



SOCIETY OF AUSTRALASIAN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGISTS

NEWSLETTER

Newsletter Editors: Katie Greenaway & Tyler Okimoto

NOTES FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

LETTER FROM THE INCOMING PRESIDENT

Dear Colleagues,

It's a pleasure to report to you that SASP is humming along very well. First, a big congratulations to Lydia Hayward (UQ), Ryan McMullan (UWS), Helena Radke (UQ), Hanne Watkins (Uni Melb), and Hugh Webb (ANU), all of whom received a SASP scholarship to attend the EASP summer school in Lisbon this upcoming August. We had a large and excellent field of applicants this year, which certainly bodes well for the future of social psychology in Australasia. This summer school exchange is part of a great relationship that we have with EASP, and I'm delighted that our students get this opportunity (all the more reason to be jealous that I'm not young anymore). Along this line, we are making progress in establishing a similar reciprocal relationship with SPSP, as their enlightened president is very supportive, and the proposal is making it's way through their glacial committee process.

We are also beginning to take advantage of our strong relationship with SPSSI, and 2014/15 will see the establishment of a new small group conference jointly sponsored by our two societies. These conferences will meet alternatively in the US and Australasia, and one option (which we hope will be popular) will be to hold some of them as a pre-conference to SASP. Our goal is for the presentations at these small group meetings to be published in the *Journal of Social Issues* or as part of SPSSI's book series.

Finally, we are making progress with the new journal that would be a collaborative venture with EASP. Recall that the exciting feature of this new journal is that authors will pre-register their experimental design and data analysis plans prior to data collection, and manuscripts will be accepted or rejected based on the introduction and methods rather than results. The hope is that this journal will strengthen our science by removing some of the pressure that can lead to selective and misleading reporting of results. I've asked Craig McGarty to serve as our journals officer to help shepherd along this initiative, and he has kindly agreed to take on this role. If the proposal does go forward, we will probably want to consider making Craig's role part of the SASP executive. We hope to have more information for you on this initiative by the time we all meet at SASP in Canberra – with a little luck we'll be at the point where our membership can start making some decisions regarding the scope of our involvement.

I would like to note how fortunate I was to come into this role when great progress had already been made on all of these fronts, so a big thank you to the past and current SASP executive.

I look forward to seeing you all in April.

Bill von Hippel

SASP CONFERENCE

SASP CONFERENCE OVERVIEW

Contributed by Michael Platow



Dear SASP members, Happy New Year and a big hello from the conference organizing committee here in Canberra!

Firstly, we would like to apologise for some of the delays with getting information out regarding the details for this year's conference, as well as a few technical issues with the conference website (which have now been resolved). Given that, we would like to take this opportunity to clearly outline some conference details, as well as provide more information about your upcoming visit to Canberra!

Key dates and information:

1. Abstract submissions close on the 21st of February. Given the lateness of this current deadline, please note that there will be no further extensions for abstract submission beyond this date.
2. Early-bird Registration closes on Friday, the 28th of February.
3. Notification of abstract acceptance will be sent by Tuesday the 25th of February, in time for Early-Bird registrations.
4. The conference will be held at the Rydges Lakeside, Canberra. A number of rooms have been set aside for delegates, at the rate of \$175 per night for standard accommodation. Please quote "1404ANUAUS" when making your reservation.

[Additional Information about the conference and your visit to Canberra](#)

This year, the SASP annual conference will be held in the Nation's Capital, and as such, provides SASP members with the opportunity to experience a number of unique events.

Some highlights include a conference dinner in Old Parliament House, in the Members' Dining Room, after which there will be a guided tour of the Museum of Australian Democracy (which includes the former House of Representatives and Senate chambers). The organizing committee will also be putting together a social event calendar, which will cover some of the iconic places around Canberra, but also aim to provide members with a more intimate view of interesting and exciting local attractions and entertainment institutions in this city.

