, rather than being restricted to Europeans.

<u>A New Form of Publishing</u>
Although readers of the *Bulletin* will be well acquainted with our familiar blue-bound annual volumes, they may not all appreciate

that we are at the forefront of a new publishing initiative. The *European Review* is an 'e-first journal', offering timely dissemination with negligible publication lag. Articles are published online very shortly after acceptance, typically within two months, and are then bound into an annual print volume at the end of the year.

The new e-first publishing model offers authors an opportunity to participate in a well-respected publication, while allowing readers the chance to see individual articles as soon as they are completed, without waiting for a whole volume or issue to be prepared.

<u>Why Your Institution Should Subscribe</u>
You might think that, because all members of the EASP (full members and affiliate members) receive the *ERSP*, it is not necessary for you to arrange an institutional subscription. This is not true! And by failing to ensure that your university subscribes you miss out on several important benefits:

(1) Subscribers immediately receive an email alerting them to each new article's publication, and *all users* at that institution are able to view and
print the article from links in the email. This is an excellent resource for graduate students.
(2) A subscription now entitles *all users* at that institution to view not only all the articles published in that year's volume, but all articles ever published in the journal, from Volumes 1 to 19!

For further information, please see the contact details at the bottom of this article.

<u>Citation Impact</u>
We are especially pleased to to emphasize that we have recently rectified a long-standing anomaly, and that the *European Review of Social Psychology* has been accepted for coverage in the all-

important **Social Science Citation Index (SSCI)**. Coverage started in 2007 and the journal should receive its first impact factor in the 2009 Journal Citation Report (published mid-2010).

As befits a journal of its long standing, *ERSP* is also abstracted or indexed by the following services: *Current Contents/Social and Behavioral Sciences (CC/S&BS); Journal Citation Reports/Social Sciences Edition; PsycINFO; Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI); Social Scisearch.*

If you all keep sending us your best work, and citing the great work we publish, we should be able to look forward to that first impact factor with confidence.

Thinking of Submitting to the *ERSP*?
We are always open to new submissions, and offer, we hope, an efficient, collegial and constructive review process.

There are three forms of manuscript submission. Many manuscripts are commissioned by the Editors, who invite contributions based on the author's recent publication of data in leading peer-reviewed journals that publish original empirical articles.

However, the Editors also very much welcome spontaneous submissions. With spontaneous submissions, authors can either submit the full manuscript or provide a ca. 5-page outline to check beforehand that the manuscript is likely to be suitable for the *European Review*. This outline should contain a full listing of their prior primary publications which will form the basis of the proposed submission.

Regardless of whether commissioned, spontaneously submitted, or invited based on outline, all manuscripts will be sent out to reviewers and the decision to accept or reject will be based on these reviews and the Editors' evaluations.

Consistent with our view that journals in the field tend to be over-edited and over-reviewed, we typically obtain two to three outside reviews of the first version of an article (relying heavily on our superb international Editorial Board), and handle the revision ourselves. We *never* go to a new reviewer for an article that has been revised in response to a first set of reviews.

All submissions and proposals should be made through the editorial office. Please note that authors should submit papers or proposals electronically to expedite the peer review process.

Please email your paper, saved in a WORD file (to allow direct editing on the manuscript) to Duncan.Nicholas@psypress.co.uk.

Please read the full instructions for authors at the journal's website:
www.psypress.com/ersp
or email:
journals@psypress.com.

Wolfgang Stroebe
Miles Hewstone

Deadlines for Contributions

Please make sure that applications for meetings and applications for membership are received by the Executive Officer by **September, 15th, 2009** latest. Applications for grants and for the International Teaching Fellowship Scheme can be received by the deadlines end of March, June, September, and December. The deadline for the next issue of the Bulletin is **September, 15th, 2009**.

The next Executive Committee Meeting will take place October 30th - November 1st 2009.

Executive Committee

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

Xenia Chryssochoou (Secretary), Department of Psychology, Panteion University, Syngrou Av. 136, Athens 176 71, Greece
e-mail: xeniachr@panteion.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@eaesp.org

web site of the EAESP:
http://www.eaesp.org