This year's keynote address will be delivered by the Race Discrimination Commissioner, Dr Tim Soutphommasane. He is an active advocate for multiculturalism and has been a driving force in combating racism in Australia. His work, therefore, is strongly related to much of our work in the areas of social influence, social change, and identity formation. We trust that his address will be of great interest to many of our members, and will hopefully generate some constructive conversations and debates between our research community and government officials.

The conference venue is located in the New Acton Precinct, which is a local cultural and dining hotspot. It hosts the award winning Nishi Art Gallery, which showcases art work from local emerging artists. The Precinct is also home to a number of acclaimed restaurants and cafes, such as Mocan and Green Grout, which was voted one of Australia's top 40 restaurants in 2013. A. Baker, which is a bakery/bar/restaurant, all rolled into one, was also voted one of the top 10 new restaurants of 2013 by Gourmet Traveller. For those keen to sample some local (and international) wines and spirits, Parlour Wine Room provides a laid-back yet sophisticated environment in which to do so. The Palace Electric Cinema, which is also located in the Precinct, provides viewers with a wide range of contemporary, as well as independent art house movies, and regularly

hosts themed movie festivals, such as the recent Greek Film Festival and Italian Movie Festival. For more information, check out the New Acton Precinct Facebook page https://www.facebook.com/NewActonPrecinct?ref=br_tf

Autumn is an especially beautiful season here in Canberra, with amazing colours all around. Given the timing of the conference, which is proximal to university and school holidays, it would be a great opportunity to visit our nation's capital, along with your family members.

All of us SASP members in Canberra look forward to welcoming you in April!

OTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE 2014 SASP CONFERENCE

Postgraduate Events

There will be a postgraduate workshop on the morning of April 10th, and a postgraduate dinner April 11th. More details will follow. For inquiries, contact Andrew Frain (andrew.frain@anu.edu.au)

Postgraduate Travel Awards

The Margaret Foddy Postgraduate Travel Awards provide financial assistance to postgraduates who wish to attend future SASP conferences. Information on how to apply can be found on the SASP website. Applications should be sent to Rebecca Pinkus at R.Pinkus@uws.edu.au no later than 21 February 2014.

The SASP Early Career Award

The SASP Early Career award will be awarded to an emerging scholar who has made an outstanding contribution to the field of social psychology in Australasia. To be eligible for this award, nominees should:

- Be a member of SASP
- Have completed their Ph.D. less than 5 years ago (adjusted for career interruptions).

Candidates can self-nominate or can be nominated by other SASP members. Candidates should send their CV, a cover letter outlining their research achievements, and two references to SASP president Bill von Hippel [billvh@psy.uq.edu.au] by 21 February, 2014. The winner of the award will be announced at the 2014 SASP conference in Canberra (10 – 12 April).

The winner of the award will be featured in a nationally circulated press release and will receive their 2014 SASP conference registration free of charge.

2ND ISPP/SASP PRE-CONFERENCE

We are pleased to announce a political psychology SASP pre-conference on the 9th of April, 2014. It will commence at 9.30 and end at 4.30 and the venue is Rydges Lakeside.

Political Psychology is a vibrant worldwide discipline that links political science and social psychology. It is focused on explaining politics and political behaviour through the lens of individual psychology and explores the interdependent relationships between the political climate and context and individual beliefs, motivations, behaviours. It is supported by a large international society and a well supported international meeting (International Society of Political Psychology).

Although Political Psychology has been researched in Australasia for many years it has never formally been organised. There is much work and expertise in Australia and New Zealand on topics such as social and behavioural change, mobilization and collective action, voting attitudes, motivation and behaviour, causes and implications of political attitudes with respect to prejudice, migration and climate change, and leadership.

Confirmed speakers include *Martha Augoustinos*, University of Adelaide (Climate change narratives during the Rudd/Gillard Government), *Andrew Markus*, Monash University (Australian political attitudes to immigration and political diversity), *Winnifred Louis*, University of Queensland (Activism and political behaviour) and *Kate*

Barelle, Monash University (Disengagement from violent extremism).

There will be a \$20.00 costs to assist with covering the venue and lunch. Registration and payment will be via the SASP 2014 conference website.

For further details, contact Katherine Reynolds: Katherine.Reynolds@anu.edu.au

**INVITATION TO SUBMIT
PROPOSALS FOR A NEW SPSSI-SASP
SMALL GROUP CONFERENCE SERIES**

Dear Colleagues,

Proposals/Letters of Interest are invited by February/August 2014 for the inaugural meetings of a new small group conference series jointly sponsored by the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) and the Society of Australasian Social Psychologists (SASP).

A total of \$7,000 in support is available for each meeting as part of a collaboration between SPSSI and SASP. The purpose of the collaboration is to strengthen links between the two organizations so that members of each may have opportunities to discuss research questions of mutual interest. This new series is modelled after the successful SPSSI-EASP small group conference series.

SPSSI and SASP wish to hold the first small group conference in 2014 in either the Eastern Pacific (anywhere in the United States) or Western Pacific (anywhere in Australia, New Zealand or another East Asian location) and to hold the 2015 meeting in the alternative location.

Those interested in submitting a proposal for a 2015 meeting have the option of planning the small group meeting as a pre-conference event prior to the SASP Annual Meeting in Newcastle, NSW, Australia, but this is not required

Deadline for Proposals:

2015 Small Group Conference: August 1, 2014 with an October 1, 2014 decision

Conference Proposal Guidelines:

In most cases:

- This program will support one meeting a year.
- Conference themes will be related to social issues and have international relevance (i.e., not focused on intra-national issues).
- At least 80% of persons attending the conference will be members of one or both organizations
- Representation from the two societies will be balanced: with no more than two-thirds of the participants being members of one of the organizations.
- Each conference will have two (or more) organizers; at least one will be a member of SPSSI and one a member of SASP. Preferably one organizer will be located in Australasia and the other in North America.
- Conference organizers are encouraged to facilitate publication of material on the conference topic through the [Journal of Social Issues](#) or SPSSI's [book series](#).

QUESTIONS:

This new series will parallel the already-established SPSSI-EASP Small Group Series. Please see the SPSSI website for additional details:

<http://www.spssi.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=page.viewPage&pageID=970&nodeID=1>

Those interested in submitting a proposal are strongly encouraged to send a short email with an Expression of Interest to David Livert livert@psu.edu and Stefania Paolini stefania.paolini@newcastle.edu.au so that we can answer any questions and provide assistance in developing your proposal.

SASP SUMMER SCHOOL

Students met at the 2014 Australasian Summer School in Social Psychology February 3-9 in the Blue Mountains. They participated in one of three workshops:

Stream 1: Social identity formation and social action

Teachers: Dr Emma Thomas & Dr Andrew Livingstone

Stream 2: What are the costs and benefits of taking experimental and mundane realism seriously in social psychological research?

Teachers: Associate Professor Blake McKimmie & Professor Kip Williams

Stream 3: Motivation, Emotion, and Human Neuroscience

Teachers: Professor Jon Maner, Professor Eddie Harmon-Jones, & Dr Cindy Harmon Jones

Many thanks to Associate Professor Tom Denson from UNSW for organising the 2014 Summer School!

SASP Summer School Abstracts

Here is a selection of projects devised by students at the 2014 Summer School:

Disgusting, Scary, or Creepy? An Argument for Differentiation

Khandis Blake, Billy Sung, Jennifer Yih, & Kun Zhao, acknowledgements to Cindy Harmon-Jones for the original idea of this project and her guidance in preliminary data collection.

Is there a distinct emotion for “The Heebie Jeebies”, an aversive response to tactile-relevant stimuli that prevents harmful objects/organisms penetrating the skin? We propose two studies examining whether “The Heebie Jeebies” can be distinguished from disgust and fear on subjective experience, emotional expression, physiological reactivity, behaviour, ambiguity/uncertainty appraisals, and approach/avoidance.

Ostracism hurts. Can stigmas be protective?

Laura Ferris (Uni of Queensland), Nita Smith (Uni of Queensland), & Hanne Watkins (Uni of Melbourne)

Ostracism hurts – but coping might be easier if you don’t take it personally. Our project examines whether recovery from ostracism is stronger when people can attribute ostracism to an external stigma. We predict people will bounce back better even if the stigma is negative, and especially if the stigma is inherently positive.



The role of target posture in emotion perception by an observer

James Cox (Uni of Missouri-St. Louis); Rosemaree Miller (Uni of Newcastle); Eric Sun (Uni of New South Wales); Amy Datyner (Uni of New South Wales); Morgan Tear (Uni of Queensland)

Our project seeks to evaluate the relative usefulness of using postural information (leaning forward vs. leaning back) in interpreting emotional and goal-directed behavior. We will display facial and bodily stimuli that conflicts in terms of motivational information, for example, a high-approach facial expression (anger) paired with low-approach body posture (leaning back), and then measure accuracy in emotion perception.

The impact of emotional evidence on mock juror decision-making

Tamara Butler (Uni of Queensland); Anna Genat (Uni of Melbourne); Ryan McMullan (Uni of Western Sydney)

We aim to investigate how emotion-laden evidence (ELE; eg, a 000 phone call) influences mock juror decision making. Specifically, ELE may be weighted over other evidence (Study 1), or ELE may produce heuristic processing which leads to reliance on stereotypical information to guide decision-making (Study 2).

Approach motivation and mate selection

Alexandra Hall (Uni of Queensland), Yixin Jiang (Uni of Sydney), Anthony Lee (Uni of Queensland), Nicholas Levy (Uni of New South Wales), and Michelle Stratemeyer (Uni of Melbourne)

Our project investigates the effect of manipulating state approach motivation on mate selection. Across two studies, we examine the effects of leaning forward (high approach) compared with supine posture (low approach) on prioritising reproductive fitness cues (i.e., physical attractiveness) over non-physical attributes, as measured using mate-dollar and dating profile selection paradigms.

Ostracism and obesity: When do we choose to ostracise stigmatised outgroup members?

Lydia Hayward (Uni of Queensland), Pete Techakesari (Uni of Queensland), Jasmine Fardouly (Uni of New South Wales), Tanya Machin (Uni of Southern Queensland)

We present the first examination of the conditions under which people will ostracise stigmatised outgroup members. Using the online ball-tossing paradigm, Cyberball, we hypothesise that participants will ostracise obese players when they can attribute their behaviour to alternate causes (for example, when the player is a burden to the group).

Sluts', 'Pirates', and 'Geeks': Reappropriation of Stigmatizing Labels

Vlad Iouchkov (Uni of Western Sydney), Madeline Judge (Victoria Uni of Wellington), Kanishka Karunaratne (Uni of Melbourne), Annamaria Klas (Deakin Uni), Morgana Lizzio-Wilson (Uni of Queensland)

We are interested in examining the reappropriation of stigmatizing labels as an identity management strategy. We want to determine what individual benefits this strategy has for mitigating identity threats, and whether it is a combination of social creativity and social competition identity management strategies.

Internalizing Imposed Identities: When do we become who you say we are?

Zoe C. Walter (Uni of Queensland), Helena Radke (Uni of Queensland), Jim A.C. Everett (Uni of Oxford), & Piyarat Thampitak (Srinakharinwirot Uni)

We aim to explore the effects of imposing a devalued categorisation that differs from how an individual self-categorizes and how this may impact emotional and identity responses. In particular, we examine how power shapes the *formation* of identities: how does power affect whether people internalize or reject an imposed identity?

When groups merge, should they use a bottom-up or top-down approach to create their new shared identity?



Arin Ayanian (Uni of St Andrews), Eileen Chu (Uni of Sydney), Maja Kutlaca (Uni of Gronigen), Malgorzata (Gosia) Mikolajczak (Uni of Warsaw), Hanzhang (Corie) Lin (Australian National Uni), & Alexander Saeri (Uni of Queensland)

This research investigates top-down, conformity-focused (“deductive”) and bottom-up, negotiation-focused (“inductive”) routes to group identity formation for existing groups. We use computer-mediated interactions to explore the differences in outcomes (e.g., cohesiveness, performance), process, and identity content when two existing groups conform to vs. negotiate a new shared identity.

Cross-categories and conflicting stereotypes in the courtroom.

Joel Anderson (Australian Catholic Uni), Michael Thai (Uni of Queensland), & Thekla Morgenroth (Uni of Exeter)

We are interested in the role of stereotypes in influencing juror verdict decisions. We intend to explore how conflicting defendant gender and stereotypes interact. Moreover, we wish to consider the stereotypes associated with the crime (i.e., murder=masculine), and how this qualifies the already conflicting stereotypes associated with the defendant.

FEATURE ARTICLE

Is greater transparency THE way to resolve the crisis in social psychology?

Contributed by Jolanda Jetten

Katie Greenaway and Tyler Okimoto asked me to comment on the recent changes to submission rules that some of the journals in the field have introduced in an attempt to enhance the “dependability of research in personality and social psychology” (see for example Funder et al. 2014). For instance if

you now want to submit a paper to PSPB you need to “submit in a separate file stimulus materials, including the verbatim wording (translated if necessary) of all independent and dependent variable instructions, manipulations, and measures. If the article is published, this appendix will be made available on-line.” Psychological Science has also made a number of changes to its submission rules requiring authors to give a more complete account of their methods, measures and results. To allow for that, they have largely lifted the word limit for Methods and Results sections (not for the Introduction and Discussions).

The question is whether these changes help us to tackle the current crisis in social psychology. Personally, I’m all in favour of greater transparency. However, I am not convinced changes like these will do all that much to help us to better assess the value of social psychological research findings.

Starting with my first point, there is of course a lot to be said in favour of greater transparency. Data and findings are never perfect and it might be good for people to be aware of this whenever they read a paper. It is important to be explicit about everything that was measured but ‘didn’t work’. For example, it is important that we acknowledge that it is a problem when effects are only found on one measure and not on other related measures. It is good that we are now explicitly asked and encouraged to talk openly about this in our papers and that we are no longer allowed (and at times even encouraged by reviewers and editors) to cherry pick and sweep any untidiness in our findings under the carpet. One issue that remains however is whether, as reviewers and readers, we are able to accept the inherent messiness of results when we move to an era where all findings are reported (including those that are not all that strong or interesting). Or are we so set in our ways that we will not be able to appreciate a data set that is not perfect? I hope the former and not the latter will be the case and that authors will feel their transparency will be rewarded and not punished.

There are broader issues to consider though and one of them is how these changes affect

the reviewer role and the relationship between authors and reviewers. A reviewer for PSPB or Psychological Science now not only has to judge the merit of the research, they are also asked to evaluate the research practices of the authors and the decisions they made along the way. Whereas it used to be the researcher and the research team that made these decisions, reviewers are now asked to double check these decisions (e.g., Is it indeed legitimate to drop outliers? Are the researchers allowed to drop an item to enhance the reliability of the scale? Is the key measure the authors focus on the right dependent variable or should the effect have been obtained on other measures too?).

Personally, I don't want to be put in this position as a reviewer. I would like to continue to *trust* that researchers have sound reasons to justify the decisions they made along the way, that authors are not hiding anything that might be important to understand their findings and that my role as a reviewer is to judge the contribution of the research to the field and not the integrity of the researchers. At best, full transparency will expose the 'real' strength of the findings; at worse, it will lead to a never-ending debate whether the decisions that researchers made along the way are the right ones (which has the potential to, rightly or wrongly, tarnish researchers' reputation).

Aside from this, and perhaps much more importantly, as a reviewer (and also as a past editor for BJSP), I'm happy to not have details on all measures and all procedures because, in my experience, my recommendation or decision whether a paper should be published hardly ever depends on issues relating to data reporting and data analysis. Indeed, it is often the quality and strength of *the idea* and not necessarily the quality and strength of the *evidence* for an idea, that determines (and should determine) whether a paper gets published. And this gets to the heart of what I'm most concerned about when I see the type of changes to submission requirements. The changes that are proposed all deal with the question of how to restore our confidence in findings, but they do little to deal with the question of how we can enhance our confidence in the ideas that led to the

findings. After all, data and findings are only of value to the extent that they test good ideas or solid theories (see Tajfel, 1972). Because findings are only as good as the theory behind them, findings (or transparency about them) can never provide any confidence that we are doing good research. It seems that we are intervening at the wrong end of the research process: we are trying to restore our faith and trust in the quality of our research by asking researchers to provide more details on procedures, measures and manipulations without demanding the same type of closer scrutiny on what these data really aim to show (see Haslam & McGarty, 2001). This is apparent from the new Psychological Science submission rules. Authors are now allowed more space for the method and results sections but they are not given more space to talk about the theory that is driving the analysis or to discuss the implications of these findings. This is hardly going to help to develop theorising or to meet the growing demand to 'connect the dots' (Ellemers 2013).

Indeed, it strikes me that by focusing solely on transparency, data reporting, and by focusing on the level of detail of data and procedure we need to have as readers, an opportunity is missed to address more important issues. If we want to be taken seriously by other researchers, funding bodies, policy makers and the public more generally, we need to reflect more on questions such as: Are the questions we are addressing worth asking? Are the outcomes we are measuring of interest to anyone other than a handful of academics in the field? Are we developing theorising that can explain something that is of value (applied or theoretical)? I worry about the answer to all those questions and am just as concerned about "false findings" as I am about "false theorising", trivial findings (findings that do not speak to issues that matter) or flimsy theorising (theories that do not address issues that matter). If we don't tackle these broader issues, then, ultimately, it doesn't really matter in what shape or form we want researchers to analyse, report or submit their data. To regain confidence in the value of social psychological research, in addition to transparency, I would therefore welcome greater discussion and reflection on the quality of our ideas and theories.

MEMBER NEWS

Some Recent Publications

- Augoustinos, M., Walker, I., & Donaghue, N. (2014, in press). *Social cognition: An integrated introduction (3rd ed.)*. London: Sage.
- Carlson, J. M., Cha, J., Harmon-Jones, E., Mujica-Parodi, L. R., & Hajcak, G. (in press). Influence of the BDNF genotype on amygdalo-prefrontal white matter microstructure is linked to nonconscious attention bias to threat. *Cerebral Cortex*.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bht089>
- Harmon-Jones, E., & Harmon-Jones, C. (2014). Affective neuroscience. In E. Diener & R. Biswas-Diener (Eds.), *Noba textbook series: Psychology*. Champaign, IL: DEF Publishers. DOI:
<http://nobaproject.com/chapters/affective-neuroscience>
- Schutter, D. J. L. G., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2013). The corpus callosum: A commissural road to anger and aggression. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 37, 2481-2488.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.07.013>
- Gable, P. A., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2013). Trait behavioral approach sensitivity (BAS) relates to early (< 150 ms) electrocortical responses to appetitive stimuli. *Social Cognitive Affective Neuroscience*, 8, 795-798.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/scan/nss072>
- Price, T. F., Hortensius, R., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2013). Neural and behavioral associations of manipulated determination facial expressions. *Biological Psychology*, 94, 221-227.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2013.06.001>
- Harmon-Jones, E., Gable, P. A., & Price, T. F. (2013). Does negative affect always narrow and positive affect always broaden the mind? Considering the influence of motivational intensity on cognitive scope. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 22, 301-307.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721413481353>
- Tang, D., Kelley, N. J., Hicks, J. A., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2013). Emotions and meaning in life: A motivational perspective. In Hicks, J. A. & Routledge, C. (Eds.), *The experience of meaning in life: Classical perspectives, emerging themes, and controversies*, pp. 117-128. New York: Springer Press.
<http://www.springer.com/psychology/book/978-94-007-6526-9>
- Eder, A. B., Elliot, A. J., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2013). Approach and avoidance motivation: Issues and advances. *Emotion Review*, 5, 227-229.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1754073913477990>
- Elliot, A. J., Eder, A. B., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2013). Approach-avoidance motivation and emotion: Convergence and divergence. *Emotion Review*, 5, 308-311.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1754073913477517>.
- Harmon-Jones, E., Harmon-Jones, C., & Price, T. F. (2013). What is approach motivation? *Emotion Review*, 5, 291-295.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1754073913477509>
- *Kalokerinos, E.K., Greenaway, K.H., Pedder, D.J., & Margetts, E. (in press). Don't grin when you win: The social benefits of emotion suppression in performance situations. Accepted to *Emotion* on August 14, 2013.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0034442>
- *This research was funded by a SASP research grant of \$500 for research conceived at the 2012 SASP Summer School.
- Rubin, M., Badaea, C., & Jetten, J. (2014). Low status groups show in-group favoritism to compensate for their low status and to compete for higher status. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1368430213514122> (For a summary, please see: <http://bit.ly/JQDuWw>)
- Guy, S., Kashima, Y., Walker, I., & O'Neill, S. (in press). Comparing the atmosphere to a bathtub: Effectiveness of analogy for

reasoning about accumulation. *Climatic Change*.

Dreyer, S., & Walker, I. (2013). Acceptance and support of the Australian carbon policy. *Social Justice Research*, 26, 343–362. DOI: 10.1007/s11211-013-0191-1

Greenhill, M., Leviston, Z., Leonard, R., & Walker, I. (2013). Assessing climate change beliefs: Response effects of question wording and response alternatives. *Public Understanding of Science*. DOI: 10.1177/0963662513480117

Leviston, Z., Walker, I., & Morwinski, S. (2013). Your opinion on climate change might not be as common as you think. *Nature Climate Change*, 3(4), 334-337. doi:10.1038/nclimate1743.

Price, J. A., Walker, I., & Boschetti, F. (2014). Measuring cultural values and beliefs about environment to identify their role in climate change responses. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 37, 8-20.

Comings and Goings

Dr Brock Bastian is leaving the School of Psychology at the University of Queensland to take up a position at the School of Psychology, University of New South Wales.

Dr Baljinder Sahdra is leaving the School of Social Sciences and Psychology at the University of Western Sydney to take up a position in the new Institute for Positive Psychology and Education at the Australian Catholic University's Strathfield campus.

Graduating Postgrads

Avelie Stuart, Thesis title: “Being active, but not an activist: Managing problematic aspects of activist identity by expressing individuality, or taking alternative forms of collective action”. Contact: a.stuart@exeter.ac.uk. Future plans: Post-doctoral research fellowship at the University of Exeter, working with Prof. Mark Levine, investigating group privacy dynamics in ubiquitous technology.

Submit your news items to the next newsletter! Email any news between April and August 2014 to: t.okimoto@uq.edu.au News may include any of the following items:

- **Publications**, in print (or online early view) + DOI
- **New Grants, Awards, or Fellowships** since Jan 2014
- **Comings/Goings**: recent relocations or new appointments
- **Personals** (e.g., seeking postdoc, special issues call, conference announcements)
- **Graduating Postgrads**: name, dissertation title, email/contact/weblink, future plans (one